against a vulnerable mind or heart’ (Stoker, 103). At the novel’s close, Humbert is left incarcerated for Clare Quilty’s murder, without Lolita and without the metaphysical resurrection he desired. His psychic vampirism has only led to the creation of another, albeit infinitely subtle, vampiric being. Humbert remains a shell of a man—living yet dead, totally devoid of a fundamental human essence. His thirst for nymphets will never be quenched because his Annabel can never be brought back to life. Thus, until his physical death, he continues to seek the enchantments of bygone days and remain ‘deep in [his] elected paradise—a paradise whose skies were the color of hell-flames—but [which was] still a paradise’ (166).

KURT FAWVER
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A MISSING EPIGRAPH FROM JOHN FOWLES’ THE FRENCH LIEUTENANT’S WOMAN

The first and subsequent early editions of John Fowles’ novel The French Lieutenant’s Woman carried an epigraph on the title page.1 The quotation, a translation from Karl Marx’s Zur Judenfrage, read: ‘Every emancipation is a restoration of the human world and of human relationships to man himself.’2 Many critics have since assessed the importance of this supra-text. One commentator has acknowledged it as ‘a determining quotation for the entire novel’ and one which: 

tends to deconstruct traditional ideas of what Marxist liberation constitutes, and also to contradict the other Marxian writings quoted as subtextual epigraphs beginning individual chapters.3 However, literary scholars ought to note that for several years recently, this epigraph has been accidentally omitted from UK editions of the novel.4 My enquiries with publishers about this matter elicited no reply, but further to correspondence with the Lyme Regis Museum (of which Fowles was a former curator), I was very pleased to be contacted by the author’s widow and literary co-executor, Mrs Sarah Fowles.

Mrs Fowles advised that the epigraph appears to have been accidentally omitted by the publishers during the preparation of the most recent edition. She expressed her particular dismay that this had passed unnoticed in what became the last edition of the novel to be proof read by her late husband. Mrs Fowles also noted that her late husband had been ‘a Marxist in the true sense, ever since University’ and that he would never knowingly have removed the epigraph from the text.5

I understand that the epigraph is to be restored to future editions.

CHRISTOPHER GOULDING
Royal Grammar School,
Newcastle upon Tyne
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ERRONEOUS INSTRUCTION: HALLY’S MISREPRESENTATIONS OF TOLSTOY AND JOE LOUIS IN FUGARD’S ‘MASTER HAROLD’…AND THE BOYS*

THE 2010 movie version of ‘MASTER HAROLD’…and the boys gives new occasion

*Many thanks to Calvin College for its sabbatical release, and to Brian D. Ingraffia for his careful reading of an earlier version of this essay.
to examine closely the original text of Athol Fugard’s celebrated play. One oft-noted aspect of the play is how seventeen-year-old Hally (a.k.a. ‘Master Harold’) ironically considers himself the middle-aged Sam’s educator when, in fact, Sam has educated Hally in the ways of life, playing a surrogate father amidst Hally’s dysfunctional family situation. Hally’s immature behaviour towards Sam and Willie has been thoroughly discussed by critics, but attention should also be paid to the incorrect information he disseminates to the two black employees of his parents’ Port Elizabeth, South Africa tea room.

Most of Hally’s incorrect information concerns Leo Tolstoy, whom Hally discusses during the ‘men of magnitude’ discussion with Sam, in which each character puts forward several noteworthy individuals whom he admires. Hally argues for Tolstoy, about whom he says, ‘Not many intellectuals are prepared to shovel manure with the peasants and then go home and write a “little book” called War and Peace.’ But this statement is problematic on two levels. First, there is no specific evidence either from prominent Tolstoy biographies or from Tolstoy’s daughter Alexandra—who reports that Tolstoy sowed, mowed, and harvested with peasants—that Tolstoy ever shoveled manure with peasants. He may have done so, of course, but such a claim is unverifiable and Hally here embellishes details to strengthen his argument. More significantly, Alexandra reports that Tolstoy began to work alongside the peasants in the 1880s, over a decade after the 1869 publication of War and Peace. Hally’s glib claim is simply not in line with the facts of Tolstoy’s chronology.

Hally’s second problematic statement closely follows when he asserts that Tolstoy ‘freed his serfs of his own free will’ (21). But Tolstoy did not actually free his serfs. He did attempt to free them in 1856, five years before Russia emancipated its serfs in 1861, but his serfs declined because they distrusted the terms Tolstoy laid out for their freedom. Here again, Hally’s information is only partially accurate.

A third example of Hally’s dubious information is when Hally smugly tells Sam, ‘Tolstoy may have educated his peasants, but I’ve educated you’ (23). This statement, spoken to a forty-five year-old, is misleading because it gives the impression that Tolstoy educated his adult peasants; in fact, he set up a short-lived school for his peasants’ children, but there is no record of Tolstoy actually educating the adults.

Shortly after Hally and Sam’s ‘men of magnitude’ discussion concludes, evidence of Hally’s factual inaccuracy continues. Hally mentions Joe Louis to Willie, Sam’s illiterate co-worker, and the following exchange ensues:

WILLIE: Brown Bomber. World Title. (Boxing pose)

Three rounds and knockout.

HALLY: Against who?

SAM: Max Schmeling.

HALLY: Correct.

Hally here appears to be quizzing Willie and Sam about a fact that Hally taught them earlier—compare how Hally similarly responds to Sam’s recognition of Tolstoy as ‘That Russian’ by saying, ‘Correct’ (21)—and Hally here seems as blithely pleased with himself as

1 Lonny Price (dir.), ‘MASTER HAROLD’... and the boys (Shoreline Entertainment, 2010). Perf. Freddie Highmore, Ving Rhames, Patrick Mofokeng.


6 I note this error in ‘Tolstoy’s Presence in Fugard’s “MASTER HAROLD”... and the boys: Sam’s Pacifist Christian Perseverance and “a Case of Illness’”, Renascence 62 (2010), 323. I am unaware of any other criticism that points out any other errors.

7 See Maude, The Life of Leo Tolstoy, I, 150–53; and Simmons, Leo Tolstoy, 158–60.


9 See titles listed in note 3, as well as essays and introductory materials in Pinch and Armstrong (ed.), Tolstoy on Education, and Archambault (intro.), Tolstoy on Education.
when he brags of having educated Sam. There is a serious problem, however, with Hally’s education of Willie and Sam concerning this immensely important event in boxing history: The African-American Louis knocked out the Nazi-supported Schmeling in the first round of their 1938 championship fight, not the third. The only fighter Louis ever knocked out in the third round of a championship fight was Nathan Mann, whom Louis fought just four months before Schmeling.10 Hally’s misinformation about the Louis–Schmeling fight—arguably the most racially charged sporting event in the dozen years preceding the play’s 1950 setting—is particularly noteworthy given the play’s apartheid context.

This apartheid context also makes Hally’s errors significant because they demonstrate the ease with which a privileged instructor may disseminate misinformation to an audience that lacks the resources to either verify or challenge such misinformation. Hally’s cavalierly offered misrepresentations—and Sam and Willie’s acceptance of them—also parallel how Hally has uncritically imbibed the racist instruction of his father and his schoolteachers.

DAVID V. URBAN
Calvin College
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Readers’ Queries

WOLSEY, THE MANOR OF THE MORE, AND JEAN DU BELLAY

DU BELLAY in England. Information, please. A. F. Pollard in his Wolsey (London, 1929; rev. edn 1953, reprint 1966, p. 325), wrote of the The More, near Rickmansworth in Hertfordshire, that it ‘was Wolsey’s favourite country house, and du Bellay thought it more splendid than Hampton Court’. This seems an extraordinary claim, but du Bellay, the French ambassador, would have been writing in 1527 or 1528 before Henry VIII’s works had remodelled Hampton Court on an even larger scale than Wolsey had in the 1520s.

Pollard provided no reference for this statement. Subsequent writers have repeated the comment without suggesting a possible source (e.g. myself in the Archaeological Journal, 116 (1959), 139; Howard Colvin in The History of the King’s Works IV. ii (London, 1982), 165; Simon Thurley, ‘The Domestic Building Works of Cardinal Wolsey’, in S. J. Gunn and P. G. Lindley (eds), Cardinal Wolsey: Church, State and Art, 91).

Du Bellay’s letters for the years 1527–47 have been published, and an index provided by R. Scheurer and L. Petris in vol. 3 of Correspondance du Cardinal Jean du Bellay (Société de l’Histoire de France, 2008). Professor Petris tells me (email of 1 October 2010) that the comment printed by Pollard does not appear in either the index or the texts, noting however that this does not mean that du Bellay did not write it, because sometimes the earlier volumes give only summaries of the letters.

Pollard implied in the preface to his Wolsey, that ‘three-quarters’ was written in the months between Hilary Term 1928 and publication in 1929 (for his working practices, see further, R. J. Knecht in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford, 2004), accessed 5 October 2010). If working in haste from memory, Pollard might have forgotten that the comment was actually made by someone else, perhaps a member of the French team who negotiated the signing of the Treaty of The More in 1525. I would be most grateful for any help in identifying the original source of du Bellay’s supposed remark. The matter has become more interesting with the recent discovery of new material showing the extent of early Renaissance decoration at The More and thus the possible validity of the comparison with Hampton Court.

MARTIN BIDDLE
Hertford College, Oxford
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