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As a study of Trollope's concept of a gentleman, this dissertation was undertaken by the writer with a very definite and clear-cut limitation in mind. The one point upon which most critics of Trollope agree is that he realistically portrayed the upper classes, the world of gentlemen, of mid-Victorian England. Basically, the writer has aimed at determining what Trollope thought that gentlemanly class was, and what he thought a gentleman was and ought to be. The writer has not aimed at a comparison of Trollope with other social critics, and has therefore refrained from introducing into this study the viewpoints of others. The writer feels that this dissertation should lead to a richer appreciation of Trollope the artist, by elucidating the conscious ideological framework within which Trollope created his novels.
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CHAPTER I

The Class of Gentlemen

Trollope uses the word gentleman in three senses: 1) perfunctorily, to mean fellow or man; 2) to designate a member of a specific social class, the upper class of Victorian England; and 3) to emphasize the possession of certain desirable moral and ethical attributes by a member of that class, for Trollope approves more highly of certain gentlemen than he does of others. Perfunctory use of the term is aptly illustrated when Mr. Levy, the money lender, visits Alice Vavasor. "We all know the tone in which servants announce a gentleman when they know that the gentleman is not a gentleman. 'A gentleman wanting to see me? What sort of a gentleman?' 'Well, miss, I don't think he's just of our sort; but he's decent to look at.'"

That Trollope uses gentleman in a class sense is quite evident. In his Autobiography, for example, he says:

There are places in life which can hardly be well filled except by "Gentlemen." . . . It may be that the son of the butcher of the village shall become as well fitted for employments requiring gentle culture as the son of the parson. Such is often the case. When such is the case, no one has been more prone to give the butcher's son all the welcome he has merited than I myself; but
the chances are greatly in favour of the parson's son. The gates of the one class should be open to the other; but neither to the one class nor to the other can good be done by declaring that there are no gates, no barrier, no difference. 2

The important word in this quotation, of course, is class. Another example concerns young Frank Gresham, son of Squire Gresham, in Dr. Thorne. "Now Frank Gresham. . . was, moreover, a gentleman, being the son of Mr. Gresham of Greshamsbury." There is no mistaking this; Frank is a gentleman because he is the son of the squire. In The Duke's Children, Lord Silverbridge, eldest son of the Duke of Omnium, thinks the world has been too hard upon Major Tifto for his iniquity. "Of course he is not a good man, nor a gentleman, nor possessed of very high feelings. But a man is not to be sacrificed altogether for that. There are so many men who are not gentlemen, and so many gentlemen who are bad fellows." The italicized portion can be construed in no other sense but that of class.

Equally obvious evidence appears in the scene between Larry Twentyman and Reginald Morton, as they meet after Larry has returned from walking Mary Masters home. Reginald is angry and for all practical purposes cuts Larry when Larry proffers a greeting. Then Trollope lets us see into Larry's thoughts. "Larry
was displeased; but the other was so thoroughly a

gentleman--one of the Mortons, and a man of property

in the county--that he didn't even yet wish to quarrel

with him." The qualification set off by dashes clearly

reveals the class meaning of gentleman. Yet another

example is provided when Sir Peregrine Orme tells his

grandson Perry he would be very unhappy if Perry married

below his "own rank." Perry then asks, " 'What do you
call my own rank?' " and Sir Peregrine answers, " 'I

mean any girl whose father is not a gentleman, and

whose mother is not a lady; and of whose education

among ladies you could not feel certain.' " This mate­

rial admits of practically no other interpretation than

that of class.

Captain Glomax, master of hounds for the URU, tell­
ing his companions at the Bush Inn about the pace of a
run one day, unknowingly helps identify for us the class
of gentlemen. "He knew as much about pace as any farmer,
or for the matter of that any gentleman, in Ufford or
Rufford. . . ." Here the word patently separates gentle­
men as a group, from farmers as a group. And in Framley
Parsonage Trollope points out the difficulties posed by
Mr. Crawley's early poverty as a married man. "But a
man who has once walked the world as a gentleman knows
not what it is to change his position, and place himself
lower down in the social rank." Class gradation is cer-

tainly the only possible meaning.

Such instances are endless. Trollope definitely
conceived of gentlemen as a distinct social class, the
class with which he is principally concerned in his
novels. Accurate observer that he was, he pictures the
gentlemanly class of his time, approving and disapprov-
ing where he sees fit, and pointing out its weaknesses
and foibles as well as its strengths and virtues. This
class of gentlemen, examination proves, has broad limits,
stretching from the highest nobility down through the
squirearchy and the professions, a fact which the Duke
of St. Bungay clearly recognizes when he says, "'... with us there is no line dividing our very broad aris-
tocracy into two parts, a higher and a lower, or a
greater and a smaller, or a richer and a poorer...'."

An understanding of Trollope's concept of the ideal
gentleman—as ideal as the limitations of human nature
will allow—can only be approached on a class basis,
for Trollope believed firmly that the ideal man would
more likely emerge from the framework of the gentlemanly
class than elsewhere. To achieve an understanding of
Trollope's ideal, therefore, the gentlemanly class
itself must be analyzed and reduced to its fundamental
characteristics.
Trollope calls certain of his characters gentlemen, and these, in turn, call others gentlemen or habitually associate with them as equals, so that these fundamental characteristics, which actually serve as identification tags, can be rather conveniently isolated. They are:

1) good family blood of long lineage, the longer the better, particularly that of families with some claim to fame; 2) breeding, or aesthetic and moral education of a common type; 3) a position of social eminence, gained through belonging to an eminent family, and/or through performing certain necessary functions for society; and 4) money, at least enough to maintain one's rank or position with self-respect.

Of these, by far the most important is blood and family background. Trollope constantly refers to the necessity of having grandfathers, preferably those who have themselves been eminent.

It is certainly of service to a man to know who were his grandfathers and who were his grandmothers if he entertain an ambition to move in the upper circles of society, and also of service to be able to speak of them as of persons who were themselves somebodies in their time. No doubt we all entertain great respect for those who by their own energies have raised themselves in the world; and when we hear that the son of a washerwoman has become Lord Chancellor or Archbishop of Canterbury we do, theoretically and abstractedly, feel a higher reverence for such self-made magnate than for one who has been as it were born into forensic or ecclesiastical purple. But not the less
must the offspring of the washerwoman have had very much trouble on the subject of his birth, unless he has been, when young as well as when old, a very great man indeed. After the goal has been absolutely reached, and the honour and the titles and the wealth actually won, a man may talk with some humour, even with some affection, of the maternal tub;—but while the struggle is going on, with the conviction strong upon the struggler that he cannot be altogether successful unless he be esteemed a gentleman, not to be ashamed, not to conceal the old family circumstances, not at any rate to be silent, is difficult. And the difficulty is certainly not less if fortunate circumstances rather than hard work and intrinsic merit have raised above his natural place an aspirant to high social position. Can it be expected that such a one when dining with a duchess shall speak of his father's small shop, or bring into the light of day his grandfather's cobbler's awl? And yet it is so difficult to be altogether silent! It may not be necessary for any of us to be always talking of our own parentage. We may be generally reticent as to our uncles and aunts, and may drop even our brothers and sisters in our ordinary conversation. But if a man never mentions his belongings among those with whom he lives, he becomes mysterious, and almost open to suspicion. It begins to be known that nobody knows anything of such a man, and even friends become afraid. It is certainly convenient to be able to allude, if it be but once in a year, to some blood relation.\textsuperscript{10}

This pride of blood and family is nowhere more apparent than in Trollope's favorite group of people, the landed gentry or squirearchy. To many of them, family or blood is a sort of religion, a thing which definitely sets them apart from those without forebears of some position. Squire Wilfred Thorne of Ullathorne immediately comes to mind in this connection, as an exaggerated
instance, no doubt, but one amply illustrative of the point.

For blood and lineage he himself had a most profound respect. He counted back his own ancestors to some period long antecedent to the conquest...

It would be unjust to say that he looked down on men whose families were of recent date... But he looked on them as great millionaires are apt to look on those who have small incomes... They might doubtless be good sort of people, entitled to much praise for virtue, very admirable for talent, highly respectable in every way; but they were without the one great good gift. Such was Mr. Thorne's way of thinking on this matter; nothing could atone for the loss of good blood; nothing could neutralise its good effects.

He speaks of a prominent family of comparatively recent renown as "dirt," merely meaning... to express his feeling that the streams which ran through their veins were not yet purified by time to that perfection, had not become so genuine an ichor, as to be worthy of being called blood in the genealogical sense." When Arabin is introduced to him, Mr. Thorne immediately calls him one of the Arabins of Uphill Stanton, although Arabin protests that Uphill Stanton has been in the hands of the De Greys for the last fifty years. "And when it has been there one hundred and fifty, if it unluckily remain there so long," said Mr. Thorne, 'your descendants will not be a whit the less entitled to describe themselves as being of the family of Uphill
Stanton. Thank God, no De Grey can buy that—and, thank God—no Arabin, and no Thorne, can sell it."

Now, it is obvious the Squire has an exaggerated pride of blood. In this respect young Frank Gresham more nearly represents Trollope's view. "He [Frank] loved it dearly, though he seldom spoke of it; as men of good family seldom do speak of it. It is one of those possessions which to have is sufficient. A man having it need not boast of what he has, or show it off before the world. But on that account he values it the more." But it is equally obvious that, though he points out their faults by exaggerating them, Trollope basically approves of Squire Thorne and his sister, who has even more pride of blood than her brother. "Such a year or two since were the Thornes of Ullathorne. Such, we believe, are the inhabitants of many an English country home. May it be long before their number diminishes." Some important ideas about blood which turn out to be commonly held by gentlemen emerge from Squire Thorne's views: 1) good blood, blood of long lineage, conveys good effects on its possessor; 2) time is required to purify blood to perfection; 3) the beneficial properties of good blood can be achieved in no way other than possessing it.

Many other characters and families help to
substantiate the feeling of reverence toward ancient family blood. In *Can You Forgive Her?*, when Alice Vavasor is considering marrying George Vavasor, or at least giving him use of her money, she thinks in this manner.

And would it not be well that she should be the means of reconciling George to his grandfather? George was the representative of the family,--of a family so old that no one now knew which had first taken the ancient titular name of some old Saxon landowner,--the parish, or the man. There had been in old days some worthy Vavaseurs, as Chaucer calls them, whose rank and bearing had been adopted on that moorland side. Of these things Alice thought much, and felt that it should be her duty so to act, that future Vavasors might at any rate not be less in the world than they who had passed away. In a few years at furthest, George Vavasor must be Vavasor of Vavasor. Would it not be right that she should help him to make that position honourable? 15

Roger Carbury, the paragon of *The Way We Live Now*, is the head of the Carbury family. "The Carburys had been in Suffolk a great many years,--certainly from the time of the War of the Roses,--and had always held up their heads." The chief Carbury of the day has always owned, and has always lived at, Carbury Hall. Although Roger's estate brings in two thousand pounds a year, he is relatively poor in relation to his rich neighbors. Nevertheless, he regards himself better than two of them and the equal, at least, of another, using blood as the basis of evaluation. "The Longestaffes of
Caversham...had the name of great wealth, but the founder of the family had been a Lord Mayor of London and a chandler as lately as in the reign of Queen Anne. The Hepworths, who could boast good blood enough on their own side, had married into new money. The Primeros,—though the goodnature of the country folk had accorded to the head of them the title of Squire Primero,—had been trading Spaniards fifty years ago...Although all three of these families are rich in comparison with Roger, in his estimation his blood gives him pre-eminence. "The Primeros were undoubtedly beneath him in the social scale...Hepworth of Eardly was a very good fellow, who gave himself no airs and understood his duties as a country gentleman; but he could not be more than on a par with Carbury of Carbury...The Longestaffes were altogether oppressive."

Abel Wharton puts the matter very clearly when he seeks the roots of his objection to Ferdinand Lopez as a suitable husband for Emily. Lopez is distasteful to him as being unlike his idea of an English gentleman and "...as being without those far-reaching fibres and roots by which he thought that the solidity and stability of a human tree should be assured." A man may be worthy, clever, and rich, but in Wharton's
opinion when he is taken into a family through marriage, something of his mother and father should be known.

Squire Thorne, we have seen, felt that good blood of long lineage conveys beneficial effects upon its possessor. This idea is implied in most of the evidence on the subject of blood, but additional explicit evidence exists. For instance, Sir Peregrine Orme became attached to Lady Mason during her first trial, and subsequently "... had gradually learned to excuse in her that want of gentle blood and early breeding which as a rule he regarded as necessary to a gentleman, and from which alone, as he thought, could spring many of those excellencies which go to form the character of a lady." Another instance concerns Sir Harry Hotspur's faith in the saving qualities of blood as a means of keeping George Hotspur from utter ruin. "Unconsciously he was telling himself that after all George Hotspur had been born a gentleman, and that therefore, underlying all the young man's vileness and villany [sic] there must be a substratum of noble soil. . . ."

But perhaps the most important proof of all appears in The Prime Minister, when Emily Lopez contrasts her husband with Arthur Fletcher, to the former's disadvantage. This passage is important because it sums up very nicely Trollope's view of the saving grace of good
blood. Emily is thinking about the violent reaction of her husband to Arthur Fletcher's note. She mentally compares the two, and finds that Arthur has a "peculiar gift," which her husband lacks.

What was it? She had heard her father say when talking of gentlemen,—of that race of gentlemen with whom it had been his lot to live,—that you could not make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. The use of the proverb bad offended her much, for she had known well whom he had then regarded as a silk purse and whom as a sow's ear. But now she perceived that there had been truth in all this, though she was as anxious as ever to think well of her husband. . . . She had once ventured to form a doctrine for herself, to preach to herself a sermon of her own, and to tell herself that this gift of gentle blood and of gentle nurture, of which her father thought so much, and to which something of divinity was attributed down in Herefordshire, was after all but a weak, spiritless quality. It could exist without intellect, without heart, and with very moderate culture. It was compatible with many littlenesses and with many vices. As for that love of honest, courageous truth which her father was wont to attribute to it, she regarded his theory as based upon legends. . . . The beau ideal of a man which she then pictured to herself was graced, first with intelligence, then with affection, and lastly with ambition. She knew no reason why such a hero as her fancy created should be born of lords and ladies rather than of working mechanics, should be English rather than Spanish or French. The man could not be her hero without education, without attributes to be attained no doubt more easily by the rich than by the poor; but, with that granted, with those attained, she did not see why she, or why the world, should go back beyond the man's own self. Such had been her theories as to men and their attributes, and acting on that, she had given herself and all her happiness into the keeping of Ferdinand Lopez. Now, there was gradually coming upon her a change in her convictions. . . .
that she had adopted even while adopting it. But now,—ay, from the very hour of her marriage,—she had commenced to learn what it was that her father had meant when he spoke of the pleasure of living with gentlemen. Arthur Fletcher certainly was a gentleman. 21

The notion that beneficial and saving qualities are communicated through inheritance of blood is clearly felt here. In spite of herself, Emily is forced to admit it.

What is the nature of these qualities communicated through blood? Of course Trollope has the physical 22 idea of family stock in mind. But he also appears to believe that moral and ethical tendencies are communicated through blood. We have already seen Sir Peregrine Orme and Abel Wharton state such a belief, and Trollope himself clearly expresses this notion in a discussion involving Sir Harry Hotspur and his daughter Emily.

Sir Harry would no more doubt his daughter than he would his own honour. There were certain points and lines of duty clearly laid down for a girl so placed as was his daughter; and Sir Harry, though he could not have told whence the knowledge of these points and lines had come to his child, never for a moment doubted but that she knew them, and would obey them. To know and to obey such points of duty were a part of the inheritance of such an one as Emily Hotspur. . . .

Emily Hotspur was a girl whom any father would have trusted; and let the reader understand this of her, that she was one in whom intentional deceit was impossible. Neither to her father nor to any one could she lie either in word or action.
And all these lines and points of duty were well known to her, though she knew not, and had never asked herself, whence the lesson had come. Will it be too much to say, that they had formed a part of her breeding, and had been given to her with her blood? 23

Not that good blood is an infallible means of grace, however! As we shall see later, good blood does not by itself guarantee the salvation of the gentleman; some, well-born, live on the brink of moral disaster, and others plunge over the edge altogether. But Trollope undoubtedly considers the possession of good blood to be a fundamental requirement of the gentleman, and, although he concedes that with great difficulty a man can rise to eminence and esteem without it, yet he feels that being born into a well-known and long-established family gives one a decided advantage and generally conveys beneficial and saving physical and moral qualities.

The second necessary characteristic of the gentleman is breeding, which is, like blood, a means of dividing gentlemen from non-gentlemen, and much more of a saving grace. Breeding means nurture or training—education in its broadest sense, both formal and informal—achieved through constant association from infancy with other gentlemen and ladies. Trollope reveals his sense of the beneficial qualities of breeding when he remarks of Mary Masters, "It never occurred to
Mrs. Masters that perhaps the very qualities that had made poor Larry so vehemently in love with Mary had come from her intercourse with Lady Ushant. In Trollope's opinion, Mary's early association with Lady Ushant, a lady of gentle blood and nurture, had had its good results.

Breeding includes the two elements, manners and morals. In general, by the term manners Trollope means how to comport oneself in society, how to dress, how to move and hold oneself, a knowledge of what to say and do, and what to avoid when in the company of others. He clearly interprets the term in an aesthetic sense, rather than in a moral or ethical one, absence of manners being equated with vulgarity. The members of the gentlemanly class, through early contact with other ladies and gentlemen, gradually absorb the manners of pleasant society. Frank Houston definitely relates the acquisition of manners with the formative period of childhood when he remarks, "Of course I like breeding. . . . Of course I like that aroma of feminine charm which can only be produced by a mixture of intellect, loveliness, taste, and early association."

The association of manners with the gentleman is easily demonstrated by Gerard Maule, who is, incidentally, a rather useless and aimless member of society.
To Adelaide Palliser, "He was a gentleman, pleasant-mannered, pleasant to look at, pleasant to talk to, not educated in the high sense of the word, but never making himself ridiculous by ignorance." In The Three Clerks Trollope shows how important it is for a gentleman to marry a lady, for a lady will have had equal training in manners.

...a man from the ordinary ranks of the upper classes, who has had the nurture of a gentleman, prepares for himself a hell on earth in taking a wife from any rank much below his own...He must either leave her or loathe her. She may be endowed with all those moral virtues which should adorn all women...but he will have to endure habits, manners, and ideas, which the close contiguity of married life will force upon his disgusted palate, and which must banish all love.

The chief reason, for instance, for Lady Lufton's objection to Lucy Roberts as a prospective daughter-in-law is her lack of style and manners; she hasn't had the advantages of lady-like upbringing that Grizzy Grantly has had, in Lady Lufton's estimation. And the same reason is advanced by Mrs. Grantly against Grace Crawley as a wife for Henry. Admitting that Grace is gentle by birth, she still points out that Grace "has had no advantages." Further proof that manners are an important aspect of the class of gentlemen is afforded by the clash between Mr. Harding and Archdeacon Grantly, on the one hand, and Obadiah Slope, on the other. Slope obviously transgresses
the code of manners as felt by the other two men. He brassily introduces himself to the Archdeacon, reels off, item by item, the physical faults of the palace, and generally puts his foot into it everywhere. Even Harding, "that mild and courteous man," is made angry by Slope's conduct. Later on, he feels that Slope's famous sermon is lacking in courtesy and finally says that Slope is not gentleman-like in his manners.

Grantly recoils from Slope as he would from a roach, and calls him an "animal." And here we may get at the feeling Trollope has for manners; they keep down the animal, are a step upward from the brute. Pertinent to this idea and partially a substantiation of it, are some of Trollope's comments on non-gentlemen and the lower classes. When Dr. Thorne tells Roger Scatcherd about Mary's true identity, for example, Scatcherd asks whether his niece has ever received any training and says he won't mind her being a bastard. Immediately Thorne thinks of Mary with her education and her manners and contrasts her with Scatcherd. As he does so, "...he hated Sir Roger Scatcherd, and regarded him with loathing, as he might have regarded a wallowing hog." Again, when young Frank Gresham attends the Duke of Omnium's dinner, which was given for purely "political" reasons, to his
horror Frank finds there Finney the attorney and Bolus the apothecary. Trollope describes the scene as a hog pen and Frank actually uses the word hogs to describe the guests. The same image is used to describe the Christmas activities of Mr. Moulder, the commercial traveller, and his friends. Trollope calls them "pigs out of the sty of Epicurus."

Sir Louis Scatcherd is the prime example of the man with no manners. "The young baronet's idea of good taste was not of the most refined description, and he did not hesitate to tell Dr. Thorne, that his, the doctor's, friendship with Mr. Gresham, must be no bar to his, the baronet's, interest." This, after Dr. Thorne's solicitude for him! The doctor hesitates to accept an invitation for himself and Louis to dine at the Greshams' because he fears Louis will "make a beast of himself." And the picture that Trollope draws of Louis' performance at that dinner gives an unparalleled account of what a gentleman is not, as far as the code of manners goes. Because Louis is the only baronet present, he thinks he should be particularly noticed, and attracts attention in a most extremely uncomfortable way for everyone present. He speaks at table of money affairs, telling how much—to the last
penny—was spent in landscaping Boxall Hill. He ques-
tions Mr. Oriel about the dowery of Beatrice, Oriel's
betrothed, with her father sitting at the table! He
asks Oriel to guess how much Squire Gresham is in debt
to him, Louis. He insults Gazebee, who leaves; and he
ends by becoming drunk. Another excellent example is
the scene in The Kelleys and the O'Kelleys, in which
the interloping Barry Lynch makes such an ass of him-
self at the fox hunt, because he attempts to act like
a gentleman with no organic feeling for their customs
and ways.

The absence of manners, in short, results in
vulgarity, which is not condoned by the gentlemanly
class. Other confirming examples appear in The Prime
Minister, in which novel Trollope makes clearer than
elsewhere his idea of vulgarity and ignorance of manners
as being opposed to gentlehood. For instance, Mr. Dick
Roby, brother-in-law of Abel Wharton, is called "a
vulgar man" by Trollope, who points out that Mrs. Roby
as a consequence of marrying him has herself become
vulgar. Arthur Fletcher certainly feels that way.
"Mrs. Roby had always been to him odious, not only as a
personal enemy but as a vulgar woman." Hence, she is a
dangerous companion for Emily Wharton, because some of
her vulgarity may rub off. And here may appear a
fundamental reason for strict and definite class lines. Another highly informative passage concerns Emily Wharton.

No woman of her age had known better what were the manners of ladies and gentlemen than Emily Wharton. She had thoroughly understood that when in Herefordshire she was surrounded by people of that class, and that when she was with her aunt, Mrs. Roby, she was not quite so happily placed. No doubt she had been terribly deceived by her husband,—but the deceit had come from the fact that his manners gave no indication of his character. When she found herself in Mrs. Parker's little sitting-room, with Mr. Parker making florid speeches to her, she knew that she had fallen among people for whose society she had not been intended. 36

Emily's ability to recognize and distinguish between gentlemen and non-gentlemen, primarily on the basis of manners, is apparent; she sees instinctively that Sexty Parker is no gentleman.

But unfortunately, she was unable to detect her husband's character through the guise of his manners. It is clear that Lopez was feigning manners, and as the story progresses it becomes clearer that he totally lacked the moral and ethical breeding of a gentleman. This important deficiency in Lopez logically affords opportunity for us to consider the third sense in which Trollope uses the word gentleman— the sense in which it is employed to emphasize desirable moral and ethical attributes in a member of the gentlemanly class. Mrs.
Dale has this sense in mind when she mentally evaluates Henry Grantly. "Here was a man who was at all points a gentleman. . . . It was solely the nature and character of the man that was in her mind. . . ." And this meaning of the word appears also in the scene between Arabella Trefoil and Lord Rufford, when she has gone to Rufford to condemn him. She tells him, "'I chose to tell you to your face that you are false, a coward, and no gentleman. . . .'" Now, very clearly, gentleman is not used in a class sense here, or at least means more than simply placing the man in the class. It goes beyond to the moral and ethical ideals for which the class stands.

This moral and ethical side of the gentleman, incorporating his sense of duty and code of honor, is the second component of breeding, being the counterpart of manners. As we shall see presently in more detail when breeding is analyzed, both manners and the moral code of the gentleman are developed in the same manner. In the first place, a "not ignoble" nature is assumed, which, as has been indicated, is more likely to occur from a long-established blood line. Long, slow, relatively unconscious training in the company of other gentlemen develops the latent attributes of this nature or is gradually absorbed until it becomes an organic part of the individual. A passage concerning
Emily Hotspur confirms this process. "She understood well that from her, as heiress of the House of Humble-thwaite, a double obedience was due to her father,—the obedience of a child added to that which was now required from her as the future transmitter of honours of the house. And yet no word had been said to her of the honours of the house; nor, indeed, had many words even been said as to that other obedience. These lessons, when they have been well learned, have ever come without direct teaching." This moral and ethical side of breeding is by far the most important aspect of Trollope's gentleman and will become the chief subject of our examination.

Let us now turn from breeding or education in its informal sense, to academic training. Most gentlemen followed a prescribed form of education—a "t'other school;" one of the great public schools, usually Eton or Harrow; and then either Oxford or Cambridge. Trollope thought highly of the English public schools, although at the same time he found much to condemn about them. In an article entitled "Public Schools," which appeared in the October 1, 1865 issue of the Fortnightly Review, he points out the importance of the public schools to the gentlemanly class.

The plan of operation, as it now stands, enables the sons of those among our gentry who
are rich, and of those who are comparatively poor, to be educated together, and thus to be welded into one whole, which is the backbone of English public and social life. . . . The son of the squire of the parish and the son of the parson are placed together at the same school, are educated in the same way, enjoy an equal footing, so that in after life they meet together with mutual sympathy and on an absolute equality as gentlemen. . . .

He sees the gentleman's sense of honor as partially the result of public school training. "We attribute to them [the public schools] much of that high spirit among our gentry which we regard as the well-spring of English honour. . . ." And according to Trollope the English gentleman's nobility largely derives from the same source. "Who can define the nobility that has attached itself to Englishmen as the result of their public schools; or can say whence it comes, or of what it consists? But its presence is so thoroughly acknowledged, that few among us do not feel that it has more than compensated for that lack of real instruction of which we all complain."

Oddly enough, intellectual training and refinement and the acquisition of knowledge do not seem to be so important as development of certain personal outlooks and cultivating an ease of manner in approaching life. To illustrate, let us compare Perry Orme with Lucius Mason in Orley Farm. Perry goes to Harrow; Lucius goes
to a private school. At the age of seventeen Lucius comes home well grounded in Greek, Latin, and Euclid, French, and Italian, and "...possessing many more acquirements than he would have learned at Harrow. But added to these, or rather consequent on them, was a conceit which a public-school education would not have created." And now to push home this contrast. Lucius, who received a German university education, is spending the Christmas vacation at Noningsby together with a group of young ladies and gentlemen. He has not been happy, for he considers the other young people more thoughtless than himself and feels they don't understand him. He tells himself they amuse themselves while he has a man's work to do. Now Trollope comments:

In all this there was much of conceit, much of pride, much of deficient education—deficiency in that special branch of education which England has imparted to the best of her sons, but which is now becoming out of fashion. He had never learned to measure himself against others,—I do not mean his knowledge or his book acquirements, but the every-day conduct of his life,—and to perceive that that which is insignificant in others must be insignificant in himself also. To those around him at Noningsby his extensive reading respecting the Iapetidae recommended him not at all...as a companion...He was not such as they were. He had not the unpretentious, self-controlling humour, perfectly free from all conceit, which was common to them. Life did not come easy to him, and the effort which he was ever making was always visible. All men should ever be making efforts, no doubt; but those efforts should not be conspicuous. 44
In this, we find support for the idea that intellectual training is of subordinate importance in the gentleman's make-up. Out of the staggering number of characters that appear in the Barchester and Palliser novels, how many stand out as men of great learning and intellectual skill, as scholars and thinkers? Arabin and perhaps Josiah Crawley!

The failure of German education also shows up in Reginald Morton, who eventually becomes squire of Bragton Hall, and who was educated and spent a great part of his youth in Germany. As a result the country folk of Dillsborough are not sure of Reginald. He does not know or understand such English traditions as the hunt, although at the close of the story, having become squire, he resolves dutifully to learn these things. His stint abroad almost destroyed his Englishness, an untimely death in Trollope's opinion, for Trollope generally cherishes the prejudice against foreigners. A good example is Abel Wharton's objection to Ferdinand Lopez, whose father was Portuguese—and who, incidentally, was educated at an English private school and a German university.

Lack of breeding and education shows up dramatically in the prominent non-gentlemen who rise in the world or attempt to push their way into the gentlemanly class.
Consider the unschooled Roger Scatcherd. This man for the earlier part of his life was a stonemason in a small English village, and had no contact with gentle life. He himself realizes that he is lost between two worlds. With a title and great wealth he feels ill at ease in the company of gentlemen, not knowing what to do or say, and passionately cries out that he is not a gentleman. Like father, like son. Roger Scatcherd was determined to make a gentleman of his son and had sent him to Eton and Cambridge, with this end in mind. "But even this receipt, generally as it is recognized, will not make a gentleman. It is hard, indeed, to define what receipt will do so, though people do have in their own minds some certain undefined, but yet tolerably correct ideas on the subject. Be that as it may, two years at Eton, and three terms at Cambridge, did not make a gentleman of Louis Philippe Scatcherd." Melmotte is another example. Trollope states that he began the world with almost no education, and he too encounters Scatcherd's difficulties, not knowing what to do or what not to do in the presence of gentlemen. He constantly displays his vulgar blatant arrogance and his ignorance of gentlemanly conduct, to the horror and embarrassment of his gentlemanly associates.

More and more, it appears that a gentleman is a
member of a class, and that he can be recognized by certain definite characteristics. Two of these—the most important—have already been isolated: 1) good blood, which gives one a better chance of being a superior person than one who does not possess it; and 2) breeding—an unwritten code of manners and moral attitudes which comes through long and intimate association with gentlemen and ladies, in both everyday and academic situations. To achieve the second is extremely difficult without possessing the first. Like blood, breeding also conveys saving qualities to its possessor, a conclusion which Mr. Michael Sadleir had apparently also reached when he spoke of Trollope's "...unwavering belief that no one human being can be wholly bad who has known breeding."  

Rank or position—a high degree of social eminence—is the third characteristic of the gentlemanly class. Trollope, through Sir Peregrine Orme, makes a distinction between the two words. Lady Mason discourages Sir Peregrine from marrying her, because doing so, she says, would be throwing away his "great rank." Sir Peregrine differs, pointing out he could not do so, even if he married "a kitchen maid." Then Lady Mason answers, "'Ah, no; I should not have said rank. You cannot lose that;--but your station in the world, the
respect of all around you. . . " Rank here obviously means a title, in itself some warranty of social eminence, but it is the superior social position of the gentleman, with or without title, with which Trollope is concerned, for in the mid-Victorian world which he portrays gentlemen commanded higher social esteem and respect than did any other class.

How did the mid-Victorian gentleman achieve his superior social position? Generally, he was born into it. Good blood and family gave eminence from the start, but in addition, Trollope felt that gentlemen best performed certain important functions in the world. Because, to Trollope, England was the greatest country of the world and the job of governing her depended upon the gentlemanly class, he felt strongly that the position of statesman was the highest that an English gentleman could achieve. In the Autobiography, he says, "...the man in Parliament has reached a higher position than the man out...to serve one's country without pay is the grandest work that a man can do... of all lives, public political lives are capable of the highest efforts." A look at the roster of gentlemen in Trollope's works shows that a predominant number of them are landed squires and members of the peerage, together with their eldest sons or heirs. This
aristocracy, particularly the highest titled and wealthiest families, supplies the most important heads of government. For example, Trollope explains how official gaps are filled. "Whether on this side or on that, the candidates are first looked for among the sons of Earls and Dukes,—and not unnaturally, as the sons of Earls and Dukes may be educated for such work almost from their infancy." He admits that a few may rise by the slow process of acknowledged fitness, but points out that these "...men have a great weight to carry, and cannot always shake off the burden of their origin and live among begotten statesmen as though they too had been born to the manner."

Barrington Erle expresses this same idea in speaking to Phineas Finn about certain aristocratic Whig families. "I do believe in the patriotism of certain families. I believe that the Mildmays, FitzHowards, and Pallisers have for some centuries brought up their children to regard the well-being of their country as their highest personal interest, and that such teaching has been generally efficacious." To demonstrate the noblemen engaged in government, out of the swarm which teems in the pages of the Parliamentary novels, one need list only a few of those serving as cabinet members or prime ministers—the Duke of Omnium, the Duke of St.
Bungay, Lord Cantrip, Lord Brock, Lord de Terrier, the Earl of Brentford, and Lord Thrift. This feeling of the important function of the statesman and member of Parliament is also held by the squirearchy. Service in Parliament is esteemed by them, and many serve almost as a matter of course. In Trollope's *Thackeray* we find almost a summation of the idea that one of the gentleman's prime functions is to help govern his country. "There are... many to whom a seat in Parliament comes almost as the birthright of a well-born and well-to-do English gentleman." Plantagenet Palliser, Lord Silverbridge, Lord Nidderdale, Lord Mistletoe, Frank Gresham, Nathaniel Sowerby, and Everett Wharton are gentlemen enjoying such birthright.

Just as Trollope accords the eminence of the peerage when he speaks of Plantagenet Palliser, his wife Glencora, and their friends as "our highest classes," so we find the squires and country gentry are the most important men in their own parishes and the immediate surrounding countryside. For example, "At Allington, Dale of Allington had always been known as a king. At Guestwick, the neighbouring market town, he was a great man... At Hamersham, the assize town, he was generally in some repute, being a constant grand juror for the county..." Sir Peregrine Orme, not a
rich man as baronets go, lives on an estate owned by his family for the last four hundred years, and, like Squire Dale, "... is by general repute the greatest man in these parts." Likewise, John Fletcher of Longbars, a squire with a large property, is "... a considerable man in Herefordshire." Anyone who has read The American Senator cannot possibly forget the esteem in which old squire Reginald Morton is held by the surrounding countryside, so strong that it lasted undiminished for two generations and could prompt Runciman, the proprietor of the Bush Inn, to say "... not a poor man in the county wouldn't be sorry to think that there wasn't a Morton left among 'em." These people provide a solidity, a focal point for life in their areas. As we shall see later in more detail, they have their duties and responsibilities, such functions as supervision of their land, provision for the poor, and service in a judicial capacity for the county; and since they own the land, life necessarily revolves about them in the rural areas.

Often, younger sons of the squirearchy and the peerage and the sons of relatively poor gentlemen were compelled to earn their livings, and generally went into the professions. Miss Sarah Marrable, admittedly a trifle strict on the subject, pretty well conveys the
viewpoint of the Trollopian world.

She had an idea that the son of a gentleman, if he intended to maintain his rank as a gentleman, should earn his income as a clergyman, or as a barrister, or as a soldier, or as a sailor. Those were the professions intended for gentlemen. She would not absolutely say that a physician was not a gentleman, or even a surgeon; but she would never allow to physic the same absolute privileges which, in her eyes, belonged to law and the church. There might also possibly be a doubt about the Civil Service and Civil Engineering; but she had no doubt whatever that when a man touched trade or commerce in any way he was doing that which was not the work of a gentleman. He might be very respectable, and it might be very necessary that he should do it; but brewers, bankers, and merchants, were not gentlemen, and the world, according to Miss Marable's theory, was going astray, because people were forgetting their landmarks. 57

Trollope himself readily admits doctors and members of the Civil Service (we recall his thirty-three years in the Post Office), provided their birth and breeding are acceptable, and allows a few other occupations. For instance, a handful of gentlemen in his novels are variously school teachers, civil engineers, artists and literary men—or like John Gordon and John Caldigate, go off diamond-hunting or gold-digging to replenish lost fortunes. But the huge majority of gentlemen who are compelled to work for their livings are either clergy-men, barristers, or military men.

Probably next in importance to the squirearchy is the clergy, who in their own way help to hold the country together. This group, symbolized by Archdeacon Grantly,
particularly feels the importance of their position. When Trollope is describing Barsetshire and giving the relative importance of its social groups, he states that the landed men are the most important, the only exception being the "clerical aristocracy" at Barchester. His comments on the Rev. Henry Clavering confirm the high social position of the clergy.

There is a class of country clergymen in England, of whom Mr. Clavering was one, and his son-in-law, Mr. Fielding, another, which is so closely allied to the squirearchy as to possess a double identity. Such clergymen are not only clergymen, but they are country gentlemen also. Mr. Clavering regarded clergymen of his class—or the country-gentlemen class—as being quite distinct from all others, and as being, I may say, very much higher than all others, without reference to any money question. Even the curates, the lowliest of the clerical hierarchy, are unquestioningly called gentlemen, provided their blood and manners are acceptable. As Sophy Longestaffe says, when she is exerting all of her ingenuity to marry her sister Georgiana to Mr. Batherbolt, the curate, so as to avoid having a Jewish in-law, "Of course it is a come-down to marry a curate,--but a clergyman is always considered to be decent."

The legal profession, particularly the position of barrister, is also regarded as a fit occupation for gentlemen, and Abel Wharton, Arthur Fletcher, Judge Staveley, and Sir William Patterson exemplify gentlemen
who have entered that profession. Abel Wharton, for instance, is a wealthy London barrister, the cousin of Sir Alured Wharton, squire of Wharton Hall in Herefordshire, and a gentleman. Abel shows his wholehearted acceptance of Arthur Fletcher by saying, "I like Arthur Fletcher, because he is a gentleman,--because he is a gentleman of the class to which I belong myself..." Of Sir William Patterson Trollope says, "Sir William Patterson was a gentleman as well as a lawyer;--one who had not simply risen to legal rank by diligence and intellect, but a gentleman born and bred, who had been at a public school, and had lived all his days with people of the right sort." So merely being a lawyer does not mean one is a gentleman--Finney, Chaffenbrass, Solomon Aram, Bearside, and Dockwrath all bear witness to this fact. Here again is unmistakable evidence that most important and indeed almost necessary for classification as a gentleman are good blood and education among gentlemen.

Medicine as a profession for a gentleman is held in question by only a few, these usually being snobs of one sort or another. The truth is that one of Trollope's most approved gentlemen, Dr. Thorne, is a country physician. As for birth and breeding, Dr. Thorne is one of the Thornes of Ullathorne. "His father had been a
Thorold. There was no better
blood to be had in England.*" His father had been one of
the clerical dignitaries of Barchester, and Dr. Thorne
is an intimate friend of the elder Squire Gresham. Phineas
Finn's father is an Irish country doctor who, like Thorne,
comes from the family of a squire. Likewise, Mark Robarts'
father is a physician at Exeter, who has a good practice
"...which had enabled him to maintain and educate a
family with all the advantages which money can give in
this country." A further example is the embryonic "per­
fect gentleman," Dr. Crofts, whom the Earl De Guest, who
also has a good nose for a gentleman, esteems so highly,
and who marries Bell Dale, the niece of squire Christopher
Dale. The only objection voiced against Crofts actually
is to his favor, because it comes from the ill-fated
Adolphus Crosbie, who thinks of Crofts as only a village
doctor, and who would prefer Bernard Dale, heir presump­
tive to the Dale estate, as his brother-in-law.

However, physicians and lawyers do not hold the
position that clergymen achieve. Bell Dale expresses
this in talking about her approaching marriage to Dr.
Crofts. "Parson's marriages are often very grand
affairs. They come in among county people. That's their
luck in life. Doctors never do; nor lawyers. I don't
think lawyers ever get married in the country. They're
supposed to do it up in London. But a country doctor's wedding is not a thing to be talked about much. Of course, Bell, who is noted for her free tongue, is exaggerating, and in doing so, emphasizes the truth.

Military service as a fit pursuit for gentlemen is easily illustrated. Bernard Dale, for instance, is an officer in the Corps of Engineers, who works hard and gets ahead in his chosen profession. Major Henry Grantly served in India as a young man and was decorated with the Victoria Cross. Colonel Jonathan Stubbs and Walter Marrable are other good examples of gentlemen who have chosen army careers. Young Earl Lovel exemplifies the navy man. Every inch a gentleman, he was a midshipman in the navy when he inherited his title.

And last there is the Civil Service, which Trollope felt was best filled by gentlemen. In this category appears Mounser Green, a fashionable young man about town, who "...was a gentleman all round." He is quite a distinguished clerk in the Foreign Office, who "... had entered the service before competitive examination had assumed its present shape, and had therefore the gifts which were required for his special position." Another government servant is Johnny Eames, who gains the Earl De Guest's high regard and inherits money from him upon the Earl's death, and whose father had been
the most intimate friend of Squire Christopher Dale. Johnny eventually works himself up to the position of Private Secretary to Sir Raffle Buffle, a position of relative eminence, replacing FitzHoward, a younger son of the Duke of St. Bungay. Henry Norman, moreover, serves faithfully in the Office of Weights and Measures until he inherits the family property of Normansgrove. Another good example is John Morton, heir to Bragton Hall, who was Secretary of the British Legation at Washington, and who Lady Penwether knew "...was a county gentleman and a respectable member of the diplomatic profession."

In Rachel Ray Trollope discloses his belief that these professions which we have been discussing require gentility for their proper execution. He says, for example, that Mr. Samuel Prong was not a gentleman and therefore was deficient in one vital qualification for a clergyman of the Church of England.

May I not call it a necessary qualification for a clergyman of any church? ... Nor do I speak of this deficiency in his clerical aptitudes as being injurious to him simply,—or even chiefly,—among folk who are themselves gentle; but that his efficiency for clerical purposes was marred altogether, among high and low, by his misfortune in this respect. ... It [gentility] is the greatest of all aids to the doctor, the lawyer, the member of Parliament,—though in that position a man may perhaps prosper without it,—and to the statesman; but to the clergyman it is a vital necessity. 71
On the other hand, there are occupations and areas of work which are not acceptable for gentlemen, and which bring no real position even if they are wealth-producing. Tradesmen, merchants, and those who make their living through money transactions are generally excluded by Trollope from the class of gentlemen. First of all, retail trade, buying and selling, is looked upon as mean and ignoble. In this connection we recall Tom Mackenzie, who disgraced his family so greatly by going into trade in the firm of Rubb and Mackenzie, which manufactured and sold oilcloth on a retail basis. In Dr. Thorne Trollope declares, "Merchants as such are not the first men among us; though it perhaps be open, barely open, to a merchant to become one of them. Buying and selling is good and necessary; it is very necessary, and may, possibly, be very good; but it cannot be the noblest work of man; and let us hope that it may not in our time be esteemed the noblest work of an Englishman." A good example of a merchant attempting to become a gentleman is Sir Joseph Mason, the wealthy London merchant who bought Groby Park and Orley Farm, and whose children are all snobs. "They had become grander people than him, had been gifted with aspiring minds, and in every turn and twist which they took, looked to do something towards washing themselves clean from the dirt of the counting-house." But neither
he nor they ever really make the grade.

Trollope is particularly opposed to financial speculation, apparently because he feels it brings out the worst in men. Confirmation of his feeling about its ungentlemanliness comes from Mrs. Sexty Parker, whose husband is feverishly engaged in it. According to her, such ventures are a thirsting for blood, with men becoming like tigers clawing at one another. "There aint no fear of God in it, nor yet no mercy, nor e'er a morsel of heart. It aint what I call manly,—not that longing after other folks' money." Roger Carbury, one of Trollope's most highly approved gentlemen, considers the city financial adventurer to be the vilest and most dishonest of all men and undoubtedly communicates Trollope's attitude. Further insight into Trollope's views of commercial speculation, of the city financial adventurer, and of shady money dealings can be gained by examining the ends of three important characters of this type. Dobbs Broughton, Ferdinand Lopez, and Augustus Melmotte all lead harried, feverish, reckless lives which eventually end in suicide. Both Broughton and Lopez die in destitute circumstances, and Melmotte kills himself on the eve of being apprehended for forgery.

Trollope, moreover, had a distrust of life founded upon anything so vacillating as business and speculation.
For example, Lady Mason's own parents had risen in the world from retail to wholesale, but they had lost their money. This misfortune indicates the insecurity of trade, of business, of transactions based on money alone. How can anything solid and substantial and lasting be based upon something which can vanish overnight? Sexty Parker nervously expresses this feeling. "But when one sees such things all round one,—a fellow utterly smashed here who had a string of hunters yesterday..." And Madalina Demolines echoes it in talking of Dobbs Broughton. "But don't you feel now, really, that City money is always very chancy? It comes and goes so quick." This question Trollope answers by saying that in England the owners of the land are the true aristocracy. Perhaps no better statement about the enduring nature of the land and the consequent social benefits to be derived from its possession appears than that of Archdeacon Grantly to his son Henry.

"I wonder people are so fond of land," said the major. "It is a comfortable feeling to know that you stand on your own ground. Land is about the only thing that can't fly away. And then, you see, land gives so much more than the rent. It gives position and influence and political power, to say nothing about the game..."

The archdeacon was striving to teach a great lesson to his son when he thus spoke of the pleasure which a man feels when he stands upon his own ground. He was bidding his son to understand how great was the position of an
heir to a landed property, and how small the position of a man depending on what Dr. Grantly himself would have called a scratch income,—an income made up of a few odds and ends, a share or two in this company and a share or two in that, a slight venture in foreign stocks, a small mortgage and such like convenient but uninfluential dribbles. 82

It has been previously pointed out that in Trollope’s estimation good blood and gentlemanly education and manners in themselves tend to bestow saving properties upon their possessors, not infallible, of course, but generally beneficial. The same seems to be true of position, also. For instance, Plantagenet Palliser "... had an assurance in his own position,—a knowledge of the strength derived from his intellect, his industry, his rank, and his wealth,—which made him altogether fearless of others." Trollope describes Mr. Walker, the attorney at Silverbridge, as "... gifted with that amount of personal comeliness which comfortable position and the respect of others will generally seem to give. A man rarely carries himself meanly, whom the world holds high in esteem." Position actually saves young Everett Wharton. This young man left Oxford without a degree, had gone into a banking-house, had then read with a barrister, had gone from there to the Stock Exchange, and finally had achieved some vague political aspirations, all the while existing on an allowance from his father, and
generally giving the impression of a weak, aimless person who can stick to nothing. But, when Everett unexpectedly becomes the heir of Wharton Hall, Sir Alured is overjoyed. "But Everett Wharton he had always liked. Everett had not been quite all that his father and uncle had wished. But his faults had been exactly those which would be cured,—or would almost be made virtues,—by the possession of a title and property. Distaste for a profession and aptitude for Parliament would become a young man who was heir not only to the Wharton estates, but to half his father's money." And when Sir Alured turns over the management of the estate to Everett, before his own death, Trollope quite obviously feels the young man saved. Here seems to lie Everett's salvation, in the responsibility he assumes as potential heir. Harry Clavering and Lord George Germain are other gentlemen who are strengthened as a consequence of assuming the management of large estates.

The first three gentlemanly characteristics—blood, breeding, and position—are very concisely summed up by Molly Grey as she questions the right of Mr. Barry, whom her father has suggested as a husband, to be a gentleman. "What right has he to be a gentleman? Who was his father and who was his mother? Of what kind were his nursery belongings? He has become an attorney, and so
have you. But has there been anyone to whisper to him among his teachings that in that profession, as in all others, there should be a sense of high honour to guide him?" To Molly, Mr. Barry is obviously not a gentleman because he is deficient in blood and breeding, and these deficiencies prevent him from possessing any real position even though he has become an attorney!

The fourth characteristic of the gentleman is the possession of adequate money to maintain his position of social eminence. In many instances this position required the maintaining of estates, large and small, with the resulting huge retinue of servants and retainers. It also often required considerable entertaining, with that accompanying expense. In many cases, it required the separate operation of a town house during the season in London. In all cases, it required the wearing of clothing of a certain quality, the maintaining of at least a decent household (at so great a cost that many gentlemen never married), and the education of children in a prescribed manner. Obviously, then, money is a necessity to the gentleman.

Of course, the need for money is greatest among the peerage and titled commoners, because maintaining a title properly proves an expensive proposition. Trollope points out, for example, that one might think an unmarried
gentleman not to be poor who possessed an income of twenty five hundred pounds a year.

But Lord Fawn unfortunately was a lord, unfortunately was a landlord, unfortunately was an Irish landlord. Let him be as careful as he might with his sixpences, his pounds would fly from him, or, as might perhaps be better said, could not be made to fly to him. He was very careful with his sixpences, and was always thinking, not exactly how he might make two ends meet, but how to reconcile the strictest personal economy with the proper bearing of an English nobleman.

And Roger Carbury thinks ill of Patrick Carbury for accepting a baronetcy without means to sustain it. "Sir Patrick, to his thinking, had been altogether unjustifiable in accepting an enduring title, knowing that he would leave behind him no property adequate for its support. A baronet, so thought Roger Carbury, should be a rich man, rich enough to grace the rank which he assumed to wear."

Most of these titled families moved to some extent in the world of fashion, and as a matter of course bore the expense of the season in London. This meant the maintenance of a town house, carriages, and other appurtenances of rank, and meant balls and dinners to be given, for the season in London was a constant whirl of activity and entertaining. In addition, during the fall and winter there was a constant stream of guests at the country estates, which entertaining involved a
steady outlay of food, drink, linens, and required adequate servants, to mention only the largest items. Let us look at a specific instance, Plantagenet Palliser, Duke of Omnium, who has three houses to maintain,—the enormous rarely-used Gatherum Castle; the country estate, Matching Priory; and the London town house, Carleton Terrace. When he becomes Prime Minister, his wife determines that through social entertaining Palliser shall become a great Prime Minister. The social onslaught which follows is exaggerated, but the exaggeration enables one to picture more normal social obligations in proper perspective. Glenoora's instructions to her housekeeper at Gatherum Castle are highly informative. "You may take it as certain, Mrs. Pritchard," she said to the housekeeper, 'that there will never be less than forty for the next two months.' 'Forty to sleep, my lady?'... 'Yes, forty to sleep, and forty to eat, and forty to drink. But that's nothing. Forty to push through twenty-four hours every day! Do you think you've got everything that you want?' This situation is exaggerated, to be sure, but large numbers of guests were entertained for weeks on end at such country houses as Harrington Hall; Saulsby, where Phineas Finn found the house full; Longroyston, the Duke of St. Bungay's country home,
where the Whig hospitality had been dispensed with a lavish hand for two centuries; and Mistletoe, the Lincolnshire seat of the Duke of Mayfair, a quarter of a mile in length. It is little wonder that Lord Fawn, unmarried at that, should feel himself an impoverished nobleman with a revenue of only twenty-five hundred pounds a year.

The position of the landed squire also required a proportionate outlay of money to maintain. In speaking of the elder Frank Gresham, for instance, who between himself and his wife squandered his patrimony, Trollope makes this non-ironical comment, "Fourteen thousand a year ought to have been enough to allow a member of parliament with a young wife and two or three children to live in London and keep up their country family mansion." Roger Carbury, who has only two thousand pounds a year, also has financial difficulties, although he is by no means improvident with his money.

At the beginning of the present century the squire of Carbury had been a considerable man in his part of the county. The income of the estate had sufficed to enable him to live plenteously and hospitably, to drink port wine, to ride a stout hunter, and to keep an old lumbering coach for his wife's use when she went avisiting. He had an old butler who had never lived anywhere else, and a boy from the village who was in a way apprenticed to the butler. There was a cook, not too proud to wash up her own dishes, and a couple of young women. . . In the year 1800 the Carbury
property was sufficient for the Carbury house. Since that time the Carbury property has considerably increased in value, and the rents have been raised. Even the acreage has been extended by the enclosure of commons. But the income is no longer comfortably adequate to the wants of an English gentleman's household. If a moderate estate in land be left to a man now, there arises the question whether he is not damaged unless an income also be left to him wherewith to keep up the estate. 92

Among the clergy, the need for money to maintain position is just as great, particularly so, of course, among the higher ranks. For example, Bishop Grantly's income had averaged nine thousand pounds a year, he had kept his carriage "as became a bishop," and he and his son, the Archdeacon, had spent their money liberally, much to the satisfaction of the Barchester tradesmen. His successor, Dr. Proudie, was ambitious and felt compelled to maintain a position in fashionable society. Hence Mrs. Proudie's constant scheming to save money in giving the social functions she feels necessary to her position. Roger Carbury's neighbor, the Bishop of Elmham, lived in noble style. "He was a man of fortune outside his bishopric; and, as he never went up to London, and had no children on whom to spend his money, he was able to live as a nobleman in the country. He did live as a nobleman, and was very popular." 93

As we turn to the rectors and vicars, Mark Robarts comes to mind. His parsonage is not extravagantly laid
out. Trollope, describing it, says, "It had all the
details requisite for the house of a moderate gentleman
with moderate means, and none of those expensive super­
fluities which immoderate gentlemen demand, or which
themselves demand immoderate means." Yet Mark has a
curate at the rate of seventy pounds a year, his wife
has a pony carriage, and he has a saddle horse and
another for his gig. His menage includes a footman, a
gardener, a groom, and female menials. "A man in his
position, well-to-do as he was, required as much as
that." Indeed, when Beatrice Gresham is going to marry
Caleb Oriel, who fortunately has a private income,
Trollope remarks that she will not have the duties and
responsibilities which too often fall to the lot of the
mistress of an English vicarage. "Beatrice was not doomed
to make her husband comfortable, to educate her children,
dress herself like a lady, and exercise open-handed
charity on an income of two hundred pounds a year." Florence Burton, Harry Clavering's betrothed, has always
lived among people of inexpensive habits, whereas Harry
is the son of a well-to-do rector and has been brought
up in very comfortable circumstances. Florence realizes
that Harry "...would not be happy as a poor man,—with­
out comforts around him, which would simply be comforts
to him though they would be luxuries to her."
But what about the lowest members of the clerical group, the curates? Here, inevitably, one thinks of Josiah Crawley, the perpetual curate of Hogglestock, with an income of only a hundred and thirty pounds a year for himself, his wife, and four children. Undoubtedly, a considerable portion of his misery derives from his feeling that his means are inadequate to his position. Trollope says, "There is not a gentleman's house in the parish of Hogglestock besides that of the clergyman; and this, though it is certainly the house of a gentleman, can hardly be said to be fit to be so." How can position be maintained when clothes for five people, "...of whom one must at any rate wear the raiment of a gentleman...", can scarcely be bought for less than ten pounds each a year? That question easily finds an answer. "But even the liberal stipend of a hundred and thirty pounds a year—liberal according to the scale by which the incomes of clergymen in some of our new districts are now apportioned—would not admit of a gentleman with his wife and four children living with the ordinary comforts of an artisan's family." Here Trollope is again speaking of Crawley, and very obviously means that a man cannot maintain the position of gentleman without the necessary money.

As the world of gentlemen goes, then, we can begin
to sympathize with the cynical, worldly-wise Maurice Maule, warning his son against making a penniless marriage, although obviously Maurice is judging by the standards of fashionable social life. "My dear Gerard, I have lived too long in the world to believe that men can coin into money the noble blood of well-born wives. Twenty thousand pounds is worth more than all the blood of all the Howards, and a wife even with twenty thousand pounds would make you a poor, embarrassed, and half-famished man."

And we also begin to understand fully the close connection between money and the phrases "like gentlemen" or "like a gentleman", which occur often in Trollope's novels. The phrases are used to mean generously, not close-fistedly, without thinking of pennies, so that the underlying meaning of a gentleman being a member of a wealthy class, comes clear. Take this example—the Grantlys are being compared with the penny-pinching Proudies. "The Grantlys, father and son, had spent their money like gentlemen. . . ." And better yet, this one from Phineas Redux. Browborough, whom Phineas beat in the Tankerville election, is to be prosecuted for bribery. Everyone knows he is guilty. "Of course, he had gone to Tankerville with money in his hand, with plenty of money, and had spent it—like a gentleman."
Now, Browborough is as far from being a gentleman as Louis Scatcherd, or Musselboro, or Quintus Slide! Quite obviously, the phrase connects the generous spending of money with the class of gentlemen.

The fact, moreover, that the position of gentleman requires money to maintain is amply illustrated from the plots of the novels themselves, for the action is to some extent dictated by this fact, since Trollope deals almost exclusively with the gentlemanly class.

We do not read very far in Trollope without encountering the marriage-for-money theme. The heir to an impoverished estate feels compelled to marry money (or is urged to do so from all sides), or a not too industrious younger son sees the necessity of doing so. Using Lord Nidderdale, the constant frequenter of the Beargarden in The Way We Live Now, as a typical instance of such an impoverished heir, Trollope states very clearly the practice of marrying for money as it existed among the upper classes at that time, although whether he agrees with the practice is another matter. Nidderdale's property was not very large, and his father, grandfather, as well as himself, had all helped add to the family embarrassments.

It had been an understood thing, since he had commenced life, that he was to marry an heiress. In such families as his, when such results have
been achieved, it is generally understood that matters shall be put right by an heiress. It has become an institution, like primogeniture, and is almost as serviceable for maintaining the proper order of things. Rank squanders money; trade makes it;—and then trade purchases rank by re-gilding its splendour. The arrangement, as it affects the aristocracy generally, is well understood... 104

And so, off and on, Nidderdale tries for the hand of Marie Melmotte, who will have a considerable dowry when she marries, in one instance doing so because pressure is being put on him by tradesmen to pay his debts. Prompted by his mother, the penniless Sir Felix Carbury also makes a play for Marie's hand and money.

The impoverished Lord Fawn also desperately looks towards marrying money almost as a salvation and his engagement to Lizzie Eustace is the direct result of this attitude.

Such a man almost naturally looks to marriage as an assistance in the dreary fight. It soon becomes clear to him that he cannot marry without money, and he learns to think that heiresses have been invented exactly to suit his case. He is conscious of having been subjected to hardship by Fortune, and regards female wealth as his legitimate mode of escape from it. He has got himself, his position, and perhaps his title, to dispose of, and they are surely worth so much per annum. As for giving anything away, that is out of the question. He has not been so placed as to be able to give. But, being an honest man, he will, if possible, make a fair bargain. 106

As for idle younger sons who marry for money, or
those who feel that their position calls them to do so, the unforgettable Hon. George De Courcy is thought of instantly. When he finally hooked a wife, she possessed thirty thousand pounds. "The lady herself was not beautiful, or clever, or of imposing manners. . . nor was she of high birth. . . . Her manners were, at any rate, innocent; and as to her birth,—seeing that, from the first, she was not supposed to have had any,—no disappointment was felt. Her father had been a coal-merchant."

Often in Trollope's novels romantic love is thwarted because of lack of money on the part of the lovers. In the following examples, the women are the ones who break off the match, in each instance unwilling to face a moneyless marriage. For instance, in The Duke's Children, the lovers who go their separate ways are Frank Tregear and Lady Mabel Grex. Lady Mabel dictates that she and Tregear will not marry, because they have both been brought up in luxury, yet neither has money at the time of their romance. Although Julia Brabazon still loves Harry Clavering, she breaks with him to marry Lord Ongar with his sixty thousand a year. "'Love is not to be our master,' she tells Harry. "'You can choose, as I say; but I have had no choice,—no choice but to be married well, or to go out like a snuff of a candle. I don't like the snuff of a candle, and, therefore, I am going
to be married well.' And Lady Laura Standish, who spent her fortune to pay her brother's debts, refuses the penniless Phineas Finn, whom she loves, to marry the wealthy Robert Kennedy. She is ambitious to become a great lady in political circles, an ambition which she considers will be furthered by such an estate as Lough-linter and such wealth as Kennedy possesses. It is interesting to note, in more fully understanding Trollope's views of the loveless marriage, that in each instance, these women find no success as the result of their decision.

To illustrate further the importance of money as a characteristic of the gentleman, we turn to the instances in which Trollope aids approved gentlemen when their position necessitates such assistance. The family and relatives of young Frank Gresham, for instance, consider it imperative for him to marry money, but Frank holds out for his penniless Mary Thorne, who, at the stroke of midnight, conveniently turns out to be a rich heiress. Because Trollope did not approve of the loveless marriage of convenience, inevitably he must have felt the need for providing such an arrangement, because the position of Frank, one of his approved gentlemen, actually demanded money.

In the same category falls the Earl of Brentford's
heir, Lord Chiltern, a wild and reckless man in his youth. In sowing his wild oats, he squandered whatever money he had and contracted huge debts which took the whole of the fortune of his sister to pay. Lord Chiltern loved Violet Effingham, and would probably have married her even had she been penniless, but as in the case of Mary Thorne, Violet is fortunately an heiress. Any other alternative probably would have been fatal to Chiltern, whom Trollope approves. He is a Bohemian with no aptitude for the ordinary pursuits of the gentleman, but he makes one of the best masters of hounds in the whole of Trollope. Love helps save him, but money is needed to allow love to function.

Other instances in which Trollope aids approved gentlemen when their position necessitates such assistance abound in the novels. After Arabin decides to alter his course in life and secure some of the good things of the world, he very fortunately falls in love with the wealthy Eleanor Bold. Phineas Finn, another poor young gentleman, after having avoided the pitfalls awaiting the M.P. without means, is finally allowed to marry the wealthy Madame Max Goesler, because the man's position demands it. Finally there is Johnny Eames, the one-time hobbledehoy. After being practically adopted by the Earl De Guest, one of Trollope's real
gentlemen and one with a nose for gentility, and after working himself up in government service to a place of relative eminence, he is left money by the Earl, presumably so that his position of fashionable gentleman can be secured. For what other reason should he be left money by the Earl De Guest? Perhaps an answer is found in the Last Chronicle when Johnny sets out on the continent to find Lady Arabin, who is so desperately needed to set things straight in the Crawley matter. Without money to insure his independence he probably could neither have demanded the time off nor have stood the expense of such a journey.

We have seen how the position of gentleman requires money to maintain. Let us now examine how actual dire poverty affects the class. That poverty can degrade the gentleman is demonstrated by Mr. Quiverful, the vicar of Puddingdale, who so eagerly desired to become the warden of Hiram's Hospital after Mr. Harding's resignation.

The impossible task of bringing up as ladies and gentlemen fourteen children on an income which was insufficient to give them with decency the common necessaries of life, had had an effect upon him not beneficial either to his spirit, or his keen sense of honour. He was not careful, as another might be who sat on an easier worldly seat, to stand well with those around him, to shun a breath which might sully his name, or a rumour which might affect his honour. He could not afford such niceties of conduct, such moral luxuries. It must suffice for him to be ordinarily honest according to the ordinary honesty of the world's ways, and to let men's
tongues wag as they would. 110

Hence he could consort with a Slope!

And, finally, in The Last Chronicle, Trollope dis-
cusses the whole matter in detail.

None but they who have themselves been poor
gentry,—gentry so poor as not to know how to
raise a shilling,—can understand the peculiar
bitterness of the trials which such poverty
produces. The poverty of the normal poor does
not approach it; or, rather, the pangs arising
from such poverty are altogether of a different
sort. To be hungry and have no food, to be
cold and have no fuel, to be threatened with
distraint for one's few chairs and tables, and
with the loss of the roof over one's head,—all
these miseries, which, if they do not positively
reach, are so frequently near to reaching the
normal poor, are, no doubt, the severest of the
trials to which humanity is subjected. They
threaten life,—or, if not life, then liberty,—
reducing the abject one to a choice between
captivity and starvation. By hook or crook, the
poor gentleman or poor lady,—let the one or the
other be ever so poor,—does not often come to
the last extremity of the workhouse...But
there are pangs to which, at the time, starva-
tion itself would seem to be preferable. The
angry eyes of unpaid tradesmen...the taunt
of the poor servant who wants her wages; the
gradual relinquishment of habits which the soft
nurture of earlier, kinder years had made second
nature; the wan cheeks of the wife whose malady
demands wine; the rags of the husband whose
outward occupations demand decency; the neglected
children, who are learning not to be the children
of gentlefolk; and, worse than all, the alms and
doles of half-generous friends, the waning pride,
the pride that will not wane, the growing doubt
whether it be not better to bow the head, and
acknowledge to all the world that nothing of the
pride of station is left,—that the hand is open
to receive and ready to touch the cap, that the
fall from the upper to the lower level has been
accomplished,—these are the pangs of poverty
which drive the Crawleys of the world to the fre-
quent entertaining of that idea of the bare bodkin.
Such a statement leads to a consideration of the saving qualities of money. We have seen that the other gentlemanly characteristics, blood, breeding, and position, in their respective ways all possess saving properties for the gentleman—and the same is true of money. First of all, it is saving in that it prevents the debasing effects of poverty itself and makes possible the culture and independence of the gentleman. But money contains another saving property, in that it allows gentlemen to make mistakes, see their errors and repent, and thus be salvaged. Without money, for example, Chiltern might easily have ended like Burgo Fitzgerald or George Vavasor. Because of his father's wealth, Lord Silverbridge could lose seventy thousand pounds on a single race, and yet live to become a valuable member of society. Ralph Newton's inheritance saves him from ruin. And Harry Clavering, with his touch of weakness and ineptitude for earning a living, is undoubtedly saved from infinite strain and temptation by his father's timely inheritance of Clavering Park.

But wealth alone will not make the gentleman. As we have seen, Sir Roger Scatcherd realizes he is no gentleman, in spite of his title and wealth. The wealthy Gustavus Moffat, son of a tailor, achieves a position of sorts among snobbish gentlemen, but Trollope points out
that his money is his only passport to this elysium. Another of the same ilk is the extremely wealthy Sir Damask Monogram, who has to some extent got over the difficulty of being the grandson of a butcher, "... and was now as good as though the Monograms had gone to the crusades." Sir Damask and his social-climbing wife have managed to be tolerated in some levels of London fashionable life through the judicious outlay of money, and live in constant fear of losing their slippery hold. When Sir Damask brings home the rumors of Melmotte's impending disaster, his wife replies, "Then he's ruined,--and there's an end of them." Nothing could more strongly illustrate the need of money to enable social-climbing non-gentlemen to hold even precariously to the world of gentlemen. Without money, they have absolutely no chance of even tolerance!

These wealthy people with no antecedents, no background, and no position, are tolerated within the fold for their money--and only for their money. The Duchess of Stevenage, to illustrate, tells her son that of course the Melmottes are vulgar. She frankly admits she's attending their ball for a purpose--hoping that Melmotte will in some way make provision for her brother Alfred's children. On the other hand, Roger Carbury, one of Trollope's elect, would never so soil his hands.
He tags Melmotte in no uncertain terms. "I look upon him as dirt in the gutter. To me, in my old-fashioned way, all his money, if he has it, can make no difference. Men say openly that he is an adventurer and a swindler. No one pretends to think that he is a gentleman. He is one whom we would not admit into our kitchens, much less to our tables, on the score of his own merits. But because he has learned the art of making money, we not only put up with him, but settle upon his carcase as so many birds of prey.'"

No, wealth alone does not make the gentleman. And what does, then? By now, we have answered that question. To summarize, let us first turn to the beliefs of Sir Peregrine Orme. "In judging the position which a man should hold in the world, Sir Peregrine was very resolute in ignoring all claims made by wealth alone. Even property and land could not in his eyes create a gentleman. A gentleman, according to his ideas, should at any rate have great-grandfathers capable of being traced in the world's history; and the greater the number of such, and the more easily traceable they might be on the world's surface, the more unquestionable would be the status of the claimant in question." If one is born into a long-established family of good blood, Trollope undoubtedly feels that saving qualities are often communicated.
Being born into such a family allows one to grow up in the company of gentlemen and ladies, so that slowly and unconsciously the manners and moral code of the class, in themselves redeeming, will be developed or absorbed during childhood and youth, and will become organic breeding, which a few inadequate and half-understood rules learned by chance and plastered on from the outside can never hope to equal. The family itself will give one a position of eminence and respect from the very outset, and will provide the education and equipment needed for one to assume some working post of esteem as an adult.

Basically, this concept is identical to that behind the age-old practice of stock-breeding, a practice which forms an excellent analogy, and which seems to have been constantly in Trollope's mind, judging from the wealth of animal and stock-breeding imagery which appears in the novels. The stock breeder—the breeder of race horses, for instance—proceeds on the theory that the union of established blood lines will most often produce the potentially winning horse. To bring out the potentialities, a time-established course of training and development is required, which cannot be accomplished overnight. During the period of training, moreover, the horse needs good handling, attention, and select
living quarters. And to drive the analogy home, the process cannot be achieved without a considerable outlay of money!
CHAPTER II

The Gentleman's Code

The four identifying characteristics of the gentleman have been determined—blood, breeding, position, and money. Broad outlines, however, are not enough. If we are really to understand the class of gentlemen, we must get at its fundamental beliefs, its sense of function, its morality—and in some detail. A thorough analysis of the gentlemanly characteristics, particularly breeding, is therefore demanded, and such an analysis reveals a number of attributes more or less common to all levels of Trollope's gentlemen. Certain of these attributes, such as courtesy, hospitality, liberality, justice, and temperance, are taken for granted by Trollope as part of the gentlemanly tradition, and appear frequently in the actions and thoughts of his gentlemen without receiving particular emphasis.

Courtesy to Trollope's gentlemen means urbanity and respect. When Slope preached his famous sermon in Bar¬
chester cathedral, for instance, Mr. Harding thought Slope rude to assail the religious convictions of his elders in the church. "'Courtesy should have kept him silent, even if neither charity nor modesty could do
so.' "To Harding, religion is not less susceptible of
urbane and courteous conduct among men than any other
study which they may take up. Roger Carbury believes
it the duty of the host to exercise "...a courtesy
towards his guests sweeter, softer, more gracious than
the world required elsewhere." His cousin Hetta, watch­
ing him perform his role as host during the course of a
whole evening, told herself "...he was a very mirror
of courtesy in his own house." Similarly, when the Earl
De Guest spread his board for his friends, "...he
entertained them simply, with a mild, tedious, old-fash­
ioned courtesy," and Josiah Crawley likewise treated
Lucy Robarts with "...an old-fashioned, polished
respect." This notion of courtesy can be traced in many
other gentlemen, such as Sir Harry Hotspur, Sir Pere­
grine Orme, and Squire Butler Cornbury, who received
Luke Rowan with the "...stiff urbanity of former days."

Hospitality is another obvious characteristic of
the gentleman. In Framley Parsonage, Trollope discusses
hospitality, declaring that the important point is to
please or gratify one's guests. Mr. Mainwaring's dinner
to the Mortons and Senator Gotobed illustrates the
 hospitable man at work, hoping to please and gratify
his guests by means of his food and wines. Roger Car­
bury likewise thinks much of the duties of hospitality.
"He held the place [Carbury Hall] in trust for the use of others." Some of the same spirit is felt in the scene in which Earl De Guest happens upon Johnny Eames asleep on his property. The hospitable old earl assures Johnny that he is welcome on the place and invites him to lunch. Mrs. Proudie's dislike for giving suppers because of the expense is contrasted with "...the unsparing, open-handed hospitality of Barchester palace in the good old days of Bishop Grantly. ..." And one of the drawbacks to Sir Alured Wharton's happiness was the fact that his estate "...delightful as it was in many respects ...was hardly sufficient to maintain his position with that plentiful hospitality which he would have loved...."

The liberality of the gentleman apparently is interpreted in two ways. First, it has the sense of lavish open-handedness. Liberal gentlemen are those who spend their money "like gentlemen." Archdeacon Grantly illustrates the man of means who spends his money liberally. Both he and his father, we have seen, have that reputation among the tradesmen of Barchester, and in this respect the Proudies are again unfavorably contrasted with the Grantlys. Like the Grantlys, Dr. Wortle pays ready money and high prices, and so the people in Bowick know the comfort of having "...an open-handed, well-to-do gentleman in the village." The notion of
liberality attached to the position of the gentleman is made clear in the case of Dolly Longstaffe's father. Longstaffe's position forbids him to question the items in tradesmen's bills, prevents him from making inquiry as to the consumption of his wine in the servants' hall, and causes him to hesitate to raise the rents of his tenants. Liberality is again illustrated by old Squire Morton, who likes to have his house full of guests and hates "petty economies." But liberality can also appear in another way. Squire Christopher Dale, for example, is close in small matters of money, but "in certain family arrangements...capable of much liberality." Other families of gentlefolk noted for their liberality are the Eustaces, Alburys, Hotspurs and Staveleys.

A sense of justice and fairness is another gentlemanly attribute. When Lady Mason confesses her forgery to Sir Peregrine Orme, his sense of justice dictates that Orley Farm must be returned to Joseph Mason—no matter what the consequences. Likewise, when Henry Thorne's actions result in such havoc to the lives of the Scatcherds, Dr. Thorne's sense of justice prompts him to pay Roger Scatcherd's defense expenses and to attend to Mary Scatcherd's comfort. Mr. Harding, "an open-handed, just-minded man," gave his bedesmen extra money out of his own pocket because he feels there
might be some truth in the rumors going around Barchester. Justice also intervenes when Lord Silverbridge tells his father his intention of becoming a Conservative. Plantagenet Palliser becomes angry and is tempted to threaten his son, but he stops, knowing that in justice he should not be angry at such offense. "To endeavour to be just was the study of his life, and in no condition of life can justice be more imperatively due than from a father to his son!" Other examples of fair and just gentlemen are Roger Carbury, Christopher Dale, Lord St. George, Will Belton, Dr. Tempest, and Lord George Germain.

Temperance or moderation appears constantly as a limiting force in the gentleman's general activity, being particularly noticeable in regard to drink. To Trollope drunkenness reduces a man to the level of a beast and causes loss of gentility. There are many admonitions against excess in the novels, particularly in Dr. Thorne. On the other hand, teetotalism is excess in the opposite direction. The idea of self-control is eminent in the notion of temperance. Dr. Thorne beautifully illustrates the point: "The doctor loved his port wine... He loved it not as a toper, but as a collector loves his pet pictures. He liked to talk about it, and think about it; to praise it, and hear it praised; to look at it turned
towards the light..." The novels are filled with such gentlemen. Almost always the drunkards are non-gentlemen like Lupex, Winterbones, Dobbs Broughton, Sexty Parker, and the Scatcherds.

Turning to those attributes of the gentleman which Trollope feels more intensely and consequently emphasizes, we find one of the most apparent to be the gentleman's love and concern for the land, for the family acres. We have already noted Archdeacon Grantly's feeling that the land is lasting and cannot fly away as can money invested in speculation. To him it means position, eminence, power, prestige—it is a constant in a world of flux and change. The same attitude lies behind the Duke of St. Bungay's remark that as long as acres are dear and the English country gentleman can retain his, the gentleman will never believe his country to be in danger. Lady Lufton's horror of property changing hands is typical of this attitude, and she warns her son, "'Never let the estate decrease in your hands. It is only by such resolutions as that, that English noblemen and English gentlemen can preserve their country.'" The same attitude lies behind old Mrs. Morton's belief that a property like Bragton should never be lessened. "'It is in that way that the country is given over to shop-keepers and speculators, and is made to be like France or Italy.'" Old Squire Vavasor
becomes furious when George wants to borrow money on the estate, and even the effete and useless Dolly Longestaffe feels that the family property should not be allowed to go to pieces.

But this notion of solid security is only part of the gentleman's feeling for the land. A more predominant part, perhaps, is a reverence resulting from the age-old association of family and estate, from the ties of antiquity. And reverence is the word, for Trollope conceives of this feeling as a religious one, often actually employing religious terminology to describe it. To the Dales of Allington, for instance, it had been "a sacred law" that no acre of the original family property would be parted from the hands of the existing squire. "It had been a religion among them; and seeing that the worship had been carried on without fail..." the property was still intact in the hands of Christopher Dale. Sir Harry Hotspur's beliefs about family estates and their function also constitute for him a "sacred religion."

Good blood, we have seen, is an important gentlemanly characteristic; and the idea of ancient family is fused with the feeling for the land. Love and pride of family, particularly of its head, is part of the religion of the gentleman, the Lovels, for example, feeling it part of
the "religion of the family" that they should cling to their head and chief. The fusion of feeling about land and family is everpresent in Trollope—witness the Whartons, Lovels, Dales, Germains, Fletchers, and Hotspurs. Will Belton exemplifies this fused emotion, as he inherits Belton Castle.

There is much in the glory of ownership,—of the ownership of land and houses, of beeves and woolly flocks, of wide fields and thick-growing woods, even when that ownership is of late date, when it conveys to the owner nothing but the realization of a property on the soil; but there is much more in it when it contains the memories of old years; when the glory is the glory of race as well as the glory of power and property. There had been Beltons of Belton living there for many centuries, and now he was the Belton of the day, standing on his own ground,—the descendant and representative of the Beltons of old,—Belton of Belton without a flaw in his pedigree! 32

Antiquity is obviously the intensifying factor of Will's emotion, and helps account for the sacred and reverent tone of Trollope's descriptions of old family houses, such as the Cleeve, the Hall at Humblethwaite, or Curbury Manor House, as compared with the profanity of newly-built houses for newly-rich people who possess newly purchased estates. This attitude is well expressed by Mr. Rattler's remark to Phineas Finn as they approach the house of Loughlinter, Robert Kennedy's new country estate, "'Very grand;--but the young trees show the new man. A new man may buy a forest; but he can't get park
trees. Trollope feels the same way about Noningsby, the new house of Judge Staveley, no matter how much he may approve of the Judge himself. "Noningsby was a delightful house; no one with money and taste at command could have created for himself one more delightful; but then there are delights which cannot be created even by money and taste."

In this lay-religion of the gentleman, family and land must be kept together, and so primogeniture or natural descent becomes a sacred law. Roger Carbury, for example, felt himself constrained "as by some divine law" to see that his land went by natural descent. He thinks it would be better for the estate to be dissipated by a Carbury than held together by a stranger, although he lives to change his mind. The man disposing of family property, according to Roger, owes a duty to those on his land, to his country, and to his ancestors, who have wished for the property to remain in the hands of their descendants. To Sir Harry Hotspur, "...that an eldest son should have all the family land,—one, though as many sons should have been given to him as to Priam,—and that that one should have it unencumbered, as he had had it from his father,—this was to him the very law of his being." This feeling is a common one. Other good expressions of it come from John Morton,
Indefer Jones, and Squire Vavasor, the latter of whom, like Roger Carbury, feels strongly about the law of natural descent, and only departs from it when convinced that George would destroy the estate.

Obviously in this religion of family and land, the heir becomes a person of importance, actually being an object of veneration and reverence from the moment of his birth. This idea is distinctly expressed by Trollope, when he points out Everett Wharton's good fortune in becoming heir to the Wharton estate and title. The former heir, a dissolute drunkard, has been accidentally killed, and because this man's only child is a girl, Everett becomes heir.

Oh,—what salvation or destruction there may be to an English gentleman in the sex of an infant! This poor baby was now little better than a beggar brat, unless the relatives who were utterly disregarding of its fate should choose, in their charity, to make some small allowance for its maintenance. Had it by chance been a boy Everett Wharton would have been nobody; and the child, rescued from the iniquities of his parents, would have been nursed in the best bedroom of Wharton Hall, and cherished with the warmest kisses, and would have been the center of all the hopes of all the Whartons. 40

This same spirit of heir-worship surrounds the birth of Lord Popenjoy: "It will be understood that for forty-eight hours before the birth of the child, and for forty-eight hours afterwards, all Manor Cross was moved in the matter,
as though this were the first male child born into the world since the installation of some new golden age.*1 1

With this feeling in mind, we can more accurately appreciate the distress of Squire Bernard Amedroz or Sir Harry Hotspur on the deaths of their only sons. Sir Harry particularly communicates the effect produced by the loss of a son and natural heir. "Sir Harry bore the blow bravely, though none who do not understand the system well can conceive how the natural grief of the father was increased by the disappointment which had fallen upon the head of the house."

An unwritten moral code governs the gentleman's conduct towards others. This code consists basically of Christian morality, but there is more. Superimposed upon this Christian base, augmenting it in places, reinforcing it in others, is a class morality or attitude toward conduct, the gentlemanly concept of honor, a concept which is a part of the breeding of the gentleman, and which is based upon his sense of self-respect and personal dignity.

"We English gentlemen hate the name of a lie. . . ." With this statement, Trollope settles the matter, and his approved gentlemen bear him out. For example, Sir Peregrine Orme, the soul of honor, "...did not easily believe a fellow-creature to be a liar, but a liar to
him once was a liar always." Phineas Finn remarks of Plantagenet Palliser, "No Englishman whom I have met is so broadly and intuitively and unceremoniously imbued with the simplicity of the character of a gentleman. He could no more lie than he could eat grass."  

Mabel Grex confirms this estimate when she calls Lord Silverbridge a gentleman and then remarks of him and his father, "Men such as you... cannot even lie with your eyelids... will not condescend to cover up a secret by a moment of feigned inanimation...."  

Impulsively, Eleanor Bold asks Arabin to answer a question "as a man of honour." Obviously she feels he must answer truthfully after such a request. And in Mr. Scarborough's Family, Squire Peter Prosper characteristically resolves to disinherit his heir, Harry Annesley, because the Squire has been told that Harry is guilty of a lie.

As the gentleman does not lie, neither does he break his promise. His word is his bond, a point of honor. And once he has promised, he must keep his word almost regardless of the circumstances. In a great many cases an offer of marriage has been extended to a woman. Lord Fawn, for example, points out to Lizzie Eustace valid objections to the continuation of their engagement, but at the same time admits he is bound by his previous
promise, if she so desires. Lord Silverbridge expresses
the same sentiment toward Isabel Boncassen when he tells
his father, "I have promised, and therefore I am
bound." Mrs. Burton, fighting for Harry Clavering
and Florence Burton, exclaims to Lady Qrigar, "His
honour will be tarnished...if he do not marry her whom
he has promised to marry...Is he not bound to keep
his promise?...if he would live with the reputation
of a gentleman there is only one course open to him." Promises occur, of course, in situations other than
affairs of the heart. Before his marriage, for example,
George Germain had promised to take a house in London at
Dean Lovelace's request, a promise which George regrets.
Nevertheless, he rents the house, because his promise is
"sacred to him." Dr. Thorne promised Roger Scatcherd he
would do all he could for Roger's son, Louis, and there­
fore felt that "...he was bound by every consideration
to perform the task." Consequently, he does all he can
to prolong Louis' life even though Louis' early death
will be advantageous to Mary Thorne. In another instance,
the Fletchers of Longbarns feel that Arthur Fletcher is
honor-bound to make the stand at Silverbridge; his
promise constitutes an obligation to Frank Gresham and
his friends.

There are other points of honor. A man may not
take money from a woman. It is for this reason that George Hotspur is roundly condemned. Phineas Finn refuses money from both Laura Kennedy and Madam Max Goesler. When offering money to Phineas, Madam Max expresses realization of the code. "'There are things one may not say here,—that are tabooed by a sort of consent,—and that without any reason.'" Phineas' answer is made in the tradition of honor. "'The offer from you...is as high-minded, as generous, and as honourable as its acceptance by me would be mean-spirited, vile, and ignoble.'" Another point involves the eternal triangle. Should a gentleman become enamored of a lady whom his friend is wooing, the code of honor requires that he remain scrupulously out of the picture until his friend has given up his suit. Lord Chiltern, for instance, feels that Phineas Finn has played him false with Violet Effingham. And perhaps Phineas has in the strict sense of the code, although there is much to say in his favor. However, the feeling that he may have been false to Chiltern goads him into consenting to fight a duel, although he realizes that public opinion will vote him foolish for such consent. Roger Carbury breaks with Paul Montague for this same reason, though he is not as justified, for Paul did not realize Roger's intentions towards Hetta until Paul had fallen in love with her himself. Another instance involves
Henry Norman, Alaric Tudor, and Gertrude Woodward. Mrs. Woodward feels that Alaric has not been true to his friend Henry in declaring his love for Gertrude before Henry has had a more prolonged chance of being successful with his suit. Henry is furious with Alaric, feeling that the man "...had forgotten every law of honour, every principle of honesty, every tie of friendship!"

Another element in the code of Trollope's Victorian gentleman is his tremendous respect for women. This respect permeates the novels and greatly influences the conduct of both ladies and gentlemen, being clearly described in the person of John Grey: "No man could be more gracious in word and manner than John Grey; no man more chivalrous in his carriage towards a woman. ..."

Trollope's approved gentlemen are of this type,—we need only recall George Vavasor, Adolphus Crosbie, or the Marquis of Brotherton to discover what happens to gentlemen who violate this respect. Not that the gentleman is not manly. John Gordon, for example, to Mary Lawrie is the personification of manliness; "...his manners to all women were soft, and to her seemed to have been suffused with special tenderness." Indeed, in The Three Clerks Trollope sees this respect as the result of the contrast between masculine strength and feminine weakness,
when he says, "Our theory is, that feminine weakness shall receive from man's strength humble and respectful service." In an excellent passage from The Last Chronicle Trollope shows how this feeling is ingrained in true gentlemen. "But, as there are men who will allow themselves all imaginable latitude in their treatment of women, believing that the world will condone any amount of fault of that nature, so are there other men, and a class of men which on the whole is the more numerous of the two, who are tremulously alive to the danger of censure on this head,--and to the danger of censure not only from others, but from themselves also."

Physical brutality of man to woman is, of course, intolerable. A blow destroys love. A woman may forgive deceit, treachery, desertion, even infidelity, says Trollope, but she cannot forgive the meanness of spirit that makes a blow possible. Furthermore, true love of man for woman is a noble feeling, but lust is foul and bestial. "How wonderful in its nature is that passion of which men speak when they acknowledge to themselves that they are in love. Of all things, it is, under one condition, the most foul, and under another, the most fair. As that condition is, a man shows himself either as a beast or as a god!"

A gentleman does not swear before a lady except
with great provocation. To Trollope, the intent behind swearing determines the vileness of the act. For instance, when Lopez swears at his wife, Emily, "...the word had been uttered with all its foulest violence, with virulence and vulgarity." This episode seemed to Emily to mark a crisis in her early married life. When Louis Scatcherd swears before Mary Thorne, Trollope remarks that he couldn't give up his ordinary mode of conversation even when on his best behavior. Again, Johnny Eames' cursing of Amelia Roper provokes this remark, "Johnny was very wrong,—wrong to utter any curse;—very wrong to ejaculate that curse against a human being; and especially wrong to fulminate it against a woman—a woman whom he had professed to love!"

Indeed, a gentleman should never speak harshly or roughly to a lady. Upon reflection, Roger Carbury apologizes to Lady Carbury for hard words spoken to her about her son, Felix. When Lucius Mason has been told his mother's guilt and is preparing to go to her, Mrs. Orme bids him "'. . . remember that harshness to any woman is unmanly.'" When Archdeacon Grantly resolves to see Grace Crawley, he wonders how he can possibly say what he has to say gently. But Trollope comments, "Nevertheless Archdeacon Grantly was a gentleman, and never yet had dealt more harshly with any woman than we have
sometimes seen him do with his wife,—when he would say to her an angry word or two with a good deal of marital authority."

Another inviolable rule of behavior toward women is that the gentleman may never present his side of the story, even though he be in the right. The degree of protection afforded women was indeed considerable. This rule is well illustrated in the person of Lord Rufford, who bethinks how he may escape from his involvement with Arabella Trefoil.

It might be said, no doubt would be said, that he behaved badly. That would be said because it would not be open to him to tell the truth. The lady in such a case can always tell her story, with what exaggeration she may please to give, and can complain. The man never can do so. When inquired into, he cannot say that he has been pursued. He cannot tell her friends that she began it, and, in point of fact, did it all. 'She would fall into my arms; she would embrace me; she persisted in asking me whether I loved her!' Though a man have to be shot for it, or kicked for it, or even though he have to endure perpetual scorn for it, he cannot say that let it be ever so true.

Phineas Finn also feels the hampering effects of this attitude, as he talks to Lady Laura Kennedy. "She could hit him with her argument; but he could only remember his, and think how violent might be the blow he could inflict,—if it were not that she were a woman, and therefore guarded." Likewise, George Germain is greatly concerned about the love letter from Adelaide Houghton.
Though he could assure himself that the fault all lay with the woman, he could not excuse himself by that argument in discussing the matter with his father-in-law. Moreover, a gentleman keeps a woman's name from scandal or from the public eye, even if he has to suffer himself as a result. When Quintus Slide tries to use Kennedy's letter to blackmail Phineas Finn, Phineas would like to kick him downstairs, but he realizes he must think first of Lady Laura and take whatever he must from Slide without flinching. Likewise, Harry Annesley withholds information of his fight with Captain Scarsborough from the authorities, so that Florence Mountjoy's name can be kept from the public.

Although formalization is inevitable, and, in actuality, convenient and necessary from a practical point of view, at its basis this sense of honor is not a codified list of rules and regulations. In the most approved of Trollope's gentlemen, as we shall eventually see, it is a moral sense upon which an individual may rely in making any decision involving his own personal conduct. The men who follow its dictates are, in the acid test, stronger than their fellows, more thoroughly individualistic, able to transcend class conventions and pressures. Their concept of honor becomes a personal morality, a sort of "inner light" founded upon
their sense of individual worth and "...that appreciation of the beauty of truth which an exercise of Christianity is supposed to exact." Inevitably, they feel a necessity to do what is right for them, and inevitably that action is dictated by unselfishness. Nearly all gentlemen possess this moral sense to some degree or another, although most, as would be expected, in their daily lives fall back upon formalized expressions of it. It is this sense that causes Christopher Dale to exclaim about Crosbie's jilting of Lily Dale, "I give you my word as a gentleman, I do not understand it." He does not use the words lightly, for he feels the world is changing for the worse, and Trollope agrees with him. Paul Montague's high estimate of the value of his personal honor is indicated when he tells Melmotte, "...in reference to what I may or may not say to any friend, or how far I should be restricted by the scruples of a gentleman, I do not want advice from you." In a similar manner, when accused of duplicity by Lord Brentford, Phineas Finn instinctively replies that he knows what the honor and truth of a gentleman demand, even to the verge of self-sacrifice, and that he has done nothing to place his character as a gentleman in jeopardy. Another revealing example of what honor may require is Sir
Peregrine Orme's attitude toward Lady Mason after she confesses her guilt. He is utterly shocked by the revelation. Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that he has received a blow from which he will never recover, he realizes that she confessed to save him from a disastrous step, and therefore she was one whom:

"...he was still bound in honour to protect!" Honor of the highest type also compels Mr. Peacocke to confess his secret to Dr. Wortle. He tells his wife,

"From the world at large I am prepared, if possible, to keep my secret, even though I do it by lying;--but to this one man I am driven to tell it, because I may not return his friendship by doing him an evil."

Trollope was intrigued by a problem posed by the code of honor. How does a gentleman avenge an insult to himself or a dear one? He realized that the duel was passé in mid-Victorian England, and admitted that participants in duels were considered fools. He also realized that personal encounters were ill-mannered, ungentlemanly, and rowdy, and that some men are not adapted by temperament to fly at their enemy's throat, and carry out their purpose "after the manner of dogs."

What then substitutes for the duel? How are insults to be held in check if both dueling and thrashing are taboo, and how is honor to be defended? Time
and again, Trollope poses this problem in his novels, and finds no really satisfactory answers provided by mid-Victorian society. Social pressure, he informs us, is relied upon to curb the expression of insolence. For example, society considers an insult to one man in a company an insult to the whole group. Moreover, men will refrain from calling others opprobrious terms which common consent will force them to retract. But, Trollope continues, society also expects the help of the man who may be insulted. He must exercise rigid self-control, for if he becomes angry, society will also attach blame to him. A final resort is simply to avoid a man who annoys one, or "consider the source," as we would say today. The latter is illustrated when Lord Rufford restrains Larry Twentyman from going after the farmer, Goarly. The idea is that a gentleman doesn't care what such a man says. Such avoidance may help somewhat in relation to oneself, but what about the insult to a woman--one's sweetheart, sister, or daughter? In many cases, of course, recourse to law is available, but unthinkable. There seems nothing left but to spurn the offender, even with the consciousness that he will be indifferent to such spurning.

For this reason Trollope felt a nostalgia for the duel and often remarked that lack of public approval
had caused an effective tool to pass away. "The old way was barbarous certainly, and unreasonable,—but there was a satisfaction in it that has been often wanting since the use of pistols went out of fashion among us." And as late as Phineas Finn, the duel seems the only means of settling the difficulties between Lord Chiltern and Phineas. There is indication, however, that as Trollope grew older and the mid-Victorian period waned, his feeling about thrashing as a means of settling a point of honor changes. In relatively early novels he wholeheartedly approves Frank Gresham's thrashing of Moffat and Johnny Eames' assault on Crosbie. In the Prime Minister, however, an older Frank Gresham takes steps to avert an encounter between Arthur Fletcher and Ferdinand Lopez. In The Way We Live Now, even though Roger Carbury says Felix Carbury needs a thrashing as much as any one ever did, Trollope's later comments upon John Crumb's beating of Felix indicate his belief that thrashing is ungentlemanly. "A John Crumb can do it, perhaps, and come out of the affair exulting; but not a Sir Felix Carbury, even if the Sir Felix of the occasion have the requisite courage." This point is brought out even more clearly when Dean Lovelace knocks the Marquis of Brotherston into the fireplace for insulting Mary Lovelace. Although Trollope has no alternative but to approve, he
confesses there is something ill-mannered and ungentlemanlike in personal encounters even between laymen, and that this is exaggerated when the assailant is a clergyman.

Preserving the honor of the family and its name is another aspect of the code. The more noble and famous the family, perhaps the stronger this sense of honor may be, but it exists among all levels of gentlemen, and is part of the breeding of both gentlemen and ladies. Plantagenet Palliser accepts without hesitation his daughter's word that she won't write Tregear without telling him, for "...the Duke was too proud of the honour of his family to believe it to be possible that she should deceive him. Nor was it possible." The Duke feels that the members of his family so understand the meaning of honor in relation to the family name that they will not violate it, and consequently no steps are taken to curtail Mary's liberty of action. Another example is Emily Lopez, who, after her husband's suicide, feels intensely that she has been the member of the family to bring reproach upon the Wharton name. Old Mrs. Fletcher, Emily's future mother-in-law and a stickler for family honor, feels a similar sentiment. Emily "...had not known,—so Mrs. Fletcher thought,—what birth and blood required of her." Feeling for the
honor of the family and its name is nowhere so strongly or clearly put as in *Is He Popenjoy?* Because of family honor, Lord George Germain is hesitant about questioning the legitimacy of his brother's heir, and at the same time feels duty-bound to make such an investigation. He supports himself with the thought, "Who is to support the honour of a great family if not its own scions?"

And after George has taken his brother's insults until he feels utterly compelled to break with him, his sister Sarah induces him to return to the bedside of the dying Marquis by using the family honor as motivation. "He is not only your brother... but the head of your family as well. It is not for the honour of the family that he should pass away without having someone belonging to him at the last moment." This concept of family honor and family name also enters into Henry Grantly's worry over whether he is doing right by his family in his proposed marriage to Grace Crawley. And surely part of the Earl of Brentford's anger at Lord Chiltern, Sir Harry Hotspur's anger at George Hotspur, and the Thorne's' anger at Henry Thorne is motivated by their feeling that these miscreants have violated family honor.

The further one reads in Trollope, the more it becomes evident that the sense of honor is inextricably bound up with the sense of duty. Trollope makes this
very clear in an extremely informative passage on the
subject, spoken by Plantagenet Palliser to his son
Silverbridge.

"Do you recognize no duty but what the
laws impose upon you? Should you be disposed
to eat and drink in bestial excess, because
the laws would not hinder you? Should you
lie and sleep all the day, the law would say
nothing! Should you neglect every duty which
your position imposes on you, the law could
not interfere! To such a one as you the law
can be no guide. You should so live as not
to come near the law,—or to have the law to
come near to you. From all evil against which
the law bars you, you should be barred, at an
infinite distance, by honour, by conscience,
and nobility. Does the law require patriotism,
philanthropy, self-abnegation, public service,
purity of purpose, devotion to the needs of
others who have been placed in the world below
you? The law is a great thing,—because men
are poor and weak and bad. And it is great,
because where it exists in its strength no
tyrant can be above it. But between you and
me there should be no mention of law as the
guide of conduct. Speak to me of honour, of
duty, and of nobility; and tell me what they
require of you." 96

Actually, this is a statement of the unwritten code of
the aristocracy, or broadly of the gentleman. Honor or
duty becomes the basis of conduct, and the idea of utility
and service is obviously important. The duties of a
gentleman inevitably are such that make him useful to
his country, his dependents, his family and friends—
usefulness emerges as a positive virtue.

One of the most useful roles for the gentleman is
service to the state. Trollope prided himself on his long
and useful career in the Post Office, and hopefully but unsuccessfully tried for a seat in Parliament. He tells us in his Autobiography that serving, really serving, in Parliament is the grandest work that a man can do, and that the study of politics is the one in which a man can make himself "most useful to his fellow-creatures."

Plantagenet Palliser is the portrait of a gentleman devoting himself to service to his country and the good of others. In Can You Forgive Her? Plantagenet knows that as an M.P. he is working for others, and not for himself. He realizes that good men struggle as they do in order that others besides themselves may live honestly and die fearlessly. When Lord Silverbridge is elected to Parliament, Plantagenet writes a sort of Chesterfieldian letter to his son, setting forth his purpose for being there. "'A member of Parliament should feel himself to be the servant of his country. . . You are there as the guardian of your fellow-countrymen,—that they may be safe, that they may be prosperous, that they may be well-governed and lightly burdened,—above all, that they may be free. If you cannot feel this to be your duty, you should not be there at all.'" This point of view is elaborated a little later when Palliser combines the ideas of work and service. "'As far as my experience goes, the happiest man is he who, being above the
troubles which money brings, has his hands the fullest of work. To feel that your hours are filled to overflowing, that you can barely steal minutes enough for sleep, that the welfare of many is entrusted to you, that the world looks on and approves, that some good is always being done to others,—above all things some good to your country;—that is happiness. Such service is the duty of a gentleman if within the realm of possibility, and after Palliser's coalition ministry falls, his sense of duty eventually calls him back to service, in spite of strong personal reasons for his remaining in retirement.

Early in The Duke's Children, the Duke of St. Bungay emphasizes this notion of service when he implores Plantagenet to return to office. Duty is duty. A man in Plantagenet's position must serve, even if returning is distasteful to him. True, he himself is retiring, says St. Bungay, but only because he fears he may now be of more harm than benefit to his party because of his age. He appeals to Palliser from two considerations, capacity and duty. If such a man as Palliser has the capacity, then his duty is obvious. "...if your country wants you, you should serve your country...The work to be done is so important, the numbers to be benefited are so great, that...[such a man] cannot be justified in even
remembering that he has a self." Such, then, is the unselfish concept of duty to country as expressed by the two leading statesmen of the Palliser novels, a concept far removed from that of selfish and self-indulgent gentlemen such as the old Duke of Omnium.

Another vitally useful service is performed by gentlemen who are also the owners of estates. To Trollope, they possess duties and responsibilities to their land and to their tenants and dependents which call for unselfish service. Sir Harry Hotspur possesses perhaps the best grasp of the gentleman's function as a landowner to be found in Trollope. His concept is the same high ideal of service and unselfish usefulness to others that was expressed by Palliser and the Duke of St. Bungay. At Humblethwaite, Sir Harry "... was a great man, with a great domain around him,—with many tenants, with a world of dependents among whom he spent his wealth freely, saving little, but lavishing nothing that was not his own to lavish,—understanding that his enjoyment was to come from the comfort and respect of others, for whose welfare, as he understood it, the good things of this world had been bestowed upon him." When his son died, Sir Harry was faced with the problem of the disposition of his estate. Estates, to him, "... were to be held as thrones are held, for the benefit of the
many. And in the disposition of this throne...he had brought himself to think—not of his daughter's happiness...but of the welfare of all those who might measure their weal or woe from the manner in which the duties of this high place were administered."

Sir Alured Wharton has this same feeling of noblesse oblige, in his case perhaps a bit kinder, a little more "human." When Everett Wharton becomes his heir, Sir Alured is delighted, giving many hints as to what should be done after he is gone. "He must surely have thought that he would return to Wharton as a spirit, and take a ghostly share in the prosperity of the farms." He points out the failings of the various tenants and their children, imploring Everett to be understanding and patient. He likes farms to go from father to son, because in that way the fathers work for their sons instead of for strangers. The wife of a great landowner also shares the duties and responsibilities of her husband. For instance, when Mary Germain becomes Marchioness of Brotherton, Lady Sarah emphasizes the nature of Mary's new duties. "'Have you thought that every tenant, every labourer on the estate will have a claim on you?'"

The duty of the landowner is again pointed out by Rev. Frank Fenwick, as he implores Squire Harry Gilmore to get over his despondency and return to his estate.
'There are debts you can only settle by daily payments. To every man living on your land you owe such a debt. To every friend connected with you by name, or blood, or love, you owe such a debt. Do you suppose that you can cast yourself adrift, and make yourself a by-word, and hurt no one but yourself?'

Another very clear duty of the gentleman is the preservation of his order. Although Squire Indefer Jones, for example, wills his estate away from his odious nephew, who is next in line to inherit, the fear that he is violating duty causes him much mental anguish. "It was a religion to him that a landed estate in Britain should go from father to eldest son, and in default of a son to the first male heir. Britain would not be ruined because Llanfeare should be allowed to go out of the proper order. But Britain would be ruined if Britons did not do their duty in that sphere of life to which it had pleased God to call them; and in this case his duty was to maintain the old order of things." This idea of maintaining his order certainly helps dictate Sir Harry Hotspur's attitude toward Emily's attraction to the rascally George Hotspur. "Was his higher duty due to his daughter, or to his family,--and through his family to his country, which, as he believed, owed its security and glory to the maintenance of its
This concept of duty to order constantly governs the lives of gentlemen, considerably limiting their sphere of action. For this reason, Lord Alston deplores Sir Peregrine Orme's intention to marry Lady Mason. "But, Orme, you and I cannot act as may those whose names in the world are altogether unnoticed." This feeling also partially causes Lady Mab Grex to feel it her duty to keep Lord Silverbridge from proposing to the American, Isabel Boncassen, for she thinks his so doing would be an outrage "to all English propriety." Preserving outward splendor and marks of distinction are likewise a part of this process, as relatively poor gentlemen like Sir Alured Wharton discover to their distress. Although he struggles to save something from his income, "...the duty of living as Sir Alured Wharton of Wharton Hall should live made these struggles very ineffective."

Another responsibility of the gentleman is duty to children. In a governing group, proper training is important, and Plantagenet Palliser, Duke of Omnium, for example, feels the necessity of devoting himself to this task when his wife dies. Largely it is a matter of communicating duties, and the Duke dedicates himself to the process. The entire novel, *The Duke's Children*, pictures the Duke's efforts to rear his sons in the
gentlemanly tradition. Such concern is also manifested by George Germain, when he becomes Marquis of Brother-ton. "He is also a pattern father, expecting great things from Popenjoy and resolving that the child shall be subjected to proper discipline as soon as he is transferred from feminine to virile teaching." Among approved gentlemen, from Palliser down through the Grantlys, Staveleys, Abel Wharton, and Sir Harry Hot-spur to relatively impoverished widows like Mrs. Woodward and Mrs. Dale, the same concern with the breeding and training of their children is evident—they feel the duty of rearing their children to be ladies and gentlemen!

Useful service to his country, his dependents, his family and friends, the acceptance of his duties and responsibilities, calls for unselfishness from the gentleman. In Trollope, those gentlemen who perform their functions and accept their responsibilities more often achieve generosity, than do the more selfish and self-indulgent. Such a feeling as generosity is simply not compatible with selfishness, and cannot spring from such a soil. It is an instinctive, spontaneous emotion, usually expressed openly and without difficulty. In truth, it is akin to love, which is another manifestation of unselfishness, even more instinctive and spontaneous
in nature than generosity.

Unselfishness as the outstanding desirable moral quality of the gentleman becomes more and more obvious as one's knowledge of Trollope increases. As unselfishness results in the acceptance of duties and responsibilities, and makes possible the noble concept of service to one's country and to others, so unselfishness allows for the play of generosity and of love, perhaps to Trollope the most important attribute of all. In Trollope it is the selfish who cannot love, or be generous, or conceive of serving others.

The relationship between selfishness and lack of generosity, on the one hand, and between love and generosity, on the other, is easily illustrated. When Adolphus Crosbie points out to Lily Dale the difficulties which her poverty is bringing on him, Trollope calls Crosbie "ungenerous," and equates this with selfishness. After his interview with Miss Prettyman, Henry Grantly feels that "...he had not treated Grace Crawley with the perfect generosity which love owes, and he was in some degree ashamed of himself." Apparently Henry feels that he should have resolved within himself to propose to Grace regardless of circumstances.

Trollope's gentlemen constantly illustrate generosity. When Quiverful is established as the new warden
of Hiram's Hospital, Mr. Harding realizes the man's rather difficult position and goes out of his way to help him get started. Moreover, Harding generously continues his ministrations to the very bedesmen who have warred against him. Dr. Thorne's generous aid to Roger Scatcherd and Squire Gresham in their difficulties; Lord Lufton's resolve to pay Mark Robarts' debts; Earl De Guest's generosity and kindness to Johnny Eames, which go far beyond the call of gratitude; Will Belton's generous resolution towards Clara Amedroz; Rev. Frank Fenwick's kindness and generosity to Sam Brattle—these are but a few of the endless examples of generosity on the part of Trollope's gentlemen. Arabin's generosity to his friend Crawley is another excellent example, because here generosity must fight pride, and obstinate pride at that. As soon as Arabin becomes Dean of Barchester, he secures a better position for Crawley, and he previously has helped to pay the man's debts. Typically, as soon as Arabin hears of Mrs. Crawley's illness, he sets off on a forty-mile ride to see how best he may render assistance. An unusual and informative example of generosity is that displayed by Henry Norman toward Alaric and Gertrude Tudor, because here generosity is working almost unconsciously and against tremendous odds. Henry gives his money, his
time, and his abilities, "...but there was no for-
giveness in such assistance. There was generosity in
it, for he was ready to part with his money; there was
kindness of heart, for he was anxious to do good to his
fellow creature; but there were with these both pride
and revenge...He was unconscious of his own sin,
but he was not the less a sinner."

These impulses of generosity even emerge occa-
sionally among the villains, though they are too
evanescent to be of much real value. Almost at the
end of his rope, Sowerby feels the generous impulse
to help Mark Robarts from the difficulties which
Sowerby has brought about; and no one can forget the
tender streak of generosity displayed by Burgo Fitz-
gerald toward the cold and hungry girl of the streets.

Love is allied to generosity, and comes from the
same source—unselfishness. Largely, the love that
receives extensive treatment by Trollope is young roman-
tic love, which usually appears as an instinctive,
spontaneous emotion. Sir Thomas Tringle, for example,
tells his son, "'Love is a very good thing, Tom,
when a man can enjoy it, and make himself warm with
it, and protect himself by it from selfishness and
hardness of heart,'" although he warns that it can
also bring heartache. Trollope is one for the heart,
not for the head, and indeed, at times seems to estimate feeling by the lack of emotional restraint displayed by an individual. We remember Augusta Gresham's snobbish indication that she would give up love for rank and birth. Trollope's sympathies are not with her. He is for open feeling. His lovers cannot help but love, and remain constant in their love.

Those gentlemen who cannot love are the selfish ones—the ones who are useless, socially and personally. They are the ones who cannot escape themselves and who eventually may allow their selfishness and self-indulgence too much play. George Vavasor, we recall, could not love easily, Felix Carbury knew nothing of the emotion, and the same is really true of Sowerby, George Hotspur, Undy Scott, and Colonel Marrable. The same failing also appears among the non-gentlemanly villains—Lopez, Melmotte, Slope, and Barry Lynch.

Gustavus Moffat is a good example of the man who cannot love. When Moffat comes to see his betrothed, Frank Gresham's sister, Moffat is lukewarm toward her. Trollope says that in a similar position, Frank would have been all for kissing her. Moffat is play-acting. He doesn't want the girl—he wants her money and her name. Elsewhere Trollope says that Moffat has never left his heart unguarded, that no youthful indiscretion
has marred his prospects. Lord Rufford possesses the
same inability to love. Trollope says he is in love
with Arabella Trefoil as much as he can be in love,
but his feeling is largely a physical attraction, and
is really more selfish than unselfish.

Such cold calculation resulting from a hard heart,
and such unalloyed physical attraction differ completely
from the warm open-hearted, spontaneous gentlemanly love
of Frank Gresham, and lack also the latter's constancy.
Love, of course, does not make the gentleman, but its
unselfishness assists in keeping a gentleman from tempta-
tions and helps preserve his generosity and his accept-
ance of duties and service which depend on an unselfish
attitude of mind. Such is the love felt by Major Henry
Grantly, Lord Silverbridge, Lord Lufton, Johnny Eames,
Paul Montague, Will Belton, Arthur Fletcher, Harry
Gilmore, Colonel Jonathan Stubbs and John Gordon, to
mention a handful of the actual number. These are the
men approved by Trollope, the ones we feel will mature
into the leaders of England and accept the task of run-
ning the country—not the selfish heartless ones, who
will be lucky to save themselves from ruin, much less
their country, such men as Augustus Scarborough, Lord
Grasslough, Lord Percival, and Bertie Stanhope.

Another important attribute of the gentleman is
manliness. Although Trollope is often loose with his diction, with manliness as well as other words, two fundamental meanings can be isolated with sureness. In the first sense, manliness refers to strength of character and manhood. Trollope deplores weakness with its accompanying ill effects on the gentlemanly class as a whole and on the individual gentleman himself, and he undoubtedly associates strength with manliness, actually equating the two meanings when Roger Carbury tells Hetta Carbury, "I should have been more manly and stronger." Strength also is the characteristic that is evident when Josiah Crawley defies Mrs. Proudie in that memorable scene at Barchester Palace; the weak Bishop Proudie is fascinated by the power exercised over him by Crawley's strength. There is no doubt as to which is more the gentleman to Trollope.

Associated with strength is the idea of self-respect and personal dignity. This idea is incompatible with weakness, and certainly helps produce in its possessor greater gentlemanliness. Again Crawley demonstrates this facet of manliness. In a letter to Bishop Proudie, he points out that the greater his trouble, the more his need for carrying himself with the self-respect which will show that he has not yet condemned himself within. Another good example is Johnny Eames at the
point of emerging from hobbleshoyhood into manhood. He takes stock of his past life in London and resolves to change his mode of living. First, he must leave Mrs. Roper's, for there he has been living with people he does not esteem, and, too, he resolves to break away from Amelia. Johnny does these things, for he realizes he cannot look back on his former life with self-respect. Mr. Peacocke exercises great personal dignity when he refuses to consider racing with Robert Lefroy to Dr. Wortle's door. Having previously resolved to confess his secret to Wortle, Peacocke has fixed a time for the interview, and he determines to wait until that hour, even though he realizes Lefroy will present a distorted account of the matter.

Personal courage is another component of manhood. When tested, the gentleman is brave. Johnny Eames, for example, is afraid of no man who walks—or animal, if we recall the episode of the bull. John Grey proves himself courageous in dealing with the near-murderer, George Vavasor; and Harry Annesley accepts the challenge thrust upon him by Captain Scarborough. When it becomes a point of honor, Phineas Finn accepts Lord Chiltern's challenge to a duel; and the Rev. Frank Fenwick routs the ruffians lurking at night around his house.

But the usual meaning of manliness in the first
sense is simply that of manhood, of the man who is independent, who stands up for himself, and is assertive. Perhaps the classic example is Archdeacon Grantly, who is leader of the forces against the Proudies and Slopes. Actually he likes a good fight, as does his fellow churchman, the Vicar of Bullhampton, who takes nothing from the snobbish Marquis of Trowbridge, for whom he has a profound distaste. Dr. Wortle is another clergyman who stands up for himself. He resembles Crawley, who receives "...a certain manly delight in warfare against authority." Dr. Thorne was not pugnacious, "...but there was that in him which would allow him to yield to no attack." He certainly proves the point in his wars with Dr. Fillgrave and with Lady Arabella Gresham. Lord Lufton is another who had a habit of taking the bit between his teeth whenever he suspected interference." He stood up to his mother in his insistence on Lucy Robarts, and Lady Lufton was no easy opponent. When Mrs. Grantly instructs the Archdeacon to rebuke Arabin, Dr. Grantly does not relish the task, for he knows he will face another manly gentleman--"...there was that about Mr. Arabin which made the doctor feel that it would be very difficult to rebuke him with good effect." Like Lord Lufton, Major Grantly also refuses to give in to an obdurate
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parent. When his father attempts to dictate to him, he bridles and refuses to submit. Frank Tregar's manhood is recognized by Plantagenet Palliser after Frank's marriage to Mary Palliser. The Duke says that Frank is "manly," and confesses he has accepted as courage what he once felt was arrogance in the young man.

The second basic meaning of manliness is one of the most important characteristics of Trollope's gentleman. This meaning receives a lengthy discussion in *Phineas Redux*, and constitutes a mature point of view, since that novel was not written until 1870-71. This statement in *Redux* is one of Trollope's most extensive treatments of an idea, is consistent, and apparently carefully thought out. It is extremely important because it helps differentiate the non-gentleman from the gentleman on the one hand and because on the other it is one effective means of grading the degree of gentlemanliness which members of the class possess.

After Phineas Finn has been acquitted from the charge of murder, Mrs. Low tells her husband she thinks Phineas unmanly for breaking down and being unable to face the world. Her comment precipitates Trollope's analysis of manliness.

The property of manliness in a man is a great possession, but perhaps there is none that is less understood,—which is more generally
accorded where it does not exist, or more frequently disallowed where it prevails. There are not many who ever make up their minds as to what constitutes manliness, or even inquire within themselves upon the subject. The woman's error, occasioned by her natural desire for a master, leads her to look for a certain outward magnificence of demeanour, a pretended indifference to stings and little torments, a would-be superiority to the bread-and-butter side of life, an unreal assumption of personal grandeur. But a robe of State such as this,—however well the garment may be worn with practice,—can never be the raiment natural to a man; and men, dressing themselves in women's eyes, have consented to walk about in buckram. A composure of the eye, which has been studied, a reticence as to the little things of life, a certain slowness of speech unless the occasion call for passion, an indifference to small surroundings, these,—joined, of course, with personal bravery,—are supposed to constitute manliness. That personal bravery is required in the composition of manliness must be conceded, though, of all the ingredients needed, it is the lowest in value. But the first requirement of all must be described by a negative. Manliness is not compatible with affectation. Women's virtues, all feminine attributes, may be marred by affectation, but the virtues and the vice may co-exist. An affected man, too, may be honest, may be generous, may be pious;—but surely he cannot be manly. The self-conscious assumption of any outward manner, the striving to add,—even though it be but a tenth of a cubit to the height,—is fatal, and will at once banish the all but divine attribute. Before the man can be manly, the gifts which make him so must be there, collected by him slowly, unconsciously, as are his bones, his flesh, and his blood. They cannot be put on like a garment for the nonce,—as may a little learning. A man cannot become faithful to his friends, unsuspicious before the world, gentle with women, loving with children, considerate to his inferiors, kindly with servants, tender-hearted with all,—and at the same time be frank, of open speech, with springing eager energies,—simply because he
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desires it. These things which are the attributes of manliness, must come of training on a nature not ignoble. But they are the very opposites, the antipodes, the direct antagonism, of that staring, posed, bewhiskered and bewigged deportment, that nil admirari; self-remembering assumption of manliness, that endeavour of twopence halfpenny to look as high as threepence, which, when you prod it through, has in it nothing deeper than deportment. We see the two things daily, side by side, close to each other. Let a man put his hat down, and you shall say whether he has deposited it with affectation or true nature. The natural man will probably be manly. The affected man cannot be so.

Mrs. Low was wrong when she accused our hero of being unmanly. Had his imagination been less alert in looking into the minds of men, and in picturing to himself the thoughts of others in reference to the crime with which he had been charged, he would not now have shrunk from contact with his fellow-creatures as he did. But he could not pretend to be other than he was. During the period of his danger, when men had thought that he would be hung,—and when he himself had believed that it would be so,—he had borne himself bravely without any conscious effort. When he had confronted the whole Court with that steady courage which had excited Lord Chiltern's admiration, and had looked the Bench in the face as though he at least had no cause to quail, he had known nothing of what he was doing. His features had answered the helm from his heart, but had not been played upon by his intellect. And it was so with him now. The reaction had overcome him, and he could not bring himself to pretend that it was not so. The tears would come to his eyes, and he would shiver and shake like one struck by palsy.

The process of becoming manly, then, requires "a nature not ignoble," which we have seen more likely to result from a long-established blood line. Next, the training of this nature must be a long, slow, unconscious one,—in actuality, the process of gentlemanly nurture,
for manliness is only one component of breeding as a whole. The result of this training will be organic in nature, not rules of etiquette plastered on from the outside. Very obviously these attributes are to be acquired in an upper class or gentlemanly environment. Another important point is the obvious relationship of the attributes of manliness with unselfishness, love and generosity, and the fact that they spring from the heart instead of the head. Since they are organic and thus unconscious, instinctive, and spontaneous, they are infinitely removed from affectation, which is a calculated, intellectual thing. Thus manliness becomes an essential mark of the gentleman. Requiring a noble nature, and long training in a gentlemanly environment, it is an organic, spontaneous quality, emotional in nature, and allied to unselfishness, which looms ever larger in an estimate of Trollope's concept of gentlemanliness. A gentleman of class is born a gentleman, but it is not far wrong to say that the degree to which he is manly determines the extent to which he is a gentlemanly gentleman.

An important addition to this notion of manliness appears in Trollope's analysis of Sir Timothy Beeswax, a man whom Trollope sees as a studied figure, his mannerisms and behavior before the House of Commons a
calculated contrivance. "For I think we must hold that true personal dignity should be achieved,—must, if it be quite true, have been achieved,—without any personal effort. . . .personal dignity is a great possession; but a man should struggle for it no more than he would for beauty."

The gentleman, usually of good blood and a product of gentlemanly nurture, is unconsciously and organically manly. The non-gentleman, even though he have the noble nature, has lacked the breeding of a gentleman, and thus may lack the necessary spontaneity. He may have a nature noble enough to overcome all handicaps, as Trollope readily admits, although Trollope would add that there are few such noble natures. And herein lies a distinction. The non-gentleman attempting to become the gentleman lacks the organic training. He must resort to deportment and etiquette, must too often assume and pretend, and use his intellect, so that the affectation is apparent, and it is seen at an instant that he is not to the manner born. Mr. Samuel Prong, the vicar of a district in Baselhurst, is a case in point.

He was a devout, good man; not self-indulgent; perhaps not more self-ambitious than it becomes a man to be; sincere, hard-working, sufficiently intelligent, true in most things to the instincts of his calling,—but deficient in one vital qualification for a clergyman of the Church of England: he was not a gentleman. May I not
call it a necessary qualification for a clergyman of any church? He was not a gentleman. I do not mean to say that he was a thief or a liar; nor do I mean hereby to complain that he picked his teeth with his fork and misplaced his "h's." I am by no means prepared to define what I do mean,—thinking, however, that most men and most women will understand me. 137

Now, if all these estimable epithets applied to Prong were true—for many of them are suspect,—what would constitute his ungentlemanliness? Applying the touchstone of the gentlemanly characteristics will help place him, of course. No one knows where he came from or knows anything of his family. He has attended none "of the regular colleges" having been educated at Islington; and he does drop his "h's." He is imperious as a clergyman, and is unpopular with his colleagues. Furthermore, his relationship with Mrs. Prime would indicate that he has an eye to the main chance. But excluding these facts, his lack of gentility would be suspect because of his affecting the personal dignity and gentlemanly manner which usually come only from blood and pride of name, from gentle nurture, from the unconscious feeling of position that produces self-confidence and manliness. Three passages describing the affectation of this man help prove the point. First, "...there was about his lips an assumption of character and dignity which his countenance and body generally
failed to maintain; and there was a something in the carriage of his head and in the occasional projection of his chin, which was intended to add to his dignity, but which did, I think, only make the failure more palpable."

Secondly, "... the mouth assumed the would-be grandeur, the chin came out, and to anyone less infatuated than Mrs. Prime it would have been apparent that the purse was not made of silk, but that a coarser material had come to hand in the manufacture."

And thirdly, "Mr. Prong, as he spoke had put out his hand, and rested it on the table with the palm upwards, as though expecting that she would put hers within it; and he had tilted his chair so as to bring his body close to hers, and had dropped from his face his assumed look of dignity. He was quite in earnest, and being so had fallen away into his natural disposition of body."

In the last instance, Prong is proposing to Mrs. Prime, and his desire causes his pose to disappear.

This man, not of gentle nurture, would betray himself in a thousand ways by his affecting and assuming that which is not organically part of him. He resembles poor Tom Tringle, son of the money magnate, Sir Thomas Tringle. In an informative passage, Tom contrasts himself with Colonel Jonathan Stubbs, and finds manliness to make the gentleman.
He knew himself to be a poor creature in comparison with Jonathan Stubbs. Though he could not have been Stubbs had he given his heart for it, though it was absolutely beyond him to assume one of those tricks of bearing, one of those manly, winning ways, which in his eyes was so excellent in the other man, still he saw them and acknowledged them, and told himself that they would be all powerful with such a girl as Ayala. Though he trusted to his charms and his rings, he knew that his charms and his rings were abominable, as compared with that outside look and natural garniture which belonged to Stubbs, as though of right, as though it had been born with him. Not exactly in those words, but with a full inward sense of the words, he told himself that Colonel Stubbs was a gentleman, whereas he acknowledged himself to be a cad.

Let us now bolster this argument by reviewing an incident in the career of the Rev. Josiah Crawley, like Mr. Prong, a clergyman of the Church of England. As Mark Robarts leaves the inn yard at Silverbridge, he hears the grooms talking about Crawley's visit to the bishop's palace. "'Footed it all the way,' said one. 'And yet he's a gentleman, too,' said the other." Robarts considers this.

It was undoubtedly the fact that Mr. Crawley was recognized to be a gentleman by all who knew him, high or low, rich or poor, by those who thought well of him and by those who thought ill. These grooms, who had been telling each other that this parson, who was to be tried as a thief, had been constrained to walk from Hogglestock to Barchester and back, because he could not afford to travel in any other way, and that his boots were cracked and his clothes ragged, had still known him to be a gentleman! Nobody doubted it; not even they who thought he had stolen the money. Mr. Robarts himself was
certain of it, and told himself that he knew it by evidences which his own education made clear to him. But how was it that the grooms knew it? For my part I think that there are no better judges of the article than the grooms.

How did the grooms know? Very probably because they felt the simplicity, the dignity, the manliness of the man. He was a gentleman, born and bred, and the breeding was not obscured by the eccentricities brought out by his poverty. As Trollope has said, you can detect gentlemanliness, or breeding, or manliness by the way a man puts his hat down. And in speaking of gentility in Rachel Ray Trollope almost duplicates what he said about manliness:

It is not the owner of a good coat that sees and admires its beauty. It is not even they who have good coats themselves who recognize the article on the back of another. They who have not good coats themselves have the keenest eyes for the coats of their better-clad neighbours. As it is with coats, so it is with that which we call gentility. It is caught at a word, it is seen at a glance, it is appreciated unconsciously at a touch by those who have none of it themselves.

That Trollope considers affectation undesirable and dangerous is easily demonstrated. In Felix Carbury's case, affectation serves to conceal viciousness. Lopez was so clever at the game, that he utterly deceived Emily Wharton, although he did not deceive her father, or the other members of the Wharton and Fletcher clans. All the snobs, non-gentlemen and gentlemen alike, are guilty of affectation, often with disastrous results.
On the other hand, simplicity, manliness, unaffectedness, being what one is, brings with it Trollope's approval. For instance, although Abel Wharton consents to Emily's marriage to Lopez, he dislikes the man and cannot pretend to open his heart to him. When Silverbridge is swindled out of seventy thousand pounds at the race track, he tries to appear nonchalant, but unsuccessfully—pretence is alien to his nature. Plantagenet Palliser is an excellent example of the man who must be what he is and must do what he must do. And Phineas Finn, in spite of himself, feels compelled to tell the assembled company at Madame Goesler's table that Violet Effingham has accepted Lord Chiltern, and thus declares the whole truth of his discomfiture and wretchedness. This is a telling example of a man's inability to affect and dissemble. Such an understanding of manliness explains why George Germain could not lie "...even by a glance of his eye or a tone of his voice," and what Lady Mab Grex meant when she said that Silverbridge and his father could not lie even with their eyelids.

Other aspects of affectation are needed to obtain Trollope's complete concept of the idea. The manners and attitudes that one adopts in company are not affectation, for they are natural to the situation. "A man is no more a hypocrite because his manner and gait when he is alone
are different from those which he assumes in company, than he is for wearing a dressing-gown in the morning, whereas he puts on a black coat in the evening." Moreover, affectation is justified in some cases, and in these the intent behind the affectation seems to determine its acceptability. For instance, disconsolate young lovers who openly display their wretchedness are often advised to hide their wound, get hold of themselves, and return to the work of the world. The appeal is to manhood. The concealment of the lover's misery will be for his own salvation. Such advice is given by Earl De Guest to Johnny Eames, by John Fletcher to his brother Arthur, by John Morton to Larry Twentyman, and by Frank Fenwick to Harry Gilmore. The Earl De Guest's is probably the best expression of this advice. "'A man should never allow himself to be cast down by anything,—not outwardly, to the eyes of other men. . . . The man who goes about declaring himself to be miserable will be not only miserable, but contemptible as well. . . . And remember what it is that I say; with your grief I do sympathize, but not with any outward expression of it. . . .'"

The manly man feels to the limits of his emotional equipment—he cannot help doing that, for he is faithful, loving, kindly, gentle, tender-hearted--unselfish. Any
attempt to limit feeling is affectation itself. Most of Trollope's approved gentlemen and ladies love intensely and constantly. Lily Dale, for instance, does not recover from her love for Crosbie, and she in turn, does not give Johnny Eames credit for "the upright, uncontrolled heartiness of his feelings." But as manliness demands no abatement of instinctive emotional reaction, it also demands, in the sense of manhood and personal dignity, that the hurt man attempt to hide his hurt from the world.

Manliness, fundamentally, consists of the spontaneous, unsought-for, unselfish, emotional reaction to life, for Trollope's gentleman is a creature of the heart, and not the head. He reacts instinctively to sorrow, pain, and happiness, both his own and others'. He loves greatly and is generous and kind to other individuals. His emotion might be roughly determined by the barometer of tears. Nearly all of Trollope's gentlemen are emotionally affected to the point of tears at one time or another, even those who adopt a considerable degree of outward reserve. When the tears are the result of personal hurt, they indicate that the individual has lived in an unguarded manner, in which connection one always remembers Trollope's approval of Frank Gresham over the cold and guarded Moffat. When the tears are for others, they indicate unselfishness, compassion, or joy.
There seems little doubt that Trollope saw the best gentlemanly training one towards unselfishness, producing an individual who instinctively feels to the limits of his emotional capacities, unhesitatingly trusting the heart instead of the intellect, who possesses a high sense of honor and duty, and who, as the result of his breeding, is spontaneously a gentleman because it is impossible for him to be anything else.
CHAPTER III

Gentlemen Who Fall

The combination of good blood and the best gentlemanly training, we have seen, in Trollope's estimation always provides more chance of producing a moral sensitivity acutely aware of baseness, dishonor, and moral turpitude. But just as the breeders and trainers of race horses find that breeding from blood lines and training in time-tested ways will not always produce the expected and desired results, so the gentlemanly class has its renegades. Some members of the class are somewhat in the position of Mrs. Hurtle, the American, of whom a fellow traveler remarked, "...there was a bit of the wild cat in her breeding." Or as Trollope remarks in Framley Parsonage, "There are men, even of high birth, who seem as though they were born to be rogues..." Blood lines and gentlemanly training are not infallible!

On the whole, in Trollope's presentation, the class itself, interested of course, in its own preservation, is fairly lenient to the transgressions of its members, particularly to those of young gentlemen. But there are limits. In Sir Harry Hotspur Trollope interests himself
in this problem of transgressions and the limits of social toleration. An important analysis of this subject involving George Hotspur, a wild, reckless scamp of a young gentleman on the verge of moral degradation, makes two basic points. First, a young man's "sowing his wild oats," if not absolutely desirable, is quite pardonable, and will be forgiven by society, if by a certain time in life, the man simply changes his ways and settles down. In this respect Trollope makes clear that George, a "very black sheep," is pretty far gone, and "... at this present period of his life had need of much change before he would be fit for any decent social herding." Secondly, such practices as gambling, drinking, wasteful spending of money, contracting debts, and even consorting with low men and low women, are pardonable. What is not pardonable is premeditated dishonesty, or more generally speaking, premeditated violation of moral and ethical relationships. "Cousin George, if not a ravenous wolf, was at any rate a very black sheep indeed. In our anxiety to know the truth of him it must not be said that he was absolutely a wolf,—not as yet,—because in his career he had not as yet made premeditated attempts to devour prey." These ideas are reiterated in more detail in a later passage which reveals that Emily Hotspur looks upon George's sins
as those of the young man sowing his wild oats, whereas her father sees George in a truer light.

It was clear to Sir Harry through it all that she knew nothing as yet of the nature of the man's offenses. When she spoke of temptation not resisted, she was still thinking of commonplace extravagance, of the ordinary pleasures of fast young men, of race-courses, and betting, perhaps, and of tailors' bills. . . . But Sir Harry knew him to be steeped in dirty lies up to the hip, one who cheated tradesmen on system, a gambler who looked out for victims, a creature so mean that he could take a woman's money! Mr. Boltby had called him a swindler, a card-sharper, and a cur; and Sir Harry. . . . had never known the lawyer to be wrong. 5

Such actions are intolerable and Trollope doubtless was in a similar frame of mind when he exclaimed in The Small House at Allington, "There are deeds which will not bear a gloss—sins as to which the perpetrator cannot speak otherwise than as a reptile; circumstances which change a man and put upon him the worthlessness of vermin." 6

So there are limits. Several instances occur in Trollope where members of the gentlemanly class exceed certain moral and ethical limits, and as a result fall from the class, being excluded to one degree or another, at least by a majority of its members. The extent of exclusion seems to be determined by the nature of the transgressions and, of course, the extent to which they become public, although one is never left in doubt as to Trollope's own view of a man's gentlemanliness. Some
sinners, for instance, might remain for some time in half-acceptance, cut by real gentlemen but still recognized by looser members of the class, morally speaking. A man might hang on in the clubs, the billiard rooms, and the sporting world, and yet be denied entry to all the houses in London. Ability to hang on would depend, in many instances, upon one's position and money. One man, at least, Nathaniel Sowerby, having lost by his acts position and money, as well as respect, seemingly excludes himself. In most cases, the transgressor disappears—to the continent, to America, to Australia—so that severance is complete, and final.

What are these moral and ethical transgressions that can result in the exclusion of gentlemen from the class or reduce them from the state of gentility, and what motives produce them? Since we have previously seen that Trollope thought the best gentlemanly training one that develops unselfishness and a high moral sense of honor and duty, it is not surprising to find that most of these transgressions are associated with selfishness in one of its various forms—self-seeking, for example, or the desire for fevered, reckless excitement or self-indulgence, such as gambling. After all, as Sir Peregrine Orme informs us, "'All sin is selfish..." Selfish self-advancement in almost all cases is a deliberate attempt to
secure money and position, and reckless self-indulgence requires money for its gratification. Consequently, to those gentlemen who possess such unrestrained selfish urges but who do not possess money, the need for money becomes imperative and poses a temptation which can only lead to moral degradation. Rich gentlemen with similar selfish desires obviously do not face such temptation, but it makes little difference, since their possession of money allows a faster plunge to immorality.

In any consideration of the downfall of these men, the individuals themselves are naturally of most importance, but in many instances, the era in which they live undoubtedly contributes to their collapse. For this is the period of middle class rise to power, an age in which increasing value is placed upon the possession of money. As the mid-Victorian period proceeds, nouveau riche manufacturers and financiers become richer and richer and edge their way deeper in the society of gentlemen. Such an environment is a breeding ground for self-indulgence and obviously is not conducive to nurturing the spirit of gentlemanliness. Step by step, the gentlemanly class steadily loses power and increasingly requires money in the futile attempt to hold its own. In this process the honor of the gentlemen is often severely tested, and the weakest go first to the
wall. Trollope tells us that the "commercial profli-
gacy of the age" prompted him in the seventies to write 
The Way We Live Now, in which he bitterly lashed out at 
the portion of the gentlemanly class that was selling out 
to the monied interests coming into power, that was 
lowering its standards and thereby actually destroying 
its own strength in a desperate effort to survive.

Let us repeat our question. What are the moral and 
ethical sins that cause gentlemen to fall? For the most 
part, these transgressions can be listed under the 
general heading, lack of principles, which simply means 
lack of a moral or ethical code. A man in the process 
of discarding his principles is erasing the moral and 
ethical relationships that have dictated his actions 
with other men. A person without principles has lost 
his sense of honor, and is constantly looking for the 
main chance. Such a person is usually utterly selfish, 
considers his end to justify the means, and will sacri-
ifice other people to that end.

Specifically, one of the major categories of sins is 
dissimulation of various forms, such as cheating, lying, 
and stealing,—in short, falseness of all sorts, from 
violating an important promise to downright swindling. 
Another concerns violation of respect for women. Extreme 
instances of the deliberate breaking of trust to a woman,
such as the completely unexpected breaking of an engagement which has been made public, as well as physical or mental brutality or cruelty, and unrestrained lust exemplify this category. Instances of lust or illicit passion include the keeping of mistresses, attempts at seduction, and the desire for another man's wife, but it must be pointed out that the extent to which these are made public or are flaunted in the world's face seems to make a considerable difference to the more tolerant members of the class. If these matters are hushed up, this tolerant section is likely to overlook them, whereas Trollope's first-rate gentlemen would never do so. Very often, illicit desire appears to accompany other moral weaknesses. In addition, several other moral or ethical faults at times accompany the ones already listed, some of them seeming to emerge as moral disintegration becomes more advanced: violence, such as brutality or attempted murder; cursing of a vicious nature; and drunkenness, the desire for which often accompanies other moral weaknesses. Also, the desire to be mysterious, not to lead an open, above-board life, is often a part of the make-up of these transgressors.

Selfishness and self-indulgence are at the root of these transgressions, and, logically enough, the sinners almost always have also completely renounced their duties
to country, dependents, family and friends. In most instances, the peers are absentee landowners, who have forsaken their land and family to live abroad. They have disclaimed their function, and life their self-indulgent lives in utter selfishness, ceasing to be Englishmen for all practical purposes. Thus we see that the same selfishness that leads to unacceptable transgression leads also to renunciation of function, and although exclusion from the class seems always the result of transgressing accepted moral boundaries, renunciation of the function of a gentleman certainly helps complete the process of exclusion.

It is interesting to observe the moral disintegration of Trollope's villains, and the word villains can be employed without much hesitation, for when Trollope's gentlemen fall, they usually fall hard. One transgression often leads to another, until, in the worst examples, after a certain point has been reached and the need for money or position becomes desperate, or self-indulgence becomes completely uncontrolled, it seems as if a stopper is pulled, so that all of the evil runs out of the man. In each instance, it appears, the more heinous the offenses, the more bestial and animalistic becomes the resulting man. (Or, to prove another point, you can just as truthfully say that the more bestial and
animalistic the man is to start with, the more heinous will be his crimes.)

As one after another of Trollope's scoundrels and rascals who fall from the class are encountered, the reader notes a highly important fact. Generally they are able to determine right from wrong, honor from dishonor; that is, they are able to feel the difference within. They almost always know they are rascals, and realize their wrong-doing. Moreover, their consciences bother them, more or less, for their evil-doing, and most of them suffer remorse for their transgressions. In most cases, in short, these men appear deliberately to decide their course of action, fully aware of what they are about and with the ability to feel morally the consequences of their acts—quite a tribute to the gentlemanly tradition. In a sense, then, such a decision is tantamount to an open defiance of the moral and ethical limits of the gentlemanly class by these transgressors, a setting up of personal standards in substitution for those of the class. And, in each instance, in one way or another, the sinner is forcefully answered!

Nathaniel Sowerby, squire of Chaldicotes in Barsetshire, is without doubt a member of the gentlemanly class. "He was a gentleman, too, of high breeding and good birth. . . ." His position, moreover, is a prominent
one, for he is a squire who has been a "county member" in Parliament for a full quarter of a century. But Mr. Sowerby is also a very poor man, up to his ears in debt, the result of money wasted "on electioneering, and more in gambling," as well as, presumably, on certain "bachelor mal-practices." For Sowerby is a man who likes a fast life, one filled with pleasure and excitement, a greedy man, too, as Trollope puts it, who has devoured "his dainty all at once." Harried by money matters, with the money-lenders knocking at the door, he maintains his fast, reckless life until his world collapses around him.

To gratify his desires, for years Sowerby has been raising money on the family estate, largely through money-lenders. He is so much in debt that it is believed "...he could not live in England out of jail but for his protection as a member of Parliament; and yet it seemed that there was no end to his horses and carriages, his servants and retinue." The man has got himself into such a position that he must constantly be scheming how to secure relatively small amounts of money to stave off first one money-lender and then another. Years of such scheming, it can easily be seen, would dull a man's moral sense and make him at times almost insensitive to moral and ethical relationships. "A more reckless being than the member for West Barsetshire could not exist. He was
reckless for himself, and reckless for all others with whom he might be concerned. He could ruin his friends with as little remorse as he had ruined himself. All was fair game that came in the way of his net." Such recklessness is a characteristic of most gentlemen who fall from the class, men like Burgo Fitzgerald, George Vavasor, Sir Felix Carbury, George Hotspur, and Undy Scott. But Trollope leaves no doubt in the reader's mind of the eventual end of such a life.

But then, at last, the time does come when the excitement is over, and when nothing but the misery is left. If there be an existence of wretchedness on earth it must be that of the elderly, worn-out roué, who has run this race of debt and bills of accommodation and acceptances—of what, if we were not in these days somewhat afraid of good broad English, we might call lying and swindling, falsehood and fraud—and who, having ruined all whom he should have loved, having burnt up every one who would trust him much, and scorched all who would trust him a little, is at last left to finish his life with such bread and water as these men get, without one honest thought to strengthen his sinking heart, or one honest friend to hold his shivering hand! 15

Nathaniel Sowerby's actions in *Framley Parsonage* provide the prelude to such an end. Having by debt endangered the family estate, Sowerby desperately and recklessly hangs on, in his search for money abandoning principles. He lies, schemes, and breaks promises, engaging in premeditated dissimulation of all sorts. His dealings with Lord Lufton and Mark Robarts leave
no doubt as to his calculated villainy. Many of the other fallen gentlemen are also liars and cheaters. George Vavasor, for instance, calculates and schemes his way to securing Alice Vavasor's money, becoming worse as his need for money grows more desperate. Sir Felix Carbury reveals the same calculation. When he detects an associate cheating at cards, for example, he immediately considers cheating also. He has no compunction at running off with Marie Melmotte and deliberately robbing her father of the money settled in her name. His idea is to get the money he needs, no matter how he gets it. George Hotspur also lies, schemes, and does the unforgiveable—he cheats inferiors at cards. Undy Scott and Alaric Tudor are out-and-out swindlers. And Colonel Marrable is perhaps the worst of all, for he deliberately swindles his own son out of his whole inheritance!

Obviously, Sowerby fits into the pattern. Yet in spite of his career of rascality, he retains moral sensitivity. At times his conscience plagues him with remorse for his evil doing and he realizes that he himself is to blame. "He had fallen into the possession of a fine property on the attainment of his manhood; he had been endowed with more than average gifts of intellect; never-failing health had been given to him, and
a vision fairly clear in discerning good from evil; and now to what a pass had he brought himself!" Elsewhere Trollope says, moreover, that despite his rascality Sowerby had ". . .within his breast a desire for better things, and in his mind an understanding that he had hitherto missed the career of an honest English gentleman."

Trollope's final comments on Sowerby state very clearly that the man has ceased to be a gentleman because of his immoral actions, but they state equally clearly that the gentlemanly characteristics have had their saving influence and might yet bring the man to grace.

That Mr. Sowerby had been a rogue, I cannot deny. It is roguish to lie, and he had been a great liar. It is roguish to make promises which the promiser knows he cannot perform, and such had been Mr. Sowerby's daily practice. It is roguish to live on other men's money, and Mr. Sowerby had long been doing so. It is roguish, at least so I would hold it, to deal willingly with rogues; and Mr. Sowerby had been constant in such dealings. I do not know whether he had not at times fallen even into more palpable roguery than is proved by such practices as those enumerated. Though I have for him some tender feeling, knowing that there was still a touch of gentle bearing round his heart, an abiding taste for better things within him, I cannot acquit him from the great accusation. But, for all that, in spite of his acknowledged roguery, Lord Lufton was too hard upon him in his judgment. There was yet within him the means of repentance, could a locus penitentiae have been supplied to him. He grieved bitterly over his own ill doings, and knew well what changes gentleness would have demanded from him.
Whether or not he had gone too far for all changes—whether the locus penitentiae was for him still a possibility—that was between him and a higher power. 20

The important phrases here are "a touch of gentle bearing" and "knew well what changes gentlehood would have demanded," for these presume good blood and gentlemanly nurture. Obviously gentlehood is here used in a moral or ethical sense; the necessary change must be a moral one.

Trollope provides yet another important comment.

Unfortunate Mr. Sowerby! I cannot take leave of him here without some feeling of regret, knowing that there was that within him which might, under better guidance, have produced better things. There are men, even of high birth, who seem as though they were born to be rogues; but Mr. Sowerby was, to my thinking, born to be a gentleman. That he had not been a gentleman—that he had bolted from his appointed course, going terribly on the wrong side of the posts—let us all acknowledge. It is not a gentlemanlike deed, but a very blackguard action, to obtain a friend's acceptance to a bill in an unguarded hour of social intercourse. That and other similar doings have stamped his character too plainly. But nevertheless, I claim a tear for Mr. Sowerby, and lament that he has failed to run his race discreetly, in accordance with the rules of the Jockey Club. 21

What is Mr. Sowerby's end? After Miss Dunstable buys Chaldicotes, he attempts the plan of living as a tenant in the old family house and of farming the land, but he soon abandons it. He has no real aptitude and cannot bear his altered position in the county. "He
soon relinquished Chaldicotes of his own accord, and has vanished away, as such men do vanish. . ." subsisting for the rest of his days, we infer, on the generosity of Miss Dunstable.

The Hon. Undecimus Scott is a considerably worse specimen than Sowerby, for Undy is a confirmed swindler who has little hope of salvation. Although he too comes of good family, he is extremely ambitious for money and self-advancement and not very scrupulous as to how these things are acquired; "...the one strong passion of his life was the desire of a good income at the cost of the public." He has his eye constantly on the main chance, cannot be trusted, and cannot "...afford to associate with his fellow-men on any other terms than those of making capital of them." Undy's tempting of Alaric Tudor into crime is typical of his relationship with others, and Trollope uses the association of these two to good purpose in providing insight into the whole area of transgressions.

Alaric, who is a poor clerk in the office of the Weights and Measures, is as ambitious for self-advancement as Undy Scott. His burning and selfish desire for quick success soon leads him to doubtful short cuts, and he is warned by his friend Harry Norman that the end does not justify the means, that goodness must be placed
before greatness. " 'Good you certainly can be, if you
look to Him for assistance. Let that come first; and
then the greatness, if that be possible.' " To Alaric,
however, it is all a quibble about a word, and his self-
ishness does not allow him to be much concerned with
goodness. Trollope shrewdly depicts the effect of
Alaric's forgetting the good and associating himself
with some of Undy Scott's nefarious schemes.

Alaric's education was going on rapidly... He
had already learnt the great utility, one may almost
say the necessity, of having a command of money;
he was beginning also to perceive that money was
a thing not to be judged of by the ordinary rules
which govern a man's conduct. In other matters
it behoves a gentleman to be open, above-board,
liberal, and true; good-natured, generous,
confiding, self-denying, doing unto others as
he would wish that others should do unto him;
but in the acquirement and use of money—that is,
its use with the object of acquiring more, its
use in the usurer's sense—his practice should
be exactly the reverse; he should be close, secret,
exact, given to concealment, not over troubled
by scruples; suspicious, without sympathies,
self-devoted, and always doing unto others exactly
that which he is on his guard to prevent others
from doing unto him—viz., making money by them. 25

Not until unalloyed premeditated swindling is per-
formed by Alaric, however, does Trollope really damn him.
His execution of Undy's scheme to get control of Miss
Golightly's fortune is the turning point. "Alaric Tudor
was now a rogue; despite his high office, his grand
ideas, his exalted ambition; despite his talent, zeal,
and well-directed official labours, he was a rogue; a
thief, a villain who had stolen the money of the orphan, who had undertaken a trust merely that he might break it; a robber, doubly disgraced by being a robber with an education, a Bill Sykes without any of those excuses which a philanthropist cannot but make for wretches brought up in infamy. But—and this point is extremely important in Trollope's view—from the moment that Alaric takes the girl's money his conscience plagues him, whereas Undy feels little remorse although he very clearly knows right from wrong. Alaric tries desperately to return the stolen money, and repents his evil-doing. The repentance makes the difference; when repentance occurs, redemption is always possible. But most of Trollope's fallen gentlemen never repent. Although the chance for redemption and a return to gentlemanhood may present itself, most of them seem incapable of real unselfish repentance. Alaric's repentance, Trollope indicates, may allow a return to gentlemanliness, although obviously it must be accomplished elsewhere than in England. After Alaric has finished his prison term and he and Gertrude are on the eve of emigration to Australia, Trollope pronounces this hope.

It will be seen that hope yet remained both for Alaric and his wife; and hope not without a reasonable base. Bad as he had been, it had not been with him as with Undy Scott. The devil had not contrived to put his whole claw...
upon him. He had not divested himself of human affections and celestial hopes. He had not reduced himself to the present level of a beast, with the disadvantages of a soul and of an eternity, as the other man had done. He had not put himself beyond the pale of true brotherhood with his fellow-men. We would have hanged Undy had the law permitted us; but now we will say farewell to the other, hoping that he may yet achieve exaltation of another kind. 27

Undy, though he feels little remorse, like all of Trollope's fallen gentleman knows the difference between right and wrong, honor and dishonor. His gentlemanly training has insured him this, as Trollope carefully points out. Indeed, in almost every case gentlemanly breeding does insure such organic knowledge, even, for example, in the case of George Hotspur, who was educated abroad and who selfishly having passed up every opportunity to become a gentleman of position, falls ignominiously to drunkenness and living off the money of his actress wife. That such an organic knowledge does exist almost universally among the fallen gentlemen attests strongly to Trollope's belief in the saving properties of the gentlemanly system. If a man has been given a fairly acute moral sensitivity and he then deliberately chooses evil, all that can be done for him has been done. In this connection Trollope contrasts Undy with Bill Sykes, pointing out the essential difference to be that Undy, because of his breeding, deliberately chose his course
of evil, and therefore merits worse punishment than the uneducated Sykes.

...but with Bill Sykes we may contrast him, as they flourished in the same era, and had their points of similitude, as well as their points of difference.

They were both apparently born to prey on their own species; they both resolutely adhered to a fixed rule that they would in nowise earn their bread, and to a rule equally fixed that, though they would earn no bread, they would consume much. They were both of them blessed with a total absence of sensibility and an utter disregard to the pain of others, and had no other use for a heart than that of a machine for maintaining the circulation of the blood. It is but little to say that neither of them ever acted on principle, on a knowledge, that is, of right and wrong, and a selection of the right; in their studies of the science of evil they had progressed much further than this, and had taught themselves to believe that that which other men called virtue was, on its own account, to be regarded as mawkish, insipid, and useless for such purposes as the acquisition of money or pleasure; whereas vice was, on its own account, to be preferred, as offering the only road to those things which they were desirous of possessing.

So far there was a great resemblance between Bill Sykes and Mr. Scott; but then came the points of difference, which must give to the latter a great pre-eminence in the eyes of that master whom they had both so worthily served. Bill could not boast the merit of selecting the course which he had run; he had served the Devil, having had, as it were, no choice in the matter; he was born and bred and educated an evil-doer, and could hardly have deserted from the colours of his great Captain, without some spiritual interposition to enable him to do so. To Undy a warmer reward must surely be due: he had been placed fairly on the world's surface, with power to choose between good and bad, and had deliberately taken the latter; to him had, at any rate, been explained the theory of meum and tuum, and he had resolved that he liked tuum better than meum;
and he had learnt that there is a God ruling over us, and a Devil hankering after us, and had made up his mind that he would belong to the latter. Bread and water would have come to him naturally without any villainy on his part, aye, and meat and milk, and wine and oil, the fat things of the world; but he elected to be a villain; he liked to do the Devil's bidding. --Surely he was the better servant; surely he shall have the richer reward. 29

And reward he receives. He cannot be legally prosecuted for his share in the swindle of Miss Golightly's money, but he can be socially prosecuted. There is no doubt about his being hurled headlong from the ranks of gentlemen—he is unanimously expelled from Parliament, unanimously expelled from his club, and vanishes in disgrace to Europe.

As unquestionably as Nathaniel Sowerby and Undy Scott, Burgo Fitzgerald is also a member of the class of gentlemen. He is "...a young man born in the purple of English aristocracy. He was related to half the dukes in the kingdom, and had three countesses for his aunts." Generally his manner appears to be charming. Although he is worthless his relatives cling to him, partly because "...there was always about him a certain kindliness which made him pleasant to those around him." Burgo is, however, an aristocratic sponge. He is thoroughly worthless and useless, a parasite who, though he has squandered a huge fortune by the age of thirty
and is now penniless, still lives on "...in the same circles, still slept softly and drank of the best, and went about with his valet and his groom and his horses, and fared sumptuously every day." He is utterly selfish. "But he lived ever without conscience, without purpose,—with no idea that it behoved him as a man to do anything but eat and drink,—or ride well to hounds till some poor brute, much nobler than himself, perished beneath him."

In him is apparent the same unrestrained selfishness and self-indulgence that appears in some other gentlemen whose transgressions resemble his, Lord Lovel, Lord Ongar, and the Marquis of Brotherton. They also show Burgo's open defiance of normal social conduct, for Burgo laughed "...to scorn all the rules which regulate the lives of other men." Lord Lovel, for example, had an audacity about him "...which threw aside all fear of the law, and which was impervious to threats and interference."

Although Burgo Fitzgerald is a spendthrift, a wastrel, and a liar, his worst transgression, and the one with which Trollope is primarily concerned, is his desire and attempt to run off with another man's wife, Glencora Palliser. Here we encounter the other major category of unacceptable transgressions—violation of respect toward women. The effect that Burgo's open flaunting of his illicit desire makes upon other
gentlemen can be well illustrated by a scene at Monk-shade, the country home of his aunt. In anger, Burgo curses Plantagenet Palliser before a breakfast group. "Then there was suddenly a silence in the room, and everyone seemed to attend assiduously to his breakfast. It was very terrible, this clear expression of a guilty meaning with reference to the wife of another man!" And Burgo is selfish throughout, for Trollope plainly tells us that he did not possess "heart enough to love truly," and during his attempt to elope with Cora, it is obvious that he thinks little of Cora and the social ostracism she would experience, but thinks much of himself and the benefits he would receive. Worse than Burgo by far, however, is the self-indulgent Earl Lovel, who so cruelly treated Josephine Murray, the mother of Lady Anna. As Trollope pictures him, his whole life is based on premeditated lust.

...it must be told that the Earl was a man who had never yet spared a woman in his lust. It had been the rule, almost the creed of his life, that woman was made to gratify the appetite of man, and that the man is but a poor creature who does not lay hold of the sweetness that is offered to him. He had so lived as to teach himself that those men who devote themselves to their wives, as a wife devotes herself to her husband, are the poor lubberly clods of creation, who had lacked the power to reach the only purpose of living which could make life worth having. Women had been to him a prey, as the fox is a prey to the huntsman and the salmon to the angler.
The dissolute Lord Ongar is perhaps worse. Failing to be pleased by his marriage with Julia Brabazon, he attempts to get another man to seduce her and so get her off his hands, and when that fails, he accuses her of adultery. The useless Marquis of Brotherton is of the same type. When he brings himself to the "premeditated slander" of calling Mary Lovelace an unprintable epithet to her father's face and before others, we feel that the world of gentlemen is done with him. The fact that these fallen peers are very wealthy tends to limit the range of their transgressions. Having money, they do not have to cheat and swindle, so that uncontrolled self-indulgence is their forte. Their money also enables them to keep from vanishing away like Sowerby and Undy Scott. The net result is the same, however, for Lovel and Brotherton have lived in Italy for years, and both Ongar and Brotherton die there. Lovel dies on his own estate but in the arms of his Italian mistress with the whole countryside calling him mad. Their money makes little difference in the long run.

So Burgo is in the company of other fallen angels, and—at that—is really better than most. Like Sowerby, Undy Scott, Alaric Tudor, and most of the fallen gentlemen we shall encounter, Burgo also possesses the ability to distinguish between right and wrong, to know that his
troubles are his own fault and that he has consciously chosen his course of action. For example, on one occasion he reviews his past life, realizes his past worthlessness, and despises himself. "As he walked on, thinking of his project, he strove hard to cheat himself into a belief that he would do a good thing in carrying Lady Glencora away from her husband. Bad as had been his life he had never before done aught so bad as that. The more fixed his intention became, the more thoroughly he came to perceive how great and grievous was the crime which he contemplated." Then comes one of the most beautiful and touching of all the scenes in Trollope. In an impulsive moment of sympathy and generosity which transcends his usual selfishness, Burgo meets a cold and hungry street girl and provides her supper and the money for a bed out of funds barely sufficient to carry him to his aunt's house the next morning, and Trollope, in a forgiving moment, says, "A sweeter tempered man than he never lived,—nor one who was of a kinder nature."

After Burgo realizes his plans for elopement have failed and his hopes are gone, he curses his luck. Even here Trollope makes the same moral qualification we have just seen. "But his curses had none of the bitterness of those which George Vavasor was always uttering.
Through it all there remained about Burgo one honest feeling,—one conviction that was true,—a feeling that it all served him right, and that he had better, perhaps, go to the devil at once, and give nobody any more trouble. If he loved no one sincerely, neither did he hate anyone; and whenever he made any self-inquiry into his own circumstances, he always told himself that it was all his own fault."

Burgo ends like Sowerby and Scott. His uncle, Sir Cosmo Monk, made an arrangement "...for remitting a weekly sum of fifteen pounds to Burgo, through a member of the diplomatic corps, as long as he should remain at a certain small German town which was indicated, and in which there was no public gambling-table." And thus Burgo Fitzgerald departs from the world of gentlemen.

George Vavasor also comes from gentry and gentlefolk, being the heir to Squire Vavasor, whose estate had been handed down from father to son for four hundred years. George moves easily in gentlemanly circles, is obviously cultured, with a developed aesthetic sense, and has extremely pleasant ways and manners when he so desires. Like Sowerby, George Hotspur, and Burgo Fitzgerald, George Vavasor is a reckless man. He calls his career "perfectly reckless," and says, "I hold myself in readiness to risk everything at any moment, in order to
gain any object that may serve my turn.' "George is, moreover, a man of mystery, a quality which Trollope thoroughly disapproves, calling it a vice. George's lodgings are very private. Few know where he lives and fewer are those who visit him. His money matters also are very secretive, no one knowing where his money comes from. Now, George has no special reason for this secrecy but he "...had always lived as though secrecy in certain matters might at any time become useful to him." In many places Trollope indicates that a gentleman should be open and above-board, and that a man who has nothing to conceal will more likely be that way. It is the cheat, the robber, the one with secret schemes, who must of necessity be close and mysterious. George Hotspur and Undy Scott have much reason for concealment, and of course Alaric Tudor finds the need for secrecy. Both Lord Lovel and the Marquis of Brotherton are mysterious figures, the one living secretly on his estate for months with an Italian mistress, and the other clothing in mystery his marriage to an Italian wife and the birth of his son by this woman. Obviously, concealment and mystery are ungentlemanly, and George Vavasor certainly errs in this respect. Moreover, the defiance so obvious in other gentlemen renegades is also apparent in George. For a period of time, he "had lived in open defiance of
"decency," and this defiance mounts throughout the pages of *Can You Forgive Her?*

In George we see also the common characteristic of the fallen gentlemen--selfishness; for George is a very selfish person who does not love easily. He had been engaged to his cousin, Alice Vavasor, but she had broken the engagement because George had proved untrue. "He had not only been untrue to her, but worse than that, had been false in excusing his untruth. He had not only promised falsely, but had made such promises with a deliberate, premeditated falsehood. And he had been selfish, coldly selfish, weighing the value of his own low lusts against that of her holy love." This analysis by Trollope places George immediately into the category of Lovel, Ongar, and Brotherton. He can be indicted on three counts--infidelity, premeditated falsehood, and lust.

Like Undy Scott and Alaric Tudor, George's desire is self-advancement. He wants power and position, to which his Parliamentary ambition bears witness, and Parliamentary ambitions require money. When money is needed to further and sustain his Parliamentary career, he cleverly and craftily gains the use of Alice's money by becoming engaged to her again, although he compromises what little integrity he has left in the process. As George's ambition and need for money increase, his moral disintegration
mounts to the point of attempted murder, and he completely crushes the faith and trust of all who have believed in him. Here are the high spots of that career. He does not hesitate to petition Alice for money, and thereby brings on himself the same condemnation that George Hotspur receives for taking money from a woman, for this act utterly violates the code of honor. He mentally calls Alice "...by every name which is most offensive to a woman's ears..." His sister Kate begins to realize that "...he carried to such a pitch that hatred...of conventional rules, that he allowed himself to be controlled by none of the ordinary bonds of society." When he fails to secure her consent to perjure herself in relation to his grandfather's will, he hurls her furiously to the ground, breaking her arm. At that point she realizes "That he was gone for ever, utterly and irretrievably ruined, thrown out, as it were, beyond the pale of men..." Back in London, George greedily resorts to drink and ends his career by attempted murder. George does not resort to heavy drinking and drunkenness until near the end of his moral crack-up, and the same is fairly true of Burgo Fitzgerald and Felix Carbury. George Hotspur ends, of course, in drunkenness and Lord Ongar dies in the grip of delirium tremens.

As we might suspect, Vavasor possesses the same
distinct moral sensitivity that the other scoundrels have. In fact, it seems likely that his initial moral sensitivity was greater than most and that he more deliberately chose the moral pattern of his life. Like Sowerby and Burgo Fitzgerald, he also seems to have possessed many virtues, and certain qualities appreciated by other people. Trollope says, for example, "There must have been something great about George Vavasor, or he would not have been so idolized by such a girl as his sister Kate." Moreover, Trollope indicates that George was potentially quite capable of feeling the commendable pride of serving his country in Parliament, although moral disintegration eventually extinguishes this pride.

George's moral sense in action can be observed in a number of cases. A good instance occurs while he is at the inn at Shap on his visit to persuade his sister to ask Alice for some money. He reviews in his mind his meeting with Alice during which she spurned him. "He was sore at heart, and very angry withal. He could have readily spurned her from him, and rejected her who had once rejected him. He would have done so had not his need for her money restrained him. He was not a man who could deceive himself in such matters. He knew that this was so, and he told himself that he was a rascal."
The section in which Trollope describes George's entry into Parliament leaves absolutely no doubt as to his choice of the life he leads and of the consequent defiance which such a choice entails.

Vavasor had educated himself to badness with his eyes open. He had known what was wrong, and had done it, having taught himself to think that bad things were best. . . . Vavasor. . . . would sometimes feel tempted to cut his throat and put an end to himself, because he knew that he had taught himself amiss. . . . He believed in his own ability; he believed thoroughly in his own courage; but he did not believe in his own conduct. He feared that he had done,--feared still more strongly that he would be driven to do,--that which would shut men's ears against his words, and would banish him from high places. No man believes in himself who knows himself to be a rascal, however great may be his talent, or however high his pluck. 57

Surely, no one can be blamed for his downfall but George himself, and no one knows it better than he, for he so ordered it.

What happens to George Vavasor? He disappears to America, John Grey refusing to allow any steps to be taken to arrest him for attempted murder,--this to the infinite regret of a Scotland Yard superintendent, who said, "'Pity's no name for it. It's the greatest shame as ever I knew since I joined the force. A man as was a Member of Parliament only last Session,--as belongs to no end of swell clubs, a gent as well known in London as any gent about the town!"
The Geroulds in their Guide to Trollope call Sir Felix Carbury "Trollope's most perfect picture of a cad," and certainly, in most respects, he is the most contemptible of those who fall from the class of gentlemen. For, again, there is no doubt that originally he was a member of that class. His father was Sir Patrick Carbury, who had been created a baronet for military service in India and who was a member of the Carbury family of Suffolk, which stretched back to at least the War of the Roses. Felix possesses "the manners of a gentleman" and can "talk well." Moreover, he knows how to dress with simplicity, and Trollope tells us, "His airs and his appearance, joined with some cleverness, had carried him through even the viciousness of his life."

At the outset of the story Felix is the heir to Carbury Hall, the family estate, at that time occupied by Roger Carbury. When his father died, Felix had inherited a thousand pounds a year and his father's title. For four years he had held a commission in the Guards, a crack army regiment. By the age of twenty-five, however, he had sold out his commission, had run through all the money that his father had left him, and was as horribly in debt as a man could be.
Like the other fallen gentlemen, Felix is a selfish creature. Trollope tells us that he never loved any one to the extent of denying himself a moment's gratification on that loved one's behalf. "His heart was a stone." This selfishness, this inability to love, is revealed once more when Trollope is describing the fact that Felix's outward demeanor wholly belies his inner disposition. Felix "...had a power of changing the expression of his countenance, a play of face, which belied altogether his real disposition. He could seem to be hearty and true till the moment came in which he had really to expose his heart,—or to try to expose it. Then he failed, knowing nothing about it."

Like the other rascals and scoundrels, Felix revels in and must have recklessness and excitement. Gambling and drinking are much to his taste. That Felix is in debt almost beyond the point of redemption seems to mean nothing to him, for with "impudent drollery" he can boast about the hopelessness of his debts. Such an attitude is contrasted with that of Roger Carbury, to whom ". . . a gentleman was disgraced who owed money to a tradesman which he could not pay." Another characteristic which Felix possesses has not appeared before—cowardice. He had been the aggressor in a quarrel with a brother officer, had first threatened,
and then had shown the white feather. He had only partially outlived this episode; many men remembered "...that Felix Carbury had been cowed, and had cowered." In Felix, nevertheless, can be seen the defiance, shaky though it may be, that has proved such a universal characteristic of Trollope's villainous gentlemen. This defiance is revealed in his reaction to Roger Carbury, whom his mother has asked to lecture Felix morally. "The time was coming,—he might almost say that the time had come,—in which he might defy Roger Carbury. Nevertheless, he dreaded the words which were now to be spoken to him with a craven fear." It seems apparent here that Roger Carbury symbolizes to Felix the moral and ethical world of gentlemen, whom he would arrogantly and blatantly defy, had he only the courage to do so.

The selfishness and desire for excitement seen in the other scoundrels likewise lead Felix Carbury to ruin. We have seen his position at the age of twenty-five, and it does not take him long to run his race. Felix is a typical example of the worthless and riotous group of young gentlemen who patronize the Beargarden, where constant gambling and drinking are the rule rather than the exception. To gratify his selfish desires, Felix does not hesitate to take money from his mother, even
though Lady Carbury is in want of funds to pay her bills. To Roger Carbury, such a situation is "so thoroughly dishonest,—so ungentlemanlike!"

Felix practices dissimulation in all its forms. He is a blatant liar and breaks promises with no hesitation. He accepts two hundred pounds from Marie Melmotte's father in exchange for a written promise to renounce Marie, and then schemes to elope with Marie and thus rob her father of the money settled on the girl. To secure money, nothing is too low for his calculating mind. He even makes the despicable suggestion that his mother borrow money for him from her suitor! That act in itself shows utter lack of respect for women, and he violates this aspect of the gentlemanly code in other ways. For example, he is deliberately unfaithful to Marie, even on the eve of their elopement to New York. And he deludes the farm girl, Ruby Ruggles, into coming to London in the hope of marrying him. Learning the truth, she says, "I think you're the falsest young man, and the basest, and the lowest-minded that I ever heard tell of."

Obviously, Sir Felix does not possess the degree of moral sensitivity of Sowerby, Fitzgerald, or Vavasor. But there are indications that he possesses some, slight and undeveloped as it may be. To illustrate, he realizes
he is bad. When his mother informs him that she has asked Roger to come and speak to him, Felix answers, "'It's all very well preaching sermons to good people, but nothing ever was got by preaching to people who ain't good.'" Later on, when he receives the two hundred pounds from Melmotte for signing the letter renouncing Marie, Trollope gives us a look into his thoughts. "Ignorant as he was as to the duties of a gentleman, indifferent as he was to the feelings of others, still he felt ashamed of himself. He was treating the girl very badly. Even he knew that he was behaving badly." His stunted moral sense is also seen in action when he detects Miles Grendall cheating at cards. "Reprobate as he was himself, this work of villainy was new to him and seemed to be very terrible." This cheating was "...an extent of iniquity that was awful to him before he had seen it..." In short, Felix is almost blind morally, but not wholly so.

Trollope unquestionably gives his estimate of this man. "Whether Sir Felix be rich or poor, the world, evil-hearted as it is, will never think him a fine fellow." The final estimate of his fellow associates is just as clear. When he comes sneaking into the Beargarden after the absence necessitated by recuperating from his thrashing by John Crumb, all of his
associates walk out of the room, one of them calling him "cad" to his face. Soon Felix left and "...so brought to an end his connection with his associates of the Bear-garden. From that time forth he was never more seen by them,--or, if seen, was never known."

Thus Felix vanishes from the world of gentlemen. Under Mr. Broune's arranging Felix goes to Germany for twelve months in the company of a clergyman, who by no means was to give him money enough to return to England. Felix is to have 175 pounds a year, and since Broune marries Lady Carbury, we feel this will be a permanent arrangement.

It is evident, then, that unrestrained selfishness can lead to moral violation that results in exclusion from the gentlemanly class. But such selfishness also has a damming effect upon the gentleman's normal attitudes toward land and family, and upon his sense of duty and service to country, family, and dependents. This effect is particularly noticeable in the fallen peers, whose functions and responsibilities are greater than those of lower-ranking gentlemen. Earl Lovel, for instance, has spent most of his manhood abroad, always a black mark in Trollope's book. Furthermore, he has committed the near-treasonable act of converting most of his land into ready cash, and to cap it all, he cares nothing for his
family. "He had never in any way noticed his heir. He cared for none that bore his name. Those ties in the world which we call love, and deem respectable, and regard as happy, because they have to do with marriage and blood relationship as established by all laws since the days of Moses, were odious to him and ridiculous in his sight, because all obligations were distasteful to him,—and all laws, except those which preserved to him the use of his own money." The Marquis of Brotherton is also condemned for his renunciation of duty and obligations, particularly so by his sister Sarah. "'What terrible mischief a man may do when he throws all idea of duty to the winds!'" Like Lovel, Brotherton has also spent his life abroad, and cares nothing for the family estate except that it bring him money. He insults his family, and does not possess the feelings of a decent English gentleman. Selfish self-indulgence has ruined him, as his brother, George, discerns. "'He has lived a life of self-indulgence till he doesn't know how to control a thought or a passion.'"

Other fallen gentlemen show similar disregard for property. For example, although both George Vavasor and Sir Felix Carbury were heirs to estates, neither showed any feeling at all for the land. Both would have squeezed the estates to pulp in extracting money to further their
selfish desires, as would also have George Hotspur could he have got his hands on Humblethwaite. Neither do these fallen gentlemen feel much sense of service to country. None of the peers, for example, serve in Parliament. It is true, of course, that Vavasor, Sowerby, and Undy Scott all have seats, but they are not serving in the gentlemanly tradition. The first two are there because of a selfish desire for position, and the other, for what he can make out of it. In brief, renunciation of duty and of approved gentlemanly attitudes added to the moral and ethical transgressions resulting from unrestrained selfishness and self-indulgence, makes more final the fall from gentility.

Having examined these fallen gentlemen somewhat in detail, let us look at their common characteristics. First, they are all born gentlemen. Secondly, their selfishness leads to self-seeking and/or self-indulgence. In those with money, it is usually self-indulgence which increases as selfishness grows less restrained. The poorer ones, to satisfy their desires, are driven to seek money. As their needs increase, money and position become a temptation which they cannot withstand, so that they resort to immoral and unethical means to gain their ends.
There are indications that Trollope feels these moral deviations to be the result of quirks in blood lines, of bad training, or of a combination of these. For instance, in an attempt to account for Sir Felix Carbury's conduct, Trollope speculates on bad blood and poor training. "Whether Sir Felix ..., had become what he was solely by bad training, or whether he had been born bad, who shall say? It is hardly possible that he should not have been better had he been taken away as an infant and subjected to moral training by moral teachers. And yet again it is hardly possible that any training or want of training should have produced a heart so utterly incapable of feeling for others as was his." Such ideas are apparently often in Trollope's mind. The possibility always exists, of course, of the whitest flock producing a black sheep, the proverbial "bad 'un." But Trollope also often speaks of deviations from established blood lines. For instance, Felix Carbury's father could easily be considered a deviate from the Carbury family, and his mother's background is extremely dubious. The same idea appears when Trollope informs us that Burgo Fitzgerald's father was one "... of the Worcestershire Fitzgeralds, of whom it used to be said that there never was one who was not beautiful and worthless." George Hotspur also comes from a dubious branch of the
Hotspur family, his father having quarrelled with the elder branch of the family, having left England, and having lived and died in Paris. When the possibility arises of keeping the Hotspur property and title together by a marriage between Emily Hotspur and George, ". . . they who knew the family, and especially that branch of the family from which George Hotspur came, declared that Sir Harry would never give his daughter to such a one as was this cousin."

Poor training also undoubtedly helps account for some of the deviation. Sir Felix Carbury is the prime example. His father was a selfish, imperious, cruel man, who had beaten and cursed Felix's mother. She herself was scarcely a lady, for she had been educated in deceit, and had practiced it during all her married life. Trollope tells us that she schemed, lied, and lived a life of maneuvers. With such examples set at home, it is little wonder that morally, Sir Felix should have failed so miserably. George Hotspur's father, we have learned, was an expatriate, and George himself was educated abroad. We already know Trollope's poor opinion of both foreign education and expatriates, and so we can reasonably infer that part of George's trouble is that he did not receive the normal early training of an English gentleman. Alaric Tudor suffered from the same cause.
His father had squandered a fortune, and becoming a widower while Alaric was yet an infant, had moved to Brussels. Consequently, Alaric spent his early years in a foreign country without a mother, and he was eventually sent to an English private school, and he later spent some time at a German academy. There is every indication that he also missed the normal training of an English gentleman. We can also assume something of Undy Scott's training from the fact that he began his career by taking his father's only advice to him and swapping himself for ten thousand pounds in the marriage market, and we have already seen Trollope state that Sowerby "under better guidance" might have remained a gentleman.

In addition to indifferent guidance and poor example set by parents, poor training includes another element from which most of the fallen gentlemen have suffered. Most have been "spoiled rotten." In these cases, overindulgent parents, sisters, and relatives have all helped lay the foundation of selfishness which later destroys. Sowerby and Vavasor have been spoiled by their sisters, and the handsome Burgo, by all who have known him. "Poor Burgo! All who had seen him since life had begun with him had loved him and striven to cherish him. And with it all, to what a state had he come! Poor Burgo! Had
his eyes been less brightly blue, and his face less god-like in form, it may be that things would have gone better with him." The Marquis of Brotherton has obviously been indulged by his doting mother, but even she has not approached Lady Carbury's indulgence of Felix. "In everything she had spoilt him as a boy, and in everything she still spoilt him as a man. She was almost proud of his vices, and had taken delight in hearing of doings which if not vicious of themselves had been ruinous from their extravagance. She had so indulged him that even in her own presence he was never ashamed of his own selfishness or apparently conscious of the injustice which he did to others." No parent and son could better illustrate this fond overindulgence and resulting selfishness than Lord Cashel and his son, Lord Kilcullen. Lord Cashel called Kilcullen's "...iniquitous vices, follies--his licentiousness, love of pleasure--his unprincipled expenditure and extravagance, a want of the knowledge of what money was: and his worst sin of all, because the one least likely to be abandoned, his positive, unyielding damning selfishness, he called 'fashion'--the fashion of the young men of the day."

In almost every instance, however, even that of Felix Carbury, these men demonstrate the moral sensitivity to feel the difference between right and wrong,
between honor and dishonor, and therefore appear con-
sciously to have chosen their paths of evil. They may
have been indulged insufferably, but they have not
failed to gain that degree of moral sensitivity.
Apparently, consciously or unconsciously Trollope
thought this moral sensitivity to be the result of the
saving and beneficial qualities in gentlemanly blood
and gentlemanly breeding. The fact itself that this
sensitivity so commonly exists in the fallen gentle-
men attests to Trollope's faith in the whole gentlem-
manly framework. He believed that no one born and bred
a gentleman, even if trained indifferently, could
entirely miss absorbing moral and ethical principles,
for the social environment in which the gentleman
matured provided these principles. Consequently a
gentleman who falls is more heavily damned simply
because the assumption can be made that as a gentleman
he should know better and be deterred from moral and
ethical wrong by more powerful forces than others.
And as Trollope has presented the gentlemanly class,
nearly always this assumption is correct.

On the other hand, many of the non-gentlemanly
scoundrels in Trollope's novels who try to push their
way into the gentlemanly fold, do not display this
moral sensitivity--or, indeed, much moral sense at all
in cases like Melmotte and Ferdinand Lopez. Blood, breeding, and position make a difference. This difference in moral sensitivity is strikingly illustrated by the contrast between George Vavasor, born and bred a gentleman, and Mr. Bott, a cotton spinner who is a Radical M.P. and the most vulgar person imaginable—by no reach of the mind a gentleman. Trollope has been eulogizing Parliament and the honor of serving therein, and George, who has just been elected, is being led into the House by Mr. Bott.

George Vavasor, as he went in by the lamps and the apple-stall, under the guardianship of Mr. Bott, felt all the pride of which I have been speaking. He was a man quite capable of feeling such pride as it should be felt,—capable, in certain dreamy moments, of looking at the thing with pure and almost noble eyes; of understanding the ambition of serving with truth so great a nation as that which fate had made his own. Nature, I think, had so fashioned George Vavasor, that he might have been a good, and perhaps a great man; whereas Mr. Bott had been born small. Vavasor had educated himself to badness with his eyes open. He had known what was wrong, and had done it, having taught himself to think that bad things were best. But poor Mr. Bott had meant to do well, and thought that he had done very well indeed. He was a tuft-hunter and a toady, but he did not know that he was doing amiss in seeking to rise by tuft-hunting and toadying. He was both mean and vain, both a bully and a coward, and in politics, I fear, quite unscrupulous in spite of his grand dogmas; but he believed that he was progressing in public life by the proper and usual means, and was troubled by no idea that he did wrong. 88

To sum up, Trollope places great faith in the ability
of the gentlemanly combination of blood and breeding to produce a moral sensitivity keenly aware of evil and dishonor, one that insures even gentlemanly renegades the awareness of their own evil, and that consequently makes their choice of evil deliberately their own. By no means does he suggest this method to be the only way of producing a moral person, but unquestionably he feels it will more often produce an exacting moral product.

Like any stock breeder, Trollope would realize that blood and training produce good results more generally than any other method, but that they do not always do so. And so we find that some gentlemen transgress morally, exceeding limits set by the class. Inevitably, unrestrained selfishness seems to be the cause. Nearly always, this transgression of moral limits is the result of a conscious decision, because gentlemanly background and training, even though sketchy, provides a moral awareness which makes a conscious decision inevitable, a moral awareness which also insures that the means of redemption exists, provided repentance occurs. This conscious choice of evil, furthermore, constitutes a deliberate defiance of agreed-upon moral boundaries to which there is only one answer. Unrepentant sinners fall from the gentlemanly class!
CHAPTER IV

Gentlemen On Sufferance

The gentlemanly class in Trollope's novels divides into three categories—an unapproved lower category, a middle one approved with reservations, and an upper one approved almost unreservedly. The lowest of these categories—morally, ethically and aesthetically speaking—is comprised largely of useless, weak, and snobbish gentlemen, some of whom may have transgressed morally and ethically, but have not gone beyond the limits set by gentlemanly society. This category also includes men, perhaps otherwise gentlemen, who are suspect because of manners, as well as "first-generation" gentlemen or those just rising into the class.

This category constitutes a fringe area between approved gentlemen, on the one hand, and those who fall, on the other, and is the section that can bring the class as a whole into disrepute. The extent of a man's transgressions and the intent behind them, we have seen, determine whether he remains within the class of gentlemen or not. Of those who fall, most are utter villains. The dividing line appears hard to fix, Trollope himself saying, "It is difficult, perhaps, to say what amount of
misconduct does constitute a scoundrel, or justifies the critic in saying that this or that man is not a gentleman." The short description of Adelaide De Baron's father, however, roughly but distinctly differentiates a member of the "lower third" from a fallen gentleman. "Her father, a man of birth and fortune, but not, perhaps, with the best reputation in the world, had married a Germain of the last generation, and lived, when in the country, about twenty miles from Brotherton. He was a good deal on the turf, spent much of his time at card-playing clubs, and was generally known as a fast man. But he paid his way, had never put himself beyond the pale of society, and was, of course, a gentleman."

Even if he does not approve, Trollope is sympathetic towards such erring people, for he realizes that a leisure class has more temptation to vice and uselessness than those reared to a necessary schedule of hard work, and, as we have seen, he is fully aware that a constant pitch of excellence cannot be maintained, that the class will naturally have its renegades and deviates. When Daniel Thwaite, the ardent democrat of Lady Anna, questions one lord's throwing away forty thousand pounds a year on race-courses, Sir William Patterson replies, "'When you make much water boil, Mr. Thwaite, some of
it will probably boil over.'* Trollope's attitude toward this lower third of the gentlemanly class seems to be—certainly not one of approval, but usually one of understanding, although often his anger or indignation gets the better of him.

Uncontrolled selfishness basically proved the ruin of the fallen gentlemen, and selfishness also afflicts this bottom portion of the class. For the most part, however, the members of this group are able to remain within accepted limits. They may be idle, weak, and useless, they may be insufferably snobbish, they may lead utterly selfish lives, but most do not become active villains, although temptation is constantly before them. Two basic factors seem to keep them on the right side of the post. The saving qualities of the gentlemanly characteristics—birth, education, position, and money—surely constitute the major factor, even though in many of these cases, as in those of fallen gentlemen, their benefits have been only partially received. Confused or inadequate training and education seems largely at fault. An individual usually has received proper aesthetic training, but inadequate moral instruction. He will have received enough moral sensitivity to save him from complete ruin, but confused training may have caused him to see his role as a gentleman in a distorted
way, so that his selfishness is augmented rather than decreased, as in the case of snobs. On the other hand, he may not have received enough of the gentlemanly tradition of service and noblesse oblige to make him lose his selfishness, accept his duties and responsibilities, and become a useful member of his class. Lord Augustus Trefoil exemplifies a man whom the tradition helps keep from ruin. He will not cheat at cards because it is "...dangerous and ungentlemanlike, and if discovered would lead to his social annihilation ..." His feeling that cheating is ungentlemanly at least helps to restrain his impulses. The second chief factor that helps keep gentlemen from ruin is found in Lord Trefoil's fear of social annihilation. The fear of falling from the class is obviously no mean deterrent. Actually the mere handful of fallen gentlemen compared with the enormous number of gentlemen in Trollope's works demonstrates his conviction of the potent force of the gentlemanly characteristics and tradition as a saving agency. This conviction seems even more strongly emphasized when we see the high percentage of gentlemen who overcome selfishness, accept their duties and responsibilities as a governing class, and become useful members of society, with high ideals of service to others—and this in spite of the fact that their money and position
pose a constant temptation to run the other course. That there are relatively so few harmfully selfish, immoral, useless gentlemen and that many of them eventually become approved, is testimony to Trollope's high opinion of the efficacy of the gentlemanly tradition.

Since the useless compose a large section of the unapproved gentlemen, to understand specifically why Trollope disapproves of uselessness ultimately aids in understanding gentlemen who are approved. In actuality, of course, uselessness is simply a negative quality. In itself it is morally neither bad nor good, although it undoubtedly leads more easily to moral retrogression. In fact, Trollope says this himself in regard to Charley Tudor. "Since Alaric's conviction Charley led a busy life; and as men who have really something to do have seldom time to get into much mischief, he had been peculiarly moral and respectable." Trollope very definitely condemns uselessness and just as strongly emphasizes the positive virtue of utility. This emphasis on utility grows as he matures, and as we shall see later, this quality becomes an important attribute of his approved gentleman.

Very often in Trollope, young gentlemen "sowing their wild oats," or generally floundering in the attempt
to find themselves, eventually make their way into the approved middle section. An examination of the reasons for this improvement is rewarding, and offers a view of gentlemanly breeding at work. Generally the change results from selfishness being dispelled—through love, through the assumption of duty and responsibilities, or through a moral sense developing as the result of experience,—often a combination of these. The theme is an old one. Deny yourself, and leave off self-indulgence. Turn your mind outward to others—to your children, to your wife, to your dependents, to your country. Do your duty in these matters and you need have no fears for England. On the other hand, selfishness and concentration on self-indulgence lead to the abandoning of normal human relationships, to the relinquishing of duties, and eventually, perhaps, to utter moral collapse—in short, to uselessness, in the Trollopian sense.

Trollope conceived of an upper class that earned its keep, and had no more sympathy with uselessness and idleness than did Carlyle. Assuredly, Trollope's uppermost purpose was not social criticism, but throughout his novels are heard undertones of approval and disapproval of the gentlemanly class, the social group in which he is interested. Gentlemen must perform their duties—must govern the nation, must assume the responsibilities
of their various positions in life, must look to the training of their children, must produce as well as consume; and to do this, they must remain unselfish. Trollope has told us how frequently he expressed his political and social convictions through Plantagenet Palliser and his wife, Lady Glencora, and we feel this is particularly true of Plantagenet. In *The Duke's Children* Plantagenet Palliser strongly feels that a governing aristocracy is necessary to bring England safely through the gradual process of progressive equality. And yet he also strongly feels that a morally bad and useless aristocracy will not only go to the wall, but in the cause of humanity, should do so. A selfish, self-indulgent, pleasure seeking, dissolute aristocracy—a useless aristocracy—would be worse than none at all. And so it is not surprising to find protest of such nature throughout Trollope. It may be humorous, chiding, and indirect, or strong and unmistakable, but it is always there.

Sir Hugh Clavering, the eleventh baronet of that name, is a thoroughly useless gentleman. "He was greedy. . . fond of pleasure, but very careful of himself in the enjoyment of it. . . every inch an English gentleman in appearance, and therefore popular with men and women of his own class who were not near enough to
him to know him well. . . selfish, and utterly regardless of the feelings of all those with whom he came in con-
tact." The man has schooled himself away from love, and
cares very little for anyone really, except himself. His
companions are men largely given over to pleasure and
self-indulgence. He is worthless as a landlord, hating
to live at Clavering Park and spending as little time there as possible.

Insight into the man can be gained by looking at his relationships with his family. Although he is head of the family, he insults his uncle and cousin, so that eventually they refuse to enter his house while he is there. He is a tyrant who reduces his weak brother, Archie, almost to the position of a menial. He is callous towards his wife, who loves him and needs his affection. Nevertheless, Hugh has some good qualities, which are admitted even by his uncle, who dislikes him intensely. "'He does not get into debt. He will not destroy the property. He will leave the family after him as well off as it was before him,--and though he is a hard man, he does nothing actively cruel.'" Here we see the difference between Sir Hugh and Sowerby or Vavasor, for example. His selfishness does not cause him to sacrifice the land, and he does nothing actively cruel. The adverb makes all the difference. In his
final estimate of Hugh, however, Trollope strongly and unreservedly states his disapproval.

But I should not myself have liked the duty of preaching an eulogistic sermon on the lives and death of Hugh Clavering and his brother Archie. What had either of them ever done to merit a good word from any man, or to earn the love of any woman? That Sir Hugh had been loved by his wife had come from the nature of the woman, not at all from the qualities of the man. Both of the brothers had lived on the unexpressed theory of consuming, for the benefit of their own backs and their own bellies, the greatest possible amount of those good things which fortune might put in their way. I doubt whether either of them had ever contributed anything willingly to the comfort or happiness of any human being. Hugh, being powerful by nature, and having a strong will, had tyrannized over all those who were subject to him. Archie, not gifted as was his brother, had been milder, softer, and less actively hateful; but his principle of action had been the same. Everything for himself! Was it not well that two such men should be consigned to the fishes. . . 12

The uselessness of the man is obviously emphasized, and Trollope's reasons for so labeling him are easily summarized. He consumes all and gives nothing. Basically he is valueless to his family, to his tenants, and to his country. During the funeral sermon preached upon Hugh's death, for instance, his tenant, Farmer Gubbins, reflects that things will go better now. The new baronet, Rev. Henry Clavering, a kind and generous man, will allow him to enclose a bit of common land without adding to his rent and will be on hand on audit days. Although the rector is somewhat weak and has
always tended toward idleness, his kindness and generosity will make him of more utility to society than Hugh, who selfishly relinquished love and duty.

Mr. Maurice Maule of Maule Abbey is another prime example of uselessness. After taking his degree at Oxford, Mr. Maule undertook what Trollope calls the most difficult life to follow with "respect and self-comfort." "He proposed to himself the life of an idle man with a moderate income,--a life which should be luxurious, refined and graceful, but to which should be attached the burden of no necessary occupation." He would not farm a portion of his land, or interest himself in any agricultural matters. In contrast, we immediately think of Earl De Guest, whose concern in life is breeding cattle and who visits London only to attend the stock shows; or of Sir Alured Wharton, who farms some of his land, when he can ill afford to do so, in order to provide easier employment for some of his old people than they would get from his tenants.

Continuing his analysis of Maule, Trollope says "Here and there we may find a man who has so trained himself that day after day he can devote his mind without compulsion to healthy pursuits, who can induce himself to work, though work be not required from him for any ostensible object, who can save himself from the curse
of misusing his time, though he has for it no defined and necessary use; but such men are few, and are made of better metal than was Mr. Maule." Note here the emphasis on purpose and work, and the equating of healthy pursuits with work.

And so it was with Mr. Maule. "He became an idler, a man of luxury, and then a spendthrift." With what results? Eventually the furniture of Maule Abbey was sold by the squire's creditors under the sheriff's orders, the land was placed in the hands of trustees, and Maule was provided with only enough income to live decently in London. He stopped this side of disaster, and he took steps to remain there. For instance, he is very careful at whist, never playing for high points or being enticed into bets beyond the limits of the club stakes, for the loss of ten or twenty pounds would seriously disturb his living arrangements. In most respects he is not enviable, but at least he does not go the way of Sowerby.

He lives a completely idle life, but is considered a good "diner out" and generally does dine out in society. Trollope says he looks like a gentleman, is well dressed and never awkward, and to leave us with no doubt about the matter says further, "That Mr. Maurice Maule was a real gentleman no judge in such matters had ever doubted."
This man is thoroughly selfish and conceited. Because he has completely turned his interest upon himself, and refused to admit that others have claim upon his attention or that he has duties and responsibilities, he is useless in two important respects. First of all, he has utterly failed to meet his duties as an owner of the land, as a squire. He cares nothing for the details of farming, causes the estate and the tenants to be placed in the hands of trustees, and allows Maule Abbey to go to ruin through his neglect. He has not been near his property for the last ten years, and very obviously does not function as a landowner.

In this respect Maule is reminiscent of the second Lord Ballindine in The Kelleys and the O'Kelleys, who remained permanently at court and through his neglect allowed the unscrupulous agent, "Sim" Lynch, to swindle him of a large portion of his estate. The selfish and dissolute Earl Grex is of the same cloth. His family seat, through his neglect, is "...so sadly out of repair as to be altogether unfit for the residence of a gentleman and his family." He had not been near the estate for years, and it has gone to utter ruin.

Secondly Maule's selfishness has resulted in utter indifference as a parent. His daughter ran off with an Irish cousin, and they are living on his professional
income as a captain in a foot regiment. A younger son went completely to the dogs and disappeared, "...and the father was perhaps thankful that he was thus saved from trouble." His eldest son, Gerard, having eight hundred pounds a year of his own, "...was living an idle, desultory life, hardly with prospects of better success than had attended his father." The two rarely meet, and really have no recognized ground for meeting. When Gerard asks his father's permission to live at Maule Abbey, an economy measure that will allow Gerard to marry, his selfish father peremptorily refuses, although Maurice knows he will never live there himself. At the age of fifty-five his most earnest desire is to marry money, the money to be used for no other purpose than the gratification and self-indulgence of Mr. Maule. Nothing else is of importance. Because of this man's selfishness, then, his property, his function in society, his name, and his children have all suffered, and he himself has barely managed to keep from reaching the point of no return.

We saw in the second chapter that Trollope is particularly concerned with the importance of nurture and breeding on the gentlemanly level. Apparently he deeply feels the obligation of parents to children on this score, and considers a young child greatly handi-
capped when a parent dies. It seems clear, as we have seen, that to Trollope the gentleman's sense of duty and noblesse oblige come primarily as the result of parental training. If so, such nurture cannot be ignored or handled indifferently by a governing class, if that class intends to survive.

Gerard Maule is an obvious product of his father's selfish indifference. He is utterly purposeless, does nothing with himself, and would be completely idle, if it were not for the fact that he hunts—and even his hunting is not of very high calibre. However, Trollope often redeems selfish and useless young gentlemen through love, and Gerard fortunately falls in love with Adelaide Palliser, cousin of Plantagenet Palliser. His eventual marriage to this girl may be the factor that keeps Gerard on the right side of the fence and that may ultimately lead to his becoming of some utility. At any rate, since money is necessary to allow marriage at the social level at which they move, Trollope sees to it that Adelaide becomes possessor of a legacy at the necessary moment. Here we see the saving quality of money as one of the gentlemanly characteristics, for the money is needed to allow love the opportunity to function properly.

This situation is suggestive of Lord Chiltern, whose
marriage with Violet Effingham in all probability is the factor that saves him from falling from the class. Love serves the turn in this case, dispels selfishness, and causes Chiltern to settle down and find an acceptable and useful niche in the world. Violet, of course, is necessarily a wealthy heiress, and the money that allows their marriage is employed usefully from Trollope's point of view.

Gerard's courtship can best be described as lackadaisical and desultory. Although Adelaide loves him, she nevertheless has qualms about marrying him. "What could she do with a man who had no ideas of his own as to what he ought to do with himself?" Lady Chiltern, on the other hand, favors the match. To her, Gerard "...was a gentleman, was tainted by no vices, and was truly in love." Nevertheless, the ladies have to tackle the problems of where the young couple may possibly live, and what they may live on. Not that Gerard doesn't love Adelaide, for he does. He simply is aimless, completely inexperienced in meeting problems, and in his own way, selfish. By and large, the portrait of Gerard shows the harm that can result from careless and indifferent training.

Other instances of selfish and indifferent fathers who produce similar offspring are the Rev. Vesey
Stanhope, whom we shall soon see in more detail; the dissolute Earl Grex, whose daughter, Lady "Mab," ruins her life through selfishness; Lord Augustus Trefoil, who passes his life in eating, drinking, and playing whist, and who has utterly abandoned his wife and daughter; Adolphus Longestaffe, Sr., who produces a snobbish and useless group of children; and Mr. De Baron, the indifferent father of the selfish and self-seeking Adelaide.

The Hon. and Rev. Vesey Stanhope, the canon in residence (or who should have been in residence) when Bishop Proudie took over in Barchester, closely parallels Maurice Maule. Years have passed since he has done a day's work, although nothing has prevented him from performing his duties except sheer idleness. He holds a prebendal stall in the diocese, one of the best residences in the close, and has the cure of three parishes; but in actuality, he has been in Italy for the last twelve years, adding to his unique collection of butterflies. His residing in Italy weighs heavily in his disfavor, for Trollope, we have observed, is strongly prejudiced against Englishmen living abroad. Such Englishmen serve no function and do not earn their keep, whether the money comes as rents from estates, or from sinecures such as Dr. Stanhope's.
Trollope's disapproval of the uselessness of this clerical parasite is unmistakable, and is sharpened when we remember his feeling for the underpaid and conscientious Rev. Josiah Crawley. When Stanhope and family return to Barchester, for instance, "...he felt himself from disuse to be unfit for parochial duty; but his prebendal home was kept empty for him, and he thought it probable that he might be able now and again to preach a prebendal sermon."

As might be expected, the Stanhope family is a selfish one. Trollope says that their great family characteristic is "heartlessness," and that they are indifferent to the happiness and well-being of those about them. Such good qualities as the doctor himself possesses are all "negative." He likes good living, is lazy, not very religious, and rarely obtrudes religious convictions on his children. This abstinence is not deliberate; he is simply so idle that "...his time for doing so had never come till the opportunity for doing so was gone for ever."

Nevertheless, Dr. Stanhope feels his failure as a father and a clergyman. Sometimes, gentlemanly feelings well up within the man. For instance, he is infuriated at his son Bertie's indebtedness. That the son of a clergyman of the Church of England should be in such a
state of affairs! Thinking of his children, however, brings his mind back upon himself. "If they were all bad, who had made them so? If they were unprincipled, selfish, and disreputable, who was to be blamed for the education which had had so injurious an effect?" Here Trollope unmistakably indicates the disastrous results of flight from duty. The man's selfishness and idleness (and his wife is as bad) are instrumental in producing a heartless, selfish, useless group of children. And so, like Maurice Maule, because of selfishness Dr. Stanhope ceases to be useful in two respects—as a churchman and as a parent.

Bertie Stanhope is an even worse product than his parallel, Gerard Maule. He is a spoiled, idle youth without a profession and without a shilling of his own. He is flighty and heartless, has no sense of rank and no prejudices—in fact, is most un-English. Bertie's performance at Mrs. Proudie's reception is enough to convince anyone that Bertie will never fit into Barchester society. He makes no attempt to provide for himself and seems to care nothing for the future. In his general indifference to life he resembles Gerard Maule, but he does not possess the one important power of Gerard's—the ability to love. He has little to keep him from absolute ruin, but Trollope shows clearly
It has been said that Bertie Stanhope was a man without principle. He certainly was so. He had no power of using active mental exertion to keep himself from doing evil. Evil had no ugliness in his eyes; virtue no beauty. He was void of any of these feelings which actuate men to do good. But he was perhaps equally void of those which actuate men to do evil. He got into debt with utter recklessness, thinking nothing as to whether the tradesmen would ever be paid or not. But he did not invent active schemes of deceit for the sake of extracting the goods of others. ... he never contrived active villainy. 35

Aristocratic uselessness is emphasized in Trollope's account of the old Duke of Omnium, an extremely rich man of high rank and position who does nothing except gratify himself. The Duke cares nothing for statesmanship and is interested in politics only for whatever power he may obtain. In the Barchester novels, he constantly handles people with that selfish end in mind. For instance, in Framley Parsonage he is pleasant enough when he entertains the huge party at Gatherum Castle, but almost everyone is there for a purpose. His cordial treatment of Frank Gresham, now the richest commoner in the county, is a far cry from the treatment Frank received when yet the son of an impoverished squire. Frank may be useful now!

Trollope's indisputable condemnation of the Duke's uselessness and selfishness in the Palliser novels is
even more emphatic, because he develops a fondness for the old man, particularly as the Duke approaches death. One of the most clear-cut examples of such condemnation appears in *Phineas Finn* when Trollope is contrasting the old Duke with the Duke of St. Bungay.

I hardly know why it should have been so, but the Duke of Omnium was certainly a greater man in public estimation than the other duke then present,—the Duke of St. Bungay. The Duke of St. Bungay was a useful man, and had been so all his life, sitting in Cabinets and serving his country, constant as any peer in the House of Lords, always ready to take on his own shoulders any troublesome work required of him . . . But the Duke of Omnium had never yet done a day's work on behalf of his country. They both wore the Garter, the Duke of St. Bungay having earned it by service, the Duke of Omnium having been decorated with the blue ribbon,—because he was Duke of Omnium. The one was a moral, good man, a good husband, a good father, and a good friend. The other,—did not bear quite so high a reputation. 37

The details of the contrast are informative. Bungay is useful because he serves his country and participates in the process of governing; Omnium is not. It is interesting that the useful man—the one who gives of himself—is the moral, good man, husband, father, and friend. In contrast, Omnium has never married, is a debauchee, and has no real friends, with the exception, perhaps, of Madame Max Goesler, who feels sorry for him. But even through her, Trollope condemns the idleness and uselessness of the man's life. When, at the point of death,
the old man expresses fear that he has failed as a duke, Madame Max reassures him. "Then she told him he had ever lived as a great nobleman ought to live. And, after a fashion, she herself believed what she was saying. Nevertheless, her nature was much nobler than his; and she knew that no man should dare to live idly as the Duke had lived." Another bit of evidence helps confirm Madame Max's estimate; for Trollope says, "...perhaps, no man who had lived during the same period, or any portion of the period, had done less, or had devoted himself more entirely to the consumption of good things without the slightest idea of producing anything in return!"

The Duke is certainly one of the outstanding examples in Trollope of a peer who does nothing to justify the privileges of his rank, just as Plantagenet Palliser, the successor to his title, is a man whom Trollope thought justified "...the seeming anomaly of an hereditary peerage and of primogeniture." Other peers fall into the same selfish, extravagant, pleasure-seeking group, although none perhaps achieves the exclusive bearing of the Duke. The Marquis of Auld Reekie and Earl Grex are noblemen whose lives have been spent in extravagance; Dumbello, who becomes Marquis of Hartle-top, stands out as a stupid worthless fool; and Lord
Rufford is called one of "our pleasure-seekers" and is used by Trollope as typical of that type.

Quite as useless are two typical gentlemen from the sporting world. No one who has read The American Senator can quite forget the fatal hunting accident of Major Caneback, the famed huntsman, and the great ball held at Rufford as he lies dying. Poor Caneback does not receive much sympathy. "But he had loved no one particularly, and... had been of very little use in the world, and had done very little more for society than any other horse-trainer!" The same sentiment holds for Reginald Dobbes, the ardent sportsman of Crummie-Toddie, who subordinates everything to sport. After describing the man at considerable length, Trollope spears him with a single sentence of criticism. "But it never occurred to him that his whole life was one of self-indulgence."

Another group of even more useless gentlemen is the young set that habituates the Beargarden club in The Way We Live Now, a club opened "...with the express view of combining parsimony with profligacy." Generally speaking, Trollope is lenient and sympathetic towards the idea of young men sowing their wild oats, but his leniency and sympathy do not extend to these rowdies. Critics agree that Trollope wrote this novel to satirize the evils of the English upper classes in the 1870's,
and so the Beargarden set receives a great deal of his attention. Basically these youths lead an idle and selfish existence, filled with gambling, drinking, and dissipation in general. The chief members are Sir Felix Carbury; Lord Nidderdale, whose family feels it necessary that he marry for money; Miles Grendall, the not too scrupulous son of Lord Alfred Grendall; Dolly Longestaffe, the heir of the snobbish Longestaffes; and Lord Grasslough, "...ugly, vicious, ill-tempered, and without any power of recommending himself to a girl."

None of these men has any real occupation or profession. Of course, Nidderdale is a Member of Parliament, but he readily admits that he doesn't attend unless his vote is needed. Both he and Felix are members of Melmotte's board of directors, but they do nothing and understand nothing that is going on. Three of them—Felix, Nidderdale and Grasslough—have callously wooed Marie Melmotte solely for the sake of her money.

This selfish and idle life helps produce active evil in two of its members. We know already the fate of Sir Felix Carbury; and Miles Grendall, in an attempt to get money quickly, resorts to cheating at cards and disappears from the scene at the beginning of Melmotte's downfall. Grasslough and Dolly Longestaffe apparently
do not change. When the Beargarden closes for a time, Dolly sorrows greatly. "The Beargarden had become so much to him that he had begun to doubt whether life would be even possible without such a resort for his 48 hours."

But Nidderdale does begin to change. He realizes 49 his own faults, and the gentlemanly tradition begins to have effect. He can no more believe in Melmotte's forging, for instance, than he could believe that Miles Grendall had cheated at cards. The idea is "...as improbable and shocking to him as that an officer should run away in battle. Common soldiers, he thought, might 50 do that sort of thing." When Nidderdale learns of Melmotte's ruin, he concludes that he cannot marry Marie now, since he thinks there is no money, and he suffers guilty pangs because of his obvious obligations to the girl. The incident that has a tremendous effect on Nidderdale is Marie's sending for him after her father's suicide. His father advises him not to go. "But Nidderdale's better feelings would not allow him to submit to this advice. He had been engaged to marry the girl, and she in her abject misery had turned to him as the friend she knew best. At any rate for the time the heartlessness of his usual life deserted him, and he felt willing to devote himself to the girl not
for what he could get,—but because she had so nearly
been so near to him." At the Melmotte house, Nidderdale takes charge of the situation, and handles for Marie and her mother whatever details are necessary, all of which is useful and unselfish on his part.

His change of heart has very decided results. When he learns from Melmotte's confidential clerk of Marie's own fortune, he replies, "'I am very glad to hear it for her sake..." and thus demonstrates dawning unselfishness. The idea of marrying her for her money does not now enter his mind. His generosity to Marie has thus helped begin a regeneration. Toward the end of the novel, when the Beargarden is nearing extinction, Nidderdale says, "'I don't think anybody has liked the Beargarden so much as I have, but I shall never try this kind of thing again. I shall begin reading blue books to-morrow, and shall dine at the Carlton. Next session I shan't miss a day in the House, and I'll bet anybody a fiver that I make a speech before Easter.'" His resolution very clearly replaces selfishness and self-gratification with the more unselfish ideas of service and utility.

Conway Dalrymple, Charlie Tudor, and Lord Silverbridge provide additional evidence of potentially selfish young men achieving utility, in these cases
love being materially assisted by a sort of moral shock-treatment. Conway's love for Clara Van Siever begins his switch to unselfishness. It is the shock of Dobbs Broughton's suicide, however, which causes him to see starkly the error of his past life, and as he prepares to tell Mrs. Broughton of her husband's death, he thinks of her and not of himself, and wonders how he can be of assistance to her in her time of need.

Charlie Tudor's love for Katie Woodward is also his redeeming possession, but Alaric Tudor's misfortune brings out the usefulness of the man. His devoted and selfless attention and assistance to Gertrude Tudor, after Alaric has been sentenced to prison, remind us of Dalrymple, and both men remind us again of Nidderdale's unselfish assistance to Marie Melmotte after her father's death. Silverbridge is brought right by love and a growing moral awareness, partially the result, undoubtedly, of losing seventy thousand pounds on a single race. By the close of *The Duke's Children* Silverbridge has resolved to desert the Beargarden and horse racing, and to settle down and devote himself to an active Parliamentary career. In these three young men, quite clearly selfishness is being replaced by usefulness.

And this is most certainly what Trollope had in
mind—to achieve utility by dispelling selfishness. Sir Gregory Hardlines' pronouncement on the efficacy of subordinating one's private interests to public service; Lady Lufton's realization that Lucy Robarts has acquired the chief of all powers, that "...of sacrificing herself for the sake of others..."; Plantagenet Palliser's lecture on the close relationship between unselfishness and utility to others—all of these point in the same direction. We have seen that selfishness is incompatible with the true spirit of the gentleman, and in the world of gentlemen that Trollope depicted, the more unselfish a gentleman becomes the more Trollope approves of him.

That useless gentlemen exist does not invalidate the gentlemanly tradition and the gentlemanly characteristics. Such gentlemen are simply evidence of the system ineffectively or wrongly operated. Many of the useless young gentlemen that have been discussed, for instance, are useless as the result of improper training and education, and even among these the gentlemanly characteristics, working in an impaired manner, often help bring an individual through to Trollope's approval.

Closely allied to the useless are the gentlemen who are weak in some respect. Weakness is another undesirable characteristic of the gentleman to Trollope; and in the
final analysis, his best gentlemen are always strong. Of course, many gentlemen are both weak and useless, but almost always in such cases, a man's uselessness seems to be the direct product of his weakness. Thus weakness, as well as selfishness, can result in diminished utility, and can bring harmful results to the class of gentlemen as a whole through the individual's inadequate and ineffective handling of his particular duties and responsibilities. But aside from the effect on the class as a whole, Trollope also shows that weakness can bring harm to the individual gentleman himself by causing him to lose his self-respect and sense of dignity.

Actually, since only a small number of weak gentlemen appear in the novels, this fact also testifies to Trollope's faith in blood lines. Unlike selfishness, however, weakness is not so easily controlled by education, the second of the gentlemanly characteristics, although proper training certainly helps upon occasion. But the characteristic of position often greatly helps, as when a gentleman succeeds to a landed estate and overcomes weakness by assuming the duties and responsibilities of a landlord. And so again, this time in relation to gentlemen temperamentally weak, the saving tendencies of the gentlemanly characteristics are
observed at work.

Frank Gresham, Sr., and Bernard Amedroz, both landed squires, aptly illustrate what harm weakness can bring to land, position, and children. Squire Gresham rapidly became a very poor man through expensive electioneering brought on by his own weakness and folly, and through the extravagance of his wife, one of the snobbish De Courcys, whose spending he was unable to curb. Refusing to face reality, however, he foolishly insisted on bringing the county hounds to Greshamsbury, having to make further financial concessions to his wife in order to achieve this desire. So, when his son comes of age, Mr. Gresham is "...an embarrassed man." Though the world at large does not know this fact to any extent, his tenants do. They contrast the magnificent celebration at young Frank's birth with the meagre affair held at his coming of age, and none of them are proud of their squire by the time of the second event.

Certain evils result from this weakness. To meet his debts, the squire has been forced to sell one-third of the original property, which any reader of Trollope will recognize as a cardinal sin, and has heavily mortgaged the remaining portion of the estate. He has thus broken faith with his forebears, whose pride it had been to pass the property from father to son without
the need of an entail, and he has grievously injured his son. "This made the squire an unhappy man. No man loved his family name and honour, his old family blazon and standing more thoroughly than he did: he was every whit a Gresham in heart, but his spirit had been weaker than that of his forefathers; and in his days, for the first time, the Greshams were to go to the wall!" Another evil results from this weakness, perhaps the greatest of them all. Because the property is so embarrassed, Squire Gresham concurs in the conclusion of his wife and the Countess De Courcy that Frank must marry money. To Trollope, nothing is more abominable than the marriage for money. To him it is a buying and selling transaction, an ungentlemanly violation of fundamental human emotions, and time after time he condemns it. To say the least, he has little respect for a father who concurs in such a marriage, even if the man acts in desperation.

The blame lies squarely upon the shoulders of the Squire. During the first few years of married life, he snobbishly desired most of the things his wife did, and in later years, his weakness and lack of resolution are responsible. His injury to his son grieves him, but does not deter him from weakly borrowing another ten thousand pounds on the property in order to insure
his daughter Augusta's marriage to Moffat, the tailor's son, a marriage of arrangement effected exclusively by De Courcy interests to a man whom Gresham knows is not a gentleman. The Squire's weakness thus hurts his family name, his property, his position, his children, and his own self-respect.

Although manifested in a different form, the weakness of Squire Bernard Amedroz brings somewhat similar results. Amedroz held high hopes for his son, spoiled the boy and even encouraged him in his recklessness until affairs got out of hand, the boy grew wilder and wilder, piled debt upon debt, and lie upon lie, and finally blew his brains out. Although the father met the debts, he sacrificed the life assurances which were to have made provision for his daughter, and largely sacrificed his own life income, so that the property should not be utterly ruined at his death. Trollope points out that Amedroz did nothing to restrain the son and in actuality blames him for the consequences. He makes very clear that Amedroz is not a bad man, but that he has always been very useless, having accomplished little in the world.

There are two important results of this man's weakness and uselessness. As in the case of Gresham, there is the effect upon others, far more serious in this
instance—his son's terrible death and the beggaring of his daughter. And, again, there is the effect upon himself as an individual. To pay the debts, Amedroz resorted to drastic steps. He sold the carriage horses; he let the park to a farmer—up to the very hall door of the castle; and he forced himself to live in extremely straitened circumstances. Such necessities affect the self-esteem of the man, although his self-pity and whining querulousness prevent him from receiving the reader's sympathy.

Weakness also leads to lack of self-respect when it causes a gentleman to become servile and obsequious, for servility causes a loss of personal dignity that is dangerous to gentility. Johnny Eames realizes this danger, for instance, when he resolves not to fetch Sir Raffle Buffle's shoes if asked to do so. He tells Lady Julia De Guest, "'And one has always to be on one's guard lest he should make one do something that is—is—that isn't quite the thing for a gentleman. You understand;—what the messenger ought to do.'"

This loss of self-respect is well illustrated by such characters as Bishop Proudie, Sir Anthony Aylmer, Archie Clavering, and Lord Alfred Grendall. All of these gentlemen weakly allow others to dominate them and determine their actions. Bishop Proudie, a rather
tragic figure, is probably the most widely-known of the group, being a classic example of the henpecked husband. Although his snobbishness and uselessness seem his most noticeable characteristics when we first meet him, his weakness is actually his outstanding trait. His wife dominates him, and he never finds complete courage to turn on her. Of course, his function as a bishop is consequently enormously hindered. He knows that Mrs. Proudie has no conception of the limits of his authority; yet he weakly subscribes to her dictates. But the shame of his humiliation and disgrace far overshadow his diminished utility as a bishop. After Mrs. Proudie has clashed with Dr. Tempest, for example, the Bishop reveals his bent spirit, as he says, "'When a man's heart is broken, he cannot forget it...'" And later his spirit is completely broken. He feels intense shame and considers resigning his diocese. To the individual, then, the terrible products of weakness are degrading humiliation and shame.

Like Bishop Proudie, Sir Anthony Aylmer is also henpecked. He is of little use as a county magistrate; and his wife, not he, runs the estate. He is deprived of such manly pleasures as club life, and is reduced to such forms of assertion as browbeating the servants—
when his wife is absent. Even his son recognizes the father's weakness and resolves to be master of his house when he marries. Sir Anthony's state of vassalage is such that only after it appears that his wife has accepted Clara Amedroz, does he "creep" out of his own quarters and chat with her during his wife's absence. Occasionally he voices a protest, but never to his wife, and never does he make an active move toward gaining control. Like Proudie, he too realizes his failing, though not as clearly, and though he is harmless, he is thoroughly valueless.

Archie Clavering and Lord Alfred Grendall are both younger sons who have no professions, and who have run through what money they originally possessed. Archie gambles, is idle, and according to Harry Clavering, "'...does no good in the world to anybody.'" He is reduced to living upon the largess of his brother, Sir Hugh, just as Lord Alfred and family have for years lived on the contributions of their unwilling relatives. Hugh is a domineering man, and Archie, fearful for his bread and butter, serves as flunky to his brother—ringing the bell for servants, and looking after the horses. Lord Alfred likewise serves as a bellringer to Augustus Melmotte, who has helped him financially in return for Lord Alfred's company and social know-how.
Both, of course, resent their servile position, but are too weak to break with their oppressors. In a memorable passage Archie weighs himself in the balance and finds he is wanting.

In some inexplicable manner he put himself into the scales and weighed himself, and discovered his own weight with fair accuracy. . . . How he did this,--how such men as Archie Clavering do it,--I cannot say; but they do weigh themselves, and know their own weight and shove themselves aside as being too light for any real service in the world. This they do, though they may fluster with their voices, and walk about with their noses in the air, and swing their canes, and try to look as large as they may. They do not look large, and they know it; and consequently they ring the bells, and look after the horses, and shove themselves on one side, so that the heavier weights may come forth and do the work. 72

Lord Alfred resents Melmotte's increasing arrogance and intimacy, and in spite of his "habitual idleness and vapid uselessness" sometimes wants to kick Melmotte and be done with it. But he never does. He "...had been born and bred a gentleman, and found the position in which he was now earning his bread to be almost insupportable." The money, however, he does not find insupportable, as Trollope bluntly observes.

Not all weaklings, of course, remain unapproved. Often, it appears, the assuming of responsibility enables some of them to win Trollope's approval. One excellent example is Everett Wharton, the vacillating, apparently
hopeless son of Abel Wharton, a youth who changes over-night when he becomes heir to Wharton Hall and thus finds a direction in life for himself. George Germain, the weak younger brother of the Marquis of Brotherton, is another. Although he is reluctant to become head of the family, the responsibility he assumes also effects an acute change in him, causing him to become a pattern statesman, landlord, and father. And Ralph Newton, the weak and useless heir to Newton Priory, becomes somewhat less weak as he assumes the duties and responsibilities of the estate upon his succession. Although his resolutions do not always hold, considerable improvement is discernible.

Weakness, then, is not approved for two basic reasons—it is detrimental to the gentlemanly class as a whole and to the individual gentleman; for weakness can lead to the diminished utility of a gentleman to society, and weakness is dangerous to the individual gentleman because it may lead to the loss of the self-respect and dignity necessary to him.

Snobs also help compose Trollope's unapproved section of the gentlemanly class. Here again we find selfishness and self-seeking to be the dominating characteristic. The snobs are interested only in themselves, and so inevitably they are largely engaged in the search for
money and position. Most of them possess little or no ability to love outside themselves. Snobbish parents, of course, believe they love their children, but their snobbish outlook and intervention often leads to difficulties or unhappiness for their offspring.

Snobbishness results from the gentlemanly characteristics being viewed in a selfish manner. So viewed, birth, education, position and money become simply ends in themselves, and valued for that reason, instead of becoming means to the end of unselfishness and service to others and to country, which is one of the chief goals of the gentlemanly tradition as Trollope conceives it. Such a misconception and distortion is very plainly the result of improper and confused training, if not of little training or none at all. Again, Trollope's tribute to the efficacy of the gentlemanly tradition can be found in the fact that by far the highest proportion of his ubiquitous snobs are to be found among non-gentlemen.

Fortunately Trollope provides a fairly explicit treatment of snobbery in his Thackeray, although it is indirect in that he is questioning Thackeray's own concept of the subject as presented in The Book of Snobs. He speaks specifically of flattery, falsehood, cowardice, lying, time-serving, and money-worship as
snobbish. But he warns that a man is never snobbish if he acts in genuine accordance with the traditions of his particular rank and position, even though they be out of date. To Trollope, the intent behind an action determines its snobbishness. An action based on affectation or pretense is snobbish, no matter who does it. A comparatively poor man is no more a snob than a duke, if he gives a grand dinner because he thinks his friends will enjoy it. But if he ekes out his silverware with plated ware and pretends the plate is true silver, that is another matter. This idea of affectation is quite important, for lack of affectation, we recall, proved the most significant aspect of manliness, such an essential characteristic of Trollope's most approved gentlemen. By and large, affectation is the chief component of snobbery in Trollope's interpretation, other related components being over-concern with exterior appearances, and emphasis on false values.

Trollope is not afraid to say, for example, that a man is no snob because he feels graced by the attention or society of a "great man." He bases this contention on an argument that appears in his novels many times.

They who have raised themselves in the world, and they, too, whose position has enabled them to receive all that estimation can give, all that society can furnish, all that intercourse with the great can give are more likely to be
pleasant companions than they who have been less fortunate... there can be no doubt that a peer taken at random as a companion would be preferable to a clerk from a counting-house—taken at random. The clerk might turn out a scholar on your hands, and the peer no better than a poor spendthrift; but the chances are the other way. 76

If the man knows the peer to be unworthy, however, and seeks him solely for the sake of his title or his money, such action would be snobbish. The tuft-hunter is a snob, says Trollope, as also is the parasite, the man who is awed by a coronet, or he who worships mere wealth.

The novels substantiate this analysis of Trollope's views of snobbery. He very carefully points out, for instance, that Fanny Robarts is no snob, although she spoke a great deal about Lady Lufton to Lucy Robarts, when Lucy first arrived at the Robarts household. Fanny had been brought up under Lady Lufton's wing...

...and of course she regarded her as being worthy of much talking. Do not let persons on this account suppose that Mrs. Robarts was a tuft-hunter, or a toad-eater. If they do not see the difference they have yet got to study the earliest principles of human nature." His dislike for fawning snobbery and affectation is revealed in Phineas Redux when the Royal Prince appears at the Universe, a fashionable London club.
All of the snobs immediately begin lionizing him, but not Mr. Monk, who is preparing to leave. Phineas Finn tells Monk that it is not the proper thing to leave while the Prince is there, but Monk replies that a quiet man like himself can creep out without notice, and he goes "without much creeping." He is going because he has no key and does not want to keep his servant up any longer! An example of affectation and emphasis on external appearance is furnished by the honeymoon of Adolphus Crosbie and his wife. Since from the De Courcy point of view an outward show must be made, on the Crosbies' honeymoon the chief expenditures are to be on externals. Ride in a carriage and skimp on your meals! Trollope, feeling deeply about this particular situation, cannot refrain from commenting, "Oh, deliver us from the poverty of those who, with small means, affect a show of wealth! There is no whitening equal to that of sepulchres whitened as they are whitened!"

The worshippers of rank and money—those who emphasize false values—also appear among the class of gentlemen, although in many cases these snobs are borderline members. Old Lady Macleod, who reared Alice Vavasor, Trollope calls a good woman, though subject to one of the most serious drawbacks to goodness which
can afflict a lady—or, it should be added, a gentleman. "...in worldly matters she was a devout believer in the high rank of her noble relatives." Sir Raffle Buffle, Johnny Eames' superior in the Income Tax Office, is an insufferable snob whose life is a tissue of envy and affectation. He pretends former close attachment to the Earl De Guest, and likes having Johnny for his secretary because of the young man's intimacy with the Earl and because the Earl has left Johnny money. Two other good examples are the hangers-on, Captain Gunner and Major Pountney, whom the Duchess of Omnium enlisted among her followers as being useful in their way. These two know the peerage by heart, and can tell the details of every unfortunate marriage for the last twenty years. Each thinks he has thoroughly succeeded in life by sitting down to dinner three times a week with peers and peeresses.

Trollope's pages are indeed filled with snobs of all descriptions—the fawning, the self-seeking, the parasites, the affected, and the envious. Other outstanding snobs from the class of gentlemen are Lady Aylmer, the incredible Longestaffes, and the Trefoils, mother and daughter. The list of non-gentlemanly snobs is even longer, particularly the social-climbers who move on the fringe of fashionable society—Mr. Bott,
the Rev. Joseph Groschut, Mrs. Tappitt, the Bonteens, Botseys, Broughtons, Monograms, Robys, and Trafficks.

Perhaps the most rewarding approach to understanding Trollope's concept of the snob in his relation to society is to examine an entire family of the species, the unforgettable De Courcys. Snobbism runs through this family like a virus, producing the ravaging effects of a disease. Not only does it damage the members of the family itself but also those with whom they come in contact. Through their pretense, their emphasis on appearance before the world, their condescension premised on an unfounded sense of superiority, their sacrifice of basic human values and qualities in the never-ending search for money, Trollope reveals how snobbishness can produce a useless, selfish group of persons, worthless in social or personal utility, and potentially, if not actively, dangerous to others. He treats them humorously for the most part, poking fun at their foibles, for he never forgets the axiom "There but for the grace of God go I!" but the implications of danger are present, and his disapproval of these people is obvious. Pretence, the relinquishing of love and affection for the sake of money and position, the worship of money and position as ends rather than as means to the end of service to others, all of this resolves
into the familiar theme of selfishness. And so it is not surprising that the De Courcys are useless—to their country, to others, and to themselves. Their snobbishness brings unhappiness, discontent, and even suffering.

The Earl De Courcy, head of the clan, is less snobbish than his wife, but the taint is certainly there. He is a useless, extremely selfish man, who has loved to live expensively and recklessly. Lord De Courcy has been a court Whig, "...following the fortunes and enjoying, when he could get it, the sunshine of the throne. He was a sojourner at Windsor, and a visitor at Balmoral. He delighted in gold sticks, and was never so happy as when holding some cap of maintenance or spur of precedence with due dignity and acknowledged grace in the presence of all the court." During his life he has been much away from home following his own selfish aims. As a parent, he frankly confesses that he has never concerned himself with his daughters—and he rightfully should include his sons as well.

His wife, Rosina, is the snob drawn to perfection. She never loses awareness of the fact that she is a countess, and automatically adopts an air of condescension toward anyone below her rank. Her reactions to people are the mechanical result of these prejudiced attitudes, reactions which can change hurriedly in the
presence of money. For example, she is originally scandalized at the possibility of Frank Gresham marrying Mary Thorne, but when Mary becomes an heiress, Lady Rosina and all the De Courcys immediately accept her and smilingly attend Frank's wedding. Lady Rosina, despite her constant efforts, manages to marry off only two of her daughters, one to an attorney who is scarcely a gentleman, and the other to Adolphus Crosbie, who provides little in the way of rank, position, or money.

With such parents, what could be expected from the children? Not much, of course, and they turn out a motley crew. Lord Porlock, the eldest son, hates his father and they never meet. Porlock leads a reckless, dissolute life, which ends in his marrying a woman of questionable reputation, so that his brother-in-law Gazebee declares that he has gone altogether to ruin. The Hon. George is the next son in age. He too has been a spendthrift and a wastrel. Well-schooled in the precept that as a younger son he must marry money, finally, around the age of forty, George does his duty—by marrying the wealthy daughter of a coal merchant, a fact which makes his parents happy, although they do not quite know what to do with their daughter-in-law. But, although George now has money enough to maintain himself,
he parasitically proceeds to live off his father's bounty, even contriving to obtain his wife's dresses from the maternal milliner. Eventually, his father turns him out of the house. John is cut from the same bolt. His snobbishness is pointed up through contrasting him with his unsnobbish cousin, Frank Gresham. First of all, snobbery has warped John's normal affections. Upon Frank's coming of age, for instance, John congratulates Frank upon being an elder son and reflects that his own chances of inheriting are slim. "What chance have I? There's Porlock's as strong as a horse; and then George comes next. And the governor's good for these twenty years.' And the young man sighed as he reflected what small hope there was that all those who were nearest and dearest to him should die out of his way, and leave him to the sweet enjoyment of an earl's coronet and fortune." Frank cannot comprehend John's blithe remarks about a father's death as a stroke of luck. He loves his father, and would consider such an event a great misfortune. Secondly, snobbery has caused John to emphasize false values. He is aghast at the heir to Greshamsbury going out before the county with only one untrained horse and a pony. With John, who does not ride well, the show of the thing is important. Frank has never looked on the matter
snobbishly; his plan is to train the one horse so that nothing in Barsetshire can stop him.

The four De Courcy daughters as a whole are as snobbish as their mother. Rosina, a frustrated spinster, is something of a religious fanatic. Actually, her life should serve as a warning to her sister Margaretta, also unmarried, who never forgets that she is a De Courcy and an earl's daughter. Margaretta has sacrificed to this idea of duty "...all popularity, adulation, and such admiration as would have been awarded to her as a well-dressed, tall, fashionable, and by no means stupid young woman. To be at all times in something higher than they who were manifestly below her in rank—that was the effort that she was ever making."

Amelia is perhaps the prize package. She serves as counselor to her cousin, Augusta Gresham, who has problems resulting from her own snobbishness. For instance, Augusta loves Mr. Gazebee, but is dubious about marrying him because he is an attorney. Amelia, who is thirty-four and unmarried, forbids the marriage, lectures Augusta about the duties and responsibilities of blood and rank, and causes the match to be broken off. Then, in a master stroke of underhandedness, Amelia marries Gazebee herself. The other sister is Alexandrina, who marries Adolphus Crosbie. She marries him
because he is a man of fashion and because she thinks she will have more freedom as a married woman. The De Courcy touch is felt in all of the preparations for the marriage. The Crosbies must take a house in a fashionable section of London, and Alexandrina must have a carriage "...got up to look as though it were private." The house is not comfortable, but comfort is not the Countess' aim. In contrast, we remember the old Earl De Guest anticipating Johnny Eames' marriage and advising Johnny to live somewhere in Bloomsbury Square at first because a house can be rented there for practically nothing. "After all, what's fashion worth?" he asks. The inevitable De Courcy haggling and scrimping in the purchase of furniture and household equipment, contrasted with the outward pretence of opulence, makes Crosbie resolve that when he gets Alexandrina away from her family, he will teach her to drop some of this affectation, but Trollope himself is doubtful. "Teach her!—at some age over thirty; and with such careful training as she had already received!" Note the emphasis on home training here; and Crosbie soon learns what De Courcy training can mean.

Crosbie, himself a snob of magnitude, painfully depicts where snobbishness can lead. His desire for fashionable life, and for alliance with the glitter and
pomp of a coronet, leads him to jilt Lily Dale and marry Alexandrina. From the beginning, Crosbie realizes his mistake, and Trollope is careful to point out that it has resulted from his selfishness. Even before marriage he suffers acutely. He feels the eyes of the De Courcys watching his every move, and has to kick the Hon. John out of his rooms. When Mortimer Gazebee is sent to fetch him on Sunday afternoons, he feels like a dog with his teeth drawn. And he sees himself becoming the servant of the Countess. His marriage is not a success and finally ends in a separation. This is the result of seeking happiness from fashionable worldly society, particularly for seeking it through a loveless marriage.

"Could he have been prosecuted and put into prison, with hard labour, for twelve months, the punishment would not have been heavier. He would, in that case, at any rate, have been saved from Lady Alexandrina."

Their taint follows the De Courcys everywhere, influencing the lives of those with whom they come into contact and bringing misery and trouble. We have seen already how the snobbishness of Lady Arabella Gresham, the sister of Earl De Courcy, helped bring her husband to near ruin, and, of course, it has its effects upon her children. Her insistence upon Frank's marrying money causes him much anguish, and brings discord between
her family and the Thornes. Probably it helps ruin the life of her daughter Augusta, who, because of De Courcy instruction, can feel snobbish toward Mary Thorne as a match for Frank, at the same time that she is going to marry Moffat, a tailor's son, redeemed to her because of his position as an M.P. and because of his wealth. As we have seen, she later sacrifices her love for Gazebee on the altar of snobbishness. And the fact that Mary Thorne has inherited money does not alter the fact of her birth, according to Augusta, who conveniently forgets Moffat and Gazebee for the moment. "I don't want to break their hearts, certainly. But there are those who put their dearest and warmest feelings under restraint rather than deviate from what they know to be proper." Augusta snobbishly implies that rank and position are more important than love, and with this idea Trollope assuredly does not agree.

Thus the De Courcy family provides insight into Trollope's feeling of snobbishness and its effects. Here is a family whose life is filled with pretence, whose worship of money and rank as desirable ends and not as means to ends results in the sacrifice of such basic human values as love and affection. Their lives become cold, calculating, and utterly useless; for selfishness always intervenes. Such attitudes bring no
happiness to those who hold them, and can bring anguish and suffering to those with whom they live. Beatrice Curtis Brown has observed that sometimes one gets the feeling that while Trollope's pen was transcribing what he was "hearing" or "seeing" at a given moment of writing "...it was operating on a plane of reality which his conscious mind hardly apprehended," and his picture of the De Courcys may be a case in point.

The De Courcys portray the gentlemanly tradition in a vitiated and moribund form—a group devoid of all vitality and sense of function, with nothing remaining but hollowness and decay. Their tragic end is recorded in *The Prime Minister* with the brief reappearance of the daughter Rosina. Nothing of the piecemeal glory and splendor is left, Rosina herself now living in a little cottage outside the old park palings. Her brother, the Earl, is a ruined man, her younger brothers are all living abroad, her sisters have married rather lowly in the world, and her mother is dead. But through it all, Rosina "...still held fast within her bosom all the old pride of the De Courcys."

Such is the tenacity of snobbery, and at this point we turn from snobs to Thomas Platter Spooner of Spoon Hall, who represents yet another type of Trollope's unapproved gentlemen, the gentleman seriously deficient
in manners and tastes. Indeed, Mr. Spooner is somewhat of a Trollopian anomaly, a squire who is scarcely socially acceptable because of his lack of manners. In a drawing room, he is the proverbial bull in the china shop. In contrast, an innumerable list of mannered squires comes to mind--the Greshams, Christopher Dale, Roger Carbury, Sir Alured Wharton, Harry Gilmore, and the Mortons, to name some of the most important. This unmannered squire, however, appears in *Phineas Redux*, a relatively fully-drawn character whose deficiency demands discussion and explanation.

Spooners is called a "squire" who has achieved a certain amount of success as a "country gentleman," and is later listed among "gentlemen," though here the term may be used only perfunctorily. Lady Chiltern, moreover, tells him she has always heard there was no more respectable family in the county than the Spooners. Because she is speaking to Spooner, she may be more courteous than factual, though this is doubtful. He owns his own land, has an income of four thousand pounds a year, owes not a shilling, and has been High Sheriff for his county. Furthermore, his family has lived at Spoon Hall ever since the time of his great-great-grandfather, and his mother was one of the "Platters of Platter House." By using these facetious family names
Trollope seems to be ridiculing Mr. Spooner, particularly when the man traces his family tree for Lady Chiltern. But he is a true sportsman and is a "permanent assistant unpaid huntsman" to the Brake hounds. He is a devotee and in his constant attention to the sport and his duties as a squire, must be considered a man of some utility in his county.

Poor Spooner has the misfortune to fall in love with Adelaide Palliser, who is a girl "...with every feminine grace of motion, highly born, and carrying always the warranty of her birth in her appearance..." and whom we have previously seen to be deeply in love with Gerard Maule. She is a lady in all respects and much better educated than young ladies in general. In fact, Spooner decides to propose to the young lady, much to the consternation of Lord and Lady Chiltern, at whose home, Harrington Hall, Adelaide is visiting. To Lady Chiltern Spooner is an "oaf", and all the women at the house concur in this estimate.

Hunting season is at its height and Spooner has been staying at Harrington Hall for some reason relating to the hunt; it is clear he would not have been invited otherwise. Since the man is completely out of his element, the whole procedure of his proposal is humorous. He comes down to breakfast dressed in a dark blue frock...
coat, with a colored silk handkerchief round his neck, and is scarcely recognizable in this garb. To Phineas Finn he looks like "... an amateur actor got up in a miscellaneous middle-age costume." To Lady Baldock he is a "hog in armour." Altogether he is ill-at-ease and uncomfortable, thrown thus amongst ladies in the drawing room.

Eventually he contrives to propose to Adelaide and is flatly refused. He feels she considers him something altogether beneath her.

And so in truth she did. Miss Palliser had never analysed her own feelings and emotions about the Spooners whom she met in society; but she probably conceived that there were people in the world who, from certain accidents, were accustomed to sit at dinner with her, but who were no more fitted for her intimacy than were the servants who waited upon her. Such people were to her little more than the tables and chairs with which she was brought in contact. They were persons with whom it seemed to her to be impossible that she should have anything in common,—who were her inferiors, as completely as were the menials around her. Why she should thus despise Mr. Spooner, while in her heart of hearts she loved Gerard Maule, it would be difficult to explain. It was not simply an affair of age,—nor of good looks, nor altogether of education. Gerard Maule was by no means wonderfully erudite. They were both addicted to hunting. Neither of them did anything useful. In that respect Mr. Spooner stood the higher, as he managed his own property successfully. But Gerard Maule so wore his clothes, and so carried his limbs, and so pronounced his words that he was to be regarded as one entitled to make love to any lady; whereas poor Mr. Spooner was not justified in proposing to marry any woman much more gifted than his own housemaid.
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This analysis does not seem to be the result of snobbishness on Adelaide's part, for all of the women present obviously agree with her, and the men as well, with the possible exception of Chiltern, who later argues with his wife about Spooner's right to propose. To Chiltern, Spooner is a man of property and a gentleman, and hence possesses the right, although we never feel he is wholly convinced; to his wife Spooner is unfit in the sense that a butcher would be unfit. Moreover, Chiltern is angry during the argument, so that some of his statements might be recalled when viewed in a calmer mood. There does not seem much doubt, however, that Lady Chiltern's attitude is consistent. The difference between Maule and Spooner in this analysis is unmistakably manners. This point is emphasized later. When Spooner is rejected for the third time, Adelaide tells him, "'But you don't know anything of the difference in people if you think that any girl would look at you, after having been--loved by Mr. Maule.'" What accounts for the difference in her feelings toward the two men? Even if we assume Adelaide to be a snob, which she really is not, we soon see that Maule has no more pretensions to birth than Spooner, and possesses far less position
and money. It is true that Spooner is ugly, and that Adelaide objects to his ugliness, but his ugliness alone would not justify her feeling that he has no right to propose. The difference almost has to be manners. Of course, the possibility exists that Adelaide is simply voicing the unreasoning objections of a girl in love. But in answer we have the attitude of the Harrington Hall guests toward Spooner, an almost unanimous reaction. This attitude is confirmed by the person Spooner finally marries. Her name is Miss Leatherside, who was even more enthusiastic a hunter than he, and who "... was hardly the woman that one would have expected to meet as a friend in the drawing room of Lady Chiltern."

The conclusion seems inescapable that here is a member of the gentlemanly class who is unapproved, not because of birth, weakness, uselessness, snobbishness, or gross immorality, but for an aesthetic reason—lack of manners. To become more of a gentleman all round, Spooner would need more knowledge of how to dress, comport himself in society, converse easily, and generally feel at ease in the mixed company of the drawing room.

Inevitably, a problem arises—how to account for such absence of manners and taste in a man of Spooner's position. Trollope provides little help in finding the answer, for not a scrap of evidence appears about
Spooner's childhood or youth. Two possibilities exist. Perhaps he failed to receive normative home training and formal academic training, so that he had little contact with mannered folk. Or perhaps he is simply insensitive by nature. We do know that the family home has a library and also that Spooner can read, though with difficulty. His cousin Ned, who helps run the property, is obviously better educated and has much better taste. Whatever the reason, there seems little doubt that in Spooner Trollope is simply describing another type of gentleman he saw on the Victorian scene, one almost unique in the list of Trollopian characters.

In truth, a man of Mr. Spooner's position should have possessed better training in manners and taste, assuming, of course, that he was not utterly coarse by nature, which scarcely seems the case. He is Squire Western, a considerable cut above Western, certainly, but still not of Trollope's squirearchy. Had the gentlemanly characteristics and the gentlemanly tradition, particularly training, operated in normal fashion, we feel, Spooner would have been more Squire Harry Gilmore than Squire Western. Indeed, the rare occurrence of a Spooner again attests strongly to Trollope's faith in the success of the gentlemanly characteristics.

"First generation" gentlemen or those just rising
into the class must also be placed among the lower rank of gentlemen, despite the fact that the few fully-developed examples in Trollope are more highly approved than the majority of the useless, weak, and snobbish gentlemen. Trollope, however, never forgets for long the advantages conferred by the gentlemanly characteristics. As Abel Wharton remarks to his son Everett, "...a man does n't [sic] often become a gentleman in the first generation.'"

Time after time, Trollope allows for "nature's gentlemen" and avers there are none more willing than he to honor them when they appear. But he implies that few such gentlemen will appear, and his novels bear out this implication. Nevertheless, during the first half of the 1870's the problem of men rising into the class of gentlemen apparently concerned him. In Lady Anna (written in 1871), for instance, Daniel Thwaite, a tailor's son, marries Lady Anna Lovel. Anna's mother, relatives, and friends all try to prevent this marriage, but Anna feels honor-bound to Thwaite, who helped her and her mother in time of need. When it becomes apparent that Anna is determined, Sir William Patterson, a thorough gentleman, gives over and suggests that Daniel go into Parliament, saying that in fifteen years no one will remember that he was not once a gentleman. But Trollope does not
approve of Thwaite, and so Daniel and his bride emigrate to Australia. In The Way We Live Now (1873) and The Prime Minister (1874), the gate-crashing parvenues are thoroughly condemned—Melmotte, Lopez, the Robys and the Monograms. However, the next two novels, The American Senator (1875) and Is He Popenjoy? (1874-75) offer acceptable figures rising into the class, Larry Twentyman and Dean Lovelace.

Larry Twentyman owns some three hundred acres of land, which he farms himself. Such men, Trollope says, actually should be called yeomen, but like to style themselves gentleman-farmers. His grandfather had purchased the farm from a neighboring squire, his father had erected an excellent house, and now Larry prospers as a farmer of his own acres, keeping intact an inheritance of almost six thousand pounds. Moreover, he attended school for three years at Cheltenham College, and he also rides well to hounds and subscribes twenty-five pounds annually to the hunt.

The rise of Rev. Henry Lovelace, Dean of Brotherton Cathedral, reads like a Horatio Alger success story. He comes from very humble origin—his father was a livery stable keeper. He managed to obtain an education and when a poor curate, he married a girl of fortune whose family, rich tallow-chandlers, bought him a living.
Although he possessed no "church interest," from this point he rose to eminence through his own native abilities.

Both these men are thoroughly useful, reasonably strong, moral, upright, admirable persons, yet neither is a complete gentleman, to Trollope or to the people with whom they associate. Larry has about him a bit of dash, "...just a touch of swagger—which better breeding might have prevented." And Larry's lack of gentlemanly training shows up in another way—he is never quite sure of himself when in the company of his social superiors. The Dean has a touch of imperiousness about him, a quality which Trollope felt incompatible with gentleness; and Trollope again shows that he never really forgets for long the advantages conferred by blood and family. "With great care and cunning workmanship one may almost make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, but not quite. The care which Dean Lovelace had bestowed upon the operation in regard to himself had been very great, and the cunning workmanship was to be seen in every plait and every stitch. But still there was something left of the coarseness of the original material." But although some coarseness still remained in Dean Lovelace, his daughter Mary was undoubtedly a lady. "She was a sweet, innocent, ladylike, high-spirited, joyous creature. Those
struggles of her father to get rid of the last porcine taint, though not quite successful as to himself, had succeeded thoroughly in regard to her. It comes at last with due care, and the due care had here been taken."

Socially Larry simply does not belong to the gentlemanly class, and his social position proves unfortunate for his desire to marry Mary Masters, daughter of the Dillsborough attorney. Mary has been reared by Lady Ushant in Bragton Hall, the old family home of the Mor- tons, and her ladylike upbringing causes Mary unsnobbishly to feel Larry beneath her. Although Reginald Morton, eventually Mary's husband and squire of Bragton, concurs in this estimate of Larry, this evidence is weakened because he loves Mary himself and because he is oversensitive to matters of blood and position. Strengthening the point is the fact that Larry achieves a certain degree of intimacy with the sons of gentry in his neighborhood, although he does not get into their houses. Dean Lovelace is in a somewhat similar position. He marries his daughter to Lord George German, who eventually becomes Marquis of Brotherton. George has married Mary for her money, and all the Germans feel that the Dean is "not quite." George's sister, Lady Sarah, perhaps the most fair and just of all the Germans, a very severe old-fashioned lady, had only assented to the Dean
originally because holy orders are supposed to make a

gentleman. The Dean, however, is certainly accepted in
general society, and thus is above Larry Twentyman in
that respect.

Trollope seems to consider both Larry and Dean Love-
lace a bit snobbish, though the strong disapproval
exhibited towards the De Courcys or the Longestaffes is
certainly absent. Larry, he says, would have been a
happy man if he had not been "...too ambitious in his
aspirations after gentry." The young fellow has his
difficulties. We have seen how he achieves only a degree
of intimacy with the sons of gentry. Moreover, young
Lord Rufford never asks him to dine at the Bush Inn, a
mark of social distinction. Worse than that, some men
of the neighborhood, certainly not gentlemen, call him
by his first name, an extremely objectionable intimacy,
but one, says Trollope, "...to which men in the posi-
tion of Mr. Lawrence Twentyman are very subject." Later
he says, "It was the foible of his life to be esteemed
a gentleman, and his poor ambition to be allowed to live
among men of higher social standing than himself."

Apparently, Trollope conceives Larry as being snobbish
in these instances, that is, as desiring the society of
social superiors so that he may shine over former ac-
quaintances, rather than so that he may improve personal-
ly. Since Larry is obviously rising socially at the close
of the novel and with Trollope's approval, perhaps Trollope is simply inconsistent. He certainly approves healthy ambition to rise in the world, and states in numerous places his belief that men of high position are generally more profitable companions than those in lower ranks of life. Trollope's prejudices and his methods of writing lend themselves to inconsistencies, although these are normally of a minor nature. More likely, he may have felt that Larry grew in stature as a result of being rejected by Mary, although, if true, he certainly never makes this clear. Then, too, the possibility always exists that he began his story with one attitude toward Larry and ended with another. In working with Trollope, it is never safe to forget what happened to his original idea of Miss Mackenzie as he proceeded to write the novel, or to forget the reason for the death of Mrs. Proudie.

Dean Lovelace also bears the taint of snobbishness. The desire of his life is to see his daughter a Marchioness, and his grandson a Marquis. The mark of the snob is deep within him, a fault which might have been fatal in its consequences to his daughter.

He, who should have been proud of the lowliness of his birth, and have known that the brightest feather in his cap was the fact that, having been humbly born, he had made himself what he was—he had never ceased to be ashamed of the
stable-yard. And as he felt himself to be degraded by that from which he had sprung, so did he think that the only whitewash against such dirt was to be found in the aggrandisement of his daughter and the nobility of her children. He had, perhaps, been happier than he deserved. He might have sold her to some lord, who would have scorned her after a while and despised himself. 125

Lovelace's compulsion to marry his daughter to a title emphasizes the real insecurity he feels as a first-generation gentleman. In contrast, we recall the Grantlys' snobbish satisfaction in Griselda's marriage to Dumbello. Their snobbishness is of a different order, being in actuality a sort of smugness, which contains none of the desperation that prompts Lovelace's ambition.

In his personal characteristics Larry Twentyman is admirable, particularly so in the tenacity of his love for Mary Masters. When she refuses him, Larry is heartbroken and loses interest in life. Young Hampton of Hampton Wick, quite concerned over Larry's plight, induces Lord Rufford to invite Larry for a day's shooting and a dinner at the Bush Inn. "'He is not half a bad fellow,' said Hampton, 'and quite as much like a gentleman as either of the Botseys.'" Now, the Botseys are rich young brewers who are intently seeking social acceptance themselves. This dinner helps Larry socially, and by the close of the novel, he is obviously being accepted by gentlemanly circles. For one thing, Trollope
definitely admits that Larry has been the hero of his tale, and for another Larry has bought some additional land, this purchase giving him almost complete charge of Dillsborough Wood. When Glomax, master of hounds of the Ufford and Rufford United Hunt Club, resigns his position, Larry is considered as one of a committee of three for the post, a considerable honor. After Mary's marriage to Reginald Morton, the new squire, Larry is asked often to Bragton Hall, where he meets gentry on an equal social footing, and he is asked several times to Hampton Wick, all of this to the envy of the poor Botseys. We feel that Larry's children will have a fair right to be classed as gentlemen and ladies, just as Mary Lovelace is a lady, although the Dean does not quite receive complete acceptance.

Largely speaking, then, although the bottom portion of the gentlemanly class includes gentlemen rising from the ranks as well as the unmannered Spooners, its bulk, as we have seen, is largely composed of the snobs, the weak, and the useless gentlemen. In these, particularly in the snobs and the useless, selfishness is apparent, although restrained enough to keep them within the gentlemanly pale. This selfishness not only detracts from their value personally, but causes neglect of function and duty—and consequently brings on them Trollope's manifest disapproval.
CHAPTER V

The Average Gentleman

Of the three categories that compose the gentlemanly class which Trollope depicts, the middle one can fairly be called the group of "average" gentlemen. This is a "human" group, interested—as we shall see—in their fair share of temporalities, but possessed of far more good than bad, and a considerable cut above their useless, weak, and arrogantly snobbish brethren. Contrasted with the "lower third," they are stronger, more useful personally and socially, and more inclined to use their material advantages as means to ends, rather than as ends in themselves. In a word, they are less selfish. Nevertheless, these people are eminently practical, possessing a realistic, commonsense attitude toward the world in which they live, its temptations, its good things, and human frailty. That they are healthily ambitious, then, is not surprising. By and large, they want the comforts and luxuries of the world for themselves and their families—sometimes a little too much so. For sometimes temptations are too alluring and a gentleman is sorely tested, although gentlemanly training is usually potent enough to prevent disaster.
This group is generally confident that the English gentleman has no peer and that the gentlemanly system has brought England to the front of nations. They compose a prejudiced, slightly intolerant, stiff-necked society, who put a great deal of faith and trust in the four gentlemanly characteristics—blood, breeding, position, and money. In truth, this portion of the class of gentlemen attests to the efficacy of these four characteristics and the system which employs them, for these gentlemen are the flower of that system. Their acceptance of the characteristics as valuable would consequently be expected, and we find that they do accept them, almost to a man. As we shall see, they are instinctively dubious of any hedging in the matter of blood and breeding—most of them can scent a "not quite" or "half-sir" a mile away. Too, they value the position of a gentleman and fully realize that money is needed to maintain it.

These gentlemen unhesitatingly assume their place in the world. They fully enjoy their superior social position and accept their privileges naturally. For the most part, however, the position and money and privileges are used for others as well as themselves, for they realize that duties and responsibilities accompany their privileges. They help run the government. They keep the details of their estates at their fingertips.
They look after their tenants and the parishes in which they own land. They administer justice in their counties. They see to such matters as roads, and help the poor. They give much in charity, and their wives and daughters consider the problem of alleviating misery as part of their daily lives. The system is far from perfect and much abuse is encountered, but men are human, these gentlemen would probably answer, and after all no system can be perfect. Although the average gentleman, moreover, may be often prone to anger and sometimes revenge, may be sometimes shortsighted and hence unjust, and sometimes too proud of himself and his position, taken as a whole he is honorable, largely unselfish, not too self-indulgent, fair, generous, and manly, and essentially lacking in that self-centered affectation which spelled death to gentility as far as Trollope was concerned.

We have already seen how highly blood is held, being in most instances a prime requisite of the gentleman. It is a precious possession to Trollope's gentlemen, and their lives are obviously subject to its influence. The oft-repeated advice of not marrying out of one's rank, for example, is founded on a prejudice toward blood as well as toward nurture. The reaction of the Whartons and Fletchers to Emily Wharton's marriage to Lopez illustrates the feeling nicely—as far as they are
concerned, she is disowned. Sir Thomas Underwood's horrified amazement at the idea of Ralph Newton marry­ing Polly Neefit is a similar sentiment. And even when a marriage for money is sanctioned, as in the case of George Germain, the resulting relationship makes no difference. Blood is blood—although it so happens that George gets a lady in Mary Lovelace. This disapproval of debasing blood ironically contrasts with the snobbish Rosina De Courcy's willingness to bring into the family anything articulate that stands on two legs, provided it possesses the requisite cash in hand.

Such typical gentlemen as Archdeacon Grantly, Chris­topher Dale, Abel Wharton, and the Duke of St. Bungay want to live and associate with their kind, with men of blood and breeding. In their daily lives, by necessity they sometimes associate with dubious quantities, but in their houses they want gentlemen and they want their children to marry into families of good blood lines. Abel Wharton rather passionately illustrates this point when he cries out to his daughter, "'I like Arthur Fletcher, because he is a gentleman,—because he is a gentleman of the class to which I belong myself... because I know all about him so that I can be sure of him; because he had a decent father and mother; because I am safe with him..."' The Duke of St. Bungay's
resentment toward the snobbish, ungentlemanly upstart Bonteen is also illustrative of this viewpoint. Trollope admits that the old hereditary Whig Cabinet ministers have learned to live with strange neighbors in the political world. "But still with them something of the feeling of high blood, of rank remains...With no man was this feeling stronger than with the Duke of St. Bungay..." Nevertheless, the Duke knows that Bonteens are now necessary. "The faces which he loved to see,--born chiefly of other faces he had loved when young,--could not cluster around the sacred table without others which were much less welcome to him." He is wise enough to realize that exclusiveness does not suit the nation but at the same time gentleman enough to wish the Bonteens gone. Nevertheless the Duke's feelings about his blood and rank are not snobbish. He is anything but a snob. Looking back at the two centuries that his family has served the country as statesmen, how could he feel much but contempt for the arrogant, pushing, boasting Bonteen? Although he never says it directly, he obviously feels that his blood and position demand service on his part, and this service he performs until he retires at an advanced age, and then only because he feels he is now a detriment rather than an asset to his party. His attitude, which reflects that of the
other average gentlemen, contains nothing of the condescending superiority of a De Courcy, or the magnified self-glorification of a Longestaffe. To St. Bungay, his blood is a means to the unselfish end of service; to the Countess De Courcy, blood gives a selfish sense of superiority.

The average gentleman feels the same way towards breeding and education as he does towards blood—breeding is a necessity in the gentlemanly world. This factor also influences relationships and alliances. We have previously seen that Lady Lufton objects to Lucy Robarts because she fears the girl has had no advantages, and that, sight unseen, Dr. Grantly and his wife object to Grace Crawley for somewhat the same reasons. The Countess Lovel fears that her daughter Anna's lack of upbringing in association with other gentlefolk will prove a handicap to the girl. The Claverings instinctively suspect the breeding of the middle-class Florence Burton, and Clara Amedroz feels she may have to blush for the indifferent breeding of Will Belton. Squire Peter Prosper, who in haste proposes to Miss Thoroughbung, sister of a wealthy brewer, lives to discover that she is much too vulgar and ill-mannered for his taste. Breeding is breeding, and the gentleman instinctively but unsnobbishly reacts to the lack of it. Examining the attitude of
typical gentlemen on this point, we recall Archdeacon Grantly's recoil from the unmannered and low-bred Slope. We also remember that Squire Christopher Dale indignantly and angrily sets out after Adolphus Crosbie when the latter has violated an axiom of Christopher's deep-rooted gentlemanly code. Abel Wharton cannot abide the vulgar Robys and Monograms; and, typically, St. Bungay's principal objection to Bonteen is the man's lack of breeding.

But it is really in their attitude toward position and money that the average gentlemen clearly categorize themselves, and particularly in their attitude towards money. Their viewpoint is that position and money enough to maintain it are eminently desirable for the gentleman, indeed, are necessary for the survival of their class—a very practical, realistic outlook. And since by and large they move in circles which expend considerable money in maintaining position, and since they require money in order to perform their functions in the world, their thoughts are never very far away from it. Generally speaking, however—and this is important—they are not snobbish in their attitude—merely realistic, and here, of course, sever themselves from the snobbish "lower third." They appreciate the comfort and security money brings, the opportunity it affords them to exercise the charity and liberality of a gentleman, and to perform
their duties and responsibilities. But—and this is equally important—this group is quite scrupulous as to where money comes from, and as a group will not really compromise themselves or their loved ones in obtaining it. Many relatively poor young gentlemen, for instance, such as Frank Tregear, Arthur Herriot, Frank Greystock, and Reginald Morton, feel they cannot marry without money, but will not marry for money alone. Arabin, when considering Eleanor Bold as a wife, scrupulously but falsely imputes her money as a motive for his desire. Trollope, with not a tinge of hypocrisy in him, makes clear that Arabin’s self-condemnation is false, but makes equally clear that the money will be a good thing, provided Arabin loved the woman in the first place.

This attitude is admirably expressed by Plantagenet Palliser to his cousin Jeffrey. "'There is no vulgar error so...erroneous, as that by which men have been taught to say that mercenary tendencies are bad. A desire for wealth is the source of all progress... Let your mercenary tendencies be combined with honesty and they cannot take you astray.'" Both Judge Staveley and Dr. Crofts, the most unsnobbish gentlemen imaginable, agree with the principle behind this statement. Staveley tells his daughter Madeline, "'High position and a
plentiful income are great blessings in this world, so that they be achieved without a stain. . . . Money and rank are only good, if every step by which they are gained be good also.' "And Dr. Crofts exclaims to Bell Dale, "'It is the best friend that a man can have. . . . if it be honestly come by.'"

Arabin exemplifies the practical acceptance of the good things of this world. Having completed a thorough search of himself, he concludes his life has not been a fully satisfying one, and so he decides to give over his previous rather monastic existence and seek a wife, family, wealth and position. Archdeacon Grantly is another who likes the good things of the world. He enjoys his position as archdeacon, likes the solid comfort of Plumstead Episcopi, and wants to set up his son Henry as a landed squire. No one would ever misconstrue Grantly as an ascetic. To his way of thinking, if the good men do not get the money, then the bad ones will get it all, and where, pray tell, will the world (and gentlemen) be then? The Claverings, father and son, likewise enjoy the luxuries of life, a fact that is quite obvious to Florence Burton, Harry's betrothed. It is indeed fortunate that Harry becomes heir to the Clavering title and estate when he does, for his mother realizes he has more propensity for the spending of
money than the making of it. Not that Harry is a spendthrift or a wastrel. He will undoubtedly become a good landlord and conscientious supervisor of the estate. He simply has been reared to believe that money and soft living are due the position of a gentleman. Frank Greystock resembles Harry in this respect. His mother, an unselfish and charitable woman, thinks her son might as well marry an heiress, for to her the Greystocks are all people who need money, a race that cannot pay their way with moderate incomes. Frank "...was the very man to whom money with a wife was almost a necessity of existence." Lord Alfred Gresley, picked by Sir Harry Hotspur as a possible husband for Emily, is fully alive to the glories of Humblethwaite and feels he need not envy his elder brother "...if only his lines might fall to him in this very pleasant place." Trollope affirms that Alfred is not specially given to covetousness, and that he feels it a duty not to seek wealth and property unless he can love the woman who possessed these things. Nevertheless, "...as he looked round him through the gloaming of the evening, he thought that he remembered that Emily Hotspur was all that was loveable."

The place that position and money hold among the average gentlemen shows up appreciably in their attitude
toward marriage alliances. The Grantlys are a little bowled over, for instance, that their daughter should have married Dumbello, heir to the Marquis of Hartle-top. Being human, it is too much to ask that they, like Lord Alfred Gresley, should not be a trifle greedy over her prospects. Dr. Wortle and his wife are just as alive to the eminence and social advantages attached to their daughter marrying Lord Carstairs, the heir of Earl Bracy, as the Earl is to the fact that his son has not made a particularly brilliant match, as the world goes. But the Earl consoles himself that, at least, Wortle is a gentleman. When the Rev. Henry Clavering succeeds to the Clavering title and estate, he indulges in sad regrets that Harry could not have married Lady Ongar, and thus have united her immense fortune with the Clavering property. To illustrate the significance of money and position, this same man, as well as his son, is horrified that his poor curate, Mr. Saul, should aspire to the hand of his daughter. Both men consider the idea as preposterous and highly impertinent. Presumably they would have voiced no objection had Saul held a living of decent income, although Saul is a bit too religious and unworldly for their gentlemanly tastes, just as he would have been too much so for Archdeacon Grantly.
This practical down-to-earth attitude toward money and position shows itself in other ways. When Will Belton takes over the Belton estate he likes the idea of being the man by whom the family should be reconstructed in its glory. "Worldly circumstances had been so kind to him, that he could take up the Belton estate with more of the prestige of wealth than had belonged to any of the owners of the place for many years past...There need be no pinching and scraping, no question whether a carriage would be possible, no doubt as to the prudence of preserving game. All this had given much that was delightful to his prospects." The Earl De Guest also knows the value of money in the gentlemanly world. He feels that his "sweetening the pot" will speed up Lily Dale's acceptance of Johnny Eames, and consequently consults Squire Dale on the matter. Nothing else that he can do will equal leaving money to Johnny, he must certainly have realized. For it is this money which gives Johnny the feeling of independence which the best gentlemen seem to possess. To the Lovel family, securing wealth to accompany the title and property of young Earl Lovel is of utter necessity. The Earl will need money to hold up his head with decency, all the Lovels realize. Another instance of the importance of position to the average gentleman is
Dr. Grantly's unbelieving amazement at Mr. Harding's resignation as Warden of Hiram's Hospital— an action simply unheard of and not to be tolerated. Gentlemen, he seems to exclaim, simply do not give up such positions and such incomes except for extraordinary reasons. Lady Ushant understands this realistic attitude toward money, and tells Mary Masters, "Men ought not to care for money or position, but they do. If he comes here, all that I have will be yours." She is telling Mary that if Reginald Morton becomes Squire of Bragton, he may want money in a wife and that consequently she is leaving her money to Mary in order to make such a match possible.

Clearly, then, the average gentlemen adopt a practical, realistic attitude toward the four gentlemanly characteristics—birth, breeding, position, and money. This practicality extends itself into a general overall outlook. Dr. Gwynn, for example, a thoroughly religious man, is also a thoroughly practical man of the world who sees no incompatibility between religion and worldliness. Most of Trollope's clergymen are of this variety and Mark Robarts' attitude toward his calling might well serve as typical.

It had been his intention, in reviewing what he considered to be the necessary properties of clerical life, in laying out his own future
mode of living, to assume no peculiar sacerdotal strictness; he would not be known as a denouncer of dancing or of card-tables, or theatres or of novel-reading; he would take the world around him as he found it, endeavouring by precept and practice to lend a hand to the gradual amelioration which Christianity is producing; but he would attempt no sudden or majestic reforms. Cake and ale would still be popular, and ginger be hot in the mouth, let him preach ever so--let him be never so solemn a hermit; but a bright face, a true trusting heart, a strong arm, and a humble mind, might do much in teaching those around him that men may be gay and yet not profligate, that women may be devout and yet not dead to the world. 18

Somewhat similar to this philosophy is the one expressed by Phineas Finn toward his political career. Phineas tells himself that one has to take the world as one finds it, with a struggle to be somewhat more honest than those around one. Those who try more than this fly too high in the clouds to be of service to men and women upon earth. The Duke of St. Bungay holds a similar political philosophy. He has been of service all his life, but his is the practical viewpoint, gained as the result of a lifetime of political activity. He knows when to come forward and when to retire--and when to compromise. He has served willingly when called, and has left office without regret. Above all he has never made the mistake of feeling that personal dishonor is attached to political failure. By not setting his sights too high, he has accomplished a great deal for his country. Judge Stave-
ley, the revered jurist, reveals the same sort of practicality in speaking about Felix Graham. "Yes, he is clever enough...and of high principles and an honest purpose. The fault which people find with him is this,—that he is not practical. He won't take the world as he finds it. If he can mend it, well and good; we all ought to do something to mend it; but while we are mending it we must live in it.' " The average gentleman, moreover, is not above a touch of expediency, if it does not seem to conflict with his honor and duty. For example, Mark Robarts, who received his living from Lady Lufton, knows she likes to intervene in parish matters, and so gives in to her when she wants to place a protégée of hers as teacher of the parish children. His wife is rather indignant about the matter, but to Mark's practical mind, it is a sort of political concession, of no major importance. Typical too, is the practice of Bernard Dale, who realistically uses his mother's high birth to gain social advantages, although never to the point of snobbery.

The average gentlemen and ladies are as a whole ambitious, although, as we have noted, they generally insist on honesty and fair dealing. Occasionally, one of these gentlemen, such as Mark Robarts, approaches the danger mark, and sometimes goes beyond it, as in
the case of Alaric Tudor. The relatively few instances of such men, however, seem to point out Trollope's firm faith in the gentlemanly characteristics and in the genteel tradition.

An excellent expression of healthy ambition comes from Sir William Patterson, himself a very practical and ambitious gentleman. Sir William is talking to Daniel Thwaite, who has voiced objection to hereditary peerages. Patterson admits it is a subject for argument, but states his opinion that the country is in favor of an aristocracy of birth. He continues:

"But be that as it may, do not allow yourself to despise that condition of society which it is the ambition of all men to enter."
"It is not my ambition."
"Pardon me. When you were a workman among workmen, did you not wish to be their leader? When you were foremost among them, did you not wish to be their master? If you were a master tradesman, would you not wish to lead and guide your brother tradesmen? Would you not desire wealth in order that you might be assisted by it in your views of ambition? If you were an alderman in your borough, would you not wish to be the mayor? If mayor, would you not wish to be its representative in Parliament? If in Parliament, would you not wish to be heard there? Would you not then clothe yourself as those among whom you lived, eat as they ate, drink as they drank, keep their hours, fall into their habits, and be one of them?"

Trollope, however, warns that ambition in reference to oneself alone and not to others is bad, conceding nevertheless that such an attitude is human. Mark Robarts'
early selfish and snobbish ambition proves nearly ruinous for him. Archdeacon Grantly's desire for the bishopric as his father lies dying is undoubtedly realistic, but it is selfish and unacceptable at such a time. More healthy ambition is described in *Framley Parsonage*, where Grantly wants to become Bishop of Westminster, "...and was anxious to compass that preferment by any means that might appear to him to be fair."

Furthermore, his desire to make his son Henry a landed squire is another indication of healthy ambition. Dr. Wortle, Abel Wharton, and Judge Staveley are all examples of men who through ambition and healthy determination have achieved eminence in their respective professions, as well as financial success. Likewise the Duke of St. Bungay has been ambitious of success in political service, and has lived to see his ambition more than fulfilled.

Of the young men, Phineas Finn well illustrates the normal ambition of the gentleman. He is keenly desirous of achieving political success and works eagerly and energetically toward that end. Phineas very emphatically tells Lady Laura Kennedy that he does not believe in a man lacking ambition. Arthur Fletcher is another young man who is ambitious to rise in his profession. His brother John points out that Arthur has always been
"ambitious and self-confident." And Frank Greystock is another ambitious young barrister, who "...intended to get on in the world, and believed that happiness was to be achieved by success."

Trollope's average gentleman is very proud of his position as English gentleman, and nobleman, if such be the case. He feels the pride of long lineage, of revered ancestors, of his considerable eminence as landowner or professional man, of what he unhesitatingly feels to be his superiority. Unlike the snobs, however, he does not feel or display this pride as arrogance or condescension. The chances are he does not display it at all unless his position is challenged, or the proper respect is not acknowledged him. He simply feels himself the product of better blood, breeding, and position. And as Trollope depicts him, from his class viewpoint he has a right, in most cases, to feel such pride.

The Earl De Guest again provides a good instance. His "pride of place" is "dear to his soul." "He knew what privileges were due to him on behalf of his blood, and was not disposed to abate one jot of them." However, it should be noted that he is not loud in insisting on them. The earl is a man interested in the breeding of oxen and spends much time in the open. "He knew himself to be every inch an earl, pottering about after
his oxen with his muddy gaiters and red cheeks, as much as though he were glittering with stars in courtly royal ceremonies. . .more an earl than any of those who use their nobility for pageant purposes." In contrast, his sister is also proud of her position, but "...her pride was maintained with more of outward show and less of inward mobility."

Plantagenet Palliser, Duke of Omnium, simple and unworldly man that he is, has the same feeling, the result of his training. "Of all that properly belonged to his rank and station he could be very proud. . ." This attitude is made concrete by the flag waving over Gatherum Castle, indication that he, the Lord Lieutenant of the county, is present on his own soil, and is also communicated by early feelings of misgiving about the marriages his son and daughter are contracting. The same pride of position is felt by the Duke of St. Bungay, Sir Peregrine Orme, Sir Harry Hotspur and Sir Alured Wharton. Lady Laura Kennedy convincingly demonstrates what a controlling influence pride of position has on gentlemen. She tells Phineas Finn that Lord Chiltern has allowed his father to do what he will with Saulsby, in order to secure enough money to pay Kennedy what Chiltern in honor feels his due. But, she says, "'Papa will never hurt him;--I know that. Hard as papa is with him, he will
never hurt Oswald's future position. *Papa is too proud to do that.*”

This pride of position, of being gentlemen, is also felt strongly by the untitled squires and by the professional men, who generally come from good families and have the feeling of tradition behind them. Old Reginald Morton in *The American Senator* was an old-fashioned squire "...quite content with his position as squire of Bragton, but with considerable pride about him as to that position." He liked to have his house full and for years hunted the county at his own expense. Roger Carbury also possesses an intense pride in being a gentleman--Carbury of Carbury. His lineage and position cause him to feel superior to all of his neighbors; and he is the character through whom Trollope releases much of his bitterness toward the lowering of gentlemanly standards and class prostitution, toward the snobbishness, dishonesty and incipient collapse he saw around him in the early 1870's. Little wonder that Roger, or men of his breed, like Christopher Dale, feel pride at their staunch uncompromised position. Similarly, Will Belton, experiencing the glory of family as well as the glory of power and property, "...felt himself to be proud of his position,--prouder than he could have been of any other that might have been vouchsafed to him." Honest
man that he is, however, Will feels momentarily ashamed of his joy, because of the sad death of Charles Amedroz by which he became heir.

Of the professional men, Dr. Wortle, clergyman and schoolmaster, takes pride in the position he has been able to establish for himself. "... he was supposed to be a comfortable man. He paid ready money and high prices. He liked that people under him should thrive, and he liked them to know that they thrrove by his means. He liked to be master, and always was. He was just, and liked his justice to be recognized. He was generous also, and liked that, too, to be known. He kept a carriage for his wife, who had been the daughter of a poor clergyman at Windsor, and was proud to see her as well dressed as the wife of any county squire." But the best example, perhaps, and surely the best known is Archdeacon Grantly, who fairly glories in his role of running the diocese while his father is living, and who afterwards is undisputed leader of the anti-Proudie forces. He likes his ecclesiastical power and the power that money gives him. He likes the fact that his father was bishop, and he enjoys the respect and deference paid him on all sides. Nevertheless, the Archdeacon is not snobbish in his pride, or at least not fundamentally so. He simply likes position for the power and sense of
self-respect it brings him and finally for the opportunity it gives him to perform his duties and responsibilities as he sees them, wrongly interpreted as some of them may be. The Archdeacon proves fairly typical of the English gentleman of the average category.

Proud as the gentleman is of his class, it is small wonder that his order as a whole should fend off the encroachment of unqualified applicants. The feeling involved is the same that exists in any exclusive club which sets high standards and blackballs freely. Most of Trollope's gentlemen do not analyze this prejudice—they know what they feel and act accordingly. The Rev. Charles Lovel perfectly exemplifies this attitude. Lady Anna Lovel and her mother, to him, are fraudulent pretenders and no ladies, and that is an end to it. No legal decision, no evidence of a legal nature would ever be able to convince his prejudiced English mind that these women are not interlopers. Whenever the reasons for class distinction are thought out partially, but very incompletely, a conclusion results somewhat resembling that expressed by Serjeant Bluestone's daughter, "I think that a girl who is a lady should never marry a man who is not a gentleman. You know the story of the rich man who could not get to Abraham's bosom because there was a gulf fixed. That is how it should be;—just as there
is with royal people as to marrying royalty. Otherwise everything would get mingled, and there would soon be no difference. If there are to be differences, there should be differences. That is the meaning of being a gentleman,--or a lady.' So spoke the young female Conservative with wisdom beyond her years.

The considered case for the necessity of preserving distinctions, both from the conservative and liberal points of view, is expressed by Plantagenet Palliser. The conservative, according to Palliser's views, wishes to maintain the differences which separate the highly placed from their lower brethren. The conservative thinks that God has divided the world as he finds it divided, and that he may best do his duty by making the inferior man happy and contented in his position, teaching him that the place which he holds is by God's ordinance. The liberal--and Palliser is an ardent liberal--is opposed to the conservative belief that the improvement of the condition of the lower man is to be secured through maintaining distances between the two groups. The liberal believes in lessening the differences, although he realizes the process will be a very slow and gradual one. In the meantime, an aristocracy is needed to carry on the work of governing until the millennium is reached.
Sir Peregrine Orme, Sir Harry Hotspur, and Sir Alured Wharton clearly demonstrate the attitude of gentlemen toward inferiors who presume equality. For example, Sir Peregrine Orme was affable to manifest inferiors and courteous to recognized equals, but "... to men who claimed an equality which he would not acknowledge, he could make himself particularly disagreeable." Sir Harry Hotspur deferred much to others outwardly and showed his pride chiefly "... by a certain impalpable noli me tangere, which just sufficed to make itself felt and obeyed at the first approach of any personal freedom." And Sir Alured Wharton "... could not endure a personal liberty, and... thought the assertion of social equality on the part of men of lower rank to amount to the taking of personal liberty. ...

This feeling that class lines must be preserved is nowhere so clearly illustrated as in the attitude of the Lovels toward Lady Anna's proposed marriage to Daniel Thwaite.

The inhabitants of the Yoxham rectory,—who were well born, ladies and gentlemen without a stain, who were hitherto free from all base intermarriages, and had nothing among their male cousins below soldiers and sailors, parsons and lawyers, who had successfully opposed an intended marriage between a cousin in the third degree and an attorney because the alliance was below the level of the Lovels, were peculiarly averse to any intermingling of ranks. They were descended from ancient earls, and their chief was an earl of the present day.
There was but one titled young lady now among them,—and she had only just won her right to be so considered. There was but one Lady Anna,—and she was going to marry a tailor! "Duty is duty," said Aunt Julia as she hurried away. She meant her nephew to understand that duty commanded her to shut her heart against any cousin who could marry a tailor. 45

The novels provide many instances of the indignant resentment of the gentlemanly class toward those whom they consider interlopers. We have just seen the attitude of the Lovels toward Anna marrying Daniel Thwaite. The young Earl Lovel, feeling a debt to Anna for the portion of the Lovel wealth she has shared with him, resolves that she and Thwaite shall be married from the Yoxham rectory. But it takes all the threats, intimidation, and power he possesses as head of the Lovel clan to force his uncle, the Rev. Charles, to consent to this arrangement. A tailor is a tailor and a gentleman is a gentleman, to the Rev. Charles, and never the twain shall meet. Aunt Julia Lovel echoes his prejudice when she says, "'My dear Frederick, you can never wash a black-moor white.'" Another instance is Archdeacon Grantly's righteous onslaught on Obadiah Slope and the other non-gentlemanly Low Church clergy imported into Barchester by the Proudie faction. If such creatures begin getting control and power, he seems to think, the world of gentlemen is doomed. And so he whips up his army,
imports the renowned warrior, Arabin, and sets out to battle. Another incident in Barchester Towers indicates that gentlemen have good reason to fear—when Mrs. Lookaloft and her daughters force their way in amongst the "quality" at the Ullathorne party and thus produce endless repercussions. For from that time forth, says Trollope, Mrs. Lookaloft's husband will be addressed with "undoubting pens" as "Esquire" by the tradesmen of 47 Barchester; and Mrs. Greenacre, another tenant's wife, feels not only resentment toward Mrs. Lookaloft, but also the spark of ambition within her own bosom. We have previously seen that the Duke of St. Bungay quietly but firmly closed the door in the face of the pushing, boasting Bonteens whenever the opportunity availed itself; and even the mild mannered Palliser, incensed by the ungentlemanly proposal of Major Pountney, sends him flying posthaste out of Gatherum Castle. Abel Wharton is appalled and nonplussed at the encroachment of Ferdinand Lopez, to him "a greasy Jew adventurer out of the gutter!" Ralph Newton finds that familiarity breeds contempt, or rather unqualified ambition, and has difficulty putting the tailor Neefit in his proper place, just as Lord Silverbridge has difficulty with Major Tifto. Roger Carbury is incensed at the inroads made by such a man as Melmotte, but his anger reaches out to
the laxity and lack of principle that makes such en-
croachment possible.

These average gentlemen pay, however, for the
privileges of their position, and the traditions that
bring their sense of personal dignity and superiority.
They work hard and are useful and serviceable. They
not only consume, they also produce—and take pride in
the fact.

The average portion of the gentlemanly class is
undoubtedly less selfish than the lower third. By and
large this fact is the fundamental distinction between
them. Particularly is this unselfishness demonstrated
in the sense of duty and service they feel toward country
and dependents. As statesmen and landowners and as
professional men, they are useful, in complete contrast
to the Maules, Ruffords, and Stanhopes. In opposition
to Daniel Thwaite's contempt for a lord, to illustrate,
Trollope points out that "...from the ranks of nobility
are taken the greater proportion of the hard-working
servants of the State." These men generally possess
"unblemished, unextinguishable, inexhaustible love of
country," as we are told in the Autobiography. John
Grey says that public life is really worthless if under-
taken so that a man can satisfy his own ambition, and
Plantagenet Palliser indicates that the chief satisfaction
comes from the feeling that one is of use. Plantagenet himself, the Duke of St. Bungay, Lord Fawn, the Earl of Brentford, Lord Cantrip, and the horde of statesmen from the Palliser novels illustrate the point. Most of them are in Parliament because they feel it their duty to be there—unselfish service to the state has been part of their training and has become a creed. The Whig Prime Minister, Mr. Mildmay, will serve to illustrate. "Mr. Mildmay was an old man, nearly worn out in the service of his country, who was known to have been true and honest, and to have loved his country well."

The landlord of the average group also has a more unselfish outlook, a more generous feeling of what is due those subordinate to him, and a more conscientious sense of his duties. First of all, he restrains self-indulgence so as not to get the property into debt. In doing so he may simply be following a tradition or the example of his forefathers, like Squire Dale, or he may have thought out the reason for so doing, like Sir Harry Hotspur, who would have taught his son that position, property, and wealth were to be given him "... not that he might put it into his own belly, or wear it on his own back, or even spend it as he might list himself, but that he might so live as to do his part in maintaining that order of gentlehood in England by
which England had become—so thought Sir Harry—the proudest and the greatest and the justest of nations."

The responsible gentlemen feel that holding on to the land will preserve their order and thus preserve England. And so the average gentlemen, by and large, hold debt-free property, men like Christopher Dale, John Fletcher, Harry Gilmore, Squire Hall, and Sir Peregrine Orme. They follow what Trollope hopes young Perry Orme will come to—"...a good English gentlemanlike resolve to hunt twice a week, look after his timber, and live well within his means."

The average landlord also has the welfare of his tenants and dependents in mind. Although many of them are not nearly so idealistic in their attitude as Sir Harry Hotspur, most are reasonably unselfish. Even if they are hard men, they are fair and just in their dealings. Most have a real feeling of noblesse oblige, illustrated by Lady Lufton's desire that the farmers around her should all be able to pay their rents without trouble, that all the old women should have warm flannel petticoats, and that the working men should be saved from rheumatism by healthy food and dry houses; and by Sir Alured Wharton's patriarchal feeling towards his tenants. They feel that a landowner's proper place is on his land among his people. Roger Carbury, for
instance, "...lived on his own land among his own people, as all the Carburys before him had done."

And Squire Dale says about his nephew and heir, Bernard, "If he were my son it would be thought better that he should live here upon the property, among the people who are to become his tenants, than remain up in London, or perhaps be sent to India.' The old tenant farmer's feeling for the squire in Tennyson's poem, Northern Farmer, Old Style, is likewise felt by the retainers that appear in Trollope—Hopkins the gardener's love for Christopher Dale, Sir Peregrine Orme's servants' love and respect for their master, and Andy Gowran's feeling for the Eustace family. Just as Tennyson's Northern Farmer, New Style is a different sort of breed, so we feel Trollope's regret at the passing of a way of life in The Way We Live Now and his remark in Is He Popenjoy? that tenants no longer have the sense of heir-worship that their fathers had. A good landlord, furthermore, is not exorbitant about rents, best exemplified perhaps through Squire Hall, who did not raise his rents when he succeeded to his property and thus was faithfully paid by his tenants in the bad times of the early 1880's.

Other responsibilities of the landowners can be illustrated by Trollope's description of Harry Norman's
succession to Normansgrove. "Harry was Mr. Norman of Normansgrove, immediately about to take his place as the squire of his parish, to sit among brother magistrates, to decide about roads and poachers, parish rates and other all-absorbing topics, to be a rural magistrate, and fill a place among perhaps the most fortunate of the world's inhabitants." The novels are full of the assumption and execution of such duties. A striking example is that of Lord George Germain, who, returning from a neighboring town where he has gone to sit on a committee for the distribution of coals and blankets, encounters his brother, the Marquis of Brotherton, going down from London for a pleasure visit at Mr. De Baron's country house. The contrast is an ironic one, for George is performing a duty which his brother selfishly has renounced.

To the statesmen and landowners must be added the service rendered by the responsible and useful professional gentlemen. Churchmen like Arabin, Grantly, and Fenwick compare favorably with Vesey Stanhope. The country is fortunate to have honest, hardworking barristers like Arthur Fletcher, Felix Graham, Sir William Patterson and Abel Wharton; doctors like Dr. Thorne and Dr. Crofts; patriotic, enterprising public servants like Henry Norman, John Morton, and Johnny Eames; or a
schoolmaster like Dr. Wortle.

These average gentlemen are not only less selfish in their attitudes toward country and dependents, they are better fathers and husbands and more considerate towards others in general. They are more capable of love and have less need for indulging themselves in order to obtain happiness and satisfaction from life. As we have observed before, the less selfish they are and the more concerned with others' welfare, the more they gain Trollope's approval and approbation. The idea is nicely summed up in Clara Amedroz's comparison of Will Belton and Frederic Aylmer. In intrinsic qualities, Will is superior. "He was full of noble qualities; -- forgetful of self, industrious, full of resources, a very man of men, able to command, eager in doing work for others' good and his own, -- a man altogether uncontaminated by the coldness and selfishness of the outer world." Or again, the idea is sharpened by the contrast between the impossibly selfish Marquis of Brotherton and his slow but honest younger brother, George. "The Marquis, in sending for his brother, hoped that, even after all that had passed, he might make use of Lord George. Lord George, in going to his brother, hoped that, even after all that had passed, he might be of use to the Marquis."
These men are quite concerned in their roles as parents. This concern particularly reveals itself in their attempts to keep their children from making mistakes in marriage, although in such cases they are sometimes a bit selfish and shortsighted in their viewpoints. Abel Wharton, for example, is torn between the fires of saving his daughter from an ill-matched marriage and breaking her heart in the process. He fears that selfishness is prompting his objections, and that, if this be true he is "cruel and unnatural." He finally gives way because he feels he is sacrificing her happiness. In relation to this point we also recall Archdeacon Grantly, Sir Harry Hotspur, Lady Lufton, Mrs. Woodward, and the Rev. Henry Clavering. Christopher Dale exemplifies the childless man who feels affection for blood kin dear to him. He is really fond of his nieces, but cannot express his concern and affection easily. As he becomes more able to give, not only in money, but of himself, he more nearly approaches Trollope's ideal. Examples of the gentleman's general unselfishness and generosity towards those around them are the Rev. Frank Fenwick's determined efforts to obtain justice for Carry and Sam Brattle, the similar determination of Dr. Wortle to stand by Mr. Peacocke in his troubles, and Judge Staveley's benevolent and
bustling desire to effect happiness in all those around him.

This middle group of gentlemen, then, is on the whole basically unselfish toward country, family, and dependents. That is, they are unselfish in the idea of service. Usually, whatever selfishness they possess concerns their own personal position and wealth. In this respect, of course, they are "human." In fact, Trollope allows for it. The idea so obviously expressed throughout his works waits a long time for a name. In one of his last novels, *An Old Man's Love*, he designates it as "ordinary selfishness," such selfishness as a man can permit himself without its resulting in self-reproof or even, perhaps, self-hatred. Ordinary selfishness is somewhat of a paradox, for it combines the notion of unselfish devotion and service on the one hand, and self-indulgence on the other. This duality distinguishes the middle section from the bottom third, which embraces only the notion of self-indulgence, although not beyond the limits of class acceptance.

Actually, ordinary selfishness is inevitable to any aristocracy, which maintains itself to a considerable extent on the two factors of superior position with its attendant outward display and the all too necessary wherewithal to maintain that position. Sir Harry
Hotspur, for example, realizes "... of what sort [was] the magnificence, which his position as a great English commoner required of him," and the democratic Lucius Mason is impressed by the aristocratic trappings of The Cleeve, which Sir Peregrine Orme takes for granted, having been to the manner born. For this reason, Sir William Patterson can say that titles of honor in England, being so justly regarded as the outward emblem of splendor and noble conduct, bear so high a value that their assumption is cautiously guarded. And this feeling can prompt the remark that the man who is insensible to the power which money brings with it must be a dolt.

The order of gentlemen simply cannot be maintained without money. Time after time, references appear concerning the poor gentlemen and the deleterious effects of his poverty, Lord Fawn being a good example.

Lord Fawn thought a great deal about money. Being a poor man, filling a place fit only for rich men, he had been driven to think of money, and had become self-denying and parsimonious, perhaps we may say hungry and close-fisted. Such a condition of character is the natural consequence of such a position. There is, probably, no man who becomes naturally so hard in regard to money as he who is bound to live among rich men, who is not rich himself, and who is yet honest. The weight of the work of life in these circumstances is so crushing, requires such continued thought, and makes itself so continually felt, that the mind of the sufferer is never free from the contamination of sixpences. Of such a one it is not fair to judge as of other men with similar
incomes. . . . He was very careful with his six-pences, and was always thinking, not exactly how he might make two ends meet, but how to reconcile the strictest personal economy with the proper bearing of an English nobleman. 71

By and large the gentlemen who can afford them enjoy the advantages of their position. They like the season in London, the entertaining at country houses, the hunting and shooting. They like the pleasure and comfort of their homes and acres, their servants, their carriages and other marks of position. They like these things not only as tokens of class eminence, but also from a sense of self-indulgence, although this self-indulgence is rigidly restrained. In short, they are worldly as well as unselfish. Not only do they run the country, but they enjoy its prosperity. Many, like Judge Staveley, Abel Wharton, Dr. Wortle, and John Gordon, have deliberately made fortunes for the sake of what money would bring. Their attitude toward it is basically the same as that of Dr. Grantly, who in many ways stands typical of this group of men.

This feeling is reflected in the attitude of the Fletchers toward Arthur's marrying Emily Wharton with her sixty thousand pounds.

Something of the truth as to Emily Wharton's £60,000 was of course, known to the Longbarns people. Not that I would have it inferred that they wanted their darling to sell himself for money. The Fletchers were great
people, with great spirits, too good in every way for such baseness. But when love, old friendship, good birth, together with every other propriety as to age, manners, and conduct, can be joined to money, such a combination will always be thought pleasant. 72

The Lovels express the same attitude when they wonder whether to get rid of Anna Lovel or not. "What uncle or what aunt, with such a nephew as Lord Lovel, so noble and so poor, could turn out an heiress with twenty thousand a year, as long as there was the slightest chance of a marriage? Not a doubt would have rankled in their minds had they been quite sure that she was the heiress." Henry Grantly indignantly maintains that his family has no right to insist that he marry a woman with money, and Trollope leaves no doubt about the attitude of the Grantly household on the question of money. "The archdeacon's son by no means despised money. How could he, having come forth as a bird fledged from such a nest as the rectory at Plumstead Episcopi?" And, season after London season, the long line of battle-scarred and strategy-wise mammas plan their campaigns to marry their daughters off comfortably.

One of Trollope's best expressions of this combination of unselfish usefulness and personal worth on the one side, and "ordinary selfishness" on the other, is the portrait of Lady Staveley. Her daughter Madeline
has gone into a lovesick "decline" following Felix Graham's departure from Noningsby, and she moons about reading a paper about sick people, written by Florence Nightingale.

But it was by no means Lady Staveley's desire that her daughter should take to the Florence Nightingale line of life. The charities of Noningsby were done on a large scale, in a quiet, handsome, methodical manner, and were regarded by the mistress of the mansion as a very material part of her life's duty; but she would have been driven distracted had she been told that a daughter of hers was about to devote herself exclusively to charity. Her ideas of general religion were the same. Morning and evening prayers, church twice on Sundays, attendance at the Lord's table at any rate once a month, were to herself—and in her estimation for her own family—essentials of life.

And they had on her their practical effects. She was not given to backbiting—though, when stirred by any motive near to her own belongings, she would say an ill-natured word or two. She was mild and forbearing to her inferiors. Her hand was open to the poor. She was devoted to her husband and her children. In no respect was she self-seeking or self-indulgent. But, nevertheless, she appreciated thoroughly the comforts of a good income—for herself and for her children. She liked to see nice-dressed and nice-mannered people about her, preferring those whose fathers and mothers were nice before them. She liked to go about in her own carriage, comfortably. She liked the feeling that her husband was a judge, and that he and she were therefore above other lawyers and other lawyers' wives. She would not like to have seen Mrs. Furnival walk out of a room before her, nor perhaps to see Sophia Furnival when married take precedence of her own married daughter. She liked to live in a large place like Noningsby, and preferred country society to that of the neighbouring town.

It will be said that I have drawn an impossible character, and depicted a woman who serves both God
and Mammon. To this accusation I will not plead, but will ask my accusers whether in their life's travail they have met no such ladies as Lady Staveley? 75

To Lady Staveley, Felix Graham is quite ineligible as a son-in-law, having no private fortune and being too over-scrupulous in the practice of his chosen profession. She contrasts him with young Perry Orme, who "...was fair and handsome, one of the curled darlings of the nation...a young man to be loved by all the world, and--incidentally--the heir to a baronetcy and a good estate."

This woman is Archdeacon Grantly to a "T," and serves as typical of the average section of the gentlemanly class. She does serve both God and Mammon, and would never suspect that the two are incompatible. And neither does the average gentleman in Trollope's novels, for he instinctively feels that money and position (and the attendant concern over securing and maintaining them) are absolutely necessary for the gentleman to perform his particular function in the world--to unselfishly concern himself with the wants and needs of those below him while the gradual process of lessening distinctions between high and low is being carried out, which, in essence, is the liberal ideal to which Trollope firmly subscribed. As Sir William Patterson ably puts it, "The energetic, the talented, the honest, and the
unselfish will always be moving towards an aristocratic side of society, because their virtues will beget esteem, and esteem will beget wealth,—and wealth will give power for good offices.* "Perfection is, of course, not obtainable from any large group of people. That the whole of Trollope's gentlemanly class is not more selfish, self-indulgent, and worldly is extremely remarkable, and--to repeat--attests to his faith in the gentlemanly matrix of blood, breeding, position, and money, as productive of a moral and honorable, largely generous and unselfish class of people, with high ideals of service and duty.
CHAPTER VI

Gentlemen Transcendent

The average gentleman, we have seen, has a very prac-
tical realistic attitude toward position and money, and
although generally unselfish in service to country and
dependents, he yet remains personally selfish within the
limits of "ordinary selfishness." The attitude toward
these three points--money, position, and personal self-
ishness--constitutes the basis of difference between
average gentlemen and the topmost of the gentlemanly
hierarchy, Trollope's most highly approved group; for
these men transcend the worldliness and personal self-
ishness of the middle category. Strictly speaking they
are not divorced from that group--rather they are the
middle group transcendent. Unselfishness has loomed
larger and larger in Trollope's gradation of the gentle-
manly class, and this upper category approaches the
self-abnegation that he regards so highly.

In Trollope's best gentlemen blood and breeding and
the gentlemanly tradition combine to produce men with a
moral sense that goes beyond class codification and
formalization, beyond worldly class convictions, prej-
udices, and pressures, beyond personal selfishness, to
decisions that are wholly unselfish and, at times, even detrimental to the worldly interests of the individuals concerned. With them honor becomes a personal morality based upon their sense of individual integrity, their absolute necessity to do what is right for them. And in each instance, following this "inner light" ends in self-abnegation and unselfishness, a fact which certainly provides insight into Trollope's concept of the best products of the gentlemanly system. The moral sense of these men usually makes decisions only after a period of inward examination or struggle. Put in a given situation, a man will worry, weigh, and evaluate, until he determines what is right for him. He feels a necessity to be right with himself, whether others understand or not—a necessity that usually bears no relation to what others think and that operates independently of their prejudices or beliefs. This necessity is very closely related to the idea of manliness or lack of affectation—being true to one's inner nature and inner being.

This search for the proper individual course of action can be called an inner struggle, and the decision that results may run counter to the beliefs of others or to his own material advantages, often denying the importance of position and money, the two characteristics
so essential to the middle group of gentlemen as the means of maintaining the class. In these cases, the individual obviously prizes his set of values more highly than that of the class, an attitude which constitutes as obvious a defiance of the class as that of the fallen gentlemen. Strangely enough, the class accepts such transcendence of its principles and beliefs. And hence derives the paradox: a gentleman can fall out of his class, but he cannot rise out of it—again testimony to Trollope's insight into the end product of the system he portrays.

Just as gentlemen moved into the middle bracket from the bottom group, so may they move into the highest category as they demonstrate sufficient unselfishness and unworldliness. The attitude which places position and money and class policies in a subordinate role, which runs counter to what would normally be expected from "ordinary selfishness" seems to be the determining factor. The extent to which such an attitude becomes permanent, of course, determines where the man finally stands in the category. Young lovers such as Frank Gresham and Henry Grantly at least approach the threshold, love prompting in them an unselfishness that renounces wealth and position. Their defiance results from objections of their families and friends,
which in actuality constitute class prejudices. Phineas Finn and Dr. Wortle are gentlemen who actually move into the upper category, both making decisions of conduct extremely prejudicial to their worldly interest and both likewise defying objections to their decisions. In truth, as we shall see, the average section of the class, with its practical realistic attitude toward wealth and position and its own preservation, with its formalized code of conduct in all of its various lines of endeavor, and with its touch of personal selfishness, is not likely to be in sympathy with gentlemen who trust only themselves in matters of moral conduct. The age-old reaction of the group against the individual comes into play, and in Trollope the average category constantly acts as a pressure group against these thoroughly individualistic gentlemen, so that a conflict of sorts inevitably results. We have only to remember Dr. Grantly and the "gentry" of Barchester versus Mr. Harding to catch the point.

These gentlemen seem long since to have achieved the attitude of unworldliness and unselfishness. They have a sort of childlike simplicity about them, show little concern with material or worldly matters, are interested in helping others rather than themselves, and so more nearly achieve self-abnegation or pure
selflessness than do other gentlemen. These men are not perfect—no one is quicker than Trollope to point out their limitations and imperfections. Most of them have some glaring fault, but they strive to correct and eliminate it. By and large, they are too good and morally exacting for the job of running the world, for they are men of high principles who are unable to compromise, to give and take when needed. Their method is an indirect one, by example or model. As leavening agents they are extremely important, and it is in this light that Trollope views and feels their value. That their moral inferiors ultimately respect their actions is proof of that pudding. To Trollope they are the cream of the gentlemanly class, not because of possessions, or position, or utility, or even personal efforts, but because of their inner moral nature, because of what they are, and because of their inner compulsion to follow that nature, because of being what they have to be.

The point remains to be made that these men are not just better men fortuitously and haphazardly. These are the ultimate products of a system which Trollope felt had produced the greatest nation on earth. They are better because they are the products of that system, better to Trollope than the products of any other class were likely to be. In these men, blood and breeding
have combined to produce natures noble enough to approach
the ultimate end of the gentlemanly system that Trollope
records so minutely and approves of so highly, the ulti-
mate end of self-abnegation and pure uncloyed selfless-
ness—natures that, in their approach to self-abnegation,
paradoxically but necessarily defy the bases of the frame-
work that produced them.

Phineas Finn and Dr. Jeffrey Wortle are men with
the tastes and tendencies of average gentlemen, who, how-
ever, transcend these attitudes by utterly renouncing
the importance of their worldly interests, doing so by
taking courses of action which no one would expect them
to take, actions which are considered foolish and un-
realistic by those around them. This self-renunciation
or denial of ordinary self-indulgence causes a tran-
scendence into the highest level of Trollope's gentlemen.

Phineas Finn is an ambitious young Irish gentleman
of good breeding, who is elected to Parliament and accepts
the seat without working at his profession of barrister,
existing on an allowance from his father, really not
enough to support him adequately. Though he calls himself
a Liberal, at the very outset of his career he nobly says
he will support measures, not a party, this to the disgust
of Barrington Erle, to whom party politics is life, and
who incidentally represents the attitude of the average
gentleman on this point.

Phineas has a taste and an aptitude for the fashionable social side of the political world, joins clubs, and becomes very popular. When offered the Treasury post in the Government, a job that provides a salary, he finally accepts, having decided, however, that he will not save his post at the expense of his beliefs and his conscience. Shortly, however, he finds himself voting with the Government because he is expected to, but he does so with a sore heart because he feels that truth is with the opposition. He becomes very concerned with his position and the dishonesty which he may be called upon to engage in if he votes consistently as a party man. Of course, he might marry money and save himself from his dilemma in that manner, but his sense of honor finds that repugnant. Finally Phineas realizes there are circumstances where a man cannot stick by the boat, and resolves to resign his Government position. His sense of personal honor dictates this action despite the fact that such action means loss of income and hence loss of his political position and the life which has accompanied it.

This action is highly revealing. This young man, who delights in fashion and social intercourse, and in the life of Parliament, renounces these things because
of a moral compulsion within him that is stronger than the desire to gratify his self-indulgence. For he has his regrets after the action has been taken, moments only, however, which do not prevail. He would not have gone beyond accepted practice in following the Government line—"ordinary selfishness" and the convention itself would have sanctioned that. But he defies ordinary selfishness, not only in this decision but by refusing to marry for money, a step which would have allowed him to maintain an independent position in Parliament. Actually, his moral sense transcends the ordinary practice of average gentlemen, and causes him to give up the life he loves, to renounce those factors that have brought him pleasure, and to return to Ireland as a penniless barrister struggling for a start in Dublin. And all this renunciation in the face of the advice of his friends! His sense of self-respect, of what is personally right and imperative for him, dictates his resignation of position and income, a sense of honor transcending conventional established practice, and—particularly for this man—constituting a rather startling act of self-renunciation and unselfishness. Imagine Archdeacon Grantly or the Duke of St. Bungay taking such action! Not that these men would not have done so, had their honor or moral sense called upon them to take such
a step. Therein lies the tale. Neither would ever have been able to see beyond ordinary, established codified conduct and the "ordinary selfishness" upon which it is based.

Indeed, when Trollope brings Phineas back to the Parliamentary scene in *Phineas Redux*, Lord Cantrip tells Phineas that his action in leaving the Government was very high and honorable conduct, because it was based on an inward struggle between party loyalty and strong personal convictions which left no choice. He says he has known the same thing done by members of a Government perhaps half a dozen times and always the men have been the best and noblest of modern statesmen.

Dr. Wortle is another average gentleman whose moral sense finds itself compelled to transcend worldly interests and class policies. Wortle is a Grantly-like character, who likes the good things of the world, and as a clergyman hates severity and is quite human. Wortle is essentially a practical man, desirous of success in the world, and quite cognizant of the material harm that may result to his school and his family as a result of the mystery surrounding Mr. Peacocke, his new usher. When Peacocke discloses the actual circumstances of the mystery surrounding him and his American wife, confessing that they have continued to live together despite the
reappearance of her supposedly-dead husband, Wortle's moral sense dictates that he will stand by Peacocke and his wife until it can be discovered whether her former husband is still alive or not. This action obviously jeopardizes the welfare of his school and is taken against the advice of his wife, the neighboring Rev. Mr. Puddicombe, and his Bishop, all of whom in this case represent the average gentlemen with their pressures. Even Mr. Peacocke looks at the matter from the ordinary practical point of view—he feels that were he in Wortle's place he would bid himself go.

And Wortle does not reach his decision automatically. He realizes that to the world his first duties are to his parish, the name of his school, and his family's welfare. He is conscious that if he sticks by Peacocke he must weather outraged public reaction and the advantage thus given to his enemies. He knows that his school may melt away and he himself be destroyed. But his sense of what is right and wrong plus perhaps a touch of natural pugnaciousness transcends "ordinary selfishness," the dictates of class common sense, his eminent position, and his excellent source of income, and demands that he do what he feels is right for him. And so he finances Peacocke's trip to America to obtain evidence of the death of Mrs. Peacocke's first husband, and meanwhile keeps
Mrs. Peacocke on the school property.

The reaction to Wortle's resolution is what might have been expected. The diocese generally does not approve, and is clearly of the opinion that all the boys will be withdrawn from the school. Mr. Puddicombe questions Dr. Wortle's "prudence." His wife has a hard time of it when questioned by the gossips of the village. Nothing could better display the average reaction than she. A good-hearted woman, a generous woman, she cannot sanction her husband's decision. Trying to defend him, at the same time she feels his action incredible. She has never got past "ordinary selfishness"; in this case she would have done what the world automatically allows and calls for. Here she is at one with Mr. Puddicombe, who "...would have left the woman [Mrs. Peacocke] to break her heart and have gone away and done his duty like a Christian, feeling no tugging at his heart-strings."

Later, when many of the boys have been removed from the school, Wortle fears he sees the handwriting on the wall. He still protests, "'They came, and according to my way of thinking, I did my duty by them. Much as I am grieved by this, I protest that I would do the same again were it again to be done.'" Nevertheless, after Peacocke's troubles are settled satisfactorily and an earl's son has proposed to the doctor's daughter, Wortle
resumes normal interests in the world around him. His wife is overwhelmed at the brilliancy of Mary's prospects, and Trollope again reveals the touch of worldliness about Dr. Wortle. "Had the Doctor been as simple as his wife in showing her own heart, it would probably have been found that he was as much set upon the coronet as she." Here then is a man, practical, ambitious, in a sense worldly, who, however, transcends the ordinary conduct of the world and his own material interests when his moral sense, acting upon its own, demands that he perform what is right for him when the situation arises, pushed by manliness into the only possible decision for him. Again one speculates what Dr. Grantly or Mark Robarts would have done with Mr. Peacocke.

So much for Phineas Finn and Dr. Wortle, examples of average gentlemen who move into the topmost level of Trollope's hierarchy. There is, however, a group who seem permanently to have achieved the attitudes of unselfishness and unworldliness that result in self-renunciation. This is a high-minded group with simple tastes and simple attitudes. As a whole they stand above the petty concerns of life, the give and take of the ordinary traffic of the world, possessing simple, uncomplicated high ideals and standards of conduct which they refuse to compromise. They are unworldly to the extent that
they often seem incapable of perceiving or understanding either the interplay of the practical, amusingly selfish forces of daily life or the subtleties of evil. Although they are not hermits, they dislike the whirl of fashionable life, preferring the quiet of the country and the presence of a few close friends. They neither despise money nor refuse enough to allow them to perform their function as gentlemen in whatever sphere of life they may find themselves, but money is meaningless to them per se and they have no desire for the power and self-gratification that high position and money bring. Taken together, they are a serious, uncomplicated, unworldly, and highly moral group of men—with a touch of the eccentric, the foolish, or the saintly about them.

Such gentlemen appear in all ranks of the gentlemanly class and in all spheres of activity—a squire of small estate such as Roger Carbury; a country doctor like Dr. Thorne; one of the highest members of the peerage, Plantagenet Palliser, Duke of Omnium; and churchmen like Josiah Crawley and Mr. Harding. A thorough analysis of these five men provides an excellent understanding of Trollope's gentlemen, in action as well as theory. Although they most certainly are individuals with differing attitudes and degrees of emphasis, we have just seen that they possess a number of common characteristics.
It is obvious, furthermore, that these characteristics form a part of the pattern of the most approved gentleman and that they provide a background which makes more understandable the unselfishness and self-abnegation that prompts the important moral decisions that we shall presently inspect. Consequently, it is important to investigate more closely these common characteristics—simplicity, unworldliness, indifference toward fashion, and unconcern for the power and pleasure that position and money can bring—because they form part of the identifying pattern of the highest gentleman and are therefore necessary to an understanding of him.

Roger Carbury, for instance, provides an excellent picture of the simple, unworldly gentleman. He is a relatively poor country squire, who cares nothing for the world of fashion or really for material things, and who in the end proves the fact by standing ready to relinquish them. Truth, honesty, and, as it turns out, unselfish service to others, take precedence over money and position with him. He is the type with high ideals and standards, who refuses to compromise them in any way. At one point Trollope calls Roger "simple-minded," not in a derogatory sense, but rather as incapable of understanding a certain worldly point of view. This simplicity is characteristic of Roger. Evil and worldli-
ness are appalling to him and in some ways incomprehensible. There is no doubt, however, that he detects the evil and worldliness about him—but, then, he is smacked in the face with it. His is practically the lone voice of protest throughout the pages of *The Way We Live Now*; on all other sides there is cynical acceptance and compromise. Roger, for example, intensely deplores the lowering of moral standards and the increasing emphasis on money that made the rise of a Melmotte possible.

That condonation of antecedents which, in the hurry of the world, is often vouchsafed to success, that growing feeling which induces people to assert to themselves that they are not bound to go outside the general verdict, and that they may shake hands with whomsoever the world shakes hands with, had never reached him. The old-fashioned idea that the touching of pitch will defile still prevailed with him. He was a gentleman;—and would have felt himself disgraced to enter the house of such a one as Augustus Melmotte. Not all the duchesses in the peerage, or all the money in the city, could alter his notions or induce him to modify his conduct. 15

Ambition for rank, moreover, means nothing to Roger. For instance, "He thought that a gentleman, born and bred, acknowledged as such without doubt, could not be made more than a gentleman by all the titles that the Queen could give." In a memorable scene, Roger, in a burst of enthusiasm, completely transcends class lines and for a moment approaches the democratic point of view. He is contrasting Sir Felix Carbury with John Crumb, the miller,
while beseeching Ruby Ruggles to give up Felix and return to John.

'And if I understand it rightly,' he continued, 'it is for a vile thing such as he [Felix], that you have left a man who is as much above him in character, as the sun is above the earth. You think little of John Crumb because he does not wear a fine coat. . . . He thinks more of you than of himself, and would give you all that he has. . . . Oh, Ruby, if you knew how highly I respect that man, and how lowly I think of the other; how I look on the one as a noble fellow, and regard the other as dust beneath my feet, you would perhaps change your mind a little.' 17

Roger shows his attitude toward money while speaking with Hetta about Felix's proposed marriage to Marie. "I can't quite sympathise with your mother in all her feelings about this marriage, because I do not think that I recognize as she does the necessity of money." 18 Certainly Roger Carbury displays simplicity, unworldliness, and indifference toward position and money as such.

Like Roger Carbury, Dr. Thorne is also "simple-minded" and unworldly, although he is more practical and possesses more common sense. This man has devoted himself to the life of simple country village practitioner, and occupies himself in helping others, rather than in his own worldly affairs. Like Roger, also, he dislikes the whirl of fashionable social life. When he arrived at Miss Dunstable's conversazione, for instance, he felt "... that it was quite impossible that he should ever be at home
there.\textsuperscript{20} As Trollope puts it, although Dr. Thorne would be valued by his close friends in the country, the fashionable world of London would never have regarded him as likely to become the object of the wealthy Miss Dunstable's affections. When eventually Trollope marries him off to Miss Dunstable to satisfy the romantic desires of his novel-reading public, Dr. Thorne is reluctant to make the move. "His profession was all in all to him,—the air which he breathed as well as the bread which he ate; and how could he follow his profession if he made such a marriage as this? She would expect him to go to London with her; and what would he become, dangling at her heels there, known only to the world as the husband of the richest woman in the town?\textsuperscript{21}

The truth is that the Doctor was known for "... his well-sustained indifference to the world's opinions on most of those social matters with which the world meddles..." Position, as such, is meaningless to him, although he is practical enough to realize its advantages for his niece, Mary. He himself is happy as a village physician. As to attitude toward money, we are told that Dr. Thorne "never worshipped wealth," that he "had scorned the idol of gold," and that he indulged in a philosophy antagonistic to the world's practice.\textsuperscript{23} In \textit{Framley Parsonage}, moreover, we learn that "...it
had been the pride of his life so to live that the world
might know that he was indifferent about money." So,
like Roger Carbury, Dr. Thorne desires a simple and un-
fashionable life, and like Roger, he is unworldly and
cares little for high position or great wealth.

Plantagenet Palliser, although one of the highest
ranking members of the peerage, is another of the simple,
unpretentious, unworldly type seen in Thorne and Carbury.
His simplicity helps hasten the collapse of his Coalition
Ministry, for Palliser cannot adapt himself to the ways
of the world. He feels, for example, that politicians
should all be statesmen. He thinks that an opposition
speech by Sir Orlando Drought was induced by personal
jealousy, and that an honest man should not keep himself
in a position where he has to deal with such people.
The more worldly Duke of St. Bungay, whose job it is
to coddle Palliser along and thus maintain the Coalition,
retorts, "According to that the honest men are to
desert their country in order that the dishonest men may
have everything their own way." Glencora, Plantagenet's
worldly wife, reflects upon her husband's simple unworld-
ly nature when he becomes Prime Minister. "She knew him
to be full of scruples, unable to bend when aught was to
be got by bending, unwilling to domineer when men might
be brought to subjection only by domination. . . . To win
support by smiles when his heart was bitter within him would never be within the power of her husband. He could never be brought to buy an enemy by political gifts,--would never be prone to silence his keenest opponent by making him his right hand supporter." She adds to this estimate later in talking to Mrs. Finn. "'If you and I were hatching treason against him in the dark, and chance had brought him there, he would stop his ears with his fingers. He is all trust, even when he knows that he is being deceived. He is honour complete from head to foot.'" Palliser is astounded that Cora should even have dreamed of asking him to give her the position of Mistress of the Robes, and Trollope explains that the man does not possess "...sufficient experience of his fellow creatures to be aware how wonderfully temptations will affect even those who appear to be least subject to them."

Palliser has never been interested in the ordinary concerns and pursuits of gentlemen. He does not ride or hunt and nothing could make him think it worth his while to give up any shred of his time to such a matter as preserving foxes. And although he holds a position which calls for contact with the world, he cares nothing for fashion, even as Prime Minister refusing to make the social gestures which position and diplomacy demand. In an era of club life, he confesses he has not dined at a London
As for money and position or rank, Palliser cares nothing about them *per se*. He does not think a man better or happier for being rich or titled. He himself is proud of carrying a point in the House and of never submitting to anyone, but not of being heir to a duke. Actually he views money mainly as a shield against want or as a means of achieving his function of service to his country. To his uncle it meant everything to be Duke of Omnium; to Plantagenet it is less than nothing. He is indifferent to rank—whether he walks out of a room first or last means nothing to him. What is important is that he has won for himself by his own aptitudes and industry the post of Chancellor of the Exchequer. This unconcern with his rank persists and eventually poses problems for him. For example, Sir Orlando Drought presumes to suggest a policy for a coming session, which he would not have done had Palliser previously shown himself more the duke.

In short, as one of the richest peers in England and a Prime Minister to boot, Palliser is a paradox. Simple to the point of often being unable to understand selfishness and evil in others, unworldly to the point of causing concern among his more realistic brethren, high-principled and uncompromising, he stands head and
shoulders above the squabbling, bickering, compromising, shifting horde of politicians that fill the pages of the Palliser novels. And just as in the case of Carbury and Thorne, his simplicity, unworldliness, and high principles reflect the unselfishness that leads to decisions of self-abnegation.

The Rev. Josiah Crawley is yet another of this simple-minded, uncompromising, unworldly type. He is a serious, stern man, in this respect resembling Carbury and Palliser, a man who has a sense of mission, a strong and uncompromising sense of his function as a clergyman that leads to labors among the poor brickmakers of Hogglestock which Grantly or Robarts would probably feel beneath them. Stories are told, for instance, of his acts of charity, "...how he had worked with his own hands for the sick poor to whom he could not give relief in money, turning a woman's mangle for a couple of hours, and carrying a boy's load along the lanes." Indeed, Dr. Tempest and others declare that he has derogated from the dignity of his position as an English parish clergyman by such acts. It is this uncompromising, unworldly sense of duty that leads to decisions on Crawley's part which are almost incomprehensible to the practical Dr. Tempest-Grantly-Robarts group of gentlemen.

Unworldliness is also demonstrated by Crawley's
attitude toward fox hunting. " 'It must be vicious in all men. . . It is in itself cruel, and leads to idleness and profligacy.' " This attitude is in violent contrast to the more worldly Archdeacon's concern over the poisoning of foxes, and Mark Robarts' enthusiasm for the sport, which led him to become a hunting parson for a period of time.

Although this man is placed in a poverty-stricken situation which tests the moral fibre of his character, he really cares nothing for position and money as such. What is important to him is doing his job and helping his parishioners—without a doubt he is the most religious of all Trollope's clergymen, and has the greatest sense of duty. He bitterly wants money enough to ward off poverty and maintain his family as gentlefolk, money enough to pay him fairly for the work which he does—but the chances are that someone might have to look after the money if he had it, lest he give it all away in charity. High position is meaningless to him—all he wants is a place where he has work to do. After all the troubles are resolved at the close of The Last Chronicle, and Crawley is outfitted with a dress coat and is ready with his wife to go down to dinner at Plumstead, he says to her, " 'I would with all my heart that I might retire to rest.' " He fears going down to dinner, after having for so long
separated himself from the social world. The simplicity and unworldliness of the man place Crawley squarely alongside Carbury, Thorne, and Palliser.

The Rev. Septimus Harding is perhaps the best exemplar of the simple-minded, unworldly gentleman. At the close of Harding's life, Archdeacon Grantly compares Harding with Grantly's father, the old Bishop. "There is the same mild sweetness...a sweetness that never could believe much evil, but that could believe less, and still less, as the weakness of age came on them." And that is Mr. Harding—a man possessing a simple, uncomplicated approach to life, with good the basic concern. Like the others of his group, Harding is impractical. He cannot keep money matters straight and is branded imprudent by Archdeacon Grantly and his wife, which is to say that he does not think and act in a worldly fashion. The difference between father-in-law and son-in-law—between topmost and middle gentleman—emerges when Harding innocently asks why the nature of Sir Abraham Haphazard's opinion in the Hiram's Hospital case should not be publicly known. To him it is a matter of justice, either black or white. To the Archdeacon such action would be foolishly revealing information to the enemy, and he replies, "...a child is not more innocent than you are in matters of business." In the
council of war following Slope's sermon in the Cathedral, moreover, Harding's idealistic suggestion to allow Slope to preach and let all hear without shame what the man has to say is, of course, swallowed up by awakened militant indignation of his brother clergymen. When he goes to London to seek out Sir Abraham Haphazard, his simplicity and unworldliness remind us of Col. Newcome, and when Harding confesses to Haphazard that he would be unable to understand Hiram's will, even were he to read it, it is impossible not to contrast him again with his worldly-wise son-in-law. When the Jupiter article appears attacking Mr. Harding's salary as warden of Hiram's Hospital and indirectly the Church of England, Harding is appalled. How could he convince the country that he was "...no avaricious lazy priest scrambling for gold, but a retiring humble-spirited man, who had innocently taken what had innocently been offered to him?" The simple unworldliness of Harding is again demonstrated when Slope keeps him waiting at the bishop's palace. We are told that he did not really know how to resent Slope. "The whole tendency of his mind and disposition was opposed to any contra-assumption of grandeur on his own part, and he hadn't the worldly spirit or quickness necessary to put down insolent pretensions by downright and open rebuke, as the archdeacon would have done." This man is incapable
of open warfare on the battle field— we think of his gentle ministrations among his bedesmen, his quiet chats with the mild old Bishop, and his playing cat's cradle with his granddaughter Posy. Trollope has this quality in mind constantly, and is as constantly contrasting it with the practical worldly outlook of Grantly. Toward the close of *Barchester Towers*, for instance, Quiverful has misgivings at supplanting a fellow clergyman of the nature of Harding. Harding realizes this and goes out of his way to help the man get started.

All this Mr. Harding had fully comprehended. It was for such feelings as these, for the nice comprehension of such motives, that his heart and intellect were peculiarly fitted. In most matters of worldly import the archdeacon set down his father-in-law as little better than a fool. And perhaps he was right. But in some other matters, equally important if they be rightly judged, Mr. Harding, had he been so minded, might with as much propriety have set down his son-in-law for a fool. Few men, however, are constituted as was Mr. Harding. He had that nice appreciation of the feelings of others which belongs of right exclusively to women. 47

Mr. Harding's lack of concern with position and his emphasis on inward qualities are beautifully illustrated in *Framley Parsonage*. He is congratulating Griselda Grantly on her match with Dumbello, and nowhere does the simplicity, the lack of snobbery and the personal ambition of Harding appear so emphatically, as in contrast to the self-seeking, worldly, selfish Griselda. Trollope says
that Grizzy kissed Harding sparely, for "...those lips now were august and reserved for nobler foreheads than that of an old cathedral hack." Grizzy is afraid her noble in-laws will not approve of her grandfather, at his age, being "...one of the working menial clergy of the cathedral," for Mr. Harding still chants the Litany from Sunday to Sunday. Trollope's choice of words is significant, for he obviously regards Harding as far more than a "hack." He approves of his lack of high station, his relative poverty, and his usefulness—as opposed to Grizzy's snobbery. The warden's advice to her is also of utmost importance. "'And I hope you will be happy,—and make others happy. ...But always think most about the latter, my dear. Think about the happiness of those around you, and your own will come without thinking.'"

Harding is equally unconcerned about money as about position and rank. His resignation of the wardenship and refusal of the deanery are enough to indicate that. The honor of his name and feeling right with himself are more important than money can ever be, a point well demonstrated in his remark to Mrs. Grantly about Henry's proposed marriage, "'Money is worth thinking of, but it is not worth very much thought.'" If the young people love each other and there is anything for them to live on,
then he feels it is wrong to keep them apart. He reas­ sure his daughter Susan with a statement that is inevitable—even from a Harding. "You know, my dear, she is the daughter of a gentleman." The Archdeacon, on the other hand, is violently opposed to the marriage, and feels Henry would be throwing himself away on the daughter of a "pauper" and a "mad curate." To a considerable degree Grantly is opposed to this match because of selfishness on his part. If his son marries this woman, he fears the Proudies will gloat over him and the low-church curates that swarmed in Barchester will scream in delight over his dismay! At this point, it is apparent that Harding, like Carbury, Thorne, Palliser, and Crawley, possesses an attitude of simplicity and unworldliness, and is not concerned with the power and pleasure which can be derived from high position and money. To repeat, these characteristics form part of the pattern of the top gentlemen and reflect the unselfishness which makes possible the self-denying moral decisions which are the most important characteristic of this group.

In addition to the unusual simplicity and unworldliness of these men, they almost always possess an unusual softness of heart and tender affection. In its best instances, Trollope conceives of this affection as
almost feminine in nature, far transcending the limits of "ordinary selfishness." Let us explore this affection in our five gentlemen, just as we did the other characteristics, for it likewise takes its place as part of the pattern.

Roger Carbury, for example, has a soft heart, though he is by nature stern and does not demonstrate affection very easily. For instance, he regrets his comment to Lady Carbury about Felix being bad. "His heart was so soft that though he knew the woman to be false and the son to be worthless, he utterly condemned himself." Plantagenet Palliser is another of the same type. "The nature of the Duke's character was such that, with a most loving heart, he was hardly capable of that opening out of himself to another which is necessary for positive friendship." Further evidence appears in relation to Plantagenet's reaction to refusing Cora the post of Mistress of the Robes. He knows she is vexed and he is miserable, "...loving her as he did with all his heart, but with a heart that was never demonstrative. ...He was in truth so soft of heart that he could not bear the discomfort of the one person in the world who seemed to him to be near to him." This love is something that develops in Palliser; at the outset of his career he is activated more by duty than love, and he never achieves the open
affection of Dr. Thorne and Mr. Harding. Dr. Thorne, himself, is brusque and authoritative in his manner. But reference is made to the "large proportions of that loving, trusting heart" and to "that manly, and almost womanly tenderness." Crawley, on the contrary, seems to have steeled his heart against his peers, as a buffer or defense against his poverty. In a pathetic scene his wife seeing him prostrated on his knees in prayer and confession, thinks, "It might be better with him now, if only he could bring himself to some softness of heart." But surely the quality is there, the stern and bitter man, like Carbury or Palliser, having difficulty expressing it. It comes out under its guise of sternness, in his relationships with his family and in his ministrations to his poor parishioners. It is not strange, then, to hear Trollope speak of the "soft womanly affection" of Mr. Harding, or to learn that Adolphus Crosbie felt of Harding "...that he had never seen a face on which traits of human kindness were more plainly written." Again we learn much of Trollope's viewpoint in a passage differentiating Grantly and Harding. Grantly is not troubled by "that womanly tenderness" so peculiar to Mr. Harding. Grantly's feeling is the human feeling that he will be true to those who are true to him. "He knew nothing of that beautiful love which can be true to a
false friend." Yet it is pointed out that the Archdeacon is not deficient in heart. He loves his family and friends—those who go along with him—with an honest, sincere love, but it is a love tempered with "ordinary selfishness."

Thus, an unusually tender affection is added to the simplicity and unworldliness which so clearly form the background of Trollope's best gentlemen. The major characteristic of this top group of gentlemen, however, is their approach toward unselfishness or self-abnegation, the result of a moral sense based on such strong self-respect that it can trust only itself in major decisions of conduct—a respect of self justified by this very tendency toward renunciation. All these men possess a "fine" conscience, a moral sense that probes and checks and tests until it emerges with the decision that is right for the individual. This searching is the result of self-doubt, of actual unsureness as to the proper course of action, and inevitably the decision is unselfish, actually one prejudicial to the worldly interests of the individual and far above what would normally be expected. This tendency toward unselfishness it is which makes the decisions of these men tolerable and eventually respected by the average members of the gentlemanly class, who come to realize there are at work forces above and beyond them.
Using the same order employed in discussing the background characteristics—Carbury, Thorne, Palliser, Crawley, Harding—let us carefully inspect these unselfish and self-denying moral decisions which form the most important part of the highest gentlemanly pattern.

Roger Carbury's major decision of conduct comes about as the result of his unsuccessful suit of Hetta Carbury, the girl he loses to Paul Montague. Admittedly, his is a situation that would tax a saint. He passionately loves a girl who does not love him, but who does love the youth whom Roger has reared and loves as a son. To complicate matters, the boy fell in love with Hetta after Roger did, although completely unaware of Roger's suit. Roger's eventual decision—indeed, his conduct throughout the entire situation—goes far beyond what we would normally expect from a man. In other words, it transcends "ordinary selfishness," and this despite the fact that he is possessed with an unreasoning anger throughout. It is difficult to visualize a Grantly or a Duke of St. Bungay following Roger's conduct or reaching his eventual decision, although Crawley or Mr. Harding could easily fit into the pattern.

Roger's struggle throughout the affair is to overcome his anger and resentment, which Trollope admits are human but unjustified, and to fight down himself. A combination
of will power and love proves successful. For instance, he refuses to listen to the selfish side of himself when he is tempted to tell Hetta that he has seen Paul with Mrs. Hurtle at Lowestoffe. Again, when Hetta's mother writes him inquiring about Paul's relationship with Mrs. Hurtle, his conscience wrestles with the answer he should give, a process that is equally true of Dr. Thorne, Palliser, Crawley and Harding. It is clear to him that as a man of honor he cannot assist his own cause by telling circumstances which had come to him directly from a rival. And in spite of opportunities, in spite of almost overpowering temptation, he remains scrupulously fair and just to Paul.

As his moral sense plays upon the situation, little by little Roger realizes he is injuring Paul by not revealing the exact nature of the Lowestoffe incident, and as the result of a period of moral examination, he decides that he must do what is fair and right, without reference to his own feelings, in every battle overcoming selfishness. Yet Trollope shows the intensity of Roger's love for Hetta by contrasting him with John Crumb, the miller who loved Ruby Ruggles.

And yet the passion which dominated John Crumb altogether, which made the mealman so intent on the attainment of his object as to render all other things indifferent to him for the time, was equally strong with Roger Carbury. Un fortunately for Roger, strong as his passion was, it
was embarrassed by other feelings. It never occurred to Crumb to think whether he was a fit husband for Ruby, or whether Ruby, having a decided preference for another man, could be a fit wife for him. But with Roger there were a thousand surrounding difficulties to hamper him. John Crumb never doubted for a moment what he should do. He had to get the girl, if possible, and he meant to get her whatever she might cost him. He was always confident though sometimes perplexed. But Roger had no confidence. He knew that he should never win the game. In his sadder moments he felt that he ought not to win it. . . . Could he, by any training, bring himself to take her happiness in hand, altogether sacrificing his own? 65

When Hetta informs Roger that she must be Paul's wife, the question arises "... in what fashion should he in future treat the man and woman who had reduced him so low? ... If it were possible he would be unselfish." He struggles to be generous and resolves that Hetta shall be pardoned entirely, and Paul treated as though he were pardoned. Now, a man of pride and particularly one who feels, justly or unjustly, that he has been injured, does not easily surrender the woman he loves to someone else. But Roger makes an unusual decision, one which goes far beyond "ordinary selfishness" and actually approaches self-abnegation. True, he does not yield to the determination that he will accept Hetta and Paul as acknowledged lovers without "a fierce inward contest," but finally resolutions are made.

But then over these convictions there came a third,—equally strong [sic],—which told him
that the girl loved the younger man and did not love him, and that if he loved the girl it was his duty as a man to prove his love by doing what he could to make her happy. As he walked up and down the walk by the moat, with his hands clasped behind his back, stopping every now and again to sit on the terrace wall,—walking there, mile after mile, with his mind intent on the one idea,—he schooled himself to feel that that, and that only, could be his duty. What did love mean if not that? What could be the devotion which men so often affect to feel if it did not tend to self-sacrifice on behalf of the beloved one? A man would incur any danger for a woman, would subject himself to any toil,—would even die for her! But if this were done simply with the object of winning her, where was that real love of which sacrifice of self on behalf of another is the truest proof? So, by degrees, he resolved that the thing must be done. The man, though he had been bad to his friend, was not all bad. He was one who might become good in good hands. He, Roger, was too firm of purpose and too honest of heart to buoy himself up into new hopes by assurances of the man's unfitness. What right had he to think that he could judge of that better than the girl herself? And so... he succeeded in conquering his own heart,—though in conquering it he crushed it,—and in bringing himself to the resolve that the energies of his life should be devoted to the task of making Mrs. Paul Montague a happy woman. 68

And so in his burst of selfless enthusiasm, he determines to induce Paul and Hetta to live at Carbury, and resolves to violate his almost reverent belief in primogeniture and to settle his property on Hetta's eldest son. In doing so, "...he must learn to regard himself as an old man,—as one who had let life pass by too far for the purposes of his own home, and who must therefore devote himself to make happy the homes of others."
A representative of the average portion of the gentlemanly class, the Bishop of Elmham, of course takes Roger in hand in a quiet practical way and prevents him from settling his property on Hetta's children—these matters, he explains, should be handled by will. " 'A man should never put the power, which properly belongs to him, out of his own hands.' " According to the Bishop, Roger is " . . . so carried away by enthusiasm . . . as to ignore the ordinary rules of life." The Bishop does succeed in persuading Roger to abandon the idea of settling his property on Paul Montague's children. But Roger " . . . was not on that account the less resolute in his determination to make himself and his own interests subordinate to those of his cousin." Such renunciation is simply the firm acceptance of one of two alternatives he had clearly stated to himself near the beginning of The Way We Live Now, realizing, as he did, that he would never fully recover from his love for Hetta, and fearful that he had already in truth lost her.

Sorrowfully looking forward through the vista of future years, he thought he saw that Henrietta would become Paul's wife. Were it so, what should he do? Annihilate himself as far as all personal happiness in the world was concerned, and look solely to their happiness, their prosperity, and their joys? Be as it were a beneficent old fairy to them, though the agony of his own disappointment should never
depart from him? Should he do this, and be blessed by them,—or should he let Paul Montague know what deep resentment such ingratitude could produce? 71

Like Roger Carbury, Dr. Thorne also makes moral decisions resulting from unselfishness. Thorne's determination of his own course of action and his defiance of those who differ are demonstrated early in life when he stood by his brother Henry when the latter was renounced by their relatives, the Thornes of Ullathorne, and this, despite the fact that he had elected to establish himself in Barchester mainly in expectation of the help which his Ullathorne connection would provide him in beginning practice. But the chief concerns of Dr. Thorne's conscience directly or indirectly involve his niece, Mary Thorne. When Roger Scatcherd, now rich and the possessor of Boxall Hill, announces his intention of leaving his property under certain conditions to his sister Mary's eldest child, Dr. Thorne faces a serious problem—since Roger does not know that Mary Thorne is in actuality that eldest child. Thorne's first duty, he decides, is to God and his conscience, his second to Mary. Under the circumstances disclosed by Scatcherd's will, what does duty require of him? Wouldn't it be an act of dishonesty to allow Scatcherd to leave a will by which his property might go to a person never intended to be his heir (although
Roger has completely lost trace of his sister's whereabouts and history in America? The ramifications of the problem seem endless.

And then other thoughts crowded on his brain. He had always professed--professed at any rate to himself and to her [Mary]--that of all the vile objects of a man's ambition, wealth, wealth merely for its own sake, was the vilest. They, in their joint school of inherent philosophy, had progressed to ideas which they might find it not easy to carry out should they be called on by events to do so. And if this would have been difficult to either when acting on behalf of self alone, how much more difficult when one might have to act for the other! This difficulty had now come to the uncle. Should he, in this emergency, take upon himself to fling away the golden chance which might accrue to his niece if Scatcherd should be encouraged to make her partly his heir? 73

He definitely makes up his mind on one point--he will tell Roger the whole truth about Mary Thorne. "Come what might, the truth must be the best." And yet he wavers, fearing Roger will claim Mary and that life at Boxall Hill will kill her.

So he informs Scatcherd of Mary's true identity and resolutely holds on to her, resisting, on Mary's part, Scatcherd's offers of money, although he wonders if such resisting is really for Mary's interest. He does what he has to do, however, and he knows that he is basically right. Later Roger tries a bribe, saying he will name Mary as his heir provided Dr. Thorne try to bring about
marriage between Mary and Roger's son Louis. Thorne defies Roger on this point, doing so at the expense of having Mary cut out of Roger's will. He is wholly unconcerned about money. What he is securing and what he is concerned about is Mary's independence. And yet he is uncertain even here. He knows, of course, that he has done right in repudiating all idea of a marriage between Mary and Louis.

But how far had he done right in keeping her from the sight of her uncle? How could he justify it to himself if he had thus robbed her of her inheritance, seeing that he had done so from a selfish fear lest she, who was now all his own, should be known to the world as belonging to others rather than to him? He had taken upon him on her behalf to reject wealth as valueless; and yet he had no sooner done so than he began to consume his hours with reflecting how great to her would be the value of wealth. 75

His agreeing to become guardian of Louis until the boy reaches the age of twenty-five adds to the doctor's doubts. As a duty he will make every effort to keep Louis alive until that age, even though the boy's early death would benefit Mary so greatly. Too, "...he had other doubts...which nearly set him wild when he strove to bring his mind to a decision." With Mary so likely to inherit, could he wisely or honestly take steps to separate Mary and Frank Gresham, whose marriage would be eminently suitable, if she inherited? "And yet he could
not bring himself to encourage it then." He could not speak to the squire and he could not counsel Mary. Through the morass of temptations, his moral sense finds the clear-cut way, all the time never thinking of himself, although his interests are most certainly involved. His desire is to determine what is right, and in a self-denying manner, he devotes his attention and energies to others, at the same time on the lookout for selfish motives on his own part.

"I will never hanker after a dead man's shoes, neither for myself nor for another," he had said to himself a hundred times; and as often did he accuse himself of doing so. One path, however, was plainly open before him. He would keep peace as to the will; and would use such efforts as he might use for a son of his own loins to preserve the life that was so valueless. His wishes, his hopes, his thoughts, he could not control; but his conduct was at his own disposal. 77

He goes far out of his way for Louis, accepts the boy's abuse—and at the same time never gives a hint of Mary's possibilities either to Mary or the Greshams, and this too in the face of Mary's being abused by them. His is a story of amazing self-control, of transcending "ordinary selfishness," of refusing to look to his own material interests or even those of his beloved Mary, when to do so conflicts in any way with what he feels to be right. Dr. Thorne is the picture of a man who rises above his fellows.
Plantagenet Palliser, Duke of Omnium, is one of Trollope's most perfect gentlemen, and certainly intended to be such. Trollope says, for instance, in the Autobiography, "Plantagenet Palliser I think to be a very noble gentleman,—such a one as justifies to the nation the seeming anomaly of an hereditary peerage and of primogeniture." And he makes an even stronger statement about this man. "I think that Plantagenet Palliser, Duke of Omnium, is a perfect gentleman. If he be not, then am I unable to describe a gentleman." He is surely Trollope's ideal statesman. Trollope realized, of course, and tells us that most statesmen by necessity have to give up personal political convictions in order to work together usefully as a party unit. Palliser is his portrait of the statesman who refuses to give up personal principles and who consequently rises above party and class.

This man has the same self-doubt and probing moral sense that we have previously seen. This self-doubt and hesitation is very clearly demonstrated in his thoughts about accepting the position of Prime Minister.

But his own position and his questionable capacity for filling it,—that occupied all his mind. If nominally first he would be really first. Of so much it seemed to him that his honour required him to assure himself. To be a faineant ruler was in direct antagonism both to his conscience and his predilections.
To call himself by a great name before the world, and then to be something infinitely less than that name, would be to him a degradation. But though he felt fixed as to that, he was by no means assured as to that other point, which to most men firm in their resolves as he was, and backed up as he had been by the confidence of others, would be cause of small hesitation. He did doubt his ability to fill that place which it would now be his duty to occupy. He more than doubted. He told himself again and again that there was wanting to him a certain noble capacity for commanding support and homage from other men. With things and facts he could deal, but human beings had not opened themselves to him. But now it was too late; and yet,--as he said to his wife,--to fail would break his heart! No ambition had prompted him. He was sure of himself there. One only consideration had forced him into this great danger, and that had been the assurance of others that it was his manifest duty to encounter it. And now there was clearly no escape,--no escape compatible with that clean-handed truth from which it was not possible for him to swerve. He might create difficulties in order that through them a way might still be open to him of restoring to the Queen the commission which had been entrusted to him. He might insist on this or that impossible concession. But the memory of escape such as that would break his heart as surely as the failure. 81

His doubt and hesitation are tacitly condemned by the Duke of St. Bungay, however, as he talks to Lord Cantrip sometime after Palliser has been in office. "The fault is that he takes things too seriously. If he could be got to believe that he might eat, and sleep, and go to bed, and amuse himself like other men, he might be a very good Prime Minister. He is over troubled by his conscience." 82

But the self-doubt and the hesitation result in Palliser's finding truth for himself and following it, the process necessary to Trollope. Time after time, his
questioning moral sense dictates decisions that are self-denying or prejudicial to his own worldly interests. These decisions pass beyond the bounds of "ordinary selfishness," and in some instances go counter to the usual practices of the average gentlemen of the political world. In places, they are obviously an outright defiance of what is usual or expected.

Palliser's decision to refuse the post of Chancellor of the Exchequer, a long coveted position, in order to take his wife Glencora to Europe in an attempt to save her from her love for Burgo Fitzgerald, is a decision of self-denial. It is a decision springing from both duty and an awakening sense of love. The dry and impassionate Palliser realizes that he has been pushed into a loveless marriage of convenience and that he has given Glencora little of his time and attention. Now his sense of right and wrong plus the dawning emotion of love dictate that he owes his time and attention to her in order to save her from the pitfall of Burgo, and so he follows almost unhesitatingly the dictates of his inner being, sacrificing the political position which he has so ardently desired. Cora fully realizes and appreciates what the choice costs her husband.

"Oh, he has been so good! It is almost impossible to make anyone understand it. If you could know how he has longed for this
office;--how he has worked for it day and night, wearing his eyes out with figures when everybody else has been asleep, shutting himself up with such creatures as Mr. Bott when other men have been shooting and hunting and flirting and spending their money. He has been a slave to it for years,—all his life I believe,—in order that he might sit in the Cabinet, and be a minister and a Chancellor of the Exchequer. 83

The Duke of St. Bungay tries to keep Palliser from refusing the post. That a man under thirty should be thought fit to be Chancellor of the Exchequer and should refuse it—for almost any reason—is unbelievable to him. He exclaims, "'Palliser, if she were dying, you should remain under such an emergency as this. She might go, but you should remain.'" The Duke of St. Bungay, as we have seen, is a representative member of the average gentlemen, and serves as a foil for Palliser all through the Palliser novels. He presents the worldly, compromising average gentleman in contrast to the more exacting, probing, idealistic Plantagenet. It is the Archdeacon Grantly—Mr. Harding relationship all over again, and for the same purpose—by contrast to point up the more approved man. St. Bungay is the voice of the class—advising, admonishing, pressuring. But Plantagenet goes his own way, following the dictates of an inner voice, and often transcends and thus defies St. Bungay's advice.

Palliser's Harding-like make-up is clearly
demonstrated in another instance. The insufferable Bonteen had been given a position on the Board of Trade to get rid of him. At Bonteen's death, Palliser asks Gresham, the Prime Minister, to give him Bonteen's position. Now, Palliser is Privy Seal and taking such a post will, in the eyes of the world, be a great come-down. To him the lowering of rank means nothing; the position will allow him to continue his work on decimal coinage, to which he is dedicated. Some of the older nobility, however, feel that Palliser is derogating from his proper position, and so the Duke of St. Bungay speaks to him. He lectures the self-effacing Palliser about the importance of bearing himself more like a duke and compares Plantagenet in this respect with his uncle, the old Duke of Omnium. He very frankly brings up the matter of the Garter which Palliser had not received, largely, in his opinion, because Palliser was too much the slave of his country and not enough the duke. Self-effacement, lack of concern for the power and splendor of high rank are a sort of heresy to the practical Duke of St. Bungay. He unconsciously feels that part of the strength of the nobility lies in its ability to secure respect through proper use and display of its advantages. To Palliser, such matters are meaningless—he wishes to be the slave of his country with no touch of the master. On this
point he and Bungay are completely at severance. St. Bungay is afraid that the world will think Palliser's post a demotion and that Palliser will be considered less than Bonteen, a consideration which does not bother Plantagenet at all. He replies, "'It is too late now, Duke; and, to tell the truth of myself, not even you can make me other than I am. My uncle's life to me was always a problem which I could not understand. Were I to attempt to walk in his ways I should fail utterly, and become absurd. I do not feel the disgrace of following Mr. Bonteen.'"

Another memorable decision concerns the payment of Lopez's election expenses at Silverbridge. Cora led Lopez to believe he would secure the Duke's interest in the Silverbridge election, but Palliser later issued a public "hands-off" statement, and so Lopez spent his electioneering expenses in vain. Being no gentleman and not understanding the unwritten laws of these matters, Lopez demands that Palliser make good his losses. Palliser is now Prime Minister and consequently his actions and decisions are of more importance to the world at large than previously. He knows well the public may consider payment to Lopez as a bribe to keep the man’s mouth shut.

But Palliser's usual manner of settling such problems
takes over. "He was trying to calculate in his mind what might be the consequences of paying money to Mr. Lopez. But when the calculation slipped from him,—as it did,—then he demanded of himself whether strict high-minded justice did not call upon him to pay the money let the consequences be what they might. And here his mind was truer to him, and he was able to fix himself to a purpose,—though the resolution to which he came was not, perhaps, wise." He concludes that in justice Lopez should be paid, because Cora was at fault, and pays the man the five hundred pounds. When he eventually comes under attack by the Public Banner, he refuses to answer 88 or to let anyone else answer. St. Bungay discovers the truth, considers the money was paid from an "over-nice sense of honour", and proposes an acceptable way out of the affair, but Palliser rejects this suggestion. When Cora learns of the attack on her husband, she comes to him and insists that the truth be told, but he answers, "'Glencora, in these matters you must allow me to judge for myself, and I will judge.'" Palliser's conduct throughout the affair is typical of him. Regardless of the consequences to himself and party, politically and personally, he follows a clear-cut, uncompromising path, one that goes far beyond justice or duty or "ordinary selfishness." With clear realiza-
tion of the distress and misery which will probably result to his thin-skinned temperament, he follows the dictates of his being—because any other course of action is impossible.

Perhaps the most important and defiant political decision Palliser makes involves the Garter given to the Earl of Earlybird, a decision which shatters tradition, comes close to political suicide, and temporarily causes the Duke of St. Bungay to split with him. When the dissolute Marquis of Mount Fidgett dies, a Garter becomes vacant. The Duke of St. Bungay strongly recommends that Palliser follow a traditional practice of nominating himself for the honor, pointing out that such a procedure is expected of him in this case. But Palliser declares it out of the question. Bungay then proposes the new Marquis of Mount Fidgett; but because this man has hitherto resided in Italy and has never done anything for his country, he is beyond consideration to the Prime Minister, although Bungay points out the man is the second richest peer in Britain, that "wealth, rank and territorial influence" have something to do with the bestowal of the honor, and that such a choice will cause fewer political repercussions than others. If desert alone must be looked for, says Bungay, Lord Drummond of their own Coalition Government has been very true to them politically. The
whole of St. Bungay's argument is that such honors are
distributed in a traditional manner and largely from
political motives. There is nothing wrong about this,
the Duke implies; these are the facts of political life.

Palliser, however, goes beyond all tradition and
political dictates to pure merit, and suggests the Earl
of Earlybird, a man whom he feels has really served his
country, having for half a century devoted himself to the
improvement of the laboring classes, especially in refer-
ence to their abodes and education, and a man, incidentally,
says Trollope, who probably had no more idea of the
Garter than he did of a Cardinal's hat. Bungay tries to
demonstrate to Palliser the political folly of giving
such an honor to a member of the opposition and to such
a self-effacing man as Earlybird. The difference in the
viewpoints of the two men is easily demonstrated. Palli-
sier discloses what lies behind his decisions and very
clearly demonstrates his defiance of tradition and polit-
ical diplomacy for the sake of personal principles. St.
Bungay thus concludes his lecture on the facts of polit-
ical life, which has attempted to show why the Earl of
Earlybird is an impossible candidate for the Garter from
a political point of view:

"...there is an aptness, a propriety, a fitness
in these things which one can understand perhaps
better than explain."
"Those fitnesses and aptnesses change, I think, from day to day. There was a time when a knight should be a fighting man."
"That has gone by."
"And the aptnesses and fitnesses in accordance with which the sovereign of the day was induced to grace with the Garter such a man as the late Marquis of Mount Fidgett have, I hope, gone by. You will admit that?"
"There is no such man proposed."
"And other fitnesses and aptnesses will go by, till the time will come when the man to be selected as Lieutenant of a county will be the man whose selection will be most beneficial to the county, and Knights of the Garter will be chosen for their real virtues."
"I think you are quixotic. A Prime Minister is of all men bound to follow the traditions of his country, or, when he leaves them, to leave them with very gradual steps."
"And if he break that law and throw over all that thraldom;—what then?"
"He will lose the confidence which has made him what he is."
"It is well that I know the penalty. It is hardly heavy enough to enforce strict obedience." 

Palliser's moral idealism and the defiance consequent on moral certitude are unmistakable.

Of course, Palliser experiences self-doubt about his decision, particularly when he is hounded in the papers about it. "It is the chief torment of a person constituted as he was that strong as may be the conviction that that thing ought to be done, no sooner has it been perfected than the objections of others, which before had been inefficacious, become suddenly endowed with truth and force." But in spite of the torments of attack, Palliser did and could have done no other than what he did. He might
afterward condemn himself and wear sackcloth, but nothing
could have prevented his following uncompromisingly his
sense of what is right, despite the consequences to him-
self and against the advice and insistent appeal of the
average gentleman, as represented by the Duke of St.
Bungay.

Roger Carbury, Dr. Thorne, and Plantagenet Palliser
are certainly exemplary gentlemen. Yet a difference
exists between these three men, on the one hand, and
Josiah Crawley and Septimus Harding, the gentlemen next
to be discussed—a difference that should be made clear
at this point. The tradition of the English gentleman
has always included the element of Christian virtue,
stressed more in certain periods, of course, than in
others. The most cursory inspection of A. Smythe-Pal-
mer's *Ideal of a Gentleman* (London, n.d.) will serve
to show the intimate equating of the Christian and the
gentleman in the Victorian period. As was pointed out
in the second chapter of this study, in Trollope the
basis of the gentleman's morality is Christianity, to
which has been added the code of honor; and the moral
sense of the best gentlemen was there described as
founded on the individual's sense of worth and the exer-
cise of Christianity. In brief, Trollope's ideal gentle-
man is the Christian gentleman. Christianity, in fact,
is so completely and unconsciously taken for granted by Trollope as part of his world that it does not receive much emphasis in his novels. To realize the emphasis which he places on Christianity as part of the Victorian gentleman's make-up, we have to read his *Life of Cicero*, where Trollope's belief in Christianity comes into conflict with paganism on almost every other page. This feeling for Christianity can be illustrated by a typical example from his Cicero. "And then how nearly he [Cicero] had realized that doctrine which tells us that we should do unto others as we would they should do unto us—the very pith and marrow and inside meaning of Christ's teaching, by adapting *sic* which we have become human, by neglecting which we revert to paganism. When we look back upon the world without this law, we see nothing good in it, in spite of individual greatness and national honor." At another place Cicero is compared with a modern "English Christian gentleman" and comes off second best.

Trollope's most approved gentlemen are all Christian gentlemen in truth, but Josiah Crawley and Septimus Harding are Christian gentlemen *par excellence*. In them the Christian element seems to dominate, so that of them we might say they are Christians first and gentlemen next. We recall the devout ministrations of Crawley among the
poor and wretched workers of Hoggle End and Harding's life of Christian practice that can prompt this epitaph from Trollope, "And so they buried Mr. Septimus Harding, formerly Warden of Hiram's Hospital in the city of Barchester, of whom the chronicler may say that that city never knew a sweeter gentlemen or a better Christian."

The Rev. Josiah Crawley, perpetual curate of the parish of Hogglestock, was a man "who feared God and his own conscience." Trollope informs us that no one could look at him "...without seeing that there was a purpose and a meaning in his countenance." We have previously noted his deep sense of religious duty and acts of charity among his poor parishioners. A man wholly impractical, like Palliser thin-skinner and unsuited for the give and take of the everyday world, he is one of the most inwardly-searching and uncompromising of Trollope's gentlemen--and the strongest. The major moral decisions of his life at first glance may not be understandable to those about him, but they are the products of his own searching, and unbendingly and unhesitatingly he follows them even to the point of martyrdom.

Of all Trollope's characters, Crawley is probably the most complicated and most difficult to understand, so difficult as to defy the complete unlocking of his character and his meaning. Trollope himself recognizes the
irreconcilable elements of the man's nature when he speaks of "the pride, the humility, the manliness, the weakness, the conscientious rectitude and bitter prejudices of Mr. Crawley." Three things are certain: first, Crawley very obviously receives Trollope's approval; second, he undergoes abject poverty and the humiliation of being falsely accused of theft, trials which the other upper-group gentlemen do not face; and third, he possesses pronounced eccentricities of personality which become exaggerated under the influence of that poverty and humiliation. The man's false pride, bitterness and hatred and resulting ungenteel demeanor which emerge under the duress of his hardships truly present a challenge. Is he actually an upper-category gentleman temporarily warped by his difficulties, or is he something wholly different? He appears to fit the pattern of the gentlemen transcendent in terms of unworldliness, sense of duty, and self-sacrifice; yet the suspicion recurs that he is fundamentally not of that group.

The challenge that Crawley poses must be accepted, and the effort to discover the truth about him necessitates a thorough examination of his life and nature that none of the other topmost gentlemen requires. Let us first examine the facts of Crawley's life in the midst of his poverty. First of all, he has cut himself off from
society. "He cared little for society, judging men to be doing evil who did care for it." At any mention of social intercourse, he retreats in uncompromising refusal, and has reduced his contacts with his social equals to an absolute minimum. His wife tells us, "... he cannot bear to enter the house of a rich man unless his duty calls him there." In fact, from the very beginning this antipathy to social intercourse manifests itself in his determination to dedicate himself to the church with no regard to his own worldly interests. Crawley, moreover, possesses a bitter hatred for high position and wealth in any manifestation. He hates Arabin's library with its gilded leather-bound books, and Arabin's sleek horse. He feels uncomfortable in Mark Robarts' study, and as he walks to Barchester to see Bishop Proudie, derives satisfaction from the thought that he will be dirty, hot, and mud-stained, in contrast to the sleek, clean, well-fed, "pretty" Bishop. He hates Dr. Tempest because Tempest's door is opened by "a man servant dressed in black." In brief, he despises the evidences of comfort and even culture among his more prosperous brother clergymen, bitterly resenting those things which help constitute grace and elegance of living, and actually taking a joy in his own poverty-stricken circumstances, so that his wife can say, "'I
fear that he regards the rich as his enemies."

To this apparent renunciation of the social amenities, to this apparent bitter hatred of the appurtenances that constitute elegant life, if we add Crawley's devout sense of mission, his stern outlook, and his granite-like unyieldingness in the face of hardship, there arises the possibility that in places, at least, this character gets out of Trollope's hand and emerges not as a gentleman, but as a half-conscious repudiation of gentlemanliness itself, stemming perhaps from the misery of Trollope's own poverty-stricken boyhood and youth. That possibility certainly exists, just as the Stebbins' conjecture that Crawley is Anthony's unconscious picture of his father is another alternative. And that possibility is challenging.

It is difficult, however, to forget Mark Robarts' realization that all who know Crawley, even the grooms at Barchester, recognize him to be a gentleman. The evidence, indeed, suggests that Crawley is the picture of a gentleman—an incredibly eccentric one—in whom poverty has brought out personality quirks which come close to destroying his gentlemanliness. Bradford A. Booth has pointed out that Trollope was much concerned with the low rate of payment to curates. In his article "Trollope and the 'Pall Mall Gazette,'" Booth identifies some previously unidentified Trollope contributions to this
periodical, one of which (July 24, 1865) concerns this subject. A statement from this article by Trollope is pertinent. " 'But to the people who want the services of a clergyman, a married curate,—or a married incumbent of a district,—with £150 per annum for all his wants, is not a pleasant sight either in a religious, or in a social, or in a professional point of view.' " Booth goes on to point out that *Clergymen of the Church of England* was published in the *Pall Mall* from November, 1865 to January, 1866, and that immediately afterwards Trollope began *The Last Chronicle*, in which Josiah Crawley is just such an impoverished curate as he had described in the *Clergy*-

men. Apparently at this time Trollope was concerned with the effects of poverty on the gentleman as clergyman and we are fairly safe in assuming that Crawley was to be used to show those effects.

But Josiah Crawley is not an ordinary clergyman. Any clear understanding of him must be premised on his unusual personality, which becomes warped and, at times, unbalanced under the pressure of poverty and humiliation. Mark Robarts makes this point strongly. "There was something radically wrong within him, which had put him into antagonism with all the world, and which produced these never-dying grievances. There were many clergymen in the country with incomes as small as that which had fallen to
the lot of Mr. Crawley, but they managed to get on without displaying their sores as Mr. Crawley displayed his. They did not wear their old rusty cloaks with all that ostentatious bitterness of poverty which seemed to belong to that garment when displayed on Mr. Crawley's shoulders. Crawley feels that his poverty is undeserved and that he works hard with insufficient reward, and both these points are true. But he protests by falling behind the defense of an enormous false pride and self-pity, a fact recognized by Arabin and Mrs. Crawley, and emphasized by Trollope. Mrs. Crawley accuses him of self-indulgence in his grief, and Trollope speaks of his "revelling in the sense of the injustice done to him." Elsewhere Trollope says, "He pitied himself with a commiseration that was sickly in spite of its truth." This portrait certainly invites the question whether such a man belongs to the highest category of gentlemen. The question can be partially answered by pointing out that Crawley seems to fit the pattern of this category and that he certainly received Trollope's sympathy and manifest approval. The real question would seem to be whether he is capable of recognizing his false pride and self-pity as forms of selfishness and whether, like Roger Carbury, he fights them. And the answer is that he does.

The man's false pride proves the greatest threat
to his gentlemanliness. It is the pride of the man who finds himself in a position which he feels should not exist, the pride of the trained, dedicated, hard-working man who feels that his worth is not recognized, that his labors are not adequately rewarded, and that his poverty-stricken position is unjust. And he is right. But it is also true that false pride provides no answer to that injustice. Crawley has not lost the feeling and desire for gentlemanly life. When he and his wife married, being poor, they decided, "They would give up ideas of gentle living, of soft raiment, and delicate feeding." At this point Trollope clearly considers Crawley a gentleman when he reminds us of the difficulties which beset the gentleman who is forced to change and place himself lower in the social rank. "There are a thousand things, mean and trifling in themselves, which a man despises when he thinks of them in his philosophy, but to dispense with which puts his philosophy to so stern a proof." But Crawley's poverty remains permanent, in spite of his industry, and his feeling of injustice eventually produces a sense of martyrdom which seemingly prevents him from acknowledging the desirability of the gentlemanly comforts. However, Crawley's bitter resentment towards the rich people and more prosperous clergymen around him probably indicates a desire on his part for these comforts, not a renunciation of
them. The man protests too much. For instance, "It

galled him. . . to think that he and his were so poorly
dressed." He cannot get over the fact that although
Arabin sits in a snug deanery and rides a sleek horse,
he, Crawley, is the better scholar and surpassed Arabin
academically. His resentment is a mask that hides the
truth. Not that he yearns and longs for wealth and posi­
tion in themselves, for that would be contrary to his
nature in spite of what bitterness has done to him. What
he secretly wants is acceptance among his peers, to achieve
which poverty must be eliminated. Thus Crawley does not
seem to be selfish in these desires. It is not so much
a desire for material comforts as it is a desire to be­
long. Indeed, the gentlemanly feeling of pride of posi­
tion still remains within him in the midst of his poverty
and shows itself upon occasion even though bitterness and
desperation may be causing him to emphasize this pride
more than would be normal to his nature otherwise. In
one such instance, Trollope remarks, "And in it all, I
think, there was nothing so bitter to the man as the derog­
atation from the spiritual grandeur of his position as priest
among men, which came as one necessary result from his
poverty." When speaking to Mr. Toogood, Crawley clearly
reveals an organic sense of gentlemanliness. "It is my
lot to have to endure the sufferings of poverty, and at
the same time not to be exempt from those feelings of
honour to which poverty is seldom subject."

Thus Crawley seems to have retained feelings of gen-
tlemanliness in the midst of his long-endured poverty,
although selfishness in the form of false pride comes
very close to destroying them. Toward the close of The
Last Chronicle in a remark to Arabin, Crawley discloses
knowledge of his fault. " 'The new Jerusalem is still
within my reach,—if it be not forfeited by pride and
obstinacy.' " This remark is of extreme importance.
Crawley must be aware of his selfishness to fight it,
and he must fight it if he is eventually to transcend
it. We feel that his acceptance of St. Ewold's is the
necessary step back into society and that this step will
help curb his faults in the future. While the Crawleys
are visiting at Plumstead, a conversation between him
and the Archdeacon demonstrates Crawley's readjustment
to the gentlemanly sphere. This conversation Crawley
relates to his wife.

"I told him that in regard to money matters, as
he called them, I had nothing to say. I only
trusted that his son was aware that my daughter
had no money, and never would have any. 'My
dear Crawley,' the archdeacon said,—for of late
there seems to have grown up in the world a habit
of greater familiarity than that which I think did
prevail when last I moved much among men;—'my
dear Crawley, I have enough for both.' 'I would
we stood on more equal grounds,' I said. Then as
he answered me, he rose from his chair. 'We
stand,' said he, 'on the only perfect level on which such men can meet each other. We are both gentlemen.' 'Sir,' I said, rising also, 'from the bottom of my heart I agree with you. I could not have spoken such words; but coming from you who are rich to me who am poor, they are honourable to the one and comfortable to the other.'

Throughout his poverty and troubles, however, and in spite of his false pride, his bitter resentment toward those above him and his terrible inner turmoil, the Rev. Crawley remains a devout, practicing Christian. As has been previously mentioned, Crawley is the most religious of all Trollope's clergymen. He continues his duties among his parishioners, helping the poor with his own hands when necessary, and refusing to think of his own comfort. Although selfish in the sense of false pride, he possesses the capability of self-sacrifice—a power of self-abnegation almost absolute when he feels such a step is right. Trollope often contrasts Crawley's false pride with his true pride; and our perception of his true pride and capability of self-abnegation, obscured as they are by his bitterness, helps justify classing him as a gentleman transcendent in spite of his eccentricities. Throughout, he retains an unwavering moral sense and a firm self-respect and belief in his integrity. We early learn about Crawley's tendency to stand up for what he believes is right, for he is no meek and submissive churchman. In an expository section describing Mrs.
Proudie's objections to Mr. Crawley, Trollope says, "Mr. Crawley... had not been so submissive to episcopal authority as it behoves any clergyman to be whose loaves and fishes are scanty. He had raised his back more than once against orders emanating from the palace..."

A clear-cut instance of Mr. Crawley's sense of self-respect and his insistence on relying upon it in his time of need is provided when, after Crawley's committal to trial by the Silverbridge magistrates on the charge of stealing a check for twenty pounds, Mrs. Proudie forces her husband to write an illegal letter of inhibition. She wants to force Crawley from his pulpit and replace him with the despicable Mr. Thumble. Of course, Proudie has no authority to force Crawley from his preferment, but Mrs. Proudie forces such a letter from him and sends it to Hogglestock by way of Thumble. Crawley, of course, refuses to abandon his pulpit and fires back a letter to the bishop setting his straight on the legality of his inhibition. Part of the letter—incidentally a masterpiece—makes clear Crawley's faith in himself. He points out that the Bishop's note was an order,—not advice—but even had it been advice he would have been unable to accept it.

"But in this matter, my lord, I could not have accepted advice from living man, no, not though the hands of the apostles themselves had made
him bishop who tendered it to me, and had set him over me for my guidance. I thank your lordship for telling me whither I am to look for assistance. Truly I know not whether there is any to be found for me on earth. But the deeper my troubles, the greater my sorrow, the more pressing my danger, the stronger is my need that I should carry myself in these days with that outward respect of self which will teach those around me to know that, let who will condemn me, I have not condemned myself. Were I to abandon my pulpit, unless forced to do so by legal means, I should in doing so be putting a plea of guilty against myself upon the record. This, my lord, I will not do." 121

It is important to note that at this point Crawley feels an absolute need of holding his pulpit.

The general consensus among Crawley's brother clergy-men is that he should have the services of a lawyer. Theirs is, of course, the common-sense viewpoint. But Crawley, with simple innocence, rises above personal consideration to a realm of truth. To Mark Robarts, who has been sent by Tempest, Grantly, et al., to speak to him on the matter, he says:

"I will have no one there paid by me to obstruct the course of justice or to hoodwink a jury. I have been in courts of law, and know what is the work for which these gentlemen are hired. I will have none of it, and I will thank you to tell the archdeacon so, with my respectful acknowledgements of his consideration and condescension. I say nothing as to my own innocence, or my own guilt. But I do say that if I am dragged before that tribunal, an innocent man, and am falsely declared to be guilty, because I lack money to bribe a lawyer to speak for me, then the laws of this country deserve but little of that reverence which we are accustomed to pay to them. And if I be guilty...I will not add to my guilt by hiring
any one to prove a falsehood or to disprove a truth." 122

When Mark protests that he should trust to others who are calmer than he, Crawley replies, "I cannot trust to any one,—in a matter of conscience. To do as you would have me is to me wrong. Shall I do wrong because I am unhappy? . . . I can trust no one with my own conscience. . . ." 123

But the most important decision of Crawley's career involves the resignation of his curacy, a decision which can bring only respect for his sincerity and feeling of integrity. After his return from London, Crawley becomes physically and emotionally ill for a period of time, the result of his long-time resentment of inadequate payment as a clergyman and of his inward turmoil about having been accused of theft. His wife realizes he sometimes becomes emotionally disturbed to the point of insanity, but she does not realize that Crawley himself sees this and fears his madness—to the point of wrestling with the idea of relinquishing his parish because he doubts his competence. His moral sense probes and turns and twists, seeking for the truth. Finally, when Crawley receives the letter from Dr. Tempest asking him to appear before the ecclesiastical board of inquiry (and definitely stating that no report will be made to the Bishop until after Crawley's trial), he goes out into his parish and,
sitting on a gate, with the rain pouring down, reviews his situation. He concludes that a jury would be right in finding him guilty—or if they knew the truth, pronounce him addle-pated, and thus unfit to hold a parish. As he sits there contemplating, along passes Giles Hoggett, an old brickmaker from Hoggle End, who imparts this wisdom: "'It's dogged as does it. It ain't thinking about it.'" This statement makes an impression on Crawley, who spends the rest of the day learning the lesson which Hoggett has attempted to teach him. "But the learning of it was not easy, and hardly became more easy when he had worked the problem out in his own mind, and discovered that the brickmaker's doggedness simply meant self-abnegation."

Now he sees very clearly what he considers his duty and goes to Dr. Tempest to announce that he will resign his preferment regardless of the outcome of the trial. Tempest, of course, from a practical point of view tries to deter Crawley from such action, bringing up the man's family as reason for not resigning.

"Man," he said, addressing Mr. Crawley with all his energy, "if you do this thing, you will then at least be very wicked. If the jury find a verdict in your favour you are safe, and the chances are that the verdict will be in your favour."

"I care nothing now for the verdict," said Mr. Crawley.

"And you will turn your wife into the
poorhouse for an idea!"

"It's dogged as does it," said Mr. Crawley to himself. "I have thought of that," he said aloud. "That my wife is dear to me, and that my children are dear, I will not deny. She was softly nurtured, Dr. Tempest, and came from a house in which want was never known. Since she has shared my board she has had some experience of that nature. That I should have brought her to all this is very terrible to me,—so terrible, that I often wonder how it is that I live. But, sir, you will agree with me, that my duty as a clergyman is above everything. I do not dare, even for their sake, to remain in the parish."

This action of Crawley's has doubtless been considered mad by many readers. Certainly the charge of selfishness itself can be brought against him. But Trollope, most likely, thought it neither mad nor selfish—rather the absolute necessity of a man to follow his inner concept of right and truth, even when that concept transcends normal humanity. In this case he must follow what his inner being dictates is right for him, regardless of the costs—transcending worldly interests and even his natural impulses, to achieve an almost complete self-abnegation. It is the old story of following the dictates of one's moral sense, this time with a vengeance, because Josiah Crawley's strength is not the strength of ordinary man. He possesses a bit of fanaticism, it is true—but it is the fanaticism of a man who in this instance, at least, knows exactly what he is doing and why. His answer to Mark Robarts, who as spokesman of
the average gentlemen has interceded with Crawley once more, and this some time after his resignation--his answer to Robarts shows more clearly than ever that he knows where he stands.

"...I feel assured that in such emergency you would look solely to duty,--as by God's help, I will endeavour to do. Mr. Robarts, there are many of us who in many things, are much worse than we believe ourselves to be. But in other matters, and perhaps of larger moment, we can rise to ideas of duty as the need for such ideas comes upon us. I say not this at all as praising myself. I speak of men as I believe that they will be found to be;--of yourself, of myself, and of others who strive to live with clean hands and a clear conscience. I do not for a moment think that you would retain your benefice at Framley if there had come upon you, after much thought, an assured conviction that you could not retain it without grievous injury to the souls of others and grievous sin to your own. Wife and children, dear as they are to you and to me,--as dear to me as to you,--fade from the sight when the time comes for judgment on such a matter as that! " 127

The compulsion to follow his own convictions shows up clearly and finally in Crawley's letter of resignation to the dean. He points out that some have suggested that he take no step until after the trial, so that the living would still remain in his hand, if there should be an acquittal. "I do not blame them. I should give such advice myself, knowing that a friend may give counsel as to outer things, but that a man must satisfy his inner conscience by his own perceptions of what is right and
what is wrong.

Josiah Crawley, we have seen, is something of an enigma. His bitter resentment and hatred of the wealth and position of his neighbors added to his ungenteel demeanor, inevitably raise the doubt whether his sympathies lie with the class of gentlemen. If he is a gentleman, the selfishness of his false pride together with the same hatred, further raises the question whether he can be viewed as a gentleman of the highest category. He obviously has Trollope's manifest approval and he apparently fits the moral pattern of this group with the exception of the selfishness of his false pride. The heart of the problem seems to be whether his resentment of wealth and position results from a renunciation of these factors or rather stems from an eccentric personality temporarily warped by hardship. The latter appears to be the case. If this be true, Crawley is a gentleman, and can be viewed as a member of the topmost group, provided he recognizes the selfishness of his false pride, fights it, and so transcends it. This he seems to do, in the process revealing his true pride and power of self-abnegation; but Josiah Crawley is so complex a character as to defy neat pigeon-holing. He seems a gentleman transcendent, but a question seems always to persist. In the final analysis the Rev. Mr. Crawley
remains a challenge.

Our consideration of Mr. Crawley thus ends on a note of challenge and brings us to the Rev. Septimus Harding, warden of Hiram's Hospital, who, particularly as presented in that concentrated little novel, *The Warden*, seems in many ways Trollope's portrait of his ideal gentleman. Simple, unworldly, self-effacing, sympathetic, with an acutely sensitive and questioning conscience, yet with a deep sense of self-respect and the strength to do what is necessary to preserve it, Mr. Harding stands in the top rank of the gentlemanly hierarchy. Of all Trollope's gentlemen, Harding probably has the most questioning conscience, the greatest self-doubt as to his rightful course of action, such doubt as must inevitably end in questioning. Like Crawley and Palliser, he is thin-skinned,—extremely sensitive as to how his name is held by the world at large. Constantly in his daily life he transcends worldly concerns and refuses the comfort and refuge of "ordinary selfishness." His son-in-law is his antithesis. Dr. Grantly is the church—and the average gentleman—militant, a man who never entertains a doubt about his position, and who is incapable of understanding or tolerating Mr. Harding's self-doubts and questioning conscience. He is a good man, a man necessary for the work of the world, as Trollope points out. But he is too
worldly and too "human" to transcend the limits of ordinary selfishness that are allowed him—and hence never reaches the unselfish sphere of his father-in-law.

To those who consider the constant self-doubts, the hesitation, the wavering and vacillation of Mr. Harding, Crawley, and Palliser as weakness instead of strength, as cowardice instead of courage, Trollope gives a final answer in his Life of Cicero, one of the best sources of Trollope's views on character, and one representing his mature views, not being begun until 1877. This evidence speaks for itself.

I think that we are often at a loss, in our efforts at appreciation of character, and in the expression of our opinion respecting it, to realize the meaning of courage and manliness. That sententious Swedish Queen, one of whose foolish maxims I have quoted, has said that Cicero, though a coward, was capable of great actions, because she did not know what a coward was. To doubt—to tremble with anxiety—to vacillate hither and thither between this course and the other as to which may be the better—to complain within one's own breast that this or that thing has been an injustice—to hesitate within one's self, not quite knowing which way honor may require us to go—to be indignant even at fancied wrongs—to rise in wrath against another, and then, before the hour has passed, to turn that wrath against one's self—that is not to be a coward. To know what duty requires, and then to be deterred by fear of results—that is to be a coward; but the man of many scruples may be the greatest hero of them all. Let the law of things be declared clearly—so that the doubting mind shall no longer doubt, so that scruples may be laid at rest, so that the sense of justice may be satisfied—and he
of whom I speak shall be ready to meet the world in arms against him. There are men, very useful in their way, who shall never doubt at all, but shall be ready, as the bull is ready, to encounter any obstacles that there may be before them. I will not say but that for the coarse purposes of the world they may not be the most efficacious, but I will not admit that they are therefore the bravest. 129

Mr. Harding's decision to resign his wardenship comes as the result of the accusations by John Bold and the metropolitan newspaper The Jupiter that the wardenship is a sinecure and that the warden is not entitled to the eight hundred pounds annual salary. It is clear that before the attack began Mr. Harding had never doubted his right to the salary. "...but that he himself was overpaid with his modest eight hundred pounds;--he who, out of that, voluntarily gave up sixty-two pounds eleven shillings and fourpence a year to his twelve old neighbours;--he who, for the money, does his precentor's work as no precentor has done it before, since Barchester Cathedral was built;--such an idea has never sullied his quiet, or disturbed his conscience." When rumors begin to float around Earchester, however, Mr. Harding feels uneasy, and questions his right to his salary as warden. Perhaps Bold is right; "...the first shade of doubt now fell across his mind, and from this evening, for many a long, long day, our good, kind, loving warden was neither
happy nor at ease." He examines the problem from all sides, and concludes that if John Hiram's will is not being carried out correctly, it would be his duty to see this done "...whatever injury it might do to his order--however ill such duty might be received by his patron and his friends?" But then, his friends may be right--and that is his dilemma. He turns his mind to his son-in-law and realizes that his case will be well fought if turned into Dr. Grantly's hands, "...but he knew also that he would find no sympathy there for his doubts, no friendly feeling, no inward comfort...Such a contest would give no comfort to Mr. Harding's doubts; he was not so anxious to prove himself right, as to be so."

"Though doubt and hesitation disturbed the rest of our poor warden, no such weakness perplexed the nobler breast of his son-in-law. ...He knew that he would not be able to animate his father-in-law with feelings like his own, but this did not much disturb him. He preferred to bear the brunt of the battle alone, and did not doubt that the warden would resign himself into his hands with passive submission." Thus Trollope describes the Archdeacon as warfare proceeds. The meeting between him and his father-in-law immediately preceding the Archdeacon's blunt and threatening speech to the bedesmen amply
demonstrates the Archdeacon's inability to perceive Harding's questioning conscience and the consequent feeling of tolerance. That Harding should allow the men to prepare a petition is unthinkable to Grantly. But Harding "...had expressly determined not to interfere in any step which the men might wish to take in the matter under dispute; he was most anxious neither to accuse them nor to defend himself." In the speech to the bedesmen, the Archdeacon threatens them with loss of their positions if they do not stop their foolishness, to which Harding makes open objection!

At this point Harding is miserable with doubt. He would regretfully break from his order and his friends, and yet he would be unable to suffer his name bandied about by the public as a symbol of greed. And as he considers, "...he became all but fixed in his resolve that some great step must be taken to relieve him from the risk of so terrible a fate." "In the meanwhile, the archdeacon, with contented mind and unruffled spirit went about his business."

In a later scene, the warden expresses his doubts openly to the Bishop and the Archdeacon. Once again Trollope very clearly reveals the difference between Harding and Grantly. The Bishop here sympathizes with the warden's doubts, but does not advise, just as
Harding would have done toward him. "But the archdeacon, though he could not sympathise, could advise, and he saw that the time had come when it behoved him to do so in a somewhat peremptory manner." He lectures Harding heavily on his duty. The warden's reaction is typical. "If it were necessary for him to suffer, he felt that he could endure without complaint and without cowardice, providing that he was self-satisfied of the justice of his own cause. What he could not endure was, that he should be accused by others, and not acquitted by himself."

When the second leading article attacking Harding appears in The Jupiter, Harding definitely resolves to relinquish his post, for now he feels that the article speaks truth and that he has no right to remain. He tells Eleanor, "'I have thought much of what the archdeacon has said, and of what this paper says; and I do believe I have no right to be here.'" He will go up to London, see the lawyers, and if the defense proposed for him is inadequate to his way of thinking, he will resign. In London, waiting to see Sir Abraham Hap hazard, he realizes he must do what his conscience tells him. "As he had said to the daughter, no one knows where the shoe pinches but the wearer. There are some points on which no man can be contented to follow the
advice of another,—some subjects on which a man can consult his own conscience only."

Harding's interview with Haphazard is the heart of The Warden. First, Haphazard informs him that the suit against Harding has been withdrawn. But this fact does not influence the warden—he wants to know whether he is legally entitled to his salary as warden. The lawyer cannot exactly assure him of that, but points out—in the common-sense, practical view of the world—that the matter is really of no concern, now that the suit against Harding has been dropped. When Harding proposes resigning, the lawyer considers him mad, bringing up his poverty and his unmarried daughter as deterrents to such action. Indeed, he uses the same word—quixotic—to label Harding that St. Bungay was to use towards Palliser in a novel written some twenty years later, and involving similar characters and a similar situation. Harding's reply is, "'A man is the best judge of what he feels himself.'" And in an impassioned speech he declares to Sir Abraham his decision to resign.

"Yes, Sir Abraham, one does question it [the justness of his income from the Hospital],--the most important of all witnesses against me—I question it myself. My God knows whether or no I love my daughter; but I would sooner that she and I should both beg, than that she should live in comfort on money which is truly the property of the poor. It may seem strange to you, Sir Abraham, it is strange to myself, that
I should have been ten years in that happy home, and not have thought of these things, till they were so roughly dinned into my ears. I cannot boast of my conscience, when it required the violence of a public newspaper to awaken it; but, now that it is awake, I must obey it. When I came here I did not know that the suit was withdrawn by Mr. Bold, and my object was to beg you to abandon my defence. As there is no action, there can be no defence. But it is, at any rate, as well that you should know that from to-morrow I shall cease to be the warden of the hospital. My friends and I differ on this subject, Sir Abraham, and that adds much to my sorrow; but it cannot be helped."

After having determined the right course of action for him, the warden is not to be deterred. No protests, intimidations, or appeals from either the Archdeacon or Mrs. Grantly can stop him from what he now knows to be right. At basis, his is not weakness, but strength—a strength greater than that of the Archdeacon, because it has come from an inner struggle after truth and a facing of that truth that the Archdeacon does not fully understand, though he does begin to grasp it as he grows older. Pushed and hounded, Harding protests, "'It can never be rash to do right..." Again urged by his daughter, Mrs. Grantly, to delay his resignation for just two days, he retorts:

"Susan...my mind on this subject is made up; it is not without much repugnance that I act in opposition to the advice of such men as Sir Abraham Haphazard and the archdeacon; but in this matter I can take no advice, I cannot alter the resolution to which I have come."

"But two days, papa--"
"No;--nor can I delay it. You may add to my present unhappiness by pressing me, but you cannot change my purpose; it will be a comfort to me if you will let the matter rest." 143

This sounds remarkably like Crawley's famous retort to Mrs. Proudie, and has the same effect in this case. And in his private note accompanying his resignation he states calmly and plainly, once and for all, his position in this affair. "Were I convinced that I stood on ground perfectly firm, that I was certainly justified in taking eight hundred a year under Hiram's will, I should feel bound by duty to retain the position, however unendurable might be the nature of the assault; but, as I do not feel this conviction, I cannot believe that you will think me wrong in what I am doing." 144

Against his own worldly prospects, in defiance of money and position, taking action when in the estimation of his friends, no action need be taken to save his honor, Harding makes a decision which ends in self-abnegation, an action taken because this man had inquired within himself and found what was the necessary course of action for him. He transcends worldliness and selfishness, and in so doing finds the strength necessary to brave and defy those who would stop him in the name of practicality and "ordinary selfishness." And it is clear that Harding was fully aware of the material things
he was relinquishing and that Trollope desired the reader to be aware of this fact. After Harding has resigned the wardenship, the Bishop offers to take him in as resident chaplain. "It was not without much difficulty that Mr. Harding made his friend see that this would not suit him; that he could not throw up the bishop's preferment, and then come and hang on at the bishop's table; that he could not allow people to say of him that it was an easy matter to abandon his own income, as he was able to sponge on that of another person."

Fairly early in *The Warden* a fundamental distinction between the attitudes of Harding and Grantly is made by Trollope. The Archdeacon, Trollope says, "... wanted success on his own side and discomfiture on that of his enemies. The bishop wanted peace on the subject; a settled peace if possible, but peace at any rate till the short remainder of his own days had spun itself out; but Mr. Harding required, not only success and peace, but he also demanded that he might stand justified before the world." But between the first and last books of the Barchester series, in the twelve years' passage of time between *The Warden* and *The Last Chronicle*, the Archdeacon gains insight into the character of Mr. Harding and the forces that motivated his resignation as warden. Near the time of Mr. Harding's death, the Archdeacon and Dean
Arabin are talking about Harding.

"I seem to have known him all my life," said the archdeacon. "I have known him ever since I left college; and I have known him as one man seldom knows another. There is nothing that he has done,—as I believe, nothing that he has thought,—with which I have not been cognizant. I feel sure that he never had an impure fancy in his mind, or a faulty wish in his heart. His tenderness has surpassed the tenderness of woman; and yet, when an occasion came for showing it, he had all the spirit of a hero. I shall never forget his resignation of the hospital, and all that I did and said to make him keep it."

"But he was right?"

"As Septimus Harding he was, I think, right; but it would have been wrong in any other man. And he was right, too, about the deanery. . . . The fact is, he never was wrong. He couldn't go wrong. He lacked guile, and he feared God,—and a man who does both will never go far astray. I don't think he ever coveted aught in his life . . ." Then the archdeacon got up, and walked about the room in his enthusiasm; and, perhaps, as he walked some thoughts as to the sterner ambition of his own life passed through his mind. What things had he coveted? Had he lacked guile? He told himself that he had feared God,—but he was not sure that he was telling himself true even in that.

And we recall that dramatic scene played at the bedside as the old Bishop lay dying, when the Archdeacon asks himself whether he really longs for his father's death. Then the "proud, wishful, worldly" man sinks on his knees and prays that his sins be forgiven. In contrast is the quiet, serene Mr. Harding, who has been in constant attendance because of love and the assistance he may render. To weigh his chances for a bishopric
would have been impossible to that unworldly, unselfish nature, even though realism and "ordinary selfishness" might possibly allow such thought.

The picture of Septimus Harding is now complete—that of a simple Christian gentleman by Archdeacon Grantly's own description. Septimus Harding relies upon his own moral sense and always finds the right answer, because his moral nature has renounced worldliness and selfishness by striving toward self-denial. It cannot err with that aim in mind. And this is the ultimate product of the gentlemanly system as Trollope conceived it—a moral sense capable of self-denial and renunciation of self, prompted by a combination of the gentleman's code and Christianity. This is the type of moral sense possessed by Carbury, Thorne, Palliser, Crawley and Harding, with Christianity the dominant element in the latter two.

These men, however, are not perfect by any means. They all have their faults, some worse than others, but on the whole they are freer from them than ordinary gentlemen. Mr. Harding has fewer than other members of the group. His suspicion of Eleanor's interest in Slope seems to be about his worst one. But Roger Carbury, for example, feels a deep anger toward Paul Montague, which is indeed unjustifiable, however understandable it may be,
and Dr. Thorne is undoubtedly overly proud of his blood
and too quick to anger upon occasion. Palliser is also
much too quick to take offense and become angry without
provocation. And once angry, he is too unwilling to for­
give and in indeed inclined to be discourteous, as he
certainly was to Alice Vavasor and Mrs. Finn. Moreover,
as Trollope predicted, he grows to love the power of
office too much toward the end of his career as Prime
Minister. Crawley's stern and unbending false pride is
probably the most glaring fault of all found in these
men, but as we have seen, by the close of The Last Chron­
icle we feel it is a fault which he may master, just as
Carbury fought down his anger and as Palliser eventually
overcame the ill effects of power.

No, they are not perfect, nor was it Trollope's
intention to present them as such. "The true picture
of life as it is, if it could be adequately painted,
would show men what they are and how they might rise,
not indeed to perfection, but one step first, and then
another, on the ladder." These men, however, have
climbed further on the ladder than most men and are yet
climbing, by achieving a high sense of honor and morality
which moves toward unselfishness through self-denial--
particularly through refusal to succumb to the selfish­
ness that the world consents to. This transcendence
of "ordinary selfishness" is what Trollope finds so laudatory in Cicero, and further knowledge of Trollope's concept of self-denial in relation to the gentleman can be found in his biography of the great Roman. For instance, he says that Cicero's character might have been that of a "modern gentleman" because of his sincerity, a quality which Trollope relates to self-denial, pointing out that the two virtues indicate the same phase of character. Sincerity has been made more easily attainable through Christianity, says Trollope; and he points out that the mid-Victorians are nearer to it than the Romans, implying, of course, that one of the basic teachings of Christianity is self-denial. Trollope's interpretation of Cicero's morality and notion of honor as expressed in De Officiis offers further insight into his ideas of the gentleman. Cicero's honor, for example, "...carries him to something beyond the mere integrity of the well-conducted tradesman." And Trollope proceeds to demonstrate how Cicero refrained from actions which were eminently acceptable at the time he lived, but which Cicero's high sense of morality (or honor) refused. In other words, what Trollope finds so praiseworthy in Cicero is identical to the self-denial of "ordinary selfishness" of his most approved gentlemen--these latter prompted to unselfishness by both Christianity and their
own high sense of honor.

It is not strange, then—indeed, it might be expected—that the characters of Thackeray whom Trollope praises should resemble his own best gentlemen. Note his comment on the constant and self-denying Dobbin: "The reader as he closes the book has on his mind a strong conviction, the strongest possible conviction, that among men George is as weak and Dobbin as noble as any that he has met in literature..." Of Esmond, he remarks, "But he is a gentleman from the crown of his head to the sole of his foot. Thackeray had let the whole power of his intellect apply itself to a conception of the character of a gentleman. This man is brave, polished, gifted with that old-fashioned courtesy which ladies used to love, true as steel, loyal as faith himself, with a power of self-abnegation which astonishes the criticising reader when he finds such a virtue carried to such an extent without seeming to be unnatural." More light is gained by a contrast of characters in the Autobiography. "How we hate the idle selfishness of Pendennis, the worldliness of Beatrix, the craft of Becky Sharp!—how we love the honesty of Colonel Newcombe, the nobility of Esmond, and the devoted affection of Mrs. Pendennis!" And there is a final comment on Dobbin and Colonel Newcombe:

"...Dobbin will be honoured because he is unselfish;
and the old colonel, though he be foolish, vain, and weak, almost worshipped because he is so true a gentle-
man." What are the virtues of these characters praised by Trollope? Nobility, self-abnegation, and unselfish-
ness. And what qualities are condemned? Selfishness, worldliness, and craft (really affectation or unmanli-
ness). And what manner of men are these? Simple, unworldly, and highly moral men, like Harding, Crawley, Palliser, Thorne, and Carbury.

Let us quickly review the approved qualities of Trollope's most approved gentlemen. First of all they are individualists who insist on finding truth for themselves. They are completely unsophisticated and care little for the world of fashion. They are unbending in principle, and will not compromise their beliefs for any reason. And they are unworldly, lacking the sharpness and practicality of "ordinary selfishness" and instinctively rising above the little selfishnesses which the world allows and even approves of. Contrari-
wise, these men cannot play the game of give and take, and usually do not even understand it. They cannot bend a little here to gain an advantage there, cannot resort to a touch of expediency if necessary, nor consent to fight evil with evil's own weapons. And therefore their value does not lie in the immediate warfare of the market
place, where one fights with a club and looks about warily. The world--selfish and unscrupulous as it is--needs its Grantlys and St. Bungays to keep it running, good men fundamentally, but possessing and accepting the personal selfishness that is needed to combat actively the selfishness outside themselves. No one knows this better than Trollope, who was a man of practical common sense if there ever was one. A statement from his Life of Cicero makes this clear. "It may be found that for the work of the world, the coarse work--and no work is so coarse, though none is so important, as that which falls commonly into the hands of statesmen,--instruments strong in texture, and by reason of their rudeness, not liable to sudden impressions, may be the best. That it is which we mean when we declare that a scrupulous man is impractical in politics." But the necessity of such men does not induce Trollope to place them higher than is their due. So is the policeman necessary to society, but his approach is different from that of the saint. And society, as well as Trollope, has always accorded the greater value and ultimate significance to the saint. The analogy is a fair one, though exaggerated, for Trollope seems to have considered his top gentlemen as leavening agents, who accomplish their good indirectly, by example or model. A statement of his about the Golden Rule will
help to explain this idea. "How different has been the world before that law was given to us and since! Even the existence of that law, though it be not obeyed, has softened the hearts of men." So the very existence of such men as Palliser and Josiah Crawley and Septimus Harding influences the conduct of the men and women around them, by pointing the way to less personal selfishness and to the virtue of self-abnegation, which Trollope clearly considered the ultimate products of the English gentlemanly system.
The abbreviations used in these notes to designate Trollope's novels are based upon the system employed by Winifred Gregory Gerould and James Thayer Gerould in their *A Guide to Trollope*. In the following list, all abbreviations are the Geroulds' with the exception of that for *The Life of Cicero*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allington</td>
<td>The Small House at Allington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Sen.</td>
<td>The American Senator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Lady Anna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayala</td>
<td>Ayala's Angel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar.</td>
<td>Barchester Towers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belton</td>
<td>The Belton Estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can You</td>
<td>Can You Forgive Her?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>The Life of Cicero.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claverings</td>
<td>The Claverings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>The Three Clerks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>Cousin Henry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>The Duke's Children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustace</td>
<td>The Eustace Diamonds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finn</td>
<td>Phineas Finn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framley</td>
<td>Framley Parsonage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotspur</td>
<td>Sir Harry Hotspur of Humblethwaite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelleys</td>
<td>The Kelleys and the O'Kelleys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Chron.</td>
<td>The Last Chronicle of Barset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie</td>
<td>Miss Mackenzie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orley</td>
<td>Orley Farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Man</td>
<td>An Old Man's Love.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popenjoy</td>
<td>Is He Popenjoy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Min.</td>
<td>The Prime Minister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Rachel Ray.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Ralph the Heir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redux</td>
<td>Phineas Redux.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough</td>
<td>Mr. Scarborough's Family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorne</td>
<td>Doctor Thorne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicar</td>
<td>The Vicar of Bullhampton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>The Warden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way We Live</td>
<td>The Way We Live Now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wortle</td>
<td>Dr. Wortle's School.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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