AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Stan L. Swagerty for the Master of Arts

in English presented on April 10, 1979

Title: THE ART OF INSINCERITY: A STUDY OF RELIGIOUS HYPOCRITES IN SELECTED NOVELS BY DICKENS, TROLLOPE, AND ELIOT

Abstract approved: June O. Underwood

In their novels Dickens, Trollope and Eliot effectively render the essential qualities of hypocrisy through the characterization of the religious hypocrite. The first chapter of this thesis provides a detailed analysis of the names of the hypocrites depicted in Dickens's novels The Pickwick Papers and Bleak House, Trollope's The Warden, Barchester Towers, and The Last Chronicle of Barset, and Eliot's Middlemarch. In each novel, the name is more than a symbol; it serves as a lens through which the reader observes the words and deeds of the hypocrite. The author uses the name to insure that the reader will view the character as the author intends. The "name-as-lens" functions to establish the author's perspective of the hypocrite.

The second chapter focuses this perspective on the cant of the religious hypocrite as manifested in the clergy and the laity. The analysis of the clergy's cant is restricted to the rhetoric of the sermon, and how the rhetoric is used hypocritically. Trollope's Mrs. Proudie and Eliot's Mr. Bulstrade represent the laity where cant is discussed.

The final chapter examines the purpose of Dickens, Trollope, and Eliot in depicting the religious hypocrite. The initial purpose discussed is the hypocrite's ability to energize the story. He, or she, provides the novel with a Byronic energy and moves the story along. In addition, the authors use the religious hypocrite to warn the reader of the threat posed by hypocrisy. The chapter is concluded with the profferring of a system, essentially a hierarchy of needs, for assessing the effectiveness of the characterization. Each author, through the adroit depiction of his religious hypocrite, effectively explicates hypocrisy and exhorts the reader to battle it in all of its manifestations.

THE ART OF INSINCERITY: A STUDY OF RELIGIOUS HYPOCRITES IN SELECTED NOVELS BY DICKENS, TROLLOPE, AND ELIOT

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of English

Emporia State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

---

by

Stan L. Swagerty

April 10, 1979

June O. Underwood

Approved for the Major Department

Harold E. Durst

Approved for the Graduate Council

PREFACE

During my first year of graduate school, I had the privilege of studying prose fiction of the Victorian era. In the course of this study, I discovered the origin of the values, attitudes, and excesses which are so much a part of my life today. Earnestness, conscientiousness, and a propensity to work excessively, the three pillars of my Victorian deportment, came to stand out in anachronistic relief. The origins of my inner bearing, seriousness and excessive attention to introspection, also became clear. The study of Victorian prose fiction provided unexpected self-discovery.

The most intriguing character that I met in my reading was the religious hypocrite. I was strongly attracted to him because one loathes the most in others what one loathes the most in himself. Despite the strength of this perverse attraction which the hypocrite has on the reader, surprisingly little has been done with him by the critics. Thus, I took it upon myself to focus on this overlooked, but by no means minor, character of Victorian fiction. I trust that my efforts at analysis of this character will prove

useful to others who might wish to explore further this as yet all but unmined literary lode.

This project provided me a marvelous opportunity to grow as a person and a writer and it also afforded me an occasion to attempt to exorcise a few of the more annoying Victorian demons which have plagued me from time to time. For such an opportunity I am indeed thankful.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. June Underwood whose ability to analyze and categorize my ideas proved invaluable. I thank Dr. Storm for his patience and expertise in helping me impart a bit more grace to my style. Dr. Jeremy Wild's quick wit and many helpful suggestions served me well during the more dreary stages of my work. I would like to thank Dr. William Cogswell for his expertise in using Tristram Shandy to help me solve a problem in Chapter One. Suffice to say that the encouragement and counsel of Dr. Gerrit Bleeker have not gone unnoticed or unappreciated. I thank my dear friend and colleague, Milton Siegele, for enriching my graduate experience immeasurably.

I would like to give especial thanks to my family for their unending moral support as I worked on my thesis. Last, I would like to thank my wife Sharen whose contributions of intellect, energy, and love made writing this thesis not only possible but actually a joy.

S. L. S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

> If we attempt to force our minds into a loving and devotional temper, without this preparation, it is too plain what will follow,--the grossness and coarseness, the affectation, the effeminacy, the unreality, the presumption, the hollowness, . . ., in a word, what Scripture calls the Hypocrisy, which we see around us; that state of mind in which the reason, seeing what we should be, and the conscience enjoining it, and the heart being unequal to it, some or other pretense is set, by way of compromise, that men may say, "Peace, peace, when there is no peace."
>
> John Henry Newman

I undertook this study in order to understand better a certain aspect of the human condition. I chose to analyze the fictive religious hypocrite in hopes of acquiring a deeper insight into religious hypocrisy and a better idea of how to overcome it. The authors included in this study depicted religious hypocrisy, through the characterization of the hypocrite, in a clear and effective manner, but they offered no means of overcoming of the condition.

The first chapter of this thesis provides a detailed analysis of the names of the hypocrites depicted in Dickens's novels The Pickwick Papers and Bleak House, Trollope's The Warden, Barchester Towers, and The Last Chronicle of Barset, and Eliot's Middlemarch. In each novel, the name is more than a symbol; it serves as a lens through which the reader

observes the words and deeds of the hypocrite. The author uses the name to insure that the reader will view the character as the author intends. The "name-as-lens" functions to establish the author's perspective.

The second chapter focuses this perspective on the cant of the religious hypocrite as manifested in the clergy and the laity. The analysis of the clergy's cant is restricted by the rhetoric of the sermon, and how the rhetoric is used hypocritically. Trollope's Mrs. Proudie and Eliot's Mr. Bulstrode represent the laity whose cant is discussed.

The final chapter discusses the purpose of Dickens, Trollope and Eliot in depicting the religious hypocrite. The initial purpose discussed is the hypocrite's ability to energize the story. He or she provides the novel with a Byronic energy and moves the story along. In addition, the authors use the religious hypocrite to warn the reader of the threat posed by hypocrisy. The chapter is concluded with the profferring of a system, essentially a hierarchy of needs, for assessing the effectiveness of the characterization. Each author, through the adroit characterization of his religious hypocrite, effectively explicates hypocrisy and exhorts the reader to battle it in all of its manifestations, but none of the authors gives instructions for warfare. They point out the condition masterfully but offer

no means for overcoming it. A contemporary of theirs, John Henry Newman, offers a method for overcoming religious hypocrisy, and answers the second part of my question:

> We cannot work ourselves up into such feelings; or, if we can, it is better we should not, because it is a working up, which is bad. Deep feeling is but the natural or necessary attendant on a holy heart. . . . We may meditate on Christ's sufferings; and by this meditation we shall gradually, as time goes on, be brought to the deep feelings.

Chapter 1

THE NAME-AS-LENS

Dickens, Trollope, and Eliot obviously relished the job of naming their literary characters. The names of their characters are richly imaginative, especially in their connotations. Some of these authors' most creative christenings were bestowed upon their religious hypocrites. These names were signs to the nineteenth century reader, and alerted him about the behavior to expect from the character. The practice of giving characters symbolic names was of course not new to the nineteenth century. It had been in vogue in English literature at least since the morality plays. More specifically, this characterization device owes its "inheritance [to] the old Religious Drama,--the Morality plays such as Everyman, in which the characters are not disguised in any way."[1]

The name of the religious hypocrite was created purposely. The author considered the name an important part

[1] Kentley Bromhill, "Names and Labels," Dickensian, 41 (1945), 92.

of the characterization and important to the achievement of his purpose in the depiction of the hypocrite. Two metaphors are useful in discussing why the choice of the name was important. First, as mentioned earlier, the name functioned as a sign or symbol with which to alert the reader to what kind of behavior to expect from the character. But the name was more than just a label; it was a lens through which the reader observed the words and deeds of the character. The author used the name to insure that the reader would view the character as the author intended. The name-as-lens serves to establish the author's perspective. Dickens, Trollope, and Eliot viewed the world differently so it follows that they would have ground their lens or chosen their names to depict their world view. In his naming process, each author displayed certain characteristics: Dickens elevates common language or colloquialisms to symbolic representation, Trollope makes use of classical and biblical allusions, and Eliot creates names through complex, associational constructs. These characteristics or tendencies are the means by which the authors attempt to establish the reader's perspective and accomplish their over-all purpose.

Critical commentary on any of the above authors' use of names is all but nonexistent. Bromhill, writing on Dickens, offers the following praise:

> This faculty of labeling the character with a fitting name is probably part of the secret of the hold Dickens's gallery of portraits has on all who read him with attention.[2]

Trollope is not nearly so fortunate at the hands of the critics:

> We have noticed before Trollope's deliberate selection, from time to time, of what Henry James deplored as "fantastic names." It has in the past been suggested that such fatal choices came from an attempt on Trollope's part to emulate Thackeray, although it seems to me far more likely that he was influenced by the Tudor and Jacobean playwrights, the reading of whose works had for some years provided his chief form of mental recreation. Even as late as Sheridan, writers for the English Stage often used a surname to illustrate trade or psychology--we have only to think of Lady Sneerwell in The School for Scandal. Trollope, however, dealt out some of these titles and his surnames with a hand of lead: Lord Grassangrains "that well-known breeder of bullocks," or Lord Gosling of Gosling Castle, whose family name is de Geese and whose eldest son bears the courtesy title of Lord Giblet.[3]

Hennessy and James fail to appreciate the satiric humor in names like Lord Grassangrains and Lord Giblet. Trollope's use of names, such as Mrs. Proudie and Rev. Slope, may appear insultingly simple to the reader, but when Trollope pits Mrs. Proudie against Rev. Crawley, an unexpected complexity suggested by the names emerges. Eliot's use of names is not even discussed by the critics. This critical neglect is inexplicable in view of the rich complexity of

[2] Bromhill, p. 93.

[3] James Pope-Hennessy, Anthony Trollope, pp. 337-8.

her names which she creates by compounding words. Her names are complex in the way that they create word associations which illuminate the psychology or morality of the character.

The names I shall first analyze will be taken from Dickens's novels, Pickwick Papers and Bleak House. An examination of the names of the religious hypocrites will follow as well as an analysis of the names of a few other characters who have a very pertinent relationship to characters. An analysis of Dickens's religious hypocrites will begin with the earliest examples, the two dissenting shepherds from The Pickwick Papers, Rev. Humm, and Mr. Stiggins. The rotund shepherd is Anthony Humm. There is a cantlike quality to his last name. "Humm" suggests the dull, monotonous whir of a machine. Humm is, in fact, described with mechanical imagery. He enters, "a'smilin' away like clockwork."[4] His display of ostentatious affection is, in truth, only a mechanical mask which he uses to obtain the favor of the flock. His smiling mask is just visual cant. This mechanical quality of Humm's is very important. To equate Humm's emotion with the mechanical face of a clock suggests that Humm is simply going through the motions of affection

[4] Charles Dickens, The Pickwick Papers, ed. Robert L. Patten, p. 380. All further references will appear in the text with the abbreviation PP.

mechanically. When it is the time of the day to be holy, Humm simply sets the hands on his clockwork face mechanically to give the emotion that his flock expects to see.

An excursion into the Oxford English Dictionary sheds even more light on the connotations of Humm. Two definitions seem especially enlightening. The first definition states the following: "To make a low inarticulate vocal sound; esp. to utter such a sound in expression of dissent or dissatisfaction . . ."[5] Humm's very name rebukes him through a quiet irony. It is as if Dickens hummed with dissatisfaction and dissent against Humm's hypocrisy. An example cited in the OED for the previous definition tells of an evangelical congregation which hummed to express their approval of the sermon. This practice of humming in approval would suggest that Humm is more interested in pleasing his audience in order to garner his hums here on earth, than he is in pleasing God. A second definition follows: "To make an inarticulate murmur in a pause of speaking, from hesitation, embarrassment, etc. Usually in phr. to hum and ha [haw]. . ."(OED). This definition and example further expands the connotations of Humm and also reinforces the reader's attitude towards him. Dickens is no doubt playing

[5] All definitions are taken from the Oxford English Dictionary unless specified otherwise. All further references will appear in the text with the abbreviation OED.

upon the audience's knowledge of the generally poor speaking ability of the dissenting clergyman. Humm's sermons are probably insubstantial, inconsequential humming and hawing rather than containing any real spiritual nourishment.

Rev. Humm's more infamous partner in cant and hypocrisy is Mr. Stiggins. The name "Stiggins" lends itself to numerous possibilities. Prig and Swig, two such possibilities, may appear a bit strained at first glance, but hopefully, upon examination of their applicability, the strain will be significantly diminished. The verb form of "prig" means to steal; Stiggins, as will be noted in more detail later, steals from Mrs. Weller. The implication is that he intends to replace Mr. Weller, and take over her estate. Stiggins is also interested in prigging the favors of the young women who seem so excessively fond of him. "One who cultivates or affects a propriety of culture learning or morals, which offends or bores others; a conceited or self-important and didactic person," (OED) is the definition of the noun form of the word "prig." Stiggins's apparent devotion to temperance (an extremely pointed observance in and of itself) and his other affectations of Christian morality make him a most irritating hypocrite. Swig, though, seems the most appropriate word cousin to Stiggins. To swig, according to the OED, is "To drink (esp. intoxicating liquor) in deep draughts; to drink eagerly or copiously." To indulge

in a "swig of whiskey" is one of the most common contexts of the word. Stiggins's alcoholism ironically underscores his exhortations to temperance.

The women of Reverend Stiggins's flock do not see him for the hypocrite that he is. This unfortunate state is reinforced by two words, "stigma" and "astigmatism," which the name Stiggins suggests. Stiggins's red nose is his stigma. It is the stain on his reputation, emblematic of his alcoholism. But apparently, the women of the flock see it only as a sign of a lingering cold. He lectures on the virtues of temperance while his red nose stigmatically mocks him and his female congregation. There is an astigmatic defect in the lens of their moral system resulting in a blurred and imperfect image of Stiggins. Their morally blurred vision distorts their understanding and they are unable to recognize Stiggins's alcoholic stigma for what it is.

Dickens continues the same complex set of associations in his later masterpieces. For example, in Bleak House, the most prominent religious hypocrite is Rev. Chadband. Many critics consider Chadband to be the finest depiction of the dissenting hypocrite. Certainly the name Chadband is one of the most evocative in Dickens's nomenclature. The name appears at first glance to be redundant. It is a compound word made up of "chad" or "shad" and "band." "Chad" would

suggest a school of fish, whereas "band" would suggest a group of one sort or another. Since "chad" suggests a group also, "band" would seem unnecessary; yet it must be remembered that band frequently connotes a group of religious people and possibly Dickens was trying to create the image of a band of religious fish as a way of satirically undercutting Chadband's pomposity.

Dickens may well have aimed at alerting his readers to still other connotations of the word. One of these refers to clothing articles with certain religious significance. "Chadband" might have suggested the word "shadbelly." Quakers frequently wore what were called "shadbelly" coats. This coat was "one which slopes gradually from the front to the tails, and has no angles. Drab coats of this shape are worn by Quakers, who are hence sometimes called "Shadbellies" (OED). Let me include here that "shadbelly" was used derisively to designate "a person having an abnormally thin or flat belly." The connotation is two-pronged in its effect on the reader. First, "shadbelly" elicits the image of the dissenter in the mind of the reader, and the dissenter, it should be remembered, caused an almost stock response of disdain from the audience. The second effect, the reference to Chadband's physique, is broad physical comedy which Dickens uses to deflate Chadband's vanity. Rev. Chadband, the bear-like gorging vessel, is anything but "shadbellied."

The second religious garment that the name represents is the clerical band. This banded collar is a sign which tells the people that its wearer is a member of the clergy. It is a sign of commitment to Christian principles and the church. Rather than have his Reverend Chadband wear the band, Dickens names him Band as a constant reminder that the reverend, by his cant and hypocrisy, disgraces his banded "calling."

Dickens creates a few other connotations with the word "band" that are equally rich and evocative. "Band" evoked the image of dissenting religious bands in many of his readers. There were a great many fanatical bands of dissenters about, and Dickens hoped to ridicule Chadband by equating him with them. For instance, General Booth, of the Salvation Army, established the Halleluiah Band of Reformed Drunkards and Wifebeaters.[6] Booth's sincerity is unquestioned, but one has to smile, as surely did Dickens's readers, at the comic christening Booth gave his band. However, Dickens's satirically comic connection of Chadband to the outrageous religious bands of the day was certainly intentional.

Three final connotations of "band" are suggested by three definitions which appear, coincidentally, in the OED,

[6] Geoffrey Best, Mid-Victorian Britain 1851-1875, p. 191.

one right after the other: "A moral, spiritual, or legal band of restraint or union," "The shackles of sin or vice . . .," "An obligation by which action is checked or restrained." Ironically, Chadband does not bind his group or band together in the traditional spiritual union described in the first definition. By obligating or joining his band, his followers so check, restrain, and narrow their potential to think for themselves that they invariably become shackled in sin. By joining the Reverend's band they abdicate their responsibility to make their own spiritual and moral judgments, and slip into the bands of sin by mindlessly believing his cant and unthinkingly following his example.

Other hypocrites in Bleak House include minor ones such as Mrs. Pardiggle and the Jellybys. The name Pardiggle is highly connotative. It sounds like "particle." If one has a particle of some substance in his eye, no matter how small it may be, it causes the eye to water and impairs the vision. This reading of the name is suggested by Jesus's admonition, "And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but not the beam in thine own" (Matt. 7:3). Mrs. Pardiggle takes great pleasure in pointing out the evils of gin to poor factory workers but is unable to see her own hypocrisy due to the beam or particle in her own life.

A woman of much the same cut as Mrs. Pardiggle is one Mrs. Jellyby. She is a religious hypocrite also given to

philanthropic work. In the OED the back-formation of "jelly" gives us "jell" which is defined, "To become a jelly; to congeal or jelly." The definition reveals the meaning of the name. Mrs. Jellyby refuses to jell into jelly. She would not "be jelly"; she would not accept her domestic duties. An example cited beneath the definition of "jell" is, "One of the gravest questions in the domestic economy, [is] whether the jelly will 'jell'" (OED). This example cited from the OED is taken from a magazine published in the 1870's, and though it takes a tongue-in-cheek attitude toward domestic duties Dickens certainly did not. Because Mrs. Jellyby would not jell into her position as wife and mother and assume fully her domestic duties, her family suffered. Her failure to "jell" is evidenced by her devotion to mission work instead of her family. The failure of her mission to the natives opens the door to proper domesticity, but refusing to "be jelly," she again closes the door and takes up the cause of the Rights of Women, continuing to ignore any of the rights of her family to her time.

Dickens's naming of the rest of the Jellyby family directly reflects upon Mrs. Jellyby's refusal to perform her domestic duties as a mother. Of Mrs. Jellyby's domestic failures Mr. Hayward says, "While she devoted her whole attention to the colonization of Borrisboola-Gha, on the Niger, her household got into utter confusion, her husband

became bankrupt and her children savages."[7] The obvious irony of his judgment is that while Mrs. Jellyby attempts to civilize the savages of Africa, her own children, as a result of her neglect, degenerate into savages. Their names symbolize and highlight different aspects of this sad domestic situation. Esther introduces us to Mrs. Jellyby's young boy, Peepy, by saying, "I made my way to the poor child, who was one of the dirtiest little unfortunates I saw, and found him very hot and frightened, and crying loudly, fixed by the head between two railings. . . ."[8] Mrs. Jellyby does not come to his rescue. A few minutes later he falls down a flight of stairs. When he shows her his injuries she just waves him away, her eyes on Africa. One interesting aspect concerning the name "Peepy" is that it is a nickname which he gave himself. Children rarely nickname themselves. That he did is not to go unnoticed. He nicknames himself "Peepy" in order to give his mother a signal of his distress.

Probably the most obvious application of the name "Jellyby" is to Mr. Jellyby. G. L. Brooks states,

> Sometimes it is only a part of a name that resembles a common English word, but the resemblance is enough to make the name significant . . . Although we sympathize

[7] Arthur Hayward, The Dickens Encyclopedia, p. 88.

[8] Charles Dickens, Bleak House, ed. Morton Dauwen Zabel, p. 27. All further references will appear in the text with the abbreviation BH.

> with Mr. Jellyby's sufferings, his spineless acquiescence makes his name appropriate.[9]

The common English word Mr. Brooks refers to is "jellyfish." The definition appropriate to Mr. Jellyby is, "A person of 'flabby' character, or deficient in energy, steadfastness, or 'backbone'" (OED). This discussion of Mr. Jellyby's "jellyfishness" as it relates to his flabby character may at first appear to be a matter of belaboring the obvious, but on further reflection a similarity emerges. Neither of the Jellyby parents has, speaking in terms of their parental duties, "jelled" yet. The name Jellyby is intended to tell the reader that both parents fail their nuclear family because they fail adequately to tend to their sex-linked roles and duties. Mrs. Jellyby will not, speaking in the figurative sense, make jelly for the family, and Mr. Jellyby will not keep his wife in line and control the money. Dickens then uses the name "Jellyby" to reflect the failure of Mr. and Mrs. Jellyby properly to assume what he believes their family roles to be.

The most sympathetic sufferer in the Jellyby family is Caddy. Caddy was christened "Caroline," which is "A name of coins of various countries . . ." (OED). The name Caroline then signified that Mrs. Jellyby's daughter was considered something of great value. Throughout the novel,

[9] G. L. Brook, The Language of Dickens, p. 215.

though, Caroline is referred to as "Caddy." This nickname is significant in many ways. The first definition of "Caddy" which is of particular importance is, "A lad or man who waits about on the lookout for chance employment as a messenger, errand boy, errand porter, chairman, or odd-job-man, etc." (OED). By nicknaming the girl "Caddy" Dickens points out that she, because of her mother's neglect and missionary work, has been reduced from a "Caroline" or something of great value, to a mere "Caddy," an assistant or errand porter. Mrs. Jellyby's neglect and philanthropic hypocrisy, exemplified by Caddy's ink-stained face and tattered clothes, illustrates graphically how Caroline has become tarnished and devalued to the state of "caddiness."

With names such as Stiggins, Chadband, and Jellyby, Dickens repeatedly demonstrates the tendency to create names by elevating common language or colloquialism to symbolic representation. The perspective of the hypocrite which he establishes through the name-as-lens device is designed to be easily accessible to the common reader. Trollope, on the other hand, restricts the accessibility of his names-as-lens by his use of classical and biblical allusions. Dickens's names are intended for the man on the street whereas Trollope writes for the traditionally educated gentleman reader. The names that I shall analyze will be taken from Trollope's clerical novels, The Warden, Barchester Towers, and The Last

Chronicle of Barset. Most of this analysis will be devoted to an examination of the names of the religious hypocrites, but I shall also analyze the names of a few other characters who have a very pertinent relationship to hypocrites. Trollope's allusions are not only broad and suggestive as one might generally expect, but he also takes numerous details from the classical or biblical personage and insinuates similar details into the actions of the corresponding character in his novel. The gentleman reader of the nineteenth century may well have grasped Trollope's classical or biblical allusions, but the common reader of the nineteenth century and most twentieth century readers probably would not. In this section on Trollope I shall endeavor to elucidate the more obscure allusions and offer interpretations of other pertinent names which are not allusions.

The Rev. Septimus Harding is in the center of controversy in both The Warden and Barchester Towers. Rev. Harding is included in this analysis of the names of religious hypocrites because he is accused of hypocrisy. But his hypocrisy is only apparent, not real. When one looks at him through the lens of his name his innocence comes into focus. Rev. Harding, or the Warden, must endure considerable tribulation during what should have ideally been his tranquil twilight years. Rev. Harding is Trollope's ideal Christian and also one of his favorite creations.

A Classical Dictionary lists three Septimuses, the first two of which show many similarities to Trollope's Septimus:

> SEPTIMIUS I, or TITUS SEPTIMIUS, a Roman knight, intimate with Horace, and to whom the latter addressed one of his Odes (2,6). He appears, from the words of Horace on another occasion (Epist., 1,3,9,seqq.), to have been a votary of the Muses; and, according to one of the scholiasts, he composed lyric pieces and tragedies. None of his productions have reached us.--II. Aulus Septimius Severus, a Roman poet, who flourished under Vespasian. He was highly esteemed for his lyric talents, but none of his pieces have reached us.[10]

Septimus's artistic kinship to his two classical predecessors is similar in that he, like them, is a lover of the song. They, of course, were composers or poets while he only published a collection of songs. More specifically, he published ". . . a collection of ancient church music, with some correct dissertations on Purcell, Crotch, and Nares."[11] The basic similarity in their love of lyric verse and song is significant. Septimius I also composed tragedies. It is interesting to note that Trollope's Septimus also composes tragic songs. They are the songs which he plays on his imaginary violoncello as his life is filled with more and more tribulation. Septimus's life further echoes back to Septimius's tragedies because his life is to a certain

[10] Charles Anthon, A Classical Dictionary, p. 1214.

[11] Anthony Trollope, The Warden, p. 4.

degree, tragic. His later years are trying and frustrating, not owing to anything he has done, but simply because he is the victim of circumstances. Because he is in the wrong place at the wrong time, he is batted back and forth between the church and the newspapers. The final similarity between Septimus Harding and Septimius I and II is that none of the works of the two classical poets has reached us. Likewise, Septimus's book of ancient church music will surely be lost in time. From this we could infer that Trollope pessimistically doubts if we will learn the lesson of Septimus Harding's tragic situation. Gentle, lamblike men like Septimus will continue to be sacrificed willingly in order to misdirect investigations by the media.

The primary action of Dean Trefoil in Barchester Towers is to die. His name points up the purpose of his death. He is a "foil" in the traditional literary sense. His death functions as a foil in that it mirrors the true motives and priorities of those around him. It so happens that the Archdeacon and Rev. Slope are both much more concerned with who would be appointed to the soon-to-be-open position than with the Dean's final days. The reader is not so surprised at Rev. Slope's maneuverings to capture the deanery, but it is disconcerting that the Archdeacon and his camp would be demonstrating the same set of hypocritical priorities. When the Dean first becomes seriously ill, the

Archdeacon's camp gathers at the deanery. The concern for the Dean takes second place to their speculations on who will replace him. The dean's critical illness reflects their shallow concern and insincerity.

> "He was indeed," said a minor canon; "and a great blessing to all those privileged to take a share of the services of our cathedral. I suppose the government will appoint Mr. Archdeacon. I trust we may have no stranger."
>
> "We will not talk about his successor," said the archdeacon, "while there is yet hope."
>
> "Oh, no, of course not," said the minor canon. "It would be exceedingly indecorous? But--"[12]

The Dean's illness reflects a sad state in the clergy. Their only concern is to present the proper decorum of emotion as they speculate about who will capture the deanery.

"Trefoil," in the deathbed context, suggests the word "travail," and two definitions of the word are particularly applicable here. The first meaning is, "The bodily or mental labor or toil, especially of a painful or oppressive nature." The second is, "The labor and pain of childbirth" (OED). At Trefoil's illness and death his high church brethren should prayerfully experience the "travails" of sickness and death with him; however, they do not.

[12] Anthony Trollope, Barchester Towers, p. 228. All further references will appear in the text with the abbreviation BT.

The second definition is especially appropriate. The pain and labor of entering life is very similar to the travail or pain and labor of leaving life. Yet, his brethren fail to support him in his illness or truly to share in his travail. Trefoil, then, acts as a mirror, or foil, to reflect the hypocrisy of those clergymen connected to his death, and sadly must experience the travail of dying without the support of his brethren.

Rev. Slope, unlike his high church brethren, lacks even decorum in the face of Trefoil's death. Slope immediately sends off letters, to curry the favor of important people who have influence in filling the position which will be open. Slope is the most blatant religious hypocrite in BT, and Trollope gives him a name which richly expresses his character. His full name is Obadiah Slope. "Obadiah" alludes to the biblical prophet who wrote the book Obadiah found in the Old Testament. The occasion and summary of the book Obadiah shows how it relates to Trollope's Obadiah:

> The occasion of the prophecy is the expulsion of the Edomites from their land, which the prophet sees as a divine judgment on that nation for its cruelties toward Israel.
>
> The first main division (vss. 1-14) deals with Edom's judgment and the moral reasons therefor. The twofold title (vs. 1a) gives the prophet's name, his inspiration, and the chief subject, Edom. An alliance of surrounding nations is being roused to wage war on Edom (vs. 1b). God's purpose is to humble the Edomites' pride and to rout them out from their supposedly impregnable mountain fortresses (vss. 2-4). The treasures of Edom have been completely ransacked (vss. 5-6). The conquest and

> expulsion of Edom is the work of her former allies (vs. 7). Edom's vaunted shrewdness will be confounded (vs. 8). Her warriors will be dismayed and, as a result, the nation will be cut off (vs. 9). The reason for these judgments, past and future, is Edom's cruelty to the brother nation, Israel (vs. 10).[13]

Rev. Slope's surname then is used by Trollope to foreshadow, or prophesy, the Reverend's life and fate in Barchester. Mr. Slope is an Edomite. An alliance of nations (the high church and Mrs. Proudie) humbles him, and deposes him from the impregnable mountain fortress or the Bishop's Palace. Slope's shrewdness will be confounded and he will be exiled from the land of Barchester. The ancient prophecy of Obadiah very tidily corresponds to the fate of Trollope's Obadiah.

"Slope" is more easily accessible in its connotations of the behavior of the character. Let us examine a few definitions that appear most applicable to the character. "Slope," when used as a transitive verb, means, "To bring into, to place or put in, a sloping or slanting position; to direct downwards or obliquely" (OED). Mr. Slope certainly acts like the transitive verb of his namesake. He works continually at converting the people of Barchester to his low church ways. Lee presents Slope the Low Churchman in the following light: "The Reverend Obadiah Slope demon-

[13] The Interpreter's Bible, ed. George Buttrick et. al., Vol. 6, p. 857.

strates all the undesirable qualities of the Low Church Clergymen. Slope constitutes Trollope's complete picture of all that a clergyman and a gentleman should not be. . . ."[14] Slope, as the worst of the Low Church Clergymen, is dedicated to slanting the minds of Barchester churchgoers down the slope until they conform with his Low Church mindset. The definition cited previously is stated in even a more specific and revealing way: "To bring [a weapon] into, or hold [it] in, a sloping position" (OED). The "sloping position" is the one where the weapon is in the position ready for the fight. Mr. Slope's predisposition for fighting gives the "sloping position" a special significance. Another negative connotation of Slope is found in the definition, "To leave [lodgings] without paying." This definition is amplified, "In the sense of 'cheat, trick,' 'slope' is recorded in dialect from 1828 onwards" (OED). Rev. Slope is indeed a deceitful man, and interestingly leaves his lodgings or palace without paying any real price. At least he does not pay enough in terms of humiliation and contrition to satisfy the need of the reader. Trollope's name "Obadiah Slope" cleverly suggests the actions and personality of the character.

[14] James Lee, "Trollope's Clerical Concerns: The Low Church Clergymen," Hartford Studies in Literature, 1 (1969), 202-3.

Trollope makes further use of names with reference to Mr. Slope by alluding to literary characters who show similarities to Slope. In Barchester Towers, Slope tries to garner the good graces of the wealthy widow Eleanor Bold by offering her father, Mr. Harding, the position of warden at Hiram's Hospital. Archdeacon Grantly sees through Rev. Slope's benevolence and responds strongly, "The sly tartufe! [sic] He thinks to buy the daughter by providing for the father. He means to show how powerful he is, how good he is, and how much he is willing to do for her. . ." (BT, p. 158). Tartuffe refers to Moliere's comic play of the same name. The play is a satire on religious hypocrisy. Tartuffe is the paragon of false piety and to label Slope thus is extremely effective. An interesting parallel between Tartuffe and Slope, which will be examined in more detail later, is their unseemly interest in women and their mysterious ability to influence them. A good deal of the Archdeacon's ire in the above incident is owing to his jealousy over Slope's apparent sex-linked power over his sister-in-law Eleanor.

Trollope's introduction of Slope to the reader also contains a literary allusion, but the tone is even more sarcastic than the Archdeacon's. Trollope's introduction follows:

> Of the Rev. Mr. Slope's parentage I am not able to say much. I have heard it asserted that he is lineally

> descended from that eminent physician who assisted at the birth of Mr. T. Shandy, and that in early years he added an 'e' to his name, for the sake of euphony, as other great men have done before him. If this be so, I presume he was christened Obadiah, for that is his name, in commemoration of the conflict in which his ancestor so distinguished himself. All my researches on the subject have, however, failed in enabling me to fix the date on which the family changed its religion. (BT, p. 25)

The general context of the allusion is to Sterne's Tristram Shandy. The "eminent physician who assisted at the birth of Mr. T. Shandy" is a male midwife named Dr. Slop, so named because of the quality of his medical work. Even though he has written a book on midwifery, he managed to flatten permanently Tristram's nose with his forceps. Rev. Slope, who "added the 'e' to his name for the sake of euphony" plies his clerical trade with equally sloppy dexterity. Obadiah is the adversary of Dr. Slop in Tristram Shandy. Obadiah ties up Dr. Slop's medical tools in a multitude of taut, intricate knots. The knots are tied in such a way as to suggest the knotty confinement that the Catholic church imposes on its members. Slope lives up to his literary namesake by creating a good deal of knotty religious controversies in Barchester. Trollope completes his undercutting of Slope by suggesting that his ancestor Dr. Slop had switched from the Catholic church to the Anglican. To accuse Rev. Slope of having Catholics in his closet was probably the unkindest cut Trollope could summon in his introduction of Slope to his readers. Trollope's use of literary allusions

to expand upon the implications of the name "Slope" very strongly undercuts his character, (possibly even more so than he had intended).

Mrs. Proudie's name clearly captures her personality: "Having or cherishing a high or lofty opinion of oneself; valuing oneself highly on account of one's position, attainments, possessions, etc. Usually in a bad sense" (OED). Mrs. Proudie is proud of herself for being the "true bishop," as well as for being well-to-do. Trollope's Mrs. Proudie is also "Disposed to take an attitude of superiority to and contempt for others" (OED). She is also, in total accordance with her name, arrogant and haughty.

The Rev. Josiah Crawley is the target of Mrs. Proudie's prideful contempt. She is convinced of his guilt and devotes herself full time to securing his conviction and humiliation. There is a powerful chemistry between the two characters which is partly created by their names. But before I analyze this reaction, let me begin by explicating the biblical allusion of Crawley's surname. The surname "Josiah" alludes to the King Josiah recounted in Second Kings and Second Chronicles of the Old Testament. "The two accounts of his reign are focused almost exclusively on the great religious reformation which he inaugurated."[15]

[15] New Bible Dictionary, ed. James D. Douglas, p. 664.

Trollope was, of course, in favor of changing the lot of the impoverished curate; therefore, it is extremely ironic that the king of Hogglestock inaugurates no reformation within the church at all. Trollope rescues Mr. Crawley at the end of the novel. He puts him into a more prosperous parish, but the fact remains that another poor clergyman must go forth and languish in poverty as did Crawley in the parish of Hogglestock. Though Trollope's Josiah affects no religious reformation in the novel, the author may have hoped to influence church reform by dramatizing his character's plight and thereby letting his fictive Josiah bring about religious reform in the real world.

But what of Josiah's Christian name? What of the name Crawley? "Crawl" is suggestive of the state to which Crawley has been reduced. His life has been one of poverty and humiliation. Now he is accused of common theft, and brought lower still. The charge is his cross to bear. It is his ultimate humiliation. But he doesn't bear his humiliation silently. He does not suffer in Job-like quietude. His lowly state does not bring about spiritual growth through humbling but rather fans the fire of his pride. Crawley takes pride in his "crawling." He is ostentatious about his poverty and humiliation. He is like Franz Kafka's hunger artist who takes fasting, an act intended to humble the flesh and strengthen the spirit, and

perverts it to a means of feeding his pride. In much the same way, Crawley proudly displays the shame of his poverty, the humiliation of his persecution. Crawley takes great pride in his shame.

It is then from the juxtaposition of the two characters that the novel draws its strength and energy. We are drawn to Mrs. Proudie and Mr. Crawley because of our fascination with "the Great sin." C. S. Lewis, in his work Mere Christianity, tells us that, "According to Christian teachers, the essential vice, the utmost evil, is Pride. Unchastity, anger, greed, drunkenness, and all that, are mere fleabites in comparison: it was through Pride that the devil became the devil."[16] Our involvement with Mrs. Proudie and Mr. Crawley is maximized because of our attitude toward pride. We hate pride and become alternately furious with both characters. Lewis says of this common attitude toward pride: "There is one vice of which no man in the world is free; which every one in the world loathes when he sees it in someone else; . . . I have very seldom met anyone . . . who showed the slightest mercy to it in others."[17] In view of this strong repugnance we have for pride, it comes as no surprise that we should become intensely involved with

[16] Clive S. Lewis, Mere Christianity, p. 109.

[17] Lewis, pp. 108-9.

Proudie and Crawley. Trollope has his audience reacting naturally to that most despised vice in which we all share to some extent. The names Proudie and Crawley are simply the labels of the two sides of the coin of pride. The names designate pride and shame. Their form is different but their substance the same. Mrs. Proudie reigns as queen in her palace of pride whereas Mr. Crawley, garbed ostentatiously in his false mortification, reigns as king of Hogglestock, the palace of shame.

Both Mrs. Proudie and Mr. Crawley are dedicated to maintaining their holds on their places of residence, both of which symbolize the same vice. Mrs. Proudie takes great pride in her Palace. She considers the palace a symbol of her wealth and rank, but it more accurately symbolizes her pride. The irony of her Palace is that she considers it a well-earned reward bestowed upon her by God. She fails to realize the grace of the gift and claims it pridefully by her supposed merit. Simply to live in the Palace is not enough for her. She is determined to control it. She controls the Palace for a time, but the fall requires her death. Trollope must have thought that her death was the only means of removing her from the Palace, the source and symbol of her pride.

The source and symbol of Mr. Crawley's brand of pride, shame, is the parish of Hogglestock. The name most

immediately suggests the word "stocks." The stocks were, of course, a device intended to humiliate publicly. The offender or sinner was placed in the stocks usually in the town square, for all to see, where he was mocked and mortified by the crowd. Mr. Crawley pridefully relishes the ostentatious stocks of his poverty. "Hoggle," the first part of the word Hogglestock, suggests "hobble." Crawley is indeed spiritually "hobbled" or bound by the shame of Hogglestock. Crawley's spiritual growth is stunted because he is hobbled by his pride. The poverty of his parish and the persecution brought on by the alleged theft are intended to produce a time of tribulation for him. According to basic Christian principles, it is only through tribulation that a Christian can grow; but Crawley refuses to bear his lowly Hogglestockian state. He will not wash his face, put on a smile, and secretly assume his fast. He instead poses pridefully in his shame, rails madly at his fate, and refuses to grow. It is only after Trollope removes Crawley from Hogglestock, the impoverished parish that nurtures Crawley's pride, and places him in the less austere parish of St. Ewold's, that the reader can hope for spiritual growth in Crawley.

To conclude the analysis of Trollopian names, I would like to discuss briefly the name of Rev. Caleb Thumble. Rev. Thumble is "A humble and obsequious pensioner in the train

of Mrs. Proudie, to whom she planned to give the living at Hogglestock when Mr. Crawley was ejected."[18] Thumble is a pitiful little man, driven by clerical poverty, who is a tool of Mrs. Proudie's pride as she carries on her war against Mr. Crawley. Thumble's poverty was his motivator. His poverty must have been indeed severe for him to consider the parish at Hogglestock a prize worth pursuing. His surname, "Caleb," signifies his station in life and the nature of his service to Mrs. Proudie. The name Caleb is from the Hebrew and means dog.[19] Caleb Thumble ". . . who existed on chance clerical crumbs as might fall from the table of the Bishop's patronage . . ."[20] is reduced metaphorically by Trollope to the status of the dog who begs at his master's (or mistress's in this case) table. "Caleb" also alludes to the biblical Caleb, who was

> . . . according to later tradition, the son of Jephonne of the tribe of Juda, one of the twelve scouts sent to reconnoiter the land of Chanaan . . . and the only one who was not a defeatist . . . and who, therefore, was allowed to enter the Promised Land with Jesue . . .[21]

"Caleb" then also alludes to "spy," but we are to think of spy only in its worst sense. Caleb is a spy of the enemy,

[19] A. van den Born, Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible, trans. Louis F. Hartman, 2nd ed., p. 299.

[20] Gerould, p. 232.

[21] van den Born, p. 299.

endeavoring to undermine Crawley. Hogglestock, ironically, is the Promised Land or Chanaan, which he reconnoiters. Mrs. Proudie promises him the Hogglestock parish if Crawley is defeated. Hogglestock, though, does not flow with milk and honey. It flows with the red, muddy water of the brick-makers and cheap gin to kill the pain of the poverty there. But apparently Caleb is so impoverished that even Hogglestock looks delusively like Chanaan. Trollope takes the biblical allusion and ironically reverses it at every turn.

The Rev. Thumble ". . . was a humble, mild-voiced man when within the palace precincts."[22] Thumble suggests even more readily than the biblical allusion, the picture of a humble man. The Rev. Thumble is a humble man whenever it is to his advantage. When he is around Mrs. Proudie or Dr. Tempest, he is the very picture of Christian humility; but when he journeys to Hogglestock to take over Crawley's church, he puffs himself full of pride and attempts to ride roughshod over the impoverished and downtrodden Crawley. One aspect of "Thumble," then, is how Trollope uses the name to suggest a canting, or, if you will, chameleon-like humility.

Finally, Rev. Thumble's name suggests thumb. He acts as Mrs. Proudie's thumb. Through him she applies pressure

[22] Gerould, p. 232.

to Mr. Crawley. Rev. Thumble's ironic lack of humility and "thumbness" are both illustrated in his first meeting with Crawley. Thumble goes to Hogglestock filled with the palatial pride of Mrs. Proudie and attempts to dominate Crawley. Crawley thwarts Thumble on every point, completely overpowers Thumble's pride with his own shameful version of the same vice. Thumble's failure to humble Crawley stirs him to even greater pride and he demands that Crawley give him his "innings." But Crawley is not playing cricket and says "Shall a man have nothing of his own; . . . [that] the bishop may touch it with his thumb?"[23] Crawley punningly pricks Thumble's pride to which Thumble rejoins, "I am not the bishop's thumb . . ." (LCB, p. 107). Strictly speaking he was not the bishop's thumb, but rather, Mrs. Proudie's. Names such as Septimus, Slope, Josiah, and Caleb illustrate Trollope's adept borrowings from classical, biblical, and literary sources. Unlike Dickens, Trollope's names-as-lens requires a certain sophistication on the part of the reader in order to view the character in the focus or perspective the author intended. Trollope further complicates the use of the lens by juxtaposing the names of Mrs. Proudie and Rev. Crawley, which combine to produce a unified picture of conflict created by pride and shame.

[23] Anthony Trollope, The Last Chronicle of Borset, ed. Arthur Mizener, p. 106. All further references will appear in the text with the abbreviation LCB.

Eliot practices naming tendencies which resemble both Dickens and Trollope's. The obvious simplicity of Farebrother is very much in keeping with Dickens, and the biblical antecedent of Peter Featherstone illustrates a favorite practice of Trollope. Eliot, though, goes beyond these two practices by creating complex word associational constructs. In addition, her names give simple biblical allusions complex ironic turns. Her names-as-lens can be viewed profitably (albeit to varying degrees) by all readers. It should be emphasized, though, that her lenses favor the more sophisticated reader who is willing to focus in as much of the complex picture as his energy and ability will allow.

As with Dickens and Trollope, I have tried to restrict the names which I shall analyze to those most closely related to religious hypocrisy. In the case of Eliot I am restricting myself to characters in the novel Middlemarch. The names I shall analyze are Rev. Cadwallader, Casaubon, Rev. Thesiger, Rev. Tyke, Rev. Farebrother, Peter Featherstone, Joshua Rigg, and Bulstrode. I chose the first five names because all of the characters are clergymen and their respective names provide a clear picture of the nature of their clerical career. Featherstone and Rigg will be analyzed because of their close relationship to the religious hypocrite Bulstrode, and because Eliot uses Featherstone and Rigg in an ironic reversal of a number of traditional Christian names and symbols.

The Rev. Cadwallader playfully refers to himself as the "angling incumbent" due to his excessive fondness for fishing the trout streams. His fishing tackle, rather than the holy books, seem to dominate his study. Rev. Cadwallader is a rural clergyman of the leisure class. He is a fisher of trout, not of men. It is certainly to his credit that he is spiritually unpretentious, but at the same time to his great discredit that he is spiritually complacent. The fishing tackle which dominates his study indicates that his priorities are reversed. He casts for trout rather than men's souls, and in so doing, ignores his call and the great commission. Despite his spiritual complacency Eliot persists in depicting him with evenhandedness. She does not openly criticize his complacency as Dickens would have. The name "Cadwallader" is criticism enough. The name suggests the words, "cad," "wallow," "wall," and "ladder." The words suggested are not sympathetic. A "cad" is "a fellow of low vulgar manners or behavior. An offensive and insulting appellation" (OED). The "Cad" in "Cadwallader," at its most merciful, indicates the Reverend had not progressed or aspired beyond the rungs of the lower spiritual ladder. To "wallow" is "to roll about, or lie prostrate and relaxed in or upon some liquid, viscous or yielding substance (e.g. mire, dust, blood, water, or sand)" (OED). The noun "wallow" is "A mud hole or dust hole formed by the wallowing of a

buffalo . . ." (OED). Cadwallader then, as suggested by his name, relaxes complacently in the cool shallow mud of his wallow. The shallow mud corresponds to his shallow spirituality. The wallow itself symbolizes his conscience, which was "large and easy, like the rest of him: it did only what it could do without any trouble."[24] The last two words suggested by his name are "wall" and "ladder." The Reverend insulates himself or "walls" himself in with his complacency. The mortar which cements the wall is the complacent tradition of the Church of England that encourages the perpetuation of idly rich clergymen like Cadwallader. Eliot then suggests four words with his name which pose the problem and solution to this clergyman's spiritual state. In order for this "cad" to leave the wallow of complacency, he must climb the ladder over the wall of clerical tradition. If he does not, he will continue to be a fisher of trout rather than a fisher of men.

Rev. Casaubon, Eliot's scholar-clergyman, is the next name to be analyzed. Unlocking the meaning of Casaubon's name is only slightly less difficult and elusive than his search for the Key to All Mythologies. "Casaubon," unlike so many of the other names I have analyzed, does not readily

[24] George Eliot, Middlemarch, ed. Gordon S. Haight, p. 53. All further references will appear in the text with the abbreviation Mm.

reveal its meaning. I would like to proffer three different speculations on the meaning of his name which may be convincing in and of themselves and perhaps stimulate further ideas concerning alternative readings of the name. "Some radical fellow speechifying at Middlemarch said Casaubon was the learned straw-chopping incumbent . . . ." (Mm, p. 52). The radical speechifier who describes Casaubon as the "straw chopping incumbent" is very close to the mark. Casaubon has spent his entire adult life engaged in intellectual straw-chopping. His scholarly search for the key to all mythologies is no more than scholarly flailing or chopping at an insubstantial straw-like substance. His work lacks both direction, substance, and conclusions. His scholarly endeavors are only a hypocritical pretense. His straw-chopping or researching accomplishes nothing; it serves only to provide a facade of intelligence and importance to Casaubon's vanity. The word "sauba," suggested by the middle of "Casaubon," is in keeping with the straw-chopping metaphor. A sauba is, "The leaf cutting art of tropical South America" (OED). Sauba's work together in building ". . . Large mounds of earth, . . . forty yards in circumference . . ." (OED). Saubas chop straw much like Casaubon but at least their work provides sustenance for their kind; whereas, Casaubon's work provides no nourishment. The comparison to the sauba ant is applicable in other ways also. The labyrinths which exist

in the ant hills correspond to Casaubon's fruitless diggings in the labyrinthine catacombs of scholarship. He, like the ants, toils endlessly in dust. Casaubon hopes to attain scholarly immortality with the publication of his Key to All Mythologies. He hopes to rise above the rest of the scholar-ants and be king of the hill; however he will never rise above the rank-and-file scholars who are also reduced to insignificance by the huge mountains of scholarship to which they contribute. Casaubon never rises above his fellow scholar-saubas and dies futilely chopping straw.

The second interpretation of the name "Casaubon" relates more directly to The Key to All Mythologies. It is almost as if Eliot created a word puzzle of the name and challenged the reader to discover it. The name can be broken down into three parts: "ca," "saw," and "bon." Parts two and three obviously suggest "see" and "good," "bon" being "The French word for 'good'" (OED). The key to unlocking the meaning of the word is "ca." Harper's Dictionary of Hinduism provides the following clue: "The Sanskrit interrogative pronoun 'who,' frequently used as an allusion to the nameless source of universal power, . . ."[25] If Casaubon could find out who the "Ka" was in ancient mythology, he might well have found the key; but of course the

[25] Margaret and James Stutley, Harper's Dictionary of Hinduism, p. 132.

"Ka" was unattainable, and Casaubon would never find the key to all mythologies. Allow me to piece the three parts of the word puzzle "Casaubon" together. Casaubon could not "see" or find the "good" (bon) "key" (ka). The good key, or the key to all mystery and mythology for a Christian (and Casaubon is a Christian clergyman), is Christ. Casaubon, though, never finds the key because he isn't really looking for it. He is looking for the key to glory here on earth, not the key to spiritual fulfillment in the Christian afterlife.

The third interpretation of the name "Casaubon" is suggested by the word "kosa." Kosa is "Sanskrit for Sheath. One of the envelopes of the soul or self, concealing its real nature, which is pure consciousness."[26] The three sheaths are pleasure, intellect, and food. Casaubon sheathes his life totally in the intellect and by so doing, stunts his growth in other important areas, particularly the social and spiritual. His sheath of intellect is more a hypocritical pretense than a true compulsion to pursue objects of the mind. He constantly wears the sheath or kosa to remind people of the scholarly image of himself which he so desperately tries to perpetuate. His death is probably hastened when Casaubon realizes that Dorothea

[26] Dictionary of Mysticism, ed. Frank Gaynor, p. 95.

peers through his intellectual sheath and sees his presumptuous research for the straw-chopping that it really is. It is only toward the end when he realizes his sauba or ant-like insignificance that he approaches the key to all mythologies.

An analysis of the name "Thesiger" proves almost as difficult as Casaubon, and because of the unusual quality of the name, I can at best only speculate on its applicability to the character. I do believe, though, that my interpretation will be of interest. Rev. Thesiger is a moderate evangelical. He chairs "a meeting which was to be held in the Town-Hall on a sanitary question which had risen into pressing importance by the occurrence of a cholera case in the town" (Mm, p. 532). It is at this meeting on the sanitary question that Bulstrode is publicly humiliated for his alleged duplicity in the death of Raffles. First, the outspoken Mrs. Hawley repudiates Bulstrode's "canting, palavering Christianity" (Mm, p. 534). Mr. Thesiger concurs with Mr. Hawley and then says to Bulstrode, "I recommend you at present, as your clergyman, and one who hopes for your reinstatement in respect, to quit the room, and avoid further hinderance to business" (Mm, p. 535). Rev. Thesiger is obviously contradicting himself. He can hardly concur with Hawley one minute and truly wish for Bulstrode's reinstatement of respect the next. He enjoys Bulstrode's moment of

humiliation as much as Hawley and the rest of the men there. Rev. Thesiger completes Bulstrode's humiliation by first cantingly wishing him well, and then by banning him from the sanitary meeting. I have recounted the Thesiger-Bulstrode scene in order to pave the way for my interpretation of his name. "Sig" means "urine" (OED), or "To steep in or sprinkle with urine" (OED). Certainly one of the most terrible humiliations is for a man to be urinated on by his enemy. "The-sig-er" then is the one who urinates on someone in order to shame or humiliate him. This interpretation of "Thesiger" is supported by the ironic context. "Thesiger" "sigs" on Bulstrode at the sanitary meeting. Bulstrode enters the sanitary meeting morally unclean. The occasion offered him an excellent opportunity for confession and cleansing. When accused of wrongdoing by Hawley, Bulstrode refuses to confess, and Rev. Thesiger steeps him in even further filth and humiliation as he haughtily casts Bulstrode from the sanitary proceedings.

To conclude the section on the meaning of names of clergymen in Middlemarch, I shall briefly discuss Rev. Farebrother and Rev. Tyke. Rev. Farebrother is too obvious for any formal analysis. He is, as his name implies, a fair and equitable Christian brother. An example in which he is more than fair is when he chooses not to court Mary Garth (he could probably have succeeded) and helps Fred Vincy to

secure her hand. Rev. Farebrother's virtues are highlighted throughout the novel by his clerical competition with Rev. Tyke. Tyke is the negative embodiment of Farebrother. "Nobody had anything to say against Tyke, except that they would not bear him, and suspected him of cant" (Mm, p. 133). The name Tyke strongly underscores the contempt which we feel for this character. "Tyke" is "Applied approbriously to a man: A lowbred, lazy, mean, surly, or ill-mannered fellow; a boor" (OED). The Rev. Tyke, in keeping with his name, qualifies as a "tyke" on all the above counts. "Tyke" also refers to "[a] dog; usually in deprecation or contempt, a low-bred or coarse dog, a cur, a mongrel" (OED). Eliot uses "Tyke," as I have just shown, also to connote a dog, a cur at that, in order to illuminate further Rev. Tyke's true nature and further demonstrate Rev. Farebrother's outstanding Christian character by comparison.

An analysis of the names Peter Featherstone and Joshua Rigg may not seem completely pertinent to the analysis of the name of religious hypocrites and their closest associates, but it is in Featherstone and Rigg's close association to the hypocrite Bulstrode that we find our rationale for including them in this discussion. Their association with Bulstrode will be demonstrated in the course of this analysis of their names. Eliot's use of the names "Featherstone" and "Rigg" is particularly interesting because of the part they play in the ironic reversal of a number of Christian names and

symbols. Peter Featherstone of Stone Court will open our analysis. "Peter," the "stone" in "Featherstone," and the "stone" in "Stone Court" all allude to the biblical Peter of the New Testament, and his nickname. "Jesus gave him the epithet of the rock."[27] A more accurate translation of the epithet is said to be "stone."[28] Eliot's Peter alludes to the biblical Peter, but he is not the rock on which a spiritual kingdom will be built. He is a rock or stone in the "Featherstone" sense. The juxtaposition of "feather" with "stone" completely undercuts the strength and longevity traditionally associated with the symbol "stone." The feather symbolizes the frailty of men and was traditionally used as a final test to see if a man had died. Peter "Featherstone" is an ironic reversal of the strength and immortality of "the rock" in the New Testament. Stone Court alludes to the kingdom of Heaven, yet Featherstone is not building a heavenly kingdom. All of his hopes are tied up in an earthly promised land. He even exhorts Fred Vincy on the importance of owning land. His kingdom, Stone Court, as his name Featherstone suggests, will not be his forever. He will die and the land will pass out of his control. Stone Court,

[27] van den Born, Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible, p. 1819.

[28] van den Born, p. 1819.

hand clasping the keys, and his left hand lying on the heaps of notes and gold" (Mm, p. 335).

Featherstone tries to extend his control of Stone Court by bequeathing the keys to the kingdom to his relative Joshua Rigg. "Joshua" alludes to the Old Testament Joshua. Joshua and Caleb ". . . are the only . . . spies to receive a portion of the promised land."[29] Joshua Rigg like his biblical counterpart receives the promised land. The promised land meant salvation to the Jews but to Rigg, Stone Court means spiritual death. Fortunately for him, he immediately sells Stone Court and thereby saves himself. We presume he takes the money and pursues his lifelong dream of sailing the seas. Eliot again ironically reverses traditional Christian associations with the promised land. She has Rigg reject Stone Court's salvation and thereby ironically save himself.

Rigg promptly saves himself by selling the promised land on Stone Court to Bulstrode. Bulstrode buys the land because he believes that owning land is the key to gaining the respect of the landed gentry of Middlemarch. He buys the land and signs the bill of sale. It so happens, though, that Mr. Raffles, the only one who knew Bulstrode's secret sin, sees Bulstrode's name on the bill of sale during his

[29] van den Born, p. 1213.

visit to see Rigg (his stepson) at Stone Court. Had Raffles not seen Bulstrode's name on Rigg's bill of sale, he, in all probability, would never have discovered Bulstrode's presence in Middlemarch and Bulstrode might have continued on living snugly undiscovered. Bulstrode inadvertently discloses his whereabouts by buying Stone Court. The name "Rigg" is perhaps Eliot's tongue-in-cheek way of acknowledging to the reader the idea of how she "rigged" the plot contrivance in order to expose Bulstrode's sin. By attempting to build his kingdom materially on earth, Bulstrode falls even further into spiritual darkness. Eliot ironically reverses the Christian names and symbols involved in the Featherstone-Riggs-Bulstrode connection. Eliot plays off the traditional associations by the use of paradox. The names and symbols lead to the depiction of the fall of Bulstrode, the ultimate religious hypocrite.

Of all the symbolic names Eliot creates for Middlemarch, "Bulstrode" is by far the richest in connotation. Bulstrode is an aggressive man. He wants money but more importantly, he wants the power it confers. The most obvious reading of "Bulstrode" is that of an aggressive man in pursuit of power. "Bulstrode" suggests "bullish" and "stride." Bulstrode is bullish in two respects. First, he is bullish in that he resembles or has the nature of a bull. He is domineering, always striving to top the other men of power

in Middlemarch. He is bullish on Middlemarchers in the stock exchange sense of the word. He tends to or aims at a rise in the price of stocks or merchandise (OED). He is a bullish banker and power-broker who constantly strives to increase his holdings. "Stride" is further suggestive of his bullish pursuit of power. "Stride" is most accurately defined in the Bulstrodian sense as "To walk with long or extended steps; to stalk. Often with implication of haste or impetuosity, or exuberant vigour, or of haughtiness or arrogance" (OED). Impetuosity and haughtiness certainly describe the tempo and tone of Bulstrode's stride.

It is not uncommon for authors to characterize their religious hypocrites, particularly those of the evangelical persuasion, as having strong sexual drives. Dickens's hypocrites Humm and Stiggins share in this trait along with Trollope's Rev. Slope. Eliot may be suggesting that Bulstrode also shares in this trait. The "bull" in "Bulstrode" may suggest a strong sexual drive which Bulstrode represses and sublimates into his banking enterprise. Bulstrode's sexual drive is symbolized by the "bull" in his name. The bull is sexually potent and virile, and his purpose is to breed as much as possible. Bulstrode's sperm is symbolized by the money in his bank. He inseminates through the lending process and dominates those inseminated. Bulstrode's banking enterprise could be interpreted to be sexual

sublimation or compensation. The connection, regardless of how irrational, between a man's ability to make money and his sexual potency, is strong in the minds of most people. Bulstrode unconsciously realizes that he cannot be a leading Christian in the community and a sexual bull at the same time, so he sublimates his sexual drive into the ultra-respectability of banking in order to preserve his shaky brand of Christianity.

Having proffered a sexual reading of "Bulstrode," I shall proceed to analyze its religious connotations. Rev. Farebrother, a man whom Eliot assures us we can fully trust, refers to Bulstrode as the "arsenic man." Farebrother uses the term in conversation with Lydgate: "I only wanted to tell you that if you vote for your arsenic man, you are not to cut me in consequence" (Mm, p. 131). Farebrother's epithet describing Bulstrode as the "arsenic man" foreshadows Bulstrode's poisoning of Raffles when he disobeys Lydgate's orders and allows Raffles to have brandy. Brandy, a derivative of wine, could be interpreted to symbolize the wine of communion. Eliot again employs religious symbols paradoxically when she depicts the "arsenic man" administering a poisonous communion which takes life rather than gives it.

Raffles, who is later murdered by the "arsenic man," refers to him as "old Nick," the devil (OED). Raffles taunts Bulstrode about his surname when he says, "I must call

you Nick--we always did call you young Nick when we knew you meant to marry the old widow. Some said you had a handsome family likeness to old Nick, but that was your mother's fault, calling you Nicholas" (Mm, p. 386). Bulstrode, according to Raffles and others, apparently looks like Old Nick. Raffles cannot foresee that Bulstrode would soon be acting like old Nick.

"Bulstrode" also suggests an interesting Catholic religious connotation. "Bulstrode" is suggestive of papal bull. This connotation is appealing for a number of reasons. First, let me provide a definition of papal bull: "An important document issued by the pope and sealed with a disk of lead called a 'bulla,' whence derives the name."[30] Papal bulls are announcements of absolute unquestioned power. It is the power of the papal bull which makes it so appropriate to the name Bulstrode. Absolute, dogmatic power is the nature of the papal bull and of Eliot's Bulstrode. "Bulstrode's" reference to the pope will be touched on later, but it is significant to note that the strongest criticism of popes has been their alleged lust for money and power. Bulstrode is certainly pontifical in relation to that criticism. In Martin Luther's Three Treatises he punned on the phrase "papal bull" in a moment of sarcasm. He said, "This

[30] The Maryknoll Catholic Dictionary, ed. Albert J. Nevins, p. 87.

I do, first because this manner of life has no witness or warrant in the Scriptures, as I have said, but is puffed up solely by the bulls (and they truly are bulls) of human popes."[31] "Bulla" also means "bubble." Luther undercuts papal bulls by reducing them to bubbles: Thin-skinned orbs, filled with nothing but false claims of wisdom and power. Eliot may well have intended that the name Bulstrode also elicit the symbol of Luther's papal bubble because he bullishly masquerades as an orb of wisdom and power but when the hypocritic skin covering of the orb is punctured by the disclosure of his sin, we realize that he, like the papal bubble, is spiritually vacuous.

Dickens, Trollope, and Eliot do a great deal to enrich their characterizations of religious hypocrites through the use of symbolic or otherwise suggestive names. Each author displays different tendencies in the creation of names. Dickens elevates words from common or colloquial language to symbolic representation. Trollope leans toward the use of classical and biblical allusions, whereas Eliot relies on subtle and complex word combinations which the reader must puzzle out in order to arrive at an interpretation. This initial chapter has included analysis of a great number of names which are either names of religious

[31] Martin Luther, Three Treatises, gen. ed. Helmet T. Lehmann, p. 202.

hypocrites, or of people closely related to and affected by the major hypocrites in question. This chapter obviously includes a good deal of speculative analysis but the intent is not to insist on the interpretations of the names as being the definitive ones, but rather to suggest just a few possibilities that the authors may have intended, and to provide the reader with a few ideas which might stimulate other possible interpretations of the names. The name is the lens used by each author to establish the perspective for viewing the religious hypocrite. The name-as-lens insures that the reader would view the character as the author intended. The lens established by the name will enable the reader to focus clearly on the cant of the religious hypocrite manifested by his words and deeds, the subject to be examined in the next chapter.

Chapter 2

CANT: FORMS OF INSINCERITY

> The Hull circuit kept its preachers on a tight rein. Each quarter day they inquired into their preachers so far as their cut of hair and coat. In 1832 they suspended a preacher for being late at chapel, not getting up early, speaking crossly to some children at breakfast, and eating the inside of the pie while leaving the crust.[32]

If the Hull circuit were still in charge of regulating clerical behavior, a goodly number of clergymen would be looking for other means of support. The conduct of the clergy and the conspicuously religious laity has long been closely scrutinized but was never more so than during the Victorian era. The Victorian era, long denounced for its blatant hypocrisy was nonetheless very critical of hypocrisy when it was discovered among its ranks. Close adherence to mores was demanded by all, but when the conforming person was suspected of insincerity, reaction was strong and harsh. The behavior of everyone was strictly observed by the spirit of Mrs. Grundy, but the clergy and laity were especially watched. They were to conform, not only to the letter of

[32] Owen Chadwick, The Victorian Church, p. 390.

the law, but to the spirit. They must not only be perfect, but sincerely perfect. The pressures of perfection produced cant. Since no one could be perfect in letter, let alone spirit, most everyone canted in an attempt to give at least the impression of conformity.

Our concern, though, is not with the everyday, unavoidable type cant that all Victorians were forced to resort to from time to time, but the cant of the clergyman and the conspicuously religious layman. The bulk of this chapter will be devoted to an examination of the cant of the evangelical hypocrite. The cant of the religious hypocrite was obvious and odious to Dickens, Eliot, and Trollope. They determined to depict cant in their novels in an effort to identify clearly its nature and manifestations to their readers. Their treatment of religious cant ranged considerably in terms of subtlety. Dickens's hypocrites canted with little subtlety at all, Trollope's evinced somewhat more sophistication, while Eliot's depiction of Bulstrodian cant was exceedingly subtle and complex.

Before detailing the structure of this chapter, I would like to discuss briefly the meanings and origin of the word "cant" in order to increase the reader's familiarity with the term. "'Cant' means to affect religious or priestic phraseology . . . to talk unreally or hypocritically with an affectation of goodness or piety . . . to deceive by pious

pretences, . . ." (OED). Anyone who has ever attended a sermon presented by one of the more primitive evangelical preachers can attest to the authenticity of Andrew Cant. Sons of Rev. Cant crowd evangelical pulpits with their gift. Evangelical cant provided the congregation with theological insulation and a sense of elitism. Cant insulated or protected evangelicals from their intellectual critics. It gave them a storehouse of stock phrases with which to retort in addition to bolstering their own occasional sags in faith. Cant also gave members of the evangelical or dissenting congregations a sense of superiority to Christians outside of their group. They prided themselves in the knowledge of their particular variety of cant. Being "in the know" gave them an edge, not to mention a sense of elitism, over Christians outside of their congregation. But cant did not originate with Andrew Cant. Its origin goes much further back. In the 1560's it meant, "To speak in the whining or singsong tone used by beggars; to beg" (OED). In the 1600's cant took on a meaning more nearly related to evangelical cant: "To speak in the peculiar jargon or 'cant' of vagabonds, thieves, and the like." In this sense, then, cant had its origins in a "desire for secrecy."[33] It was the jargon of the criminal element. Thieves could stand among

[33] Brook, The Language of Dickens, p. 96.

their victims discussing the best way of robbing them and the victims would be none the wiser. Cant was a jargon intended to protect thieves. Religious cant draws strongly on this origin. It is frequently used as a means of soliciting from the congregation. Dickens, Trollope, and Eliot all create religious hypocrites who employ cant to make money. Their hypocrites, Dickens's hypocrites in particular, canted like thieves. Stiggins and Chadband canted blatantly for capital gain. Dickens stressed their close relationship to thieves by their obvious cant for cash jargon.

Worse than the religious hypocrite's use of cant for the profit motive, though, was his use of cant to affect theological insulation and elitism. Many evangelical ministers, like their forefather Andrew Cant, relied very heavily on cant as a part of their pulpit discourse. It was so much easier to cant than to try to think of clearer terms of expression for the laity. Besides, the laity knew what all the jargon meant anyway. Why waste the intellectual energy of explicating the subtleties of salvation when one can simply say, "You must be born again!" The problem with evangelical cant is that most ministers failed to see that it had subversive qualities. Evangelical cant alienated, through ignorance, the uninitiated unbeliever and subsequently blocked the potential for the intended purpose of the

Gospel. It also repelled many of the more sophisticated, intellectual Christians and, as a result, built walls between an already divided and antagonistic world of protestant Englishmen. Cant, a jargon intended to simplify the language of Christianity and draw Christians together with a common vocabulary, instead acted to undermine ironically both aims. It baffled the receptive unbeliever and repelled the more sophisticated Christian.

An essay on evangelical cant, written by John Foster, a Baptist minister, was published in 1805. Foster's work, an excerpt of which follows, was titled "Essay on Some of the Causes by Which Evangelical Religion Has Been Rendered Unacceptable to Persons of Cultivated Taste."

> The usual language of hypocrisy, at least of vulgar hypocrisy, is cant; and religious cant is often an affected use of the phrases which have been heard employed as appropriate to evangelical truth; with which phrases the hypocrite has connected no distinct ideas; so that he would be confounded if a sensible examiner were to require an accurate explanation of them; while yet nothing is more easy to be sung or said. Now were this diction, for the greater part, to vanish from Christian society, leaving the truth in its mere essence behind, and were, consequently the pretender reduced to assume the guise of religion on the wide and laborious plan of acquiring an understanding of its leading principles, so as to be able to assign them discriminatively in language of his own; the part of the hypocrite would be much less easily acted, and less frequently attempted.[34]

[34] Humphrey House, The Dickens World, p. 117.

Foster ably amplifies and clarifies the nature of cant as it relates to the religious hypocrite. Cant is an easy mask for the hypocrite to hide behind. It is a patchwork of verbal camouflage which allows him to deceive and seek his advantage. Cant is the language of hypocrisy. Cant is the gammon of the hypocrite's religious confidence game. Dickens is a master of imitating and satirically exposing the obvious cant of vulgar hypocrisy, whereas Trollope and Eliot explore some of cant's more subtle hypocritical manifestations.

The cant of the religious hypocrite doesn't restrict itself to the realm of words; it also finds expression in works and conduct. The cant of Christian works includes philanthropy without charity and Christian conduct or manners without love. Dickens's Mrs. Pardiggle demonstrates the cant of philanthropy by her greedy solicitations for charity; her canting crusade for the "reformation of manners" is illustrated by her heartless badgering of the gin-drinking brickmakers for their lack of temperance. The cant of Christian works and conduct is a case of form without substance, works without charity. Cant of this sort encouraged a hypocritical moral posturing. Christians engaged in philanthropy in order to give their fellow Christians the right impression. Paul's message in Corinthians Chapter 13 was ignored; and their canting works of

philanthropy without charity availed them nothing. Their recognition here on earth was their reward.

The pressure to exhibit perfect conduct or manner produced a great deal of cant. Still further there was tremendous pressure not only to conform to the evangelical code of conduct but to do so in a spirit of seriousness. Let me amplify on the nature of this code of conduct and the notions of seriousness and earnestness. The values behind the conduct encouraged cant.

> These values carried the seeds of their own negation: carried too far a virtue could easily become a vice. Chastity, or more generally, strict notions of sexual behavior, could and notoriously did turn into prudery; insistence upon . . . diligence became an unwholesome obsession with work for its own sake; "seriousness" became pompous solemnity and bigotry; "earnestness" and manliness became priggishness.[35]

Again pressure to conform encouraged posturing; and in order for the posturing to be carried off successfully, the poser must also frame his pose with seriousness. "To be serious was to cherish Evangelical views; more generally, a serious person was puritanically opposed to the vanities and frivolities of life, devoid of humor, and intolerant of others' frivolity and indulgences."[36] The cant produced when one conforms to a code of conduct solely to gain moral acceptance

[35] Richard D. Altick, Victorian People and Ideas, p. 176.

[36] Altick, p. 175.

is morally regressive for the poser; the poser expends his energies in an attempt to simulate the appropriate forms. The poser's simulation of form is a canting, empty form of morality. When he attempts to conform not only to the letter by simulation but to the spirit by taking on a seriousness, then the personally destructive quality of the cant is compounded. The poser becomes lost in a maze of mixed motives and hopelessly regresses through ironically earnest self-deception. The cant of empty works, framed in seriousness, is complex. The cantor is self-deceiving and self-serving. Trollope and Eliot, in their depictions of Mrs. Proudie and Bulstrode respectively, illustrate the complexities of cant which I have attempted to outline here.

In brief, this chapter will treat the manifestations of the hypocrite's cant as illustrated in the novels The Pickwick Papers, Bleak House, Barchester Towers, The Last Chronicle of Barset, and Middlemarch. The introduction to this chapter set out as clearly as possible the nature of cant, particularly as it concerns the religious hypocrite. Cant is the language of hypocrisy. It is the tool the hypocrite uses to secure his desired objects. This chapter will be broken down into two parts. The first part will focus on the clergy's rhetoric of cant which they employ in their sermons. The next section will discuss the cant of the laity.

Mr. Humm, Mr. Stiggins, and Mr. Chadband, three of Dickens's most memorable religious hypocrites, are clergymen. They are all of the dissenting persuasion. Dickens sprinkles their words with a generous amount of cant. Their canting is particularly prominent in their sermons. This analysis of their cant will confine itself to the rhetoric of cant which they employ in their sermons. Before beginning my analysis, I would like to provide a brief background on the Victorian sermon.

> It is now difficult for us to believe in the great popularity of the Victorian sermon, but the Victorian age was the age of the preacher, and although the sermon was not the only form his preaching took, it was the most obvious and the most widely popular. No right-minded Victorian thought his Sunday properly spent unless he heard at least one sermon. Many made a practice of hearing two, and there were some who often heard three . . . Nor was this hearing of sermons looked upon merely as a duty. It was to many men a keen pleasure, for which they were willing to pay in time and trouble.[37]

The Victorian sermon provided the clergyman a powerful vehicle with which to influence his congregation. Most of the congregation was favorably disposed to the sermon in general. "Sermon" did not elicit the strong, negative connotations that it does today. The clergyman had in the sermon a vehicle of expression which was viewed favorably. The sermon also gave him numerous opportunities during the

[37] Robert Green, "Hard Times: The Style of a Sermon," Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 11 (1970), 1393.

week to ply his influence by providing him with a powerful and persuasive position from which to wield his cant.

The sermon of the dissenting preacher was especially susceptible to intrusions of cant, and since the preachers Dickens depicts are dissenters, I believe it would be helpful to provide some informative material detailing certain characteristics of the sermon common to dissenting preachers. There was a great deal of pressure on dissenting preachers to deliver long sermons and without the aid of manuscript or notes.

> In 1830-40, reading sermons from manuscripts was obnoxious to most dissenters. John Angell James, famous minister in Birmingham, delivered a sermon of two hours from memory, but took the precaution of having his brother sit in the pulpit with the manuscript to prompt. At the end of the first hour, when he asked leave to pause, members of the congregation lobbed oranges into the pulpit to refresh him. William Jay claimed the virtue of brevity, by which he meant forty-five minutes. We know of one preacher who normally preached for two hours, and of a funeral sermon of three hours. Services of ordination could last three to five hours. The sermon hour of the Reformation was still normal. Once a boy sitting by the gallery clock slowed the pendulum to make James's sermon longer, and James apologized when by looking at his own watch he saw that he had spoken for ten minutes over the hour. Prayer was always extemporary and usually lasted half an hour.[38]

The "virtue of brevity" was certainly discouraged. Two mistaken notions concerning sermons are evident from the above. The first false assumption which the congregation, and most

[38] Chadwick, The Victorian Church, pp. 408-9.

likely a good portion of the clergy held, was that "longer" meant "better." Good sermons, like good novels, should be long. A sermon of one hour was good, of two hours better, of three better still. Quantity was obviously being mistaken for quality. The second false assumption was that lecturing from a manuscript or notes was somehow less "spiritual" than extemporaneous sermonizing. Many believed that the spirit moved best in the preacher who was not tied to his text. In short, the long, extemporaneous sermon was considered the most spiritual. These two false assumptions placed the preacher in a terrible position. He must preach long, seemingly extemporaneous sermons or be thought spiritually deficient. This pressure generally produced three different responses by the preacher. Like the aforementioned Rev. James, he might expend the tremendous energy it took to write and memorize long sermons. Ironically though, his efforts would be counterproductive because the extra time he must spend composing and memorizing his sermon is time away from other more important pastoral duties. The second response was to work up as good an outline as possible, memorize it, and extemporize with the outline as a guide. The third response was simply to open the Bible, randomly pick a scripture, and sermonize extemporaneously on it for an hour or so. All three responses offer prime opportunities for the instrusion of cant. All are attempts to create the

appearance of a divinely-inspired sermon when, in fact, they are no more than pretense. All, by length and apparent spiritually-inspired extemporaneous delivery, are canting forms without substance. They are masks of inspiration and spirituality.

The three methods of preparation for the sermon are not equal in the opportunity that they offer cant to intrude. Logically, one would assume that the greater the amount of extemporaneous speaking involved in the delivery, the greater the reliance of the preacher on canting phrases in order to give the impression of divine inspiration because certainly a divinely-inspired, extemporaneously delivered sermon would not include stammering and unduly long pauses. As a result, religious jargon served as the canting rhetorical camouflage to give the impression of a sermon with divine coherence and unity. As one would expect, Dickens's dissenting preachers preferred the third and most extemporaneous style of sermon described. This type sermon allowed Dickens's hypocritical clergyman the most opportunities to ply their trade of cant. One final element of the sermon which reveals the pretense of cant concerns itself with the purpose of the evangelical sermon. "Evangelicals thought that conversion was the proper aim of all preaching."[39] It

[39] Brian Heeney, A Different Kind of Gentleman: Parish Clergy as Professional Men in Early and Mid-Victorian England, p. 41.

is important to watch Dickens's canting preachers to see if they pursue the "proper aim of all preaching." The "proper aim" provides the reader with a moral touchstone which enables him more clearly to evaluate the true objectives of the hypocritical preacher's sermon.

Anthony Humm is a hypocritical clergyman in The Pickwick Papers who preaches primarily to convert sinners to the cause of temperance. Tony Weller recounts one of Humm's sermons to his son Samuel Weller. Tony begins by recalling the "kiss of peace" which preceded the sermon. "Such goin's on, Sammy! 'The kiss of peace,' says the shepherd; and then he kissed the women all 'round, and when he'd done the man with the red nose began. I was just a thinkin' whether I hadn't better begin too . . ." (PP, p. 380). Tony exposes Humm's cant to the reader by interpreting it literally. Humm's canting use of the "kiss of peace" begins by misquoting the apostle Paul who said, "Salute one another with a holy kiss" (1 Cor. 16:20). Humm's kisses are not in the Paulinic spirit. His kisses are hypocritical. He pretends innocent affection but, in reality, his attitude towards the women is sexual. On this occasion of Humm's just-mentioned cant, Mrs. Weller had brought her husband, Tony Weller, to the meeting so that he might be born again. Tony has been set up for a bit of soul-saving without his assent. Humm unthinkingly plies his cant upon Tony. He begins

traditionally enough by saying, "Where is the sinner; where is the mis'rable sinner?" (PP, p. 380). Humm follows that first bit of jargon by foolishly referring to Tony as a vessel of wrath. Tony takes Humm's evangelical jargon at face value and is insulted. Upon being called a "mis'rable sinner," Tony asks of Humm, "My friend, did you apply that 'ere observation to me? 'Stead of begging my pardon as any gen'lm'n would ha' done, he got more abusive than ever: called me a wessel, Sammy--a wessel of wrath--and all sorts o' names" (PP, p. 380).

Humm heaps the cant of condemnation and abuse on Tony, fully expecting him to submit meekly to the treatment. By taking offense, Tony is reacting unconventionally. Dickens, though, goes beyond Tony's unexpected indignation in the face of Humm's cant. Tony angrily and ironically addresses Humm as "my friend," and unknowingly answers Humm's cant in kind. "My friends" was a common beginning of evangelical sermons at that time. The salutation had originally been one of Christian warmth and affection, but through time and overuse it came to be only a cold attention-getter. Tony's use of the phrase, "My friend," is essentially no different than its usage in evangelical cant. Tony provides the terminal punctuation to his unconventional response to Humm's canting condemnation by rudely depositing the shepherd under a table. Tony's literal translation of Humm's cant of

conversion, cant because Humm attempts to convert Tony in the wrong tone and for the wrong reason, exposes Humm for the hypocrite that he is.

Humm's deputy shepherd and partner in cant is red-nosed Mr. Stiggins. Mrs. Weller has asked Mr. Stiggins to edify her wayward stepson Samuel who is summoned to attend the edification session. His father, Tony Weller, takes Samuel aside before the sermon and warns his son of what to expect. Stiggins does not directly deliver the sermon in this chapter. The narrator recounts the sermon and provides some quotes from it. The sermon is passed over rather quickly. The narrator apparently expects the reader to flesh out the outline with his imagination. Even though the record of the sermon is brief, it still is amply rich enough to deserve analysis. It is easy to suppose how histrionic Stiggins must have become during his sermon. I draw this notion from the fact that prior to his discourse, he engaged in numerous outrageous histrionics. In response to Tony Weller's indifference, Stiggins groaned. Samuel, who is "onto" Stiggins's cant, asks him where it hurts. Stiggins, in a burst of drama, "placing his umbrella on his waistcoat" says "in the buzzim . . ." (PP, p. 380). Samuel, playing along, asks if Stiggins is thirsty. He, ". . . with many rollings of the eye, clenched his throat with his right hand, and mimicked the act of swallowing, to intimate that he was

athirst" (PP, p. 380). Stiggins provided a subtle intimation, indeed. When he is informed that the Weller household has no rum, his favorite tap of vanity, "he cast up his eyes, and rapped his breast with his umbrella;" (PP, p. 725-6). If Stiggins engaged in all the previous histrionics just to order a libation, it is easy to imagine how excessive his gestures were during his sermon. Mr. Stiggins gets drunk and then proceeds to give his sermon. The narrator makes only one mention of Stiggins's histrionics. He was, ironically, exhorting Samuel to avoid intoxication while Stiggins, himself, ". . . became singularly incoherent, and staggering to and fro in the excitement of his eloquence, was fain to catch at the back of a chair to preserve his perpendicular" (PP, p. 729). Stiggins concludes his fancied melodrama, ". . . as he leant over the back of the chair for a considerable period of time, and closing one eye, winked a good deal with the other . . ." (PP, p. 729). His position over the chair appears to be a prayerful one but he is really taking a bow for his performance of cant and hypocrisy. His knowing wink is just the closing of the curtain. The wink is the key which unifies the histrionics in the scene. He "rolls his eyes" and "casts eyes up" so that Mrs. Weller will watch him and not see what's really happening. After his successful sermon, successful because it kept him in the good graces of Mrs. Weller, he winks. By so doing,

he acknowledges his hoodwinking of Mrs. Weller. The canting histrionics before and during his sermon rendered her incapable of seeing his hypocrisy.

Stiggins's words are as full of pretense and deception as his gestures. The words and gestures of his sermon are intended to give the impression that he is divinely inspired, but of course, in reality, Stiggins is not inspired by any divine spirit. In order to assume artificially the appearance of the spirit-filled preacher, he literally fills himself with the spirits of rum. Having cantingly assumed the proper spirit, Stiggins launches into his sermon. The narrator recounts the sermon:

> . . . Mr. Stiggins, getting on his legs as well as he could, proceeded to deliver an edifying discourse for the benefit of the company, but more especially of Mr. Samuel, whom he adjured in moving terms to be upon his guard in that sink of iniquity into which he was cast; to abstain from all hypocrisy and pride of heart; and to take in all things exact pattern and copy him (Stiggins) in which case he might calculate on arriving, sooner or later at the comfortable conclusion, that, like him, he was a most estimable and blameless character, and that all his acquaintance and friends were hopelessly abandoned and profligate wretches. Which consideration, he said, could not but afford him the liveliest satisfaction.
>
> He furthermore conjured him to avoid, above all things, the vice of intoxication, which he likened unto the filthy habits of swine, and to those poisonous and baleful drugs which being chewed in the mouth, are said to filch away the memory. At this point of his discourse, the reverend and red-nosed gentleman became singularly incoherent, and staggering to and fro in the excitement of his eloquence, was fain to catch at the back of a chair to preserve his perpendicular (PP, pp. 727, 729).

The first type of verbal cant which Stiggins uses in his sermon is an inappropriate use of scripture. Dickens ironically reverses these attempts by Stiggins to quote scripture. Stiggins warns Samuel "to be upon his guard in that sink of iniquity into which he was cast." Stiggins creatively changes "den of iniquity" to "sink of iniquity," but the problem with his variation on the phrase is only beginning. "Den of iniquity" is not a biblical phrase but the creation of some Calvinist preacher. Stiggins thought he was improving on "scripture" by changing the "den" to "sink," but his phrase "sink of iniquity" is mere pseudo-scripture.

The phrase is a variation of another piece of pseudo-scripture, but where is the irony? The phrase "den of iniquity" most closely resembles "den of thieves," a term Jesus used to label the money changers in the temple. Jesus, it is recalled, drove the thieves or money changers out of the temple because they were involved in cant. The "den of thieves" is a direct reference to people who robbed by means of cant. The irony of this reference is that Stiggins is a Victorian era version of one of the thieves who robbed by cant. As he exhorts Samuel to avoid the "sink of iniquity" or the company of robbers, he himself cons money from the women of the flock. He also intends to fleece Mrs. Weller of her substantial income. The irony of Stiggins's first

verse of pseudoscripture is completed in the second half of the verse. Samuel is warned "to be upon his guard in that sink of iniquity into which he was cast." The sink into which Samuel is cast is Mr. Stiggins's presence. Stiggins turns the room into a den of thieves. Samuel is aware of Stiggins's thieve's cant and is on his guard.

Stiggins's second attempt to incorporate scripture is notable for its greater faithfulness to the original, but it is no less ironic than his pseudoscripture. "To abstain from all hypocrisy and pride of heart" is quoted accurately from Jeremiah 49:16. The cant is clearly ironic at this point. Stiggins, the proud hypocrite, warns against the same evil.

After essentially warning Samuel not to be like him, Stiggins sets out a perverse spiritual formula which in essence states that in order for Samuel to be saved spiritually from the sink of iniquity, he must follow Stiggins's example, "to take in all things exact pattern and copy by him (Stiggins), in which case he might calculate on arriving, sooner or later at the comfortable conclusion . . ." (PP, p. 729). Stiggins pridefully sets himself up as a canting Christ figure. He sports a red nose in the place of Christ's stigmata. He exhorts Samuel to a Stigginsian salvation which will bring about a "comfortable conclusion: "that, like him, he was a most estimable and blameless character,

and that all his . . . friends were hopelessly abandoned and profligate wretches" (PP, pp. 727, 729). In other words, if Samuel will take up the cross of cant and follow his savior Stiggins, he will see himself as morally perfect and his friends as degenerate. The result of Stigginsian salvation produces just the opposite result of Christianity. When one converts to Christianity, he is forgiven of his sins and in that state he will react toward his brother's sin with love, not rejection. Stiggins's blamelessness is simple pride, whereas, true blamelessness for the Christian can come only through Christ. Stiggins displays the ultimate in pride through his sermon. He presents a perverse spiritual formula in which he replaces Christ as the savior with himself. He then concludes his sermon with a hypocritical exhortation for Samuel to avoid intoxication. Stiggins is so intoxicated by liquor, (the spirit of cant), that he nearly falls down. Stiggins concludes his sermon as he leans over a chair; he cantingly assumes a prayerful position and then winks proudly to himself.

Dickens's satirization of cant reaches its zenith in Bleak House. He creates the Rev. Chadband to serve as the ultimate mouther of mundane morality. Chadband's cant is not displayed in the sermon of the traditional Sunday morning worship service. He presents his gospel of pious jargon at Mrs. Snagsby's home. I shall be drawing examples of

Chadbandian cant from pseudo-sermons delivered on two different occasions at Mrs. Snagsby's home. Chadband's style makes virtually everything he says sermonesque. He is always trying to hold forth or dominate the floor. He continually speaks in long paragraphs and holds the center of attention with his rambling cant for sufficient duration to suggest strongly that what he says should be listened to within the sacrosanct framework of the sermon.

Chadband includes as a part of his sermon an assortment of histrionics intended to increase the persuasiveness of his presentation. To some readers, Chadband's canting histrionics may appear too outrageous to be believable. If his gestures are considered too outrageous, the reader considers them comic and misses the fact that Dickens was not emphasizing comedy here but trying to expose a cant of gesture that was common to his day. Referring again to the pamphlet written by the Baptist minister of the Victorian era, John Foster,

> he unerringly discerned the weaknesses of certain of his brethren, and the things which were likely to disgust an outsider--such as grimacing, the solemn lifting up of the eyes, artificial impulses of the breath, grotesque and regulated gestures and postures in religious exercises, an affected faltering of the voice . . .[40]

[40] V. C. Clinton-Baddeley, "Stiggins," Dickensian, 50 (March 1954), 54.

As one can see from Foster's list of common histrionics, Dickens, if anything, used a great deal of restraint in his depiction of Chadband. Dickens limited Chadband's histrionics to a few regulated gestures and eye contact.

Chadband's most consistently regulated gesture is his hand signal. ". . .[he] never speaks without first putting up his great hand, as delivering a token to his hearers that he is going to edify them" (BH, p. 200). The raised hand was traditionally a sign of spiritual authority and wisdom. Chadband draws on the tradition of this gesture constantly with the intent that his audience will associate the authority and wisdom of the gesture with him. His excessive reliance on the gesture serves to underscore his insecurity in his own authority and wisdom. As a result of his insecurity, he cants to compensate. The gesture is not only intended to settle the audience but is also intended as a warm salutation of brotherly love. Chadband always accompanies the gesture with "My friends," but his greeting does not contain warmth and love. It cants in that respect, too. It is merely a signal to still the crowd so he can take the floor. To have raised his hand and yelled "Quiet!" would have carried an equal measure of brotherly love.

Chadband, being a typical depiction of the evangelical clergy, is not blessed with keen intellect or wisdom. Obviously parishioners do not want to be saddled with a

feeble-minded minister. Chadband realizes this and is more than glad to give his little gathering a show of wisdom. He rhetorically asks, "'What is the light? What is it? I ask you what is the light?' Mr. Chadband draws back his head and pauses . . ." (BH, p. 273). Pausing dramatically, Chadband affects the profound look of the wise man; but in that empty evangelical head, the spirit of wisdom does not stir.

The narrator tells of another Chadbandian affectation: "It happens that Mr. Chadband has a pulpit habit of fixing some member of his congregation with his eyes, and fatly arguing his points with that particular person" (BH, p. 273). A minister exercises considerable control over his congregation from the profound heights of the pulpit. To look a parishioner in the eye is a serious matter. The parishioner receiving the eye will tend to take whatever the minister says more seriously, whether it be about salvation or softball. Chadband ignores the responsibility of his action. His seemingly profound eye contact is nothing more than a meaningless habit.

Brooks, in his work The Language of Dickens, describes an interesting affectation of verbal cant which he labels the "sanctimonious pronunciation." He says, "Certain pronunciations seem to have been regarded as sanctimonious, particularly those which rise from the stressing of words which are

normally lightly stressed."[41] Chadband says "toe" for "to" and "untoe" for "unto." Brooks gives a linguistic description of another example:

> A glide-vowel, usually spelt e and probably pronounced schwa [ə], often develops between a consonant and [r], . . . The glide is no doubt to be regarded as a mark of sanctimonious speech when Chadband speaks of "Terewth."

Sanctimonious pronunciation was one of the smaller units of verbal affectation which contributed to larger verbal units such as rhetorical questions and outlandish or otherwise abused metaphors. These larger units of verbal cant are clothed in the rhythms and diction of a Bible English or pseudoscripture, and are enunciated in a sanctimonious manner.

Chadband uses the rhetorical question extensively in his sermons in order to give the impression of an agile, intelligent mind. It is a tool of cant which he uses to deceive his audience.

> The question-and-answer method, intended to simplify complicated subject matter, becomes absurdly self-defeating as Chadband uses it, because in his mouth, inflation and inflection--a pretty pattern of sound to be filled willy-nilly--have replaced simple sense.[42]

The question and answer method is intended to simplify the complex but Chadband perverts it so that it will glorify

[41] Brooks, p. 81.

[42] Trevor Blount, "The Chadbands and Dickens's View of Dissenters," Modern Language Quarterly, 25 (1964), p. 303.

him. In chapter nineteen, the occasion for the first sermon in Bleak House, Chadband surveys the meal spread before him on the Snagsbys's table. It appears to offer a perfect opportunity for him to discourse on the "bread of life." Upon viewing the meal, some gear clicks in his mind and he begins his question and answer journey presumably leading to the "bread of life." His method is like a maitre d' who does not know where the table is. Chadband leads rhetorically by backing blindly toward an unknown destination. To return to the incident at hand, Chadband surveys the meal and begins his display of the rhetorical question method:

> "My friends," says he, "what is this which we now behold as being spread before us? Refreshment. Do we need refreshment, my friends? Because we are but mortal, because we are but sinful, because we are but of the earth, because we are not of the air. Can we fly, my friends? We cannot. Why can we not fly, my friends?
>
> Mr. Snagsby, presuming on the success of his last point, ventures to observe in a cheerful and rather knowing tone, "No wings?" But, is immediately frowned down by Mrs. Snagsby.
>
> "I say, my friends," pursues Mr. Chadband, utterly rejecting and obliterating Mr. Snagsby's suggestion, "why can we not fly? Is it because we are calculated to walk? It is. Could we walk, my friends, without strength? We could not. What should we do without strength, my friends? Our legs would refuse to bear us, our knees would double up, our ankles would turn over, and we should come to the ground. Then from whence, my friends, in a human point of view, do we derive the strength that is necessary to our limbs? Is it," says Chadband, glancing over the table, "from bread in various forms, from butter which is churned from the milk which is yielded untoe us by the cow, from the eggs which are laid by the fowl, from ham, from tongue, from sausage, and from such like? It is. Then let us par-

take of the good things which are set before us!" (BH, p. 201).

The mind of Chadband certainly works in mysterious ways. His method is based more on the free-flow of word association than any particular logic. He moves from refreshment to mortality and then queries, "Why can we not fly, my friends?" Mr. Snagsby's heckling answer, "No wings," underscores the ludicrous movement of Chadband's mind and the ridiculous nature of the question. Chadband answers his question, "Why can we not walk?" with an equally obvious question, "Is it because we are calculated to walk?" "It is," he answered. From there he discusses the physics and physiology of walking and begins to wander peripatetically back to the table. After asking where we derive the strength to walk, he refers to the bread on the table. Ordinarily one would assume that he is now ready to rehash the "bread of life" theme of Jesus' parable; but no, he instead exclaims in the very fleshly tone of "come and get it," ". . . let us partake of the good things which are set before us!" His question and answer method is a mere circumlocution of cant which leads not to spiritual bread but only to mortal nourishment.

A pattern in Chadband's sermon is for him to open with a rhetorical question and answer the question with a long list of comparisons. Chadband abuses metaphors with the same zeal that he abuses the question-answer method. His metaphors

do not make the abstract concrete, they do not simplify the complex, instead, like the rhetorical question, they are intended strictly to glorify him. Before analyzing my particular examples of the aforesaid pattern I shall first provide some historical background on the practice of abusing the metaphor. Humphrey House amplifies on this Chadbandian tendency in his book Dickens' World:

> The habit of distending such commonplace comparisons was so ingrained in evangelical speech that one of the evangelists of the Home Missionary Society devised a sort of parlour-game called Church Questions, "for the purpose of creating in his little flock a spirit of inquiry after truth, and to induce them to search the Scriptures. At every monthly meeting, the answers to the last question are given by each member, and the next question is proposed. The questions are all founded in Scripture, and the answers have the explanatory texts appended to them. From the whole is collected an instructive and pleasing train of illustrations." For example:
>
> > QUESTION:--In what respects do the people of God resemble jewels. (Founded on Mal. III, 7.)
> >
> > ANSWER:--In their origin. --In their great rarity. --In their beauty. --In their shining quality. --In their preciousness. --In their durability. --In being ornamental. --In their value being frequently determined by their weight. --In not being susceptible of injury by passing through a moderate fire.
>
> It is easy to see how the use of such language--still more the playing of such a game--induces hypocrisy. The associations proceed from word to word, ever moving further from the original point of reference; and a habit of association once formed may proceed in indefinite triumph with no point of reference at all.[43]

[43] House, pp. 116-17.

As is in the case of the histrionics, Dickens uses considerable restraint in his choice of Chadbandian metaphors. Dickens's choices are more authentic than comic, and he is more interested in satirizing the Chadband-type than exploiting him for easy laughs. To give a better idea of the restraint Dickens uses in his choice of metaphors, I shall recount one of the more comic possibilities that he passed up. A famous comedian by the name of Mathews tells of returning home from church one evening to find the coal-heaver, who wrote "S. S." after his name to stand for "Sinner Saved," making love to the cook. The coal-heaver, ". . . S. S., ingeniously explained that he was only 'basting her with the hoyle of salivation.'"[44] In view of such incredibly funny metaphor abuse available to Dickens, one has to marvel at his restraint.

Chadband abuses metaphors within a distinct pattern, which I shall refer to as the question-metaphor pattern. This pattern consists of a rhetorical question followed by a list of metaphors which are ostensibly intended to answer the question. "Peace be with us!" says Chadband. To this opening he responds with the rhetorical question, "My friends, why with us?" He then appears to answer his question by listing a trite group of antithetical analogies:

[44] Clinton-Baddeley, pp. 55-6.

". . . because it is not hardening, because it is softening; because it does not make war like the hawk, but comes home untoe us like the dove" (BH, p. 272). These obfuscating analogies do not answer the question. Their only purpose is to glorify the pseudo-rhetorical skills of the speaker. It should be emphasized that Chadband does not answer the truly important question he poses. This question-without-answer pattern will recur throughout his sermon. What Chadband hopes to achieve through his parallel structuring of the dependent clauses is the poetry and profundity of the Bible; instead he only strings together lines of sing-song nonsense.

Chadband, it is to be recalled, asked the rhetorical question, "What is that light? What is it? I ask you what is that light?" (BH, p. 273). Supplying his own reply he says, "It is . . . the ray of rays, the sun of suns, the moon of moons, the star of stars. It is the light of Terewth" (BH, p. 274). It is interesting to note the irony inferred by the metaphorical progression of comparing the light of truth to sun, moon, and stars. The choice of the sun is a good one because the sun radiates light and warmth, stimulating growth. Chadband's effort to extend this comparison proves foolish. The moon gives off light that has a very limited practical use. It gives off no warmth. Stars provide virtually no light or warmth. They are at best cold,

distant, and surrounded by darkness. Chadband juxtaposes "star of stars" to "Terewth." The "terewth" which Chadband pronounces so affectedly is just as cold and distant as the light of the stars he compares it to.

His canting version of "terewth" has no more meaning or vitality than his ill-chosen metaphor. What is the light? The light is "terewth." Predictably, Chadband next asks ". . . what is this Terewth, then?" (BH, p. 274). Suffice to say, Chadband never gets around to answering that question. Most ministers would have answered those two rhetorical questions with the response that "Jesus is the truth and the light." Significantly, Chadband does not even insert that well-traveled phrase.

Chadband concludes the first sermon with more question-metaphor patterns. He notes to the congregation that they have partaken of food and then goes on to ask whether they have partaken of anything else. "My friends, of what else have we partaken? Of spiritual profit? From whence have we derived that spiritual profit? My young friend stand forth!" (BH, p. 206). In an attempt to appear to be a divinely inspired man, Chadband asks where they have derived their spiritual profit that day. He then summons the boy Jo. Chadband's "spiritual profit" is cant. He is not interested in whether the congregation profits spiritually from his sermon. He wants to profit materially from

the occasion and he is cunning enough to realize that Jo represents his meal ticket. Chadband's realization of Jo's potential monetary worth to him produces the following list of metaphorical cant: "My young friend, . . . you are to us a pearl, you are to us a diamond, you are to us a gem, you are to us a jewel" (BH, p. 206). The metaphor game described by House seems especially poignant now. Chadband would not have done well at the game, though, as we can clearly see by his feeble attempt to list metaphors on the same subject. Chadband's metaphors are canting because his monetary motive causes the metaphors, pearl, diamond, etc. to be viewed literally rather than figuratively. Chadband continues in like manner, now determined or so it appears, to "save" Jo. He begins by pointing out Jo's sinfulness by stringing together another list of metaphors: ". . . you are in a state of darkness, . . . because you are in a state of bondage" (BH, p. 206). Jo is in a state of spiritual darkness because Chadband has produced an atmosphere so thick with cant that truth or light could never shine through. The state of bondage does not refer to Jo's being in the bondage of sin but refers ironically to Jo's being in a state of bondage to Chadband and Mrs. Snagsby. Jo is bound by Chadband's greed and Mrs. Snagsby's jealousy. Just as Chadband's rhetorical questions never lead to any spiritual truth, in the same way the metaphors he used in his

conversion attempt never lead to salvation for Jo. Chadband condemns Jo a sinner with a string of canting metaphors, but he stops short of ever showing Jo the way to receive the Gospel.

Chadband continues to reduce the concept of truth from the sublime to the ridiculous through his use of pious phraseology. He attempts to achieve this pious prose by clothing all of his phrases in the stylistic garb of the English of King James's version of the Bible. He hopes that the deceiving ring of scripture will impart an unearned profundity to his rhetoric. Chadband also attempts to elevate his pseudoscripture by presenting it in the time-honored tradition of the parable. He demonstrates his imitation of scripture as he expounds on the nature of "terewth":

> ". . . if the master of this house was to go forth into the city and there see an eel, and was to come back, and was to call untoe him the mistress of this house, and was to say, 'Sarah, rejoice with me, for I have seen an elephant!' would that be Terewth?" (BH, p. 275).

Once again Chadband resorts to his favorite stylistic pet, parallel structures, to achieve a scriptural style. He proudly splices together the infinitive phrases "was to go . . . and was to come . . . and was to call . . . and was to say . . .," but rather than capturing the eloquent metre of an Old Testament prophet, he accidentally effects a comical sing-song doggerel.

Chadband concludes his unconsciously ludicrous explication of the ultimate verity by saying, "Or put it, my juvenile friends, that he saw an elephant, and returning said, 'Lo, the city is barren, I have seen but an eel,' would that be Terewth?" (BH, p. 275). At this point Chadband is padding his sermon by simply reversing his illustration.

Chadband concludes his first sermon by asking Jo to attend future discourses. His attempt at pseudoscripture begins,

> Will you come, my young friend, and inquire of his good lady where I am to be found to deliver a discourse unto you, and will you come like the thirsty swallow upon the next day, and upon the next day after that, and upon many pleasant days, to hear discourses? (BH, p. 206-7)

Chadband attempts to imitate scripture by syntactic repetition of the phrase, "upon the next day." He achieves repetition in a sense but as an imitation of the spiritual poetry of the Old Testament, Chadband does not, as the author parenthetically comments, poetically soar beyond a "cow-like lighteness." Chadband is guilty of something much worse than merely bad poetry. He is canting all the way through his question. Mrs. Snagsby is not a "good lady" and Jo is not his friend. Chadband plies this cant in order to curry Mrs. Snagsby's favor and fortune. He pursues Jo because Jo is his means of exploiting Mrs. Snagsby. Chadband uses all of the elements of the rhetoric of cant,

histrionics, sanctimonious pronunciation, the question-metaphor pattern, and pseudoscripture, in order to create a mask of false piety which will enable him to secure monetary advantage.

Whereas Dickens's sermonic canters are after mammon, Trollope's Mr. Slope sermonizes to gain influence in the community. The most famous sermon delivered in Trollope's Barsetshire series is one delivered by that infamous low church clergyman Rev. Slope. This sermon, like Stiggins's, is not recorded directly as it was spoken; instead, Trollope recounts the sermon as did Dickens through the use of paraphrase. However the plot context surrounding the Slope sermon and the content of the sermon itself are a good deal more sophisticated than the Stiggins sermon. Though more sophisticated, the Slope sermon is much more conservative than Stiggins's in terms of satirization of the canting, hypocritical preacher. Dickens has Stiggins staggering drunkenly about, spouting pseudoscripture in an unbelievable display of cant and hypocrisy. Trollope chooses a less offensive (at least to his low church readers) presentation. Before Trollope's recounting of the novel, he dislaims,

> It would not be becoming were I to travesty a sermon, or even to repeat the language of it in the pages of a novel. In endeavoring to depict the characters of the persons of whom I write, I am to a certain extent forced to speak of sacred things. I trust, however, that I shall not be thought to scoff at the pulpit, though some may imagine that I do not feel all the reverence that is due to the cloth. (BT, p. 47)

It is difficult, if not impossible, to know whether we can take Trollope at his word or if he decided not to parody low church preaching because he felt he could not improve upon Dickens's effort. A bitingly satiric parody of Slope's sermon would certainly be in keeping with Trollope's overall tone toward Slope; but possibly Trollope's dislike of sermons in general discouraged him from composing a protracted parody.

Let us begin the discussion by comparing the purpose of Slope's sermon to the usual purpose of the Low Church or Evangelical sermon. Traditionally,

> Evangelicals thought that conversion was the aim of all preaching. High churchmen, on the other hand, taught that the art of the preacher was to persuade his hearers to participate in the community life of the church, and to help them understand their doctrines.[45]

The quotation just cited from Heeney's A Different Kind of Clergyman indicates that Slope's sermon approaches the purposes common to both Evangelical and High Church sermons but he stops short and perverts the purposes of both to his own ends. He attempts to convert, but not to the Gospel; rather, he attempts to convert the congregation to his doctrinal point of view. It is very interesting that Slope's sermon is characteristic of the High Church variety because of its preoccupation with doctrine. But Slope perverts the High

[45] Heeney, A Different Kind of Gentleman, p. 41.

Church purpose in order to gain a following to his Low Church views. He is not interested in helping the congregation understand doctrine and thereby edifying and unifying them. He is instead intent upon selling his particular doctrine in an effort to divide the people and shift the balance of power to his side.

The purpose of Slope's sermon ". . . was to express his abomination of all ceremonious modes of utterance, to cry down any religious feeling which might be excited, not by the sense, but by the sound of words, and in fact to insult cathedral practices" (BT, p. 48). Essentially Slope is denouncing what he considered High Church cant in the pulpit. Further, Slope calls for reason, sense if you will, to be emphasized rather than sound. How unlike Dickens's evangelical clergyman Slope is. Slope sounds very high and dry in some respects. Trollope, though, quickly steps in and tells the reader how to view rightly Slope's purpose:

> Had St. Paul spoken of rightly pronouncing instead of rightly dividing the word of truth, this part of his sermon would have been more to the purpose; but the preacher's immediate object was to preach Mr. Slope's doctrine, and not St. Paul's, and he contrived to give the necessary twist to the text with some skill. (BT, p. 48)

Trollope states clearly that Slope is not interested in presenting the truth according to St. Paul, but the truth according to St. Slope. Slope condemns the High Church clergy in attendance (virtually all the clergy of Barset-

shire) of cant when his sermon is based on cant. He warns the congregation to focus on the sense and not the sound of the words while at the same time he is twisting the Gospel to his own advantage.

Trollope completes the recounting of Slope's sermon by subtly juxtaposing the theme of the sermon, cant, with Trollope's ideal Christian, Mr. Harding. In Slope's sermon, he asserts that the church music performed just prior to his sermon places undue emphasis on ritual over meaning. Slope indirectly attacks Mr. Harding by saying that Harding placed "music over meaning" and in so doing, committed cant rather than true worship. Slope attacks the meek, unpretentious Mr. Harding unmercifully when he says in the conclusion of his sermon,

> The words of our morning service, how beautiful, how apposite, how intelligible they were, when read with simple and distinct decorum! but how much of the meaning of the words was lost when they were produced with all the meretricious charms of the melody! (BT, p. 48)

Slope accuses Mr. Harding's church music of cant. Slope's theme is repeated three times in his sermon and basically warns the clergy and laity to forsake the forms of the High Church and return to the sense or reason which he represents. The reader, of course, is never allowed to forget that Slope's "reason" really means Low Church cant. We know that the music, which Slope brands as cant, is played by a sincere Christian and we, therefore, accept the music to be sincere

in what it expresses. On the other hand, Slope's efforts to point out cant and direct the people to greater truth is ironic because of the cant and falsehood which so permeate the essence of his character.

In Trollope's The Last Chronicle of Barset, he again refrains from presenting a sermon directly, but he does make mention of the sincere spiritual nature of the Rev. Crawley's sermons. We gather from his comments on Crawley's discourses that they would probably be among the few Trollope would have cared to hear. Trollope juxtaposes his mention of Crawley's sincere, useful sermons with Rev. Thumbles's attempts to usurp Crawley's pulpit in Hogglestock. The critic Kerpneck notes that

> . . . every reader recalls the sermons preached by Mr. Crawley when surrounded by hostility and malice, the suspicions even of those who love him and the pounding ambition of those (like Mr. Thumble) who hunger for even such a "place" as his, Crawley fights off the madness that constantly impends over him, brushes off his personal plight, puts his sense of immensely ill-used merit behind him and preaches timely and useful Christian sermons.[46]

Kerpneck's assessment of the sincerity of Crawley's sermons underscores the purpose of the juxtaposing of Crawley and Thumble in the same pulpit. Crawley is sincere, free of cant whereas Thumble is not. He, unlike Crawley, is not concerned with the souls of the people in the congregation but

[46] Harvey Kerpneck, "Trollope's Effeminate Clergymen," Queen's Quarterly, 82, 199.

solely with usurping Crawley's living at Hogglestock.

Eliot's Middlemarch offers no sermons to analyze in the way that Dickens and Trollope did, but like Trollope's juxtaposition of Crawley and Thumble, Eliot offers a similar juxtaposition of the sermons of Rev. Farebrother and Rev. Tyke. Eliot does not record a sermon by either but comments by other characters provide a clear idea of their individual styles and sincerity. Lydgate says of Farebrother's preaching, "I never heard such good preaching as his--such plain easy eloquence. He would have done to preach at St. Paul's Cross after old Latimer. His talk is just as good about all subjects: original, simple, clear" (Mm, p. 362-3). In the same scene Lydgate comments on Tyke's doctrines: "a good deal of his doctrine is a sort of pinching hard to make people uncomfortably aware of him" (Mm, p. 363). Dorothea affirms Lydgate's opinion and then comments on Mr. Tyke's sermons: "I have been looking into a volume of sermons by Mr. Tyke: such sermons would be of no use at Lowick" (Mm, p. 363). Dorothea goes on to say that the purpose of his sermons seems to emphasize the condemnation of the people rather than a means to salvation; the means which he does present, she says, he attempts to make as narrow as possible by constricting it with doctrine. Tyke is suspected of cant. An incident relating to his sermons confirms that suspicion. It seems that many of Tyke's parishioners are going to hear

Farebrother preach instead of him. Tyke cantingly responds by threatening to give his parishioners no more coal if they go to hear Farebrother preach. Eliot uses the comments of trustworthy characters to compare and contrast Farebrother's and Tyke's sermons. Crawley and Farebrother are mentioned because they emphasize a strong common denominator in this discussion of canting sermons. All of the canting preachers I have discussed,--Humm, Stiggins, Chadband, Slope, Thumble, and Tyke,--cant in order to glorify themselves; whereas, Crawley's and Farebrother's sermons are designed to glorify God and edify the congregation.

Foster said that cant is the language of hypocrisy. In the first part of this chapter we analyzed Dickens's, Trollope's, and Eliot's depictions of cant in the pulpit. Dickens works out a complex rhetoric of cant which includes various histrionics and verbal devices. Trollope, in his recounting of the Slope sermon, presents a cant couched in situational irony. Eliot presents cant in the pulpit by using the comments of reputable characters to point out the difference between a sincere preacher and a canting one. Having focused on depictions of cant in the pulpit, I would now like to conclude the first part of this chapter by discussing cant depicted among the congregation. I shall restrict my discussion to Mrs. Proudie's canting ventures in Trollope's The Last Chronicle of Barset and the banker Bulstrode's cant in Eliot's Middlemarch.

"'That she-Beelzebub hates him for his poverty, and because Arabin brought him into the diocese,' said the archdeacon, permitting himself to use very strong language in his allusion to the bishop's wife" (LCB, p. 81). In this particular situation, the archdeacon speaks of Mrs. Proudie with accuracy. She hates Crawley for the very reasons he says. She hates Crawley because of his poverty, and because he is aligned with her enemies. Crawley's poverty catalyzes her hate. The reasons for this cause-effect relationship are twofold. First, she comes to hate his poverty because it insults her sense of decorum. Having a poor cleric in the diocese, shames her. To her, it is like having a poor relation living next door to the palace. The second explanation for her hate is that she considers Crawley's poverty his fault. She, like so many of the middle class, holds the mistaken notion that poverty is a result of sloth rather than a simple lack of money. She hates him because of his threadbare coat and unpaid bills. However, her main reason for hating Crawley (prior to his victory over her at the Palace) is his alliance with her enemy, the High Church faction of Dr. Grantly and Arabin. The High Church faction are her enemies because they are her rivals for control over the diocese. It is Mrs. Proudie's hate for Rev. Crawley and her lust for control of the diocese which bring about her cant of word and deed. Her cant emanates from her attempts

to oust Crawley from his parish at Hogglestock over his alleged theft. She acts in a totally unethical, not to mention unChristian, way, in her attempts to destroy Crawley and gain advantage over the high and dry faction.

Mrs. Proudie bases a great deal of her cant concerning Crawley on the fact that his situation undermines the souls of the people. She has denied him due process and considers him a criminal.

> I say down with common felons! A downright robbery of twenty pounds, just as though he had broken into the bank! And so he did, with sly artifice, which is worse in such hands than a crowbar. And now what are we to do? Here is Thursday, and something must be done before Sunday for the souls of those poor, benighted creatures at Hogglestock. (LCB, p. 85)

One of Mrs. Proudie's most prevalent canting phrases deals with her feigned concern for the "souls of the people." She repeats her pet phrase in the same scene when she says, ". . . suppose they let him out, is he to go about like a roaring lion--among the souls of the people?" (LCB, p. 85). The roaring lion is a scriptural allusion to Satan. The irony is that it refers to her rather than Crawley because by destroying Crawley she would impoverish the souls of his family and his congregation. She particularly favors the aforesaid phrase because of its powerful effect on her husband. "When Mrs. Proudie began to talk of the souls of the people, he (the bishop) always shook in his shoes" (LCB, p. 85). Her cant preys on the bishop's true concern for the

people's souls and thereby exercises considerable control over him.

Mrs. Proudie uses cant to force her husband to press for Crawley's conviction. She frequently suggests plans of action to her husband which are illegal in terms of church legal proceedings.

> The poor bishop knew that it was useless to explain to her the various mistakes which she made, . . . When he would do so she would only rail at him for being lukewarm in his office, poor in spirit, and afraid of dealing roundly with those below him. (LCB, p. 264)

Mrs. Proudie uses her cant to rebuke and berate an already spiritually impoverished man. She tries to give the impression to him that she is simply exhorting him to his duty, but her language is devastating in its connotations. She says that he is being lukewarm. "Lukewarm" alludes to the verse in Revelations 3:16 which says, "But because thou are lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I am about to vomit thee out of my mouth." She condemns him for being lukewarm on the strength of a powerful allusion which unquestionably demoralizes her spiritually sensitive husband. She rails at him for being poor in spirit. The phrase "poor in spirit" alludes to Jesus's sermon on the Mount where he delivered the Beatitude, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:2). She takes this blessing and twists it perversely into a curse of condemnation. Mrs. Proudie takes language with strong biblical allusions

and employs it cantingly. She condemns her husband in order to destroy Crawley and in the process of preying after Crawley, she spiritually damages her husband.

Her most blatant use of cant occurs when Rev. Crawley visits the Palace. She begins her cant during the social amenities by saying, "I hope your wife and children are well, Mr. Crawley" (LCB, p. 144). This is mere window dressing. By pursuing and gaining Crawley's conviction she would, in effect, terminate the family income and force them into the streets penniless. Following her initial remark, she says, "I have felt for Mrs. Crawley very deeply" (LCB, p. 144). This remark is cant in two ways. First, Mrs. Proudie does not care about the welfare of Mrs. Crawley or she would obviously not be trying to destroy Mr. Crawley, and, second, the remark digs at Mr. Crawley by saying in effect, "It must be so difficult for a woman to bear the shame of discovering that her husband is a thief." As I mentioned earlier, Mrs. Proudie hates Crawley because his poverty insults her sense of clerical decorum. His alleged theft adds greatly to his lack of decorum. Crawley's poverty and alleged theft offend her sensibilities and she responds with cant intended to point out his lack of decorum to him. "It is unseemly, very unseemly indeed," says Mrs. Proudie; "nothing could possibly be more unseemly" (LCB, p. 146). She concludes her denunciation of Crawley's unseemli-

ness with the familiar, "And especially to the souls of the people" (LCB, p. 146). Her ostensible concern for the souls of the people belies her true concern for Crawley's lack of clerical decorum.

I shall conclude my discussion of the cant of Mrs. Proudie by looking briefly at a remark by her which is representative of her frustration with Crawley and of the cant which that frustration produces. She says,

> Something must, of course, be done to put a stop to the crying disgrace of having such a man preaching from a pulpit in this diocese. When I think of the souls of the people in that poor village, my hair literally stands on eng. And then he is disobedient! (LCB, p. 269)

Her remarks follow a familiar pattern. The first illustrates her concern with Crawley's impropriety by his refusal to step down from the pulpit. The second remark again deals with her false concern for the congregation's spiritual welfare. Her last remark truly reflects her feelings. "And then he is disobedient!" she exclaims. For a moment, she drops her mask of cant and speaks her true feelings. She is not interested in a clergyman who will take good care of the souls of the people, but rather one who will wear a nice coat, pay his bills on time, and be obedient to her.

Mrs. Proudie would probably have approved of Eliot's Mr. Bulstrode. He was not only an evangelical, but a rich banker. Gissing, though, provides a more in-depth look at the Bulstrode type.

> The pious businessman who professed Christian virtues he ignored in practice might be a fine hypocrite, but he was more likely to be a Pharisee, concealing his worldly motives from himself or proving that at heart he was really a good Christian by a gesture of atonement or repudiation.[47]

Gissing's description of the pious businessman fits Bulstrode exceptionally well. Bulstrode follows a distinct pattern wherein he cants and then attempts to atone by still further cant which manifests itself in the form of penitential bribes. I shall examine in detail two examples of this pattern. The first concerns Bulstrode's original sin, as it were, and his attempt at atonement by giving money to Will Ladislaw. The second deals with his ministerings to Raffles and his gift to Lydgate. Bulstrode slips into the practice of cant via the fellowship of Christian businessmen route. He works for a Mr. Dunkirk and is in good standing with him because of an aptitude for accounting and Christianity. When a confidential subordinate partner of Dunkirk's dies, Bulstrode is elected to fill the position. He becomes the new confidential accountant. He finds that his new position compromises his Christianity when he ". . . became aware that one source of magnificent profit was the easy reception of any goods offered, without strict inquiry as to where they came from" (Mm, p. 451). Bulstrode successfully deals with

[47] Walter E. Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind, p. 407.

this moral inconsistency; "his religious activity could not be incompatible with his business as soon as he had argued himself into not feeling it incompatible" (Mm, p. 451). As the new confidential accountant, Bulstrode is in a situation especially conducive to producing cant. His duties no doubt included some juggling of the books. His whole position is designed to deceive by giving the impression that the business operates on the right side of the law. The confidential accountant is essentially a confidence man. He is not what he appears to be.

After Bulstrode rationalizes away his confidence game, he goes on to commit an act which ultimately leads to his undoing. Dunkirk dies and Bulstrode convinces Mrs. Dunkirk to join him in a marriage of convenience. He marries her for money, not love. But before she will agree to enter into this marriage, she asks him to see if her daughter is still alive. Bulstrode checks into the matter and discovers that the daughter is indeed still alive. "The daughter had been found; but only one man besides Bulstrode knows it, and he was paid for keeping silence and carrying himself away" (Mm, p. 452). In this situation, Bulstrode cants through his actions. He goes through the motions of finding truth and, as providence would have it, turns it up; but he closes his eyes to the truth, puts the daughter away from him, and protects his inheritance-to-come. His

rationale for greed is that he would use the money and position more for the glory of God than would the daughter. Bulstrode clothes his greed and deception in a rationale of cant. His cant secures the marriage of convenience and assures his inheritance.

Despite Bulstrode's efforts to repudiate his actions through rationalizations, he still feels a great deal of guilt. But intermingled with his guilt is an equal measure of fear that his original sin (of disinheriting the daughter) will be uncovered. It is this mixed motive that leads him to seek to atone for his sin by giving money to Will Ladislaw, (the disinherited daughter's son).

> "It is my wish, Mr. Ladislaw, to make amends for the deprivation which befell your mother." . . . Mr. Bulstrode paused. He felt he was performing a striking piece of scrupulosity in the judgment of his auditor, and a penitential act in the eyes of god. (Mm, p. 456)

Ladislaw meets this "penitential act" by exposing the sin which necessitated it. Bulstrode replies, "'I will not deny that you conjecture rightly . . . And I wish to make atonement to you as the one still remaining who has suffered a loss through me'" (Mm, p. 456). Bulstrode goes on to make an offering of penance to Ladislaw. Therein lies the cant in Bulstrode's apparent atonement. The offering, in the form of a sizable amount of money, does not go beyond an empty act of penance because Bulstrode is not truly penitent. His offering of penance or atonement is an act of cant because

his gift to Ladislaw is in reality no more than hush money. Bulstrode hopes to produce a feeling of loyalty and obligation on Ladislaw's part by giving him the yearly payments. Bulstrode says, "I am ready to narrow my own resources and the prospects of my family by binding myself to allow you five hundred pounds yearly during my life . . ." (Mm, p. 456). Bulstrode is binding not himself but Ladislaw. If he can bind or give Ladislaw the feeling of obligation through the money, then Bulstrode can be free. Ladislaw wisely rejects Bulstrode's penitential act of cant and saves himself. Lydgate, though, as will be discovered in the next section, does not act so wisely.

The second example of Bulstrode's cant-atonement pattern concerns his ministerings to the ill Raffles and his gift to Lydgate. Cant locks Bulstrode into a vocation that is something less than his ideal. The sin of his early cover-up comes back to haunt him in the person of Raffles. Raffles threatens to expose Bulstrode's secret and thus Bulstrode must now pay Raffles hush money in order to protect his image. Bulstrode again cants to maintain his public Christian image, and so carries on his confidence game. In the course of his dealings with the extortionist, Raffles becomes seriously ill with what Lydgate diagnoses as a form of poisoning from bad liquor. Bulstrode is placed in a position where he can live out his early desire to be a

missionary. Because of Raffles's illness, he has a chance to minister to the sick as Christ did. Bulstrode does minister to Raffles, but his ministering is poisoned by canting motives and actions. To begin with, he does not want Raffles to live because were Raffles to die, his secret would be safe. "He knew that he ought to say, 'Thy will be done,' and he said it often. But the intense desire remained that the will of God might be the death of that hated man" (Mm, p. 511). Bulstrode's ministering is undermined by a diseased motive. "He could not but see the death of Raffles, and see in it his deliverance" (Mm, p. 516). Bulstrode's ministerings are supposed to be based on strict obedience to Lydgate's orders.

> . . . [Lydate] gave minute directions to Bulstrode as to the doses [of opium to be given], and the point at which they should cease. He insisted on the risk of not ceasing; and repeated his order that no alcohol should be given. (Mm, p. 516)

At this point, if Bulstrode would at least obey the letter of the law despite his motives, he might be on the road to true atonement. Yet a sin of omission and commission conclude his ministry of cant, ending in Raffles's death. First, Bulstrode omits specific information concerning the administering of the opium to the maid Mrs. Abel. ". . . he had not told Mrs. Abel when the doses of opium must cease" (Mm, p. 520). He commits a sin of cant when he allows Raffles to be given alcohol. He says to Mrs. Abel, "That is

the key to the wine cellar. You will find plenty of brandy there" (Mm, p. 520). The next morning he completes his work of cant. "He put the phial [which contained the opium] out of sight, and carried the brandy-bottle downstairs with him, locking it again in the wine cooler" (Mm, p. 521). Bulstrode's ministry to the ill Raffles is in truth the means with which he murders him. Symbolically, Bulstrode functions as a priest whose job is to minister the sacraments to Raffles. An obedient ministering of the sacraments will result in both their salvations; but Bulstrode perverts the mass to his own selfish ends and murders Raffles physically and himself spiritually. Bulstrode cants in ministering the "mass of obedience" to Lydgate's directions and commits spiritual suicide.

Bulstrode's gift of money to Lydgate completes the cant-atonement pattern, but Lydgate responds differently than Ladislaw. The day before Bulstrode begins ministering to Raffles, Lydgate asks for a long term loan of one thousand pounds. Bulstrode responds like a hardened business man instead of the charitable Christian he pretends to be, and coldly recommends that Lydgate declare bankruptcy. The very next day Bulstrode mysteriously reconsiders.

> "I have been reconsidering this subject. I was yesterday taken by surprise, and saw it (the request for the loan) superficially. Mrs. Bulstrode is anxious for her niece, and I myself should grieve at a calamitous change in your position. Claims on me are numerous, but on reconsideration, I esteem it right that I should incur a small sacrifice rather than leave you unaided." (Mm, p. 518)

Bulstrode concludes his little offer of penance for his hastiness of the day before and says, "'You can give me a note of hand for this, Mr. Lydgate," . . . 'And by-and-by, I hope you may be in circumstances gradually to repay me'" (Mm, p. 518). To which Lydgate responds, "'I am deeply obliged to you . . .'" (Mm, p. 518). This exchange is very important because it occurs before Bulstrode disobeys Lydgate's orders and virtually murders Raffles. Bulstrode, the shrewd businessman, is investing in his future. His loan is not intended to free Lydgate from financial pressure but rather bind Lydgate in obligation to Bulstrode.

Bulstrode cants at every turn in the exchange. To begin with, he cares nothing for Rosamond or whether Lydgate should have a calamitous fall in his position. The loan is intended to protect Bulstrode from a calamitous fall, and ironically Lydgate's acceptance of it leads to his own fall. Lydgate soon finds "circumstances" where he repays Bulstrode; but the repayment is much more than the loan. The loan's purpose is three pronged: First, it appears to atone for the refusal of the day before; second, it is intended to atone for Bulstrode's death wish for Raffles; and third, it is intended to buy Lydgate's complicity in accordance with Bulstrode's diseased motive.

> The banker felt he had done something to nullify one cause of uneasiness, [his rejection of Lydgate's initial request] and yet he was scarcely the easier. He did not measure the quantity of diseased motive which had made him wish for Lydgate's good will. (Mm, p. 518-19)

Bulstrode wants the death of Raffles. His guilt stirs him to atone by being charitable to Lydgate, but the charity undergoes through cant a perverse metamorphosis and becomes a bribe to bind Lydgate in obligation. Lydgate blindly accepts the bribe, unable to discern the true nature of the "loan," and destroys his career in Middlemarch by guilt through association. The cant-atonement pattern is repeated, only this time the gift of atonement is accepted and the consequences of the pattern are allowed to run their course. The results are devastating. Raffles is dead; Bulstrode and Lydgate, dishonored. An examination of the cant of the religious hypocrite, as manifested in his words and deeds, fills in the picture of the hypocrite which was brought into focus by the name-as-lens discussed in Chapter One. The final chapter will examine the authors' purposes for depicting the hypocrite and will proffer a method for ascertaining the degree of success achieved by each author in pursuing his purpose.

Chapter 3

HIERARCHY OF POWER

Chapters One and Two of this paper demonstrate how much care Dickens, Trollope, and Eliot take in depicting their religious hypocrites. The richly connotative names and the complex use of cant indicate that, even though none of the religious hypocrites are the main characters in the novels, they are nonetheless very important to their success. Our authors depict the religious hypocrite with several purposes in mind, and the purposes are much more significant than merely entertaining the reader with a bit of comic relief. Their religious hypocrites function as an integral part of the structure of the novel.

One of the hypocrite's major literary purposes is to supply energy for the movement of the plot. The hypocrite, as characterized by our three authors, is a veritable power plant which the authors draw upon to infuse their novels with energy. This energy is created in three ways: first, energy is created when the hypocrite comes into conflict with a sympathetic character. This energy is a classic example of the kind produced in the antagonist-protagonist

clash. The second situation in which the hypocrite stimulates the creation of energy is that in which his values come into conflict with the reader's. The third energy-producing situation is more complex. The religious hypocrite gives off what I term the energy of evil. The hypocrites in our discussion are satanic or Byronic in the way they are totally dedicated to achieving their own selfish ends regardless of the means employed. Some hypocrites are obviously more evil or Byronic than others and as one would expect they infuse energy into the novel in direct proportion to how evil they might be.

Dickens uses the religious hypocrite to accomplish episodic intensification. Harvey elucidates the term by saying,

> Critics frequently discuss Jacobean plays in terms of "episodic intensification." By this they mean the impulse to exploit the full possibilities of any particular scene, situation, or action without too much regard for the relevance of such local intensities to the total work of art.[48]

Because The Pickwick Papers and Bleak House were originally serialized, Dickens was well aware that he should not write too many chapters which were devoted to building quietly and subtly toward a climax. He had to provide energy and intensity in every installment in order to keep up the interest in his story. As a result, he probably engages in more

[48] John W. Harvey, Character and the Novel, p. 89.

episodic intensification than was desirable, although Harvey grants that Dickens controls himself artistically in Bleak House.[49] It is interesting to note how Dickens inserts his hypocrites into the novels with a regularity approaching the systematic. He inserts the hypocrite with such regularity because of the hypocrite's capacity to create an almost stock response in the reader. The hypocrite is sure to create energy by eliciting reader involvement. Stiggins creates an energy which carries the novel and betters its chances for success. But Stiggins does not appear enough in The Pickwick Papers to supply the necessary energy. Besides, if he appeared too regularly in this loose, baggy, monster of fifty-seven chapters, he would wear out his welcome and fail to produce the desired energetic result. Dickens solves this problem by creating a secular charlatan to complement Stiggins. Mr. Alfred Jingles, a man who even physically resembles Stiggins, combines with him to form a team of secular-sacred hypocrites whose purpose is to energize the chapters which they grace with their presence. To put in concrete perspective the regularity with which they appear throughout the novel, I have gathered the following information. The letter above the line is the initial of the hypocrite: 'S' for Stiggins, 'J' for Jingles. The

[49] Harvey, p. 89.

number below the line is the number of the chapter in which they appear.

J	J	J	J	J/S	J	J	S	S	J	S
2,3	7-10	15,16	18	22	23	25	27	33	42	43

S/J	J	S	J	J
45	47	52	53	57

These data are intended to impress visually upon the reader the regularity with which Dickens inserts Stiggins and Jingles in order to engage more fully the reader and thereby more fully to energize the novel.

Dickens once again employs the sacred-secular combination to intensify episodically his novel Bleak House. Chadband and Mrs. Jellyby are the religious hypocrites while Mr. Vholes and Mademoiselle Hortense make up their secular counterparts. Although Vholes and Hortense are not hypocrites like Chadband and Jellyby, they are similar in that they are evil. It is their evil or Byronic nature that infuses so much energy into the plot. Their Byronic quality, a selfish devotion to their own ends regardless of the consequences, gives them this incredible potential to produce energy and at the same time aligns them in terms of function with the religious hypocrite. Dickens, as he does with Stiggins and Jingles, employs this sacred-secular combination of episodic intensifiers. The following data are read in the

same manner as that from The Pickwick Papers.

C	J	H	J	H	C	C/H	J/H	C	C	J	V
3	4-6	12	14	18	19	22	23	24	25	30	37

J	V	H	V	C	V	J	V	H	C/H	V	V
38	39	42	43	44	45	50	51	53	54	60	62

V	J
65	67

The above data dramatically indicate the regularity with which Dickens uses his religious hypocrites and their secular counterparts to engage the reader and intensify the novel. The common denominator between the two couples is again their Byronic nature. Both couples supply energy to the novel but Vholes and Hortense supply more because, as their action clearly demonstrates, they are the more evil. In both The Pickwick Papers and Bleak House, Dickens evenly intersperses his energizing characters so that they appear in more than one-third of the total chapters.

While Dickens seems especially successful in creating energy by engaging the emotions of the reader, Trollope succeeds in creating energy by pitting his religious hypocrites against characters within the book. Of course, energy is also created when the reader sides with the character opposing the hypocrite, but that reaction is secondary to the

sparks that fly when Trollope strikes his hypocrite against another flinty character. Barchester Towers is primarily energized by Rev. Slope. He is locked in combat with Mrs. Proudie, Archdeacon Grantly, and Dean Arabin. Slope constantly fans the flames of these ongoing conflicts as he attempts to outmaneuver his adversaries. Trollope uses the hypocrite Slope to generate tremendous energy in the novel.

Slope's conflicts with Proudie, Grantly, and Arabin are energetic manifestations which are second only to the indefatigable and undefeatable Byronic spirit within him. The spirit of selfishness and pride generates a great deal of energy. When Dean Trefoil becomes deathly ill, the ever-opportunistic Slope immediately sends three letters to men of influence so that he can gain the riches of the deanery and the prestige of the position. His letter-writing is disrespectful and vulgar, not to mention unethical. They ably illustrate his selfishness and lack of ethics. His letter-writing also, as one would expect, creates energy by infuriating the reader. The most outstanding example of Slope's Byronic bearing is his defiance in the face of defeat. He comes out the loser in all of his conflicts but still reacts with disdain. He is not humbled by defeat. As Slope is driving out of Barchester after his final defeat, he meets the Archdeacon. "They did not speak now; but they looked each other full in the face, and Mr. Slope's

countenance was as impudent, as triumphant, as defiant as ever" (BT, p. 487). Trollope employs Slope effectively throughout the novel and wisely does not allow Slope to leave Barchester until very near the end. Slope energizes Barchester Towers through his conflicts, his Byronic bearing, and by infuriating the reader at every turn. Trollope's use of his hypocrite, Slope, to energize the plot and move the story is very successful because of Slope's infuriating ubiquity from the beginning to the end of the novel.

Trollope's The Last Chronicle of Barset is energized almost entirely by either apparent or real hypocrisy. Trollope begins the novel with people at a party discussing Rev. Crawley's alleged theft of a check for twenty pounds. Obviously the amount is not what causes the excitement; Crawley's clerical position does. Crawley's apparent hypocrisy produces the initial spark which starts the novel moving. Trollope's use of clerical hypocrisy elicits a predictable response in the reader. People hate hypocrisy in anyone; however, they simply will not tolerate it in a clergyman. Crawley's apparent hypocrisy carries the plot along nicely until Mrs. Proudie, a bona fide hypocrite of the first order, enters the story. She takes upon herself the task of destroying Crawley for his apparent hypocrisy. Trollope has created a remarkable energy-producing combination. He is pitting the loathsome and real hypocrisy of

Mrs. Proudie against the pitiable and apparent hypocrisy of Crawley. Trollope is producing energy in three ways simultaneously. Mrs. Proudie and Crawley are both Byronic in their sheer doggedness to win the battle. Energy is generated because a hypocrite is placed in conflict with a sympathetic character and because a hypocrite's perspective is placed in conflict with the readers. Trollope, though, makes two very serious mistakes in his management of energy in the novel. To begin with, Crawley triumphs over Mrs. Proudie much too soon. A face-to-face confrontation should have been delayed to the last possible instant. For as soon as Crawley crushed her at the confrontation in the Palace (an incident which takes place in the first fourth of the book), her menacing potential is greatly undercut. From there on she tries to undo him, but the reader is reasonably sure that she can no longer win. Trollope de-energizes the novel by reducing the intensity of the conflict between Proudie and Crawley, after Crawley silences her in the Palace, she can never seriously threaten him again.

Mrs. Proudie continues to stalk Crawley with all of her energy. Her chase, undercut though it may be, is captivating. It holds the reader and helps carry on the story. Unfortunately, two-thirds of the way through the novel, Mrs. Proudie dies of a heart condition. It is her hypocritical heart which pumps life and energy through the novel, yet

Trollope arrests the energy and the novel stalls. Trollope has the right formula for success in Barchester Towers but fails to realize it. The Last Chronicle of Barset, like Barchester Towers, would have been successful in terms of energy had Mrs. Proudie, like Slope, been a vital part of the plot from beginning to end.

There are eighty-seven chapters in Eliot's novel Middlemarch, but she waits until chapter seventy-one before she completely terminates the energy-producing potential of her religious hypocrite Bulstrode. Before his fall he produces energy in all of the three ways mentioned earlier. His merciless treatment of Lydgate when Lydgate asks for a loan is an example of his conflict with a sympathetic character. A more common way in which Bulstrode energizes the story, though, is the one in which his canting actions or perspective conflict with the reader's perspective. Eliot creates the most energy by exploiting Bulstrode's nature. Of all the religious hypocrites discussed up to now, Bulstrode is decidedly the most evil. Unlike Chadband, whose evil nature is overshadowed by the evil of Mr. Vholes, Bulstrode has cornered the market on evil in Middlemarch. Eliot exploits this evil during the period of time when Bulstrode murders Raffles by taking the reader into Bulstrode's disturbed and frantic mind and engages the reader in the chaos. The reader vicariously shares in the turbulence. Eliot

creates a prolonged and intense climax which is extremely enervating. Soon thereafter, Bulstrode is publicly humiliated and subsequently incapable of creating the energy which his evil hypocrisy once allowed. The energy loss brought about by Bulstrode's fall does not produce the problem that Mrs. Proudie's did in LCB. Mm, unlike LCB, is not in need of a new or contrived energy source to sustain enough reader involvement to complete the novel. The natural unfolding of the denouement of the last few chapters is of sufficient interest in and of itself to interest the reader. Eliot succeeds where Trollope fails because she waits longer to de-energize her religious hypocrite and because she does not have to rely on a contrived energy to carry her story through to its completion.

The religious hypocrites function very effectively as power plants which provide energy for the movement of the plot. Dickens, Eliot, and Trollope, whether they are totally aware of the fact or not, exploit the hypocrite's potential to empower the narrative. The technical or literary purpose of the hypocrite is secondary, though, to the social purpose intended by the author. Dickens intends, in large part, to show the pernicious effects that the religious hypocrite has on the family. Trollope's purpose is much the same but with a few variations which enable his hypocrites to affect a greater sphere of influence. In other words, Trollope's

hypocrites exert their negative influence beyond the confines of the nuclear family. Eliot also shows how the hypocrite affects the family and society, but she does not just duplicate Dickens and Trollope's pattern. She goes back to the source, to the hypocrite himself, and examines the effects his hypocrisy has on his life. Dickens, Trollope, and Eliot's primary purpose for depicting the religious hypocrite is to show the negative effects which the hypocrite has on the family, society, and himself.

Dickens's religious hypocrites seem especially intent on destroying particular families and exhibit sex-linked characteristics. The male hypocrites, Stiggins and Chadband, manipulate women in order to satisfy their needs for money or ego. They seduce the women's affections in order to profit in some way. The male hypocrite's sex-linked characteristic, then, is his power over women. The female hypocrite, such as Mrs. Pardiggle and Mrs. Jellyby, also exhibits sex-linked characteristics. Typical of these characteristics is an impaired moral vision which results in the failure properly to fulfill their role as mother and wife. The female hypocrite is also guilty of emasculating her husband and rendering him incapable of adequately fulfilling his duties as head of the household. Dickens believed, as did almost all the men of his day, that a family could not survive if the parents failed to assume properly their roles

in the traditional way. The father ruled the family, handled the money, and made all of the major decisions, while the wife obeyed the husband unquestioningly, took care of the children, and tended the house. This is the family order which Dickens values and which his female hypocrites threaten.

The male hypocrites pose a greater danger to the family unit than their female counterparts. Whereas the female generally tends to go no further than disrupting the preordained order, the males could destroy the unit by their ability to seduce wives. Stiggins and Chadband are threats to the marriage because of their divisive influence. They seduce the women's affections and come between husband and wife. This is exactly what happens in The Pickwick Papers with Stiggins and Mrs. Weller. He seduces her affections in order to satisfy his need for food and money and successfully wedges himself between husband and wife. He so thoroughly claims her allegiance that she turns on her husband Tony and berates him for not meeting the high moral standard which Stiggins espouses. An amplification on a few of the specifics will clarify Stiggins's activities. Stiggins continually intrudes on the Weller household. By deceiving Mrs. Weller with his cant, he intends to usurp Tony Weller's position. Stiggins plants seeds of sedition in Mrs. Weller's mind by suggesting that her husband is

hard-hearted and unresponsive to the "Word." He wedges himself between the couple, and, with every visit, drives them further apart. Mr. and Mrs. Weller are separated with finality when Mrs. Weller dies. It seems she imprudently sits on the wet ground listening to a drunk preacher (Stiggins, presumably). She, who was previously a teetotaler happens to be under the influence of alcohol at the time she catches cold. She attempts a death bed reconciliation with her husband, but it is too trite and tardy to be significant. Stiggins acts as a divisive element in the marriage of the Wellers, and destroys their marriage as a result of his seduction.

Dickens uses Chadband in a similar way. Chadband attempts to come between the Snagsbys and Dedlocks. In both cases he attempts to profit materially by undermining the relationship between the husband and wife. First, he attempts to satisfy his gluttony by seducing the affections of Mrs. Snagsby and by appealing to a jealousy which she harbors against her husband. As he plays up to this jealousy to gain her allegiance, it grows in intensity. The second marriage which Chadband threatens is that of Sir Leicester Dedlock and his wife, Lady Honoria Dedlock. Chadband knows of her past relationship with Captain Hawdon and attempts to extort money from Sir Leicester by threatening scandal. Mr. Bucket asks Chadbands his business and he responds:

> My friends, we are now--Rachel my wife and I--in the mansions of the rich and great. Why are we now in the mansions of the rich and great, my friends? Is it because we are invited? Because we are bidden to feast with them, because we are bidden to rejoice with them, because we are bidden to play the lute with them, because we are bidden to dance with them? No. Then why are we here, my friends? Air we in a possession of a sinful secret, and doe we require corn, and wine, and oil--or, what is much the same thing, money--for the keeping thereof? Probably so, my friends. (BH, p. 555)

Chadband's attempt at extortion fails because he cannot manipulate men with the same ease as he does women. In a sense he is defeated by what Dickens considers proper manliness. First, Mr. Bucket treats Chadband contemptuously. When Chadband leaves, one is relatively sure he will not receive any hush money. Chadband is successful in threatening the marriage of the Snagsbys. He succeeds in satisfying his gluttony and in making life even more miserable for an already unhappy couple. If Mr. Snagsby had been a true man, he, like Mr. Bucket, would never have allowed Chadband to exploit him. Sir Leicester foils Chadband because he is a gentleman. He receives Chadband and company with cold indifference. Chadband tries to threaten the marriage by revealing the sinful secret; he tries to exploit the jealousy of Sir Leicester as he did with Mrs. Snagsby. Sir Leicester rejects the threat, forgives his wife, and foils Chadband by an admirable display of Christian manliness. Chadband's attempt to extort from Sir Leicester is an obvious case of him being overmatched. Christian manliness goes a long way

way in repulsing the likes of Chadband. If the husband properly assumes his position as head of the family, it will be safe.

Dickens continues to demonstrate the effects of the religious hypocrite on the family with his depictions of Mrs. Pardiggle and Mrs. Jellyby. Because of their devotion to philanthropic works of greedy benevolence, they fail to carry out properly their duties as wife and mother. In addition, their unseemly aggressiveness emasculates each of their husbands to the point where he is no longer the head of the family. Mrs. Pardiggle's missionary zeal has so blinded her to the condition of her family and others in need that she degenerates into hypocrisy. Her hypocritical zeal further reinforces the blindness to her family's needs and they suffer as a result. Mrs. Pardiggle cannot see clearly because of the mote or particle that is in her eye. On an errand of "rapacious benevolence," as Esther labels it, Mrs. Pardiggle drops by Bleak House in order to enlist Mr. Jarndyce's aid in some charity. She forces her children to accompany her on her charitable excursions and also to donate their own allowances to charities. She proudly itemizes their gifts for Esther's benefit:

> . . . my eldest (twelve), is the boy who sent out his pocket money, to the amount of five-and-Threepence, to the Tockaloopo Indians . . . Alfred, my youngest (five), has voluntarily enrolled himself in the Infant Bonds of Joy, and is pledged never through life, to use tobacco in any form. (BH, p. 77)

Mrs. Pardiggle is blind not only to the ferocious discontent of her family, but also to the heart-rending needs of a poor brickmaker's family. Esther and her cousin Ada are invited to accompany Mrs. Pardiggle as she makes her rounds. The visit concerns a gin-drinking brickmaker whom Mrs. Pardiggle is trying to convert to the ways of temperance. Her impaired moral vision does not allow her to see the scene around her. The brickmaker tries to focus the setting accurately for her:

> "Is my daughter a washin'? Yes she is a washin'! Look at the water. Smell it! That's wat we drinks. Now do you like it, and what do you think of gin instead! An't my place dirty? Yes, it is dirty--it's nat'rally dirty, and it's nat'rally unwholesome; and we've had five dirty and unwholesome children, as is all dead infants, and so much the better for them, and for us besides. Have I read the little book what you left? No, I an't read the little book what you left. There an't nobody here as knows how to read it; and if there was, it wouldn't be suitable to me. It's a book fit for a babby, and I'm not a babby." (BH, pp. 81-2)

Because of that speck in Mrs. Pardiggles's eye, she is unable to see the situation of the brickmaker. The filth of the house passes unnoticed under her eyes. The unhealthy living conditions directly contribute to the death of five infants, yet she is unmoved. The brickmaker's predilection for the gin over the muddy water is a mystery to her. The mote in her eye is her dedication to the cause of temperance. As she blindly concludes her temperance cant and exits, she fails to see the child, who lies dying in the house. A few minutes after her departure the child dies.

Like Mrs. Pardiggle, Mrs. Jellyby also suffers from distorted moral vision. The title of chapter four in Bleak House, "Telescopic Philanthropy," is descriptive of Mrs. Jellyby's moral vision. Esther clarifies the applicability of the title to Mrs. Jellyby:

> She was a pretty, very diminutive, plump woman, of from forty to fifty, with handsome eyes, though they had a curious habit of seeming to look a long way off. As if--I am quoting Richard again--they could see nothing nearer than Africa! (BH, p. 29)

The object of Mrs. Jellyby's telescope philanthropy is ". . . the general cultivation of the coffee berry--and the natives . . ." (BH, p. 26). Suffice to say, her devotion to the subject of Africa is intense. Her epistolary output directed towards the success of her philanthropy is even more prodigious than that of the perpetually moving Mrs. Pardiggle. Mrs. Jellyby's Herculean output is achieved at the expense of her family. Her son Peepy opens the action of the chapter with his head caught between two iron railings. Moments after being freed from the railings, he falls down a flight of stairs. Seeking motherly attention for his numerous injuries, Peepy interrupts Mrs. Jellyby in the midst of her philanthropic correspondence. "Mrs. Jellyby merely added, with the serene composure with which she said everything, 'Go along, you naughty Peepy!' and fixed her fine eyes on Africa again" (BH, p. 29).

Mrs. Jellyby does not manage her massive mailing mission single-handedly. She employs one assistant, or more specifically, her daughter Caddy, to aid in the production of the one hundred or more letters that are turned out daily. Mrs. Jellyby, hypocritically farsighted, can focus only on Africa while the immediacy of Caddy's needs go unnoticed and unmet. Caddy is overworked, unkempt, and terribly discontented, yet her mother is blind to the fact. During dinner, Caddy has to leave the table three to four times to work on letters. Esther notes with incredulity that even at midnight Mrs. Jellyby and Caddy are still busy with letter writing. Caddy's tumbled hair, ink-stained face, and threadbare clothes reflect the sad state of neglect brought upon her by continuous occupation with the mission work. Because of her oppressive workload and unnaturally mortified personal state, Caddy has become, like Mrs. Pardiggle's children, ferociously discontent. "'I wish Africa was dead!' she said on a sudden. . . . 'I do!' she said. 'Don't talk to me, Miss Summerson. I hate it and detest it. It's a beast'" (BH, p. 33). The farsighted Mrs. Jellyby, eyes ever on Africa, overlooks the plight she has created for her Caddy.

Mrs. Jellyby devotes all of her time and energy to evangelical philanthropy, and her family suffers. Her single-minded pursuit of power completely isolates her from

her children and husband. Mr. Jellyby laments the awful condition of his family and says to Caddy, ". . . the best thing that could happen to them [the family] was, their being all Tomahawked together" (BH, p. 317). Caddy interprets her father's hyperbole:

> "No, of course I know Pa wouldn't like his family weltering in their blood . . . but he means that they are very unfortunate in being Ma's children and that he is very unfortunate in being Ma's husband; and I am sure that's true, though it seems unnatural to say so." (BH, p. 319)

The children are very unfortunate. Mrs. Jellyby will not even assist Caddy in her wedding arrangements. Because of Mrs. Jellyby's indifference, Esther aids Caddy in her wedding preparations. Esther attempts to include Mrs. Jellyby in the wedding plans, but Mrs. Jellyby declines, saying, ". . . these are really ridiculous preparations, though your assisting them is a proof of your kindness" (BH, p. 319). After labeling her daughter's wedding preliminaries ridiculous, she examines Caddy's wedding clothes and adds this sad afterthought: "My good Miss Summerson, at half the cost, this weak child might have been equipped for Africa" (BH, p. 319). By refusing to aid Caddy, Mrs. Jellyby shows her perverse placement of evangelical philanthropy and the pursuit of power over marriage and family. Mrs. Jellyby subordinates her family to the pursuit of power. Marriage was a sacred Victorian institution; subsequently, when Mrs. Jellyby ridicules and rejects Caddy's entrance into that

institution, she commits a grievous wrong.

Mrs. Pardiggle and Mrs. Jellyby both refuse to accept their role as mother in their families and subsequently their families suffer. They not only refuse to assume their maternal duties but they also refuse to subject themselves to their husband's authority. They emasculate their husbands by refusing them their divine right over the household. Mrs. Pardiggle intimates the relative lack of importance of her husband to the family: "We usually observe the same routine. I put down my mite first; then my young family enroll their contributions, according to their ages and their little means; and then Mr. Pardiggle brings up the rear" (BH, p. 78). Mrs. Pardiggle has taken over as head of the household from her husband. In the name of benevolence, she steals her children's allowance and robs her husband's position. Mr. Jellyby is also very unfortunate; he, like Mr. Pardiggle, is deposed as head of the family by a wife who blindly pursues the power to be found in evangelical philanthropy. Her mission work bankrupts him and leaves him a "shorn lamb" (BH, p. 216). She usurps his place and deprives him of his power. Dickens's male religious hypocrites, Stiggins and Chadband, pose as external threats to the family as they seduce the wife's affections and undermine the marriage relationship. Mrs. Pardiggle and Mrs. Jellyby's religious hypocrisy poses an internal threat to the

family because they neglect their children and usurp their husbands' positions.

Trollope's purpose in depicting the religious hypocrite follows the Dickensian pattern discussed above, though with some variations. His hypocrites threaten not only the order and unity of the nuclear family, but the order and unity of the community as well. Slope, like his Dickensian counterparts, has definite ability to influence women.

> He is gifted with a certain kind of pulpit eloquence, not likely indeed to be persuasive with men, but powerful with the softer sex. In his sermons he deals greatly with denunciations, excites the minds of his weaker hearers with a not unpleasant terror, and leaves an impression on their minds that all mankind are in a perilous state and all womankind too, except those who attend regularly to the evening lectures at Baker Street. (BT, p. 27)

Slope first uses his special power with women to garner the good will of Mrs. Proudie. He hopes to use her to achieve greater things. After securing a foothold with Mrs. Proudie, he proposes marriage to her daughter Olivia. Slope discovers that Olivia has no dowry to speak of, and, realizing that she cannot help further his career, gravitates back to Mrs. Proudie. Upon Slope's selection as chaplain to the Bishop, he decides to usurp the Bishop's position.

> He knew he would have a hard battle to fight, for the power and patronage of the scene would be equally coveted by another great mind--Mrs. Proudie would also choose to be Bishop of Barchester. Mr. Slope, however, flattered himself that he could outmaneuver the lady. (BT, p. 27)

It is at this point that Slope becomes divisive and threatens the security of the Proudies's marriage, a marriage which is not altogether stable to begin with. Slope attempts to gain the bishopric by causing husband and wife to war between themselves. By keeping them engaged in a running battle, he intends to run the diocese. He very nearly succeeds.

Slope also threatens the unity in the Harding and Grantly households. His apparent sway over Eleanor Bold's affections makes her appear foolish and traitorous to her father, Mr. Harding and her brother-in-law, Archdeacon Grantly. It is not until her surprise announcement of her engagement to the perfectly acceptable Arabin that Mr. Harding and the Archdeacon forgive Eleanor for her infidelity.

Trollope with his depiction of Slope goes beyond a mere duplication of the Stiggins-Chadband pattern. He characterizes Slope as a threat, not only to the order of the family, but also to that of the community. One need only look at the divisive effects of his sermon to understand Slope's capacity to create schisms in Barchester. His sermon is not intended to convert unbelievers to Christianity like most evangelical sermons; nor is it intended to explain doctrine or unify the community as were most High Church sermons. Slope's sermon attacks supposed High Church

ritualism in Barchester. His sole purpose is to win converts to his Low Church camp. He cares nothing for the "souls of the people," as Mrs. Proudie would say. As a result, his sermon breaks the truce between the Low and High Church factions in Barchester, creates confusion and disorder, and sets up a wall which alienates the members of the Christian community in Barchester. "All Barchester was in a tumult" (BT, p. 51). Slope, then, divisively threatens the unity and order of the nuclear family and the Christian family of the community of Barchester.

Mrs. Proudie, like Mrs. Pardiggle and Mrs. Jellyby, suffers from an obscured moral vision. She is blinded by pride and thus acts in hypocritical ways. Mrs. Proudie works full time like her counterparts from Bleak House, and like them she is devoted not to full-time motherhood but to the full-time pursuit of power. Mrs. Proudie spends all of her energy in Barchester Towers trying to usurp the Bishop's power and works full time in The Last Chronicle of Barset attempting to exercise that power. Because she is better off financially, her children's needs are taken care of by servants; they do not suffer neglect like that of the Pardiggle and Jellyby children. Trollope focuses not on the effects of the deficiencies in Mrs. Proudie's motherhood, but on her emasculation and destruction of her husband. Her aggressiveness results in a role reversal which ruins the

bishop as a man. In her efforts to destroy Crawley, she continually overrides her husband's orders and makes him vulnerable to failure, humiliation, and ridicule. His humiliation over the Crawley affair drives him into a deep depression. His state is so severe that she is moved to help him but she just further emasculates him. "You cannot do your duty in the diocese if you continue to sit there doing nothing, with your head upon your hands. Why do you not rally and get to your work like a man?" (LCB, p. 550). At a time when her husband desperately needs her sympathy and support, she further undermines him. Trollope takes the reader into Mrs. Proudie's mind right after her unsuccessful attempt to exhort her husband.

> She had loved him dearly, and she loved him still; but she knew how,--at this moment she felt absolutely sure, --that by him she was hated! In spite of all her roughness and temper, Mrs. Proudie was in this like other women,--that she would fain have been loved had it been possible. She had always meant to serve him. She was conscious of that; conscious also in a way that, although she had been industrious, although she had been faithful, although she was clever, yet she had failed. At the bottom of her heart she knew that she had been a bad wife. (LCB, p. 557)

Mrs. Proudie's hypocrisy emasculates and destroys her husband. She reverses the roles and crushes him with shame. Her hypocrisy destroys her marriage from the inside. Trollope points out that the marriage fails because her hypocrisy induces her to be a "bad wife."

Trollope gives Mrs. Proudie a sex-linked characteristic usually restricted to male religious hypocrites. That is, he makes her an external threat to a family. Whereas Pardiggle and Jllyby pose internal threats to their respective families, Mrs. Proudie is capable of posing an internal and external threat to the family. The external threat which she poses is her attack on Rev. Crawley. She is very much like the male religious hypocrite in her initial attempts in manipulating Rev. Crawley. She invites him to the Palace where she hopes to seduce his affections and overpower him with her will. Rev. Crawley is a gentleman, in the Trollopian sense, and is much too manly to be overpowered by Mrs. Proudie. He rebuffs her attempts and she declares her holy war to protect the souls of the people from Crawley "a common criminal." The threat she poses to his family is very real. If she can achieve Crawley's public disgrace as a thief by evicting him from the pulpit at Hogglestock, she will essentially cut off all financial assistance to Crawley's already poverty-stricken family. If Mrs. Proudie succeeded in her scheme the only alternative open to the Crawleys, a family without money or a potential breadwinner, would be to send the children to different relatives until he was released from prison. In short, Mrs. Proudie poses a very real external threat to the Crawley family, and had she succeeded, they would have had to break

up if they were to survive. With Rev. Slope and Mrs. Proudie, Trollope does not content himself with a mere duplication of the Dickensian patterns of male and female religious hypocrites. Slope is a divisive threat not only to the family, but to the Christian community at large. Mrs. Proudie goes beyond the sex-linked traits of Pardiggle and Jellyby and takes on sex-linked characteristics that were typically male. As a result she not only internally threatens her own family's unity but acts as a divisive threat to the Crawley family as well. Trollope takes the sex-linked traits of the stereotypical male and female religious hypocrites and presents them in a more complex manner and thereby brings greater emphasis to the threat which the hypocrite poses to the family and the community.

Eliot clearly and purposefully demonstrates the effects of Bulstrode's hypocrisy on the family and the community, but she goes beyond Dickens and Trollope and depicts with great sensitivity and understanding the effects of Bulstrode's hypocrisy on himself. But before I examine the effects of Bulstrode's actions on himself, I would like first to discuss the effects his hypocrisy had on family and community. As if taking her cue from Trollope, Eliot develops her hypocrite Bulstrode in such a complex way as to remove him even further from the Dickens's stereotype of the male religious hypocrite. Bulstrode, unlike Stiggins, Chadband,

or Slope, poses an internal threat to his family. In this respect, he is like Mrs. Proudie. They are androgenous hypocrites because they exhibit hypocritical traits of both sexes. Whereas Mrs. Proudie is androgenous in her divisiveness, Bulstrode is androgenous because he poses an internal threat to his family. His hypocrisy brings about public disgrace and he must leave Middlemarch. His family is greatly affected. His daughters are sent away to school to escape shame; subsequently, the family unit is broken down. Worse still, his wife Harriet must share in his shame. It is at this point, though, that Bulstrode's similarity to Mrs. Proudie breaks down. Mrs. Proudie's hypocrisy crushes her husband, but Bulstrode's does not crush his wife. In the face of the tribulation brought upon by his shame, she rises to a higher plain of spiritual maturity. Unlike the bishop who is crushed by suffering, this woman, a member of the weaker sex, grows through it. Eliot goes beyond Dickens in her depiction of an androgenous hypocrite and beyond Trollope when she actually shows something positive emerging from a hypocrite's actions.

Eliot continues to build upon the androgeny of Bulstrode's hypocrisy when she depicts his external threat to the family. Bulstrode is a divisive seducer like Slope, but Bulstrode goes beyond the stereotyped male religious hypocrite. Bulstrode has a way with men rather than women. He

threatens the family by seducing the husband's allegiance rather than the wife's. For example, Lydgate seeks Bulstrode's favor in the form of a loan and Bulstrode rejects him. By rejecting Lydgate's request, Bulstrode is in effect driving Lydgate and Rosamond farther apart. He is acting as an agent to destroy the marriage. The day following his rejection of the loan request, Bulstrode acts as seducer again. Bulstrode needs Lydgate's allegiance if he is to get away with murdering Raffles, so he grants him the loan. Lydgate gladly accepts the loan but realizes that in so doing he has compromised himself. The community judges Lydgate guilty by association with Bulstrode and his chances of succeeding as a physician in Middlemarch are ruined. Because of Lydgate's disgrace, he can no longer establish a practice in Middlemarch capable of turning enough profit to satisfy Rosamond's demands for material comfort. Subsequently, she forces him to compromise his ethics, and he practices at an expensive spa to support her tastes and save some shred of their marriage. Thus, Bulstrode induces compromise which wedges itself between them. Their marriage never recovers. Lydgate dies young and embittered over the compromise.

Eliot depicts the effects of the hypocrite in a much more complex way than Dickens or Trollope. Bulstrode shares traits of both male and female hypocrites, and surprisingly,

in his wife's case, the effects are not entirely negative. Eliot's presentation of the hypocrite's effect on the community is very similar to Trollope's characterization of Slope, but, as one would expect by now, Eliot goes beyond Trollope. Bulstrode has a divisive influence on the community just as Slope does.

> The banker was evidently a ruler, but there was an oppositive party, and even among his supporters there were some among who allowed it to be seen that their support was a compromise, and who frankly stated their impression that the general scheme of things, and especially the casualties of trade, required you to hold a candle to the devil. (Mm, p. 115)

Bulstrode's divisiveness is much more powerful and morally complicated than Slope's. Bulstrode goes beyond the simple erection of a wall between the High and Low Church factions. He divides a man against himself. He causes a man to compromise himself just as he is always doing within his own conscience. Eliot shows that Bulstrode does more than just highlight doctrinal differences. He causes men to compromise themselves morally.

As a banker, Bulstrode naturally exerts a good deal of influence in Middlemarch. He holds power over many people because he had lent them money. Bulstrode, though, places the borrowers under considerable pressure to conform to his idea of morality. His expectations are unethical, hypocritical, unreasonable. He used "the loan method" to gain power "out of all proportion to its external means" (Mm, p. 115).

These loans by the Christian businessman are no more than hypocritical extortions which force the borrowers to conform to Bulstrodian morality. Eliot says Bulstrode's desire for power over his borrowers is "a sort of vampire's feast in the sense of mastery." Bulstrode's hypocrisy then not only divides men against each other and their own conscience, but also enslaves them.

Eliot presents the hypocrite Bulstrode in an attempt to show the effects of his hypocrisy on the family and the community. Though she employs a much more complex dramatization of her purpose than either Dickens or Trollope, it is still the same in its basic intent, to show the hypocrite's effects on family and society. Eliot, though, does not stop there. She again goes beyond Dickens and Trollope. She dramatizes and analyzes the effects of the hypocrite's hypocrisy on himself. Eliot shows that Bulstrode not only victimizes family and society, but himself also, in terms of fear, paralysis, and alienation.

Bulstrode constantly nurses a fear that his past sins will be uncovered and that his veil of hypocrisy will be wrecked from top to bottom. This fear increases dramatically in intensity when he is tending the ill Raffles. "He felt a cold certainty at his heart that Raffles--unless providence sent death to hinder him--would come back to Middlemarch before long. And that certainty was a terror" (Mm, p. 449).

Raffles inspires cold terror in Bulstrode's heart because he could expose Bulstrode to public shame.

> It was not that he [Bulstrode] was in danger of legal punishment or beggary: he was in danger only of seeing exposed to the judgment of his neighbors and the mournful perception of his wife certain facts of his past life which would render him an object of scorn and an opprobrium of the religion with which he had diligently associated himself. (Mm, pp. 449-50)

This intense fear of discovery and public disgrace has a tremendous impact on Bulstrode's life. "Bulstrode felt himself helpless" (Mm, p. 449). His fear was bringing on sickness and paralysis. His hypocrisy was morally immobilizing him. The sickness of his soul was manifesting itself physically.

> A hypochondriacal tendency had shown itself in the banker's constitution of late; and a lack of sleep, which was really only a slight exaggeration of an habitual dyspeptic symptom, had been dwelt on by him as a sign of threatening insanity. (Mm, p. 498)

Bulstrode's fear continues to undermine his moral health and his moral resiliency. When he is publicly disgraced at the sanitary meeting, his worst fears have come to pass and he is paralyzed. "Bulstrode, after a moment's hesitation, took his hat from the floor and slowly rose, but he grasped the corner of the chair so totteringly that Lydgate felt sure that there was not strength enough in him to walk away without support" (Mm, p. 535). Bulstrode, shamed into near paralysis, must be physically assisted from the meeting by Lydgate.

Bulstrode's paralysis is compounded by alienation. He is cast out of the community. Bulstrode is "stoned . . . for not being the man he professed to be" (Mm, p. 602). Paralyzed by his own guilt, shame, and hypocrisy, he is then publicly humiliated at the sanitary meeting, signifying his excommunication and alienation from the community. The pariah staggers home in hopes of a sympathetic reception by his wife. She is merciful but "he shrank from confession" (Mm, p. 602). Because he would not confess his wrongs to her, he alienates them from each other.

> That she should ever silently call his acts Murder was what he could not bear. He felt shrouded by her doubt: . . . Sometimes perhaps when he was dying he would tell her all: . . . Perhaps: but concealment had been the habit of his life, and the impulse to confession had no power against the dread of a deeper humiliation. (Mm, pp. 602-3)

Eliot shows through Bulstrode's example the serious repercussions which can result from hypocrisy. She, like Dickens and Trollope, shows how the family and society can be victimized by the hypocrite; but she goes on to depict how the hypocrite can victimize himself through fear, paralysis, and, worst of all, alienation from family and society.

CONCLUSION

Dickens, Trollope, and Eliot use the names, words, and deeds of the hypocrite to point up the danger of hypocrisy to the family, society, and to the hypocrite himself. Our authors are equally effective in accomplishing their purpose, even though they depict hypocrites who are not equally powerful. Each author takes care not to impart more power to the hypocrite than would suit the context. The novels under discussion by Dickens and Trollope are essentially comic and as a result are limited in how powerful a hypocrite they can successfully develop whereas Eliot's Middlemarch is a drama and is therefore capable of coping with a more powerful hypocrite.

If an author is depicting a religious hypocrite in order to warn his readers of the danger posed by such characters, then the author must follow certain fundamental guidelines. The author who succeeds in his characterization will create a truly dangerous hypocrite. What characteristics make up a "truly dangerous" religious hypocrite? The answer is really very simple. The character must be evil and powerful. If the hypocrite does not possess those two basic characteristics, he will not be truly dangerous, and

therefore will not pose a real threat to family, society, or himself. Abraham Maslow suggested the following order of need fulfillment in human beings: physiological needs, safety needs, love and belonging needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization needs. Self-actualization cannot take place until all of the needs which precede it have been satisfied. The needs must be satisfied in the given order.[50] Maslow's hierarchy of needs suggested a similar hierarchy for the fictive religious hypocrites. The religious hypocrite has a hierarchy of fulfillment which, like Maslow's, has a very distinct and inflexible sequence. Furthermore, the higher up in the hierarchy or the closer to self-actualization the hypocrite is, the more evil, powerful, and potentially dangerous he is. The religious hypocrite's hierarchy of need is as follows: 1) monetary needs, 2) esteem needs (vanity), 3) greater monetary needs, and 4) power (pride) needs. The sequence here is rigid. Needs one, two, and three must be satisfied before the fourth can be satisfied. To reach the self-actualization implied by step four the hypocrite must first satisfy his need for money and adulation. Likewise, the religious hypocrite who poses the most danger to family, society, and self must be at the top of the hierarchy. Therefore, it follows

[50] Robert F. Biehler, Psychology Applied to Teaching, pp. 411-14.

logically that if an author wants to create a truly dangerous hypocrite, he must make sure that his hypocrite is a proud member of the fourth order.

Dickens, Trollope, and Eliot's success or failure in their efforts to depict the religious hypocrite will be based upon where their hypocrite fits into the hierarchy. Stiggins and Chadband never get beyond step two of the hierarchy. They are basically hedonists. Both men go to considerable lengths to satisfy their first order needs. They are dedicated to gluttony and to the acquisition of petty cash. The needs of the first order are somehow met and they move on to step two where surprisingly, their vanity or need for adulation is also quickly met. Neither, though, can pass beyond step three. Stiggins attempts to include himself as an inheritor to Mrs. Weller's estate. Mr. Weller thwarts the attempt and Stiggins receives a beating and unholy baptizing in the watering trough. Chadband tries his hand at extortion from Sir Dedlock in order to satisfy the needs of step three. He does not count on the likes of Detective Bucket, though, and the reader is led to believe that Chadband does not receive a shilling. Stiggins and Chadband are never threatening in any real sense because they never progress beyond step three and acquire the power so necessary to pose danger to others. Mrs. Pardiggle and Mrs. Jellyby also fail to pose a real and present danger.

Both want power more than anything. Dickens undercuts any chance of their success, though, because he makes them of the wrong sex. Nineteenth century England was a man's world. A woman was never going to achieve any significant amount of power. She could be rich but not powerful. Dickens, though, does not allow his female hypocrites, Mrs. Pardiggle and Mrs. Jellyby, to advance beyond step two. He makes them women of modest means and subsequently, they pose no more than a modest threat. They are stuck forever at step two, tirelessly trying to scrape up sufficient money to use as leverage of power. It could be asserted that Dickens fails in his depiction of the hypocrite because none of his hypocrites is truly threatening. Nothing could be further from the truth. Because Dickens's hypocrites appear in comic novels, he must be very careful not to give them so much power that they interfere with the traditional comic ending in which all the conflicts are resolved. By restricting his hypocrites to level two of the hierarchy, he is keeping their power at a level acceptable to the comic context, and insuring a tidy, all's-well-that-end's-well, resolution.

Trollope's hypocrites also dwell in comic novels, but Trollope allows them to have more power. Mrs. Proudie poses a much greater threat than either Mrs. Pardiggle or Mrs. Jellyby because she has fully satisfied the advanced monetary

needs of step three and is expending all her energies in an effort to acquire the power necessary to satisfy step four. She cannot succeed in the acquisition of step four because she is a woman. No woman is going to triumph over the likes of Josiah Crawley or Dr. Tempest. Trollope allows Mrs. Proudie to have enough power to make herself a nuisance, but not enough to make herself a threat. Mrs. Proudie can make Rev. Crawley's life unpleasant, but only the male dominated legal system can make it unbearable. Slope, too, falls short of posing a real threat, although he has the necessary motive to lead him ultimately to hypocritical self-actualization. "He wanted a wife, and he wanted money, but he wanted power more than either" (BT, p. 220). Slope has his priorities in order. He wants power more than anything but he will not achieve the fourth step because he "wants money." Slope doggedly pursues power, but he cannot achieve step four without satisfying step three. Rev. Slope has the sway over the women in Barchester, but he has no such luck with the men. Men respect money, not emotion, and at the end of Barchester, Slope comes to realize this. He realizes that to have power he must be able to influence the men, but in order to do this, he must gain their respect with a show of wealth. At this point, Slope leaves Barchester and sets out to satisfy the needs of step three, advanced monetary needs, so that he can pursue power in earnest. We

are led to assume that Slope fulfills step three because at the end of Barchester Towers, Trollope reports that Slope has married a rich widow. Trollope's religious hypocrites are stronger than Dickens's in the respect that they are striving at higher levels on the hierarchy. Interestingly, their greater power gives them more prominence in their novels, yet Trollope keeps them in check. They are not allowed to attain step four, and as a result pose no threat to straining or upsetting the comic resolution. Within the comic context, Trollope succeeds in depicting hypocrites of substantial strength and vigor, but he intuitively restrains his hypocrites at level three, as if knowing that a hypocrite of the fourth order would disrupt the comic novel and resolution.

Eliot begins where Trollope leaves off. It is as if she takes Rev. Slope from the ease and luxury of the rich widow's home on Baker Street, renames him Mr. Bulstrode and settles him into the town of Middlemarch. Eliot's Bulstrode begins his tenure in Middlemarch with steps one, two, and three satisfied. As a young accountant for Mr. Dunkirk, his basic monetary needs are met. As a respected evangelical brother, his adulation needs are met, and as the husband of the rich widow, Mrs. Dunkirk, his advanced monetary needs are met. As a result, he devotes himself single-mindedly to the pursuit of power and the self-actualization of his pride.

Bulstrode's pursuit of power goes well, but he conceives of a way to expedite the process. He realizes that if he could acquire large tracts of land in addition to his money, he could influence and manipulate even more people. The power he wants rests with the landed gentry so he sets about the task of becoming one of them. He acquires the Featherstone property to solidify his position in step three so the power he needed in step four could be more easily acquired. A hypothetical question arises as to whether Slope would have been as potentially dangerous as Bulstrode if he had been at the same place on the hierarchy? The answer is "no," because Slope lacks the one ingredient necessary to make the religious hypocrite a real and present danger. Slope is not evil. Bulstrode, though, is. Eliot repeatedly describes him with satanic and, especially, vampirish imagery. Had Eliot not circumstantially derailed Bulstrode's pursuit of power, he would have crushed and consumed everyone in the novel. Eliot places him at the top of the hierarchy at the very start of the novel and also makes him diabolical. Eliot creates in Bulstrode the ultimate religious hypocrite. A religious hypocrite of the fourth order would have overpowered a comic novel, but Eliot's Middlemarch provides a dramatic context which is capable of containing Bulstrode. Even within the dramatic confines, Bulstrode threatens to overpower the novel, but Eliot adroitly defuses him. Dickens,

Trollope, and Eliot create religious hypocrites of varying strengths. Each author successfully creates religious hypocrites to suit the context whether comic or dramatic, and in that sense achieves his purpose by providing the reader with a clear view of religious hypocrisy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altick, Richard D. Victorian People and Ideas. New York: Norton Publishing Co., 1973.

Anthon, Charles. A Classical Dictionary. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1882.

Best, Geoffrey. Mid-Victorian Britain, 1851-1875. New York: Schocken Books, 1972.

Biehler, Robert F. Psychology Applied to Teaching. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1974.

Blount, Trevor. "The Chadbands and Dickens's View of Dissenters." Modern Language Quarterly, 25 (1964), 295-307.

Bromhill, Kentley. "Names and Labels." Dickensian, 41 (1945), 92-3.

Brook, George L. The Language of Dickens. London: Deutsch, 1969.

Buttrick, George, Gen. ed. The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. VI. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

Chadwick, Owen. The Victorian Church. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Clinton-Baddeley, V. C. "Stiggins." Dickensian, 50 (1954), 53-6.

Dickens, Charles. Bleak House, ed. Morton Dauwen Zabel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1956.

_____. The Pickwick Papers, ed. Robert L. Patten. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1976.

Douglas, James D., Gen. ed. The New Bible Dictionary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Erdman's Publishing Co., 1962.

Eliot, George. Middlemarch. ed. Gordon S. Haight. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968.

Gaynor, Frank, ed. Dictionary of Mysticism. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953.

Gerould, Winifred. A Guide to Trollope. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948.

Green, Robert. "Hard Times: The Style of a Sermon." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 11 (1970), 1375-96.

Harvey, W. J. Character and the Novel. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1965.

Hayward, Arthur L. The Dickens Encyclopedia. New York: Dutton Press, 1924.

Heeney, Brian. A Different Kind of Gentleman: Parish Clergy as Professional Men in Early and Mid-Victorian England. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1976.

Houghton, Walter E. The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870. New Haven, Conn. Published for Wellesley College by Yale University Press, 1957.

House, Humphrey. The Dickens World. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Kerpneck, Harvey. "Trollope's Effeminate Clergymen." Queen's Quarterly, 82 (1975), 191-214.

Lee, James W. "Trollope's Clerical Concerns: The Low Church Clergymen." Hartford Studies in Literature, 1 (1969), 198-208.

Lewis, C. S. Mere Christianity. New York: Macmillan Co., 1971.

Luther, Martin. Three Treatises, Gen. ed. Helmut T. Lehmann. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973.

Murray, James A., Gen. ed. The Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

Nevins, Albert I. The Maryknoll Catholic Dictionary. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1965.

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

Stutley, James, and Margaret Stutley. Harper's Dictionary of Hinduism. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1977.

Trollope, Anthony. Barchester Towers. Garden City: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1945.

_____. The Last Chronicle of Barset. ed. Arthur Mizener. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1964.

_____. The Warden. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1894.

van den Born, A. Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible. trans. Lewis F. Hartman. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963.