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Abstract
This essay seeks to extend the study of male consumption in the Victorian period, focusing specifically on the practice of aesthetic collecting in Wilkie Collins’s The Woman in White (1860). I compare male characters in this text, in terms of class and gender identity, in order to offer a pre-Wildean understanding of the Victorian male consumer. The novel’s treatment of the aristocracy and the middle classes offers substantial textual evidence of a relationship between consumption and masculinity, especially with regard to the collection of art as the acquisition of cultural capital. Drawing on the work of Pierre Bourdieu, I clarify the connection between class position and the possession of cultural capital in nineteenth-century Britain, and explore other cultural assumptions concerning aesthetic proficiency, social status and consumer behaviour. I consider the theory of cultural capital in its relation to practices of collecting by taking into account the aesthetic tastes and cultural goods ascribed to the nineteenth-century collector figure. In this way, a collector’s embodied cultural capital translated into a capacity to identify the aesthetic properties of artistic objects. The recognised ownership of such culturally-valued works of art represents the collector’s objectified cultural capital. How a collector comes to be in the position to distinguish, or indeed to own, art objects reflects his own social situation in terms of his class status, education and access to economic capital. My argument, in brief, is that the very notion of the collection differs between the classes. I argue that the practices of aesthetic collection carried out in The Woman in White validate the notion of cultural capital.

Wilkie Collins’s The Woman in White (1860) demonstrates a prescient understanding of what Pierre Bourdieu, over one hundred years later, would term cultural capital. Through a mapping of Bourdieu’s theory of cultural capital onto two main characters from the novel, Walter Hartright and Frederick Fairlie, my aim is to show how conflicting discourses of the male collector compete for hegemony in the novel. The bourgeois collector, Hartright, with whom the authorial perspective clearly identifies, attempts to establish himself as the hegemonic male identity. Obstructing this is the aristocratic collector, Fairlie, whose most powerful ideological weapon is his possession of cultural capital. The problem facing Hartright is that he needs to capture that cultural capital, and the only way to do this is to redefine what it is and how it can be acquired. These two distinct models for the collector, the aristocratic and the bourgeois, who are at the same time effeminate and normatively masculine, reflect a split distinction of cultural capital between a feminine-coded consumption and a masculine-coded production. Fairlie, through his possession of old money, has the wealth to buy the quality goods he wants, and so becomes consumerist and
feminised. Thus, his cultural status is negated. By contrast, Hartright, the bourgeois hero, does not possess old money, but earns it through his skills and abilities. He is able to acquire cultural capital not as something to be bought and consumed, but as an element of his productive abilities as an artist figure. That this is the case will be reflected in my accompanying discussion of sexual objectification and masculine gender identity. The aristocrat is asexual while the bourgeois man's aesthetic appreciation of women has an ultimately productive aim: it enables him to marry and have children. The disparity between these two characters is well rehearsed by critics. The connection between gender and sensation fiction has served both the novel and the critics well, generating a range of influential and edifying readings. However, the critical tendency to focus on the differences between Fairlie and Walter on the grounds of their gender identity has also deflected attention away from the ways in which they are similar, notably in their affirmation of each other's aesthetic tastes. I begin with an overview of Bourdieu’s theory of cultural capital as well as the historical context of collecting as a specific form of consumer behaviour in the nineteenth century.

The Culture of Capital

Recent work in Victorian studies has demonstrated that using Bourdieu to think about the Victorian period leads to identifying, through cultural analysis, the development of the modern form of cultural capital that he describes. The phenomenon of taste is central to the study of the mid-nineteenth-century male collector figure in the novel because ‘taste functions as a marker of class’. Bourdieu frequently concerns himself with the entrenched connection between cultural capital and social position since ‘a work of art has meaning and interest only for someone who possesses the cultural competence, that is, the code, into which it is encoded’. In other words, exposure to the high culture associated with elevated familial origin is expected to manifest itself through acquired aesthetic tastes, which consequently reinforce social difference. Factors such as education, wealth, and the possession of certain cultural objects affect the development of aesthetic disposition, social mobility and cultural capital. Bourdieu offers a description of cultural capital, which he divides into three forms. Firstly, the embodied state refers to the cultural capital personified in the individual,
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in the form of ‘long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body’. More specifically, embodied cultural capital is the taste, skills, knowledge and attitude that the aesthetically accomplished individual exhibits. Secondly, the materiality of objectified cultural capital, or ‘cultural goods’ acquired by the individual indicates aesthetic competency. Additionally, Bourdieu notes, ‘cultural goods can be appropriated both materially, which presupposes economic capital, and symbolically, which presupposes cultural capital’. Such a notion articulates the potential economic convertibility of a collection of art, and consequently the social prominence and financial worth of a collector’s objects. Thirdly, institutionalised cultural capital, educational qualifications which confirm the cultural capital of the individual and secure the ‘certitude of cultural competence which confers on its holder a conventional, constant, legally guaranteed value with respect to culture’.

The discourse of consumer preference emerged in a specific historical and cultural context during the nineteenth century. Patrick Brantlinger takes into account the effect of nineteenth-century developments such as industrialism, romanticism and liberalism on patterns of consumption, and he suggests that taste, ‘the faculty or process of qualitative discrimination’, functioned as both a private and public phenomenon. Individual consumers, as a collective, generate patterns of economic demand which could be perceived outwardly as ‘national taste’. Aside from exposing the gap between high and mass culture, nineteenth-century industrial art and the commodification of ornamental household products undoubtedly affected the quantity of consumption as modern industry intruded especially on the private and domestic sphere. The societal changes in commercial activity that allowed individuals a growing access to mass-produced goods were responsible for the perception of the diminishing quality of national art in the Victorian period.

The emergence of a politically-empowered industrial middle class in the early nineteenth century also had dramatic implications for Britain’s art industry. At the height of their power, the bourgeoisie commanded influence over the circulation of industrial capital, all the while contributing to a reshaping of Victorian class relations and the growth of industrial culture. The middle-class contribution to the art market
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modified the common perception of the collector figure as an aristocrat, instead taking into account the increased economic and cultural capital of the middle-class gentleman. Thus, the rise of the bourgeois gentleman collector in Victorian Britain complicated the traditional links between taste and the aristocracy. The social ascension of the Victorian bourgeoisie also had ramifications for masculine identity, especially for the idea of the gentleman. The two different types of gentleman identifiable with this period, the traditional gentleman of noble birth and the modern self-made man, were strongly connected to their respective class positions. 

Around the mid-Victorian period the term had extended beyond aristocratic social lineage to include those who possessed a moral standing from the middle classes as well. The growing flexibility of the gentleman’s position paralleled the advent of increased bourgeois economic capital. No longer did the aristocracy’s inherited wealth dominate gentlemanly status. The new middle-class gentleman, or the man of trade, emerged, idealising the qualities of his class, such as ‘industry, piety, integrity, business acumen’.

The effect of a shifting political climate on the new models of masculinity in Victorian England was matched by the middle-class consumer’s access to economic and cultural capital. Bourgeois masculinity may be contextualised within the rise of industrial capitalism and the new-found ability to participate in parliamentary politics and the art market. Middle-class men began to define themselves against the older aristocratic values of inherited land and wealth, instead asserting a self-made type of male identity. Once considered to be a marker of gentlemanly status, a man’s leisure time now became indicative of idleness: ‘the degeneracy and effeminacy of the aristocracy focused on its softness, sensuousness, indolence, luxuriousness, foppishness and a lack of a proper sense of purpose and direction’.

In this period idealised masculine identity meant contributing to the public world as an active generator of capital, as well as demonstrating qualities of strength and independence. Moreover the possession of economic wealth and a new found sense of freedom of choice entitled both the gentleman and the bourgeois producer to
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function as legitimate consumers in a market-driven society.\textsuperscript{20}

Although the parameters of what constituted gentility shifted during this period, the differing ideas of the gentleman collector figure were united by the expectation that they could live without manual labour: ‘for it was leisure which enabled a man to cultivate the style and pursuits of the gentlemanly life’.\textsuperscript{21} This notion will prove fundamental to my examination of Fairlie and Walter as collectors because economic capital both enables and restrains their pursuit of gentlemanly lifestyles. The new perception of the gentleman figure shifted class boundaries and allowed a form of social mobility between Britain’s middle and upper classes.\textsuperscript{22} This phenomenon is potentially replicated when collectors surround themselves with the artistic markers of an upper-class lifestyle. Despite its connection to a new way of achieving greater social mobility, however, the simulation of an aristocratic way of life through aesthetic collecting proves problematic in \textit{The Woman in White}. Moreover, the shift in what makes cultural capital is linked to the historical context of a rising middle class, and the novel is both an expression of that shift, a text supporting and promoting it, and an attempt to negotiate the anxieties it causes. We see a new construction of cultural capital emerging as part of a general cultural transformation driven by socio-historical change.

Before beginning a literary investigation of collecting, it is essential to situate the practice within a cultural and historical framework. From the second half of the nineteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century, the classificatory nature of the Victorian age, with its emphasis on ‘organising individual things into groups of things’, manifested itself through the figure of the individual collector.\textsuperscript{23} The ‘classificatory impulse’ of the Victorian collector was the idiosyncratic feature of this mode of collecting.\textsuperscript{24} In organising a collection, the collector was imbued with the power to classify his objects into an appropriate system that relied on a particular object’s temporal, spatial and internal qualities.\textsuperscript{25} The Victorian collector’s principles of organisation produced an overall aesthetic and economically valuable collection of carefully chosen art objects.\textsuperscript{26} The Victorian collector systematically acquired objects of cultural value and aggregated them according to how they fitted within the overall collection.\textsuperscript{27} The historical practice of collecting, in particular, the symbolic
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relationship between collectors and their collections, is related both to self-understanding and the presentation of the self. An object signifies something to its collector as well as something about its collector. The way in which the Victorian collector organised his collected objects reflected his particularised persona. Although the manner of classification separated these representatives from both phases of collecting, it would appear that they shared an obsession with acquiring objects of personal significance.  

The relationship between personal meaning and value, however, reflected shifts in the economic climate of nineteenth-century Britain.

In my reading of collecting as a subsidiary of consumer behaviour in *The Woman in White* I do not mean to overlook the challenge posed by the Aesthetic movement, which can be traced to as early as the 1860s. Studies into the processes of male consumption have tended to concentrate on the relationship between masculine social/political status and men’s consumption of fashionable clothing and commodities. The historical example of Oscar Wilde, for instance, has been important in the critical analysis of male consumption and decadent masculinity. Equally, sensation fiction, the genre to which the novel under consideration belongs, and its hereditary connection to later Aesthetic novels puts a separate pressure on my treatment of the pre-Wildean male consumer. *The Woman in White* as precursor to texts like *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891) and the connection between the sensational and the Aesthetic novel, are perhaps outside the scope of this essay.

However I acknowledge that a character like Fairlie could be said to prefigure later examples of the satirical aesthete in literature, such as George Meredith’s Sir Willoughby Patterne or Henry James’s Gilbert Osmond. The Aesthetic movement, with its emphasis on beauty, has implications for the study of *The Woman in White* because it advocated an Aesthetic sensibility that was not limited to art. One of the
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tenets of the movement, the “art for art’s sake” dictum, referred not only to the creation of art without moral, religious or narrative considerations, but also to the belief in bringing a quality of attention to the structure and execution of one’s life. Fairlie’s pattern of collecting is a significant, and figurative, anticipation of Aestheticism because he typifies the more harmful values that came to be associated with the movement: his indolent lifestyle combined with his narcissism places him very much in the Aesthetic tradition or what Kathy Alexis Psomiades calls ‘life-style aestheticism’. My understanding of the relationship between masculine identity and cultural capital does not invalidate the significance of Aestheticism, rather my difference in focus leads to an alternative interpretation of Fairlie as a Victorian male collector.

Frederick Fairlie: The Gentleman’s Collection

Frederick Fairlie, Hartright’s employer and a character who would appear to be on the periphery of the plot, is the novel’s foremost collector figure. Fairlie functions in a contradictory manner because, although lacking in title and nobility, as a member of the gentry he adopts the bearing and manner of the British aristocracy. Accordingly his collecting habits also align with this class identity: he imitates the aesthetic qualities of the aristocracy. Even more problematic is the way in which Fairlie exhibits behaviour consistent with aristocratic masculinity: Collins repeatedly portrays him as effeminate and insubstantial, qualities that became sharply associated with nobility by the mid-Victorian period. Fairlie represents the typical mid-Victorian impression of aristocratic masculinity in his weak, effeminate and non-procreative conduct.

First, his delicate condition signals a weakened mind and body, and by proxy, a weakened authority. Indeed his fragile condition undermines the authority tied to his class position, and casts into doubt his ability to manage the family’s welfare. Second, his influence as head of the household is not taken seriously by the other characters in the house:

Mr. Fairlie is too great an invalid to be a companion for anybody. I don’t know what is the matter with him, and the doctors don’t know what is the matter with him, and he doesn’t know what is the matter with him. We all say it’s the nerves.
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In this description by Marian Halcombe, Collins establishes Fairlie’s self-indulgent and infantile temperament. In fact, when Marian advises Hartright to humour him, she involuntarily represents her uncle as a child, rather than as a respected member of Britain’s gentry. The reference to his nerves, a condition more commonly associated with the hysterical female, also reinforces his effeminate, and hence ineffectual, command of the household.

Fairlie’s peculiar priorities are what essentially create his collecting personality, which is also inextricably tied to his social standing. At the outset, as a member of the gentry and a wealthy landowner, Fairlie possesses the financial means to acquire valuable objects. His consumption corresponds naturally with his social situation. The supposition that he has inherited cultural capital along with his economic wealth forms a natural parallel with his gentlemanly rank. His privileged access to experiencing legitimate culture evokes Bourdieu’s understanding of cultural capital, in terms of the effect of one’s upbringing on matters of taste. Fairlie holds two types of cultural capital. First of all, his embodied cultural capital, or aesthetic familiarity, is highlighted by references to eminent painters (pp. 43, 44, 46). Fairlie also makes continual allusions to his taste (pp. 44, 159, 339, 347). Second, his ‘highly appreciative feeling towards Art and its professors’ is materialised in a collection of cultural goods that are financially valuable and intrinsically beautiful (p. 11). His ‘coins, prints and water-colour drawings’ serve as objectified cultural capital which support his aesthetic and economic superiority in the novel (p. 37). Fairlie’s aspirations to the aristocracy, with its associations of inherited cultural nobility, ground his possession of cultural capital. He collects in a manner that is consistent with the aristocratic social milieu he strives to imitate, acquiring items of legitimate artistic worth. For example, he recognises the value of a number of unspecified drawings at an art sale, ‘really fine specimens of English water-colour Art’ (p. 45), and obtains them in order to restore their worth. His acquisition of the drawings with the intention of having them preserved by straining and mounting illustrates his awareness of the economic benefit of collecting, although his taste is not strictly governed by this principle. When Fairlie exclaims, ‘Do let me teach you to understand the heavenlypearliness of these lines’, it is clear he adores his objects because of their aesthetic quality as well (p. 159).

Fairlie is under no obligation to justify his penchant for collecting, because it was regarded as a conservative pursuit for a member of his class. His declaration that he is improving national taste is especially relevant, particularly within the context of the Great Exhibition, held in the same year The Woman in White is set, and the cultural fears it generated about the decline in the quality of British art (p. 347). Its exhibits were equally appreciated and criticised for connecting high art and industrial art, a cultural panic that may be signalled in Fairlie’s desire to collect objects of traditional artistic merit. His propensity for objects of historical significance, such as his Raphael pieces, removes him from the realm of industrial taste and mass
consumption, instead situating him as an aesthetic connoisseur.\(^{35}\)

In *The Woman in White* the symbolic relationship between the collector and his objects is characterised by the type of objects he collects. It follows that Fairlie’s collection of various artworks and ornaments show a great deal about his aesthetic taste:

On the opposite side stood two antique cabinets; and between them, and above them hung a picture of the Virgin and Child, protected by glass, and bearing Raphael’s name on the gilt tablet at the bottom of the frame. On my right hand were chiffoniers and little stands in buhl and marquetterie, loaded with figures in Dresden china, with rare vases, ivory ornaments, and toys and curiosities that sparkled at all points with gold, silver and precious stones.

(p. 41)

Hartright’s use of words like ‘gilt’, ‘antique’, ‘rare’ and ‘precious’ connote high cultural value. Above all, these objects appear to be of significant monetary worth, and consequently are well looked after and ‘protected’. Fairlie’s sense of ownership involves privacy and restricted access to his collection.

Categorising and classifying and other related activities of aesthetic collecting are just as important as the objects themselves for uncovering what a collection discloses about its collector. Fairlie organises his collection in both an aesthetic and classificatory manner. In particular, the decorative items that Fairlie chooses to display adhere to a system of recurring regulation:

One side of the room was occupied by a long bookcase of some rare inlaid wood that was quite new to me. It was not more that six feet high, and the top was adorned with statuettes in marble, ranged at regular distances one from the other. (p. 41)

Hartright’s description neatly illustrates the order and regularity that Fairlie imposes on his collection. Likewise, Fairlie systematises his compilation of etchings and drawings into several different coloured portfolios which he keeps in his rooms (pp. 44-45). He also catalogues his objects with ‘ostentatious red-letter inscriptions underneath. “Madonna and Child, by Raphael. In the possession of Frederick Fairlie”’ (p. 199). Fairlie not only labels the material core of his objects, he draws attention to his possession of them in identifying both the artist and his own name.

Fairlie’s collection of ‘matchless Rembrandt etchings’ denotes his social status through their artistic and economic value (p. 129). The presumed social implications of collecting are supplemented further by what the activity reveals about Fairlie as an individual subject. Through the consumption of art and other items of value, Fairlie
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exercises a form of agency over his possessions. He is imbued with the power to collect, arrange and dispose of his belongings, a power that he fails to execute over human beings. He fills the void of his self-engrossing existence by attaining inorganic things that he can control and organise, thus he creates a ‘closed dialogue with himself’. Instead of asserting his authority over other members of the household, he remains isolated and prefers to commune with his collection. Such a fixation with collected objects is shown to be harmful because it supplants fundamental human contact. Fairlie predominantly preoccupies himself with cultural goods instead of social and familial dealings. Baudrillard points to the instability of ‘normal human relationships’ as a reason for the archetypal collector preferring the company of inanimate objects:

Ordinary relationships are such a continual source of anxiety: while the realm of objects, on the other hand, being the realm of successive and homologous terms, offers security.

Operating solely as a collector, Fairlie’s unfamilial relationships with his family and servants do not allow him to partake in the social duties associated with being the head of household.

In The Woman in White, Fairlie’s simulation of aristocratic social behaviour evokes the distinct cultural assumptions about gender associated with noble rank during this period. His overall physical appearance connotes effeminacy. In particular, Hartright’s account of his first meeting with Fairlie again explicitly specifies his effeminate appearance and manner:

His feet were effeminately small, and were clad in buff-coloured silk stockings, and little womanish bronze-leather slippers. Two rings adorned his white delicate hands […] Upon the whole, he had a frail, languidly-fretful, over-refined look—something singularly and unpleasantly delicate in its association with a man, and, at the same time, something which could by no possibility have looked natural and appropriate if it had been transferred to the appearance of a woman. (p. 42)

The adjectives in this passage more often correspond with a female subject. However, Hartright does not go so far as to label Fairlie as feminine or masculine; rather he alludes to a more androgynous condition, as Lyn Pykett notes, ‘Frederick Fairlie
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seems to belong to an intermediate sex or gender’.  

In addition to an effeminate physical appearance, Frederick Fairlie also displays nervous tendencies throughout the novel (pp. 37, 39, 43, 78, 110). His masculine identity is depicted as sensitive and bordering on the hysterical. He is equated with, and defined against, Laura and Anne Catherick, the novel’s other nervous characters. In perpetuating a state of nervous sensitivity he occupies a fundamentally feminine position. Whereas both Laura and Anne have justified cause for their delicate conditions, both women undergo distressing experiences that result in institutionalisation, Fairlie’s tortured nerves are assumed to be exaggerated: according to Hartright, ‘Mr. Fairlie’s selfish affectation and Mr. Fairlie’s wretched nerves meant one and the same thing’ (p. 43). Although Fairlie mostly feigns his weakened nerves in order to have things his own way, he is without a doubt incapacitated, both mentally and physically. As Gabrielle Ceraldi argues, ‘Mr. Fairlie’s sufferings may not be as intense as he pretends, but clearly he is not psychologically healthy either’.  

In terms of ideal masculinity, Fairlie’s diseased body, oversensitivity and high-pitched and languid voice denote a disintegration of the natural gender order. Collins’s representation of Fairlie embodies the cultural association between effeminate behaviour and passive asexuality, as evidenced by his perpetual state of bachelorhood. One of the integral expectations of Victorian society was that man progress from bachelorhood to married life in order to fulfil his civic responsibilities. Marriage was an institutionalised arrangement that allowed men and women to legitimately produce a nuclear family, which had a rightful claim on any inheritance. Against standard practice, Fairlie explicitly rejects matrimony:

I considerately remain single; and my poor dear brother, Philip, inconsiderately marries. What does he do when he dies? He leaves his daughter to me. She is a sweet girl. She is also a dreadful responsibility. Why lay her on my shoulders? Because I am bound, in the harmless character of a single man, to relieve my married connexions of all their own troubles. (p. 345)

Strangely, Fairlie feels that by not marrying he is being considerate to his family. By
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now the reader is prepared for Fairlie’s selfish and peculiarly negative viewpoints: in this case, remaining single prevents him from burdening his relatives. The absence of interest in sex, in combination with the androgynous description of Fairlie, implies a state of asexuality and a failure to reproduce, which compromises his masculine status.

Just as Fairlie’s ‘shattered condition’ (p. 620) makes him an unfavourable model of Victorian masculinity, so too does his preference for objects over human company, which leaves him without successors. He therefore falls short of satisfying the expectations required by his class and gender identity. It is significant that he is absent from the closing pages of the novel. Collins makes room for the ascent of a true gentleman by removing the physically and morally-weaker male from the narrative: ‘[Fairlie] had been struck by paralysis, and had never rallied after the shock’ (p. 626). Fairlie’s death results in Limmeridge House descending through the family line: Laura’s child, a boy, inherits the property. We can assume that the inheritance includes Fairlie’s immense and valuable collection of art, coins and ornaments as well, to be guarded by Walter Hartright until his son reaches maturity. While individual characters rise and fall, their objects of collection remain to be absorbed into the family estate, but that estate has been newly invigorated by the entry of the middle-class hero, Hartright: the subject of the following section.

Walter Hartright: Embodying Cultural Capital

Walter Hartright represents an alternative model of Victorian masculinity. He embodies many of the paradigms of self-help and ideal manliness that permeated nineteenth-century Britain, in which class and gender identities were mutually involved. Hartright is not a collector in the sense of the word that applies to Fairlie. However, Hartright exhibits patterns of collecting behaviour, and the possession and increased acquisition of cultural capital plays an important role in the construction of his masculine identity.

To prepare the reader for Hartright’s eventual social ascension, Collins surrounds his male protagonist with gentlemanly attributes on a number of occasions in *The Woman in White* (pp. 19, 20, 54, 114, 128, 155, 503, 533). All of these references indicate a ‘natural’ gentlemanly disposition. In particular, Marian recognises Hartright’s discipline and integrity in his initial meeting with ‘the woman in white’. She tells him ‘your management of the affair […] showed self-control, the delicacy, and the compassion of a man who was naturally a gentleman’ (p. 71). The word ‘naturally’ is important because it assumes an authentic gentlemanly nature, as opposed to the affected mannerisms of Fairlie or Sir Percival Glyde. These frequent
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references to Hartright’s well-mannered character augment his moral status and reassure the reader of his capacity to act with authority and power. Furthermore, his association with a gentlemanly standing emphasises a competent masculine identity that is in direct contrast to Fairlie, the novel’s gentleman figure in terms of rank.

Hartright’s achievement as a ‘thoroughly competent drawing master’ derives from his capacity as an artist, a position he shares with his late father (pp. 10, 19). In terms of the possession of cultural capital, the drawing master has an advantageous position. On one hand, Hartright inherits embodied cultural capital in the form of an intellectual discernment of cultural objects (p. 484). From his father, he additionally obtains social capital in the form of reputation and artistic relationships (p. 11). Hartright inherits both intrinsic and extrinsic aesthetic abilities that he converts into a profitable income when he takes up residence as a drawing master at Limmeridge House. On the other hand, Hartright’s cultural capital is institutionalised through his formal artistic training; his ‘accomplishment in art’ and ‘sufficiently educated taste’ (pp. 44-45) implies a temporal commitment to the acquisition of cultural capital.

When Professor Pesca informs Hartright that he is ‘to be treated there on the footing of a gentleman’, it becomes apparent that his respectable amount of cultural competence, combined with his ‘most exceptional references to character and abilities’, allows him to be easily regarded as a gentleman (p. 19).

It is necessary to the narrative of The Woman in White that the profession of its middle-class hero carries with it a satisfactory amount of embodied and institutionalised cultural capital. However, Hartright’s competency with upper-class culture and specialised knowledge of art does not mean that he collects in the traditional sense. Indeed he does not initially possess the necessary economic capital to enable him to collect valuable artistic objects. As an alternative he cultivates his aesthetic persona through his efforts as a hired drawing master and artist. Although he exhibits an artist’s eye for beauty, he initially lacks the economic and social capital required to have an artistic collection of his own. However, Hartright sometimes displays the motivations and actions that are identifiable with the Victorian collector figure, because he effectively collects information and experiences throughout the novel. While Hartright and Fairlie are related through their shared collecting motives, Hartright’s collecting personality can be read in more symbolic terms. At the end of the novel, the collection that reflects his character consists of experiences, not of artistic objects.

Although Hartright does not collect objectified cultural capital, he certainly holds sufficient cultural capital in its embodied form. The tastes of the aesthetic collector figure are fundamental to the study of collecting practices, and Hartright’s

---

43 According to Bourdieu, social capital exists in the form of a network of symbolic relationships ‘of mutual acquaintance and recognition’ that are socially instituted and guaranteed through a familial connection. Bourdieu, ‘The Forms of Capital’, p. 250.

aesthetic tastes often align with those of his employer. The affirmation of a legitimate collector’s embodied cultural capital, then, verifies his own aesthetic sensibilities. Hartright comments on items from Fairlie’s collection:

Although my nerves were not delicate enough to detect the odour of plebeian fingers which had offended Mr. Fairlie’s nostrils, my taste was sufficiently educated to enable me to appreciate the value of the drawings, while I turned them over. (p. 45)

In this passage, Hartright’s overt remark about Fairlie’s amplified sensitivity underlines the differing class and gender status between the two characters. However, their shared artistic appreciation of the drawings connects the two men in terms of embodied cultural capital. Hartright recognises the value of Fairlie’s collection, whilst Fairlie continually avows their shared artistic tastes (pp. 44-45). It is a reciprocal relationship in which one character endorses the other’s embodied cultural capital, and vice versa.

As a collector Hartright is in other ways similar to Frederick Fairlie as both men share a desire for mastery. Fairlie’s desire for mastery over his objects is consistent with his domination over his servant, Louis (pp. 157-58). Equally, the ‘unrelenting need, even hunger’ associated with collecting as an activity can be witnessed in Hartright’s desire for knowledge to gain power over the novel’s villains. The ongoing search for the truth, by any means necessary, demonstrates the obsessive potential of his personality. His underlying motives for wanting to vindicate Laura ‘being robbed of her station’ (p. 414) are clear. He wants to own her: ‘in the right of her calamity, in the right of her friendlessness she was mine at last. Mine to support, to protect, to cherish, to restore’ (p. 414). Without doubt, the possessive implications of this statement suggest a sense of ownership, and are certainly comparable to the language Fairlie uses in relation to his treasured possessions. Hartright’s desire to have possession of Laura, and the lengths to which he goes to secure this possession, show his obsessive tendencies. In effect, it bears a striking resemblance to the urges of the typical systematic collector, whose collection will always be incomplete if it does not include a particularly significant object.

Collins establishes a relationship between Hartright and Laura, as subject and object, right from their first meeting. Hartright, because he is male, a narrator and has an artist’s eye, is invested with the power to perceive Laura. He objectifies her by referring to her through his painting: ‘the water-colour drawing that I first made of Laura Fairlie, at an after period, in the place and attitude in which I first saw her, lies on my desk while I write’ (p. 51). In his distanced admiration of Laura’s appearance, most notably ‘the charm of her face and head, her sweet expression’ (p. 53), Hartright

embodies the power that the subject wields over the object: ‘the (masculine) gaze recreates the visible body of a (feminine) other precisely as it wishes’.\textsuperscript{46} Essentially Laura is an ideal ‘representation, sculpted by a male hand’ and her absorption into a structure of power is normalised by Hartright’s seemingly innocent sketch.\textsuperscript{47} Hartright concedes that his drawing does not suffice to communicate Laura’s beauty: ‘Does my poor portrait of her, my fond, patient labour of long and happy days, show me these things?’ (p. 52). His painting merely diminishes her to an object to be collected, or, ‘a fair, delicate girl in a pretty light dress’ (p. 52). Hartright’s artistic objectification of Laura, combined with Collins’s use of possessive pronouns and active verbs – ‘How can I see her again as she looked when my eyes first rested on her?’ (p. 51) – further accentuates Hartright’s position of power as a male collector figure and an aesthetic evaluating subject.

The power that the collector exerts over his objects is also replicated through the deceptive system of patronage that exists between Hartright and Laura. Under the pretence that she is contributing financially to the household, Laura sincerely believes that she is earning a profit: she unknowingly sells her ‘poor, faint, valueless sketches’ to Hartright (p. 479). He purchases and retains control over Laura’s pictures, which is akin to collecting them. He ascribes a great deal of sentimental value to them: ‘I have all those hidden drawings in my possession still; they are my treasures beyond price’ (p. 479). Looking back in time, his collection of priceless drawings materially represents his bond with their artist. I use the word priceless in a dual sense. The drawings are priceless because they have very little economic value in the Victorian art market, and concurrently they are priceless in the eyes of Hartright because no amount of money would make him part with them (p. 479). Through keeping hold of these emotionally important items, he is able to commune with significant events of his past and to tangibly reinforce his connection with Laura. These sketches (deemed to be aesthetically valuable by their collector) authenticate a particular experience in Hartright’s past.\textsuperscript{48}

Hartright’s gradual acquisition of social and cultural capital is one of many factors that shape his masculine identity. Undoubtedly, Hartright demonstrates nervousness and sensitivity, particularly in the earlier stages of the novel (pp. 33, 72 and 81), and his position as the hero of \textit{The Woman in White} is at once destabilised by the shades of femininity suggested by these transitory states of hysteria, especially in his curious encounter with Anne Catherick (p. 23). On the lonely London road


\textsuperscript{47} Le Doeuff, \textit{The Sex of Knowing}, p. 79.

\textsuperscript{48} William R. McKelvy usefully points out that the purchasing of art from Laura, or as she is also known, Lady Glyde, confirms Hartright’s ‘social arrival’ because it makes him a patron of aristocratic art: ‘Hartright’s evolution from aesthetic employee to industrious collector is an intriguing change of role’. McKelvy, ‘\textit{The Woman in White} and Graphic Sex’, \textit{Victorian Literature and Culture}, 35:1 (March 2007), pp. 287-308 (p. 299).
Hartright displays heightened anxiety, and his disturbed state of mind results from the shock and thrill of this meeting, a sensation that Collins’s readers are thought to have replicated upon reading this passage. The ‘accelerated heart rate’ and ‘increased blood pressure’ experienced concurrently by Hartright and the reader are sensations that are more typically associated with the female subject.\(^\text{49}\) In order to regain authority and to represent the expectations of manliness, and the cultural capital associated with this role, he must reshape his masculine identity from sensitive and bordering on hysterical. Collins counters Harright’s effeminate disposition by dispatching him on a dangerous foreign expedition (p. 156). Hartright survives the perils of Central America and returns to the narrative as a man of action, or as Rachel Ablow has described him, a figure of nineteenth-century ‘strength and self-reliance’.

Hartright’s masculine identity, especially his sexuality, is significantly tied to his aesthetic awareness. I have already referred to Harright’s consuming male gaze and his objectification of Laura, but there are other examples linking sexual desire and aesthetic appreciation. Most striking is his viewing of Marian:

The instant my eyes rested on her, I was struck by the rare beauty of her form, and by the unaffected grace of her attitude […] perfection in the eyes of a man […] She had not heard my entrance into the room and I allowed myself the luxury of admiring her for a few moments. (p. 34)

Hartright’s gaze is both aesthetic and erotically charged: he exhibits the refined judgment of a drawing master, and the sexual admiration of a male.\(^\text{51}\) His admiration is a mixture of erotic and aesthetic gratification and both of these dispositions are reinforced when Hartright catches a glimpse of Marian’s face (pp. 34-35). He continues to notice the artistic beauty of her form, yet he is repulsed by her masculine facial features and cannot ‘reconcile the anomalies and contradictions’ of her appearance (p. 35). Neither his aesthetic nor his erotic tastes endorse Marian as an

\(^{49}\) D. A. Miller, ‘Cage aux folles: Sensation and Gender in Wilkie Collins’s *The Woman in White*’, in *The Making of the Modern Body*, ed. by Catherine Gallagher and Thomas Laqueur. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 107-36 (pp. 107, 110). Tamara S. Wagner has written about the issue of effeminacy in Collins’s fiction. Wagner observes that the representation of Victorian manliness in *The Woman in White* is both sensitive and restored, and discusses its implications within the context of sensation fiction, where heightened emotional drama is typically present in both male and female characters. See Wagner, ‘Overpowering Vitality’.


object of desire. In this instant, it is clear that Marian will not become the hero’s love interest. Like a collector magnetised by an aesthetic object, Hartright is instead drawn to Laura Fairlie’s beauty and vulnerability. Hartright’s attraction to Laura encompasses three forms of desire: aesthetic, erotic, and the desire for mastery over her that I alluded to earlier. Hartright’s aesthetic sense and taste is shown to be linked to his virile sexuality, which is a significant difference between him and Fairlie. Hartright achieves a socially-sanctioned claim on Laura and creates a legitimate space to act out his homosexual desires, through marriage. He also gains a higher social class, with its related benefits of social and economic capital. As Rachel Ablow notes; ‘Hartright represents a fantasy of a middle-class male power to reinvent the self’. The marriage seals his economic and social re-invention.

Hartright proves that he is deserving of that status with his defeat of the novel’s aristocratic villains. His individual conduct reflects the Victorian paradigms of self-help and true gentlemanliness. He further fortifies this position by producing a male heir (p. 625). The baby, ‘kicking and crowing in [Marian’s] arms’ (p. 625), introduced in the last chapter of the novel, represents Hartright’s virility as well as a triumphant social ascension consistent with Victorian values and culture. In this final chapter, which concludes the collection of narratives, all of the false and immoral aristocrats are removed, leaving way for Hartright and his son to inaugurate a new line of honourable gentlemen (p. 626). Collins subscribes to the conventions of Victorian fiction by concluding his novel with a contended image of ‘normative, naturalised heterosexual domesticity’. The performance of his social duty allows Hartright to achieve ideal Victorian manhood and to be convincingly referred to as the new head of the Limmeridge household.

In the final chapter, this scene of paternity and tenderness also reveals much about Victorian inheritance patterns and their consequences for collecting practices. The Limmeridge estate, which includes the property and the items contained in it, is conferred on the new head of Limmeridge. Although Laura and her baby are the familial connection to the estate, Hartright, being an adult male, must assume the responsibility of property and its holdings. This leaves him in possession of all of Fairlie’s treasured artistic objects, thereby making him an aesthetic collector, in the sense of the word as it applies to the ownership of cultural goods. Hartright acquires the objectified cultural capital to match the embodied cultural capital he has displayed throughout the novel. The possession of so many valuable objects is left to an aesthetically cultivated and ideally masculine individual. Collins uses gender to discredit aristocratic methods for acquiring cultural capital and to privilege a bourgeois model based on productive talent rather than consumption.

Although taste is a fundamental power of the aesthetic collector, money is also an essential tool of collecting, and it serves as a key element in the materialistic and

---

capitalist world of the novel. Money is the ultimate power that constitutes collecting aesthetics. It is not by chance that the novel incorporates patterns of inheritance in its narrative framework. In its framing of inheritance, *The Woman in White* sits within the conventions of sensation fiction. Mr. Gilmore, the Fairlie family’s solicitor, warns the reader ‘Miss Fairlie’s inheritance is a very serious part of Miss Fairlie’s story’ and the ‘comfortable little fortune’ that Laura Fairlie stands to inherit is very sought-after in the novel (pp. 147, 149). Both Count Fosco and Sir Percival Glyde gain access to her personal estate on her marriage to Glyde. With the death of both these characters, as well as Fairlie, her inheritance eventually transfers to Hartright and elevates him to a position of increased social and cultural capital. The plot of *The Woman in White* hinges on the transference of inheritance, and the related economic and social power it provides to the male characters.

The ‘forces of circulation in the Victorian novel’ and the notion of inheritance also play a significant part in the representation of the collection in the novel. The endurance of the material object in the world of the novel affords the collector figure a certain hope of an afterlife. The act of bequest transfers the original collector’s embodied and objectified cultural capital to another consciously chosen successor. In *The Woman in White*, the fact that Hartright’s tastes endorse Frederick Fairlie’s makes him the ideal heir to Fairlie’s collection. Hartright will preserve the aesthetic value of the collection, whilst exercising his own moral sensibilities. In this instance, the collector’s objects survive him and are re-circulated. If, then, the collected objects endure in a material sense through their re-circulation, the collectors also continue to signify, through their metonymic association with their collections. Whether signifying something to the collector, or signifying something about the collector, the collected objects of “collecting men” in *The Woman in White* reveal distinctive cultural meanings pertaining to the social identity of their owners.
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