4 in William Blake's universe, a mathematical and philosophical expression of perfection and completeness in an age where the mysticism of number 3 was the ultimate ruler to describe life, completeness and perfection.

Keywords
Blake, cosmogony, Pythagoreans, numerology, Trinity, Urizen, Milton, Ahania, Los, Fuzon, Zoa, Tetractys, JHWH, Augustine

Rezümé

William Blake az angol irodalom egyik legnagyobb hatású szerzője. Sajátos világ-képével mind a mai napig formálja az irodalmi köztudatot, és ebben a világképben központi helyet foglal el számmisztikája és a világmindenséget leíró négyes látás-módja. A számok Blake-nél fontos jelentéssel bírnak, kozmológiai látásmódjában és az önmaga által teremtett univerzumban nem csupán szimbólumként, de sajátos rendező elvként működnek.

A tanulmány célja, hogy bemutassa Blake számmisztikájának legfontosabb ele-meit és rávilágítson azokra az analógiákra, amelyek mentén Blake kialakította ön-álló rendszerét. A vizsgálat során különös figyelmet kapnak a Blake-t ért neoplato-nikus hatások, az ókor klasszikus matematikai és filozófiai iskolái, kiváltképpen a püthagoreusok, valamint a kereszténység biblikus hagyománya és Szent Ágoston filozófiája.

Célom továbbá, hogy magyarázatot adjak a 4-es szám misztikájának jelentésére és jelentőségére William Blake univerzumában. A 4-es szám a tökéletesség és a tel-jesség matematikai és filozófiai kifejeződése volt egy olyan korban, ahol az élet, a teljesség és a tökéletesség leírására a 3-as szám misztikája volt uralkodó.

Kulcsszavak
Blake, kozmogónia, számmisztika, Szentháromság, püthagoreusok, JHVH, Uri-zen, Milton, Ahania, Los, Fuzon, Zoa, tetraktüsz, Augustinus

ÁGNES BERETZKY

Women's Suffrage and Irish Home-Rule: A Comparative Analysis and Assessment of the Use of Violence against the British Establishment

In his new-year message, 1914 was characterised by the Archbishop of York as 'a very fateful year' in the history of the British Empire: the much debated issue of the Irish Home Rule and the similarly controversial demand for women's voting rights were the two top-listed challenges to social order.[1] In the background of both problems lay a long-standing contemptuous public attitude, which manifested it-self in anti-Irish sentiments, and a stereotypical image of women being oppressed and subservient. The present paper aims to discuss some common features of the anti-Irish and the male supremacist sentiments in Britain, together with the paral-lels between the Irish home rule/independence movements and women's rights, especially suffrage movements. The law-abiding and the violent attitudes will be contrasted, in the light of their legacies: it is a fact that the organisations that pro-moted pacifism in both questions have faded from public memory, whereas there are forty-five Easter Rising Memorials throughout Ireland together with a statue of Emmeline Pankhurst at Westminster. Does history teach us that violence pays off?

The negative stereotyping of the Irish had been present in Britain since 1169, the year of Henry II's occupation of the island, and was further aggravated by the virulent anti-Catholicism of the reformation and that of the enlightenment. This prejudice was still widespread in 1836, when the young Benjamin Disraeli wrote: '[The Irish] hate our order, our civilization, our enterprising industry, our pure re-ligion. This wild, reckless, indolent, uncertain and superstitious race have no sym-pathy with the English character. […] Their history describes an unbroken circle of bigotry and blood.'[2]

As regards the situation of women in Britain, it was originally the misinterpret-ed Biblical 'inferiority and moral weakness' that offered the necessary justification for male domination in politics, society and culture. In 1822, Britain saw the pass-ing of the world's first animal protection legislation, the *Cruel Treatment of Cattle Act*. It included fines up to five pounds or two months imprisonment for 'beating or abusing ox, cow, […] steer, sheep, or other cattle.'[3] Apparently, bulls were ex-cluded. So were women. Francis Buller, ridiculed later as Judge Thumb, supposed-ly stated in 1782 that a 'man had the right to beat his wife with a stick not thicker

---

1   Mark BOSTRIDGE: *The Fateful Year: England 1914*, Penguin, 2014, 2–3.
2   Robert BLAKE: *Disraeli*, Faber & Faber, 2010, 131.
3   Richard BURN: *The Justice of the Peace and Parish Officer,* London, 1820, Vol. I, 125.

than his thumb.' This commonly held misconception was only dispelled in 1851, almost three decades after animal protection legislation was enacted; however, in English-speaking countries common law was often cited as self-defence by cruel husbands up until the twentieth century.[4]

From the eighteenth century onwards, biological racism and evolutionary reasoning gradually replaced biblical justification for the stereotypes of the 'brutal, bigoted' Irish and the 'silly-subservient' women. By offering (often pseudo-intellectual) evidence for social and political oppression, scientific racism largely contributed to the rationalization of the British domination of Ireland after the Act of Union in 1800. A prime example is John Beddoe, a leading ethnologist and a contemporary of Darwin, who provided a widely quoted example for evolutionary inferiority. Having analysed the population of the British Isles using the physical descriptions of a population of thirteen thousand males, he complied his *index of negrescence*. He published his findings in *The Races of Britain* (1862) arguing that all men of genius had less prominent jaw bones in contrast to the Irish and the Welsh, who were loosely related to the 'Africanoid,' thus popularizing the image of the 'ape-like Celt.'[5]

Similar to biological racism against the Irish, the idea of the intermediate position in evolutionary reasoning was equally effective at underpinning (male) domination in the second half of the nineteenth century. Exposed to far fewer selective pressures than men, especially in war and competition, women were placed between nature and men; together with children and congenital idiots, whose powers of intuition, perception, and perhaps of imitation were 'characteristic of the lower races, and therefore of a past and lower state of civilization.'[6] Thus argued Charles Darwin, who, a few months before his engagement, at twenty-nine, listed the pros and cons of marrying, which included:

> *Marry*
> Children—(if it Please God)—Constant companion, (and friend in old age) who will feel interested in one,—object to be beloved and played with—better than a dog anyhow.—Home, and someone to take care of house.—Charms of music and female chit-chat. These things good for one's health, but *terrible loss of time*.
> *Not marry*
> Freedom to go where one liked—choice of Society & *little of it*.—Conversation of clever men at clubs—[…] fatness & idleness […].[7]

4   Elizabeth Foyster: *Marital Violence: An English Family History, 1660–1857*, Cambridge University Press, 2005, 12.

5   John Beddoe: *The Races of Britain*, *A Contribution to the Anthropology of Western Europe,* London, Thürner & Company, Ludgate Hill, 1862, 11.

6   Charles Darwin: *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex,* London, John Murray, 1871, Vol II, 26–27.

7   Charles Darwin: Second Note on Marriage [July 1838], darwinproject.ac.uk/tags/about-darwin/family-life/darwin-marriage

One has to bear it in mind that compared to the average mid-nineteenth-century white upper-class English male, Darwin was surprisingly enlightened and liberal-minded; a staunch abolitionist, who considered Blacks and Indians people, feeling disgust and horror at their mistreatment.[8]

We have seen that the Irish were subjected to the widely-held biological racism, whereas women had to face the biological racism of the 19th century. Therefore, both fights—whether for a wide variety of aims under the concept of Home Rule or for women's rights under the unifying theme of the right to Vote—implied rejecting the stereotypes and rationalisations offered throughout history for British or male domination.

The roads for both the Irish nationalist and the various suffrage groups were complex from the start with different, even divergent, aims ranging from domestic parliament for Ireland to full independence, equal political rights for the middle-class and universal suffrage for house-owning women. Consequently, the methods therefore had to be different, too.

Most scholars agree that the credit for the mass mobilisation of British women should be given to the large pacifist organisation of the *National Union of the British Suffrage Societies (NUWSS)*, into which the pioneering smaller organisations were combined in 1897. Its leader, Millicent Fawcett remained constitutional in approach, preferring to lobby parliament with petitions and hold public meetings for the right to vote that she believed should be extended to all women regardless of class.

In Britain, single women ratepayers had been allowed to vote since 1869 at local elections, and married women established far more control over their property than anywhere else in Europe. However, owing to such implacable opponents as Prime Minister Asquith, King Edward, Queen Mary, the majority of the Conservatives and the widely held belief in all political circles that women's votes would favour 'the other party,' wider suffrage proposals kept getting delayed. Frustrated by a deeply prejudiced and split public opinion and the lack of headway, in 1903, Emmeline Pankhurst and her daughters founded the *Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU)*. The new organisation's more militant tactics were devised primarily by one of Pankhurst's daughters, Christabel, with the main aim of obtaining publicity through militancy. One instance: on a Friday, 13th of October 1905, after a Liberal Party meeting when Christabel spat at and struck two policemen, and then refused to pay a fine, she achieved the desired martyr-status. The subsequent celebrations on her release from jail drew an unprecedented level of publicity and excitement. In her letter to the editor of *The Times,* the law-abiding Millicent Fawcett stated:

8   'Great God how I should like to see the greatest curse on Earth, Slavery, abolished.' – wrote Darwin to the renowned American botanist, Asa Gray, commenting on the Civil War. Charles Darwin to Asa Gray [5 June 1861]. In: *The Correspondence of Charles Darwin,* Vol. 9, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994, 163.

Many of us have worked persistently and quietly by voice and pen for women's suffrage for the best part of half-a-century […] but nothing is done here in England materially to forward the success of the women suffrage movement. […] a group of women […] have deliberately adopted, other and more sensational methods to force the attention of the country […] In my opinion, far from having injured the movement, they have done more during the last 12 months to bring it within the realms of practical politics than we have been able to accomplish in the same number of years.[9]

However, it was not only publicity and martyrdom that drove the Pankhurst-Organisation towards violence. In the suffragette interpretation, it was part of a conscious tactic. 'It is perhaps one of the strangest things of our civilisation, argued Emmeline Pankhurst, where [women] are forced to say that an appeal to justice, that an appeal to reason, the evidence of their fitness for citizenship, should be of less value than the breaking of panes of glass.'[10] Besides violence, excitement also played its part. Many suffragette stories openly admit that it was exhilarating, 'a bit of a lark!' There is a lovely description of breaking windows by a Suffragette called Charlotte (Charlie) Marsh in which she describes it 'as though I was playing hockey.'[11]

Nevertheless, the time quickly arrived when violence as a strategy started to backfire. Originally, two distinct traditions of militancy were present among the suffragettes: for the Leftists, including Sylvia Pankhurst, radical attitude was part of the movement itself in a wider struggle against oppression everywhere. Much of the suffragette violent action, on the other hand, was undertaken by freelance militants as a sign of individual heroism, often without the permission and knowledge of the WSPU's more conservative leaders. While the organisation was officially committed to the sanctity of life, increasing violence suggested that the Pankhursts had difficulty in restraining and controlling their more fanatical supporters' individual initiatives, e.g. using horsewhips on the deputy governor in Holloway prison or burning a train guard with sulphuric acid.[12]

The opposing traditions of constitutionalism and militancy had been present in Irish history too, practically since the Act of Union. The federal, law-abiding interpretation of the Home Rule put forward by Charles Parnell, his skilful use of parliamentary procedure, and his renunciation of violent extra-Parliamentary action made him a very capable negotiator. At the end of 1885, the highly centralised organisation of the *Irish National League* had 1,200 branches spread around the country with Parnell asserting immense authority and control. The *Irish Parliamentary Party* into which it merged in 1900 is generally regarded as the first modern British political party. Gladstone described Parnell in the following way: 'I do not say [he was] the ablest man; I say the most remarkable and the most interesting. He was an intellectual phenomenon.'[13]

Ultimately, the O'Shea-divorce issue and Parnell's premature death greatly altered the course of Irish politics. For generations of Irish people, he grew to become the figure with an almost mythical reputation which no later leader could hope to compete with,[14] not even John Redmond, Parnell's successor as the head of the *Irish Parliamentary Party* between 1900 and 1918. It is fashionable to dismiss Redmond's moderate Anglo-Irish policy as ineffectual, yet today it seems possible that it would have given Ireland both the long-awaited independence and unity. The limited Home Rule Bill, with which he was satisfied, would almost certainly have been amplified later as a result of Britain's liberal Commonwealth policy, or as a specific result of Irish-American pressure, while in relation to Irish unity it was precisely Redmond's moderate Anglo-Irish policy which would have made possible the entry of an anglicized North into an Irish parliament. His willingness to co-operate with England and accept her constitutional methods assured the North that, in an Ireland endorsing his policy, she could preserve a stable connection with the British Commonwealth and international life.[15]

Furthermore, the election of 1910 changed everything to Redmond's advantage, giving his parliamentary party the balance of power at Westminster, which marked a high point in his political career. He used this immense influence to persuade the Liberal government of Asquith to introduce the Third Home Rule Bill in April 1912 to grant Ireland national self-government. This could no longer be blocked by the Lords, but its enactment was merely delayed for two years. Home Rule had reached the climax of its success and Redmond had gone much further than any of his predecessors in tailoring British politics to Irish needs. At the same time, militant Irish separatism remained a marginal force even at the end of the first decade of the twentieth century. Had All-Ireland Home Rule evolved earlier, there might perhaps also have been no Easter Rising, no Anglo-Irish War, no independent twenty-six county-Free State and no ensuing civil war.

It was obviously Ulster unionism rather than the Tory Party, which formed the key obstacle to securing Home Rule for the entire country. As Patrick Pearse explained on the formation of the *Irish Volunteers* movement in Galway: 'Ireland armed would be able to make a better bargain with the Empire than Ireland unarmed.' Notwithstanding the organization's militant tone, there was nothing in the manifesto explicitly critical of Redmond's Irish Party or its goal of Home Rule.[16]

[9] Millicent FAWCETT: Letter to the editor. *The Times*, CCXXXV, 27 October 1906, 8.

[10] June PURVIS: *Emmeline Pankhurst, A Biography*, London, Routledge, 2002, 177–178.

[11] Tessa BOASE: Mrs Pankhurst's Purple Feather: Fashion, Fury and Feminism, London, Aurum Press, 2018, 221.

[12] C. J. BEARMAN: 'An Examination of Suffragette Violence'. The English Historical Review, CXX, 2005/4, 368–369.

[13] Richard Barry O'BRIEN: The Life of Charles Stewart Parnell, New York, Huskell House Publishers, 1968, Vol II/357.

[14] Frank CALLANAN: *The Parnell Split, 1890–91*, New York, Syracuse University Press, 1992, 151–152.

[15] Michael SHEEHY: *Divided We Stand*, London, Faber & Faber, 1955, 55.

[16] Fearghal McGARRY: *The Rising: Ireland, Easter 1916*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016, 49.

Mrs Pankhurst was most possibly influenced by Charles Parnell's campaign for the Irish Home Rule, first of all, by his autocratic approach: by 1909, and with her daughter Christabel, she insisted on the total control of the WSPU. She referred to her organisation as a volunteer army, a distinctive uniform was devised, and more direct threats to public order were carried out. Unlike Parnell, however, she was unwilling to compromise and negotiate.

By 1912, and still having witnessed no real progress in Parliament, the level of militancy was on the rise again, turning the WSPU into a guerrilla organisation: pipe bombs, chemicals, explosions and stones were all tools to carry out their sacred plans. According to official sources, 103 acts of destruction were carried out in the first seven months of 1914 alone. The attacks were executed by about a hundred top activists, some of them paid agents.[17]

It is important to note that by that time the peaceful NUWSS had fifty thousand members in six hundred regional societies, about *fifteen times* more than the militant WSPU membership, as the unwillingness of the latter to change their vision about women's vote to include those without property cost them many members. Sylvia Pankhurst, heading the Leftists, among others, broke with her mother and sister and moved into the East End of London to accomplish a more radical social, as well as political, revolution in women's lives.[18]

The outbreak of the Great War meant a sudden turning point for both the Irish and the suffragette causes. The first law ever passed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom to establish a devolved government in Ireland was formally postponed for a minimum of twelve months. The southern *Irish Volunteers* split into the larger *National Volunteers* and followed Redmond's call to support the Entente war effort.[19] He was hoping that the common sacrifice by Irish nationalists and Unionists would bring them closer together. 'Let Irishmen come together in the trenches' he argued 'and risk their lives together and spill their blood together, and I say there is no power on earth that when they come home can induce them to turn as enemies upon one another.'[20] His confidence was not totally unfounded: out of the of 140,000 who followed him and formed the National Volunteers, many enthusiastically enlisted in Irish regimens of the tenth and sixteenth (Irish) Divisions of the New British Army.

At the same time, and after having been released from prison, Emmeline Pankhurst seemingly suspended militancy and requested all WSPU members to support the war effort instead. The prosecution of the war, however, became Emmeline's new passion. She rejected pacifism and started making recruiting speeches: 'If you go to this war

and give your life, you could not end your life in a better way—for to give one's life for one's country, for a great cause, is a splendid thing.'[21] Militancy, so it seems, was not primarily a reaction to the mistreatment of women or the indecision at Westminster, but rather Emmeline and Christabel Pankhurst's constant character trait that finally alienated most of their supporters and may have confirmed anti-suffrage views. On the other hand, Millicent Fawcett—who lacked sensationalism and was therefore unjustifiably devalued—saught a workable consensus. In 1918, eight million women over thirty finally got the right to vote. Nevertheless, only one woman was elected; Constance Markiewicz, who was a member of *Sinn Fein* and thus refused to take any oath of allegiance, never took her seat. (In 1925 Emmeline Pankhurst joined the Conservative Party.)

Was suffragette violence a mistake? Was militancy instrumental in granting women's voting rights? The answer to both questions must be an unequivocal yes. However, it was not the window- and bone-breaking suffragettes, but the German Kaiser's militant conduct that significantly contributed to the outbreak of the Great War and the cessation of violent suffragette activities. The latter two, in Millicent Fawcett's words 'opened up both opportunities and men's minds.'[22]

The analogous question remains whether Irish violence was a mistaken means to achieve a higher end: independence. Moderate John Redmond denounced the rebels as traitors, whose actions, he argued, had been driven more by the hatred of Home Rule than England.[23] Logically so, as by 1914 he had become a nationalist hero of Parnellite stature and could have had every expectation of becoming the head of a new Irish government in Dublin. Nevertheless, the Great War intervened, and unlike the feminist cause, to the disadvantage of the law-abiding forces: the radicals led by among others James Connolly and the fanatical Patrick Pearse staged the misguided and rather unexpected uprising of 1916, 'a Passion Play with real blood.'[24] The rest is history.

Abstract

Women's Rights and Irish Home-Rule: A Comparative Analysis and Assessment of the Use of Violence against the British Establishment

Women's rights and Irish home-rule were the two most powerful issues in early 20th century United Kingdom that largely dominated political discourse. The main aim of the paper is to draw a parallel between these two prominent problems, their roots, together with the methods

---

[17] C. J. BEARMAN: 'An Examination', 396–397.

[18] PURVIS: Emmeline Pankhurst, 270–271.

[19] A minority of around 9,700 members remained as the original *Irish Volunteers* with radicals in key positions.

[20] Joseph P. FINNAN: John Redmond and Irish Unity: 1912–1918, New York, Syracuse University Press, 99–101.

[21] PURVIS: *Emmeline Pankhurst*, 272.

[22] Melanie PHILIPS: *The Ascent Of Woman: A History Of the Suffragette Movement and the Ideas Behind It*, Little Brown, 2003, 303.

[23] MCGARRY: *The Rising*, 285.

[24] Philip JENKINS: "Easter 1916: Blood, Sacrifice and Holy War", aleteia.org/2016/03/28/easter-1916-blood-sacrifice-and-holy-war/

and solutions offered whether constitutional or violent. Secondly, it is a fact that the organisations that promoted pacifism in both questions have faded from public memory, whereas there are forty-five Easter Rising Memorials throughout Ireland together with a statue of Emmeline Pankhurst at Parliament. Although history seemingly teaches us that violence pays off, the paper claims that despite public opinion or legacy, neither the militant suffragettes nor the radical Irish Volunteers were the prime agents in bringing about a real solution to the problems of both minorities.

Keywords
Great-Britain, prejudice, Irish, women's rights, suffragettes, violence

Rezümé
Nőjogok és ír autonómia: az erőszak, mint eszköz szerepe és megítélése
Összehasonlító elemzés

Nagy-Britanniában a huszadik század első évtizedének két legnagyobb kihívása egyértelműen a női választójog és az ír autonómia-követelések voltak. Jelen tanulmány arra vállalkozik, hogy egyrészt párhuzamba állítsa a nők és írek iránti előítéletesség forrásait és a hatalomgyakorlók jogkiterjesztéssel szembeni ellenérveit, valamint megvizsgálja a két ügy jogkövető vagy éppen jogsértő élharcosainak tevékenységét és sikerességét. Jelen tanulmány annak bebizonyítására tesz kísérletet, hogy a közvélekedéssel ellentétben a nők és az írek esetében is a militáns magatartás figyelemfelhívó volt ugyan, azonban nem tekinthető a létrejött jogkiterjesztés okának.

Kulcsszavak
Nagy-Britannia, előítélet, ír autonómia, női jogok, szüffrazsettek, erőszak

Elena Rimondo

From Anti-Heroism to Complete Obscurity and Return: Thomas Hardy's Modern Tragic Heroes

George Eliot, by claiming the right to the tragedy of common people condemned to a monotonous life, made the first step towards the convergence of the realistic mode of the novel and tragedy. Yet Thomas Hardy's novels induced many contemporary critics to adopt the adjective 'tragic' to describe his heroes' and heroines' destinies. This contribution will illustrate, first of all, how Hardy internalised George Eliot's legacy, then, in the second part, it will argue that in Hardy's universe, which is dominated by chance and by an indifferent nature, the hero's tragic destiny coincides with an utterly meaningless death.

When, in 1874, Thomas Hardy's novel *Far from the Madding Crowd* was serialised, many readers thought they were reading George Eliot's latest novel. One of the reasons for their mistake was probably the fact that *Far from the Madding Crowd* does not belong to the category of Hardy's tragic novels. No such confusion arose in the reception of *The Return of Native*, Hardy's first experiment with the form of tragedy.[1] There are indeed many reasons why George Eliot's novels can be defined as tragic, but not as authentic tragedies. For example, George Eliot attributes a fundamental role to the individual's possibility to exert his or her free will in shaping his or her destiny.[2] Moreover, the sense of continuity following the tragic event at the end of her novels breaks with the sense of finality inherent to the tragic form.[3] According to Jeanette King, who defined George Eliot's novels as 'pathetic tragedies',[4] Eliot's most lasting legacy lies in the convergence of the realistic mode and the tragic form.[5] If the artist's aim is 'to extend our sympathies'[6] through a faithful representation of reality and life, the tragic situation is the one which, more than any other, can stimulate and facilitate our ability to sympathise. Yet George Eliot did not limit herself to claiming common people's right to tragedy. In the well-known Chapter XVII of *Adam Bede*, she introduced a short but effective apology of Dutch painting, which was generally considered inferior at the time. On the

---

[1] See Dale Kramer: *Thomas Hardy: The Forms of Tragedy*, London, Macmillan, 1975, 48.

[2] See Jeannette King: *Tragedy in the Victorian Novel: Theory and Practice in the Novels of George Eliot, Thomas Hardy and Henry James*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1978, 90.

[3] See King: *Tragedy in the Victorian Novel*, 94 and K. M. Newton: 'Tragedy and the Novel.' In Phillip Mallett (ed.): *Thomas Hardy in Context*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013, 122–131, 128.

[4] King: *Tragedy in the Victorian Novel*, 70.

[5] See King: *Tragedy in the Victorian Novel*, 45 and 89.

[6] George Eliot: 'The Natural History of German Life' (July 1856). In A. S. Byatt and Nicholas Warren (eds.): *Selected Essays, Poems and Other Writings*, London, Penguin, 1990, 107–139, 110.