

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. For example:

- Manuscript pages may have indistinct print. In such cases, the best available copy has been filmed.
- Manuscripts may not always be complete. In such cases, a note will indicate that it is not possible to obtain missing pages.
- Copyrighted material may have been removed from the manuscript. In such cases, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or as a 17"x 23" black and white photographic print.

Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack the clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, 35mm slides of 6"x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography.



**Order Number 8718677**

**“Grace of character”: The gentleman in Anthony Trollope’s  
Palliser novels**

Lewis, Juanita Florence, Ph.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1986

**U·M·I**  
300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



## INFORMATION TO USERS

While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. For example:

- Manuscript pages may have indistinct print. In such cases, the best available copy has been filmed.
- Manuscripts may not always be complete. In such cases, a note will indicate that it is not possible to obtain missing pages.
- Copyrighted material may have been removed from the manuscript. In such cases, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or as a 17"x 23" black and white photographic print.

Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack the clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, 35mm slides of 6"x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography.



"GRACE OF CHARACTER": THE GENTLEMAN IN  
ANTHONY TROLLOPE'S PALLISER NOVELS

by

Juanita Florence Lewis

A Dissertation Submitted to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro  
1986

Approved by

  
Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser William J. Lane

Committee Members Donald G. Darnell  
Walter H. Bentley  
Ronald D. Correll

4 June 1986  
Date of Acceptance by Committee

19 June 1986  
Date of Final Oral Examination



LEWIS, JUANITA FLORENCE, Ph.D. "Grace of Character": The Gentleman in Anthony Trollope's Palliser Novels. (1986). Directed by Dr. William G. Lane. 313 pp.

In An Autobiography Trollope writes that the Palliser novels portray "a perfect gentleman": what kind of man he is, how he thinks of himself in relation to others, and what kinds of values determine his conduct. It is generally accepted that the gentleman is important in all of Trollope's fiction, but little attention has been given to how Trollope uses the term gentleman or what it means in different contexts in the novels.

Trollope's idea of the gentleman is derived from a cultural tradition that blends classical influences; the medieval knight's code of chivalry, honor, and loyalty; and the tradition of the courtier. Trollope's literary treatment of the gentleman is influenced by the early Victorian reaction to the dandy and by the novels of Jane Austen and Thackeray. Courtship and marriage is a major theme in the novels because it allows Trollope to explore a character's fundamental values and the extent to which a character balances the claims of self with social and moral duties to others.

The Palliser novels are especially good for evaluating both Trollope's idea of the gentleman and his portrayal of the gentleman over time. Through its numerous characters and several plot lines, this interrelated series of six novels creates a complex and densely peopled social world in which surfaces and outward signs can too easily become

substitutes for content, substance, and worth. Yet the novels also demonstrate that the moral life is still possible in this complex and rapidly changing world. Trollope shows the development of Plantagenet Palliser, "a perfect gentleman," in three major roles--husband, public servant, father--and explores the ways Palliser's moral and ethical values determine his actions. As Palliser faces several private and public crises, he does not surrender his values: he affirms them. Throughout the series, the comparison of Palliser to other husbands, public servants, and fathers reveals the attitudes of mind and spirit necessary for Trollope's ideal gentleman.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to the members of my dissertation committee for their assistance and advice: Professors Walter H. Beale, Ronald D. Cassell, Donald G. Darnell, and William G. Lane. I owe special thanks to Professor Cassell, who allowed me to write on the novels of Disraeli and Trollope for his history class; that was when I began to appreciate Trollope and the Palliser novels and when I discovered the interest that became the subject of my dissertation. Throughout the writing process Professors Darnell and Lane gave excellent criticism that helped simplify my task and make the process enjoyable. Professor Darnell kindly agreed to direct the final reading phase during my director's absence. I am particularly grateful to my director, Professor Lane, for his tolerant patience as I worked through ideas and approaches and for his making himself readily available to provide assistance and direction. Had it not been for Dr. Lane's kindness and professional courtesy, this project would never have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE . . . . .	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. THE GENTLEMAN FROM CASTIGLIONE TO TROLLOPE . . . . .	20
III. NONGENTLEMEN: AMBITION FOR PLACE AND POWER . . . . .	79
IV. CADS, SCOUNDRELS, AND RAKES . . . . .	131
V. PLANTAGENET PALLISER: THE PERFECT GENTLEMAN . . . . .	213
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	299

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

Among Anthony Trollope's forty-seven novels are two series of six novels each, the Barsetshire and the Palliser series. The novels within each series are linked by plots, places, and reappearing characters; and the Barsetshire novels, especially the last two, provide transitional links to the second series. The Barsetshire series, published from 1855 to 1867, has remained the most popular of Trollope's novels, but the Palliser novels, published from 1864 to 1880, have gained increasing critical attention. The Palliser series consists of Can You Forgive Her? (1864-1865), Phineas Finn, the Irish Member (1869), The Eustace Diamonds (1873), Phineas Redux (1874), The Prime Minister (1876), and The Duke's Children (1880).<sup>1</sup> Contemporary criticism of these novels was frequently negative, and modern critical comment has not always agreed with--indeed has at times entirely discounted--Trollope's own view of these novels and their purposes. Adopting the title Michael Sadleir used in his 1927 classification of Trollope's novels, twentieth-century readers have most often seen the Palliser series as "political novels" and have consequently evaluated them in terms of their portrayal of political events and personalities and their

treatment of political ideas. For the last thirty years, however, since A.O.J. Cockshut's 1955 study, readers have paid increasing attention to the characters in the novels and their relationships with each other; marital relationships, particularly that of Plantagenet and Glencora Palliser, have been emphasized.<sup>2</sup> There is, however, a unifying theme for the six Palliser novels that has received virtually no attention. This theme, the ideal of the gentleman, provides structural unity and pulls together the separate threads of the many plot lines running through the Palliser novels to create the pattern of the perfect gentleman, Plantagenet Palliser.

Although the ideal of the gentleman as a unifying theme for the Palliser series has not been explored, readers have identified that ideal as a major concern in Trollope's novels. C. J. Vincent, for example, wrote in "Trollope: A Victorian Augustan" (1945):

What is the noblest work of an Englishman? It is to live like a gentleman. Like his eighteenth century predecessors, Trollope is interested in manners, in morals, and in the relations of men to other men. In a sense his novels form a courtesy book, a kind of nineteenth century Il Cortegiano, in which he sets forth the good man living the good life. And yet his characters are never prigs, nor are they ideals impossible of realization. . . . (417)

In Trollope's Later Novels Robert Tracy twice identifies the creation of a gentleman as both the unifying theme and the instructional purpose of the Palliser novels. Tracy describes the Palliser series as really a single novel,

a long and multiplotted but carefully structured novel of society. This novel would condemn romantic individualism and exalt both English society and the ideal product and support of that society, the English gentleman. (16)

Like Vincent, Tracy believes that Trollope's novels are in fact a courtesy book:

In a sense, he was writing a Victorian version of The Courtier; or, like Spenser, he could claim that "the general end" of all his books "is to fashion a gentleman or noble person in virtuous and noble discipline." The Palliser cycle is an epic that defines and celebrates the English gentleman, the essential guarantor of social and moral values, and the other novels consistently explore this theme. (71)

How Trollope actually "fashions a gentleman" throughout the Palliser series, or in any of the other novels, is suggested in much of the criticism. Both Tracy and Geoffrey Harvey, for example, comment on Trollope's use of analogical or contrasting plots, plotting devices that came from Trollope's reading and annotating of well over two hundred Jacobean plays (38-39, 44; 33-53). Jerome Thale and Arthur Mizener write that Trollope's multiple plots provide commentary on each other, one plot defining the conflict in another plot, or the characters in a subsidiary plot illustrating the ways in which characters in a major plot succeed or fail (147-57; 163). Roger L. Slakey also insists that Trollope's subplots cannot be separated from the main plots. Furthermore, Slakey argues, the tendency to read and evaluate only one plot and "to fasten upon one action, often not even a major action,"

and to interpret everything in the light of one example has distorted Trollope's fictional structures and purposes (311). This reading of single plots or single actions, Slakey suggests, has also failed to grasp the authorial and narrative "attitudes toward life and values" (311), a judgment with which David Skilton agrees. Skilton points out that the role of the Trollopian narrator, often "underestimated, and even ignored altogether," is essential in any novel, for it is the narrator who provides "the rules by which the fictional world runs, and the rules by which the reader can make moral and other judgments on the events of that world" (13, 145).<sup>3</sup> The standard of moral behavior in the novels, the basis on which the narrator makes judgments about the characters and their fictional world, is the code of the gentleman, the gentleman's attitudes, manners, and values (Kincaid 12; Schawacker 1742A). The situations in the novels thus test the characters' moral standards and values but do not determine them (Kincaid 12). The gentleman recognizes moral complexity, but not moral relativity; as Anne Aresty Naman writes, "Goodness may not be found unalloyed, but it can be located and defined" (106). Throughout the Palliser novels, then, as in any other Trollope novel with multiple plots, the varied plot movements and the mediating narrative voice work together to locate and define goodness--the good man, the good life, the good choice.



Trollope's own comments about the Palliser novels reveal that he was indeed concerned to portray "a perfect gentleman" and to show how the gentleman lives and works with others. In An Autobiography Trollope discusses the series at length, commenting on the characters and themes in the novels and on his purposes in creating an inter-related series that allowed him to follow a group of characters over a period of almost twenty-five years. Trollope was particularly fond of Can You Forgive Her?; not only was it the first novel in the series, but it was his "first presentation . . . of Plantagenet Palliser, with his wife, Lady Glencora."

By no amount of description or asseveration could I succeed in making any reader understand how much these characters with their belongings<sup>4</sup> have been to me in my latter life; or how frequently I have used them for the expression of my political and social convictions. . . . they have served me as safety-valves by which to deliver my soul. (165)

Trollope's claim that he uses the novels and their characters to express his "political and social convictions" has often led readers to assume that he was working with political events and theories, with politics primarily as the science or practice of government. Trollope's further comments on the series, however, reveal that formal government is only a small part of his view of politics. For Trollope, politics denoted also the myriad ways in which a society's predominant values are established and passed down, both to social subgroups and to succeeding generations, and the ways in which these

values influence social and personal relationships and affect the kinds of choices people make.

Because Trollope was always interested in the nature of choice and the process by which people make the judgments that shape their lives, he tended to choose his characters from the gentry and aristocracy. Such characters were above the brutish struggle for mere physical and economic survival and were more likely to be concerned with the moral and ethical significance of human action.<sup>5</sup> Using these groups in the Palliser novels, Trollope says, permits him both to celebrate the social order and to illustrate the qualities and attributes that determine one's place in the social order:

In these personages and their friends, political and social, I have endeavoured to depict the faults and frailties and vices,--as also the virtues, the graces, and the strength of our highest classes; and if I have not made the strength and virtues predominant over the faults and vices, I have not painted the picture as I intended. Plantagenet Palliser I think to be a very noble gentleman,--such a one as justifies to the nation the seeming anomaly of an hereditary peerage and of primogeniture. (165-66)

Another of Trollope's major purposes in the Palliser series is to depict the nature and extent of human growth and change, to show how experience shapes and confirms character, intensifying both strengths and weaknesses:

In conducting these characters from one story to another I realised the necessity, not only of consistency,--which, had it been maintained by a hard exactitude, would have been untrue to nature,--but also of those changes which time always produces. There are, perhaps, but few of us who, after the lapse of ten years, will be found to have changed our chief

characteristics. The selfish man will still be selfish, and the false man false. But our manner of showing or of hiding these characteristics will be changed,--as also our power of adding to or diminishing their intensity. It was my study that these people, as they grew in years, should encounter the changes which come upon us all; and I think that I have succeeded. (168)

Throughout the Palliser series, then, Trollope's emphasis is character, as it is in all of his novels. For Trollope, character is primary, plot secondary. Though plot is by no means unimportant, and though Trollope makes modest claims for his skill in plot construction that frequently misdirect his critics, to him "the plot is but the vehicle" for the characters (Autobiography 116). In Trollope's novels, the multiple plots serve to group and regroup his characters, constantly pairing and contrasting, delineating similarities and differences, and always emphasizing characters in their relationships with others. As Tracy writes, the ideal Trollopian character, the gentleman, "lives up to his calling only when he functions as a part of society, accepting society's values and fulfilling the duties of his position" (10), and the structure of the multiplot novel emphasizes social integration by "implicitly reject[ing] the excessively individualistic man" in favor of the man of fundamental, ordinary decency (57). In a discussion of the purpose of multiple or subsidiary plots, Trollope writes:

Though the plot itself may require but few characters, it may be so enlarged as to find its full development in many. There may be subsidiary plots, which shall

all tend to the elucidation of the main story, and which will take their places as part of one and the same work,--as there may be many figures on a canvas which shall not to the spectator seem to form themselves into separate pictures. (Autobiography 216-17)

Just before his comment on the use of subsidiary plots, Trollope insists that "There should be no episodes in a novel" (216). Modern readers have frequently seen Trollope's subsidiary plots as irrelevant episodes, but Trollope considered them "organic parts of the structures of his novels" (Tracy, Trollope's Later Novels 39).

Throughout An Autobiography, Trollope's remarks on the use of subsidiary plots reveal not only his belief that his multiplot novels are structurally and thematically unified, but they suggest also how he uses the six novels in the Palliser series to portray the progressive development of Plantagenet Palliser, his perfect gentleman. For example, Trollope's comments on Can You Forgive Her? and The Prime Minister clearly reveal that a major facet of the gentleman's character is demonstrated in the way the gentleman conducts himself in his private, domestic, or marital relationships. Trollope describes the young Glencora's first love, the "beautiful, well-born, and utterly worthless" Burgo Fitzgerald (166), and the marriage to Plantagenet Palliser her family quickly arranged to prevent her wasting herself and her fortune on Burgo. This was a real wrong to Glencora, Trollope writes, as "it must ever be wrong to force a girl into a marriage with a

man she does not love, and certainly the more so when there is another whom she does love" (166). Yet Glencora is able to overcome this sense of wrong and injury; she

is brought, partly by her own sense of right and wrong, and partly by the genuine nobility of her husband's conduct, to attach herself to him after a certain fashion. The romance of her life is gone, but there remains a rich reality of which she is fully able to taste the flavour. She loves her rank and becomes ambitious, first of social, and then of political ascendancy. He is thoroughly true to her, after his thorough nature, and she, after her less perfect nature, is imperfectly true to him. (167-68)

As he records in the novels the "changes which come upon" the Pallisers over the years, Trollope points out that their basic characters remain unchanged:

The Duchess of Omnium, when she is playing the part of Prime Minister's wife, is the same woman as that Lady Glencora who almost longs to go off with Burgo Fitzgerald, but yet knows that she will never do so; and the Prime Minister Duke, with his wounded pride and sore spirit, is he who, for his wife's sake, left power and place when they were first offered to him; --but they have undergone the changes which a life so stirring as theirs would naturally produce. (168)

In order for readers to "understand the characters of the Duke of Omnium, of Plantagenet Palliser, and of Lady Glencora," Trollope writes, they must read the novels of the series "consecutively" (169). Only then can readers appreciate the characters as they reveal themselves over time. Trollope reiterates his concern that the novels be read in sequential order (329) when he discusses another facet of his gentleman's character, his conduct as politician and statesman. Trollope writes that he has long imagined a statesman very different from the ordinary

political types he has portrayed frequently, both in the Palliser series and in other novels. The ordinary political man, Trollope says, was merely a type and was consequently easily drawn:

The strong-minded, thick-skinned, useful, ordinary member, either of the Government or of the Opposition, had been very easy to describe, and had required no imagination to conceive. The character reproduces itself from generation to generation; and as it does so, becomes shorn in a wonderful way of those little touches of humanity which would be destructive of its purposes. . . . as a rule, the men submit themselves to be shaped and fashioned, and to be formed into tools, which are used either for building up or pulling down, and can generally bear to be changed from this box into the other, without, at any rate, the appearance of much personal suffering. (326-27)

This type of political character is blindly loyal to the party and its beliefs and will perform whatever action the party seems to require, for he has become a "tool," a machine for use. Such men allow themselves to be so used, Trollope says, because they "have been thoroughly taught that in no other way can they serve either their country or their own ambition." And though they are "the men who are publicly useful," he has never ceased to wonder that stones of such strong calibre should be so quickly worn down to the shape and smoothness of rounded pebbles" (327). His wondering about the adaptability and conformity of such men led him to imagine another kind of political man:

But I had also conceived the character of a statesman of a different nature--of a man who should be in something perhaps superior, but in very much inferior, to these men--of one who could not become a pebble, having too strong an identity of his own. To rid one's self of fine scruples--to fall into the

tradition 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. But every now and again we see the attempt made by men who cannot get their skins to be hard--who after a little while generally fall out of the ranks. The statesman of whom I was thinking--and of whom I had long thought--was one who did not fall out of the ranks, even though his skin would not become hard. He should have rank, and intellect, and parliamentary habits, by which to bind him to the service of his country; and he should also have unblemished, unextinguishable, inexhaustible love of country. That virtue I attribute to our statesmen generally. They who are without it are, I think, mean indeed. This man should have it as the ruling principle of his life; and it should so rule him that all other things should be made to give way to it. But he should be scrupulous, and, being scrupulous, weak. When called to the highest place in the council of his Sovereign, he should feel with true modesty his own insufficiency; but not the less should the greed of power grow upon him when he had once allowed himself to taste and enjoy it. Such was the character I endeavoured to depict in describing the triumph, the troubles, and the failure of my Prime Minister. And I think that I have succeeded. (327-29)

The Palliser novels thus explore the public and private behavior of Plantagenet Palliser. Trollope was firmly convinced that in Palliser he had created "a perfect gentleman. If he be not, then I am unable to describe a gentleman" (330). Since Trollope also indicates that an understanding of Palliser's character can come only from reading all of the novels in which he appears and seeing the ways in which he is alike or different from other men in the novels, we must be concerned with all of the plot lines and characters and with the total progression of the

series. This must be our concern not only because it enables us to appreciate the character of Trollope's perfect gentleman, but also because it is the best way to determine what Trollope means by the term gentleman. Robin Gilmour writes that though the idea of the gentleman is "centrally important in [Trollope's] work" and "feeds the roots of his values," it is rarely an overt subject in his novels (Idea 149); and Walter M. Kendrick argues that Trollope's concept of the gentleman is based on "the feelings that, more than any laws or doctrine, really govern behavior." Because of its emphasis on feelings as distinguished from "articulated and therefore unreal thoughts," Kendrick says, the concept of the gentleman is "never defined in words" in Trollope's novels (96-97). Throughout the Palliser series, the ideal of the gentleman is a covert subject; it is only in The Prime Minister that the attitudes and manners of the gentleman emerge as a fully conscious subject and theme of the series. In The Prime Minister Trollope invokes Samuel Johnson's definition of the gentleman and places it in opposition to Emily Wharton's more democratic definition.<sup>6</sup> But Trollope's concept of the gentleman reflects a tradition reaching far beyond Johnson's definition, drawing on the Roman concepts of pietas, dignitas, and gravitas<sup>7</sup> and incorporating elements from chivalry and the tradition of the courtier.



## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The following abbreviations will be used for parenthetical references to these novels: CYFH?--Can You Forgive Her?, PF--Phineas Finn, TED--The Eustace Diamonds, PR--Phineas Redux, TPM--The Prime Minister, and TDC--The Duke's Children.

<sup>2</sup> In his 1913 biography of Trollope, T.H.S. Escott grouped together four of the Palliser novels (Phineas Finn, Phineas Redux, The Prime Minister, and The Duke's Children) and discussed them, along with Ralph the Heir, as political novels (245-69). Escott discussed Can You Forgive Her? and The Eustace Diamonds not as political novels but as novels treating the woman question, or the theme of women's independence and women's rights (218). The grouping of the six as political novels was firmly established by Michael Sadleir in Anthony Trollope: A Commentary (Appendix II.c 416-17). Beatrice Curtis Brown discusses the series as political novels, comparing them briefly with the Barsetshire series (38) and with Disraeli's political novels (75-81). Like Brown, Rebecca West discusses the series broadly, not as individual novels or an interrelated series; she describes them as "political novels" which "owe a superficial unity to the appearance in all" of Plantagenet and Glencora (141). West focuses primarily on two characters, Plantagenet Palliser and Marie Goesler; and as James K. Kincaid says, she attacks Marie "with inexplicable

but entertaining fury" (194 n.13). A.O.J. Cockshut's Anthony Trollope: A Critical Study is a major work that has resulted in a shift of critical interest and emphasis. Cockshut argues that "Trollope is a gloomier, more introspective, more satirical, and more profound writer than he is usually credited with being" (9) and that Trollope's novels represent a progress to pessimism. Cockshut's study has been invaluable in bringing a new seriousness to Trollope criticism and suggesting new approaches to Trollope's work, especially the later novels. Ramesh Mohan describes the series as "Political Novels" or "Chronicles of Parliamentary Life." He argues that Trollope "had no central idea to run through these novels" (60), and he criticizes the novels for their lack of historical accuracy, their failure to portray the "change and stir" of actual political events and to present "convincing portraits of important statesmen" (58, 62). In The Moral Trollope Ruth apRoberts also discusses the series as political novels. Drawing primarily on Asa Briggs's study of Walter Bagehot and Trollope, apRoberts shows how closely Trollope's fictional treatment of British parliamentary government fits within Bagehot's analysis of the two parts of government, the dignified (or ceremonial) and the efficient, and the major functions of the efficient part of government--elective, expressive, teaching, informing, and legislative (128-30). ApRoberts also posits a "situation ethics" for

Trollope's novels and argues that Trollope views surrender of principle as necessary in political action (133). In Anthony Trollope, His Art and Scope, P. D. Edwards excludes The Eustace Diamonds from the Palliser series (166 n.1, 137; The Eustace Diamonds is also excluded by Alley 2199A; Bartrum 2886A). Edwards's interest, however, is not the political themes in the novels, but the tension between public and private life. Arthur Pollard's Anthony Trollope also emphasizes the tension between public and private life. Pollard argues that Trollope's interest is not political issues per se or the professional lives of his politicians, but "the character of politicians and their attitudes towards their work" (87). John Halperin's Trollope and Politics provides the most extensive and detailed treatment of the political themes throughout the series. He also gives attention to the novels' emphasis on the interdependence of political and social, public and private life (58-66). Since he accepts Cockshut's premise that the novels trace Trollope's "progress to pessimism," Halperin sees Phineas Finn as "the last of the pre-lapsarian political novels--the novels written before Beverley" (111). Because Trollope lost the election at Beverley (17 November 1868), Halperin argues, "from The Eustace Diamonds on, the Palliser novels begin to articulate a more jaundiced view of the political process" (152). In The Changing World of Anthony Trollope Robert M. Polhemus writes that "The great

problem of political life had become for Trollope the major problem of the age: how to care about other people, please them, and still make and keep one's own soul" (149).

Polhemus reads Can You Forgive Her? as a study of married life, relations between the sexes, and feminism; Phineas Finn and Phineas Redux as "political novels of extraordinary range" (149); and The Prime Minister as a novel of "overwhelming pessimistic power" (197). Polhemus also sees a "progress to pessimism" in the series; however, he attributes that pessimism not to Trollope's losing the election at Beverley, but to novels Trollope had written since Phineas Finn--particularly He Knew He Was Right and Ralph the Heir (178). R. C. Terry's Anthony Trollope: The Artist in Hiding places the Palliser series in a category of "novels concerned with social values." Each novel, Terry claims, pictures "a society facing the steady decline of traditional patterns of moral and religious certainty, a culture perplexed by new social philosophies" (220). Though Terry identifies several thematic concerns in the novels, he seems to find no standard of moral or social judgment embodied in the individual novels or the series as a whole. Juliet McMaster's Trollope's Palliser Novels: Theme and Pattern is concerned with the novels' exploration of the process of making judgments, their analysis of "the mind in process of decision" (23). McMaster thus stresses the characters within the novels, their ability to perceive

and distinguish between the true and the false, and the process by which a character arrives at a decision. The political themes in the novels are discussed also by Amery i-viii; Gulliver 684A; Halperin, "The Eustace Diamonds" 138-60; Tomlinson 83-101; and the courtship and marriage themes are discussed by Denton 1-10; Hart 685A; Hoyt 57-70; Kincaid 175-234; Lucas 7712A; Polhemus, "Being in Love" 383-95; Tracy, Trollope's Later Novels 20-30.

<sup>3</sup> For additional commentary on the role of the Trollopian narrator, see McMaster, "Pride and Prejudice" 19; Mizener 169-70; Snow, "The Psychological Stream" 15-16; Tillotson 6-17.

<sup>4</sup> "Belongings" is a term that occurs frequently in Trollope's writings; it includes those people to whom one is obligated or has duties, from immediate family members to friends and relatives to members of the community in which one lives. In An Autobiography, for example, Trollope identifies the old Duke of Omnium as "one of the belongings [of Plantagenet and Glencora] of whom I have spoken" (165). "Belongings" and their role in giving one social roots and a defined place in the social order are important in illustrating ways in which Ferdinand Lopez is not a gentleman. By lying about his ancestry and social origins, Lopez removes the customary signals by which people have learned to predict behavior. None of Lopez's associates "knew whence he had come, or what was his

family" (TPM 1: 3). A gentleman should never conceal his origins or lie about his parents' social standing; his absolute honesty about his "belongings," especially when he has achieved a position higher than that of his parents, marks him as worthy of the name gentleman. "But if a man never mentions his belongings among those with whom he lives, he becomes mysterious, and almost open to suspicion" (TPM 1: 2). And in The Duke's Children, when Lady Mabel Grex thinks about how much older she is than Lord Silverbridge, though both are twenty-two, she wonders "What she would be in ten years, she who already seemed to know the town [London] and all its belongings so well?" (128).

<sup>5</sup> Gindin 32; Smith 132-36; MacCarthy 276; Beyers 15, 20-21; Snow, Trollope 12-13; Brown 19; Lansbury, Reasonable Man 72, 76, 95; Terry 222-23; Tracy, Trollope's Later Novels 73-74, 81, 84; Pollard 197; Wildman 66-68; Betsky 162; Gilmour, "A Lesser Thackeray?" 301-302; Naman 133-34.

<sup>6</sup> According to Trollope, "Johnson says that any other derivation of [the word gentleman] than that which causes it to signify 'a man of ancestry' is whimsical." Though people make some "allowances for possible exceptions" to Johnson's dictum, "The chances are very much in favour of the well-born man . . ." (1: 3). Emily's hierarchy of values for her ideal man includes intelligence, affection, ambition, and education (1: 290). Because Emily's definition of the gentleman excludes birth and breeding,

and places greater emphasis on cleverness than on principles, she accepts the outward manner of Ferdinand Lopez as sufficiently indicative of the inner man. Since Emily has no real opportunity for close association with Lopez before they are married, she sees and knows only Lopez's "gifts of intellect, gifts of temper, gifts of voice and manner and appearance" (1: 233-34). In contrast to his daughter, Abel Wharton places little emphasis on education alone, which cannot "'stand in the place of principles, or a profession, or birth, or country'" (1: 34). Though Emily initially rejects her father's--and Johnson's--definition of the gentleman, her marriage to Lopez teaches her the flaws in her own view, and she moves back to full allegiance to the traditional definition.

<sup>7</sup> Simon Raven defines pietas as "a conservative ideal, inculcating courage, temperance and something more than respect for the established way of life" (28). Gravitas, denoting dignity and seriousness, referred to the rejection of "mean or monetary occupations" and the emphasis on the "open manner" in which gentlemen must live (54). Dignitas was a man's ability to conduct "himself worthily among great men and on great occasions" (28). Describing far more than a man's surroundings, dignitas applied not to "the merely static process of keeping up appearances," but to character, to the qualities that enabled a gentleman "to emerge with grace from the most squalid situation" (54, 28). See also Mason 21-22.

## CHAPTER II

## THE GENTLEMAN FROM CASTIGLIONE TO TROLLOPE

The tradition of the English gentleman has been a major cultural influence for centuries.<sup>1</sup> The ideal originated in the reciprocal obligations of the feudal lord to provide protection and of his followers to provide loyal service. These mutual obligations formed a contractual relationship affirmed by oath, by the spoken word, which remained the heart of the English gentleman's code of honor (Raven 55-56; Betsky 162). As the need for a warrior class diminished, the medieval knight was replaced by the Renaissance ideal of the gentleman. Softened by both humanistic and Christian thought, the Renaissance ideal was predominantly civic and moral. After both its size and power were increased by the Tudor monarchy, the gentry became the largest and most active element in society (Bornstein 107-108; Ferguson 116). Though governing had previously been the privilege and responsibility of the nobility, the gentry were now educated to become the governors and protectors of society (Ferguson xvi-xvii). The ideal of the gentleman thus became the dominant social and educational ideal from the Renaissance throughout most of the nineteenth century (Bornstein 21; Ferguson 59-68).



Gentlemen, or the gentry, were originally those who provided voluntary military or other service; their award for such service was a gift of land (Raven 37). Members of the landed gentry lived on the income from their land; they did not work on the land themselves, but they did have to direct the work done on their land. The status of gentlemen was derived from these distinguishing characteristics: ownership of land; freedom from labor, particularly manual labor; and leisure.<sup>2</sup> Historically, then, divisions between social groups rested on differences of rank and status, and status came from one's position on the social ladder, or one's rank in the hierarchy of grades.<sup>3</sup> Up to the beginning of the nineteenth century, the middle ranks of society (agriculture, industry and commerce, and the professions) were distinguished from the lower aristocratic ranks, or the gentry, by "the necessity of earning their living," and from the bottom ranks (the laboring poor) less by their income than by the property they owned. Such property was not land but "stock in trade, livestock, tools, or the educational investment of skill or expertise" (Perkin 20-21, 23).

As Peter Laslett points out, the system of status did not prevent social mobility. A family could move into the gentry, for example, when it had acquired sufficient wealth to permit them to live without performing manual labor or working for wages. When the family had had such wealth

for at least one generation, it graduated into the gentry (35-36). From the sixteenth century on gentlemen's sons had also gone into the city to become apprentices in profitable trades; gentlemen's sons married daughters of rich merchants, and merchants' sons married daughters of country gentry. Such marriages brought entire families into the gentry, for the country gentry registered their family members in the city whenever the Heralds made their Visitations (Laslett 48).<sup>4</sup> These patterns of social mobility--blends of new wealth with old rank and status--had been in operation for more than five centuries before the nineteenth century began. There had thus long been a need for some form of education, some way of preparing men to fill higher status positions.

The oldest method of training young men to become gentlemen was the courtesy book, originally combined with some form of apprenticeship. The courtesy book, in prose and verse, was in existence by at least the thirteenth century in both France and Italy and lasted in England until around 1780, when it split into the etiquette book and the novel of manners (Rebhorn 12; Rothblatt 60). Designed as much to increase the overall level of civilization as to assist those who sought increased status and rank, medieval courtesy books attempted to provide the young page with the training in manners and the arts that would make him a gentleman fit for a position in the upper ranks of society

(Rebhorn 12; Bornstein 20). The page would also learn much by living among and observing the behavior of knights, the ideal medieval gentlemen. During progressive shifts from medieval to chivalric to courtier, the courtesy book continued its instructive purpose for those seeking upgraded status. Heavily influenced by humanistic moral and social views, Renaissance courtesy books assumed that man could be perfected (Milligan xix) and that he would benefit from the self-discipline acquired while serving an ideal outside himself. Ultimately, of course, society itself would benefit from the results of such personal and moral striving.

The Renaissance ideal of the gentleman was described in translations of numerous Italian works<sup>5</sup> and in such English works as Sir Thomas Elyot's The Governour and Sir William Segar's The Booke of Honor and Arms and Honor, Military and Civil (Bornstein 21, 120-21). Of the Italian courtesy books, Castiglione's The Courtier was the most important. First translated into English in 1561 by Sir Thomas Hoby, it was known in England at least as early as 1531, for it is referred to in Elyot's The Governour (Mason 50, 52; Milligan xiv). Castiglione's influence on Renaissance courtiers and literature resulted in a pattern for the ideal gentleman that lasted for four centuries (Mason 50-56). This pattern, grafted onto the older knightly code of honor, underwent changes of emphasis and

interpretation according to "changing styles, moods, fashions, and values" (Rothblatt 61), and the pattern was still reasonably intact when Trollope was writing.

According to Castiglione, the ideal courtier should "bee a gentleman borne and of a good house," because his rank and the example of his ancestors made it more likely that he would try to live nobly and honorably. A gentleman who does not develop his natural qualities and abilities to their fullest or who swerves "from the steps of his ancestors . . . staineth the name of his familie." But men who are not nobly born, who are not gentlemen, lack the heritage of family honor and tradition; because "they have a want of provocation and of feare of slaunder," they do not feel bound to go any further or achieve more than did their ancestors. Gentlemen, on the other hand, strive to exceed the achievements of their ancestors and feel acute shame if they do not "arrive at the least at the bounds of their predecessors set forth unto them" (269).

The courtier must have knowledge of all aspects of the profession of arms. He must know the weapons of war and be skilled in the use of all. He must be a good horseman; and because he needs strength, lightness, and quickness for many movements in combat, he must participate in "manly activitie." Approved activities include wrestling, swimming, leaping, running, tennis, vaulting, and dancing, but not tumbling, juggling, or "climing upon a cord." Of all possible activities, the most manly is

hunting, "for it hath a certaine likenesse with warre, and is truely a pastime for great men." Hunting is also well established as a tradition, being "much used among them of olde time" (Castiglione 278, 280-81); the long tradition thus lends prestige to hunting and sets it far above other leisure activities.

The courtier must know all the rules of the duel, especially those regarding choice of weapons and the kinds of quarrels or controversies for which a duel can or must be fought. For the sake of himself and his friends, he must be prepared to duel only when absolutely necessary; he must therefore endeavor to use the rules on quarrels to avoid giving offense. Nor should he "runne rashly to these combats," however good his own chances; but when a duel is unavoidable, he must be skillful and must act with courage and wisdom (Castiglione 279). The tradition and code of the duel lasted well into the nineteenth century. Strict codes were adopted to cover causes of quarrels, choice of weapons and seconds, and the conduct of the duel itself.<sup>6</sup> The Palliser novels contain several references to duels; Phineas Finn and Lord Chiltern fight a duel, yet Chiltern, the challenger, remains one of Finn's most loyal friends.

Everything the courtier does should be done with grace, making all efforts seem natural and spontaneous, but such ease and grace can come only after much "rehearsal" (Castiglione 276). The art of the courtier is concerned

with the creation of self, but the subsidiary art of sprezzatura, or nonchalance, is designed to hide the conscious art that goes into a particular performance (Rebhorn 16, 33-35). The art that conceals art thus magnifies the image of the courtier, simultaneously revealing his knowledge and "suggesting that however accomplished he may appear to be, he is potentially even greater" (Rebhorn 36). Since distrust and jealousy are inevitable in a patronage society, a major aim of this concealing art is to enable the courtier to avoid making others feel threatened by his abilities and study (Castiglione 286), which would be thought to give him an advantage in the competition for place and favor. The courtier must therefore rehearse his performances, his actions, so that they seem natural and unpracticed.

Similarly, the courtier must avoid all forms of boasting and self-praise (Castiglione 275). Since men are not entirely self-sufficient, they must learn to acquire favor and to seek promotion without making their intent blatantly obvious. The courtier, then, must conceal his ambition as well as his disappointment over promotions not received; to do otherwise would cast suspicion on his motives and his general moral character (Castiglione 359). Yet Castiglione stresses that the best way to obtain favor and promotion is by deserving them (360). This is the underlying reason for all the advice to the courtier to

develop his own character and abilities and to acquire the proper dress, gestures, behavior, and manners. The courtier is concerned with these outward signals of his character not for their own sake, but because they form the basis of others' judgments about him and his motives (Castiglione 370).

Because he will be judged in part by his friends, the courtier should carefully choose his friends, endeavoring to select someone "like unto him selfe in conditions" and making him "an especiall and hartie friend" (Castiglione 372-73). This special friend should be his confidant; the courtier should not freely confide his thoughts to a number of so-called friends. The courtier realistically cannot expect to have several true and loyal friends, and especially not among men who are different from him "in conditions." Since "there are in our minds so many dennes and corners, that it is unpossibile for the wit of man to know the dissimulations that lye lurking in them" (372), the courtier must work with as many known qualities as possible, which is why he should choose a friend from among those men most like himself.

Closely tied to sprezzatura are the concepts of masking and dissimulation. Sprezzatura, that "certaine disgracing to cover arte withall," or the art "that appeareth not to be arte," is in fact the chief form of masking recommended to the courtier (Castiglione 286).

Other forms of masking are described as dissimulation. The mere idea of dissimulation posed problems for eighteenth- and nineteenth-century writers,<sup>7</sup> but as Castiglione presents it, it is not intended to be the deceitful practice it is often taken to be. Dissimulation is a part of Castiglione's idea of grace. A purely social practice, it does not imply moral deficiencies on the part of the courtier. It "derives solely from the unreasonableness of the world" and is intended to bridge awkward social moments when the courtier could give offense (Trafton 288). Dissimulation also serves to ensure essential privacy and to protect the courtier from wrong judgments by others.

Distinguishing between appearance and reality is always a problem, especially when the necessity and purposes of masking are freely acknowledged. Yet Castiglione's concern with masking and dissimulation goes beyond the behavioral situations to analyze the moral problems they pose. The courtier must be fully aware of both; only then can his role playing achieve "the truest sort of freedom" as well as social success (Rebhorn 14). Dissimulation, a form of role playing, is involved when the courtier "maketh semblant not to understand that he doth understand" (Castiglione 422). If understanding would require a response that would embarrass others or create hostility, it would be wiser to pretend not to understand. Sometimes, too, the task of the courtier is "to deceive



opinion, and to answer otherwise than the hearer looketh for" (430). The examples illustrating this last kind of dissimulation make it clear that Castiglione's intent is to help the courtier avoid harsh, offensive, or combative response that would create a breach in personal and social relationships, and the dissimulated responses all depend on forms of irony (424-29).

Castiglione's view of dissimulation and its ends is especially important in terms of eighteenth-century views of civility and sociability and nineteenth-century views of spontaneity, reticence, and openness. The question of what and how much to reveal about himself has always been a concern of the gentleman; too much openness can be as dangerous and as isolating as excessive reticence or aloofness. Because of the civic and social functions the gentleman performs, he has always had to adapt his behavior to changing definitions and values. He therefore generally adopts some form of masking, whatever he calls the form he adopts. The resulting problem is still the need to distinguish between appearance and reality, and the resulting moral questions are variations on the chivalric concepts of honor, truth, loyalty, and the integrity of self.

The most important intermediary figure linking Castiglione's courtier with the nineteenth-century gentleman is probably Lord Chesterfield, who blended the tradition of the courtier with the seventeenth-century

French cult of honnêteté. The cult of honnêteté was concerned with the social role of the "honnête homme," a term then quite different from its present meaning. Setting standards of taste and personal conduct, honnêteté sought "to please simply for the sake of giving pleasure"; seeking to please others for ulterior motives was unworthy, even sordid. The honnête homme endeavored to please by doing what was fitting in all situations. Acquiring graceful, polished manners was the goal of his life, and pursuit of this goal required perfect leisure (Mason 61-62).

Chesterfield's letters to his illegitimate son, Philip Stanhope, indicate that he too was concerned with creating a perfect gentleman whose behavior and manners pleased others. The French overlay is only the patina of Chesterfield's gentleman, however, for Chesterfield's concern with manners echoes Castiglione's concern with the purposes of dissimulation. Chesterfield's society was still the old patronage society, and ambitious young men still had to please those who could provide the favors and promotions necessary not only for social advancement, but also for social survival. Like Castiglione, Chesterfield is concerned with the "vices of the heart, lying, fraud, envy, malice and detraction" (Mason 64).<sup>8</sup> These vices are the moral flaws that hinder the gentleman's development of his character; they are the vices that prevent good behavior and distort human relationships. They therefore isolate

the individual, but the disorder they create also threatens society.

Though there is a moral emphasis in Chesterfield, it tends to be obscured by the greater concentration on surface behavior, forms and manners, or civility. Sheldon Rothblatt explains that in the eighteenth century civility was "a fully nuanced word," "an open-ended word continually pointing beyond itself." In addition to the surface behavior of social convention, the word also denoted a scale of values and attitudes, the ultimate goal being the elimination of violence and cruelty. For the eighteenth century, then, the conduct described by the word civility "is always more important than the examples to which it refers" (19, 22). But the use of the word changed, and Chesterfield's later critics tended to overlook the understated, often implied concern with moral improvement. These critics saw Chesterfield's concern with manners as evidence of insincerity and hypocrisy, and they were appalled by his endorsement of dissimulation, which had come to mean only dishonesty, deceit, and treachery.<sup>9</sup>

Yet the concept of masking and role playing in Chesterfield, derived essentially from Castiglione, is not limited to the performance itself or to the nature of acting. There is always the risk that the mask chosen will create false impressions and can thus be used solely to deceive. To avoid such intentional and manipulative deception, Castiglione insists that the courtier must know

himself, his own disposition and abilities, and he must not lie or misrepresent himself (360). Since it is unlikely that any man can play a false role successfully, there will be inevitable gaps between false mask and real man. The recommended types of dissimulation are not intended to help the false courtier handle such a revelation of his own deception, so he must shape his mask to reflect his true self and his real qualities. Castiglione's view--and Chesterfield's is quite similar--thus incorporates a flexible, creative ideal, for it demands the "continual control and conscious direction" of the courtier as he develops and projects his own character (Rebhorn 16).

Two writers influenced by the reaction to Chesterfield, and the most immediate literary influences on Trollope's portrayal of the gentleman, are Jane Austen and William Makepeace Thackeray. Trollope readily acknowledged his admiration of their work in An Autobiography and his lecture "On English Prose Fiction as a Rational Amusement." In the lecture Trollope describes Austen's novels as portraying "a circle of gentlemen and ladies" and intended to show "how men should act to women, and women act to men." Trollope's further comments on Austen's theory of character reveal that he is interested in her portrayal of the gentleman as a human reality, which in no way lessened the importance of the gentleman as an ideal type worthy of emulation. In describing how Austen used her characters

to teach manners and virtues, Trollope writes, "It is not that her people are all good;--and, certainly, they are not all wise. The faults of some are the anvils on which the virtues of others are hammered till they are bright as steel" ("On English Prose Fiction" 105). By using some characters as foils for others, Austen was able to make virtue attractive, and vice or folly unattractive. Because he perceived Austen's didactic purpose and her theory of character as being almost identical to his own, Trollope would the more highly value her portrayal of behavior and its consequences.

During his early Post Office days, Trollope claims,

I had already made up my mind that Pride and Prejudice was the best novel in the English language,--a palm which I only partially withdrew after a second reading of Ivanhoe, and did not completely bestow elsewhere till Esmond was written. (Autobiography 38)

At the same time, Trollope was busily engaged in "castle-building," creating in his mind tales that he progressively developed for weeks or months, and it is possible that he began to borrow from Austen's plot and character patterns for his castles in the air. Austen's novels possibly influenced Trollope's device of pairing gentlemen and non-gentlemen in order to explore the process by which a woman learns to recognize and choose the good and honorable man over the more flashy seeming-gentleman.<sup>10</sup> Another possible influence is Austen's treatment of courtship and the marriage proposal. Darcy's first proposal to Elizabeth Bennett, for example, typifies a kind of ungentlemanly

behavior that Trollope uses frequently, though the men in Trollope who exhibit Darcy's kind of pride are generally much less worthy than Darcy. Stressing his own greater worth--birth, status, advantages--Darcy makes his proposal in terms of his personal and social superiority. As Philip Mason says, Darcy's proposal is a failure in magnanimity (72), one of the classical virtues of the gentleman. Trollope uses variations of this kind of proposal to explore the depth and degree of gentlemanliness, and to make courtship a test of character, of motives and perceptions.<sup>11</sup>

Austen's novels explore the dangers of acting, of the performance that is successful but dishonest; her villainous young men are therefore actors who deceive others by their dissimulation. Their polished social graces conceal their lack of principle (Gilmour, Idea 19; Mason 74). The Chesterfieldian gentleman thus came to be seen only as a successful performer concealing ulterior motives, and gradually deteriorated into the Regency dandy<sup>12</sup> and the fashionable young men of the silver-fork novel. Ellen Moers describes the dandy as "a creature perfect in externals and careless of anything below the surface" and "the epitome of selfish irresponsibility" (13). Because he cultivated "style as an end in itself," the Regency dandy set himself apart "from earlier types of unregenerate gentlemanliness"--the roistering buck, the macaroni, the fop, the beau (Gilmour, Idea 52, 51). It was

this external perfection that held an ambivalent attraction for the Victorian imagination.

Following Edward Bulwer's Pelham (1828), William Maginn's attack on Bulwer's novels in Fraser's Magazine (1830), and Thomas Carlyle's attack on Pelham and dandyism in Sartor Resartus (serialized in Fraser's, 1833-1834), a reaction set in against the emptiness of style for its own sake (Gilmour, Idea 48-50; Moers 169-210). Carlyle "made dandyism a metaphor for all the dead moral and intellectual habits which a serious new generation must cast off" (Gilmour, Idea 50), and his critical statement had tremendous influence on a number of Victorian writers, and especially on Dickens and Thackeray.<sup>13</sup> As Robin Gilmour shows in his discussion of the Regency period and the dandy, the criticism of the dandy reflected an increasing distrust of dissimulation, of manners as a means to an end. Like the novels of the young Disraeli and other silver-fork novelists, Pelham is a confessional novel in which the dandy-hero reveals ambition as the motivating force for his pleasing manners. "The ghost of Lord Chesterfield stalks the pages of the silver-fork novel," writes Gilmour, for the intent of the fictional dandy is to please others in order to advance himself (Idea 54).

Trollope certainly shared this revulsive reaction to the dandy. In his commonplace book for 1835-1840 he recorded his reaction to Bulwer's novels, which "only make

me think how wrong he is in his ideas on life & human nature--how false his philosophy is" (Letters 2: 1021).

Trollope also sees Bulwer's heroes as essentially identical; they are

all the same person--all damned gentlemanlike--decidedly clever--very distingué--chivalrous & courageous in the extreme--successful in their amours & perfectly unnatural--I think his novels are calculated to injure a very young man. They would be apt to make him think that he could be every thing at once, & lead him really to be nothing. (Letters 2: 1022)<sup>14</sup>

Trollope thus shares Austen's concern with acting, with seeming to be rather than being.

Thackeray's most important work was done in the last days of the dandy's heyday and the beginning of the Victorian emphasis on the moral character and manliness of the gentleman. In numerous sketches, essays, and novels--from The Yellowplush Correspondence (1838) to The Newcomes (1855)--Thackeray explored the question "What is a gentleman?" One form of the town gentleman that both Thackeray and Trollope knew well and often portrayed was the Gent, "a second-hand, shop-worn imitation of the dandy" (Moers 215). T.H.S. Escott writes that Trollope knew this pseudo-fashionable society of the "shabby genteel" in London--the West End gambling houses, gin houses, and dancing saloons--and portrayed it in The Three Clerks (26); Trollope describes his reaction to his experience of this world in An Autobiography (46-48). The ease with which a young man beginning his working life in the city could be



caught up in this life is one of many problems facing several young men in the novels of both Trollope and Thackeray. As the Gent yearned for full status as a gentleman, so did the snob, another of Thackeray's favorite subjects in his exploration of gentlemanliness. Thackeray also portrayed other varieties of the gentleman: the gentleman rogue in Barry Lyndon; <sup>15</sup> the contemporary gentleman in Pendennis; "the embryonic Victorian gentleman hero" in Henry Esmond (Gilmour, Idea 70); and a quixotic Coverley-type gentleman in The Newcomes.

Vanity Fair provides "three samples" of the gentleman, "all officers in the army, all falling well short of perfection" (Mason 110). Of these three, William Dobbin, "Thackeray's least equivocal portrait of a gentleman" (Gilmour, Idea 71), has many of the qualities Trollope later assigned to his gentlemen. Dobbin is "an honest plodding fellow, quite without George Osborne's dashing style or [Rawdon Crawley's] unquestioning assumption that he had the right to live fashionably on nothing a year" (Mason 114). Dobbin is loyal to his less worthy friend Osborne, faithful to his love for Amelia and protective of her interests; he is brave, honest, and respected by the men in his regiment. He is by no means a Romantic hero, for he is also ugly, dull, and clumsy; but he is "the first of a long line of unselfish [and] self-sacrificing" Victorian fictional gentlemen (Mason 114). Gilmour

emphasizes Dobbin's importance as a model for Henry Esmond, Colonel Newcome, and other gentlemen in the Victorian novel:

It is very much to Thackeray's purpose that we should not only see through the fashionable novelists' idea of what a gentleman is, but come to respect an image of gentlemanliness which has nothing to do with fashion. (Idea 70)

Dobbin's physical features and awkwardness place him "on the opposite pole from the gentleman dandy," and his goodness, firmly rooted in his moral being, "is not reduced by the sneers of the worldly" (Idea 70). By setting Dobbin against two more dashing and physically attractive men, Thackeray conveys the increasing concern with the dangers of seduction by attractive surfaces. The counterpointing of opposites and similarities, the slow accumulation of knowledge from experience of the unworthy man, the potential human tragedy caused by a failure to delve below surfaces to seek, recognize, and consciously choose the worthy man--these become major emphases in Trollope's novels.

In his comments on Thackeray's novels, Trollope says little about Dobbin, though he does object to Thackeray's making him "so shamefully ugly, so shy, so awkward" (Thackeray 92). Trollope's criticism of Vanity Fair reveals that he is more intrigued by the women, the choices they make, and the reasons for their choices. He has much more to say about Henry Esmond's character and gentlemanly qualities. Esmond has faults: he "likes his books, and cannot swear or drink like other soldiers" (Thackeray 125).

Nonetheless,

he is a gentleman from the crown of his head to the sole of his foot. . . . This man is brave, polished, gifted with that old-fashioned courtesy which ladies used to love, true as steel, loyal as faith himself, with a power of self-abnegation which astonishes the criticising reader without seeming to be unnatural. (Thackeray 126)

Trollope admires the portrayal of Esmond, for he believes it is easy to describe a man as virtuous, but much more difficult to show this virtuous man in action, to show him "carrying his virtues with a natural gait, so that the reader shall feel that he is becoming acquainted with flesh and blood, not with a wooden figure" (Thackeray 126).

Thackeray's The Newcomes is particularly important for Trollope's fiction. Barnes Newcome's cold and exacting cash-nexus values, as well as his wife bullying and irresponsible sexual behavior, have their counterparts in Trollope's novels. The Barnes Newcome-Clara Pulleyn-Jack Belsize triangle possibly influenced Trollope's handling of similar relationships. But The Newcomes is most important for its portrayal of Colonel Newcome, a character Trollope greatly admired:

I know no character in fiction, unless it be Don Quixote, with whom the reader becomes so intimately acquainted as with Colonel Newcombe. How great a thing it is to be a gentleman in all parts! How we admire the man of whom so much may be said with truth! . . . It is not because Colonel Newcombe is a perfect gentleman that we think Thackeray's work to have been so excellent, but because he has had the power to describe him as such, and to force us to love him, a weak and silly old man, on account of this grace of character. (Autobiography 221)

Gilmour comments on Trollope's use of the phrase "grace of character," a perfect expression of "the interdependence of morals and manners, the ethical and the social, in the Victorian concept of the gentleman." For Gilmour, the phrase indicates that Trollope was far more comfortable with the idea of the gentleman than was Thackeray. It expresses what Trollope knew: "The perfect gentleman must have qualities of character, of course, but he must also carry them with a grace that is beyond the reach of art or affectation" (Idea 12, 13).

Trollope was indeed comfortable in portraying gentlemen, their way of life, their behavior, their vices and virtues. Despite the long-term poverty of his family and his early adult life, Trollope was firmly convinced of the importance of being born a gentleman and of the superiority of gentlemen. These convictions shaped his belief that being born a gentleman could provide the strength of character that enables a man to endure and overcome the effects of poverty and adversity. Trollope knew that poverty did not build character and had never improved anyone's character (Lansbury, Introduction ii), but he did believe that a man who already had character could survive poverty's distorting effects. And being born a gentleman enabled one to develop character. Gentlemanliness thus "feeds the roots of his values," but only rarely in the novels does it emerge "as a subject or problem in its own

right" (Gilmour, Idea 149). It is therefore necessary for the reader to extrapolate from the novels what Trollope means by the term gentleman.

First, it is important to note that Trollope uses the word gentleman in three senses (Shrewsbury 1).<sup>16</sup> Possibly the most common use of the word is as a perfunctory courtesy title. The result of social inflation, such use of the word had appeared long before the nineteenth century.<sup>17</sup> The natural desire of people to be perceived as more worthy than they are or as having whatever attributes bring rank and status, and thus the respect of others, accounts for this use of gentleman. Its social purpose restricts this use of the term to public occasions. Trollope uses it, for example, in An Autobiography as a general term describing unidentified staff members of newspapers and periodicals. In such instances the term describes an unknown or unnamed man who performs a specific function; his birth, character, and overall behavior are not at issue. In the novels, probably the most frequent use of gentleman as a courtesy title occurs in descriptions of hunts and of all-male gatherings, club activities and meetings discussing hunt concerns. The hunt is open to almost everyone in the community, excluding, Trollope says, only "rustic labourers" and wage earners. There is therefore a "feeling of out-of-door equality" ("About Hunting" 208-209). The atmosphere of the hunt suspends the normal patterns of

deference, and the men customarily refer to each other as gentlemen. In such situations, then, the courtesy title is a convention of the occasion and its purpose. Examples of such use of gentleman can be readily found in the novels, particularly in the meetings of the Dillsborough Club (The American Senator). However, an entirely different context is invoked if the hunt conventions are breached and someone is redefined as "not a gentleman."

Second, Trollope uses gentleman to describe any man who has the rank and status of a gentleman--in other words, a man who was born a gentleman. This group does not necessarily have wealth. Members of poorly paid professions are gentlemen, and the upper ranks of the aristocracy, the titled nobility, are gentlemen. Gentleman in this second instance denotes social rank; it does not indicate that those having that rank also have the personal characteristics or moral attributes that a gentleman is expected to have. This is conveyed by Trollope's third use of gentleman, which designates particular moral or ethical qualities. Many men who are born gentlemen do not live as gentlemen should live. They fall short of the standard in some way, but they are not necessarily cads, villains, or vicious men. Some are, as are George Vavasor and Earl Grex, whose failures are intentional. Others whose failures are not intentional are merely weak and cowardly, as is Lord Fawn. In both cases, however, the failures of gentlemen and the consequences

of their failures on self and others are carefully noted and judged in the novels. Some succeed in living as gentlemen should live, and a very few exceed the customary expectations, but they too have human failings. Trollope's ranking of gentlemen thus parallels the hierarchical structure of society.

The first requirement for the Trollopian gentleman, then, is birth and breeding. Trollope does not deny the possible existence of "Nature's Gentlemen," but he believes they are rare indeed; this is why he insists "There are places in life which can hardly be well filled except by 'Gentlemen.'" He concedes that the son of the village butcher could be as well qualified as the parson's son "for employments requiring gentle culture." It can happen, and Trollope admits that it has often happened. Yet he holds to his conviction that "the chances are greatly in favour of the parson's son" (Autobiography 36-37). In a similar context, Trollope writes,

. . . I do not scruple to say that I prefer the society of distinguished people, and that even the distinction of wealth confers many advantages. The best education is to be had at a price as well as the best broadcloth. The son of a peer is more likely to rub his shoulders against well-informed men than the son of a tradesman. The graces come easier to the wife of him who has had great-grandfathers than they do to her whose husband has been less,--or more fortunate, as he may think it. The discerning man will recognize the information and the graces when they are achieved without such assistance, and will honour the owners of them the more because of the difficulties they have overcome;--but the fact remains that the society of the well-born and of the wealthy will as a rule be worth seeking. (Autobiography 154-55)

And in Thackeray, Trollope writes that

there can be no doubt that a peer taken at random as a companion would be preferable to a clerk from a counting-house--taken at random. The clerk might turn out a scholar on your hands, and the peer no better than a poor spendthrift; but the chances are the other way. (86)

Good birth, good family or blood, wealth--these bring inevitable advantages. Trollope values the advantages and never pretends otherwise. Birth, blood, and family are almost interchangeable terms in Trollope, for they are the prerequisites of breeding. James Bryant Shrewsbury, Jr., describes the Trollopian sense of breeding as "education in its broadest sense, both formal and informal--achieved through constant association from infancy with other gentlemen and ladies" (14). Breeding includes not only the manners of the gentleman--knowing how to dress, walk, talk, and behave in society--but his morals, his beliefs about his honor and his duties.<sup>18</sup> The "long, slow, relatively unconscious training" that results in breeding (Shrewsbury 21) is described in Sir Harry Hotspur of Humblethwaite:

Emily Hotspur was a girl whom any father would have trusted; and let the reader understand this of her, that she was one in whom intentional deceit was impossible. Neither to her father nor to any one could she lie either in word or action. And those lines and points of duty were well known to her, though she knew not, and had never asked herself, whence the lesson had come. Will it be too much to say, that they had formed a part of her breeding, and had been given to her with her blood? She understood well that from her, as heiress of the House of Humblethwaite, a double obedience was due to her father,--the obedience of a child added to that which was now required from her as the future transmitter of honours of the house. And yet no word had been said to her of



the honours of the house; nor, indeed, had many words ever been said as to that other obedience. These lessons, when they have been well learned, have ever come without direct teaching. (12)

For Trollope, breeding is knowledge and understanding acquired over several generations, and unconsciously, almost instinctively, learned by successive generations.

The Hotspurs represent the good blood and good breeding of the long-established family. But Trollope also shows that established families do not always represent good blood and good breeding, and each generation learns what it lives with. The bad blood and breeding of old families are seen in the De Courcy family in the *Barsetshire* series; "the Worcestershire Fitzgeralds, of whom it used to be said that there never was one who was not beautiful and worthless" (CYFH? 2: 342); and the Fichy Fidgett family, the head of which is customarily "a man of pleasure," meaning "a man of sin" (TPM 2: 223). The family's heritage is also one of the reasons it is so critical that a woman marry a man who has more than mere rank as a gentleman, for she takes the level of her husband. This notion becomes important when Lord Silverbridge decides to marry Isabel Boncassen, granddaughter of a dock laborer. And it is important in another sense in explaining the Ferdinand Lopez-Emily Wharton marriage in The Prime Minister. Mrs. Roby, sister of Emily's deceased mother, assumes a maternal relationship with Emily. But she has married Dick Roby, a vulgar man, and she has become vulgar; this is

demonstrated repeatedly in her assistance of Lopez's schemes, her betrayals of Emily and Mr. Wharton, and her circle of friends. Trollope's concept of birth and breeding thus makes courtship and marriage of social and moral importance, for marriage is never only a private, personal matter. Marriage affects not only friends and relatives but the entire community, and the effects of marriage in Trollope can be long-term.

Trollope's gentleman needs also to have money. Money gives him freedom and opportunity for service in Parliament; his financial security allows him to be disinterested rather than self-seeking. Money frees him from poverty, which frequently distorts character and behavior (as it does for Josiah Crawley and for many of the elderly widowers and spinsters in the novels). Money also makes it less likely that the family will be ruined or the estate lost through the heir's youthful recklessness. Plantagenet Palliser can easily afford to pay Lord Silverbridge's gambling losses, even of £70,000 at once, and is more than willing to do so if his son can thereby learn to choose his associates more carefully. Bernard Amedroz, an idle, thriftless man himself, pays £10,000 for his son Charles's debts; but it means sacrificing provision for his daughter Clara, and to some extent his own income. Trollope's gentlemen also need money to pay for the normal living expenses: the season in London, carriages and horses,

servants, the extra costs of entertaining, and benevolent assistance of their tenants and dependents. The gentleman must maintain his property, pay for his children's education, and buy clothing and food for his family. The Trollopian gentleman must pay his debts to tradesmen--his butcher's bills, his wine bills, his tailor's bills, and so on. Some definitions of the gentleman say he is free to ignore all debts except those owed to his social equals, and that his gambling debts, his so-called debts of honor, take precedence (Laski 15-16), but the Trollopian gentleman cannot overlook his debts to his social inferiors and to small tradesmen. Since these people are dependent on their earnings, the gentleman is the more obligated to honor his debts to them.

The gentleman should own land because it gives him ties to past and future; land represents the "continuity and strength" of the family in the community (Terry 227), and it is the means by which the family exercises its influence (McMaster, "Country Estates" 74). Land also gives the gentleman a function, duties to be performed for the benefit of others.<sup>19</sup> In carrying out these duties, the gentleman should spend money as freely as he can afford to do so. He is obligated to his "belongings," his family, relatives, friends, tenants, and dependents. This sense of purpose and duty governs the life of Sir Harry Hotspur:

. . . he was a great man, with a great domain around him,--with many tenants, with a world of dependants

among whom he spent his wealth freely, saving little, but lavishing nothing that was not his own to lavish, --understanding that his enjoyment was to come from the comfort and respect of others, for whose welfare, as he understood it, the good things of this world had been bestowed upon him. (Sir Harry 1-2)

The gentleman should live by the principles of honestum, which Trollope describes as "a system of morality" that "will suit only gentlemen, because he who shall live in accordance with it must be worthy of that name."

Honestum is the moral code derived from Cicero's De Officiis, and Trollope is careful to point out that the Latin honestum means much more than its equivalent English terms honor and honesty: "Modern honor flies so high that it leaves honesty sometimes too nearly out of sight; while honesty, though a sterling virtue, ignores those sentiments on which honor is based. 'Honestum' includes it all."

Honestum is further defined as the question of "whether a thing is fit to be done or left undone" (The Life of Cicero 2: 314-15, 316), and what is fitting is not limited either to social appropriateness or to legal obligation. What is fitting is what is honest and manly; the notion of manliness is difficult to separate from the dictates of honestum. Honestum covers acts of commission and acts of omission, and it covers truth of speech and truth of action. The essential guide in questions of honestum is the individual conscience and sense of honor. Palliser pays Ferdinand Lopez's campaign expenses because he feels a sense of personal obligation. He knows Lopez is not a

gentleman, but that knowledge does not determine his actions. Palliser believes Glencora led Lopez on, lured him with promises of the Duke's support in the Silverbridge election, so he pays Lopez. There are also men in the novels who have no sense of right and wrong and therefore cannot live in accordance with honestum. These men are obviously not gentlemen in the full sense of the term.

Other examples of honestum are found in Trollope's letters and in An Autobiography in the descriptions of his dealings with publishers and the reading public and in his attitude toward critics and criticism. N. John Hall refers to Trollope's "almost quixotic honesty and fairness in dealing with publishers." Hall gives two examples: Trollope's offering to lower the agreed-upon price for John Caldigate because Blackwood's Magazine was then having difficulties, and his offer to repay Chapman & Hall the £120 it lost over the contract for The Duke's Children (Introduction Letters 1: xv).<sup>20</sup> Another kind of honesty is described in Trollope's evaluation of George Lewes as critic:

He is, I think, the acutest critic I know,--and the severest. His severity, however, is a fault. His intention to be honest, even when honesty may give pain, has caused him to give pain when honesty has not required it. (Autobiography 139)<sup>21</sup>

A gentleman does not lie; he is particularly forbidden to give a direct lie. Whenever he gives his opinion, he must be honest; but since criticism can be unpleasant or

painful, he does not give pain by speaking unnecessary critical truths. Further illustration of this type of criticism comes in Trollope's revelation of his own failure in some criticism he did for the Pall Mall Gazette. A friend who thought he was being blamed unjustly for his conduct had written a pamphlet vindicating himself. He brought the pamphlet to Trollope, and asked Trollope to read it and give an opinion. Thinking the request injudicious, Trollope refused; but the man brought a second pamphlet, which Trollope agreed to read:

I then went very much out of my way to study the subject,--which was one requiring study. I found, or thought I found, that the conduct of the gentleman in his office had been indiscreet; but that charges made against himself affecting his honour were baseless. This I said, emphasising much more strongly than was necessary the opinion which I had formed of his indiscretion,--as will so often be the case when a man has a pen in his hand. It is like a club or a sledge-hammer,--in using which, either for defence or attack, a man can hardly measure the strength of the blows he gives. . . . It certainly was not open to me to white-wash with honesty him whom I did not find to be white; but there was no duty incumbent on me to declare what was his colour in my eyes,--no duty even to ascertain. But I had been ruffled by the persistency of the gentleman's request,--which should not have been made,--and I punished him for his wrongdoing by doing a wrong myself. (Autobiography 183-84)<sup>22</sup>

Trollope's view of honestum overlaps with his concept of manliness; to some extent, a concern of both is to keep the individual as free as possible of servile obligation, of dehumanizing sycophancy. In his lecture "The Civil Service as a Profession," Trollope defines manliness as independence--keeping one's soul free, avoiding behavior

that inhibits moral growth. The gentleman's first duty is the development of his personal characteristics and his moral nature, for he is what he brings to any relationship. His moral perception shapes and determines his expectations and his attitude toward others. To avoid servile gratitude and its effect on the spirit, the gentleman should, in any contractual relationship, give more than he receives in return, and he should especially do so in employment. This belief may well be a carryover of the idea that earning money demeans a gentleman, but for Trollope it pays tribute to the necessity both of honestly earning one's own way and of keeping oneself free of gratitude for unmerited favor. Trollope tells his fellow civil servants,

But he who for every half-crown gives service to the full value of half-a-crown,--surely there need be no servility there, no feeling of favour. In such a case the workman confers the favour, and may fairly feel within his own bosom that he does so.

It is however in your power to reverse the matter altogether, and to place the balance clearly on the right side. For every half-crown that you receive be careful to give work to the value of three and sixpence, and then do not care a straw for any man. He who so arranges his weights and measures never does care a straw for any man. . . . That you may attain your object,--that manly independence without which no profession can be pleasant, it is not necessary that all the world should know the amount of return you make. It is only necessary that one man should know it;--and that one man will always know it. I need not tell you who that one man should be. ("The Civil Service" 11-12)

By keeping himself free of servility, a man affirms his own worth. But, as Castiglione advised the courtier, the man need not proclaim his action or motives to others; this is

something he does for himself, and though others inevitably benefit from his action and the manly spirit resulting from it, he need not publicize himself. Such action, in fact, would unfairly create in others the impression that they were receiving favor, thus destroying the purpose of the originating motive.

Trollope's view of manliness also envelops those relationships in which, by law or by social custom, men have power over others. This aspect of manliness embraces the theme of mastery, the uses and abuses of power, and the idea of the machine. It is a theme Trollope works with in many contexts: relationships between employer and employee, master and servant, husband and wife, and so on. Trollope also tells his audience of civil servants:

You will allow no superior to treat you as a machine, to be wound up and set a-going at his will. Pray remember that other men are not to be wound up at your will.

If you allow yourself to regard any one under you as less than a man, you are as mean in that thought, as though you imagined him who is over you to be more than a man. Nay, one meanness will accompany the other. When I see that Smith wants to make a machine of Jones, I know that Smith is a machine ready to the hands of Brown. ("The Civil Service" 15-16)

Trollope shows in the Palliser novels how this process works both ways. The Barrington Erles, the Bonteens, Robys, and Ratlers who surrender independence of thought and action and accept the conforming demands of party loyalty have become machines. Because they allow themselves "to be wound up and set a-going," they expect that others should



similarly adapt. Their own choice becomes a paradigm for what they feel they have a right to expect from others, and their reaction to those who do not surrender principle and personal conviction is one of mingled hatred and fear.<sup>23</sup>

Furthermore, Trollope claims, if

manliness and independence be not achieved it is our own faults. Despots do not make slaves, but slaves make despots. And when you see a man crouch beneath a rod, you should generally blame him who endures the rod more than him who uses it. ("The Civil Service" 6)<sup>24</sup>

The gentleman has a dual moral obligation: his manliness demands that he not allow himself to become a machine, a slave; and his manly respect for the integrity of the individual demands that he not attempt to enslave others. The chivalric code, which required that the gentleman protect the weak and oppressed, is thus incorporated in Trollope's concept of manliness.

A similar belief about the necessity of keeping oneself free of tyranny and oppression is expressed in Trollope's comments on slavery. In his lecture "The Present Condition of the Northern States of the American Union," Trollope refers to slavery as a "degrading social institution." But, he claims,

I am no abolitionist, for abolition, as the term is now used, means the instant emancipation of four million helpless creatures who as free men--made free by instant edict--could only starve or live by rapine till they were extirpated. I am no abolitionist; but I would not own a slave for all the wealth of all the Indies. It is the degradation of the white master which moves me rather than the hardship of the African. ("The Present Condition" 36)

Later, in an article for St. Paul's, Trollope wrote that slavery had been "more terrible perhaps for the possessor than for the possessed" ("American Reconstruction" 670). The lecture makes it clear that though Trollope is appalled by the monumental arrogance of the slaveholders and the inhuman cruelty to slaves, his gravest concern really is with the "degradation of the white master." By accepting and glorying in his role as tyrant and oppressor, the slaveholder destroyed his own honor and manly independence.

Another ungentlemanly form of mastery is that of a man over a woman, the will to possess her or to control her spirit. The impulse to master women can be difficult to overcome, for such mastery has social and legal sanction.<sup>25</sup> Good breeding should teach the gentleman that such an urge to mastery is morally repugnant, that he must allow women their separateness. The desire for mastery is the underlying reason for Louis Trevelyan's belief that he is right, but that whether he is or is not right, his wife Emily is still bound to obey his commands. A gentleman cannot claim the absolute, blind obedience that Trevelyan and Robert Kennedy demand of their wives. Kennedy wants mastery over every aspect of Lady Laura's life--her thoughts, her friends, her daily schedule, her headaches. To him, a wife is property, by law and by Biblical sanction; his will to power is masked by claims of religious duty. Nor can the urge to mastery be disguised as sexual passion; the intent

is still to own the person and control the spirit. This is the vicious impulse epitomized by Sir Griffin Tewett's determination to possess Lucinda Roanoke: "He wanted her, and he meant to have her"; "he would have the thing he wanted" (TED 2: 15, 26). The descriptions of their encounters--the angry, threatening words, the physical violence--make it clear that Sir Griffin intends to use physical and sexual force to control Lucinda and limit her freedom of movement. The implication is that Lucinda's marriage to Sir Griffin would be so brutally devastating that the cold tyranny of Kennedy would pale by comparison.

Furthermore, though the sexual double standard is widely accepted, the gentleman does not take advantage of the freedom it allows him. Such behavior for the man is without legal and social punishment, but the absence of such punishment places an extra burden on the gentleman to consider the welfare of the woman, for it is always she who will suffer. Sexual transgressions and society's response to them are recurring concerns in Trollope; he is particularly concerned with the imbalance of social censure. The concern appears in Can You Forgive Her? in the question of Lady Glencora's elopement with Burgo Fitzgerald, and it appears in the unforgettable scene of George Vavasor with Jane, his discarded mistress. In the preface to The Vicar of Bullhampton, Trollope writes,

It will be admitted probably by most men who have thought upon the subject that no fault among us is

punished so heavily as that fault, often so light in itself but so terrible in its consequences to the less faulty of the two offenders, by which a woman falls. (vi)

The consequences are so terrible, Trollope says, because the woman never fully understands before the act the completeness of the resulting social isolation; that ignorance stems from social secrecy and religious hypocrisy. On the one hand, redemption is promised; but sexual sin in a woman makes others so afraid of the possible taint that they will have nothing to do with her. She is therefore denied all chances of social salvation or moral redemption, and is thrust more deeply into sin for minimal survival.

But the man, who is most to blame, knows that he will escape penalty. In an article for St. Paul's on Dion Boucicault's stage portrayal of a prostitute, Trollope writes,

When we talk of the purity of women we seem to forget altogether that men also should be pure, and that purity of life among men, if it could be increased, would tend more directly than any special teaching to the virtue of women. ("Formosa" 79)<sup>26</sup>

Men--and especially gentlemen--are bound by the same moral demands as are women. Since gentlemen have, or should have, the advantages of birth and breeding, all their behavior, including their sexual behavior, should be consistent with the requirements of honestum and manliness. Because the sexual double standard harms others while

leaving him free, his attempt to claim freedom from moral responsibility is a violation of the gentleman's moral code.

The moral dimension of manliness is demonstrated also in Trollope's portrayal of male-female relationships. The gentleman has a chivalrous respect for women which yet does not deny natural human desire. He thoroughly enjoys being with women as well as with men, and he is able to converse with them intelligently on important subjects. The gentleman rejects a life like that represented by Reginald Dobbes and Crummie-Toddie: an all-male world of Spartan simplicity, isolated from the world of women, devoted to shooting. Shooting excludes women, hunting does not. The hunting scene in Trollope's novels is a microcosm of society, where men's relationships with women are as important as their relationships with men. The gentleman must consciously reject the restrictions of the all-male world and choose the potential for greater freedom and growth offered by the world where women are also participants. Such a choice is illustrated by Lord Silverbridge's departure from Crummie-Toddie to seek Isabel at Killancodlem.

The gentleman is thoroughly alive to passion and values the joy of sexual love. In Trollope, coy lovers are not looked upon with favor; pretending love and denying love are forms of lying. A proper courtship and marriage is firmly grounded in sexual passion. For Trollope's lovers,

sexual desire, the longing for one's lover, is joyous. Sexual desire is revealed in numerous scenes--the woman's hands nervously moving on the man's arm, the fingers wanting to touch and caress; a man's thoughts of the woman's breath, the curve of her bust, the movement of her skirts, the way she sits and moves.<sup>27</sup> Both sexual attraction and sexual revulsion are conveyed by a woman's shudders, extremely different in their nature. Alice Vavasor's shudder when George demands a kiss and a profession of love tells him beyond doubt that he repels her. When John Grey later visits, Alice's shudder at the mere sound of his voice makes clear to the reader what Alice has already acknowledged to herself: she loves and desires John Grey, not George Vavasor. Similarly, when Arthur Fletcher hears Emily Lopez describe her feelings, before she again sends him away, he is assured "not only of love that might have sufficed,--but of hot, passionate love"; he thinks in amazement, "and yet she expected that he would not come again!" (TPM 2: 331). A gentleman who loves a woman, and is fortunate to discover similar love on the woman's part, would be a coward or a fool if he did not persist.

But a gentleman may be disappointed in love; the woman may choose another lover. In such instances the man may not adopt the pose of the courtly lover; manliness forbids such behavior. Rather than making public display of his

emotions and disappointments, he must continue to perform his duties. This is demonstrated by the manner in which Will Belton conducts himself after being rejected by Clara Amedroz, and by the advice Mary Masters sends Larry Twentyman after she accepts Reginald Morton: "Bid him be a man" (The American Senator 2: 496-503). A nice description for such public displays is given throughout John Fletcher's advice to Arthur not to whimper, not to howl. John Fletcher also expresses other aspects of manliness:

" . . . Gird yourself up and go on with what you've got to do. Put your work before your feelings. What does a poor man do, who goes out hedging and ditching with a dead child lying in the house? If you get a blow in the face, return it if it ought to be returned, but never complain of the pain. If you must have your vitals eaten into,--have them eaten into like a man." (TPM 1: 150)

Disappointment does not relieve the gentleman of his obligations to others, nor does grief. He will inevitably face both, for they too are part of his life; but his social and moral obligations to his "belongings" and to the community at large allow him to transcend a morbid concentration on self.

Though he must not wallow in his emotions or force others to do so, a gentleman is free to express his emotions. He can become angry, even with those dearest to him, but he must never be cruel and he must avoid giving unnecessary pain. If he unintentionally injures someone, especially those closest to him, as soon as he becomes

aware that he has caused pain, the gentleman must acknowledge his fault. He must apologize. This type of behavior is shown again and again in Palliser's domestic relationships. Since the spoken word remains, the gentleman must be careful of his actual words, even at times of emotional stress. Giving the lie is a serious offense, for the gentleman thus derogates the other's manliness and accuses him of moral cowardice. Yet even Palliser in a moment of shock says to Frank Tregear, "I do not believe it." Recognizing what he has said, he immediately apologizes, only again to burst out, "I do not believe a word of it" (TDC 39-41). Unlike Palliser, who is always aware of what is due to others, Lord Fawn is aware mostly of what is due himself. Therefore, when Lucy Morris charges him with speaking an "untruth" (not a lie, but an untruth), Lord Fawn takes himself off into sulking isolation until Lucy apologizes. The difficulty is always expressing oneself honestly without creating embarrassment for others, and without assuming that one is due more than other people. The Trollopian gentleman does not permit his sense of self to become an excuse for humiliating others.

The expressions of spontaneous emotion acceptable for a gentleman include tears. Many of Trollope's nongentlemen also express emotions in tears, so tears do not automatically denote gentlemanliness. But they do indicate a capacity for emotion, for instinctive human response, and



they indicate that the character is not completely cold and calculating. Tears may be the result of an insult, of hurt feelings, or of an assault on self-esteem. This is the common-ground response: Major Tifto sheds tears in such instances, and so does Captain Bellfield. Tears shed for others reveal unselfishness or compassion; these are the tears that reveal qualities of gentlemanly feeling. Phineas Finn, for example, after hearing Lady Laura Kennedy describe what her life has become since her marriage to Kennedy, and her exile in a foreign country to escape his tyranny, cannot respond: "He was holding her now by the hand, but he could not speak for the tears were trickling down his cheeks" (PR 1: 104). Arthur Fletcher, when listening to Emily talk about her marriage to Lopez and its consequences for her and her father, about her dead child and her thoughts of suicide, not only has tears running down his face but is audibly sobbing (TPM 2: 180). Spontaneous expressions of emotion are acceptable behavior, but the higher expression is a compassionate response to and sharing of another's pain.<sup>28</sup>

Related to honest expression of emotion is that aspect of manliness requiring frankness and openness, and rejecting pretence and affectation. It is unmanly for any man to pretend to be other than what he is. The conscious effort of the aging Maurice Maule to maintain the appearance of a young dandy is a case in point, as is the life-style of

Captain Gunner and Major Pountney, "two middle-aged young men" (TPM 1: 182). In his lecture "The Civil Service," Trollope provides a definition of honest manliness; a man has achieved this state, he says, when he does not pretend "to anything, either to knowledge, or to sanctity, or to property which he does not possess" (7). The pretensions of the Reverend Joseph Emilius to sanctity and high motives are therefore unmanly. Conversely, Plantagenet Palliser, who is socially shy and easily injured by accusations of others, is manly, for he does not pretend to be other than what he is; there is no duplicity in Palliser. Manliness entails a degree of openness, conveying that one's life or character contains nothing that must be concealed from others. Having secrets is threatening; it raises questions about what is being concealed, and why. George Vavasor is a good example. Most of his associates do not know where or how he lives, nor have they been to his residence. The lack of openness, the insistence on a mysterious privacy, is one of the many signals of George Vavasor's antisocial nature.

In summary, the first requirement of the Trollopian gentleman is birth, being born to the rank of gentleman, which in turn means belonging to an established family. Such birth makes possible the second requirement, gentlemanly breeding, or the informal and formal process by which the gentleman acquires manners and morals. Birth and

breeding require money, both to perpetuate the qualities of good breeding and to perform the duties owed to others. The gentleman will be as liberal as possible in performing his duties, but his liberality should not prevent his children from continuing family tradition. He will therefore serve as steward of accumulated wealth and of land, from which wealth should continue to come. Third, the moral sense of the gentleman includes honestum (honor and honesty) and manliness. Moral attitudes of the gentleman include avoidance of servility and unearned favor (independence), aversion to the oppression of others (justice and magnanimity), respect for women (chivalry), appreciation of marriage and controlled sexual passion (unselfishness, love, generosity), and recognition of feelings and their proper balance (sense and sensibility). The gentleman's virtues include all the classical virtues, such as courage, constancy, and temperance; the difference is that in Trollope these virtues are subsumed under the virtues of honor, honesty, and manliness.

There are several actions, some of which have been mentioned, that prevent a born gentleman from developing or maintaining the moral sense that makes him a true gentleman. This view of moral growth and moral failure is an essential corollary of Trollope's theory of character; it is only by making moral choices that one becomes moral. Repeatedly in the novels we see a character's moral

consciousness grow as that character chooses right action; and we see the loss of moral sense, the blurring of lines between right and wrong, resulting from repeated wrong choices or immoral actions. Generally, it is not a single wrong choice or action that is of importance, but the total pattern of a character's choices. Choosing blackness may be the result of ignorance, selfishness, or cowardice, or it may be a conscious choice; but in any case, the effects of repeated choices are cumulative. The ultimate consequence is the inability to alter one's nature, the incapacity to choose the good.

Trollope uses traditional motifs and even clichés to describe certain kinds of behavior. Because blackness in male sheep is an overt social and moral problem in Sir Harry Hotspur of Humblethwaite, the novel works explicitly with categories of ungentlemanly behavior. Emily would prefer not to be responsible for making distinctions between white sheep and black sheep; for her, the problem would be solved if black sheep were excluded from society. The narrator summarizes the arguments:

As Lady Elizabeth had said to her daughter, that question of admitting black sheep into society, or of refusing them admittance, is very difficult. In the first place, whose eyes are good enough to know whether in truth a sheep be black or not? And then is it not the fact that some little amount of shade in the fleece of male sheep is considered, if not absolutely desirable, at any rate quite pardonable? A male sheep with a fleece as white as that of a ewe-lamb, is he not considered to be, among muttons, somewhat insipid? It is this taste of which Pope was conscious when he declared that every woman was at heart a rake. And so

it comes to pass that very black sheep indeed are admitted into society, till at last anxious fathers and more anxious mothers begin to be aware that their young ones are turned out to graze among ravenous wolves. This, however, must be admitted, that lambs so treated acquire a courage which tends to enable them to hold their own even amidst wolfish dangers.  
(41)

This passage expresses a central problem confronting women and their families in Trollope's novels; the problem is introduced in Can You Forgive Her? and runs throughout the Palliser series. The physical and social attraction of the cad is repeatedly set against the seeming dullness of the moral man; both men and women must learn to see beyond surfaces, and that means seeing in multiple senses, not just for visual or aesthetic pleasure.

Degrees of blackness are also explored in Sir Harry as the narrator constructs a hierarchy of male sins and examines the point at which a black sheep becomes wolfish. The least harmful and most common of male sins are the sins of conviviality, or "table blackness" (43). Men who enjoy companionship and conversation generally learn to love the consequent smoking and drinking, which, like the shared food, give a sense of community, of shared values and beliefs. Drinking has social purposes. In Trollope, the public social drinker is normally a born gentleman who accepts the values of his rank. The private drinker, especially the one who conceals it, is another matter. For concealment is pretence, and pretence is unmanly; pretence is wolfish. Some distinctions also need to be made, at

least by the reader, on the basis of the drink preferred. Conservative country gentry like the Whartons and Fletchers drink port wine; young bachelors drink wine or champagne; the old Duke of Omnium and Burgo Fitzgerald drink curaçao; "men of pleasure" drink liqueurs; Mr. Cheesacre and Major Tifto drink cherry brandy to obtain false courage. Signals are also given by the man who refuses the social drink. George Vavasor, for example, refuses the communal, after-dinner drink with his grandfather.

A second and more serious type of sin is "venial blackness," or sexual sin (42), which does not necessarily result in the social exclusion of the male.<sup>29</sup> In describing society's reaction to the male sheep's sexual behavior, the narrator comments:

Blackness such as that will all be condoned, and the sheep received into almost any flock, on condition, not of repentance or humiliation or confession, but simply of change of practice. The change of practice in certain circumstances and at a certain period becomes expedient; and if it be made, as regards tints in the wool of that nature, the sheep becomes as white as he is needed to be. (42-43)

This comment has greater significance when we remember that George Hotspur is the black sheep being described; that he is living with, and off the earnings of, an actress; and that he intends to marry Emily only as a means of extricating himself from debt. Palliser judges such sexual behavior harshly, as is shown in the counterpointing of private and public social judgments of the Marquis of Mount Fidgett and the effect these judgments have in determining Palliser's bestowal of the Garter on Lord Earlybird.

The third form of sin, and the most serious in both social and moral terms, is the exploitation of others, "premeditated attempts to devour prey." At this point the black sheep has become "a ravenous wolf" (41).<sup>30</sup> Such predatory behavior is less the deceit resulting from weakness and cowardice than the deliberate, planned attempts to exploit others. Gambling can be the impulse of the moment, but cheating at cards requires forethought. Predatory behavior includes any knowing misrepresentation for personal gain.<sup>31</sup> It includes forgery, a vice of both George Hotspur and Ferdinand Lopez; and it includes George Vavasor's advance preparation for duplicity, the cards printed with the name Gregory Vance and carefully stored away until he needs to leave the country to escape the consequences of his actions. Predatory behavior also includes sexual exploitation, using women as objects or as a means of raising money. Marriage for money only is a betrayal of manliness. Using a wife's wealth is acceptable if there is mutual love and respect, for that is a marriage in which husband and wife share everything, as is true of the marriage of Phineas Finn and Marie Goesler. Attempting to persuade or coerce a woman to marry a man she does not love in order to gain money is an ungentlemanly act, and it is an action not engaged in by fathers and brothers who are true gentlemen.

The true Trollopian gentleman is therefore a man who must have much more than the advantage of rank. He has very definite social duties and functions, and he has moral obligations to himself and others. In Trollope's novels a man can have human failings and yet be a perfect gentleman. Being a gentleman demands constant awareness of others and of the problems posed by social change. More than anything else, perhaps, it demands enough introspection to achieve honest self-awareness, which then necessitates conscious moral striving, an effort to live by the dictates of one's sense of honor. The ideal of gentlemanliness is difficult to comprehend in isolation from other concepts and behaviors, for gentlemanliness is also defined as much by what it is not as by what it is. And this is the value and significance of the many-peopled, multiplotted Trollope novel.



## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Of the large number of books and articles written about the history and tradition of the gentleman, the following are particularly useful. The influence of the chivalric and courtier traditions is discussed by Mark Girouard, The Return to Camelot; Wayne A. Rebhorn, Courtly Performances; Diane Bornstein, Mirrors of Courtesy; and Arthur B. Ferguson, The Indian Summer of English Chivalry. Good treatments of classical influences are Howard Erskine-Hill, The Augustan Idea in English Literature; Richard Jenkyns, The Victorians and Ancient Greece; and Sheldon Rothblatt, Tradition and Change in English Liberal Education, especially valuable for tracing the shifts in meaning of such key terms as civility, liberality, independence, and sociability. Essays focusing on Trollope's use of the classics are Frank Pierce Jones, "Anthony Trollope and the Classics"; Robert Tracy, "Lana Medicata Fuco: Trollope's Classicism"; C. J. Vincent, "Trollope: A Victorian Augustan"; and William A. West, "Trollope's Cicero." Very good overviews of the English gentleman in literature, with discussions of both eighteenth- and nineteenth-century writers, are Philip Mason, The English Gentleman; and Robin Gilmour, The Idea of the Gentleman in the Victorian Novel. Victorian permutations of the ideal of the gentleman (the aristocratic, the entrepreneurial, the middle-class, the

professional, the Evangelical or Christian Socialist, and the working-class ideal) are discussed by Harold Perkin in The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880 (192-283). Ivan Melada explores Trollope's fictional treatment of the entrepreneurial ideal in The Captain of Industry in English Fiction, 1821-1871 (164-87). General overviews of the English gentleman are Esmé Wingfield-Stratford, The Making of a Gentleman; Thomas Ballantyne, Essays in Mosaic; and A. Smythe-Palmer, The Ideal of a Gentleman. The last two are anthologies of excerpts on the several aspects of the gentleman. Ballantyne's anthology is fairly small; Smythe-Palmer's is much larger, offering approximately 1,500 excerpts, from the thirteenth through the early twentieth century, with well over 400 from nineteenth-century writings. The largest of such anthologies is Kenelm Henry Digby's The Broad Stone of Honour, which went through several editions from 1822 to 1877, ending in five volumes. Digby's influence on nineteenth-century society, from the novelists to Samuel Smiles's self-made man to the Boy Scout creed, is discussed by Girouard (56-66). Helpful in exploring cyclical degenerations of the gentleman into dandy and aesthete are Ellen Moers, The Dandy; and Martin Green, Children of the Sun. Retrospective views of the gentleman are offered by Simon Raven, The English Gentleman; and Harold J. Laski, "The Danger of Being a Gentleman" (13-32). Specifically on the Trollopiian gentleman, and

apart from the chapters in Mason and Gilmour, possibly the best treatment is a 1954 dissertation, "Trollope's Concept of a Gentleman," by James Bryant Shrewsbury, Jr. Shrewsbury does not put Trollope in either a literary or historical context, but his examination, using the entire canon, does provide valuable insight into the behavior of Trollope's male characters. There are serious problems with Shirley Robin Letwin's The Gentleman in Trollope, such factual errors as numerous misspellings of characters' names, inaccurate application of the "Sir" title, confusion of characters with author, and skewed use of textual evidence; see also Andrew Wright, rev. 105-107. Letwin's book is reviewed also by Noel Annan (7-12) and Peter Stansky (122-30).

<sup>2</sup> Laslett 29, 44; Raven 30, 55; Perkin 25, 38; Bornstein 108.

<sup>3</sup> Laslett makes important distinctions between class and social status or status group and discusses signals of status (22-52). Class, and its association with material possessions and economic power, came in the nineteenth century.

<sup>4</sup> Bornstein describes similar patterns of mobility from 1300 through the seventeenth century (107-134). In addition to acquiring gentility by marriage, a man could acquire it by the manner of his own life. In such cases the King of Arms took proper testimony, and if he judged

that gentility had been so acquired, conferred a coat of arms upon "the newly acknowledged gentleman" (Wagner 78).

<sup>5</sup> Ruth Kelso discusses Italian courtesy books in The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century.

<sup>6</sup> Baldick gives a duelling code representative of those in force for England and the Continent, the twenty-six commandments of the Irish code duello adopted in 1777 (34-36). Historically, insults to women were the major cause of duels, but for England, from the seventeenth century on, the most serious offense was the lie, the gravest form being the lie direct (32). Comment on the duel and its reform in the nineteenth century is given in Escott 260; Perkin 273-78; Gilmour, Idea 27-29.

<sup>7</sup> Trollope was one of those concerned with the ethical problem of dissimulation, as evidenced by his marginal note on Bacon's essay "Of Simulation and Dissimulation":

There is nothing here to solve the acknowledged difficulty in Ethics as to the right a man has to hold back that which is his own, and the duty incumbent on him not to lie. Bacon studies that which is politic rather than that which is proper, when he recommends "the power to feign if there be no remedy." (Sadleir, "Trollope and Bacon's Essays" 23)

In the novels, holding back what is rightly one's own is manly reticence and honor.

<sup>8</sup> Brown similarly defines Trollope's interest as being "the fundamental sources of evil which lie in the heart, rather than in their social manifestations" (43). Trollope is, however, very much a social novelist, and a central

concern in the novels is the relation of characters to others in their personal and social worlds.

<sup>9</sup> The bases of late eighteenth-century and Victorian criticism of Chesterfield's morality are discussed in Gilmour, Idea 16-22; Rothblatt 30-31. Rothblatt links the ambivalence in Chesterfield's Letters to Georgian liberal education theory and its connection of two incompatible terms, liberty and licence. Gilmour describes a similar ambivalence in Newman's definition of the gentleman (Idea 88-92), an inherent tension between manners and morals also discussed by Culler (189-239).

<sup>10</sup> Mason's analysis of the failings of Austen's nongentlemen, especially the charming, flashy young men, implies similarities with Trollope's unworthy men (72-79). Comparisons of Austen and Trollope as novelists of manners are common; see, for example, Booth 138-39, 225; apRoberts 82-83; Terry 12.

<sup>11</sup> One such proposal is that of Sir Frances Geraldine to Cecilia Holt in Kept in the Dark. She will have £20,000, and he has only a small property. But he thinks of the "great things he was about to do for Cecilia Holt" and is convinced she should be grateful; after all, "he was about to make her Lady Geraldine." When Cecilia breaks the engagement, Sir Francis concludes that since there can be no flaw in him, there must be some wrongdoing on her part; she must have another lover (6-7).

<sup>12</sup> See Moers 12-94 and Martin Green 6-14. The lifestyle of the Regency dandy, especially its more immoral aspects, is well presented in T.A.J. Burnett, The Rise & Fall of a Regency Dandy.

<sup>13</sup> Gilmour discusses Dickens's portrayal of Chesterfield as Sir John Chester in Barnaby Rudge (1841). He argues that Dickens's criticism of Chesterfieldian manners set out the contrary values of a reforming middle-class approach to manners. The key words are frank, open, manly, earnest, sincere--acknowledging the possibility of a bridge between manners and morals, feeling and social form. (Idea 20-21)

See also Moers 230-33; and Blount 149-65 for Dickens's use of the dandy as villain.

<sup>14</sup> Trollope also comments on the sameness of Bulwer's novels in An Autobiography. The creation of the false surface is his basic criticism of both Bulwer's and Disraeli's novels. From all of Bulwer's novels "comes the same flavour of an effort to produce effect" (228), and Disraeli's novels are pervaded by "a feeling of stage properties" that succeed only in creating "paste diamonds" (236).

<sup>15</sup> Gilmour examines Barry Lyndon as gentleman rogue (Idea 43-44). Trollope describes Barry Lyndon as "a man possessed by all meannesses except cowardice," a man who managed only "to look like a gentleman," never to be one (Thackeray 70-71).

<sup>16</sup> Cockshut also notes that Trollope uses gentleman in three senses, but he considers it evidence that Trollope's thought on the subject was "confused" (Anthony Trollope 50-51).

<sup>17</sup> Castiglione comments on such linguistic inflation (268), and Laslett refers to the common tendency, already present in Stuart England, to call people by higher titles than those they merited (38).

<sup>18</sup> For example, breeding would have taught Larry Twentyman to walk without a swagger. Young Tom Tringle would have learned not to wear his chains and rings, which brought him the unfavorable notice of others. Lizzie Eustace would have learned that it was vulgar to display her Bible for Lady Fawn's benefit. Good breeding would have taught Ferdinand Lopez that there are things a gentleman does not say, even or especially to his wife.

<sup>19</sup> The duties performed by landowners in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are discussed in Clark 217-28.

<sup>20</sup> In an article for St. Paul's, Trollope describes a similar action by Charles Dickens. Fearing that he might be unable to complete Edwin Drood, Dickens made arrangements to ensure that his publisher would be reimbursed for any loss. Trollope says that such action on Dickens's part "gives evidence of his high honour and thoughtful integrity" ("Charles Dickens" 371).

<sup>21</sup> The idea that one should not inflict pain echoes Newman's definition of a gentleman (1853). Trollope's honestum incorporates an injunction against giving unnecessary pain, but I have read nothing to indicate that Trollope read and was influenced by Newman's definition, though I think it quite likely. Newman was certainly a devoted reader of Trollope from 1858 on; Snow writes that he was "the last supporter in Trollope's lifetime and one of the most perceptive" (Trollope 175). In a letter to Trollope on 28 October 1882, Newman wrote that he read many of the novels "again and again" (Letters 2: 993-94).

<sup>22</sup> Additional illustrations of honesty in criticism, honesty of writers, and "unrecognized dishonesty" may be found in the Autobiography (70-84, 96-106, 238-46).

<sup>23</sup> Trollope's hatred of the attempt to turn subordinates into machines that can be turned on and off at will also underlies his animosity toward Rowland and Frederic Hill, who considered Post Office employees "so many machines who could be counted on for their exact work without deviation, as wheels may be counted on, which are kept going always at the same pace and always by the same power." Trollope's response was "always to obey authority in everything instantly, but never to allow my mouth to be closed as to the expression of my opinion" (Autobiography 122, 124).

<sup>24</sup> Trollope expresses a similar view in The New Zealander when he says that the blame for despotic power



rests on the subjects (39-40). And in his lecture "The Present Condition of the Northern States of the American Union," he argues that one of man's obligations is "rebellion, when rebellion is needful":

Rebellion is a crime; but it is not necessarily a sin. Rebellion is a crime; but it may be, and often is, a virtue which no man, with an honest heart within his breast, should allow himself to neglect.  
(43)

Wingfield-Stratford also insists that a gentleman's honor and conscience are incompatible with conformity and tyranny (110-11).

<sup>25</sup> In an article on mastery and independence in He Knew He Was Right, Gatrell writes that "society has institutionalized this one form of mastery, that of husband over wife" (100), and that general acceptance made it a favorite Trollope subject. The resulting failure to question, to see the damaging effects on both husband and wife, is an example of what Overton identifies as "institutional thinking" (45-46) and "habit blindness" (167-68).

<sup>26</sup> See also Trollope's comments on the sexual double standard in his letter (25 May 1870) to Lady Anna Steele (Letters 2: 522, 524), and in the lecture "On English Prose Fiction" (107-108).

<sup>27</sup> Terry comments on the imagery of hunting and the turf used to convey sexual feeling (76-77). Hunting imagery, however, is also important in portraying the urge to mastery.

<sup>28</sup> I owe to Shrewsbury this insight about the importance of tears (115), though I disagree with his argument that tears in response to personal insults indicate Trollope's approval of the man. Trollope's understanding of human nature and his ability to convey the pain and embarrassment of such men as Major Tifto are not equivalent to approval.

<sup>29</sup> The discussion of sexual behavior in Sir Harry is presented in social, not moral, terms. Yet the moral judgment is implicit in the syntax, the typical Trollopian cadence that Hugh Sykes Davies describes as indicating the process by which actions and motives are analyzed and judged (76-80). Moral judgment is also implied in the commentary on the third and most deadly sin.

<sup>30</sup> In The Commentaries of Caesar Trollope uses the "ravenous wolf" to describe another kind of predatory behavior: Caesar's inhumanity and cruelty, his lack of charity (11-27), and the encroaching Roman empire (28-29). Pollard writes that Trollope took the wolf-lamb image for Caesar's ruthlessness from Aesop (178). Though Trollope apparently chose the image for use in Caesar, written three years before Sir Harry, it became one of his favorite images for the predation he depicts in the subsequent novels.

<sup>31</sup> Givens has written on the theme of predation in the Palliser novels; she identifies George Vavasor, Lizzie Eustace, and Ferdinand Lopez as the most predatory characters in the series (2844A).

## CHAPTER III

## NONGENTLEMEN: AMBITION FOR PLACE AND POWER

Because Trollope strongly believed in "the gradual effect of moral teaching and education" (Autobiography 276), he made his chief didactic purpose as a novelist the teaching of virtue and nobility. He believed that mixed characters, "with not more of excellence, nor with exaggerated baseness" (Autobiography 133), were honest representations of actual men and women, and thus provided better illustration and proof of the lessons he would teach. Trollope considered absurd the argument that fiction is false "because it deals with an imagined and not with a real world of people." Fiction is not fact, but it is truth, "truth of description, truth of character, human truth as to men and women" ("On English Prose Fiction" 113, 124). This human truth is what Trollope believed made it possible for him to teach lessons of virtue and nobility:

. . . that honesty is the best policy; that truth prevails while falsehood fails; that a girl will be loved as she is pure, and sweet, and unselfish; that a man will be honoured as he is true, and honest, and brave of heart; that things meanly done are ugly and odious, and things nobly done beautiful and gracious. (Autobiography 133-34)

Since Trollope believed that "men's conduct will be actuated much by that which is from day to day depicted to them as leading to glorious or inglorious results"

(Autobiography 200), he depicted in his novels men whose conduct resulted in "inglorious results," and he tried to demonstrate the kinds of behavior and attitudes likely to result in failure and loss.

Considering the emphasis that Trollope placed on portrayal of believable characters and his belief that the novel could teach moral conduct, it is not surprising that his portrayal of gentlemen in the Palliser novels ranges far beyond merely explaining the nature of the true gentleman. His gradually unfolding definition of gentlemanliness incorporates also definition by negatives, an exploration of the behavior and conduct of men who want to be gentlemen, men who want merely to be accepted as gentlemen, and men who choose not to be gentlemen. In their portrayal of such men, the Palliser novels examine several forms of pretence, affectation, and dissimulation, for all of these men present a certain character, or persona, to themselves and to others. Seeing beyond the persona presented is especially important for two categories of Trollope's male characters: the born gentlemen who ignore the moral imperative of the gentleman,<sup>1</sup> and the nongentlemen, those who lack the birth or breeding of the gentleman but wish to be accepted as gentlemen, to associate with gentlemen on terms of equality, or to exploit their relationship with gentlemen for material gain.

Trollope's novels portray a surprising variety of nongentlemen, and his sketches of nongentlemen are as

skillful as those of his gentlemen, or those of his cads, scoundrels, and rakes. Hugh Walpole writes that "no novelist in English fiction is better at drawing cads, sharpers, bounders, down-at-heel loafers, ladies of light virtue, lawyers' touts, shabby detectives" (94-95). Not all of Trollope's nongentlemen, however, are of the types Walpole describes. Some who lack the birth and breeding for rank as gentlemen are yet thoroughly manly and honorable men, as is Jacob Bunce, Phineas Finn's landlord. One group of nongentlemen consists of "gentlemen farmers," men of new wealth who have purchased land and estates and other outward signs of rank and status. Because these men lack birth and breeding, they lack manners and education, and they frequently lack the moral sense and awareness of others that are the ideal result of proper breeding. Larry Twentyman in The American Senator is one good example of this type of gentleman farmer. He uses his acres and status as a landowner to apply pressure to Mary Masters even after she has rejected his proposal. Thinking that Mary, the daughter of a poor attorney, can do no better, Larry applies pressure by talking to others in the community and to Mary's parents and sisters. His pride and his actions in publicizing his unrequited love not only embarrass Mary and give her stepmother emotional leverage, but they are the cause of Larry's own embarrassment when Mary accepts the proposal of the squire. Larry Twentyman is by no means a bad man; he is respected and well liked by

the community. But his public talk about Mary and his love for her, as well as his public whining when he is drunk, are actions that create difficulties for others who care for him; they are also actions that gentlemanly breeding would have made impossible.

In the Palliser novels, Larry Twentyman's counterparts are found in Mr. Cheesacre and Thomas Platter Spooner. Mr. Cheesacre, one of Arabella Greenow's suitors, is a major figure in the third plot of Can You Forgive Her?<sup>2</sup> One function of the Cheesacre-Greenow-Bellfield plot is its demonstration that a woman's suitors do not embody either absolute worth or absolute worthlessness. The woman's task thus involves a weighing of the good and bad qualities in both men and choosing the more worthy, or rejecting the less worthy. The other two plots in Can You Forgive Her? of course make the same point, and readers often disagree that the woman in each case does in fact make the right choice. The problem of deciding what constitutes worth or what kinds of conduct truly make a man unworthy is thus shared by character and reader.

In the eyes of Cheesacre, "his wealth indeed constitutes his worth" (McMaster, Palliser Novels 24). His wealth is so important to him that he is constantly boasting of it, and he has no reservations about comparing his financial security to the poverty of his friend Bellfield. For Cheesacre, poverty is a moral flaw; "he

despised poverty in others. It was well that there should be poor gentry, in order that they might act as satellites to those who, like himself, had money" (1: 93). Echoing the public boasting of Sir Louis Scatcherd in Doctor Thorne, Cheesacre announces his worth at the Yarmouth picnic: "'I can walk into every bank in Norwich without seeing my master. There ain't any of my paper flying about, Mrs. Greenow. I'm Samuel Cheesacre of Oileymead, and it's all my own'" (1: 96). In this instance he has been made bold by the wine he has drunk, but his boasting of his property (700 acres, free and clear) and wealth is an essential part of his character. He yet wants more wealth; he is as much attracted by Mrs. Greenow's fortune of £40,000 as he is by her "matured charms" (1: 94). Mrs. Greenow's generosity worries Cheesacre, who fears "she would spend her own money so fast before he got hold upon it, that the prize would be greatly damaged." She pays her bills, is generous to her servants, buys or rents what is necessary for her comfort, and lends money to the poor Fairstairs family. But Cheesacre "desired to obtain the prize unutilated,--in all its fair proportions. Any such clippings he regarded as robberies against himself" (1: 402).

The description of Cheesacre is both physical and moral:

He was a stout, florid man, of about forty-five, a bachelor, apparently much attached to ladies' society, bearing no sign of age except that he was rather bald, and that grey hairs had mixed themselves with his

whiskers, very fond of his farming, and yet somewhat ashamed of it when he found himself in what he considered to be polite circles. And he was, moreover, a little inclined to seek the honour which comes from a well-filled and liberally-opened purse. He liked to give a man a dinner and then to boast of the dinner he had given. (1: 77-78)

Cheesacre's major flaws are failures in magnanimity and breaches of hospitality. He uses his liberality as a weapon to force the deference and respect of others; he never extends hospitality without making others aware that his having done so is a mark of his superiority. He reminds everyone that he has provided the picnic (1: 92), and he tells Kate Vavasor that he has just loaned Bellfield twenty pounds. Gentlemen do not tell the secrets of other gentlemen, nor do gentlemen boast of the assistance they provide each other; but of course neither Cheesacre nor Bellfield is a gentleman. After he has told Kate about the loan to Bellfield, he cautions her not to mention it again. Kate delivers a reprimand--"Such things should not be mentioned at all"--but he is too obtuse to comprehend the import of the reprimand: "No, they shouldn't; and therefore I know that I'm quite safe with you, Miss Vavasor" (1: 85).

Chapter 39, with its ironic title "Mr. Cheesacre's Hospitality," depicts several of Cheesacre's violations of hospitality. Jealous of his friend and rival Captain Bellfield, and fearful of Bellfield's possible progress with the widow, Cheesacre invites Bellfield to Oileymead for a month. His gesture has no shred of charity or



generosity, for it is merely an extension of the spying he has engaged in for some time: he wants to keep an eye on Bellfield, to know his comings and goings. Despite all the rooms with many windows and the mahogany furniture he has boasted about, Cheesacre places Bellfield in "a back room looking over the farmyard in which there was no fireplace." He thus reveals that he has no concern with his guest's comfort, that Bellfield is not worth the usual courtesies from the host. After dinner there are pipes, but no cigars, and brandy and water; Cheesacre has decided that cigars are too expensive to offer his poor friend: "He wasn't going to put himself out, as he called it, for Bellfield!" (1: 406). He chides Bellfield for his poverty and his unfitness for Mrs. Greenow. When Bellfield refuses to stop his courting so Cheesacre will have a clear field, Cheesacre attacks: "'I wish you'd pay me some of the money you owe me'" (1: 408). Because he cannot control Bellfield, Cheesacre becomes increasingly petulant and abusive. At breakfast he complains about the way Bellfield "hack[s] that ham about"; of course Bellfield would be more careful if he had ever bought a ham. Bellfield is near tears and unable to eat; his protest against the verbal abuse of his host is met by further attack: "'Can you pay me the money that you owe me, Bellfield?'" (1: 410-11). Having demonstrated his own pettiness and ruining the morning meal for Bellfield, Cheesacre relents somewhat on

the way into town and finally offers Bellfield a cigar, "the weed of peace" (1: 411). Bellfield, a friend of Cheesacre's for many years, has been a frequent guest and has often depended on Cheesacre for financial assistance. He is in fact one of Cheesacre's "belongings." If Cheesacre were a gentleman, he would know his duty to the less fortunate, especially to those less fortunate others who are part of his personal world.

In addition to trying to keep track of Bellfield's movements, Cheesacre's spying has included paying Jeannette, Mrs. Greenow's maid, for information about the widow's activities and visitors, particularly Bellfield. Jeannette takes Cheesacre's half-crowns and tells him lies and half-truths. His spying is another mark against him, for gentlemen do not spy on others; they especially do not employ others to spy for them. Louis Trevelyan's spying on his wife and his hiring the private detective Bozzle to follow her and provide the information he wants to hear signal his moral deterioration. Similarly, Robert Kennedy's questioning of others in an effort to prove to himself that his wife lied to or betrayed him is unmistakable evidence that Kennedy lacks the moral sense of the gentleman. Watching others is at best an invasion of their privacy, an attempt to curb their independence. Even the very honest and honorable attorney Mr. Masters is angered at discovering his wife is watching him, keeping track of where he goes in

the community and how long he sits talking to the men at Bush Inn.

Cheesacre also has no reservations about telling Mrs. Greenow of Bellfield's poverty, debts, and lies: "'He isn't a bad fellow, you know, only there's no trusting him for anything'" (1: 200). He claims Bellfield is a liar and "a downright swindler" (1: 421). He says Bellfield lies about his military service at Inkerman<sup>3</sup> and offers his belief that Bellfield was "in prison all the time." Mr. Cheesacre overdoes his criticism of Bellfield, however, when he argues that even greater than Bellfield's lies and deceit about his past is the amount of money he owes Cheesacre. The widow's comment is the perfect squelch: "'However much it is, I'm sure you are too much of a gentleman to say'" (1: 422). Poor Cheesacre wants to be a gentleman, but he has no comprehension of how a gentleman behaves, of what a gentleman can or cannot say about others, or of how to court. Mrs. Greenow kindly advises him on how to conduct future courting: "'And look here, Mr. Cheesacre, if it should ever come to pass . . . that you are making love to a lady in earnest, talk to her a little more about your passion and a little less about your purse'" (1: 423). He cannot act on that advice, however, because he has no sense of self and no values apart from his property and his wealth. That is his worth, and without it he would be just a poor man, like the other poor men he so despises.

Cheesacre's dress and behavior when he goes to propose to Mrs. Greenow are further evidence of his lack of breeding. His dress is unmanly in its affectation<sup>4</sup> and inappropriate for the on-the-knees position he adopts:

He clothed his nether person in knickerbockers, with tight, leathern, bright-coloured gaiters round his legs, being conscious of certain manly graces and symmetrical proportions which might, as he thought, stand him in good stead. And he put on a new shooting-coat, the buttons on which were elaborate, and a wonderful waistcoat worked over with foxes' heads. He completed his toilet with a round, low-crowned hat, with dog's-skin gloves, and a cutting whip. (2: 69)

(Cheesacre has previously criticized Bellfield's dress, but Bellfield is taller, slimmer, and better able to carry off the fancy dress.) Having had two glasses of cherry brandy, Cheesacre carries out the task he has set himself. He gets on his knees, not "without some little cracking and straining on the part of the gaiters with which his legs were encompassed." Though she is "painfully aware that he might not be able to rise with ease," Mrs. Greenow is embarrassed by his behavior and tries to prevent his proposal; she even threatens to push him over if he does not get up and stop making a fool of himself (2: 73). She likes a bit of romance, so long as she can remain in control of it rather than allowing it to control her thoughts and actions, but she finds Cheesacre's behavior unromantic and ludicrous in its excess.

Captain Bellfield is different from Cheesacre in every way. Mrs. Greenow has known of his poverty from the

beginning; she knows that the tradesmen have to scramble for their money and that Bellfield cannot pay his washer-woman (1: 74). She knows because she made inquiries. But Bellfield is certainly more physically appealing than Cheesacre:

He was a well-made man, nearly six feet high, with dark hair, dark whiskers, and dark moustache, nearly black, but of that suspicious hue which to the observant beholder seems always to tell a tale of the hairdresser's shop. He was handsome, too, with well-arranged features,--but carrying, perhaps, in his nose, some first symptoms of the effects of midnight amusements. Upon the whole, however, he was a nice man to look on,--for those who like to look on nice men of that kind. (1: 79-80)

Mrs. Greenow indeed finds him nice to look on. When she evaluates her two suitors, she duly considers Cheesacre's worth: "Mahogany-furnished bedrooms assist one's comfort in this life; and heaps of manure, though they are not brilliant in romance, are very efficacious in farming." She does not despise money or what brings money, but she rejects Cheesacre because she is not greedy; she does "not want more money." Since she has plenty of money, Bellfield's debts (less than £400) do not bother her. Nor do his stories about Inkerman worry her: "She also had her Inkermans, and was quite aware that she made as good use of them as the Captain did of his." Whatever faults he has, she believes "that she could cure them,--as far as they needed cure" (2: 65). The narrator briefly contrasts Bellfield and Burgo Fitzgerald, then describes Mrs. Greenow's choice of Bellfield as appropriate and prudent:

Upon the whole I think that she was lucky in her choice; or, perhaps, I might more truly say, that she had chosen with prudence. . . . He was simply an idle scamp, who had hung about the world for forty years, doing nothing, without principle, shameless, accustomed to eat dirty puddings, and to be kicked--morally kicked--by such men as Cheesacre. But he was moderate in his greediness, and possessed of a certain appreciation of the comfort of a daily dinner, which might possibly suffice to keep him from straying very wide as long as his intended wife should be able to keep the purse-strings altogether in her own hands. Therefore, I say that Mrs. Greenow had been lucky in her choice, and not altogether without prudence. (2: 260)

Bellfield, despite his poverty, lies, and debts, is not a vicious or cruel man. He is weak, indolent, and selfish, yet his selfishness extends only to securing creature comforts. Mrs. Greenow makes a choice that would not work for either Alice Vavasor or Glencora Palliser: Mrs. Greenow is just past forty, sixteen years older than her niece Alice; Glencora was perhaps eighteen when she married and is still under twenty-one when Burgo Fitzgerald reenters her life. Mrs. Greenow, the only daughter of the impoverished Squire Vavasor, was thirty-five when she married, and she married for money, a tradesman (blacksmith) thirty years her senior. Much of her marriage was spent nursing her husband; she had not found that disagreeable and was kind to and considerate of her husband. She is grateful to his memory and grateful for his money. A rather earthy, honest woman, she believes that everyone needs some romance (rocks and valleys) in their life, but she is realistic and commonsensical enough

to know that romance cannot exist unless there is money for necessities (bread and cheese).<sup>5</sup> She has earned her bread and cheese and now aims for rocks and valleys. And she has no illusions about reforming or saving Bellfield, whereas both Alice and Glencora have romantic notions about reforming and saving their unworthy men. Mrs. Greenow does not intend to try to curb Bellfield's drinking and smoking; she knows she will let him have more money than she should; and she knows "he'll be making eyes, too, at some of the girls who'll be fools enough to let him" (2: 241). In her eyes, such flirting is not entirely negative; she has previously told Kate that older people would enjoy mild flirting if the younger ones would just cooperate by playing the game.

Mrs. Greenow has reasoned through the arguments and has explained her choice to her niece Kate, cautioning Kate that her choice is appropriate to her age and situation but would be a wrong choice for Kate or for "any other young person" (2: 240). Mrs. Greenow knows herself, her own longing for a man; she is sexually experienced, and she cares nothing about what people might say about her. Mrs. Greenow is in fact a rebel, but she is wise enough to value bonds with family and community. In other words, she is not a Romantic rebel who believes she can live successfully or happily apart from society. Her forms of rebellion are therefore moderate, allowing her to retain a place in the social network.

Thomas Platter Spooner, who appears in Phineas Redux and briefly in The Duke's Children, is similar to Cheesacre in many ways. Few critics have commented on Spooner, and there seems to be no appreciation of how closely the Spooner-Adelaide Palliser-Gerard Maule plot in Phineas Redux parallels the Cheesacre-Greenow-Bellfield plot in Can You Forgive Her? or how the earlier plot illuminates Adelaide Palliser's similar choice. Juliet McMaster discusses Adelaide's choice as evidence of the theme of random accident versus merit, and concludes that "worth has nothing to do with the matter" (Palliser Novels 73). Yet, like Mrs. Greenow, Adelaide does not have a choice of absolute worth against absolute worthlessness, and she too loves the seemingly less worthy man. She too must evaluate the two suitors and decide for herself what constitutes worth and which man is right for her. James Bryant Shrewsbury, Jr., describes Spooner as one of Trollope's "unapproved gentlemen, the gentleman seriously deficient in manners and tastes." He classes Spooner as a gentleman, a country squire:

He owns his own land, has an income of four thousand pounds a year, owes not a shilling, and has been High Sheriff for his county. Furthermore, his family has lived at Spoon Hall ever since the time of his great-great-grandfather. (211-12)

Spooner has, however, ignored the obligations of the gentleman to his land and his "belongings," particularly to his tenants. Choosing to devote himself to hunting, he



acts as unofficial assistant to Lord Chiltern, master of the Brake hounds. For the last ten years the management of his land has been in the hands of a distant cousin, Edward (Ned) Spooner.

Though Mr. Spooner is over forty, he thinks he can still pass for a young man because he rides hard, can shoot all day, and can still smoke and drink until late at night without feeling tired the next day. Yet to the young Adelaide he is an old man, not particularly attractive:

He was a red-faced little man, with broad shoulders, clean shaven, with small eyes, and a nose on which incipient pimples began to show themselves. To himself and the comrades of his life he was almost as young as he had ever been; but the young ladies of the county called him Old Spooner, and regarded him as a permanent assistant unpaid huntsman to the Brake hounds. It was not within the compass of Miss Palliser's imagination to conceive that this man should intend to propose himself to her as her lover.  
(PR 1: 166-67)

However, with the permission of Lord Chiltern, who is Adelaide's host and thus temporarily her protector, Spooner does become Adelaide's suitor. In addition to his age and physical appearance, Spooner has another flaw which is greatly to his disadvantage in Adelaide's eyes: "He could read, and he always looked at the country newspaper; but a book was a thing that he couldn't bear to handle" (1: 158). Despite his family's having lived at Spoon Hall for generations, the implication is that the Spooners have always lacked breeding, which includes education and a knowledge of literature, particularly the classics;

probably no Spooner had ever gone to one of the great public schools. Gentlemen were distinguished by their personal libraries as much as by their well-stocked wine cellars and by their old oaks, visible evidence of the stability and continuity of the family.

On the morning he makes his first proposal to Adelaide, Spooner calls attention to himself by forgoing his daily ride to hounds. Instead, he stays behind and joins the ladies at breakfast. His dress makes his intentions immediately clear to everyone present except Adelaide; like Larry Twentyman, he creates embarrassment for the woman he would make his wife.

He was dressed in a dark-blue frock-coat, with a coloured silk handkerchief round his neck, and had brushed his hair down close to his head. He looked quite unlike himself, and would hardly have been known by those who had never seen him out of the hunting field. In his dress clothes of an evening or in his shooting-coat, he was still himself. But in the garb he wore on the present occasion he was quite unlike Spooner of Spoon Hall, whose only pride in regard to clothes had hitherto been that he possessed more pairs of breeches than any other man in the county.  
(1: 162)

As soon as she sees Spooner's "light-blue necktie," Madame Max Goesler "at once suspected the execution of some great intention." Phineas Finn is simply amazed,

absorbed in his observation of the difference in the man. In his pink coat he always looked as though he had been born to wear it, but his appearance was now that of an amateur actor got up in a miscellaneous middle-age costume. He was sprightly, but the effort was painfully visible. (1: 163)

Spooner has decided to propose to Adelaide because, since she enjoys hunting, he thinks she "would probably like

a man addicted to hunting." Besides, "he didn't think he had ever seen a girl sit a horse better than Adelaide Palliser sat hers" (1: 158). As Philip Collins argues, Spooner's thoughts get mixed up, and images of woman and horse blur and merge in his mind. Collins comments on a passage in chapter 19 (1: 164) when Spooner is talking to Phineas Finn about both horses and Adelaide. His thoughts and remarks move back and forth between the two subjects of his interest. Collins acknowledges the use of the word screw as a term for a horse not perfectly sound. Such use of the term, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, was common in the nineteenth century, and it is one of many slang terms for horses appearing frequently in Trollope's novels. Collins says that Spooner's remark "'There's nothing like a good screw'" is not intended by Trollope as a double entendre; on the other hand, however, Collins argues that "Trollope was, after all, a worldly-wise man" who was bound to know the use of screw as sexual slang since the late eighteenth century.<sup>6</sup> Read from a modern, post-Freudian perspective, the passage is humorous, and its placement in the sequence of Spooner's thoughts, just before his proposal to Adelaide, is undoubtedly important. Whether Trollope intended a sexual reference is debatable, but the passage does convey the natural sexual desire mixed with the romantic impulse--exhibited also in Spooner's impressions of the way Adelaide sits a horse (Terry 77).

What is significant about the entire chapter is its revelation of Spooner's lack of knowledge about how to conduct himself, how to cope with all these apparently rather new feelings, how to approach Adelaide. This too proves his lack of breeding, his deficiency in gentlemanliness.

As Spooner talks to Phineas, he comments, in sequence, on Adelaide, his own property and financial security, again on Adelaide, "a clean-made little mare" (which the narrator comments is not a reference to Adelaide), the value of a good screw, and the ladies back at the house. Obviously restless and trying to decide how he can separate Adelaide from the others so that he can propose, he asks Phineas's help, prefacing his request with comments that are at best rude: "'They tell me you know all about women'"; "'I don't mind asking you, because you've done this kind of thing before'" (1: 164). Spooner also requests active assistance from Phineas, using language which equates the marriage proposal with the challenge to a duel:

"I think I shall propose to that girl. I've about made up my mind to do it, only a fellow can't call her out before half a dozen of them. Couldn't you get Lady C. to trot her out into the garden? You and she are as thick as thieves." (1: 165)

Phineas refuses to get involved, to help put Adelaide in a position where Spooner can easily approach her. Perhaps he remembers Lady Chiltern's complaints (when she was still Violet Effingham) about Phineas and Lady Laura setting her up for a proposal from Phineas which she did not want (PF 2: 67-72).

Spooner finally seizes the opportunity of accompanying Adelaide on a walk to the village. He makes his proposal on the way, preparing himself by thoughts of hunting:

Ride at any fence hard enough, and the chances are you'll get over. The harder you ride the heavier the fall, if you get a fall; but the greater the chance of your getting over. This had been a precept in the life of Mr. Spooner, verified by much experience, and he had resolved that he would be guided by it on this occasion. (1: 167)

Spooner's dependence on hunting analogy, though a logical result of his narrow concentration for the past ten years, makes him both more unperceptive and more obstinate. At first too surprised to say anything, for she had "hardly ever spoken" to Spooner previously, Adelaide finally tells him to go away, his proposal "can't be of any use."

Echoing Cheesacre's offensive insistence to Mrs. Greenow, Spooner replies:

"I don't know why it shouldn't be of use, Miss Palliser, I'm a man of good property. My great-great-grandfather lived at Spoon Hall, and we've been there ever since. My mother was one of the Platters of Platter House. I don't see that I've done anything out of the way. As for shilly-shallying, and hanging about, I never knew any good to come from it. Don't let us quarrel, Miss Palliser. Say that you'll take a week to think of it." (1: 168)

Both Cheesacre and Spooner are so confident that their material possessions give them worth that they fail to consider worth of the individual, a man's personal worth. And both men are so convinced of their superiority to the rival suitor that it is inconceivable to them that they would be refused; both therefore accuse the women of "shilly-shallying." Cheesacre responds to Mrs. Greenow's objections

to the term by attacking Bellfield's character; Spooner, by putting Adelaide on the defensive, forcing her either to lie or to be truthful and embarrass him further: "'You seem to think that I'm something,--something altogether beneath you'" (1: 168). This is in fact what Adelaide thinks, but she denies it, and then walks away, leaving him standing in the path. He is so humiliated--"he had encountered a decided fall [and] it was not sensible practice to ride the horse at the same place again"--that he sneaks back to Harrington Hall, packs, and leaves "without seeing Lady Chiltern or any of her guests" (1: 169). His embarrassment causes him to ignore the courtesy due his host and hostess and their guests.

Adelaide finds Spooner inferior, but not because of her relationship to the Pallisers. "She was the youngest daughter of the youngest brother of the existing Duke of Omnium, and the first cousin, therefore, of Mr. Plantagenet Palliser." She had had little contact with the Duke; orphaned as an infant, Adelaide had been brought up by Mrs. Attenbury, an older half-sister, whose husband was "a mere nobody, a rich, erudite, highly-accomplished gentleman, whose father had made his money at the bar, and whose grandfather had been a country clergyman" (1: 154). Adelaide is poor, but she has the birth, blood, and breeding of a lady. Fleeing an arranged marriage with Count Brudi, Adelaide had left Florence, ostensibly to visit

Lady Chiltern, but really to follow Gerard Maule to England. The fact that she loves Gerard is more important than any difference she perceives in the two men:

It was not simply an affair of age,--nor of good looks, nor altogether of education. Gerard Maule was by no means wonderfully erudite. They were both addicted to hunting. Neither of them did anything useful. In that respect Mr. Spooner stood the higher, as he managed his own property successfully. But Gerard Maule so wore his clothes, and so carried his limbs, and so pronounced his words that he was to be regarded as one entitled to make love to any lady; whereas poor Mr. Spooner was not justified in proposing to marry any woman much more gifted than his own housemaid. (1: 169)

These are Adelaide's thoughts, growing from her irritated embarrassment because of Spooner's proposal, her love for Gerard, and her frustration at Gerard's indolence and failure to declare himself. She specifically recognizes attributes of speech, dress, and culture that indicate Gerard has at least some breeding and education, which make him more worthy than Spooner with all his property.<sup>7</sup>

Despite Adelaide's initial rejection, Spooner makes another attempt. Talking the matter over with his cousin Ned, Spooner gets some sensible advice and the reader gains both information about Ned's former life and further comment about the danger of romantic allegiance to a foolish dream.<sup>8</sup> Since Spooner has heard about a quarrel between Adelaide and Gerard (the news came from his questioning of the Chilterns' servants), he thinks he might have a good chance. And as is frequently the case with Trollope's characters who are steeling themselves to engage in

questionable conduct, Spooner prepares himself by reciting favorable proverbs, like "none but the brave deserve the fair" (2: 114). Yet he is less than generous, and somewhat cowardly, in picking a time when the Chilterns are absent from Harrington Hall and Adelaide is less protected and more vulnerable. He recognizes that his timing might be held against him, but he rationalizes his action as bravery. He tells Ned:

"Old Chiltern is such a d----- cantankerous fellow, and perhaps Lady C. may say that I oughtn't to have taken advantage of her absence. But, what's the odds? If she takes me there'll be an end of it. If she don't, they can't eat me." (2: 114-15)

He has Ned drive him over, so that he will not be flushed from the exertion of driving the horses when he arrives at Harrington Hall. When they arrive, he springs "out of the phaeton with a quite youthful jump" so that any watchers will believe he is much younger than his weather-beaten face indicates, and dashes "briskly up to the front door" (2: 116). The difference in perspective is conveyed by the use of mythological allusions: Spooner sees himself as "a young Bacchus in quest of his Ariadne," but Adelaide looks "at him rather as Diana might have looked at poor Orion than as any Ariadne at any Bacchus." Spooner is sensitive enough to understand that look: "for a moment Mr. Spooner felt that the pale chillness of the moon was entering in upon his very heart and freezing the blood in his veins" (2: 117). Adelaide suspects that he has come



now because he has heard about her quarrel with Gerard, and when he tactlessly refers to her engagement as being "all over," she lashes out at him in her pain:

"And if you do believe it, what a mean man you must be to come to me when you must know how miserable I am, and to think that I should be driven to accept you after losing him! You never could have been anything to me. If you wanted to get married at all, you should have done it before I was born. . . . But you don't know anything of the difference in people if you think that any girl would look at you, after having been---  
---loved by Mr. Maule." (2: 121)

Spooner has previously embarrassed Adelaide in the company of the Chilterns and their other guests. He comes to her when she believes she has lost the man she loves, and reminds her of that loss. Adelaide again leaves him sitting alone, trying to decide how he can best get out of the house. He leaves with a slower, less brisk and youthful step than he entered, but he has such control over his face that Ned does not at first comprehend what has happened. Spooner also lashes out, abusing his cousin, who threatens to leave him and Spoon Hall. But Spooner lifts his whip and strikes "the poor off-horse in his agony. Then Ned forgave him" (2: 122). Like Cheesacre, who develops some love for Mrs. Greenow during the process of courting her, Spooner does have genuine feeling for Adelaide. Unlike Cheesacre, who turns his back and weeps at being refused, Spooner takes his disappointment out on his cousin and the horse. Despite his own pain in this instance, Spooner makes another appeal to Lady Chiltern, for he honestly believes that Adelaide

cannot really love a poor man (2: 320). When we next see him in The Duke's Children, he is over fifty and married to the former Miss Leatherside. He had indicated to Lady Chiltern that his unrequited love for Adelaide would drive him to drink, and he indeed drinks far too much and is often unable to hunt. When he does hunt, his wife prevents him from jumping fences. She is protective and mothering, and Spooner, greatly altered, is no longer sure of himself or his actions.

Besides the "gentleman farmers" like Cheesacre and Spooner, the Palliser novels portray also new men of great wealth. One of these is Sir Damask Monogram, son of a contractor and grandson of a butcher. Created for The Way We Live Now, Sir Damask makes a single appearance in The Prime Minister, when he and his wife are among the guests at Mrs. Roby's dinner party (chapters 9-10, 1: 78-91). Another character whose wealth comes from trade, yet gives him status and social mobility, is Robert Kennedy, a major character in Phineas Finn and Phineas Redux. The Palliser novels also portray men concerned with the making of money by dishonest means; for money, whatever its source, can buy the outward signs of status and rank and allow one to move more freely among gentlemen. These include the moneylender Mr. Clarkson in Phineas Finn; Mr. Scruby, the greedy election agent, and Mr. Grimes, the dishonest tradesman (he waters the beer), in Can You Forgive Her?; and Sexty

Parker, the small-time speculator ruined by Ferdinand Lopez in The Prime Minister.

However, the largest and most important group of non-gentlemen in the Palliser novels is that comprised of toadies and tuft-hunters, low-level political hacks, and other hangers-on. Essentially parasitic, these men use various schemes to ingratiate themselves with those who can provide place and favor. This group includes such presumptuous political men as Mr. Bott and Mr. Bonteen, and the tuft-hunters using military titles, Captain Gunner, Major Pountney, Major Tifto, and Captain Green. Some military men, like Captain Bellfield, are so poor they sell their commissions, continuing to use the title. Military titles are also assumed by the shabby genteel or the not at all genteel; the title is a means of gaining entrée to the social circles where a man can possibly attach himself to someone of wealth and bask in the glow of reflected wealth and influence. These questionable military officers range from the weak and irresponsible seekers of personal comfort (Captain Bellfield), to the vain men with an inflated sense of self-importance (Major Tifto), to the vicious predator (Captain Green).

The first political tuft-hunter introduced in the Palliser novels is Mr. Bott, who appears only in Can You Forgive Her? but is mentioned in The Prime Minister.<sup>9</sup> Mr. Bott is not content with being a political associate of

Plantagenet Palliser, but intrudes himself into Palliser's domestic life.<sup>10</sup> By his presumptuous interfering, he creates serious problems for the young couple, and Glencora both fears and hates him. Our first view of Mr. Bott is through Glencora's eyes, as she describes him to her cousin Alice Vavasor. Glencora is concerned about the repeated clashes between two other guests, the poet Mrs. Conway Sparkes and the Duchess of St. Bungay, wife of one of the leaders of the Whig party.

"'It makes me tremble in every limb when Mrs. Sparkes attacks her,' Lady Glencora said to Alice in Alice's own room that night, 'for I know she'll tell the Duke; and he'll tell that tall man with red hair whom you see standing about, and the tall man with red hair will tell Mr. Palliser, and then I shall catch it.'" (1: 240)

Mr. Bott, the tall man with red hair, is thus introduced to the reader as Glencora sees him: a nosy, eavesdropping, tale-bearing man, in other words, a spy in her own household, busily gathering gossipy tidbits about his young hostess to report to her husband.

Later, in a chapter titled "Three Politicians," Mr. Bott is compared to the Duke of St. Bungay and Plantagenet Palliser. We learn that Bott is a frequent guest at Matching Priory because of the assistance he provides Palliser, who finds him "a very serviceable man in his way" (1: 254). Bott, something over fifty, is a member of Parliament for St. Helens and "a pledged disciple of the Manchester school" who claims "to be a thorough-going

Radical" (1: 253). But he has a liking for aristocrats, especially such aristocratic politicians as Palliser and the Duke of St. Bungay. Palliser apparently expected that Bott would spend his time in the library working on political matters. Bott, however, is more interested in pursuing aristocratic sport: "Twice he went out shooting, but as on the first day he shot the keeper, and on the second very nearly shot the Duke, he gave that up." He then declined to hunt, choosing for the most part "to spend his time, as Lady Glencora said, in standing about" (1: 254).

Mr. Bott's physical appearance and irritating mannerism are further reasons for Glencora's hostility:

He was a tall, wiry, strong man, with a bald head and bristly red beard, which, however, was cut off from his upper and under lip. This was unfortunate, as had he hidden his mouth he would not have been in so marked a degree an ugly man. His upper lip was very long, and his mouth was mean. But he had found that without the help of a razor to these parts he could not manage his soup to his satisfaction, and preferring cleanliness to beauty had shaved himself accordingly. (1: 254)<sup>11</sup>

When he is standing about, Glencora complains, he rubs his hands and smiles and seems to be about to say something. As Glencora tells Plantagenet, "'But when he looks at me in that way, I can't help stopping, as I think he is going to speak; and then he always says, "Can I do anything for you, Lady Glen-cowrer?"'" (1: 254). She hates the way he says her name.

As Alice Vavasor quickly perceives, Bott is responsible for the refrain "Lady Glencora is very young" (1: 252) that so many of her guests repeat without thought, thus failing to consider or appreciate Glencora's individuality. Alice is also quick to recognize the truth of Glencora's suspicions about Bott. Having commented on Glencora's youth so often, Bott has convinced everyone that Glencora needs a guardian, and he has assigned himself this role. Palliser has unconsciously accepted and tolerated Bott's spying on Glencora. His mind on other things, Palliser has not really stopped to consider how it is he hears certain things, who actually brings bits of information to him, or why. But when Glencora's unhappiness forces him to face and deal with the situation, he is shocked by his unconscious wrong against his wife and against himself.

Mr. Bott even approaches Alice, attempting to get her to discuss her cousin with him; and he presumes to act and speak for Palliser:

"I have reason to know that Mr. Palliser is very much gratified that you should be so much with her."  
(1: 260)

"Our friend, Mr. Palliser, I am proud to say, relies much upon my humble friendship. Our first connection has, of course, been political; but it has extended beyond that, and has become pleasantly social;--I may say, very pleasantly social." (1: 270)

Bott, along with Mrs. Marsham, attempts to control Glencora's conduct. Whatever they tell her she should do, Glencora does the opposite. More than willing to comply with her

husband's wishes, she wants him to express those wishes himself; she will not accept them "secondhand by Mr. Bott or old Mother Marsham" (1: 281). Part of Glencora's defiance seems designed to force Palliser into direct, personal communication, to treat their marriage as a personal relationship and not a political relationship in which he can have secretaries deliver communications for him.

We see other aspects of Bott when he takes the new member George Vavasor as his protégé. Bott's character and moral nature are further clarified as the narrator compares the two Members of Parliament:

Nature, I think, had so fashioned George Vavasor, that he might have been a good, and perhaps a great man, whereas Mr. Bott had been born small. Vavasor had educated himself to badness with his eyes open. He had known what was wrong, and had done it, having taught himself to think that bad things were best. But poor Mr. Bott had meant to do well, and thought that he had done very well indeed. He was a tuft-hunter and a toady, but he did not know that he was doing amiss in seeking to rise by tuft-hunting and toadying. He was both mean and vain, both a bully and a coward, and in politics, I fear, quite unscrupulous in spite of his grand dogmas; but he believed that he was progressing in public life by the proper and usual means, and was troubled by no idea that he did wrong. (2: 45)

Bott ingratiates himself with Palliser, and easily shifts his opinion as he thinks Palliser's attitudes change (1: 297). He has no real allegiance except to his own ambition and to currying favor that might help him achieve that ambition. His desire to bully Glencora and thereby gain greater influence with Palliser is disguised as concern for

Glencora, a woman he knows only in her relationship to Palliser. Bott latches on to Palliser in Parliament, constantly whispering comment and advice so that Palliser is unable to attend to the debates. When Palliser leaves while the House is still sitting, Bott goes with him, succeeding "in getting hold of his arm in the lobby." Bott's poisonous presence is drawing to a close, however, as the narrator hints: "Had not Mr. Palliser been an even-tempered, calculating man, with a mind and spirit well under his command, he must have learned to hate Mr. Bott before this time" (2: 49).

Palliser does indeed learn to hate Bott, after Bott sends Mrs. Marsham to tell Palliser that Lady Glencora is dancing with Burgo Fitzgerald at Lady Monk's party. When Palliser goes to bring Glencora home, Bott tries to grab Palliser's arm and whisper in his ear. Lady Glencora sees this, and is grateful that her husband seems indifferent and does not even stop to speak to Bott (2: 107). Palliser has become gradually aware of the truth of his wife's complaints about Bott's and Marsham's spying, which he has unwittingly encouraged. Lady Monk's ball teaches him the truth; "he had begun to hate Mr. Bott, and had felt cruelly ungrateful, when that gentleman endeavoured to whisper a word into his ear as he passed through the doorway into Lady Monk's dining-room" (2: 193). Having seen the truth, Palliser makes no excuses for himself but faces his duty to



himself and to the wife he has only recently realized he dearly loves. Marsham and Bott will no more be his guests, and Bott soon loses his seat. Several months later, when Glencora and Plantagenet are awaiting the birth of their first child, and planning the wedding of Alice Vavasor and John Grey, Glencora tells Alice that Bott and Marsham are to be married, commenting, "'You know how I love them both, and I could not possibly wish any better reward for either'" (2: 404). There is much truth in Glencora's comment, for both Bott and Marsham are ambitious, unscrupulous, mean-spirited, and willing to leave false impressions if doing so will aid their cause. No information is given about the Bott-Marsham marriage, but one tends to agree with Glencora that they deserve each other.

Another political figure of a different order is Mr. Bonteen, important in Phineas Finn and Phineas Redux and appearing occasionally in The Eustace Diamonds. Trollope's description of Bonteen as "a hack among the hacks" (PR 1: 284) is accepted by readers without question.<sup>12</sup> Like Ratler, Roby, and other little political figures who obediently accept the party line out of expediency and selfish ambition, Bonteen represents a type of political action and service directly opposed to Palliser's love of country and concern for its people. Bonteen is like Bott in that by working with Palliser on Exchequer matters, he has more frequent and close social association with the powerful

aristocrats at the head of the Whig, or Liberal, party. He is also like Bott in his assumption that by assisting Palliser he automatically acquires greater personal worth and political merit. But Bonteen's major importance is his attitude toward and relationship with Phineas Finn, whom he hates from Finn's first days as Member of Parliament.

Bonteen's hostility toward Finn is presented in Phineas Finn as the result of political differences, and in Phineas Redux as political enmity spilling over into social and personal relationships. A close reading of the two novels, however, reveals that Bonteen's hatred of Phineas is purely personal; as Andrew Wright argues, Bonteen is simply jealous of Phineas (Dream and Art 102), who is handsome, popular with men and women, and seemingly blessed by Irish luck. Bonteen has a pretty wife, who is not popular or well liked, and Bonteen himself is not attractive to women--and Lady Glencora hates him. As was true for Mr. Bott, Bonteen's work causes him to spend much time at Matching Priory with the Pallisers and their guests, and his behavior there is unpleasant evidence that he lacks breeding, that he has no qualities of gentlemanliness. His self-revelation of course bars him from the higher office he seeks.

One of our earliest glimpses of Bonteen is in chapter 14 of Phineas Finn; he is one of Kennedy's guests at Loughlinter. We see him through Phineas's eyes: "Bonteen, indeed, was a noisy pushing man whom nobody seemed to like,

and Phineas wondered why he should be at Loughlinter, and why he should be in office." He recalls the explanation he had been given previously by Laurence Fitzgibbon, another Irish member of Parliament: Bonteen gets his minor offices because he unhesitatingly speaks and votes as he is instructed (1: 129). It is also at Loughlinter that Bonteen's jealousy of Phineas begins. He insists on making a bet with Phineas on who will shoot the most birds; Phineas reluctantly makes the bet, and then wins it. "Mr. Bonteen, however, was not beaten by much, and was in consequence somewhat ill-humoured" (1: 133). A gentleman should of course accept defeat in such matters gracefully, and especially so when he initiated the competition. By the time the party leaves Loughlinter, Bonteen and Ratler have agreed on their dislike of Finn, a dislike based on evidences of Finn's popularity: "Why did Kennedy go down off the mountain to get him a pony? And why did Mr. Gresham play chess with him?" (1: 152).<sup>13</sup>

Bonteen's jealousy of Phineas grows, aided by Mrs. Bonteen's resentment of Phineas's popularity, which results in what she perceives as slights of her and her husband. At Matching Priory Mrs. Bonteen tries to impress Phineas with her knowledge of the Pallisers, repeating gossip about the Pallisers' early marital difficulties and Glencora's influence over the old Duke since the birth of the heir (2: 82-83). Mrs. Bonteen is particularly annoyed by the

old Duke's attentions to Madame Max Goesler, and to make matters worse, Madame Max seems also to like and be liked by Phineas. On one occasion when the Duke and Madame Max are on the terrace, Mrs. Bonteen hovers about, "looking on with envious eyes, meditating some attack, some interruption, some excuse for an interpolation, but her courage had failed her and she had not dared to approach" (2: 89). The old Duke remains unaware of her presence, but Madame Max sees her and understands her motives. Mrs. Bonteen later complains to Lady Glencora and is made even more angry by Glencora's apparent delight that the Duke had enjoyed himself. When the old Duke's invitations go out for the garden party at The Horns, Phineas is invited but the Bonteens are not. Mrs. Bonteen's "wrath against Phineas was great. He was 'an Irish adventurer' . . ." (2: 234). Bonteen's hostility to Phineas thus grows from personal and social jealousy long before there are grounds for political enmity.

Political enmity comes with the approaching vote on Irish tenant right; Phineas will vote his convictions, against his party, will resign office and return to Ireland. Before the vote occurs, Phineas faces a joint attack by Bonteen and Ratler at his club. Bonteen expresses his belief that political independence is useless; besides, independent members only upset the calculations of others. He then slurs Phineas's Irishness:

"The fact is, Finn . . . you are made of clay too fine for office. I've always found it has been so with men from your country. You are the grandest horses in the world to look at out on a prairie, but you don't like the slavery of harness." (2: 296)

Bonteen can easily accept "the slavery of harness" as long as he gains from it, but in Phineas Redux his too public hostility toward Phineas causes him to lose the expected fruits of the slavery he has accepted.

When Quintus Slide is prevented from publishing the letter from the now crazed Robert Kennedy, Slide writes a series of malicious attacks on Phineas, violating the spirit but not the letter of the injunction. With the newspaper attacks going on, Bonteen's criticism of Phineas becomes increasingly public, hypocritical, and vicious. He and Phineas both hope to be granted office by the new cabinet being formed, so Bonteen now "cloaks his attack on Phineas with the fraudulent charge of sexual misconduct" (Barickman et al. 231) in an effort to destroy Phineas's chances. Trying to persuade Lord Fawn that Phineas is as black as Slide has painted him, Bonteen argues:

"I never liked him from the first, and always knew he would not run straight. No Irishman ever does."

"All the world knows it to be true. He was always there; at Loughlinter, and at Saulsbury, and in Portman Square after she had left her husband. The mischief he has done is incalculable. There's a Conservative sitting in poor Kennedy's seat for Dunross-shire."  
(1: 280)

Bonteen does not comprehend that by charging Phineas with sexual misconduct, he is also publicly attacking Lady Laura.

A gentleman never discusses a woman in public, nor does he say anything which would even seem to suggest her lack of virtue. Bonteen fails to understand that Phineas's refusal to defend himself against Slide's attacks is the result of his desire to protect Lady Laura from further humiliation; both Phineas and Mr. Low have agreed that the first priority is to protect the lady, let the costs to Phineas be what they will. Furthermore, though Bonteen seems concerned about the party's loss of Kennedy, he forgets that Lady Laura has blood ties to the most powerful figures in the party, and that her father, the Earl of Brentford, now nearly senile, is still remembered for his public service.

The newspaper attacks continue, and the gossip circulates, growing as it goes the rounds of clubs and social gatherings. The opposition to political office for Bonteen also grows as the women become involved. Lady Cantrip talks to her husband, Finn's superior at the Colonial Office when Phineas chose to vote against the party. Unlike Bonteen, Lord Cantrip respects Finn's courage in adhering to personal principle; he thought Finn's action "high and honourable conduct" (1: 328). And Lady Glencora persuades her husband to drop his support for Bonteen. Bonteen's loss of political favor, however, is also the result of his own arrogance in his relationships with other politicians. He has insulted Phineas about his vote for Irish tenant right, and he shows the resulting exchange of letters to

others. Lord Cantrip advises Phineas to ignore Bonteen's insults and accusations: Bonteen is such a cunning and mean-spirited man Phineas would only be further damaged.

The most devastating blow to Bonteen's ambition is one he himself delivers. In an effort to make others see Bonteen as she does, Lady Glencora singles him out

for her special attention, and in the presence of all who were there assembled he made himself an ass. He could not save himself from talking about himself when he was encouraged. On this occasion he offended all those feelings of official discretion and personal reticence which had been endeared to the old duke [the Duke of St. Bungay] by the lessons which he had learned from former statesmen and by the experience of his own life. To be quiet, unassuming, almost affectedly modest in any mention of himself, low-voiced, reflecting always more than he resolved, and resolving always more than he said, had been his aim. Conscious of his high rank, and thinking, no doubt, much of the advantages in public life which his birth and position had given him, still he would never have ventured to speak of his own services as necessary to any Government. That he had really been indispensable to many he must have known, but not to his closest friend would he have said so in plain language. To such a man the arrogance of Mr. Bonteen was intolerable. (1: 357-58)

The Duke of St. Bungay is present in all six Palliser novels, and he is particularly important because of his role as friend and adviser to Palliser. He is also the kingmaker, the powerful political figure behind the scenes, carrying messages to and from the Queen and the Prime Minister, the man involved in the formation of all cabinets. Bonteen's display of arrogance before this powerful politician is therefore crucial. Such political hacks may be necessary, the duke concedes, but "a constant, gentle

pressure against the door would tend to keep down the number of the Bonteens" (1: 359).

Bonteen does not become Chancellor of the Exchequer, with a place in the Cabinet. He is offered instead "the inferior office of President of the Board of Trade," which he accepts.

But having done so he could not bring himself to bear his disappointments quietly. He could not work and wait and make himself agreeable to those around him, holding his vexation within his own bosom. He was dark and sullen to his chief, and almost insolent to the Duke of Omnium. (2: 22)

It is easy for Bonteen to be insolent to Palliser, Duke of Omnium, because he has convinced himself that is a better man than Palliser, more politically worthy, and more knowledgeable about Exchequer matters. These are comments Bonteen makes publicly, and they help draw forth another of Slide's attacks. In this one Slide places all blame for Bonteen's loss of favor on the evil of Phineas Finn, but Slide also suggests that Bonteen will be the leader of the Liberal party before the session is over (2: 26). This merely feeds Bonteen's ego and injured pride.

During these personal and political controversies, Bonteen has also involved himself in the affairs of Lady Lizzie Eustace, who has run away from her husband of one year, the Reverend Joseph Emilius, and has taken refuge with the Bonteens. His actions to protect Lady Eustace from the husband who demands her return are parallel to Phineas's actions to protect Lady Laura Kennedy. Bonteen



seems unaware that the accusations he has made against Phineas could be made also against himself, and with more justification, for Bonteen's active involvement and his public accusations of Emilius exceed Phineas's friendly support of Lady Laura. Phineas enters his club one night and overhears a drunken Bonteen loudly speculating that "'Mr. Phineas Finn, or some such fellow as that'" would be after Lady Eustace at once (2: 51). The ensuing quarrel and the tension it generates in *The Universe* are eased by the appearance of the Prince. But when Bonteen leaves the club, speaking to Barrington Erle and Laurence Fitzgibbon, but slighting Phineas who is with them, Phineas comments on his own dislike of Bonteen. "Then, with a laugh, he took a life-preserver out of his pocket, and made an action with it as though he were striking some enemy over the head" (2: 57). Bonteen is of course murdered that night, and Phineas is arrested and tried for murder. This sequence of events brings further attacks from Slide, and Phineas, through a series of agonizing experiences, learns an indelible lesson about the dangers of dealing with non-gentlemen. One cannot touch pitch without being defiled; or, as Mr. Low told Phineas earlier about Slide, "'You have encountered a chimney sweeper, and of course you get some of the soot'" (1: 252).

Quintus Slide is one of Trollope's most frightening portraits of the nongentleman. All the nongentleman seem

to share certain traits: excess and unwarranted pride, belief in their own power, no sense of others or of obligations to others, and lack of self-awareness. The common human habits of rationalization and self-persuasion seem to be carried to extremes by nongentlemen so that they become totally unaware of any discrepancy between word and deed, motive and action, appearance and reality. The true Trollopian gentleman remains painfully aware of such discrepancies and endeavors to bring his actions and his understanding of them into closer harmony. Quintus Slide, however, is the nongentleman par excellence; incapable of the necessary introspection to examine his own motives, he never recognizes his malice and vindictiveness for what they are. His targets are Phineas Finn (in Phineas Finn, Phineas Redux, and The Prime Minister) and Plantagenet Palliser (in The Prime Minister). It would not be wrong to say that being attacked by Slide marked a man as an honorable and worthy gentleman.

Slide is "a young man, under thirty, not remarkable for clean linen," who talks of 'Ouses and horgans. We are told, "It was not that he was insincere in all that he was daily saying,--but simply that he never thought about it." With no principles of his own, no political loyalties, his main interest is the fight itself, "having a good subject on which to write slashing articles" (PF 1: 242). Though Slide has no political loyalties, he does have ambition;

he intends to represent Loughton (1: 262), which has for a long time been the Earl of Brentford's borough. However, Phineas Finn is elected to represent Loughton, and when Phineas refuses to agree to Slide's terms ("You shall have Loughton this session if you'll promise to make way for me after the next election." PF 1: 319), Slide becomes a determined enemy. Slide's thinking follows consistently simplistic lines of either-or: you are either for me or against me; either you do what I want or I will destroy you. He has an extreme urge to master others, to make them into machines that function at his will.<sup>14</sup>

Slide argues that "'private quarrels between gentlemen and ladies have been public affairs for a long time past,'" that "'the morale of our aristocracy,--what you call the Upper Ten,--would be at a low ebb indeed if the public press didn't act as their guardians'" (PR 1: 200). Slide intends to publish the letter from Kennedy in which Kennedy complains of Phineas's treachery and Lady Laura's sin against and subsequent desertion of her husband. He will agree not to publish the letter if Phineas will guarantee that Lady Laura will return to her husband. But Phineas does not have such influence over Lady Laura, nor would he try to persuade or coerce her to return to a life she hated or to a husband who is now insane. Slide pretends to high motives--"'morals and purity of life'" (1: 200)--and he mouths part of the code of the gentleman: "'Purity of

morals, Finn;--punishment for the guilty;--defence for the innocent;--support for the weak;--safety for the oppressed; --and a rod of iron for the oppressors!" (1: 201). But Slide has no comprehension of what is meant by these phrases, what kinds of behavior they require or forbid. Impressed by "the extent of the duties, privileges and influences of the daily press," Slide merely claims for himself the superior position of the godlike judge and punisher of others.<sup>15</sup>

Though his subsequent article does not quote Kennedy's letter, Slide "contrived to repeat all the bitter things which it contained, with some added venom of his own" (1: 240). His utter lack of any of the qualities of honestum is indicated by his intent either to use the letter or to exert power over Lady Laura and Phineas, by his blatant disregard of the spirit of the injunction while obeying its letter, and by his blending of his malice with Kennedy's vindictiveness. The narrator emphasizes the case against Slide's action by commenting on Slide's motives for publishing an article that was "a tissue of lies":

The paper 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. The weapon which he had used was one to which his hand was accustomed, and he 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. (1: 249-50)

Slide has obviously taught himself to believe that the way

he uses The People's Banner is right, proper, and moral. He so defines the concepts of "editor," "power of the press," and "the public" that he never looks inward to examine his own attitudes and motives. He consequently gives no thought to the actual pain his articles cause others, or to how they damage people or disrupt their lives. His concern is the amorphous public, not individual men and women, and his view of the public is a reflection of his self-image. Phineas Finn's reaction to this "first thunderbolt" from Slide is not anger: he is hurt, wounded in spirit. He is hurt by every single accusation in Slide's article, from the attack on Lady Laura to the allusions to his own poverty. (The word hurt is used six times in as many lines. PR 1: 250)

Slide's attack on Palliser in The Prime Minister results from similar personal spite and malice. Slide had written a letter to Palliser, requesting invitation to Gatherum Castle. He had alluded to his powerful position in the press and reminded Palliser of the public's right to know about his private life. In return for an invitation, Slide would of course provide a good press for Palliser and his ministry. Since he became Prime Minister, Palliser has been forced to deal with so many greedily grasping men that he at first wonders if Slide's letter is "a terribly bad sign of the times." After a hearty laugh at Slide's presumption, the Duke of St. Bungay answers Palliser's question: "'The man is both a fool and a blackguard; but

I don't think we are therefore to suppose that there are many fools and blackguards like him'" (1: 164). But St. Bungay misjudges Slide's motives, even after all the attacks on Phineas and Lady Laura, for he thinks only that Slide perhaps thought he might be sent an invitation by a secretary.

Considering Palliser's refusal to invite him to Gatherum a rejection of "'the right 'and of fellowship'" (2: 89), and Slide never forgives such slights, Slide from this day becomes Palliser's enemy. His opportunity for attack comes when Palliser pays Ferdinand Lopez's campaign expenses.<sup>16</sup> Even if there is no truth to Slide's charges, the chance of accusing the Prime Minister of having a borough in his pocket is a perfect opportunity for revenge. Like Phineas, Palliser is hurt by Slide's attacks, both because he recognizes the motive of malice and because he cannot defend himself without involving Lady Glencora. She would prefer that he place the blame on her, but that would be against every principle he holds dear:

"I couldn't do it, Cora. Though the stain were but a little spot, and the thing to be avoided political destruction, I could not ride out of the punishment by fixing that stain on my wife. I will not have your name mentioned. A man's wife should be talked about by no one." (2: 108)

Though he is always hurt by attacks on himself, Palliser is thrown into absolute agony by any attack on his wife, by the mere suggestion from a third party that she is less than perfect. They have their disagreements and domestic

battles, as all married couples do, but no one will ever hear him criticize his wife and thus embarrass her or subject her to ridicule. Both Palliser and Finn have a chivalrous respect for women generally, and both suffer temporary loss of political status because they choose to protect the women in their lives. Lord Silverbridge unconsciously absorbs this chivalric attitude, as we see by his reaction to Dolly Longstaff's profession of love for Isabel Boncassen and his reference to her as a "pert poppet" (TDC 547-49).

None of the nongentlemen discussed here have the advantages of birth and breeding, and whether breeding would have made a large difference in their characters is perhaps a moot point. But breeding should have provided, at the very least, the ability to distinguish between right and wrong, and a consciousness of right action apart from simple self-interest. The nongentleman's major failure seems to be a lack of manliness: he has no accurate view of himself, his abilities, or his personal worth; he fails to perceive the interdependence of character, individual action, and social success; and he seems unaware of the reciprocal obligations underlying personal and social relationships. This lack of manliness makes it impossible for the nongentleman to build the kind of character appropriate to a gentleman; without manliness, he cannot acquire the innate sense of honor and honesty that should

determine his actions. Because he is blind to what is due others, the nongentleman places disproportionate emphasis on himself and the claims of self; his actions consequently result in increased failure and loss. In Trollope, no goal--whether personal, social, or financial--can be achieved and maintained without due recognition of the interdependence of all of human life. It is this understanding that separates nongentlemen from gentlemen.



## Notes

<sup>1</sup> These are the men that Shrewsbury calls "fallen gentlemen" (122) and that I call simply cads, scoundrels, and rakes; they are the subject of the next chapter.

<sup>2</sup> This third plot has often been dismissed as unrelated to the other two and therefore of no real structural or thematic importance in the novel (James, in Smalley 249; Marsh i-ii; Pope-Hennessy 254; Pollard 83). Even those who see the widow Greenow's choice between two suitors as parallel to the choice facing Alice Vavasor and Glencora Palliser tend to see the Greenow plot only as "comic relief" (Escott 213; Edwards 19, 92; Booth 84; Terry 30, 74). In recent years, however, readers have begun to take the third plot seriously and to discuss its integral thematic relationship to the other two (Garrett 81, 185; McMaster, Palliser Novels 23-24; Kendrick 71; Wright, Dream and Art 81-82). The dovetailing of the three plots is undoubtedly at least partly the result of Trollope's planning for the installments in serial publication (Hoyt 59), but the balancing of plots featuring a choice between the worthy man and the wild man is used throughout the series, as well as in many of the other novels.

<sup>3</sup> Trollope also uses the spelling Inkermann. Other variants include Rattler/Ratler, Mrs. Attenbury/Mrs. Atterbury, Trompeton/Trumpington. In The Eustace Diamonds there is a confusion of Brook Street/Bruton Street for Lady

Linlithgow's residence. A similar confusion of address is incorporated into the plot of The Duke's Children, when Lord Silverbridge addresses a letter to Isabel at Bruton Street instead of Brook Street (chapter 68).

<sup>4</sup> One is reminded of Trollope's comment in Thackeray on the "affectation of finery; the vulgarity which apes good breeding but never approaches it" (20) and the often quoted statement, "I hold that gentleman to be the best dressed whose dress no one observes" (197). Trollope makes similar comments about writing style and personal behavior styles. Any affectation that causes a man to stand out and be noticed--style for its own sake--is a negative sign.

<sup>5</sup> Cockshut is wrong, I think, when he argues that the love leading to marriage in Trollope's novels is "separable from the sexual instinct," that "physical desire is a male peculiarity," and that Trollope reduces "the married state [to] the 'bread and cheese' of love" (Anthony Trollope 112). The rocks and valleys/bread and cheese opposition is one of the ways the tension between romance and reality is presented; no more a negative quality than reality, "bread and cheese" denotes the staples, the sustainers of life. Surely, too, the women who reject a man by saying they do not have the love a woman should have before she mates with a man (and the phrase is frequently used), or say that they do not love the man the way a wife should love her husband, are admitting that sexual desire is part of their concept of love.

<sup>6</sup> Collins names the wrong Spooner, identifying Ned as Adelaide's suitor (302-303).

<sup>7</sup> McMaster describes Gerard as "virtually a negative quality . . . completely lacking in determination or energy or social position or money" (Palliser Novels 73), and Shrewsbury finds him the "obvious product of his father's selfish indifference" (175). Gerard will be discussed more fully in the next chapter in terms of the parental and moral failures of Maurice Maule, the "old padded dandy" (PR 2: 48).

<sup>8</sup> Ned had loved a young woman named Polly Maxwell. Too poor to marry, they had yet sworn fidelity, and neither had ever released the other from their youthful vows. They thus condemned themselves to a life of regrets and loneliness (2: 112), both passing up other opportunities to marry.

<sup>9</sup> In The Prime Minister Mr. Bott is referred to by Lady Glencora, who has become ashamed of her social and political failures: Major Pountney, Ferdinand Lopez, Sir Orlando Drought, and Sir Timothy Beeswax. She comments to Mrs. Finn:

"I've known a good many vulgar people in my time . . . but none ever so vulgar as our ministerial supporters. You don't remember Mr. Bott, my dear. He was before your time;--one of the arithmetical men, and a great friend of Plantagenet's. He was very bad, but there have come up worse since him. Sometimes, I think, I like a little vulgarity for a change; but, upon my honour, when we get rid of all this it will be a pleasure to go back to ladies and gentlemen." (2: 300)

<sup>10</sup> Critics who discuss Bott generally do so only in terms of his political role (Halperin, Trollope and Politics 65; Pollard 87). Marsh comments only that "Mr. Bott and Mrs. Marsham are fitted to a nicety" (v). Both the Geroulds' Guide and the Hardwick Guide merely comment on his self-appointed role as Glencora's guardian (29; 118).

<sup>11</sup> Later, in a vehement argument with Palliser, Glencora refers to Bott as "'that odious baboon with the red bristles'" (2: 90). Her aversion to Bott and his spying becomes quite intense, as her husband is for a long time too unperceptive to comprehend the nature of Glencora's objections or to sense Bott's threat to their marital happiness.

<sup>12</sup> Halperin, Trollope and Politics 195, 207; Pollard 93; McMaster, Palliser Novels 64, 74.

<sup>13</sup> It is relevant here to note the argument that Coral Lansbury presents in chapter 4 of The Reasonable Man (68-81), where she discusses the sense of success, personality, and popularity in Trollope's writings. Lansbury points out that an attractive appearance may bring a man admiration, as it does for Adolphus Crosbie and Burgo Fitzgerald, but men who are admired are not popular: "popularity in Trollope's definition is always derived from moral excellence" (76). Male popularity is thus directly related to the moral dimension of Trollope's concept of the gentleman, for it denotes personal merit and moral worth.

A man who is popular in the Trollopian sense will never experience total defeat or failure, partly because of his own inner qualities, but also because he will always have friends; and in Trollope, a man with true friends cannot fail. This Trollopian sense of popularity is important in understanding the long-term hostility between Bonteen and Finn and the shifting grounds of conflict--Parliament; private dinner parties; The Universe, the club of both men, which in Phineas Redux becomes the center of all the threads of conflict. We see Bonteen in the club, never alone, always making himself one of a group, "affecting popularity, and always at work increasing his influence" (PR 1: 308).

<sup>14</sup> Edwards discusses Slide's initial approach to Phineas in terms of Phineas's attractiveness to men, hinting a possible sexual attraction (20). McMaster describes him as "a character as odious as Mr. Slope in Barchester Towers, and made repellent by the same ugly sexual overtones" (Palliser Novels 67). Slide certainly has a prurient interest in the private lives of others, which he disguises as his concern for public morality. He does not restrict his interest in the secret sins of others to speculation and gossip, which would be sufficiently damaging, but publishes his speculations as mixed innuendo and fact.

<sup>15</sup> The power of the press, and the abuses of that power for misguided or selfish motives, are frequent Trollope

subjects. They appear in The Warden and numerous other novels; in The New Zealander, the biography of Palmerston, the Autobiography, and other nonfiction. For narrative comment on the power of the press and the arrogance of editors, see Phineas Redux, chapter 27 (1: 233-40).

<sup>16</sup> The circuitous route by which the information reaches Slide in the first place is an interesting comment on the nongentlemen on the outer fringes of the social world in the Palliser novels. After Lopez loses the election, he becomes friends with Major Pountney, who also has a grievance against Palliser. (Pountney had asked for the Duke's support/patronage for Silverbridge; Palliser was so offended he asked Pountney to leave Gatherum. In subsequent club talk, Pountney implied he was asked to leave Gatherum because of his relationship with Glencora.) Pountney passes the information on to Lizzie Eustace, who in turn gives it to Slide in exchange for advice about investing in Lopez's speculative schemes.

CHAPTER IV  
CADS, SCOUNDRELS, AND RAKES

In the early nineteenth century, cad was a term used by students at Eton and Oxford to describe townsmen who hung about the colleges, providing the students with whatever they needed for their leisure activities and sports.<sup>1</sup> As seems always to have been the case, collegians' leisure activities were sometimes unsavory, and a main role of the cad was to cater to the unsavory and sordid impulses of students. By extension the term cad came to be colloquially applied to any townsman. The negative connotations of the word made it appropriate also to describe the born gentleman whose conduct was not what was expected of a gentleman, and this use of the term was well established by the middle of the nineteenth century. In Trollope's novels a cad is most normally a man who ignores the moral imperative of the gentleman.<sup>2</sup> He has rank and status, and he may be physically attractive, but he has no character, no principles, no sense of honor or honesty. The cad is also unmanly; he is furtive instead of open, selfish instead of generous, fickle instead of constant, wasteful instead of conserving, idle instead of active, lustful instead of loving. Because he is an angry, resentful, hating man, he is incapable of forming and maintaining lasting human relationships. The

cad in fact embodies those attitudes that are the antithesis of such Victorian values as manliness, earnestness, and duty.

The rake is a particular variety of the cad. Because he has rejected the duties and function of the gentleman, the rake has excess leisure, and he uses his money (or other people's) to indulge his vices--gambling, drinking, and womanizing. Womanizing is of course one of the politer terms to describe the rake's behavior; his irresponsible sexuality results in his exploitation of women, sometimes of his own rank, sometimes of poor women forced into prostitution for survival, sometimes of servant girls. In either case, the rake betrays his own manliness and violates the gentleman's chivalric obligation to women, to the defenseless, to the poor and oppressed. Paying a prostitute a few shillings is a subversion of the gentleman's duty to his "belongings" and his community, to all those who are in some way dependent on his goodwill.

In the novels women sometimes refer to men who lack courtesy and breeding, whatever their rank, as cads. Lady Glencora, for example, describes certain members of the London sociopolitical circle as "cads and caddesses" (TPM 1: 346). The terms scoundrel and villain were sometimes applied to gentlemen, or those others had assumed were gentlemen, but they were more generally applied to men of low birth. Their behavior might be no different from that of cads, but it was assumed that gentlemen knew better.



The gentleman's heritage, his breeding, education, and associations from infancy were all expected to provide the gentleman with knowledge and instinctive understanding of right behavior. It was therefore assumed that a gentleman's failures were more serious and self-condemning; he was seen as choosing his fate, so to speak, whereas the man of low birth, who did not have the greater advantages of breeding, would more frequently misjudge and conduct himself improperly because of his lack of breeding.

The more vicious and predatory the cad's behavior, the more likely he was to be called a scoundrel or a villain. George Vavasor, for instance, could at various times in his life be called a scoundrel. Burgo Fitzgerald, who has neither the energy nor the will for active violence against others, is a cad, but he might not necessarily be called a scoundrel.<sup>3</sup> And Ferdinand Lopez, who lacks the birth and breeding of a gentleman but is skilled at imitating the outward manner of the gentleman, might be called a cad so long as others still accept him as a gentleman and judge him in terms of expected gentlemanly behavior. Progressively, however, empirical evidence proves Lopez's complete lack of the feelings of the gentleman, and he is then variously described as a scoundrel or a villain.

The Palliser novels present a fascinating group of cads, scoundrels, and rakes. Several are minor characters in only one novel, and others have a major role in one

novel, then disappear. Lord George de Bruce Carruthers, Sir Griffin Tewett, and Frank Greystock appear only in The Eustace Diamonds, though Lord Carruthers is mentioned in Phineas Redux; Joseph Emilius has a minor role in The Eustace Diamonds and Phineas Redux. The lives of several rakes are merely summarized (Sir Florian Eustace and Admiral Greystock in The Eustace Diamonds and the Marquis of Mount Fidgett in The Prime Minister); such summaries provide keys for interpreting character or the situation shaping a particular action. Since the comedy of manners tends to eliminate characters who threaten to subvert society and its values, the cad, scoundrel, and rake are often rejected by the community. The greater the threat posed by the character's behavior, the greater his final separation (exile or death) from the society he has warred against. Two of the most thorough cads in the Palliser novels--George Vavasor and Burgo Fitzgerald--appear in Can You Forgive Her?, the first novel of the series. Both characters appear only in this novel, though Burgo is present in subsequent novels in the thoughts and memories of Plantagenet and Glencora Palliser.

George Vavasor is seen in a variety of ways by Trollope's readers, sometimes sympathetically.<sup>4</sup> Throughout the novel, however, George is portrayed as a man who intentionally chooses to do wrong and to exploit others. Both nature and breeding have given him the potential to

be a good and honorable man, yet his selfish concern with material gain invariably causes him to act dishonestly. In the earlier stages of his moral deterioration he is fully aware of the wrongness of his actions, but he always persuades himself it is too late to change his habits. On those occasions when George analyzes his own conduct, he sometimes considers suicide "because he knew that he had taught himself amiss" (2: 45), yet it is easier for him to continue the pattern than to try to change it. He therefore simply acknowledges to himself that he is "a rascal" (1: 391; 2: 46) and continues to prey on others.

George Vavasor violates the ideals of gentlemanly conduct in every aspect of his life--his mysterious privacy and isolation, his attitude toward family and land, his exploitation of women and rejection of the social bond symbolized by the marriage vow, his physical violence against his sister, and his hating and wishing to destroy anyone who does not serve his purposes. He learns to use his facial scar and its reminder of his capacity for violence to convey and exaggerate real anger, and he chooses his words and actions for the effect they will have on others. The scar that runs down the left side of his face, from the eye to the jawline, "a black ravine," is also a reminder of George's potential for heroic action. During his boyhood he had fought with a housebreaker about to enter his sister's room; George's face had been ripped open by the housebreaker's chisel, which George had then wrenched

from the man, driving it through his opponent's throat and killing him. Since then, however, George has learned to use the resulting scar as a means of intimidating others; "he would so contort his face that the scar would, as it were, stretch itself out, revealing all its horrors, and his countenance would become all scar." With his black hair, dark eyes, and thick black eyebrows, George's face so contorted has a ferocious aspect. When his face is contorted in anger, "all his face which was not scar, was eye and eyebrow" (1: 41). By using his scar and its reminder of violence to create fear, George perverts heroic action.

The potential for heroic action in fact becomes cowardice, for George plays on the fears of women, particularly his cousin Alice and his sister Kate. Everything that he does or says is the result of his calculation of the effect a particular word or action will have on someone else. As Juliet McMaster says,

he speaks for effect, and frames his propositions craftily with an eye to the person he is trying to persuade, deliberately suspending his own spontaneous feelings in order to speak what will most get at his listener. (36)

To George, people have no value or importance in their own right; they are of value to him only so long as he can use them for his purposes. When he cannot so use them, he wishes to destroy them. Early in the novel, when he and Kate are discussing John Grey, Kate discounts her brother's

praise of Grey. She knows that he speaks "sometimes from his heart . . . but his words come generally from the head" (1: 32). In Trollope, the head and heart dichotomy is inextricably linked to honestum and manliness. The head represents the coldness of calculated thought, a hardness of attitude that places material standards against the intangible but enduring values of gentlemanly conduct. The heart represents honest, open, generous manliness; it is instinctive human response to people and feelings without regard to material advantages or disadvantages. Without heart, honestum and manliness are inoperative, for without heart, a man is incapable of disinterested concern for others, and he is especially incapable of love and its concomitant attitudes.<sup>5</sup>

The grandson and heir of Squire Vavasor, of Vavasor Hall in Westmoreland, George is thirty-two at the beginning of the novel. His grandfather, with an income of at most £1,000 a year, has spent the last twenty years paying off the debts on the family estate so that the property can continue in the family (2: 131). Two years prior to the beginning of the novel, George had wanted to raise money on the Vavasor estate to invest in the wine business, but his grandfather refused: "No one but a ruined man would attempt to raise money on the family estate!" (1: 36-37). George has neither seen nor spoken to his grandfather since, for he believes he has an immediate right to use the

property that will become his after his grandfather's death. The background thus provided lets the reader know that George has no feeling either for the land or for his family's attachment to a particular place. Nor does he have the proper feeling for the family itself, which is even older than the Palliser family. The Vavasors are an old Saxon family, related to the Vavaseurs described by Chaucer (1: 326).

The reader quickly learns other details about George that prove he has also ignored other duties of the gentleman. During the two years he has not spoken to his grandfather, George's engagement to his cousin Alice was broken off after she discovered his infidelity and falsehood:

He had not only been untrue to her, but, worse than that, had been false in excusing his untruth. He had not only promised falsely, but had made such promises with a deliberate, premeditated falsehood. (1: 25)

Alice had learned about George's mistress, the woman he had been living with for three years.<sup>6</sup> George had subsequently become engaged to an heiress named Miss Grant, who died a month before they were to be married. Thus unable to get his hands on Miss Grant's money, George decides to become reconciled to his cousin Alice: she has a fortune of £10,000, and he intends to have her money. Because Alice was once engaged to him, George convinces himself that he has a claim on her fortune, that she is still obligated to help him win election to Parliament.

In the meantime, of course, Alice has become engaged to John Grey. The son of a clergyman, Grey owns Nethercoats, a twelve-acre estate which has beautiful, spacious gardens, rare shrubs, and excellent greenhouses. Grey had taken honors at Cambridge and now pursues scholarly interests; his library is known even among the universities as one of the finest private collections in England. He goes to London only when he needs to use a library or to see an editor or publisher (1: 103). Grey's seclusion, his withdrawal from active public life, is in Alice's eyes his one flaw, but it is something she feels unable to discuss with him. Though Alice loves Grey, she yet doubts that she will be happy with him or that she can make him happy. She sees him as perfect, and that perfection both frightens and angers her:

He was noble, generous, clever, good,--so good as to be almost perfect; nay, for aught she knew he was perfect. Would that he had some faults! Would that he had! Would that he had! How could she, full of faults as she knew herself to be,--how could she hope to make happy a man perfect as he was! (1: 24)

Alice also has a characteristic in common with such other Trollope characters as Emily Hotspur and Emily Wharton. Greatly valuing her own judgment and independence, Alice resents any sort of advice or persuasion. She takes enormous pride in making her own independent decisions, yet she is so afraid of the consequences of error and misjudgment that she sees every decision as an indication of her personal and moral worth. Like the two Emilys, once Alice

makes a mistake in judgment, she puts herself through a masochistic process during which she refuses both self-forgiveness and the forgiveness of others. Though he has intuitively recognized these flaws in Alice, John Grey cannot always adequately describe what he feels; he is like Palliser in his awareness of the inadequacy of language to express intuitive knowledge and profound feelings.<sup>7</sup>

As Alice knows, Grey is clearly the better and more worthy man, and his physical attractiveness far exceeds that of George. Grey is also a much larger man than George, a fact easily overlooked because George is always exaggerating and posing, while Grey always conducts himself in the understated manner of the gentleman, drawing no undue attention to himself. George himself describes Grey as an "uncommonly handsome" man who talks well, not like a prig (1: 31). Grey is tall and very handsome, with brown hair [and] bright blue eyes," and to Alice he has "a mouth like a god" (1: 113). There are other differences between the two men. John Grey is popular and well liked--by his servants at Nethercoats and his London landlord; by his lawyer Mr. Tombe; by John Vavasor, Alice's father; in fact, by all he meets. He has one intimate friend, Frank Seward, a former schoolfellow, a clergyman and college tutor, and Plantagenet Palliser later becomes an intimate friend.

George Vavasor, however, has no close friends apart from his sister Kate. He has "lodgings in Cecil Street,-- down at the bottom of that retired nook," but his lodgings



are so private that but few of his friends know where he lives.

Vavator also maintained another little establishment, down in Oxfordshire; but the two establishments did not even know of each other's existence. There was a third, too, very closely hidden from the world's eye, which shall be nameless. . . . (1: 120-21)

George compartmentalizes his life; he chooses a life of mystery "as though secrecy in certain matters might at any time become useful to him" (1: 121).<sup>8</sup> He employs one groom at his second establishment, but he keeps no other servant, not even a valet, for "a valet about a man knows a great deal of a man's ways" (1: 125). During the entire novel, few people are welcomed at Vavator's lodgings: Mr. Scruby and Mr. Grimes, who work in his campaigns; Burgo Fitzgerald, to borrow money and discuss his plans to elope with Glencora; and Jane, his discarded and destitute mistress, who makes one unexpected visit to beg for money to buy food. George's secretiveness and mystery are maintained even among the huntsmen of the Roebury Club. Though these men admire his horsemanship, they neither like nor trust him:

He was not a man that made himself really popular in any social meetings of men. He did not himself care for the loose little talkings, half flat and half sharp, of men when they meet together in idleness. He was not open enough in his nature for such popularity. (1: 161)

During the hunt Vavator also maintains his chosen isolation from others: "He never [rides] in a crowd, always keeping himself somewhat away from men as well as hounds" (1: 178).

He rides "always in the next field to the left," never speaking to anyone (1: 181).

Yet Alice reengages herself to George after jilting John Grey. George has no love for Alice; he merely wants her money, but he would not object to mastering her and possessing her person (Wright, Dream and Art 83). He also hates John Grey, whom he describes to Kate as "a gentleman, a scholar, and a man of parts," because of his gentlemanly breeding and conduct. And for George, hating means wishing to harm: "He could not violently dislike a man and yet not wish to do him any harm" (1: 123). He can best harm Grey by taking Alice away from him. Because George sees himself as intellectually superior to those around him, he thinks marriage "an old-fashioned custom, fitted indeed well enough for the usual dull life of the world at large . . . but which was not adapted to his advanced intelligence." Though taking John Grey's intended wife from him will give George pleasure, it would have been better "if Alice could have been taught to think as he did as to the absurdity of those indissoluble ties" (1: 311-12). He lacks the courage to attempt such a lesson, for he recognizes an aspect of Alice's character that Grey also recognizes: she will boldly risk every shilling of her fortune, but her conscience, her sense of duty and honor, will never let her compromise her character or reputation. With these thoughts running through his mind, George writes Alice,

again proposing marriage. He does not hesitate to tell her he expects to use her money to obtain a seat in Parliament, but he also promises that if she accepts he will "endeavour to be reconciled" to their grandfather (1: 315). He chooses just those arguments that will appeal to her and will play on her doubts of her fitness to be Grey's wife. After the letter is written, George thinks contemptuously of her and women generally: "'I'll bet two to one that she gives way. . . . Women are such out-and-out fools'" (1: 316). He flips a coin to determine whether he will actually mail the letter; that is how much marrying Alice means to him.

Alice accepts his proposal, stipulating that the marriage be a business agreement only; she will provide money, but nothing else. She makes it clear, or tries to, that there is no love on her part, that the marriage must be based on mutual interests and affection, not on "passionate love" (1: 338). Alice is in fact attracted by the idea of reconciling George and his grandfather, affirming family honor and tradition, and she believes that men should be active in public life. When he receives her letter and her generous offer of money for his election expenses, he says to himself, "'It is probably the best thing that I could do, whatever the effect may be on her'" (1: 340).

It is from this moment that things begin to go against George. Knowing that he does not love Alice, he yet wants

her to love him; if she will not, he will try to master her and reduce her to submission. He therefore sets out to change the terms contained in the letters. Alice has, however, fully realized her error of judgment. In her thoughts, Grey becomes the Paradise she has rejected; and George, the Pandemonium she chose instead (1: 371). Yet she persuades herself that she might possibly be George's savior: "She might save him from ruin, and help him to honour and fortune." But because there is no love, she cannot kiss him or accept his kisses; they would "pollute her" (1: 359). She soon realizes, despite their letters, that George will insist on marriage in fact as well as name, and she decides she will commit suicide before she will let that happen (1: 384-85). She will give George every bit of money she has, but she will not give him herself.

In chapter 35, "Passion versus Prudence,"<sup>9</sup> the clash of wills between the two cousins demonstrates what the pattern of their second engagement will be like. George forgets or ignores the conditions of Alice's letter, which he had accepted, and now demands that she declare her love for him. He wants her money certainly, but he wants also to be the recipient of her love. When he insistently demands a kiss,

She shuddered as she sat, still silent, on her seat, and he saw that she shuddered. With all his desire for her money,--his instant need of it,--this was too much for him; and he turned upon his heel, and left the room without another word. (1: 366)

He thinks of that shudder with anger, one moment vowing to let her and her money go, the next moment vowing to punish her for this mistreatment of him. His ego had caused him to believe that Alice had continued to love him, despite his conduct toward her, but now he knows better:

He had read the truth at a glance. A man must be very vain, or else very little used to such matters, who at George Vavasor's age cannot understand the feelings with which a woman receives him. (1: 391)

George also knows that he cannot now take Alice's money with any sense of honor or right action. But telling himself he is a rascal, he determines to get her money anyway.

At the same time he begins to indulge his anger against Alice, his anger against his grandfather grows, and he begins wishing the old squire would die (1: 365). Hating his grandfather, he yet carries out the reconciliation he has promised both Alice and Kate. This is prudent action on his part, for he needs Alice's money, and because he is too ashamed and cowardly to request it himself, he uses Kate to make the requests. George's reconciliation with his grandfather demonstrates his complete lack of grace and sincerity; he observes only the bare minimum of form, and he takes pains to let his grandfather know it is form without feeling. His apology to his grandfather consists entirely of "'I'm sorry there has been any quarrel, and all that, you know'" (1: 401). Throughout the four days he is at Vavasor Hall, the only time he is alone with his

grandfather is the half-hour after dinner, during which the old squire always has three glasses of port. George's refusal to have a single drink is an offense, and that offense is compounded by his refusal to converse with his grandfather; he obstinately stares at the fire instead.

Only after George wins his seat in Parliament does he again visit Alice, his first visit after the shudder which so angered him. Still unable to force her to love him or to feign love, he uses temper and violent emotion to try to master her. He throws a small ruler Grey had given her behind a sofa, and a ring he had brought her into the fireplace. Indifferent to slights from men, George cannot endure "any personal slight from a woman" (2: 109). If he has tried to make himself agreeable to a woman, in his mind she is obligated to prove "personal favour" of him; but Alice has shown that she loves Grey, not George. He thinks that if he were free to do so, if he did not need her money, he would dispose of Alice as readily as he threw the ring into the fireplace. "And he would have been clever enough to do so in some manner that would have been exquisitely painful to Alice, willing as she might be to be released from her engagement." If "that wretched old man in Westmoreland" would just die, then George would have access to those "paltry acres" and would be free of his dependence on Alice (2: 110).

While George feeds on his anger toward Alice and his grandfather and his wish to punish them, his thoughts

naturally turn to his heroes, the murderers Rush and Palmer; he believes that they were great men of genius and courage. In George's mind, Rush and Palmer were "manly" because they rejected "all scruples and squeamishness." He believes that for every murderer hanged, twenty are not, and of course he is clever enough to commit murder without being detected:

He did not tell himself that he would like to murder his grandfather. But he suggested to himself, that if he desired to do so, he would have courage enough to make his way into the old man's room, and strangle him; and he explained to himself how he would be able to get down into Westmoreland without the world knowing that he had been there,--how he would find an entrance into the house by a window with which he was acquainted,--how he could cause the man to die as though, those around him should think, it was apoplexy. . . . If he were to become an active student in the Rush or Palmer school, he would so study the matter that he would not be the one that should be hung. He thought that he could, so far, trust his own ingenuity. But yet he did not meditate murder. (2: 111-12)

With such an egocentric view of his own powers and ability, he is not far from meditating murder. The roles he has assigned himself have progressed from using his facial scar to exaggerate real emotion, to using verbal violence and threats of physical violence, to fantasizing murder.

George's moral deterioration is hastened by his discovery that it is not Alice's money he has been using, but John Grey's. Acting to protect Alice as much as possible from George's rapaciousness, Grey had, with the assistance of his lawyer and Alice's father, worked out a scheme so that Alice would think she was using her money, but it would be paid to George from Grey's account. The scheme is a truly magnanimous act on Grey's part, for his

annual income is only £1,500. Concluding that Alice and Grey have conspired against him, George feels a new and more bitter hatred of her; his vanity has been sorely wounded. Vowing to punish Alice for her deceit and treachery, George wonders if his sister Kate is in the conspiracy: "If so, Kate also should be included in the punishment." He intends now to punish Grey, though his prudence momentarily sways him; it might after all "be well that he should hide his wrath till after provision should have been made for this other election" (2: 118). This time, however, passion controls him, not his prudent concern for material gain. Knowing that Grey is a scholarly gentleman of high breeding, George thinks he can bully him. But Grey, though he dreads the attention a noisy quarrel brings, is yet "a man whose courage was quite as high as that of his opponent. To bully or to be bullied were alike contrary to his nature" (2: 121). George attributes his own actions and motives to Grey, accusing him of lying and of contriving "'this rascally pettifogging way of obtaining power'" over Alice's fortune (2: 122). We are forcefully reminded of the superior size and strength of this gentle scholar, for he takes George by the nape of the neck, leads him out the door to the landing, and tosses him down the stairs.

Undeterred from seeking revenge against Alice, George vows he will get her money, as long as she has "a pound over which he could obtain mastery by any act or violence within his compass." Whatever the consequences, he will



get her money, though it means destroying Alice and ruining his sister Kate: "He had gone too far to stick at any scruples" (2: 125). George has now reached the stage where he could commit murder. The angry violence has ceased to be primarily a pose he adopts to force the desired response from others, and he can no longer control or regulate his own behavior.

Though Kate's devotion to her brother has been both foolish and single-minded, George's behavior following their grandfather's death frightens Kate:

There had come upon him of late a hard ferocity which made him unendurable. And then he carried to such a pitch that hatred, as he called it, of conventional rules, that he allowed himself to be controlled by none of the ordinary bonds of society. (2: 152-53)

Discovering that his grandfather has disinherited him, George takes Kate for a walk among the fells, thus removing her from the protection of other family members. He attempts to force Kate to agree to perjure herself, to testify that the will was made after the squire's mind failed. Grabbing the clothing around Kate's throat, George shakes his sister repeatedly, threatens to kill her, and finally pushes her down with such force that her arm is broken. Watching her brother walk rapidly away over the mountain, Kate thinks of him, of "his misery, and his disgrace," for she knows he is now an outcast, "beyond the pale of men" (2: 167). She also tries to plan her future behavior toward her brother. The narrator comments that a woman cannot forget or forgive a blow; a blow ends all love:

"a blow given by the defender to the defenceless crushes it all. . . . it is not the blow that she cannot forgive, but the meanness of spirit that made it possible" (2: 173-74). Few men in Trollope's novels strike a woman, or even threaten to do so. In the Palliser novels only three characters use physical violence against a woman. These three--George Vavasor, Sir Griffin Tewett, Ferdinand Lopez--are also the most repulsive villains in the novels.

Chapter 57, appropriately titled "Showing how the Wild Beast got himself back from the mountain," traces George's thoughts and actions after his assault on Kate. He has indeed become a "wild beast." Remembering his fury at being unable to coerce Kate, even by threats of violence and murder, he admits to himself that only his prudent self-interest had kept him from killing his sister: "But what could he gain by murdering her,--or, at any rate, by murdering her there, out on the mountain-side? Nothing but a hanging! There would be no gratification even to his revenge" (2: 176). As he walks to the inn at Shap, he curses all events and people that have in some way hindered him or failed to serve his purposes:

He cursed his grandfather, his uncle, his sister, his cousin, and himself. He cursed the place in which his forefathers had lived, and he cursed the whole county. He cursed the rain, and the wind, and his town-made boots, which would not keep out the wet slush. He cursed the light as it faded, and the darkness as it came. Over and over again he cursed the will that had robbed him, and the attorney that had made it. He cursed the mother that had borne him and the father that had left him poor. He thought of Scruby, and

cursed him. . . . He cursed the House of Commons, which had cost him so much, and the greedy electors who would not send him there without his paying for it. He cursed John Grey. . . . He cursed this world, and all worlds beyond. . . . (2: 178)

The venting of so much rage against so many imagined wrongs seems at first the dramatic posturing of an egocentric adolescent. Yet it marks a significant change in George's view of himself and others. Up until his assault on Kate, George has been able to admit to himself that he has intentionally chosen the wrong, the dishonest, the unmanly course. That knowledge, in fact, has been the reason for his secrecy and mysterious privacy, for they have been the means of concealing his activities. After attacking his sister, George knows he has severed the relationship with the one person whose devoted support has been his sole anchor to family and community. A transference also takes place in his mind, and he now attributes to others the blame for his misfortune. Having made a vocation of victimizing others, he now sees himself as victim. Though he can still act and speak for effect, he begins losing control of the role he has played; his rage becomes uncontrolled and without direction or purpose. His anger is so out of control that he continues cursing while he eats and drinks, scaring the servant girl. He tries to stop, but he cannot restrain himself. Knowing "that the battle for him was over," George thinks again of suicide:

He thought of an express train rushing along at its full career, and of the instant annihilation which it would produce. But if that was to be the end of him,

he would not go alone. No, indeed! why should he go alone, leaving those pistols already loaded in his desk? Among them they had brought him to ruin and death. Was he a man to pardon his enemies when it was within his power to take them with him, down, down, down-----? (2: 179)

He intends to kill John Grey. Thinking a hasty departure afterwards will be necessary, he begins his preparations for leaving the country.

At this point in the novel, readers are introduced to Jane, George's mistress. George apparently stopped supporting her sometime between his first engagement to Alice and his engagement to Miss Grant, the heiress. He had then also given Jane all of 100 pounds to set up a small shop of some kind, but of a kind that could not possibly support her. The implication is that she has been forced into prostitution,<sup>10</sup> but that goes against the grain for her. Destitute and starving, she has come to beg for George's assistance, for "something to buy food" (2: 324). There is pathos in the description of the care she has taken with her clothing and appearance, trying to appear attractive so that George will again look kindly on her:

She was a woman of about thirty years of age, dressed poorly, in old garments, but still with decency, and with some attempt at feminine prettiness. There were flowers in the bonnet on her head, though the bonnet had that unmistakable look of age which is quite as distressing to bonnets as it is to women, and the flowers themselves were battered and faded. She had long black ringlets on each cheek, hanging down much below her face, and brought forward so as to hide in some degree the hollowness of her jaws. Her eyes had a peculiar brightness, but now they left on those who looked at her cursorily no special impression as to their colour. They had been blue,--that dark violet

blue, which is so rare, but is sometimes so lovely. Her forehead was narrow, her mouth was small, and her lips were thin; but her nose was perfect in its shape, and by the delicacy of its modelling, had given a peculiar grace to her face in the days when things had gone well with her, when her cheeks had been full with youth and good living, and had been dimpled by the softness of love and mirth. There were no dimples there now, and all the softness which still remained was that softness which sorrow and continual melancholy give to suffering women. . . . Her faded dress was supported by a wide crinoline, but the under garment had lost all the grace of its ancient shape, and now told that woman's tale of poverty and taste for dress which is to be read in the outward garb of so many of Eve's daughters. The whole story was told so that those who ran might read it. When she had left her home this afternoon, she had struggled hard to dress herself so that something of the charm of apparel might be left to her; but she had known of her failure. . . . With long tedious care she had mended the old gloves which would hardly hold her fingers. She had carefully hidden the rags of her sleeves. She had washed her little shrivelled collar, and had smoothed it out painfully. It had been a separate grief to her that she could find no cuffs to put round her wrists;--and yet she knew that no cuffs could have availed her anything. Nothing could avail her now. (2: 321-22)

That Jane was a girl of breeding from a good family is made clear from the description of her facial features, particularly her nose (Jenkyns 146). Her love for George has betrayed her frequently, and it does so once more in this meeting. George's first response is that he is not likely to give her money; he has ordered her never to come to him at his lodgings and she has now disobeyed him. He has £500 in his pockets, but he is unwilling to give her a shilling. Instead, he uses her love for him to manipulate her. Telling Jane about his loss of property, political advantage, and Alice, he threatens to kill himself. She

pleads with him to fear "God's anger" and not to take his life (2: 325).<sup>11</sup> Though she knows him well enough to know his threats are probably unreal, Jane quietly leaves, without a shilling, after he promises not to kill himself. This scene, set against earlier scenes in the novel--an even poorer Burgo Fitzgerald buying a meal for a sixteen-year-old prostitute who begs for food, Kate giving her paltry allowances to her brother--marks George Vavasor as the supreme caddish scoundrel in the Palliser novels, his predatory behavior topping the villainy even of Ferdinand Lopez. George values nothing or no one, nothing but himself and his purposes of the moment, but Lopez, even on the day of his suicide, is capable of showing some kindness to others.

The only person George is unable to manipulate is John Grey. In his final confrontation with Grey, George tries to force Grey into an impulsive response. He calls Grey a blackguard, spits in his face, and challenges him to a duel. However, during the time he has worked to protect Alice from George, Grey has learned far too much about his opponent to attach any importance to George's verbal abuse. Had Grey's conduct been other than entirely honorable, or had George's previous behavior been consistent with gentlemanly breeding, the situation would be quite different. As it is, George finds it impossible to ruffle Grey's confident, calm sense of the rightness of his being. Grey refuses a duel not only because it is a stupid thing

to do, but also because he wants no contact with George. The second time George calls him a coward, Grey responds only, "'Perhaps I am;--but your saying so will not make me one'" (2: 331). The response conveys a sense of self and personal integrity that George could not achieve and therefore cannot comprehend. Having grown used to using words for the effect they have on others, George has no means of communicating with a man like Grey, who knows that the word itself and what it represents are two entirely different things, and that the character of the speaker determines both the emotional and ethical significance of the words used. Grey knows the danger posed by a loaded pistol in the hands of an angry man, but he also knows that the words coming from that angry man in no way touch the essence of his being. Grey's complete manliness thus reduces George's anger and threatened violence to ineffectual drama. George fires, just barely missing Grey's head, but he then momentarily forgets how to use the weapon, and fearing Grey's superior physical strength, runs away. The reader last sees George on a steamer headed for America.

During George's progress through the novel, he is a disruptive, subversive force. A man without any generosity or charity, George tries to pinpoint the weaknesses of others and use them for his own material gain, and his viciousness is most thorough with the women in his life.

A small man himself, he chooses to prey on women because they are more vulnerable; his essential cowardice, despite his boyhood killing of a housebreaker, makes him a bully. He conducts a form of psychological warfare against women, using their romantic notions against them. Neither Alice nor Kate is prepared for the resulting emotional turmoil, but in coping with the effect George has on them and their lives, each experiences the ritual death of comedy and emerges with new strength. Kate and Alice retrace their wrong steps, covering both moral and physical ground, until they are fully acquainted with the reasons for their own misjudgments.<sup>12</sup> Kate is reborn into a new sense of self not dependent on her brother's image of her, and Alice, finally able to accept Grey freely and without reservation, can help him make the necessary transition from a secluded life on his estate to public service. Plantagenet Palliser also assists in the transformation of Grey to public servant, as he discusses with Grey the obligation of honest men and of true gentlemen to lend their talents to their country. At the end of Can You Forgive Her? Grey becomes the Parliamentary member for Silverbridge; he gives up the seat in The Prime Minister only because he is being sent on a diplomatic mission to Persia. He and Alice are frequent guests of the Pallisers in subsequent novels, but they have actual speaking roles only in The Eustace Diamonds. In that novel, Grey, like Palliser, is the voice of order, reason, and justice. In one sense, then, though



George Vavasor is himself despicable, the effects of his actions become the means by which others achieve greater personal and moral growth.

A friend and former companion of George Vavasor, Burgo Fitzgerald is the second major cad in Can You Forgive Her? Though Burgo's beauty is admired, he is not popular with or well liked by the people he lives with on a day-to-day basis. He draws a lot of sympathy from readers, but that seems to be less the result of Burgo's own character and actions than it is the consequence of readers' fondness for Glencora,<sup>13</sup> who is indeed one of Trollope's greatest achievements in character portrayal. The character of Burgo is also finely drawn, subtly shaded by self-absorption and a reckless urge to self-destruction. Like George Vavasor in his lack of heart and incapacity to love, Burgo is unlike George in that he is not vicious. He never wants or intends to harm others, yet he harms them nonetheless. He harms others because he is never aware of them as separate beings; he sees them only in relation to himself and his needs, and in this he is very much like George. Burgo acts blindly and selfishly, with no thought of consequences to himself or others. He evades thinking about his life, his conduct, or his alternatives; he tells Plantagenet Palliser very late in the novel, after he has brought himself to a totally ruined state, "'As long as I can help it, Mr. Palliser, I never think of anything'" (2: 371).

Burgo's first appearance in the novel is at the Edgehill hunt, some five chapters before Glencora and Plantagenet first appear. Like George's intentional separation of himself from the other huntsmen, Burgo's reckless behavior at the hunt is the pattern in miniature of his entire life. He is one of the ignorant and unheeding hard riders, a man no one

had ever known to crane at a fence, or to hug a road, or to spare his own neck or his horse's. And yet poor Burgo seldom finished well,--coming to repeated grief in this matter of his hunting, as he did so constantly in other matters of his life. (1: 179)<sup>14</sup>

In this particular hunt, Burgo forces his horse to attempt "a huge ditch and boundary bank," which Sir William, the master of the hounds, carefully avoided (1: 185). He rides "at the bank as though it had been the first fence of the day," spurring his horse as if he can force fresh strength into it. Instead, he drives the horse to its death (1: 186).

With such a graphic image of Burgo's unthinking recklessness fixed before the reader, the novel quickly fills in details of Burgo's previous life. "Born into the purple of English aristocracy," Burgo is "related to half the dukes in the kingdom." He had had a fortune sufficient for him to live without working, but he has long since spent the entire fortune as well as "other windfalls that had come to him." These windfalls are his winnings on horse races at Newmarket, and "gifts" from women are implied. He is now thirty (the same age as Palliser), and

for some years he

had been known to be much worse than penniless; but still he lived on in the same circles, still slept softly and drank of the best, and went about with his valet and his groom and his horses, and fared sumptuously every day. Some people said the countesses did it for him, and some said that it was the dukes;--while others, again, declared that the Jews were his most generous friends. At any rate he still seemed to live as he had always lived, setting tradesmen at defiance, and laughing to scorn all the rules which regulate the lives of other men. (1: 187)

People know a great deal about Burgo and his life, but there is some mystery as to exactly where and how he gets his money. We are told too about his chance, more than eighteen months before, to marry a great heiress. What had actually taken place between Burgo and Glencora we never really know. The Small House at Allington tells us little more than that Glencora loved dancing with Burgo, and Can You Forgive Her? gradually provides additional information, but it is recollections filtered through the memories of different characters (Burgo, George, Alice, Glencora, Plantagenet, Lady Monk, and the faceless observers, or "the world," the gossipmongers), and colored by present circumstances. What we are first told here is that Glencora offered no resistance to a marriage with Plantagenet and severed her relationship with Burgo (1: 188). But "people still said he had obtained the heart" of Glencora, if not her hand and wealth (1: 188); and as we gradually discover, "people" have also often said this to Burgo. By his own listening to and participating in the gossip about Glencora, Burgo creates his own romantic illusions.

Burgo's one advantage is his beauty:

He was one of those young men with dark hair and blue eyes,--who wear no beard, and are certainly among the handsomest of all God's creatures. No more handsome man than Burgo Fitzgerald lived in his days; and this merit at any rate was his,--that he thought nothing of his own beauty. But he lived ever without conscience, without purpose,--with no idea that it behoved him as a man to do anything but eat and drink, --or ride well to hounds till some poor brute, much nobler than himself, perished beneath him. (1: 188)

Though Burgo's dissipation is reflected in his appearance and in his general health, his beauty is not impaired.

There is

in his eyes and cheeks a look of haggard dissipation, --of riotous living, which had become wearisome, by its continuance, even to himself--that told to all who saw him much of the history of his life. Most men who drink at nights, and are out till cockcrow doing deeds of darkness, become red in their faces, have pimples on cheeks and watery eyes, and are bloated and not comfortable to be seen. It is a kind dispensation of Providence who thus affords to such sinners a visible sign, to be seen day by day, of the injury which is being done. The first approach of a carbuncle on the nose, about the age of thirty, has stopped many a man from drinking. No one likes to have carbuncles on his nose, or to appear before his female friends with eyes which look as though they were swimming in grog. But to Burgo Fitzgerald Providence in her anger had not afforded this protection. He became at times pale, sallow, worn, and haggard. He grew thin, and still thinner. At times he had been ill to death's door. . . . But still his beauty remained. The perfect form of his almost godlike face was the same as ever, and the brightness of his bright blue eye was never quenched. (1: 299-300)

Those bright eyes merely get brighter when Burgo is drinking, and this is usually the only way men can tell he is drunk. The physical effects of his drinking, and the hinted consequences of those late nights when he is "doing deeds of darkness," are taking their toll on his overall

condition. The extraordinary exterior beauty thus becomes a cover, and almost a compensation, for the horrors within, the unspeakable possibilities that Glencora's relatives sought to protect her from. Burgo's life-style is really the same as that of Admiral Greystock or of Sir Florian Eustace (TED, chapter 1), and had he the unlimited funds to support it, he would quite possibly live much as the Marquis of Mount Fidgett lived (TPM, chapter 64). The rake with money can haunt the houses of his peers, preying on their wives and daughters, but the rake without money must lower his sights and head for side streets and back alleys. These Burgo seems to know well. Yet he also manages a bit of dalliance with Lucy, his aunt's maid. As he breakfasts in bed--on paté de foie gras and curaçao--and reads a French novel,<sup>15</sup> Lucy enters, and Burgo asks about his aunt:

"Tell me, Lucy," said he, "how is the old girl?"  
 "She's as cross as cross, Mr. Burgo. Indeed, I shan't,--not a minute longer. Don't, now; will you? I tell you she's waiting for me." (2: 265-66)

She says she shan't, at least not now, but quite obviously she has.

Burgo's pursuit of Glencora is his chief activity in the novel, yet his pursuit of the woman he supposedly loves is based on his selfish view of what Glencora's money can do for him. He knows well what consequences Glencora would face should she run away with him, but he chooses not to think through his motives, and he especially does not think of Glencora. In fact, Burgo cannot see Glencora as an

individual; he sees merely the woman he has created in his mind, a portrait formed in equal parts of his memories of a past time when all of life seemed to hold more promise for him and of his present desire to use Glencora to create a romantic, idyllic refuge from the awful boredom of the dissipated life he has freely chosen. He tells George Vavasor, "'I make pictures to myself of a sort of life which I think would suit us . . .'" and George completes the romantic dream: "'Something like Juan and Haidee, with Planty Pall coming after you, like old Lambro'" (1: 303).

When he talks with George Vavasor, Burgo stresses his noble motives in trying to get Glencora to leave her husband: he "knows" she is not happy with Palliser, and he professes not to be concerned with her money: "'Heaven knows I want money bad enough, but I couldn't take away another man's wife for money'" (1: 301). He had originally been concerned with Glencora's wealth, for that had been the sole reason his aunt, Lady Monk, had brought Burgo and Glencora together. Glencora was supposed to be the means of replenishing the fortune Burgo had wasted. Like Burgo, Lady Monk gives no thought to Glencora herself, or to what would be in Glencora's best interests, and both aunt and nephew have resentful anger toward Plantagenet Palliser, the man who calmly walked off with the prize they had targeted for Burgo's use. This too Burgo uses as self-justification: the fact that Glencora knew him first,

before Palliser entered the picture, is further proof in his own mind that she really loves him, not the man she married.

Further conversation between the two men reveals that Burgo has seen Glencora twice in the eighteen months since her marriage; on only one occasion had they spoken, and then just to exchange greetings. Burgo's conviction that Glencora is "fond" of him clearly reveals his inability to distinguish between shades and degrees of liking, fondness, and love, and he especially does not comprehend the feelings and circumstances that would impel a woman to take the step he wants Glencora to take. He does not know Glencora; he has no comprehension of what she values or fears. The reports that others have brought him about Glencora's unhappiness undoubtedly capitalize on the evidences of her frustration,<sup>16</sup> and since he lives superficially, lightly skimming the surfaces of perception, Burgo automatically translates what he hears into Glencora's love for him. And of course he would do so, for that justifies his intentions.

After Burgo leaves George, we are allowed more access to the pattern of his thought, such as it is, and come to know the processes of self-persuasion and self-justification conditioning his thoughts and perceptions. As to Glencora's money, of course it is "perfectly true" that that is not his concern. It is not a concern because he really believes he will be able to get some of it: "That in the event of

her going off with him, some portion of her enormous wealth would still cling to her, he did believe. Seeing that she had no children he could not understand where else it should all go" (1: 306). Of course he has always cared more for Glencora than for her money, and on "the day on which she told him that all between them was to be over for ever,--he had, for a few hours, felt the loss of his love more than the loss of his money" (1: 307). Though he convinces himself he loves the woman, not her money, he thinks of the woman's money as "his money," money he had a right to but which Palliser unfairly took from him. And "by degrees tidings had reached him that she was not happy,--reaching him through the mouths of people who were glad to exaggerate all that they had heard." These same people first implanted in his mind the thought of running away with Glencora, whispering "that such things had been done, and must be expected" in cases of arranged marriages that rupture such a great love as his and Glencora's (1: 307).

One of the chief tale-bearers is Lady Monk, who bears much malice toward Palliser because he upset her plan of marrying her nephew to Glencora's great wealth. Burgo describes his aunt as "'that old harridan'" and tells George he hates her: "'It isn't love for me now so much as downright malice against Palliser, because he baulked her project before. She is a wicked old woman'" (1: 302). Though he recognizes her motive of malice and knows that



her intent is more to harm Palliser than to assist her nephew, he refuses to think through what she encourages him to do. He knows that she is in fact urging him to run away with Glencora, and he is angry at her pretence of not really understanding his purpose. Burgo's failure to perceive her need to give the appearance of morality is neatly captured:

Had he been a man who ever reflected he must have known that such a woman as his aunt could only assist him as long as she might be presumed to be ignorant of his intentions. But Burgo never reflected. The Fitzgeralds never reflected till they were nearer forty than thirty, and then people began to think worse of them than they had thought before. (1: 343)

Here, too, is a succinct rendering of the bad breeding of the beautiful but worthless Worcestershire Fitzgeralds.

On the day the Pallisers are supposed to appear at Monkshade, and another guest asks Burgo if he has heard that Glencora is not going to accompany her husband, Burgo's public display of anger embarrasses everyone:

"I have heard,--and be d----d to him," said Burgo. Then there was suddenly a silence in the room, and everyone seemed to attend assiduously to his breakfast. It was very terrible, this clear expression of a guilty meaning with reference to the wife of another man! (1: 343)

The shocked embarrassment yet gives occasion for titillating gossip, and we understand how Burgo's social improprieties are always fraught with moral significance. It is his conduct that keeps alive the speculation about Glencora's unhappiness and the rumors of her elopement with Burgo; presumably no man would act as Burgo does without some

encouragement from the woman in question. And we see how gossip and rumor, so pervasive in the Palliser novels, grows and feeds on itself, always made more dramatic and portentous by hindsight, constantly reshaping and restructuring the actual event:

They who were then present used afterwards to say that they should never forget the breakfast. There had been something, they declared, in the tone of Burgo's voice when he uttered his curse against Mr. Palliser, which had struck them all with dread. There had too, they said, been a blackness in his face, so terrible to be seen, that it had taken from them all the power of conversation. (1: 344)

Added to Burgo's outburst at breakfast is his later self-dramatization, his mad riding "as though he resolved to do himself and his uncle's steed a mischief" (1: 344). The violent, self-destructive behavior is evident to everyone, and it too becomes a part of the store of gossip, as does the meeting of Palliser and Burgo later on the same day. Like a petulant child, Burgo scowls at Palliser, "but Mr. Palliser did not notice the scowl and put out his hand to his late rival most affably." Throughout his three-day stay at Monkshade Palliser seems not "to notice anything, or to fear anything" (1: 349). Palliser's imperturbable calm and his consistently gentlemanly conduct in such circumstances sometimes cause him to be seen as a stupid man (Cockshut, Anthony Trollope 163-64), but his conduct is the result both of his sense of self and his complete faith in his wife, both before and after he becomes aware of Burgo's intentions. And as Glencora tells Alice Vavasor, that trust is fully justified (2: 280).<sup>17</sup>

While Palliser is still at Monkshade, a letter from Burgo appears in Glencora's room at Matching Priory. Her maid denies knowledge of how the letter got there. (Knowing women's susceptibility to Burgo's beauty, the reader may well doubt the maid's truthfulness. The later vignette of Burgo and Lucy makes us think that possibly Burgo has adopted Cheesacre's strategy of using Glencora's maid to spy on Glencora. Burgo, of course, cannot afford the steady outlay of half-crowns, so his payments to the maid would have to be in a different coin.) This is the letter in which Burgo proposes the elopement, but though Glencora reads the letter and thinks of its promise of love, she does not respond to it.<sup>18</sup>

As Lady Monk prepares for her ball, she goads Burgo to action, telling him that Glencora's coming to the ball is proof of her love for him, and calling him cowardly if he refuses to act. She also lends Burgo £200 to make his preparations for the elopement, knowing that she can obtain the money only "by some villanous [sic] falsehood to her husband," who has long since tired of Burgo's sponging (2: 82-83). Her action is overtly justified by her belief that Burgo was wronged, but it is covertly justified by her resentment at having her former schemes thrown into disarray by Palliser. Yet she also tells Burgo, perhaps unconsciously, what would become of Glencora if she should run off with him.

"I think that you were much wronged in that matter. After what had passed I thought that you had a right to claim Lady Glencora as your wife. Mr. Palliser, in my mind, behaved very wrongly in stepping in between you and--you and such a fortune as hers, in that way. He cannot expect that his wife should have any affection for him. There is nobody alive who has a greater horror of anything improper in married women than I have. I have always shown it. When Lady Madeline Madtop left her husband, I would never allow her to come inside my doors again,--though I have no doubt he ill-used her dreadfully, and there was nothing ever proved between her and Colonel Graham. One can't be too particular in such matters. But here, if you,--if you can succeed, you know, I shall always regard the Palliser episode in Lady Glencora's life as a tragical accident. . . ." (2: 81)

A "tragical accident," yes, but if Burgo succeeds, Glencora would be forever barred from society; she would be isolated from all ties with family and friends, entirely dependent on Burgo for society, companionship, and conversation. What a terrible punishment that would be for Glencora, with all her impulsive warmth and generosity, her vivacious and sparkling wit (which Palliser cannot himself achieve but cherishes in his wife), her energetic action and her frustration at the social and political bars that deny her further scope for action. Burgo himself has not the energy to be a match for Glencora; he is all show and talk and no purposeful action, while Palliser, so long as he has a real task at hand, thinks and acts far more than he talks.

Before the ball, Burgo contemplates his intended action. His thoughts at this time, coupled with his aunt's remarks about Lady Madeline Madtop, clearly prove his awareness of what Glencora's fate would be if she should go away with him:

. . . some thoughts that were almost solemn passed across his mind. This thing that he was about to do, or to attempt,--was it in itself a good thing, and would it be good for her whom he pretended to love? What would be her future if she consented now to go with him, and to divide herself from her husband? Of his own future he thought not at all. He had never done so. . . . His desire to put himself in possession of so magnificent a fortune had simply prompted him, as he might have been prompted to play for a high-stake at a gaming-table. But now, during these moments, he did think a little of her. Would she be happy, simply because he loved her, when all women should cease to acknowledge her; when men would regard her as one degraded and dishonoured; when society should be closed against her; when she would be driven to live loudly because the softness and graces of quiet life would be denied to her? Burgo knew well what must be the nature of such a woman's life in such circumstances. Would Glencora be happy with him while living such a life simply because he loved her? And, under such circumstances, was it likely that he would continue to love her? Did he not know himself to be the most inconstant of men, and the least trustworthy? . . . he did ask himself all these questions with something of true feeling about his heart, and almost persuaded himself that he had better take his hat and wander forth anywhere into the streets. It mattered little what might become of himself. . . .

But then the remembrance of his aunt's two hundred pounds came upon him . . . and a certain idea of honour told him that he was bound to do that for which the money had been given to him. As to telling his aunt that he had changed his mind, and, therefore, refunding the money--no such thought as that was possible to him! To give back two hundred pounds entire,--two hundred pounds which were already within his clutches, was not within the compass of Burgo's generosity. . . . (2: 96-97)

Burgo is capable of generosity to a young prostitute who needs a meal and a place to sleep. But with Glencora, the woman he pretends to love, the woman he has persuaded himself he loves, he is not capable of similar generosity, for being generous with her would indeed threaten his self-interest. Besides, giving up Glencora also means

NO PAGE 170

returning his aunt's loan of two hundred pounds, a price he finds too high to pay for Glencora's well-being and happiness. In his thoughts too is the implication of what Glencora's fate would be when he inevitably tired of and abandoned her. She would obviously be forced into the hard and spiritually destructive life of prostitution; Burgo knows many such women.

In addition to the later image of Jane, George Vavasor's mistress, Trollope's contemporary readers would probably have remembered portrayals of fallen women, particularly those in the novels of Thackeray. Becky Sharp's struggle for economic survival would probably come to mind, and the elopement of Clara Pulleyn with Jack Belsize, the man she had loved before she was forced to marry Barnes Newcome, would undoubtedly be recalled.<sup>19</sup> But there are differences: Clara Pulleyn was escaping a husband who beat her, who humiliated her and angered the community by his seduction of a village girl, finally abandoning her and his illegitimate children to survive however they could. Barnes Newcome is a much more vicious man than Palliser could even easily comprehend, and Jack Belsize is a much more honorable man than Burgo could imagine being in his most fantastic dreams. Genuinely loving Clara Pulleyn, Jack Belsize wants only to protect her from Barnes Newcome's viciousness. Despite the differences in character and situation, however, Clara Pulleyn's action forever bars her from all society; she

cannot reenter the lives of either her friends or the children she abandons. Readers would thus know the potential consequences as well as Burgo does. Yet knowing what Glencora's life would inevitably become, Burgo continues with his plan, and this in my mind makes him a far less attractive and sympathetic character than he is frequently seen to be.

At the ball, Glencora dances with Burgo, primarily because Mrs. Marsham dares to speak for her and tell Burgo that Glencora will not dance with him. While they are dancing, however, and out of the hearing of Mr. Bott and Mrs. Marsham, Glencora asks Burgo to do her "a kindness": "'Go away, and leave me. Go to the sideboard, and then do not come back. You are doing me an injury while you remain with me.'" When he asks her again to leave Palliser and run away with him, Glencora responds, "'But I am not so minded. Do you not know that you insult me by proposing it?'" (2: 106). Unable to believe that Glencora now freely chooses Palliser, Burgo visits the Palliser home in Park Lane ten days later. His timing is all wrong, however, for in these ten days Palliser has virtually dropped all other interests and activities and has concentrated on his wife and marriage. After ten days of talk and "confessions," Palliser and Glencora are well on the way to reconciling differences and grievances and are learning to know and appreciate each other. Burgo intrudes himself into this time of learning and beginning anew, and he arrives at the



door just as Palliser is going out for a walk. Though both Glencora and the reader have by now come to know Palliser's nobility, this scene is surely one of Palliser's greatest:

"Is Lady Glencora at home?" asked Burgo, before he had seen the husband. . . . "I am not sure," said Mr. Palliser, making his way out as he had originally purposed. "The servant will find out for you." Then he went on his way across Park Lane and into the Park, never once turning back his face to see whether Burgo had effected an entrance into the house. Nor did he return a minute earlier than he would otherwise have done. After all, there was something chivalrous about the man. (2: 276)

Palliser's behavior in this instance certainly does not prove a lack of strong feeling on his part. He feels very strongly, as we later discover, when he tells Alice

"I thought it better that she should see him or not, as she should herself decide." (2: 281)

"I am very glad that you were within reach of her, as otherwise her position might have been painful. For her, and for me perhaps, it may be well that he has been here. As for him, I can only say, that I am forced to suppose him to be a villain. What a man does when driven by passion, I can forgive; but that he should deliberately plan schemes to ruin both her and me, is what I can hardly understand." (2: 282)

Unlike Burgo, Palliser thinks of Glencora--her position more than his own, her choice instead of his. Though he feels strongly about his wife and their marriage, he yet recognizes that if Burgo will keep asking Glencora to choose, the choice must indeed be hers.

Glencora does choose. As soon as Burgo is brought to her room, she asks the servant to send Alice to her, a request that should have told Burgo his plan had no chance of success. But he persists in his demand that she go with

him, even though her first words to him are "'I will not go with you'" (2: 277). Four times she asks him to go, to "be generous" to her, and she tells him she sent for Alice because she "'did not choose to be alone'" with him. As he turns to go, he feigns pain and accuses Glencora of being "hard." This she cannot let pass, for she does not like to cause unnecessary pain to those who have been important in her life. She tries to assure him that she had once loved him, but though she may have wronged him in the past, she cannot now wrong her husband. Like George Vavasor attempting to change the terms of the letters, Burgo now changes Glencora's past tense to present tense and exclaims, "'she loves me!'" Recognizing her mistake, Glencora tells him to go, and his second accusation that she is "hard and cruel" gives her the necessary knowledge about the character of her former lover (2: 279). Knowing that he has lost out entirely, Burgo summons enough romantic flair to give Glencora a final kiss.

Glencora's lack of hardness and cruelty toward Burgo is demonstrated months later, when at Baden she watches him gamble away what is obviously his last shilling. Like the other watchers, she fears his suicide, and she pleads with Palliser to help him. As Glencora had previously told Alice, she cannot comprehend "poverty and crime in the lump," the large picture conveyed by the statistics that her husband loves; she can respond only to individuals-- she can nurse a sick woman, feed a hungry one, or hate a

very wicked man (2: 287), but large numbers and their meaning elude her. Because of such instinctive response to individuals and their immediate need, she asks her husband to help a man who now needs it, but she also asks that Palliser not give Burgo money to gamble with. Palliser pays Burgo's hotel and food bills, and once back in England, informs Sir Cosmo of Burgo's plight. Burgo's uncle arranges a weekly remittance of fifteen pounds, to be paid as long as Burgo "should remain at a small German town . . . in which there was no public gambling-table" (2: 378).

Like George Vavasor, Burgo's caddishness is punished by exile. Each poses a threat to the ordered and just society that exists by virtue of gentlemen (Lansbury, Reasonable Man 80-81); once it is recognized that the cad cannot accept and live by the values of that just society, the threat he represents is resolved by removing him from society. Where he goes or how he then lives is less important than the fact that he is removed. His removal indicates that he can temporarily threaten society and its values, but he cannot destroy it or the civilized traditions by which it operates. Though the social structure provides a large degree of individual freedom within prescribed boundaries, the community and its values are ultimately more important than erratic individuals who threaten the benefits that others derive from community. So George is sent to a young country which can possibly

better accommodate and use his violent energy,<sup>20</sup> and the essentially ineffectual Burgo is secluded in a quiet German town.

In contrast to George Vavasor and Burgo Fitzgerald is the old Duke of Omnium, a rake who manages to accommodate himself to some of the demands and expectations of society. The old duke appears in three Barsetshire novels--Doctor Thorne, Framley Parsonage, The Small House at Allington--and in the first four novels of the Palliser series. The Barsetshire novels contain the most references to the duke's habits, but in The Eustace Diamonds he himself alludes to the rakishness of his younger days (2: 373). In Framley Parsonage the Duke of Omnium is most often described as he is seen through the eyes of Lady Lufton and her set at Framley Court, and by Lady Lufton he is certainly seen as a rake and adulterer:

It was so thoroughly understood at Framley Court that the duke and all belonging to him was noxious and damnable. He was a Whig, he was a bachelor, he was a gambler, he was immoral in every way, he was a man of no Church principle, a corrupter of youth, a sworn foe of young wives, a swallower up of young men's patrimonies; a man whom mothers feared for their sons, and sisters for their brothers; and worse again, whom fathers had cause to fear for their daughters, and brothers for their sisters. . . . (46)

And in Framley Parsonage there is much comment about the duke's frequent visits to Lady Hartletop, mother of Lord Dumbello. The duke's relationship with Lady Hartletop assumes some importance in The Small House at Allington, for it is in this novel that Plantagenet has his little

rebellion and carries on his mild and tentative flirtation with Lady Dumbello, Lady Hartletop's daughter-in-law. The flirtation, comical and by the book as it is, seems to pose no real problem to Plantagenet; whether consciously or unconsciously, he has picked the coldest, most unfeeling woman in London. Yet his conduct, so different from his usual dedication to political work, causes comment, and his uncle becomes concerned about the rumors. As the duke talks to Plantagenet about the way people are talking, the nephew is thinking "that people for a great many years had talked about his uncle and Lady Dumbello's mother-in-law" (429). The duke's relationship with Lady Hartletop is of course the reason he objects to Plantagenet's behavior, as Plantagenet perfectly understands: "Two such alliances between the two families could not be expected to run pleasantly together, and even the rumour of any such second alliance might interfere with the pleasantness of the former one" (430-31). The arranged marriage with Glencora resolves this little problem and leaves the duke free to continue his relationship with Lady Hartletop, without fear that similar games are being played by the younger generation.

However, despite the duke's forty-year relationship with Lady Hartletop, he ends by treating her unkindly. When it is "rumoured all over London that the Duke of Omnium [is] dying," Lady Hartletop naturally wants to see him once more. Bidding Glencora to write his old friend that he is

"too weak to see any but his nearest relatives," the duke chooses instead to have Madame Max Goesler at his bedside (PR 1: 217). Madame Max is much younger, slimmer, and prettier, and undoubtedly more alluring because she had refused to be either the duke's mistress or his wife (PF 2: 169-78, 198-225). Through knowing Marie Goesler, the old duke has been able to temper his ducal arrogance with an old-fashioned, chivalric courtesy, and when he is near death he again expresses his desire to marry her: "'I would do it now if I thought it would serve you'" (PR 1: 219). Yet he has not acquired sufficient grace to avoid causing pain to the old woman who had shared so many of his younger years. The Dowager Marchioness of Hartletop appears at Matching Priory, basing her claim to see the dying duke on their forty-year acquaintance; she weeps and moans when she is not admitted to the duke's room, and she leaves without seeing him again before his death. It is clear that this old woman, now almost seventy-five, still loves the duke:

She had submitted herself to discomfort, indignity, fatigue, and disappointment; and it had all been done for love. With her broad face, and double chin, and her heavy jowl, and the beard that was growing round her lips, she did not look like a romantic woman; but, in spite of appearances, romance and a duck-like waddle may go together. The memory of those forty years had been strong upon her, and her heart was heavy because she could not see that old man once again. Men will love to the last, but they love what is fresh and new. A woman's love can live on the recollection of the past, and cling to what is old and ugly. (PR 1: 225)

Madame Max has the grace and generosity to nurse the querulous duke in his last days, but the duke cannot bring himself to make a similar gesture to Lady Hartletop.

The old duke's wish to marry Madame Max Goesler and his continuing fondness for her after she refuses him are his finest moments, the time when he comes closest to being a gentleman as well as an aristocrat. While the nobility of his bearing is never questioned in the novels, the nobility of his conduct frequently is. The Duke of Omnium is compared to the Duke of St. Bungay in the same chapter which records his meeting of Madame Max (PF chapter 48 2: 81-89). The men of St. Bungay's family have always taken active political roles, serving monarch and country, a tradition continued by the present Duke of St. Bungay.

But the Duke of Omnium had never yet done a day's work on behalf of his country. They both wore the Garter, the Duke of St. Bungay having earned it by service, the Duke of Omnium having been decorated with the blue ribbon,--because he was Duke of Omnium. The one was a moral, good man, a good husband, a good father, and a good friend. The other,--did not bear quite so high a reputation. (PF 2: 82)

Both dukes have the rank and status of gentlemen, but only the Duke of St. Bungay has the moral and ethical qualities of the true gentleman. The narrator continues his contrast of the two dukes by pointing out St. Bungay's lesser importance in the mind of the public, which yet regarded Omnium "with an almost reverential awe." The narrator then attempts to account for this difference in perception:

I think the secret lay in the simple fact that the Duke of Omnium had not been common in the eyes of the

people. He had continued to envelope himself in something of the ancient mystery of wealth and rank. (PF 2: 82)

From the Barsetshire novels we know that the duke has maintained exclusiveness, and when he shows himself publicly, he maintains an aloof, haughty, and arrogant bearing. This unapproachability adds to the public view of him, and he remains to them a figure of mystery.<sup>21</sup>

At the time the old duke begins his courting of Marie Goesler, he is over seventy, and she is around thirty.<sup>22</sup> Part of the duke's attraction to Marie is an appreciation of her dark, exotic beauty, so different from the "fair faces" of English women, and her "quickness" and "grace of motion." Her youthful slenderness is also somewhat new: "The ladies upon whom the Duke had of late most often smiled had been somewhat slow,--perhaps almost heavy,--though, no doubt, graceful withal." Marie's beauty becomes in the duke's mind "the beauty of some world which he had not yet known" (PF 2: 199), and she becomes also a symbol of what he has lost. He first offers her the use of his villa on Como (PF 2: 177-78), but she rejects the chance of becoming his mistress. He then offers her his coronet, but she also refuses his proposal of marriage (2: 214-24). Though her knowledge of English society contributes to her decision,<sup>23</sup> her refusal is also conditioned by a wish to remain free, unfettered by the restrictions a duchess would face, and by her love for Phineas Finn. Phineas has yet to acquire the mature self-awareness that will make him worthy



to be her husband, so she chooses merely to wait, living as well and as fully as she can in the meantime.

In the last two years of his life, the duke depends more and more on Marie Goesler's beauty, kindness, and physical presence, and she comes to love the old man in her own way. She tells Phineas, "'But I do like the man. He is gracious, and noble in his bearing. He is now very old, and sinking fast into the grave; but even the wreck is noble'" (PR 1: 149). When Phineas inquires what she does when the duke summons her to Matching Priory, she replies, "'Read to him;--talk to him;--give him his food, and do all that in me lies to make his life bearable'" (PR 1: 150). The last time she is sent for, she goes immediately and is there for the duke's last nine days. His faith that Marie will always be there when he needs her is touching in its simplicity:

"I knew she would come," said the old man, turning his head round slowly on the back of his chair. "I knew she would be good to me to the last." And he laid his withered hand on the arm of his chair, so that the woman whose presence gratified him might take it within hers and comfort him.

"Of course I have come," said Madame Goesler, standing close by him and putting her left arm very lightly on his shoulder. It was all that she could do for him, but it was in order that she might do this that she had been summoned from London to his side. (PR 1: 218)

The duke is somewhat unusual in Trollope's gallery of characters, for most of his characters die as they have lived. In addition to the querulousness of frail age, the duke is filled with regrets and thoughts of what might have

been. He depends on Marie for reassurance that he has not been a failure, and she conducts herself admirably in providing the human warmth and moral support he desperately seeks. Their final recorded conversation provides one of the finest examples of honestum in the novels:

"It has been a great comfort to me that I have known you," he said.

"Oh no!"

"A great comfort;--only I wish it had been sooner. I could have talked to you about things which I never did talk of to any one. I wonder why I should have been a duke, and another man a servant."

"God Almighty ordained such difference."

"I'm afraid I've not done it well;--but I have tried; indeed I have tried." Then she told him he had ever lived as a great nobleman ought to live. And, after a fashion, she herself believed what she was saying. Nevertheless, her nature was much nobler than his; and she knew that no man should dare to live idly as the Duke had lived. (PR 1: 226)

This is an example of honestum because of Marie's recognition of the honest thought, yet not speaking the thought which would achieve nothing. She knows he is dying, as he also knows, and her speaking the truth could effect no change in his life, accomplish no good. It would cause only pain and humiliation. Final judgment of the duke's life must come from another source; it is not Marie's concern or responsibility here.<sup>24</sup> Her concern is simply a human one. She therefore speaks the literally dishonest but morally necessary truth, allowing the old man to die with dignity and reasonably at peace with himself and the woman at his bedside.

Two rakish fathers who are much more selfish and spiteful than the old bachelor Duke of Omnium are Maurice

Maule and Earl Grex. Maurice Maule, a character of some importance in Phineas Redux, is the father of Gerard Maule, who is also important in Phineas Redux and appears briefly in The Duke's Children. Maurice Maule is now fifty-five, and like Mr. Spooner, he considers himself a young man.<sup>25</sup> In his schooldays, Maule had won a reputation for cleverness and always looking handsome: "He had been one of those show boys of which two or three are generally to be found at our great schools, and all manner of good things had been prophesied on his behalf" (PR 1: 182). He was a student at Oxford during the Tractarian movement, and there he was a member of a group of "men of fashion" who talked of books, spent money, and read poetry. After Oxford he had chosen

that career which is of all the most difficult to follow with respect and self-comfort. He proposed to himself the life of an idle man with a moderate income,--a life which should be luxurious, refined, and graceful, but to which should be attached the burden of no necessary occupation. (1: 183)

Maule achieves his goal, after a fashion, and the only ones who suffer are his wife and children. "He had married early, and his wife had died soon"; "he had ill-used his wife" by continuing "a liaison with a complaisant friend" (1: 183, 185). The mistress has been in his life for twenty years, and she has become a problem, for she stands in the way of his finding a wealthy wife. He has not been near Maule Abbey, his country estate in Herefordshire, for ten years. He has only a life interest in the property,

which brings at most an income of £2,000 a year. Of his three children, Maule knows little and cares less. His daughter married an Irish cousin, a captain in a foot regiment, and lives in India; his younger son "had disappeared." He is rumored to have gone "utterly to the dogs" (1: 154, 184). His older son, Gerard, he corresponds with when one of them has "something special to say to the other" (1: 184). There is no attempt on Maule's part to maintain any relationship with his son: "They had no recognized ground for meeting. They did not belong to the same clubs. They did not live in the same circles. They did not follow the same pursuits" (1: 184). Father and son have in fact quarreled about the family property, and they quarrel again when Gerard asks if he and Adelaide can live in Maule Abbey. Mr. Maule Senior would not consider living there himself, and his refusal to let his son do so means that Gerard and Adelaide must delay their marriage. Beyond being a thoroughly selfish man, Maule has two reasons for refusing to assist his son: he is jealous of his son, whose income of £800 is slightly larger than his own; and he fears that having a married son might damage his social position. Furthermore, his son's request to live at Maule Abbey reminds the father that his death is inevitable, and that the property will then go to his son. The "faint idea of death" offends and angers him (1: 193).

Maurice Maule carefully plans his daily activities and expenditures so that he can live exactly as he pleases. He

is careful to be back in his rooms by midnight:

No one knew better than Mr. Maule that the continual bloom of lasting summer which he affected requires great accuracy in living. Late hours, nocturnal cigars, and midnight drinkings, pleasurable though they may be, consume too quickly the free-flowing lamps of youth, and are fatal at once to the husbanded candle-ends of age. (1: 186)

He has no duties, no function; he has shrugged off every task he finds even slightly disagreeable. His time is therefore entirely his own. He breakfasts at noon, making sure to finish both breakfast and newspaper "at the same moment." He allots himself two cigarettes after breakfast; these and a French novel last him until two o'clock. Then he dresses and goes to view paintings and other art objects, talking always as if he is a possible buyer. He considers himself "a man of taste" and "an artist" in all that he does; he is particularly fond of music, pictures, books, pretty women, good eating, and good drinking (1: 183). After his daily view of art objects, he calls "on some lady whose acquaintance at the moment might be of service to him;--for that idea of blazing once more out into the world on a wife's fortune was always present to him" (1: 185). He goes to his club at 5:00 and plays "a rubber in a gentle unexcited manner till seven," then generally dines out.

He was known as a good diner out, though in what his excellence consisted they who entertained him might find it difficult to say. He was not witty, nor did he deal in anecdotes. He spoke with a low voice, never addressing himself to any but his neighbour, and even to his neighbour saying but little. But he looked like a gentleman, was well dressed, and never awkward. (1: 186)

Maule in fact lives as do many men in the novels, the unattached males who are invited to complete the seating at the dinner table. These men need the dining out to stretch small incomes, and of course they meet new people, who can become the suppliers of more dinners.<sup>26</sup>

Maurice Maule is also one of Madame Goesler's suitors. The news that the old duke is dying gives him some hope, he thinks, for he knows some small truth and a great deal of rumor about her relationship with the duke. He had concluded that "there could be no chance for himself, or for any man, as long as the Duke was alive" (1: 216). Exactly what her relationship with the duke is, Maule does not know; he knows the club gossip which says that there was a private, secret marriage, or that Madame Goesler is the duke's daughter. And he knows that Madame Goesler is a wealthy widow, which is really all that matters. He is neither realistic nor gallant in his belief that she might marry him, and he is certainly less than honest in his view of what he would bring to such a match:

He was a good deal older than the lady, who, in spite of all her experiences, was hardly yet thirty. But then he was,--he felt sure,--very young for his age, whereas she was old. She was a widow, he was a widower. She had a house in town and an income. He had a place in the country and an estate. She knew all the dukes and duchesses, and he was a man of family. She could make him comfortably opulent. He could make her Mrs. Maule of Maule Abbey. She, no doubt, was good-looking. Mr. Maule Senior, as he tied on his cravat, thought that even in that respect there was no great disparity between them. (1: 267)

He calls on Madame Goesler the day after her return to London following the duke's death. She is in mourning, yet this is the day he intends to propose. Maule can speak only in terms of club gossip, which saw the old duke as a symbol of aristocracy, never as a vulnerable human being. He talks about the dignity with which the duke carried his rank; and Madame Goesler remembers "how he looked with his nightcap on, when he had lost his temper because they would not let him have a glass of curaçao" (1: 268-69). She knew him as a man of noble bearing, but weak and fretful as death approached. The entrance of Phineas Finn prevents Maule's proposal on this day, and Phineas prevents his second attempt as well.

On the day Maule tries a second time, Madame Goesler has just received Glencora's note about Bonteen's murder and Phineas's arrest and imprisonment in Newgate. It is one of the few times she is not fully in command of herself, for her mind is filled with worry about Phineas. She never once doubts his innocence: "What judge of character would any one be who could believe that Phineas Finn could be guilty of a midnight murder?" (2: 68). Phineas is a gentleman, and a gentleman would face his opponent, confronting him in an open and direct manner, not strike him down from behind in the cover of darkness. Maule, who does not at all keep up with personalities and events in the political world, cannot even comprehend Madame Goesler's rapid questions, and not having heard the gossip, he is not

clear whether it was Bonteen or Finn who was murdered. Realizing it is not a good time for his proposal, Maule leaves and goes to his club to hear the news, to find out whatever it was he was supposed to be able to tell Madame Goesler. He reacts with jealousy and wounded vanity: "'I hope he'll be hung, with all my heart,' said Mr. Maule, who thought that he could read the riddle which had been so unintelligible in Park Lane" (2: 72). Yet after Phineas is acquitted, he finally proposes to Madame Goesler. He has heard of her trip to Prague and her uncovering there the evidence that freed Phineas. Vain as Maule is, he decides none of this really proves that Madame Goesler loves Phineas. Her response to this proposal is not greatly different from Adelaide Palliser's reaction to Spooner's proposal:

"Mr. Maule," said Madame, smiling, "is not this rather sudden?" Mr. Maule admitted that it was sudden, but still persisted. "I think, if you please, Mr. Maule, we will say no more about it," said the lady, with that wicked smile still on her face. Mr. Maule declared that silence on the subject had become impossible to him. "Then, Mr. Maule, I shall leave you to speak to the chairs and tables," said Madame Goesler. No doubt she was used to the thing, and knew how to conduct herself well. He also had been refused before by ladies of wealth, but had never been treated with so little consideration. (2: 265)

Gerard Maule, the older son of Maurice and the only one of his three children who actually appears in the novels, is first presented to the reader by the comments that other important characters (Phineas Finn, Lady Chiltern, Lord Chiltern) make about him. Lord Chiltern tells Phineas



that Gerard is "'a young fellow who thinks he can ride to hounds . . . and who very often does succeed in riding over them'" (PR 1: 26). The young man's affectations exasperate Chiltern:

"And why does he pretend to do nothing? When he's out he rides hard; but at other times there's a ha-ha, lack a-daisical air about him which I hate. Why men assume it I never could understand. It can recommend them to nobody. A man can't suppose that he'll gain anything by pretending that he never reads, and never thinks, and never does anything, and never speaks, and doesn't care what he has for dinner, and, upon the whole, would just as soon lie in bed all day as get up. It isn't that he is really idle. He rides and eats, and does get up, and I daresay talks and thinks. It's simply a poor affectation." (1: 27-28)

In the hunting field, Chiltern often explodes in anger at Gerard's clumsy riding over the hounds, but Gerard is impervious. Chiltern complains to Adelaide that nothing seems to penetrate Gerard's air of indifference. Though Chiltern's rough words are intended to jar Gerard into some form of activity and concern for himself, Chiltern perceives that "'nothing will ever do any good. As for offending him, you might as well swear at a tree, and think to offend it. There's comfort in that anyway.'" If rough speech cannot force an idle young man to take stock of himself, at least it is reassuring to know that the rough words do not offend and create antagonism. That Gerard is entirely unaware that he is the target of Chiltern's frustrated anger is made clear when Gerard comments to Adelaide, "'I heard him going on to-day to some one as

though his whole soul depended on it'" (1: 65). Gerard seems unaware that that "some one" was himself.

Obviously, then, Gerard has limited awareness of himself or others in relation to himself. He is like his father in his lack of energy, yet Gerard is a young man and need not be so careful about exhausting himself. Gerard has in fact taught himself that energy is purposeless, that "the man who stands still is the man who keeps his ground" (1: 66). He tries to present rational arguments to defend his lack of energy and ambition, but he is clearly afraid of the risk of action. It is easier for him to be idle, to remain in stasis, than to actively pursue an ambitious goal and fail in the attempt. He even compares his view to Phineas's idealistic ambition. He believes that Phineas's desire to be in Parliament is foolish because it will cost him election expenses, and Phineas cannot be assured of an office that will pay even a small salary. Phineas can make the leap; he can follow his dream and try to make it productive. But Gerard is unwilling to make the leap of faith required by positive action, and this is why he procrastinates so long before proposing to Adelaide, and after he has finally done so, why he makes no effort to secure the income that would make the marriage possible. He waits for time and chance to resolve his problems.

Much of Gerard's attitude may well be caused by the example of his father and his father's selfish indifference

(Shrewsbury 175). His father, at least from the child's perspective, seems to have managed to live fairly well by doing nothing himself, but depending on others to supply many of the good things in his life. Gerard is no longer a child, yet he remains unable to direct and control his own life. That would require self-awareness and a thorough understanding of his obligations to others, neither of which he has. Like many other cads and weak men in Trollope's novels, Gerard expects Adelaide to save him from himself and the consequences of his actions, or rather his failures to act. He asks her to assume the task of reforming and saving him, "'the task of curing the sick one, and of strengthening the weak one'" (PR 1: 66). She is to be his teacher, and he will be dependent on her.

Adelaide is the only other person that Gerard is even remotely conscious of. He senses many of her thoughts, and he gives a reasonably accurate description of the way Adelaide sees him: "'. . . a poor creature, generally half asleep, shallow-pated, slow-blooded, ignorant, useless, and unambitious'" (1: 66). Adelaide does indeed think Gerard lacks ambition. It seems, at least on the surface, that Spooner would be a more worthy husband for Adelaide. Spooner knows how to conduct himself among men and can talk on subjects of interest to huntsmen, but he does not know how to conduct himself with women, nor does he know how to converse with Adelaide, a well-educated, talented woman who also writes for the Times. Adelaide chooses Gerard because

she loves him, but she also sees in him a potential that is lacking in Spooner.

Gerard's dependence on some outside force to resolve his problems is realized through Adelaide's social and familial relationships. Knowing that Gerard and Adelaide have insufficient money between them to marry, Marie Goesler requests that the old duke's legacy to her of £20,000, which she has refused to accept, be presented to Adelaide as a legacy from the duke. The Pallisers also have the wedding at Matching Priory, and such visible support and endorsement of the marriage act to remove other obstacles. Unwilling to risk the displeasure of the Pallisers, Maurice Maule no longer objects to his son's request to live at Maule Abbey. As Glencora had perceptively remarked of Maurice, "'Men of that sort are always jealous of their sons'" (1: 265), but with such a powerful family now supporting his son's interests, Mr. Maule Senior cannot afford to let his jealousy control his actions. That might work to limit chances for his own comfort and pleasure.

Another father whose selfishness damages his children is Earl Grex, who appears in The Duke's Children. Like Maurice Maule, Earl Grex has not been near his country seat for many years. Like Maule Abbey, Grex is "so sadly out of repair as to be altogether unfit for a residence of a gentleman and his family" (292). Neither Earl Grex nor his son Lord Percival has any liking for the property, but the

earl's daughter, Lady Mabel, loves the place and visits it from time to time. It is only for Lady Mabel that the house and property embody memories and traditions of family history. Part of the reason for her love of Grex is her tendency to melancholic brooding, an attitude arising from what she readily perceives as the deterioration of her family and the restricted, poverty-stricken fate to which this deterioration dooms her. These perceptions about time, history, and fate are what make her seem old and tarnished.<sup>27</sup> Silverbridge gets from her such an aura of world-weary experience that he fears she would always see him as a child. Yet Lady Mabel's hard bitterness and sophistication are the result of excess knowledge of how her father and brother choose to live and of her painful awareness that she cannot make the free and honest choice of marrying for love. She must marry money, and that knowledge itself deforms and distorts.

Earl Grex is descended from a very old family that traces its history "from some time prior to the Conquest" (73). He wears the Garter, but he seems never to have done anything to deserve the honor. He has a seat in the House of Lords, though he is rarely there; he chooses to spend his time at Newmarket or at the Beaufort Club. A man of pleasure in his youth, Earl Grex had devoted years to eating, drinking, and womanizing. Now that he is older and in failing health, he finds such pastimes no longer

possible or pleasurable; so he gambles at cards and at the races.

He was a grey-haired, handsome, worn-out old man, who through a long life of pleasure had greatly impaired a fortune which, for an earl, had never been magnificent, and who now strove hard, but not always successfully, to remedy that evil by gambling. . . . Nevertheless he was a handsome old man, of polished manners, when he chose to use them. . . . (73-74)

These polished manners are frequently discarded when he is at home, and this, along with his neglect of duties to the land and his family, signals that Earl Grex ignores the moral imperative of the gentleman. A gentleman might impulsively gamble, especially when he is caught up in the moods of camaraderie, but no gentleman devotes his life to gambling. Nor is the true gentleman permitted to drop courtesy and consideration of others when he is at home. One of the most significant signs of the gentleman is his treatment of those who live most closely with him; it is essential that his conduct toward family and "belongings" be as honorable and courteous as his treatment of friends. This concept is important in Trollope, and it is an idea running through much nineteenth-century commentary on the gentleman. Being rude to or ashamed of relatives, especially of older relatives or of one's parents, indicates bad breeding.

Earl Grex and his son Lord Percival hate each other; the hatred is so virulent on the earl's part that even when he is on his deathbed, he refuses to see his son. Lady Mabel says things had gone so far with her father "that he

could not be good to anyone. I think that he felt that it would be unmanly not to be the same to the end'" (609).

The emotional cost to others of the earl's attitude is expressed in Lady Mabel's thoughts about the way "the pious godly people" are obligated to live:

" . . . I think the pious godly people have the best of it in this world. Let them be ever so covetous, ever so false, ever so hard-hearted, the mere fact that they must keep up appearances, makes them comfortable to those around them. Poor papa was not comfortable to me. A little hypocrisy, a little sacrifice to the feelings of the world, may be such a blessing." (609)

The eighteenth-century concept of civility and Trollope's honestum agree on this point: honesty neither requires nor justifies brutality to others, and adherence to manners, to social forms, can often prevent unnecessary discomfort and pain for others. Only a self-centered man would adopt a mode of behavior that would encourage him to ignore the feelings of others; calling it "manly" does not make it so.

Earl Grex's gambling debts cause him to deprive his children of their rights to the family property and its income. He has several times induced his daughter to sign papers, signing away her rights; he arranges to cut off an entail, promising to pay his son. But on Derby day, when the earl wins a large amount, he cannot avoid covering his son's losses, especially since the entail money has not been paid. He pays, but he is bitterly angry at his son, "whom he hated worse than any one else in the world" (154). At the same time Silverbridge loses £70,000 at Doncaster,

Earl Grex loses about one-fourth that amount. He pays it with the remaining money that was to be his daughter's, "all that [she] was ever to have" (412). When he dies, there is a mortgage on Grex, and if Lord Percival does not oppose her, she will get "scrapings" from the sale of personal property, but not Grex which she so loved. Having failed to marry money, Lady Mabel must thus assume a status similar to that of Lady Rosina de Courcy, a lonely spinster supported by memories of family and pride of blood. Though Palliser believes strongly in the aristocratic order, he also believes that only a moral aristocracy can serve the country: "if his order, or many of his order, should become as was now Lord Grex, then, he thought, that his order not only must go to the wall but that, in the cause of humanity, it had better do so" (569).

The cads, scoundrels, and rakes in Trollope's novels fail primarily because of selfishness. Their selfishness handicaps not only their relationships with others, but it also severely limits the development of manliness. The failure of such men is therefore first of all a failure of self: the failure to develop an individual personality, to acquire maturity and self-awareness, and to develop a moral sense that places claims of self in a properly balanced relationship with the claims of others. Because the cad, scoundrel, or rake has neither personal awareness nor moral perception, he has failed to become fully human; he is an incomplete, fragmented man. His birth and breeding have



given him adequate opportunity to develop honestum and manliness, yet his selfishness repeatedly causes him to choose wrongly, until at last habitual self-persuasion and self-teaching prevent right action.

However, the true gentleman lives with the knowledge that he cannot choose selfish action. The gentleman is much aware of the human tendency to choose the easier and more expedient course of action, yet he is also fully conscious of what he would become should he make the selfish or unmanly choice. The gentleman strives to avoid the distortion of perspective and judgment that would inevitably result from choosing wrong action, for his primary concern is being a gentleman, not merely looking or acting like a gentleman. Remaining aware of human weakness and of every man's potential for evil or wrong action is essential for the gentleman. Though he may, during the times of his introspective self-examination, appear weak, he is constantly strengthening his character and moral perception through his conscious efforts to avoid merely selfish or expedient action. The results of such striving are best seen in the life and character of Plantagenet Palliser, the perfect gentleman whose development is portrayed throughout the Palliser novels.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Certain key words and their meanings in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are discussed throughout Gilmour's Idea of the Gentleman and Rothblatt's Tradition and Change. For example, Rothblatt's discussion of illiberal aspects of liberal education--no woman students, no ladies convenient for social education of young gentlemen, students' subsequent dependence on town women and street girls (in itself an illiberal education)--provides an excellent base for understanding patterns of student vice (87-91). Many of these patterns were continued after students were no longer restricted by the public school or university environment, a fact that demonstrates the interdependence of nature and nurture, so central to the notion of the gentleman's breeding. Other references are of course standard dictionaries, handbooks of synonyms, and various wordbooks. Writers on Trollope also frequently discuss key terms in the novels; these will be noted where appropriate.

<sup>2</sup> Sometimes, too, characters divide men into two groups, gentlemen and not gentlemen, or gentlemen and cads. See, for example, the dialogue between characters attempting to place Emilius in the social hierarchy (TED 2: 371-72).

<sup>3</sup> Readers are more sympathetic to Burgo than are other characters in the novel (Sir Cosmo Monk and Alice Vavasor, for instance). Plantagenet Palliser calls Burgo "a villain"

because of his plans, his premeditated attempt, to harm Glencora (CYFH? 2: 282).

<sup>4</sup> Both Hoyt and apRoberts list George Vavasor among Trollope's studies of the abnormal personality (61 n.22; 102), specifically the egomaniac. McMaster's view is similar, for she sees him as an "egoistic self-dramatizer" whose adoption of a succession of roles prevents the formation or expression of a real self (Palliser Novels 35-36). To Pope-Hennessy, George is evil (252), and both Wright and Halperin find him unscrupulous (Dream and Art 83; Trollope and Politics 48). Halperin writes that "George Vavasor is the man as beast and the beast as politician" (50). Hardwick describes him as "erratic in his nature and his ways but romantically manly" (64). Shrewsbury indicts him "on three counts--infidelity, premeditated falsehood, and lust" (143). Walpole finds George "revolting," but he also finds John Grey and Alice Vavasor "revolting," if for different reasons (100). Edwards argues that Trollope was using George to project his own fears about the consequences of women's rights, implying that women with freedom of choice would choose such men as George Vavasor. Because of his fears about women's rights, Edwards says, Trollope transforms George into "a conventional stage villain" to serve his moral purpose (99). Kendrick also sees George as acting like a "stage villain" because he chooses the romantic behavior of "a literary stereotype" (70). George does have some characteristics in common with the villain

of nineteenth-century melodrama, but he is also a fictional representation of the nothingness resulting from acting and playing roles and never becoming a person. It should be remembered, too, that the villain of nineteenth-century melodrama tests the community's values, but he is always overcome by the forces of good--in this case, the values of the gentleman. See also Grimsted 80-98.

<sup>5</sup> Polhemus discusses the importance of "heart" in Trollope's novels (Changing World 183), referring to O'Connor's earlier study (165-83). Cadbury writes that the opposition of head and heart is a basic theme in Trollope's novels (331), and Bareham relates the opposition to Jane Austen's sense and sensibility theme (60-63).

<sup>6</sup> George's infidelity is also described as his "ill-usage" of Alice (1: 61). In Trollope's novels, "ill-usage" and "ill-treatment" of a woman are shorthand references to the man's violation of his vows of love, fidelity, and honor, or his sexual infidelity. Generally, "ill-usage" signifies that a man is keeping a mistress, as Maurice Maule does throughout his marriage and after his wife's death.

<sup>7</sup> McMaster provides an excellent discussion of this aspect of Can You Forgive Her? (Palliser Novels 20-37). She argues that Trollope explores "the discrepancy between theory and fact, and between language and reality" partly by concentrating on Alice's separation of thought and

feeling (25) and partly by portraying John Grey and Palliser as "men who are aware of the dangers of language, and mindful of the necessity of keeping it properly related to reality" (34). McMaster identifies Alice's problem as her tendency to separate her thoughts and feelings, not the feminist issue identified by Escott. Readings of Alice's story as Trollope's disapproval of women's rights or women's independence concentrate especially on paragraph 3 of chapter 11 (1: 109-110); the fourth paragraph is unfortunately ignored. The two need to be considered together, since they are question ("What should a woman do with her life?") and answer (the what is less important than the how, living with truth and honesty, equally important for men and women). Readings of the novel as antifeminist are, however, clearly in the majority; see Barickman et al. 214-15; Cockshut, Anthony Trollope 162; Escott 207-210; Edwards 92-95; Flint xxvi-xxvii; Halperin, Trollope and Politics 41-45; Hart 685A; Letwin 142-44; Lucas 7712A; Polhemus, Changing World 103-111; Pollard 84-85; and Underwood 1698A. Countering the view of Can You Forgive Her? as an antifeminist novel are the readings provided by Lansbury, Reasonable Man 80-102, 215; Overton 6-7, 100; Garrett 181-89; and apRoberts 162-63.

<sup>8</sup> Ferdinand Lopez in The Prime Minister is very much like George Vavasor. Lopez maintains the same secrecy about where and how he lives and how he gets his money, but

he has the added mystery of birth, family, and social origins. No one knows anything about Lopez's family; they know only that he is a Portuguese who is possibly a Jew and that he looks like a gentleman. Lopez shares with Vavator an urge to mastery: he has "learned to carry his empire in his eye," the "combative eyes" that assert the claims of self (TPM 1: 5). Also, Lopez is even more skilled than Vavator in shaping his speech to mislead and manipulate others, and he has a better sense of how people and situations can be used for his own gain. Like Vavator in his egocentric thought, Lopez, the rootless outsider, is a skilled simulator of gentlemanliness. It is only after Lopez marries an English gentleman's daughter that the gap between real man and false mask becomes evident, and that widening gap confirms the traditional belief that gentlemanliness cannot be learned in one generation.

<sup>9</sup> Edwards misreads this chapter, I think, when he assumes that its title refers to Alice's dilemma, "passion" being her sexual attraction to George, and "prudence" being the safety and social conformity of a marriage to Grey (94-96). The letters exchanged make very clear what Alice expects of her marriage to George (1: 313-16, 338-39). Within chapter 35 itself, the title is explicitly related to the dilemma George faces. His prudence is his desire to use Alice's money (1: 363); his passion is the anger he feels at her refusal to profess her love (1: 365). He

cannot vent his anger, "the better part of his nature," because of his prudence, his immediate need for her money (1: 365). A similar reading of the Alice-George relationship seems to be the foundation of Polhemus's view of Alice as "terribly repressed" and "sexless" (Changing World 110-11); McMaster refutes Polhemus (Palliser Novels 28-29). Letwin also misstates the nature of Alice's thoughts about and relationship with George (142-44). Letwin quotes a phrase from Grey's letter to Alice, a phrase Grey humorously applies to George (1: 21), and fragments of George's arguments to Alice on the balcony at Basle (1: 44-53), attributing them to Alice herself and presenting them as Alice's thoughts.

<sup>10</sup> Both Flint (xxii) and Booth (85) refer to Jane simply as a prostitute and make no distinctions between her and the young prostitute Burgo encounters twice. Flint further comments that George seems to have deprived Jane of her living quarters, placing "some unrevealed successor" in that "carefully hidden third establishment." Jane's destitution and her hollow cheeks, hinting both starvation and disease, are in contrast to the youth and increasing prosperity of the young prostitute. In Man and Woman Cockshut points out Trollope's unusual reversal in making the young prostitute hungry the first time Burgo meets her, but "comparatively prosperous" on their second meeting (20).

<sup>11</sup> Suicide is not an option open to the true gentleman; it goes against manliness, conscience, and religious duty

(Trollope, Cicero 2: 294, 323). There are suicides in Trollope, generally the result of excessive concentration on dishonest means of getting and using money--for example, the speculators Ferdinand Lopez in The Prime Minister and Dobbs Broughton in The Last Chronicle of Barset, and the debt-ridden gambler Charles Amedroz in The Belton Estate. See Levine 196; Sadleir, Commentary 63; Girouard 88.

<sup>12</sup> In her discussion of the importance of places and things in Trollope, McMaster comments on the frequency with which characters return to the place associated with a previous bad choice or wrong action (Palliser Novels 180-210). McMaster writes that these returns are "a kind of ritual": characters "go back in time as well as in space, they face their past selves, they exorcise a ghost, they sometimes succeed in making a new start" (192).

<sup>13</sup> Terry sees Burgo's motivation is his pursuit of Glencora as sexual desire and responsiveness to her beauty; he dismisses what he refers to as Trollope's "ambiguous references to [Burgo's] want of money" (119). There are several such references, but it is quite difficult to see them as ambiguous. Wildman also comments on Burgo's "passionate, sensual love" for Glencora but finds him "thoroughly untrustworthy"; Burgo is "the complete sensualist" who is "utterly ruthless" in his pursuit of self-gratification (116, 86). Edwards finds Burgo "a Byronic exhibitionist" driven by "physical and moral



recklessness" (144). Though Marsh describes him as "the entire and perfect rotter, dissolute, selfish, and utterly irresponsible," he still thinks Burgo "pitiable and lovable; and beyond a doubt the most convincingly beautiful man in fiction" (vi). Levine writes of Burgo in terms of Trollope's treatment of selfishness as a social problem rather than a form of demonic evil. Levine finds such portrayals of human failure one of Trollope's strengths as a realist: the novels consistently demonstrate that "the traditions of civilization are normally sufficient to deal with the monstrous possibilities caused by the imposition of the self on the world" (197). Pope-Hennessy points out that Burgo is akin to Dorian Gray: "his dissipations never make him look older" (256-67). McMaster's terse dismissal of Burgo as "little better than a burnt-out firework" (Palliser Novels 25) carries subtle hints that surface when we remember Skilton's statement that Burgo "leads a life immediately recognizable from Marcus's The Other Victorians" (94 n.61). Such a life would tend to burn one out very quickly, a conclusion reached also by Blyth (xi-xvi).

<sup>14</sup> The huntsman riding "almost neck and neck" with Burgo is Pollock, "the sporting literary gentleman," Trollope's caricature of himself. Of Pollock, "all the world declared that he was as ignorant of hunting as any tailor," yet the world also declared that "when he couldn't ride he could tumble" (1: 179).

<sup>15</sup> The phrase "French novel" is a general term for melodramatic and sensational novels, for "trashy and exciting fiction" such as the novels by Eugène Sue (Centenary TED Notes 2: 383). The novels of Eugène Sue, author of The Wandering Jew (1844-1845) and The Mysteries of Paris (1842-1843), are sometimes compared to those of Dumas père. The term "French novel" becomes virtually a code phrase to denote shallowness and selfishness. Both Lizzie Eustace and Maurice Maule are fond of "French novels." These are not pornographic novels. For Trollope's comments on the potential moral dangers of such sensational fiction, see Autobiography 200-201, 206-208.

<sup>16</sup> Polhemus describes Glencora's frustration in terms of sexual guilt: "the chagrin and the sense of guilt that a passionate but apparently sterile young woman might feel at not bearing a child"; "the neurotic bitchiness and guilt which post-Freudians might expect of a woman beginning to think of herself as a sexual failure" (Changing World 109-110). Polhemus is at least partly right, for there is evidence to support sexual frustration on Glencora's part, and regrets on both her and Plantagenet's part that Glencora has not yet become pregnant. Yet this is not exactly the result of Glencora's apparent barrenness, or of Palliser's "sexual inadequacy" (Edwards 151-52; Terry 118-19). It is more the result of Palliser's blind devotion to work, as Halperin argues (Trollope and Politics 58). Palliser

habitually studies blue books until somewhere in the early morning hours (1:00-3:00 a.m.) and of course does not go to Glencora at such a time. Too often when he does spend time with her, he is trying to explain to her the mysteries of the English Constitution and parliamentary system. As Halperin says, this is not the way to make love to a woman.

<sup>17</sup> Glencora's regrets about Burgo and the manner in which she severed their relationship are not adequate support for an argument that she continues to love Burgo, though she long remembers the feeling of the love she once had. (Such memories are common in Trollope's characters, male and female, but their memory of the former feeling does not mean that the feeling itself remains. Similarly, characters who make right choices frequently regret the good things they lost--money, for instance--in not making the wrong choice.) Glencora's regrets seem rather to cluster around her perception that Palliser is disappointed because she has not yet become pregnant, her translation of that disappointment into his lack of love for her (1: 226-27, 164-68; see also Wijesinha 302), and above all else, her belief that her mode of leaving Burgo violated her integrity and sense of proper conduct: "'I did it like a beast that is driven as its owner chooses'" (1: 267). Though she accepted the pressure applied by family members, the choice was still not her fully free and independent choice. For Trollope, such independence of spirit is as important for women as it is for men; as long as people do

not make their own choices, they are neither fully human nor moral beings. My own view of the Palliser marriage follows that of Gatrell, who argues that Trollope frequently portrays characters learning to love each other (102). Perhaps love that grows slowly is less romantic than "love at first sight," but Trollope's portrayal of the developing and growing love between the Pallisers, which takes both of them by surprise, is surely both a realistic and artistic achievement. (See also Wijesinha's argument that the marriage is "allowed to develop according to its own internal logic" [45].) Nor is it fair to argue that genuine love between the Pallisers would require one or both of them to submerge the individual personality into the other. That is what Robert Kennedy expects of marriage, and the rigidity of his expectations destroys the possibility of love.

<sup>18</sup> This letter and Glencora's thoughts about it seem to be the basis of the belief of many readers that Glencora "planned" to elope with Burgo. See, for example, apRoberts 148; Aitken, "Genus Girl" 430-31; Cockshut, Anthony Trollope 162; Gindin 38; Letwin 81, 84-85; Walpole 102-103; and Wildman 113-15. Glencora makes no plans, no preparations for such an action; she merely thinks about it while her husband is locked away reading his blue books. Even in her talks with Alice, Burgo is more symbol than cause of Glencora's frustration and discontent.

<sup>19</sup> Wildman 86; Schreyer 15-19; McMaster, "Theme and Form" 177-78; Gilmour, "A Lesser Thackeray?" 192; Skilton 40-42.

<sup>20</sup> In his lecture "The Present Condition of the Northern States of the American Union," Trollope compares America as a young country to a bold, brash, loud, conceited young man (54-57). There is hope for both, Trollope says, because the energy and ambition of the young are ultimately productive. As long as the young can and do read and write, they will set themselves right at last by purposeful direction of energy and ambition.

<sup>21</sup> Though critics generally concur with the Geroulds' view of the old duke as "the embodiment of the ducal tradition" (184), there are diverging opinions. Cockshut sees the importance of the old duke as satirical: as a "moral touchstone" he is "the obverse of Mr. Harding"; he is "the aristocrat who represents evil incorporated into a system" (Anthony Trollope 156, 161). Wildman discusses the duke as a man of pleasure much like Thackeray's Marquis of Steyne and Disraeli's Lord Monmouth (83). For Shrewsbury, the old duke symbolizes "aristocratic uselessness" (180). It can be argued that Trollope uses the two Dukes of Omnium to represent the two parts of government, the old duke representing the dignified or ceremonial aspect of government, which both Bagehot and Trollope believed had its own importance, and the younger duke, Plantagenet Palliser, embodying the efficient parts of government. See Briggs (87-115) and apRoberts on Briggs (128-30). Viewing the two dukes in this way aids in understanding Trollope's portrayal of Palliser in The

Prime Minister and the nature of Palliser's political failure. As the head of a coalition government intended to do no real work, Palliser cannot adapt to the ceremonial role he is expected to assume, whereas the old duke could have. Palliser wants to do real work, to be of practical use, and the enforced inactivity of his position gives him too much time for introspection, which has its dangers; all his energies are forced inward rather than being expended in action. The ceremonial role damages him and his sense of self-worth because it deprives him of function; as Glencora says, the inappropriate role almost destroys him (TPM 2: 309).

<sup>22</sup> In Phineas Finn she is described as "probably something over thirty years of age" (2: 25), yet three years later she is "hardly yet thirty" (PR 1: 267). There are frequent discrepancies in the ages Trollope assigns characters from novel to novel, but usually only differences of two or three years. It is often simpler to see characters' ages as approximations.

<sup>23</sup> Cockshut sees Marie's refusal of the duke as the result of her knowledge of her social inferiority (Anthony Trollope 125), and Naman sees it as caused by an awareness both of the inferiority of her rank and social position and of her personal worth, which would make her "an honorable wife for any man" (112). As the daughter of a country attorney, Marie's birth places her in the gentry,

her marriage to an Austrian banker gave her wealth, and she makes of her foreignness, her Jewishness, an asset rather than a liability. Though she must be ever mindful of her status as an outsider, Marie's grace, character, and conduct make her the inferior of no one in the novels. On this point I agree with Letwin, but I would not call Marie Goesler a "perfect gentleman" (74). She is a "perfect lady," and she illustrates the distinction in Trollope's thought when he says that Glencora is not "a perfect lady" but is "all over a woman" (Autobiography 330).

<sup>24</sup> Walter Allen, in a discussion of several religious attitudes in Trollope's novels, says that Trollope is usually not thought of as a Christian novelist (84-86). This aspect of Trollope's work has been overlooked, and it is an aspect that ties together the concept of the gentleman and the narrator's efforts to distinguish between act and agent while requesting sympathy and charity for the human agent. These moral attitudes keep the gentleman's soul free of destructive malice and vengeance. The gentleman must assume responsibility for making judgments about others' conduct, but he must also not make certain judgments about those whose conduct he is judging.

<sup>25</sup> Phineas Finn calls Maule "'that old padded dandy'" (PR 2: 48), and Lady Glencora says that "'what there is of him comes chiefly from the tailor'" (PR 2: 265). The

description of Maule's life, from schooldays on, makes it clear that he is a leftover dandy, somewhat comparable to Dickens's Department Turveydrop (Boll 22).

<sup>26</sup> McMaster calls Maule a social success (Palliser Novels 75), and Halperin describes him as "a knowledgeable social politician" (Trollope and Politics 208), presumably because of his skill in evaluating and using the London social world to ensure the continued enjoyment of the good things he cannot afford to buy for himself.

<sup>27</sup> When Lord Silverbridge compares Isabel Boncassen, the woman he chooses to marry, and Lady Mabel Grex, the woman he almost chose, he accurately perceives their differences:

Lady Mabel with all her grace, with all her beauty, with all her talent, was a creature of efforts, or, as it might be called, a manufactured article. She strove to be graceful, to be lovely, to be agreeable and clever. Isabel was all this and infinitely more without any struggle. When he was most fond of Mabel, most anxious to make her his wife, there had always been present to him a feeling that she was old. . . . Something had gone of her native bloom, something had been scratched and chipped from the first fair surface, and this had been repaired by varnish and veneering. Though he had loved her he had never been altogether satisfied with her. But Isabel was as young as Hebe. (544)

Youth and freshness in Silverbridge's thought are equivalent to naturalness, to lack of artifice and affectation.

Natural, unpretentious being seems younger than the artificial, the seeming to be. His choice of Isabel is as necessary for him as it is appropriate for the optimistic sense of possibilities and beginnings with which the series closes.



## CHAPTER V

## PLANTAGENET PALLISER: THE PERFECT GENTLEMAN

Plantagenet Palliser is "Trollope's fullest and subtlest portrayal of a human being" (Cockshut, "Trollope's Liberalism" 175). Trollope portrays the development of Palliser over a period of more than twenty years, and the range of years allows Trollope to explore several facets of the life of his perfect gentleman: his personality, characterized by austerity, reserve, and seeming coldness; his arduous preparation for his political role and the ways his dedication to public service handicap his personal and social growth; his difficulties in personal and social relationships; his marriage, his slow awakening to love, and the inevitable difficulties of living with a woman of a temperament so different from his own; his strong sense of family and his restructuring of relationships with those relatives the old duke had ignored or quarreled with; and his learning to be a father, with all its pain and joy. Many readers have been interested chiefly in Palliser as a political character, as Trollope's ideal statesman. These interests in the political context and background of the novels have naturally led to attempts to identify prototypes of Palliser and other fictional characters among nineteenth-century historical figures.<sup>1</sup> However, it is in the

complexities and demands of private life that Palliser truly excels. His marital and parental roles, emphasized in the first and last novels of the series, provide the enclosing frame for his life's work. The nobility and generosity of Palliser's conduct in domestic relationships are the epitome of the honesty, fairness, and justice that are his primary political motives.<sup>2</sup> It is in the parental role that Palliser's views about rank and status, the aristocratic order and its obligations to others, the nature and purpose of politics and government, all come together. In this harmonious unity of seeming opposites, gentlemanliness and its values are triumphant, and it is a triumph both for Palliser as Trollope's perfect gentleman and for the series cataloging the stages of his growth.

Palliser is introduced in The Small House at Allington as a rising politician, a young man of twenty-five committed to the ideal of service:

He had chosen to be a politician, and in that pursuit he laboured with a zeal and perseverance which would have made his fortune at any profession or in any trade. He was constant in committee-rooms up to the middle of August. He was rarely absent from any debate of importance, and never from any important division. Though he seldom spoke, he was always ready to speak if his purpose required it. . . . He was a thin-minded, plodding, respectable man, willing to devote all his youth to work, in order that in old age he might be allowed to sit among the Councillors of the State. (230)

This devotion to politics and to preparation for future service has its cost, however. It consumes so much of Palliser's time and attention that he does not participate

in normal social activities: "He did not hunt or shoot or keep a yacht, and had been heard to say that he had never put a foot upon a race-course in his life" (229). When he sees Lady Dumbello at country house parties, he talks with her, for she is a beautiful woman. The conversation between the two is innocent and conventional, yet people begin gossiping and speculating. Lady De Courcy suggests to other women that Lady Dumbello will "go off with" Palliser because "Lord Dumbello is tired of her." "But in this, as in almost everything else, the wicked old woman spoke scandal" (233).

It is not until his uncle, the old duke, talks to Palliser about the rumors that anything other than social conventionalities enters Palliser's mind. He persuades himself that despite his work, he might be able "to spare an hour or two for Amaryllis in the shade" (436). He recognizes that the life he has chosen, its constant study and preparation, is hard; and he tells himself that he is obligated, as a gentleman, not to surrender to his uncle's implied threats of cutting off his income (431). Yet he really does not know what to say to Lady Dumbello, or how to flirt:

It was really very hard work. If the truth must be told, he did not know how to begin. What was he to say to her? How was he to commence a conversation that should end by being tender? She was very handsome certainly, and for him she could look interesting; but for his very life he did not know how to begin to say anything special to her. A liaison with such a woman as Lady Dumbello--platonic, innocent, but nevertheless very intimate--would

certainly lend a grace to his life, which, under its present circumstances, was rather dry. He was told--told by public rumour which had reached him through his uncle--that the lady was willing. She certainly looked as though she liked him; but how was he to begin? The art of startling the House of Commons and frightening the British public by the voluminous accuracy of his statistics he had already learned; but what was he to say to a pretty woman? (434)

Palliser's dedication to political work has not only restricted his social relationships with men, but it has also deprived him of relationships with women. He has spent little time talking with women, and he really does not know how to carry out the flirting he thinks he wants to engage in. He has "heard of men of his class doing the same sort of thing all his life," but he does not understand how it is done (436). This inadequate knowledge of women will pose problems for him when he marries, especially in the early stages of his marriage. He has trained himself to gather facts and statistics and to present them accurately to an audience, and he soon learns the inadequacy of language in conveying perceptions and feelings. The effect that gossip and rumor have on him also becomes important later, both in the way they determine the actions of Burgo Fitzgerald and in the manner in which Palliser copes with rumor about Glencora and Burgo. Rumors about Glencora's supposed feelings have an even greater effect on Burgo, though he has had far more experience than Palliser with all types of women, but Burgo is more handicapped by his lack of perception and sensitivity and his failure to consider others. Burgo wants to take another man's wife in

order to get some portion of her money, but Palliser wants only a mild and gentle flirtation, something of "an hour or two" that will relieve the hard monotony of his work. This too is an ominous sign, for it indicates that Palliser as a young husband will give inadequate time to an even younger wife who needs his time, conversation, and attention.

The closest Palliser ever comes to impropriety with Lady Dumbello is his attempt to establish intimacy by using her first name:<sup>3</sup>

"Griselda," he said--and it must be admitted that his tone was not bad. The word sank softly into her ear, like small rain upon moss, and it sank into no other ear. "Griselda!"

"Mr. Palliser!" said she; and though she made no scene, though she merely glanced upon him once, he could see that he was wrong.

"May I not call you so?"

"Certainly not. Shall I ask you to see if my people are there?" He stood a moment before her hesitating.

"My carriage, I mean." As she gave the command she glanced at him again, and then he obeyed her orders.

When he returned she had left her seat; but he heard her name announced on the stairs, and caught a glance of the back of her head as she made her way gracefully down through the crowd. He never attempted to make love to her again, utterly disappointing the hopes of Lady De Courcy, Mrs. Proudie, and Lady Clandidlem. (563-64)

By the end of the season Palliser has accepted the marriage arranged by his uncle and the Marquis of Auldreekie, guardian of Lady Glencora MacCluskie, "the great heiress of the day" (564). The old duke signifies his pleasure by giving Matching Priory to the young couple, and to Glencora he gives The Horns as a wedding present (565).

The reintroduction of Palliser with his wife in Can You Forgive Her? is a logical extension of the novel's

family and social relationships, for John Vavasor, Alice's father, had married Alice Macleod, one of Glencora's relatives, and Alice and Glencora are cousins. Alice's wavering between George Vavasor and John Grey is to her maternal relatives an unpleasant reminder of Glencora's infatuation with Burgo. It brings down on Alice the family pressure applied by Lady Macleod and Lady Midlothian, and it stirs Glencora to renew her relationship with Alice.

In Can You Forgive Her? Palliser is about five years older, but his habits are unchanged, despite his eighteen-month marriage. He still devotes most of his time to his work. He is not brilliant and knows it, so he has trained himself to read and research, to collect his facts, and to present them in an informative rather than an eloquent manner. Palliser's earnestness and factual accuracy make him worthy of the confidence of others, and he is always listened to in the House of Commons. He is a dull speaker, not given to jokes or rhetorical flourishes; he labors to impart information, not to impress or entertain by oratory and eloquence. In fact, Palliser is a true Trollopian gentleman in his distrust of oratorical arts; he considers oratory a sin against honesty in politics (1: 246-47).<sup>4</sup> As Glencora tells Alice Vavasor, Palliser still does not ride or hunt, and like all the Pallisers, he is a nontalker (1: 223-24). Both his political work and his view of the purposes of language have increased his personal reticence; he is much given to silence, and throughout most of his life

he finds it difficult to convey the truth and depth of his own feelings. He has learned to know the importance attached to words, and he knows that others often assign more meaning to words than the speaker intended. Palliser fears this reaction in others, and this too increases his silence and reserve. As he tells Glencora in the climactic breakfast scene after Lady Monk's ball,

"It is not always easy for a man to show what he thinks by what he says. . . . My fear is that you should suppose me to think more than I do. And it was for that reason that I determined to sleep on it before I spoke to you." (2: 184)

Like John Grey, Palliser knows that expressions of emotion and feeling can become ways to manipulate others, and his reluctance to unfairly influence his wife's behavior makes it difficult for him to convey the love and need he feels. His actions are frequently a better guide to his intent than are his words or personal manner, as Alice soon recognizes (2: 294-95).

Palliser's long hours at political work and his turning his home into political offices are serious threats to his marriage. In talking to Alice about Palliser's long hours studying blue books, Glencora is inspired with greater interest in her husband, his activities, and his political prospects (1: 266), but she is still bored and lonely and feels that no one at Matching Priory loves her (1: 268). Glencora tells Alice that Palliser never quits work before 1:00 a.m., and often studies until 3:00 or

later; she is apparently always awake and hears him come upstairs (1: 245). After receiving the letter from Burgo, Glencora goes to London to be with her husband, for she does not want to be alone at Matching Priory with Burgo in the vicinity. Yet when Palliser returns at 1:00 a.m. from a session of Parliament and finds Glencora there, he gives her a long lecture on the British Constitution and politics (2: 16-17).

Palliser has not in fact become conscious of his own feelings. Because the marriage was arranged, he continues to think of it as a business merger, an alliance between two extremely wealthy families. As business, the marriage has been a success. It saved Glencora and her wealth from Burgo, "a spendthrift, unprincipled, and debauched," and it saved him from "his little threatened mischance,--a passing fancy for a married lady" whom he had pursued "not in the most ardent manner" (1: 247-48). Furthermore, though he was rich before his marriage, Glencora's wealth added to his gave him "that rock-like solidity which is so necessary to our great aristocratic politicians" (1: 248). That "colossal wealth," along with his innate honesty and personal integrity, makes it possible for him to provide disinterested public service; he seeks neither place nor income for himself, but only the influence and position that will enable him to serve his country and help those below him improve their social and economic positions.



Palliser only gradually becomes aware of his wife as a person. In the early months of their marriage his inexperience with women makes him blind to Glencora's feelings and needs. He thinks the marriage has gone well for both him and Glencora; he sees the arrangement as especially good for Glencora, since he has given her "almost unlimited power of enjoying her own money, and [he] interfered but little in her way of life" (1: 249).

Unfortunately, he keeps himself so apart from his wife that he really knows little about "her way of life." He hears the hints and suggestions that Mr. Bott and Mrs. Marsham make, and because Mrs. Marsham was his mother's friend, he tends to trust her, not even suspecting her motives. Knowing his own inexperience with women, he has sought "motherly advice" for both himself and Glencora from Mrs. Marsham (2: 85) and from his spinster cousin, Miss Iphigenia Palliser (1: 294).

Long before Palliser becomes conscious of his wife's unhappiness, the reader is thoroughly acquainted with it through Glencora's talks with Alice Vavasor, the cousin she has brought to Matching Priory to be her confidante and to provide anchors to protect her from her fear of impulsive action (2: 14). These talks reveal, too, that despite her loneliness, boredom, and frustration, Glencora has learned to love her husband; neither she nor Palliser, however, yet realizes that they love each other, though Alice does recognize the fact (1: 268). Evidence of Glencora's love

is found in her concentration on what Palliser might think or feel about her. If she did not love him, it is unlikely that she would care so much about his thoughts and feelings. She often talks about her regret that she has no child as yet (1: 226-27, 257, 261, 285). She believes she sees her husband's regret and disappointment "in his eyes when he asks [her] questions," yet she also knows he would never "say an unkind word, not if his own position depended on it" (1: 227). But she feels his disappointment, feels guilty, and imagines that he could not possibly love her; she convinces herself that she could win his love only by her actions, and she says she has not "'done a thing for him that can make him love'" her (1: 268). Glencora also imagines herself ugly (1: 230).

Glencora's feeling that she has somehow betrayed her husband by not yet giving him an heir causes her to fantasize ways of freeing her husband so that he can take another wife who might give him a child. She tells Alice that before she would allow the dukedom to leave Palliser's descent and go to his cousin Jeffrey, she would kill herself "'so that he might marry again.'" As Glencora sees it, there are only two ways to ensure that her husband has an heir: she can kill herself, or she can run away with Burgo (1: 257). Seeing an elopement with Burgo as a form of suicide, a way of freeing Palliser to seek another wife, Glencora convinces herself that running away with Burgo is appropriate self-sacrifice and self-punishment:

"But what now is the only honest thing I can do? Why, leave him;--so leave him that he may have another wife and be the father of a child. What injury shall I do him by leaving him? He does not love me; you know yourself that he does not love me." (1: 285)

Alice cannot convince her otherwise; that reassurance can come only from her husband. And as both women realize, Glencora is idle and bored; she has no occupation, no sense of purpose. A child would give Glencora occupation and purpose; and the knowledge that Palliser can and does love her, both because of who she is and in spite of what she does or does not do, would confirm her sense of worth as the wife of one of England's greatest men. Palliser's love for his wife comes through in oblique, understated ways, but his wife needs to be told; she wants daily professions of love. Glencora recounts to Alice some of her private conversations with Palliser; she seems to have missed the significance of Palliser's kissing her even when their disagreements are unresolved--for instance, about how Glencora should avoid difficulties between two of their guests, the Duchess of St. Bungay and Mrs. Conway Sparkes (1: 258).

Glencora has tried indirectly to let her husband know of her feelings and her fear of behaving foolishly, but she expresses that fear in terms of not wanting to meet Burgo socially (1: 244, 286). Since the words Glencora uses do not convey her underlying fears, Palliser fails to comprehend her intended meaning; what she attempts to convey is emotional and psychological, not factual. From Palliser's

point of view, his wife should have no fear of meeting anyone, anywhere (1: 286). So Glencora looks to Alice to save her; Alice is her charm for self-protection against Burgo and the will to destroy herself (2: 14, 22). Yet Palliser's concern for his wife's health and safety causes him to be rude to Alice (1: 288). Glencora insists on walking with Alice in the Priory ruins on a cold December night, and this is the time Glencora most explicitly describes her two alternatives, as she sees them, of suicide or elopement with Burgo. Mrs. Marsham and Mr. Bott attempt to forbid the walk, but Glencora challenges Palliser to forbid it. He refuses, saying only that he thinks it foolish (1: 280). Glencora returns emotionally overwrought, shivering and with her teeth chattering. Knowing nothing about the nature of his wife's conversation with Alice, Palliser of course misreads the signs, and he holds Alice responsible for keeping his wife out in the cold for almost an hour. Palliser's angry words are directed at his cousin Jeffrey, who stood watch to protect the women, but Alice knows the anger is meant for her. Palliser says absolutely nothing to Alice, not even asking if she is also cold. "Alice felt the slight and understood it all. He had told her plainly enough, though not in words, that he had trusted his wife with her, and that she had betrayed that trust" (1: 288). Under the influence of Bott and Marsham, Palliser has failed to see his wife as an adult responsible for her own actions. He has himself repeated

to Glencora the Bott-Marsham refrain, telling Glencora that she is "very young" (1: 258), and it is quite likely that his view of Glencora as a wayward child makes it impossible for him to act as a lover or husband. He has assumed a protective paternal stance in his attitude toward his wife's behavior. Only when he sees Glencora's temperament and personality as part of her individuality can their marriage move to a more adult and mutually responsive level.

Palliser's awareness of his marital failure comes as a result of Lady Monk's ball. After Bott sends Marsham to tell Palliser of Glencora's dancing with Burgo, Palliser returns to bring his wife home; he had made a brief appearance earlier to greet the hostess and other people he cannot afford to ignore, but had then gone back home to his blue books. While Mrs. Marsham is gone, Mr. Bott still watches Glencora, yet when Palliser arrives, Glencora sees that her husband shakes off Bott's clutching hand and does not even pause to speak to the would-be informant. The scene is impressive, and it reveals to Glencora the worth and chivalrous nobility of the man she has married.

"Here is Mr. Palliser," said she, speaking again in her ordinary, clear-toned voice. Burgo immediately rose from his seat with a start, and turned quickly towards the door; but Lady Glencora kept her chair.

Mr. Palliser made his way as best he could through the crowd up to his wife. He, too, kept his countenance without betraying his secret. There was neither anger nor dismay in his face, nor was there any untoward hurry in his movement. Burgo stood aside as he came up, and Lady Glencora was the first to speak. "I thought you were gone home hours ago," she said.

"I did go home," he answered, "but I thought I might as well come back for you."

"What a model of a husband! Well; I am ready. Only, what shall we do about Jane [a cousin who came with Glencora]? Mr. Fitzgerald, I left a scarf in your aunt's room,--a little black and yellow scarf,--would you mind getting it for me?"

"I will fetch it," said Mr. Palliser, "and I will tell your cousin that the carriage shall come back for her."

"If you will allow me--" said Burgo.

"I will do it," said Mr. Palliser; and away he went, making his slow progress up through the crowd, ordering his carriage as he passed through the hall, and leaving Mr. Bott still watching at the door.

Lady Glencora resolved that she would say nothing to Burgo while her husband was gone. There was a touch of chivalry in his leaving them again together, which so far conquered her. He might have bade her leave the scarf, and come at once. She had seen, moreover, that he had not spoken to Mr. Bott, and was thankful to him also for that. . . . (2: 107-108)

Palliser's conduct here is a sample of that "grace of character" that Trollope so admired in Thackeray's Colonel Newcome. There is no display of excess emotion, no public scene, no action that severs social relationships or creates rancor. His behavior also permits Glencora to retain her dignity. Readers of the series cannot help but think how Robert Kennedy would have handled a similar situation, especially when he walks among the crowd at Mr. Gresham's party, watching his wife as Mr. Bott watches Glencora (PF 2: 298-303). Palliser would never so disgrace himself or humiliate his wife. Years later, when Glencora's championing of Ferdinand Lopez makes Palliser subject to the newspaper attacks of Quintus Slide, he tells Glencora that he would never "'say a word against [her], even to a friend.'" He has never done so, and never could: "'If my

anger were at the hottest, I would not confess to a human being that you were not perfect,--except to yourself'" (TPM 2: 22). For Palliser, public display of anger or displeasure with his wife would be equivalent to verbal abuse.

As he takes Glencora home after Lady Monk's party, Palliser refuses to be drawn into verbal combat, though Glencora is spoiling for battle and attempts by her questions to force a dramatic confrontation (2: 109). She insists that she will never allow either Mr. Bott or Mrs. Marsham to be her guests again, and she uses such a defiant tone that Palliser postpones the emotional conflict it suggests (2: 180). When Glencora comes down to breakfast the next morning, Palliser is already there, reading his newspaper. He rises when his wife enters, kisses her, and inquires, "'Have you any headache this morning?'" (2: 183). Palliser may not know women very well, but he has learned the social euphemism that women use both to evade unpleasant tasks and to avoid putting into words things that often should not be said, at least at a particular time. Palliser is also willing to allow Glencora the freedom that euphemism permits her, whereas Kennedy always responds to Lady Laura's headaches with the coldly analytical approach of the scientist or detective, determined to track down and eliminate their causes. Kennedy's attitude increases the oppressive tyranny of marriage for Lady Laura, and one suspects that her headaches, both real and feigned, increase

in proportion to her husband's refusals to allow her that evasive tactic. Glencora, however, has few headaches, and she has none on this important morning.

As the Pallisers breakfast, they discuss the usual things--the weather, recent news, and yesterday's political speeches. Palliser is tempted not to discuss the events of the previous night, yet his feeling that Glencora has defied him (her refusal to entertain Bott and Marsham) tells him he cannot be silent on the subject. But he finds the necessity so unpleasant that he hides behind his newspaper, using it to mask his "deferring the evil moment" (2: 184). Glencora brings up the subject, and then she invites him to get on with his scolding: "'I don't want to stop you, Plantagenet. Pray, go on. Only it will be so nice to have it over'" (2: 185). She can for a while avoid her real concerns by accusing Palliser of employing spies and listening to their reports; these charges permit her to be bold and defiant. But Palliser asks her if she really believes he "commissioned" Bott to watch her. By forcing her to distinguish between Bott's behavior and her husband's actions, Palliser also forces Glencora to bring out her true discontent. She refuses to lie; she replies only that Bott has certainly watched her. Palliser's impassioned response moves her: "'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'" (2: 188). Such a declaration of



confidence causes her "spirit [to rebel] against the deceit which she herself was practising" (2: 188). She has not told her husband about Burgo's letter, nor has she had sufficient trust in him to confide her own sense of failure. Her pent-up emotions come tumbling out, startling her husband: "'I know that I have never made you happy. . . . I know that I never can make you happy'" (2: 188). Glencora goes on to talk about the lack of love in their marriage, insisting to her husband, "'No, Plantagenet; I shall never make you happy. You have never loved me, nor I you. We have never loved each other for a single moment . . .'" (2: 189). And then she brings out what has really been preying on her mind, her sense of failure and her belief that destroying herself would free her husband to marry again:

"What matters it whether I drown myself, or throw myself away with such a one as him [Burgo], so that you might marry again, and have a child? I'd die;-- I'd die willingly. How I wish I could die! Plantagenet, I would kill myself if I dared."  
(2: 189-90)

Glencora's emotional outburst and her threats of suicide reveal to Palliser the depth of his wife's despair and his failure as a husband. Recognizing the plea for help, he tells her, three times, "'I do love you.'" If she indeed cannot love him, "'it is a great misfortune to us both. But we need not therefore be disgraced.'" As for their having no child, "'Believe me that you wrong my thoughts. Of course I have been anxious, and have, perhaps,

shown my anxiety by the struggle I have made to hide it. I have never told you what is false, Glencora'" (2: 190).<sup>5</sup> Palliser insists that Glencora is the only woman he wants: "'I would rather have you for my wife, childless,--if you will try to love me,--than any other woman, though another might give me an heir. Will you try to love me?'" (2: 190). Despite all that she has said, Palliser offers his love and readily extends his forgiveness. Like Alice Vavasor, Glencora thinks that she should be punished, that she should not accept "his forgiveness too easily" (2: 190). Palliser says he will give up politics for the season and take her abroad, to Switzerland, Germany, and Italy. Furthermore, to provide his wife with a female companion, they will take Alice Vavasor with them. "He was killing her by his goodness. She could not speak to him yet; but now, as he mentioned Alice's name, she gently put up her hand and rested it on the back of his" (2: 191).

At this moment, they are interrupted by a knock on the door; the Duke of St. Bungay has arrived to see Palliser. Both Plantagenet and Glencora sense that St. Bungay has come to offer Palliser the position of Chancellor of the Exchequer, the one government office he wants, the one for which he has prepared himself for years. Glencora immediately frees him from his promise to take her abroad, but he insists that he can still exercise choice: "'but though I am wanted, I need not go'" (2: 191-92). He

believes that after a year abroad "he would be nobody in politics" (2: 193), but he still has a choice. He has made a promise to Glencora, and he sees keeping that promise as essential to his happiness as it is to his wife's. St. Bungay has indeed come to offer Palliser the Exchequer position, but Palliser declines, citing his promise to take his wife abroad. Though Glencora would free him from his promise, "'Her happiness demands it, and it is partly my fault that it is so'" (2: 196, 197). Knowing that Palliser has coveted the Exchequer post, and unaware of what Palliser cannot and will not reveal about his private life, St. Bungay continues to press and persuade. He insists, "'Palliser, if she were dying, you should remain under such an emergency as this. She might go, but you should remain'" (2: 197). Palliser, however, is influenced by a more compelling emergency:

Mr. Palliser remained silent for a moment or two in his chair; he then rose and walked towards the window, as he spoke. "There are things worse than death," he said, when his back was turned. His voice was very low, and there was a tear in his eye as he spoke them; the words were indeed whispered, but the Duke heard them, and felt that he could not press him any more on the subject of his wife. (2: 197)

Yet, so that his friend will comprehend "how imperative is the duty" that compels him to refuse the Cabinet post, Palliser does tell St. Bungay

". . . the sacrifice to me will be almost more than I can bear. This thing that you have offered me to-day is the only thing that I have ever coveted. I have thought of it and worked for it, have hoped and despaired. . . ." (2: 198)

The confession of what he is giving up to keep his promise to Glencora certainly does not prove that he is motivated by a "cold nobility" (Pollard 88); it is not the self-regarding honesty of keeping his word merely to say that he has done so. It is an acknowledgment of grief, loss, and regret. Palliser knows that he cannot choose otherwise, but he also honestly acknowledges the pain he presently feels and the regrets he is bound to experience in coming months and years.

After the Duke of St. Bungay leaves, Palliser takes a walk in Kensington Gardens to think about his conflicting duties. He acknowledges to himself, "'It has been my own fault . . . and with God's help I will mend it, if it be possible.'" He sees the Exchequer office as now a past possibility; "he knew that his wife's safety was his first duty." And he reiterates to himself the promise he had made Glencora: "'She shall have her own friend with her'" (2: 200). His "book of destiny" had earlier suggested that he must face "some violent domestic trouble" (1: 250). This has in fact been necessary in order for Palliser to learn to balance the claims of political ambition and those of domestic happiness. As John Halperin says, it is only when Palliser realizes that his public life and his private life are the same life that his marriage can be fertile or that his political ambition can be realized (Trollope and Politics 60). When Palliser brings Glencora back to

Matching Priory after their trip abroad, she is pregnant. Just after his heir, Lord Silverbridge, is born, he also gets the coveted position of Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Palliser, however, is "awkward at making a new beginning." He has not adjusted to lack of activity, but for the first time he hates "his papers and figures and statistics, and [cannot] apply himself to them" (2: 275). Before they go abroad, he takes Glencora to Matching Priory for a week, and the constant attention to his wife begins to bore her, though this is what she had thought she wanted. He accompanies her on her drives; he sits with her in the mornings and evenings; he has all his meals with her; and since he has no figures or statistics to work on, he goes to bed early. As Glencora tells Alice, it was a "very terrible" week.

He never spoke a word to rebuke her. He never hinted that there had been aught in her conduct of which he had cause to complain. He treated her with a respect that was perfect, and indeed with more outward signs of affection than had ever been customary with him. (2: 228)

Glencora says also that during the entire week Palliser "was always looking after" her (2: 228-29). He was, of course, for he had not forgotten her threats of suicide. At the time he had walked among the elms in Kensington Gardens, he had thought "The blame had been his, perhaps, more than it had been hers." Remembering his wife's words, he had seen that

it was manifestly his imperative duty,--his duty of duties,--to save her from the pitfall into which, as

she herself had told him, she had been so ready to fall. For her sake and for his this must be done. (2: 229)

The pitfall is Glencora's self-destruction, by whatever means; it is indeed Palliser's duty to save her from that. He yet needs the company and work of men, and he dreads "all these coming dreary days" (2: 285). But in many ways the trip is good for him, not only in saving his wife and preserving their marriage, but also in broadening his understanding of others.

Palliser learns, for example, to adjust his view of Mr. Bott, and this he can do after he learns that Alice, as well as Glencora, had seen Bott as an enemy. Alice's comment that Bott "'had a way that I especially dislike of trying to make little secret confidences,'" and her conviction that "'he endeavoured to do mischief,'" are confirmation of Glencora's charges and of Palliser's belated understanding of those charges. Palliser feels constrained to drop his association with Mr. Bott, and that becomes easier after Bott loses his seat. Palliser's remark, "'I suppose he will remain now among his own people,'" signifies his recognition that he and Bott are not social equals, nor are they political and moral equals (2: 303). In Lucerne, when Palliser's seeming loss of political influence has begun to prey on his mind and make him "fretful and unhappy" (2: 306), John Grey appears, to renew his suit to Alice. His coming at this particular

time is providential, for Grey becomes Palliser's friend, providing the male companionship and conversation he needs. With Grey, as with Alice, Palliser can freely discuss politics; Glencora is still uninterested in and bored by politics, though she later sees politics as a way of achieving social ascendancy.

Palliser is "a man not apt to new friendships" (2: 306), but when Grey approaches and introduces himself, Palliser knows enough about him "to be aware that Mr. John Grey was a man with whom he might permit himself to become acquainted" (2: 308). Because he wants the assistance of the Pallisers in winning Alice as his wife, Grey confides in Palliser, telling him about the Alice-George Vavasor relationship. As he talks about Alice's motives and her intent to be unselfish, he enables Palliser to understand that women who make such mistakes of judgment often have difficulty in learning to forgive themselves (2: 314-15). This helps Palliser understand the reason for some of Glencora's recent behavior. Sometime later Grey tells Palliser of George Vavasor's attempt to kill him, and this helps teach Palliser how little one really knows about others. Palliser at first finds the threat of violence lurking beneath the social surface simply incomprehensible:

"He actually walked into your rooms in the day time, and fired a pistol at you as you were sitting at your breakfast! He did that in London, and then walked off and went abroad, as though he had nothing to fear!" (2: 336)

It is incomprehensible for several reasons: "one man whom he now called his friend had been nearly murdered in daylight, in the heart of his own part of London, by another man whom he had reckoned among his Parliamentary supporters" (2: 336). All his recent experience and his accumulating knowledge of men--particularly Burgo, Bott, and George Vavasor--and their capacity for intentional and unintentional evil make Palliser increasingly aware of human complexity. This new awareness of men's capacity for evil and violence, deepened by the events in subsequent novels,<sup>6</sup> becomes knowledge he uses to advantage years later in steering his sons away from gambling and racing and the shady, disreputable types those two activities attract.

It is also at Lucerne that Glencora tells Palliser she is pregnant, news that temporarily causes him to lose his calm reserve. His behavior is well described, often with humor and gentle irony:

He was beside himself when he left her, which he did with the primary intention of telegraphing to London for half a dozen leading physicians. He went out by the lake side and walked there alone for ten minutes in a state of almost unconscious exaltation. He did not quite remember where he was, or what he was doing. The one thing in the world which he had lacked; the one joy which he wanted so much, and which is so common among men, was coming to him also. In a few minutes it was to him as though each hand already rested on the fair head of a little male Palliser, of whom one should rule in the halls of Gatherum, and the other be eloquent among the Commons of England. . . . Dandy and Flirt [Glencora's ponies] should feed on gilded corn, and there should be an artificial moon always ready in the [Priory] ruins. If only those d---able saddle-ponies of Lucerne had not come across his wife's path! He went at once into the yard and



ordered that the ponies should be abolished;--sent away, one and all, to the furthest confines of the canton; and then he himself inspected the cushions of the carriage. Were they dry? As it was August in those days, and August at Lucerne is a warm month, it may be presumed that they were dry. (2: 340)

He calls Alice by her first name, confirming her impression that he is "eager and moved beyond his wont." He asks Alice to go to Glencora, cautioning Alice,

"But, if you please, do be as calm with her as you can. She is so easily excited, you know. Of course, if there's anything she fancies, we'll take care to get it for her; but she must be kept quiet." (2: 341)

At first eager to continue vicariously enjoying Palliser's reaction, Glencora asks, "'But, Alice, how did he look? Did you observe anything about him? Was he pleased?'" (2: 342). Palliser's coddling protectiveness and cautions soon exasperate Glencora, and she blurts out to Alice, "'I wish I had never told him a word about it. . . . He would never have found it out himself, till this thing was all over'" (2: 346).

Palliser's talks with Grey about politics help shift his obsessive concern from Glencora's pregnancy. Grey believes "'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 concedes that such a man has certainly done a great deal, but he believes that men have more extensive obligations, and he persuades Gray that a man can live honestly and be a Member of Parliament too.

He knew very well that he himself was working for others, and not for himself; and he was aware, though he had not analyzed his own convictions on the matter,

that good men struggle as they do in order that others, besides themselves, may live honestly, and, if possible, die fearlessly. (2: 348)

Palliser so persuades Grey that Grey agrees to stand for election at Silverbridge. Grey is elected, becoming a Member of Parliament at the same time Palliser becomes "actually Chancellor of the Exchequer" and a member of the Cabinet (2: 417).

Palliser and Glencora are major characters in Can You Forgive Her?, but in the next three novels--Phineas Finn, The Eustace Diamonds, Phineas Redux--the Pallisers have secondary roles. Readers have glimpses of the Pallisers' married life and their social activities at Matching Priory; the marriage seems quite happy, though Palliser still works long hours. All three novels offer commentary on the ways political and social relationships are formed and maintained, as well as on the variety of motives governing men's political choices. The complexity of London social and political life is thus carefully drawn, forming the background for the more concentrated analysis of the world that watches and evaluates Palliser's choices and behavior in The Prime Minister, and for the unexpected pitfalls among which Lord Silverbridge must maneuver in The Duke's Children. For example, the disreputable men and women composing the fictional world of The Eustace Diamonds reveal the prevalence of nongentlemen and cads, the selfishly ambitious people choosing London as the stage for their actions to

achieve money and power, status and influence. The novel is thus a necessary depiction of the ways in which new men and their narrowly focused concern with self and material gain threaten and work against the values of the true gentleman (Phineas Finn in Phineas Redux, Palliser in The Prime Minister, Palliser and his sons in The Duke's Children).

Though Phineas Finn chronicles primarily the growth to political maturity of Phineas Finn, much in the novel is necessary for appreciating Palliser as the perfect gentleman in the series.<sup>7</sup> Phineas's changing ideas about political service must be compared to Palliser's views, as explained in Can You Forgive Her? to John Grey (2: 348, 417) and in The Prime Minister to Phineas Finn (2: 257-68), and in all of his political discussions with Lord Silverbridge in The Duke's Children. Phineas chooses to be a disciple of Joshua Monk, an honest politician whose beliefs are very much like Palliser's and whose advice to the young Phineas is often similar to the advice Palliser gives his son in The Duke's Children.<sup>8</sup> Phineas's encounters with Mr. Bonteen parallel those of Palliser with Mr. Bott, Mr. Bonteen, Sir Orlando Drought, and Sir Timothy Beeswax, and those of Lord Silverbridge with Sir Timothy Beeswax. Also, by presenting Phineas's increasing knowledge of Robert Kennedy--knowledge acquired both through Phineas's political and social relationship with Kennedy and through Phineas's

role as Lady Laura's confidant--Phineas Finn portrays Kennedy as a cold and demanding man whose actions highlight Palliser's essential grace and complete gentlemanliness in his marital relationship.

In the early stages of Phineas's acquaintance with Robert Kennedy, he asks himself if Kennedy is really a gentleman (1: 55-56). Phineas knows that Kennedy is a wealthy man and a Member of Parliament, but is he a gentleman? Lady Laura Standish, daughter of the Earl of Brentford and niece of the Duke of St. Bungay, who chooses to marry the wealthy Kennedy instead of the poor Phineas, must discover her own answer to that question, as Emily Wharton must later learn the truth about Ferdinand Lopez, who looks like and is assumed to be a gentleman (The Prime Minister). Kennedy's silent reserve reminds readers of Palliser, and Lady Laura's comment that "'He never forgot anything in his life, and was never unmindful of anything'" (1: 307) echoes Jeffrey Palliser's remark that Plantagenet Palliser "'does not forget'" (CYFH? 1: 289) and Glencora's statement to Alice, "'If anything is out of order [Plantagenet] has it put to rights at once'" (CYFH? 1: 283). Lady Laura explicitly compares her husband and Palliser as politicians --both useful men, neither an orator--but concedes that Palliser is "'of course higher in the class'" (PF 1: 340).

Lady Laura is more wrong than right, however, for Kennedy's similarities with Palliser are only on the surface. Palliser has friends, and he makes new friends,

though not easily; but Kennedy has no friend. "It may be doubted whether he had ever talked enough to any man to make that man his friend" (PF 1: 41). Kennedy has "over a million and a half of money, which he [is] mistaken enough to suppose he had made himself" (1: 40), but the wealth was accumulated by the hard work of his father and uncle in their business at Glasgow. He has a "magnificent place in Perthshire, called Loughlinter," which he had built twenty-five years ago (PF 1: 41, 121). Now forty-three, Kennedy sits "for a Scotch group of boroughs," but he is a man not given to action or to personal involvement of any kind.

He never spoke much to any one, although he was constantly in society. He rarely did anything, although he had the means of doing everything. He had very seldom been on his legs in the House of Commons, though he had sat there for ten years.  
(1: 41)

Kennedy refuses to "'lend money to any one under any circumstances'" (PF 1: 41), whereas Palliser unhesitatingly gives his cousin Jeffrey £500, telling him to forget it-- it is not important (CYFH? 1: 263). Palliser often invites his cousins--Jeffrey, Euphemia (Phemy), and Iphigenia (Iphy)--to Matching Priory, knowing that they might profit from the social life there, and that his hospitality will certainly assist their more straitened financial circumstances. Palliser is generous to John Grey and Alice Vavasor, having their wedding at Matching Priory and giving them a service of Sèvres china "because Grey likes china"

(CYFH? 2: 410). Glencora provides the dresses for the six bridesmaids, and Palliser gives each bridesmaid "a brooch and an armlet" (CYFH? 2: 402).<sup>9</sup> Palliser provides similar assistance for the wedding later of his poorer cousin Adelaide Palliser (Phineas Redux), and he often requests that Glencora invite Lady Rosina de Courcy to visit them, for he knows that Lady Rosina, despite her blood, leads a life of poverty, and he enjoys her honest, unaffected conversation (The Prime Minister). But there is no indication that Kennedy cares for any relatives other than his mother; he does not share his wealth. Whatever charitable contribution Kennedy makes is an impersonal one:

But though he would not lend money, he gave a great deal,--and he would give it for almost any object. "Mr. Robert Kennedy, M.P., Loughlinter, £105," appeared on almost every charitable list that was advertised. No one ever spoke to him as to this expenditure, nor did he ever speak to any one. Circulars came to him and the cheques were returned. The duty was a very easy one to him, and he performed it willingly. Had any amount of inquiry been necessary, it is possible that the labour would have been too much for him. (PF 1: 41)

Because Lady Laura has used her fortune of £40,000 to pay the debts of her brother, Lord Chiltern (1: 139, 313), she chooses to marry wealth. She tells Phineas that Kennedy was not concerned about the loss of her fortune and was in fact generous about her marriage settlement (1: 155). However, Kennedy is somewhat like George Vavasor, for after his marriage to Lady Laura, he reneges on the previous agreement and harasses Laura's family for payment

to him of her original fortune (PF 1: 341, 2: 15; PR 1: 173). Within five months, both Kennedys are miserable in their marriage. Lady Laura has been accustomed to more freedom of thought and action than her husband is willing to permit, and he, averse to what he calls the "petting" of grownups (1: 339), eschews all expressions of love, substituting duty for happiness. He establishes for his household a series of "hours and rules" and likes for his wife to be as punctual in their observation as he is (1: 207). And Lady Laura "had been perhaps more punctilious in this respect than she might have been had she loved him heartily" (1: 207). This comment by the narrator throws added light on the Palliser marriage and on Glencora's behavior; genuine love allows people to be natural, to be themselves.

Kennedy's preference for rigid, unbroken routine includes prayers at nine, breakfast at a quarter past nine, then two hours after breakfast opening letters and attending to accounts, all with his wife's presence and assistance (1: 207-208). Attendance at church twice on Sundays is also required of Lady Laura, and she is expected not to have guests or to read novels on Sunday (1: 208). Kennedy defends his Sunday routine, especially the ban on novels, by invoking his mother's rules: "'My mother's ideas on the subject are very strict, and I cannot think that it is bad for a son to hang on to the teaching of his

mother'" (1: 212). Kennedy also plans for his wife "a certain course of reading" and expects "that his wife should read the books he had named, and worse still, that she should read them in the time he had allocated for the work" (1: 208). Laura recognizes the routine as an attempt to control her, and the morning hours at business she realizes are "all form and verbiage, a pretence at business" (1: 209). In an effort to gain some time for herself, she uses her headaches to escape church attendance, but her husband's insistence that headaches come "always from the stomach" (1: 212) and his repeated sending for Dr. Macnuthrie to treat her illness deprive her of even this small freedom.

One night after the House ends that day's sitting, Phineas saves Kennedy from being garrotted; he had seen two men in the shadows, then saw them following Kennedy, and "without much thought" went to Kennedy's aid (1: 281). Unlike Ferdinand Lopez, who saves Everett Wharton from a similar attack and calculates how he can best use the situation to further his own interests (TPM 1: 207-212), Phineas thinks only that he is obligated to Kennedy, especially since Lady Laura has requested that he be her husband's friend. Yet, despite the fact that Phineas saved his life, Kennedy has no genuine gratitude or affection for Phineas. Instead, he is jealous of Phineas, whom he sees as his wife's "black swan" (2: 58). This of course is



echoed later, when Palliser, referring to Ferdinand Lopez, tells his wife, "'Cora, your geese are all swans'" (TPM 1: 194); but the difference between Phineas and Lopez, the two men labeled swans, helps delineate important ways in which Kennedy and Palliser differ. Palliser likes Phineas (PR 2: 350), and it is Phineas who is trusted to make the necessary response in the House to Quintus Slide's attacks on Palliser.<sup>10</sup> Phineas can be relied on to show due respect and courtesy, and to evade gracefully any mention of Glencora's name in delivering the response to the opposition (TPM 2: 161-67). Kennedy, however, concludes that Phineas is really not a gentleman, a judgment made only by Kennedy and Mr. Bonteen. In Kennedy's words, Phineas "'has neither position, nor money, nor birth.'" Lady Laura counters that Phineas does have position, and "'He is a gentleman,'" which is the most important requirement of birth (2: 58). As the son of a doctor, Phineas is a gentleman; but the family, consisting of one son and five daughters, is indeed poor. Kennedy also accuses his wife of sharing the women's "idolatry" of the handsome young Phineas (2: 59-60). He twice accuses Lady Laura of lying (2: 109, 127); he accuses her of loving Phineas and tells her she can love no man but him (2: 112); and he demands that on "any question of social intercourse" his wife "consent to adopt [his] opinion" (2: 113). In his desire for mastery of his wife, Kennedy is the direct opposite of Palliser, and very much like Louis Trevelyan in

He Knew He Was Right. Like Lord Fawn, Kennedy is also a moral coward, fearful of public opinion:

He was a man terribly in fear of the world's good opinion, who lacked the courage to go through a great and harassing trial in order that something better might come afterwards. His married life had been unhappy. His wife had not submitted either to his will or his ways. He had that great desire to enjoy his full rights, so strong in the minds of weak, ambitious men, and he had told himself that a wife's obedience was one of those rights which he could not abandon without injury to his self-esteem. He had thought about the matter, slowly, as was his wont, and had resolved that he would assert himself. He had asserted himself, and his wife told him to his face that she would go away and leave him. He could detain her legally, but he could not do even that without the fact of such forcible detention being known to all the world. (2: 114-15)

Readers can only remember how very differently Plantagenet Palliser handled his marital difficulties, how he took all blame upon himself, how he willingly endured "a great and harassing trial in order that something better might come afterwards." Palliser can accept and even cherish the ways in which Glencora is unlike him, but Kennedy wants a wife who is a replica of himself. Palliser can allow Glencora freedom of action, but Kennedy believes that such freedom for Lady Laura threatens him. He sees such freedom for women as endangering the order of his codified world; it is in fact a sign of impending chaos. Laura once told her husband, "'There are moments, Robert, when even a married woman must be herself rather than her husband's wife,'" and "'You cannot make a woman subject to you as a dog is so. You may have all the outside and as much as the

inside as you can master. With a dog you can be sure of both'" (2: 20). Kennedy's response to such assertions from his wife is simply blank incomprehension; as Andrew Wright says, Kennedy has "a copybook notion of marriage," a view consisting of "maxims of male dominance and female submission" (Dream and Art 101).

Because he cannot allow room for his wife's individuality, Kennedy denies the possibility of love, and he makes their marriage a state of isolation and loneliness for them both. Lady Laura eventually leaves him, and he, concerned with the letter of the laws of God and man, goes to law "for the restitution of his conjugal rights" (2: 286). If he cannot control and master the "inside" of his wife, he will at least use his legal claim to her body to control as much of the "outside" as he can. There is great sadness in this, yet it also irrevocably proves Kennedy's lack of gentlemanliness. Resorting to law to claim the use of a woman's body flies in the face of honor and manliness; such use of force is worse even than the lustful use of prostitutes. It is impossible to imagine the true Trollopian gentleman--Palliser, for instance, or Phineas Finn, or John Grey--using legal and social convention to force himself on a woman.

In The Eustace Diamonds Plantagenet Palliser appears even less frequently than he does in Phineas Finn; he is in only five of the eighty chapters. Palliser is involved in decimal coinage work, a monetary reform by which a penny

would equal five farthings and a shilling would equal ten pennies (TED 2: 68). There is much joking in the novel about what the new penny should be called--a farthing, a quint, a semitenth, a squint, or cock-eyes--and Glencora hopes that the new coins will not be named "'Pallisers, or Palls, or anything of that sort'" (2: 140-43). It is generally assumed by critics that Palliser's attention to this coinage work is proof that he is neglecting real political work and committing himself to trivial matters.<sup>11</sup> However, as the notes to the Centenary Edition of the novels make clear, decimal coinage was more than a trivial concern. The matter had been considered "by various commissions and committees from 1841 onwards. Following an international conference in 1867 a commission was set up in 1868 to assess possible changes in coinage for the sake of uniformity" (Centenary PR Notes 2: 366). The subject was thus of "topical interest in the 1870s," when The Eustace Diamonds was published (Centenary TED Notes 2: 403). Since Palliser is still Chancellor of the Exchequer, his carrying out the work mandated by his government is less his concern with trivia than it is his acceptance of the duties that fall naturally to his office.<sup>12</sup>

However, with Palliser very much in the background in The Eustace Diamonds, the two dominant political figures become the new Conservative Member of Parliament, Frank Greystock, and a Liberal supporter of the government, Lord Fawn. Frank Greystock is a beginning barrister, age thirty;

he is the son of Dean Greystock of Bobsborough, a "fine old Tory of the ancient school" (1: 33). Frank is also a first cousin of Lizzie Greystock Eustace, and he was a friend of her deceased husband, Sir Florian Eustace (1: 32). He has toyed with the affections of Lucy Morris (1: 31-32), which he is aware of but persuades himself that he has "said nothing" binding him to Lucy (1: 48). His actions, however, constitute an implied promise that both Lucy and Frank's mother recognize (1: 26-27). Yet Frank's parents persuade him to seek an heiress, to marry money, and Lucy, a penniless orphan of twenty, is governess to the younger two of Lady Fawn's seven unmarried daughters. Frank Greystock likes to live well (1: 116), and he lives beyond his means, owing the "Tailors, robemakers, and booksellers [who] gave him trust, and did believe that they would get their money" (1: 28).

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. (1: 32)

Because Frank sees success only in terms of financial gain, he acts on his parents' advice and transfers his attentions to Lizzie Eustace, despite the fact that he has become engaged to Lucy Morris (1: 120-21). Though Frank at first is hostile to the idea of marrying money, he gradually persuades himself by thinking of "the Quaker's advice to the old farmer, 'Doan't thou marry for munny, but goa where

munny is!" (1: 119).<sup>13</sup> This is the advice he frequently repeats to himself, justifying his failure to see Lucy for more than six months after they become engaged. Frank Greystock thus becomes one of Lizzie Eustace's suitors, along with Lord George de Bruce Carruthers and Lord Fawn.

Lord Fawn had been one of Violet Effingham's suitors (Phineas Finn), but she had married Lord Chiltern. Lord Fawn "had consoled himself with blue-books, and mastered his passion by incessant attendance at the India Board" (TED 1: 24). Because he too is poor and needs to marry money, he engages himself to Lizzie, knowing "nothing about her" (1: 78), only to be frightened away by the scandal over Lizzie's diamond necklace. Lord Fawn is a moral coward (1: 146; 2: 139), easily swayed by public opinion. He wants to do the right thing, but because he has no innate sense of honor or honesty, he can rarely determine what is the right course of action. His intellect is characterized by its "short straight grooves," within which every "supposed wrong was always running up and down, renewing its own soreness" (1: 144). He "would not go a hair's breadth astray, if he knew it" (1: 144), "if only he could find out what would be the right thing" to do (1: 143).

Not to break his word, not to be unjust, not to deviate by a hair's breadth from that line of conduct which would be described as "honourable" in the circle to which he belonged, not to give his political enemies an opportunity for calumny,--this was all in all to him. (1: 143)

Like Robert Kennedy, Lord Fawn "rarely forgot anything" (1: 180). He remembers the ways in which others offend and wrong him; he long carries his resentment against Frank Greystock and Lucy Morris over the matter of the Sawab of Mygawb (1: 61-68, 180, 244-48, 261-69). He certainly does not intend to do wrong or to act improperly; his errors are acts of ignorance, not acts of volition. However, he is not truly concerned with the good or honorable act for its own sake or with his own manly independence. Instead, he is "most anxious to do right so that he might not be accused of being in the wrong,--and at the same time gifted with but little of that insight into things which teaches men to know what is right and what is wrong" (2: 139). Fawn's inability to determine what is right, what transcends merely socially acceptable behavior, proves his lack of honestum and manliness. In The Prime Minister the Duke of St. Bungay gives an appropriate description of the nature of Fawn's honesty: "'A sort of bastard honesty,--by precept out of stupidity. There is no real conviction in it, begotten by thought'" (2: 241).

Though Fawn never really knows whether his motives and actions are right or wrong, Frank Greystock knows that he has evaded what personal honor demands (2: 330). He has not intended to ignore Lucy as long as he has, but he recognizes that he has vacillated and been tempted by Lizzie's money and her flattery. Only when he sees Lizzie as

"soiled, haggard, dishevelled, and unclean" can he see beyond the exterior beauty (2: 336). The characters of these two men, along with all the others clustering around Lizzie, make The Eustace Diamonds a somber, serious comedy. Lizzie's world contains no man comparable to Plantagenet Palliser. The values of the gentleman are therefore almost nonexistent in the novel; but every time Palliser, or the world of Matching Priory, makes an appearance, there are strong reminders of what is lacking among those in Lizzie's world and at Portray Castle.

Plantagenet Palliser is more visible, more active, in Phineas Redux, yet his role in the novel is subordinate to the portrayal of the completion of Phineas Finn's growth to maturity and self-consciousness. The novel is concerned also with honor and personal integrity, or their lack, in such politicians as Phineas, Mr. Monk, Mr. Bonteen, and Mr. Gresham, as well as with the social politics of Lady Glencora, Lady Cantrip, Marie Goesler, and Mrs. Bonteen. The ways in which the men's political world and the women's political world merge and influence each other are important for the next novel, The Prime Minister, which illustrates how Glencora's social politics create problems for her husband's coalition government. Glencora's social politics in The Prime Minister constitute the same kind of threat to gentlemanliness as do the intrigue and deception of Lizzie Eustace and her world or the financial



speculation and exploitation that characterize the world of Ferdinand Lopez.

In Phineas Redux, after the death of the old duke, Palliser becomes Duke of Omnium (1: 228-30). The change in his rank is a source of regret:

. . . men would call him Duke of Omnium; and then he could never sit again in the House of Commons. It was in that light, and in that light only, that he regarded the matter. To his uncle it had been everything to be Duke of Omnium. To Plantagenet Palliser it was less than nothing. . . . It was a toy that would perhaps please his wife, but he doubted even whether she would not cease to be Lady Glencora with regret. In himself this thing that had happened had absolutely crushed him. He had won for himself by his own aptitudes and his own industry one special position in the empire,--and that position, and that alone, was incompatible with the rank which he was obliged to assume! His case was very hard, and he felt it;--but he made no complaint to human ears. "I suppose you must give up the Exchequer," his wife said to him. He shook his head, and made no reply. Even to her he could not explain his feelings. (1: 228)

Palliser does not complain easily about his disappointments. He tries instead to accept the unpleasant accidents of life. Though he makes no response to his wife, she knows very well what the loss of the coveted seat on the Treasury Bench means to him; she tells Madame Goesler, "'He's an Othello now with a vengeance, for his occupation is gone'" (1: 230). It is only in the House of Commons that real work is done, according to Palliser's view; but once he becomes a peer of the realm, he must leave the Commons and sit in the House of Lords. The vacant Exchequer post also gives rise to Bonteen's ambition to take the place of his former chief. After Bonteen's efforts fail and he becomes President of

the Board of Trade, he is angrily resentful, believing the position an inferior one (1: 361).

Unlike Bonteen, Palliser does not see the Board of Trade position as an inferior or worthless one. When he becomes the Duke of Omnium, Palliser becomes also "Lord Privy Seal,--a Lordship of State which does carry with it a status and a seat in the Cabinet, but does not necessarily entail any work." Palliser, however, cares "nothing for status" and is unhappy in his new office. He has, in fact, "almost envied Mr. Bonteen the realities of the Board of Trade" (2: 156). The Board of Trade offers useful work, real duties and function, but the Lord Privy Seal has primarily a ceremonial role. Palliser's "chief gratification" has always been "the feeling that [he is] of use" (CYFH? 1: 379), but as Lord Privy Seal he does not have that gratification. After Bonteen's murder, Palliser sees a way he can be of use. For the first time he requests a favor: he asks Mr. Gresham to give him Bonteen's position (2: 155).<sup>14</sup>

Palliser's request for Bonteen's position brings criticism from the Duke of St. Bungay, who feels "that the Duke of Omnium [is] derogating from his proper position" (2: 156). St. Bungay tells Palliser that "'much of the welfare of your country depends on the manner in which you bear yourself as the Duke of Omnium'" (2: 157). As St. Bungay continues his lecture on the demands of high rank and

invokes the old Duke of Omnium as a model, Palliser insists that his "one ambition" is "'To be the serviceable slave of [his] country'" (2: 158). From St. Bungay's point of view, the Duke of Omnium should not follow such a man as Bonteen. Palliser's response conveys a recognition of his own strength and failure:

"It is too late now, Duke; and, to tell the truth of myself, not even you can make me other than what I am. My uncle's life to me was always a problem which I could not understand. Were I to attempt to walk in his ways, I should fail utterly, and become absurd. I do not feel the disgrace of following Mr. Bonteen."  
(2: 159)

Palliser's failure lies in his inability to assume the ducal arrogance his uncle so thoroughly mastered; he has "a morbid dislike to pretences" (2: 156). He yet knows who he is, what his abilities are, and what kinds of behavior he is capable of. This knowledge is Palliser's strength, his manliness.<sup>15</sup>

In a discussion of manliness later in Phineas Redux, the narrator comments that the quality is often misunderstood and is thus "generally accorded where it does not exist, or more frequently disallowed where it prevails" (2: 251). Often associated only with masculinity (Booth 10), manliness is a broader term that embraces differences of personality and temperament; it does not require that all men fit the same stereotypical mold.

That personal bravery is required in the composition of manliness must be conceded, though of all the ingredients needed, it is the lowest in value. But the first requirement of all must be described by a negative. Manliness is not compatible with

affectation. . . . An affected man . . . may be honest, may be generous, may be pious;--but surely he cannot be manly. The self-conscious assumption of any outward manner, the striving to add,--even though it be but a tenth of a cubit to the height,--is fatal, and will at once banish the all but divine attribute. Before the man can be manly, the gifts which make him so must be there, collected by him slowly, unconsciously, as are his bones, his flesh, and his blood. They cannot be put on like a garment for the nonce,--as may a little learning. A man cannot become faithful to his friends, unsuspecting before the world, gentle with women, loving with children, considerate to his inferiors, kindly with servants, tender-hearted with all,--and at the same time be frank, of open speech, with springing eager energies,--simply because he desires it. These things, which are the attributes of manliness, must come of training on a nature not ignoble. But they are the very opposites, the antipodes, the direct antagonism, of that staring, posed, bewhiskered and bewigged deportment, that nil admirari, self-remembering assumption of manliness, that endeavour of twopence halfpenny to look as high as threepence, which, when you prod it through, has in it nothing deeper than deportment. . . . The natural man will probably be manly. The affected man cannot be so. (2: 252)

As "the attributes of manliness" indicate, the manly man is also the true Trollopian gentleman. This description of manliness is offered by the narrator to counter criticism of Phineas Finn's behavior after his imprisonment, trial, and acquittal. Nearly convicted of murder on circumstantial evidence, Phineas maintains manly grace and dignity throughout the long ordeal, especially when he is in public view in the courtroom.<sup>16</sup> Afterwards, the reaction sets in; he temporarily breaks down, "and he could not bring himself to pretend that it was not so. The tears would come to his eyes, and he would shiver and shake like one struck by palsy" (2: 253). Phineas's emotional and physical reaction

are a natural consequence of his horrifying experience; to pretend that these reactions are nonexistent would result in further damage. It is more honest, more manly, to recognize and admit the emotional consequences, to let them run their course. Only then can Phineas get on with his life and return to his political duties. Palliser is similarly manly during many public and private crises, in Phineas Redux, The Prime Minister, and The Duke's Children.

Sensitivity to one's own emotions also makes the gentleman more responsive to the feelings of others. For example, Palliser's sensitivity to Phineas's feelings and fears helps Phineas move from isolation and withdrawal and resume his active participation in life. The Pallisers invite Phineas to Matching Priory to ease his reentry into social and political life. Phineas dreads comments and questions about the trial; he is not sure that he can yet discuss the ordeal without breaking down. When he enters the crowded drawing room,

the Duke came forward to greet him. "I am particularly happy to see you at Matching," said the Duke. "I wish we had shooting to offer you, but we are too far south for the grouse. That was a bitter passage of arms the other day, wasn't it? I am fond of bitterness in debate myself, but I do regret the roughness of the House of Commons. I must confess that I do." The Duke did not say a word about the trial, and the Duke's guests followed their host's example. (2: 304)

Palliser's complete grace is demonstrated in his use of ordinary subjects--shooting and political debates--that he knows Phineas is interested in. By thus deflecting

attention from Phineas's trial, Palliser gains Phineas time to collect his bearings.<sup>17</sup> Later in the evening Phineas can and does talk about the trial. Sir Gregory Grogan, the Liberal Attorney-General and the prosecutor at Phineas's trial, comes over to ask Phineas's forgiveness, telling him, ". . . I should have lived a broken-hearted man if the truth had become known too late. As it is I tremble and shake in my shoes as I walk about and think of what might have been done" (2: 308-309). After this Phineas can discuss the trial. He later learns that Glencora and Marie Goesler have carefully planned this night for him, so that he will know he still has friends.

In The Prime Minister Palliser's three-year term as head of a coalition government puts him in the spotlight much as the murder trial had put Phineas on public display. The position of head of his country's government is one Palliser has never wanted, and he feels particularly unqualified for the kind of prime minister presently required:

To be a fainéant ruler was in direct antagonism both to his conscience and predilections. To call himself by a great name before the world, and then to be something infinitely less than that name, would be to him degradation. (1: 60)

After a few months in office, and after Glencora's lavish entertaining of hundreds has gained notoriety, Palliser feels only shame, and he has an acute sense of failure:

. . . there was creeping upon him the idea that his power of cohesion was sought for, and perhaps found,

not in his political capacity, but in his rank and wealth. (1: 161)

But there was shame,--and self-accusation at having accepted so great an office with so little fixed purpose as to great work. It might be his duty to subordinate even his pride to the service of his country, and to consent to be a fainéant [sic] minister, a gilded Treasury log, because by remaining in that position he would enable the Government to be carried on. But how base the position, how mean, how repugnant to that grand idea of public work which had hitherto been the motive power of all his life!  
(1: 162)

It seems to Palliser that everyone in his Cabinet, except himself, has real work to do. As he had envied Bonteen's work earlier, he now envies those in his Cabinet who have tasks to perform, work to do, and even routines to help them get through the official day. Palliser believes he was chosen because of his rank and wealth, not because of his personal qualities and abilities. He cannot persuade himself that he is Prime Minister because of his personal merit or achievement, for the position makes use of none of his abilities or his previous study and work. Throughout his term in this high office, then, Palliser's conscience is constantly being lacerated by his belief that the role forces him into seeming dishonesty, falseness, and unnaturalness.

Once her husband becomes Prime Minister, Glencora determines to try to teach him her idea of politics. She does not want to be known simply as the wife of her husband; she wishes "to be written of in memoirs, and to make a niche for herself in history" (1: 265). Glencora's campaign

of lavish entertaining is intended to win social popularity for herself and her husband, but to many her efforts amount to a kind of bribery. Explaining her social strategies to Marie Goesler Finn, Glencora argues insistently:

"The country goes on its own way, either for better or for worse, whichever of them are in. I don't think it makes any difference as to what sort of laws are passed. But among ourselves, in our set, it makes a deal of difference who gets the garters, and the counties, who are made barons, and then earls, and whose name stands at the head of everything." (1: 53)

Glencora thus sees her husband's government as a way for her to gain social ascendancy. She persuades herself that everything she does is done for her husband, yet she does not stop to consider what conduct on her part would be best for him. This failure on Glencora's part is prepared for in Can You Forgive Her? She is like Burgo Fitzgerald in her failure to consider the consequences of her actions.

. . . there was no thoughtfulness, or care either for herself or her husband. She was ready to sacrifice herself for him, if any sacrifice might be required of her. She believed herself to be unfit for him, and would have submitted to be divorced,--or smothered out of the way, for the matter of that,--if the laws of the land would have permitted it. But she had never for a moment given to herself the task of thinking what conduct on her part might be the best for his welfare. (CYFH? 2: 297)

This characteristic determines Glencora's actions throughout most of The Prime Minister. She knows and appreciates her husband's character, but she often wishes he were different. The changed circumstances for both Glencora and Plantagenet in this novel therefore intensify their personal differences, and the actions of each often counter the needs and



preferences of the other. Marital conflict is thus predominant in the novel, yet their love is also shown. Glencora agonizes over the ways her behavior torments her husband, and Palliser grieves over his inability to socialize as Glencora would like for him to do.

Whenever Palliser believes he has "vexed" Glencora, "his heart [is] sad within him. . . . When she was unhappy he was miserable, though he would hardly know the cause of his misery" (1: 69). Glencora becomes angry when her husband will not appoint her Mistress of the Robes, but his explanation of his refusal contains his recognition of his own failure,<sup>18</sup> as well as his recognition and acceptance of his wife's nature:

" . . . I have put myself into a groove, and ground myself into a mould, and clipped and pared and pinched myself all round,--very ineffectually as I fear,--to fit myself for this thing [political duty]. You have lived as free as air. You have disdained,--and though I may have grumbled I have still been proud to see you disdain,--to wrap yourself in the swaddling bandages of Court life. . . ." (1: 58)

"You are what you have made yourself, and I have always rejoiced that you are as you are, fresh, untrammelled, without many prejudices that afflict other ladies, and free from bonds by which they are cramped and confined. Of course such a turn of character is subject to certain dangers of its own." (1: 70)

Though she is still resentful that Palliser would not let her be Mistress of the Robes, she responds to his declaration of love: "'I cannot be at ease within myself while I think you are resenting my refusal. You do not know how constantly I carry you about with me.'" Glencora tells him, "'You

carry a very unnecessary burden then," but he knows, from the change in her voice and "the light of her eye," that she is no longer angry at him (1: 71).

This early conflict sets the pattern for later ones, as the actions and goals of husband and wife are almost directly opposed. Yet their constant awareness of each other is the enduring bedrock supporting the marital conflict and political difficulties. In one sense, then, The Prime Minister depicts the Palliser marriage in its most difficult and painful stage, but the great strength of that marriage, and its undeniable joys, are effective contrasts to the Emily Wharton-Ferdinand Lopez marriage portrayed in the novel's other plot. The problems in both marriages, and the ways in which the husbands handle disagreements with the wife, are necessary for filling in the portrait of Palliser as a perfect gentleman. For example, one could not imagine Palliser acting as Ferdinand Lopez does at The Horns, when he tries to master Emily, demanding that she adopt his beliefs and think and act as he dictates, all the time talking louder than he realizes, frowning angrily at her and almost striking her (1: 353-55).<sup>19</sup> Ferdinand Lopez, like Robert Kennedy, underscores the importance of being a gentleman; each man demonstrates the worth of gentlemanly values by his lack of them.

Many of the best comments on Palliser's nobility and gentlemanliness in The Prime Minister are found in Glencora's

thoughts about her husband and in her conversations with Marie Finn. She knows he is "full of scruples, unable to bend when aught [is] to be got by bending, unwilling to domineer when men might be brought to subjection only by domination" (1: 50-51). She knows he is generous to her, that "After some fashion, of which she was profoundly ignorant, her own property was separated from his and reserved to herself and her children" (1: 51). Glencora has, too, "a wholesome fear of a certain quiet power" which Palliser possesses (1: 93). His personal integrity gives him a strength that amazes Glencora; because she fears the "quiet power" of his character, she quite often does what she wants to do, telling her husband about her actions only after the fact, as she does about the garishly vulgar remodeling of Gatherum (1: 168), and as she later abets the engagement of their daughter without her husband's knowledge (The Duke's Children).

When Glencora discovers how much her husband has been hurt by Quintus Slide's newspaper attacks, the result of her going against Palliser in supporting Ferdinand Lopez as the candidate for Silverbridge, she is furious at herself, and furious at her husband because her actions have harmed him. Her anger is increased because Palliser's associates have kept from her the seriousness of the wound to her husband's spirit. She is angry at Palliser for having a sensitive conscience, and angry because he will not publicly put the blame on her. Glencora challenges him to do what

lesser men would do, to put the blame on her, and she uses Adam's blame of Eve as one of her models (2: 102-104). Palliser refuses. As Glencora turns to leave, he calls her back for a kiss, telling her, "'Do not think I am angry with you because the thing vexes me'" (2: 104). The lessons Palliser learned early in their married life remain with him; he always distinguishes between the person of his wife and the consequences of her actions. He needs for her to know his love is constant, not dependent on what she does or does not do.

Quintus Slide later begins actually using Glencora's name in his articles, and Glencora tells Marie Finn that that will hurt Palliser even more. Her comments also give a fine description of her husband's chivalry:

" . . . there is a dash of chivalry about him worthy of the old poets. To him a woman, particularly his own woman, is a thing so fine and so precious that the winds of heaven should hardly be allowed to blow on her. He cannot bear to think that people should even talk of his wife. And yet, Heaven knows, poor fellow, I have given people occasion enough to talk of me. And he has a much higher chivalry than that of the old poets. They, or their heroes, watched their women because they did not want to have trouble about them--shut them up in castles, kept them in ignorance, and held them as far as they could out of harm's way." (2: 153)

Not only does Palliser not watch her, not attempt to limit her freedom of action, but if he should by chance come upon a private situation, he would refuse to see and hear.

Glencora insists to Marie:

" . . . If you and I were hatching treason against him in the dark, and chance had brought him there, he would

stop his ears with his fingers. He is all trust, even when he knows that he is being deceived. He is honour complete from head to foot. . . ." (2: 153)

Alluding to the way he responded to the Burgo episode during their early married life, Glencora tells Marie that Palliser "'behaved like a god. I could never tell him what I felt,-- but I felt it'" (2: 153). Though she loves Palliser, Glencora says, "'He is a god, but I am not a goddess . . .'" (2: 154).<sup>20</sup>

A later conversation between Phineas and Marie Finn parallels Glencora's analysis of her husband's character. Phineas is sometimes unsure how to interpret Palliser's behavior, for Palliser's shyness frequently comes across as pride and arrogance. Marie has been around Palliser enough to know that he prefers simplicity and naturalness, and that he abhors obsequious behavior: "'He hates all bowing down'" (2: 211). When Phineas wonders if Palliser hates his opponents, Marie responds that "'It is not the opposition he hates, but the cause in the man's mind which may produce it'" (2: 211).

"He is a Sir Bayard to you," said Phineas, laughing.  
 "Rather a Don Quixote, whom I take to have been the better man of the two. I'll tell you what he is, Phineas, and how he is better than all the real knights of whom I have ever read in story. He is a man altogether without guile, and entirely devoted to his country. . . ." (2: 211)

Marie's comparing of Palliser to Don Quixote is important, for it links Palliser with both Don Quixote and Thackeray's Colonel Newcome, idealists who were perfect gentlemen, characters much admired by Trollope.

Marie's comparison is counterpointed by the Duke of St. Bungay in his criticism of Palliser for bestowing the Garter on Lord Earlybird. Rather than using the Garter as a reward for political support, as has been customary, Palliser chooses to honor a man who lives as gentlemen should live. With only a moderate fortune, Lord Earlybird "For nearly half a century . . . had devoted himself to the improvement of the labouring classes, especially in reference to their abodes and education" (2: 228). Earlybird's life reflects Palliser's belief that rank and wealth are intended to be used to help others. Although he is socially awkward, Lord Earlybird is a good man, quiet and unassuming, and he has influenced his large family to follow his example of service to others. Palliser thus awards the Garter to Lord Earlybird, and the Duke of St. Bungay condemns his action: "'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'" (2: 231).

Readers seem to remember St. Bungay's description of Palliser's behavior as "Quixotic," but they also seem to overlook Marie's comparing Palliser to Don Quixote.<sup>21</sup> The two really need to be considered together; they make statements both about the speakers making the comparisons and about the character of the man described. Both St. Bungay and Marie recognize the political importance of the

expedient action, but Marie has more respect for the man who ignores the expedient to choose the good. More willing than Palliser to make political and personal compromises that place expediency above honor, the Duke of St. Bungay believes that principle and conviction are secondary to political necessity. But, as Marie recognizes, Palliser's actions often reflect the highest sense of honor, the kind of honor that causes a man to act not in terms of social convention, legal principle, or public opinion, but in terms of his inner knowledge of right action. Often misunderstood by others, this is the kind of honest action Trollope describes in An Autobiography and the Life of Cicero as included in the Latin honestum but omitted from the equivalent English terms of honor and honesty. It is the kind of honest action demonstrated in Trollope's reimbursement of his publishers, and in the resignations of Septimus Harding (The Warden), Josiah Crawley (The Last Chronicle of Barset), and Phineas Finn (Phineas Finn and Phineas Redux).

The Duke of St. Bungay does, however, value the qualities of Palliser that make him "Quixotic." He values those qualities in Palliser as a man and a friend, but not in Palliser as a politician. Palliser has affinities with Mr. Finespun, whom he replaced as Chancellor of the Exchequer, and with Mr. Gresham, the Liberal Prime Minister whose terms in office alternate with those of the

Conservative Mr. Daubeny. In Can You Forgive Her? the Duke of St. Bungay describes Finespun's character:

" . . . I admire his character and his genius, but I think him the most dangerous man in England as a statesman. He has high principles,--the very highest; but they are so high as to be out of sight to ordinary eyes. They are too exalted to be of any use for everyday purposes. He is as honest as the sun, I'm sure; but it's just like the sun's honesty,--of a kind which we men below can't quite understand or appreciate. . . ." (2: 194)

And in The Prime Minister St. Bungay talks to Glencora about Palliser's honesty:

"His honesty 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. Give him credit for all that, and remember that you cannot find everything combined in the same person. . . ." (1: 267)

In Phineas Finn Mr. Monk describes Mr. Gresham as a man whose "'generosity is for mankind at large'" rather than for a party or a class (2: 298), and in Phineas Redux he describes Gresham's weaknesses:

" . . . he has a self-consciousness which makes him sore at every point. He knows the frailty of his temper, and yet cannot control it. And he does not understand men as did these others [Lord Brock and Mr. Mildmay]. Every word from an enemy is a wound to him. Every slight from a friend is a dagger in his side. But I can fancy that self-accusations make the cross on which he is really crucified. . . ." (2: 339)

Palliser is very much like Gresham; Gresham's frail temper and easy wounding are paralleled by Palliser's behavior as Prime Minister. Those characters who like and respect Palliser (Monk, Lord Cantrip, Phineas and Marie Finn, for instance) frequently comment on the reasons for Palliser's



unintentional rudeness; they know the rudeness is the result of ill health and a tormented spirit, but they also know Palliser intends to act in ways he cannot quite manage under those circumstances.

Both Palliser's political honesty and his awareness of the realities of his world are found in his most extended statement of his political views (TPM chapter 68, 2: 257-69). As he explains his beliefs to Phineas, Palliser becomes so caught up in his own vision that he throws off his hat and speaks eloquently. The goal of politics, Palliser says, is "'continual improvement in the condition of the lower man'" (2: 264). Anything else is dishonesty. Like Trollope (Autobiography 266-69), Palliser advocates not equality but a tendency toward equality, a constant and gradual reduction of "'the distances which separate the highly placed from their lower brethren'" (2: 264). The work must be constant and gradual because some distances will remain "'till a millennium shall be reached'" (2: 265). As to equality, Palliser says the word is "'open to many objections'":

" . . . Men's intellects are at present so various that we cannot even realize the idea of equality, and here in England we have been taught to hate the word by the evil effects of those absurd attempts which have been made elsewhere to proclaim it as a fact accomplished by the scratch of a pen or by a chisel on a stone. We have been injured in that, because a good word signifying a grand idea has been driven out of the vocabulary of good men. Equality would be a heaven, if we could attain it. How can we to whom so much has been given dare to think otherwise? How can you look at the bowed back and bent legs and abject face

of that poor ploughman, who winter and summer has to drag his rheumatic limbs to his work, while you go a-hunting or sit in pride of place among the foremost few of your country, and say that it is all as it ought to be? You are a Liberal because you know that it is not all as it ought to be, and because you would still march on to some nearer approach to equality; though the thing itself is so great, so glorious, so godlike,--nay so absolutely divine,--that you have been disgusted by the very promise of it, because its perfection is unattainable. Men have asserted a mock equality till the very idea of equality stinks in men's nostrils." (2: 265)

Because of his high ideals of both political and personal life, Palliser is relieved when his ministry comes to an end. He feels that his ministry has accomplished nothing, though St. Bungay tells him he has "'Carried on the Queen's Government prosperously for three years'" (2: 306), which is no mean accomplishment. Mr. Monk too assures Palliser that he has provided real service:

"The Government was carried on, and was on the whole respected. History will give you credit for patriotism, patience, and courage. No man could have done it better than you did,--probably no other man of the day so well." (2: 384)

Monk regrets only Palliser's present plans to retire "from official life." If the country loses Palliser's services, Monk says, "'the country will have lost more than it has gained by the Coalition'" (2: 385). Beyond his own sense of failure, Palliser's main regret on leaving his high office is how it might affect Glencora, whether it will make her unhappy. She admits that it will make her unhappy, yet she "'shall not be all unhappy.'" She tells Palliser that she will find her contentment in him, for the office

was making him ill (2: 309). Yet Glencora also expresses great anger about the actions of Sir Orlando Drought and Sir Timothy Beeswax in undermining Palliser's ministry: "'What beasts; what brutes, what ungrateful wretches men are!--worse than women when they get together in numbers enough to be bold. Why have they deserted you?'" (2: 319). Glencora often wishes she could actively battle for her husband, for she could "brazen out a job" (2: 155) and turn on Palliser's enemies with her teeth (2: 309).

Though Glencora's behavior often causes Palliser problems, he so loves and admires her that without her he is lost. The Duke's Children, the last novel of the series, opens just after Glencora's death. Between the last two novels, about two years elapse. For the first nine months after the end of Palliser's ministry, he and Glencora had remained in England, then they took their three children abroad for a full year. When they return to London, Glencora complains of a cold and sore throat, and "A week after their arrival at Matching she was dead" (TDC 2). Palliser's grief is profound. He feels that he has lost the one friend "to whom he could open himself" (3). Without Glencora, "he knew himself to be helpless": "It was not only that his heart was torn to pieces, but that he did not know how to look out into the world. It was as though a man should be suddenly called upon to live without hands or even arms" (2). Now that Glencora is gone, and despite his

feelings of loss and helplessness, Palliser must assume all duties of guiding their three children. He has thus far spent little time with his sons, Lord Silverbridge and Gerald, for they have been with their tutors, and he is especially worried about how he will guide his daughter, Lady Mary, nearly nineteen, through the hazards of choosing a worthy husband (4).

What Palliser soon learns is that on their trip abroad, Lady Mary fell in love with Frank Tregear, twenty-two, second son of a Cornwall squire. Frank Tregear became a friend of Lord Silverbridge's at Oxford; Tregear had taken honors, being "a second-class man," but Silverbridge had been sent down for painting the Dean's house red one night (19). Tregear had won Glencora as well as Mary; he had at first reminded Glencora of Burgo, now remembered as "poor in spirit" and "unmanly." Though Tregear does not surpass Burgo in "external grace," he is "altogether different in mind and character" (20). Glencora saw and appreciated the differences, but she still had a fondness for attractive surfaces, for "tinsel" (21). Glencora had encouraged the love between Tregear and Lady Mary, and the two had actually become engaged while they were in Italy. Glencora meant to tell Palliser later, uniting with her daughter against Palliser as "a great outside power, which can hardly be overcome, but which might be evaded, or made inoperative by stratagem" (16). The closest Glencora had come to telling

Palliser about their daughter's engagement was the promise she extracted from Palliser on her deathbed, that Mary would have a fortune ample enough to marry a poor man if she chooses to do so. Tregear is poor, his annual income being only the four hundred pounds he receives from his father. Echoes from the Palliser past, as recorded in Can You Forgive Her?, thus pervade the novel, for Palliser wonders if Glencora's final intrigue meant that she never forgot Burgo (41, 55, 92, 175).<sup>22</sup>

Though Palliser knows Glencora was "essentially human" (2), after her death he tries to enshrine her memory, making even her name a religion. He does not use her name publicly because for him it carries the something "sacred," the "religion in [her] memory" (118). In his private chambers Palliser whispers her name over and over to himself: "'Cora, Cora,' he had murmured, so that the sense of the sound and not the sound itself had come to him from his own lips" (118). For a long time Palliser refuses to admit, even to himself, that Glencora deceived him about Tregear and Mary; he instead holds Marie Finn responsible (55, 60, 63, 100-101), though she had found out only from what Glencora said as she lay dying and from what Mary and Tregear told her later (9-18, 28-32). Acting to preserve Glencora's memory and to protect her name, Palliser sends Marie Finn a letter, written in coldly formal, third-person style, effectively separating her from the Palliser family

(97), whose interests she has faithfully served since the time she refused to marry the old duke. Knowing Palliser's keen sense of honor, and valuing her own integrity and sense of self, Marie writes Palliser, demanding an apology and outlining the reasons the apology is necessary (115-17). As her letter indicates, Palliser has an obligation to her because of her lower social rank and her friendship with Glencora, and he has an obligation to himself. He cannot now in his grief deny the truth of Glencora's character and personality. By being false to Glencora, he would be denying the reality of his life and experience for the past twenty-four years or so.

Palliser slowly acknowledges to himself, over a period of weeks, the truth of Marie's statements. He recognizes that he has many debts to her, "for the solicitude shown by her to his uncle, for the love which had made her so patient a friend to his wife, for the nobility of her own conduct in many things" (120). He has been unjust, and he has been obstinate. He therefore writes a more personal letter of apology, in which he states "'I believe I did you a wrong, and therefore I write to ask your pardon'" (176). After writing the letter he thinks he can no longer like Marie, especially since "all the favours had been from her to him and his" (177). That thought, however, is only the result of pride and embarrassment. The first time he sees Marie after his letter of apology, he tells her he is glad of the

opportunity to "acknowledge my indebtedness to you, and to say to you somewhat fuller than I could do in my letter that I am sorry for the pain which I gave you" (334). Much later, the combined efforts of Lady Cantrip and Marie Finn have made Palliser conscious that "'Girls are so different!'" (523), and he is wavering in his opposition to his daughter's marriage to Tregear. Mary has become ill and has suffered severe headaches. Marie tells Palliser he really cannot honorably oppose his daughter's happiness:

". . . How will it be with you if she should live like a ghost beside you for the next twenty years, and you should then see her die, faded and withered before her time,--all her life gone without a joy,--because she had loved a man whose position in life was displeasing to you? . . ." (524)

Palliser knows he could not bear such consequences. He thanks Marie for her concern and honesty: "'But all that you have troubled yourself to think and to feel in this matter, and all that true friendship has compelled you to say to me, shall be written down in the tablets of my memory.'" And, he says, "'My child has at any rate been fortunate in securing the friendship of such a friend'" (525). Palliser in effect apologizes to Marie three times, and all three statements are gracious and generous. The process of changing his mind has been painful for Palliser, but when he comes around it is always wholeheartedly; no grudges or resentments remain.

Palliser opposes Tregear not only because of the secrecy of the engagement and Tregear's lower rank and lack

of wealth. He knows, as Tregear knows, that a gentleman should have spoken with the father of the girl he wished to marry (26-27, 39). Palliser is also aware that Tregear's influence is the reason Silverbridge enters politics as a Conservative, and there has never before been a Conservative Palliser. To Plantagenet, being a Conservative, when it is possible to be a Liberal, "might be the part of a fool, but could not fairly be imputed as a crime" (59). Too, whatever the influences on or causes of his son's choice, it was his son's choice. He cannot therefore withhold support from his son, for "in no condition of life can justice be more imperatively due than from a father to his son" (59).

Palliser learns that Tregear has also tried to persuade Silverbridge to end his racetrack association with the shady Major Tifto (214), and this is advice in his son's best interest. After Palliser has relented and accepted Tregear, he attempts to discuss money and living arrangements with his future son-in-law. Tregear is covered with embarrassment, for his four hundred pounds a year is such a small amount when stacked against the Palliser wealth. Suddenly sensing how awkward the whole situation is for Tregear, Palliser breaks off, suggesting that the arrangements be made with Mr. Moreton, his man of business, thus removing for Tregear the embarrassment of a direct discussion of his relative poverty (629). Palliser's grace and courtesy let Tregear know that he can look forward to a pleasant relationship with his father-in-law.



It is, however, the relationship between Palliser and his sons, especially Silverbridge, that provides much of the interest and some of the most tender moments in the novel. His advice to his sons also contains many of his beliefs about the nature of the true gentleman. Palliser is less concerned with his sons' racing and gambling debts than in using their experience to teach moral values:

If he could only so operate . . . on the minds of both his sons, as to make them see the foolishness of folly, the ugliness of what is mean, the squalor and dirt of ignoble pursuits, then he could easily pardon past faults. If it were half his wealth, what would it signify if he could teach his children to accept those lessons without which no man can live as a gentleman, let his rank be the highest known, let his wealth be as the sands, his fashion unrivalled? (518)

Palliser's teaching is by both example and words.<sup>23</sup> By his own behavior Palliser teaches Silverbridge much about the way the gentleman must live with others, especially those with whom he is most closely related. For example, peers have a special gallery of the House of Commons, but Palliser would never make use of that gallery "without letting his son know of his coming" (200). He would no more spy on his son than he would on his wife.

One night when Palliser does come to the lower House, Silverbridge impulsively invites his father to dine with him at the Beargarden. Palliser's life has been too busy for him to be a club man; he has not dined in a club for fifteen years. Proud of his father, Silverbridge is "especially anxious to make things pleasant" for him, and

Palliser "liked the feeling that he was dining with his son" more than he liked his dinner (205). Palliser is gracious to all his son's friends who stop by their table, including Frank Tregear, who is not aware of the identity of Silverbridge's guest until it is too late to retreat. After dinner father and son move to a private room in the library for coffee. They talk about Silverbridge's future and all that Palliser will willingly give up to Silverbridge on his marriage. Silverbridge bursts out that he "'can't bear to hear'" his father "'talking of giving up anything.'"

Then the father looked round the room furtively, and seeing that the door was shut, and that they were assuredly alone, he put out his hand and gently stroked the young man's hair. It was almost a caress. . . . (208)

The private conversation is interrupted by Major Tifto, who has the courage of drink. Silverbridge has become ashamed of his association with Tifto, and he does not want to introduce the man to his father. Palliser, however, knows of his son's relationship with Tifto and he thinks the introduction should be made, so he introduces himself. Drunk and cocky, Tifto drops the h's he has so carefully cultivated, and he talks about racing bets and losses of no real interest to Palliser, who is certainly not a man of the turf. Embarrassed, Silverbridge exclaims, "'Tifto, you are making an ass of yourself'" (212), providing yet another slight for which Tifto vows revenge. Earlier that night, while they were still at the House, Palliser had talked with

Silverbridge about the differences between public and private life and the necessity of choosing friends for private life. After Tifto leaves, Palliser gives similar advice, urging his son to choose friends he can be proud of. He yet reminds his son that Tifto, like every other man, "is entitled to be treated well" (214).

Silverbridge ultimately learns the lesson well and demonstrates a generosity worthy of his father. In revenge for Silverbridge's slights, Tifto lames a horse, causing Silverbridge to lose £70,000. Tifto gets very little of the money resulting from his action; Captain Green and his friends make off with most of the money. Tifto loses his position as master of hounds for Runnymede, and he loses his membership in the Beargarden. Silverbridge refuses to participate in the various punitive actions taken against Tifto; he is repelled by the sordidness of the whole sequence of events and by the character of the swindlers who lamed the horse by driving a nail into its foot. Months later, a whining and destitute Tifto comes to Silverbridge, urging him to seek revenge on Captain Green. Silverbridge cannot do that, but he can give Tifto money to aid him in his present difficulties. Tifto becomes "an annual pensioner on his former noble partner, living on the allowance made him in some obscure corner of South Wales" (597). Even a villain like Ferdinand Lopez or Major Tifto is entitled to humane treatment and justice, and Silverbridge

follows his father's example. Hating the villain or seeking revenge would reduce the gentleman to the same level as his opponent.

Palliser's two sons love and admire their father; they wish they could be more like him.<sup>24</sup> But they are young and immature; they must still learn how to be both men and gentlemen. They are indeed fortunate in having a loving and wealthy father; otherwise, their lives would undoubtedly have taken another direction. The younger son gets himself expelled from Cambridge because he leaves to watch Silverbridge's horse race, then foolishly misses the train back. Silverbridge's concern is that Gerald's escapade "'will almost break the governor's heart,'" especially since Silverbridge was sent down from Oxford (138). In an effort to avoid further pain and grief for his father, Silverbridge goes to Cambridge to plead with the Master of Trinity. Twice during his session with the Master, Silverbridge has tears in his eyes or rolling down his face. Silverbridge tells the Master that Gerald's disgrace will almost break his father's heart, that the sons have caused much grief to a father who "'never did anything foolish himself'" (141).

The Master was much moved. That a young man should pray for himself would be nothing to him. . . . Nor would a brother praying simply for a brother avail much. A father asking for his son might be resisted. But the brother asking pardon for the brother on behalf of the father was almost irresistible. (141)

Gerald is nevertheless expelled. He subsequently loses £3,400 to Lord Percival, who, like his father Earl Grex,

constantly gambles for money. Gerald writes Silverbridge, asking if he should borrow from the moneylenders. Knowing how much Palliser has feared his sons' possible entanglements with the moneylenders, Silverbridge immediately sends his personal IOU to Lord Percival. When Palliser finds out about Gerald's debt, he gives his son a powerful lecture on the evils of gambling, stressing the ignoble and ungentlemanly behavior of the gambler. In Gerald's letter to Silverbridge describing this lecture, the son's pride in and love for the father are quite evident:

. . . I wish I could tell you all that the governor said, because it was really tip-top. . . . I shall cut that kind of thing altogether. You should have heard the governor spouting Latin! And then the way he sat upon Percival, without mentioning the fellow's name!

. . . He did pitch into me,--not abusing me, nor even saying a word about the money, which he at once promised to pay, but laying it on to gambling with a regular cat-o'-nine-tails. And then there was an end of it. He just asked the fellow's address and said that he would send him the money. I will say this;--I don't think there's a greater brick than the governor out anywhere. (520, 521)

Whenever his sons get into a scrape, Palliser always delivers a lecture, for he is concerned that his sons learn those lessons by which a gentleman lives. He customarily ends his lecture by something like "'And now there shall not be a word more said about it'" (364). He is always true to his word; he does not constantly nag his sons about past faults and actions. In fact, he could not do so without altering his own nature, or without chipping away at his sons' self-esteem and eroding the confident trust existing

NO PAGE 282

between his sons and between himself and his sons.

Palliser's "mingled simplicity, courtesy, and self-assertion" combine to give him a manner that awes others (626), but his children know his guiding motives as well as they know the love he expresses in a variety of ways.

One of the severest tests of Palliser's gentlemanliness comes when Silverbridge wants to marry the American Isabel Boncassen. It is a major trial because, far more than his daughter's love for Tregear, his heir's marriage to an American causes him to evaluate the discrepancy between his political theory and his private preferences, to determine if his theory is false within his own life. Silverbridge had tried to please his father by proposing to Lady Mabel Grex, but she had "coyed her love" (486), and then he met Isabel. Isabel loves him, and she is favorably impressed by the simple manliness of his proposal: "He had put forward no claim but his own love," and "no hint had fallen from him of the greatness of the benefits which he would confer on her" (380). Isabel is yet much aware of these benefits, and she appreciates the difficulties she would face in learning to be a duchess. She therefore refuses to marry Silverbridge unless she can be assured of full acceptance as Palliser's daughter. Palliser does, of course, finally relent, for he loves his son, and he likes Isabel, admires her beauty, and respects her intelligence. In his private meeting with Isabel, Palliser endeavors to

explain to her that his initial resistance was not personal, but stemmed from his views about aristocracy. He asks that Isabel love him: "'I must either love [Silverbridge's] wife very dearly, or else I must be an unhappy man. And she must love me dearly, or I must be unhappy'" (570). Palliser could not endure separation from his children, and this feeling about family is shared by Isabel. She has told Silverbridge "'Love me, love my mother'" (568), and "'As other girls have to be taken with their belongings, so must I, if I be taken at all'" (587). Isabel would not allow her husband to reject her mother, a provincial and socially awkward woman whose whole life is her family.

To confirm his full acceptance of Isabel as his son's wife, Palliser gives her the ring which was his first present to Glencora. Silverbridge is surprised by the gift; his mother "wore it always," and he did not think his father "would ever have parted with that" (574). The ring is a signal to both Silverbridge and Isabel that Palliser has once again come around with his whole being. Few men could have chosen such a symbol of abiding love, making at once a gesture that would have pleased Glencora and giving her an additional role in continuing family tradition that surpasses a paragraph or two in the memoirs of someone she did not love. The ring symbolizes too that Palliser has made peace with his past and his doubts about what his marriage did or did not mean. He is now free to return to



political office, and once he decides to do so, he is a happier man. The movements in the novel, personal and familial, are thus future-oriented, promising growth and new life. One suspects that this promise would be much less, and much bleaker, if Palliser were not a perfect gentleman, if he were incapable of finally respecting the individuality of his children in the same way he respected and valued Glencora's individuality. His values permit the possibility of growth and change, and in accommodating the others in his personal world, Palliser does not surrender his principles and values: he affirms them.

Throughout the Palliser series, Trollope presents the growth and developing perception of Plantagenet Palliser, his perfect gentleman. Trollope never presents Palliser as a perfect human being; but in portraying Palliser's weaknesses, personal flaws, and his consciousness of the ways in which he fails, Trollope explores the attitudes of mind and spirit that are necessary for his ideal gentleman. As the novels demonstrate, the ideal of the gentleman is both a reality and a goal. Trollope's portrayal of Plantagenet Palliser is a testament to the author's belief in the importance and value of gentlemen and to his deep conviction that gentlemanliness has no necessary relation to a man's appearance or deportment.<sup>25</sup> Plantagenet Palliser is an aristocrat who chooses also to be a gentleman, and his main concern as a father is that his

sons learn the moral lessons that will enable them to be gentlemen. Palliser in fact subscribes to Trollope's belief that the English gentleman is the best possible thing for a man to be. Both character and author would concur with Gerard Manley Hopkins: ". . . if the English race had done nothing else, yet if they left the world the notion of a gentleman, they would have done a great service to mankind" (Abbott, Letters 176).

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> ApRoberts identifies Lord Palmerston as a political model for Palliser (145), as does Halperin (Trollope and Politics 215-16; see also Halperin's introduction to Trollope's Lord Palmerston i-vi). Kenney chooses Lord John Russell (283-84). For a few of the other identifications of fictional characters with historical figures, and fictional event with historical reality, see Bloomfield 67-74; Halperin, "Phineas Finn" 121-37; Robbins 303-16; Tingay 23-38; Dinwiddy 31-46; Benny Green, "Goodby" 258-60, and "Politicians in Print" 83; McCormack xi-xxxii. Trollope's biographers (Escott, Sadleir, Pope-Hennessy) also identify historical prototypes for several fictional characters. Escott claims Palliser "had no original" in history "but merely personifies his creator's notion of the pattern gentleman" (265). The Stebbinses take a psychological-biographical approach, arguing that the Pallisers are fictional representations of Trollope's parents (220, 221, 287, 296).

<sup>2</sup> Marriage and family were important in Trollope's system of values, as he indicated when discussing the moral significance of love in the novel:

Would the love-making of our world be done better without the teaching of such professors [novelists]? That it should be done is an essential necessity of our existence. That it should be done well is, perhaps, of all matters in our own private life, the most important to us. It is in itself,--in the doing of it, the brightest spot in our existence. Upon

it,--the manner in which it is done, the causes by which it is actuated, depends the happiness of our future life. No social question has been so important to us as that of the great bond of matrimony. And why? Because every most wholesome joy and most precious duty of our existence depends upon our inner family relations. For what, after all, are made those outer struggles of existence, but that these may be satisfying to us and those belonging to us? ("on English Prose Fiction" 109)

<sup>3</sup> Other readers have a very different view of Palliser's relationship with Lady Dumbello. Schreyer, for example, describes it as "a contemplated flight" (12), and Levine argues that in Can You Forgive Her? Palliser is "something of a hypocrite and a cynic" because he does not tell Glencora of "his own bumbling attempt at adultery" (202).

<sup>4</sup> Trollope's view of oratory is discussed by Halperin, Trollope and Politics 62; Pollard 87; and Tyson 146-53. Trollope also frequently comments on oratory, especially the sin committed by the speaker who tries to persuade others to believe what he himself does not believe. See, for example, Cicero 2: 262, 275-76; Lord Palmerston 210-11; Autobiography 323-24. Narrative commentary on dishonest use of language appears throughout the Palliser series, particularly in the chapters featuring the political debates in the House of Commons and those presenting Quintus Slide's newspaper articles.

<sup>5</sup> Later in the novel the narrator comments on Palliser's wish to hide his regret and disappointment from his wife:

He had not had wit enough to hide his grief from his wife; his knowledge of women and of men in social life had not been sufficient to teach him how this should be done; but he had wished to do it. (CYFH? 2: 340)

<sup>6</sup> The forms of violence and evil depicted in later novels, all involving people that Plantagenet and Glencora know, include Phineas Finn's rescue of Robert Kennedy from a garrotting, and Phineas's duel with Lord Chiltern (PF); the two break-ins to steal Lizzie Eustace's diamonds and Lizzie's perjuries (TED); Lucinda Roanoke's insanity, her last resort to avoid marriage to the sadistic Sir Griffin Tewett (TED); the trial of Mr. Browborough for election bribery (PR); Kennedy's attempt to shoot Phineas, and Kennedy's subsequent insanity (PR); the murder of Bonteen and Phineas's trial (PR); the personal villainy and financial frauds of Ferdinand Lopez, and Lopez's suicide (TPM); Tifto's laming of Silverbridge's horse, and the world of gamblers and card cheats on the fringes of London club society (TDC).

<sup>7</sup> John Sutherland suggests that Phineas was intended as Trollope's political hero, but that as the series progressed Trollope's view changed, and he "came to prefer Palliser's aloof, theoretic and serviceable nobility over the Irishman's more passionate manliness" (Introduction 19).

<sup>8</sup> Monk advises Phineas on speaking in Parliament: to be "short,--always short" and to "eschew all action and gesticulation" (PF 1: 148), in other words, to avoid the behavior so characteristic of such speakers as Mr. Daubeny

and Sir Timothy Beeswax. Monk's comments on Mr. Turnbull, the Radical demagogue, and Turnbull's inability to distinguish between public and private action (PF 1: 166-67) parallel Palliser's advice to Silverbridge on the necessity both of accepting and working with one's political and professional associates, and of exercising more discrimination in selecting companions for private life (TDC 204, 213). Monk also shares Palliser's view, and Trollope's, on the meaning of the word equality (PF 1: 128; TPM 2: 264-65; Autobiography 266-69). Perhaps most important of all is that Monk shares Palliser's view of the essential purpose of politics: "' . . . the wish of every honest man should be to assist in lifting up those below him, till they be something nearer to his own level than he finds them'" (PF 1: 128).

<sup>9</sup> After Glencora tells Palliser that Alice is the only person in the world she wants "to pet," besides him, he gives "her carte blanche as regards expense" (CYFH? 2: 402).

<sup>10</sup> In "Trollope's Dialogue" Polhemus discusses the first meeting of Marie Goesler and Phineas Finn (PF 2: 26-29), arguing that Phineas allows Marie to put him "in a bad light" before Palliser. Since Phineas refuses "to defend himself or in any way embarrass" Marie, Polhemus writes that "Palliser never does quite believe Phineas to be sound" (102). However, as the novels repeatedly demonstrate, a gentleman does not attempt to defend himself against a woman.

Palliser would certainly be aware of the restraint demanded of Phineas in this particular dinner-party conversation. Also, Palliser's conversations with Phineas, especially in The Prime Minister, show that Palliser both likes and trusts Phineas, as do Palliser's talks with Silverbridge about Phineas's speeches in the House of Commons.

<sup>11</sup> Halperin, Trollope and Politics 160-61; Polhemus, Changing World 177; Gindin 30; Wright, Dream and Art 24-25.

<sup>12</sup>In his introduction to the Centenary Edition of The Eustace Diamonds, W. J. McCormack points out several embedded historical allusions, especially British attitudes to India and Ireland, commenting that he believes Trollope "was scarcely aware of what happens in such passages . . . his rapid assimilation of the mood of Victorian Britain was such that he transmitted these richly contradictory effects before they registered with him" (xxvii). McCormack argues that Trollope's canon is "a very large mosaic" (xiv) and suggests that this mosaic pattern is the reason the "Brave New Critics" have no patience with Trollope: "Every stroke of Trollope's pen concedes the existence of a world beyond that of his official operation . . ." (xxvii). McCormack's view of the shifting levels of the Trollopidian novel is thus closely akin to what Bill Overton attempts to do throughout his book, The Unofficial Trollope, as he points out the myriad ways in which what Trollope actually does and shows in the novels counters his public, official statements of his work and his beliefs.

<sup>13</sup> Tennyson's "Northern Farmer: New Style," line 20. Tennyson's poetry, particularly the 1869 volume The Holy Grail, is important in several of Trollope's novels; and The Idylls of the King, a literary paradigm for the Palliser series, figures prominently in The Eustace Diamonds. Lizzie displays a volume of Tennyson for Lady Glencora's benefit (2: 135), much as she displays the Bible to impress Lady Fawn (1: 85). An accomplished actress, Lizzie adopts a succession of roles, all of which are based on her reading of the poetry of Byron and Shelley. Byron is Lizzie's favorite poet, and she dreams of a Corsair lover. (Lizzie's romantic dreams and the young Glencora's infatuation with Burgo Fitzgerald have resulted in some interesting comparisons of the two women; see Tracy, Trollope's Later Novels 22; Edwards 144-45, 173.) Talk about loving poetry characterizes Trollope's most dishonest and predatory characters--George Vavasor, Lizzie Eustace, and Ferdinand Lopez. Other characters read and enjoy poetry (Glencora, Plantagenet, Alice Vavasor, Phineas Finn, Marie Goesler, etc.), but they do not talk about loving poetry or being "made up of poetry" (George Vavasor, CYPH? 1: 45).

<sup>14</sup> Earlier in Phineas Redux Glencora had urged Palliser to request for himself the Garter that became available on the old duke's death. Palliser refused, telling Glencora, "'There are things that men do not ask for'" and "'I never yet asked for anything,--and never shall.



No honour has any value in my eyes unless it comes unasked'" (2: 151, 152). Palliser's beliefs about work and honors explain not only his request for Bonteen's position but also his later rejection of the Duke of St. Bungay's advice to award another vacant Garter to himself or to Lord Drummond (TPM 2: 225-27). If Palliser would not request a Garter from Mr. Gresham, it is unlikely that he would award himself one when he is Prime Minister.

<sup>15</sup> McMaster believes that Palliser is "not a complete man" (Palliser Novels 117), and Letwin argues that Palliser lacks manliness. Letwin defines manliness as "a species of courage," "a capacity to adjust to unpleasant circumstances and to accept right choices that are distasteful without complain [sic]" (204). By Letwin's definition, Palliser is nothing if not manly. Trollope's comments on manliness and courage throughout the Life of Cicero indicate that he is broadening those terms, in the same way he broadens honor and honesty (Cicero 1: 298-301; 2: 211, 220-21, 246-47). True courage means that a man "can willingly imperil all because duty requires it" (2: 247); it is cowardice "to know what duty requires, and then to be deterred by fear of results" (1: 299). Bravely facing death is the lowest form of manly courage; it is a disgrace "To fear death more than ignominy . . ." (2: 221).

<sup>16</sup> Overton writes that being a public spectacle, having one's misfortunes witnessed and discussed, intensifies the

ordeal for the character (95-98). Overton's discussion includes Phineas Finn and Josiah Crawley, but it applies also to Palliser as he endures both political difficulties and domestic crises.

<sup>17</sup> Phineas, too, manifests a similar grace. Twice in Phineas Redux he endeavors to lessen the embarrassment of others. In the first instance, Lady Baldock is lamenting the fate of her daughter Augusta, who has become a nun. Lady Baldock criticizes "'the nasty, low, lying, wheedling priest [who] got hold'" of her daughter. She then remembers that Phineas is an Irish Catholic:

"Oh, laws! I quite forgot. I beg your pardon, Mr. Finn; but you're one of them!"  
 "Not a nun, Lady Baldock." (1: 25)

In the manner recommended by Castiglione, Phineas pretends he does not understand, using humor instead of a direct response. In the second instance, Adelaide Palliser makes comments about the Kennedy marriage, only to become "as red as fire" when she remembers the rumors linking Lady Laura and Phineas. Phineas makes a gentle, low-key response to Adelaide, then rapidly shifts to other subjects. "And so the red colour faded away from poor Adelaide's face, and the unpleasantness was removed" (2: 306-307).

<sup>18</sup> Palliser's awareness of what his dedication to work has cost him is stressed in later novels, and there is poignancy in the regrets he discusses with Lord Silverbridge. In The Prime Minister Palliser talks to Phineas

about his regrets that he does not hunt and lacks social ease; he recognizes that his chief activities (reading, writing, thinking) are solitary ones (2: 258). And in The Duke's Children Palliser tries to help his children avoid his own narrow social life (57, 135, 206, 490). He regards his sons' sports "wistfully," seeing them as the "proper recreations for a man of wealth" (490).

<sup>19</sup> Lopez's behavior at the garden party causes Glencora to revise her opinion of him. She afterwards exclaims, "'What fools, what asses, what horrors men are!'" and she tells Marie, "'There was not a row, but there was enough of a quarrel to be visible and audible. He walked about and talked loud to the poor woman'" (1: 356).

<sup>20</sup> This seems to be a borrowing from Thackeray's Henry Esmond, whose hero Trollope described as a gentleman from head to toe. In his biography of Thackeray, Trollope quotes Beatrix Esmond's statement to her cousin Henry, "'All the time you are worshipping and singing hymns to me, I know very well I am no goddess'" (Thackeray 125).

<sup>21</sup> Letwin accepts St. Bungay's view as Trollope's (203), as does apRoberts (146); see also Halperin, Trollope and Politics 216. Terry seems to overlook the Garter episode, for he argues that Palliser allows himself no "gestures of independence" (212).

<sup>22</sup> For many readers, Glencora's role in her daughter's secret engagement is proof of an enduring love for Burgo

Fitzgerald. See Terry 127; Polhemus, Changing World 223; Pollard 105; Butte 6342A; Lansbury, Reasonable Man 223; Letwin 86; Edwards 153. Basch sees The Duke's Children as evidence that Glencora's marriage of convenience was "tragic" (76), and Tinker writes that Palliser's domestic difficulties in the novel are a continuing punishment for his early neglect of his private life (v). It is perhaps possible that too much emphasis is placed on a character's thoughts--Palliser's, for instance, or Glencora's--as that character is trying to work through a crisis. Equal emphasis should be given to the character's thoughts after the crisis has passed, especially since Trollope is well-known for analyzing the self-deception and self-justification within his characters' thoughts.

<sup>23</sup> Walpole sees the novel as Palliser's education by his children's follies (114), and McMaster agrees that the novel is concerned with the teaching of the father (Palliser Novels 140-41). Halperin, however, insists that the children can teach Palliser nothing, that all the teaching in the novel is from Palliser to his sons, and from Palliser to the reader (Trollope and Politics 257). The novel seems to show that all learn something about themselves and the nature of their world, that the teaching is two-way, often indirect, and frequently the result of accumulating experience.

<sup>24</sup> Booth sees the novel as recording Palliser's domestic failure through his weakness of character (101).

Polhemus argues that Palliser remains disappointed in his children because he cannot change them (Changing World 230), and Terry writes that the novel portrays the children's alienation from the father (129). Neither the father's lectures nor the children's follies prove a lack of love or sympathy between father and children, and there is much comment in the novel that negates reading it as a study of alienation.

<sup>25</sup> In Trollope's novels, deportment more often than not has a negative connotation, denoting style as opposed to substance, form as opposed to content. Trollope's negative use of the term seems to derive from the dandy's emphasis on style; deportment is equivalent to affectation, and affectation is specifically defined as the opposite of manliness (PR 2: 252). In The Duke's Children, for example, Sir Timothy Beeswax speaks in Parliament on the necessity of preventing "the invasions of foreigners," especially on the judicial bench. Phineas Finn responds:

"The Right Honourable gentleman no doubt means . . . that we must carry ourselves with some increased external dignity. The world is bewigging itself, and we must buy a bigger wig than any we have got, in order to confront the world with self-respect. Turveydrop and deportment will suffice for us against any odds." (203)

The point is made even more strongly in The Duke's Children in the description of Sir Timothy as "all buckram [and] deportment" (600). The narrator comments that for most

public men with official duties of a solemn nature, "Mr. Turveydrop, the great professor of deportment, has done much. But there should always be the art to underlie and protect the art;--the art that can hide the art." Like manliness, personal dignity is not a garment that can be donned for particular occasions; dignity is "evinced, in part, by the carriage of the body, [but] that carriage should be the fruit of the operation of the mind" (601). And in The Prime Minister Emily Wharton Lopez weighs her previous judgment of Ferdinand Lopez as a gentleman against the realities of his motives, words, and actions (chapters 29-31, 37, 39). Emily at first identifies Lopez's failure as his lack of "some peculiar gift, or grace, or acquirement" (1: 289). Emily's father had always associated this "peculiar gift" with the gentleman and the long process of breeding that created the character of the gentleman. Only when Lopez tells Emily to play on her father's love to get money from him--"'Get round him when he's a little down in the mouth'" (1: 369)--does she face the mistake she made through pride, obstinacy, and inexperience: ". . . the veil had fallen from her eyes. She could now see the difference between manliness and 'deportment'" (1: 371). Deportment is thus the surface, the outward signs of manliness and gentlemanliness--those aspects of the gentleman which are most easily counterfeited.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliographies

- apRoberts, Ruth. "Anthony Trollope." Victorian Fiction: A Second Guide to Research. Ed. George H. Ford. New York: MLA, 1978. 143-71.
- Lyons, Anne K. Anthony Trollope: An Annotated Bibliography of Periodical Works by and about Him in the United States and Great Britain to 1900. Greenwood, FL: Penkeville, 1985.
- Olmsted, John Charles, and Jeffrey Egan Welch. The Reputation of Trollope: An Annotated Bibliography, 1925-1975. Garland Reference Library of the Humanities, vol. 88. New York: Garland, 1978.

Primary Sources

Unless otherwise indicated in the text, the edition of the Palliser novels cited is the 1973 Oxford Trollope. The Centenary Edition follows the Oxford Trollope and offers a greatly expanded notes section for each of the novels.

- Trollope, Anthony. "About Hunting." Saint Paul's, November 1867. Rpt. in Writings for Saint Paul's Magazine. By Anthony Trollope. Ed. John Sutherland. Selected Works of Anthony Trollope. Ed. N. John Hall. New York: Arno, 1981. 206-19 [original pagination].
- Trollope, Anthony. "American Reconstruction." Saint Paul's, September 1868. Rpt. in Writings for Saint Paul's Magazine. By Anthony Trollope. Ed. John Sutherland. Selected Works of Anthony Trollope. Ed. N. John Hall. New York: Arno, 1981. 662-75 [original pagination].
- Trollope, Anthony. The American Senator. The World's Classics. 1931. New York: Oxford UP, 1951.
- Trollope, Anthony. An Autobiography. Introduction by Michael Sadleir. The World's Classics. New York: Oxford UP, 1924.
- Trollope, Anthony. Ayala's Angel. The World's Classics. New York: Oxford UP, 1929.

- Trollope, Anthony. The Belton Estate. 1865. New York: Dover, 1985.
- Trollope, Anthony. Can You Forgive Her? Preface by Sir Edward Marsh. The Oxford Trollope. Ed. Michael Sadleir and Frederick Page. 1948. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.
- Trollope, Anthony. Can You Forgive Her? Introduction by Kate Flint. Preface by Norman St. John-Stevas. Ed. Andrew Swarbrick. The Centenary Edition of Anthony Trollope's Palliser Novels. Ed. W. J. McCormack. The World's Classics. 1948; 1973. New York: Oxford UP, 1982.
- Trollope, Anthony. "Charles Dickens." Saint Paul's, July 1870. Rpt. in Writings for Saint Paul's Magazine. By Anthony Trollope. Ed. John Sutherland. Selected Works of Anthony Trollope. Ed. N. John Hall. New York: Arno, 1981. 370-75 [original pagination].
- Trollope, Anthony. "The Civil Service as a Profession." Lecture, 1861. Rpt. in Four Lectures by Anthony Trollope. Ed. Morris L. Parrish. London: Constable, 1938. 4-26.
- Trollope, Anthony. The Commentaries of Caesar. Introduction by Ruth apRoberts. Selected Works of Anthony Trollope. Ed. N. John Hall. New York: Arno, 1981.
- Trollope, Anthony. Doctor Thorne. The World's Classics. 1926. New York: Oxford UP, 1934.
- Trollope, Anthony. The Duke's Children. Preface by Chauncey B. Tinker. The Oxford Trollope. Ed. Michael Sadleir and Frederick Page. 1954. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.
- Trollope, Anthony. The Duke's Children. Ed. with an introduction by Hermione Lee. The Centenary Edition of Anthony Trollope's Palliser Novels. Ed. W. J. McCormack. The World's Classics. 1954; 1973. New York: Oxford UP, 1983.
- Trollope, Anthony. The Eustace Diamonds. Preface by Michael Sadleir. The Oxford Trollope. Ed. Michael Sadleir and Frederick Page. 1950. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.
- Trollope, Anthony. The Eustace Diamonds. Ed. with an introduction by W. J. McCormack. The Centenary Edition of Anthony Trollope's Palliser Novels. Ed. W. J.



- McCormack. The World's Classics. 1950; 1973. New York: Oxford UP, 1983.
- Trollope, Anthony. "Formosa." Saint Paul's, October 1869. Rpt. in Writings for Saint Paul's Magazine. By Anthony Trollope. Ed. John Sutherland. Selected Works of Anthony Trollope. Ed. N. John Hall. New York: Arno, 1981. 75-80 [original pagination].
- Trollope, Anthony. Framley Parsonage. The World's Classics. New York: Oxford UP, 1926.
- Trollope, Anthony. He Knew He Was Right. 1869. New York: Dover, 1983.
- Trollope, Anthony. How the "Mastiffs" Went to Iceland. Introduction by Coral Lansbury. Selected Works of Anthony Trollope. Ed. N. John Hall. New York: Arno, 1981.
- Trollope, Anthony. Hunting Sketches. Introduction by Cedric Ellsworth Smith. Hartford, CT: Edwin Valentine Mitchell, 1929.
- Trollope, Anthony. Kept in the Dark. 1882. New York: Dover, 1978.
- Trollope, Anthony. The Last Chronicle of Barset. The World's Classics. 2 vols. New York: Oxford UP, 1932.
- Trollope, Anthony. The Letters of Anthony Trollope. Ed. N. John Hall, with the assistance of Nina Burgis. 2 vols. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1983.
- Trollope, Anthony. The Life of Cicero. 2 vols. New York: Harper, 1881.
- Trollope, Anthony. Lord Palmerston. Introduction by John Halperin. Selected Works of Anthony Trollope. Ed. N. John Hall. New York: Arno, 1981.
- Trollope, Anthony. The New Zealander. Ed. N. John Hall. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- Trollope, Anthony. "On English Prose Fiction as a Rational Amusement." Lecture, 1870. Rpt. in Four Lectures by Anthony Trollope. Ed. Morris L. Parrish. London: Constable, 1938. 91-139.
- Trollope, Anthony. Phineas Finn. Preface by Sir Shane Leslie. The Oxford Trollope. Ed. Michael Sadleir and Frederick Page. 1949. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.

- Trollope, Anthony. Phineas Finn. Ed. with an introduction by Jacques Berthoud. The Centenary Edition of Anthony Trollope's Palliser Novels. Ed. W. J. McCormack. The World's Classics. 1949; 1973. New York: Oxford UP, 1982.
- Trollope, Anthony. Phineas Redux. Preface by R. W. Chapman. The Oxford Trollope. Ed. Michael Sadleir and Frederick Page. 1951. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.
- Trollope, Anthony. Phineas Redux. Introduction by F.S.L. Lyons. Ed. John C. Whale. The Centenary Edition of Anthony Trollope's Palliser Novels. Ed. W. J. McCormack. The World's Classics. 1951; 1973. New York: Oxford UP, 1983.
- Trollope, Anthony. Preface. The Vicar of Bullhampton. The World's Classics. 1924. New York: Oxford UP, 1933. v-vii.
- Trollope, Anthony. "The Present Condition of the Northern States of the American Union." Lecture, 1862 or 1863. Rpt. in Four Lectures by Anthony Trollope. Ed. Morris L. Parrish. London: Constable, 1938. 29-64.
- Trollope, Anthony. The Prime Minister. Preface by L. S. Amery. The Oxford Trollope. Ed. Michael Sadleir and Frederick Page. 1952. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.
- Trollope, Anthony. The Prime Minister. Introduction by John McCormick. Ed. Jennifer Uglow. The Centenary Edition of Anthony Trollope's Palliser Novels. Ed. W. J. McCormack. The World's Classics. 1952; 1973. New York: Oxford UP, 1983.
- Trollope, Anthony. Sir Harry Hotspur of Humblethwaite. 1870. New York: Dover, 1985.
- Trollope, Anthony. The Small House at Allington. 1948. London: Zodiac, 1981.
- Trollope, Anthony. Thackeray. English Men of Letters. Ed. John Morley. New York: Harper, [1879].
- Trollope, Anthony. The Way We Live Now. The World's Classics. 2 vols. New York: Oxford UP, 1941.

### Secondary Sources

- Abbott, C. C., ed. The Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins to Robert Bridges. London: Oxford UP, 1935.

- Aitken, David. "Anthony Trollope on 'the Genus Girl.'" Nineteenth-Century Fiction 28 (1974): 417-34.
- Allen, Walter. "The Last Chronicle of Barset." Anthony Trollope. Ed. Tony Bareham. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1980. 81-94.
- Alley, Kenneth Donald. "Anthony Trollope's Parliamentary Novels: A Study in Thematic Structure." DA 28 (1967): 2198A-99A. Bowling Green State U.
- Amery, L. S. Preface. The Prime Minister. By Anthony Trollope. The Oxford Trollope. Ed. Michael Sadleir and Frederick Page. 1932. New York: Oxford UP, 1973. i-viii.
- Annan, Noel. "How Should a Gent Behave?" Rev. of The Gentleman in Trollope: Individuality and Moral Conduct, by Shirley Robin Letwin. New York Review of Books 3 February 1983: 7-12.
- apRoberts, Ruth. The Moral Trollope. Athens: Ohio UP, 1971.
- Bailey, James William. "The Development of a Moral Ideal in the Barset and Parliamentary Novels of Anthony Trollope." DA 28 (1963): 4592A. Wayne State U.
- Baldick, Robert. The Duel: A History of Duelling. New York: Clarkson N. Potter, 1965.
- Ballantyne, Thomas. Essays in Mosaic. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington, 1879.
- Bareham, Tony. "Patterns of Excellence: Theme and Structure in The Three Clerks." Anthony Trollope. Ed. Tony Bareham. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1980. 54-80.
- Barickman, Richard, et al. Corrupt Relations: Dickens, Thackeray, Trollope, Collins, and the Victorian Sexual System. New York: Columbia UP, 1982.
- Bartrum, Barry A. "The Parliament Within: A Study of Anthony Trollope's Palliser Novels." DA 37 (1976): 2886A-87A. Princeton.
- Basch, Françoise. Relative Creatures: Victorian Women in Society and the Novel. New York: Schocken, 1974.
- Betsky, Seymour. "Society in Thackeray and Trollope." The Pelican Guide to English Literature, vol. 6: From Dickens to Hardy. Ed. Boris Ford. 1958. Baltimore: Penguin, 1966. 144-68.

- Beyers, Brian D. "Anthony Trollope: Reform and the Individual Consciousness." Standpunte 119 (1975): 14-22.
- Bloomfield, Morton W. "Trollope's Use of Canadian History in 'Phineas Finn' (1867-1869)." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 5 (1955): 67-74.
- Blount, Trevor. "Sir Leicester Dedlock and 'Deportment' Turveydrop: Some Aspects of Dickens's Use of Parallelism." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 21 (1966): 149-65.
- Blyth, Henry. The Rakes. New York: Dial, 1971.
- Boll, Ernest. "The Infusions of Dickens in Trollope." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 1 (September 1946): 11-14.
- Booth, Bradford A. Anthony Trollope: Aspects of His Life and Art. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1958.
- Bornstein, Diane. Mirrors of Courtesy. Hamden, CT: Archon, 1975.
- Briggs, Asa. "Trollope, Bagehot, and the English Constitution." Victorian People: A Reassessment of Persons and Themes, 1851-67. rev. ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1970. 87-115.
- Brown, Beatrice Curtis. Anthony Trollope. The English Novelists. London: Arthur Barker, 1950.
- Burnett, T.A.J. The Rise & Fall of a Regency Dandy: The Life and Times of Scrope Berdmore Davies. Boston: Little, Brown, 1981.
- Butte, George Charles. "Politics and Personality in Anthony Trollope's Palliser Novels." DA 33 (1972): 6342A. Johns Hopkins U.
- Cadbury, William. "Shape and Theme: Determinants of Trollope's Forms." PMLA 78 (1963): 326-32.
- Castiglione, Baldassare. The Courtier. Trans. Sir Thomas Hoby. Three Renaissance Classics: The Prince, Utopia, The Courtier. Introduction and notes by Burton A. Milligan. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953. 242-618.
- Clark, G. Kitson. The Making of Victorian England: Being the Ford Lectures Delivered Before the University of Oxford. 1962. New York: Atheneum, 1967.

- Cockshut, A.O.J. Anthony Trollope: A Critical Study. 1955.  
New York: New York UP, 1968.
- Cockshut, A.O.J. Man and Woman: A Study of Love and the Novel, 1740-1940. London: Collins, 1977.
- Cockshut, A.O.J. "Trollope's Liberalism." Anthony Trollope. Ed. Tony Bareham. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1980. 161-81.
- Cohen, Joan Mandel. Form and Realism in Six Novels of Anthony Trollope. The Hague: Mouton, 1976.
- Collins, Philip. "Business and Bosoms: Some Trollopian Concerns." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 37 (1982): 293-315.
- Culler, A. Dwight. The Imperial Intellect: A Study of Newman's Educational Ideal. New Haven: Yale UP, 1955.
- Davies, Hugh Sykes. "Trollope and His Style." Review of English Literature 1 (October 1960): 73-85.
- Denton, Ramona L. "'That Cage' of Femininity: Trollope's Lady Laura." South Atlantic Bulletin 45.1 (1980): 1-10.
- Dinwiddy, J. R. "Who's Who in Trollope's Political Novels." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 22 (1967): 31-46.
- Edwards, P. D. Anthony Trollope, His Art and Scope. New York: St. Martin's, 1978.
- Erskine-Hill, Howard. The Augustan Idea in English Literature. London: Edward Arnold, 1983.
- Escott, T.H.S. Anthony Trollope: His Work, Associates and Literary Originals. London: John Lane, 1913.
- Ferguson, Arthur B. The Indian Summer of English Chivalry: Studies in the Decline and Transformation of Chivalric Idealism. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1960.
- Flint, Kate. "Introduction: Trollope and Sexual Politics." Can You Forgive Her? By Anthony Trollope. Ed. Andrew Swarbrick. The Centenary Edition of Anthony Trollope's Palliser Novels. Ed. W. J. McCormack. The World's Classics. New York: Oxford UP, 1982. xv-xxx.
- Fraser, Russell A. "A Pernicious Casuistry: A Study of Character in Vanity Fair." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 12 (1957): 137-47.

- Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. 1957. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1973.
- Garrett, Peter K. The Victorian Multiplot Novel: Studies in Dialogical Form. New Haven: Yale UP, 1980.
- Gatrell, Simon. "Jealousy, Mastery, Love and Madness: A Brief Reading of He Knew He Was Right." Anthony Trollope. Ed. Tony Bareham. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1980. 95-115.
- Gerould, Winifred Gregory, and James Thayer Gerould. A Guide to Trollope. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1948.
- Gilmour, Robin. The Idea of the Gentleman in the Victorian Novel. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981.
- Gilmour, Robin. "A Lesser Thackeray? Trollope and the Victorian Novel." Anthony Trollope. Ed. Tony Bareham. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1980. 182-203.
- Gindin, James. "Trollope." Harvest of a Quiet Eye: The Novel of Compassion. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1971. 28-56.
- Girouard, Mark. The Return to Camelot: Chivalry and the English Gentleman. New Haven: Yale UP, 1981.
- Givens, Donna Stine. "Trollope's Palliser Novels: The Motif of Predation." DAI 36 (1975): 2844A. U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Green, Benny. "Goodby to the Hustings." The Spectator 232 (1974): 258-60.
- Green, Benny. "Politicians in Print." The Spectator 230 (1973): 83.
- Green, Martin. Children of the Sun: A Narrative of "Decadence" in England after 1918. 1976. n.p.: Wideview Books, 1980.
- Grimsted, David. "Melodrama as Echo of the Historically Voiceless." Anonymous Americans: Explorations in Nineteenth-Century Social History. Ed. Tamara K. Hareven. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971. 89-98.
- Gulliver, Antony Frank. "The Political Novels of Trollope and Snow." DA 30 (1969): 684A. U of Connecticut.

- Hall, N. John. Introduction. The Letters of Anthony Trollope. 2 vols. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1983. 1: xiii-xxvi.
- Hall, N. John. Introduction. The New Zealander. By Anthony Trollope. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972. xi-xli.
- Halperin, John. "The Eustace Diamonds and Politics." Anthony Trollope. Ed. Tony Bareham. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1980. 138-60.
- Halperin, John. Introduction. Lord Palmerston. By Anthony Trollope. Selected Works of Anthony Trollope. Ed. N. John Hall. New York: Arno, 1981. i-vi.
- Halperin, John. Trollope and Politics: A Study of the Pallisers and Others. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1977.
- Halperin, John. "Trollope's Phineas Finn and History." English Studies 59 (1978): 121-37.
- Hardwick, Michael. A Guide to Anthony Trollope. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1974.
- Hart, Charles W. "Courtship and Marriage in the Novels of Anthony Trollope." DA 30 (1968): 685A. Columbia U.
- Harvey, Geoffrey. The Art of Anthony Trollope. New York: St. Martin's, 1980.
- Hoyt, Norris D. "'Can You Forgive Her': A Commentary." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 2 (September 1947): 57-70.
- Jenkyns, Richard. The Victorians and Ancient Greece. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1980.
- Johnson, P. Hansford. "Trollope's Young Women." On the Novel: A Present for Walter Allen on His 60th Birthday from His Friends and Colleagues. Ed. B. S. Benedikz. London: J. M. Dent, 1971. 17-33.
- Jones, Frank Pierce. "Anthony Trollope and the Classics." Classical Weekly 37 (1944): 227-31.
- Kelso, Ruth. The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1964.
- Kendrick, Walter M. The Novel-Machine: The Theory and Fiction of Anthony Trollope. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1980.

- Kenney, Blair G. "Trollope's Ideal Statesmen: Plantagenet Palliser and Lord John Russell." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 20 (1965): 281-85.
- Kincaid, James K. The Novels of Anthony Trollope. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.
- Lansbury, Coral. Introduction. How the "Mastiffs" Went to Iceland. By Anthony Trollope. Selected Works of Anthony Trollope. Ed. N. John Hall. New York: Arno, 1981. i-ii.
- Lansbury, Coral. The Reasonable Man: Trollope's Legal Fiction. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1981.
- Laski, Harold J. "The Danger of Being a Gentleman: Reflections on the Ruling Class in England (1932)." The Danger of Being a Gentleman and Other Essays. New York: Viking, 1940. 13-32.
- Laslett, Peter. The World We Have Lost: England before the Industrial Age. 3rd ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1984.
- Letwin, Shirley Robin. The Gentleman in Trollope: Individuality and Moral Conduct. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1982.
- Levine, George. "Trollope: Reality and the Rules of the Game." The Realistic Imagination: English Fiction from Frankenstein to Lady Chatterley. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1981. 181-203.
- Locke, Elizabeth Hughes. "Anthony Trollope and the Novel of Manners." Diss. Duke U, 1972.
- Lucas, Nancy Beissner. "Women and Love Relationships in the Changing Fictional World of Anthony Trollope." DA 34 (1973): 7712A. U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- MacCarthy, Desmond. "Anthony Trollope." Portraits. 1931. New York: Oxford UP, 1955. 270-77.
- McCormack, W. J. "Introduction: The Myth of England." The Eustace Diamonds. By Anthony Trollope. The Centenary Edition of Anthony Trollope's Palliser Novels. Ed. W. J. McCormack. The World's Classics. New York: Oxford UP, 1983. xi-xxxii.
- McMaster, Juliet. "Pride and Prejudice: 'Acting by Design.'" The Novel from Sterne to James: Essays on the Relation of Literature to Life. By Juliet and Rowland McMaster. Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble, 1981. 19-36.



- McMaster, Juliet. "Theme and Form in The Newcomes." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 23 (1968): 177-88.
- McMaster, Juliet. "Trollope's Country Estates." Trollope: Centenary Essays. Ed. John Halperin. London: Macmillan, 1982. 70-85.
- McMaster, Juliet. Trollope's Palliser Novels: Theme and Pattern. London: Macmillan, 1978.
- Marsh, Sir Edward. Preface. Can You Forgive Her? By Anthony Trollope. The Oxford Trollope. Ed. Michael Sadleir and Frederick Page. 1948. New York: Oxford UP, 1973. i-vi.
- Mason, Philip. The English Gentleman: The Rise and Fall of an Ideal. New York: William Morrow, 1982.
- Melada, Ivan. "The Idea of a Gentleman." The Captain of Industry in English Fiction, 1821-1871. Albuquerque: U of Mexico P, 1970. 164-87.
- Milligan, Burton. Introduction. Three Renaissance Classics: The Prince, Utopia, The Courtier. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953. iii-xix.
- Mizener, Arthur. "Anthony Trollope: The Palliser Novels." From Jane Austen to Joseph Conrad: Essays Collected in Memory of James T. Hillhouse. Ed. Robert C. Rathburn and Martin Steinmann, Jr. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1958. 160-76.
- Moers, Ellen. The Dandy: Brummell to Beerbohm. New York: Viking, 1960.
- Mohan, Ramesh. "Trollope's Political Novels (Chronicles of Parliamentary Life)." The Indian Journal of English Studies 1 (1960): 57-69.
- Naman, Anne Aresty. The Jew in the Victorian Novel: Some Relationships between Prejudice and Art. New York: AMS, 1980.
- O'Connor, Frank. "Trollope the Realist." The Mirror in the Roadway: A Study of the Modern Novel. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956. 165-83.
- Overton, Bill. The Unofficial Trollope. Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble, 1982.
- Perkin, Harold. The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880. Studies in Social History. Ed. Harold Perkin. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.

- Polhemus, Robert M. "Being in Love in Phineas Finn/Phineas Redux: Desire, Devotion, Consolation." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 37 (1982): 383-95.
- Polhemus, Robert M. The Changing World of Anthony Trollope. Berkeley: U of California P, 1968.
- Polhemus, Robert M. "Trollope's Dialogue." Trollope: Centenary Essays. Ed. John Halperin. London: Macmillan, 1982. 95-108.
- Pollard, Arthur. Anthony Trollope. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Pope-Hennessy, James. Anthony Trollope. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971.
- Raven, Simon. The English Gentleman: An Essay in Attitudes. London: Anthony Blond, 1961.
- Rebhorn, Wayne A. Courtly Performances: Masking and Festivity in Castiglione's Book of the Courtier. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1978.
- Robbins, Frank E. "Chronology and History in Trollope's Barset and Parliamentary Novels." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 5 (1951): 303-16.
- Rothblatt, Sheldon. Tradition and Change in English Liberal Education: An Essay in History and Culture. London: Faber and Faber, 1976.
- Sadleir, Michael. Anthony Trollope: A Commentary. Introduction by A. Edward Newton. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1927. [A revised edition was published in 1945.]
- Sadleir, Michael. "Trollope and Bacon's Essays." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 1 (Summer 1945): 21-34.
- Schawacker, Erwin William, Jr. "The Narrative Persona of the Novels of Anthony Trollope." DA 33 (1972): 1742A. U of Pennsylvania.
- Schreyer, Alice. "'Ignorance Is Not Innocence': Anthony Trollope as Novelist and Preacher." Columbia Library Columns 26.3 (1977): 11-19.
- Shrewsbury, James Bryant, Jr. "Trollope's Concept of a Gentleman." Diss. Ohio State U, 1954.
- Skilton, David. Anthony Trollope and His Contemporaries: A Study in the Theory and Conventions of Mid-Victorian Fiction. New York: St. Martin's, 1972.

- Slakey, Roger L. "Trollope's Case for Moral Imperative." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 28 (1974): 305-320.
- Smalley, Donald, ed. Trollope: The Critical Heritage. The Critical Heritage Series. Ed. B. C. Southam. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1969.
- Smith, Sheila M. "Anthony Trollope: The Novelist as Moralist." Renaissance and Modern Essays Presented to Vivian de Sola Pinto in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday. Ed. C. R. Hibbard. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1966. 129-36.
- Smythe-Palmer, A. The Ideal of a Gentleman: Or a Mirror for Gentlefolks, a Portrayal in Literature from the Earliest Times. New York: E. P. Dutton, n.d.
- Snow, C. P. Trollope: His Life and Art. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975.
- Snow, C. P. "Trollope: The Psychological Stream." On the Novel: A Present for Walter Allen on His 60th Birthday from His Friends and Colleagues. Ed. B. S. Benedikz. London: J. M. Dent, 1971. 3-16.
- Stansky, Peter. "The English Gentleman." Rev. of several titles, including The Gentleman in Trollope: Individuality and Moral Conduct, by Shirley Robin Letwin. Raritan 2 (Spring 1983): 122-30.
- Stebbins, Lucy Poate, and Richard Poate Stebbins. The Trollopes: The Chronicle of a Writing Family. New York: Columbia UP, 1945.
- Sutherland, John. Introduction. Phineas Finn, The Irish Member. By Anthony Trollope. New York: Penguin, 1972. 7-32.
- Terry, R. C. Anthony Trollope: The Artist in Hiding. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1977.
- Thale, Jerome. "The Problem of Structure in Trollope." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 15 (1960): 147-57.
- Tillotson, Kathleen. "The Tale and the Teller." Mid-Victorian Studies. By Geoffrey and Kathleen Tillotson. London: U of London, Athlone P, 1965. 1-23.
- Tingay, Lance O. "Trollope and the Beverley Election." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 5 (1950): 23-38.

- Tinker, Chauncey B. Preface. The Duke's Children. By Anthony Trollope. The Oxford Trollope. Ed. Michael Sadleir and Frederick Page. 1954. New York: Oxford UP, 1973. i-vi.
- Tomlinson, T. B. "Trollope's 'Political' Novels: Phineas Finn to The Duke's Children." The English Middle-Class Novel. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1976. 83-101.
- Tracy, Robert. "Lana Medicato Fuco: Trollope's Classicism." Trollope: Centenary Essays. Ed. John Halperin. London: Macmillan, 1982. 1-23.
- Tracy, Robert. Trollope's Later Novels. Berkeley: U of California P, 1978.
- Trafton, Dain A. "Structure and Meaning in The Courtier." English Literary Renaissance 2 (1972): 283-97.
- Tyson, Raymond W. "Trollope on Public Speaking." Southern Speech Journal 32 (1966): 146-53.
- Underwood, Horace Horton. "Social Place in the Fiction of Anthony Trollope." DA 33 (1972): 1698A-99A. State U of New York at Buffalo.
- Vincent, C. J. "Trollope: A Victorian Augustan." Queen's Quarterly 52 (1945): 415-28.
- Wagner, Anthony Richard. Heralds and Heraldry in the Middle Ages: An Inquiry into the Growth of the Armorial Function of the Herald. 2nd ed. London: Oxford UP, 1956.
- Walpole, Hugh. Anthony Trollope. English Men of Letters. Ed. J. C. Squires. London: Macmillan, 1928.
- West, Rebecca. "A Nineteenth-Century Bureaucrat." The Court and the Castle: Some Treatments of a Recurrent Theme. New Haven: Yale UP, 1957. 133-64.
- West, William A. "The Last Chronicle of Barset: Trollope's Comic Techniques." The Classic British Novel. Ed. Howard M. Harper, Jr., and Charles Edge. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1971. 121-42.
- West, William A. "Trollope's Cicero." Mosaic 4.3 (1971): 143-52.
- Wijesinha, Rajiva. The Androgynous Trollope: Attitudes to Women Amongst Early Victorian Novelists. Washington, DC: UP of America, 1982.

- Wildman, John Hazard. Anthony Trollope's England. Brown University Studies, vol. 5. Providence, RI: Brown U, 1940.
- Wingfield-Stratford, Esmé. The Making of a Gentleman. London: Williams and Norgate, 1938.
- Wright, Andrew. Anthony Trollope: Dream and Art. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.
- Wright, Andrew. "Trollope Revises Trollope." Trollope: Centenary Essays. Ed. John Halperin. London: Macmillan, 1982. 109-133.
- Wright, Andrew. Rev. of several titles, including The Gentleman in Trollope: Individuality and Moral Conduct, by Shirley Robin Letwin. Nineteenth-Century Fiction 38 (1983): 104-109.