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"We must not look at goblin men, / We must not buy their fruits": The Politics of Feminine Consumption and Sexuality in Christina Rossetti’s “Goblin Market”

Dawn Cunningham ’09

The politics of food and consumption, and its partnership with sexuality and the erotic element in literature, is not a novel concept of study; however, its presentation in various texts evokes questions of cultural and historical significance. Christina Rossetti’s 1859 poem “Goblin Market” is an exemplary—and certainly complicated—example of the ways in which food and sexuality can powerfully interact and inform the reading of a text. This long fable poem has an overt sexual tone, as well as language and scenes suggestive of rape and incest—all of which are inextricably linked to the politics of female consumption and desire. I argue that Rossetti’s creation of the evil goblin market presents a clear connection between Victorian traditions of consumption and the performance of female sexuality and purity. She clearly fleshes out the price(s) of temptation within an Edenic trope of the fruit garden. Thus, the politics of consumption become equated with sin and temptation; yet, this equation is complicated as consumption also becomes associated with incestual love and unfailing sisterly devotion. Specifically, the role of the cornucopia of fruits, which the goblins offer to Laura and Lizzie, contributes to the effective eroticism in the narrative and complicates the definition of forbidden within a Victorian context. Rossetti’s poem is an essential contribution to the discourse of food studies in literature, as it sheds light on the evolution and universality of the literary conversation between food and desire—and specifically, food and desire in poetry.

“Goblin Market” is especially rich as a text because it invites numerous, conflicting readings, the earliest positing the long poem as a fairy tale or fable for a younger readership, but further study prompted critics to recognize the complexity of the work, and acknowledge its theological discussion of temptation (Christ and Robson 1460). While conceding to the poignancy of religious readings of Rossetti’s poem, for the sake of focus, my arguments will be restricted to the erotic elements and relationships within the text, concentrating specifically on Rossetti’s characterization of Laura and of Laura’s troubling physical relationship with Lizzie. My reading of the text, as it concerns the connection between the alimentary and the sexual, negates the depiction of Lizzie as a Christ figure, and negates the embrace between Laura and Lizzie as purely indicative of sororal devotion (Arseneau 128-129). The presentation of food, namely the enticing array of fruits, which the goblins present to Laura and Lizzie, substantiates the sexed reading of “Goblin Market”; it is impossible to deny the length and devotion given to the erotic within the textual passages that examine the goblin wares. Richard Menke examines this relationship further by identifying that the reader’s own experience in reading/tasting the textual passages pertaining to the fruit is itself orally erotic (110-111). Thus, Rossetti not only successfully establishes the narrative text and interpersonal relationships as erotic, but she also effectively translates her poetry as an oral and auditory erotic experience for the reader—cementing the significant interaction between food and sexuality in the poem.

Framing “Goblin Market” within its Victorian context and within the context of Rossetti’s highly pious lifestyle is integral to grasping the work’s major themes and arguably, its contradictions. But primarily, Suzanne Daly and Ross G. Forman highlight the important ways in which food studies in Victorian literature contribute to a broader cultural and historical cognition, arguing for the legitimacy of the culinary element as integral to the canon of literary scholarship (363). Daly and Forman underline the emergence of a “commodity culture” in Britain and how this, along with the continued growth of imperial strength and trade, “placed food and drink at the center of cultural politics” (364-365). Food, and how it changed hands, became an entity around which social and cultural practices were based, identifying the notion of “food as commodity, [as] significant aspect of the economic life of the period; the social history of food as part of Victorian domestic life” (Daly and Forman 365). Daly and Forman also note its literal and symbolic importance in the quotidian performance of religion and social class/status, certainly a social construction that would have not gone unrecognized or unaffected by Rossetti (371). The characterization of Rossetti’s personal life, as broadly acknowledged by English scholarship, is reduced to a commentary on her intense piety, which twice forbid her from entering into marriage (Christ and Robson 1459). The central role that religion played in Rossetti’s life informs the way in which most scholars interpret the themes and symbols in “Goblin Market,” viewing the poem as a “moral fable” which warns of the surrender to temptation via Laura’s physical and spiritual decline as a fallen woman, and praises the concept of sacrifice for sororal devotion via Lizzie’s procurement of the antidote from the goblin men (1460). However, I would cite Virginia Woolf’s estimation, as noted by Christ and Robson, of Rossetti’s narrative style, which is distinguished by “the distinctive combination of sensuousness and religious severity” (1460). It is particularly the former quality of Rossetti’s writing which is arguably the most sensational and surprising given her religious foundations; which is to say, she seems to beautifully exemplify the erotic relationship between food and sexuality in the narrative of “Goblin Market,” while simultaneously seeming to rebuke and forbid this relationship.

An (female) erotic reading of the text necessarily revolves around Laura’s economic encounter with the goblins, where she tastes their sensual fruits and likewise the consequences of mature sexuality outside the bounds of social propriety. Martine Watson Brownley, like many other scholars, emphasizes the significance of this scene in the promulgation of varying theological and sexual themes, stressing that not only is the language of the fruit important, but so also are the characterizations of the goblins themselves (179). The opening stanza of Rossetti’s poem is concerned entirely with the itemization of the fruits, which the goblins sell, the language of which is highly erotically charged, while it
concurrently highlights the relationship of consumer to product—in this case, Laura’s purity and innocence exchanged for mature sexuality, experience. Victor Roman Mendoza’s extensive essay on the poem catalogues this “consumer desire” by referencing the repetitive, purposeful incantation of “Come buy, come buy” ushered from the goblins to Laura (920). According to Mendoza, “The listing of the various fruits promises and provides pleasure, then, as the list is both framed with the phrase assuring consumer enjoyment (again, ‘Come buy’) and is itself visually alluring and poetically seductive. The text incites one to consume conspicuously, to abide by the appeal to one’s senses uncritically” (921). This is highly reminiscent of the aforementioned Menke’s depiction of the text as an erotic experience for both the sisters, Laura and Lizzie, and the reader himself as taking part in the visual and auditory literary experience.

A mere skimmed reading of Rossetti’s first stanza not only evokes a symbolic feminine sexuality, but it also, as Mendoza and Menke suggest, invites the reader to salivate; Mendoza further suggests that, “The act of reading then is intimately related to the act of eating” (922). The exotic list of fruits is littered with insinuated eroticism, the “Plump unpecked cherries” (line 7), the “Wild free-born cranberries” (11), the suggestiveness of ripeness, and the alluring gesture of the goblins asking Laura to “Taste them and try.../to fill your mouth,/Sweet to tongue and sound to eye” (25; 28; 30). The overall eroticism and orality suggested by Rossetti’s language informs the reader’s ultimate interpretation of the text and in its divination of its moral and social ethics. I would suggest that Rossetti’s overt sexual tone taken throughout the text is troubling to the popular contention that “Goblin Market” should be seen as a kind of theological wag of the finger to those enticed by sexual temptation. And while Lizzie seems reluctant to eye the goblin men and even remonstrative toward Laura, she chides, “We must not look at goblin men,/We must not buy their fruits:/Who knows upon what soil they fed,/Their hungry thirsty roots?” (42-45). Brownley explicitly notes the characterization of the goblin men as important to the erotic reading of the text. In lines 71-76, the physical manifestations of the goblins—i.e. temptation, impure sexuality, &c—are defined in varying degrees of disgust by the narrator:

One had a cat’s face,
One whisked a tail,
One tramped at a rat’s pace,
One crawled like a snail,
One like a wombat prowled obtuse and furry,
One like a ratel tumbled hurry slyrly.

Particularly the image which likens the goblins to rodents exemplifies Brownley’s assessment that, “The descriptions of the goblins’ appearances, attributes, and actions suggest the inhuman, animalistic nature of any experience in which they are participants. Sexual experience with goblin men requires payment with a part of the self” (180). In Laura’s case, this transaction of the self resulted in her payment with “a golden curl,” (125) a detail Brownley claims is merely another hint at the (barely) implicit sexuality of the text, in correlating sexuality with hair (Brownley 180).

And as Laura snips the strand of golden hair from her hair, she lets out a solitary tear, “more rare than pearl” but ultimately seems more concerned with the hurried consumption of the goblin’s enticing edibles (line 127). The undeniably erotic—if not violent—and repetitive language which Rossetti employs to construct this image focuses on Laura eating the fruits alone, as opposed to engaging in any physical, sexual acts with the goblins themselves. In lines 134-136, “She sucked and sucked and sucked the more/Fruits which that unknown orchard bore;/She sucked until her lips were sore”; and it is resolutely obvious to the reader that Laura has exhausted herself in an individual, self-indulgent sexual act, and has now passed from innocence/nai"vete/purity to experience/knowledge/spoiled (Rossetti 1468). Brownley concentrates on this action of private sexuality, noting how “Laura autoerotically indulges herself” and that “the intense pleasure results in slight physical discomfort which suggests harmful overindulgence” (180). Further, Brownley remarks upon the significance of the pleasure itself being oral and autoerotic for Laura, suggesting perhaps that Laura’s desire as a sexual consumer results from a selfishness and immaturity (180). Quickly, the reader infers from Rossetti’s violent sexual language as it relates to Laura’s consumption, that Laura will not peacefully digest the goblin’s fruits and remain unscathed, but instead that her initiation into immoral, adult sexuality would be nearly fatal to swallow.

Returning home alone from her feasts at the goblin market, Laura is met by a very worried sister Lizzie who, as the voice of reason and sacrifice throughout the poem, offers the tale of Jeanie to her beleaguered sister—another woman felled by the tempting shouts of the goblin men. Rossetti’s insertion of a mini-fable within her larger text is significant—if not overindulgent, too—in that it informs the reader of the social and moral ramifications of Laura’s impulsiveness. Jeanie, like Laura, ate the fruits of the goblin men, but was afterward unable to seek them out and eventually died from unfulfilled desire and curiosity (Rossetti 1469). Finally, Lizzie somberly notes that where Jeanie had fallen, no plant life will grow, suggesting a threatening image of infertility, notwithstanding slow decay and death, that touches upon the personal and social ramifications of giving in to pre-mature, selfish sexuality (1469). Brownley claims that Laura’s initial taste of the goblins’ fruits has destroyed her ability to act and react normally within society, which wholly isolates her from society and from her sister (180). She goes on to claim that the reason for Laura’s prolonged sense of unfulfilled desire comes from her lack of recognition of its “dangerous emotional and intellectual dimensions inherent in the experience with the fruit” and that her fever in effect may only break once she is made aware of this (Brownley 181).

However, Lizzie’s warnings are not heeded by Laura, whose “mouth waters still” and intends to return to the goblin market the following night, despite the alarmingly obvious parallels between her intentions and that of the ill-fated Jeanie (line 166, Rossetti 1469). And though she returns the following night, she, like Jeanie, is unable to hear the goblins’ cry and is much afflicted,
while Lizzie is tormented by it and pleads with Laura to return home. As Laura realizes that only Lizzie is susceptible to the goblins' charms, she reacts hysterically, provoking a parade of dramatic, fatalistic questions:

- Must she then buy no more such dainty fruit?
- Must she no more such succous pasture find,
- Gone deaf and blind?
- Her tree of life dropped from the root:
- She said not one word in her heart's sore ache; (257-261)

Laura laments the loss of such succulence and "gnashe[s] her teeth for baulked desire, and wept / As if her heart would break" (lines 268-269, 1472). Constance W. Hassett comments specifically on Laura's "baulked desire" as the thematic core of the piece, as the intercession of her insatiable desire as a result of her moral (read: sexual) turpitude (20). For Hassett, it is significant that not only is Laura, at this point in the text, unable to find the fruits which so recently fulfilled her, but she is also knowledgeable that they are being kept from her, for Lizzie can still hear the goblins' call (20). Further, she claims that, "Rossetti's goblins are not just tempters, they are desire, or rather the agents of desire's paradox; they deal in what arouses, exhilarates, and injures appetite, and the sisters experience them differently. Each in her own way is a desirer of the goblins' fruit, and each discovers for herself the convulsive, self-divided nature of her yearnings" (Hassett 20). And as Lizzie witnesses her sister's decay, perhaps Rossetti's commentary on the moral decline of the sexually compromised woman in Victorian society, she deduces that she must get for her sister what Laura cannot obtain herself—a further foray into sexual experience and oral indulgence (Rossetti 1472).

I would argue that Lizzie's sacrificial act in allowing Laura to suck from her body the succulent juices of the goblins' fruits—identifiably an incestual-erotic which receives more attention later—is injurious to Rossetti's themes of religious redemption and negation of sexual temptation. Brownley argues that the only ways in which Laura's emotional and physical "baulked desire" can be reversed is either through death or "by another kind of love more powerful than the sexual one she has discovered with the goblins" (182). This, as Brownley claims, is the love imbued in Lizzie's selfless act in procuring the fruits and fruit juices from the goblins (182). I wholly disagree with Brownley's assessment that Lizzie's act remains entirely unselfish, evidenced by the erotic interaction between the sisters as they reunite upon Lizzie's return from the goblin market. Furthermore, I find Brownley's assessment conveniently ignores the violent intimacy portrayed in Lizzie's interaction with the goblins, a scene whose language and positioning encourages this critic to deem it a rape scene. As Hassett notes, the goblins initially appear to Lizzie as benevolent, amiable even, but they ultimately force Lizzie to imbibe the poisonous juices of their fruits alone, in much the same way that Laura did (21). However, in Laura's case, Rossetti's language certainly conferred a sense of her own enjoyment into the scene; she longed to suck their fruits, Lizzie clearly does not.

Rossetti spends lines 390-398 evoking for the reader the true nature and physicality of these goblins, what their intentions really were for Lizzie as she wanted only to buy fruit to save her sister's life. The language is undeniably violent and suggestive of rape:

- They trod and hustled her,
- Elbowed and jostled her,
- Clawed with their nails,
- Barking, mewing, hissing, mocking,
- Tore her gown and soiled her stocking,
- Twitched her hair out by the roots,
- Stamped upon her tender feet,

*Hold her hands and squeezed their fruits
Against her mouth to make her eat.* (399-407, my emphasis)

Disturbingly, Rossetti spends a considerable amount of time, four long stanzas, to develop this scene and reiterate the forcefulness with which the goblins attacked her with their fruits, force-feeding her as Hassett notes (21). In the interest of space and scope, it is not prudent to reproduce all passages here that suggest Lizzie was raped, suffice it to say that Rossetti continually offers parallel phrases wherein the goblins, "Cuffed and caught her" (424), "Bullied and besought her, / Scratched her, pinched her black as ink, / Kicked and knocked her" (426-428) until they were "Worn out by her resistance" (438). Hassett comments that Lizzie, unlike Laura, takes care not to open her mouth, not inviting the fruit into her mouth and body, or biting it decadently (21-22). Instead, she is *resisting* the fruits the goblins offer her, and while her act still remains unselfish, she certainly does not return from her encounter with the goblins with a sensation of "exaltation that her love for Laura has triumphed over evil" as Brownley suggests (182-183). I would argue that this seemingly trivial estimation of Brownley's is highly problematic, as well as her and many other scholars' contentions that Lizzie was not sexually assaulted by the goblin men.

I would align myself primarily with Hassett, who declares that:

There is no question that 'Goblin Market' offends against the code of maidenly decorum and challenges the equation of bodily indulgence with irrevocable harm. Not only does 'Goblin Market' resist unambiguous endorsement of the wisdom of avoiding 'the haunts of goblin men,' it insists on Laura's recovery in a rapturous scene that begins its many offenses with a nearly blasphemous sacramental invitation. (22)

This delves into the latter portion of my argument that the erotic element in Rossetti's "Goblin Market," as associated with the politics of consumption, not only drives the text itself but invites the reader to respond—in this case, with confusion and perhaps bewilderment at the incestuous suggestiveness of Laura and Lizzie's consummation scene.

This "nearly blasphemous sacramental invitation" of which Hassett speaks, wherein Lizzie drenched in the fruit juices of the goblin market beckons her spoiling and unfulfilled sister Laura to literally drink from her. Again, the tone of Rossetti's language is undeniable in its evocation of sororal love, and yet, it seems to be the kind of physical, sororal intimacy, which smacks of incest
and certainly, immorality within a Victorian context. As she returns home, having run from the violent sexual attack she incurred, she seeks solace for the guilt and shame of her ravishment to be washed from her body, both literally and metaphorically. Strangely, she calls to Laura and asks, “‘Did you miss me?’” (465), a line likely included at Rossetti’s impulse and necessity for rhyme, for it would otherwise seem unusual that Lizzie should utter this odd phrase, either after having been attacked, or after supposedly performing a wholly unselfish, Christ-like act. Lizzie’s enticement of Laura completes the stanza in a way of troubling language:

‘Come and kiss me.
Never mind my bruises,
Hug me, kiss me, suck my juices
Squeezed from goblin fruits for you,
Goblin pulp and goblin dew.
Eat me, drink me, love me;
Laura, make much of me:
For your sake I have braved the glen
And had to do with goblin merchant men.’ (466-474, my emphasis)

Hassett comments on the interaction between Laura and Lizzie as “an uninhibited consumption scene in which Laura is transported with pleasure and pain” as a favorite with illustrators and visual theorists who identify the (re)presentation of this scene as indicative of the text’s troubling relationship with the male gaze (Hassett 23; Kooistra 140-141, 159). Hassett characterizes Laura’s reaction to the fruit juices as “a gorging consumption” that turns from sexual pleasure into a sort of painful healing—despite the fact that Rossetti’s language makes it sound like an orgasm. But, Hassett does argue, and I would agree, that the poem is at best conflicted, entirely unable to decide whether to relish or to chide those who are given to temptation (24). As a result of this, I find that the readership is drawn into this conflicted relationship to the text, which is likely responsible for its continued, universal interest by scholars and my own disbelief in the poem’s legitimacy as a religious fairy tale for children.

In a literary assessment of sororal desire in both “Goblin Market” and Beloved, Leila Silviana May characterizes the consumption scene between Laura and Lizzie as decidedly erotic, insomuch as it becomes a form of resistance or insubordinate sexuality that effectively undermines the social structures which would stifle feminine desire (134). In her discussion of feminine and sororal sexuality in the context of constrictive and fearful Victorian propriety, May claims that, “there was something about sibling relations which was troubling, and it was not simply the scarcely mentioned (though very real) fear of incest which provoked this worry; even (or perhaps mostly) the relation between sisters was to be feared and strictly disciplined at the same moment that it was eulogized and monumentalized” (135). Stemming from this, she notes that in fact, frequent literary representations of the idyllic sororal relationship often implicitly demonstrated “another kind of passion and another kind of ‘sister’ than those they seem to believe themselves to be eulogizing—one who is not the creation of the patriarchal organization of desire” (135). May’s convoluted discussion of masculine and feminine desires within the Victorian context of patriarchy ultimately yields the assertion that Laura and Lizzie desire one another and that, interestingly, Rossetti’s textual consideration of the consummation scene between Laura and Lizzie is given much more length and depth than the initial scene wherein Laura engorges the goblins’ fruits (138). May goes so far as to suggest, through a theological reading of the text, that through their act of mutual consumption, the two sisters have fallen and are essentially rendered as the same entity—which is to say, they are stripped of their own individual identities and desires (139). However, my own argument and the scope of this paper precludes any serious consideration of this portion of May’s thesis, though I would certainly agree that Rossetti’s intention may have been to mark the two sisters as similar after the consummation scene, in that Laura resembles Lizzie as reborn and pure of sexual urges and temptations.

May also asserts, as I do, that the consummation scene concludes with Laura’s own erotic climax, “swoon[ing] from this orgy of orally incestuous consumption and cannibalism, and awakens to a renewed innocence and life” (140). But more importantly, May comments upon the complication of this incestuous erotic relationship due to the performance of Laura and Lizzie’s consumption of the goblin fruits. She equates the action of consumption with oral sexuality and draws upon the connotations of the English language, which invariably mimic this equation between food and sex. May cites the language employed to describe desire, either sexual or alimentary, such as “‘appetite,’ ‘desire,’ ‘craving,’ and ‘hunger,’ interchangeably, with no substantial alteration in meaning. The sensual satisfaction derived from language or from food is often described in precisely the same terms” (145). This explicitly draws connections between literary representations of consumption and sexuality, and how they interplay and inform each other in the reading of a text. In the case of “Goblin Market” the erotic tone in Rossetti’s language is essentially omnipresent, and I would argue that the hint of same-sex, incestuous desires in the consummation scene between Laura and Lizzie, and Laura’s eventual orgasm into purity—also problematic—mark the scene as more significant than mere testimony to the value of sororal love. Hassett agrees that the “tidiness of this adage leaves many readers dissatisfied and sends them back into the poem to further explore the gap between Laura’s vividly represented experience and its blandly compact summation” (29). Laura herself asks, post-climax, “Pleasure past and anguish past, / Is it death or is it life?” (522-523). Her sister may have saved her from a rapidly declining life defined by “baulked desire” but to what alternative? May would likely argue that she was reborn in the context of dominant Victorian patriarchy, returning both Laura and Lizzie to constrictive models of femininity and (a)sexuality.

The rapidly summarized ending of “Goblin Market” not only intends to mark the poem as a moral tale which women should tell to their daughters and sisters, but also to definitively mark the longstanding relationship between food and desire. Despite the prescriptions of Victorian propriety—whether along
sexual, social or familial axes—Laura, now a mother with children of her own, still recalls the goblin market with nostalgia. She speaks to her children of:

Those pleasant days long gone
Of not-returning time:
Would talk about the haunted glen,
The wicked, quaint fruit-merchant men,
Their fruits like honey to the throat
But poison in the blood;
(Men sell not such in any town;) (550-556)

Hassett comments on Laura’s recollective relishing of the goblins’ fruits, effectively re-experiencing the acts of consumption which betray her own “pleasurable yearning” and belies her attempt to discourage her own progeny from repeating her selfish foray into feminine sexuality (29). While Hassett suggests that Rossetti’s mindful presentation of the role which temptation and sexuality play in Laura’s present life is meant to add “texture to the innocence that has triumphed over ‘poison in the blood’” I would argue that this only negates the nature of the innocence that Laura truly has achieved through the orally-incestuous scene with Lizzie (29).

Christina Rossetti’s “Goblin Market” has endured countless interpretations and in-depth analyses of thematic elements and their connection to what is known of Rossetti’s personal life, yet Mary Arseneau cites a contemporary trend in Rossetti scholarship which invites critic to “read her poetry against the grain of this Victorian cultural understanding that symbols and emblems are coherent and interpretable, emphasizing instead Rossetti’s resistance to interpretation” (107). By this rationale, then, the venture of inscribing meaning to symbols in Rossetti’s poem would be futile in the name of reading Rossetti as intended. This impulse rings false to me, evidenced simply by again invoking Daly and Forman’s insistence that food studies are a legitimate component of culture studies, certainly at the time in which Rossetti was writing (365). They vehemently suggest that, “the study of food and drink can—and should—take us anywhere in the Victorian period that we wish to go” (372). It is with sentiment in mind that I argue for the analysis and interpretation of Rossetti’s text as indicative of not only her own personal beliefs, but also—and more significantly—indicative of the culture of propriety and moral coding in which she lived and wrote.

The primary problem of interpretation, Arseneau argues, is the symbolic rendering of the goblin fruit (122). She notes that many scholars attribute it simplistically to a marker of sexual temptation and deviance, but that the more correct analysis in light of Rossetti’s text is the recognition of the goblin fruit as “a sign of disobedience rather than one of sexual transgression” (122). However, this distinction seems irrelevant. I would argue that the operative emphasis in Arseneau’s line of thinking is the primacy of fruit and the politics of (feminine) consumption in Rossetti’s poem. “Goblin Market” underscores both the evolution and the universality of the literary conversation and negotiation of food and desire, and specifically, food and desire in poetry. Kooistra, in a substantial sociohistorical rendering of the illustrations accompanying volumes
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