INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again - beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University Microfilms International

8112753

Engelberg, Betty Jean Rosenberg

MORAL ACTION IN ANTHONY TROLLOPE'S NOVELS: THE EFFECT OF SOCIAL MILIEU, PERSONALITY, AND ABSTRACT PRINCIPLES

City University of New York Ph.D. 1981

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1980

by

Engelberg, Betty Jean Rosenberg

All Rights Reserved

MORAL ACTION IN ANTHONY TROLLOPE'S NOVELS: THE EFFECT OF SOCIAL MILIEU, PERSONALITY, AND ABSTRACT PRINCIPLES

by

BETTY JEAN ROSENBERG ENGELBERG

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in English in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1980

© COPYRIGHT BY

BETTY JEAN ROSENBERG ENGELBERG

1980

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in English in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

date — Chairman, Examining Committee

date — Executive Officer

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

MORAL ACTION IN ANTHONY TROLLOPE'S NOVELS: THE EFFECT OF SOCIAL MILIEU, PERSONALITY, AND ABSTRACT PRINCIPLES

by

Betty Jean Rosenberg Engelberg

Adviser: Professor Morton N. Cohen

For Anthony Trollope and many, perhaps most, of his Victorian contemporaries, the concepts of good and evil had great power. To Trollope, the art of living is behaving morally, whatever one's circumstances. Any action which can be described as right or wrong, good or bad, can be described as moral action.

In Trollope's novels, moral action is largely shaped by three factors. First is the social milieu of the character, which influences moral actions through accepted social practice and social pressures. The personality of the character, whether he is strong or weak, flighty or serious, deep or shallow, is the second factor. The third factor is one which many twentieth-century authors might hesitate to include--abstract principles. For Trollope's *Weltanschauung* includes a realm of ideas which exist independent of social milieu, personality, or the interaction of the two. Through their effects on a character's heart and mind, abstract concepts concerning good and evil influence his moral actions.

Each chapter of this study presents one aspect of life in terms of moral action. Each of the six chapters--"Religion," "Choosing a Mate," "Marriage," "Money," "Power," "Politics"--analyzes moral decisions made by a number of Trollope's most interesting characters, explaining in each case the part played by the character's social milieu, his personality, and abstract values in determining his action. In the chapter "Religion," for example, one of the moral actions analyzed is Mr. Harding's (The Warden) decision to resign the wardenship of Hiram's Hospital. Julia Brabazon's (The Claverings) decision to marry for money rather than for love is one of the moral choices dissected in "Choosing a Mate." Whether to stay with her husband or run away with the man she loves is Glencora Palliser's (The Palliser Novels) moral dilemma, one of those dealt with in the chapter, "Marriage."

Trollope, the artist, finely anatomizes the process by which social milieu, personality, and abstract ideas, interacting one with the other, shape moral behavior. No matter what a person's lot in life, whether or not he chooses to act morally is, to Trollope, the ultimate determinant of whether or not his life may be termed successful.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For his guidance and his patience, I would like to thank my dissertation sponsor, Professor Morton N. Cohen. I can never sufficiently thank my husband, Don, for his unfailing help and support; without it, this dissertation could not have been written. To my children, Shlomo Tzvi, Yocheved Michal, Yitzchak Chaim, and Freyda Rivka, I dedicate this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS vi

INTRODUCTION 1

RELIGION 12

CHOOSING A MATE 38

MARRIAGE 67

MONEY 99

POWER 131

POLITICS 170

CONCLUSION 205

BIBLIOGRAPHY 210

INTRODUCTION

For Anthony Trollope and many, perhaps most, of his Victorian contemporaries, the concepts of good and evil had great power. Action which can be described as right or wrong, good or bad, is moral action. Examples of Trollope's moral judgments abound. Moral action, for Trollope, frequently includes marrying or not marrying, managing money, and social climbing, but rarely relates to sleeping, eating, or riding to hounds.

In Trollope's novels, moral action is largely shaped by three factors. First is the social milieu of the character, which influences moral actions through accepted social practice and social pressures. The personality of the character, whether he is strong or weak, flighty or serious, deep or shallow, is the second factor. The third factor is one which many twentieth-century authors might hesitate or even refuse to include--abstract principles. For Trollope's _Weltanschauung_ includes a realm of ideas which exist independent of social milieu, personality, or the interaction of the two. Through their effects on a character's heart and mind, abstract concepts concerning good and evil influence his moral actions.

Before developing this theory of moral action in Trollope's works, let me review the opinions of some important Trollope critics on the subject. In Ruth apRoberts' Trollope: Artist and Moralist, she says that "It is Trollope's art to be advocate for each one of his characters; he makes the best case possible for one, and then juxtaposes this with the demands of the other, defended with a similar passionate sympathy."[1] Trollope's tolerance of and sympathy for people, his understanding that almost every man, in his own eyes, is right, or at least justified, in his actions, misleads some critics to think that Trollope is not concerned with morality.

Michael Sadleir, one of the first and most influential of Trollope's critics, flatly states that "In his Autobiography . . . [Trollope] speaks of the moral purpose of his fiction; but no modern reader can take this statement very seriously. . . . At heart he was of all men the most tolerant of other's failings; . . . toward most of the lapses that a conventional society condemns, he shows a humorous sympathy which is almost cynicism."[2] Sadleir wrongly identifies tolerance and sympathetic amusement with approval and moral unconcern. He implies that if one can admit the difference between folly and evil, condemn the sin without condemning the sinner, admit that sinners can have admirable traits

just as good men can have unadmirable traits, one cannot be concerned with morals.

James Pope Hennessy carries Sadleir's attitude even further.

> Art and morality are ever poles apart, and . . . [Trollope's description of Lady Ongar's schemes for undermining Harry Clavering's engagement to Florence Burton is far more convincing than her belated and improbable repentance. We may fancy that the innocent girl reader, the young pupil towards whom the author creeps in so very close, must have learned a good deal from Lady Ongar's thoughtful campaign. Lizzie Eustace, also, could provide helpful lessons in how to be at once venal and seductive, while Orley Farm, in the person of Lady Mason, invests forgery and lying with a specially impressive stoic grandeur. To condemn Lady Ongar to perpetual widowhood, to marry Lady Eustace off to dreadful Mr. Emilius, and to banish Lady Mason to a round of continental spas might satisfy English middle-class morality but would it assuage the curiosity of Trollope's favorite readers in the schoolroom?[3]

Lady Ongar's sin was not the machinations she used to trap Harry Clavering. Cecilia Burton's were just as adept. Lady Ongar's sin was marrying a depraved man for his money. His treatment of her was terrible enough to stop any innocent young girl from copying her. Clearly clever, but shallow and contemptible, Lizzie Eustace was a fitting mate for the "dreadful Mr. Emilius." No innocent girl would imitate her. And Lady Mason is a woman to be pitied, not to be emulated. Her dignity is admirable; her position is not. Very few people would choose to bring upon themselves enormous suffering to prove that they would not snivel while bearing it.

Trollope is, in truth, an advocate for each of his characters and shows them in three dimensions, as a mixture of bad and good, as tried by circumstances--that is, he portrays them artistically. Nevertheless, the consistency between the characters' sins and their consequent punishments, the amount of space devoted to their sins and sufferings, indicate that Trollope fully intended that every reader, sophisticated and innocent alike, should draw the moral from his tales.

Sadleir sees Trollope, the artist, as largely unconcerned with moral issues; Hennessey sees him as amoral. A. O. J. Cockshut sees Trollope as a fervid moralist. This is not to say, however, that he totally approves of Trollope's approach. Cockshut, in fact, accuses Trollope of "disastrous illogicality in his religious ideas" because "his religion turns morality into an idol, irrational and purposeless. It never struck him [Trollope] that Christianity involves the belief that the moral struggle of life is a means, not an end, and that work, which is temporal, is directed toward eternal rest."[4] Cockshut makes no distinction between Trollope as novelist and Trollope as Christian. As Cockshut notes, Trollope writes novels about moral action, not theology. From his novels one can only ascertain Trollope's moral ideas, not his theological beliefs. Whereas Cockshut recognizes the overwhelming importance of moral action in Trollope's novels, his critical perceptions are frequently blurred

by his persistence in trying to find theological tenets. To gain the "eternal rest" that Cockshut mentions, morality may or may not be sufficient, but it is necessary. Whatever Trollope's personal beliefs might have been concerning the necessity of a particular theology in the quest for heaven, his writings say nothing at all on the subject.

Another critic, who, like Cockshut, recognizes the central role morality plays in Trollope's novels, is Robert M. Polhemus. In _The Changing World of Anthony Trollope_, Polhemus' main topic is the significance in Trollope's novels of the changes in society as England went from the well-ordered world in which everyone knew his place to a much more fluid world in which the wellborn had to vie for place with the merchant princes and major industrialists. He claims that "the best moments in . . . [Trollope's] work come when he makes his characters realize the world's uncertainty and the conflicting forces of tradition and innovation in their lives. Moral crises and questions of conscience occur when his people feel the pressure to give up conventional assumptions and act in new ways."[5] Polhemus not only sees the importance of moral action in the novels, but he also recognizes that action as intimately related to society. Polhemus accurately observes that Trollope "cannot imagine the quality of personal life as distinct from the quality of life in the community."[6]

Ruth apRoberts expands this view of moral action. She describes the situations that Trollope loves to deal with as occurring "when by inevitable circumstances, characters, motives, and principles are brought into hostile collision, in which good and evil are . . . blended on each side."[7] In such cases

> Moral perception . . . is to be achieved only through the most meticulous examination of the individual case, all sides of it, its history, the motivation of each agent involved, the results of action or inaction, repercussions in many directions. . . . This is . . . why Trollope's work is . . . so involved with minutiae of psychology and manners. For these minutiae can concertedly twist moral perspectives in unpredictable ways. Virtue is seldom a matter of black and white . . . and . . . Trollope chooses those cases where it is least a matter of black and white; hence, moral dilemmas. . . . To determine virtue is the only concern really worthy of our study, and it is, in a way, the only interesting study.[8]

Implicit throughout Polhemus' book is the assumption that moral action is central to Trollope's work and that social environment is a major determinant of moral action. Polhemus directs his attention toward the effects of changes in society on the moral actions of the characters. Implicit in his treatment, however, is the general understanding that, whether changing or stable, the social milieu, through its demands on each character and the character's own need to fit within society, is a significant factor in moral action. Ruth apRoberts, who titled her book <u>Trollope: Artist and Moralist</u>, sees Trollope as a moralist and sees the connection between not only social milieu but also personality and abstract principles and moral

action. ApRoberts tries to prove that Trollope is both a true artist and a perceptive moral philosopher. Although she does not give a close reading of the novels, she does note the value of the few efforts to do so.

Before one can analyze moral action in Trollope's novels, one must clear away some cobwebs about the nature of Trollope's moral principles. Briefly, in answer to those who believe Trollope was concerned only with character or manners, one must recognize that the evidence is against them. The Victorian Age was characterized by moral earnestness. In his study, The Victorian Frame of Mind, Walter E. Houghton explains that for believers, "To be in earnest morally is to recognize that human existence is not a short interval between birth and death in which one fingers as many guineas as possible and eats all the good dinners he can, but a spiritual pilgrimage from here to eternity in which he is called upon to struggle with all his power against the forces of evil, in his own soul and in society."[9] Whether Trollope accepted the tenets of an orthodox religion matters little, because, in Houghton's words, "As the difficulties of belief increased, the essence of religion for Christians--and for agnostics the 'meaning of life'--came more and more to lie in strenuous labor for the good of society."[10] Victorians as a whole, religious or not, saw life and conceptualized it as a moral experience. Thus, Trollope would not have felt it necessary to label Phineas Finn's political

decisions, or Mr. Harding's decision about the wardenship of Hiram's Hospital, or Sir Peregrine Orme's decision about whether or not to marry Lady Mason great moral dilemmas. His readers knew they were. Victorians thought within an implicit moral framework, and we have no reason to assume that Trollope rejected this particular frame of reference, whether or not he accepted all Victorian moral precepts.

The second point I wish to challenge is the assumption that some critics, notably Cockshut and apRoberts, make, that one can derive Trollope's religious beliefs from his literary works. Although no irrefutable evidence exists to prove that he was an orthodox Christian, no evidence exists to support the contention that he was not. ApRoberts tries to prove Trollope's scepticism with a passage from Clergymen of the Church of England that expresses many religious doubts.[11] But doubting can show intellectual honesty rather than disbelief. Thomas Arnold also doubted.[12] One must distinguish between a writer's work and his life. Dean Swift treats morality as an end rather than a means to an end in his work; his work also contains no dogma. To assume that Trollope was not conventionally religious might lead us to see a liberalism in his thinking that most likely did not exist. His conclusion in Dr. Wortle's School was probably not intended to say that bigamy, under certain circumstances, is perfectly all right. His attitude was rather that it

is for us to pity people in the Peacockes' situation and for God (if there is a God) to judge them. Actually, in ending the novel happily by disposing of Mrs. Peacocke's first husband, Trollope carefully avoided saying whether bigamy is ever justified. Because in similarly ambiguous situations which appear frequently in his novels Trollope consistently sidesteps questions of dogma, one must keep an open mind about his religious belief or lack of it.

The third and last point about Trollope's moral principles that must be clarified is what apRoberts calls Trollope's moral relativism, his Situation Ethics. If this means that Trollope had no definitely established moral principles, she overstates her case. Trollope holds certain principles firmly; in certain situations these principles collide with each other to produce situations where the right thing to do is not obvious. In _The Warden_, for instance, Mr. Harding, a clergyman, must choose between supporting those who claim the church misappropriates funds and supporting those who feel that the worldly and spiritual power of the church must not be weakened. Mr. Harding must make a truly difficult decision--a decision between two rights rather than between a right and a wrong. If by Trollope's moral relativism, apRoberts means that Trollope is willing to deal with such situations, and give his opinion of which good is the greater good, one must agree that Trollope is a moral relativist. If she means, on the other hand, that the fact that one good

is a lesser good in this situation in any way negates the validity of that good, then she is incorrect. For if one deserves the title of "moral relativist" by having a concept of greater goods and lesser ones in particular cases, then even the Rabbis of the Talmud--surely noted for their moral absolutes--must be termed "moral relativists." For the Talmud demands that every case in which two or more moral principles clash must be considered individually to determine which moral principle takes precedence or to work out some compromise among them. If a definition of moral relativism is to be useful, surely it must exclude the Talmudic Rabbis.[13]

Each chapter that follows will present Trollope's handling of one aspect of life in terms of moral action. Each will demonstrate rather than argue; each will try to show by example Trollope's concept of the process of moral action.

NOTES

[1] Ruth apRoberts, Trollope: Artist and Moralist (London: Chatto & Windus, 1971), p. 53.

[2] Michael Sadleir, Trollope: A Commentary (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 132.

[3] James Pope Hennessy, Anthony Trollope (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971), p. 19.

[4] A. O. J. Cockshut, Anthony Trollope: A Critical Study (1955; rpt. London: Collins, 1968), p. 22.

[5] Robert M. Polhemus, The Changing World of Anthony Trollope (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), p. 3.

[6] Polhemus, p. 150.

[7] apRoberts, p. 38.

[8] apRoberts, pp. 69-70.

[9] Walter E. Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), p. 221.

[10] Houghton, p. 251.

[11] apRoberts, pp. 106-08.

[12] Houghton, p. 133.

[13] Roger Slakey's article, "Trollope's Case for Moral Imperative," Nineteenth-Century Fiction, 28 (1973), 306., which I saw only after I had written this, uses a similar argument based on Christian sources.

RELIGION AND THE CHURCH

> In my days, I have written something about clergymen but never a word about religion.[1]

The truth of this statement, which Trollope makes in South Africa, is attested to by the critical controversy that rages over Trollope's religious faith or lack thereof. Trollope, in fact, does not discuss religious dogma. What he does discuss is moral action in a religious context--that is, the way people react to religious philosophy, institutions, or beliefs in terms of their own societal ties, personalities, and abstract ideas.

The religious philosophy most frequently expressed sympathetically in Trollope's novels is melioristic. Christian ethical concepts and the clergymen who promulgate them are meant to help guide people to a better life, and, although it does not have to include happiness and material comfort, the better life is all the better if it does. Trollope's novel most obviously an expression of this philosophy is The Vicar of Bullhampton. The vicar, Frank Fenwick, tries to help Carry Brattle, a young woman who has been seduced, to find some decent place for herself in the hostile world. The vicar, rather pugnacious by nature, somewhat susceptible to the charms of the unhappy

but young and pretty Carry, already convinced of the propriety of his action, acts admirably. But although Trollope does make clear how much Fenwick's ideas and his personality influence his behavior, the influences that determine his moral actions precede the action of the novel. It is Fenwick's (and Trollope's) understanding of what shapes others' moral actions that is significant in this book. Carry Brattle is one of the very few characters in Trollope's oeuvre who is allowed to remain flat, the representative of her group rather than a sharply defined individual. This makes it very easy to see Trollope's approach to moral action. Trollope describes Frank Fenwick trying to help Carry. Carry could be any "fallen woman." Fenwick is more realistic in his approach to her problem than many clergymen would be.

> He strove to make her understand that she could have no escape from the dirt and vileness and depth of misery into which she had fallen, without the penalty of a hard, laborious life, in which she must submit to be regarded as one whose place in the world was very low. . . . And he knew, also, that humble, contrite, and wretched as was the girl now, the nature within her bosom was not changed. Were he to place her in a reformatory, she would not stay there. Were he to make arrangements . . . for her board and lodging, with some collateral regulations as to occupation, needlework, and the like,--she would not adhere to them. . . . Could she have been sent to the mill, and made subject to her mother's softness as well as to her mother's care, there might have been room for confident hope.[2]

Despite the fact that Carry is contrite, that in the abstract she recognizes her fault, her personality, which led her to ignore her ideas and ideals once, will

not now support her through the ordeal of the repentence that society demands of her. Trollope is obviously convinced that to offer a lifetime of misery in this world in return for forgiveness in the next is not the effective way of encouraging moral behavior. If society really wishes to reform its sinners, then society must be careful not to make the rewards of sin more palatable to the sinner than the rewards of virtue. When Carry does run away from some such an arrangement as the one described, Trollope points out that

> The straight-going people of the world, in dealing with those who go crooked, are almost always unreasonable. . . . Say they who are not bad to those who are bad, "Because you have hitherto indulged yourself with all pleasures within your reach, . . . now,--now that I have got a hold of you and can manipulate you in reference to your repentance and future conduct,--I will require from you a mode of life that, in its general attractions, shall be about equal to that of a hermit in the desert. If you flinch you are not only a monster of ingratitude towards me, who am taking all this trouble to save you, but you are also a poor wretch for whom no possible hope of grace can remain." . . . It is hardly recognised that a sudden change from billiards to good books requires a strength of character which, if possessed, would probably have kept the young man altogether from falling into bad habits. (367-68)

Trollope makes clear, both through Frank Fenwick's perceptions and in his own voice, that the Victorian road to repentance is paved with about equal parts of vindictiveness and stupidity, neither of which is very likely to lead the sinner to his presumably desired destination. In both of these selections, Trollope assumes that sinner, minister, and society all share

the same abstract ideas--the same moral standards. He points out that society, to use its power to control actions of its members, must reward good behavior and punish bad behavior. He objects to the alternatives society offers the "fallen woman,"--to live in honest disgrace, despair, and misery, or to live in sinful pleasure. If the woman's personality were strong enough to choose the first alternative, she probably would not have fallen in the first place. Thus Trollope allows us to see clearly the interaction of abstract ideas, social milieu, and personality in determining moral behavior.

Several of Trollope's novels tie together the concepts of religion, moral action, and humanitarianism. Dr. Wortle, in Dr. Wortle's School, takes it as his duty to pity and help the unfortunate bigamous couple, the Peacockes, rather than to judge them, condemn them, and make an example of them. Father John, the Catholic priest in The Macdermots of Ballycloran, and Father Marty, in An Eye for an Eye, serve as guides and comforters to the unfortunate rather than as theologians. Each of these clergymen is sympathetic to the twentieth-century liberals. They, perhaps, led Cockshut to make his observation that Trollope "turns morality into an idol, irrational and purposeless," that Trollope never noticed "that Christianity involves the belief that the moral struggle of life is a means, not an end."

Trollope, however, is aware that there is more to religion than social welfare. He talks about the old days, "when cathedral services were kept up for the honour of God rather than for the welfare of the worshippers. . . ."

> We use our cathedrals in these days as big churches, in which multitudes may worship, so that, if possible, they may learn to live Christian lives. They are made beautiful that this worship may be attractive to men, and not for the glory of God. What architect would now think it necessary to spend time and money in the adornment of parts of his edifice which no mortal eye can reach? But such was done in the old days. . . . Multitudes, no doubt, crowded our cathedrals in those times . . . but they were there for the honour of God, testifying their faith by the fact of their presence.[3]

Trollope is certainly aware of the difference between the anthropocentricity of the religion of his day and the theocentricity of the religion of an earlier day. And, while he may not desire to return to the earlier standard, his question, "What architect would now think it necessary to spend time and money in the adornment of parts of his edifice which no mortal eye can reach?" indicates that he understands the extent and nature of the loss. Perhaps the best known moral struggle in Trollope's novels is the struggle between the church as an institution, with a purpose not immediately and solely melioristic, and what, for lack of a better term, may be described as humanitarian utilitarianism. Reverend Septimus Harding has to decide, not whether his allegiance will be to the church he loves or to the welfare of the people, but, in a case where the

two conflict, which he will support. This type of moral dilemma, in which a character is torn between two goods rather than between good and evil, is prevalent in Trollope's novels.

The plot of The Warden revolves around the fair distribution of the proceeds of property left by John Hiram in 1434 for the establishment of an almshouse with a warden, to care for twelve poor old Barchester workingmen. The position of warden of Hiram's Hospital was usually held by the precentor of the Barchester Cathedral. Over the years, the income from the property has increased and, by the time our story opens, while the old men are well provided for, the warden is quite lavishly paid. The warden, Mr. Harding, and his hospital are caught in a time of flux. Reformers are attacking distribution of church wealth. "Eager, pushing politicians have asserted in the House of Commons, with very telling indignation, that the grasping priests of the Church of England are gorged with the wealth which the charity of former times has left for the solace of the aged or the education of the young."[4]

Mr. Harding, a popular, kind, gentle, older clergyman, is always eager and willing to do right, to take morally positive action. At the first whisper of possible unfairness, he increases his old men's stipend from his own pocket. In church matters he virtually always thinks with and acts with high church Dr. Grantly,

"his strong minded son-in-law, the archdeacon, the man of whom alone Mr. Harding stood in awe" (13). One realizes that

> With such a tower of strength to back both his arguments and his conscience, it may be imagined that Mr. Harding has never felt any compunction as to receiving his quarterly sum of two hundred pounds. Indeed, the subject has never presented itself to his mind in that shape. He has talked not unfrequently, and heard very much, about the wills of old founders and the income arising from their estates during the last year or two; he did even, at one moment, feel a doubt (since expelled by his son-in-law's logic) as to whether Lord Guildford was clearly entitled to receive so enormous an income as he does from the revenue of St. Cross; but that he himself was overpaid with his modest eight hundred pounds--he who out of that voluntarily gave up sixty-two pounds eleven shillings and fourpence a year to his twelve old neighbours, he who, for the money, does his precentor's work as no precentor has done it before, since Barchester Cathedral was built--such an idea has never sullied his quiet or disturbed his conscience. (16)

The importance of social environment in determining Mr. Harding's moral actions is abundantly clear. Dr. Grantly is the warden's son-in-law and chief advisor. Dr. Grantly's father is the bishop, Mr. Harding's closest friend.

To understand Mr. Harding's position, his ethical dilemma, one must try to put oneself into his religious Church of England world. Despite the shift from theocentricity to anthropocentricity in the nineteenth-century, religion was not a dead issue in 1855, when The Warden was published. The Test and Corporation Act, which required all men desiring to hold corporate office to take the sacrament of the Church of England, had been repealed less than thirty years before, one year before

the Catholic Emancipation Act passed. Because it refused to modify the oath "on the true faith as a Christian," Parliament did not seat a Jew until three years after The Warden appeared. Not until 1871, sixteen years after The Warden's publication, were College Fellowships and University posts open to adherents of all religions. In 1855, the church was important not only for the benefits it conferred on humanity, not only for its theology, or even for the honor it gave God, but in and of itself, as an institution which embodied power and authority in this world, with certain authorization, in the minds of most of its adherents, from the next. Mr. Harding, being one of the people who took the rightness of the church for granted, never thought to question the rightness of the church--until John Bold intruded himself into Mr. Harding's peaceful world.

The narrator of The Warden, who may be safely identified with Trollope, says,

> Bold is a strong reformer. His passion is the reform of all abuses: state abuses, church abuses, corporation abuses . . . abuses in medical practice, and general abuses in the world at large. Bold is thoroughly sincere in his patriotic endeavours . . . but . . . it would be well if one so young had a little more diffidence himself and more trust in the honest purposes of others--if he could be brought to believe that old customs need not necessarily be evil and that changes may possibly be dangerous; but no. Bold has all the ardour and all the self-assurance of a Danton, and hurls his anathemas against time-honoured practices with the violence of a French Jacobin. (18-19)

Trollope evidently has more sympathy with reform than with reformers. This young man, although on such friendly terms

with Mr. Harding and his younger daughter, Eleanor, that he will soon become Mr. Harding's second son-in-law, is the one who directs attention to the "abuse" at Hiram's Hospital. It is at this point, when reform becomes part of his society, part of his environment, part of his reality, that Mr. Harding must reevaluate the ethical aspects of his position. With two arrogant, morally certain men on either side of him, each representing an opposing cause, each very dear to him, Mr. Harding begins his struggle to determine proper moral action to take in his unfortunate situation.

> He wished for Eleanor's sake to think well of Bold and to like him, and yet he could not but feel disgusted at the arrogance of his conduct. What right had he to say that John Hiram's will was not fairly carried out? But then the question would arise within his heart: Was that will fairly acted on? Did John Hiram mean that the warden of his hospital should receive considerably more out of the legacy than all the twelve old men together for whose behoof the hospital was built? Could it be possible that John Bold was right and that the reverend warden of the hospital had been for the last ten years and more the unjust recipient of an income legally and equitably belonging to others? What if it should be proved before the light of day that he, whose life had been so happy, so quiet, so respected, had absorbed eight thousand pounds to which he had no title and which he could never repay? I do not say that he feared that such was really the case; but the first shade of doubt now fell across his mind, and from this evening for many a long, long day, our good, kind, loving warden was neither happy nor at ease. (31)

Mr. Harding is now in the unenviable position where no matter what he does, he is wrong. If he supports Bold and the beadsmen, he strikes at the authority and power of the church. If he does not, he may be perpetuating

unfairness. The warden is a quiet man and his preference is to "remain quiet in the matter" (49) and allow the powers that be, whether church or reform, to decide what is proper. Dr. Grantly and Mr. Bold, however, do not permit this. They are determined to fight the battle and the warden is caught in the crossfire. He is forced to take moral action--to get to one side or the other--out of the middle.

Trollope makes clear that all parties directly involved in this battle--Grantly, Bold, the beadsmen, and certainly Mr. Harding--are good, moral, upstanding men. Trollope asks that no one doubt that Dr. Grantly "was fully confident of the justice of his cause" (45). Bold, he says, is "thoroughly sincere." Some critics try to discredit Dr. Grantly as a worldly, self-interested "status-quoite."[5] Others claim that Bold is not really quite a "gentleman."[6] They are only partly right. Trollope is describing a situation in which no one is completely right, but everyone is right by his own lights--a situation in which pros and cons are so evenly balanced that one cannot easily step in and say, "Obviously church interests are paramount here," or "Obviously the plight of the poor beadsmen must be remedied." Into the middle of this muddle is thrown the very good but very timid Mr. Harding, the only character with whom the reader is completely in sympathy. Pressure is brought upon him from both sides. Social considerations and ethical ones exactly balance. Mr. Harding cannot take action based on

either of these considerations, so he acts based on the third factor that influences moral action--personality.

Since the beginning of the fight over Hiram's Hospital, Mr. Harding has been almost morbidly afraid of the bad publicity which he fears is inevitable.

> Was his humble name to be bandied in men's mouths as the gormandizer of the resources of the poor, as of one who had filched from the charity of other ages wealth which had been intended to relieve the old and the infirm? Was he to be gibbeted in the press to become a byword for oppression, to be named as an example of the greed of the English church? . . . He became all but fixed in his resolve that some great step must be taken to relieve him from the risk of so terrible a fate. (55)

After the first negative article appears in the Jupiter, a popular newspaper, Trollope describes Mr. Harding's state of mind.

> The hard and stinging words of that newspaper article, each one of which thrust a thorn, as it were, into his inmost soul, were fresh in his memory; . . . Was he to be looked on as the unjust griping priest he had been there described? Was he to be pointed at as the consumer of the bread of the poor . . . and be known as one of those greedy priests who by their rapacity have brought disgrace on their church? And why? Why should he bear all this? Why should he die? For he felt that he could not live, under such a weight of obloquy. (88)

Mr. Harding speaks to the bishop and to Dr. Grantly: "I am, as others are, anxious to prove to the world that I have been right and to uphold the place I have held; but I cannot do it at such a cost as this. I cannot bear this. Could you tell me to do so" (88)? Archdeacon Grantly, unable to understand a decision based on anything other

than strong conviction or pure cussedness, can and does tell him to do so. In an eloquent two and one-half page argument for the church, Dr. Grantly admonishes his father-in-law.

> "It is not that you think that there is any justice in these charges or that you doubt your own right to the wardenship; you are convinced of your own honesty, and yet would yield to them through cowardice."
> "Cowardice!" said the bishop expostulating.
> Mr. Harding sat unmoved, gazing on his son-in-law.
> "Well, would it not be cowardice? Would he not do so because he is afraid to endure the evil things which will be falsely spoken of him? Would that not be cowardice?" (90)

Dr. Grantly's argument is, of course, somewhat unfair. Mr. Harding is by no means as certain where his duty lies as Dr. Grantly is. Nevertheless, after the second negative article in the <u>Jupiter</u>, Mr. Harding tells his daughter Eleanor that "'there are some things which a man cannot bear; I cannot bear that,' and he put his hand upon the newspaper" (126).

Mr. Harding cannot base his moral decision on social pressure; Grantly, representing the church and conservatism, and Bold, representing reform and change, stand in approximately equal relationship to him. Nor can he clearly resolve the ethical clash between church and reform. Ultimately, he is forced to take action which is moral in character based largely on his own personality, rather than on ethical principles. Had either resigning the wardenship or keeping it been entirely satisfactory on an ethical

basis, Mr. Harding surely would have been no coward. He would have done his duty. Indeed, for him, the situation then would have required no special courage--no kind of courage he did not have in abundance. But a nice clear-cut situation is what Mr. Harding did not have. Neither partisan enough to look for a fight, nor thick-skinned enough to tolerate one, Mr. Harding resigned the wardenship of Hiram's Hospital.

In The Warden, one sees a conflict between the two aspects of religion that we have discussed--Christian ethical ideals, which are the basis of Trollope's melioristic philosophy, and the church as an institution. The reforming clergymen previously mentioned, Fenwick, Wortle, and Fathers John and Marty, see the church primarily as an organization set up to provide shepherds like themselves to care for the huge, confused, and often miserable herd of humanity. Although, at least in the case of the Catholic priests, Trollope does convey to his reader that church and theology do play some part in their lives, albeit one which is of no concern to anyone but themselves, the religious commitment of these clergymen seems to lie primarily in humanitarianism. Other clergymen react more strongly to the church as an institution. Mark Robarts, in Framley Parsonage, seems to see religion embodied in Mother Church, a mentor with certain social and ethical conventions that can be ignored by its members in general, and its ministers in particular, only at their

own risk. Robarts sees the church as influencing moral action of its adherents through social legislation--a sort of supernatural Lady Lufton--not infallible, but infinitely better than any other available alternatives. Mr. Slope and Mrs. Proudie, on the other hand, look upon the church as an avenue to personal power. Mr. Slope (Barchester Towers) sees the church as a ladder to personal promotion and wealth in this world. Mrs. Proudie (Barsetshire novels) views it as a vehicle to extend her power and domination in this world right into the next. None of these characters, however, seems to have very strong feelings either about God or about religious dogma. Trollope makes it obvious that Mrs. Proudie's concern with dogma springs from her desire to dominate. Mr. Harding is the only major character so far mentioned who appears to have a sense of the Divine Presence mixed with humanitarianism and respect for the church as an institution.

Mr. Harding, however, feels that it is bad form to argue or discuss dogma or sectarian religious practices unless with those who share one's own opinions. In Barchester Towers he criticises Mr. Slope for doing so.[7] Perhaps because the belief that some people are damned, not for wickedness but because they do not accept a specific creed, conflicts with Trollope's deeply felt humanitarianism, Trollope insists that it is God's job to judge and condemn, if necessary; ours is to pity and to help. Trollope would probably agree with Catholic

theologian Karl Rahner, who has recently said, "An orthodox theologian . . . is forbidden to teach that everybody will be saved. But we are allowed to _hope_ that all will be saved."[8]

This attitude is central to the novels in which Trollope portrays the effect of religion as theology on life. In several books, notably _Nina Balatka_ and _Linda Tressel_, this theme is major, but his most complete study of it is in _John Caldigate_. The characters in _John Caldigate_ most interesting from the religious point of view are Caldigate's ex-mistress, Euphemia Smith, his wife, Hester, and, most of all, his mother-in-law, Mrs. Bolton.

The plot of _John Caldigate_, in a nutshell, is that Caldigate, a rather wild young man, sows his wild oats, then settles down and marries the woman he loves, Hester Bolton. In an attempt at blackmail, Euphemia Smith, his ex-mistress, turns up and claims falsely that she, and not Hester, is his wife by a prior ceremony.

When Mrs. Smith first meets John Caldigate, it is already obvious that if she were ever respectable, she is no longer quite a lady. She herself tells Caldigate,

> "If you had made a false step, got into debt and ran away, or mistaken another man's wife for your own, or disappeared altogether under a cloud for a while, you could retrieve your honour, and sinking at twenty-five or thirty, could come up from out of the waters at thirty-five as capable of enjoyment and almost as fresh as ever. But a woman does not bear submersion. She is draggled ever afterwords. She

> must hide everything by a life of lies or she will get no admittance anywhere. The man is rather the better liked because he has sown his wild oats broadly."[9]

Shortly afterwards she says,

> "I can stand apart and defy them all; and as I look at them looking at me, and almost know with what words they are maligning me, I can tell myself that they are beneath me, and that I care nothing for them. . . . But it seems hard that all this should be so because I am a widow,--and because I am alone,--and because I am poorly clothed."
>
> As she said this there were tears in her eyes, true ones, and something of the sound of a broken sob in her voice. And Caldigate was moved. The woman's condition was to be pitied, whether it had been produced with or without fault on her own part. (50-51)

At the beginning of the story, one can feel only sympathy for the hard plight of the "fallen woman." Trollope's sympathy for Carry Brattle comes to mind. The reader never does find out whether or not Mrs. Smith was at fault in whatever misfortune led to her degradation. One can only feel the unfairness of the society that laughs at the same faults in men for which it so severely punishes women. But, although the reader does not yet notice it, one might point out that nowhere in these or any other passages does Mrs. Smith see herself in any but a social context. She does not, for instance, stop to discuss whether or not a woman who commits a fault at twenty-five may at thirty or thirty-five be a better person. Goodness as a quality apart from social acceptance is not a part of Mrs. Smith's mental framework. The women who ostracise her may in fact be beneath her. She is probably

more intelligent, prettier, and better educated than they are; but as she herself realizes, this knowledge means nothing to her. Even her personality traits, except as they win her social or material rewards, have no separate value for her. She accepts the judgment of society even if it is wrong or unfair. Her actions, moral or otherwise, are determined only by what success they will win her--success defined by the world at large. Furthermore, one must keep in mind that it is Mrs. Smith, not Trollope, who claims that nothing can redeem an initial degradation. Mary Thorne (Doctor Thorne) overcomes illegitimacy; Mrs. Peacocke overcomes adultery.

In The Vicar of Bullhampton one feels only sympathy for the unfortunate Carry Brattle. In John Caldigate Trollope provides a foil to his "fallen woman." Put into a position as likely to crush a woman as any in which Euphemia Smith may have been placed, Hester Bolton Caldigate evaluates her situation and conducts herself in a way very different from Mrs. Smith. Mrs. Smith claimed that she went on the stage against her parents' wishes and married an actor who treated her cruelly, then died of drink. Against her mother's wishes, Hester Caldigate married a man whose past life made a charge of bigamy plausible, and who was convicted of bigamy and jailed. Unlike Mrs. Smith, however, Hester Caldigate did not allow her situation to crush or degrade her. Mrs. Smith allows herself to be manipulated into a negative self-image and into negative moral actions

by a society that rewards this behavior, punishes that. Hester Caldigate bases her actions largely on abstract ideas--in this case religious ones--and defines herself in terms of how well she measures up to her ideal standard of behavior. Hester says, "'I am bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh . . . made so by a sacrament which no jury can touch. What matters what the people say? They may make me more unhappy than I am. They may kill me by their cruelty. But they cannot make me believe myself not to be his wife'" (419). Hester does not measure herself by her social milieu. She has a better yardstick. She discusses her situation with her father-in-law.

> "I do not regard what other people say."
> "That might be possible for a man, Hester, but a woman has to regard what the world says."
> "I know it all, father. I know what you would tell me. If I live here after he comes out of prison people will say that I am his mistress. . . . Let them call me what they will. It is not what they call me, but what I am. It is bad for a woman to have evil said of her, but it is worse for her to do evil." (426)

This is a direct answer to the pitiful complaints of Mrs. Smith at the beginning of the book. One is at first tempted to say that the difference between the two women is not in their religious beliefs, but in their personalities--their characters. Apparently, this is not true. Their basic make-ups seem similar; they are both attractive and intelligent. Both women are strong--they are survivors.

Implicit in Mrs. Smith's speeches, however, is the belief that the true goal of life is success--worldly

success. Good behavior is only a path to success, and if this path is closed, then one must choose another path to the same destination. Whereas Trollope, in <u>The Vicar of Bullhampton</u>, points out that it is important for society to reward good behavior, in <u>John Caldigate</u> he emphasizes that one must not allow one's behavior to depend solely upon society's rewards. Good behavior itself has no value to Mrs. Smith. Hester, on the other hand, admits that people can make her unhappy but they cannot affect what she is. "It is not what they call me, but what I am." Her aim is not necessarily to be happy, although she certainly does not scorn happiness, but to be good. And, to Hester, good is what God says is good. She and her husband were joined "by a sacrament which no jury can touch." God gave her her husband, and with God's help, she will do as her husband bids her do (426). She literally draws her strength from and directs her actions by the oldest and most powerful Abstraction. Note that in <u>John Caldigate</u> Trollope has altered his perspective somewhat from what it is in the novels with a strong humanitarian bias. In <u>John Caldigate</u> it is made explicit that as important as human happiness is, there is a greater good, and that is human goodness, which, in this case, is defined by standards of religion, not society. The world of the melioristic novels tends to be anthropocentric; the world in this novel tends to be theocentric--despite Trollope's obvious disapproval of the religious fanaticism of Hester's

mother, Mrs. Bolton, who stands to one side of Hester as Mrs. Smith stands to the other.

Mrs. Bolton is a religious fanatic--and Trollope's portrait of her and analysis of her moral actions is superb. Unlike her daughter, and even more unlike Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Bolton "was one of those who regarded all discomfort as meritorious, as in some way adding something to her claim for heaven" (194). Furthermore,

> It was one of the tenets of her life,--the strongest, perhaps, of all those doctrines on which she built her faith,--that this world is a world of woe; that wailing and suffering, if not gnashing of teeth, is and should be the condition of mankind preparatory to eternal bliss. For eternal bliss there could, she thought, be no other preparation. She did not want to be happy here, or to have those happy around her whom she loved. (429)

As Mrs. Smith is mainly controlled by outside forces, and Hester by ideas, it appears that what controls Mrs. Bolton is her own personality. Even religions which encourage denial of the flesh do so in order to encourage an exaltation or ecstasy of the spirit, not merely to gain merit through misery. It is Mrs. Bolton who believes that misery per se, rather than the way one bears the misery that comes upon one in the course of life, gives certain passage into the world to come. That misery may be one's lot on this earth is true, but the belief that it "should be," that "for eternal bliss there could . . . be no other preparation," reflects Mrs. Bolton rather than her religion. This passage is an example of Trollope's

technique of making the best possible case for each of his characters. He describes to the reader how the character feels and thinks without necessarily pointing out the flaws in the character's assumptions or logic. Trollope contrasts Mrs. Bolton's attitude to Hester's.

> The young wife . . . was able to burst asunder the remnants of fanaticism with which her mother had endeavoured to constrain her. . . . Hester looked abroad, and soon taught herself to feel that the world was bright and merry, that this mortal life was by no means necessarily a place of gloom, and the companionship of the man to whom Providence had allotted her was to her . . . happy, . . . enjoyable, . . . sufficient. . . . There might be suffering and tribulation,--suffering even to death. But her idea of the manner in which the suffering should be endured and death awaited was altogether opposed to that which was hot within her mother's bosom. (430)

Hester accepts the world as a pleasant place which she enjoys as much as her situation and duties permit. Desire for worldly pleasures and society's approval control her behavior only as long as they do not conflict with her moral and religious responsibilities. Mrs. Smith wants to enjoy the world as much as possible and recognizes no code which might cause her to limit her enjoyment. Desire for worldly pleasure completely controls her behavior. Mrs. Bolton is so afraid of allowing herself to be manipulated by the desire for pleasure that she condemns all worldly pleasure and enjoyment as dangerous. She forgets that there are less obvious temptations and pleasures which can influence moral behavior.

Mrs. Bolton makes a convincing case against her son-in-law. He had been "a spendthrift, a gambler, and,

if the rumours which had reached them were true, given to the company of loose women. She had striven with all her might that such a one should not be allowed to take her daughter from her, and had striven in vain. He had succeeded;--but his character was not changed by his success" (207). She tells Hester that she will have nothing to do with John Caldigate. "There are the sheep,--and there are the goats!'" she says, "'Of which is he? . . . I will not trust myself in the way of sinners, because by some worldly alliance to which I myself was no consenting party, I have been brought into worldly contact with them'" (208). Mrs. Bolton insists in her own mind that "She at any rate was sincere. . . . She would be true to her principles even at the expense of all her natural yearnings. Of what use to her would be her religious convictions if she were to give them up just because her heartstrings were torn and agonized? The man was a goat though he were ten times her child's husband" (209). Trollope comments that

> She knew she was right. She knew at least that were she to act otherwise there would be upon her conscience the weight of sin. She did not know that the convictions on which she rested with such confidence had come in truth from her injured pride,--had settled themselves in her mind because she had been beaten in her endeavours to prevent her daughter's marriage. She was not aware that she regarded John Caldigate as a goat,--as one who beyond all doubt was a goat,--simply because John Caldigate had had his way, while she had been debarred from hers. Such no doubt was the case. And yet who can deny her praise for fidelity to her own convictions. (210)

Note that the alliance of which Mrs. Bolton dissapproves she sees as a "worldly alliance" rather than one made holy by sacrament. When Hester tells her mother she will not leave her husband, Hester says, " I know but one Judge, and He is there; and He has said that those whom He has joined together, man shall not put asunder " (316-17). Her mother thinks that "Hester had begged the whole question. . . . And she spoke of purity as though it were a virtue which could be created and consecrated simply by the action of her own heart, as though nothing outside,--no ceremony, nor ordinance,--could affect it" (317). What Mrs. Bolton thinks is exactly the opposite of what Hester says. Critics who verge towards interpreting Trollope as a more liberal or modern thinker might prefer to believe that, because Hester has faith in her husband, and because Hester is not concerned with the opinions of those around her, she is claiming that love alone can sanctify a relationship. This is patently not true. In fact, she claims Divine authority for her actions. Mrs. Bolton hears what she wants to hear. Mrs. Bolton's judgment of Caldigate and her motives for making this judgment resemble Mrs. Proudie's prejudiced opinions about Dr. Grantly transposed from a humorous to a serious note.

Trollope demonstrates to his readers exactly how Mrs. Bolton has come to take negative moral action. In trying to be more than human, in her mistrust and suppressing of normal human pleasures and desires, she

perverts her desire for pleasure into strange forms. She is willing to damn Caldigate for thwarting her. After the trial which declares him a bigamist, Trollope explains Mrs. Bolton's state of mind. "Any allusion to a possibility that the verdict had been a mistaken verdict was distasteful to her. Her own original opinion respecting Caldigate had been made good by the verdict. The verdict had proved her to be right, and her husband with all his sons to have been wrong. The triumph had been very dark to her; but still it had been a triumph" (431). The women in _John Caldigate_, especially Mrs. Bolton, are almost emblematic for Trollope's warning in _Barchester Towers_, "Till we can become divine, we must be content to be human, lest in our hurry for a change we sink to something lower."[10] Euphemia Smith, allowing worldly pleasures alone to determine her moral behavior, is "less than human" because she denies entirely any spiritual component in herself. Mrs. Bolton, at the other extreme, by denying herself all worldly pleasures, denies her own humanity. Her personality, by warping her religious beliefs, controls her behavior. Of the three women, only Hester enjoys the world without allowing it to control her, is sincere in her religion without aiming to become more than human, is, in Trollope's terms, fully human.

We see, then, that for Trollope, moral action related to religion and the church is influenced by society's pressures and practices, the personalities of characters,

and the abstract principles to which some of them, at least, ascribe. While it is true that in many instances Trollope looks favorably on a melioristic role for religion and the church, he recognizes other religious influences on moral action as legitimate, including the role of abstract principles exemplified by Hester Caldigate. Trollope is especially interested in situations where abstract and societal influences come into conflict, and those in which the preponderance of "good" does not clearly lie with one side or the other. It is particularly in such circumstances that the personalities of the characters sway the moral action.

NOTES

[1] Quoted in James R. Kincaid, The Novels of Anthony Trollope (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), p. 58.

[2] Anthony Trollope, The Vicar of Bullhampton (1924; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 282-83. Subsequent references to this edition appear in the text.

[3] Anthony Trollope, Clergymen of the Church of England (n.p.: Leicester University Press, 1974), pp. 31-32.

[4] Anthony Trollope, The Warden (New York: Signet-The New American Library, 1964), p. 15. Subsequent references to this edition appear in the text.

[5] Donald Smalley, ed., The Critical Heritage (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; New York: Barnes and Noble, 1969), p. 31.

[6] Geoffrey Tillotson, Afterword, The Warden, by Anthony Trollope (op. cit.), p. 203.

[7] Anthony Trollope, Barchester Towers (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), pp. 67-68.

[8] E. Kennedy, "Quiet Mover of the Catholic Church," New York Times Magazine, 23 September 1979, pp. 66-67.

[9] Anthony Trollope, John Caldigate (1946; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1952), p. 47. Subsequent references to this edition appear in the text.

[10] Trollope, Barchester Towers, p. 459.

CHOOSING A MATE

> You say that it would be dangerous to interfere with "the family arrangement." I think it is impossible to do so to any great extent. You cannot, by Act of Congress or Parliament make the woman's arm as strong as the man's or deprive her of her position as the bearer of children. We may trouble ourselves much by debating a question which superior power has settled for us, but we cannot alter the law. . . . The necessity of the supremacy of man is as certain to me as the eternity of the soul.[1]

Trollope's writings are peppered with similar sentiments, not quite so unequivocally expressed. Modern critics try hard to reconcile Trollope's outspoken traditionalism with his sympathetic presentations of ambitious and rebellious women in his novels. The most common device for attempting this reconciliation is some form of the dictum that a writer may put more into his works than he himself knows. Using a variant of this argument, James Kincaid, for example, argues that Trollope was, essentially, too thick to understand the implications of his own novels.

> When he was safely away from the intricacy of his fiction and into the simplicity of ideas, Trollope could announce with almost desperate confidence that

> "the necessity of the supremacy of man over woman is as certain to me as the eternity of the soul." . . . Nor is Trollope's lecture on the higher education of women any more suggestive of interesting notions on the subject. But within the novels themselves, the platitudes disappear completely and the easy answers of both male supremacists and feminists alike are seen to be irrelevant entirely to the dilemma of the woman faced with no satisfying alternatives. For many of Trollope's heroines, life offers only the challenge of making a brilliant marriage. Failure means absolute emptiness, but so may success.[2]

One might more accurately say, not that Trollope's ideas vanish when he portrays characters, but, that in the novels, Trollope explores and explicates not his own ideas, but his characters' ideas, and the interaction of their ideas with their social milieu and their own personalities. He objectively reveals what motivates his characters. Because he steps into his characters' shoes so effectively, it is sometimes very difficult to tell where or with whom Trollope's sympathies lie. Confusion arises most often in those areas where ideas and expectations have changed since the nineteenth-century. In areas where ideas and expectations have not changed, there is little or no confusion. Most critics agree, for instance, that Crosbie (Small House at Allington) is a cad, and Louis Trevalyn (He Knew He Was Right) a madman, despite sympathetic presentation. Mrs. Proudie is still a shrew, Mr. Harding a good, kind, old gentleman, Mr. Turnbull (Palliser novels) a demagogue. Totally selfish Bertie Stanhope (Barchester Towers), on the other hand, one suspects is taken as less of a villain in the twentieth-

century age of self-fulfillment than he was in the morally earnest, altruistic nineteenth-century. In an age where one of its finest scientists, T. H. Huxley, could say that one should choose to starve rather than to steal bread,[3] the positions of Lady Mason (Orley Farm), the forger, and Mr. Scarborough (Mr. Scarborough's Family), the rogue, very likely appeared much less ambiguous than they do to readers today.

Certainly significant are changes in interpretation of the role of women. Today, political power and monetary success are considered perfectly acceptable goals for a woman, and she may go out and earn them herself. Horror and disgust with a society that does not give a woman the freedom to pursue these goals herself may lead one to overlook the fact that, even today, marrying for money or power alone is dehumanizing, a form of prostitution. The difference between the nineteenth and twentieth-century readers' mental furnishings may easily explain differing evaluations of characters such as Lady Laura Standish (Palliser novels), Lady Mabel Grex (The Duke's Children), Alice Vavasour (Can You Forgive Her?), and Julia Brabazon (The Claverings). If one hopes to understand Trollope's approach to women, sex, love and marriage, one must keep in mind his own statements on the subjects and the general attitudes of his age as regards them. It may be the twentieth-century reader who sees Trollope's women faced with "no satisfying

alternatives" rather than the nineteenth-century author. One must avoid Kincaid's facile sympathy for "Trollope's heroines" for whom "life offers only the challenge of making a brilliant marriage." It is they who define their lives in terms of monetary and dynastic success, not Trollope. It is they, and not Trollope, who refuse the challenge of creating a marriage based on love, and see no possible satisfaction in it. Trollope's "heroines," if one can speak about heroes and heroines at all in connection with Trollope, do hold traditional nineteenth-century views on sex, love, and marriage. Trollope's heroine in The Claverings, however, is Florence Burton, not Julia Brabazon; Isabel Boncassen and Mary Palliser are the heroines in The Duke's Children, not Lady Mabel Grex. Kincaid's "heroines" are not Trollope's heroines except perhaps in the way that Satan is the hero of Paradise Lost. To Kincaid's heroines, failure to make a brilliant marriage may mean "absolute emptiness, but so may success." Perhaps this is true because Trollope sees what they strive for as empty--therefore, whether they succeed or fail, the result is emptiness. Fortunately, to explore Trollope's artistry, one facet of which is his ability to portray what motivates moral action, we need not necessarily agree precisely on how Trollope sees each of his characters.

There is very little room for disagreement about Trollope's opinion of the moral action that Julia Brabazon, an important character in The Claverings, takes, whatever

the reader's opinion about the sympathy Trollope may or may not have felt for her. Julia Brabazon marries Lord Ongar even though she does not love him; moreover, he is not in any way attractive, respectable, or even decent. Indeed, his only virtues are his money and his rank. Trollope tells his reader that Lord Ongar is bald, "weak, thin, and physically poor, and had, no doubt, increased this weakness and poorness by hard living. . . . He hunted, though he could not ride. He shot, though he could not walk. And, unfortunately, he drank, though he had no capacity for drinking! . . . He had engaged himself to Julia Brabazon, purchasing her at the price of a brilliant settlement."[4] When Trollope speaks of one human being "purchasing" another, he clearly indicates his disapproval. Lord Ongar's unattractiveness is obvious.

In her own mind, however, Julia sees herself acting in a principled fashion.

> Julia Brabazon had no doubt that she was doing well. . . . She had taught herself that romance could not be allowed to a woman in her position. She was highly born, the daughter of a peer, without money and even without a home to which she had any claim. Of course she had accepted Lord Ongar, but she had not put out her hand to take all these good things without resolving that she would do her duty to her future lord. The duty would be doubtless disagreeable, but she would do it with all the more diligence on that account. (27)

Note the words that signify a moral imperative. In Julia's world, a wellborn woman who had no money was certainly in a bad position, but Julia's choice was not

the only possible choice. Julia is acting on principle. She "could not be allowed" romance. She resolved to "do her duty"--a resolution more admirable because her duty would be disagreeable. The words are words that would be appropriate if she were describing the life of poverty she would lead because she would not compromise her integrity. But it is obvious that Julia herself thinks she is doing her duty, as a poor but wellborn woman, to marry well, regardless of what she thinks of her future husband.

This same passage also points to Julia's strength of character. Julia "taught herself" to forego romance. She "resolved" to do her duty. Because it was disagreeable "she would do it with all the more diligence." When her sister tells her some unpleasant things about Ongar, she does not even resent it. "She had made herself understand that the hearing of such things as these was a part of the price which she was called upon to pay. . . . But she had made her selection with her eyes open, and was not disposed to quarrel with her bargain, because that which she had bought was no better than the article which she had known it to be when she was making her purchase" (29). She "made herself" understand. She knew what she was doing, did it voluntarily, and so refused even to pity herself. She "taught herself," "made herself," "resolved." Julia Brabazon was strong and turned her strength to her purpose. In order to marry Ongar, she stifled every natural impulse,

an accomplishment a woman of less strength and determination would not have been able to achieve. Julia's personality assuredly influenced her action. In this selection the marketplace theme is reiterated. Hearing such things was "part of the price." Julia did not quarrel with her "bargain." She made her "purchase." Polhemus believes that for Trollope, "a good society must be based on strong, trusting personal relationships," not poisoned by the profit motive.[5] Julia and Ongar are using each other.

When Julia talks to Harry Clavering she says,

> "Love is not to be our master. . . . I have no choice but to be married well, or to go out like a snuff of a candle. I don't like the snuff of a candle, and, therefore, I am going to be married well."
> "And that suffices?
> "It must suffice. And why should it not suffice? You are very uncivil, cousin, and very unlike the rest of the world. Everybody compliments me on my marriage. Lord Ongar is not only rich, but he is a man of fashion. . . ." (5)

The world clearly plays its part in Julia's decision. No one seriously doubts that Julia is selling herself. Julia's own sister thinks it (28). But all congratulate her; no one except Harry reprimands her. She is, in fact, doing as some of society wholeheartedly believes she ought and most of the rest half-heartedly believes she ought. Abstract principles, personality, and social milieu all play their parts in determining the moral action Julia takes. Trollope concludes this particular section with a description of Lord and Lady Ongar after their wedding.

> But though the lord might be only half a man, Julia Brabazon walked out from the church every inch a countess. Whatever price she might have paid, she had at any rate got the thing which she had intended to buy. As she stepped into the chariot which carried her to the railway station . . . she told herself that she had done right. . . . Mercenary! Of course she had been mercenary. Were not all men upon whom devolved the necessity of earning their bread? (32)

This passage combines Julia's strength and dignity, her sense of having done right, and her marketplace philosophy, but, more important, it highlights that characteristic of Trollope's which apRoberts emphasizes--Trollope's advocacy of each of his characters. Trollope makes Julia a sympathetic character despite her immoral action--and it is clear that Trollope considers it immoral. He again uses the language of the marketplace to describe Julia selling herself rather than giving herself to her husband. And he makes clear that Julia is treated as she values herself--as a piece of property. Her husband dies very shortly after their marriage, but not before falsely declaring that Julia has been unfaithful to him. Julia suffers the consequences of having married a brute. When Ongar dies and Julia goes to claim his property, people turn their backs on her. In the chapter of The Claverings entitled "Lady Ongar Takes Possession," Trollope compares Julia's betrayal of herself with Judas' betrayal of Jesus. Trollope says eight times in eight pages that "the price was in her hand," and concludes, "She had the price in her hands but she felt herself tempted to do as Judas did--to go out and hang herself" (127).

Several of the many female characters in Trollope's novels who make values intrinsically human secondary to values basically material--Lady Laura Standish, Lady Mabel Grex, Lady Mason, Lady Carbury (The Way We Live Now), to name a few--appear to be, like Lady Ongar, rather sympathetic characters. Society taught them, as it taught Lady Ongar, to value material success very highly. They themselves extend this principle and teach themselves that material success matters more than any other kind of success. The reader's sympathy for these women is aroused first by his conviction that society has misled them, then by his respect for their singleminded pursuit of the goal they consider worthy, and most, perhaps, by his admiration for the passion and strength he sees in their personalities. Like Julia Brabazon, Lady Laura, for example, displays the strength and determination characteristic of these women. She loves Phineas Finn, but ruthlessly suppresses her feelings in favor of her ambitions. She almost told Phineas "that she would have loved him had she not been poor,--that she was beginning to love him and had quenched her love, because it had become impossible to her to marry a poor man."[6] Note again that it is not Trollope that says it is impossible for her to marry a poor man, nor is it forbidden to her by law; given her ambitions, she herself decides that it is not possible. After she marries another man who has money and position, she asks herself:

> How would it have been with her had she thrown all ideas of fortune to the winds, and linked her lot to that of the young Phoebus who was lying at her feet? If she had ever loved any one, she had loved him. And she had not thrown away her love for money. So she swore to herself in her cold unhappiness. She had married a rich man in order that she might be able to do something in the world. (304)

Lady Laura, Lady Ongar, and their like pervert marriage from a relationship based on love to a means to some other end. To use another person in such a way, to marry a man for his money, even if one wants to spend his money for a worthy purpose, is wrong. Trollope demonstrates that for these women, not only is their choice morally wrong, but it is ineffective. Their own warm feelings and the pervasiveness of the human element in marriage, make these women miserable if the marital relationship is not good--and if their spouses also have warm feelings, they too are made miserable.

It is, of course, not only women who must decide whether to marry for love or for other ends. Lord Lufton (Framley Parsonage), Henry Grantly (The Last Chronicle of Barsetshire), and Frank Gresham (Doctor Thorne) choose to marry for love, even when those closest to them pressure them to give up their chosen wives for the sake of worldly expedience. Trollope, however, does not underestimate the temptations to marry money, power, or rank that men must face. If they make the wrong choice, they also pay harsh penalties. Adolphus Crosbie, the "villain" of The Small House at Allington, chooses to marry for worldly success.

Crosbie, a man about town, comes into the country for a vacation and there falls in love with and becomes engaged to Lily Dale. He immediately regrets his impulsiveness. Lily has no fortune and no particular standing in society.

> Was he absolutely about to destroy all the good that he had done for himself throughout the past years of his hitherto successful life? . . . To do the man justice, I must declare that in all these moments of misery he still did the best he could to think of Lily herself as of a great treasure which he had won,--as of a treasure which should, and perhaps would compensate him for his misery. But there was the misery very plain. He must give up his clubs, and his fashion, and all that he had hitherto gained, and be content to live a plain, humdrum, domestic life, with eight humdred a year, and a small house, full of babies. It was not the kind of Elysium for which he had tutored himself.[7]

Crosbie's every word indicates how completely he has espoused worldly values, how completely he has weaned himself from any values more "human." A wife he loves and children compare ill with "his clubs and his fashion." A family would "absolutely . . . destroy all the good . . . of his hitherto successful life," unless a large income comes with it. It would be "misery." As Julia Brabazon "had taught herself that romance could not be allowed to a woman in her position," as Lady Laura made up her mind that she could not allow herself "the same freedom of choice" in marriage that others take (139), so Crosbie had "tutored" himself for a life different from the one of love and affection Lily opens to him. Notice the use of words that indicate that the characters deliberately choose their own paths. A combination of societal

influence and personal conviction push Crosbie toward deserting Lily--although as Trollope says, "Adolphus Crosbie was a clever man; and he meant also to be a true man,--if only the temptations to falsehood might not be too great for him" (107).

To understand properly Trollope's theory of moral action, it is necessary for the reader to stop here and ask himself what would have been the course of the moral action had Lily been wealthy and socially prominent. The chances are, Crosbie would have married Lily and they would have lived happily ever after. Crosbie was not naturally false. Trollope says that "he had some principles of right and wrorg" (134). Had he not been tested, he would not have failed. Perhaps, had he married a rich, prominent Lily, had his love grown, had they had children, and had he loved them as he was not able to love them in the projected "small house, full of babies," perhaps, had he been tested then, he would have been strong enough to pass the test. Crosbie, like most of Trollope's characters, is not intrinsically vicious or intrinsically angelic. He is, morally speaking, a compendium, a total of all the moral decisions he has made in the past. Those he will make in the future and their effect on his moral "total" are determined not only by his character, social milieu, and personal beliefs at the time he must make choices, but also by the nature of the choices he must make.

Lily, when she begins to recognize Crosbie's discontent with their engagement, offers him his freedom. This third choice, an alternative to jilting Lily or to marrying her, would offer an escape for Crosbie that would at least allow him to retain some shred of honor and his honesty. He thinks to himself that

> . . . he would thus escape from the ruin at which he had been gazing for the last week past. For it was ruin,--utter ruin. He did love her; so he declared to himself. But was he a man who ought to throw the world away for love? Such men there were; but was he one of them? . . .
>
> Then his heart misgave him, and he lacked the courage to extricate himself from his trouble; or, as he afterwards said to himself, he had not the heart to do it. (138-39)

For Crosbie, a life which does not include social success is utter ruin. Like many of Trollope's "tested" characters, Crosbie is put into a situation in which two crucial values or goals lie in opposite directions rather than together. Crosbie wants love and he wants worldly success. Mr. Harding, when forced to choose between supporting the church or supporting reform, rises to the occassion and does not let the situation destroy him. Lady Glencora Palliser, as we shall see, also makes a difficult choice and then makes it into a successful choice. Crosbie, evidently, must choose whether to marry Lily and throw away the world for love, or to marry Lady Alexandrina de Courcy and throw away the world for nothing as do Lady Ongar and Lady Laura. Of course, one must keep in mind that Crosbie could have broken his engagement to Lily and not

married Lady Alexandrina. This might have been, for him, not an admirable, but an acceptable choice.

But Crosbie is unable to accept Lily's generous offer. He lacks the courage to face directly his own weakness, to rectify his mistake, and to own to Lily that he values material success more than he values her love. What leaves the reader less sympathetic to Crosbie than to Lady Ongar or Lady Laura is his weakness. He is too weak to do what he needs to do, and, what is worse, as Trollope allows us to see, he deceives himself into believing that his weakness is actually soft-heartedness, while this self deceit demonstrates that Crosbie does have some standards into line with which he must bring or seem to bring his actions, it does not negate his cowardice. Lady Ongar and Lady Laura sin from strength and conviction, wrongheaded though they be, but Crosbie sins from weakness and falseness.

> He could measure the whole thing at its worth,--Courcy Castle with its privileges, Lady Dumbello, Lady Clandidlem, and the whole of it. He knew that he had been happier on that lawn at Allington, and more contented with himself, than ever he had been even under Lady Hartletop's splendid roof in Shropshire. . . . He knew that there was something better, and that that something was within his reach.
>
> But, nevertheless, the air of Courcy was too much for him. . . . It was of no use for him to tell himself that the Small House at Allington was better than Courcy Castle. Satan knew that heaven was better than hell; but he found himself to be fitter for the latter place. . . . It was the line of life into which he had fallen, and he confessed inwardly that the struggle to extricate himself would be too much for him. (165)

A combination of social pressure, his own values, and

his own weakness defeats him. Compare him to Lady Ongar, who "made her selection with her eyes open." Lady Ongar, until she learns better, honestly thinks that she has made the best choice open to her. Crosbie never seems to have his eyes quite open. Self-deceit is part and parcel of his weakness. He claims to recognize the better choice but choose the worse. No one, certainly no one as selfish as Crosbie, intentionally chooses what he believes is worse for himself. Crosbie would like to think he is above Courcy Castle, that he has the right values, that he is happier elsewhere. Crosbie conveniently forgets that Satan did not have the privilege of leaving hell; Crosbie chooses not to leave Courcy.

> He had said to himself a dozen times during that week that he never could be happy with Lily Dale, and that he never could make her happy. And then he had used the old sophistry in his endeavour to teach himself that it was right to do that which he wished to do. Would it not be better for Lily that he should desert her, than marry her against the dictates of his own heart? . . . If by any absolute self-sacrifice he could secure Lily's well-being, he would not hesitate for a moment. But would it be well to sacrifice her as well as himself?
>
> He had discussed the matter in this way within his own breast, till he had almost taught himself to believe that it was his duty to break off his engagement with Lily. (213)

Crosbie does have some principles and he does try to make his actions conform to his principles. But his weakness and self-deceit play a major part in determining the moral action that he chooses to take, just as Julia Brabazon's strength and clearsightedness determine hers. Crosbie does

jilt Lily Dale and marry Lady Alexandrina. Compare Lady Ongar's attitude after her marriage to Crosbie's after his. Trollope tells us that, "though the lord might be only half a man, Julia Brabazon walked out from the church every inch a countess. Whatever price she might have paid, she had at any rate got the thing which she had intended to buy." Crosbie, on the other hand, thinks to himself:

> There she was, opposite to him, his very actual wife,--bone of his bone; and what was he to say to her? . . . He bethought himself how much easier it would have been to talk to Lily. . . . .
> "Take care of my bonnet," she [Alexandrina] said, as she felt the motion of the railway carriage when he kissed her. . . . How often would he have kissed Lily, and how pretty would her bonnet have been when she reached the end of her journey, and how delightfully happy would she have looked when she scolded him for bending it (432-33)

Crosbie is false to Lily, false to his wife, false to himself. Acted upon by social pressure, the values of the Courcy Castle set with whom he identifies, abstract values, which he has, but has rationalized away, and his own personality, comprised of lukewarm passions, weakness, and self-deceit, he becomes the "villain" of the piece and wends his own miserable way through the rest of his life.

Crosbie is one of the few characters that Trollope allows his reader to condemn quite thoroughly. More often, Trollope's understanding of the exigencies of life,--of situation, ideas, and character--forbids him to condemn easily. If one compares Crosbie to other Trollope

characters who start his stories with the potential for either good or evil, it appears, at first glance, that he handles them more gently than he handles Crosbie. Trollope, for instance, describes Frank Greystock, "hero" of The Eustace Diamonds, in terms similar to those in which he describes Crosbie.

> He was quick, ready-witted, self reliant, and not over-scrupulous in the outward things of the world. He was desirous of doing his duty to others, but he was specially desirous that others should do their duty to him. He intended to get on in the world, and believed that happiness was to be achieved by success. Frank Greystock, when he was invited to stand for Bobsborough in the Conservative interest, had not for a moment allowed any political heterodoxy on his own part to stand in the way of his advancement.[8]

The portrait has in it, perhaps, more action and decision than does Crosbie's, but the aims and goals of the men are very similar; both believe that worldly success leads to happiness, and neither is "over-scrupulous" as to how he reaches his goal.

Frank has his own "Lady Alexandrina" in the person of Lizzie Eustace. Frank certainly has much more love for Lizzie than Crosbie did for Lady Alexandrina; on the other hand, Lizzie is by far the less worthy of the two. Frank, however, knows that

> As for looking about for a girl whom he could honestly love, and who should have a fortune of her own, as well as beauty, birth, and all the other things--that was out of his reach. If he talked to himself of love, if he were ever to acknowledge to himself that love was to have sway over him, then must Lucy Morris be the mistress of his heart. He had

> come to know enough about himself to be aware of that; but he knew also that he had said nothing binding him to walk in that path. It was quite open to him to indulge a discreet ambition without dishonour. Therefore he also had come to call upon the beautiful widow. (27)

Note that Frank does not have to teach himself that love should have sway over him, but only to acknowledge it. He is considerably more self aware than Crosbie is and considerably more honest with himself. Nevertheless, on this Thursday morning call, made before he proposes to Lucy, Frank very nearly proposes to the beautiful and rich widow, his cousin, Lizzie Eustace. He is saved from the engagement only by the timely interruption of another caller--Lizzie's aunt, Lady Linlithgow. One cannot but notice that, whereas Frank's love for Lucy does stop him from returning to Lizzie the next day or the day after and engaging himself to her, it was not his love for Lucy or his lack of love for Lizzie that stopped his proposal on that Thursday, but chance. Frank did not take morally negative action--and morally negative action it would surely have been--and engage himself to the woman he did not love instead of the woman he did love--not because he came to a decision that forbade this course of action, but because outward circumstances saved him. As we saw in the case of the moral action taken by Mr. Harding in <u>The Warden</u>, Trollope has a very fine understanding of moral action taken for reasons not too closely connected to moral decisions. Trollope is evidently committed to judging a person primarily

on the basis of what he does, not on the basis of what he thinks of doing or plans to do.

When Frank is about to write his marriage proposal to his beloved Lucy Morris, his thoughts virtually parallel those of Crosbie. They are not, perhaps, quite as strong, but then, he has not actually committed himself yet, as had Crosbie before the quote taken from his thoughts above.

> Why should he not at once make up his mind to marry her? He could do it. There was no doubt of that. It was possible for him to alter the whole manner of his life, to give up his clubs, to give up even Parliament if the need to do so was there, and to live as a married man on the earnings of his profession. There was no need why he should regard himself as a poor man. . . . There was nothing in the prospect which would frighten Lucy, though there might be a question whether he possessed the courage needed for so violent a change. . . .
>
> It was an expensive and a luxurious mode of life, and one from the effects of which a man is prone to drift very quickly into selfishness. He did not hesitate to tell himself that he must make a great change if he meant to marry Lucy Morris. (70)

There is little or no self-deception in Frank's character. He knows it is he and not Lucy who will suffer from the changes that his marriage to her will entail. He does not fool himself into thinking that she will be happier without him. Frank does write and propose, but at various times after regrets the move--and in the same language that Crosbie regrets his engagement to Lily. "He had written that letter to her in his chambers one night in a fit of ecstasy, and could it be right that the ruin of a whole life should be the consequence" (181)? This reflects less negatively on Frank in The Eustace Diamonds than it did on

Crosbie in The Small House at Allington because in The Eustace Diamonds its effect is ironic. The reader realizes not after the fact but immediately that ruin for Frank lies not in marriage to the impoverished Lucy, but in marriage to the rich and vicious Lizzie. In The Small House at Allington, when Crosbie thinks about marriage to Lily ruining him, the reader knows nothing about what his future life will be if he jilts Lily. Crosbie, therefore, appears to be simply shallow and contemptible. The reader is at least as impressed, in The Eustace Diamonds, by how miserable Frank will be if he marries Lizzie as by what a cad he will be if he jilts Lucy.

Like all people, the embryo couple, Frank and Lucy, must contend with the influence of their social milieu. Although Frank and Lucy's social milieu in The Eustace Diamonds is much less vicious than that of Crosbie at Courcy Castle in The Small House at Allington, it is for that reason perhaps doubly difficult for the couple to resist it. Lady Fawn is a good example of the type of person with whom they have to contend. Her opinion is representative of the opinion of their world in general.

> Lady Fawn was one of the best women breathing, unselfish, motherly, affectionate, appreciative, and never happy unless she was doing good to somebody. It was her nature to be soft, and kind, and beneficent. But she knew very well that if she had a son, a second son, situated as was Frank Greystock, she would not wish him to marry a girl without a penny who was forced to earn her bread by being a governess. The sacrifice on Mr. Greystock's part would, in her estimation, be so great that she did not believe that it would be made. Womanlike, she regarded the man

> as being so much more important than the woman that she could not think that Frank Greystock would devote himself simply to such a one as Lucy Morris. Was it probable that a man of the world, such as Frank Greystock, a rising man, a member of Parliament, one who, as everybody knew, was especially in want of money--was it probable that such a man as this would make her his wife just because she was good, and worthy, and sweet-natured?
> No doubt the man had said that he would do so, and Lady Fawn's fears betrayed on her ladyship's part a very bad opinion of men in general. It may seem to be a paradox to assert that such bad opinion sprang from the high idea which she entertained of the importance of men in general; but it was so. . . . She could not believe that Mr. Greystock should think so much of such a little girl as to marry her. Mr. Greystock would no doubt behave very badly in not doing so, but then men do so often behave very badly! And at the bottom of her heart she almost thought that they might be excused for doing so. (234)

Lady Fawn obviously joins Frank Greystock and Adolphus Crosbie in equating happiness with worldly success. Her assumption is that Lucy--"good, and worthy, and sweet-natured,"--is worth less to a man as his wife than a woman rich, prominent, and titled. Furthermore, Lady Fawn's attitude toward men and women is surely one with which Trollope disagrees. As he did with Mrs. Bolton, as is his custom, Trollope does not contradict her opinions, but only describes her opinions fully, so the reader can evaluate them himself. Rather than simply allowing the man and the woman their different roles, Lady Fawn judges the man, not stronger only, or even smarter, but "much more important than the woman." Lady Fawn obviously feels that being "good, and worthy, and sweet-natured" entitles a woman to no special position, consideration, or respect compared to that due to any man, just because he is a

man. Trollope says that Lady Fawn "had but one son, and of all her children he was the least worthy, but he was more important to her than all her daughters" (234). Whereas Trollope surely believes in the "supremacy of man" over woman, on the other hand, he does not believe that men are worthier or more important than women. The view of women implicit in his writings, as a matter of fact, is close to that presented by Houghton as one of the commonly accepted attitudes toward women during the Victorian period. Houghton cites Ruskin's lecture "Of Queen's Gardens" as a description of this attitude.

> Ruskin begins by rejecting the notion both that woman is "the shadow and attendant image of her lord, owing him a thoughtless and servile obedience," and that she has a feminine mission and feminine rights that entitle her to a career in the world like a man's. Her true function is to guide and uplift her more worldly and intellectual mate; "His intellect is for speculation and invention; his energy for adventure, for war, and for conquest, wherever war is just, wherever conquest necessary. But the woman's power is for rule, not for battle--and her intellect is not for invention or creation, but for sweet ordering, arrangement, and decision." . . . In Shakespeare and Scott, in Dante and Homer, women are "infallibly faithful and wise counsellors"; and by their virtue and wisdom men are redeemed from weakness or vice.[9]

Although this attitude might smack too much of "separate but equal" to be palatable to our age, it is certainly not equivalent to man being "much more important than the woman." One might argue that Trollope treats Crosbie more roughly than Frank Greystock because Crosbie "could measure the whole thing at its worth,--Courcy Castle with its privileges, Lady Dumbello, Lady Clandidlem, and the whole

of it." Perhaps Crosbie should have found it easier to resist accepting the evaluation of the Courcy Castle people because he did not thoroughly love and respect them. Frank and Lucy had to resist the opinions of those whom they did thoroughly love and respect.

Some of the strength Frank finds to resist the temptations of the world's estimate of his position, as well as Lady Eustace and her money, comes from Lucy herself. It did not occur to this reader, at least, to question Lily Dale's nobility when she offered to release Crosbie from their engagement. If one compares her behavior with Lucy's behavior when she is placed in the same situation, however, one cannot fail to see that Lily's behavior implies some degree of agreement with the standards of Courcy Castle. Lily accepts that the decision to marry or not to marry may legitimately, if not nobly, be based on wealth rather than on love, and that such a decision may yet lead to happiness for Crosbie. Perhaps by assuming that Crosbie could or would retreat from their engagement with his honor still bright, she herself becomes part of the social milieu that pulls him away from her. Lucy Morris, on the other hand, does write a letter to Frank offering him the same semi-honorable retreat--but she leaves it unmailed.

> Why should she lie to him, as she would lie in sending such a letter? If he did throw her over he would be a traitor, and her heart would be full of reproaches. Whatever might be his future lot in life, he owed it to her to share it with her, and if he evaded his debt he would be a traitor and a miscreant. She would never

> tell him so. She would be far too proud to condescend to spoken or written reproaches. But she would know that it would be so, and why should she lie to him by saying that it would not be so? (307)

Lucy refuses complicity with the establishment that tells her that there need be no loyalty between men and women, that rank is more desirable than virtue, and that it is more important to receive wealth from a wife than to receive love. Lucy strengthens Frank's strengths rather than bowing to and thoroughly accepting his weaknesses.

The matter of the marriage between Frank and Lucy, however, is not really settled in Frank's mind until he learns that Lizzie lied to him about the theft of her diamonds. Only at this point does he fully realize what kind of person Lizzie is and what living with her as a wife could mean.

> Of course she had lied to him and to all the world. From the very commencement of his intimacy with her he had known that she was a liar, and what else could he have expected but lies? As it happened, this particular lie had been very big, very efficacious, and the cause of boundless troubles. It had been wholly unnecessary, and from the first, though injurious to many, more injurious to her than to any other. He himself had been injured, but it seemed to him now that she had absolutely ruined herself. . . . .
>
> It was marvelous to him that the woman could have been so false and have sustained her falsehood so well. And this was his cousin, his well-beloved--as a cousin, certainly well-beloved--and there had doubtless been times in which he had thought that he would make her his wife! He could not but smile as he stood looking at her, contemplating all the confusion which she had caused and thinking how very little the disclosure of her iniquity seemed to confound herself. (378-79)

Unlike Crosbie, who blames Lady Alexandrina for being herself and not Lily, Frank is honest enough with himself not to hate Lizzie for deceiving him, but to laugh at himself for deceiving himself.

At the end of the story, Trollope completely exonerates Frank Greystock from blame. Despite the fact that Frank is saved from Lizzie Eustace twice by chance rather than by virtue, once by Lady Linlithgow's morning call, once by the truth about the diamonds, Frank is judged by his final action. His is faithful to Lucy. Trollope defends Frank.

> All his friends told Frank Greystock that he would be ruined were he to marry Lucy Morris; and his friends were people supposed to be very good and wise. The Dean and the Dean's wife, his father and mother, were very clear that it would be so. Old Lady Linlithgow had spoken of such a marriage as quite out of the question. The Bishop of Bobsborough, when it was all mentioned in his hearing, had declared that such a marriage would be a thousand pities. And even dear old Lady Fawn, though she wished it for Lucy's sake, had many times prophesied that such a thing was quite impossible.
>
> Frank Greystock doubtless had vacillated, but on the balance of his convictions as to his own future conduct he had been much nobler than his friends. He had never hestiated for a moment as to the value of Lucy Morris. She was not beautiful. She had no wonderful gifts of nature. There was nothing of a goddess about her. She was absolutely penniless. She had never been what the world calls well dressed. And yet she had been everything to him. There had grown up a sympathy between them quite as strong on his part as on hers, and he had acknowledged it to himself.
>
> He had never doubted his own love, and when he had been most near to convincing himself that in his peculiar position he ought to marry his rich cousin because of her wealth, then, at those moments, he had most strongly felt that to have Lucy Morris close to him was the greatest charm in existence. (405-06)

Frank's personality, his own ideas, and perhaps even his social group, which itself forms an affectionate and loving circle, determine Frank's moral decision. Frank's nobility lies not in his selflessness, however, but in his great respect for human virtues as well as worldly values. He realizes that his greatest happiness lies with Lucy.

Frank turns out a good man and Crosbie emerges as a cad perhaps partly because Frank's love for Lucy is stronger than Crosbie's love for Lily. Frank is a man of stronger passions, and he is also more honest with himself than Crosbie is. Character influences the outcome. Frank's action is also affected by his milieu. Although the people who surround him would not have condemned him for jilting Lucy, and this aspect of his society he has to fight, he knows also that they are people who will accept Lucy and appreciate her once his marriage to her becomes certain. Crosbie seems to have no family, home, or social milieu other than Courcy Castle, which represents a group very different from Frank's group. Frank also sets his ideals a bit higher than Crosbie sets his. Frank values qualities not necessarily connected with material success; Crosbie has to fight, and fights a loosing battle, to think of Lily as a treasure he has won--Frank never doubts Lucy's worth. Something of each of these--personality, social milieu, and abstract ideas--finally determines the moral actions of both Frank Greystock and Adolphus Crosbie.

Yet in Trollope's books, as in life, one cannot ignore the role that chance plays in determining how a character acts. In life, as in a card game, the player decides how to play his cards, but chance decides which cards he is to hold. Suppose the newspapers had not picked up the Hiram's Hospital story. Would Mr. Harding have handled his situation in the same way? Suppose Lily Dale had been rich. Suppose Lady Linlithgow had been in bed with a bad cold that Thursday morning when Frank almost proposed to Lizzie. Whereas Trollope does not at all allow chance to determine moral action--actions of chance cannot be moral or immoral, only those controlled by people can--he does accept the role it plays in what happens. Chance helped Frank to resist the temptation to jilt Lucy and marry Lizzie. Nonetheless, if Frank had decided to jilt Lucy and marry Lizzie, he had plenty of opportunity to do so. But Frank made the right decision and Crosbie made the wrong one. Whatever factors determined the moral actions of these two similar young men, Trollope ultimately judges them by their actions; they are responsible for what they do.

In this same book, however, Trollope describes an eighteen-year-old girl, Lucinda Roanoke, who is caught in a moral deadlock. She must choose either to marry a man she despises for money and position, or, as Julia Brabazon put it, "go out like the snuff of a candle." She does not have enough money to postpone her decision,

and if she decides against the marriage, she must sink back into absolute obscurity, dragging with her her aunt, who has sacrificed everything she has for Lucinda to make a good marriage. Unfortunately for Lucinda, chance does not deal her another card to save her from the necessity to make this particular decision. Despite her obvious dislike for him, her fiance does not break the engagement; no one suddenly leaves her an inheritance; no suitor appears who could give her both money and love, or even one of the two--in fact, no other suitor appears at all. Lucinda ultimately decides not to marry the despised fiance, but her mind snaps with the strain of making the decision. Trollope does not allow chance occurrences to relieve characters from their moral responsibilities. But Trollope is consciously aware that a character who may be able to handle one situation with ease, honor, and credit may be destroyed by another. The next chapter, "Marriage," contains perhaps the most outstanding example in Trollope's writings of the interaction between moral consciousness and chance--the fate of the marriage of Plantagenet and Glencora Palliser.

NOTES

[1] Anthony Trollope in The Letters of Anthony Trollope, ed. Bradford A. Booth (London: Oxford University Press, 1951), p. 417.

[2] Kincaid, p. 29.

[3] T. H. Huxley, "A Liberal Education; and Where to Find It," T. H. Huxley on Education, ed. Cyril Bibby (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), p. 83.

[4] Anthony Trollope, The Claverings (1924; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1951), p. 27. Subsequent references to this edition appear in the text.

[5] Polhemus, p. 187.

[6] Anthony Trollope, Phineas Finn (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 140. Subsequent references to this edition appear in the text.

[7] Anthony Trollope, The Small House at Allington (London: Everyman's Library-Dent, 1970), p. 64. Subsequent references to this edition appear in the text.

[8] Anthony Trollope, The Eustace Diamonds (New York: Doubleday, 1951), p. 19. Subsequent references to this edition appear in the text.

[9] Houghton, p. 350.

MARRIAGE

Early in her marriage, Lady Glencora Palliser must decide whether or not to leave her husband, Plantagenet, and run away with the man she loves, Burgo Fitzgerald. Trollope never treats Glencora's decision as a foregone conclusion. There is no hint of moral complacency in his handling of this "eternal triangle." In Can You Forgive Her?, Trollope describes and evaluates Lady Glencora's situation and behavior. First he must explain how Lady Glencora comes to be in a position where such a decision is necessary. Trollope tells his readers

> how near she went to throwing herself, with all her vast wealth, into the arms of a young man, whom no father, no guardian could have regarded as a well-chosen husband for any girl;--one who as yet had shown no good qualities, who had been a spendthrift, unprincipled, and debauched. Alas, she had loved him! It is possible that her love and her wealth might have turned him from evil to good. But who would have ventured to risk her--I will not say her and her vast inheritances,--on such a chance? That evil, however, had been prevented, and those about her had managed to marry her to a young man very steady by nature, with worldly prospects as brilliant as her own, and with a station than which the world offers nothing higher.[1]

Trollope himself says "that a girl should really love the man she intends to marry" (I, 143). Despite the badgering of "those about her," Lady Glencora surely should not have married a man she did not love. She herself

recognizes that she "had been sacrificed through her own weakness" (III, 72). Had she, on the other hand, married the handsome wastrel, Burgo Fitzgerald, she would have faced "terrible dangers of shipwreck" (I, 325). To the twentieth century reader it may seem obvious that Lady Glencora should have remained single yet a while. Lady Glencora, however, was an eighteen-year-old heiress, living in an age when women had few privileges and fewer rights, and "nice" young women obeyed their elders. It had seemed impossible to her to resist the pressures brought to bear on her. She tells her cousin, Alice Vavasor, that Alice herself will eventually have to succumb to the same pressures.

> "You'll have to give way. You'll find that they'll get the better of you. Your father will storm at you, and Lady Macleod will preach at you, and Lady Midlothian will jump upon you."
> "I'm not a bit afraid of Lady Midlothian."
> "I know what it is, my dear, to be jumped upon. We talk with such horror of the French people giving their daughters in marriage, just as they might sell a house or a field, but we do exactly the same thing ourselves. When they all come upon you in earnest how are you to stand against them? How can any girl do it?" (I, 303)

"Alice protested to herself that no father, no aunt, no Lady Midlothian should persuade her into a marriage of which she feared the consequences. But Lady Glencora had made for herself excuses which were not altogether untrue. She had been very young, and had been terribly weighted with her wealth" (I, 305). Whereas Lady Glencora did wrong, her behavior is understandable and perhaps

forgivable. This is evidently the attitude Trollope expects his readers to adopt toward Lady Glencora and the first decision she makes. Though warm and impulsive by nature, Lady Glencora was neither strong enough nor principled enough to fight the usages of society. She allowed herself to be driven into marriage with a virtual, if virtuous, stranger. In making her first decision, to marry Plantagenet Palliser, she was swayed neither by principle nor by personality, but by social pressure.

Lady Glencora, no matter how sympathetic a character, cannot escape from the consequences of her action. The second decision Lady Glencora must make, whether or not to leave her husband for her sweetheart, results from her first decision, to marry one man while loving another. Almost immediately Lady Glencora realizes that there is no satisfactory solution for her problem. When she thinks of her husband and Burgo Fitzgerald we see her "weighing them one against the other, and connecting her own existence with theirs, not as expecting joy or the comfort of love from either of them, but with an assured conviction that on either side there must be misery for her" (III, 72). Although she bitterly regrets her marriage, she does not deceive herself about her situation or her own responsibility for it.

> "I would give everything I have in the world to have been true to him. They told me that he would spend my money. Though he should have spent every farthing of it, I regret it; though he should have made me a beggar, I regret it. They told me that he

> would ill-use me, and desert me,--perhaps beat me. I do not believe it; but even though that should have been so, I regret it. It is better to have a false husband than to be a false wife." . . .
> "I am not honest. By law I am his wife; but the laws are liars! I am not his wife. I will not say the thing that I am." (II, 8)

It does not occur to Lady Glencora that she can or should be able to atone for her wrong choice in such a way as to abolish its consequences. Unlike Lucinda Roanoke, who does not have the strength or resiliency to cope with the choices life thrusts upon her, Lady Glencora is able to cope not only with the choices life presents to her, but also with the much more difficult choices forced upon her by her own wrong decision. She has the courage to evaluate her position and to try to make the best of it for herself and, especially, for the two men who love her.

Although her first decision was the result of coercion, her second certainly does not spring from social pressure. "Of that shame before all the world which must be hers forever should she break her vows and consent to live with a man who was not her husband, she thought hardly at all" (III, 72). Abstract principles, in the form of extrinsic concepts or religious ideas, play a negligible part in her decision. "And as for female purity," rages Glencora, "Ah! What was their idea of purity when they forced me, like ogres, to marry a man for whom they knew I never cared? Had I gone with him,--had I now eloped with that man who ought to have been my husband,--whom would a just God have punished worst,--me, or those two old women

and my uncle, who tortured me into this marriage" (III, 205)? This abrupt dismissal of the problems of marital fidelity and religious dogma is the only discussion of these two subjects in the book. Lady Glencora regrets her first decision, not because she acted immorally by some religious standard nor even because she betrayed some romantic ideal, but because she acted dishonestly. Lady Glencora feels soiled by her marriage. She bitterly regrets, not her unhappiness, which may well have been her lot anyway, but her falseness. "It is better to have a false husband than to be a false wife," she says. "I am not honest." The wellspring of Lady Glencora's moral action at this point certainly lies not in social environment and not in abstract principles but in her personality.

Trollope says of Lady Glencora, "I do not know that she was at all points a lady, but had Fate so willed it she would have been a thorough gentleman" (II, 313). The point of view Trollope seems to espouse in Can You Forgive Her? is that the solution to problems like Lady Glencora's springs from within the person rather than from external pressure or intellectual or religious principles. "Women doubt every day," says Trollope, "who solve their doubts at last on the right side, driven to do so, some by fear, more by conscience, but most of them by that half-prudential, half-unconscious knowledge of what is fitting, useful, and best under the circumstances, which rarely deserts either men or women" (II, 328). Glencora's

generosity and her sense of honor are not abstractions but are basic to her personality. They provide the common ground on which she and her husband, who is also a thorough gentleman, are finally able to meet. Lady Glencora accuses Palliser of setting spies to watch her. Palliser is hurt, insulted, and angry. "Do you believe in your heart," he asks Glencora, "that I trusted to Mrs. Marsham's eyes rather than to your own truth" (III, 79)? Lady Glencora admits that she does not. Palliser replies,

> "Then it is ignoble in you to talk to me of spies. I have employed no spies. If it were ever to come to that, that I thought spies necessary, it would be all over with me."
> There was something of feeling in his voice as he said this,--something that almost approached to passion which touched his wife's heart. (III, 80)

By showing his deep commitment to the standard of behavior that they share, Palliser is able, for the first time, to touch his wife's heart. In response, Lady Glencora for the first time speaks freely to her husband. She admits her love for Fitzgerald; she admits that she has considered running off with him. "But before God," she declares, "my first wish is to free you from the misfortune that I have brought on you. . . . What matters it whether I drown myself, or throw myself away by going with such a one as him, so that you may marry again, and have a child" (III, 82)? Perfectly able to accept his wife's statement as true because of the inherent honesty which they share, Palliser tries to answer her with protestations of love

which Glencora does not believe. Finally, he again approaches her as a gentleman. "I have never told you what is false, Glencora," he says. "No; you are not false!" she replies. "I would rather have you for my wife, childless,--" he continues, "if you will try to love me,-- than any other woman, though another might give me an heir. Will you try to love me" (III, 83)? This is the beginning of understanding between the Pallisers. Although Lady Glencora is still very much in love with Fitzgerald, she sends him away. "I shall stay with my husband as I am bound to do. Because I have wronged you I will not wrong him also" (III, 203). Her resolution is based on honor-- honor not as an abstract quality dictated by some extrinsic code--but honor as a deep-seated quality of personality, violation of which shakes the balance of her character. Whether or not Lady Glencora regains her happiness, she has regained her sense of direction and self-respect. The danger to the Pallisers' marriage, however, is not yet completely over. Lady Glencora still loves Fitzgerald, and her husband, sacrificing his much-loved political career, takes her away from London, away from temptation, to try to establish with her a firmer and more loving relationship. The Palliser marriage now has a foundation of respect and trust on which to build, but respect and trust, while fine and necessary qualities, are somewhat abstract and watery when set against elemental desires.

A grand passion between Palliser and Glencora is apparently out of the question, but there are elemental desires other than sexual ones.

> On a sudden there came to him tidings which upset all his plans, . . . which made everything impossible, which made the Alps impassable and the railways dangerous, which drove Burgo Fitzgerald out of Mr. Palliser's head, and so confused him that he could no longer calculate the blunders of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer. All the Palliser world was about to be moved from its lowest depths, to the summits of its highest mountains. Lady Glencora had whispered into her husband's ear that she thought it probable--; she wasn't sure;--she didn't know. And then she burst out into tears on his bosom as he sat by her on her bedside. (III, 283)

Glencora is pregnant. "I won't deny that I am very happy," she said. "It seemed as though I were destined to bring nothing but misery to everybody, and I used to wish myself dead so often. I shan't wish myself dead now" (III, 287). "All the Palliser world was about to be moved." The focus of Glencora's life has changed; the focus of Plantagenet Palliser's life has changed; the focus of both their lives is now the same. Burgo Fitzgerald cannot compete with Baby and the Pallisers know it. Immediately Glencora's and Plantagenet's lives become intertwined one with the other.

> He wanted her to eat six or seven times a day; and always told her that she was eating too much, remembering some ancient proverb about little and often. He watched her now as closely as Mrs. Marsham and Mr. Bott had watched her before; and she alwys knew that he was doing so. She made the matter worse by continually proposing to do things which she knew he would not permit, in order that she might enjoy the fun of seeing his agony and amazement. (III, 290)

Lady Glencora says she "had no idea that he would be such an old coddle" (III, 290). When Alice suggests that soon he will have a child to coddle, Lady Glencora protests that no child could possibly survive it. "I shall take that matter into my own hands. He can do what he pleases with me, and I can't help myself; but I shan't let him or anybody do what they please with my baby. I know what I'm about in such matters a great deal better than he does. I've no doubt he's a very clever man in Parliament; but he doesn't seem to me to understand anything else" (III, 290-91). For the first time, Lady Glencora speaks in certain, wifely terms about her marriage. She obviously plans to stay with her husband, and she does not speak in terms of regret. Chance, circumstance, or perhaps something like the Shavian Life Force, cements the Pallisers' marriage.

A few days after Glencora announces her pregnancy, the Pallisers, with Alice Vavasor, interrupt their journey home to England at Baden. On a visit to the gambling rooms in this town, Alice and Lady Glencora see Burgo Fitzgerald stake his entire bankroll on rouge et noir and lose; his desperation is obvious in the way he carries himself as he leaves the gambling saloon.

> "What shall I do, Alice?" said Lady Glencora, with her eyes still fixed on him who had been her lover.
> "Tell Mr. Palliser," whispered Alice.
> Lady Glencora immediately ran up to her husband and took him away from Mr. Grey. Rapidly she told her story,--with such rapidity that Mr. Palliser could

> hardly get in a word. "Do something for him;--do, do. Unless I know that something is done, I shall die. You needn't be afraid."
> "I'm not afraid," said Mr. Palliser.
> Lady Glencora, as she went on quickly, got hold of her husband's hand, and caressed it. "You are so good," said she. (III, 320)

Though Burgo may always retain a place in Lady Glencora's heart, he has been moved from the center of her life to the periphery. Even Alice, champion of matrimonial bonds (II, 10-11), sees that Fitzgerald is no longer a threat to her friend's marriage. Where once Alice would have told Glencora to forget Burgo, that his fate was no concern of hers, she now feels secure enough to encourage Glencora to help him. Glencora feels no awkwardness in turning to her husband to help her ex-sweetheart. She and Plantagenet know instinctively that while Glencora's heart was focused on Plantagenet and Burgo as sources of romantic love, Plantagenet, though twenty times her husband, was threatened. While Glencora's heart is focused on the welfare of her unborn child, however, Burgo, though twenty times as charming as her husband, is no threat to him. Lady Glencora may have been willing to trust herself to the love of a good-natured ne'er-do-well, but she certainly would not trust her child to him. In the role of romantic hero, Burgo Fitzgerald can certainly upstage Plantagenet Palliser--but in the role of husband-father, he is a failure. Lady Glencora, as a prospective mother, appreciates and loves her husband for what he is--a potentially fine father.

Although the decision is more difficult for her than for most, Lady Glencora must decide, as do all people, whether or not to be married and to stay married. Once the affirmative decision is made, a married couple has a lifetime in which to explore the possibilities for moral action within their relationship--a relationship which those actions render either supportive or destructive to the individuals involved. In The Last Chronicle of Barset, Trollope describes and analyzes the marriages of three couples in terms of moral action. The main action of the novel centers around the Reverend Josiah Crawley, and it is his marriage which is, therefore, most fully described. Trollope also describes the marriages of two of Crawley's fellow clergymen, Archdeacon Grantly and Bishop Proudie. Each marriage acts as a foil to each of the other marriages.

When the book opens, all three clergymen are in crisis situations. The crisis each faces is typical of that man's life. Reverend Crawley, who has had a very, very hard life, is in dire straits. Archdeacon Grantly, who has had a very pleasant life, is in a correspondingly less difficult position. Bishop Proudie's great misery is also consistent with his past life. Trollope is not exploring how people react to sudden reversal of fortune. He is examining how they deal with difficult situations within the normal course of their lives. Reverend Crawley, an honest, hard-working, very poor clergyman-

scholar, "upon whom the troubles of the world always seem to come with a double weight" is, as usual, afflicted greatly.[2] He is suspected of stealing a check for twenty pounds. He himself says that, as a result of his hard life and currently unbearable situation, he suffers from "sickness of the body, and sickness of the heart, and sickness of the spirit . . . and . . . sickness of the mind" (142). Archdeacon Grantly, a clergyman in a very comfortable position in the world, has a son who wishes to marry Reverend Crawley's daughter, "the penniless daughter of an impoverished half-mad country curate who was about to be tried for stealing twenty pounds" (440). Grantly says, "It would break my heart" (12). The Crawley case itself precipitates a crisis for Bishop Proudie. Mrs. Proudie, a strong partisan, demands that the bishop take official action to relieve Mr. Crawley, a member of the opposite church party, of his clerical duties. She "demanded of him that he should exercise certain episcopal authority which he knew did not belong to him" (78).

Custom, as Diogenes has pointed out, is "the unwritten law." It is clear that Trollope considers respect for that law to be a very important factor in a good marriage. Particularly in the marriages of the Crawleys and the Proudies, moral behavior is associated with the wife's ability or lack thereof to protect the image her husband is expected to project as the strong, competent, dominant male. Both his self-image and the face he presents to

the world are important. Mrs. Crawley "could not bear to torment . . . her husband . . . by any allusion to his own deficiencies. She could not endure to make him think that she suspected him of any frailty either in intellect or thought. Wifelike, she desired to worship him, and that he should know that she worshipped him" (143). She is also careful to protect his public image. When police officers come to take Mr. Crawley before the magistrates, he is nearly prostrate. Trollope describes Mrs. Crawley's response:

> She went up to her husband, hat in hand, and looking round to see that she was not watched, put the hat on his head, and then lifted him as it were from his chair. He did not refuse to be led, and allowed her to throw round his shoulders the old cloak which was hanging in the passage, and then he passed out, and was the first to seat himself in the Silverbridge fly. (55)

Trollope is aware that this is "role playing" and that role playing reflects an understanding of custom, an appreciation of "the unwritten law." By permitting each person to know approximately what behavior is expected from him in most situations, it helps people relate to each other and to the society in which they live. When Mr. Crawley prepares to go to London to get legal advice, his conversation with his wife makes clear that he understands role playing.

> "You should go and do it all, for you are wiser in these things than I am, were it not that I may not dare to show that I submit myself to my wife."
> "Nay, my dear!"

> "But it is ay, my dear. It is so. This is a thing such as men do; not such as women do, unless they be forlorn and unaided of men. I know that I am weak where you are strong; that I am crazed where you are clear-witted. . . . But, for all that, it may not be that you should do my work. There are those watching me who would say, 'Lo! he confesses himself incapable.'" (230-31)

In every society, specific types of behavior are given certain values other than their intrinsic ones. If Mr. Crawley were to allow his wife to go to London for him, he would be admitting not just that she is more practical than he, but that he is incompetent to manage his own affairs. Nineteenth-century convention demanded that the husband be strong and the wife submissive. Today, convention demands sexual equality. Each convention is, of course, only a convention. In one marriage the woman, in fact, will dominate, in another, the male; in most, perhaps, the woman will dominate in some areas, the male in others. Reverend Crawley recognizes this. Society, nevertheless, demands that men and women conform outwardly to certain roles. The spouse that makes his or her mate feel like and appear to be a successful male or female, whatever the standard for successful may be, is acting constructively within the marriage, and, therefore, morally.

Society's rules of behavior are established by general consent. Mrs. Proudie demonstrates her unawareness of and indifference to these rules at a most basic level. She refuses to accept any limits to her own ego, even to accept definitions of words. Words have set meanings,

after all, because people have agreed to make this word mean this and that word mean that, just as they have decided that this coin is worth this much and that coin that much. One must accept certain definitions, values, behaviors, conventions, common to the members of one's society, if one wishes to function properly within that society. Two examples from the text illustrate Mrs. Proudie's non-acceptance and the danger implicit in that non-acceptance.

> "What feeling can one expect from a convicted thief?"
> "Not convicted as yet, my dear," said the bishop.
> "A convicted thief," repeated Mrs. Proudie; and she vociferated the words in such a tone that the bishop resolved that he would for the future let the word convicted pass without notice. After all she was only using the phrase in a peculiar sense given to it by herself. (77)

On the next page we read: "'That scandal must at any rate be inhibited.' Now the bishop did not at all like the use of the word inhibited, understanding well that Mrs. Proudie intended it to be understood as implying some episcopal command against which there should be no appeal,--but he let it pass" (78). In the mouth of a different character, another Victorian expressed a concept of meaning similar to Mrs. Proudie's.

> "When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, in rather a scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean--neither more nor less."
> "The question is," said Alice, "whether you <u>can</u> make words mean so many different things."
> "The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master--that's all."[3]

Mrs. Proudie's unwillingness to accept socially agreed upon limits makes her a bad wife in two ways. First, by not accepting society's interpretation of the proper roles for husband and wife, Mrs. Proudie constantly embarrasses her husband in public by demonstrating his weakness and her tyranny. Second, society has set up social customs, roles, rules, whose purpose is to guide its members to some reasonable balance of power. Despite our conviction that women were poorly treated in the nineteenth-century, their public submissiveness and lack of legal clout were offset by the courtesy, financial support, and protection they received--not a bargain that a woman would choose today, perhaps, but one which enabled people to rub along fairly comfortably. Mrs. Proudie's rejection of social limits, as well as being an embarrassment to her husband, is a refusal to uphold her part of the social bargain she made when she married. Both Mrs. Crawley and Mrs. Grantly exercise a great deal of power in their respective families, but Mrs. Proudie aims to exercise unlimited power in her family and in her husband's diocese. Attempting to take total control of any other person's life is destructive behavior, immoral in any situation, and even more so in the context of marriage, where two people vow to support each other in every possible way. Just as Mrs. Proudie batters down all the safeguards provided by the secular and the religious judicial systems by miscalling Crawley "a convicted thief" and demanding that the bishop

"inhibit" him, so she batters down all the safeguards of social usage when she publicly ignores her husband and usurps his authority. In a crucial incident, Dr. Tempest, one of the clergymen of Barsetshire, has come to the palace to speak to the bishop about Mr. Crawley. In a previous encounter, Dr. Tempest has informed Mrs. Proudie that he will not be guilty of the impropriety of discussing the case with her. He is in conference with the bishop, and Mrs. Proudie is there, despite the impropriety.

> Dr. Tempest rose from his chair, and advancing to the table put both his hands upon it. "My lord," he said . . . "I should be untrue to my conscience and to my feeling of what is right in such matters, if I were to take any part in a discussion on this matter in the presence of--a lady."
>
> "Dr. Tempest, what is your objection?" said Mrs. Proudie, rising from her chair, and coming also to the table, so that from thence she might confront her opponent; and as she stood opposite to Dr. Tempest she also put both her hands upon the table.
>
> "My dear, perhaps you will leave us for a few moments," said the bishop. . . .
>
> "Why should I be dismissed from your room without a reason?" said Mrs. Proudie. "Cannot Dr. Tempest understand that a wife may share her husband's counsels,--as she must share his troubles?" . . .
>
> "My dear, I really think you had better leave us for a few minutes," said the bishop.
>
> "No, my lord,--no," said Mrs. Proudie, turning round upon her husband. "Not so. It would be most unbecoming that I should be turned out of a room in this palace by an uncourteous word from a parish clergyman. . . . There are other clergymen in the diocese besides Dr. Tempest who can undertake the very easy task of this commission. As for his having been appointed rural dean I don't know how many years ago, it is a matter of no consequence whatever. In such a preliminary inquiry any three clergymen will suffice. It need not be done by the rural dean at all."
>
> "My dear!"
>
> "I will not be turned out of this room by Dr. Tempest;--and that is enough."
>
> "My lord," said the doctor, "you had better write to me as I proposed to you just now."

> "His lordship will not write. His lordship will do nothing of the kind," said Mrs. Proudie.
> "My dear!" said the bishop, driven in his perplexity beyond all carefulness of reticence. "My dear, I do wish you wouldn't,--I do indeed. If you would only go away!"
> "I will not go away, my lord," said Mrs. Proudie.
> "But I will," said Dr. Tempest, feeling true compassion for the unfortunate man whom he saw writhing in agony before him. (359-60)

The interplay of Mrs. Proudie's rejection of the social code and her lust for power makes the bishop's weakness and his problem with his wife stand out in high relief. Mrs. Proudie, in a very "unbecoming" way, adopts the same belligerent posture as the dean when she confronts him. Her cardinal sin, of course, is not leaving the room when her husband asks her to do so. Not only does she embarrass him, but she denies him the right to a private conversation, even in connection with his work over which she, in fact, has no authority. She accuses the dean of not understanding "that a wife may share her husband's counsels." It is obvious that she is the one that does not understand the difference between a confidential tête à tête between husband and wife and a wife's public interference in business matters which are no official concern of hers. Mrs. Proudie then blithely brushes aside the whole proper ecclesiastical hierarchy and procedure because they limit her power. Finally, she publicly attmpts to deny her husband the right to take any action of which she disapproves, whether it concerns her or not. She announces that he will not write to

Dr. Tempest. Mrs. Crawley, essentially a strong and supportive personality, acts morally and uses the social code to help her bolster her husband's ego and his public image so that he may regain the feeling of control over his own life which he is in danger of losing. By ignoring the social code, Mrs. Proudie, a power-hungry, sterile figure, acts immorally, destroys her husband's ego and his public image, and thereby intimidates him into remaining a weak and ineffective person.

Role playing, in public or in private, is obviously an important factor in the character of a marriage, but the personalities of the husband and the wife are more important factors. One aspect of marriage in which personality plays a conspicuous part is the sensitive area of criticism and disagreement. A wife must sometimes oppose her husband's inclinations or desires to further his best interests, and vice versa, of course. Faced with a husband "moody and disappointed . . . morose, sometimes almost to insanity" (4), Mrs. Crawley rebukes her husband.

"Be a man and bear it. Ask God for strength, instead of seeking it in an over-indulgence of your own sorrow."
"Indulgence!"
"Yes, love;--indulgence. It is indulgence. You will allow your mind to dwell on nothing for a moment but your own wrongs."
"What else have I that I can think of? Is not all the world against me?"
"Am I against you?"
"Sometimes I think you are. When you accuse me of self-indulgence you are against me,--me, who for myself have desired nothing but to be allowed to do

> my duty, and to have bread enough to keep me alive, and clothes enough to make me decent."
> "Is it not self-indulgence, this giving way to grief? Who would know so well as you how to teach the lesson of endurance to others?" (83)

It is difficult to criticize and difficult to accept criticism. Mrs. Crawley's strength and clear-sightedness enable her to do a wife's job and rebuke her husband when rebuke is necessary, and neither cringe nor become angry when he tries to make her feel guilty for doing so. Mr. Crawley sometimes feels that his wife is against him--as she sometimes should be. To act morally, a wife must try to strengthen her husband in areas where he is weak, even if she must criticize him to do it.

Archdeacon Grantly's wife also helps her husband despite himself. Unlike the despondent and moody Mr. Crawley, Archdeacon Grantly is quite able to enjoy life, but he is a stubborn man with a hot temper. He is angry because his son contemplates a marriage which, from the worldly point of view, is improvident. Announcing to his wife his intention to disinherit his son if he marries to displease his family, the archdeacon tells her to write and inform their son of his decision. "I will write to Henry, of course, if you bid me," Mrs. Grantly tells her husband,

> "and I will give him your message, whatever it may be; but not to-day, my dear."
> "Why not to-day?"
> "Because the sun shall go down upon your wrath before I become its messenger. If you choose to

> write to-day yourself, I cannot help it. I cannot hinder you. If I am to write to him on your behalf I will take my instructions from you to-morrow morning. When to-morrow morning comes you will not be angry with me because of the delay."
>
> The archdeacon was by no means satisfied; but he knew his wife too well, and himself too well, and the world too well, to insist on the immediate gratification of his passion. Over his bosom's mistress he did exercise a certain marital control,--which was, for instance, quite sufficiently fixed to enable him to look down with thorough contempt on such a one as Bishop Proudie; but he was not a despot who could exact a passive obedience to every fantasy. His wife would not have written the letter for him on that day, and he knew very well that she would not do so. He knew also that she was right;--and yet he regretted his want of power. (244)

Mrs. Grantly minimizes the effect of her husband's fault. He, in fact, "was apt at such moments to think that she took an unfair advantage of him by keeping her temper" (432). Her opposition to him, thwarted though he feels, is the result of the healthy interaction of two personalities. Note the recognition that each partner in the marriage has a certain amount of control which each exercises in a legitimate and constructive manner. This constitutes moral action within a marriage.

Mrs. Proudie, on the other hand, misinterprets, misjudges, and misuses her wifely power. Where Mrs. Crawley attempts to shore up her husband's weakness, and Mrs. Grantly moderates her husband's wrath, Mrs. Proudie takes advantage of her husband's weakness to add to her own power. The bishop argues with his wife. Mrs. Proudie says,

> "It will be well that Thumble should be there in person as he will want to look for lodgings in the parish."
> "But, my dear---"
> "Well, bishop?"
> "About lodgings? I hardly think that Mr. Thumble, if we decide that Mr. Thumble shall undertake the duty---"
> "We have decided that Mr. Thumble should undertake the duty. That is decided."
> "But I do not think he should trouble himself to look for lodgings at Hogglestock. He can go over on the Sundays."
> "And who is to do the parish work? Would you have that man, a convicted thief, to look after the schools, and visit the sick, and perhaps attend the dying?"
> "There will be a great difficulty. . . . Who is to pay Mr. Thumble?"
> "The income of the parish must be sequestrated, and he must be paid out of that. Of course he must have the income while he does the work."
> "But, my dear, I cannot sequestrate the man's income."
> "I don't believe it, bishop. If the bishop cannot sequestrate, who can? But you are always timid in exercising the authority put into your hands for wise purposes. Not sequestrate the income of a man who has been proved to be a thief! You leave that to us, and we will manage it." The "us" here named comprised Mrs. Proudie and the bishop's managing chaplain. (78-79)

Mrs. Proudie's limitless drive for mastery over everyone and everything leads her to usurp her husband's legitimate power and to encourage, indeed, insist that he, in turn, exercise power he does not have. The bishop wonders "whether it might not be possible for him to overcome his enemy in this matter" (79). His wife is truly his enemy. He says to himself that he could perhaps rebel. "She could not make him interfere. . . . But to be scolded publicly was the great evil which he dreaded beyond all evils. . . . [A]t such moments as that, he would feel that any submission was better than the misery which

he suffered" (79-80). Rather than attempt to minimize her husband's weakness, Mrs. Proudie uses it against him. Scolding and defiance, one can see, can be praiseworthy or blameworthy, moral or immoral, depending on their use. Mrs. Crawley and Mrs. Grantly are able to support and guide their husbands through opposition. Mrs. Proudie is not.

The same distinction holds true in another much discussed area of marriage--how far one partner can operate independently of the other. When her husband "told her that she was a beggar, and that it was better to starve than to beg," Mrs. Crawley "had borne the rebuke without a word in reply and then had begged again for him and endured the starvation herself" (5). When it came time for the Crawleys' son to go to Cambridge, Crawley's friend, the dean, and Mrs. Crawley "between them managed this, leaving Mr. Crawley very much in the dark, as Mrs. Crawley was in the habit of leaving him" (6). Given the nature of Mr. Crawley's personality, Trollope obviously considers this substantial amount of independent action on Mrs. Crawley's part quite legitimate. In the case of the Grantlys, when Mrs. Grantly writes to her son, Henry, to tell him about his father's change of heart respecting his proposed marriage and to ask him to come to see her and his father, she "read to the archdeacon all that she had written,--with the exception of the post script:--'You may be quite sure that there will

be no unpleasantness with your father.' That was the postscript which was not communicated to the archdeacon" (451). Trollope evidently considers this small independent action also a part of Mrs. Grantly's job as a wife. Compare the legitimate and praiseworthy independent actions of Mrs. Crawley and Mrs. Grantly with that of Mrs. Proudie. When the bishop receives a letter of resignation from Mr. Crawley, Mrs. Proudie demands that he act on it at once. Since the disastrous interview with Dr. Tempest, the bishop feels no worse can happen to him and he, for once, refuses. Mrs. Proudie then takes it upon herself to act for him, without his consent.

> Some hour or two before Mr. Thumble's return Mrs. Proudie returned to her husband, thinking it better to let him know what she had done. She resolved to be very firm with him, but at the same time she determined not to use harsh language if it could be avoided. "My dear," she said, "I have arranged with Mr. Thumble."
> "You have done what?" said he, throwing down the pen.
> "I have arranged with Mr. Thumble as to going out to Hogglestock," said she firmly. "Indeed he has gone already." Then the bishop jumped up from his seat and rang the bell with violence. "What are you going to do?" said Mrs. Proudie.
> Then the servant entered. "John," said he, addressing the man, "let Mr. Thumble know the moment he returns to the palace that I wish to see him here."
> Mrs. Proudie allowed the man to go before she addressed her husband again. "What do you mean to say to Mr. Thumble when you see him?"
> "That is nothing to you. . . . Why have you taken upon yourself to send that man to Hogglestock?"
> "Because it was right to do so."[4] (526-27)

There can be no doubt that Trollope thoroughly disapproves of Mrs. Proudie's action. It is equally clear that Mrs.

Crawley did right. Yet in several ways their actions are similar. Both involve major steps despite strong objections of the husbands. In both cases the women act on their own, without their husbands' knowledge in matters where the husbands could legitimately claim authority. Neither acts from malice towards her husband. Even though Mrs. Proudie's methods are disastrous in this case, these same steamroller tactics probably secured her husband his bishopric in the first place. As noted above, Mrs. Crawley's begging secures her son's education. Despite these similarities, we say that Mrs. Crawley acts to minimize the effects of her husband's pride, whereas Mrs. Proudie uses her position to take advantage of and increase her husband's weakness and expand her own power. This is correct, but how does the reader unerringly and unhesitatingly distinguish between actions which are so very similar, and not just superficially? The answer is that Mrs. Proudie has "gone beyond the line." Society sets up certain guidelines to protect its members from one another. Mrs. Crawley acts according to them; Mrs. Proudie does not. Trollope's definition of "going beyond the line" may be compared to his definition of a "gentleman." Trollope claims that a man might "be defied to define the term--and would fail should he attempt to do so. But he would know what he meant, and so very probably would they who defied him."[5] The reader knows

that Mrs. Crawley's action is legitimate just as surely as he knows that Mrs. Proudie's is not.

Mrs. Grantly and Mrs. Crawley both act morally within their marriages. They take action and exercise control within acceptable limits. They wield their own power without trying to render their husbands powerless or even feeling any need to do so. They give in neither to the urge to control another person nor to the temptation to do nothing and "to let things go as they would" (51). Mrs. Proudie succumbs to the lust for power, manipulates her husband, and usurps his power. One might think from the foregoing discussion that, according to Trollope, only women act morally or immorally within the confines of marriage. This is not true, but the center of interest in _The Last Chronicle of Barset_ is the interaction of each clergyman with the outside world. The interaction between the men and their wives is only a secondary focus. One sees the women in this book, therefore, primarily as they affect their husbands' lives. Trollope, however, is careful to acknowledge that men usually get what they deserve. Archdeacon Grantly and Reverend Crawley, who both have good wives, have also an understanding of inner strength, which the bishop, as much as one might sympathize with him, lacks. Compare each man's estimate of what constitutes disgrace or degradation. Archdeacon Grantly's son, Henry, wants to marry Crawley's older daughter, Grace. The archdeacon opposes the marriage on purely worldly

grounds, and speaks of the Crawleys with "all their disgrace" (14). When the archdeacon meets Grace Crawley, however, he immediately recognizes her worth. "'You are a good girl,' he said, 'a dear, dear, good girl. When this cloud has passed away, you shall come to us and be our daughter'" (447). Even the worldly archdeacon recognizes that outer circumstances do not alter inner worth and Grace Crawley will bring no disgrace to his family. When Mr. Crawley comes before the magistrates, he tells his wife that the crowd has come "to see the degradation of a clergyman." His wife answers, "Nothing can degrade but guilt." Crawley replies, "Yes--misfortune can degrade, and poverty. A man is degraded when the cares of the world press so heavily upon him that he cannot rouse himself" (56). Crawley, like Grantly, does not confuse outer circumstances with inner worth. A man is degraded not by his circumstances but by his own inability to stand up under them.

Crawley and Grantly both recognize inner worth as a quality independent of outer circumstances. Compare their attitudes to Bishop Proudie's. After Dr. Tempest's disastrous visit, the bishop says to his wife: "'You have behaved in such a way that I do not know that I shall ever speak again,' said the bishop. . . . You have disgraced me.'" His wife replies, "Disgraced you! I disgrace you! It is you that disgrace yourself by saying such words" (360). Later, when he contemplates

resigning his bishopric, he thinks: "Such a measure as that would bring punishment where punishment was due. It would bring his wife to the ground,--her who had brought him to the ground. The suffering would not be all his own. When she found that her income, and her palace, and her position were all gone, then perhaps she might repent the evil that she had done him" (526). At no time does the bishop realize that in her analysis of his disgrace his wife was right, that he disgraced himself by his words. He is disgraced because he does not realize that he is responsible for his own actions, that he allowed his wife to rule him. His weakness, not her strength, was his downfall. Mrs. Quiverful, the wife of one Barchester clergyman, says: "There are men who must have what you call a terribly bad life of it, whatever way it goes with them. The bishop is weak, and he wants somebody near to him to be strong. She was strong,--perhaps too strong; but he had his advantage out of it" (534). Lady Lufton, an important person in the diocese, agrees. "He is so weak that he cannot walk without a stick to lean upon. No doubt she was a virago, a woman who could not control her temper for a moment! . . . But, nevertheless, she was useful to him" (537). The weak bishop is not worthy. He does not recognize that "he had his advantage out of it." The worthy men have wives that help them; the unworthy man has not, or, rather, has a wife that helps him no more than he deserves.

The Crawleys' and the Grantlys' marriages are characterized by the respect the partners show one another and by the constructive ways in which they interact--by moral behavior. They abide by the rules society has set up to guide their behavior because this adherence allows them to relate successfully to each other and to other people since all the members of the society know the rules. Each partner responds to the other's personality by trying to maximize his strengths and minimize his weaknesses. As it was with Glencora, the wives' abstract principles cannot really be discussed apart from their personalities when analyzing their moral behavior in a marital context. The critic John Hagan notes John H. Wildman's objection to the fact that Trollope sometimes fails "to separate principles from personalities." Hagan points out that in certain situations, that separation is "precisely what was to be avoided."[6] Trollope, for instance, gives a clear statement of Mrs. Proudie's abstract principles. The bishop

> knew well that she would not hear a word in mitigation of Mr. Crawley's presumed offence. Mr. Crawley belonged to the other party, and Mrs. Proudie was a thorough-going partisan. I know a man,--an excellent fellow, who, being himself a strong politician, constantly expresses a belief that all politicians opposed to him are thieves, child-murderers, parricides, lovers of incest, demons upon the earth. He is a strong partisan, but not, I think, so strong as Mrs. Proudie. He says that he believes all evil of his opponents; but she really believed the evil. The archdeacon had called Mrs. Proudie a she-Beelzebub; but that was a simple ebulliation of moral hatred. He believed her to be simply a vulgar, interfering, brazen-faced virago. Mrs. Proudie in truth believed

> that the archdeacon was an actual emanation from Satan, sent to those parts to devour souls,--as she would call it,--and that she herself was an emanation of another sort, sent from another source expressly to Barchester, to prevent such devouring, as far as it might possibly be prevented by a mortal agency. (77)

No doubt her conviction of absolute righteousness influences her to give Mr. Thumble orders without her husband's knowledge or consent. In the context of her marriage, however, her appetite for absolute power is more significant than those principles which permit her to feed it.

In Can You Forgive Her? Trollope describes only the embryonic relationship between Plantagenet and Glencora Palliser. In The Last Chronicle of Barset, however, he depicts three mature marriages. Trollope describes the wives of Archdeacon Grantly, Mr. Crawley, and Bishop Proudie. Mrs. Grantly, although a wife never tried by the misery and misfortune that plague the Crawleys, has filled her place well. Her husband "had the most profound respect for her judgment, and the most implicit reliance on her conduct. She had never yet offended him, or caused him to repent the hour in which he had made her Mrs. Grantly" (15). Mrs. Crawley, the wife who has been sorely tried, he describes in glowing terms.

> It is declared that a good wife is a crown to her hûsband, but Mrs. Crawley had been much more than a crown to him. As had regarded all the inner life of the man . . . she had been crown, throne, and sceptre all in one. That she had endured with him and on his behalf the miseries of poverty, and the troubles of a life which had known no smiles, is perhaps not to be alleged as much to her honour. She had joined herself to him for better or worse, and it was her

> manifest duty to bear such things. . . . But she had also done much more than this. She had striven hard to be contented, or, rather, to appear to be contented, when he had been most wretched and most moody. She had struggled to conceal from him her own conviction as to his half-insanity, treating him at the same time with the respect due to an honoured father of a family, and with the careful measured indulgence fit for a sick and wayward child. In all the terrible troubles of their life her courage had been higher than his. The metal of which she was made had been tempered to a steel which was very rare and fine. (4-5)

The best Trollope can say for Mrs. Proudie is that "It cannot be said that she was a bad woman, though she had in her time done an indescribable amount of evil. She had endeavoured to do good, failing partly by ignorance and partly from the effects of an unbridled, ambitious temper" (523).

NOTES

[1] Anthony Trollope, Can You Forgive Her?, 3 vols. (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1902), I, p. 326. Subsequent references to this edition appear in the text.

[2] Anthony Trollope, The Last Chronicle of Barset (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1964), p. 4. Subsequent references to this edition appear in the text.

[3] Lewis Carroll, Alice's Adventures in Wonderland & Through the Looking Glass (New York: Signet-The New American Library, 1960), p. 186.

[4] In the text, the third word of this passage was "of."

[5] Anthony Trollope, An Autobiography (1953; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 34.

[6] John Hagan, "The Divided Mind of Anthony Trollope," Nineteenth-Century Fiction, 14 (1960), 12.

MONEY

Trollope sees an "unbridled, ambitious temper" like Mrs. Proudie's as dangerous under any circumstances. Indeed, an ambitious temper alone can lead one astray, as it almost leads the archdeacon astray. Even Mr. Crawley, whose major goals are not linked to "getting ahead," makes himself and his family more miserable than their circumstances warrant when he allows his frustrated ambitions to ride him. The motto of Alaric Tudor, in The Three Clerks, is "Excelsior!" This ambitious man aims always for a higher income, a higher social position, higher standing in the power hierarchy, and his ambition is eventually his undoing. As Tudor recognizes, the first prerequisite for the good life he seeks is a fat pocket-book, and his quest for money makes up a large part of his history. The story of Alaric Tudor is the story of the moral evolution of a rogue.

To be able to appreciate the moral of Alaric Tudor's tale, one must understand the role money plays in Trollope's novels. Money in the novels holds the same ambivalent position it holds in real life. Polhemus points out that Trollope's "hardheaded insistence on the materialistic basis of the good life is one of the things that makes the assessment of life in his novels

so impressive."[1] Money is a very desirable thing to Trollope, essential to pleasant living. Because Trollope never underestimates the value of money, he never minimizes the temptation of wealth. His descriptions of poverty and near poverty are poignant.

> None but they who have themselves been poor gentry,--gentry so poor as not to know how to raise a shilling,--can understand the peculiar bitterness of the trials which such poverty produces. The poverty of the normal poor does not approach it; or, rather, the pangs arising from such poverty are altogether of a different sort. To be hungry and have no food, to be cold and have no fuel, to be threatened with distraint for one's few chairs and tables, and with the loss of the roof over one's head,--all these miseries, which, if they do not positively reach, are so frequently near to reaching the normal poor, are, no doubt, the severest of the trials to which humanity is subjected. . . . By hook or crook, the poor gentleman or poor lady,--let the one or the other be ever so poor,--does not often come to the last extremity of the workhouse. . . . But there are pangs to which, at the time, starvation itself would seem to be preferable. The angry eyes of unpaid tradesmen, savage with an anger which one knows to be justifiable; the taunt of the poor servant who wants her wages; the gradual relinquishment of habits which the soft nurture of earlier, kinder years had made second nature; the wan cheeks of the wife whose malady demands wine; the rags of the husband whose outward occupations demand decency; the neglected children, who are learning not to be the children of gentlefolk; and, worse than all, the alms and doles of half-generous friends, the waning pride, the pride that will not wane, the growing doubt whether it be not better to bow the head, and acknowledge to all the world that nothing of the pride of station is left,--that the hand is open to receive and ready to touch the cap, that the fall from the upper to the lower level has been accomplished.[2]

Trollope surely understands why Lady Mabel Grex tells her ex-sweetheart, Frank Tregear, that she must marry.

> "Of course I have to marry. Who does not know it? Do you want to see me begging bread about the streets? You have bread; or if not, you might earn it. If you marry for money . . . you will do that which is in itself bad, and which is also unnecessary. What other course would you recommend me to take? No one goes into the gutter while there is a clean path open. If there be no escape but through the gutter, one has to take it."[3]

Kincaid claims that Lady Mabel "sees more clearly than any other figure in Trollope just what a woman's lot is."[4] One should say, rather, that Trollope understands the temptation of wealth; he understands Lady Mabel's point of view. He does not agree with it. Trollope says, "Expediency is the dangerous wind by which so many of us have wrecked our little boats."[5] The right choice is not always obvious or easy. Trollope believes "that a good society must be based on strong, trusting personal relationships" but that the "profit motive" can poison "even the most intimate human relationships."[6] Trollope does not advocate that one sell oneself for money--not in marriage or in any other enterprise. One Mr. Booker, an author in The Way We Live Now, bemoans the necessity of writing and publishing enthusiastic reviews of literary garbage. "He felt it to be hard upon him that he should be compelled, by the exigencies of his position, to descend so low in literature; but it did not occur to him to reflect that in fact he was not compelled, and that he was quite at liberty to break stones, or to starve honestly, if no other honest mode of carrying on his career was open to him."[7] Like Huxley, Trollope sees

"honest starvation" as a real, if unpleasant, alternative to dishonest comfort. Mr. Booker, Lady Mabel, and the long line of Trollope's characters who sell themselves or their honor for money--Adolphus Crosbie, Mr. Sowerby (Framley Parsonage), Lady Mason (Orley Farm), to name three--do have a choice, and make the wrong one. Alaric Tudor is one of their number.

When The Three Clerks opens, Trollope tells the reader that Alaric Tudor is an ambitious man who lives "with the steady aim of making the most of such advantages as fate and fortune had put in his way" (8). He chooses Harry Norman, a fellow clerk in the Weights and Measures office, for his friend, not because he is better off financially than Tudor himself, but, says Trollope, "had Norman been as poor as Tudor, Tudor might probably have shrunk from rowing in the same boat with him" (9). The "profit motive" helps determine Tudor's choice of friends. Trollope presents Tudor making progressively more money-motivated, less personal decisions in his relationships with people. Norman introduces Tudor to his close friends and cousins, the Woodwards--Mrs. Woodward and her three daughters, Gertrude, Linda, and Katie. Over the period of a few years, Tudor becomes very close with the family. When an old uncle of Mrs. Woodward, Captain Cuttwater, comes to live with the Woodwards, Tudor, after being told that the captain has some money, openly declares to Gertrude and Linda that

he will make the old man like him. He proceeds to agree with all the captain's pet theories, "speaking with a sort of mock earnestness which completely took in the captain, but stealing a glance at the same time at the two girls who sat over their work at the drawing-room table" (46). Not only does Tudor bamboozle Captain Cuttwater, but, much more reprehensibly, he bamboozles the young Linda Woodward as well. He is walking with seventeen-year-old Linda, and,

> though he knew that marriage with a girl without a dowry would for him be a death-blow to all his high hopes, he could hardly resist the temptation of conjugating the verb to love. Had he been able to choose from the two sisters, he would probably have selected Gertrude . . . but Gertrude was bespoken; and it therefore seemed all but unnatural that there should not be some love passages between him and Linda. (52)

Although he says enough to win Linda's heart, he does not "choose to commit himself to all the assured intentions of a positive declaration" (56). All these decisions, the decision to make friends with Norman, the decision to make up to Captain Cuttwater, the decision to profess love to Linda with no intention of marrying her, result primarily from the ambitious character of Alaric Tudor. He consistently puts his own self-interest ahead of those people he professes to care about. Up to this point, however, his sins are relatively small; some are barely sins at all.

From the time that he courts Linda with no intention of marrying her, however, Tudor's position as wolf in the fold is set. Trollope as narrator cries out to Mrs. Woodward: "My friend, my friend, thou who wouldst have fed thy young ones, like the pelican, with blood from thine own breast, had such feeding been of avail; thou who are the kindest of mothers; has it been well for thee to subject to such perils this poor weak young dove of thine" (56)? Trollope finds it necessary to explain how Alaric is so easily accepted into a group which accepts values based on "strong, trusting personal relationships." He makes clear that, although Mrs. Woodward is his "own chief favorite in the tale" (28), she is still responsible for Tudor's admission to her family circle. "She never could be got to express adequate horror at fast young men and was apt to have her own sly little joke at women who prided themselves on being punctilious" (24). Consequently Mrs. Woodward grants her girls too much freedom to become close with Norman, Tudor, and the third clerk of the title, Charley Tudor. As with Sir Harry Hotspur, a fine man whose somewhat excessive pride of family leads to his daughter's death, Mrs. Woodward's punishment far exceeds her crime. Nevertheless, the ability of a person like Tudor to penetrate a basically sound social group depends on the chinks in its moral armor. "No one of our greater novelists," said Paul Elmer More, saw more clearly than Trollope "the inexorable nexus of cause and

effect in the moral order, or followed more relentlessly the wide-spreading consequences of the little defalcations of will, the foolish misunderstandings of sympathy, the slight deflections from honesty."[8] Tudor can make fun of Captain Cuttwater while ingratiating himself with the man without offending the Woodwards because prior to the captain's joining the Woodwards at Surbiton Cottage, "When his name was mentioned in the family conclave, he was always made the subject of some little, feminine joke; and Mrs. Woodward, though she always took her uncle's part, did so in a manner that made them feel that he was fair game for their quizzing" (31). Furthermore, Captain Cuttwater was welcomed to the cottage largely because he would pay rent and would leave his money to his grand-nieces. Speaking to Gertrude, Harry Norman shows how the Woodwards' attitude to their uncle is wrong.

> "Alaric seemed to me to be bent on making a fool of the old man; and, to tell the truth, I cannot approve of his doing so. . . . Gertrude, do you mean to say you think it right that Katie should sit by and hear a man talk as Captain Cuttwater talked last night? Do you mean to say that the scene which passed, with the rum and the curses, and the absurd ridicule which was thrown on you mother's uncle, was such as should take place in your mother's drawing-room?" (49)

Whereas the Woodwards are basically a loving family and Alaric Tudor is basically not a loving person, their own small flaws blind them to the signs of Tudor's much larger ones.

Perhaps because Alaric is pulling ahead of him professionally, perhaps because after several years of intimacy Norman sees Tudor will connive to get ahead, Harry Norman begins to see the direction of Tudor's actions and remonstrates with him.

> "In following up your high ambition--and I know you have a high ambition--do not allow yourself to believe that the end justifies the means, because you see that men around you act as though they believed so."
> "Do I do so--do I seem to do so?" said Alaric, turning sharply round.
> "Don't be angry with me, Alaric; don't think that I want to preach; but sometimes I fancy, not that you do so, but that your mind is turning that way; that in your eager desire for honourable success you won't scrutinize the steps you will have to take."
> "That I would get to the top of the hill, in short, even though the hillside be miry. Well, I own I wish to get to the top of the hill."
> "But not to defile yourself in doing so."
> "When a man comes home from a successful chase, with his bag well stuffed with game, the women do not quarrel with him because there is mud on his gaiters."
> "Alaric, that which is evil is evil. Lies are evil---"
> "And am I a liar?"
> "Heaven forbid that I should say so: heaven forbid that I should have to think so! But it is by such doctrines as that that men become liars."
> "What! by having muddy gaiters?"
> "By disregarding the means in looking to the end."
> "And I will tell you how men become mere vegetables by filling their minds with useless--needless scruples. . . . What great man ever rose to greatness . . . who thought it necessary to pick his steps in the manner you have described?
> "Then I would not be great," said Harry.
> "But surely God intends that there shall be great men on earth?"
> "He certainly wishes that there should be good men," said Harry.
> "And cannot a man be good and great?"
> "That is the problem for a man to solve. Do you try that. Good you certainly can be. . . . Let that come first; and then the greatness if that be possible." (78-79)

Note that Alaric's first concern is that Harry may have spotted a fault rather than that he might have a fault. "Do I do so?" he asks. "Do I seem to do so?" From his own willingness to argue that the ends justify the means it is clear that Norman has sized him up correctly. Thus far, Tudor's decisions appear to be based on his personality. His ambition rules him but is usually moderated by his better qualities. As more political and monetary rewards are offered him, however, not only does his ambition become stronger, but he develops a theory to fit his ambition.

Tudor's new friend, Undecimus Scott, reinforces his theory. Scott has all Tudor's negative qualities and none of his virtues. His friendship with Tudor parodies Tudor's friendship with Harry Norman.

> He had an easy way of getting intimate with young men when it suited him, and as easy a way of dropping them afterwards when that suited him. He had no idea of wasting his time or opportunities in friendships. Not that he was indifferent as to his companions, or did not appreciate the pleasure of living with pleasant men; but that life was too short, and with him the race too much up hill, to allow of his indulging in such luxuries. He looked on friendship as one of those costly delights with which none but the rich should presume to gratify themselves. He could not afford to associate with his fellow men on any other terms than those of making capital of them. (90)

Undy Scott represents the negative influence of society on Tudor's behavior. Trollope states that

> Alaric was no more blind to his own interest than was his new ally. But there was this difference

> between them; Undy lived altogether in the utilitarian world which he had formed around himself, whereas Alaric lived in two worlds. When with Undy his pursuits and motives were much such as those of Undy himself; but at Surbiton Cottage, and with Harry Norman, he was still susceptible of a higher feeling. (91)

Trollope sees Tudor "wandering between two worlds." The subjectivity of these worlds is twofold. A person forms the world he lives in by choosing those who live with him; he forms the world he lives in by judging which facts about the world, to him, represent reality. Undy Scott's reality is not the same as Harry Norman's reality. Both realities influence Alaric Tudor.

Undy Scott immediately approaches Tudor with a dishonest proposition. Tudor is preparing a report on "the boundaries and privileges of certain mines situated . . . on Crown property" (69). Scott invites him to speculate in the stocks of the very mine he is supposed to be investigating objectively. He seduces Tudor with the "everyone is doing it" argument. In response, Tudor asserts his co-worker, Fidus Neverbend's, honesty. Scott says,

> "I'll be bound he will not return without a few Mary Janes in his pocketbook. He'll be a fool if he does, I know."
>
> "Why, that's the very mine we are down here about."
>
> "And that's the very reason why he'll purchase Mary Janes. He has an opportunity of knowing their value." . . .
>
> "I think you mistake his character."
>
> "Why, Tudor, what would you think now if he not only bought for himself, but was commissioned to buy by the very men who sent him down here?" (96)

Scott says he has no faith in Fidus Neverbend. "What! have faith in a man merely because he tells me to have it! . . . He may, for aught I know, be just as good as the rest of the world; all I say is that I believe him to be no better" (96). Tudor is impressed with this very weak argument. Scott never says he knows Neverbend or Neverbend's superiors are speculating in stocks that they themselves evaluate. He says he believes it. He claims he has no faith in Neverbend's honesty because he has no proof of it--but he believes, or claims he believes, in the man's dishonesty without proof. A person forms his own world. Tudor buys the shares in the mine he is investigating. Trollope says that Tudor "should have been able to look with clearer eyesight on the landmarks which divide honour from dishonour, integrity from fraud, and truth from falsehood. But he had never prayed to be delivered from evil. His desire had rather been that he might be led into temptation. . . . . Power, station, rank, wealth . . . became daily more dear to his heart" (104). These things in themselves are good, but Tudor's ambitious personality, his theories of proper behavior, society as he chooses to see it, lead him to do more than becomes a man to get them. Trollope says, "The object is good, but the means of attaining it--the path to the object--ah! there is the slip" (355). Tudor realizes over three hundred pounds profit on his shares. "Such was the price," says Trollope, "which Scott,

Manylodes & Co., had found it worth their while to pay him for his good report on Mary Jane" (120).

Although one would not yet call Alaric a rogue, he is no longer an honest man. In his pursuit of wealth he relegates personal relationships to a back seat. Trollope describes Tudor's feelings when he realizes that he has offended Mrs. Woodward. "He loved Mrs. Woodward dearly, and greatly desired her love and sympathy. But what then? He could not have everything. He determined, therefore, not to trouble his mind" (137). Indeed, more and more he thinks of people in terms of how useful they may be to him. "Alaric did not despise the sympathy of Captain Cuttwater. It might turn out that even Captain Cuttwater could be made use of" (137). Captain Cuttwater is of use. After Gertrude rejects Norman's offer of marriage, Cuttwater informs Alaric that he plans to make Gertrude his heir and would be very happy should Alaric and Gertrude marry. Just as friendship for Harry Norman, who had befriended Tudor and brought Tudor into his own family circle, does not stop Tudor from standing against him for promotion, so neither friendship nor loyalty to Linda stops Tudor from wooing and winning Gertrude.

Alaric becomes accustomed to his own dishonesty. Never asking himself if "he would be justified in turning to his own purpose any information which he might obtain in his official career" (173), he traffics in shares and speculates. With the help of his friend, Undy Scott,

he silences his conscience by convincing himself that everyone does what he does. Harry Norman, who provided some counterweight to Scott, has been alienated by Tudor's engagement to Gertrude. Tudor has taught himself

> that money was a thing not to be judged of by the ordinary rules which govern a man's conduct. In other matters it behoves a gentleman to be open, aboveboard, self-denying, doing unto others as he would wish that others should do unto him; but in the acquirement and use of money--that is, its use with the object of acquiring more, its use in the usurer's sense--his practice should be exactly the reverse; he should be close, secret, exacting, given to concealment, not over troubled by scruples; suspicious, without sympathies, self-devoted, and always doing unto others exactly that which he is on his guard to prevent others from doing unto him--viz., making money by them. (190-91)

His ambition drives him. "He . . . encouraged himself by that mystic word, 'Excelsior!' To him it was a watchword of battle, repeated morning, noon, and night. It was the prevailing idea of his life" (287). But Trollope comments: "'Excelsior'! Yes; how great, how grand, how all-absorbing is the idea! But what if a man may be going down, down to Tophet, and yet think the while that he is scaling the walls of heaven" (287)? How frightening is a man's capacity to fool himself! From Tudor's own ambition springs his theory of life, and he then perceives society in such a way that it fits both his ambition and his theory. He tells his cousin Charley Tudor that,

> "seeing what a place the world is, seeing what are the general aspirations of other men, seeing what, as it appears to me, the Creator has intended for

> the goal of our labours, I look for advancement, prosperity, and such rank and station as I may be able to win for myself. The labourer is worthy of his hire, and I do not mean to refuse such wages as may come in my way." (311)

Tudor has developed a theory to fit his ambitions and a God to fit his theory. He has convinced himself that God sanctions dog-eat-dog Mammonism. When Tudor tries to convince his cousin Charley to marry for money, Charley is shocked. He gives Tudor his last warning: "You should remember this--that nothing that is wrong can become right because other people do it" (313).

Alaric Tudor heeds neither Harry Norman nor Charley Tudor when they warn him against doing wrong. Through Undy Scott, Alaric becomes trustee for the fortune of Miss Golightly, a fortune which amounts to twenty thousand pounds. As soon as he obtains full control of the money, he takes five thousand pounds to pay "the calls due upon the West Cork shares held by both himself and Undy Scott" (353). Each decision Alaric has made in the past has led up to this. Influenced by his ambition, by his companions, by his ideas and ideals, he makes wrong decision after wrong decision until his moral stature disintegrates completely. From the time he let Norman's income influence his friendship, from the time he allowed money to touch his personal relationships, his feet were set on the path he followed. He stands for promotion against his friend--for money; he ingratiates himself with Captain Cuttwater--for money; he sells out the

government that employs him--for money; he marries Gertrude--for money. Finally, he sells his last shred of honor--for money.

> Alaric Tudor was now a rogue despite his high office, his grand ideas, his exalted ambition; despite his talent, zeal, and well-directed official labours, he was a rogue; a thief, a villain who had stolen the money of the orphan, who had undertaken a trust merely that he might break it; a robber, doubly disgraced by being a robber with an education, a Bill Sykes without any of those excuses which a philanthropist cannot but make for wretches brought up in infamy. (354)

If the moral of Alaric's tale could be "Love of money is the root of all evil," then the moral of Doctor Thorne might be "Love of money and position is the root of all evil," or, if not that, perhaps "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me." Several characters in the book worship at the shrines of money or rank. Trollope tells us that, to Mr. Moffat, the son of a rich tailor, "an independent spirit . . . . was one that placed its sole dependence on a respectable balance at its bankers."[9] Lady Amelia de Courcy's "devotion to the peerage was such, that she would certainly have declined a seat in heaven if offered to her without the promise that it should be in the upper house" (79).

The psychological interest of Doctor Thorne lies in the complex interaction between money, rank, and inner worth. This interaction takes place in society at large, in the minds and hearts of the characters, and in the moral actions the characters take. The theme of the book

is legitimacy--which, in the overall context of the book, Trollope sees as a kind of achieved equilibrium between birth, worth, and money. Except for the doctor himself, all the main characters in Doctor Thorne are in uncertain positions. The Scatcherds, Miss Dunstable, and Mr. Moffat have wealth but no position; the Greshams have rank but no money. Mary Thorne, the doctor's niece, was "brought into the world without a legitimate position in which to stand" (94), is really illegitimate, and has neither rank nor wealth. Mary's struggle to achieve "legitimacy," to learn how to value herself and how to behave towards others--to establish for herself a position in the world--is the center of the novel. Mary's attitude toward rank, money, and inner worth, and their relative or absolute importance, and the actions she takes on the basis of her ideas, are the moral center of the book.

Unlike the moral graph of Alaric Tudor's career in The Three Clerks, which was one of linear descent, the moral picture in Doctor Thorne is a collage, with all the minor characters and their attitudes toward money, rank, and personal worth surrounding and setting off Mary Thorne and her moral position. Although Trollope has so intertwined money, rank, and character in Doctor Thorne that it is impossible to isolate one alone for discussion, money has the advantage of being the one variable in the situation; it can affect rank and character though rank

and character are themselves set. This variability is accurately and succinctly described by Squire Gresham. "If Porlock [the heir of Earl de Courcy] were to marry the daughter of a shoeblack, without a farthing, he would make a _mésalliance_: but if the daughter of the shoeblack had half a million of money, nobody would dream of saying so" (468).

Sir Roger Scatcherd is a poor stone-mason who becomes a contractor and makes a lot of money. When he acquires wealth, he loses his position. Sir Roger, unfortunately, is never able to regain his equilibrium. He has always had a weakness for liquor and now he is drinking himself to death. Dr. Thorne remonstrates with him.

> "Have you not unbounded wealth? Can you not do anything you wish? be anything you choose?"
> "No," and the sick man shrieked with an energy that made him audible all through the house. "I can do nothing that I would choose to do; be nothing that I would wish to be! . . . What gratification can I have except the brandy bottle? If I go among gentlemen, can I talk to them? If they have anything to say about a railway, they will ask me a question: if they speak to me beyond that, I must be dumb. If I go among my workmen, can they talk to me? No; I am their master, and a stern master. They bob their heads and shake in their shoes when they see me. Where are my friends? Here!" said he, and he dragged a bottle from under his very pillow. "Where are my amusements? Here!" and he brandished the bottle almost in the doctor's face. "Where is my one resource, my one gratification, my only comfort after all my toils? Here, doctor; here, here, here! . . . I'm worth three hundred thousand pounds; and I'd give it all to be able to go to work to-morrow with a hod and mortar, and have a fellow clap his hand upon my shoulder, and say: 'Well, Roger, shall us have that 'ere other half-pint this morning?'" (127)

Sir Roger, says Trollope, is "still the same good companion, and still also the same hard-working hero" (113). But neither his talent, his warmth, his iron frame and constitution "which God had given to him" (114), nor his commitment to radical philosophy can save him from the bottle. Society gives him no place, and loneliness and alienation drive him to drink.

The combination of wealth without position and the example of his father's method of coping with the Scatcherd's social situation kills Roger's son, Louis, too. Trollope points out that

> nothing on earth can be more difficult than bringing up well a young man who has not to earn his own bread, and who has no recognized station among other young men similarly circumstanced. Juvenile dukes, and sprouting earls, find their duties and their places as easily as embryo clergymen and sucking barristers. Provision is made for their peculiar positions: and, though they may possibly go astray, they have a fair chance given to them of running within the posts. The same may be said of such youths as Frank Gresham. There are enough of them in the community to have made it necessary that their well-being should be a matter of care and forethought. But there are but few men turned out in the world in the position of Louis Scatcherd; and, of those few, but very few enter the real battle of life under good auspices. (290-91)

That Trollope recognizes the importance to and responsibility of society in promoting the proper behavior of its members is patent. Because he has no set of people who will readily accept him, Louis' companions are those leeches who gather around rich men. Trollope says that the worst of his character "was brought into play by

the fact that he was not a fool. . . . [H]e was not to be done, not he. . . . He could spend his money freely; but he would so spend it that he himself might reap the gratification of the expenditure. He was acute, crafty, knowing, and up to every damnable dodge practised by men of the class with whom he lived" (293). Louis is not "naturally . . . of a depraved disposition" (292), but since his character is not strong like his father's, and since the only group of people that fully accepts him provides a negative influence, Louis consistently makes the wrong moral choices and sinks further and further into vice and dissipation. Like his father, he dies of drink. His mother says bitterly, "This comes of their barroniting. . . . If they had let him alone, he would have been here now, and so would the other one. . . . [P]eople such as us should never meddle with them above us. See what has come of it; see what has come of it" (514)!

Although the Scatcherds cannot cope with wealth out of proportion to their rank, both Emily Dunstable and Mr. Moffat can. Emily Dunstable is the very rich daughter of a manufacturer. The reader meets her at Courcy Castle, where the De Courcys have invited her so that their nephew, Frank Gresham, can try to marry her and her fortune. Miss Dunstable is quite aware that she is invited into good society in order that some penniless scion of a good family might marry her. Unlike Roger Scatcherd who cannot bend with his fortune and make the best of it, Miss

Dunstable, with a cynical sense of humor to protect her, survives. When one of her "instructors in fashion" tells her that "curls are not the thing," Miss Dunstable replies, "They'll always pass muster . . . when they are done up with banknotes" (191). A less strong person, like Louis Scatcherd, cannot handle such a painful situation. Miss Dunstable thinks her one friend at Courcy Castle, Frank Gresham, is also after her money and challenges him. "You have never gloated over me as the bird of prey gloats over the poor beast that is soon to become carrion beneath its claws? You have not counted me out as equal to so much land, and calculated on me as a balance at your banker's" (247)? It must be clear, not only that Miss Dunstable does not approve of predacious persons, but also that Trollope does not. The "profit motive" should not enter personal relationships. One person is not to make use of another--certainly not by marriage--by making oneself "rich by one great perjury" (247). Miss Dunstable, by dint of strong character, strong principles, and a strong belief that "The rank is but the guinea's stamp,/ The man's the gowd for a' that," survives society. She makes friends with those few people who ignore her lack of rank and excess of money and relate to her on the basis of inner worth.

Mr. Moffat, the rich son of a tailor, also survives in society. Unlike any of the characters discussed thus far, he is the true product of a materialistic society. "He

was a man in whose breast the ambition of being great in the world, and of joining himself to aristocratic people was continually at war with the great cost which such tastes occasioned" (201). One can hardly accuse Mr. Moffat of allowing the profit motive to poison his personal relationships; rather, one might compliment him on keeping business relationships such as marriage pure of any taint of emotion. Mr. Moffat decides that he can do better for himself than to marry Augusta Gresham, to whom he is engaged, and jilts her in order to marry Miss Dunstable. His first proposal to Miss Dunstable is as follows:

> Mr. Moffat then went on to show how it behoved them both, in holding out their hands half-way to meet the aristocratic overtures that were made to them, not to allow themselves to be made use of. The aristocracy, according to Mr. Moffat, were people of a very nice sort; the best acquaintance in the world; a portion of mankind to be noticed by whom should be one of the first objects in life of the Dunstables and Moffats. But the Dunstables and the Moffats should be very careful to give little or nothing in return. . . . In all their intercourse with the Dunstables and Moffats, they would expect a payment. It was for the Dunstables and Moffats to see that, at any rate, they did not pay more for the article they got than its market value.
>
> The way in which she, Miss Dunstable, and he, Mr. Moffat, would be required to pay would be by taking each of them some poor scion of the aristocracy in marriage; and thus expending their hard-earned wealth in procuring high-priced pleasures for some well-born pauper. Against this, peculiar caution was to be used. Of course, the further induction to be shown was this: that people so circumstanced should marry among themselves. (226-27)

The entire proposal of marriage is in the language of the marketplace; there is no place in it for even a pretense

of love. Furthermore, in the marital business transactions between the monied and the aristocratic, Mr. Moffat assumes that neither group would consider giving generously to the other, or even fairly, if that were avoidable. Each is out only to make the best bargain he can for himself. The proposal brings forcibly to mind Alaric Tudor's speech "that money was a thing not to be judged of by the ordinary rules which govern a man's conduct" (190-91). One can hardly speak of Mr. Moffat as a man without a proper position because, to him, everything is a matter of dollars and cents; he recognizes no value, nothing that money cannot buy. Everything has a price; therefore, his position can be defined very simply by his bank balance--in fact, one can hardly speak of Mr. Moffat as a man at all. Neither personality, of which he has virtually none, nor society, which he sees only in terms of an intricate network of financial ties, influences his moral action. He is motivated by an economic theory of life that makes Malthus look like a humanitarian.

It is difficult for the reader thoroughly to condemn Moffat, partly because he is hardly more than a caricature, partly because, as he has no feelings at all, he is actuated by no malice, but more because Augusta Gresham, his intended bride, is hardly more admirable than he.

> She was now going to make a suitable match with a man of large fortune, who had been procured for her as an eligible parti by her aunt, the countess. She did not pretend, had never pretended, that she

> loved Mr. Moffat, but she knew, she said, that in the present state of her father's affairs such a match was expedient. . . . Mr. Moffat would bring fortune; she would bring blood and connexion. (56)

Once again expediency is condemned. The type of marriage here proposed, Trollope describes as a winter match.

> Instead of heart beating to heart in sympathetic unison, purse chinks to purse. The rich new furniture of the new abode is looked to instead of the rapture of a pure embrace. The new carriage is depended on rather than the new heart's companion; and the first bright gloss, prepared by the upholsterer's hands, stands in lieu of the rosy tints which young love lends to his true votaries. (255)

"For Mr. Moffat she had never cared a straw," says Trollope after Moffat jilts her, "and when, therefore, she lost the piece of gilding for which she had been instructed by her mother to sell herself, it was impossible to pity her" (457). When life revolves around the cash nexus, humanity becomes diminished, shrivels up. Augusta does have feelings, but they are, in the case of Mr. Moffat, easily overborn by the De Courcy family whom she holds in great respect, and their values which she shares. When, much later, she wishes to marry a Mr. Gazebee, whom she does love, her feelings are overcome once again by the De Courcys, but not at all easily. Then we pity her . She is wrong to agree to marry Mr. Moffat, and wrong not to marry Mr. Gazebee, but social pressure and mistaken ideas overcome her natural feelings.

Augusta's mother, Lady Arabella Gresham, is a fine representative De Courcy. Except for her maternal feelings, which are very real indeed, she is almost as materialistic as Mr. Moffat. Lady Arabella says to Dr. Thorne about her son, Frank:

> "Yes, doctor; he must marry money."
> "And worth, Lady Arabella; and a pure feminine heart; and youth and beauty. I hope he will marry them all."
> Could it be possible, that in speaking of a pure feminine heart, and youth and beauty, and such like gewgaws, the doctor was thinking of his niece? (175)

Inner worth, to Lady Arabella, is nothing, a gewgaw--class and money everything. Her materialism is more obnoxious to the reader than Mr. Moffat's because her strong family feelings lead her to be spiteful and malicious in pursuing a moneyed match for her son. When she finds her son attracted to Mary Thorne, her unkindness to the girl leads one to believe that even without the upbringing that shaped her ideas and behavior, Lady Arabella would not have been an exceptionally fine person.

Lady Arabella is married to Squire Gresham, a kindly, gentle man with little sense of responsibility and less backbone. When he came into his inheritance, he had a clear income of fourteen thousand pounds a year, but "Lady Arabella chose to live as she had been accustomed to do, and as her sister-in-law the countess lived: now Lord de Courcy had much more than fourteen thousand

a year" (13). The squire cannot curb Lady Arabella's spending, or, indeed, his own, and when the money is gone, he starts selling and mortgaging property and taking loans. Dr. Thorne is able to arrange loans for the squire through his friend, Roger Scatcherd.

> And Mr. Gresham, feeling that that difficulty was tided over for a time, and that the immediate pressure of little debts would be abated, stretched himself on his easy chair as though he were quite comfortable; --one may say almost elated.
>
> How frequent it is that men on their road to ruin feel elation such as this! A man signs away a moiety of his substance; nay, that were nothing; but a moiety of the substance of his children; he puts his pen to the paper that ruins him and them; but in doing so he frees himself from a score of immediate little pestering, stinging troubles; and, therefore, feels as though fortune had been almost kind to him.
>
> The doctor felt angry with himself for what he had done when he saw how easily the squire adapted himself to this new loan. (167-68)

Gresham is a weak, affectionate, easy-going man. Nothing bothers him too much unless it makes him uncomfortable. When Lady Arabella makes him uncomfortable with her unreasonable demands for more money, he gives her money, partly because hers is the stronger will, partly just to make himself comfortable again. As soon as he temporarily silences his creditors, even in the midst of ruin, he is happy again. Certainly Squire Gresham's weakness of character rather than his social milieu or his ideas determines his easy-come, easy-go attitude toward money. Despite the squire's amiability, he bears the blame for ruining his family. This is not a positive moral action!

Frank Gresham, the squire's son, is admirable in that, despite enormous pressure from his family to marry money, he remains true to his love for Mary Thorne. Raised side by side with her, he comes to love her and proposes to her before any prudential concerns seriously enter his head. Their love is real, however, and with a little encouragement from Emily Dunstable, he remains true to Mary. When he learns of Mary's low birth, he tells his father: "It is a pity and a misfortune. It might, perhaps, have been a reason why you or my mother should not have had Mary in the house many years ago; but it cannot make any difference now" (468). "It cannot make any difference now," is also the answer to his family's objection that Mary is penniless. Frank refuses either to sell himself or foreswear his love for Mary. Frank does not change his mind from beginning to end, but as the story progresses, the stubbornness of the boy becomes the firmness of the man. More by nature than by training or from conviction, Frank acts morally.

Dr. Thorne, Mary's uncle, works through most of his conflicts between money, rank, and inner worth before the main action of this book begins. Despite the fact that "No man plumed himself on good blood more than" Dr. Thorne, he adopts his brother's bastard daughter and makes "for her a station as best he could" (94). When needs must, he puts the person ahead of the trappings, dear as the trappings were to his heart. By the time Lady Arabella

asks his help in keeping Mary away from her son, Dr. Thorne can tell her: "Should she tell me to-morrow that she was engaged to marry Frank, I should talk over the matter with her, quite coolly, solely with a view to her interest, as would be my duty; feeling, at the same time, that Frank would be lucky in having such a wife" (321). The only decision Dr. Thorne must make in the course of the book is whether to tell anyone that Mary stands a good chance of inheriting her maternal uncle, Roger Scatcherd's wealth. He decides that to tell anyone would be to put Mary in a false position. He would, in effect, be saying that Frank should wait to decide whether or not to cast Mary off until he knows if she is an heiress. "He was anxious enough that she should be Frank Gresham's wife, for he loved Frank Gresham; he was anxious enough, also, that she should give to her husband the means of saving the property of his family. But Frank, though he might find her rich, was bound to take her while she was poor" (482). Although the reader is not given the background of Dr. Thorne's decisions, they are apparently the result of good principles and a good heart.

Mary herself has no trouble finding a proper attitude toward money. "No wealth, no mere worldly advantage could make anyone her superior" (85). Mary's attitude toward money is surely the moral touchstone of the book. She talks to her uncle who is wondering if

he did right or wrong to raise her apart from the wealthy Scatcherds.

> "After all," said he, "money is a fine thing."
> "Very fine, when it is well come by," she answered; that is, without detriment to the heart or soul."
> "I should be a happier man if you were provided for as is Miss Oriel. Suppose, now, I could give you up to a rich man who would be able to insure you against all wants?"
> "Insure me against all wants! Oh, that would be a man. That would be selling me, wouldn't it, uncle? Yes, selling me; and the price you would receive would be freedom from future apprehensions as regards me. It would be a cowardly sale for you to make; and then, as to me--me the victim. No, uncle; you must bear the misery of having to provide for me--bonnets and all. We are in the same boat, and you shan't turn me overboard."
> "But if I were to die, what would you do then?"
> "And if I were to die, what would you do? People must be bound together. They must depend on each other. Of course, misfortunes may come; but it is cowardly to be afraid of them beforehand. You and I are bound together, uncle." (140)

Not money but love is the tie that binds. Trafficking in either separately is acceptable; trafficking in both together is not. Mary can cope with money problems.

It is "the god of . . . [Lady Amelia de Courcy's] idolatry" (458), high birth, that Mary must fight against the hardest.

> She said to herself, proudly, that God's handiwork was the inner man, the inner woman, the naked creature animated by a living soul; that all other adjuncts were but man's clothing for the creature; all others, whether stitched by tailors or contrived by kings. Was it not within her capacity to do as nobly, to love as truly, to worship her God in heaven with as perfect a faith, and her god on earth with as leal a troth, as though blood had descended to her purely through scores of purely born progenitors? So to herself she spoke; and yet, as she said it, she knew that were she a man, such a man as the heir of

> Greshamsbury should be, nothing should tempt her to sully her children's blood by mating herself with any one that was base born. . . .
>
> And so, with a mind at war with itself, she came forth armed to do battle against the world's prejudices, those prejudices she herself still loved so well. (97-98)

Mary is harder on herself than the world is. The squire himself tells Frank that, "were she an heiress, the world would forgive her birth on account of her wealth" (468). Money, in Doctor Thorne, functions, like death, as the great equalizer. When Lady Arabella approaches Mary to try to convince her to break her engagement to Frank, Mary has not yet been equalized. Lady Arabella tells Mary that "Frank is not in a condition to marry without money. Think of the position which Mr. Gresham's only son should hold in the country; think of the old name, and the pride we have in it. . . . He, having so much to give, will not break his word to you--to you who have nothing to give in return" (500, 502). Mary, despite later qualms, responds immediately to this. She thinks of "that heart of hers, beating with such genuine life, capable of such perfect love, throbbing with so grand a pride; had she not given that? And was not that, between him and her, more than twenty Greshamsburys, nobler than any pedigree" (502)? She replies aloud, "I have taken no account of what will be given between your son and me in your sense of the word giving" (502). To Trollope, "Love can only be paid in its own coin: it knows of no other legal tender" (557). For Mary, love is separate from worldly

concerns. Giving love has nothing to do with giving money. One inherits or works for money; one marries for love. Her moral victory, however, does not so much lie in this conviction, as in the strength of the conviction. Nothing would be easier for Mary than to accept a penniless, even a nameless suitor, if she loved him enough. Her victory is to allow Frank Gresham to take her, penniless and nameless in marriage, to allow him to put personal worth and her love before worldly advancement. Because of her character, her upbringing, and her principles, Mary wins her moral struggle against the world, "not without dust and heat."

In The Three Clerks and Doctor Thorne, Trollope explores the right ways and the wrong ways to get money. There is nothing inherently evil in money--quite the contrary. Honorably obtained and wisely used, money gives great pleasure. Trollope makes clear, however, that there are values which should override material ones--values that are even more important to a happy life than money. Honesty should have been more important to the ambitious Alaric Tudor than money. Unfortunately, he fit his principles to his ambition rather than limiting his ambitions according to his principles. Furthermore, the social milieu he established for himself by his choice of Undy Scott as his mentor reinforced his worst tendencies, personal and philosophical. Frank Gresham, on the other hand, makes the right choice in deciding to marry the penurious Mary. Although

Frank has to fight his mother and the whole De Courcy family, his social milieu still recognizes the existence of virtuous love. In addition he has at least a modicum of principle which tells him that it is bad in the abstract to desert Mary. The overriding consideration, however, is his own personality, which will not allow him to make the wrong decision in this matter which he sees is vital to his happiness. Surely money, like all other aspects of life, must be governed by moral standards.

NOTES

[1] Polhemus, p. 217.

[2] Trollope, _Last Chronicle_, p. 66.

[3] Anthony Trollope, _The Duke's Children_ (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 296.

[4] Kincaid, p. 232.

[5] Anthony Trollope, _The Three Clerks_ (1907; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 355. Subsequent references to this edition appear in the text.

[6] Polhemus, p. 187.

[7] Anthony Trollope, _The Way We Live Now_ (1951; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1975), p. 99. Subsequent references to this edition appear in the text.

[8] Paul Elmer More, "My Debt to Trollope," _The Demon of the Absolute_ (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1928), p. 98.

[9] Anthony Trollope, _Doctor Thorne_ (1926; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp. 225-26. Subsequent references to this edition appear in the text.

POWER

Trollope has a strong distrust of power and the people who wield it. Although he appreciates the individual who acquires the power to control his own destiny, as soon as a person has enough power to control or manipulate others and, a fortiori, when such a person actually uses this power, Trollope becomes concerned.

Power can have several sources. Money is one of the major sources of power. From our examination of previous novels, it is clear that Trollope recognizes that it is good to have money to buy comfort, and equally clear that he insists that there are considerations that take precedence over monetary ones in any number of situations. But the passages examined so far have not considered money's role as a source of power, that is, its role in giving one person control over others.

Although one of Trollope's later novels, The Way We Live Now, discusses money as surely as do The Three Clerks and Doctor Thorne, where the latter two books examine the proper place of money in the scheme of things, the former explores a world where money is power, Mammon rules, and the only question left is the place of man in Mammon's kingdom. The moral behavior of the individual and the society confronted with power can be assessed

only if one understands the nature of the power they must handle. Trollope pictures society, as Dorothy Van Ghent describes it, as one

> in which a full-scale demolition of traditional values was going on, correlatively with the . . . dehumanization of men, women, and children . . . a process brought about by . . . the exploitation of the human being as a "thing." . . . People were becoming things, and things (the things that money can buy or that are the means for making money or for exalting prestige in the abstract) were becoming more important than people. People were being de-animated, robbed of their souls, and things were usurping the prerogatives of animate creatures--governing the lives of their owners in the most literal sense. . . . [T]he qualities of things and people were reversed.[1]

Traditional values are being replaced by the cash nexus, people by things, God by Mammon. In the five-hundred word introduction to the chapter, "Madame Melmotte's Ball," the individual existence of one of the main characters is so meaningless that the name "Melmotte" never once appears.

> Some people had expressed an opinion that such a ball as this was intended to be could not be given successfully in February. Others declared that the money which was to be spent,--an amount which would make this affair quite new in the annals of ball-giving,--would give the thing such a character that it would certainly be successful. . . . The Duchess of Stevenage had come up from Castle Albury herself to be present at it and to bring her daughters. . . . Her brother, Lord Alfred Grendall, was known to be in great difficulties, which,--so people said--had been considerably modified by opportune pecuniary assistance. And then it was certain that one of the young Grendalls, Lord Alfred's second son, had been appointed to some mercantile position, for which he received a salary which his most intimate friends thought that he was hardly qualified to earn. . . . Where the Duchess of Stevenage went all the world would go. . . . A prince of the blood royal was to be there. How this had been achieved nobody quite

> understood; but there were rumours that a certain lady's jewels had been rescued from the pawn-broker's. Everything was done on the same scale. . . . One Cabinet Minister and two or three under-secretaries had agreed to come because it was felt that the giver of the ball might before long be the master of considerable parliamentary interests. It was believed that he had an eye to politics, and it is always wise to have great wealth on one's own side. (29-30)

Money will "make this affair." Guests are bribed or blackmailed rather than invited to attend. People want not their host, but wealth on their side. Not Melmotte, but money wields power.

Although in this money-dominated world, it is often unclear whether people with money have power or the money itself is the power, Melmotte, as owner and manipulator of large sums of money, is certainly a power figure in the book.

> It was said that he had made a railway across Russia, that he provisioned the Southern army in the American civil war, that he had supplied Austria with arms, and had at one time bought up all the iron in England. He could make or mar any company by buying or selling stock, and could make money dear or cheap as he pleased. All this was said of him in his praise,--but it was also said that he was regarded . . . as the most gigantic swindler that had ever lived. (31)

Despite his reputation for dishonesty, because of his money, society accepts Augustus Melmotte. In a world that measures everything by the gold standard, as long as Melmotte has gold, or people believe he does, he is powerful. Place Melmotte in a world of traditional values, however, and he is "A failure! Of course he's

a failure, whether rich or poor;--a miserable imposition, a hollow vulgar fraud from beginning to end,--too insignificant for you and me to talk of, were it not that his position is a sign of the degeneracy of the age. What are we coming to when such as he is an honoured guest at our tables" (II, 44)? Trollope uses a triple perspective to view power in The Way We Live Now. In the money-centered society of the book, whether power lies with people or with money is left ambiguous. Measured against a traditional value system, money-centered people appear worthless, empty. This triple perspective on power, as determined by people who have money, or by the money itself, or by traditional atandards, makes power itself appear uncertain, almost chimerical. Individuals must decide how to react to the money, the man who has it, and the system.

As one might deduce from the title, the influence of society on the moral action of the individual is very pronounced in The Way We Live Now. Equally pronounced, however, is the effect of each individual's moral action on the moral tone of the society. One must, therefore, closely examine the moral position of both the society and the individual in The Way We Live Now. The moral measure of society in this book is taken by gauging its reaction to the financial colossus, Melmotte. A. O. J. Cockshut points out that "Everybody is following everybody else's lead in accepting Melmotte. Excessive deference is

paid to public opinion, and the result is that public opinion ceases to exist. Who is to say who the leader is when everyone is walking in a circle following the man in front?"[2] The hollow men go round the prickly pear. Very few of the characters in the book and none of those in London society are able to reach beyond what other people say to some objective value system by which they can evaluate the world. Just as the power that rests in Melmotte is questionable, so is the power of the group. Each individual looks to the other in search of leadership none can give. Without strongly held ideas to guide action, neither an individual nor a society can act effectively. Although Trollope rarely discusses theology, in his other novels there is an implied, an understood value system based on Christian ethics, given authority, ultimately, by God, which virtually all the characters accept and by which they measure themselves and others. Even those characters who, measured by this yardstick, fall short, either, like Mrs. Proudie, do not realize they do not measure up, or, like Crosbie, realize it and repent, or at least bemoan, their own weakness. In The Way We Live Now, Trollope shows society essentially without God. The only strong, effective people in this society are those who cling tightly to Mammon's creed; when they are evaluated by Christian ethical standards, they, too, crumble. People with no values, or convictions, or goals are unable to act. Those with positive values

act positively. Those with negative values act negatively. London society in this book is, like Alaric Tudor, between two worlds, two sets of values, but the materialistic world of Undecimus Scott is taking over.

With one or two possible exceptions, there are no real gentlemen in The Way We Live Now, certainly none who are part of its society. ApRoberts, who generally minimizes the importance of religion in Trollope's novels, says that, "it is good to recall the pervading importance in Trollope's novels of the concept of the 'gentleman,' and how the concept is practically an extension of Christian morals into manners, a sort of 'sanctity of heart and morals.'"[3] Society no longer clings to those Christian values that produce gentlemen. Near the end of the story, Melmotte commits suicide and his daughter sends for help to Lord Nidderdale, the man with whom a marriage of convenience had been arranged for her. Nidderdale's father, the Marquis of Auld Reekie, acting according to negative, purely materialistic values, warns Nidderdale to stay away from her until he sees if the marriage will still be expedient.

> But Nidderdale's better feelings would not allow him to submit to this advice. He had been engaged to marry the girl, and she in her abject misery had turned to him as the friend she knew best. At any rate for the time the heartlessness of his usual life deserted him, and he felt willing to devote himself to the girl not for what he could get,--but because she had so nearly been so near to him. "I couldn't refuse her" he said over and over again. "I couldn't bring myself to do it. Oh, no;--I shall certainly go."

> "You'll get into a mess if you do."
> "Then I must get into a mess. I shall certainly go. I will go at once. It is very disagreeable, but I cannot possibly refuse. It would be abominable."
> (II, 336)

Kind, disinterested behavior is out of character even for the good-natured Nidderdale. In most circumstances, "the heartlessness of his usual life" precludes helping someone except "for what he could get." He repeats "over and over again" that he cannot refuse Marie Melmotte. One feels that he is acting under the influence of some fragment, some remnant, of a half-remembered, long-since-discarded code of honor, which he can no longer quite grasp, but cannot ignore. He responds positively, albeit momentarily, to the power of traditional values. In a different society with different values, Lord Nidderdale would surely be a gentleman. In this society, even among the nobility, it would take another Abraham to rediscover God, the ethical system He gave man, and the code of a gentleman man derived from it.

One characteristic that runs through this materialistic society on every level is abuse of power. From the comparatively small amount of power wielded by relatively insignificant individuals to the massive power wielded by Melmotte, all power is directed to the goal of getting ahead. Even what very little power religion has is turned to the use of the good-natured materialist in order to save him the trouble of censuring others' behavior or controlling his own. Lord Nidderdale asks,

> "What's the use of being beastly ill natured? I'm not very good at saying my prayers, but I do think there's something in that bit about forgiving people. Of course, cheating isn't very nice: and it isn't very nice for a fellow to play when he knows he can't pay; but I don't know that it's worse than getting drunk like Dolly Longestaffe, or quarrelling with everybody as Glasslough does,--or trying to marry some poor devil of a girl merely because she's got money. I believe in living in glass houses, but I don't believe in throwing stones." (209)

Lord Nidderdale represents the finer products of this London society. Georgiana Longestaffe, a woman anything but good-natured, represents, perhaps, the worst. Taught to use the power of those "good things with which providence had endowed her" (3) to win worldly promotion by snaring the richest and highest ranking husband possible, Georgiana bemoans to her mother her loss of Mr. Breghert, a former suitor. Her mother says, "You couldn't have loved him, Georgiana." Georgiana replies:

> "Love him! Who thinks about love nowadays? I don't know any one who loves any one else. You won't tell me that Sophy is going to marry that idiot because she loves him! Did Julia Triplex love that man with the large fortune? When you wanted Dolly to marry Marie Melmotte you never thought of his loving her. I had got the better of all that kind of thing before I was twenty."
>
> "I think a young woman should love her husband."
>
> "It makes me sick, mamma, to hear you talk in that way. It does indeed. When one has been going on for a dozen years trying to do something,--and I have never had any secrets from you,--then that you should round upon me and talk about love!" (II, 425)

Georgiana is correct, of course, in accusing her mother of hypocrisy when she talks to her about love. Neither Georgiana nor her society, nor her mother thinks about

love nowadays. Georgiana, however, has learned her mother's lesson and the lesson of her society too well; not only is she willing to marry for his wealth alone someone to whom she is indifferent, she is willing to marry someone totally inappropriate in every other way, someone by whom she is disgusted, only for his money. It is, in fact, questionable whether she any longer has feelings about anything other than wealth. It is this that shocks her mother. Lord Nidderdale and Georgiana Longestaffe are products of the same society, a society which puts material success above any other goal; they, of course, use what power they have to pursue wealth and show little concern for other values. Evidently they have not been taught enough of the traditional Christian moral system for it to have affected their principles. Nidderdale twists the Christian doctrine of forgiveness almost out of recognition, and Georgiana discards love altogether. She contamplates marrying Mr. Breghert, a Jew.

> For herself she regarded the matter not at all, except as far as it might be regarded by the world in which she wished to live. She was herself above all personal prejudices of that kind. Jew, Turk, or infidel was nothing to her. She had seen enough of the world to be aware that her happiness did not lie in that direction, and could not depend in the least on the religion of her husband. Of course she would go to church herself. She always went to church. It was the proper thing to do. (II, 92-93)

Despite the fact that Georgiana goes to church, religion obviously has had absolutely no impact on her. The real

difference between Lord Nidderdale and Miss Longestaffe lies in their respective personalities, not in their social milieu nor in their principles. They represent both classes of the society in which they live--the good-natured materialists and the ill-natured materialists. The moral action of the book is composed of the sum total of the moral actions of such characters, which is to say, the real moral action we examine is that of London society itself. The society institutionalizes and accepts any amount of abuse of power as long as it is accompanied by or in pursuit of that wealth which gives power and position.

> The new farthing newspaper, "The Mob," was already putting Melmotte forward as a political hero, preaching with reference to his commercial transactions the grand doctrine that magnitude in affairs is a valid defence for certain irregularities. A Napoleon, though he may exterminate tribes in carrying out his projects, cannot be judged by the same law as a young lieutenant who may be punished for cruelty to a few negroes. . . . I do not know that the theory was ever so plainly put forward as it was done by the ingenious and courageous writer in "The Mob"; but in practice it has commanded the assent of many intelligent minds. (II, 171)

To explore the moral qualities of London society in <u>The Way We Live Now</u> and its influence upon its members, one must continue to examine the moral nature of typical Londoners. Trollope says of Lady Carbury, a main character in the book, that she "was false from head to foot, but there was much good in her, false though she was" (17). "She was true to her children--especially devoted to one

of them--and was ready to work her nails off if by doing so she could advance their interests" (11). Unfortunately, however, Lady Carbury equates her children's welfare only with their wealth. She pushes her son, a true wastrel, to marry Marie Melmotte for her fortune. "Should he do that,--what a blessed son would he have been to her! How constantly in her triumph would she be able to forget all his vices, he debts, his gambling, his late hours, and his cruel treatment of herself! . . . In her very heart of hearts she worshipped wealth" (101). She invests an enormous amount of time, energy, and money to promote the marriage, and is even quite ready to connive at an elopement if Marie's father does not consent to the match. "I shall be the happiest and proudest mother in England if this comes about" (191). Lady Carbury worships wealth as the giver of all good things, the source of all pride and happiness, the water that washes out all sin.

All Lady Carbury's ambition, even as a girl, had been "to marry and have the command of money, to do her duty correctly, to live in a big house and be respected" (13). Trollope says that

> To be scolded, watched, beaten, and sworn at by a choleric old man till she was at last driven out of her house by the violence of his ill-usage; to be taken back as a favour with the assurance that her name would for the remainder of her life be unjustly tarnished; to have her flight constantly thrown in her face; and then at last to become for a year or two the nurse of a dying debauchee was a high price to pay for such good things as she had hitherto enjoyed. (14)

She, however, does not seem to agree. Even as a woman with children themselves old enough to marry, Lady Carbury still faithfully follows Mammon, still believes "that it had been the business of her life, as a portionless girl, to obtain maintenance and position at the expense of suffering and servility" (335). Money, in Lady Carbury's world, is no longer a means to an end, happiness, but an end in itself, a god that one serves even with suffering. When her daughter, Hetta, persistently refuses to marry a man she does not love, even though doing so would relieve her mother of the burden of her care and provide a good connection for the family, her mother compares her to her vile and wicked brother. "But ask yourself whether you do not give as much pain, seeing what you could do for us if you would. But it never occurs to you to sacrifice even a fantasy for the advantage of others" (II, 15). Lady Carbury believes that "a woman, . . . if she were unfortunate enough to be a lady without wealth of her own, must give up everything, her body, her heart,--her very soul if she were that way troubled,--to the procuring of a fitting maintenance for herself" (II, 383). A rich marriage, even after the unhappy marriage she herself made, is still the summum bonum for Lady Carbury, money a powerful god to which her daughter ought to sacrifice as do all other right-thinking people. "To Lady Carbury there was no second way of looking at the matter" (68).

Trollope makes it particularly easy for the reader to trace the factors that shape Lady Carbury's moral actions. "Her mother had run away from her father, and she had been tossed to and fro between this and that protector, sometimes being in danger of wanting any one to care for her, till she had been made sharp, incredulous, and untrustworthy by the difficulties of her position" (12-13). The society she lives in only reinforces the values she learned at such an early age. On her, like on Miss Longestaffe, religious teaching has had no effect. "Lady Carbury always went to church when she was in the country, never when she was at home in London. It was one of those moral habits, like early dinners and long walks, which suited country life. . . . As to the purpose for which people go to church, it had probably never in her life occurred to Lady Carbury to think of it" (158). All her power, all her energy, all her soul are devoted to serving the god she sees as all-powerful, wealth. This is wrong. Lady Carbury, however, remains a sympathetic character because she has not lost the ability to love. She loves her children, especially her worthless son, Felix. "Though her reason might be ever so strong in bidding her to desert him, her heart, she knew, would be stronger than her reason. He was the one thing in the world that overpowered her" (293). The role of environment, of ideas, and of personality in shaping Lady Carbury's actions is clear.

The role these three factors play in the life of her son is equally clear.

> Whether Sir Felix, her son, had become what he was solely by bad training, or whether he had been born bad, who shall say? It is hardly possible that he should not have been better had he been taken away as an infant and subjected to moral training by moral teachers. And yet again it is hardly possible that any training or want of training would have produced a heart so utterly incapable of feeling for others as was his. He could not even feel his own misfortunes unless they touched the outward comforts of the moment. It seemed that he lacked sufficient imagination to realize future misery though the futurity to be considered was divided from the present but by a single month, a single week,--but a single night. He liked to be kindly treated, to be praised and petted, to be well fed and caressed; and they who so treated him were his chosen friends. He had in this the instincts of a horse, not approaching the higher sympathies of a dog. But it cannot be said of him that he had ever loved any one to the extent of denying himself a moment's gratification on that loved one's behalf. His heart was a stone. (17-18)

Felix uses what power he has, power over his mother, power over his sister, power over Marie Melmotte, simply to gain material advantage. His nature is bad, his training is bad, and he has neither mind enough to entertain abstract ideas nor heart enough to entertain any feelings. He is so thoroughly unable to plan ahead that the night before he and Marie Melmotte plan to elope, Felix gets drunk and gambles away all the money for the elopement. Felix is a second generation Mammonite; he is the ultimate product of the civilization Trollope describes. He has not even the imagination or the intellect to be a grand rogue like Melmotte, who, in fact, must be imported from out of England.

Melmotte is the embodiment of wealth and power in <u>The Way We Live Now</u>. Trollope indicates that at times Melmotte's power is his wealth. Melmotte feels sure, for instance, that his daughter will not marry without his consent. "Of course his daughter might run away," he thinks. "But who would run away with her without money? And there could be no money except from him. He knew himself and his own strength" (232-33). When it is suggested to Melmotte that he might become a baronet, Trollope comments that, "Indeed, there was no knowing what honours might not be achieved in the present days by money scattered with a liberal hand" (233). In these passages, Melmotte's power is equated with his wealth, but other passages prove that Trollope recognizes within the man a personal power that is independent of external trappings. When his financial empire is crumbling around him and he is in imminent danger of being jailed for forgery, Melmotte is yet able to carry himself as if nothing has happened, so that he himself, by his own demeanor, should not prove the truth of current rumors and accusations.

> The carrying an external look of indifference when the heart is sinking within,--or has sunk almost to the very ground,--is more than difficult; it is an agonizing task. In all mental suffering the sufferer longs for solitude,--for permission to cast himself loose along the ground, so that every limb and every feature of his person may faint in sympathy with his heart. A grandly urbane deportment over a crushed spirit and ruined hopes is beyond the physical strength of most men;--but there have been men so strong. Melmotte very nearly accomplished it. (II, 293)

Trollope further admires the man for his ability to analyze his own mistakes, not of principles, of course, but of tactics. "There was a certain manliness about him which showed itself perhaps as strongly in his own self-condemnation as in any other part of his conduct at this time. Judging himself as though he were standing outside himself and looking on to another man's work, he pointed out to himself his own shortcomings" (II, 295). Finally, when Melmotte realizes that everything is certainly over for him, he decides that

> He would stay at home till it was time for him to go down to the House, and then he would face the world there. He would dine down at the House, and stand about in the smoking-room with his hat on, and be visible in the lobbies and take his seat among his brother legislators,--and, if it were possible, rise on his legs and make a speech to them. He was about to have a crushing fall,--but the world should say that he had fallen like a man. (II, 304)

While Trollope is able to give ungrudging admiration to inner strength, as soon as that strength reaches out to control other people his deeply rooted belief that a person must be unscrupulous to be powerful, expressed unequivocally in his _Autobiography_, overrides his admiration.[4] People gain power over other people by taking advantage of their weaknesses.

> [E]xperience had told . . . [Melmotte] that men who were themselves only half-plucked, might easily be cowed by a savage assumption of superiority. And he, too, had generally the advantage of understanding the game, while those with whom he was concerned did not, at any rate, more than half understand it. He could thus trade either on the timidity or on the ignorance

> of his colleagues. When neither of these sufficed to give him undisputed mastery, then he cultivated the cupidity of his friends. (21

Even strong reformers, like John Bold, or staunch Conservatives, like Archdeacon Grantly, are suspect by Trollope's standards. Certainly Mrs. Proudie, Linda Tressel's aunt, Madame Staubach, Mrs. Bolton, and both the Earl and the Countess of Lovel in Lady Anna are heartily condemned for their tyranny. More than a little inner strength, according to Trollope, is likely to turn to outer strength and is too much of a good thing. Trollope even makes a plea for weakness.

> In social life we hardly stop to consider how much of that daring spirit which gives mastery comes from hardness of heart rather than from high purpose, or true courage. The man who succumbs to his wife, the mother who succumbs to her daughter, the master who succumbs to his servant, is as often brought to servility by a continual aversion to the giving of pain, by a softness which causes the fretfulness of others to be an agony to himself,--as by any actual fear which the firmness of the imperious one may have produced. There is an inner softness, a thinness of the mind's skin, an incapability of seeing or even thinking of the troubles of others with equanimity, which produces a feeling akin to fear; but which is compatible not only with courage, but with absolute firmness of purpose. (441-42)

Despite the fact that the soft one often prolongs the pain of the one he is supposedly protecting from pain, as Paul Montague prolongs the pain of Mrs. Hurtle by his inability to make a final break with her, despite the fact that the softness of a parent, like Lady Carbury, often leads to the ruin of her child, Trollope fears the impulse one

person has to impose his will on another. Combine this fear of power with Trollope's obvious horror of materialism and unscrupulousness, and imagine his reaction to a society that worhips Melmotte. Mrs. Hurtle, the American widow to whom Paul Montague has engaged himself and then unengaged himself, makes the keynote speech of the book.

> "I would sooner see that man than your Queen or any of your dukes or lords. They tell me that he holds the world of commerce in his right hand. What power;--what grandeur!"
> "Grand enough," said Paul, "if it all came honestly."
> "Such a man rises above honesty," said Mrs. Hurtle, "as a great general rises above humanity when he sacrifices an army to conquer a nation. Such greatness is incompatible with small scruples. A pigmy man is stopped by a little ditch, but a giant stalks over the rivers."
> "I prefer to be stopped by the ditches," said Montague. . . .
> "Ah,--you mean he is bold in breaking those precepts of yours about coveting worldly wealth. All men and women break that commandment, but they do so in a stealthy fashion, half drawing back the grasping hand, praying to be delivered from tempation while they filch only a little, pretending to despise the only thing that is dear to them in the world. Here is a man who boldly says that he recognizes no such law; that wealth is power, and that power is good, and that the more a man has of wealth the greater and the stronger and the nobler he can be.
> (245-46)

Mrs. Hurtle, an outsider like Melmotte himself, sees clearly the hypocrisy of the society that will soon crucify the man it now idolizes because he will be proved to have been doing exactly what people thought he was doing all along. Unlike Lady Carbury who worships wealth, Mrs. Hurtle admires power. Lady Carbury has no use for the man without the money; Mrs. Hurtle admires the man

himself. She, like Melmotte, is herself a figure of power. According to her, no Englishman can "stand firm on his own footing" (II, 195). While Londoners look to each other to tell them their minds, Mrs. Hurtle knows her own mind. Among other things she knows, she knows that she wants to marry Paul Montague.

Although Trollope allows Lady Carbury to marry happily at the end of the book, he does not allow Mrs. Hurtle to marry his English hero, Paul Montague. It is obviously not her morals or materialism that Trollope holds against Mrs. Hurtle; Lady Carbury shares them. It is her strength. Mrs. Hurtle herself once killed a man who was trying to rape her; another time she held off her no-good husband at gun point, divorced him, and legally secured her money from him. She asks Paul: "Is it because I protected myself from drunken violence that I am to be rejected? Am I to be cast aside because I saved my life while in the hands of a reprobate husband and escaped from him by means provided by law;--or because by my own energy I have secured my own property" (446)? Trollope's answer seems to be, "Yes!" "From the story as told by herself, what man would wish to marry her? She had seen so much of drunkenness, had become so handy with pistols, and had done so much of a man's work, that any man might well hesitate before he assumed to be her master" (446-47). Trollope admits that she is a loving woman, with many of the qualities all people love.

"She was conscious . . . of her own beauty. . . . And she knew herself to be clever, capable of causing happiness, and mirth and comfort. She had the qualities of a good comrade--which are so much in a woman" (451). Nevertheless, "Circumstances had made her what she was. Circumstances had been cruel to her. But she could not now alter them" (450). Despite her inborn good qualities, circumstances have forced Mrs. Hurtle to develop strength that, combined with her admiration of power makes her a dangerous and unfit bride for Paul Montague. Even though the moral actions she takes are acceptable, nonetheless, she is punished for them.

Marie Melmotte, Augustus Melmotte's daughter, is also a power figure, albeit on a smaller scale. She, also, is not permitted to marry the English Lord Nidderdale, who, while no great prize, is considerably better than the American opportunist Trollope marries her to at the end. Marie learns that if she refuses to give in to her father, even if he beats her, she does have some control over her own life. "I never will yield a bit for that," she says. "When he boxes and thumps me I always turn and gnash my teeth at him" (II, 167). Although she once steals from her father to elope with Felix Carbury, and once refuses to turn over to him money he had put in her name, the second offense she offers to rectify, and Trollope does understand that she behaves as she does only in self-defense. Melmotte "had taught her to regard him as her

natural enemy, making her aware that it was his purpose to use her as a chattel for his own advantage, and never allowing her for a moment to suppose that aught that he did was to be done for her happiness" (II, 256). Nevertheless, like Mrs. Hurtle, her circumstances and moral training make her, by Trollope's standards, unfit.

Although Mrs. Hurtle's and Marie Melmotte's moral standards may be no better than those of London society, they at least have power and vitality to lend some life and direction to the society of followers, each one of whom looks to the others for guidance. Trollope, however, considers powerful people without proper values dangerous to society; furthermore, he seems to feel that a powerful person with proper values is a contradiction in terms. The characters that are supposed to offer hope of redemption may be Hetta Carbury and her fiancé, Paul Montague, but they are too weak and ill-defined to serve the purpose. The group that shares Trollope's moral standards lives in the country and lacks power. Roger Carbury, cousin to Lady Carbury, avoids the city as much as possible because "The old-fashioned idea that the touching of pitch will defile still prevailed with him" (69). Lady Carbury claims that "He lived in a world which, though slow, had been good in its way; but which, whether bad or good, had now passed away" (283). He loves his cousin, Hetta, but his love is not returned and he claims, and his claim is believed, that he can never

love anyone else; he, therefore, will have no children--he is sterile. Of the two country clergymen that Trollope feels are good men, one is a Catholic priest, and, therefore, celibate; the other is a bishop who "never went up to London, and had no children" (148). The only other possibility for redemption lies with John Crumb, an inarticulate lower class countryman, whose fiancée Felix Carbury tries to seduce. Crumb goes to the city for just long enough to beat up Carbury, claim his bride, and retreat again to the country. Crumb's moral standards are good and he has the power to enforce them. His marriage gives promise of fertility, but, nevertheless, it is uncertain whether Trollope really intends to claim that society is so degenerate that "good" society must go altogether and the Crumbs, essentially noble savages, must save England.

London society, which is the focus of The Way We Live Now, is, at best, like Lord Nidderdale, weak, ineffective, and materialistic, at worst, like Sir Felix Carbury, weak, vicious, ineffective, and materialistic. If, by chance, a strong man should arise from this society, a man unable to accept either the weakness of this society or the moral restrictions of traditional society, who yet, unlike Melmotte, wishes to be a good man and do right, he might resemble Mr. Scarborough, the main character in Mr. Scarborough's Family. "All virtue and all vice were comprised by him in the words 'good-nature' and 'ill-

nature'."[5] He takes pride in his unselfishness. He is "bold, defiant, self-satisfied, and yet not selfish" (74). "He was a good-natured, fearless, but not a selfish man" (15). "He regarded himself as being altogether unselfish and virtuous from his point of view" (5). His lawyer, Mr. Grey, points out, however, that Mr. Scarborough "believes only in his own reason. . . . He is quite content with himself because he thinks that he has not been selfish. He cares nothing that he has robbed everyone all round" (157). The good-natured, unselfish Mr. Scarborough, in fact, is an egoist who sets himself up as the sole judge of right and wrong.

> All church-going propensities . . . he scorned from the very bottom of his heart. . . . And law was hardly less absurd to him than religion. It consisted of a perplexed entanglement of rules got together so that the few might live in comfort at the expense of the many. Robbery, if you could get to the bottom of it, was bad, as was all violence; but taxation was robbery, rent was robbery, prices fixed according to the desire of the seller and not in obedience to justice, were robbery. "Then you are the greatest of robbers," his friends would say to him. He would admit it, allowing that in such a state of society he was not prepared to go out and live naked in the streets if he could help it. (194)

Mr. Scarborough accepts no laws, whether God's or man's, as binding. He justifies this to himself in the same way Mrs. Proudie justifies herself--by redefining words to suit his purposes. He defines robbery out of existence--that is, until the word is meaningless and, therefore, not powerful over him. He claims he is not dishonest by redefining honesty. "That one set of words

should be deemed more wicked than another as in regard to swearing, was to him a sign either of hypocrisy, of idolatry, or a feminine weakness of intellect" (194). He lumps together all laws, secular, religious, and social, and calls them "conventionalities" (175). As his son Augustus says, "He sets God and man at absolute defiance" (68).

Mr. Scarborough, like Mrs. Bolton, perhaps, allows his ideas to determine his actions with a vengeance! What Mr. Scarborough does to set all laws "at absolute defiance" is to be married to his wife twice, once before the birth of his first son, Mountjoy, once before the birth of his second son, Augustus. The only purpose of this maneuver, so Mr. Scarborough thinks, is to protect his sons from the injustice of the entail, which stipulates that he, the father, does not own, but has only a lifetime interest in his estate, and the estate must pass to his eldest son. Mr. Scarborough assumes that, should all go well, his estate will go to his elder son; so that his second son might also be rich, he saves money rather than spending it on himself (2, 73). Nevertheless, should he so choose, Mr. Scarborough is prepared to make either son his legal elder son. Trollope says that Mr. Scarborough "was affectionate to his children, and anxious above all things for their welfare, or rather happiness" (1-2). Although some critics claim that Mr. Scarborough is a creation "original, almost to incredibility,"[6] in the matter of child rearing, he strongly resembles Lady Mason (<u>Orley</u>

Farm), Lady Arabella, Lady Carbury, and all other parents in Trollope's novels who want the best for their children and do not care how they achieve it, or whether their children agree with them as to what the best is. In other words, Mr. Scarborough misuses parental power. Like Lady Mason, in the name of justice, he puts his children's material welfare above the law of God or man; like Lady Arabella, he imposes his values on them; like Lady Carbury, he puts their happiness, not their welfare, before everything.

When Mr. Scarborough, a man so sick that he must shortly die, finds that his elder son, Mountjoy, has raised so much money on post obits from the Jews that "the whole property would at his death fall into their hands" (3), he initiates his contingency plan to put himself and his estate out of reach of the law. He produces his second marriage certificate and declares Mountjoy illegitimate. The estate, therefore, will at his death descend to his second son, Augustus, and the Jews will have no claim to anything. Augustus, in order to prevent a lawsuit at his father's death, and his father, in order to clear Mountjoy from debt, for the amount of the principal alone, buy up the worthless post obits from the moneylenders. "Since . . . [Mr. Scarborough] had fallen into business relations with his younger son, he had become convinced that a more detestable young man did not exist" (365-66). "[T]he idea, " therefore, "of doing some injury to Augustus was the one object that exercised

. . . his mind" (365). Having cleared Mountjoy of debt, so that anything he inherited would belong to him and not his creditors, Mr. Scarborough first decides to will all the furniture, cattle, books, silver, and general effects to Mountjoy, leaving only the bare house and land to Augustus. Then, his desire for vergence against Augustus still not satisfied, he produces the first marriage certificate and totally disinherits Augustus. Some critics treat Mr. Scarborough as a contemporary Robin Hood and admire his "radical morality" as Kincaid calls it, which they seem to feel is the only possible morality in a world in which traditional values, represented in this book by Mr. Grey, are dying.[7] These critics then project their approval onto Trollope using passages where Trollope serves as advocate for Mr. Scarborough, as he does for each of his characters, as pegs on which to hang their interpretation. Although critics might admire a Robin Hood figure, which, if one substitutes "robbing everyone to give to your sons" for "robbing the rich to give to the poor," Mr. Scarborough might resemble, Trollope would not. He is the last man to admire the well-meaning outlaw who rejects traditional values and usurps society's power in order to impose his will and his values on others.

Like Quintus Slide, the yellow journalist in Phineas Redux, Mr. Scarborough does not recognize his own motives or know he does wrong. Quintus Slide's article

> from beginning to end was full of falsehood and malice, and had been written with the express intention of creating prejudice against the man who had offended the writer. But Mr. Slide did not know that he was lying, and did not know that he was malicious. . . . [H]e had been led by practice to believe that the use of such weapons by one in his position was not only fair, but also beneficial to the public. . . . [T]he anonymous accusation of sinners in high rank was, on behalf of the public, the special duty of writers and editors attached to the public press.[8]

Likewise, although Mr. Scarborough thinks that he has done everything for his sons' benefit, and that his actions correct injustices inherent in the law, his underlying motive is power. "To run counter to the law! That had ever been the chief object of the squire's ambition. To arrange everything so that it should be seen that he had set all laws at defiance! That had been his great pride" (366). "The law, he thought, in endeavoring to make arrangements for his property,--the property which should have been his own,--had sinned so greatly as to drive a wise man to much scheming" (523). No reason is ever given or implied why Mr. Scarborough should feel that he is entitled to the property. His attitude towards "his" property is reminiscent of Lizzie Eustace's towards "her" necklace.

> She knew well enough that she was endeavoring to steal the Eustace diamonds, but she did not in the least know what power there might be in the law to prevent or to punish her for the intended theft. She knew well that the thing was not really her own; but there were, as she thought, so many points in her favor that she felt it to be a cruelty that anyone should grudge her the plunder. Was she not the only Lady Eustace living? . . . She would break her heart

> should she abandon her prey and afterward find that Mr. Camperdown would have been wholly powerless against her had she held on to it. (32-33)

Although Lizzie admits her impure motives to herself and Mr. Scarborough does not, her attitude, that she is in some way entitled to a piece of property that belongs not to her but to her husband's family, is very similar to his. Equally so is her approach to the law as a hostile power attempting to limit her power and, therefore, to be circumvented. In character, Augustus resembles Lizzie even more than his father does, and it is interesting to see Mr. Scarborough compare Augustus with himself.

> Augustus was very like his father in his capacity for organizing deceit, for plotting, and so contriving that his own will should be in opposition to the wills of all those around him. But they were thoroughly unlike in the object to be attained. Mr. Scarborough was not a selfish man. Augustus was selfish and nothing else. Mr. Scarborough hated the law,--because it was the law and endeavoured to put a restraint upon him and others. Augustus liked the law,--unless when in particular points it interfered with his own actions. Mr. Scarborough thought he could do better than the law. Augustus wished to do worse. (188)

Mr. Scarborough does not see that he and his son are equally dishonest, if not equally nice, and that of the two, he himself is surely the more dangerous. As unpleasant as Augustus is, he points out quite rightly that, if as at this time he believes, he is the rightful heir to the property, his father's

> "attempt to rob me of it was just the same as though he should break into a bank and steal what

> he found there. He knows that just as well as I do; but to suit his own purposes, he did it. . . . I don't suppose my father can be punished for his attempt to rob me of twenty thousand a year, and therefore he talks to me about it as though it were a good joke. Not only that, but he expects me to receive it in the same way." (45)

If Augustus were the rightful heir, then Mr. Scarborough had stolen his property to give it to Mountjoy. If one wishes to claim, as Mr. Scarborough does, that "a little delay in a ceremony in which he had no voice" (73) ought to make no difference in Mountjoy's prospects, then Mr. Scarborough had no right to reclaim the estate for Augustus only to cheat the moneylenders. Even if one wishes to say that the moneylenders are themselves so evil that it is proper to cheat them, then Mr. Scarborough should not have reinstated Mountjoy as heir only out of spite for Augustus. Any way one looks at it, Mr. Scarborough, although he is not selfish, wishes to exercise control of ownership over property which is not his--whatever his motives, his intention is theft. "The world says I'm dishonest, but I am not" (196), says he. One need not accept his statement as accurate, even if one chooses to accept it as sincere.

To understand clearly why Mr. Scarborough is a rogue instead of the unconventional hero he thinks he is requires one to understand Trollope's approach to the law. Law is a source of power in _Mr. Scarborough's Family_ much as money is a source of power in _The Way We Live Now_. Just as money is not in itself a power for good or for

evil, so law can be the one or the other, depending on how it is used. The law can be used, as Mr. Grey tries to use it, to promote justice, or as Mr. Scarborough uses it, to subvert justice. Mr. Grey rebukes Mr. Scarborough after he announces that Mountjoy is illegitimate.

> "You speak as though the law had given you the power of disinheriting him."
> "So it did."
> "But not the power of giving him the inheritance."
> "I took that upon myself. There I was stronger than the law. Now I simply and humbly ask the law to come and help me." (177)

The law is a set of rules agreed upon by members of a society to regulate fairly, and, indeed, make possible civilized interaction among themselves. The man who runs amok and ignores the law is antisocial in the truest sense. The outcome, if many men should follow Mr. Scarborough's "radical morality" would be that no man could trust another. "After having been so wickedly deceived by my own father, I can trust no one" (359), says Mountjoy. Although it is true that the law is absolutely essential to civilization, it is not true, as Augustus claims, that "the making of all right and wrong in this world depends on the law" (45), nor is it true that the laws should be "as Holy Writ" (526), as Mr. Grey regards them. Secular law is man-made, not God given. Trollope evidently believes, however, that there is a Higher Law and that secular law should be implemented with an eye to it. In <u>Orley Farm</u>, one of Trollope's

heroes, a fledgling attorney named Felix Graham, is credited by Trollope with the idea that lawyers (like speculators in The Three Clerks), "should be guided in their work by the general great rules of the world,--such for instance as those given in the commandments: --Thou shalt not bear false witness; Thou shalt not steal; and others."[9] In fact, one might suspect that the frequent misuse of the law in Mr. Scarborough's world, like the frequent misuse of money in The Way We Live Now, is partially due to the lack of religious faith apparent even in the good characters, like Mr. Grey (166). People need a set of values independent of social influences to teach them how to deal properly with one another in general and with money and the law in particular.

The presence of religion in the lives of the characters appears to be one of the chief differences between the main plot and the sub-plot in Mr. Scarborough's Family. In the sub-plot, Harry Annesley's father is a parson. Furthermore, Harry gets into trouble with his uncle, Mr. Prosper, by not listening to him read Sunday sermons to his household. Trollope's point seems to be not that the Annesley-Prosper clan is particularly religious but that religion is a regular part of their lives. The sub-plot as a whole is a running commentary on the main plot. Mr. Scarborough's continuous assertions that his unselfishness justifies his dishonesty are undercut by comments that Harry Annesley has "but little

of a young man's selfishness, with nothing of falseness or dishonesty" (21), and that Harry's family is "honest . . . unselfish . . . unpretending" (262). Mr. Scarborough has only the one virtue of unselfishness; more is better--and the one does not preclude the others. Mr. Scarborough becomes unjust because he seizes more power than the law allows him. Trollope, in his underplot, makes clear that trust, justice, fairness require not that one free oneself from the trammels of the law, but that one restrict oneself even more closely than the law requires. Mr. Prosper, Harry's uncle, tells Harry that he will not marry, and Harry can depend on inheriting his entailed estate, Buston. Mr. Prosper tells him also that it is unnecessary for him to train for a profession; he will make Harry an allowance so that the heir of Buston will not have to work for his living. Mr. Prosper hears malicious gossip about Harry, decides that Harry is fit neither for the inheritance nor for the allowance, makes plans to marry, and cuts off Harry's allowance. Harry, rightly, protests. "I suppose he can do it. The law will allow him. But the injustice would be monstrous" (215)! Harry's father, on the other hand, points out that

> "[T]here was a contract understood, if not made . . . [t]hat you should be to him as a son. . . . You might have sat by while he read a sermon to his sister and nieces. You understood his vanity, and you wounded it, knowing what you were doing. . . . He thinks that he is quarrelling with you about the affair in London, but it is in truth because you have declined to hear him read the sermons after having taken his money." (220-21, 224)

Both Harry and his uncle act improperly, not because the law of the land constrains them to do so--on the contrary. They do wrong because they ignore the obligations they owe each other in addition to their legal obligations. Note also that Mr. Prosper thinks he acts from one laudable motive, while, in fact, he acts from another, much less praiseworthy. Mr. Scarborough claims he acts for the welfare of his children, which he does try to do, but he acts as he does primarily because he hates the law "because it was the law, and endeavoured to put a restraint upon him" (188). The sub-plot, as a matter of fact, argues that one who acts like either Mr. Scarborough or Mr. Prosper is either a knave or a fool. Harry's father tells him about Mr. Prosper that

> "It is dreadful to have to depend on a fool,--to have to trust to a man who cannot tell wrong from right. Your uncle intends to be a good man. If it were brought home to him that he were doing a wrong he would not do it. He would not rob; he would not steal; he must not commit murder, and the rest of it. But he is a fool, and he does not know when he is doing these things." (239)

All Mr. Scarborough's rationalizations for his dishonesty are demolished. Right and wrong are not obscure, uncertain, esoteric concepts which only he can understand but clear and visible standards which only a fool can miss. Mr. Scarborough, then, is either a knave or a fool, and, in neither case can one trust him.

Mr. Scarborough likes to play God. "He would rob anyone,--but always to eke out his own gifts to other

people" (514). He takes it upon himself to decide who should have and who should want. In his unscrupulous pursuit of power, he says, "I have made efforts on behalf of others, in which I have allowed no outward circumstance to control me" (202-03). The outward circumstance which he has not allowed to control him is that Tretton, the estate he holds, does not belong to him. It could as easily refer to the existence of some unloved relative whose convenient demise would leave one of his sons heir to a fortune. Mr. Scarborough's self-righteous statement just says in fancy language that the ends justify the means. Quoted previously from The Three Clerks and here enlarged upon is Trollope's reaction to this philosophy.

> The object is good, but the means of attaining it--the path to the object--ah! there is the slip. Expediency is the dangerous wind by which so many of us have wrecked our little boats. . . . Every great man, who gains a great end by dishonest means, does more to deteriorate his country and lower the standard of his countrymen than legions of vulgar thieves, or nameless unaspiring rogues. . . . He has taught us a great lesson, that a man who has before him a mighty object may dispense with those old-fashioned rules of truth to his neighbours and honesty to his own principles, which should guide us in ordinary life. At what point ordinary life ends, at what crisis objects may be considered great enough to justify the use of a dispensing power, that he has not taught us; . . . That must unfortunately be left to the judgment of the individual. How prone we are, each of us, to look on our own object as great. (355-56)

Scarborough is, like Alaric Tudor, a rogue, or, more charitably, like Mr. Prosper, a fool. "One cannot make an apology for him without being ready to throw all truth and all morality to the dogs. But if you can

imagine for yourself a state of things in which neither truth nor morality shall be thought essential, then old Mr. Scarborough would be your hero" (567-68). This, the opinion of Mr. Merton, Mr. Scarborough's resident doctor, an objective observer, Kincaid interprets to mean that, in the context of the society of the book, "Conventional truth and conventional morality are indeed both inessential and irrelevant, and Mr. Scarborough is therefore certainly our hero, one of the very few absolute heroes in Trollope."[10] Even Kincaid does not attempt to argue that Trollope advocates dumping truth and morality, but it is Kincaid, not Trollope, who prefaces the words "truth" and morality" with the adjective, "conventional." Mr. Scarborough puts himself above truth and above morality and demands that the world accept his idiosyncratic values. Nowhere in his entire ouevre does Trollope support this kind of tyranny or this kind of tyrant. As we have seen, he opposes it in The Three Clerks (1858), in Orley Farm (1862), and, as we shall see, in his Life of Cicero (1880). ApRoberts quotes his Life as Trollope restates the position he adoped twenty-two years before in The Three Clerks: "'To say that Caesar was justified in the armed position which he took in Northern Italy . . . is to rob him of his praise.' The method of the man was to defy law and justice. If you admire Caesar, you must admire him as lawbreaker. But 'there are some of us who think that such a man, let him be ever so great . . . will in the end do more harm than good.'"[11] Interestingly

enough, Polhemus bases a sympathetic interpretation of Mr. Scarborough on the same passage Kincaid uses by commenting that, "People, of course, *were* increasingly ready to throw all absolute notions of truth and morality to the dogs."[12] Trollope does not quote the objective Mr. Merton as saying anything about absolute or relative truth and morality. He plainly claims one must throw out "*all* truth and *all* morality" (italics mine).

"The old man has cared nothing for God or man," says Mr. Barry, Mr. Grey's not over-scrupulous law partner, but, "in my mind he has been so clever that he ought to be forgiven all his rascality" (562-63). This is an attitude similar to the one Trollope fights in *The Way We Live Now*. "A certain class of dishonesty, dishonesty magnificent in its proportions, " says Trollope in his *Autobiography*, "has become at the same time so rampant and so splendid that there seems to be reason for fearing that men and women will be taught to feel that dishonesty, if it can become splendid, will cease to be abominable."[13] Polhemus is evidently willing to assume that Trollope would differentiate here between "splendid" and "benevolent" and "successful." "Old Scarborough tells lies, manipulates people, cheats his son's creditors, swindles another son, ruins his dead wife's good name, but he does all this out of benevolent motives. Moreover, he gets good results."[14] To Polhemus, Mr. Scarborough is, not a hero, but a man of "integrity"[15] because his

dishonesty is, by his own standards, well-meaning, and, perhaps, by some standard, successful. Mr. Scarborough's desire to do right and his affectionate heart and "good-nature" would seem, by Trollope's standards, to qualify him as a sympathetic figure, but not as a man of integrity. It is surprising that Polhemus, who so beautifully explains Trollope's love for "the virtue of powerlessness" and the "positive will not to control others,"[16] suggests that Trollope considers a man who "manipulates people" a man of integrity. One might also question Mr. Scarborough's success. He sees his children's happiness, not to say welfare, as tied exclusively to their material well-being and, therefore, does not examine any non-material considerations before he declares Mountjoy illegitimate.

> It did not occur to him that, in making such a revelation as to his son's mother, he would inflict any great grief on his son's heart. To be illegitimate would be, he thought, nothing unless illegitimacy carried with it loss of property. . . . The two brothers had hitherto lived together on fairly good terms. . . . How it might be between them when their relations with each other should be altogether changed, Mr. Scarborough did not trouble himself to enquire. (6-7)

Mr. Scarborough's "good results" in addition to those things Polhemus already named, include bringing his sons to hate each other passionately, bringing himself to hate Augustus and vice versa, totally destroying the career and reputation of his friend and lawyer, Mr. Grey--and all for nothing. On his deathbed, Mr. Scarborough asks Mountjoy, now heir to everything, to do "something" (565)

for his brother, Augustus, who has been ruined by his father's wrath, and Mr. Scarborough's last intelligible words are, "With such a property as this in your hands, gambling becomes very serious" (567). Mountjoy provides for Augustus, although probably not as lavishly as he had been provided for originally, and then gambles away for the second time the property his father was so determined to save.

Mr. Scarborough, as T. H. S. Escott explains, "has conceived and nursed, till it becomes something like a monomania, a detestation of legal restrictions generally and those imposed by the law of entail in particular."[17] This idea, joined with his strong will and intelligence leads him to attempt to impose his will and his standards on those around him, with what success we have seen. In a world where the law has ceased to function as a tool to further morality and has become an end in itself "making all right and wrong in this world," or the "Holy Writ", Mr. Scarborough usurps the power of the law and makes it function to serve his own ends, which, he convinces himself, are moral. "How prone we are, each of us, to look on our own object as great." Just as in the vacuum left by the decay of traditional morality in the world of The Way We Live Now, money fills the place of God and provides society with a set of values, so here Mr. Scarborough tries to fill that place with his own will and impose not his own set of values, as he thinks, but his own desires on the world.

NOTES

[1] Dorothy Van Ghent, The English Novel: Form and Function (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), p. 128.

[2] Cockshut, p. 205.

[3] apRoberts, p. 63.

[4] Trollope, Autobiography, p. 309.

[5] Anthony Trollope, Mr. Scarborough's Family (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 194. Subsequent references to this edition appear in the text.

[6] Unsigned Notice, Critical Heritage, p. 515.

[7] Kincaid, p. 251.

[8] Anthony Trollope, Phineas Redux (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), pp. 249-50. Subsequent references to this edition appear in the text.

[9] Anthony Trollope, Orley Farm (1951; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 175.

[10] Kincaid, p. 254.

[11] apRoberts, pp. 58-59.

[12] Polhemus, p. 241.

[13] Trollope, Autobiography, p. 304.

[14] Polhemus, p. 240.

[15] Polhemus, p. 241.

[16] Polhemus, p. 140.

[17] T. H. S. Escott, Anthony Trollope (New York: Kennikat Press, 1967), p. 298.

POLITICS

> I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat. --John Milton
> *Areopagitica*

Just as money and power are closely linked in *The Way We Live Now*, and the law and power in *Mr. Scarborough's Family*, so politics and power are linked in *Phineas Finn*, *Phineas Redux*, and *The Prime Minister*. In these three novels, Trollope examines the proper, the moral use of power in the political arena. Proper use of political power must be considered separately from use and abuse of other types of power because political power, like parental and marital authority, what Juliet McMaster calls "the politics of love,"[1] must be exercised. One may refrain from using money or the law as tools to extend control over other people; one may, like Mr. Harding, never try to control others. Nevertheless, parents must rear their children, husbands (according to Trollope) guide their wives, politicians govern their countrymen. Every person must assume responsibility for exercising power wisely at some time in his life and also for deciding how far to submit to and how far to rebel against power used to control him at other times. Proper use of power,

proper submission to power and proper rebellion against power, maintenance of a reasonable balance of power, all constitute moral political action. On the one hand, as Trollope points out in <u>The Way We Live Now</u>, one need not give ones "hinder parts to be kicked merely because . . . [another person] put[s] up his toe" (II, 135). On the other hand, when Phineas Finn says, "a man in office must be a slave," Mr. Monk bluntly replies, "You cannot do joint work with other men altogether after your own fashion" (PF, II, 252-53). The key is balance.

Trollope, who is usually very suspicious of power and those who wield it, makes an exception in favor of politics and politicians.

> I have always thought that to sit in the British Parliament should be the highest object of ambition to every educated Englishman. I do not mean to suggest that every educated Englishman should set before himself a seat in Parliament as a probable or even possible career; but that the man in Parliament has reached a higher position than the man out,--that to serve one's country without pay is the grandest work that a man can do,--that of all studies the study of politics is the one in which a man may make himself most useful to his fellow-creatures,--and that of all lives, public political life is capable of the greatest efforts.[2]

This is perhaps why Phineas Finn's decision to take a seat in Parliament when it virtually falls into his lap, despite the fact that it means giving up his career for a number of years and remaining financially dependent on his father, is not seriously condemned. <u>Phineas Finn</u>, <u>Phineas Redux</u>, and <u>The Prime Minister</u> picture political

life as Trollope sees it. The first two describe the coming of age of the fledgling politician Phineas Finn. In the first book Phineas is made aware of the positive side of political life, in the second, the negative. The factor that gives Phineas the opportunity to exercise political virtue at all is his pleasant personality. In The Prime Minister Trollope explains that the greatest gift a Prime Minister, and, by extension, any politician, can have is "the power of attracting personal friends. . . . [T]he man who can be all things to all men, who has ever a kind word to speak, a pleasant joke to crack, who can forgive all sins, who is ever prepared for friend or foe but never very bitter to the latter, who forgets not men's names, and is always ready with little words,--he is the man who will be supported at a crisis."[3] This is just the power that Phineas has. "Nature had been very good to him, making him comely inside and out,--and with this comeliness he had crept into popularity" (PF, II, 22).

> It soon came to be admitted by all who knew Phineas Finn that he had a peculiar power of making himself agreeable which no one knew how to analyse or define. "I think it is because he listens so well," said one man. "But the women would not like him for that," said another. "He has studied when to listen and when to talk," said a third. The truth, however, was, that Phineas Finn had made no study in the matter at all. It was simply his nature to be pleasant. (PF, 118)

One critic complains that Trollope gives Phineas "no strictly individual life."[4] Since Phineas has to ability to be "all things to all men," this does imply that "[h]e

lacks something in individuality. He is a little too much a friend to everybody" (PF, II, 309). If this were not true, however, he would be less successful as a politician. His charm first gets Phineas the offer of a seat and later buoys up his political success. He questions his own good fortune. "Why,--what was his income? What his birth? What his proper position" (PF, 255)? His pleasant personality alone gives Phineas entrée into the political world. This world, to Trollope, is the most desirable world of all, but political virtue, unlike Roger Carbury's "fugitive and cloistered virtue," which is afraid to touch pitch lest it be defiled (WWLN, 69), is forced to sally out to meet her adversary and must run her race despite dust and heat.

The first leg of the race any budding politician must run depends upon learning how to use properly that small unit of power that belongs to him, his vote. Even before obtaining his seat, Phineas must evaluate and cope with pressures from without and from within, all pushing him to cast his vote in one direction or another. Pressures from without come first from the different people with whom Phineas surrounds himself. The man who recruited him for the Liberal party, Barrington Erle, is repulsed when Phineas claims that he wishes to look to measures rather than to men.

> "I wouldn't change my view in politics either for you or for the Earl, though each of you carried seats in your breeches pockets. If I go into Parliament, I

> shall go there as a sound Liberal,--not to support a party, but to do the best I can for the country."
>
> Barrington Erle turned away in disgust. Such language was to him simply disgusting. It fell upon his ears as false maudlin sentiment falls on the ears of the ordinary honest man of the world. Barrington Erle was a man ordinarily honest. . . . He was convinced that Liberal politics were good for Englishmen, and that Liberal politics and the Mildmay party were one and the same thing. It would be unfair to Barrington Erle to deny to him some praise for patriotism. But he hated the very name of independence in Parliament, and when he was told of any man, that that man intended to look to measures and not to men, he regarded that man as being both unstable as water and dishonest as the wind. . . . With a good Conservative opponent he could shake hands almost as readily as with a good Whig ally; but the man who was neither flesh nor fowl was odious to him. (PF, 14-15)

Mr. Low, "the barrister, with whom . . . [Phineas] had been reading for the last three years" (PF, 42), on the other hand, says that he sees nothing "that can satisfy any manly heart" in taking political office where one must always vote the party line.

> "Even if you are successful, what are you to become? You will be the creature of some minister, not his colleague. You are to make your way up the ladder by pretending to agree whenever agreement is demanded from you, and by voting whether you agree or do not. And what is to be your reward? Some few precarious hundreds a year, lasting just so long as a party may remain in power and you can retain a seat in Parliament! It is at the best slavery and degradation, --even if you are lucky enough to achieve the slavery." (PF, 46)

Mr. Low believes in political independence, and Trollope apparently accepts his point of view as a legitimate one, if not the only legitimate one. Political independence, however, does not guarantee Trollope's

approval. Mr. Turnbull, a Radical political demagogue, is also an independent, but Trollope is even less pleased with his political position than with Barrington Erle's. Turnbull enjoys his power and rather than compromising his popularity by working constructively with the government, he always sits in Opposition.

> Having nothing to construct, he could always deal with generalities. Being free from responsibility, he was not called upon either to study details or to master even great facts. It was his business to inveigh against existing evils, and perhaps there is no easier business when once the privilege of an audience has been attained. It was his work to cut down forest-trees, and he had nothing to do with the subsequent cultivation of the land. (PF, 163)

Mr. Monk, also a Radical, whom Phineas adopts as his mentor, meets with considerably more approval from Trollope than does Mr. Turnbull. Mr. Turnbull challenges Mr. Monk's decision to take a seat in the Liberal cabinet.

> "I cannot reconcile your known opinions with the practices of your colleagues." . . .
> "I thought that they might possibly leaven the batch of bread which we have to bake,--giving to the whole batch more of the flavour of reform than it would have possessed had I absented myself. . . .
> "You could have supported them, if anything were proposed worthy of support," said Mr. Turnbull.
> "Yes; but I could not have been so effective in taking care that some measure be proposed worthy of support as I may possibly be now." (PF, 165)

Direct influence from the people is also brought to bear on Phineas. His landlord, Mr. Bunce, is another Radical who wins Trollope's respect if not his agreement. Even though Mr. Bunce does not have the vote, he is active

politically. When Mrs. Bunce and Phineas try to convince him not to demonstrate for the ballot by citing his responsibilities as a husband and father, he answers: "If everybody with a wife and family was to say so, there'd be none there but roughs, and then where should we be? What would the Government people say to us then? If every man with a wife and family was to show hisself in the streets to-night, we should have the ballot before Parliament breaks up, and if none of 'em don't do it, we shall never have the ballot" (PF, 230). Note that despite the range of opinions expressed on vote casting, whether one should vote men or measures, whether one should compromise one's independence of action by accepting a government position, or not, all Phineas' acquaintances except Mr. Low are either Radicals or Liberals.

> He, Phineas, had come into Parliament as it were under the wing of a Government pack, and his friendships, which had been very successful, had been made with Ministers, and with the friends of Ministers. He had make up his mind to be Whig Ministerial, and to look for his profession in that line. He had been specially fortified in this resolution by his dislike to the ballot,--which dislike had been the result of Mr. Monk's teaching. Had Mr. Turnbull become his friend instead, it may well be that he would have liked the ballot. . . . But now he began to reflect how far this ministerial profession would suit him. Would it be much to be a Lord of the Treasury, subject to the dominion of Mr. Ratler? Such lordship and such subjection would be the result of success. . . . Would it not be better for him to abandon the idea of office trammels and go among them on the People's Banner? . . . But what would Violet Effingham say to the People's Banner and Quintus Slide? (PF, 243)

The influence of the political company he keeps certainly

does have a significant influence on Phineas' developing political convictions and decisions.

Besides the influences of those members of his own particular political-social group, influences from the society at large also affect Phineas' decisions. Talk, gossip, newspapers all have significant impact on a politician's position, and, therefore, he will often go far to placate any one or any combination of them. To Phineas, for instance, "there quickly came . . . a reputation for practical usefulness. . . . And no man seemed to know how his reputation had come" (PF, II, 22). Furthermore, when the People's Banner published a condemnatory article about Phineas' duel with Lord Chiltern, Trollope comments:

> Certainly I think that the duel did him no harm in society. Otherwise he would hardly have been asked to a semi-political dinner at Lady Glencora Palliser's, even though he might have been invited to make one of the five hundred guests who were crowded into her saloons and staircases after the dinner was over. To have been one of the five hundred was nothing; but to be one of the sixteen was a great deal. (PF, II, 23)

In _Phineas Finn_, Phineas is fortunate that these ill-defined but powerful forces work for him most of the time rather than against him. In _Phineas Redux_ he is not so lucky. Even towards the end of _Phineas Finn_, what people say becomes more important to Phineas as it becomes less benign. Although loss of his salary will necessitate his withdrawal from political life, Phineas makes it clear

that he intends to resign from office in order to vote against the party and support an Irish tenant-rights bill introduced by his friend, Mr. Monk. A political enemy from his own party, Mr. Bonteen, accuses Phineas of acting coy.

> The last words which Bonteen had spoken made it impossible to him now not to support his old friend Mr. Monk. It was not only what Bonteen had said, but that the words of Mr. Bonteen so plainly indicated what would be the words of all the other Bonteens. He knew that he was weak in this. He knew that had he been strong, he would have allowed himself to be guided,--if not by the firm decision of his own spirit,--by the counsels of such men as Mr. Gresham and Lord Cantrip, and not by the sarcasms of the Bonteens and Ratlers of official life. But men who sojourn admidst savagery fear the mosquito more than they do the lion. He could not bear to think that he should yield his blood to such a one as Bonteen. (PF, II, 297)

On the same issue he thinks to himself:

> He did wish that he had been a little less in love with independence, a little quieter in his boastings that no official considerations should ever silence his tongue. But all this was too late now. He knew that his skin was not thick enough to bear the arrows of those archers who would bend their bows against him if he should now dare to vote against Mr. Monk's motion. His own party might be willing to forgive and forget; but there would be others who would read those reports, and would appear in the House with the odious tell-tale newspapers in their hands. (PF, II, 275)

That trait of being thin-skinned, which Phineas shares with Plantagenet Palliser, the main character in The Prime Minister, endows talk, gossip, and newspapers with increasingly greater influence on their political action, whether moral or otherwise.

Whether here social influence is for good or for evil, whether Phineas is right or wrong to give up office to vote his conscience, is hard to judge. "Perhaps there is no question more difficult to a man's mind than that of the expediency or inexpediency of scruples in political life" (PF, II, 179-80). Certainly this question is important in the Phineas novels and paramount in The Prime Minister. Although Trollope never opts simply for expediency, he does opt for certain men putting aside personal convictions for the higher principle of serving the country. As it is in The Warden, the moral choice presented is not one between a good and an evil, but a choice between two goods. Trollope describes the necessities of government and the qualifications for statesmanship.

> Four-and-twenty gentlemen will amalgamate themselves into one whole, and work for one purpose, having each of them to set aside his own idiosyncrasy, and to endure the close personal contact of men who must often be personally disagreeable, having been thoroughly taught that in no other way can they serve either their country or their own ambition. These are the men who are publicly useful, . . . as to whom I have never ceased to wonder that stones of such strong calibre should be so quickly worn down to the shape and smoothness of rounded pebbles. . . . To rid oneself of fine scruples--to fall into the traditions of a party--to feel the need of subservience, not only in acting but also even in thinking--to be able to be a bit, and at first only a very little bit, --these are the necessities of the growing statesman. . . . To become a good, round, smooth, hard, useful pebble is his duty, and to achieve this he must harden his skin and swallow his scruples.[5]

Trollope seems to sympathize with Monk who tells Phineas

that "his conscience was of that restless, uneasy sort which is neither useful nor manly" (PF, II, 78). Lord Cantrip, like Monk another positive role model for Phineas, tells him flatly that "A man in office,--in an office which really imposed upon him as much work as he could possibly do with credit to himself or his cause,--was dispensed from the necessity of a conscience with reference to other matters" (PF, II, 284). But Phineas feels he must "throw up his position, resign his seat, and go to work at the Bar instantly, if he found that his independence as a man required him to do so" (PF, II, 269). Note that Phineas is thinking as much in terms of power as in terms of morality and scrupulousness. Nevertheless, Trollope certainly agrees that if Phineas must choose between his feeling of "independence as a man" and his party, he must throw over his party; Phineas' increased ability to accommodate his principles to political necessity in Phineas Redux, however, indicates that Trollope might feel that if he chooses to be a politician, a man must so train himself that each time his principles conflict with government policy, he should not experience a crisis of conscience. Exactly how much Phineas bases his decision to give up his office and vote his conscience on true scruples, and how much on fear, as a thin-skinned man, of what people will say if he votes with his party after supporting Monk's bill and asserting his own independence so vigorously, it is, perhaps, unnecessary to determine.

Despite the fact that Phineas' retirement at the end of Phineas Finn may not have Trollope's unqualified approval, Phineas' conscience, scruples, and "unbuyableness," although they might lessen Finn's political usefulness, reaffirm the reader's faith in political honesty. Even the members of the government that he leaves seem to respect him. Lord Cantrip reassures Phineas that his political life is not over. "We shall have you back again before long, I don't doubt" (PF, II, 328). The Prime Minister, Mr. Gresham, says, "These things will occur in political life, . . . but I think that they seldom leave rancour behind them when the purpose is declared, and when the subject of disagreement is marked and understood" (PF, II, 329). From the moment of entering the world of Phineas Redux, however, the pleasant political world of Phineas Finn is left behind. The political world of Phineas Redux is dark and bleak. Trollope says that Phineas "had had the pleasant things of parliamentary adventure, and now must undergo those which were unpleasant" (PR, 32). The very borough Phineas stands for is dark and dirty.

> Tankerville was a dirty, prosperous, ungainly town, which seemed to exude coal-dust or coal-mud at every pore. It was so well recognised as being dirty that people did not expect to meet each other with clean hands and faces. Linen was never white at Tankerville, and even ladies who sat in drawing-rooms were accustomed to the feel and taste and appearance of soot. . . . At Tankerville coal was much loved, and was not thought to be dirty. Mr. Ruddles [the local Liberal agent] was very much begrimed himself, and some of the leading

> Liberal electors, upon whom Phineas Finn had already called, seemed to be saturated with the product of the district. (PR, 31)

Although the voters of Tankerville are blackened by political corruption, are accustomed to elect the candidate who pays highest for their votes, are influenced by candidate's campaign promises which are made only for political effect without reference to their desirability or feasibility, the voters at Tankerville are in fact no more politically dishonest than those of the two pocket boroughs Phineas represents in Phineas Finn. Lord Tulla, who controls Loughshane, the first borough Phineas stands for tells Finn, "We won't discuss politics, if you please, Mr. Finn; because, as I have already said, I am throwing aside all political considerations" (PF, 16). When Phineas goes to the Earl of Brentford's borough, Loughton, one of the townsmen comes up to him and says: "'Never mind what you hear about a Tory candidate, Mr. Finn, . . . the Earl can do what he pleases here.' And it seemed to Phineas that it was thought by them all to be rather a fine thing to be thus held in the hand by an English nobleman" (PF, 296-97). Throughout Phineas Redux incident parallels incident from Phineas Finn. In the latter book, Phineas is aware of political corruption, but in that book he need not confront it directly and also benefits from it; in Phineas Redux, Phineas must confront it and suffer from it. Phineas knew that Loughshane and Loughton should have been disenfranchised, but until there was

a vote on the matter, he had nothing to do with their existence and little to do to win their seats. In Tankerville, Phineas must actively rather than passively share the corruption. He must canvass; he must support Church disestablishment, not because he favors it, but because it is politic to do so. Although he personally is only mildly interested in disestablishment, he "made two or three great speeches every evening, and astonished even Mr. Ruddles by his oratory. He had accepted Mr. Ruddles's proposition with but lukewarm acquiescence, but in the handling of the matter he became zealous, fiery, and enthusiastic" (PR, 36). Campaigning in Tankerville is no more unscrupulous than standing for pocket boroughs, but as it is more active, so it grates more strongly against Phineas' thin skin.

After the elections are over, Mr. Daubeny, the Conservative Prime Minister, makes a last bid for remaining in power with an overwhelming Liberal majority against him in the House. He announces that his party will bring forth a bill to disestablish the Church! The whole political world is in chaos. Phineas discusses it with the Duke of St. Bungay.

> "Why should he do it at all? asked Phineas.
> "That's what everybody asks, but the answer seems to be so plain! Because he can do it, and we can't. He will get from our side much support and we should get none from his."
> "There is something to me sickening in their dishonesty," said Phineas energetically. (PR, 116)

Phineas forgets that he himself used the Church issue to gain power, although the fact that he at least mildly approves of disestablishment puts him, perhaps, slightly above Daubeny in scrupulousness. Although this clever ploy may keep the Conservatives in power for a while longer, the Conservatives themselves are almost as unhappy as the Liberals.

> At the great stronghold of conservative policy in Pall Mall men were silent, embarrassed, and unhappy. . . . To these gentlemen there could be no triumph, whether Mr. Daubeny went out or remained in office. They had been betrayed;--but as a body were unable even to accuse the traitor. As regarded most of them they had accepted the treachery and bowed their heads beneath it, by means of their votes. And as to the few who had been staunch,--they also were cowed by a feeling that they had been instrumental in destroying their own power by endeavouring to protect a doomed institution. (PR, 348)

The question of party or principle once again raises its head. After having vigorously condemned Daubeny for introducing a measure Conservatives cannot believe in, Phineas must decide whether or not to vote for the bill advocating that reform which he was so outspoken in supporting at Tankerville. The Liberal leader, Mr. Gresham, has decided to call upon the House "to reject the Church Bill simply because it was proposed from that side of the House on which the minority was sitting" (PR, 276). Barrington Erle makes clear to Phineas that he will be expected to vote with his party.

> "By the bye, Phineas, we must have no tricks on this Church matter. We mean to do all we can to throw

> out the second reading."
> "You know what I said at the hustings."
> "D--- the hustings. I know what Browborough said, and Browborough voted like a man with his party. You were against the Church at the hustings, and he was for it. You will vote just the other way." . . .
> "I don't know that I can do that."
> "By heavens, if you don't, you shall never more be officer of ours,--though Laura Kennedy should cry her eyes out." (PR, 119)

Contrast this rough speech to the almost laudatory comments of Lord Cantrip and Mr. Gresham when, in Phineas Finn, it is clear that Phineas is going to vote against his party on principle. Phineas does vote with his party, whether because he becomes convinced of the merits of the Liberal position, or because he wants office, or both. But here, as in Mr. Scarborough's Family, there is no doubt that Trollope is telling his readers that something, whether correctable or not, is rotten in English politics. The Conservative party presents a bill for Church disestablishment which the Liberal party defeats. Browborough, whose campaign against Finn at Tankerville is based on the slogan, "The prosperity of England depends on the Church of her people" (PR, 36), votes with his party for disestablishment. Phineas, who makes three speeches a night in favor of disestablishment, votes against Daubeny's bill. It is more than significant that the chapter in which the vote is taken is called "Seventy-Two," which is the margin by which the Liberals defeated Daubeny's Church Bill. In Phineas Finn, Clause 72 exempted certain pocket boroughs from disenfranchisement. At the

time the vote on Clause 72 was to be taken, Phineas was the sitting member for one of the boroughs named, and a member of the Liberal government which was trying to save them. He asks himself, "Could he, an ardent reformer, a reformer at heart,--could he say that such a borough as Loughton should be spared" (PF, II, 46)? He comes to the conclusion that, as a member of the government, he must vote to spare the borough, and he does. Trollope is forcibly reminding the reader that Phineas has dealt with the conflict of party and principle previously, and then, too, decided to vote with his party. The difference lies in the fact that the first time, he had not taken a stand on an issue and then been forced to reverse it. Political necessities have not changed, but the necessity of Phineas' conformity to them is something that, in Phineas Finn, Phineas is able either to rationalize, ignore, or put out of his mind. In Phineas Redux he is allowed to do nothing to sweeten the bitterness of his capitulation. Compromising principles disturbs Phineas' conscience; doing so publicly, for one so morbidly sensitive to public opinion as he, hurts his pride.

Newspapers, gossip, and personal influence do nothing to make Phineas any happier and go a long way toward making him, as they later make Palliser, miserable. In Phineas Finn, negative newspaper articles about Finn are ineffectual. Even his duel with Lord Chiltern, publicized by the People's Banner, does not hurt him.

In Phineas Redux, on the other hand, the same newspaper that attacked Finn in Phineas Finn, is, like Tankerville, obviously blackened by corruption.

> Mr. Quintus Slide was now, as formerly, the editor of the People's Banner, but a change had come over the spirit of his dream. His newspaper was still the People's Banner, and Mr. Slide still professed to protect the existing rights of the people, and to demand new rights for the people. But he did so as a Conservative. He had watched the progress of things, and had perceived that duty called upon him to be the organ of Mr. Daubeny. (PR, 194)

Worse than ohanging his politics, Slide, in the name of "purity of morals" (PR, 201), threatens Finn with a letter from Lady Laura Kennedy's estranged husband charging his wife and Phineas, if not with adultery, than certainly with very improper behavior. Slide says he will publish the letter if Finn cannot arrange a reconciliation between Lady Laura and her half-mad husband. Darkness of mind touches Kennedy, but also touches Slide, who really believes that "there isn't a peer among 'em all as would live with his wife constant, if it was not for the press" (PR, 200). When Finn asks why Slide threatens him, Slide answers:

> "Morals! Morals! We shall be able to say that we've done our best to promote domestic virtue and secure forgiveness for an erring wife. You've no notion, Finn, in your mind of what will soon be the hextent of the duties, privileges, and hinfluences of the daily press. . . . If we see that we can induce the lady to go back to her husband, we shall habstain from publishing, and virtue will be its own reward. I needn't tell you that such a letter as that would sell a great many copies, Finn." (PR, 202-03)

Furthermore, Slide plunges Phineas into the darkness

shared by himself and Kennedy, very nearly permanently, by encouraging Phineas to see Mr. Kennedy. Kennedy tries to kill him. The salaciousness, love of power, and greed of the editor of the People's Banner are emphasized in _Phineas Redux_, where, although apparent, they are left in the background in _Phineas Finn_. In _Phineas Redux_, unlike in _Phineas Finn_, when Slide does publish, his articles do affect both Finn's feelings and his career.

> And he did believe that such an article as that would have the effect of shutting against him the gates of that dangerous paradise which he desired to enter. He had no great claim upon his party; and, in giving away the good things of office, the giver is only too prone to recognize any objections against an individual which may seem to relieve him from the necessity of bestowing aught in that direction. Phineas felt that he would almost be ashamed to show his face at the clubs or in the House. He must do so as a matter of course, but he knew that he could not do so without confessing by his visage that he had been deeply wounded by the attack in the People's Banner.
> (PR, 250-51)

Like the political necessities that Finn must, but cannot, comfortably accept, newspaper attacks pierce his thin skin, adversely affect his career, and further disillusion him with political life.

Gossip, which in _Phineas Finn_ did not bother Phineas because it helped rather than hurt him, in _Phineas Redux_ becomes libelous and damaging. Not only that, but personal influence, the Brentfords' and Lady Laura's in particular, which was so valuable to him in _Phineas Finn_, is now disastrous. People in general, and Mr. Bonteen in

particular (PR, 280), believe in Phineas' non-existent adulterous relationship with Lady Laura.

> His luck had been against him throughout. Mr. Quintus Slide, with his People's Banner, and the story of that wretched affair in Judd Street, had been as strong against him probably as Mr. Bonteen's ill-word. Then he thought of Lady Laura, and her love for him. His gratitude to Lady Laura was boundless. There was nothing he would not do for Lady Laura,--were it in his power to do anything. But no circumstance in his career had been so unfortunate for him as this affection. A wretched charge had been made against him which, though wholly untrue, was as it were so strangely connected with the truth, that slanderers might not improbably be able almost to substantiate their calumnies. (PR, 329)

When the ladies, especially the Duchess of Omnium, try to pressure the Liberal establishment to give Phineas a place, their attempt, unlike that in Phineas Finn which succeeds, backfires. "Mr. Gresham was firmly resolved that no woman's fingers should have anything to do with his pie" (PR, 360). In Phineas Finn, Phineas' luck was all good. "As he thought of it he remembered stories of great generals who were said to have chained Fortune to the wheels of their chariots, but it seemed to him that the goddess had never served any general with such staunch obedience as she had displayed in his cause" (PF, II, 105). In Phineas Redux, as he says, "His luck had been against him throughout." The power of newspaper articles, gossip, and influence does not bother Phineas as long as it does not hurt him; the unfairness of their power impresses itself on Phineas only when that unfairness directly hurts him.

No facts have changed--not even situations have changed, but the world, in Phineas Redux, becomes dark to Phineas. "There is no honesty in the life we lead" (PR, II, 37), he says. To cap Phineas' disillusionment, he is arrested and tried for the murder of Mr. Bonteen. Thanks to the heroic efforts of Madame Max Goesler, whom he later marries, he is honorably acquitted. He leaves prison even more embittered, sadder, and more pessimistic than before. To Lady Laura he writes, "I am to be re-elected triumphantly at Tankerville without a penny of cost or the trouble of asking for a vote, simply because I didn't knock poor Mr. Bonteen on the head" (PR, II, 277). He forgets the equally meaningless elections at Loughshane and Loughton. Mr. Daubeny provokes another spurt of bitterness from Phineas when he welcomes Phineas back to the House during one of his speeches. Phineas complains to Mr. Monk.

> I hate men who can make capital out of occasions, who can be neat and appropriate at the spur of the moment,--having, however, probably had the benefit of some forethought,--but whose words never savour of truth. If I had happened to have been hung at this time,--as was so probable,--Mr. Daubeny would have devoted one of his half hours to the composition of a dozen tragic words which also would have been neat and appropriate. (PR, II, 299)

Phineas forgets not only his own speeches at Tankerville that answer to about the same description, but also that several years previously he had complained to Mr. Monk that as an office holder, "when directed to get up and speak on a subject he was bound to do so" (PF, II, 163).

Thin-skinned, and, therefore, vulnerable to newspaper attacks and public opinion, essentially scrupulous, and, therefore, disgusted by power ploys and compromised principles, Phineas is rubbed raw by the wheelings and dealings of political life. By the end of the book, when he is finally asked to take office, he tells Madame Max that he may not accept the offer. He is angry that Mr. Gresham now offers the place he withheld at Bonteen's instigation. In the key speech of the book, Madame Max tries to persuade him to accept.

> "If you go into office you become the servant of the country,--not his servant, and should assume his motive in selecting you to be the same as your own in submitting to the selection. Your foot must be on the ladder before you can get to the top of it."
> "The ladder is so crooked."
> "Is it more crooked now than it was three years ago;--worse than it was six months ago, when you and all your friends looked upon it as certain that you would be employed? *There is nothing, Mr. Finn, that a man should fear so much as some twist in his convictions arising from a personal accident to himself*." [Italics mine]. . .
> "You think it will be so with me?"
> "I shall think so if you now refuse--because of the misfortune which befell you--that which I know you were most desirous of possessing before that accident." . . .
> "A man may have always desired that which is worthless."
> "You tried it once, and did not find it worthless. You found yourself able to do good work when you were in office. If I remember right, you did not give it up then because it was irksome to you, or contemptible, or, as you say, worthless; but from difference of opinion on some political question. You can always do that again."
> "A man is not fit for office who is prone to do so."
> "Then do not you be prone." (PR, II, 329-31)

Phineas' personality, his sensitivity, makes him

particularly susceptible to social influences, to the opinions of those about him, to slights, real and imagined. His scrupulousness combined with his thin skin, makes it very difficult for him to accept the compromises a statesman must make between his personal convictions, the convictions of the people with whom he must work, and concrete political reality. Unfortunately, despite Madame Max's good advice, Phineas does allow his convictions to be twisted, not only by the murder trial, but, more, perhaps, by personal accidents in the form of unpleasant political decisions he must make, unpleasant gossip he must face, unpleasant disappointments he must accept--the unfairness of life in general and political life in particular. Phineas rejects office. Although in Phineas Finn his resignation is somewhat Quixotic, it is positive because it reaffirms political values--both the high duty of the politician and the importance of the measures he implements. In Phineas Redux, his rejection of office is negative, a vote of "no confidence" in the same system whose value he affirmed by his prior resignation.

In The Prime Minister, Finn, now married to Madame Max, has evidently achieved a balanced outlook on politics, an outlook which falls somewhere between the romance of Phineas Finn and the despair of Phineas Redux. He takes office under the new Prime Minister--the Duke of Omnium, Plantagenet Palliser. During Palliser's term of office, primarily through his character and moral actions, Trollope

explores that balance to which he points in Phineas Finn and Phineas Redux. That Phineas, so much farther down the political ladder than the Duke, should be closer to becoming a "good, round, smooth, hard, useful pebble" than Palliser is hard to believe, but it is one of the assumptions that Trollope insists his readers accept. Trollope describes Palliser as one of those men "who cannot get their skins to be hard." Most of these men "fall out of the ranks" and do not attempt to make politics their career, but Palliser "was one who did not fall out of the ranks, even though his skin would not become hard."[6] By the time Palliser becomes Prime Minister, Phineas Finn has been in politics for many years, although not nearly so many as the Duke, and

> He did not in truth suffer much himself from what was said in the "People's Banner." He had become used to the "People's Banner" and had found out that in no relation of life was he less pleasantly situated because of the maledictions heaped upon him in the columns of that mewspaper. His position in public life did not seem to be weakened by them. His personal friends did not fall off because of them. Those who loved him did not love him less. It had not been so with him always, but now, at last, he was hardened against Mr. Quintus Slide. But the poor Duke was by no means equally strong. (PM, II, 209)

Every word of an adverse newspaper article is "gall and wormwood to him. In every paragraph there was a scourge which hit him on . . . raw and opened wounds" (PM, 359). Glencora alternately bemoans his thin skin and castigates him for it. "I wish I could make you thick skinned," she says, "It's the only way to be decently comfortable in

such a coarse, rough-and-tumble world as this is" (PM, II, 23). Like Mrs. Crawley, she frequently is a help to her husband despite himself. She scolds Palliser for allowing articles by Quintus Slide to disturb his peace.

> "What is it that you fear? What can the man do to you? What matter is it to you if such a one as that pours out his malice on you? Let it run off like the rain from the housetops. You are too big even to be stung by such a reptile as that." He looked into her face, admiring the energy with which she spoke to him. "As for answering him," she continued to say, "that may or may not be proper. If it should be done, there are people to do it. But I am speaking of your own inner self. You have a shield against your equals, and a sword to attack them with if necessary. Have you no armour of proof against such a creature as that? Have you nothing inside you to make you feel that he is too contemptible to be regarded? . . . Why blench if your conscience accuses you of no fault? I would not blench even if it did." . . .
>
> "You must throw me to the whale. Let somebody say in so many words that the Duchess did so and so. It was very wicked no doubt; but they can't kill me,--nor yet dismiss me. And I won't resign. In point of fact I shan't be a penny the worse for it."
> (PM, II, 101-03)

Like Mrs. Grantly who could hold her temper while her husband lost his, Glencora serves as a balance for the Duke. She sees that in the Duke "such sensitiveness is simply a disease" (PM, II, 215), and she tries to cure him. The Duke fights not to allow this disease to influence his moral actions directly, but he cannot control its indirect influence. The Duke, for instance, "did not like advice. He was so thin-skinned that any counsel offered to him took the form of criticism" (PM, II, 92). His failure to accept advice leads him to make political mistakes; he ignores Warburton's advice and mishandles

Lopez, ignores the Duke of St. Bungay's advice and misuses his opportunity to recommend a Knight of the Garter. For a man who puts his duty to his country before all else, these mistakes are errors in moral behavior. Furthermore, the Duke's sensitivity limits his usefulness. He becomes "so moody, so irritable, and so unhappy" (PM, II, 3) that it is doubtful that he would be able to last long in office because of his own limitations and the limitations of those who must work with him.

There is another aspect of the Duke's personality that is a political drawback. As his wife says, "Though he is a god, he is a dry, silent, uncongenial and uncomfortable god" (PM, II, 154). Bradford Booth, even more outspoken than Glencora, calls him "a dry stick."[7] Trollope says the most important gift a Prime Minister can have is the "power of attracting personal friends" (PM, II, 34). Palliser's inability to do so further limits his political usefulness. Mr. Ratler, an important Liberal office holder who often serves as a barometer for the House, says, "On our own side, in our old party, there are a score of men who detest the Duke, though they would fain be true to the Government. They have voted with him through thick and thin, and he has not spoken a word to one of them since he became Prime Minister. What are you to do with such a man? How are you to act with him" (PM, II, 312)? The duchess tries frantically to overcome the disadvantage of Palliser's indifference to people

by entertaining lavishly, "conquering the world by graciousness and hospitality" (PM, 165).

> During this time the Duke was at the Castle, but he showed himself seldom to his guests,--so acting, as the reader will I hope understand, from no sense of the importance of his own personal presence, but influenced by a conviction that a public man should not waste his time. He breakfasted in his own room, because he could thus eat his breakfast in ten minutes. He read all the papers in solitude, because he was thus enabled to give his mind to their contents. Life had always been too serious to him to be wasted. Every afternoon he walked for the sake of exercise, and would have accepted any companion if any companion had especially offered himself. But he went off by some side-door, finding the side-door to be convenient, and therefore when seen by others was supposed to desire to remain unseen. . . . On Sunday the Duke, always right in his purpose but generally wrong in his practice, had stayed at home working all the morning, thereby scandalising the strict, and had gone to church alone in the afternoon, thereby offending the social. (PM, 187-89)

The poor Prime Minister, in addition to being thin-skinned, "dry, silent, uncongenial, and uncomfortable," is also terribly scrupulous. It is Palliser's integrity that initially wins him the trust of Liberals and Conservatives alike, so that when neither could form its own government, he was chosen to lead a Coalition Government. Palliser's scrupulousness is thoroughly moral, admirable, and useful when it leads him voluntarily to renounce control over his pocket borough, Silverbridge. It is at least ninety-nine per cent good when he voluntarily lowers his official position in order to complete a job that otherwise would not be properly done. Compare his honesty to Phineas Finn's, who, though a man more than moderately honest

himself, did sit for a pocket borough, and did refuse to take office once, largely because his pride had been hurt. Palliser's honesty, says the Duke of St. Bungay, "the old Duke," "is not like the honesty of other men. It is more downright;--more absolutely honest; less capable of bearing even the shadow which the stain from another's dishonesty might throw upon it. . . . He is very practical in some things, but the question is, whether he is not too scrupulous to be practical in all things" (PM, 267). Whereas to Trollope the Prime Minister's honorableness is always absolutely admirable, it is not always compatible with him serving his country, which is "the grandest work that a man can do." "There is such a thing as a conscience with so fine an edge," says the Duke of St. Bungay, "that it will allow a man to do nothing. You've got to serve your country" (PM, 62). As so frequently happens in Trollope's books, a character, in this case the Duke of Omnium, must decide, not between good and evil, but between good and good. Although the Duke knew, for instance, when he accepted the position of Prime Minister, that he would sometimes have to yield to others, "he had not known how terrible it is to have to yield when a principle is in question,--how great is the suffering when a man finds himself compelled to do that which he thinks should not be done" (PM, 298). Trollope points out a middle way between those who will do anything for political power and those who will not bend at all, even for the

good of the country. On the one hand, "Had some inscrutable decree of fate ordained and made it certain,--with a certainty not to be disturbed,--that no candidate could be returned to Parliament who would not assert the earth to be triangular, there would rise immediately a clamorous assertion of triangularity among political aspirants. The test would be innocent. Candidates have swallowed, and daily do swallow, many a worse one" (PM, 97). On the other hand, for Mr. Boffin, an ex-minister who was "inclined to criticise the lax principles of men who, for the sake of carrying on her Majesty's government" (PM, 99) could bend far enough to accept place in the Coalition, Trollope has little patience. Proper political behavior is that which, without being unprincipled and unscrupulous, gets the job done. When Palliser makes complaint that smacks of Roger Carbury's isolationist philosophy, that he who touches pitch will be defiled, the Duke of St. Bungay gives him a sharp set down. Palliser says,

> "When I see a man who is supposed to have earned the name of a statesman, and been high in the councils of his sovereign, induced by personal jealousy to do as he is doing, it makes me feel that an honest man should not place himself where he may have to deal with such persons."
> "According to that the honest men are to desert their country in order that the dishonest men may have everything their own way." (PM, II, 149)

The Duke of Omnium is an honest man and he is certainly not willing to leave the country in the hands of the unworthy. As the old Duke points out, however, Palliser's

honesty is not like that of other men. This is fully illustrated by the Duke's decision, based on his moral principles, to make Lord Earlybird a Knight of the Garter. When Omnium speaks to the old Duke, the Duke of St. Bungay, about the matter, the old Duke first suggests that Omnium himself should accept the honor, a suggestion which Omnium flatly refuses to consider. Then the old Duke suggests that the Garter be given to the Liberal peer who, next to Omnium himself, is the richest peer in the country. Again, despite the fact that the old Duke assures him that either of the two proposed choices would give no offense, the Prime Minister refuses to listen. "He has done nothing for his country," says Omnium, "and nothing for his sovereign." "If you are determined to look to what you call desert alone, I would name Lord Drummond," answers St. Bungay (PM, II, 227). But the Duke of Omnium is not happy with any of these suggestions; he suggests a philanthropic Conservative peer, Lord Earlybird.

> "He is a man of a great heart and of many virtues. Surely the country, and her Majesty on behalf of the country should delight to honour such a man."
>
> "I really doubt whether you look at the matter in the right light," said the ancient statesman, who was in truth frightened at what was being proposed. . . . "There are certain great prizes in the gift of the Crown and of the Ministers of the Crown,--the greatest of which are now traditionally at the disposal of the Prime Minister. These are always given to party friends. I may perhaps agree with you that party support should not be looked to alone. Let us acknowledge that character and services should be taken into account. But the very theory of our Government will be overset by a reversal of the rule

> which I have attempted to describe. You will offend all your own friends, and only incur the ridicule of your opponents. It is no doubt desirable that the high seats of the country should be filled by men of both parties. . . . But I know that my opponents when their turn comes will appoint their friends to the Lieutenancies, and that so the balance will be maintained. If you or I appoint their friends, they won't appoint ours. Lord Earlybird's proxy has been in the hands of the Conservative leader of the House of Lords ever since he succeeded his father. . . . I think you are Quixotic. A Prime Minister is of all men bound to follow the traditions of his country, or, when he leaves them, to leave them with very gradual steps."
>
> "And if he break that law and throw over all that thraldom;--what then?"
>
> "He will lose the confidence which had made him what he is." (PM, II, 229-31)

The Duke of Omnium, like Mrs. Proudie and Mr. Scarborough, decides to place his personal judgment before the traditions of his country, and bestows the honor on Lord Earlybird. His sensitivity that rejects advice and his terrible scrupulousness bring down Omnium. St. Bungay reads the situation aright. "[T]he younger Duke . . . had rebelled against his Mentor and had obstinately adhered to his Quixotism! The greed of power had fallen upon the man, . . . and the man's fall was certain" (PM, II, 232). Lady Glencora had predicted when he became Prime Minister, that, though his scrupulousness would not change, Omnium could be brought to love power. "Power is so pleasant that men quickly learn to be greedy in the enjoyment of it, and to flatter themselves that patriotism requires them to be imperious" (PM, 51). Now, near the end of the Prime Minister's tenure in office, Lady Glencora says,

"There is a devil creeps in upon them when their hands are strengthened" (PM, II, 301).

"I think he is becoming a tyrant with his own men," Lady Glencora tells her very close friend, Mrs. Finn. "He spoke the other day of Lord Drummond almost as though he meant to have him whipped." Mrs. Finn replies, "The weight of the load on his mind makes him irritable" (PM, II, 215). His sensitivity, his inability to deal with people, his scrupulousness, combined with the day in and day out responsibilities of power and position surely make Omnium irritable, and nearly drive him mad. Glencora tells Mrs. Finn:

> "I'll bet you a guinea that Sir Timothy Beeswax has to go out before the beginning of next Session. . . . He mentioned Lopez' name the other day before Plantagenet. . . . Plantagenet pulled that long face of his looking as though he meant to impose silence on the whole world for the next six weeks. . . . He didn't declare to himself that he'd dismiss Sir Timothy, because that's not the way of his mind. But you'll see that Sir Timothy will have to go. (PM, II, 215-16)

In her concern for her husband, Glencora consults the Old Duke. She tells him that

> "I asked him whether we shouldn't have Lord Drummond at Matching, and he told me angrily that I might ask all the Government if I liked."
> "Drummond contradicted him the other day."
> "I knew there was something. He has got to be like a bear with a sore head, Duke. . . . He used to be so fond of Lord Cantrip."
> "I think he likes Lord Cantrip," said the Duke.
> "He asked his lordship to do something, and Lord Cantrip declined."
> "I know all about that," said the Duke.
> "And now he looks gloomy at Lord Cantrip."
> (PM, II, 220)

Government under the leadership of a crotchety man cannot long continue, and as soon as Mr. Gresham, the usual leader of the Liberal party in the House, is able to form a government, the Duke's government is brought down. A Prime Minister cannot be capricious, either from scruples or from spite, in wielding power, because the government is set up to protect itself against abuse of power. The system itself limits, guides, and controls the behavior of its political servants.

Palliser, in his political decisions is obviously influenced by his surroundings, political and otherwise, especially by the Duke of St. Bungay, his wife, and, less fortunately, the newspapers. His thin skin and dry, uncongenial personality make it difficult for him, with the best of intentions, to behave in a useful way in political situations. His scrupulousness, his commitment to abstract principles influences his behavior greatly, but not always for the better. If moral political behavior is that behavior which most efficiently serves the country, then Palliser's behavior is not always moral. If moral political behavior, however, is interpreted as that behavior which, over a lifetime, is always and in every situation aimed at promoting the welfare of the country, the welfare of the country being the highest goal for which a man can strive, then Plantagenet Palliser is the very epitome of the moral man. Although in his first disappointment at losing power, he tells the old

Duke that he will not hold office again, saying "Caesar could hardly have led a legion under Pompey" (PM, II, 305), the Duke, motivated by his "unblemished, unextinguishable, inexhaustible love of country,"[8] realizes "He must declare that Caesar would at some future time be prepared to serve under Pompey" (PM, II, 385). He informs Mr. Monk, "For a few years I would prefer to remain out of office. But I will endeavour to look forward to a time when I may again perhaps be of some humble use" (PM, II, 386).

Plantagenet Palliser, Phineas Finn, the Duke of St. Bungay, Lord Cantrip, and other members of the Government have made service of their country their greatest ambition. In Can You Forgive Her? John Grey says to Palliser, "It seems to me that if a man can so train himself that he may live honestly and die fearlessly he has done about as much as is necessary." Palliser, however, is aware "that good men struggle as they do in order that others, besides themselves, may live honestly, and, if possible, die fearlessly" (III, 294-95).

NOTES

[1] Juliet McMaster, Trollope's Palliser Novels: Theme and Pattern (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 38.

[2] Trollope, Autobiography, p. 251.

[3] Anthony Trollope, The Prime Minister (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), II, 314.

[4] Unsigned Notice, Critical Heritage, p. 311.

[5] Trollope, Autobiography, pp. 307-08.

[6] Trollope, Autobiography, pp. 308-09.

[7] Bradford A. Booth, Anthony Trollope: Aspects of His Life and Art (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1958), p. 99.

[8] Trollope, Autobiography, p. 309.

CONCLUSION

For Trollope, the art of living is behaving morally whatever one's circumstances. He states this credo explicitly in Can You Forgive Her?

> A woman's life is important to her,--as is that of a man to him,--not chiefly in regard to that which she shall do with it. The chief thing for her to look to is the manner in which that something shall be done. It is of moment to a young man when entering life to decide whether he shall make hats or shoes; but not of half the moment that will be that other decision, whether he shall make good shoes or bad. (I, 144)

Whether a young man or woman decides to make good shoes or bad depends partly on which sells better. People often adopt the life style accepted by the society in which they live. A blatantly materialistic society like that in The Way We Live Now naturally produces a Felix Carbury; the same type of society encourages women like Julia Brabazon to marry for wealth rather than worth. As Trollope pointed out in the cases of Carry Brattle and Mrs. Smith, the choice society offers to the "fallen woman" is counterproductive. If she wishes to repent she must live a life of misery--honest misery, of course, but misery nonetheless. If she does not repent, her life will be one of pleasure--sinful pleasure, but still pleasure. In other words, society reinforces behavior it considers immoral rather than

behavior it considers moral. Although Trollope makes clear in both cases that sinful pleasure is no real pleasure at all, he nevertheless condemns the society that makes it appear to be the more attractive choice. Society's influence is not always negative, however. In Mr. Harding's world, the two social groups that vie for his support, the church group and the reformers, are both good. Adolphus Crosbie, Alaric Tudor, Frank Greystock, and Frank Gresham are each exposed to healthy society as well as corrupt society. The first two men choose poorly; the last two choose well. Social milieu plays an important role in determining whether people will act morally, which is, in Trollope's novels, equivalent to whether they will adopt a proper life style.

Of course personality also influences one's choice of life style. Phineas Finn's exceptionally pleasant personality gives him a splendid opportunity to make good political shoes. Plantagenet Palliser, with a much less appealing personality, has a much harder time of it. Three other characters in particular allow their personalities u unusual scope to affect "the manner in which" their "somethings" are done. Mrs. Bolton, Mrs. Proudie, and Mr. Scarborough allow their drive to power to override all other considerations. Indeed, Mr. Scarborough, like Caesar, "from the beginning of his career, had shown his determination to sweep away as cobwebs the obligations which

the law imposed upon him."[1] Their ways of doing their "somethings" are illegal, immoral, and dangerous.

In addition to social milieu and personality, abstract ideas and ideals also influence choice of life style. The characters that Trollope himself seems most to admire are those who look not so much to what they must do as to the manner in which they choose to do it. Mr. Harding's life, while pleasant, has not been especially exciting, nor does it appear that he chose his calling with any more special foresight or intelligence than most young men do. But he taught himself to love what he did and to do it well; he "does his precentor's work as no precentor has done it before." When a "shade of doubt" falls acrosss his mind as to whether or not he is entitled to the stipend he receives as warden of Hiram's Hospital, he is "neither happy nor at ease" until the doubt is settled. The sense of right and wrong directs the warden's life, and he feels that it is his responsibility and his pleasure to live his life properly. Like the warden and under much less pleasant circumstances, Mrs. Crawley lives by the same standards. Her "something" is done in the finest and most virtuous manner; she is a "woman of valor." The Pallisers are the last characters whose moral natures have been exhaustively examined who fit also into the group of people who choose to do as well as possible that which it has fallen to their lot to do. Forced into a loveless marriage with a virtual stranger, led by her own energy and sense of honor,

Glencora makes the very best she can of her situation--she teaches herself to appreciate her husband and works very hard to be a good wife to him. Palliser does his "something" in the grand manner. He claims that he fell into politics as a young man. "There was a seat in the House for me when I was twenty-one. . . . It was a matter of course that I should be a Liberal. . . . I took it at first very much as a matter of course" (PM, II, 262). Later, after he grew into the career he had fallen into, "Patriotism with him was a fever, and the public service an exacting mistress" (PM, II, 302). He devoted himself totally to service of his country. Each of these characters devotes his life to an ideal of moral behavior, even Glencora, whose code of honor is so completely internalized that it hardly qualifies as an abstract idea.

Trollope, the artist, finely anatomizes the process by which social milieu, personality, and abstract ideas, interacting one with the other, shape moral behavior. No matter what a person's lot in life, whether or not he chooses to act morally is, to Trollope, the ultimate determinant of whether or not his life may be termed successful. In other words, for Trollope, by definition, good guys finish first.

NOTES

[1] Anthony Trollope, The Life of Cicero, 2 vols. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1881), II, p. 118.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aitken, David. "Anthony Trollope on 'the Genus Girl.'" Nineteenth-Century Fiction, 28 (1974), 417-34.

Alexander, D. M. "Trollope's Cosmopolitanism." Nineteenth-Century Fiction, II (June, 1947), 3-10.

apRoberts, Ruth. Trollope: Artist and Moralist. London: Chatto and Windus, 1971.

Baker, Ernest A. "Trollope." The History of the English Novel. From the Brontes to Meredith: Romanticism in the English Novel. 1936; rpt. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1972. viii, 112-60.

Booth, Bradford A. Anthony Trollope: Aspects of His Life and Art. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1958.

----------, ed. The Letters of Anthony Trollope. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

----------. "Trollope on Scott: Some Unpublished Notes." Nineteenth-Century Fiction, V (December, 1950), 223-30.

----------. "Trollope's Orley Farm: Artistry Manque." From Jane Austen to Joseph Conrad: Essays Collected in Memory of James T. Hillhouse. Ed. Robert C. Rathburn and Martin Steinmann, Jr. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958, pp. 146-59.

Bowen, Elizabeth. Anthony Trollope: A New Judgement. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Briggs, Asa. Victorian People. London: 1954; New York: 1963; Penguin, 1970.

Brinton, Crane. English Political Thought in the 19th Century. London, 1933; rpt. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962.

Buckley, Jerome Hamilton. The Victorian Temper. New York: Vintage Books: A Division of Random House, 1951.

Carroll, Lewis. _Alice's Adventures in Wonderland & Through the Looking Glass_. New York: Signet--The New American Library, 1960.

Cecil, David. "Anthony Trollope." _Victorian Novelists: Essays in Revaluation_. 1933; rpt. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958, pp. 245-79.

Cockshut, A. O. J. _Anthony Trollope: A Critical Study_. 1955; rpt. London: Collins, 1968.

Coyle, William. "Trollope as Social Anthropologist." _College English_, XVII (1955-6), 392-97.

Davies, Hugh Sykes. _Trollope_. Writers and Their Work, No. 118. London: Longman's, Green & Co., 1960.

Edwards, P. D. _Anthony Trollope_. Profiles in Literature Series. New York: Humanities Press, 1968.

----------. "Trollope Changes His Mind: The Death of Melmotte in _The Way We Live Now_." _Nineteenth-Century Fiction_, XVIII (1963-4), 89-91.

Escott, T. H. S. _Anthony Trollope_. New York: Kennikat Press, 1967.

Gerould, Winifred Gregory and James Thayer Gerould. _A Guide to Trollope_. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948.

Glavin, John J. "Trollope's 'Most Natural English Girl.'" _Nineteenth-Century Fiction_, 28 (1974), 477-85.

Grossman, Richard H. and Andrew Wright. "Anthony Trollope's Libraries." _Nineteenth-Century Fiction_, 31, i (1976), 48-64.

Hagan, John. "The Divided Mind of Anthony Trollope." _Nineteenth-Century Fiction_, 14 (1960), 1-26.

----------. "_The Duke's Children_: Trollope's Psychological Masterpiece." _Nineteenth-Century Fiction_, 13 (1958-9), 1-21.

Hall, N. John. "Trollope's Commonplace Book, 1835-40." _Nineteenth-Century Fiction_, 31, i (1976), 15-25.

Halperin, John. "Trollope's _Phineas Finn_ and History." _English Studies_, 59, 2 (1978), 121-137.

Hardwick, Michael. _A Guide to Anthony Trollope_. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1974.

Hennessy, James Pope. Anthony Trollope. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971.

Houghton, Walter E. The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.

Huxley, T. H. "A Liberal Education; and Where to Find It." T. H. Huxley on Education. Ed. Cyril Bibby. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Karl, Fredrick R. A Reader's Guide to the Nineteenth Century British Novel. New York: The Noonday Press: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1964.

Kennedy, E. "Quiet Mover of the Catholic Church." New York Times Magazine, 23 September 1979, 22-23, 64, 66-70, 72, 74-75.

Kincaid, James R. "Bring Back The Trollopian." Nineteenth-Century Fiction, 31, i (1976), 1-14.

----------. The Novels of Anthony Trollope. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

Kleis, John Christopher. "Passion vs. Prudence: Theme and Technique in Trollope's Palliser Novels." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, XI, 4 (Winter, 1970), 1405-414.

Letwin, Shirley. "Trollope, the Pallisers and the Way We View Now." Times Literary Supplement, 5 July 1974, 727-28.

McMaster, Juliet. Trollope's Palliser Novels: Theme and Pattern. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Mizener, Arthur. "Anthony Trollope: The Palliser Novels." From Jane Austen to Joseph Conrad: Essays Collected in Memory of James T. Hillhouse. Eds. Robert C. Rathburn and Martin Steinmann, Jr. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958, pp. 160-76.

----------. The Sense of Life in the Modern Novel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964.

More, Paul Elmer. "My Debt to Trollope." The Demon of the Absolute. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1928.

Parrish, Morris L., ed. Anthony Trollope: Four Lectures. 1938; rpt. London: Constable, 1969.

Polhemus, Robert M. The Changing World of Anthony Trollope. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

Pollard, Arthur. Anthony Trollope. London, Henley and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

Quiller-Couch, Arthur. Charles Dickens and Other Victorians. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925.

Sadleir, Michael. Trollope: A Commentary. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Shaw, W. David. "Moral Drama in Barchester Towers." Nineteenth-Century Fiction, XIX (1964-5), 45-54.

Skilton, David. Anthony Trollope and His Contemporaries: A Study in the Theory and Conventions of Mid-Victorian Fiction. London: Longman, 1972.

Slack, Robert C. Bibliographies of Studies in Victorian Literature: For the Ten Years 1955-1964. Urbana, Chicago, and London: University of Illinois Press, 1967.

Slakey, Roger L. B. Jr. "Trollope's Case for Moral Imperative." Nineteenth-Century Fiction, 28 (1973), 305-20.

Smalley, Donald. "Anthony Trollope." Victorian Fiction: A Guide to Research. Ed. Lionel Stevenson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1964, pp. 188-213.

----------, ed. Trollope: The Critical Heritage. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul; New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1969.

Stebbins, Lucy and Richard Poate. The Trollopes: The Chronicle of a Writing Family. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.

Stephen, Leslie. "Anthony Trollope" Studies of a Biographer. Vol. IV. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1902.

Stone, Donald D. "Trollope as a Short Story Writer." Nineteenth-Century Fiction, 31, i (1976), 26-47.

Stryker, David. "The Significance of Trollope's 'American Senator.'" Nineteenth-Century Fiction, V (1950-1), 141-49.

Trollope, Anthony. The American Senator. 1931; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

----------. An Autobiography. 1953; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1974.

----------. Ayala's Angel. 1929; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

----------. Barchester Towers. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

----------. The Belton Estate. 1923; rpt. Oxford University Press, 1974.

----------. The Bertrams. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1859.

----------. Can You Forgive Her? 3 vols. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1902.

----------. Castle Richmond. 3 vols. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1979.

----------. The Claverings. 1924; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.

----------. Clergymen of the Church of England. n.p.: Leicester University Press, 1974.

----------. Cousin Henry. London: Oxford University Press, 1929.

----------. Doctor Thorne. 1926; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.

----------. Dr. Wortle's School. 1928; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.

----------. The Duke's Children. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.

----------. The Eustace Diamonds. New York: Doubleday, 1951.

----------. An Eye for an Eye. New York: Stein and Day, 1967.

----------. Framley Parsonage. 1926; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

----------. The Golden Lion of Granpère. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd.; New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1924.

----------. _Harry Heathcote of Gangoil: A Tale of Australian Bush Life_. Melbourne: Landsdowne Press, 1963.

----------. _He Knew He Was Right_. 1948; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

----------. "Higher Education of Women." _Four Lectures_. Ed. Morris L. Parrish. 1938; rpt. London: Constable, 1969.

----------. _Is He Popenjoy?_ 1944; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.

----------. _John Caldigate_. 1946; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1952.

----------. _The Kellys and the O'Kellys_. 1929; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1978.

----------. _La Vendée_. 3rd ed. London: Chapman and Hall, 1874.

----------. _Lady Anna_. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.

----------. _The Last Chronicle of Barset_. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1964.

----------. _The Letters of Anthony Trollope_ Ed. Bradford A. Booth. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

----------. _The Life of Cicero_. 2 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1881.

----------. _Linda Tressel_. 1946; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

----------. _Lotta Schmidt: And Other Stories_. London: Alexander Strahan, 1867.

----------. _The Macdermots of Ballycloran_. New York: John Lane, 1906.

----------. _Mr. Scarborough's Family_. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.

----------. _Nina Balatka_. 1946; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

----------. _An Old Man's Love_. 1936; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

----------. "On English Prose Fiction as a Rational Amusement." Four Lectures. Ed. Morris L. Parrish. 1938; rpt. London: Constable, 1969.

----------. Orley Farm. 1951; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1974.

----------. Phineas Finn. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.

----------. Phineas Redux. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.

----------. The Prime Minister. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.

----------. Rachel Ray. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952.

----------. Ralph the Heir. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

----------. Sir Harry Hotspur of Humblethwaite. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.

----------. The Small House at Allington. London: Everyman's Library--Dent, 1970.

----------. The Struggles of Brown, Jones and Robinson: By One of the Firm. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1870.

----------. Tales of All Countries First Series. London: Chapman and Hall, 1861.

----------. The Three Clerks. 1907; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1978.

----------. The Two Heroines of Plumplington. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.

----------. The Vicar of Bullhampton. 1924; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

----------. The Warden. New York: Signet--The New American Library, 1964.

----------. The Way We Live Now. 1951; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Van Ghent, Dorothy. The English Novel: Form and Function. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.

Wagenknecht, Edward. Cavalcade of the English Novel. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1943.

Walpole, Hugh. Anthony Trollope. New York: Macmillan, 1928.

West, Rebecca. "A Nineteenth-Century Bureaucrat." The Court and the Castle. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.

Williams, Raymond. Culture and Society 1780-1950. 1958; rpt. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Young, G. M. Portrait of an Age. 2nd ed. 1953; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.