There should be some unknown regions preserved as hunting-grounds for the poetic imagination.
—George Eliot, Middlemarch

“I like a descent,” said Shirley—“I like to clear it rapidly; and especially I like that romantic Hollow, with all my heart.”
“Romantic—with a mill in it?”
“Romantic with a mill in it. The old mill and the white cottage are each admirable in its way.”
—Charlotte Brontë, Shirley

In *The Realistic Imagination*, George Levine ends his chapter on Trollope’s realism by concluding that it “is, then, no more than any other literary method, a precise description of a ‘real’ world. It is rigorous only in its exclusion of extremes, or in its assimilation of them into the multiplicities and diffusions of the continuing flow of surfaces. Mystery is transformed into the quotidian. . . . Romantic heights—the rocks and mountains—must be balanced by ‘bread and cheese’” (203). Levine here understands Trollope’s realism as narrative that disciplines subversive energies or romantic impulses, but what he writes in the following chapter, on “The Landscape of Reality,” complicates the polarization of the real and the romantic in Trollope’s “exclusion of extremes.” Addressing charges against English realism’s typical settings, Levine asserts that “The simplest explanation for the absence of the sublime in English realist fiction is the absence of the sublime in English landscape. But the mind is its own place, and the landscape of fiction, as I have been trying to suggest, is no literal transcription of the world as the novelists could see it” (212). Trollope’s Palliser novels, and above all the *Phineas* diptych, collude with Levine’s claim that the fictional mind “is its own place,” and, in so doing, trouble the idea that Trollope’s novels consistently quotidianize the mysterious energies that they consistently invoke. The fictional mind in *Phineas Finn* and *Phineas Redux* is actually two places, or, more accurately,
two or more versions of the same places. Like the carriage rides of Henri de Marsay in *La Fille aux yeux d’or*, Trollope’s shifting portrayal of largely British locations reveals a strategic alternation between disenchantment and reenchantment facilitated by Phineas’s mobility as outsider in England.

In this sense, *Phineas Redux* in 1874 functions as an intriguing transitional piece, tethered as it is simultaneously to *Phineas Finn*, its prequel, and to its thematic twin, *The Way We Live Now*. *Phineas Redux* is a radical departure in style and tone, and *The Way We Live Now* is similarly the work of an embittered Trollope who returned to London in April of 1873 after a visit to the colonies and was revolted by a lack of decorum in the capital. The last chapter alluded to an economy of romance preserved by the manner in which Trollope seems to code and recode characters as romantic given necessities of the plot at a particular moment. This recoding also impacts space, and it will animate the discussion here of the relationship between four locales which Trollope links through phonological similarity and through the movements of his narrative’s hero: Loughshane, Phineas’s first and third borough; Loughton, his second; Loughlinter, the Scottish district of Robert Kennedy and his wife, Lady Laura Stanton; and London, the basic center of the action. Following a brief look at the function of various geographical separations in the novels, a more thorough examination of the opposition between Loughlinter and London—the most important geographical axis in the novels—reveals that Trollope uses the two sites to articulate a growing disenchantment in *Phineas Finn* and an apparent confrontation and reversal of it in *Phineas Redux*. First a disenchanted rewriting of, and then a tribute to, Scott and the Gothic, this second half of Trollope’s *Bildungsroman* measures the narrative’s recovery of romance and simultaneous discomfort at it, and begins the work of implicating the metropolitan imperial center within this loss and recovery.

### (a) The Space of Disenchantment

For all the wavering between Irishness and Englishness in the narrator’s portrayal of certain characters in *Phineas Finn*, and for all the talk of Ireland as “the colonies next door,” there is an equal force invested in preserving the appearance of permanent separation between the two elements. Not coincidentally, this schism emerges through Finn, whose identity, as demonstrated in the last chapter, is uncertain enough to vacillate between Irish

---

1. To a much lesser extent, *Phineas Redux* is also the product of 1873, as debates over Trollope’s reworking of the manuscript (the first draft of which he completed before his departure from England) have shown. See Chapman and Tinker.
and English through the course of the novel. Early on, the narrator blithely excuses Finn’s “lover[’s] perjuries” with recourse to distance: “Phineas was a traitor, of course, but he was almost forced to be a traitor, by the simple fact that Lady Laura Standish was in London, and Mary Flood Jones in Killaloe” (1.145). The cleft becomes more emphatic at the end of the first volume, as Finn begins to feel “that he had two identities,—that he was, as it were, two separate persons,—and that he could, without any real faithlessness, be very much in love with Violet Effingham in his position of man of fashion and member of parliament in England, and also warmly attached to dear little Mary Flood Jones as an Irishman of Killaloe,” and then becomes final once it is clear that Finn cannot remain in England (1.330). “His Irish life,” the narrator tells us at one point, “was a thing quite apart and separate from his life in England” (2.271). At another point, Finn himself admits, “My life in Ireland is to be a new life, and why should I mix two things together that will be so different?” (2.348). At the end of Phineas Finn, Finn’s marriage to Mary Flood Jones—whom Polhemus has derisively termed “a cute blob of Irish dew bound to fade” (394)—ensures his continued removal from England. The narrator knows that Mary is a distraction from the English portion of Phineas Finn, admitting as much when, briefly returning to her, he writes, “the reader I hope will not quite have forgotten Mary Flood Jones,” further stressing the divide between England and the largely forgotten Ireland (1.144). Trollope’s solution to this separation was a clumsy but effective one: “As I fully intended to bring my hero again into the world,” Trollope writes in his Autobiography, “I was wrong to marry him to a simple pretty Irish girl, who could only be felt as an encumbrance on such return. When he did return I had no alternative but to kill the pretty simple Irish girl,—which was an unpleasant and awkward necessity” (318). Dougherty has argued that Mary thus “is imaginatively linked to the Great Famine, functioning as the surplus population of the narrative precisely because of her unhybridized and unassimilable Irishness” (143). There is little in the text to support the Famine association, as the previous chapter demonstrated, but the stability of Mary’s Irishness can only be an “encumbrance” to the instability of Finn’s nationality as it facilitates his movement in the novels. This movement is ultimately what allows for Trollope’s evocation and renegotiation of imaginary borders and spaces.

Moretti’s Atlas of the European Novel invokes Walter Benjamin’s notion of the “phenomenon of the border,” from the latter’s Arcades Project. (Bakhtin’s chronotope of the threshold could also be included here.) Benjamin imagines the internal divisions of cities as the place where one witnesses this phenomenon at its sharpest, but Moretti broadens it to a “phenomenology of the border” that can encompass his discussion of the rise of the
historical novel at the turn of the nineteenth century in Europe (Atlas 35). There are “two kinds” of borders, claims Moretti: “external ones, between state and state; and internal ones, within a given state. In the first case, the border is the site of adventure” (emphasis in original). Moretti’s elaboration of this point and its relevance to one of his main arguments—that the novel created the nation-state and that the nation-state, which cannot be represented visually as a city or village can, found the novel to express it—treats at length Scott’s novels of the Lowlands and their relationship to England. Waverley in particular is central for Moretti, as it is also central for Trollope. The geographical location of the gothic novel’s plots, according to Moretti, had already provided an initial outline for Scott’s later drawing of borders; in the handy map Moretti provides, the vast majority of British gothic novels take place in Scotland, well outside of what he calls “Austen’s English space” (16). My discussion of Balzac’s La Fille aux yeux d’or broached the idea of the remoteness and specific properties and function of gothically constructed space in an otherwise urban novel, where it imports an instant aura of mystery and seems to remove the narrative from the urban. Moretti’s consideration of the borderlands of the historical novel brings valuable context to Scott, but in order to understand the specific relevance of the border to Trollope’s Palliser series, one must examine the manner in which the treatment of it changes over time. Scott’s borders are, in Trollope’s novels, still very much in play.

Like the British novel over the course of the nineteenth century, Trollope does not simply start in London. Indeed, to some degree his development as a writer mirrors the development and movement of the novel in Britain from Scott onward. If Trollope’s earliest fiction is set, like Scott’s, at junctures of Englishness and Otherness—and for Trollope, as for Scott, this involves what Michael Hechter has called the “Celtic fringe”—then it moves through its perhaps Austenian period in Barsetshire before it finally settles in Dickensian London (quoted in Moretti, Atlas 13). A map of Trollope’s settings would square readily with a map of the shifting settings of the nineteenth-century English novel as Moretti describes it. Karen Faulkner has provided a useful look at “Anthony Trollope’s Apprenticeship,” arguing that “he tries out,” in the course of his growth as a writer, “the subjects, voices, and styles of Edgeworth, Carleton, Scott, Austen, Dickens, Fielding, and others” (161). One could also note, though, that in addition to the clear-cut stylistic inheritances from these writers, Trollope also tries on the various spaces they produce and reproduce. The Phineas novels are a clear engagement with Scott, but they also mark a shift in Trollope’s writing and in the English novel of the nineteenth century. In Trollope’s novels, the romantic potential of the border—recall Moretti’s “site of adventure”—and of what lies across the
border can never be taken for granted. Rather, Trollope’s narratives alter the specific importance of an area depending on their momentary needs, just as they toy with and constantly alter alterity (Irishness). The unstable political identity of Loughshane and Loughton is a corollary to this process. Moreover, the duel at Blankenberg in *Phineas Finn* and the shady transactions of the Reverend Emilius in *Phineas Redux* adduce the Continent as a source or site of romance, although this, too, will be complicated by a simultaneous domestication of the Continent as England is reenchanted in *Redux*. Finally, the problems of Trollope’s portrayal of Loughlinter and London highlight the novelistic remapping of thoroughly disenchanted regions, in order to recuperate or relocate romance.

The political geography of Britain in *Phineas Finn* offers a means of gauging the extent to which the novel openly views the construction of space and what it represents as an arbitrary matter. (The treatment of political “adventurers” in the novel also introduces the abuse of political laxities that will later arise in *Phineas Redux*’s electoral fraud, Melmotte’s ascension in *The Way We Live Now*, and Lopez’s unsuccessful campaign in 1876’s *The Prime Minister*.) The story of Phineas’s rise and fall in the first installment is inextricable from the fate of the political districts for which he stands. Parliament only opens for Phineas at the news that the Earl of Tulla, a patient of Phineas’s father and a Member for Loughshane, “a little borough in the county Galway,” is to step down from his position (1.5). Local differences are, apparently, erased or rendered insignificant, and so the Irish Catholic Phineas succeeds in being elected to a seat vacated by “a fine, high-minded representative of the thorough-going Orange Protestant feeling of Ireland.” By the end of the first volume, Finn has lost his seat for Loughshane, only to find himself in the position to stand for a seat in Loughton, in England, which he does successfully. The Anglicizing of Finn discussed in the last chapter seems to begin, predictably, at about this point; Phineas lies “in his bed at the Loughton inn,” reflecting on “the great political question on which the political world was engrossed,” “the enfranchisement of Englishmen,—of Englishmen down to the rank of artisans and labourers” (1.297). Loughton the district is eventually “doomed,” dissolved by an act of redistricting. So, his seat having been politically unmapped out from under him, Finn returns to stand again for Loughshane (2.79). He runs against the very Norman- and English-sounding Lambert St. George and is “returned by a majority of seventeen votes” (2.105). Soon, Loughshane, too, is on the blocks, and it is ultimately dissolved thanks to the very Irish Reform Bill for which Finn himself votes, “the measure which deprived Loughshane forever of its parliamentary honours” (2.342). Phineas’s mobility from borough to borough is itself unusual, but it is not nearly as curious as the fact that both of his boroughs
are withdrawn from the political map, forcing him first back into an Irish seat and then out of Parliament altogether.

Alongside the political redistrictings, the mapping of the British Isles in *Phineas Finn* simultaneously complicates the pattern of romance and its geographical placement as Moretti describes it. Where it fits Moretti’s pattern, one witnesses the lingering traces of traditional recourse to romance on the Continent. The duel between Chiltern and Phineas on the sand dunes at Blankenberg is a throwback to an era that is, by the text’s own incessant admission, gone. It is the only duel in the entire Palliser series, with the possible exception of the “high-noon” styled horsewhipping threats between Ferdinand Lopez and Arthur Fletcher in the streets in *The Prime Minister*. Because of its uniqueness, and because the reader is constantly told, through the entirety of the Palliser novels, that duels belong to the past, the meeting on the beach at Blankenberg is crucial. Firearms themselves are out of fashion “in these peaceable days,” the narrator of *Can You Forgive Her?* (1864–5) says, and a character later in the novel points out that “men don’t fight now-a-days” (1.42; 2.270). Burgo Fitzgerald’s hot-headed claim that he would gladly fight Plantagenet Palliser “at two paces’ distance” elicits the rebuke that “men do not fight now,” and John Grey similarly rebuffs George Vavasor’s challenge to a duel, calling it “foolish” (2.81; 2.330). In *Phineas Finn*, too, the narrator repeatedly—and retroactively, only after the duel has actually been fought—insists on the idea that duels are a relic of the past. Even Lady Baldock, who is certainly not inclined to like Phineas Finn, disbelieves Finn’s involvement in the duel simply because she disbelieves the possibility of duels in her day and age: “Fought a duel about Violet!” she exclaims, “People don’t fight duels now, and I should not believe it. . . . I don’t believe a word of it. It is absurd. I dare say that Gustavus invented it at the moment, just to amuse himself” (2.38). Duels are considered, in the narrative present of *Phineas Finn*, part of the past, the stuff of imaginative “invention.”

More importantly, though, because of this pastness and rarity, and the surreptitious manner of its execution by Chiltern, Phineas, and their seconds, the episode of the duel is a source of gossip and “mystery” for the London political scene (2.137). Trollope’s narrator even renders the scene in the past perfect, rather than the past tense in which Trollope’s novels are invariably written. The account begins with the assertion that “the duel did come off on the sly,” but as soon as specifics are given, it is pushed further into the grammatical past: Fitzgibbon “had been in Flanders,” and “had stood with his friend Phineas on the sands at Blankenberg, a little fishing-town some
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2. In a sort of narrative amnesia in *Phineas Redux*, Phineas Finn says, “There are times in which one is driven to regret that there has come an end to duelling, and there is left to one no immediate means of resenting an injury” (2.57).
twelve miles distant from Bruges, and had left his friend since that at an hotel at Ostend,—with a wound just under the shoulder, from which a bullet had been extracted” (2.3–4). Even the participants note the pastness of dueling. The narrator points out, as Finn weighs Chiltern’s challenge, that “few Englishmen fight duels in these days. They who do so are always reckoned to be fools” (1.353). In the contextual material to his edition of *Phineas Finn*, Jacques Berthoud reminds us that dueling was largely hounded underground by the formation, with royal support, of the Anti-Dueling Association in 1845 (Trollope, *Phineas Finn* 2.370). So, in addition to the pastness of the duel, distance is imperative, and the Continent beckons. Chiltern points out to Phineas, “we can be in Belgium in an hour or two, and back again in a few more hours;—that is, any one of us who may chance to be alive” (1.353). The passage above, which situates the duel in concrete space—“twelve miles distant from Bruges,” at Blankenberg—cedes to the slightly more mysterious language of a meeting that remains “quite unobserved amidst the sand-heaps,” so that “not a living soul, except the five concerned, was at that time aware that a duel had been fought among the sand-hills” (2.4; 2.5). (The five are Phineas and his second, Fitzgibbon; Chiltern and his second, Captain Colepepper; and Fitzgibbon’s doctor, O’Shaughnessy.)

Nor is this the last word on the Continent in the *Phineas* novels, but it changes in *Phineas Redux* as the novel quickly becomes a detective or legal thriller. After the murder of Mr. Bonteen for which Phineas is assumed guilty and tried, Europe is simultaneously the source of the major elements of the crime and of its solution, as it is simultaneously a place of romance and resignation. The Reverend Joseph Emilius, Bonteen’s murderer, comes from central Europe, as does the key to Bonteen’s apartment that Emilius has made (2.229). The murder weapon “as a certainty . . . was of French,—and probably of Parisian manufacture,” and the word “mystery” is used again, as it was in the episode of the duel in *Phineas Finn*, to refer to the character of the weapon and its at first unknown provenance (2.289). And yet, despite the fact that *Phineas Redux* is enabled by objects from the Continent, which inject narrative complications and adventure into London, the Continent is elsewhere coded as disenchanted. After Lady Laura Kennedy has left Robert Kennedy due to his increasing jealousy and fundamentalist religiosity, she and her father settle in Dresden, which is remarkably English to them. Lady Laura tells Phineas in a letter that her father “does—nothing. He reads the English papers, and talks of English parties” (1.58). Not at all confined to *Phineas Redux*, the perceived disenchantment of even the Continent is actually everywhere in the Palliser series: the narrator of *Can You Forgive Her?* complains that “Ludgate Hill is now-a-days more interesting than the Jungfrau” (1.44) and that “almost everybody now does know Lucerne” (2.351),
and *The Eustace Diamonds* (1873) says similarly that “Switzerland and the Tyrol, and even Italy, are all redolent of [the tour planner] Mr. Cook” (1.292). Such statements complicate Moretti’s argument that the English novel sees only forces of mystery and evil in Europe. In the Pallisers, the Continent is as banal as it is evil.

Of singular importance during Phineas’s visit to Dresden is Lady Laura’s and Phineas’s day-trip to “the fortress of Königstein,” perched “on that wonderful rock” and up a “very steep hill” (1.101; 1.107). The narrative’s language wants to mark Königstein off as a locus of enchantment, but Lady Laura’s conversation with Phineas at Königstein is merely a continuation of their conversation at Loughlinter, a similar exercise in duty over passion. The case of Loughlinter in *Phineas Finn* and the case of Königstein in *Phineas Redux* are clearly analogous, not merely because they construct the expectation of enchantment and then ruthlessly disappoint it, but because of technology’s role in the journeys to and from those supposedly remote places. Lady Laura, we are told, “did succeed in carrying him off to the fortress of Königstein,” in the vocabulary of an almost mythical abduction, but their return, after the disappointments, is much more mundane: “[T]here they remained till the evening train came from Prague, and took them back to Dresden” (1.101; 1.107). Phineas’s first trip to Loughlinter in *Phineas Finn* unfolds in remarkably similar fashion; he and Mr. Ratler approach by coach, slowly, and the narrator describes the romantic landscape: “On the other side of the Lough there rose a mighty mountain to the skies, Ben Linter. At the foot of it, and all round to the left, there ran the woods of Linter, stretching for miles through crags and bogs and mountain lands” (1.119). At Loughlinter, Lady Laura responds to Finn’s romantic advances with duty over passion. Only a return trip by train can adequately capture the collapse of romantic potential. Once again, Phineas is taken “to the railway station” for his return voyage to London (1.142).

Königstein in *Phineas Redux* and Loughlinter in *Phineas Finn* (as opposed to Loughlinter in Redux, which alters things) both witness a collision of romance and the quotidian that is characteristic of a larger ambivalence. In the evocation of the Continent, there are, of course, the duel, the bludgeon, and the illegal key, but there are also the repeated complaints, in the Palliser series, of a Europe that has become all too known. The indecision here parallels the waffling between romance and its undoing in Balzac’s novels, even if Trollope’s narratives do not go to Balzacian lengths to interrogate these terms. Violet Effingham and Lord Fawn in *Phineas Finn* voice the dilemma nonetheless, in language that will echo throughout Trollope’s rendering of romance and its disappearance and reveal its importance to the Palliser novels: “A mystery is good for nothing if it remains always a mys-
tery,” Lord Fawn complains, to which Violet replies, “And it is good for nothing at all when it is found out” (2.34). These are the stakes: the desire for the unraveling of mysteries and the desire for their preservation. Loughlinter’s depiction, between *Phineas Finn* and *Phineas Redux*, between disenchantment and reenchantment, mirrors this exchange.

(b) Loughlinter, London, and the Space of Reenchantment

Trollope’s narrator, in a brief description of Phineas’s leisurely days visiting Loughlinter, emphasizes the importance of certain places to *Phineas Finn* by setting them all in motion around each other in a single paragraph:

In those days he often wandered up and down the Linter and across the moor to the Linn, and so down to the lake. . . . He was thinking of his life, and trying to calculate whether the wonderful success which he had achieved would ever be of permanent value to him. Would he be nearer to earning his bread when he should be member for Loughton than he had been when he was member for Loughshane? Or was there before him any slightest probability that he would ever earn his bread? And then he thought of Violet Effingham . . . (1.300–1)

Violet, of course, lives in London. Of the four sites specified or alluded to in this paragraph, Loughlinter and London are perhaps the most persistently important to *Phineas Finn* and *Phineas Redux*; however, they function differently in the two novels, and these differences are revealing. Absent from *Can You Forgive Her?*, the first of the Pallisers, Scotland represents disappointed romance in *Phineas Finn* via Lady Laura’s decision there for sense over sensibility and via Trollope’s equation of Scotland with sense. Four years later, *The Eustace Diamonds* already rethinks this categorization, as if preparing the way for the wholesale attempt to reenchant Scotland to dangerous effect in *Phineas Redux*. The story of these shifts raises questions best answered by attending to their specific narrative purpose. A pattern of enchantment and disenchantment emerges that is at odds with critical renderings of Scotland and the border as consistent sites of otherness and adventure.

*Phineas Finn* shows Trollope acknowledging a creeping disenchantment that begins by polluting the romantic territories—both literary and geographical—of Scott. Trollope regarded Scott highly, prizing *Ivanhoe* as one of his three favorite English novels (Autobiography 41). The clearest debt in *Phineas Finn* is to *Waverley*, a novel informed by events contempo-
Part II: Trollope and the Problem of Integration

Rarity to its composition but based on events that were, as the novel’s subtitle declares, already “Sixty Years” in the past. The historical novel, by definition, constructs the past as its project. Trollope’s invocation of *Waverley* is thus doubly ironic; not only does he adduce the perceived romance of Scott’s territories in order to subvert it, but this subversion is accomplished partially by means of dragging Scotland into the narrative present. “Loughlinter,” the narrator explains, “wanted that graceful beauty of age” (1.119). It “was all of cut stone, but the stones had been cut only yesterday.” Odes to the beauty of the rugged landscape and to “waterfall over waterfall” as Phineas arrives, soon give way to the “half natural and half artificial,” with a path “arranged so that not a pleasant splashing rush of the waters was lost to the visitor” (1.120). The Highlands have been tamed, the novel posits, and so have the Highlanders of Scott: “these Highlanders, with all that is said of their family pride, have forgotten the Mackenzies already, and are quite proud of their rich landlord,” Lady Laura tells Phineas (1.123). The purpose of the half-flattering description of Loughlinter is to taint Robert Kennedy by association. The newness and false character of Loughlinter castle match the newness of Kennedy’s money and an upward mobility on which the narrator is quick to cast aspersions as a tired tale and a diminishing of tradition: “He was laird of Linn and laird of Linter, as his people used to say. And yet his father had walked into Glasgow as a little boy,—no doubt with the normal half-crown in his breeches pocket” (1.119). The narrator himself appears bored with Robert Kennedy’s story, and the broader depiction of Kennedy emphasizes this by repeatedly categorizing him as dull and unromantic. The text’s introduction of him reports that he “seemed to be afflicted with some difficulty in speaking,” and Aspasia Fitzgibbon, joking about Mr. Kennedy with Phineas, compares him unflatteringly to a monkey Kennedy gazes on during a visit to the zoo: “Did you ever see such a contrast in your life? . . . Between Mr. Kennedy and a monkey. The monkey has so much to say for himself, and is so delightfully wicked! I don’t suppose that Mr. Kennedy ever did anything wrong in his life” (1.40). A later conversation between Lady Laura and Kennedy, after their marriage to each other, reveals to an even greater extent Kennedy’s position in the text as the antithesis of romance when he tells his wife, “Passion, Laura, can never be right” (2.115). Kennedy is dull, and his dullness in *Phineas Finn* is depicted by the narrator as powerful enough to have tainted Scott’s landscapes. “There is some ballad about the old lairds,” the reader is told, “but that belongs to a time when Mr. Kennedy had not been

---

3. The Mackenzies were a highland clan in the upper northwest of Scotland, according to Browne, while the fictional Loughlinter would have fallen into an area of Perthshire marked by astonishing clan mixture. As Scott’s *Waverley* is dedicated to Scottish writer Henry Mackenzie, Trollope could also have used the name to amplify the notion that Scott’s Scotland is forgotten.
This idea of a transformation in Scotland, of a shift from the romantic to the dull, is paired with modernization. The Kennedys—Robert and his father—are said to have altered the landscape by vastly increasing the “acres on the property under cultivation” (1.123). Lady Laura, as if in defense of Kennedy, attempts to dismiss the idea of any actual transformation by questioning the picturesque associations of the Highlands; she asserts rather that any romance to the Highlands is the product of imagination, and she blames Scott. After she tells Phineas of the Highlanders’ changing allegiance from their clan to their landlord, Phineas remarks, disappointed, “That is unpoetical” (1.124). Veering from history into aesthetics, Lady Laura replies, “Yes;—but then poetry is so usually false. I doubt whether Scotland would not have been as prosaic a country as any under the sun but for Walter Scott;—and I have no doubt that Henry V owes the romance of his character altogether to Shakspeare [sic].” Lady Laura’s diatribe is just the most direct shot in Trollope’s war on Scott in Phineas Finn, and, by extension, on the sort of romance Scott represents. In a later chapter, Kennedy helps Phineas to an appointment with Lady Laura when Phineas is running late and he borrows a pony from a “Donald Bean.” Donald Bean is a Highland warrior in Scott’s Waverley, and Scott’s presentation of him is the stuff of adventure. En route to Bean’s hideout, Waverley stops to rest and reflect:

He had now time to give himself up to the full romance of his situation. Here he sate on the banks of an unknown lake, under the guidance of a wild native, whose language was unknown to him, on a visit to the den of some renowned outlaw, a second Robin Hood perhaps, or Adam o’Gordon, and that at deep midnight, through scenes of difficulty and toil, separated from his attendant, left by his guide:—what a fund of circumstances for the exercise of a romantic imagination, and all enhanced by the solemn feeling of uncertainty at least, if not of danger! (78)

Trollope’s Donald Bean, on the other hand, is a mere tenant, his pony “not much bigger than a dog” (1.134). Scott’s Scotland finds itself brutally reduced and undeniably tamed in Trollope’s telling of it.

Indeed, Trollope’s taming of Scott creates a locus of destroyed wildness in Phineas Finn, a sort of place where romance goes to die. Lady Laura is the first to see this happen, in scenes clearly meant to parallel the fruitless romantic discussions between Flora Mac-Ivor and Waverley in Scott’s novel. Flora’s passion is to her cause, and so Waverley ultimately marries the safer, less revolutionary Rose Bradwardine. Trollope’s narrator makes it clear that Lady Laura’s passion is for Phineas, whom she sees as “handsome as a
god” (1.136). That she chooses Kennedy over Phineas heightens the sense of damaged romance that pervades Loughlinter, for Lady Laura’s decision is based on a fidelity to duty rather than to passion. Of Kennedy, she simply says, “I have thought it wise to accept his offer,” hardly a ringing endorsement (1.138). “I have accepted the owner of Loughlinter as my husband,” she explains, “because I verily believe that I shall thus do my duty in that sphere of life to which it has pleased God to call me” (1.138–39). The narrator repeatedly frames this resignation to duty as a renunciation of romance, as Laura tells herself that her moment of conference with Finn “would be the alpha and the omega of the romance of her life” and that, “having put aside all romance as unfitted to her life,” “life for her must be a matter of business” (1.158; 1.201–2). What is at stake in Laura’s choice is clear, and the text actually punishes her for her decision of duty over passion. She confesses to Phineas at the end of the first volume that she has “made a mistake,” later specifying to Violet Effingham that she was wrong to “satisfy [her] mind and [her] ambition without caring for [her] heart” (1.302; 2.66). She phrases this even more strongly to Phineas at the close of Phineas Redux: “When I was younger I did not understand how strong the heart can be. I should have known it, and I pay for my ignorance with the penalty of my whole life” (2.349). Laura opts for duty, and Trollope’s text refuses to see unquestioned virtue in this. Meanwhile, Loughlinter exerts its taming force on still another character: Lord Chiltern, who, unlike Laura, is billed from the outset as wild. I showed, above, the text’s portrayal of Chiltern as a savage or wild man, but his marriage to Violet Effingham threatens to socialize him, as he promises to “change for the better” (2.123). Later, in Phineas Redux, Phineas asks Lady Laura whether Violet’s and Chiltern’s marriage has made him “quite tame,” and Laura responds in the affirmative (1.98). Bizarrely, the promise of self-control and marriage that Chiltern makes to Violet happens neither where Violet lives nor where Chiltern lives but rather at Loughlinter, where both are visitors. Trollope’s narrative seems to require the diminished Scotland as a disenchanted backdrop for the scene of Chiltern’s chastening, and it goes out of its way to lure them both there for this scene.

Lady Laura’s choice at Loughlinter leads to a disillusionment central to her character in both Phineas Finn and Phineas Redux. The Königstein episode in the latter summons textual memories of Loughlinter, in its rejection of passion, its spatial construction of disenchantment, and its subjection of romantically inflected territories to a stern quotidianization. These memories of Phineas Finn are important, because they highlight the fact that the presence of Loughlinter in Phineas Redux will acquire a force blatantly antithetical to its earlier avatar. At Kennedy’s request in Redux, Phineas travels to Scotland for a visit, but the landscape and its symbolic weight have been
altered. Loughlinter has been reinvigorated as a site of mystery and romance, and the literary corollaries on which Trollope leans are—not surprisingly, if one recalls Balzac’s *La Fille aux yeux d’or*—the Gothic. As Phineas arrives, “The door was opened for him by an old servant in black, who proposed at once to show him to his room. He looked round the vast hall, which, when he had before known it, was ever filled with signs of life, and felt at once that it was empty and deserted. It struck him as intolerably cold, and he saw that the huge fireplace was without a spark of fire” (1.84–5). It is even more significant that the gothic work on which Trollope’s narrator appears to be leaning most heavily is one by Scott, *The Bride of Lammermoor* (1819), a debt made clear by allusion to that novel’s servant, Caleb Balderstone (1.86). Trollope’s resurrection of Scott is concretized by the inclusion of dialect at Loughlinter, as the servant asks Phineas whether he would “visit the laird out o’ hand, or would he bide awee?” Not once in *Phineas Finn* was Loughlinter’s Scottishness allowed to leach through written speech, but *Phineas Redux* continues in 1874 a process that Trollope began in 1873’s *The Eustace Diamonds*, a slow disentangling of Scotland and England that will restore to the Highlands their literary peculiarity and potential as romantic trope. Gowran, who speaks always in dialect in *The Eustace Diamonds*, remarks on differences in riding styles between Scotland and London (1.206); the Londoners are painted as comically ignorant of local Scottish customs (1.222); and, despite the high amount of English tourists to Scotland, the narrator assures us, it is yet unmarred by the tour guides, unlike Europe (1.292). If it were ill-suited for romance in *Phineas Finn*, Trollope’s Pallisers have reenchanted Scotland by the time *Phineas Redux* begins.

The significance of this reenchantment extends beyond the local portrayals of a separate Loughlinter, however, because Loughlinter becomes the major source of narrative complication in the first volume of *Phineas Redux*. Finn’s meeting with Kennedy there goes badly; Kennedy ultimately threatens Finn with a poker from the fireplace; and the narrator categorizes the Scottish Member, in no uncertain terms, as a “madman” (1.91). This madman soon brings his discontent to London, and Finn is called in to the office of *The People’s Banner*, a newspaper edited by Quintus Slide, to peruse a letter that Kennedy hopes the *Banner* will publish. The letter intends to castigate Lady Laura publicly for her decision to separate from Kennedy, and Slide threatens to publish it but agrees to wait until Finn has spoken with Kennedy (1.201–2). If the meeting between the Irish Member and the Scottish Member in Loughlinter goes badly, their meeting in London goes worse, but the narrative’s depiction of it redraws some important boundaries. Not only have Loughlinter and Scotland been reenchanted, as it were, in *Phineas Redux*, but the mystery that they represent in the novel now serves to com-
plicate other locations. Finn is told that Kennedy is staying in London at a hotel called “Macpherson’s in Judd Street. I suppose he likes to keep among the Scotch” (1.202). And, indeed, Trollope’s narrator paints Macpherson’s as a dislocated stand-in for Scotland. First, it is in London but, apparently, not of London: “Judd Street runs into the New Road near the great stations of the Midland and Northern Railways, and is a highly respectable street. But it can hardly be called fashionable, as is Piccadilly; or central, as is Charing Cross; or commercial, as is the neighborhood of St. Paul’s. Men seeking the shelter of an hotel in Judd Street most probably prefer decent and respectable obscurity to other advantages” (1.203–4). Furthermore, the “landlord [of Macpherson’s] had originally come from the neighbourhood of Loughlinter,” and the speech of everyone at the hotel is rendered in Scott-like dialect (1.204). The name chosen for the location, in addition, recalls that of James Macpherson, responsible for the Ossian poems hoax in 1765. Trollope uses popular imaginings of Scotland to carve out a section of London in which mystery can exist.

Kennedy, of course, fires a pistol at Phineas during the meeting, and this act has ramifications for the future of Phineas Redux even as it simultaneously conjures associations with the past duel between Phineas and Chiltern in Phineas Finn. It confirms for Phineas—and for the reader, if there were still any doubt—that Kennedy is insane, “so mad as to be not even aware of the act he had perpetrated” (1.208). Hugh Walpole, writing in 1928, sees the portrayal of Kennedy’s madness as praiseworthy because it shows Trollope as a “modern” (“No post-war psycho-analytic realist can teach him anything”), but the larger issue here is the effect of this madness on the novel (108). Because of Finn’s mere association with the shot, as its target, and because of the speculation surrounding his friendship with Lady Laura, he is vilified by his political enemies in London. The altercation in Macpherson’s hotel is explicitly compared to Phineas’s duel with Chiltern in a manner that highlights the difference, that alerts the reader of the Palliser series to some significant changes that must have taken place in Trollope’s fictional imagination during the five years between Phineas Finn and Phineas Redux. One is reminded in Redux that Phineas “had once stood up to be fired at in a duel, and had been struck by the ball. But nothing in that encounter had made him feel sick and faint through every muscle as he had felt just now” (1.209). The later encounter, the narrator seems to emphasize, was like a duel but was not a duel; it was something far more nefarious. Furthermore, it happened not on a distant foreign beach, a border site where such activities may be imagined and executed, but in a section of London marked off by the text as a mysterious, foreign place of its own within the larger metropolis. The effects within London society are as those of a boulder heaved into a pond: “A great deal
was said by very many persons in London as to the murderous attack which had been made by Mr. Kennedy on Phineas Finn in Judd Street, but . . . no public or official inquiry was made into the circumstance. Mr. Kennedy, under the care of his cousin, retreated to Scotland” (1.278). The mysterious lack of closure to the event allows for any amount of speculation public and private, in what the narrator bills as a sort of generator of fiction. The duel gives rise to one “very romantic story” after another regarding Phineas, Lady Laura, and Mr. Kennedy (1.279). The fame attaching itself to Phineas in the wake of the episode is, according to the narrator, what ultimately ushers in the envy of his peers and leads to Finn’s downfall: “Fame begets envy, and there were some who said that the member for Tankerville [Phineas’s district in Redux] had injured his prospects with his party” (1.280). Loughlinter’s arrival in London, then, can be seen as a primary determinant in the novel’s narrative arc, an incident that will help to dictate Finn’s fate hundreds of pages later.

Kennedy and, by extension, Loughlinter are the main source of narrative tension in the first volume of Phineas Redux. Despite the shift in Loughlinter’s function within the Pallisers, though, Trollope remains true to an economy of romance. At the outset of volume two, of course, the novel’s direction changes dramatically when Mr. Bonteen is murdered by another import to London, the Reverend Emilius. Mr. Bonteen’s body is discovered in chapter XLVII, and the few chapters immediately thereafter catalogue the social effects, and the effects on parliamentary business, of the murder: Finn and Emilius are arrested, Mrs. Bunce has her say, and then Parliament has its say. But then, apparently no longer needed as a force of mystery in the novel, Kennedy is quickly removed in chapter LII when he dies in his castle at Loughlinter, and with him dies the danger that Loughlinter represents. For the rest of Phineas Redux, the trial of Phineas Finn takes center stage. From this point, the multiple references to Loughlinter serve neither to recall Phineas’s and Lady Laura’s conversation from the beginning of Phineas Finn, when she chooses duty over passion, nor to summon the aura of dread surrounding Kennedy in the first half of Phineas Redux, but rather to provide a romantic horizon for the future in the form of a sentimental question. With Kennedy hardly in the ground, Lady Laura wonders, “Might it not still be possible that there should be before her a happy evening to her days; and that she might stand once more beside the falls of Linter, contented, hopeful, nay, almost glorious, with her hand in his [Finn’s] to whom she had once refused her own on that very spot?” (2.110). Later, again, she asks herself, “How often might they stand there again [at Loughlinter] if only his [Finn’s] constancy would equal hers?” (2.223). The novel’s portrayal of Loughlinter is extravagantly inconstant. Rather than situate it, à la Scott, as a consistent
locus of enchantment on the border between Highlands and Lowlands (it is located, fictionally, in Perthshire, within a short coach trip of Callander), it plays first the part of disillusion in \textit{Phineas Finn} and then that of violent (gothic) Other in \textit{Phineas Redux} before it anchors the sentimentality of Lady Laura’s role at the end of the novel. The importing of Loughlinter into the increasingly heterogeneous, late-imperial London, though, opens a fresh channel in Trollope’s fiction that will be pursued further in the next chapter, through \textit{Phineas Redux} and \textit{The Way We Live Now}.

\textbf{(c) On Not Knowing: Detection, Empiricism, and the Verdict on the Evidence}

Trollope’s shifting borders and his new portrayal of London’s openness organize themselves, finally, around two violent crimes in \textit{Phineas Redux}. The first, Kennedy’s attempt on Phineas’s life, is quickly forgotten when Mr. Bonteen is found bludgeoned to death. Scholarship has, with the exception of Walpole, largely dismissed \textit{Redux}, but the novel’s second act contains the most concentrated and self-conscious instance, in Trollope’s fiction, of the instability central to my argument, between empiricism and disenchantment and the resistance to them. It is thus especially illuminating as a debate over literary realism’s potential and potential complications. Trollope scripts Phineas’s trial for the murder of Mr. Bonteen as a clear epistemological duel that occurs in London but is engendered by characters from outside of London, and he does so while simultaneously acknowledging this contest’s importance to ideas of fiction and knowledge. The courtroom scenes that preoccupy the second half of \textit{Phineas Redux} continue the negotiation of a narrative epistemology in Trollope’s work that begins with \textit{The Eustace Diamonds}—a detective epistemology that is radically empirical, fully rational, and coded as urban. Detection is a subtlety in \textit{The Eustace Diamonds}, but it is made to stand trial in \textit{Phineas Redux}.

Trollope was evidently spurred on by the publication and success of Wilkie Collins’s \textit{The Moonstone} in 1868, in which the theft of a gem precipitates Britain’s first detective novel. He admits in his \textit{Autobiography} the influence of Collins on \textit{The Eustace Diamonds} but makes an important distinction in authorial method:

\begin{quote}
The plot of the diamond necklace is, I think, well arranged, though it produced itself without any forethought. I had had no idea of setting thieves after the bauble till I had got my heroine to bed in the inn at Carlisle; nor of the disappoint-\end{quote}
ment of the thieves, till Lizzie [Eustace] had been wakened in the morning with
the news that her door had been broken open. All these things, and many more,
Wilkie Collins would have arranged beforehand with infinite labour, preparing
things present so that they should fit in with things to come. (344)

As the methods vary, so too have critical appraisals of their success. Robert
Polhemus has dismissed the detective thread of *Phineas Redux* as “second-
rate Wilkie Collins,” and there is indeed sufficient cause to see both stylistic
and thematic similarities in *The Eustace Diamonds*, *Phineas Redux*, and
*The Moonstone* (179). Both authors present detection and the style of knowl-
edge that underwrites it as profoundly empirical, even scientific. Agents of
the police test theories through experiments couched in the language of the labora-

ty—the hypnosis of Franklin Blake in *The Moonstone*, for example,
or the duplication of the murderer’s possible pedestrian routes in *Phineas
Redux*. Furthermore, crime and detection are foregrounded as urban phe-


omena. *The Moonstone’s* Sergeant Cuff is called up from London, and his
rigorous methodology baffles the rural constabulary, while Major Mackin-
tosh in *The Eustace Diamonds* not only responds to the crime from London
but posits that, given the expertise of the theft, the criminals were probably
also from London and planned to return the diamonds there in order to fence
them (2.76). The metropolis becomes implicated in both the nature of the
crime and the solution to it.

Trollope differs from Collins, though, on the status of detective epist-
emology. D. A. Miller argues that *The Moonstone* “is more fundamentally
about the securities of perception and language than about the problems
they pose” and that it is “thus perfectly obedient to the imperatives” of mono-
logical power (54, 57). *The Eustace Diamonds* appears to toe this line self-
consciously and somewhat humorously within its articulation of detection
as both absolute and rational. Of Major Mackintosh, the London detective
called to the case, the narrator writes that “there was nothing he couldn’t find
out” (2.70). Another “eminent detective officer,” Mr. Bunfit, has the following
exchange with Lord George, who asks him:

“Do you believe that I’ve got [the diamonds]?”

“A man in my situation, my lord, never believes anything. We has to suspect,
but we never believes.” (2.76)

The remainder of that chapter plays fairly consistently on the “suspicions”
of the police and the “beliefs” of the other characters. Compare a similar
exchange from *Phineas Redux*, between Lord Chiltern and a detective inves-
tigating the murder of Mr. Bonteen: “You don’t mean to say that you believe it?” said Lord Chiltern to the officer. ‘We never believe and we never disbelieve anything, my Lord,’ replied the man. Nevertheless, the superintendent did most firmly believe that Phineas Finn had murdered Mr. Bonteen’ (2.81). The relentless detective epistemology of *The Eustace Diamonds* becomes complicated in *Phineas Redux*. The narrator’s sober tone in the second volume of *Redux* even adopts at times the functionality of a police report, as in the startling stylistic shift that occurs at the outset of chapter XLVII, when this detective story is introduced into the novel: “On the next morning at seven o’clock a superintendent of police called at the house of Mr. Gresham and informed the Prime Minister that Mr. Bonteen, the President of the Board of Trade, had been murdered during the night. There was no doubt of the fact. The body had been recognised, and information had been taken to the unfortunate widow” (2.58). Finn is arrested on the strength of empirical evidence—he carried a weapon similar to that used in the murder, was overheard threatening to kill the victim on the night of the murder, is identified by an eyewitness, and has no verifiable alibi—and this evidence is enough to convince even some of his closest friends that he may be guilty.

Even more alarming than the shift to detective fiction in *Phineas Redux*, though, is Trollope’s refusal to allow the detective interest to matter to the plot. Where Collins maintains mystery in order to build suspense, Trollope shows his hand immediately:

> The reader need hardly be told that, as regards this great offence, Phineas Finn was as white as snow. The maintenance of any doubt on that matter,—were it even desirable to maintain a doubt,—would be altogether beyond of the power of the present writer. The reader has probably perceived, from the first moment of the discovery of the body on the steps at the end of the passage, that Mr. Bonteen had been killed by that ingenious gentleman, the Rev. Mr. Emilius. . . . (2.77–78)

With Finn’s innocence established and Emilius’s guilt disclosed to the reader, *Phineas Redux* revolves not around the detectives but rather around the duel between their empirical knowledge and the nonempirical knowledge of others—the love and the character testimonies of Finn’s friends—in a court of law. The unasked question of the novel is never “Who done it?” as it is in Collins’s novel and, indeed, in most detective fiction. Trollope’s work wonders rather which type of knowledge matters more. Coral Lounsbury has argued that legal structure and constant recourse to strictures of the law in Trollope’s Pallisers both reveal and satisfy Trollope’s personal taste for social order. Yet the legal forum in *Phineas Redux* sees a complex negotia-
tion of empirical and emotional knowledge, upsetting the sorts of certainties Miller sees in *The Moonstone*. One might have anticipated Trollope’s later ambivalence toward detection. Even as the police enter *The Eustace Diamonds*, their stated goal is “to unravel the mystery” that has already been said, by the narrator, to possess “a certain charm” (2.133; 2.46).

The physical evidence amassed by the police in their investigation of Finn is damning. The trial, though, quietly undercuts this physical evidence through a defense that commences with the decidedly nonempirical values of fiction and friendship. In one of the most perplexing moments in the novel, Mr. Bouncer, a novelist, is called as an expert witness. Bouncer testifies that Finn cannot be guilty because, by having announced his intention to kill Bonteen and then immediately having done it, Finn flouts conventions of literary emplotment as old as Shakespeare and as practiced by Scott (2.193–94). Finn’s lawyer, Mr. Chaffanbrass, sums up Bouncer’s testimony thus: “If I understand you then, Mr. Bouncer, you would not dare so violate probability in a novel, as to produce a murderer to the public who should contrive a secret hidden murder,—contrive it and execute it, all within a quarter of an hour?” (2.194–95). Bouncer’s acknowledgment of this point passes in Finn’s favor, and what is improbable first in fiction is then held to be improbable in fact. A degradation of empirical knowledge accompanies this glorification of fiction. Lord Chiltern’s opinion matches that of Madame Max Goesler and Lady Laura, all of whom believe Finn innocent: “I am quite sure from my knowledge of the man that he could not commit a murder,” Chiltern proclaims, “and I don’t care what the evidence is” (2.211). While Chiltern carries it to an extreme, there are important examples of the futility of evidence elsewhere in the Victorian novel. In Dorothea Brooke’s vindication of Lydgate in Eliot’s *Middlemarch*, she claims, “I feel convinced that his conduct has not been guilty. I believe that people are almost always better than their neighbours think they are” (691). The narrator continues by stating that Dorothea prefers to “cautious weighing” “an ardent faith in efforts of justice and mercy, which would conquer by their emotional force.” In *The Moonstone*, Mr. Bruff informs Miss Clack that Sergeant Cuff is wrong to suspect Rachel Verinder: “If he had known Rachel’s character as I know it, he would have suspected everybody in the house but her. . . . If the plainest evidence in the world pointed one way, and if nothing but Rachel’s word of honour pointed the other, I would take her word before the evidence, lawyer as I am!” (217)

Trollope reiterates elsewhere in the novel the opposition between “evidence” and “private knowledge or personal affection” (2.280), but his resolution of the opposition in *Phineas Redux* is surprisingly consistent in its anti-empiricism. This belief in Phineas Finn’s character, in the face of
evidence to the contrary, drives Madame Max to Prague, where she finds opposing evidence that will exonerate him, the mould of the key used to gain entry into the victim’s house (2.214). Because the epistemological duel here is between empiricism (evidence) and its opposite (belief), however, the evidence of Madame Max cannot be permitted simply to counter the evidence of the police; were Trollope to do so, the duel between types of knowledge would be over, with empiricism the victor. All that arrives from Prague is a telegram from Madame Max stating what was found there, and as Sir Gregory, the prosecutor, makes clear, a telegram is not evidence and thus “proves nothing” (2.216). Mirroring the language of the police earlier in *Phineas Redux* and in *The Eustace Diamonds*, the prosecutor Sir Gregory goes on to say, of the telegram’s report, “I neither believe it nor disbelieve it; but it cannot affect the evidence” (2.217). The jury, however, do believe it. Their belief in Madame Max’s claim of evidence trumps the solid, present evidence offered by the police, and they acquit Phineas Finn. There is no doubt here that the jury’s conclusion is correct—as the narrator has already stated, Phineas is not guilty. George Levine has argued that “Trollope’s attitude toward meaning and explanation is profoundly secular” and “rational” (*Darwin and the Novelists* 193), yet in the trial of *Phineas Redux* it is non-empirical “belief” in a foreign source—not rational material knowledge—that leads to truth.

*Phineas Redux* mobilizes many of the same fictional forces on which Trollope first depends in *Phineas Finn*, but an examination of the shifting function of those forces shows a palpable sense of crisis and a commensurate fictional response to it. *Phineas Finn*’s uncertainties as to the location and possibility of romance and mystery, both within England and within a Scotland that we are told is normally dependably romantic, are severely undercut in its sequel. In *Phineas Redux*, the energies that will complicate the plot and drive it forward are neither conveniently contained across the Channel (as the duel at Blankenberg was) nor eviscerated by alleged anachronism (as Scott’s Highlands were), as they were in *Phineas Finn*. Rather, romance is at full foreign strength and within striking distance of England’s capital, where it occasions serious considerations over the nature of knowledge and its representation in realist fiction. Such transformations are visible through Trollope’s confrontation of disenchantment, which sees him simultaneously retreating into the literary and exurban past (the Scottian Gothic) and reinserting borders that had, in *Phineas Finn*, all but lost their relevance. The resurrected borders of England, however, are a failure in the Pallisers if their
purpose is the containment and easy localization of mystery and romance, if their aim is a solid and trusty separation of the earth into what McClure calls “zones of order and disorder” in his discussion of empire’s imagina-
tive geography (*Late Imperial Romance* 2). *Phineas Redux* imagines the penetrability of London, the heart of the imperium, by foreign energies that are—as they were not in *Phineas Finn*—irremediably and unmistakably and consistently foreign. As in Balzac’s *La Fille aux yeux d’or*, the increased mobility of people that Sassen describes in today’s “global city” appears here as a cherished opportunity for narrative complication, for romance that will set London abuzz with mysteries to unravel and mysteries to preserve.

It is here, in London, that Trollope differs most significantly from contemporaries who also made the city—and an epistemology coded as urban—a primary focus in their novels. Dickens is, naturally, the exemplary architect of fictional London, and his England is often anchored in a larger, global geography: consider *Martin Chuzzlewit*’s (1844) American journey; *Dombey and Son*’s (1848) shipping concerns and “Native” visitor; *Bleak House*’s “tele-
scopic philanthropy” (1853); the French-Revolutionary preoccupations of *A Tale of Two Cities* (1859); and the transhemispheric movements of Magwitch in *Great Expectations* (1861). However, Dickens’s actual foreign incursions into London are largely cosmetic—never major, indispensable players in the manner of Trollope’s *Phineas Finn*, *Augustus Melmotte*, and Madame Max Goesler. And, for all its variegated social strata, complex inner geography, and position as capital of the world, Dickens’s London never feels as dan-
gerously cosmopolitan as Trollope’s London is in *Phineas Redux* and *The Way We Live Now* or as Balzac’s Paris is in *La Fille aux yeux d’or*. Trollope appears to fully envision, in a way that *The Moonstone* only sensationalisti-
cally anticipates, 4 certain results of empire that attend those of the quotidian-
ization of formerly unknown or mysterious corners of the globe: the world’s arrival in London, globalization’s pivotal role in that arrival, and the broader consequences for fiction and fact. Ashis Nandy’s claim, that “the experi-
ence of colonizing did not leave the internal culture of Britain untouched,” becomes increasingly true (*Intimate Enemy* 32). Having begun to imagine the romantic possibility in the permeability of London by the outside world in *Phineas Finn* and *Phineas Redux*, Trollope’s next major work 5 feels like

4. Even in *Dombey and Son*’s truly global dealings, and for all of Solomon Gill’s acknowledgments of their transformation of London, what lies outside of England is still the stuff of adventure, a vast, foreign expanse in which ships can go down (as Walter Gay’s does in Barbados, or as John Harmon’s does in *Our Mutual Friend* [1864–65]) and important characters can be presumed missing while others wander the earth looking for them. The world has not yet been disencharcted.

5. After Redux, for which Trollope received £2500 in 1874, he published *Lady Anna* (1874) and *Harry Heathcote of Gangoil* (1874), both shorter, less substantial and less well-received works, for which he received $450 and $1200, respectively (Trollope, *Autobiography* 364). For *The Way We Live Now* in 1875, Trollope was paid $3000, more than he had received for anything since 1869,
an angry retraction, an elaboration of the dangers of cosmopolitanism. *The Way We Live Now* seeks a refuge of last resort from the battleground of disenchantment and reenchantment that London has become in the *Phineas* novels.

when *Phineas Finn* earned him £3200. A debate still rages over the contemporary success of *The Way We Live Now*—cf. Super (“Was The Way?”) and Sutherland (“The Commercial Success”)—but that will be treated in the next chapter. More important to the concerns of my argument, though, is the fact that, after *Phineas Redux*, *The Way We Live Now* is Trollope’s next novel set in and around London.