Notes to Introduction

1. This standard of manliness is perhaps epitomized by Charles Kingley’s doctrine of muscular Christianity, which receives extensive scrutiny in James Eli Adams’s *Dandies and Desert Saints*; see 98–102, 106–47.

2. Such a concentration on the secret society as a rhetorical figure at once aligns my project with J. M. Roberts’s emphasis on the “mythology” of secret societies and distances it from more fact-based studies. One work that operates between these two extremes is Sissela Bok’s *Secrets*, which investigates the ethics of secrecy, including that of secret societies. See her fourth chapter, “Secret Societies,” 45–58, for a helpful discussion of some of the ethical implications of secret societies in a variety of social conditions.

3. My approach is modeled after that of Mary Poovey in *Uneven Developments*, which draws on a wide range of texts and approaches in order to “extrapolate” and “reconstruct” a “symbolic economy” of middle-class femininity that delimits the “conditions of possibility for those texts” (15).

4. Saltmarsh’s comment is expanded upon by J. M. Roberts on 9–11 of *Mythology*.

5. *British Poets and Secret Societies* contains a number of essays that attempt to make connections between various secret societies and such writers as Percy Shelley, W. B. Yeats, and Rudyard Kipling. It also offers background material on Freemasonry, the Rosicrucians, and the Golden Dawn, as well as on more well-known historical phenomena like the Combination Acts, the Luddite rebellion and the Tolpuddle Martyrs. *Secret Texts: The Literature of Secret Societies* is a collection of critical essays on topics ranging from Yeats’s affiliation to the Golden Dawn to Thomas Peacock’s parody of the Illuminati in *Nightmare Abbey* to Rudyard Kipling’s *Kim* and colonial Freemasonry.


8. The difficulty of defining what constitutes a secret society can be seen in both Norman MacKenzie’s *Secret Societies* and Charles Heckethorn’s *The Secret Societies of All Ages and Countries*. In his Introduction MacKenzie first proposes a gradation of associations—open, limited, private, secret—then warns against “trying to force particular associations into these categories, for we know that there are many intermediate degrees of secrecy” (14). Heckethorn similarly backs away
from his first attempt to classify secret societies into seven categories based on their ultimate goals—religious, military, judiciary, scientific, civil, political, and anti-social—admitting that “the line of division is not always strictly defined,” and proposing instead the “two comprehensive divisions of religious and political” (I: 3), though it remains unclear what exactly these two terms represent or where one starts and another begins.


10. Kucich helpfully identifies several of these explanatory models on 14–33 of The Power of Lies.


12. Welsh also briefly addresses the Post Office scandal on 54.

13. In addition to Kucich and Adams, both of whose projects are dedicated to documenting just this sort of individual resistance, see 80–84 of Philip Barker’s Michel Foucault and 212–15, 254–56 of Mark Cousins’s and Athar Hussein’s Michel Foucault for more on this problem of resistance.

14. The strengths and the weaknesses of an exclusively Foucauldian approach are best seen in D. A. Miller’s groundbreaking study, The Novel and the Police. Miller touches on secrecy and surveillance in the Victorian novel as a literary genre and his formalist approach provides an excellent model for identifying the attitudes toward the figure of the secret society engendered by the rhetorical devices of particular texts, as well as the ways in which narrative strategy can serve to mask an arbitrarily circumscribed field of meaning. However, Miller’s exclusively Foucauldian approach sometimes itself arbitrarily circumscribes his texts’ fields of meaning to the unambiguous reinforcement of the social panopticon, even though a text like Wilkie Collins’s The Moonstone remains self-divided over its apparently monological resolution via the marriage of Franklin Blake and Rachel Verinder.

15. Dahl defines the seven criteria of polyarchy on 220–24 of Democracy and Its Critics.

16. Raymond Williams provides an extraordinarily helpful discussion of the history of the word “democracy” in England on 93–98 of Keywords.

17. Of necessity, this account of Victorian England’s struggle to achieve more equitable political representation is both abridged and filtered through the lens of contemporary criticism. Even Victorian radicals might have felt uncomfortable identifying their goals as “democratic,” preferring instead terms like “representative,” “popular” or even “republican,” whereas more conservative reformers probably would have described themselves as Whigs, Liberals, Utilitarians or even Tory Radicals rather than advocates of guardianship. Despite their choice of terms, however, the main issue separating the period’s various pro-democracy positions was whether political representation should be direct or mediated, inherent or earned, a division most clearly captured by the more modern terms that it helped to spawn, radical and guardianship democracy.

18. A fuller summary of both positions is given on 123–30 of Jon Roper’s Democracy and Its Critics.
19. Lively and Rees, 59. Lively and Rees reproduce all of the texts of this debate, including the revised 1824–25 edition of Mill’s “Essay,” Macaulay’s response, and Bentham and Mill’s responses to Macaulay. Their Introduction also provides a summary of the complexities of the debate (1–52), which centered not just on democracy but also on the usefulness of Utilitarian arguments for crafting public policy.

20. Ibid., 72–79. Mill’s position is itself grounded not in Paine’s Rights of Man, but in a number of works by Bentham, including Plan of Parliamentary Reform, in the Form of a Catechism, with Reasons for Each Article: with an Introduction, Showing the Necessity of Radical, and the Inadequacy of Moderate Reform (Works, III: 433–557) and “Resolutions on Parliamentary Reform” (Works, X: 495–97). Bentham’s Book of Fallacies (Works, II: 371–488) also contains a number of relevant thoughts on the non-representative system of government current at the time.

21. Another important transitional figure in the democracy debates is Thomas Carlyle, whose “Signs of the Times” contains a penetrating criticism of democratic reform as merely another species of mechanism. As Raymond Williams observes in Culture and Society, “Carlyle sees democracy, in fact, as in one sense an expression of the . . . laissez-faire spirit: a cancelling of order and government, under which men can be left free to follow their own interests” (79–80). Carlyle was the most articulate advocate of an older non-democratic form of aristocratic guardianship. This important alternative to democracy and Carlyle’s relation to it will be explored in detail in chapter 1.

22. See, e.g., 52–53 and 479–82.

23. See, e.g., 183, 239–49, and 409–10. Tocqueville explains that this “tyranny of the majority” is so dangerous because, “there is nothing so irresistible as a tyrannical power that commands in the name of the people, because, being vested with the moral power that belongs to the will of the greatest number, it acts at the same time with the decision, the promptness, and the tenacity that a single man would have” (212).

24. Mill would later incorporate many of the major points of Tocqueville’s argument into On Liberty (1859).

25. Mill, “Tocqueville on Democracy in America, vol. II,” Essays on Politics and Culture, 256–60. Himmelfarb suggests that this crucial reversal in the second review signals Mill’s early break with the Utilitarian radicalism of his father and Jeremy Bentham brought on by his father’s death, a break equally evident in Mill’s “Civilization” and his companion essays on Bentham and Coleridge (xxi–xxiv).

26. Advocates of radical democracy were divided, however, between republicans, who largely followed Paine’s example of reconceiving the state according to rationally-derived and self-consciously ahistorical ideals of “natural rights,” and constitutionalists, who sought to justify democracy using English political traditions supposedly dating back to before the Norman invasion. In Radical Expression, James Epstein helpfully differentiates between these two forms of English radicalism and shows how they continued to inform one another through the mid-nineteenth century; see especially his first chapter, 3–28.

27. Macaulay’s account of the making of the Constitution of 1688 is worth noting, not only
because the ceremonies he describes were still used on formal occasions, but also because they resemble the rituals of more esoteric secret societies: “As our Revolution was a vindication of ancient rights, so if was conducted with strict attention to ancient formalities. In almost every word and act may be discerned a profound reverence for the past. The Estates of the Realm deliberated in the old halls and according to the old rules. Powle was conducted to his chair between his mover and his seconder with the accustomed forms. The Serjeant with his mace brought up the messages of the Lords to the table of the Commons; and the three obeisances were duly made. The conference was held with all the antique ceremonial. On one side of the table, in the Painted Chamber, the managers for the Lords sate covered and robed in ermine and gold. The managers for the Commons stood bareheaded on the other side... The assentors of liberty said not a word about the natural equality of men and the inalienable sovereignty of the people” (History III: 285).

28. As Jon Roper notes, “By describing the adaptive ability of the constitution to meet new challenges by overturning old precedents and claiming new conventions as part of ancient traditions, historians like Macaulay attempted to find in their nation’s history a defence against the incursion of new ideas such as democracy, republicanism and an equal right to liberty. If the constitution was protean, it might endure without changing its outward forms: instead merely periodically admitting a different emphasis on the relationships which existed within it” (120).  

29. As Elaine Hadley notes, “this royal melodrama seems specifically designed to obscure rather than reveal the secret transactions going on in private boxes” (173).  

30. “A cabinet is elected by a legislature; and when that legislature is composed of fit persons, that mode of electing the executive is the very best” (Bagehot, 27).  

31. Bagehot identifies in descending order of importance five functions for the House of Commons: 1) to choose the Prime Minister, “the most important function of the House of Commons” (165); 2) to express the mind of the English people; 3) to teach the lower orders in need of education; 4) to inform the English people of the important issues of the day and various minority opinions of those issues; and 5) to legislate. This hierarchy of functions places him squarely in the guardianship camp, even without his assertion that the Prime Minister and his cabinet will masterfully direct the House of Commons much as a good rider does his horse: “A good horse likes to feel the rider’s bit; and a great deliberative assembly likes to feel that it is under worthy guidance... A great assembly is as soon spoiled by over-indulgence as a little child. The whole life of English politics is the action and reaction between the Ministry and the Parliament” (165).  

32. See also Mill’s comments in Thoughts (Essays, 345). Mill’s Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform is reprinted on 327–58 of Essays on Politics and Culture. 

33. See Mills comments in Thoughts, found on 346 of Essays; and Considerations, 182. 

34. To these nineteenth-century critiques might be added a more modern post-structuralist one; namely, that Mill’s fears stem from his inability to think outside of class-identity politics, to consider that a given manual laborer might have divided and even contradictory loyalties that could cause him to vote differently from other members of his class. 

35. See also Mill’s position in Thoughts, found on 341 of Essays.
36. *Considerations*, 139–41. Mill’s plan was to award a number of votes to each individual that was roughly commensurate with their level of education and innate intelligence, as measured by a national exam that would have presumably been authored by and measured against Mill himself.

37. More recently, Chantal Mouffe and others have rewritten Tocqueville’s question in declarative form: “capitalist relations constitute an insuperable obstacle to the realization of democracy” (Mouffe, 2).

38. The reason I have stressed actions rather than intentions is that some of those characterized as members of secret societies, like Roman Catholics, would not themselves have necessarily supported radical democracy. Instead, they wanted only the removal of their own legal disabilities. However, in pressing for equality for themselves they indirectly forwarded equality for all, both by establishing a precedent that others could follow and by appealing, in however limited a fashion, to the doctrine of social equality.

39. For more on the dangers of this tutelary power, see 663–65.

40. On the desirability of private associations, see 667–68. Earlier, Tocqueville also makes an observation especially relevant to this study when he observes that, despite the danger inherent in an unlimited freedom of association, such an unbridled right does have one singular advantage: “in countries where associations are free, secret societies are unknown. In America there are factious persons, but no conspirators” (184).

41. This shift towards representing Roman Catholicism as a foreign threat to all good Englishmen is, to a certain extent, a natural outgrowth of logic behind Catholic Emancipation itself, since, according to Gauri Viswanathan’s *Outside the Fold*, Tory support for Emancipation “was motivated in part by the conviction that aiming for a nation of good Englishmen was a more realistic goal that achieving a nation of good Anglicans” (5). Viswanathan makes a powerful case that removing Catholics’ legal disabilities was a way to deemphasize their religious identity in order to foster their secular identity as citizens of England.

42. Invocations of the figure of the secret society therefore negatively signify the same gap between bourgeois modernity’s promises and its willingness to meet those promises as the publication of radical manifestoes do in the same period. According to Janet Lyon, “the manifesto is the form that exposes the broken promises of modernity: if modern democratic forms claim to honor the sovereignty of universal political subjecthood, the manifesto is a testament to the partiality of that claim” (3). See her analysis of the rhetorical and ideological characteristics of the manifesto form in chapter one, “Manifestoes and Public Spheres,” esp. 32–34.

---

**Notes to Chapter 1**

1. See Pick and Knight, 105.

2. With the exception of the first two of these journals, reference to which is found in Pick
and Knight, 163, all of the above journals and their publication dates come from the British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books (1955).

3. This widespread rhetorical presence of English Freemasonry makes it akin to what Richard Altick, in The Present of the Present, refers to as a topicality of everyday life.

4. In Daniel Deronda, George Eliot has the German music master Klesmer welcome Gwendolyn on “the hard, climbing path of an endeavouring artist” by saying, “If you take that more courageous resolve I will ask leave to shake hands with you on the strength of our freemasonry, where we are all vowed to the service of Art, and to help her by helping every fellow-servant” (241, ch. 23). Dickens also connects freemasonry and art in Little Dorrit, through Henry Gowan’s ironically deflated “brotherhood of the brush” (562, book II, ch. 7), whereas in David Copperfield he evokes the profession of the law when he has David refer to the “Masonic understanding” between himself and the Surrogate (612, ch. 43). Similarly, in Bleak House he yokes together law and the figure of freemasonry through the character of Mr. Tulkinghorn, about whom Volumnia Dedlock declares, “he must be a Freemason . . . [she is] sure he is the head of a lodge, and wears short aprons, and is made a perfect Idol of, with candlesticks and trowels” (625–26, ch. 40). Finally, Thackeray deploys the figure of freemasonry in Vanity Fair to rhetorically insulate the great world against narrative intrusion: “We must be brief in descanting upon this part of her career. As I cannot describe the mysteries of freemasonry, although I have a shrewd idea that it is a humbug, so an uninitiated man cannot take upon himself to portray the great world accurately, and had best keep his opinions to himself, whatever they are” (642, ch. 51).


6. This and the following section on Masonic history have been constructed from a variety of sources, including Norman MacKenzie’s Secret Societies, 152–77; Charles William Heckethorn’s The Secret Societies of All Ages and Countries, vol. II, 1–110; J. M. Roberts’s The Mythology of the Secret Societies, 17–57; and Pick and Knight’s Pocket History of Freemasonry. Specific references will be documented in the notes, but more general comments are an amalgam of the above four texts.

7. For a list of these divisions, see the entry on “Officers and Titles” in A. E. Waite’s A New Encyclopedia of Freemasonry (II: 205–08), originally published in the late 1910s.

8. This internal division had been caused partly by a general slackness in the administration of the Grand Lodge up to 1751, when the split occurred, and partly by a number of changes in custom and ritual. For more details on the split, see Pick and Knight, 88–89.

9. Among Carlyle’s twentieth-century critics, only Chris Vanden Bossche has attempted to connect Carlyle and Freemasonry. See his “The Speech of God-Devils” and his comments on “Cagliostro” and Sartor Resartus in Carlyle and the Search for Authority.


11. I am aware of the irony involved in suggesting that Sartor Resartus could be right at home in a Tory periodical, since its original readers in Fraser’s Magazine adamantly hated it, with many actually canceling their subscriptions. What I want to argue is not that Carlyle’s text actually was
at home in *Fraser’s*, but rather that elements of it were as violently Tory as the most hostile of its early readers.

12. This passage also has the added benefit of having already been subjected to intense critical scrutiny. See, for example, Charles Biernard’s “Rebelling from the Right Siade” and G. B. Tennyson’s “Sartor” Called “Resartus.” The latter was the first and is still the most comprehensive account of the relationship between style and content in *Sartor Resartus* and of the relationship between this text and Carlyle’s earlier work.

13. The radical political leveling implied by this example also hints at the book’s second-to-last chapter, “Tailors,” which not only elevates the figure of the tailor because it is he who makes these “clothes,” but also suggests that everyone might be a tailor, or a maker of meaning. This radical possibility is also noted in Dibble, 33. However, the rhetoric of the “Tailors” chapter is more confused than Dibble acknowledges, since immediately after it suggests that all men might be tailors, it quickly specifies that society’s tailors are most likely to be found among the nobility, poets, moral teachers, and prophets of the world (III.11.212–13).


15. Other names offer similar hidden humor: Teufelsdröckh’s publisher is *Stillschweigen und Co*”, “Silence and Company,” which is located in Weissnichtwo, or “Know-not-where.” Also, the paragraph is prefaced by the English Editor’s ironically amused question, “what vacant, high-sailing air-ships are these, and whither will they sail with us?” (I.11.55). In addition, the emblems passage operates on the premise that human beings are naturally naked—”he [man] is by nature a Naked Animal; and only in certain circumstances, by purpose and device, masks himself in Clothes” (I.1.4)—not only in terms of meaning, but also in terms of clothes (else why would Clothes be so “inexplicably significant”) and this abrupt, though subtle, juxtaposition of the ideas of nakedness, Emblems and kingship creates an effect not unlike that of the fable, “The Emperor’s New Clothes,” which laughingly makes the same Radical point that we are all nakedly equal under our clothes. Underscoring the importance of reading the humor in this passage is the English Editor’s earlier assertion that the “man who cannot laugh is not only fit for treasons, stratagems and spoils; but his whole life is already a treason and a stratagem” (I.4.26). Echoing G. B. Tennyson, recent critics have begun to acknowledge the central importance of humor to Carlyle’s rhetoric, with Abigail Burnham Bloom arguing that in *Sartor*, “Carlyle developed a process of transcending seemingly incongruous statements through a technique he called the ‘inverse sublime’” (153).
16. A number of critics have argued that this formal difficulty does ultimately empower the reader. Brian Cowlishaw, for example, observes, “textual obscurity is in a sense required to relate Teufelsdröckh’s Clothes-Philosophy appropriately. . . . If all means of expressing the Infinite, of embodying the ideal, are necessarily flawed and finite, then perfect, direct expression of ideas must be impossible” (51). Since Cowlishaw reads Sartor Resartus along radically Radical lines, he follows this more neutral observation with the assertion that Carlyle’s style is designed to create active readers primed for “the work of cultural revolution,” or the public recognition of social life as construction and presentation. Cowlishaw’s comparison of Carlyle’s verbal techniques and filmmaker Bertold Brecht’s cinematic ones makes Carlyle into far more of a post-structuralist than I hope to show he is; nevertheless, his point about the effects of Carlyle’s style on the consciousness of the reader is well-taken. In “The Open Secret of Sartor Resartus,” Lee Baker similarly argues that Carlyle’s “pervasive ironic play with the meaning of symbols ‘guides’ the reader, as Carlyle says, to a stage of enlightenment whereby he begins to see the Open Secret of the Clothes Philosophy” (222). Other critics to notice the close relation between content and form include Charles Biernard, “Rebelling from the Right Siade”; Jerry Dibble; Stephen Franklin, “The Editor as Reconstructor”; J. Hillis Miller, “‘Hieroglyphic Truth’ in Sartor Resartus”; and G. B. Tennyson.

17. Tennyson’s close reading of this passage on 244–47 forms the basis for my own.

18. The refusal of Sartor Resartus to quiescently conform to contemporary notions of genre and periodization adds to its formal aura of mystery. Is Sartor a novel, a philosophical essay, a biography, an autobiography, a Romantic text, a Victorian text, a Modernist text? Most critics who address this issue label Sartor a “transitional text,” wisely evading the need to apply conventional genre and period categories. See, for example, Baker, “The Old Clothesman Transformed”; Biernard; Dale Davis, “Symbolizing the Supernatural in Carlyle’s Sartor Resartus”; Haney; and George Levine, “Sartor Resartus and the Balance of Fiction.” Just how unsatisfactory a more definite answer is can be seen in John Lindberg’s “The Artistic Unity of Sartor Resartus,” which awkwardly tries to label Carlyle’s text “a true novel.”

19. The Editor continues this important early material, promising to defend “the Institutions of our Ancestors . . . at all hazards” over the course of the book (I.2.11). This paternalistic assurance encourages the British Reader not to rely too heavily on his own “metaphysical acumen,” because the Editor’s objective ambivalence to some of Teufelsdröckh’s ideas guarantees that both Editor and Reader are “on the same side,” as it were. However, whether or not they really are “on the same side” is open to considerable debate. See, for example, Baker, “The Open Secret of Sartor Resartus”; Leonard Deed, “Irrational Form in Sartor Resartus”; Daniel Deneau, “Relationship of Style and Device in Sartor Resartus”; Dibble, 50–56; and Alvin Ryan, “The Attitude Towards the Reader in Carlyle’s Sartor Resartus.”

20. Many critics discuss Carlyle’s doctrine of symbols. Among the most helpful sources are Jeffrey R. Di Leo, “The Clothing of Truth”; Findley, 174–80; Gallagher, 195–99; and Hillis Miller, 8–19.

21. Though not published until 1833–34 in Fraser’s Magazine, Sartor Resartus had already been completed by July of 1831, sixteen years prior to the publication of De Quincey’s “Secret Societies.”
For more on the publication history of *Sartor Resartus*, see Brookes, 16–47; Tennyson, 126–56; and Vanden Bossche, *Carlyle and the Search for Authority*, 40–42.

22. Earlier in the text, Teufelsdröckh had provided a potential example of virtuous secrecy in action when he speculated about the efficacy of hoodwinking an otherwise mutinous army: “Suppose your sinews of war quite broken; I mean your military chest insolvent, forage all but exhausted; and that the whole army is about to mutiny, disband, and cut your and each other’s throat,—then were it not well could you, as if by miracle, pay them in any sort of fairy-money, feed them on coagulated water, or mere imagination of meat; whereby, till the real supply came up, they might be kept together, and quiet? Such perhaps was the aim of Nature, who does nothing without aim, in furnishing her favourite, Man, with his so omni-potent or rather omni-patient Talent of being Gulled” (II.3.86). In other words, normal men’s capacity to be gulled, or to have concealment/secrecy successfully practiced upon them, is a gift from Nature to those extraordinary few who lead, or guard, everyone else.

23. This stress on the role of the hero is what motivates Carlyle to privilege biography over other forms of writing, since it is only in biographical works that “the Lives of heroic god-inspired men” are made manifest. For more on Carlyle and biography, including his own early biographical essays on Schiller, Goethe and others, see Patrick Brantlinger, “‘Romance,’ ‘Biography,’ and the Making of *Sartor Resartus*”; Deen; Sam Pickering, “*Sartor Resartus*, Thomas Carlyle, and the Novel”; Tennyson; and Vanden Bossche, *Carlyle and the Search for Authority*.

Notes to Chapter Two

1. Two pages later, *The Annual Register* rather gleefully observes that “the misdirected struggles of the ‘working classes,’ as they delight to call themselves, have been productive of results the very opposite to those proposed as their aim. And some of the most valuable and ingenious machines, in use, actually owe their existence to the pressure of trades-unions upon the capitalist, who naturally seeks, through the intervention of mechanical labour, to emancipate himself from the thralldom we have been describing” (206).

2. For more on Luddism, see John Dinwiddy’s “Luddism and Politics in the Northern Counties,” M. I. Thomis’s *The Luddites: Machine-Breaking in Regency England*, Henry Pelling’s *A History of British Trade Unionism*, 19–20, or E. P. Thompson, 547–602; on the Pentridge rising, see Thompson, 659–69; on the “Last Labourers’ Revolt,” see Thompson, 225–28; on the Captain Swing riots, see E. J. Hobsbawm’s *Captain Swing*.

3. See chapters three (70–99) and five (147–65) of *Radical Expression*, which examine the parodic complex of meanings surrounding the cap of liberty and radical convivial dining, respectively, in England during the Napoleonic wars.

4. The Acts sought to do this primarily by combining these two distinct strands of popular discontent. As E. P. Thompson observes, “The Combination Acts (1799–1800) served only to bring
illegal Jacobin and trade union strands closer together,” both in fact and in the popular imagination (181). For more on working-class societies at the turn of the century see Thompson, 102–85, 500–501, Baernreither, 115–430, or Pelling, 11–34. For more on the Combination Laws, see Pelling, 15–17, 20–23.

5. Baernreither even describes the repeal of the Combination Laws as “the turning point in the history of the English working class” (11). Engels’s comments on this point are worth quoting in full because, despite their revolutionary stance, they display a distrust of secrecy very similar to that voiced by the critics of trade unionism: “At this point came help in the shape of a law enacted by the old, unreformed, oligarchic-Tory parliament, a law which never could have passed the House of Commons later, when the Reform Bill had legally sanctioned the distinction between bourgeoisie and proletariat, and made the bourgeoisie the ruling class. This was enacted in 1824, and repealed all laws by which coalitions between working-men for labour purposes had hitherto been forbidden. The working-men obtained a right previously restricted to the aristocracy and bourgeoisie, the right of free association. Secret coalitions had, it is true, previously existed, but could never achieve great results. In Glasgow, as Symonds relates [in “Arts and Artisans”], a general strike of weavers had taken place in 1812, which was brought about by a secret association. It was repeated in 1822, and on this occasion vitriol was thrown in the faces of the two working-men who would not join the association, and were therefore regarded by the members as traitors to their class. . . . So, too, in 1818, the association of Scottish miners was powerful enough to carry on a general strike. These associations required their members to take an oath of fidelity and secrecy, had regular lists, treasurers, book-keepers, and local branches. But the secrecy with which everything was conducted crippled their growth. When, on the other hand, the working-men received in 1824 the right of free association, these combinations were very soon spread over all England and attained great power” (214–15).

6. The recent prosecution, or perhaps persecution, of the Tolpuddle Martyrs in 1834 would have also reminded the public of the propensity of supposedly illegal oaths among the working classes.

7. All quotations from the trial come from Archibald Swinton’s Report, the appropriate page numbers of which will be parenthetically noted in the text. A somewhat biased and much abridged summary of the trial is given in the Chronicle section of The Annual Register for 1838, 7–12.

8. For more on the legal conventions of this period in England and Scotland, see Leon Radzinowicz, A History of English Criminal Law and Its Administration from 1750.

9. This tendency toward grounding most of the charges under the rubric of a central conspiracy is even more pronounced in the aborted trial of these men in November, 1837. In this original trial, the spinners were charged with only nine crimes—charges three, four and five of the later trial did not yet exist—but all of them relied on the presence of the “secret select committee” or a similar conspiratorially body for validity. Given the results of the second trial, it seems fairly certain that had this first trial been allowed to continue, the men would have been acquitted on all charges. For a transcript of the first trial, see The Rights of Labour Defended.

10. In addressing the charge of murder against M’Lean, for example, the Lord Justice-Clerk
tells the jury that if they believe the defense’s witnesses then M’Lean has an alibi, and then reminds them, “You know the account he [M’Lean] endeavours to give of this. You know the circumstance of his denying his name to the officer that apprehended him,—the state in which he was when the officer took him into custody. You know that he left Glasgow in a clandestine manner,” etc. (368). This kind of qualified portrayal of the defense’s evidence can be found throughout the Lord Justice-Clerk’s statement.

11. Initially, the jury also found charge ten proven, but this decision was reversed by the court because of its dependence on the charge of conspiracy, which had been found not proven.

12. The opening follows its final biblical exhortation with examples of how “their betters” are acting to “monopolize a good thing,” citing the Corn Laws, dueling, and the suppression of Canada as upper-class parallels of trade-union intimidation.

13. Note especially the first clause, “in the opinion of the jury,” which follows the example of Lord Mackenzie and the Lord Justice-Clerk in implicitly discounting the jury’s verdict.

14. The obvious implication, later voiced by O’Connell in the House of Commons, that trade unions and Parliament might enjoy a number of suggestive similarities, goes unstated.

15. The original petition was withdrawn due to members’ objections, but a revised version was re-presented on 13 February. Echoing the writer in *Tait’s Edinburgh Review*, Mr. Wakley observed that “the public mind was most firmly disposed to entertain a feeling of prejudice against the unfortunate cotton-spinners of Glasgow. . . . From the very moment of the assassination of the unfortunate man, Smith, in Glasgow, the press and the authorities of the place had striven to cast a prejudice on the cotton-spinners, and to point them out as the persons by whom the murder was committed” (*Hansard*, 40: 1060).

16. O’Connell goes on to describe the Orange Association as an illegal combination that seemed exempt from government prosecution, despite the practice of dangerous oath-taking (*Hansard*, 40: 1069–72). As one might expect, none of this made it into the *Annual Register*’s account of the debate, which simply states, “Mr. O’Connell moved, by way of amendment, for a select committee to inquire into trades’ unions and combinations generally, in the united kingdom” (207).

17. For the place of this metaphor of disease among Carlyle’s rhetorical strategies for representing the Chartists, see John Plotz, “Crowd Power.” According to Plotz, in *Chartism* Carlyle “wants to strip the crowd of language while retaining a sense of the importance of the message it has to convey” (97), thereby co-opting the Chartists’ power to speak about themselves on the basis of what he represents as their “inarticulate” desire for a redress that only he can provide.

18. See also Brantlinger, *The Spirit of Reform*, 93.


20. For more on the differences between Burkas and Kuboolas, see “The Thugs; or, Secret Murderers of India,” 358–59.

21. For more on the symbolism and rituals of the Thuggee, see 5–6 in the same source; “The
Thugs; or Secret Murderers of India,” 375; and the sections on the Thuggee in Heckethorn and MacKenzie.

22. Careful readers might even have noticed the similarities between the review articles and Swinton’s Report of the Trial, including the almost identical complaining in both of the difficulty of prosecuting trade unionists/Thugs. We have already seen the prosecutor’s remarks to this effect regarding the spinners, but what is striking is the almost identical logic and language applied to the Thugs: “But even if all the English magistrates in India had been aware of and cordially co-operated with each other, they would have effected little towards the suppression of Thuggee. The ordinary tribunals and modes of proceeding, which answered in some degree for the detection of ordinary offenders, were of little use against Thugs. Except in the rare instance of a gang being apprehended with stolen property in possession, which the relations of the murdered person were there to identify, the only witnesses who could ever be brought against them were some of their own fraternity; and the evidence of men whose preliminary step must be to confess themselves the most ruthless villains in existence, is naturally received with great mistrust” (“The Thugs, or Phansigars,” 12). The response to this difficulty in India was the appointment of an Inquisition-like body to pursue suspected Thugs (“The Thugs, or Phansigars,” 15); some readers, no doubt, could see the efficacy of a similar step in England to prosecute suspected trade unionists.


24. Ibid., 38–40; and The Spirit of Reform, 92–93.

25. For more on Dickens and Scott, see Alison Case’s “Against Scott”; Kim Michasiw’s “Barnaby Rudge: The Since of the Fathers”; and S. J. Newman’s “Barnaby Rudge: Dickens and Scott.” For connections between Dickens’s novel and other literary works, see Iain Crawford’s “Nature . . . Drenched in Blood”; Natalie Schroeder’s “Jack Sheppard and Barnaby Rudge”; and Michael Stieg’s “Ten-Thousand-a-Year and the Political Content of Barnaby Rudge.”


27. See Stieg, 68. Despite his observation on the important role assigned to Sim, Stieg uses him only as means to connect Barnaby Rudge to Samuel Warren’s Ten-Thousand-a-Year (1839–41), concluding from his comparison of the two novels that Dickens’s presentation of Sim reflects his “irrational class bias” (68). Certainly, this is an incomplete reading of the political ramifications of the novel, as I hope my analysis will show. However, Stieg’s article is one of few to recognize Sim’s importance in the novel. Sim also receives some small attention in Steven Marcus’s Dickens: From Pickwick to Domby (185–86) and Myron Magnet’s Dickens and the Social Order (61–62). One measure of the degree to which Sim has been forgotten is his absence from studies in which he would be highly relevant, including Kim Michasiw’s “Barnaby Rudge: The Since of the Fathers,” Thomas J. Rice’s “The End of Dickens’s Apprenticeship,” and Joan Friedberg’s “Alienation and Integration in Barnaby Rudge.”

28. Quotations from Barnaby Rudge will be cited parenthetically in the text according to chapter and page number.
29. T.A. Jackson goes a bit farther, calling Sim’s inclusion “totally without historical warrant.” His remarks are worth quoting in full, not only for their historical sensitivity to proto-trade unionism, but also because they offer a critique of Dickens’s politics as reflected in his presentation of the ‘Prentice Knights: “Not only is the whole notion of an apprentices’ conspiracy in 1774 one as totally without historical warrant as it was made to appear ludicrous; it is open to serious objection on the ground that it burlesques most unforgivably the genuine ‘conspiracies’—the earliest form of trade unionism—of the adult journeymen of the period. Dickens in short, cannot be acquitted of the charge of concocting a burlesque of the ‘underground’ Radical clubs of a period of struggle against anti-Jacobin reaction, and of the trade unions of the period before the repeal of the Combination Acts in 1825—a burlesque based upon caricatures circulated by malevolent Tories and reactionaries—and palming this off, by implication, as a picture of the operative machinery of Chartist agitation” (28).

30. A listing of all of Dickens’s known and suspected historical sources for *Barnaby Rudge* can be found in Rice’s *Barnaby Rudge: An Annotated Bibliography*.

31. There is a small minority of critics who contest this historical connection. S. J. Newman, for example, writes that the ‘Prentice Knights “is surely no parody of 1830s Unionism” (178), though he gives no evidence for this claim.

32. See Rice’s entry on *Chartism* in his *Annotated Bibliography*.

33. Dyson, for example, concludes that the “apprentices’ designs against their masters’ daughters are rendered doubly ridiculous, by the tawdry initiation ceremonies of their conspiracy, and by the moral as well as physical repulsiveness of the lads themselves” (57).

34. Note 3 to Chapter 8 of *Barnaby Rudge*, 749.

35. See esp. 215, 217.

36. See Rosenberg, 21.

37. The longest discussion of the ‘Prentice Knights in print appears in Myron Magnet’s *Dickens and the Social Order*, which identifies the group as a typical millenarian organization rather than placing them within the structure of social disorder presented in the novel (see 133–45).

38. Rice argues that this interconnection anticipates Dickens’s similar tendency in his later, better-known novels. See “The End of Dickens’s Apprenticeship,” 172.

39. Harold Folland, in “The Doer and the Deed,” arrives at a similar interpretation of the novel, and this interpretation leads him to suggestively identify John Chester, rather than the elder Rudge or Gashford, as the novel’s principle villain.

40. Spies and spying actually come up a number of times in the novel. See also 16.180, 17.186, and 57.521. Interestingly enough, the time scheme of the novel makes it likely that Gashford was probably among the spies, eavesdroppers and *agents-provocateurs* who helped to provide the need for and to enforce the Combination Acts, which led to the kind of public mistrust of secrecy that the novel relies upon in its depiction of the ‘Prentice Knights.

41. Thom Braun similarly refers to the novel as “untypical of the author” (85). For more of the genesis of the novel, see Braun, 85–90.
42. Quotations from *Sybil* will be cited parenthetically in the text according to book, chapter and page number.

43. Though it provides one of the best general introductions to *Sybil*, reading the novel through the lens of the “new Toryism” proposed by the Young England movement, Richard Levine’s *Benjamin Disraeli* critically misreads the novel as endorsing the “Two Nations” doctrine (see, e.g., 77–78). For another good general introduction to the main themes of the novel, see Braun, 91–111.

44. This article offers one of the best early analyses of the complex class dynamic at work in the novel. See also Brantlinger’s discussion of the same topic in *The Spirit of Reform*, 97–101.

45. This article is reprinted in a somewhat revised form in *Disraeli’s Fiction*, 105–27.

46. Gallagher most clearly articulates this goal on 207.

47. Disraeli’s fidelity to historical sources like, in this case, *The Annual Register* of 1838, is well-documented. For his use of Blue Book evidence, see Sheila M. Smith, “Willenhall and Wodgate” and “Blue Books and Victorian Novelists.” Lois Bucler’s “Disraeli’s *Sybil* and Holinshed’s *Chronicles*” and Martin Fido’s “From his own Observation” both add to the list of Disraeli’s historical borrowing, proposing Tudor chronicles and William Dodd’s *The Factory System Illustrated in a Series of Letters to Lord Ashley*, respectively, as likely sources.

48. As Gallagher observes, “the business of representing a constituency in Parliament is portrayed as a kind of nonrepresentation, which is often conducted through absence rather than presence” (208).

49. Again, Gallagher’s comments are instructive: “Disraeli’s statesmen . . . are primarily engaged in the activity of creating and interpreting representations; the representations of *Sybil*’s Lord Masque and Mr. Tadpole, however, are not symbols, but lies: lies, moreover, that disguise themselves as the most intimate, secret truths” (208). The emphasis in this passage seems slightly misplaced, however, falling on lies rather than on the telling of lies as a practice of secrecy.

### Notes to Chapter 3

1. Dickens is quite careful, however, to inform his readers of his own religious convictions: “However imperfectly those disturbances are set forth in the following pages, they are impartially painted by one who has no sympathy with the Romish Church, though he acknowledges, as most men do, some esteemed friends among the followers of its creed” (40–41).

2. In “Art and Argument,” Daniel Schwarz also describes Sybil as “an *emblem* . . . for the potential of the church” (20) and goes on to argue that “Sybil and St. Lys demonstrate the potential of England’s religious traditions: the Church of England and the older Catholicism” (21). See also Thom Braun’s *Disraeli the Novelist*, 98–99, and Richard Levine’s *Benjamin Disraeli*, 95–134, for more on Catholic motifs in *Sybil*.

4. Walter Arnstein, Catholic versus Protestant in Mid-Victorian England, 212. Arnstein’s point is amply demonstrated by Walter Walsh’s paranoid denunciations of Ritualism in The Secret History of the Oxford Movement: “It is a significant fact that secrecy has largely characterised the Ritualistic Movement, even from the first year of its existence [1833], when it was known by another name [Tractarianism].... Secret Ritualistic Societies have now come into existence, and are increasing in number every year. At present the Church of England is literally honeycombed with Secret Societies, all working in the interests of the scheme for the Corporate Reunion of the Church of England with the Church of Rome. These secret plotters are the real wire-pullers of the Ritualistic Movement” (xxxix-xl).

5. Though he only discusses English Catholicism, not Anglo-Catholicism, Norman’s statement in his Introduction to The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century remains particularly apt: “Two of what Cardinal Wiseman [in The Religious and Social Position of Catholics in England. An Address Delivered to the Catholic Congress of Malines, August 21, 1863 (1864)] once called the ‘three epochs,’ each marking ‘the date of a step in the progress of English Catholicism’—Catholic Emancipation in 1829, the enlarged episcopate of 1840, and the Restoration of the Hierarchy in 1850—were accompanied by public displays of hostility to indications of Catholic growth” (2).

6. Wendy Hinde describes the Catholic questions as “the most intractable and divisive issue in English domestic politics for the first thirty years of the nineteenth century” (vii). Similarly, Edward R. Norman, in The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century, writes, “The union of the throne and altar, the settlement of property, the stability of institutions, the very political freedoms which Englishmen so cherished, seemed all to be related to the maintenance of the Protestant Constitution” (31).

7. See Norman, Roman Catholicism in England, 3–4; and The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century, 10.

8. For more on the collapse of contemporality implied by this use of past events, see Norman, The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century, 16–17.

9. Of course England also had a long literary tradition of anti-Catholicism that was reproduced and expanded in the nineteenth century by such lurid titles as On the Education of Roman Catholic Children and the Rejection of the Bible by Their Priests (1816), Forty Popish Frauds (1835), The Errors of Romanism Traced to Their Origin in Human Nature (1844) and literally hundreds of others. Their tone is admirably exemplified by an article in the founding issue of Fraser’s Magazine: “of all known sects or pretended religions at this day in Christendom, POPERY IS THE ONLY, OR THE GREATEST HERESY; and he who is forward to brand all others for heretics, THE OBSTINATE PAPIST, IS THE ONLY HERETIC” (22). For more on the historical longevity of anti-Catholicism in England, see Norman, Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England, the first monograph-length study of this topic and the recipient of the prestigious Thirlwall Essay Prize for 1967; Sheridan Gilley, “Roman Catholicism,” which offers a brief and well-annotated history of Victorian Roman Catholicism, concentrating especially on the increasing presence of Roman Catholics in Victorian England and on competing figures with the English Catholic revival; and D. G. Paz, Popular Anti-Catholicism in Mid-Victorian England, which investigates “what led
ordinary people to become anti-Catholic” in order to construct a “systematic and comprehensive” explanation for “the persistence of anti-Catholicism over time” (18).

10. For more on the power of Irish organization in the 1820s, see chapter 4, “Ireland on the Brink,” of Hinde’s Catholic Emancipation, 99–127.

11. My account of this debate is necessarily selective. For a complete blow-by-blow, and almost day-by-day, narrative of the events leading to the Catholic Emancipation Act, see Hinde’s Catholic Emancipation.

12. Mr. Goulburn’s comments are recorded in The Annual Register, 1829: “But there had lately arisen in that country [Ireland] a combination which extended itself throughout every class of the Catholic community, with an organization unexampled in other countries, or amongst other political societies, and whose principle hostility was directed at the Established Church” (41).

13. Earlier, the article had left little doubt that emancipation was not among the kinds of “measures” it proposed: “Let not the English Protestant, after he has achieved what he has done—after he has reached the proud and glorious point of elevation on which he stands, now voluntarily degrade himself into the inferior and bondsman of the Irish Catholic. Let not England, after having fought and triumphed over the world—after having shed her blood like water, and thrown away her treasures like dust, to gain the magnificent and commanding stature she enjoys, now suffer herself to be vanquished, ruined, and enslaved, by this polluted, profligate, and contemptible domestic enemy” (44).

14. This article offers a point-by-point refutation of the claims made against Catholic emancipation and provides an excellent introduction to the topic.

15. See The Annual Register, 1829, 3, 4. See also 25 April 1829, 80, in the “Chronicle” section, where a “Seditious Placard” accuses both men of treason.

16. For similar sentiments, see also “Substance of Sir Robert Inglis’s Two Speeches on the Catholic Question,” 811; and “The Supremacy of the Church of Rome not Acknowledged by the British Christians Till the Ninth Century,” 345.


18. The Protestant MPs’ oath has also been reprinted a number of times. See, e.g., Norman, The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century, 52; or Hinde, 161. Not until April 1866 were denominationally-specific oaths replaced by a simple declaration of allegiance to the crown: “I, A. B., do swear that I will be faithful to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, her heirs and successors according to law, so help me God.”

19. The provision in the oath that the Catholic MP would not attempt to subvert the present church establishment occasionally provided reactionary Protestants with the grounds for accusing liberal Catholics of casuistry whenever they attempted to address religious reform (see, for example, The Annual Register, 1838, 103).

20. These provisions all turned out to be a dead letter, but their very inclusion points to the degree to which the figure of the secret society could influence the Act’s writers.
21. One of the few exceptions to this universal distrust of the Jesuits comes from a qualified criticism of the religious orders sections of the Act in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*: “If we could have wished any part of the act expunged, it would have been the clauses relating to the Jesuits—not because we approve of their institution, but, because, being convinced that they can do no harm, their suppression appears to manifest suspicion, and to detract... from that general acquiescence from which other provisions of the act were received... they could do little mischief in this age or nation, even by the exercise of their former arts and intrigues. The Jesuits are no longer... the soul of every traitorous plot, and the assertors of papal encroachment” (“Foreign Views of the Catholic Question,” 305).

22. Anti-Jesuit sentiments also penetrated English society at its most respectable levels, as demonstrated by Dr. Thomas Arnold’s comments to “An Old Pupil” in a letter dated 28 February 1838: “No man can doubt the piety of Loyola and many of his followers; yet, what Christian, in England at least, can doubt that, as Jesuitism, it was not of God; that it was grounded on falsehood, and strove to propagate falsehood?” (Stanley II: 110). Carlyle also operates within this tradition when he writes in 1850, “Where you meet a man believing in the salutary nature of falsehoods, or the divine authority of things doubtful, and fancying that to serve the Good Cause he must call the Devil to his aid, there is a follower of Unsaint Ignatius” (*Works*, 20: 305).

23. For example: “The form of national government, the Jesuits prefer, is undoubtedly despotic, so long as this, the most centralized of all forms of government, is really under their command.... The progress of civilization and increased rapidity of communication have tended to shorten the periods of their successes in the maintenance of avowed despotisms. Still, being perfectly indifferent to the amount of human and national suffering they occasion, in their warfare against freedom, a brief enjoyment of the control over the depositories of absolute power has attractions for them, which they either cannot or will not resist” (Newdegate, ix); and “Reference has been made to attempts at assassination, attributed to the Jesuits, as well as to those historically known to have been perpetrated by them. None seems too elevated for the malevolent designs of those conspirators” (Newdegate, lix).

24. Though written forty years after the Catholic Relief Act, Newdegate’s exposé still offers a relevant example of anti-Jesuit feeling in the 1820s, both because of the remarkable continuity of anti-Jesuitism in England over time, and because Newdegate’s own politics remained largely mired in early nineteenth-century Toryism. For more on Newdegate’s politics, see Walter Arnstein’s *Protestant versus Catholic in Victorian England*.

25. Newdegate writes that “the intensity of their combination, and the secrecy, with which it is enforced, enables the Great Secret Society to grapple with the most powerful Governments in the world” (xi).

26. For a brief account of the Hampden controversy, see John Shelton Reed’s *Glorious Battle*, 9–10. See also R. W. Church’s *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years*, 159–76.

27. The attribution of irrationality to Catholicism also evokes the similar charges of irrationality leveled at trade unions and connected to the practice of secrecy.
28. Passages from *Tracts for the Times* will be given according to volume, tract and page number, respectively.

29. This article is actually a response to the publication of Froude’s *Remains* that same year, but it provides the clearest example of the way in which anti-Catholic rhetoric and accusations of Jesuitism could be directed at the Tractarians.

30. See Arnstein, 214. For further background, see Walter Ralls, “The Papal Aggression of 1850.”

31. See Flindall, 116. One contemporary example of these fears of a French plot appears in “The Popish Partition of England.” English Protestants could even cite the Pope’s exactly contemporary excommunication of Sardinia as an example of the threat to national sovereignty that could be posed by closer religious ties with the Papacy. The relevance of this example might be questioned, however, as J. R. Beard would do as early as January, 1851 in *Tait’s Edinburgh Magazine*.

32. The Papal Brief is reprinted in the “State Papers” section of *The Annual Register, 1850*, 405–11.

33. The “Durham Letter” was widely reproduced, including in *The Annual Register, 1850*, 198–99. For more on the events surrounding “papal aggression,” see Holmes, 74–103; Norman, *Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England*, 52–79; and Arnstein, 40–61.

34. *The Annual Register, 1850* sums up the deleterious effect of Wiseman’s pastoral: “If the national sensibilities and independence of the English people were wounded by the Papal Brief, the offence was tenfold aggravated by the style and tenour of the Cardinal’s Pastoral” (197). The pastoral itself is reprinted in the “State Papers” section, 411–414.

35. *The Times* (October 14, 1850), editorial, 4. Because of the potential confusion arising from parenthetical documentation, references to *The Times* will be provided in the notes.

36. *The Times* (October 22, 1850), leading editorial, 4. This editorial even went so far as to suggest that the fact that the government had known about plans for a Roman Catholic restoration for three years might be a sign of conspiratorial maneuvering by Lord Minto, sent as a diplomat to Rome in 1847.


38. *The Times* (October 19, 1850), leading editorial, 4. Even in its most scathing denunciations of “foreign despotism” and “spiritual aggression,” however, *The Times* was careful to limit the range of its attacks to Rome only: “It is not, indeed, to the English Catholics so much as to the see of Rome itself that these objections may be fairly addressed; for our Roman Catholic countrymen have as a body probably no active part in these proceedings of the alien authority which they acknowledge” (*The Times*, October 19, 1850, 4).

39. The first of these articles contains sermon extracts delivered by Anglican clergymen on 5 November and the second, a letter to the editor, reexamines the role of Jesuit conspirators in the plot. A complete list of all the items in *The Times* relating to “papal aggression” printed between the paper’s first editorial on 14 October and Wiseman’s declaration of loyalty on behalf of English Catholics, entitled “The Queen and the Pope,” on 16 November can be found in the list of works cited.

40. This article, like a number of others, was not so much interested in the restoration of the hierarchy as in both attacking the Anglo-Catholics in the Established church who had made this
restoration seem possible to Rome and urging disestablishment. For more on these topics, see also “The Anglo-Catholic Theory” and “Royal Supremacy and Papal Aggression.”

41. As with The Times, however, the reviewer was careful to assert, “We do not mean here to charge our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects with any of these diabolical intentions—far from it” (579). On this subject, Blackwood’s was even in agreement with the Edinburgh Review, which also declared “we do not for a moment question either the loyalty or the patriotism of our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects” (“Ultramontane Doubts,” 538).

42. Relevant articles in the Dublin Review include “Catholicism, a Conservative Principle” and “The Hierarchy.”

43. Beard’s other articles are “March Gales and the Government” and “Parliamentary Session of 1851,” both of which argue against the impending Ecclesiastical Titles Act.

44. Beard perceptively continues, noting that “other people would never have heard about it, if it had been that, just at the time of the appointments, the London newspapers were (on good grounds) ill-disposed towards the Pope and Popery [because of Sardinia], and had nothing else to occupy them” (47).

45. Like Beard’s later articles, Newman’s Lectures were written during the debate over the Ecclesiastical Titles Act (14 & 15 Vict., c. 49), which had been introduced on 14 February 1851 and would be made law 1 August 1851. The Act is reprinted on 457–59 of the “Public Documents” section of The Annual Register, 1851. For more on the historical context of the Lectures and an interesting discussion of their surprising melding of genres, see A. O. J. Cockshut’s “The Literary and Historical Significance of the Present Position of Catholics.” All quotations from the Lectures themselves will be cited parenthetically in the text according to page numbers from the 1899 Longman’s edition.

46. Responding to Newman’s wit, David DeLaura even refers to the Lectures as “perhaps the finest sustained comic performance in his writings” (129).

47. Newman does not hesitate to declare his loyalty to and respect for what he calls “the possession, and so deservedly the glory, of our own people; and in so taking it I need hardly say, I take it for the very reason that it is so rightfully the object of our wonder and veneration” (25).

48. Evaluated from a purely political viewpoint, Newman’s strategy in the Lectures was unsuccessful—even the masterful caricature of English anti-Catholicism as Russian anti-John-Bullism was insufficient to prevent the passage of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act two months later. However, the fact that the Act remained practically a dead letter, since its provision allowing Roman Catholic prelates with spurious titles to be fined 100 pounds was never enforced, suggests that Newman’s appeal to extra-political standards of value was partially effective.

49. The exception to this internationalization of anti-Catholic rhetoric was the continued denunciation of Tractarianism, and later Ritualism, within the Established Church. However, the earlier quotation from Walsh’s Secret History shows the ambivalence about such a domestication of the Catholic threat: Walsh attempts to show how the Established Church is virtually overrun by Secret Societies dedicated to the foreign agenda of Rome. To a certain extent, then, even Ritualism was made as foreign as possible. For more on Tractarianism and Anglo-Catholicism after

**Notes to Chapter 4**

1. See, for example, the narrator’s musings during a brief break in Ali’s recitation on 262–64.

2. For more on Taylor’s novel, see Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness*, 86–90; and Joved Majeed, “Meadows Taylor’s *Confessions of a Thug*.”

3. John William Kaye, author of perhaps the foremost nineteenth-century account of the Mutiny, writes that this strategic declaration and the capture of Delhi “imparted a political, a national significance to a movement, which otherwise might have been regarded as little more than a local outbreak” (II: 120). Kaye’s three-volume *History of the Sepoy War* offers a day-by-day and region-by-region account of the events leading up to the Mutiny and its progress through September, 1857. It also contains an outstanding fold-out map of Oude and its environs, with all of the locales significant to the progress of the Mutiny marked and labeled with their nineteenth-century British spellings. Kaye’s work is succeeded and to a certain extent challenged by Colonel G. B. Malleson’s three-volume *History of the Indian Mutiny, 1857–58*, which narrates events through the close of the Mutiny in 1858.

4. By the end of June British troops and civilians had been driven from or imperiled in Delhi (11 May), Aligarh (20 May), Etawah (21 May), Nusseerabad (28 May), Lucknow (30 May), Bareilly (31 May), Bhurtpore (31 May), Shahjehanpore (31 May), Budaun (1 June), Sectapore (3 June), Mohamndee (4 June), Neemuch (4 June), Allahabad (6 June), Jhansi (7 June), Fyzabad (8 June), Jaumpore (8 June), Sultanpore (8 June), Futtehpore (9 June), Naogong (10 June), Gwalior (14 June), Mozuffernugger (14 June), Furruckabad (18 June), and Cawnpore (27 June).

5. The Well of Cawnpore incident (15 July) is only the most famous of the many atrocities committed by both sides during the Mutiny and was probably carried out in response to British brutality during the retaking of Allahabad (15–18 June). For more on the rhetorical and emotional significance of the Well of Cawnpore in England see Patrick Brantlinger’s *Rule of Darkness*, 199–224.

6. By the end of August, British troops had defeated rebel forces at Etawah (24 May), Budleekka-Serai (8 June), Allahabad (18 June), Trimmoo Ghout (12 July), Futtehpore (13 July), Aong (15 July), Cawnpore (17 July), Arrah (3 August), Judgespore (11 August), Aligurh (24 August), and Nuijahfgurh (25 August). Many of the smaller towns originally occupied by the rebels had also been abandoned by this point.

7. As Jenny Sharpe writes, “By attributing the origins of the rebellion to the fear of technology [the Enfield rifle], colonial explanations represent the Mutiny as a war between religious fanaticism and Reason” (60). An excellent example of how “the affair of the greased cartridges” could translate into a view of Indians as fanatical and mentally deficient savages can be found in Blackwood’s *Edinburgh Review*: “The Sepoy is in general childishly ignorant. . . . To this cause may in great mea-
sure be attributed the readiness with which the cartridge grievance was accepted, and the atro-
cious outburst of 'heathen rage' that ensues" ("The Company's Raj," 633).

8. At least one reviewer agreed with him, writing that "cartridges alone would never have done
the mischief, had not the minds of men been prepared for revolt by a combination of causes. Yet
there is no cause, alone and singular. The whole system of the native army was rotten at the core"
("The English in India," 196).

9. One article denied outright that the annexation of Oude had anything to do with the Mutiny:
"It is a pure absurdity to speak of the mutiny as occasioned by the annexation [of Oude]. The muti-
neers, at least, who should know the truth, have never said so. In all their recorded sayings and
published proclamations, there is not a word of accusation against the Government on the score
of rapacity and oppression—those sins being purely and entirely the invention of Fast-day preachers,
platform-humanitarians, and all that large class of the ignorant 'unco' guid, who practiced
that easiest of all virtues—the confession of other men's sins" ("The English in India," 198).

10. "It is impossible to calculate the saving of human life which has resulted from the British
conquest of that country, if it was only through the stopping of murders by authority" ("The Sepoy
Rebellion," 254).

11. "The benefits already conferred on the unhappy Out-castes by English rule are incalcula-
ble. Admitted into European families as domestic servants, they are at once raised into a new posi-
tion; received by Missionaries into schools, they are proved to have the mental qualities of a man"
("The Sepoy Rebellion," 221).

12. Indeed, for some writers, Britain's benevolent elevation of the natives did not go far enough
because it did not include more active evangelism supported by the government. In fact, one reviewer
credited this inconsistent application of principle with fomenting the Mutiny: "The constantly avowed
policy was to introduce inventions, science, all material improvements openly, and Christianity
by stealth. To this day many persons of experience think themselves profound and far-seeing in
advocating the continuance of this course; though their stealth is the parent of the distrust which
has exposed the Sepoys to the seduction of conspirators. Stealth is not English; stealth is not Christian,
and that is enough. Stealth begets ignorance and suspicion; and we want knowledge and confi-
dence" ("Crisis of the Sepoy Rebellion," 537).

13. See, for example, "The Sepoy Rebellion," 223.

14. In an attempt to answer this question, the author attributed the Mutiny to the possibility
that "the Asiatic mind is incapable of analysing motives, or drawing a distinction between
clemency and weakness" (258), but even this explanation suggests that more dissatisfaction was
behind the events of 1857 than he wished to admit. As Ainslee T. Embree writes in one of the
most helpfully sized introductions to the range of opinion surrounding the Indian Mutiny, the posi-
tion taken by the Bentley's author was appealing because "it permitted the continuance of the belief
that British rule in India had not awakened any deep antagonism," thus precluding any examina-
tion of "the presuppositions that had been used to explain the nature of British power" (viii). Embree's
1857 in India offers not only a succinct overview of events and their subsequent transformation
in political discourse but also a wide range of nineteenth and twentieth-century examples of that discursive range.

15. According to Viswanathan’s argument, such alleged fears that England sought the wholesale conversion of India to Christianity would have been misplaced, since English policy tended not towards religious conversion, but rather towards weakening the practice of Indian religions in the name of secularization.

16. “There appears little doubt now that a widely ramified conspiracy had been arranged to seize Calcutta and restore the Muhammadan rule, and that it failed more through accident than any display of energy on the part of the European officers. But though the conspiracy was thus forced into a different direction, it speedily burst forth in all its hideous strength” (“Our Indian Empire,” Bentley’s Miscellany, 260).

“To crown all, we are informed by the last mail that papers have fallen into the hands of Government, implying an extensive conspiracy among the natives to overthrow the British dominion. A plan of Calcutta is said to have been found marked out for simultaneous attack, and the deposed King of Oude is in custody on suspicion of complicity in the plot” (“The Bengal Mutiny,” Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine, 385).

17. The following lengthy quotation from an article in the November, 1857 issue of Fraser’s Magazine makes clear what exactly is at stake in thus characterizing the Mutiny as the result of a conspiracy: “Again, as the very openness of the mutiny revealed the sources of disaffection, it was gradually discovered that the mainspring was not religious, nor hardly military, but political. That a plot had for some time been forming, which had for its object the restoration of the Emperor of Delhi, cannot be questioned. Nor does there seem ground for doubting the complicity of the King of Oude, who with one hand was despatching emissaries to Lucknow, and with the other laying petitions before the Houses of Parliament, thus, as it appears to us, the mutiny of the army was a mutiny for political objects, cloaked by a religious grievance, which was speedily abandoned, but without any primary connexion with civil insubordination and discontent” (“The Indian Mutinies,” 628). In other words, by attributing the Mutiny to the plotting of a general conspiracy involving several Muslim leaders, not only could the agency of India’s people be neatly effaced, but their rebellious actions could be severed from any anti-imperial grievances.

18. All this is not to say that there were no plans to overthrow British rule in India, but rather that by publicizing them within the rhetoric of the figure of the secret society English writers effectively transformed a potential revolution into another morally reprehensible instance of, in the words of one English periodical writer, “dissimulation displayed by these perfidious Asiatics” (“The Government of India and the Mutinies,” 490).

19. He had already proposed this possibility in fewer words on 17 July 1857 (Hansard, 146: 1709).

20. Lord John Russell’s remarks were designed to diminish the threat of potential conspiracies, but the fact that he had to do so while speaking on the floor of the House indicates just how much credence conspiracy theories were generating in the debate over the Indian Mutiny.

22. The idea of a Russian plot was never without its critics, most of whom justifiably complained of a lack of factual basis; see, for example, the following refutation in Blackwood’s: “we dismiss at the outset all idea of Russian instigation. Though suggested in some of the Indian journals, and insinuated in Parliament by no less an authority than the Chairman of the East India Company, we can find no warrant for this suspicion in any of the facts or papers before us” (“The Bengal Mutiny,” 387).

23. For more references to the chupatties, see “The English in India,” 197; “The Indian Mutinies” (August 1857), 238; and The Annual Register, 1857, 245.

24. The question of whether or not there was a factual conspiracy or even a secret society behind the events of 1857–58 is addressed in numerous histories of the Mutiny. See, e.g., Embree, ix; Kaye, Vol. 2, 108–110; and Majumdar, 337–82.

25. For more on the Sepoys as both bestial and childlike, see The Annual Register, 1857, 251; and “A Familiar Epistle from Mr John Company to Mr John Bull,” 246.

26. A more moderate, but still no less damaging view of Indian Hindus emerged from a December, 1857 article in Blackwood’s on “The Religions of India.” While initially this looks unrelated to the Mutiny, the article actually participated in the campaign to highlight Indian primitiveness, and thereby to justify denying them democratic rights. Its opening sentences read: “India is pre-eminently a Land of Idols and of strange gods. Polytheism, and its never-failing attendant, idolatry, which in modern times have disappeared so much from the face of the earth, still exist in pristine vigour in the Indian peninsula” (“The Religions of India,” 743).

27. These stereotypes endured in British policy long after the Mutiny, making Britain particularly ill-equipped to cope with the later Indian independence movement. For the effects of popular stereotypes of Indians on British thinking after the Mutiny, see Thomas Metcalf’s The Aftermath of Revolt.

28. A copy of the Act of Parliament that enabled this transfer of authority can be found in the Public Documents section of The Annual Register, 1858, beginning on 226. In his brief, encyclopedic account, “After the Mutiny: From Queen to Queen Empress,” David Washbrook takes a somewhat different view of the effects of this transfer of power from the East India Company to the British government. He asserts that this initial assumption of control of the subcontinent by the British government was actually a liberating change for native Indians, who were given unprecedented opportunities to participate in their own government, and that only after Victoria was crowned Empress of India in 1877 was such popular involvement sharply curtailed. However, Washbrook’s account offers little evidence to support this claim, which seems strangely at odds with the racist constructions of India promulgated in the aftermath of the Mutiny.

29. Mutiny literature also serves as the focus of Steve Attridge, “Echoes of Empire III: Dis-Orientated Fiction,” and Nancy Paxton, “Mobilizing Chivalry: Rape in British Novels About the Indian Uprising of 1857.” Attridge’s article, which actually precedes Brantlinger’s account in Rule of Darkness, takes a similar approach towards Mutiny novels of the 1890s, using Edward Said’s work in Orientalism
to argue that these novels work to enforce a “textual possession” of India that helps to rationalize
the Indian Mutiny. Attridge also performs brief readings of several twentieth-century novels that
work against this tradition. Nancy Paxton adds a feminist hermeneutic to these approaches to Mutiny
literature, arguing that the frequent motif of rape in novels written after the Mutiny manages the
demands of English women and Indian men for greater autonomy. According to Paxton, rape simulta-
neously robs both groups of their potential for full citizenship by portraying English women as
helpless victims and Indian men as unlawful savages, even as it places English men in the role of
chivalrous protectors, or, using the terms of democratic debate, guardians.

30. These and other contemporary plays, melodramas and military dramas are cited in
Brantlinger, Rule of Darkness, 205–6.

31. See Brantlinger, Rule of Darkness, 208–11.


33. Dickens’s initial reaction to the Indian Mutiny is well known, and can be found in a letter
written to Angela Burdett Coutts, dated 4 October 1857: “I wish I were Commander in Chief in
India . . . I should do my utmost to exterminate the Race upon whom the stain of the late cru-
elties rested . . . to blot it out of mankind and raze it off the face of the Earth” (Letters, 2: 889).

34. For a somewhat different approach to “Perils,” see Lillian Nayder, “Class Consciousness and
the Indian Mutiny in Dickens’s ‘The Perils of Certain English Prisoners’.”

35. As the editor of Household Words, Dickens himself would have been intimately familiar with
the rhetorical tendencies of British accounts of the Mutiny. Between 4 July 1857 and 12 June 1858
(Vols. 16 and 17), the Contents page for Household Words lists 33 entries for India(n), including
one article in no. 399 (Saturday, November 14, 1857), “Wanderings in India,” that refers to both
Indian Thuggee (on 457–58) and the Nena [Nana] Sahib (on 458–63). For more on Dickens and
the Indian Mutiny, see William Oddie, “Dickens and the Indian Mutiny” and Jeremy Tambling, Dickens,
Violence and the Modern State.

36. Collins’s choice of diamonds has been the subject of at least two twentieth-century arti-
cles, Mark Hennelly’s “Detecting Collins’ Diamond” and William Burgan’s “Masonic Symbolism
in The Moonstone and The Mystery of Edwin Drood.” Burgan’s article is of particular interest since it
situates the issue of the diamond within a larger pattern of Freemasonry in the novel.

37. One of the first critics to notice the novel’s imperial subtext was John Reed, whose 1973
essay, “English Imperialism and the Unacknowledged Crime of The Moonstone,” helped to pave the
way for future interpretations of the novel’s stance on the issue of empire.

38. Quotations from The Moonstone will be cited parenthetically in the text according to period,
narrative, chapter and page number.

39. See, for example, First Period, chapter 5, 32.

40. As an idea of the scope of opium production in India during the Indian Mutiny, opium accounted
for roughly 20 percent of Britain’s total Indian revenue, or £16,335,606 between 1857–59 (The
Annual Register, 1859, 30–31). For more on the real and symbolic presence of opium in England,
see Alethea Hayter, Opium and the Romantic Imagination.
41. Lillian Nader writes that this overlap of sexual and imperial themes through the person of Franklin Blake “illuminates the paradox of Victorian guardianship, in both its patriarchal and its imperial guises. As Rachel’s prospective husband, he promises to protect his future wife, while stripping her of her sexual and legal autonomy and her property rights. As an Englishman with ties to ‘the Honourable John,’ he promises to civilize India, while exploiting its people and claiming its wealth for his own” (Nayder, 122).

42. See also Nayder, 119.

43. As this subtle usage of dating suggests, Collins did extensive background research on India before writing The Moonstone. His notes can be found in the Morris L. Parish Collection at Princeton University.

44. Further examples of Crusoemancy can be found on I.i.10.83, II.iii.2.329, and II.iv.6/20.454.

45. Lillian Nayder also notes that Betteridge’s devotion to Robinson Crusoe is amusingly ironic in another way, in that Betteridge automatically identifies with Crusoe even though he is himself a servant: “In a novel about imperial crime, it proves to be one of Collins’s central ironies that Betteridge valorizes Defoe’s idyll of empire building, Robinson Crusoe, while misapplying its tale of mastery and subservience to his own case. Persistently quoting from Defoe’s work, Betteridge is identified with Crusoe, overlooking his ties to Friday” (Wilkie Collins, 123).

46. This passage comes from Ezra Jennings’s journal, which is not divided into chapters as the other narratives are, but rather into dates, and sometimes into hours. Passages from the Fourth Narrative will therefore be cited according to the dates in his journal, the time (when necessary), and the pages in the Oxford edition of the novel.

47. Jennings reveals his birthplace and background to Franklin Blake on II.iii.9.411.

48. This reenactment is carefully staged to appeal to scientific authorities as well, as Ezra Jennings’s appeals to the theories of Dr. John Brown (413), William Benjamin Carpenter (432), and Dr. John Elliotson (433) make clear. For more on Collins’s use of contemporary science, see Ira Nadel’s “Science and The Moonstone,” Jenny Bourne Taylor’s In the Secret Theatre of Home, 174–206, and Ronald Thomas’s “Minding the Body Politic.”

49. The novel allows a glimpse of this possibility in Mr. Bruff’s narrative. One of the Indians comes to visit him at his office in order to inquire about the terms of money-lending in England, and Bruff feels “bound to testify that he was the perfect model of a client. He might not have respected my life. But he did what none of my own countrymen had ever done, in all my experience with them—he respected my time” (II.ii.2.310).

50. See Miller’s reading of The Moonstone in The Novel and the Police, 37–54, especially 40–42.

51. Elisabeth Rose Gruner examines the role family secrecy plays in the novel in her “Family Secrets and the Mysteries of the Moonstone.” She writes, “Drugs, imperialism, and theft are subsumed into the larger question of family relations (cousinly or closer) which is at the heart of The Moonstone. What is the Victorian family and whose purposes does it serve? Collins asks, and the answer does not come back in the family’s favor” (127).
Notes to Chapter 5

1. For more on these and other Italian secret societies, see Heckethorn, vol. I, 264–76 and vol. II, 72–77, 157–95; and MacKenzie, 172–73, 195–201. They are also mentioned briefly in Holt, 44–47.

2. For more on the Fenians, see Heckethorn, vol. II, 275–87; and MacKenzie, 186–94.

3. The background given here and elsewhere in the chapter on Italian unification is necessarily abridged. I have gathered the facts primarily from Shepard B. Clough and Salvatore Saladino, A History of Modern Italy, whose own approach to the period through documents written by and about those actually participating in the Risorgimento gives a sense of what unification meant to those involved. These facts have been checked against accounts found in Albrecht-Carrié, Italy from Napoleon to Mussolini; Edgar Holt, Risorgimento; and Clara M. Lovett, The Democratic Movement in Italy 1830–1876. Italian unification has long been a contested site for historiography, with early writers often interpreting the process as the apotheosis of liberal principle, whereas more recent critics have noted the contradictions and political shortcomings of Italy’s resurgence. A brief and helpful survey of these trends in the historiography of Italian unification through 1984 appears in John A. Davis, “Reading History: Italian Unification.” A more thorough overview of shifts in historical thinking about Italy through 1972, two years after the republication of Rosario Romero’s influential Il Risorgimento in Sicilia, can be found in Agatha Ramm, “The Risorgimento in Sicily: Recent Literature.” See Dennis Mack Smith, “The Unification of Italy: Some Myths Re-examined” and William C. Mills, “Unity Deferred: The ‘Roman Question’ in Italian History, 1861–82” for two examples of the new historiography in practice.

4. For contemporary military historians’ account of the war with Austria, see “The Italian Campaign of 1859” and “The Campaign in Italy.”

5. England was not lacking in contemporary accounts detailing the background to unification. A particularly well-informed and fairly unbiased summary of Italy affairs from 1856 onwards appears in “Tidings from Turin,” while background on both French and Austrian relations with Italy since 1815 can be found in “Foreign Affairs—War in Italy,” which paints both imperial powers as dictatorial.

6. Similar fears of French intentions can be found not only in periodical articles like “Napoleonism and Italy,” but also in more literary productions of the same period. Two poems by Tennyson, for example—“Rifleman Form!” (published 9 May 1859) and “Jack Tar” (written by 14 May 1859)—both express anxiety over a possibly incipient war with France.

7. In England Against the Papacy, 1858–61, C. T. McIntire offers an insightful and well-referenced analysis of the specific debate in England over how to curtail Papal power in Italy during the early years of unification. McIntire contextualizes this debate within the concurrent struggle for political power between Tories and Liberals in Parliament, thereby adding yet another layer of ideological impurity to England’s already compromised response to the Italian Question. According
to McIntire, both Tories and Liberals agreed that Papal government was completely inappropriate for a modern state, but each party adopted its own strategy to ameliorate the situation, with the Tories first attempting a policy of rapprochement with the Pope and the Liberals later tacitly supporting the annexation of the Papal States by Piedmont.

8. See “Napoleonism and Italy,” 261; and “Papers on the Italian Question,” 542.

9. In general, this article is heavily invested in chronicling Mazzini’s decline throughout the Italian peninsula, thereby allaying English fears of radical republicanism in a united Italy. The article is also concerned to attribute most of Italy’s progress towards independence to Count Cavour, whom it represents in glowing terms. After his death Cavour actually became the object of an almost Garibaldian hero-worship; this sentiment is evident in “The Neapolitan and Roman Question” and also in Menella Bute Smedley’s contemporary poem, “Cavour.” More recently, Nick Carter has challenged the iconic status of Piedmont’s scheming Prime Minister, arguing that Cavour’s success was more serendipitous than anything else and that his skills as a statesman have been overblown.

10. *Macmillan’s* is generally quite friendly to Italian unification and even to Mazzini, who is often portrayed as the heroic embodiment of the national ideal.

11. For English hero-worship of Garibaldi in 1859–60, see “The Struggle at Melazzo,” “The Situation of the Moment in Italy,” and “Garibaldi and the Italian Volunteers.” Like Cavour, Garibaldi has also undergone revisions in recent histories; see, for example, Lucy Riall, “Hero, Saint, or Revolutionary? Nineteenth-Century Politics and the Cult of Garibaldi.”

12. For Collins’s use of the Rugeley murder case, see John Sutherland, “Wilkie Collins and the Origins of the Sensation Novel”; the similarities between the plight of Anne Catherick and that of the Marquise de Drouhault were first noted by Clyde K. Hyder in “Wilkie Collins and *The Woman in White.*”

13. It is important to note that *The Woman in White* engages with more than just the Italian Question. It represents a novelistic intervention into legal debates over the definition of lunacy and the rights of married women to own property and to file for divorce, as well as the exigencies of novel publication and the social implications of a female-majority population. For more on Collins and the lunacy debate, see Jenny Bourne Taylor, 98–130 and Barbara Fass Leavy, “Wilkie Collins’s Cinderella”; on the influence of current debates over divorce and married women’s property, see Nayder, *Wilkie Collins,* 74–85; on the novel’s reflection of the circumstances of publication, see Gwendolyn MacDonagh, “Fill Up All the Gaps”; and on Collins’s approach to the problem of “surplus women,” see Susan Balée, “Wilkie Collins and Surplus Women.”

14. These articles were, in order, “Austria” (18 June), “Viva L’Italia!” (9 July), “Piedmont” (16 July), and “North Italian Character” (10 September). Lillian Nayder uses these articles as one point of entry into the “agents of Empire” present in the novel. In her highly perceptive examination of the imperial implications of *The Woman in White* she also notes that Collins had already written a similar piece for *Household Words* in 1856 entitled “My Black Mirror,” and that he was acquainted with Italian revolutionaries living in London, including the father of Dante Gabriel Rossetti, an exiled member of the Carbonari and, according to Julian Symons’ notes to the Penguin edition of the novel, possibly the original of Pesca.
15. Walter actually refers to this process of foreign immigration twice, once while explaining the presence of Mrs. Rubelle in England (on 439), and later at greater length during his investigation of Fosco: “The year of which I am now writing was the year of the famous Crystal Palace Exhibition in Hyde Park. Foreigners in unusually large numbers had arrived already, and were still arriving in England. Men were among us by the hundred whom the ceaseless distrustfulness of their governments had followed privately, by means of appointed agents, to our shores” (584).

16. In “Witnesses and Truth,” Adele Wills argues that Collins’s technique of legalistic narration in both *The Moonstone* and *The Woman in White* allows him to call upon contemporary legal definitions of truth to “redress the balance, and reinterpret social assumptions” about a variety of societal Others (on 93). Certainly, one can see this process at work in *The Moonstone*, in which the racial marginalized Indians become agents of English law by the end of the novel; however, *The Woman in White* seems to me to problematize Wills’s argument, not only because the narration is wholly controlled by Walter Hartwright, who seeks to naturalize his own rise to the upper-middle class, but also because the character in the story who most benefits from his opportunity to speak, Count Fosco, hardly qualifies as a marginalized Other.

17. Critics have noticed this tendency towards interested self-effacement. See, for example, Pamela Perkins and Mary Donaghy, “A Man’s Resolution.”

18. At the vestry fire, during the unsuccessful rescue of Sir Percival, Hartright “hardly knowing what I did, acting desperately on the first impulse that occurred to me,” smashes the skylight, thereby letting “out the flame instead of letting in the air” and guaranteeing Sir Percival’s demise (536). During his reconstruction of Sir Percival’s last moments, Walter proposes that “He must have dropped in his death-swoon, he must have sunk in the place where he was found, just as I got on the roof to break the skylight window” (544), thus occluding his own potential responsibility for killing the baronet.

19. Viewed from Walter’s perspective as narrator, this elevation of Fosco into a double of himself is necessary to hold the story together. In order to secure his role as hero, Walter must match wits with a villain of suitable stature; in order to keep his readers’ sensations at a fever pitch, he must also provide them with secrets in need of revelation. Fosco serves both purposes at once, acting as an almost-unbeatable foe whose power derives precisely from his ability to keep secrets. Unfortunately for Walter, most critics, following U. C. Knoepflmacher’s argument in “The Counterworld of Victorian Fiction,” agree that this portrayal of Fosco works too well, that, in fact, Fosco emerges as a more interesting and attractive character than Walter himself.

20. Fosco stands no lower in his own estimation, as evidenced by his indignant riposte to Glyde’s imputation that he will “worm out” the secret of Anne Catherick: “Percival! Percival!” he cried passionately, ‘do you know me no better than that? Has all your experience shown you nothing of my character yet? I am a man of the antique type! I am capable of the most exalted acts of virtue —when I have the chance of performing them. It has been the misfortune of my life that I have had few chances. My conception of friendship is sublime! Is it my fault that your skeleton has peeped out at me? Why do I confess my curiosity? You poor superficial Englishman, it is to magnify my
own self-control. I could draw your secret out of you, if I liked, as I draw this finger out of the palm of my hand - you know I could! But you have appealed to my friendship, and the duties of friendship are sacred to me. See! I trample my base curiosity under my feet. My exalted sentiments lift me above it” (351–52).

21. As John Kucich notes, “Sir Percival is not Laura’s only deceitful husband” (91).

22. In The Novel and the Police, D.A. Miller argues that Walter’s trip to Central America is needed to “stabilize his male self-mastery” so that he can be the appropriate “manly husband” for Laura (on 173, 166). Hartright’s journey also neatly exemplifies the kind of “masculine plot” identified by Herbert Sussman in Victorian Masculinities, a plot in which time abroad is needed to learn the “practices and technologies of the self” required to control potentially disruptive male energy (on 10). Sussman’s model of the masculine plot is most succinctly summarized on 47. In The Power of Lies, John Kucich ties these ideas of masculine self-mastery to practices of secrecy when he observes that one of the lessons Walter learns in the jungle is how to employ “stratagem” against his enemies (on 91).

23. During his return from Mr. Kyrle’s office, Walter actually displays the lessons of colonialism in action when he acts to foil the pursuit of Sir Percival’s agents: “I reached home on foot, taking the precaution, before I approached our own door, of walking round by the loneliest street in the neighborhood, and there stopping and looking back more than once over the open space behind me. I had first learnt to use this stratagem against suspected treachery in the wilds of Central America—and now I was practicing it again, with the same purpose and with even greater caution, in the heart of civilized London!” (474).

24. This strategy of using secrecy as a reluctant last resort calls to mind Steinmetz’s comments in The Novitiate about England’s distaste for its own necessary system of spies and informers, which he contrasts with the Jesuits’ willing embrace of panoptical surveillance. Such a reference to the Jesuits would hardly be out of place in Collins’s novel, since during his stay at Blackwater Park, Fosco even refers to himself as a Jesuit: “I am a Jesuit, if you please to think so—a splitter of straws—a man of trifles and crochets and scruples—but you will humour me, I hope, in merciful consideration for my suspicious Italian character, and my uneasy Italian conscience” (265). This evocation of Jesuitism is more complex than it at first appears, since it reverses the usual sense of the word in English by making it seem as if being “a splitter of straws” is a virtue rather than a sign of duplicity, and by connecting this rehabilitated definition to the Count’s Italian nationality. At the same time that the Count articulates his Jesuitical scruples, however, Marian remains suspicious about “something in his manner of expressing of them” (265), suggesting that underneath this seemingly new aspect of virtuous secrecy there remains the same false spirit of Jesuitism. Since this Jesuitism remains connected to Fosco’s declaration of national character and conscience, Italy, too, remains under suspicion as a result of Marian’s misgivings.

25. For similar instances of questioning, see 503 and 514.

26. “Rome at the Close of 1867. Notes from Within the City” was written in the immediate aftermath of Garibaldi’s failed attempt to seize the city and contains an account of the battle of
Mentana. An account of the battle of Mentana can also be found in “Garibaldi’s Last Campaign.” These articles were likely among Disraeli’s sources for his version of the battle in *Lothair*.

27. On English hero-worship for Garibaldi, see “Italy and France” and Garibaldi’s Invisible Bridge.”

28. Rhetorical attacks on Napoleon III also appear in “Italy,” “Italy and France,” and “Rome at the Close of 1867. Notes from Within the City.”

29. One example of the kind of general Anti-Papal sentiments articulated in English periodicals throughout the 1860s can be found in “Rome at the Close of 1867. Notes from Within the City.” More specific accusations of Jesuitism were not wanting during this period either; for example, Edward Dicey, writing for *Macmillan’s*, attributed many of Italy’s present problems to the presence of the Jesuits.

30. For more on Italy and Ireland, see “Mr Thomas Trollope’s Italian Novels” and “Italian Brigandage.”

31. However, as one article correctly noted, the English were also violating the Act by supporting Garibaldi; for the author, this lawlessness and the duplicity that went along with it, made Italian unification an unattractive cause. See “Italy.”

32. This continued suspicion of republicanism, and the principles of radical democracy on which it was based, can be seen even in articles otherwise friendly to unification; for example, one author for the *Edinburgh Review* wrote that, “For the decisions of Universal Sufferage, to which it is now the fashion for democrats and despots to pay equal homage, we can never affect to feel submission or respect; but this [the vote in Lombardy to join the Kingdom of Italy under Victor Emmanuel] was an instance in which, whatever had been the voting franchise, the result would have been the same” (“The Kingdom of Italy,” 255).

33. Several pages later, the author alludes to a secret society known as the Camorra (on 584–85), a clandestine group of smugglers, gamblers, extortionists and murderers. More details on this organization are given in Heckethorn (I: 264–74).

34. Voicing a common complaint, the reviewer continued, “There is an unreality about even the best characters in the book which mars their life, and makes them little better than abstractions and dreams” (“Mr Disraeli’s *Lothair*,” 85). The novel’s strategies of characterization and the resulting sense of unreality were also attacked in the *North British Review*, which declared, “The future historian, if any were to rise, who should fancy that in *Lothair* he had discovered the key to the characters of the actors of these days, will have fallen under the spell of some mischievous goblin, who has feigned a false resurrection scene for his bewilderment” (“Lothair,” 454).

35. The same review also dismisses *Lothair* as “a passive instrument” and “a mere puppet” of the Anglicans and Roman Catholics vying for his fortune and decries the lack of difference between these two groups of religious conspirators (on 142, 156). Even otherwise friendly reviewers were forced to admit that the novel was something of a “fairy tale” (“Disraeli’s *Lothair*,” 278), in part because of its portrayal of European secret societies. The writer for the *Edinburgh Review* found it necessary to excuse Disraeli’s “thoroughly extravagant and, as we believe, entirely false in fact” representation of secret societies as “hardly condemnatory” (“Disraeli’s *Lothair*,” 286). Others were less forgiving, finding “his revelations about the secret societies, Mary-Anne and Madre Natura...
... worthy of the unsuspicious credulity of an Abbé Barruel" ("Lothair," North British Review, 462). For more on the critical history of Lothair, see R.W. Stewart’s Disraeli’s Novels Reviewed.

36. The novel’s original publication and reception history can be found in Braun, 4–7, 130–32. Its contemporary success is also detailed on 3–7 of J. M. Roberts, who writes, “The best reason for paying attention to [Disraeli’s views as expressed in Lothair] here lies not in the possible effect on his behaviour but in the acceptability he felt they would command. Such ideas [of secret societies] were the common intellectual furniture of the minds of his contemporaries; this is why they provided a good focus for his novel. For once, Disraeli is significant as a typical rather than an eccentric figure. His words expressed a widely held mythology and Lothair, the novel from which they were taken, became, almost at once, a best-seller in both England and the United States” (4).

37. A similarly brief summary is also available in Schwarz, 129–30. More lengthy summaries accompanied nearly all of the novel’s nineteenth-century reviews; the summary featured in Blackwood’s is particularly detailed (and caustic).

38. For more on the historical basis for Lothair, see Braun, 132 and the Edinburgh Review article, “Disraeli’s Lothair.”

39. Like Lothair, Grandison is also based on a real person, the controversial Cardinal Manning, with whom Disraeli had had a political falling out shortly before beginning the novel. See Schwarz, 127–28.

40. Richard Levine points out the centrality of these three female figures during his brief but insightful reading of the novel in Benjamin Disraeli, 136–44.

41. The reader is allowed into a secret meeting of the Standing Committee in Chapter XI, where it is revealed that they are a kind of transnational revolutionary organization on the order of the Carbonari, on 55–58.

42. A related memory of past risings actually convinces the General, now known as Captain Bruges, to lead that contingent of Italian revolutionaries of which Lothair is a part: “It was only toward the end of the preceding month that he had resolved to take the field; but the organization of the secret societies is so complete that he knew he could always almost instantly secure the assembling of a picked force in a particular place” (252–53).

43. This is not to say that the connection between the figure of the secret society and the issue of political representation was entirely severed in the years following the publication of Lothair; rather, even when constituencies pressing for more equitable representation were accused of being secret societies, they were associated with foreignness. In the years leading up to WWI, for example, various working-class groups, including trade unions, were denounced as French-inspired Communists or German-inspired Socialists; political radicals became Anarchists, a group made anathema both by its Russian roots and by several successful political assassinations carried out by anarchists in Russia, Italy and the United States; Ritualists within the Anglican Church continued to be accused of Papal-inspired Jesuitism after Walter Walsh’s denunciatory The Secret History of the Oxford Movement (1898); Indian nationalists remained subject to associations with the Mutiny and the figure of Thuggee;
and even nonviolent supporters of Irish independence were stigmatized as Fenians, and, during the war, as German sympathizers. At the same time, practices of secrecy still remained attractive to the elite public, especially when connected to the expansion and preservation of the British Empire. In this more imperial vein, although in his final will he did devote much of his wealth to establishing the now-famous Rhodes Scholars program, Cecil Rhodes, in the many earlier drafts, designated increasingly large sums to the creation of a secret society “on the Jesuit model” dedicated to bringing the world under British control. For more on Rhodes’s early wills, see John Marlowe’s _Cecil Rhodes_, especially 210–11; and Robert Rotberg’s _The Founder_, 100–102, 234–35.

44. By the 1880s Disraeli’s rather chaotic mix of foreign conspirators would be disciplined into a new subgenre of British fiction, the spy novel. According to David Stafford, whose “Spies and Gentlemen” provides an excellent introduction to this new genre, early British spy novels sought to resolve the “apparent contradiction between the activities of the international spy and the calling of an English gentleman” through precisely the same formal mechanism that those who invoked the figure of the secret society attempted to differentiate between, for example, Roman Catholicism and English Protestantism: the “contradiction was largely resolved through the attribution of all the negative connotations of espionage to the figure of the foreign spy. It quickly became established as a convention of the genre that there was a clear distinction between spies, who were foreign, and secret agents, who were British” (491).

45. We can see this potential association between secrecy and domesticity growing stronger in each succeeding literary text discussed in this book. In _Sartor Resartus_, it may be the swallows that practice “the mason-craft,” but it is important to note that they do so in the protected space provided for them by the head of Teufelsdröckh’s own domestic world, his father. In addition, Carlyle’s supposed autobiography constantly plays at both secreting and revealing the details of private life, entering, for example, into Teufelsdröckh’s failed intimacy with Blumine while clothing that intimacy in such abstract symbolic garments that the particulars remain carefully veiled (II.5). In _Barnaby Rudge_ Dickens does not simply oppose the ’Prentice Knights and the Varden family, or the Protestant Association and the Haredales; instead, he roots each secretive organization in the frustrated desires of the domestic sphere and resolves the public unrest caused by these societies in the privacy of marriage. _Sybil_ similarly links secrecy and domesticity by using a marriage to end the Plug Riots, even as the novel suggests by ironic juxtaposition that working-class men like Dandy Mick may be forced into combination not just by the exploitative truck system but also by the breakdown of domestic ties caused by female and child labor in the nation’s coal mines. The novels of Collins are even more insistent about the link between secrecy and domesticity. Not only do the Verinders close ranks to stifle Sergeant Cuff’s investigation into the family’s dirty laundry, both literal and figurative, in _The Moonstone_, but _The Woman in White_ revolves around the practices of licit (Walter) and illicit (Percival) secrecy in the marriages of Laura Fairlie.

46. Tosh highlights the growing importance of “home,” as a private space distinct from the public realm of commerce, in Victorian constructions of virtuous masculinity; he then tracks changes in the construction of “home,” many of which led to the home—and any man in it—being sub-
ject to feminine authority, and how those changes challenged Victorian men to preserve their manliness. According to the logic of Tosh’s argument, one way to remain “a man” while escaping the moral pollution of commerce would be to form a private association exclusively made up of men, thereby bracketing off a home-like space that remained unproblematically manly. Those middle-class Victorian men who joined the Freemasons, the X-Club, the Royal Society, or any of the other numerous male social and professional clubs especially available in the last third of the century in the metropolis, did so, at least in part, to indicate their manliness and their virtue. They then protected this newly won territory through the practices of secrecy to which such organizations bound their members.

Figuratively related to the Masons and other groups cited above, but rendered less unambiguously acceptable to late-Victorian men by their association with femininity, were the large number of more esoteric societies that flourished in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As Janet Oppenheimer observes in *The other world: Spiritualism and psychical research in England*, the final thirty-year period of Victoria’s reign was an “age of ‘Esoteric Buddhism,’ of the Rosicrucian revival, of cabalists, Hermeticists, and reincarnationists” (160). Groups like Helena Petrova Blavatsky’s Theosophical Society, Robert Wentworth Little’s Rosicrucian Society, and Dr. William Wynn Westcott and Samuel Liddell MacGregor’s Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn used the allures of secrecy and occult knowledge to attract many members of Britain’s privileged classes, the most well known of which is probably William Butler Yeats. For information on these organizations beyond that found in Oppenheimer, see Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness*, 227–53; Mackenzie, 130–46; Heckethorne, 219–30; and Ellie Howe’s *The Magicians of the Golden Dawn*. 

Notes to Chapter Five
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