

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

4.1 Conclusion

The tendency to a myopic solution-based approach to the book, the dissociative/drug precedents of *The Moonstone* and *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, and the modern tendency to seek understanding through the lens of depth psychology, and attention on Dickens' own possible personal guilt and subversive social streak all conspire to lead readers away from allowing the patterns to naturally build to a theme of nature righting and in-eradicatable stasis of man lurking under faces of citizenry.

The prevalent theory is not wholly incompatible with the discoveries presented above. Used as a working model, the idea that the shadow story was to remain an inside literary joke, a 'story never to come out,' (as character Bazzard describes his own tragic play) clears up any dissonance easily enough. Then the reader is left free to imagine Forster's and Dickens Jr.'s ideas about how the plot structure was to unfold enjoy complete compatibility. In the shadow theory, Jasper, Neville and Edwin would most probably have to be killed in order for the secret to remain. This is just how witnesses have it: "Neville was, I believe to have been killed" (Forster, 1874: 411)

Further, following the deeper clues beyond questions and toward answers opens the prospect of a 'marriage' i.e., sacrificing of Rosa by Tartar. Just so, "Rosa was to marry Tartar." (Forster, 1874: 411)

This leaves the idea of Jasper condemned and executed by the ‘long and strong arm’ of justice. Forster expects Jasper’s confession to have been unusual, *as if told of another man*. Imagine the originality of it. In other words, there was to have been again the central element of some sort of doublespeak. If accurate, it only supports the shadow story theory. Friends and family adamantly held that Dickens intended to end the book in “a review of the murderous career by himself at the close when the murderer’s temptations were to be dwelt upon as if some other man were the tempted. His wickedness elaborated on as if told by another.” (Forster, 1874: 412)

This is unsurprising because such a unique angle for a confession would leave ample ‘wiggle room’ in the writing to fulfill both the revealed and the concealed stories. In this way Dickens could remain honest to his friends and yet reserve the element that was ‘not communicable or the book’s interest would be lost.” (Forster, 1874: 409)

“The testimony of Forster does not tell us that Dickens communicated the secret in a letter. He quotes none: he says "I was told," orally, that is. When he writes, five years later (1874), "Landless was, I THINK, to have perished in assisting Tartar finally to unmask and seize the murderer," he is clearly trusting, not to a letter of Dickens's, but to a defective memory; and he knows it. He says that a nephew was to be murdered by an uncle. The criminal was to confess in the condemned cell. He was to find out that his crime had been needless.” (Lang, 1910: 26)

This second stratum was indeed ‘a tragedy never to come out.’ How could it have surfaced and melded? Actually, the satisfaction (and delightful eeriness) of

the achievement comes precisely when the reader realizes that, it is possible to imagine, the cult kills Drood, frames Jasper, and Tartar 'marries' (sacrifices) Rosa. One can imagine the 'radiant,' 'glowing' appearance of the bride, the 'bonds' of matrimony, 'nevermore would the world know Miss Budd.' etcetera.

As it is, the strands submitted in this present research remain unexplored by academia. If, one day, men of credentials take up the task of answering why these demonstrable patterns exist, and will to forego presuppositions to allow the evidence to accrue away from the mere theme of dissociation and toward an idea more fantastic, the spirit of that great conjurer Charles Dickens will be resurrected to awe the literary world afresh.