Notes to Introduction

1. The journal folded after eleven volumes, and Thompson later attempted to revive *The Mask* as a weekly (May to August 1879). Lewis turned his hand to more purely “theatrical” writing, producing the famous melodrama *The Bells* in 1871.


5. An important exception is the field of romantic drama. Even in this thriving and exciting field, however, connections between theater and the novel have yet to be fully articulated.

6. The list of work on nineteenth-century spectacle and theatrophilia is a long one, but two encyclopedic highlights are Richard Altick's *The Shows of London* (Cambridge, Mass.:
Notes


Notes


14. Litvak writes that “One of this book’s lessons, I think, is that theatricality in novels tends to have an antinarrative effect; my resistance to historical schematization may represent something of a mimetic tribute to the subject” (*Caught in the Act*, 275). Theatrical spectacle may indeed impede the linear flow of narrative, but the relations between theater and the novel are historically determined, as I argue.

15. One of these is Byerly, who in *Realism, Representation, and the Arts in Nineteenth-Century Literature*, addresses ways in which novelistic realism is both formed and (occasionally) endangered by the proximity of other forms (theater, music, and the visual arts).

16. A recent exception to the critical rule of viewing the relationship between theater and the novel as competitive is Vlock, who claims that the Victorian novel hams it up, not only borrowing from and giving back to theater, but also collapsing in a “mutually interdependent” embrace.


19. Virtually everyone who has offered an account of the “rise of the novel” since Ian Watt’s book of that name has had to deal with the “double rise” theory. I will discuss my own views on how the elevation of the novel enabled the emergence of middle-class identity in the following chapter. Watts, *The Rise of the Novel* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957).
Notes


21. The concept of biologically grounded female “nature” was itself a product of post-Enlightenment thinking, as Thomas Laqueur has demonstrated. In his formulation, the eighteenth century developed the concept of binary sexual difference (as opposed to the previous “one-flesh” model in which the female body was merely an inferior version of the male body) and explained behavioral differences as a matter of biology. While this concept was contested throughout most of the eighteenth century, it attained the status of truth in the nineteenth. Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990).

22. Mary Poovey notes that “as late as the 1740s,” women “were associated with flesh, desire, and unsocialized, hence susceptible, impulses and passions,” but “the eighteenth century witnessed the gradual transformation of this sexualized image of woman as willful flesh into the domestic ideal.” Poovey, *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 10.


24. Poovey argues that “the middle-class ideology we most often associate with the Victorian period was both contested and always under construction; because it was always in the making, it was always open to revision, dispute, and the emergence of oppositional formulations” (*Uneven Developments*, 3). See also Fredric Jameson’s use of the concept of “nonsynchronous development” (*Ungleichzeitigkeit*) in *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1981).


26. Virtually all critics of the theater/novel connection discuss this split. Litvak, for example, analyzes the governess/actress dichotomy (58), while Franklin configures it as theatrical woman/angel in the house (82).

27. Franklin writes that “what might be described as a novelization of the theater took place in nineteenth-century British culture” (127). After the theater became domesticated in the 1860s and 1870s, with “Cup and Saucer” dramas by T. W. Robertson leading the way to middle-class respectability, the theater of the ’80s and ’90s became increasingly
psychological. As Mary Jean Corbett has argued, this move from “Robertsonian realism” to “the interiorized psychological drama of Jones and Pinero” is made possible by “the domestication of the theater, the drama, and the actress.” She writes, “although the English theater of the 1890’s did not forego social mimesis, its apparent innovation lay in its attention to character, and what comes to be considered most ‘real’ for the late Victorians is that which is most private and interior.” Corbett, Representing Femininity: Middle-Class Subjectivity in Victorian and Edwardian Women’s Autobiographies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 131–32. On the drive towards realism and the increasing respectability of the theater, see Michael Booth, Theatre in the Victorian Age (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); his introductions to English Nineteenth-Century Plays (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969–76); and Allardyce Nicoll, A History of English Drama 1660–1900 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), vol. 5, 7–27. Nicoll notes that after the international copyright agreement of 1887 and the U.S. copyright bill of 1891, English playwrights began to publish their plays for a reading audience. Acting editions were still published, but plays were also printed in “a dignified form apt to appeal to the ordinary reading public” (72).

28. Much has been written about the origins of Romantic antitheatricalism, which led not only to a middle-class flight from the theaters, but also to a divorce between “high literature” and the stage. Barish blames Romanticism’s “cult of interiority” for this split (295–349), and Nicoll suggests additional economic reasons why “legitimate” authors turned away from playwrighting. Recent feminist work sees antitheatricalism as an attempt to control the disruptive spectacle of the female body: see especially Julie Carlson’s In the Theatre of Romanticism: Coleridge, Nationalism, Women (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), and “Impositions of Form: Romantic Antitheatricalism and the Case Against Particular Women,” ELH 60 (1993): 149–79.

29. See Hadley, Melodramatic Tactics, 38–76, on the Old Price Wars, and 80–131 on “melodramatic resistance” to the New Poor Law.


31. Kristina Straub argues that the professionalization of acting began as an effort to masculinize the actor. Although the actor’s body was feminized and sexualized in its role as theatrical spectacle, the rise of acting as a career worked to legitimate this display as manly labor. Sexual Suspects: Eighteenth-Century Players and Sexual Ideology (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992). While nineteenth-century actor-managers like William Charles Macready did much to continue this process of legitimating the theatrical profession for men, however, the profession of “actress” was associated with immorality and sexual license until the latter half of the nineteenth century. For the case against actresses, see Tracy Davis, Actresses as Working Women: Their Social Identity in Victorian Culture (London: Routledge, 1991). See Corbett, Representing Femininity, Kent, “Image and Reality”; and Gail Marshall, Actresses on the Victorian Stage: Feminine Performance and the Galatea
Notes


33. An important exception here is the celebrated figure of Sarah Siddons, whose phenomenal success depended largely upon her ability to play both the actress and the respectable wife and mother. On “the incomparable Siddons” and her difference from other acting women, see Carlson, In the Theatre of Romanticism, 162–75.

34. On the tendency of carnival to reinscribe the boundaries it would seem to subvert, see Stallybrass and White, along with Umberto Eco, “The Frames of Comic ‘Freedom,’” in Carnival! ed. Thomas A. Sebeok (Berlin: Mouton, 1984).

Notes to Chapter 1

1. Athena Vrettos describes the textualization of the body by hysteria—the body comes to require the “affective hermeneutics” of the skilled (which is to say sympathetic) reader. Vrettos, Somatic Fictions: Imagining Illness in Victorian Culture (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1995).


3. See Armstrong, Desire and Domestic Fiction, for an account of how the rhetoric of eighteenth-century conduct books produced “a [female] subject who in fact had no material body at all. This rhetoric replaced the material body with a metaphysical body made largely of words” (95). We might also consider Burney’s diary entries on stage fright in relation to critical work on shame and performance. See, for example, Sedgwick’s “Queer Performativity: Henry James’s The Art of the Novel,” GLQ 1 (1993): 1–16; and Litvak, Caught in the Act, 195–234.

4. As Jameson explains in The Political Unconscious, the development of genre is always uneven, since the individual text contains “a host of generic messages—some of them objectified survivals from older modes of cultural production, some anticipatory, but all together projecting a formal conjuncture through which the ‘conjuncture’ of coexisting modes of production at a given historical moment can be detected and allegorically articulated” (99). On the nonsynchronous development of social formations, see especially 94–99 and 141–45.

5. While most scholars who subscribe to the rise of a middle class argue that it occurred sometime during the eighteenth century, 1832 is frequently given as the latest date by which a middle class had become solidified and visible in Britain. See Davidoff and
Hall, Family Fortunes, for an influential version of this argument. For an interesting complication of this idea, see Dror Wahrman, who claims that 1832 is not “an endpoint of a long social transformation,” but a “catalyst” in Britain’s conceptualization of itself. “It was not so much the rising ‘middle class’ that was the crucial factor in bringing about the Reform Bill of 1832,” he writes, “rather, it was more the Reform Bill of 1832 that was the crucial factor in cementing the invention of the ever-rising middle-class.” Wahrman, Imagining the Middle Class: The Political Representations of Class in Great Britain, c. 1780–1840 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 18. Of course, not everyone agrees that the middle class ever solidified at all (see, for example, Martin Wiener, English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850–1980 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981], on the “failure” of the middle classes), and few who agree that this solidification did happen agree on when it happened, or began to happen (see Wahrman for an extensive summary of the scholarly history of this debate). Many scholars (Davidoff and Hall, Armstrong, and Wahrman among them) allow that what would become a recognizable middle class in the nineteenth century was becoming increasingly visible during the last few decades of the eighteenth century at the latest. My interest in Evelina lies in how the novel works through categories (class, genre, and gender) that are in the process of being reformed by this very visibility.


7. While public theater never “fell,” per se, ticket sales did fall off as the box office suffered a decline in the early decades of the nineteenth century. For an account of the decline of public life, see Richard Sennett, The Fall of Public Man: On the Social Psychology of Capitalism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976); on the fading of public amusements, see Castle, Masquerade and Civilization, 331–46.

8. I do not mean to suggest that Burney was somehow antipathetic to theater itself. Indeed, Burney very much wanted a career as both novelist and dramatist. Theatricality and spectacle, however, have a much different valence in her fiction than they do in her drama. For an eloquent treatment of Burney as playwright, see Barbara Darby, Frances Burney, Dramatist: Gender, Performance, and the Late-Eighteenth-Century Stage (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1997).


10. This argument is made most clearly by Susan Greenfield, “‘Oh Dear Resemblance of Thy Murdered Mother’: Female Authorship in Evelina,” Eighteenth-Century Fiction 3
Notes


11. The only critics that I have found to discuss the use of theatrical forms in Evelina are Castle—who remarks in passing that “Evelina is structured by the heroine’s progress through a series of popular London entertainments, each of which becomes an anagram for civilization itself” (Masquerade and Civilization, 260)—and Doody, who notes the novel’s ties to the eighteenth-century tradition of theatrical farce, especially the highly physical comedy of playwrights like Thomas Foote (Frances Burney, 48–51). She writes that Burney “seizes a ‘masculine’ mode of comedy, largely derived from the public medium of the stage, wraps it up in the ‘feminine’ epistolary mode, and uses the combination for her own purposes” (48). I consider the relationship between theatrical and novelistic modes more contentious than this formulation suggests.


13. Evelina has been read as self-referential not only in its epistolary structure (Evelina as author manquée mirrors Burney’s own situation) but also in its plot. Evelina’s acceptance by her father reflects Burney’s own desired acceptance by a literary patriarch; the vindication of her mother signals an acceptance of the novel genre’s matrilineal heritage. Gina Campbell argues, for example, that “the narrative of Evelina’s social success . . . stand[s] as a trope for Evelina’s (and thus [Burney’s] own) literary recognition.” Campbell, “How to Read Like a Gentleman: Burney’s Instructions to Her Critics in Evelina,” ELH 57 (1990): 559.

14. Doody, in Frances Burney, locates Duval’s character in the theatrical tradition of comic female roles played by men: “Madame Duval—vain, overdressed, highly painted, simpering, and rude—has all the traditional larger-than-life qualities of the stage dame” (50).


Notes


19. On the opposition between absorption and theatricality, see especially Michael Fried, Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980).

20. James Thompson characterizes this process as one that turns merchandise into treasure, which only has value in private (175). See his reading of Evelina as “white elephant” (an “inestimable treasure that cannot be traded” [176]). Thompson, Models of Value: Eighteenth-Century Political Economy and the Novel (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1996).

21. Burney was herself a great admirer of Garrick (1817–1879), who was a friend of the Burney family. See her Early Journals and Letters, vols. 1 and 2, where she applauds the actor’s apparent verisimilitude.

22. Garrick’s performance also marks a specific moment in the history of theater. By the late eighteenth century, as Kristina Straub has shown, the polarizing and gendering of specular relations into “female spectacle” and “male spectator” was well on its way to becoming naturalized. The male actor troubled these distinctions, however, and the professionalism of the actor—bodied forth by the respectable Garrick—worked to masculinize the actor’s body. Garrick’s “natural” acting also sought to counteract the feminizing effects of self-display (Sexual Suspects). For a contradictory reading of Garrick as an “overloaded” character, see Deidre Lynch, The Economy of Character: Novels, Market Culture, and the Business Of Inner Meaning (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 72–75.

23. Lacan’s theories of “the gaze” have been adapted to an analysis of gendered spectatorship by feminist film theory, first by Laura Mulvey (“Visual Pleasure” and “Afterthoughts on Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema,” Frame-works 15–17 [1981]: 12–15) and later by theorists such as Teresa de Lauretis, E. Ann Kaplan, and Kaja Silverman. For a discussion of the gaze in theatrical space, see Sue-Ellen Case, Feminism and Theatre (New York: Methuen, 1988), 112–32. Case writes that in traditional theater women “become fixed in the position of object of the gaze, rather than as the subject directing it” (120).

24. For the theatrical antecedents of this form of comedy, see Doody, Frances Burney, 51.
Notes


26. On the psychoanalytical process of abjection, see Kristeva, *The Powers of Horror*, who defines the abject as that which must be expelled out of disgust to form the identity of the subject, to create necessary boundaries between the self and other. Disgust also occurs when those boundaries are questioned or begin to break down.

27. I do not mean to suggest that Evelina is not always under the threat of sexual assault, but that the frequency of these threats escalates in relation to her public exposure in the care of Madame Duval. On sexual assault in the novel, see Susan Staves, “Evelina; or Female Difficulties,” *Modern Philology* 73 (1976): 368–81; and Newton, *Women, Power, and Subversion*.

28. In *Actresses as Working Women*, Tracy Davis discusses the popular association of actresses and prostitutes, although she considers acting and prostitution to be “parallel rather than convergent professions” (80).

29. Bristol does have the public promenade at the Hotwells, where all eyes are on Evelina. However, except for two instances that receive relatively little narrative space, Evelina refuses to participate in public amusements in favor of a retirement that is increasingly aligned with the novel. When, for example, Evelina declines to attend a public assembly, it is asked what she does with her time; “The young lady reads,” responds Mrs. Selwyn (275).

30. Another point of connection between the two scenes lies in their shared genealogy: the image of the monkey and the de-wigged woman were both extremely popular in the comic mezzotints of the 1770s that, as John Hart has demonstrated, likely served as sources for the comic scenes in *Evelina*. The two images even come together in a popular print from 1776, “Slight of Hand by a Monkey, or the Lady’s Head Unloaded,” in which a monkey sitting on a wall lifts a massive wig off a woman passing below. See Hart, “Frances Burney’s *Evelina*: Mirvan and Mezzotint,” *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 7 (1994): 60–61.


32. The plot of *The History of Caroline Evelyn* is compressed in the beginning of *Evelina*: Caroline Evelyn, the daughter of a gentleman and a former tavern waitress (the future Madame Duval), is raised by Arthur Villars after her father’s death. When she is sent at the age of eighteen to Paris to live under her mother’s care, Caroline is pushed into an unwanted marriage and escapes from her mother’s tyrannical clutches into a private marriage with Sir John Belmont. Belmont burns the marriage certificate and abandons Caroline, who gives birth to a daughter that she entrusts to Villars on her deathbed. The only manuscript of the novel was burned by Burney on her fourteenth birthday.

33. As previous critics have noted, Evelina’s assumed last name, Anville, is an anagram of her first name, which is in turn a derivative of her mother’s maiden name, Evelyn. On the significance of naming in the novel, see Doody, *Frances Burney*, 40–41, or Amy J. Prawl, “‘And What Other Name May I Claim?’: Names and Their Owners in Frances Burney’s *Evelina*,” *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 3 (1991): 283–99.

Winter, 1987); and Henry Siddons, Practical Illustrations of Rhetorical Gesture and Action (New York: Benjamin Blom, Inc., 1968 [1822]).

35. It is a point of contention as to whether or not Mansfield Park is a conservative novel that celebrates the workings of a benevolent patriarchy or a covertly feminist novel. On the novel’s self-divided feminism, see Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1979), 163–68.


38. The most well known of these, perhaps, is Lional Trilling, The Opposing Self (New York: Viking, 1955). Litvak, Caught in the Act, also develops the idea of this novel’s “claustral” sensibilities, while Lynch, The Economy of Character, discusses the “agoraphobia” of English novels of manners in general and Austen’s novels in particular.


41. Litvak, in fact, reads this final authorial intrusion as an open return of the theatrical. The narrator, he claims, comes forward in the role of Mrs. Norris, with her bustle and noisy intervention: “In the embarrassing moment when the ordinarily discreet Jane Austen advances to the proscenium to ring down the curtain on the final scene of her drama, we witness something like a return of the repressed” (Caught in the Act, 25).

42. This episode has been read as embodying the novel’s distinction between “real feelings” and “the impersonation of feeling.” See David Marshall, “True Acting,” 87; and A. Walton Litz, Jane Austen: A Study of her Artistic Development (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), 127.

43. As Gary Kelley remarks of Fanny’s relationship to Edmund, “Love begins with reading, with reading together, with literature” (“Reading Aloud in Mansfield Park,” Nineteenth-Century Fiction 37 [June 1982]: 31). Kelley notes that this kind of “romance of education” is a sub-genre of the late-eighteenth-century novel. For a discussion of the
romance of reading in the nineteenth century, see Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction*, 203–50.

44. For the most influential reading of the Mansfield Park theatricals as a locus of insincerity, see Lionel Trilling, *Sincerity and Authenticity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971). Trilling writes that Austen’s “objection to the histrionic art is . . . [that] impersonation leads to the negation of the self, thence to the weakening of the social fabric” (75). Barish sees the novel as harboring a “hostility to impersonation,” and notes that the Crawfords’ acting ability marks them as “malleable and indeterminate” (*The Antitheatrical Prejudice*, 306–7). C. Knatchbull Bevan gives another reading along these lines (“Personal Identity in *Mansfield Park*: Forms, Fictions, Role-Play, and Reality,” *SEL* 27 [1987]: 595–608).

45. Litvak considers this upset of domestic discipline a mere diversion. In his reading, the private theatricals serve as a distraction from the theatricality of authority in the novel, a vetting of overt theatricality that allows the more covert theatricality of Sir Thomas’s authority to get down to business. But since theatricality is inherently unstable, any authority based on it is vulnerable to returns of an overt, disruptive theatrical mode (*Caught in the Act*, 1–26).

46. As many critics have remarked, the “infection of acting” that Yates spreads to Mansfield Park is aligned with the corruption of the aristocracy. Sir Thomas’s disapproval of the plan stems partly from class antipathy, as Avrom Fleishman notes in *A Reading of Mansfield Park* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1967), 26–29.


48. Litvak similarly notes that “all along, in eschewing acting, Fanny has been playing a role, albeit ‘sincerely’” (*Caught in the Act*, 21), and Galperin writes that Fanny’s refusal to act “is part of a larger theatricalization in which sincerity turns out to be anything but the inability to act” (“The Theatre at Mansfield Park,” 258).

49. For a reading of this scene as a “thoroughly theatrical event,” in which Sir Thomas appears as “the novel’s preeminent juggler of theatrical conventions,” see Litvak, *Caught in the Act*, 22–23.

50. Erickson discusses Austen’s success at the lending libraries, which enabled her to reach an audience that could not necessarily afford to buy individual books. See *The Economy of Literary Form*, 125–41, for a detailed account of Austen’s relationship to the circulating library.


52. For an account of how Hume’s theories of sympathy apply to eighteenth-century theories of fiction reading, see Gallagher, *Nobody’s Story*, 166–74. Gallagher considers property to be the link between sympathy and fiction. The reader can sympathize with the “nobodies” of fiction because they belong to no one, and hence everyone.
53. Issues of contagion orbited discussions of sympathy throughout the eighteenth century, as Mullan notes (26–27). For an account of the nineteenth century’s association of sympathetic contagion with both theater attendance and novel reading, see Vrettos, Somatic Fictions, 83–99.

Notes to Chapter 2

1. Ina Ferris argues that the novel was such a vexing object for the reviews because both novels and reviews were open to charges of commercialism: “The two discourses—novelistic and critical—stood in peculiarly close and tangled relationship in this period, for each was a borderline discourse, neither fully literary nor fully commercial, and each was a response to the expansion of print culture and of the literary marketplace” (30). Ferris, The Achievement of Literary Authority: Gender, History, and the Waverley Novels (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992).

2. Everett Zimmerman argues that Scott’s historical novels mark a point by which fiction and history had been effectively separated (as they had not been during the eighteenth century), which allows Scott to conjoin them in new (and newly fictive) ways. Zimmerman, The Boundaries of Fiction: History and the Eighteenth-Century British Novel (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996).


4. Like many of Scott’s innovations, this one was hardly new. Michael McKeon’s Origins of the English Novel (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987) traces the long and extensive relationship between romance and history. See especially 52–64.

5. There was a small smattering of positive reviews. The Gentleman’s Magazine and Historical Chronicle called it a “highly interesting and tragical Tale,” and then proceeded directly to excerpts, while The London Literary Gazette allowed that if St. Ronan’s Well had any popularity (“whatever quantum it may attain”) it would be due to “the spirit with which the characters are drawn, [rather] than to the story.”

6. This summary describes St. Ronan’s as it was first published, but not how it was originally written. In the first manuscript (extracts from the proof sheets of which were printed in the Athenæum on February 4, 1893), Clara Mowbray loses her virtue to Francis Tyrrel before her mock marriage to Bulmer. When Scott’s printer, John Ballantyne, read the manuscript, he prevailed upon Scott to expunge the objectionable incident. Scott cancelled and rewrote about twenty-four pages.

7. In connection with this passage, Ferris quotes Scott’s famous distinction between himself and Jane Austen: “The big Bow-wow strain I can do myself like any now going, but the exquisite touch which renders ordinary commonplace things and characters interesting from the truth of the description and sentiment is denied to me” (253). Ferris remarks that the 1832 introduction to St. Ronan’s Well is very careful to separate Scott’s “big Bow-wow strain” from the female novelistic field—the province of the “exquisite touch.”

8. Part of the critical disappointment with St. Ronan’s in fact focused on the title, which reviewers found deceivingly “romantic” for a novel of contemporary life. See British Critic (16) and Scot’s Magazine (739).
9. There were, of course, exceptions. The Examiner begins its review this way: “This is another proof, almost equally convincing with that afforded by St. Ronan’s Well, that the imagination of SIR WALTER SCOTT should for a season or two lie fallow. . . . St. Ronan’s Well and Redgauntlet are not simply nods on the part of our Scottish Homer, but sound slumbers—the author absolutely snores” (441).

10. Kathryn Sutherland has also remarked on this resemblance, noting that Scott was working on his “Life of Richardson” at the same time he was writing Redgauntlet; she finds Redgauntlet to be Scott’s most Richardsonian novel. See her introduction to Redgauntlet (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).

11. Redgauntlet’s status as “historical” novel has spurred an extended critical debate, since the text’s main incident (a third Jacobite uprising) is patently fabricated. How can it be said to offer any “realism” at all? Arguing for Scott as a historical realist, David Brown observes that Scott “sacrifices strict, factual verisimilitude in the service of a deeper verisimilitude of manners” (182). Historical realism, in these terms, “depends on an imaginative recreation of the period, rather than on a mere extrapolation from historical fact” (181). Redgauntlet’s denouement, in which General Campbell pardons everyone, may be “Scott’s most audacious piece of historical fantasy,” but it is also “founded securely on the underlying social reality of the period” (166). Brown, Walter Scott and the Historical Imagination (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979). This line of reasoning, which sees “truth” as paramount to fact, derives from Lukács’s widely influential essay on Scott in The Historical Novel (London: Merlin Press, 1962). According to Lukács, “What is lacking in the so-called historical novel before Scott is precisely the specifically historical” (19). While Redgauntlet cannot be said to be historically factual, it can be said to be “historical” and realistic insofar as it dramatizes and particularizes actual social and political shifts. Redgauntlet’s denouement institutes realism, then, when it represents the triumph of the Hanoverian political system over the “fantasy” of Jacobite heroism.

12. As Hugh Redgauntlet tells it, the “family curse” is that the Redgauntlets shall always back the losing side in any political struggle. As quite a few of Scott’s critics have noted, however, the curse actually pans out as the family’s history of intergenerational struggle.

13. Sutherland also makes this point in the introduction to Redgauntlet, xxii.


18. Henry White chronicles the unfortunate performance history of Redgauntlet. At least two plays based on Wandering Willie’s tale, however, had a reasonable run in France. White, Sir Walter Scott’s Novel’s on the Stage (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1927).
Notes to Chapter 3

1. Franklin discusses the prevalence and importance of the theatrical doppelgänger at mid-century (*Serious Play*, 80–131, especially 82–83).

2. On the abject, see footnote 26, chap. 1.


4. While individual serial installments were quite cheap, they added up over time, which is one thing that made them so attractive to publishers. Serialization also kept initial production costs down, which allowed publishers a maximum return on a minimum financial risk (as opposed to investing in the printing of a triple-decker novel that might fail to sell). See Feltes, *Modes of Production in Victorian Novels*, plus Hughes and Lund, *The Victorian Serial*.

5. Working-class readers were neither hidden nor in hiding during this period, which means that it took an act of ideological blindness not to notice them. In *The Reading Lesson*, Brantlinger traces public fears and discussions surrounding working-class readers and writes that “in the 1830’s, the debate about mass literacy shifted from whether the ‘lower orders’ should be taught to read and write at all to the questions of what they were reading, what they should read, and how to control their reading” (95).


8. Schlicke stresses the symbolic importance of the suppression of the celebrated Bartholomew Fair, which was founded in the twelfth century, granted a royal charter by Henry I in 1133, and effectively killed in July 1840, while Dickens was writing *The Old
Notes

Curiosity Shop. For the downfall of the Bartholomew Fair and the fair’s ties to carnivalesque tradition, see Schlicke, Dickens and Popular Entertainment, 89–96, as well as Stallybrass and White, The Politics and Poetics of Transgression, 111–15 and 176–77. For the influence of pantomime on The Old Curiosity Shop, see especially Eigner, The Dickens Pantomime, 18–20 and 101–2.


10. Axton, Circle of Fire, does not comment on The Old Curiosity Shop but focuses his discussion of the early works on Sketches by Boz, Pickwick Papers, and Oliver Twist. According to Axton, these works use overt theatricality to expose “the grotesque histrionism at the heart of middle-class culture and morals,” while in the later novels theatricality is sublimated but nonetheless present.

11. Critics of The Old Curiosity Shop especially favor the carnivalesque model to discuss the novel’s power, as we can see in Mark M. Henneley’s extensive treatment of carnivalesque themes and figures. Like most other critics of Dickensian play, Henneley sees the Dickensian carnivalesque as solely liberating. Henneley, “Carnivalesque ‘Unlawful Games’ in The Old Curiosity Shop,” Dickens Studies Annual 22 (1993): 67–120.

12. Although Litvak never discusses The Old Curiosity Shop, it is easy to see how his argument might proceed in terms of Quilp, the panoptic dwarf who parodies the less sinister omniscience of the single gentleman (that is, Master Humphrey or Dickens himself). Quilp’s death might be seen to purge the text of the negative aspects of panopticism, while his daughter the Marchioness, who has a habit of airing her eye at keyholes, lives out the fantasy of heroic surveillance. On the novel’s thematics and tactics of omniscience, see Audre Jaffe, Vanishing Points: Dickens, Narrative, and the Subject of Omniscience (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991); on the activity of looking in the novel, see Michael Greenstein, “Lenticular Curiosity and The Old Curiosity Shop,” Dickens Quarterly 4 (1987): 187–94.


14. In “Dickens and Theatre,” Glavin discusses Dickensian spectacle as antidote to (feminized) realism: “Refusing realism’s restrictive canons of limit and embodiment, Dickens aligns his fiction with Spectacular Theatre’s promise to displace the solid with new discoveries, endlessly shifting and diverse. He builds his novels as places of play, springing his audience (as his protagonists are sprung) from the feminized regime of the domestic body and domesticated space” (201). Of course, as Glavin argues, spectacular play is only fun when the spectacle is made of someone else.

15. For this reading of the novel, see Schlicke, Dickens and Popular Entertainment, 87–136.

16. For an extended discussion of the way in which the novel’s opening is structured by a series of oppositions between Nell and her surroundings, see Robert Patten’s “‘The story-weaver at his loom’: Dickens and the Beginnings of The Old Curiosity Shop,” in Dickens the Craftsman: Strategies of Presentation, ed. Robert B. Partlow (Carbondale: Southern


18. As Garrett Stewart writes of this star-crossed connection, “Nell and Quilp are in a sense each other’s precondition, yet they are forever irreconcilable. . . . Both Nell and Quilp define a limit which makes sense only in the presence of the other; they only exist so long as they coexist.” Stewart goes on to demonstrate that Nell’s exit from the novel is precisely timed to coincide with Quilp’s death by drowning. Stewart, *Dickens and the Trials of Imagination* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), 97–99.


20. Elizabeth Bronfen writes, “[Nell’s] perfect corpse effaces all traces of death’s inscription in life” (*Over Her Dead Body: Death, Femininity and the Aesthetic* [New York: Routledge, 1992], 89). In Bronfen’s terms, Nell’s body becomes an “auto-icon,” which covers death by replacing the material body with an “image” of itself. The dead body thus becomes other than itself and, in Nell’s case, more than itself.

21. Sue Zemka argues that Little Nell’s apotheosis encodes the novel’s wish for its own cultural ascent. In her reading, Nell’s upwardly mobile flight through lower-class amusements to the calm respectability of the church signals a desire on Dickens’s part to overcome the novel’s ties to lower-and lower-middle class entertainments. Zemka, “From the Punchmen to Pugin’s Gothics: The Broad Road to a Sentimental Death in *The Old Curiosity Shop*,” *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 48 (1993): 291–309.

22. On the pornographic nature of Nell’s representation, see Hilary M. Schor, *Dickens and the Daughter in the House* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 34.

23. On Dick’s much-discussed theatricality, see for example Schlicke, *Dickens and Popular Entertainment*, 131–36; for a reading of Dick as an entertainer who transforms from being a theatrical clown who entertains for his own sake to being a citizen who puts his theatricality to work for others, see Feinberg, “Reading *Curiosity*: Does Dick’s Shop Deliver?” *Dickens Quarterly* 7 (1990): 200–211. See Stewart, *Dickens and the Trials of the Imagination*, 100–103, for a discussion of Dick and Quilp as contrasting doubles, and 112–13 for a reading of the Marchioness as Nell’s alternative.

24. The model for many of Dick’s scenes with the Marchioness may actually be a popular eighteenth-century farce entitled “High Life Below Stairs.” As Lynn Bartlett argues, Dickens most likely saw the play in London in 1827 or 1830 and included borrowings from it in both *Pickwick* and *Curiosity Shop*. Bartlett, “High Life Below Stairs, or Cribbage in the Kitchen,” *English Language Notes* 23 (1985): 54–61.

25. “The terror of the Medusa,” Freud writes, “is the terror of castration.” In Freud’s formulation, the Medusa’s snaky hair symbolizes her possession of the phallus, multiplied many times over, and the split genitalia of the female, both of which signify castration to the male viewer. In response to the spectacle of his own castration, the male viewer becomes rigidified in an enactment of his own possession of the phallus. The beheading of

26. In the text as published, Quilp’s curious hilarity at encountering the small servant for the first time suggests his discovery of her parentage, as does this passage late in the novel: “[The Marchioness] supposed herself to be an orphan; but Mr. Swiveller, putting various slight circumstances together, often thought Miss Brass must know better than that; and, having heard from his wife of her strange interview with Quilp, entertained sundry misgivings whether that person, in his lifetime, might not also have been able to solve the riddle, had he chosen” (669). Dickens’s reasons for suppressing Sally’s explicit confession of maternity have long been a subject of critical debate, although all explanations that I have found focus on the Marchioness. One theory suggests that Dickens did not want to bring up a rival to Little Nell, a rival that might distract from his dying heroine. The most prevalent theory, however, holds that it is the Marchioness’s perverse pedigree that must be suppressed; see Angus Easson, “Dickens’s Marchioness Again,” *Modern Language Review* 65 (1970): 517–18.

27. A reading of Sally Brass as monstrous mother can be found in Schor, *Dickens and the Daughter in the House*, 36–37.

28. Both the sublime and the abject work by the same mechanism, anchoring an ideological system by marking or masking the vanishing point of the symbolic order. So the abject might be said to lie just on the other side of the tolerable from the sublime; as Kristeva writes, the abject in is fact “edged with the sublime” (11). On the connection of the sublime to the abject, see Mary Russo, *The Female Grotesque: Risk, Excess and Modernity* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 30–34. For recent discussions of the abject status of bodies that transgress regulatory norms for sex and gender, see Russo and also Butler’s *Bodies That Matter*.


30. On Jewsbury’s tastes as a publisher’s reader and her righteous condemnation of certain subjects and styles (especially sensation), see Fahnestock, “Geraldine Jewsbury.”


32. Judith Rosen provides a reading of how Jewsbury is able to draw on what she calls “conventions of domestic theatricality” (depictions of femininity as disciplinary performance) to legitimate Bianca’s acting as “an extension of domestic duty into the public sphere.” Rosen, “At Home upon a Stage: Domesticity and Genius in Geraldine Jewsbury’s...”
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Notes to Chapter 4

1. Flaubert’s actual defense attorney, Sénard, opened his four-hour statement with a similar sentiment, describing the author’s intention as “an eminently moral and religious intention that can be described in these words: the incitement of virtue through the horror of vice” (Evelyn Gendel, trans., “The Trial of Madame Bovary,” in Madame Bovary, trans. Mildred Marmur [New York: New American Library, 1964], 348).

2. Sénard summed up his long argument by saying that “in this book the defects of education are brought to life as they really are in the living flesh of our society. . . . [With] every line the author is putting to us this question: ‘have you done all you should in the education of your daughters?’” (ibid., 396).

3. For a reading of the conventionalizing views that both prosecutor and defense attorney took of the novel, see Dominic LaCapra, Madame Bovary on Trial (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1982), 34–52. LaCapra observes that while the opposing counsels came to different conclusions about the work’s morality, they were in agreement that literature should serve conventional morality. He also notes the shared focus the two men put on Emma Bovary: “both assume that she is the central character and that the reader’s relation to her will be one of identification or recognition” (35).

4. It is specifically realism that Pinard targets here: “Christian morality stigmatizes realistic literature, not because it paints the passions: Hatred, vengeance, love (the world only lives by these, and art must paint them)—but because it paints them without restraint, without bounds” (Gendel 347).

5. LaCapra argues at length that in its focus on Christian morality the trial never explicitly addressed the true “ideological crime” for which Flaubert was hauled into court.
According to LaCapra, *Madame Bovary* offended most deeply in ways the court could not recognize, since the novel’s critique of bourgeois convention effectively undermined the authority through which the court operated. I agree with this, although I would amend it to note that the court *was* able to articulate the novel’s “crime” in the language of an unexamined gender politics, which then stood in for the more unsettling (although not unrelated) politics of taste and class. For a brilliant discussion of the ways in which nineteenth-century blasphemy trials in England dealt with the repressed content of class warfare, see Joss Marsh, *Word Crimes: Blasphemy, Culture, and Literature in Nineteenth-Century England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

6. While Flaubert’s attorney spoke for him and, indeed, claimed the privileges of the authorial voice, I do not assume—as Minnelli does—that Sénard spoke as Flaubert might have done. Flaubert was tremendously pleased with Sénard’s performance and famously dedicated the 1857 edition of *Madame Bovary* to him, but it is hard to believe that Flaubert agreed with Sénard’s view of the novel as moral tonic. LaCapra reads Flaubert’s dedicatory gesture as “both serious and—whether intentionally or not—ironic” (53).


8. The remark (“Woman, what have I to do with thee?”) is from John 2:4. The passage is part of the letter to Feydeau, dated January 11, 1859 (*Letters II*, 14).

9. Flaubert wrote to Louise Colet that “I feel at home only in analysis—in anatomy, if I may call it such” (*Letters I*, 166) and later referred to his composition of *Madame Bovary* as “a work of criticism, or rather of anatomy” (*Letters I*, 207). While English critics would come to call the kind of realism practiced by Flaubert “morbid anatomy,” they did not always reserve the term for realism. In the sensation debates, for example, the term is often used to describe a novel that is considered too explicit (sexually, or otherwise), although not necessarily realistic.

10. Lemot was inspired by the closing words of Saint-Beuve’s article on Flaubert, which appeared in the *Moniteur Universel* on May 4, 1857: “Son and brother of eminent doctors, M. Gustave Flaubert wields the pen as others wield the scalpel. Anatomists and physiologists, I find you on every page!” (quoted in *Letters I*, 231).


12. See, for example, Brantlinger’s *The Reading Lesson*, 9; Carla L. Peterson, *The Determined Reader: Gender and Culture in the Novel from Napoleon to Victoria* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1986), 161; and Stewart’s *Dear Reader*, 86. Stewart refers to *Madame Bovary* as “the ultimate novelist critique of romance reading and
its erotic abasements” (86). For a treatment of reading as both poison and cure, see Maryline F. Lukacher, “Flaubert’s Pharmacy,” Nineteenth-Century French Studies 14 (1985–86), who writes that “Flaubert came to see literature as pharmakon” (37).

13. Tony Tanner, Adultery in the Novel: Contract and Transgression (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), sees the opera scene as a turning point in the novel. Emma, he writes, “never leaves the theater, because when she does walk out during the third act, her consciousness has discovered its final mode of operating; it has been definitively theatricalized” (340). I certainly agree with this, as with Tanner’s claim that in the third portion of the novel Emma’s “physical, theatrical, and lexical realms are running together” (340), although I do not think that we need to wait for this scene to see it happen: her consciousness is already theatricalized.

14. The pharmacist, Homais, claims that theater teaches “virtue under the guise of entertainment,” while the priest offers a catalog of antitheatrical cliché: “the fact alone that people of different sexes are brought together in a glamorous auditorium that’s the last word in worldly luxury—and then the heathenish disguises, the painted faces, the footlights, the effeminate voices—it can’t help encouraging a certain licentiousness and inducing evil thoughts and impure temptations” (246). Of course the priest himself is a materialist who merely repeats church opinion; the “debate” masks (even as it displays) the agreement (even identity) of these two men and their moralizing positions.

15. Graham Daniels offers a thorough discussion of this scene and its relation to The Bride of Lammermoor. He suggests that Scott’s novel—and Scott’s name—operate here as a symptom of romanticism. (It is worth noting, of course, what a switch this is from earlier constructions of Scott’s healthy and curative romanticism.) Daniels, “Emma Bovary’s Opera—Flaubert, Scott, and Donizetti,” French Studies 32 (June 1978): 285–303. See also John R. Williams, “Emma Bovary and the Bride of Lammermoor,” Nineteenth-Century French Studies 20 (1992): 352–60, on the significance of this scene, particularly its ties to Emma’s eroticized reading practices.


19. As in this passage, for example: “The artist must raise everything to a higher level: he is like a pump; he has inside him a great pipe that reaches down into the entrails of things, the deepest layers. He sucks up what was lying their below, dim and unnoticed, and brings it out in great jets of sunlight” (Letters I, 189).

20. Braddon wrote to her literary mentor, Edward Bulwer-Lytton, that “I have never written a line that has not been written against time—sometimes with the printer waiting outside the door” (Robert Lee Wolff, “Devoted Disciple: The Letters of Mary Elizabeth Braddon to Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton, 1862–1873,” Harvard Literary Bulletin 22 [January 1974]: 10). On the sensation novel’s connection to the mass market, see especially Brantlinger (Reading Lesson) and Cvetkovich (Mixed Feelings).

21. On the theatricality of sensation and the surprisingly antitheatrical politics of sensation fiction, see Litvak, Caught in the Act, 128–45. Stern (“‘Personation’ and ‘Good Marking-Ink’) ties the antitheatricality of sensation novels to Victorian fears over performative identity and the desire to ground identity in the body and in biological science. On the embodied response of sensation reading, see both D. A. Miller (The Novel and the Police) and Cvetkovich (Mixed Feelings).


23. In “What is ‘Sensational’” Brantlinger discusses sensation’s ties to melodrama; Hadley analyzes the function of the melodramatic mode in East Lynne (Melodramatic Tactics, 166–79).

24. Wolff claims that Braddon’s acting career began in 1857 and lasted for three years, but Carnell offers new evidence that Braddon’s career began in 1853 and lasted for seven or eight years, during which time Braddon played a large number of parts. For Wolff’s description of Braddon’s time on stage, see Sensational Victorian, 45–78; for Carnell’s extended reading of Braddon’s life as an actress and her continued interest in professional theater, see The Literary Lives of M. E. Braddon, 11–87.

25. Ruth Burridge Lindemann has written of Braddon’s positive depiction of the theatrical profession in general and the female performer in particular. She argues that Braddon attempts to elevate the position of the profession actress (perhaps to dignify her own past) by writing “middle-class morality, industry, and economic necessity into her theatrical character references” (“Dramatic Disappearances: Mary Elizabeth Braddon and the Staging of Theatrical Character,” Victorian Literature and Culture 25 [1977]: 288). For a reading of theatricality (and antitheatricality) in Lady Audley’s Secret, see Litvak, Caught in the Act, 141–45.
26. Barbara Leckie discusses how addictive reading comes to stand in for and to superecede the representation of adultery in *The Doctor’s Wife*. She writes that Braddon “does not need to represent adultery because reading carries all of the passionate force and moral suspicion of adultery” (*Culture and Adultery: The Novel, the Newspaper, and the Law* [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999], 142). Indeed, “It is in reading as opposed to adultery . . . that the reader becomes aware of Isabel’s body—its appetite, its craving, its desire” (150).

27. Braddon seems quite sensible of the generic stretch this entailed. She wrote to Bulwer-Lytton that she was going to “infuse a dash of poetry” into *The Doctor’s Wife*, and in the same letter asked him, “Have you read anything of Gustave Flaubert’s, & do you like that extraordinary Pre-Raphaelite style. I have been wonderfully fascinated by it, but I suppose all that unvarnished realism is the very reverse of poetry” (Wolff, “Devoted Disciple,” 20). Braddon was an admirer of French novels—Flaubert and Zola in particular—and wrote of them in *Belgravia* (“French Novels,” *Belgravia* 3 [July 1867]: 78–82) and in an unpublished manuscript in the Robert Lee Wolff Collection of Victorian Fiction at the Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas at Austin.


29. This reading runs counter to most criticism on the novel, which reads Isabel’s addictive reading as dangerous and diseased. Pamela Gilbert (*Disease, Desire, and the Body in Victorian Women’s Popular Novels*) considers Isabel’s reading a form of contagion, through which the men in her life are infected and (albeit indirectly) die. Leckie writes that “Isabel’s reading is the greatest crime against the family in *The Doctor’s Wife*” (*Culture and Adultery*, 147). Leckie allows, however, that Isabel’s reading “goes nowhere”: “while she cannot say no to reading, she can say no to adultery” (150). This seems to be the point: saying “yes” to eroticized and performative reading means saying “no” to the host of other temptations for which reading stands. I am inclined to agree with Flint, that “Novel-reading remains uncondemned as an activity in itself: what is seen to matter is the cultivation of a self-knowing, responsible attitude towards it” (*The Woman Reader*, 291), although it does seem to me that the novel allows for a passionate attachment to fiction, not only a responsible one.

30. In an essay that discusses the novel as an uneasy mixture of three fictional genres (sentimentalism, sensationalism, and realism), Tabitha Sparks argues that this “sentimental ‘utopian’ ending . . . is a major weakness in Braddon’s project to make *The Doctor’s Wife* realistic” (“Fiction Becomes Her: Representations of Female Character in Mary Braddon’s *The Doctor’s Wife*,” in *Beyond Sensation: Mary Elizabeth Braddon in Context*, ed. Marlene Tromp, Pamela K. Gilbert, and Aeron Haynie [Albany: SUNY Press, 2000], 207). But if realism is not the true project here, then this utopian ending marks the ultimate success of sentimental reading practices.


32. Leckie (*Culture and Adultery*) also notes this passage: “At the close of *Madame Bovary* Emma is dead from poisoning but perhaps for her too there is an antidote; for not only is she reanimated every time a reader picks up the novel but also another novelist, say Braddon, might someday write a sequel” (151). Since the Moore novel I examine in the
next chapter is really a sequel to Braddon’s sequel, we could call this moment the beginning of a franchise.

Notes

Notes to Chapter 5


2. Pease theorizes an “aesthetic of the obscene” that developed in the late nineteenth century and allowed high-cultural artists to demonstrate their “disinterest” in and formal mastery over obscene content. While Moore was not, as Pease points out, openly pornographic, I would argue that his use of “strong content” balanced by a distancing formalism operates similarly to this aesthetic.

3. Moore contributes here to the transformation of the publishing industry, which had been dominated by female writers for much of the Victorian period but was gradually taken over by men as (and because) the novel became a high cultural artifact. Tuchman and Fortin (Edging Women Out) call the years 1880–1900 “the period of redefinition,” when “men of letters, including critics, actively redefined the nature of a good novel and a great author. They preferred a new kind of realism that they associated with ‘manly’ literature—that is, great literature” (8).

4. Sala’s main target is Margaret Oliphant, who attacked Braddon in a 1866 Blackwood’s piece that discussed the reinstatement of the “domestic Index Expurgatorious” and that I discussed in the previous chapter.

5. Moore’s battle with the lending libraries is well documented. When Mudie took exception with Moore’s first novel, A Modern Lover (1883), Moore undertook to publish A Mummer’s Wife in one affordable volume—it first appeared for ten shillings—thus circumventing the lending libraries of Mudie and W. H. Smith. The publisher
Notes


8. It is important to note that Moore is not against drama qua drama. He was himself a dramatist and was active in promoting theater all of his life. (For Moore’s role in the startup of the Independent Theatre Society of London and the Irish Literary Theatre in Dublin, see Frazier, *George Moore.*) What Moore is determined to do throughout this essay, however, is to keep fiction writing separate from theatrical writing.


10. Virtually all critics of *A Mummer’s Wife* locate this split as being at the core of Kate’s problem. The general critical consensus, however, is that Kate’s middle-class upbringing makes her unfit for the “loose morals” of theatrical life, that the drastic change of lifestyle destroys her. In focusing on the change in milieu, critics are here following the epigraph to the first edition of the novel, which reads, “Change the surroundings in which a man lives, and, in two or three generations you will have changed his physical constitution, his habits of life and a goodly number of his ideas” (from Victor Duruy’s *Introduction to the History of France*). While the change in milieu is clearly part of Kate’s difficulties, the similarity between her “two worlds” also contributes to her downfall. For the “incommensurable spheres” theory, see Farrow, *George Moore*, 49; Starkey, “Moore and French Naturalism,” 67; William C. Frierson, “George Moore Compromised with the Victorians,” in *The Man of Wax: Critical Essays on George Moore*, ed. Douglas Hughes (New York: New York University Press, 1971), 78; and Chaikin, “George Moore’s Early Fiction,” 29.

11. For the explanation of Kate’s self-destruction as motivated by middle-class guilt,

12. Critical fixation on the bourgeois/bohemian split has almost entirely occluded these similarities. Cave has noted that the two spheres are “viciously linked,” since the mummers turn the puritan condemnation of pleasure to their own material advantage (39), and a few critics have remarked that Kate remains essentially the same character in her two roles (Farrow, George Moore, 46; Cave, A Study of the Novels of George Moore, 35; and Dunleavy, George Moore, 67).

13. Previous critics have also identified sentimentality as the novel’s whipping-boy: Frazier, George Moore, 114; Farrow, George Moore, 48; Dunleavy, George Moore, 67; Ure, “George Moore as Historian of Consciences,” 91–92; Cave, A Study of the Novels of George Moore, 41; Mitchell, “A New Perspective,” 21–24, and “George Moore’s Kate Ede,” 72–73. While critics routinely locate Emma Bovary as the source for her sentimentality, C. Heywood (“Flaubert, Miss Braddon, and George Moore,” Comparative Literature 12 [1960]: 151–58) and Mitchell (“A New Perspective”) both suggest the English source for Kate in The Doctor’s Wife. Mitchell provides the only sustained discussion of connections among the three novels.

14. Although the Heinemann edition is quite different from the original edition of the novel, published by Vizetelly in 1885, I have chosen to use it for two reasons: first, because it is frequently used by Moore scholars; second, because it is the version of the novel Moore himself considered to be the best. For a detailed examination of the novel’s publication history and an account of Moore’s radical revisions of the novel, see E. Jay Jernigan, “The Bibliographical and Textual Complexities of George Moore’s A Mummer’s Wife,” Bulletin of the New York Public Library 74 (1970): 396–410.

15. See D. A. Miller’s account of how secrecy (and reading) provide the subject with “a secret refuge,” “a free, liberalizing space” in which to construct him or herself against the “world’s carceral oppressions” (The Novel and the Police, 215).

16. See Tracy Davis, Actresses as Working Women, for an account of the fetishizing of tights and the role of these garments in Victorian pornography.

17. The connection between popular fiction and drink had been a staple of the sensation debates of the 1860s and continued throughout the century. The connection is made particularly clearly in an 1874 Temple Bar article on “The Vice of Reading,” in which reading is characterized as “a vulgar detrimental habit, like dram-drinking” (251).


19. In the novel as originally published, Laura Forrest was even more eccentric: Jernigan has in fact pointed out that the character as originally written was “a Dickensian caricature.” In the 1917 rewrite, however, Moore softened the character’s eccentricities to make her more “realistic” and less of a sore thumb in this otherwise naturalistic novel (Jernigan, “The Bibliographical and Textual Complexities of George Moore’s A Mummer’s Wife,” 408).

20. See Cave, A Study of the Novels of George Moore, 247–48, and ibid., 408.
Notes

Note to Conclusion

1. Edgar Jepson remembers Smithers's reaction this way: “he came round next day to see me in a bad temper and asseverated that excited John Bull was the very John Bull for which the Public were aching. I could see that, simple enthusiast in the free that he was, he really believed this—these fanatics are so simple-minded” (Memories of a Victorian [London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1933], 287).