

## People and Money in E. M. Forster's *The Longest Journey*

Rajih S. Al-Harby

Assistant Professor, Department of English, College of Social Sciences,  
Umm Al-Qura University, Makkah al-Mukarramah, Saudi Arabia

(Received on 6/6/ A.H. 1419; accepted for publication on 27/8/A.H. 1420)

**Abstract.** In his novel *The Longest Journey*, E. M. Forster dwells upon the relationship between his characters and money to suggest the need for a balanced attitude towards money and to expose the dangers of putting it before human needs and passions. It is particularly important, Forster believes, that those who inherit England should be able to connect the "new economy" with the "old morality." The following study shows that if money becomes the prime motive of actions, it breeds unhappiness and discomfort as in the case of the Eliots and the Pembrokes. On the other hand, it brings content and happiness to those who use it as a means for the betterment of their society as is obvious in the case of Stephen Wonham and the Ansells. The characters who come on top at the end of the novel are those who admit the importance of money and use it as a means for more civilized ends. On the other hand, the losers are those who pretend that money is not important when they actually put it on top of everything else.

The relationship between people and money always attracted the attention of great Victorian and Edwardian writers such as Thackeray, James, Trollope, Conrad, Hardy, Shaw, Wells, and Lawrence. In particular, this concern with money reflects a major preoccupation of the Edwardian society to a large degree. The Industrial Revolution, the money coming from the colonies of the British Empire, and the rewarding foreign investments made England a very wealthy nation. Nigel Messenger describes the turn of the twentieth century as a time of "great extremes of affluence and poverty" in which "the upper classes flourished and lived lives of comfortable leisure," while "the lower classes led lives of constrained respectability or unrelieved squalor in the big cities that had grown up during the nineteenth century."<sup>(1)</sup> In his essay "Notes On the English Character" E. M. Forster describes England as "a great commercial nation" whose national figure is "Mr. Bull with his top hat ... and his substantial balance at the bank."<sup>(2)</sup> Wilfred Stone also points out that "Between 1880 and 1910 England gradually changed

(1) Nigel Messenger, *How to Study an E. M. Forster Novel* (London: Macmillan, 1991), 3-4.

(2) E. M. Forster, "Notes On The English Character," *Abinger Harvest* (London: Edward Arnold, 1936), 3.

from the leading industrial power in Europe into the leading financial power, and along with this change went an ethical shift from what might be called Victorian work values to Edwardian money values.”<sup>(3)</sup> George Orwell wrote about this period: “There never was, I suppose, in the history of the world a time when the sheer vulgar fatness of wealth, without any kind of aristocratic elegance to redeem it, was so obtrusive as in those years before 1914.”<sup>(4)</sup>

E. M. Forster repeatedly indicated his fears of what he saw as a divorce between wealth and morality in the booming economy of his nation. A few examples suffice to show the extent of Forster’s worries. In the “The Challenge of Our Time” he regrets the blindness of his time to the economic basis of his culture: “In came the nice fat dividends, up rose the lofty thoughts, and we did not realize that all the time we were exploiting the poor of our own country and the backward races abroad, and getting *bigger* profits from our investments *than we should*”<sup>(5)</sup> (emphasis is mine). He becomes even more concerned about the improper use of this wealth in “Coronation Nightmare” when he criticizes the extravagance associated with that occasion: “Why this colossal expense, when debts are unpaid and areas destitute?”<sup>(6)</sup> It is not surprising then that in a letter to Hilton Young, Forster explains that what he finds interesting in both Communism and Christianity is “their attempts to cut out money,” because, he adds, “money is dangerous.”<sup>(7)</sup> When in his *Commonplace Book*, Forster quotes Gerald Heard on the idea that money is power, he notices that Heard “does not account for the strange effect money has had on the character.”<sup>(8)</sup> Hence, Mary Lago rightly asserts that Forster “grew up extremely conscious of and often worried about money’s power over human beings, and particularly about its effects on friendship.”<sup>(9)</sup>

Forster’s great worries about the effects of money on people show in the repeated references to money in most of his works. His reservations about the exploitation and the misuse of the financial gains of the British Empire explain why they are particularly noticeable in the two novels which deal with who inherits England: *The Longest Journey* and *Howards End*. While Forster’s handling of money in *Howards End* received adequate attention,<sup>(10)</sup> very little attention has been paid to the role of money in *The Longest Journey*. Whatever comments are there they have been made in passing by people who discussed the novel in general. This is surprising because even the most

- 
- (3) Wilfred Stone, *The Cave and the Mountain* (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), 250.  
 (4) George Orwell, “Such, Such Were the Joys,” *In Front of Your Nose: Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1968), 4:357.  
 (5) E. M. Forster, “The Challenge of Our Time,” *Two Cheers for Democracy* (London: Edward Arnold, 1951), 55.  
 (6) E. M. Forster, “Coronation Nightmare,” *The Spectator*, March 19, 1937, 509.  
 (7) Mary Lago and P. N. Furbank, eds., *Selected Letters of E. M. Forster* (London: Collins, 1985), 2:172-73.  
 (8) E. M. Forster, *Commonplace Book*, ed. by Philip Gardner (London: Scolar Press, 1985), 91.  
 (9) Mary Lago, *E. M. Forster: A Literary Life* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995), 11.  
 (10) See Paul Delany, “‘Islands of Money’: Rentier Culture in E. M. Forster’s *Howards End*,” *English Literature in Transition*, 31, no. 3 (1988), 285-96; and Wilfred Stone, “Forster on Love and Money,” *Aspects of E. M. Forster*, ed. by Oliver Stallybrass (London: Edward Arnold, 1969), 111.

casual reader of this novel cannot fail to notice the centrality of money in it. It has more than seventy-two references to money and it is the only Forster novel which has a full chapter written using economic terms. Chapter 28, often referred to by critics as the "coinage chapter,"<sup>(11)</sup> consists of three short paragraphs devoted entirely to the narrator's philosophic commentary and has no reference to either action or character. The chapter poses a question that haunted Forster, namely, how to reconcile ideals and the actualities of worldly life. Thus, monetary terms are used to present philosophical and moral dilemmas.

One cannot fail to notice the centrality of money in a novel where most of the characters are connected to the others by monetary relations. Rickie, the main character, is connected to his detested, miserly father by inheritance. The Silts, poor cousins of Mr. Eliot, inherit the money of Rickie's aunt when she dies intestate. The lack of money postpones Agnes's marriage to Gerald until the latter's death. Rickie's need to make a living takes him to Sawston where the Pembrokes dominate and corrupt his life. Mrs. Failing's money attracts the legacy hunting Agnes, who tries to bribe Stephen and unsuccessfully attempts to disinherit him. It is worth noting here that money in the novel is mainly in the hands of the bad people which suggests that there is more than meets the eye in Rickie's thought that "things were so crookedly arranged" (p.47).<sup>(12)</sup> On the other hand, the more sympathetic characters are the ones with little or no money at all; the characters who either have money or are bent on making money are flawed and not admired. At the end of the novel, there is some kind of poetic justice when money is finally returned to its rightful or more appropriate agents. The story ends with Stephen and his daughter inheriting the land and living off the money they make from Rickie's posthumously published stories.

Alistair Duckworth asserts that Forster's life in the first decade of the twentieth century had a political dimension.<sup>(13)</sup> Indeed, his poem *A Voter's Dilemma* suggests his mistrust of both Liberals and Conservatives<sup>(14)</sup> because of both parties' concern with profiteering from munitions rather than with peace and justice. Thus, his insistence upon the connection between money and the inheritance of England is tremendously important because it suggests that he is pointing to certain qualities that he would like to see in those who inherit England. To use the words he uses in "The Challenge of Our Time" Forster seems to be saying those who inherit England should be able to connect the "new economy" with the "old morality." John Colmer calls it a connection between "Money" and "Culture" when he attributes the Ansells' ease with money to their ability to associate money with culture.<sup>(15)</sup> In other words, those who inherit England should combine their business acumen with honesty, an interest in human relationships and a

(11) See Barbara Rosecrance, *Forster's Narrative Vision* (London: Cornell University Press, 1982), 78-79; and Fredrick Crews, *The Perils of Humanism* (London: Macmillan Education Ltd., 1962), 59-62.

(12) All page references are to E.M. Forster, *The Longest Journey* (London: Bantam Books), 1997.

(13) E. M. Forster: *Howards End*, ed. by Alistair Duckworth (New York: Bedford Books, 1997), 13.

(14) See "A Voter's Dilemma" in E. M. Forster, *Abinger Harvest* (London: Arnold, 1936), 31-32.

(15) John Colmer, *E. M. Forster: The Personal Voice* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1975), 70.

willingness to use money as a means for more civilized ends particularly to support art. In "The Challenge of Our Time" Forster expresses his hope that "in the new economy there may be a sphere for human relationships, and for the despised activity known as art."<sup>(16)</sup> For Forster, these qualities constitute the balanced and healthy attitude toward money which he would like to see in those who inherit the England. Thus, in *The Longest Journey*, a novel which opens with a debate, Forster is debating whether England is to be left in the hands of people like the Eliots and the Pembrokes or in the hands of people like Mr. Ansell and Stephen Wonham. The following close reading of the novel shows how Forster disqualifies the Eliots and the Pembrokes from the race and heralds the success of the Ansell and the Wonhams. Consequently, the book closes with the triumph of Stephen and the Ansell. Carola Kaplan rightly asserts: "Thus, the narrative suggests that England's salvation lies in the hands of honest and right-minded business men such as Mr. Ansell, whose money supports his son, and Stephen, or at least the person he eventually becomes. In other words, Forster seems to place his greatest hopes in men who use their business acumen to support and protect art and intellect."<sup>(17)</sup>

Since the novel is, in a way, about the education of Rickie Eliot, it is important to begin with the hero's own problem with money. When we first meet Rickie, he is a limping (already physically disqualified), twenty-year-old, Cambridge student who is about to have control of his inherited fortune. The novel opens with a scene which suggests Rickie's preoccupation with money. While his friends are engaged in the metaphysical debate about the cow, Rickie's mind (rickety) wanders to the court where he sees: The kitchen-men with supper-trays upon their heads. ... cold food for three, apparently at half-a-crown a head, for someone he did not know; hot food, a la carte—obviously for the ladies haunting the next staircase; cold food for two, at two shillings—going to Ansell's room for himself and Ansell." (p.4).

That Rickie includes the prices of these orders prepares us for how money-conscious he is at this particular stage of his development. The same idea is echoed later in the novel. Despite Mr. Eliot's wealth, Rickie and his mother had lived in very poor conditions. When his mother tells him that because of the death of his father things will be different, the boy immediately asks "Shall we be poorer?" (p.26). While dining at the Silts', Rickie, looking at the 'athletic' turkey and the pudding, thinks: "these symbols of hilarity had cost money" (p.32). A few pages later, he offers money to enable Gerald, who bullied Rickie a great deal at school, and Agnes to get married.

As the narrative unfolds we discover that while self-conscious about money in general, Rickie is uneasy about his inherited money. He seldom talks about it and the few times he considers it suggest dissatisfaction and disdain. At the Silts' who openly and repeatedly talk about Rickie's fortune, he feels "bad enough being 'so rich'" (p.47).

(16) E. M. Forster, "The Challenge of Our Time," *Two Cheers for Democracy* (London: Penguin Books, 1965), 66.

(17) Carola M. Kaplan, "Absent Father, Passive Son: The Longest Journey," *E. M. Forster*, ed. by Jeremy Tambling (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 62.

He leaves them for the Pembroke's where his fortune becomes a reason for "shame" when he discovers that Gerald and Agnes, two people in love, will not marry because they "had no beastly money" (p.47). The fact that he inherits both his father's money and his father's lameness suggests some kind of sickness and disgust associated with this inherited money. The narrative suggests two possible reasons for Rickie's unease about his money. Both reasons have to do with the source of this expected money.

The first possible explanation for Rickie's disgust with his own money comes from his belief that there is something "shady" about its source. He tells Ansell that: "About a hundred years ago an Elliot did something shady and founded the fortunes of our house" (p.31). Consequently, Rickie not only rebels against the Eliots and their inherited money but also expresses admiration for the life of trades people, a life very different from his own wealthy family. Rickie admires the earned money of the Ansell's who keep a shop. During his stay at the Ansell's, Rickie contrasts the "live" money that rattles through their tills with the "dead" money that comes silently to him through the death of others:

"Listen to your money!" said Rickie. "I wish I could hear mine. I wish my money was alive."  
 "I don't understand."  
 "Mine's dead money. It's come to me through about six dead people – silently."  
 "Getting a little smaller and a little more respectable each time, on account of the death-duties."  
 "It needed to get respectable."  
 "Why? Did your people, too, once keep a shop?"  
 "Oh, not as bad as that! They only swindled. (p. 31)

Rickie's above-quoted words uncover the first reason for his contempt for his money. Another possible reason is that it is the money of a wicked person who does not yield it willingly; the narrative suggests that there seems to be something uncanny about this kind of money. The same idea, of accepting the money of unpleasant (unloved) figures, is later repeated when Stewart Ansell declares that Stephen Wonham "would sooner die than take money from people he did not love" (p. 218). It is made very obvious that Rickie's father is a very wicked, stingy man, who would not, willingly, give money to his son. Rickie's relationship with his father is revealed in a flashback which implies the terrible deprivation of Rickie's childhood and shows the father's stinginess. Mr. Eliot is a selfish wealthy man who uses money for his own pleasures and does not spend it on his wife and child. Thus, Rickie's father is definitely not a suitable candidate for the inheritance of the land.

The same can be said about Rickie's aunt, (Mrs. Failing!), who is rich but neither honest nor willing to use money for the betterment of her society. Mrs. Failing is first introduced as "dressed in brown silk," and a "brown silk shawl" (p.83). However, money cannot buy her contentment and happiness. She dislikes her home and she tries, in vain, to sell it or let it but "she asked too much, and as it was neither a pretty place nor fertile, it was left on her hands" (p.96). Like Rickie's father, she limps. So connected are the spiritual and the physical that the physically unbalanced, limping Eliots also lack a balanced attitude toward money. Mrs. Failing is a selfish wealthy woman who uses her money to manipulate and control people around her. For instance, whenever she wants to

get rid of Stephen she would lay "two or three sovereigns on the step above him" and he would sweep them up with a word of pleasure. The narrator comments that Stephen "was kept like a baby in such things" (p.131).

Later in the narrative, Forster provides more incidents to show how Mrs. Failing puts her money before more important concerns for the people around her. For example, not knowing that Stephen is to blame, Mrs. Failing turns out five families of her tenants on account of her broken windows. One of these devastated families is the Thompsons who have lived in the valley for hundreds of years (p.268). More importantly, despite Stephen's repeated appeals, she does not repair the bridge which has claimed the lives of many children near her home. We are not surprised because we already know that her attitude toward charity is appalling. She believes that unselfish people are "deathly dull" and that they give their money because "they are too stupid or too idle to spend it properly on themselves" (p.91). It is certainly ironic that Stephen, the pagan, should reproach her for not being "her brother's keeper": "There wants a bridge," he explodes. "A bridge instead of all this rotten talk and the level-crossing. It wouldn't break you to build a two-arch bridge" (p.93). It is also important and symbolic that Mrs. Failing fails to build the bridge. Trusted with the family's secret about Stephen's identity, she has the chance of bridging the lives of these two brothers but she fails to do that. She keeps the secret as long as it amuses her. She thinks: "I like the idea of their mutual ignorance. It is amusing" (p.233). When the secret is out and people start to talk, she simply turns penniless Stephen out of the house, at the same time informing him of his true identity. Again she resorts to her money to get rid of Stephen; she offers him a hundred pounds annually if he goes to Canada. Her refusal to repair the bridge is also symbolic of her inability to connect the "new economy" with the "old morality." Thus, like her brother, Mr. Eliot, she is also excluded from the inheritance of the land.

In addition to the Eliots, Forster also disqualifies the Pembrokes from the inheritance of England. Very early in the book, Forster uses the image of Mr. Pembroke holding his foot "like a wounded dog" (p.11) to connect him with the limping Eliots. The Pembrokes are depicted throughout the novel as always hankering after more financial gains. Money motivates their actions but they are neither honest about it nor willing to use it for more civilized ends. They avoid talking about it in public. They always pretend that money (the cow) is not there when they are the people most associated with it in the novel. Their small house, Shelthorpe, has "an air about it which suggested a certain amount of money" (p.32). Dunwood house, their day school, "reeks of commerce and snobbery" (p.174). Nevertheless, throughout the novel, Mr. Pembroke resorts to euphemisms for money. Instead of saying a young man must first make some money, he would say a young man must "settle soon enough" (p.14), "get his foot on the ladder" (p.16) or "make his way" (p.37). During the Pembrokes' first visit to Cambridge, Mr. Pembroke, a father figure to Rickie, repeatedly asks the boy about his plans for the future. When Rickie, reluctantly, admits that he may take up writing as a career, Mr. Pembroke says he approves of writing only if Rickie "could make a living by it" (p.16). When Rickie replies that he is "certain it wouldn't pay him", Mr. Pembroke "uneasily"

advises the artist "not to consider money" and that he "never mentioned the word 'pay'" (p.16). Later in the narrative, when Rickie suggests that Agnes has exposed Stephen to get his aunt's money, Mr. Pembroke's reply is similar: "Money .... Who mentioned money?" (p.197). The dramatic irony is that the reader is always aware of the disparity between the Pembrokes' words and the reality of their situation. This exclusion of money by the Pembrokes is also confirmed in the description of their own house in which "neither the cry of money nor the cry for money shall ever be heard" (p.33).

More importantly, the Pembrokes are condemned because they "seek money without requiring it" (p.202). In other words, they are interested in money as an end in itself. Stewart here reflects Forster's view that "One of the evils of money is that it tempts us to look at it rather than at the things that it buys."<sup>(18)</sup> The novel also shows that the Pembrokes sacrifice personal relationships for the sake of money. They acquire money at the expense of more humane values and concerns. For instance, Mr. Pembroke coaxes Rickie and Agnes to cancel their trip to Italy because he has an offer of private pupils. Mr. Pembroke's justification is "it seemed unreasonable to leave England when money was to be made in it" (p.167). The Pembrokes keep building boarding houses at the expense of the day boys for whom the school was originally built. "After the financial success of Dunwood House, a new boarding house is being built and the local mothers are frantic" (p.172). However, it is made clear that money brings them nothing in return but misery, pain, and humiliation. The Pembrokes' attempts to make more money rebound on them and usually it is someone else who gets the money which they have tried to procure. The narrator's words that in "classic drama ... by trying to advance our fortunes, we shatter them" (p.249) sum up the Pembrokes' relationship with money. They accuse Mrs. Orr of "dishonesty" and of "establishing a boarding house" just because she has taken up Varden, a little boy whose mother has left Sawston, as a day boy. Forced to join the Pembrokes' boarding house, Varden gets a chance to contact Stephen Wonham who writes back a letter which rekindles Rickie's feelings for his half-brother and creates the "wide gulf between him and Agnes. When Agnes first knows about Rickie's stories, she tries to encourage him: "It does seem a pity that you don't make something of your talents. It seems such a waste to write little stories and never publish them" (p.70). She recommends that he writes something that lasts an hour instead of the long stories. She later thinks he should write "a sparkling society tale, full of verve and pathos" (p.148). After her engagement to Rickie, Agnes keeps "flying to London to push Rickie's fortunes" (p.163). Despite Agnes's eagerness to make money out of Rickie's talents, the stories do not get published until he has divorced her. When the stories finally get published, it is Stephen and his daughter who get most of that money. Finally, Stephen's dismissal is engineered by the legacy-hunting Agnes Pembroke who is rightly described by George Thomson as "a kind of a suburban dragon whose corrupting fire is money rather than flame."<sup>(19)</sup> Ironically, it is her attempt to acquire Stephen's money that leads to Rickie's freedom from the clutches of the Pembrokes.

Unfortunately, the Pembrokes' imbalanced attitude towards money is infectious

(18) E. M. Forster, "The Last Parade," *Two Cheers for Democracy* (London: Edward Arnold, 1951), 6.

(19) George Thomson, *The Fiction of E. M. Forster* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967), 151.

and later Rickie shows symptoms of being infected. Ironically, Rickie himself realizes, when he joins Sawston school, that his "programme involved a change in values as well as a change of occupation" (p.149). He calls it "the new life" in which as the narrator comments "as the term wore on he lost his independence—almost without knowing it" (p.160). When Rickie joins the Pembrokes at Sawston he temporarily adopts their perspective on money. Rickie who has offered to support Agnes and Gerald if they marry because he has more money than he really needs, is made to believe by the Pembrokes that he is in need of more money. When Ansell asks him why he and Agnes would not marry sooner, Rickie replies that he "must get money, worse luck." When Ansell says "you'd got money," Rickie uses one of Mr. Pembroke's metaphors: "I must get my foot on the ladder, then" (p.75). This dialogue implies that Rickie is simply repeating what he has heard from Mr. Pembroke, a father-figure. Rickie later takes Agnes to a cheap restaurant in the Soho area in London. When one of Rickie's friends remarks that the restaurant is "frightfully cheap," Agnes replies: "Just why Rickie brings me" (p.138). As they are leaving, Agnes pays and the narrator comments: "she always did the paying, Rickie muddled so with his purse" (p.138). Widdrington, Rickie's college friend, tells Ansell "Pembroke and that wife [Agnes] simply run him" (p.175). The narrator also announces "Henceforward he [Rickie] deteriorates... He remained conscientious and decent but the spiritual part of him proceeded toward ruin" (p.187).

It is at this point, the climax of the novel, that Forster chooses to present his "coinage chapter" about the "bankruptcy of the soul." It is the last chapter in the Sawston section dominated by the greedy Pembrokes who have failed to "connect" the "new economy" with the "old morality." It is followed by the last section of the novel, titled "Wiltshire," dominated by Stephen and the Anells with their rightful use of money. Thus, the arrangement of the sections reflects Forster's wishful thinking about the future of England. The Sawston way of thinking is to end and to be replaced by a more natural and a healthier perspective on the question of wealth and money. As far as Rickie is concerned, the chapter is also indicative of growth and change. Rickie goes "bankrupt" for the second time because he has just discovered that Stephen is the illegitimate son of his beloved mother not his detested father. At first, he cannot accept that it was his worshipped and glorified mother who had erred in the past. The conventional Sawston with all its "petty prejudices, and snobberies" block his view: "As Forster saw it, these little things blinded people to the values of the good life. They were distractions that stood between mankind and the liberty of spirit which is one essential to any real happiness. And they blocked human communications, the basis of mutual understanding, which is the other. "Only connect" was Forster's famed motto. While we are chained to shibboleths, we are still children. We are not serious; we play with life."<sup>(20)</sup>

Rickie suffers but it is explicitly stated that the soul will be healthier after the pain of bankruptcy: "Perhaps she will be the richer in the end. In her agony, she learns to reckon clearly. Fair as the coin may have been, it was not accurate; and though she knew

(20) See the second page of the Introduction by Louis Auchincloss (1992) in *Great Novels and Short Stories of E. M. Forster* (New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, Inc., 1999), this four-page introduction is not page numbered at all.



it not, there were treasures it could not buy. The face, however beloved, was mortal, and liable as the soul herself to err. We do but shift responsibility by making a standard of the dead" (p. 219).

Out of the wreckage comes a better Rickie who is neither as passive nor as receptive as he used to be. Rickie stands firm in his refusal to accept his wife's plan to disinherit his half-brother. Agnes has repeated Stephen's versified mockery of the old lady to her. Agnes had confidentially learnt this song from Rickie who heard the drunk Stephen singing it when they went out for a ride one day. We now learn that on her first visit to Cadover, Agnes thought "Oh, here is money. We must try and get it" (p.185). Ironically, through her attempt to gain Stephen's money, Agnes loses what could have been her money because Rickie finally deserts her for his brother. When Rickie discovers the truth about Agnes, he is totally astonished: "How can you think of such things? You behave like a poor person. We don't want any money from Aunt Emily, or from any one else. It isn't virtue that makes me say it: we are not tempted in that way: we have as much as we want already" (p.184). He insists that his aunt's money should go to Stephen. He tells Agnes that "the right and proper thing for my aunt to do is to leave every penny she's got to Stephen" (p.185). He goes even further to assert that if his aunt's money "ever did come to him, he would refuse to accept it" (p.198).

That artistic ideals are more important than money for Rickie is the glimpse of hope which prepares us for Rickie's eventual salvation. He refuses Agnes's meddling with his literary career. Although his imaginative fantasies about getting in touch with nature do not get accepted for publication, he sticks to his high artistic ideals and refuses to change them according to Agnes's advice. She, unable to appreciate these imaginative pieces, advises him to write something more obvious, something that would be popular: "couldn't you make your stories more obvious? I don't see any harm in that. Uncle Willie floundered hopelessly. He doesn't read much, and he got muddled. I had to explain and then he was delighted..... But couldn't you express them more clearly?" (p.137). Agnes's main concern is to get these stories published but Rickie, a real artist, does not even for a moment consider lowering his standards to allow his stories to sell. He later explains to his aunt that he could never write at the Pembrokes' and how things have changed under the support of Ansell and Stephen: "I should have had time to write it, but the people round me coloured my life, and so it never seemed worth while. For the story is not likely to pay. Then came the volcano. .... Two men I know [Ansell and Stephen] ... burst into the room. They said, 'what happened to your short stories? They weren't good, but where are they? Why have you stopped writing? ... You must write. Because to write ... is you.' Well I have written, and yesterday we sent the long story out on its rounds" (p.265). Unlike Agnes, Stewart and Stephen are interested in Rickie's ability to write regardless of any economic returns. It is to Ansell and Stephen, the inheritors of the land, that Rickie turns at the end.

If the book opens with Rickie's life dominated by Stewart Ansell, the last section of the novel brings the two together again. Rickie swings back to the Ansell's camp with

their healthier attitude toward money. Throughout the novel, Forster presents the Ansell's attitude toward money favorably. For instance, unlike Mr. Eliot, Mr. Ansell "had what no education can bring - the power of detecting what is important" (p.29). The essential opposition between Mr. Eliot, an urban barrister who "had all the money" (p.25), and Mr. Ansell, "a provincial draper of moderate prosperity" (p.28) is conveyed in the comparison of their attitudes towards money. Despite the appeals of the mother, Rickie's father would not "send his lame, delicate son to a private school" (p.25). On the other hand, Mr. Ansell "had borrowed money to start him [Stewart] at a rapacious and fashionable private school; he had sent him to tutors; he had sent him to Cambridge" (p.29). In short "Like many fathers, he had spared no expense over his boy" (p.29). Unlike Mr. Eliot, Mr. Ansell is not educated but he knows, intuitively, that his son should pursue whatever makes him happy. Thus, the narrator credits Mr. Ansell with a healthy perspective on money when he describes him as a man who "liked money and social position. But he knew that there is a more important thing" (p.29). John Colmer rightly attributes the Ansell's ease with money to the fact that they succeed to "connect" it with culture while the Pembroke's insincere attitude is due to their dissociation of culture from money.<sup>(21)</sup> This is true because in the realm of the novel, the Ansell's use their money to provide their children with learning, knowledge and good taste while the interest of the Eliots and the Pembroke is not in gaining these aspects of culture but rather in making money out of money. The negative attitude of the Eliots and the Pembroke toward art and literature is in total contrast to their eagerness for accumulation of wealth. At the end of the novel, it is to the house of the Ansell's that Rickie and Stephen turn for refuge and comfort. Agnes Pembroke is outraged because "Ansell ... had sheltered the fugitives and given them money, and saved them from the ludicrous checks that so often stop young men" (p.251).

Like the Ansell's, Stephen is both honest about money and willing to use it for more civilized ends. His attitude is contrasted with that of Rickie's aunt. The image of Mrs. Failing is made even worse by juxtaposing it to the humane response to Stephen's dismissal of her shepherds and his poor rustic companions. On his way to the Pembroke's, Stephen thinks of what his poor friends have sacrificed for him: "He must pay back the friends who had given him shillings and clothes. He thought of Flea, whose Sundays he was spoiling—poor Flea, who ought to be in them now, shining before his girl. "I daresay he'll be ashamed and not go to see her, and then she'll take the other man" (p.237).

Unlike his aunt, Stephen is frank about money and he certainly believes that there are things which are more important than money. The quotation above shows that Stephen has no scruples about accepting money from friends. He even accepts these people's clothes as is the case with Flea who consequently will not be able to see the girl he loves. Later, Stephen would ask for Rickie's money without apology "'you must put down against me.' He would say. In time ... he would rent or purchase a farm" (p.256). When a man, wanting to show off in front of his woman, tips Stephen a sovereign, the

(21) John Colmer, *The Personal Voice* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), 70.

latter changes it into a postal order and sends it to the people at Cadover. "It did not pay them back, but it paid them something, and he felt that his soul was free" (p.238). That the nature-loving characters such as Stephen, his father, and Mrs. Eliot are very open about money, suggests that undue reticence about money is not natural.

That money is not the prime motive of Stephen's action is best illustrated by two of his acts: his rejection of Mrs. Failing's money if he gets settled in Canada and his refusal of Agnes's blank check if he keeps away from Rickie. As for Mrs Failing's money, he explains to Ansell who thinks Stephen is too proud: "But I am not proud. Look how I've taken your pouch! The hundred pounds was - well, can't you see yourself, it was quite different? It was, so to speak, inconvenient for me to take the hundred pounds" (p.208). These words suggest that Stephen, unlike the Eliots and the Pembrokes, puts his personal dignity above money. A few pages later he shocks Agnes who, brandishing an open check, pushes before him a "pseudo-legal document" composed by Mr. Pembroke which reads "In consideration of the sum of ..... , I agree to perpetual silence—to restrain from libellous...never to molest the said Frederick Eliot by intruding—" (p.213). Unable to understand the reason for Stephen's refusal to sign the paper, Agnes explains: "But its money we offer you" (p.214). She can never understand that this pagan, poor, illegitimate Stephen has an innate sense of dignity which is lacking in those religious, well-off, genteel men and women. The last scene in the novel contrasts his views to those of Mr. Pembroke, a greedy clergyman.

Indeed, the ending of the novel celebrates the defeat of the unbalanced attitude toward money, represented by the Pembrokes and the Eliots, and the victory of those who can connect the "new economy" with the "old morality" represented by the combination of Ansell (Cambridge) and Stephen (Wiltshire). Stephen gets Rickie's money and the Silts, not the Pembrokes, get Mrs. Failing's fortune and manor. Because Mrs. Failing dies intestate, her manor, Cadover, passes to the Silts, poor cousins of Rickie's father. Interestingly, the last chapter contains echoes of the first one. The question of money is again stressed. If *The Longest Journey* opens with a scene that suggests preoccupation with money, it ends with a whole chapter dominated with the question of money and profits. The last few pages of the novel suggests that the Pembrokes' endless quest for money is to be stopped. Mr. Pembroke, now a clergyman, tries to cheat Stephen and get more than his due out of the royalties of Rickie's posthumously published stories. Mr. Pembroke, shown as greedy and selfish, is humiliated in the negotiations with Stephen over the division of the profits of Rickie's stories:

"A case of half and half—division of profits."

"Half and half?" said the young farmer [Stephen] slowly. "What do you take me for? Half and half, when I provide ten of the stories and you only four?"

"I—I—" stammered Mr. Pembroke.

"I consider you did me over the long story, and I'm damned if you do me over the short ones!"

"Hush! if you please, hush!—if only for your little girl's sake." He lifted a clerical palm.

"You did me," his voice drove, "and all the Thirty-Nine Articles won't stop me saying so (p.275).

Stephen's bullying of Mr. Pembroke, the rhetorician who is now reduced to stammers, is a joke at the expense of the authority represented by Mr. Pembroke, an ex-school master and a present clergyman. His thoughts are now being recorded to illustrate his hypocrisy. For instance, we learn that he wishes to bury a knife in Stephen's wide back and that this desire passes "partly because it was unclerical, partly because he had no knife, and partly because he soon blurred over what had happened" (p. 276). This hypocrisy is exactly what Forster worried about when he distrusted both political parties in his country. However, that the final chapter of the book contains many echoes of its first one suggests the end of an era and a beginning of a new one. The novel seems to suggest a brighter future for England under leaders who will be willing to view money "not [as] an end in itself but [as] a very useful and civilizing means to a civilized end."<sup>(22)</sup> Forster explicitly states that Stephen and not Mr. Pembroke is to inherit the land: "Though he could not phrase it, he believed that he guided the future of our race, and that, century after century, his thoughts and his passions would triumph in England. The dead who had evoked him, the unborn whom he could evoke—he governed the paths between them." (p. 278)

It is clear that the idea of "connecting" and "bridging" is again emphasized. Bridging is an important metaphor for Forster who is always asking his readers to bridge and "connect." Toward the end of the book, Stephen tells Mr. Pembroke, and the readers, that the Silts have "bridged the railway, and made other necessary alterations" (p.275). A similar kind of bridging is also suggested at the end of the novel by Rickie's implied continuation in Stephen and his daughter. Despite his death, Rickie's presence, through his art, rings a very positive note. There is something of Rickie that will live on after all. Martland notes that Forster in *The Longest Journey* shows "that it is possible to contribute to posterity without raising children of the flesh"<sup>(23)</sup> and that "Rickie's legacies as an artist, his 'children', are his writings."<sup>(24)</sup> His stories have been published and Stephen and his daughter are to get the lion's share of that money. It is also suggested that Stephen will gain more money through the possible marriage of his daughter to the Silts' son. The novel ends with the image of Stephen and his daughter, to carry their mother's name, in the outdoors. Finally the past is reconciled with the present and the future. The fact that Stephen connects the past and the future reinforces and echoes the main connection which is to be made between the "new economy" and the "new morality." Hence, he would be the leader of future generations.

In conclusion, E. M. Forster's concern with the relationship between people and money was in accordance with the Edwardians' preoccupation with the question of wealth. This close study of *The Longest Journey*, Forster's autobiographical novel, indicates that by emphasizing the consequences of his characters' attitudes towards money, Forster is suggesting the need for a more balanced attitude toward it especially

(22) Wilfred Stone, in *The Love That Failed: Ideal and Reality in the Writings of E.M. Forster*, ed. Richard Martin (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), 116.

(23) Arthur Martland, *E. M. Forster: Passion and Prose* (London: The Gay Men's Press, 1999), 85.

(24) Martland, *E.M. Foster*, 84.

for those who are to inherit and lead England. Analysis of the attitudes of the main characters reveals that a healthy attitude towards financial matters means the ability to combine the "new economy" and the "old morality" or "money" and "culture". Money should never be the prime motive of actions; it should be used as a means for more civilized ends. Examples of people who fail to meet the requirements of a balanced attitude towards money are the Eliots and the Pembrokes who are depicted as unhappy, discontented and finally defeated. On the other hand, people who made the connection are presented as happy, contented and triumphant at the end. Examples of the second kind are the Ansell and the land-related characters such as Stephen, his parents, and the Silts.

## العلاقة بين المال والشخصيات في رواية إي إم فورستر الرحلة الأطول

راجح بن سعد الحربي

أستاذ مساعد، قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية العلوم الاجتماعية، جامعة أم القرى،

مكة المكرمة، المملكة العربية السعودية

**ملخص البحث.** شغل الطغيانُ المادي على كثير من المبادئ والقيم بال كثير من الكتاب الموقين أمثال تاكري و جيمز وترولوب وكونراد وهاردي وشو ولورانس . ولقد اهتم فورستر بهذا الجانب خصوصا في روايته نهاية هواردز و الرحلة الأطول اللتين تتناولان موضوع وراثه الأرض البريطانية. إلا أن النقاد أغفلوا هذا الجانب المهم في الرحلة الأطول والتي هي أحب الروايات إلى فورستر وأكثرها التصاقا بحياته. أظهر هذا التحليل للشخصيات والمواقف في هذه الرواية تأكيد فورستر على أن الذين يرثون الأرض البريطانية ينبغي أن يجمعوا بين الفطنة الاقتصادية والمبادئ الإنسانية السامية. فرغم أهمية المال إلا أنه ينبغي عدم وضعه بأي حال من الأحوال فوق الاعتبارات الإنسانية والأخلاقية، لأن من شأن ذلك تحويل السعادة إلى شقاء كما يتضح ذلك جليا في مصير بعض الشخصيات في نهاية هذه الرواية. إن الشخصيات التي تكذب وراء المال وتضعه فوق كل اعتبار هي الخاسرة في النهاية، بينما ينتصر أولئك الذين، رغم اعترافهم بأهمية المال، جعلوا منه وسيلة إلى غايات إنسانية أسمى وأكبر.