

Purdue University
Purdue e-Pubs

Open Access Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

January 2015

The Counterfactual History Novel in Nineteenth-Century British Literature

Elizabeth Moline Cuddy
Purdue University

Follow this and additional works at: https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/open_access_dissertations

Recommended Citation

Cuddy, Elizabeth Moline, "The Counterfactual History Novel in Nineteenth-Century British Literature" (2015). *Open Access Dissertations*. 1107.
https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/open_access_dissertations/1107

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

**PURDUE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL
Thesis/Dissertation Acceptance**

This is to certify that the thesis/dissertation prepared

By Elizabeth M. Cuddy

Entitled

THE COUNTERFACTUAL HISTORY NOVEL IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY BRITISH LITERATURE

For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Is approved by the final examining committee:

Dr. Manushag Powell

Chair

Dr. Emily Allen

Dr. Dino Felluga

Dr. Kristina Bross

To the best of my knowledge and as understood by the student in the Thesis/Dissertation Agreement, Publication Delay, and Certification Disclaimer (Graduate School Form 32), this thesis/dissertation adheres to the provisions of Purdue University's "Policy of Integrity in Research" and the use of copyright material.

Approved by Major Professor(s): Dr. Manushag Powell

Approved by: Dr. Ryan Schneider

8/24/2015

Head of the Departmental Graduate Program

Date

THE COUNTERFACTUAL HISTORY NOVEL IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY
BRITISH LITERATURE

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty

of

Purdue University

by

Elizabeth M. Cuddy

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

of

Doctor of Philosophy

December 2015

Purdue University

West Lafayette, Indiana

This work is lovingly dedicated to my family.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would not have been able to complete this journey without my committee's guidance, Purdue University faculty and staff's assistance, friends' support, and my family's unflagging encouragement.

Special thanks to Dr. Manushag Powell for her invaluable advice and encouragement during the writing and revision process. If there are alternative universes out there, I can only hope that my counterparts are so fortunate as to have her as an advisor. Warm thanks are also owed to the rest of my committee: Dr. Emily Allen, Dr. Dino Felluga, and Dr. Kristina Bross for their insightful commentary and suggestions.

I must also recognize members of Purdue University's faculty and staff whose aid and expertise made navigating the perilous mazes of paperwork and the seas of library research possible. In particular, I'd like to thank the English Department's Jill Quirk and the Humanities Social Sciences and Education librarians and staff.

Time is a precious gift, especially when given from one doctoral candidate to another. The feedback and companionship given by Laura Eidam, Nancee Reeves, Heather Nelson, and Adam Watkins during the each stage of the writing process was deeply appreciated. (On a less solemn note: we did it!)

Despite my best efforts, a body cannot live on research alone. I must recognize those who habitually helped me escape from academia—for at least a few hours at a time.

Life in graduate school would have been very different without the friendship of Abigail Moore, Jillian Canode, and Billy Sands. I also owe recognition in a similar vein to the staff of the West Lafayette Public Library—particularly Gale Charlotte, Ruth Cushman, Nancy Hartman, and Bekke Aaron—whose conversation was a bright spot in each day.

Lastly, I must express my gratitude to my family. Your generosity and encouragement is the foundation upon which I have built every good thing in my life, including this academic project. I could not have done it without you. My parents, Thea and Michael, instilled a love of learning in me at an early age, and they—along with my sisters, Catherine and Anne, and my brother-in-law, Sam—have collectively borne the many manifestations of my love of literature and history with no small amount of patience, grace, and good humor. To my family, immediate and extended, I dedicate this project with all my love and affection.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
History in Early Nineteenth-Century British Fiction.....	4
History's Rise as an Academic Discipline.....	9
Contemporary Scholarship and the Counterfactual History Novel	11
Chapter Contents.....	14
CHAPTER ONE. A COUNTERFACTUAL REVOLUTION: SIR WALTER SCOTT, <i>REDGAUNTLET</i> , AND THE HISTORY NOVEL	16
The Jacobite Risings and Sir Walter Scott's <i>Redgauntlet</i>	18
Reading <i>Redgauntlet</i> 's Histories.....	25
Folklore and History	27
Women and the History of House Redgauntlet	33
Writing Legal Histories.....	41
<i>Redgauntlet</i> 's Reception in Nineteenth-Century British Literary Culture	48
Closing.....	61
CHAPTER TWO. PLAYING WITH HISTORY: THE BRONTË JUVENILIA'S WRITTEN WORLD	63
"We wove a web in childhood": The Genesis of the Glass Town Saga	69
"Miss Brontë, what are you thinking about?": Student, Teacher, and Writer	79
"O Angria Arise!": Charlotte Brontë's Glass Town Saga	83
Introducing Arthur Wellesley (and Eleven Other Adventurers).....	84
The Many Counterfactual Layers of the Glass Town Saga	89

	Page
“Now I come to my own loved home”: The Voices of the Glass Town Federation	98
A “Farewell to Angria”?	105
CHAPTER THREE. POLITE FICTIONS: THE COUNTERFACTUAL STRATEGIES OF MARY ANNE EVANS	119
Mary Anne Evans, the Women Question, and Feminist Literary Scholarship	122
Mary Anne Evans’ Many Names	124
Introducing George Eliot	125
Seeking George Eliot	128
Presenting a Genuine George Eliot	131
Introducing Dinah Morris	139
A Counterfactual Conclusion for <i>Adam Bede</i>	141
From Pseudonym to Counterfactual Persona: Mary Anne Evans’ Polite Fictions in Life and After Death	145
CODA	155
BIBLIOGRAPHY	158
VITA	179

ABSTRACT

Cuddy, Elizabeth M. Ph.D., Purdue University, December 2015. *The Counterfactual History Novel in Nineteenth-Century British Literature*. Major Professor: Manushag Powell.

Although scholarship has long since established the history novel's general course, few critical readings of the history novel address the innovative means through which writers could manipulate the use of history within these novels. My dissertation explores how Britons' fascination with history not only shaped the progress of the history novel throughout the nineteenth century, but also directly influenced a specific type of narrative within this developing subgenre: the counterfactual history novel.

It is worth taking the long view when considering the history novel, as it was—and is—an important form for literary experimentation and interdisciplinary discussion. While this project's immediate goal is to establish the significance of the counterfactual history novel's rise, its broader objective is to reassess the history novel's place in nineteenth-century British literary culture. By arguing that the history novel—via the counterfactual history novel—played a crucial role in the development of nineteenth-century Britons' historical consciousness, this dissertation expands our awareness of how widely history and literature were transformed over the course of this century. It is through the variable medium of the counterfactual history novel that history novelists

were able to expand the boundaries of the history novel and, in doing so, assist in the creation of a new literary subgenre, speculative fiction.

INTRODUCTION

History narratives were very much in vogue throughout the nineteenth century in Britain, their form and content varying widely to fulfill the reading public's needs.¹ Although literary scholarship has long since established the history novel's general course—it was recognized as the preeminent form of the novel at the beginning of the nineteenth century, edged out by the social novels with more contemporary settings around the mid-century mark, and ultimately classified as a literary subgenre better suited for children's entertainment than adults' edification by the century's final decades—few critical readings of the history novel address the innovative means through which writers could manipulate the use of history within these novels. Thanks to the rise of historical studies as a serious academic discipline during the 1830s, writers could now experiment with more speculative forms of fiction set in the past, the present, and in some instances, even the future.

My dissertation explores how Britons' fascination with history not only shaped the progress of the history novel throughout the nineteenth century but also directly influenced a particular type of narrative within this developing subgenre: the

¹ Both the spectrum of literary works set in the past and the wide array of nonfiction works written by historians throughout the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century may be accurately referred to as *historical narratives* and will be addressed as such throughout this project.

counterfactual history novel.² Although neither counterfactual history novels nor scholarly counterfactual historical essays would gain much critical or popular attention during the first two thirds of the nineteenth century in Britain, close readings of texts composed between the 1820s and the 1880s by Sir Walter Scott, the Brontë siblings, and Mary Anne Evans demonstrate that the counterfactual could offer writers more imaginative means of employing history narratives at the very moment the history novel was being eclipsed by both the newly professionalized historical nonfiction and the growing popularity of the realist novel.

Because *counterfactual history* is a broad term, I will first address the language associated with this project. A counterfactual history novel is one that considers plausible outcomes for a historical event before rejecting or undermining the possibility of potential ahistorical scenarios.³ This project concentrates upon the greater stakes at hand with each author's use of the counterfactual in order to better understand why and how traditional historical narratives are insufficient to make the author's desired point. This counterfactual history novel performs three congruent acts while serving as tangible

² When applied to nineteenth-century British texts, our contemporary understanding of the word *counterfactual* may be an anachronistic one—the etymological examples within *The Oxford English Dictionary* date only as far back as 1946. But the concept, if not the term, has existed for as long as language has been able to distinguish possibility from actuality. Isaac D'Israeli, the noted Man of Letters, was the first British writer to discuss publicly the benefits of counterfactual histories for both historians and the general public in his essay, "Of A History of Events Which Have Not Happened" (1824).

³ People often use the terms *counterfactual history* and *alternative history* interchangeably even though these types of narratives possess only related—not identical—meanings. Alternative history narratives go a step further than counterfactual history narratives' consideration of alternatives and actually explore a hypothetical course of events through a fictional narrative or narratives. A well-known example of a twentieth-century counterfactual history narrative is *It's A Wonderful Life* (1946) wherein the angel Clarence shows George Bailey what would have happened to his family, friends, and town had he not existed. Clarence's vision shows George (and filmgoers) what fates would befall his loved ones without his presence, but because George recants his wish to nullify his existence, they do not and will not come to pass. Similarly, a well-known example of a twentieth-century alternative history narrative is the first *Back to the Future* (1985) film; this movie gains its alternative history status in the final minutes of the film when Marty McFly learns that the combination of his inadvertent trip to the 1950s and his efforts to get back to the 1980s via a time-traveling DeLorean has changed his family and the town for the better.

evidence of history novelists' reactions to both the stricter forms required of history novels in the 1830s and the greater freedom allotted to novelists who wrote fiction with contemporary settings: First and foremost, the counterfactual history novel permits writers and readers to consider how past events could have unfolded differently. Secondly, the counterfactual history novel endows persons denied power by society and allows them to participate within or comment upon discussions they would otherwise be excluded from. And finally, the counterfactual history novel allows readers and writers to experiment with the limitations of the history narrative by writing novels and novellas set in the future as well as those set in the past. In other words, counterfactual history novels also allowed authors to reclaim history for novelists—and to invent it for fictional worlds of their own creation.

The counterfactual history narrative has long been a neglected area of scholarship in studies of nineteenth-century British literature. Although historians and literature scholars have begun to work with counterfactual and alternate history narratives within the past few decades, there is still much to do in these fields of study. While this project's immediate goal is to demonstrate the significance of the counterfactual history novel, its broader objective is to reassess the history novel's place in nineteenth-century British literary culture. Consequently, my dissertation shows that the history novel is a more flexible and adaptable form of literature than previously recognized; through the variable medium of the counterfactual history narrative novelists were able to challenge the boundaries of both the traditional historical narrative and the history novel and, in doing so, lay the foundation for the creation of a new literary subgenre, speculative fiction.

History in Early Nineteenth-Century British Fiction

The proceedings that led to the counterfactual history novel's development were prompted by historical nonfiction and historical fiction's complex relationship in early nineteenth-century Britain. As a first step towards explaining the correlation between these types of narratives and their individual relationships with the counterfactual history novel, I offer a brief outline of the historical literature dominating the market and an outline of the professionalization of historical studies during this period. While not comprehensive, these two overviews will provide a cursory introduction to the literary and scholarly circumstances in which the counterfactual history novel began.

It was difficult for many of the earliest British history novelists to find pleasing balance between fact and fiction. Anne Stevens has described the convoluted nature of these novelists' situation, explaining that the history novel offered eighteenth-century readers a new way "to encounter the historical past, and in this respect it [the history novel] should be seen in relation to not only narrative history but also biography, memoir, and antiquarian complications as well as to historical drama and poetry, all of which draw upon the historical record in different ways and for varying ends, both complementing and competing with each other" (27). The two forms of historical literary narratives associated with the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-centuries are generally identified as the romance (or the historical romance) and the first full-fledged examples of history

novel proper—the latter of which is fairly close in both structure and content to more contemporary examples of historical fiction.⁴

Although it might seem obvious to draw a direct connection between the historical romance and the counterfactual history novel, the relationship between these two types of literature is not quite as simple as it may seem.⁵ Eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century readers were well-acquainted with the romance's flexible nature, but romances' close ties to other literary subgenres—including secret histories, gothic, and utopian narratives, all of which have ties to the counterfactual historical novel—make tracing the ties between the romance and the counterfactual history a complex process and possibly one that is best addressed on a case-by-case basis, depending on the romances and counterfactual history novels in question. Fortunately, there is a much more straightforward relationship between the counterfactual and the early nineteenth-century history novel whose popularity was owed in part to its role in establishing the importance of a cultural worldview through historical context.

⁴ Margaret Anne Doody makes a convincing argument in the opening of *The True Story of the Novel* (1996)—“Romance and Novel are one. The separation between them is part of a problem, not part of a solution” (15)—that this project does not wish to dispute, but I do believe that it is easier to discuss the respective contributions made to the counterfactual history novel by addressing the influences of the romance and the history novel separately, as these forms made distinct contributions to the counterfactual history novel.

⁵ The romance belongs to a rich literary tradition traced through the Renaissance, the Middle Ages, and all the way back through the Classical period, and making a clear distinction between true histories and historical romances was a topic of great importance to many writers. After all, it would not do to allow the historic trappings of a romance to become confused with the work accomplished by historians, lest one become a living Arabella modeled on Charlotte Lennox's protagonist from *The Female Quixote* (1752). For an in-depth analysis of Lennox's contrasts between romantic tales and history narratives see Everett Zimmerman's essay “Personal Identity, Narrative, and History: *The Female Quixote* and *Redgauntlet*” in *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*'s special issue *Reconsidering the Rise of the Novel* (2000), and the essays “Arabella Unbound: Wit, Judgment, and the Cure of Lennox's *Female Quixote*” by Patricia L. Hamilton, “The Sole Business of Ladies in Romances”: Sharing Histories in Charlotte Lennox's *The Female Quixote*” by Katharine Beutner, and “Reading Female Readers: *The Female Quixote* and *Female Quixotism*” by Marta Kvande, all collected within *Masters of the Marketplace: British Women Novelists of the 1750s* (2011). For more on the history of the romance see Barbara Fuchs' monograph *Romance* (2004).

At the turn of the century, books like Jane Porter's *Thaddeus of Warsaw* (1803) and Sir Walter Scott's *Waverley* (1814) changed the reading tastes of literary Britain while laying much of the groundwork for the counterfactual history novel. Although he was no means the first historical novelist, Sir Walter Scott became one of most influential writers of historical fiction during the first decades of the nineteenth century and as such is often given credit for establishing the history novel's status as the preeminent form of the novel during this period. It was through the history novel that authors like Porter and Scott were able to direct audiences through the worldview of literary characters whose cultural identity resonated with readers' own, and in doing so met with success beyond their expectations.⁶

Yet while the reading public's eagerness for good history novels never faltered, their preferences began to shift yet again around the third decade of the nineteenth century as the professionalization of historical studies as a serious academic discipline began in earnest. A desire for accuracy in historicity was soon transferred even to historical fiction, to the point where novelists found themselves approaching their subject with a historian's eye and relying only upon authenticated sources. For example, while audiences had once welcomed the inclusion of the mythical and supernatural in order to portray culturally accurate depictions of peoples' beliefs, literary and historiographical tastes in the 1830s and 1840s began to avoid including these elements. Even Scott, who had been hailed by the previous generation as a master of this form of literature, was now criticized for including too many fantastic and fictional elements in his history novels. By

⁶ History novels could be profitable, too; Richard Altick has determined that between 1829 and 1849 78,270 sets of the *Waverley* novels were sold (383).

“excluding those elements of tradition, legend, and fantasy that Scott had utilized so extensively and following only bona fide historical sources,” James Simmons explains, these writers reconstructed an earlier period with the deliberate patience and care of an archaeologist fitting together the fragments of some shattered pot. They maintained a strict control over all the fictional elements introduced, never permitting them to dominate. History was not compromised for the sake of the story at hand, as was true of the novels of Scott and his imitators. The goal of these later writers was emphatically not entertainment but rather the instruction of the reading public in the important moments of the past. (36)

While some novelists achieved renown by adhering to these new standards—Edward Bulwer-Lytton, Harriet Martineau, Charles Macfarlane, and Sir Francis Palgrave are a few of the authors Simmons includes in this category (Simmons 36)—not all writers cared to do so, and in many instances the works of historical novelists were compared to actual history texts and still found wanting. Despite the best efforts of novelist-historians, the study of history noticeably diverged from literature during this same period. Between the readers’ mounting interest in fiction with more contemporary settings and the growing professionalization of the history discipline, many novelists turned their

attention away from the history novel, leaving the writing of historical narratives for their colleagues in academia.⁷

History's Rise as an Academic Discipline

Even as the history novel's influence can be seen in counterfactual history novel's development, so too can the professionalization of historical studies in nineteenth-century Britain—albeit in a slightly different manner. If the contents of the traditional history novel of the early nineteenth century in Britain were meant to help readers gain a better understanding of historical events, the introduction of the counterfactual in the history novel challenges these same readers' understanding of history. Novelists were able to make use of the counterfactual because each successive generation of their audiences were becoming more knowledgeable about modern history, thanks to this subject's integration into curriculums into all levels of education which, in turn, made it much more visible in literary culture.

Given the importance of children's historical education in this dissertation's second chapter, it is appropriate that this discussion of historical pedagogy opens with educator Thomas Arnold's contributions to the field of historical scholarship. As the headmaster of Rugby, Arnold caused a great deal of controversy when he added modern history classes to this public school's curriculum in the 1830s. Arnold also played a role

⁷ While many novelists did turn away from the history novel, a few did continue to experiment and were accorded great respect for their novels written within this literary subgenre. Amongst the most noteworthy examples are William Makepeace Thackeray's *Vanity Fair* (1847-48), Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities* (1859), and George Eliot's *Romola* (1862-63). It should also be noted that although they are not history novels in precisely the same vein as those listed above, other authors—like Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* (1893)—were known and respected for their thematic use of history while others still—like Robert Louis Stevenson's *Treasure Island* (1883) and Rider Haggard's *Cleopatra* (1889)—adopted a slightly more cavalier approach to historical accuracy and wrote tremendously popular adventure novels that were set loosely in the historical past.

in the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford's decision formally to acknowledge history as an academic field of study in 1848 and 1852, respectively (Simmons 28-29). "The fault of systems of classical education in some instances has been, not that they did not teach modern history," education reformer Thomas Arnold argues in his essay "Rugby School—Use of the Classics" (1834), "but that they did not prepare and dispose their pupils to acquaint themselves with it afterwards, not that they did not attempt to raise an impossible superstructure, but that they did not prepare the ground for the foundation and put the materials within reach of the builder" (354). Through Arnold and many other teachers and scholars' efforts, historical studies were gradually integrated in educational curriculums across Britain—although it was oftentimes a slow process at the lower levels of education. Universities produced slightly speedier results since Victorian historiography encouraged its students to view this subject's introduction as an act of progress.⁸

This model of historical progress was also carried over from the realm of the classroom to the page of the history text; new standards were decided upon and historians worked diligently to maintain them for the professionalization of their academic discipline. Accordingly, the "'scientific' historian eschewed narrative and popular appeal and composed instead austere accounts, exploring very precise, narrowly formulated questions and aimed at a small but appreciative readership. Such histories were documented by footnotes and bibliographies that grounded them firmly in related scholarship" (Howsam 25-26). While it took slightly longer for these scientifically-

⁸ Reba N. Soffer explains: "History received an important position in the universities because a historical habit of thinking had already led Victorians to imagine individual and national development as a process extending from primitive origins to a civilized present and a still better future" (36).

oriented standards to be incorporated into children's texts and lessons, the remaining impediments standing between students and their modern history lessons gradually gave way as history lessons became both a fundamental element of all students' education and a potential stepping stone to a promising career since the (male) candidates vying for positions within the British Civil Service were obligated to take the Civil Service Exam which included an important history component.⁹ By the second half of the nineteenth century it was quite clear that historical studies were capable of altering both how Britons viewed Britain's history as well as how they might view their own individual roles and legacies in the national narrative. For many, history was no longer solely a narrative controlled by others or confined to pages written about the past—it was also a source of power that they might harness to shape their personal history for future Britons.

⁹ After the recommendations made in the Northcote-Trevelyan Report on the Organization of the Permanent Civil Service of 1854 were made public, the British Civil Service implemented the exam-system to ensure that only the most promising applicants would be hired for this branch of government service. As a result, "From the 1850s on, the textbook assumed a more scientific and examination-orientated form, in which political and national history predominated and the young citizen was encouraged to practise more public virtues which would benefit the Empire" (Mitchell 82).

Contemporary Scholarship and the Counterfactual History Novel

Historically, only a few literature scholars have worked with the counterfactual, but recent trends in scholarship suggest that these circumstances may be slowly changing.¹⁰ This dissertation project, for example, was inspired in part by Damian Walford Davies's "Introduction: Reflections on an Orthodoxy"—an essay found in the collection *Romanticism, History, Historicism: Essays on an Orthodoxy* (2009)—where Davies recommends that scholars specializing in both Romanticism and history narratives take a look at counterfactual history narratives since these pieces may be regarded as an unappreciated form of historical fiction. Davies' argument in this piece may be brief, but it is also compelling. He points out that "no sustained attempt has been made to extend counterfactualism into the spheres of literary studies and literary history" (10), and there "is an opportunity here to embrace more radical rhetorical moves in our attempts to get at—and away from—texts, temporality, and (constructions of) the literary 'past'" (10). Davies is referring specifically to counterfactual histories written during the Romantic era, but the points he makes in this piece are also true of the works written during the Victorian period as well.

¹⁰ There are a handful of historians who have also begun working with nonfiction historical counterfactual narratives in recent decades, including Niall Ferguson who edited the collection essays *Virtual History: Alternatives and Counterfactuals* (1997) and Allan Megill, Steven Shepard and Phillip Honenberger who wrote the chapter ("Virtual History and Similar Works" in their book *Historical Knowledge, Historical Error: A Contemporary Guide* (2007). It should also be noted that there are a handful of literary scholars who work with either late-Victorian literature or postmodern alternative history novels—but not nineteenth-century counterfactual history novels—whose work will become relevant in the next stage following this dissertation project. These scholars and works include Darko Suvin's essay, "Victorian Science Fiction, 1871-85: The Rise of the Alternative History Sub-Genre" (1983) and his book, *Victorian Science Fiction in the UK: The Discourses of Knowledge and of Power* (1983); Karen Hellekson and her *The Alternate History: Refiguring Historical Time* (2001); Gavriel Rosenfeld's "Why Do We Ask 'What If?' Reflections on the Function of Alternative History" (2002); and two unpublished dissertations, across two unpublished dissertations: William Joseph Collins's *Paths Not Taken: The Development, Structure, and Aesthetics of Alternative History* (1990) and Edgar V. McKnight Jr.'s *Alternative History: The Development of a Literary Genre* (1994).

Although Davies was the person to explicitly bring the counterfactual to my attention, his was not the only scholarly work published that year to address the counterfactual and nineteenth-century British literature. In her article “Subjunctive Time: Henry James’ Possible Wars” (2009) Wai Chee Dimock offers an ingenious method of detecting the counterfactual in texts. Although Dimock addresses Henry James’ writing in this piece, she is more interested in his subtle evocations of the counterfactual through careful word choice and punctuation. In essence, Dimock suggests that the counterfactual need not be viewed only as descriptions of possible scenarios, instead, she argues persuasively that readers might spy the counterfactual through what is and is not explicitly stated, that

Ghosts are still afoot in the world. Here, they seem to have made their way into the morphology of the English syntax, creating itineraries that, not having materialized, can be revisited in any number of ways....

Punctuation, syntax, and narrative are compounded matrixes for James, ghostly matrixes. Together they generate a push and pull on the rope of time, roping in events that are not actual, but also not discountable. These events are held in abeyance; and because they are, they also have an unending shelf life, a non-indicative world that will always be there.

(247)¹¹

¹¹The passage Dimock analyzes was one James wrote for an interview: “The war [World War I] has used up words; they have weakened, they have deteriorated like motor car tires; they have, like millions of other things, been more overstrained and knocked about and voided of the happy semblance during the last six months than in all the long ages before, and we are now confronted with a depreciation of all our terms, or, otherwise speaking, with a loss of expression through increase of limpness, that may well make us wonder what ghosts will be left to walk” (James qtd. in Dimock 245).

Dimock's work with the counterfactual here is significant for multiple reasons. To begin, her approach to counterfactual historical texts differs so radically from the traditional narrative-based close reading strategy that it opens a different, more subtle means of interpreting counterfactual. And secondly, the subtextual ghosts with the "unending shelf life" referenced in the passage above encourages the interpretation of nontraditional texts; Dimock suggests punctuation and verb tense, but this same strategy could be applied to both counterfactual narratives and the concept of a counterfactual literary persona—as will be seen in the third chapter of this dissertation.

The third and final piece of contemporary criticism on the counterfactual is Catherine Gallagher's "What Would Napoleon Do?: Historical, Fictional, and Counterfactual Characters" (2011). While Gallagher's argument revolves around the intersection of historical, the fictional, and the counterfactual depictions of historical persons, her work also provides insight into a number of other relevant topics, including nineteenth-century British and French historical literature and the geneses of French counterfactual and alternate history novels. Gallagher's assessment of historical, fictional, and counterfactual depictions of Napoleon Bonaparte is fascinating, but it is her work with counterfactual and alternate history narratives—especially as they pertain to literary history, literary theory, and historiography—that demonstrates the wide range of potential topics that can be brought into discussion with the counterfactual history novels, nonfiction counterfactual history narratives, alternate history novels, and alternate history narratives. If the publication of Davies and Dimock's essay and article signaled an upswing of interest in counterfactual historical narratives by literary scholars, Gallagher's article will hopefully encourage further interdisciplinary speculation and study.

My own goal for this dissertation on the counterfactual historical novel is to ultimately shape it into a publishable monograph capable of providing a more comprehensive reassessment of the relationship between British historiography and historical fiction over the course of the nineteenth century. Many excellent articles and essays have been written by literary scholars (and a few historians) on nineteenth-century British historiography and historical fiction, but few of these works recognize the fundamental affiliation between the form and content of academics and novelists' historical narratives, much less trace their interlinked path throughout the whole of the nineteenth century. While this project is still in the early stages, the preliminary work featured in the first three chapters should give a sense of both scope and scale of this future endeavor.

Chapter Contents

The following chapters progress chronologically, each addressing the authors' use of the counterfactual history in novels, short stories and novellas, and—in one very special case—a literary pseudonym. The dissertation will then conclude with a coda that gives a brief overview of my plans for the next stages of this project.

I open Chapter One with an examination of the counterfactual nature of Sir Walter Scott's *Redgauntlet* (1824). *Redgauntlet* is a well-positioned starting point for this dissertation's discussion of the counterfactual history novel since it also serves as a of capstone for Scott's popular Waverley sequence—the same series of novels through which Scott helped establish the conventional standards for the history novel. Here, I will show that through novels like *Redgauntlet*, novelists could strategically employ the

counterfactual as a platform through which marginalized voices—such as late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Jacobites—might be heard more clearly.

In Chapter Two I offer a glimpse into the way the Brontë siblings experimented with the relationship between history narratives, literary narratives, and a nation's cultural identity by creating their own counterfactual written world, the Glass Town Federation. Charlotte Brontë's practice of continually refining her vision of the Glass Town Federation's past, present, and future through layers of counterfactual narratives reveals how her use of counterfactual narrative made a tangible difference in her life as she worked towards participating in Britain's literary culture as an adult.

And in Chapter Three I explore Mary Ann Evans' complex relationship with the counterfactual in both her novel *Adam Bede* (1859) and the nineteenth-century literary marketplace. By adopting and maintaining the counterfactual literary persona George Eliot, Evans was able to maintain a division between her public and private lives, quietly support the efforts of contemporary women's rights movements, and shape a literary legacy that is still recognized today.

CHAPTER ONE. A COUNTERFACTUAL REVOLUTION: SIR WALTER SCOTT,
REDGAUNTLET, AND THE HISTORY NOVEL

It is both fitting and deliberate that this dissertation's discussion of the history novel begins with Sir Walter Scott's *Redgauntlet* (1824). Many of Scott's works played a significant role in establishing the history novel as a credible form of literature during the first decades of the nineteenth century in Britain, and few were as influential as those belonging to the Waverley sequence.¹² As even a brief survey of *Redgauntlet* scholarship determines, it is difficult to discuss any aspect of this novel without at least a cursory reference to Scott's use of historicity. However, while many scholars have discussed historicity in relation to *Redgauntlet*, what has yet to be fully explored are the ramifications of Scott's decision to write a counterfactual historical novel as the capstone for his *Waverley* sequence. I intend here not only to rectify this oversight, but also to lay the groundwork for a more expansive discussion of British literary culture's shifting expectations of literary and historical narratives throughout the nineteenth century.

Like Darsie Latimer's own efforts to unravel the mystery of his heritage, this project will be an historical inquiry. When Scott first published *Waverley* in 1814, his novel's portrayal of the Second Jacobite Rising of 1745 was taken as a model by many novelists; however, ten years later, in 1824, Scott deliberately chose to deviate from the

¹² In addition to *Redgauntlet*, the Waverley sequence is composed of *Waverley* (1814), *The Black Dwarf* (1816), *Old Mortality* (1816), and *Rob Roy* (1817) ("*Redgauntlet*," *The Walter Scott Digital Archive*).

increasingly scrupulous standards adopted by writers of history novels when he centered *Redgauntlet* on the possibility of a Third Jacobite Rising in 1765. Although it may initially appear illogical that an author whose reputation was built upon his ability to create meticulously researched historical novels would choose to conclude his series of historical novels with the counterfactual Jacobite revolt featured in *Redgauntlet*, I argue that Scott's decision to do so was based upon his confidence in his readers' ability to interpret historical narratives—due in part to his previously published history novels—and that this proficiency could be adapted to consider more theoretical scenarios in counterfactual historical fictions. As this chapter will attest, counterfactual historical fictions were far more than mere literary curiosities. By working with counterfactual history novels, authors could reclaim history for novelists even as historical studies were officially becoming recognized as an academic field of study, and in doing so they could also develop a strategy through which marginalized voices—such as late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Jacobites—could speak freely.

To begin, this chapter will briefly review the events of the Jacobite risings. It will then offer a reading of *Redgauntlet* and demonstrate how effectively Scott prepares his readers to consider the possibilities raised by the counterfactual by easing them through the more familiar territory of historical narrative interpretation. Finally, this chapter will conclude by examining how and why *Redgauntlet*'s counterfactual Jacobite Rising was treated with such disdain by contemporary critics. In short, *Redgauntlet*'s use of the counterfactual may not have been a tremendous literary success amongst its original audience, but with *Redgauntlet* Scott could give the Jacobite movement a final

opportunity to be heard from and, more significantly, meet a better end than this movement was permitted in actuality.

The Jacobite Risings and Sir Walter Scott's *Redgauntlet*

Before this chapter can begin its discussion regarding the relationship between the counterfactual and the nineteenth-century British history novel *Redgauntlet*, it may be helpful to review Jacobitism's history and how Scott portrayed a third, fictional, Jacobite Rising in the final installment of his Waverley sequence.¹³

The genesis of the Jacobite Risings originated in the religious, political, and social unrest of the late seventeenth century.¹⁴ From January of 1689 onward, the royal line of succession was in contention between James Stuart's two lines of offspring: the first line consisting of Mary and William, Mary's sister Anne, and Anne's Hanoverian cousin who would become George I of England; the second line beginning with the James's son borne by Mary of Modena, his second, Catholic, wife—who would later become known amongst his followers as James Stuart or James VIII and III of Scotland and England—as

¹³ It should be noted that the following paragraphs are meant to serve as a general overview and that this outline of the general progress of the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth century Jacobite movement is by no means comprehensive.

¹⁴ In 1685 the staunchly Catholic James—who would be crowned James VII of Scotland and James II of England—succeeded his more moderate brother Charles II. James' ascension to the throne worried many of his subjects; Charles' quiet adherence to the Catholic faith had been tolerated, James's more overt loyalty to the Catholic Church was more problematic, especially given his recent remarriage and the very real possibility of a new Catholic heir. Although James officially adopted a policy of religious toleration, this "policy was seen by some, particularly in the light of renewed French persecution of Protestants, as the beginning of something even more sinister: the restitution of Catholics to power and property, and eventually of Catholicism itself" (Pittock, *Jacobitism*, 15). The subsequent birth of James Francis Edward, Prince of Wales to James's second wife, Mary, in June of 1688 (Szechi xii) was taken by many of his subjects as a sign that a new Catholic dynasty was being established in Britain and as a result, James' daughter Mary and her Protestant husband William of Orange were "invited" by "a small and unrepresentative group of magnates" (Pittock, *Jacobitism*, 15-16) to England in November of that same year. By late December James had fled to France and a month later England's House of Commons declared James's departure an abdication (Szechi xii).

well as his son, Charles Edward Stuart.¹⁵ The Jacobites' efforts to wrest the monarchy back into the control of the Stuarts was not a strictly-British affair; the political, religious, and social ramifications of this conflict spread far beyond the shores of the British Isles and into Continental political concerns as well.¹⁶ Jacobites and their allies were found throughout Europe, and their combined efforts to depose Britain's reigning monarch in favor of a Stuart would span decades, countries, and royal courts.

The introduction of the Jacobite political movement brought another factor into the already volatile mix that was eighteenth-century European politics. Abroad, England was embroiled in armed conflict with a number of countries as England, France, Spain and Austria battled for European dominance; at home, the English worried over Queen Anne's heirless state and the Scottish Parliament's refusal to approve measures that would bring additional financial and martial support in England's war with France (Devine 6-7). Furthermore, the Catholic Louis XIV of France not only actively encouraged Jacobites' efforts in order to undermine his enemy, he also recognized James Stuart as James VIII and III of Scotland and England, thus solidifying both France and the Jacobites' positions in their respective fights against England (Devine 7-8). The English realized that a drastic alteration of the status quo was called for, and a

¹⁵ Supporters of James and Charles Stuart were known collectively as *Jacobites*, a term coined at the turn of the eighteenth century ("Jacobitism"), and James III and Charles Edward Stuart were designated the Old Pretender and the Young Pretender amongst those who opposed this branch of the Stuart family's attempts to regain their lost throne.

¹⁶ France, for example, was the Stuarts' natural and strongest ally; as a Catholic nation who had a long, tempestuous relationship with England, France's rulers were eager to assist James and Charles Edward Stuart and their supporters.

reorganization of the governments of England, Scotland, and Wales was finally settled upon.¹⁷

Although it might have taken decades for the social reality to catch up to the political one, the Act of Union of 1707 effectively united the kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Wales in name and governing bodies. Scottish representatives joined their English and Welsh counterparts in the British Parliament, and citizens from all three kingdoms paid equal taxes and custom duties, and competed for positions within the national government (Colley 12).¹⁸ While the Union was not a popular concept in either Scotland or England (Pittock, *Scottish Nationality* 59), many Scots were particularly outspoken, and as a result in the aftermath of the Union Jacobites were able to solidify their political base; by the elections in 1710 sixteen of the forty-five members of Parliament sent from Scotland were Jacobites, and not long after Queen Anne's death in 1714 a petition openly circulated in Scotland calling for the abolishment of the Union (Pittock, *Scottish Nationality* 63). The Jacobites' efforts intensified further as the Hanoverian George I was crowned, and in August of 1715 the revolt that would become known as the First Jacobite Rising began. This rebellion did not last long, however; despite the best efforts of the Earl of Mar and his 12,000 soldiers, Mar's forces were routed by the Duke of Argyll's army in December of that same year (Harvie, *Scotland: A Short History* 116). According to Murray Pittock, the failed Rising of 1715 "emphasized

¹⁷ While Scotland's ties to England had been strengthened when James Stuart—James IV of Scotland and James I of England—ascended the English throne in 1603 to succeed his childless cousin Elizabeth Tudor, these kingdoms were still distinct entities possessing separate Parliamentary bodies until 1707.

¹⁸ It should be noted that not every administrative aspect in Wales and Scotland was brought under this centralized government; Wales and Scotland both retained some autonomy over their own religious organizations, aristocratic privileges, educational system, and—as a later section of this chapter will discuss in greater detail—legal practices (Colley 12).

to Scottish Jacobites what their English and Irish colleagues already knew: that a successful Rising was unlikely without committed aid from a foreign power. Its conduct demonstrated the grave difficulties faced by the Jacobites in communication and coordination, both within the British Isles and across the Channel” (*Jacobitism* 49). But while the failure of the 1715 Rising may have had a terrible effect on Jacobites’ morale, it did lay the groundwork for a Second Rising in 1745. “The cosmopolitanism of Jacobitism helped to sustain it when in domestic terms it seemed to languish in terminal and impotent decline” (39), T.M. Devine explains, noting that the many Jacobites scattered across the European continent continued to support their cause even in the face of the Rising’s first decisive martial defeat. In Britain, Jacobites continued garnering support for future endeavors, inadvertently assisted by the fact that the British government “did not punish the disaffected areas after the 1715 Rising sent out the wrong signals, and a power vacuum was created which helped to increase the chances of another rebellion” (Devine 41). The opportunity for the Second Jacobite Rising of 1745 came from the Jacobites’ readiness to rectify the mistakes made during the Rising of 1715 and from France’s desire to create a conveniently timed distraction for England while both countries were entangled in the War of Austrian Succession (Harvie, *Scotland: A Short History* 118). This time the Jacobites’ Scottish forces would be supplemented by French troops, resolving one of the major strategic weaknesses of the First Rising.

Unfortunately for the Jacobites, once again their eagerness to instigate a Rising did not necessarily translate to victory. Although Charles Edward Stuart experienced great success in convincing Highlanders to join his campaign, taking Edinburgh in September of 1745, and gaining supporters with each new conquered territory, further

assistance from the Jacobites' French allies was needed to invade England, and France would not be able to supply this help in time (Szechi xxii, 98). By the battle at Culloden in April of 1746 it was clear that this Second Rising, like the Rising of 1715, would be quashed by the English (Harvie, *Scotland: A Short History* 119). The Jacobites were routed first on the battlefield, then in the political arena, and finally in the hearts and minds of this cause's followers as even the staunchest Jacobites were forced to admit that their window of opportunity had closed. The Jacobites' disillusionment in their cause settled in quickly since they were not the only persons to learn from past mistakes—the English were determined that there would be no Third Rising.¹⁹

Tellingly, it was not until the Jacobites' most overt political activity was brought to an end that the idea of Jacobitism became popular throughout all of Britain, and Sir Walter Scott is owed much of the credit for this notable shift in perspective. Through his novels and journal articles Scott presented a new interpretation of Scottish history that all of his readers could follow without questions of political or national loyalty coming into play. "Everything belonging to the Highlands of Scotland has of late become peculiarly interesting" (283), Scott declares in the opening paragraph of his "Culloden Papers" (1816) essay. Confident of his readers' current fascination with all things Scottish, Scott chides his audience, reminding them of their recent ignorance, before noting that

in England, the knowledge of the very existence of the highlanders was, prior to 1745, faint and forgotten; and not even the recollection of those civil wars which they had maintained in the years 1689, 1715 and 1719,

¹⁹ Szechi notes that the majority of the English Jacobite community "lost its faith in the mid-1750s" (130). He then added that some "Catholics stayed loyal to Charles Edward throughout the remainder of his miserable life, but from 1766 he was no longer formally recognised as 'King of England' by the papacy, and their respect for him and remittances to him waned with the passing of the older generation" (130-31).

had made much impression on the British public. The more intelligent, when they thought of them by any chance, considered them [the Highland Scots] as complete barbarians; and the mass of the people cared no more about them than the merchants of New York about the Indians who dwell beyond the Alleghany mountains.... Such was the universal ignorance of the rest of the island respecting the inhabitants of this remote corner of Britain, when the events of the remarkable years 1745-6 roused them ‘like a rattling peal of thunder.’ (283-84)

While Scott may exaggerate the degree of English obliviousness regarding Scottish history and culture, his pointed remarks regarding the Rising of 1745 as the reason behind his readers’ interest in Scotland hit uncomfortably close to home. With its “potent mixture of themes of love, loyalty, exile and loss” (Devine 237), the Second Jacobite Rising’s depiction in both nonfiction history texts and history novels made for a splendid means of capturing and keeping readers’ attention as nineteenth-century Britons contemplated the dramatic scope of the failed Jacobite movement. But to borrow Pittock’s pithy phrase, it was the “rehabilitated Celtic Scotland” (*Scottish Nationality* 79) that riveted the English, not the lives lived by contemporary Scots. It is the contrast between the Scotlands addressed in *Redgauntlet* that makes the final novel in Scott’s Waverley sequence so absorbing. The novels that preceded *Redgauntlet* in the Waverley sequence—*Waverley* (1814), *The Black Dwarf* (1816), *Old Mortality* (1816), and *Rob Roy* (1817) (“Redgauntlet,” *The Walter Scott Digital Archive*)—assisted in the creation of a Scotland whose Jacobitism was safely confined to the past; in *Redgauntlet*, however,

readers have no choice but to envision the ramifications of Jacobitism's revival, should there be a Third Jacobite Rising.

For those unfamiliar with the text, an overview of *Redgauntlet* is called for. *Redgauntlet* opens with a series of letters written between Darsie Latimer and Alan Fairford while Darsie is traveling through the Scottish countryside and Alan establishing his career as a lawyer in Edinburgh. Within their correspondence Darsie and Alan describe their activities and new acquaintances, including two mysterious individuals—a woman who is identified as “Green Mantle,” and a man known only as Mr. Herries of Birrenswork—both of whom prove to be linked to the mystery of Darsie's identity. Matters come to a crux, however, when Darsie is kidnapped and held by Herries—who is actually Darsie's uncle, Hugh Redgauntlet, an unpardoned Jacobite who has been quietly plotting a Third (counterfactual) Jacobite Rising since the failure of the second rebellion in 1745. His interest in Darsie is due to Darsie's birthright as Sir Arthur Darsie Redgauntlet, the head of the house Redgauntlet; Darsie was unaware of his true identity because his mother had arranged for him to be hidden from the Redgauntlets to prevent Hugh from using Darsie as a pawn in his plans to restore the Stuarts to the throne.

Meanwhile, distressed by the implications of the news received in his letters and Darsie's disappearance, Alan leaves Edinburgh to rescue his friend, and discovers that the Jacobite Rising organized by Hugh Redgauntlet is close to taking action and that Charles Edward Stuart has arrived in Scotland in the guise of the Italian priest Father Bonaventura. By informing Stuart of the crimes committed by Hugh Redgauntlet against his nephew in the name of the Jacobite cause, Alan comes closer to achieving Darsie's release, but neither Darsie nor Alan nor Green Mantle (who turns out to be Darsie's elder

sister, Lillas, who did not escape her uncle's custody) are truly free of Hugh Redgauntlet until the Jacobite Rising is destroyed from within.

Darsie's refusal to assist his uncle and the Jacobites may be the most important problem Hugh Redgauntlet is confronted with as the Third Rising dissolves before his eyes, but it is hardly the only one. Much to Hugh's horror, Charles Edward Stuart rebuffs his supporters' request that he give up his mistress and, as a result, effectively divides his powerbase. The Third Jacobite Rising is now in shambles, and when King George III's military representatives arrive to suppress the insurgents Charles Edward Stuart chooses to leave Scotland for the last time. With the would-be rebels utterly routed before the Rising could fully come to fruition, Darsie, Alan, and Lillas are freed and Hugh Redgauntlet elects to live the rest of his life in exile on the Continent. In the novel's final pages readers are informed that Darsie takes up his title and position as the head of House Redgauntlet, Alan and Lillas marry, and Hugh Redgauntlet dies as a monk whose devotion to God was only superseded by his devotion to the Stuarts.

Reading *Redgauntlet's* Histories

From *Redgauntlet's* opening page, Darsie Latimer is introduced to Scott's readers as a man who understands the importance of history narratives. Scott's readers are encouraged to come to this conclusion as they read the first of many letters Darsie writes to his friend Alan Fairford as Darsie reminds Alan about how little Darsie knows about his own past. "I repeat the little history now," Darsie writes to Alan, "as I have a hundred time done before, merely because I would wring some sense out of it" (5). But while his particular interest in history is perhaps a little more personal than most, Darsie Latimer

was hardly the only eighteenth-century Briton trying to make sense of history narratives. Late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century history writers and antiquarians debated fiercely over how nonfiction history narratives should be written and how the field of history would serve the needs of contemporary society. In *The Art and Science of Victorian History* (1985), Rosemary Jann expands on this historiographical moment, explaining that “Enlightenment thinkers in effect applied the same intellectual tools to both nature and history: their purpose in investigating both was to replace transcendental with empirical cause” (xvii). The process through which historical narrative construction was refined would be a lengthy one, spanning the better part of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as schools of theory were developed, university academic departments founded, and pedagogical models tested.

While they may not have been as well-educated in the conventions of historical narrative construction as their late nineteenth-century descendants would be, Scott’s readers would have been familiar with the types of source narratives historians drew upon to write the histories of nations, cultures, and peoples. Consequently, the historical narratives featured in *Redgauntlet* would certainly have been recognized as such by Scott’s readers. By presenting his readers with three distinct types of historical narratives—in the form of folklore, biographical anecdotes, and legal precedent—this novel furthers Scott’s readers’ education in historical theory and narratology while also preparing them for their introduction to counterfactual historical fictions.

Folklore and History

While folklore in and of itself is not inherently counterfactual, the folktales found in *Redgauntlet* establish the groundwork for Scott's counterfactual Jacobite Rising—thus requiring this novel's readers to reconsider the perspective from which Jacobitism and Scottish history and culture were viewed in nineteenth-century Britain. Scott's readers would have been accustomed to reading folklore in history texts; although folktales were not treated as historical narratives in their own right, they were viewed as supplementary texts capable of enhancing cultural understanding (O'Brien, "History and the Novel," 391).²⁰ In this spirit Scott, introduces the folklore featured in *Redgauntlet*. Many of Scott's history novels reference Scottish folklore, myth, and legend, and—as the close reading of *Redgauntlet* reviews included in the second half of this chapter make plain—Scott's readers adored the glimpses of a nostalgic Scottish past found in these works.

But folklore is capable of serving political purposes too, a fact that nineteenth-century Britons tended to disregard when considering Jacobitism and Scott's history novels. As Regina Bendix has noted, "Folklore studies, in the two hundred years they have existed, have always been socio-politically engaged.... Many of the first large folklore collections were the result of sociopolitical aspirations, with antiquarians, for example, collecting specimens of 'otherness,' whether of other times or other cultures" (111). Hugh Redgauntlet certainly viewed the folktales centered on his family history as a wellspring of inspiration for his part in a Third Jacobite Rising—a conclusion that shocks

²⁰ Karen O'Brien has also observed that by the latter half of the eighteenth-century many history writers used established history texts to lay the broad strokes of a particular period's history so their own monographs could focus upon narrower topics: "historians paid greater attention to the social and artistic dimensions of life in the past, and, by the end of the century, produced many more specific studies of particular periods, regions or persons, or topics such as literary history, histories of costume, chivalry and sport" ("The History Market," 106-7).

Darsie Latimer and his companions. Initially, Darsie is under the impression that these folktales are just examples of old Scottish folktales.²¹ It is not until Hugh Redgauntlet begins his contribution to Darsie's education on the history of House Redgauntlet that Darsie realizes that he possesses a familial connection to the stories he is told by Wandering Willie, an itinerant musician whose family once lived on land owned by the Redgauntlets, and the man who turns out to be his uncle.

Wandering Willie's recitation of the events experienced by his relative Steenie Steenson is a striking one, and it is hardly surprising that Darsie is affected by this tale even before he knows of his own ties to House Redgauntlet.²² This story is a thrilling one as it mixes the mundane and the supernatural; its commentary on greed, debts, and judgment is capable of serving, as James Kerr has noted, "not only as a parable of the Redgauntlets' past but as a parable of the novel itself" (252). Generations ago, Willie relates to Darsie, as his "guidesire" Steenie was delivering the rent owed by his family to his liege lord Sir Robert Redgauntlet, a terrible event occurred and before Sir Robert could enter the payment in his account books Sir Robert died (87).²³ Understandably unsettled, Steenie flees, hoping that Sir Robert's butler will find the money he had left behind and finish the accounting—but it was not to be. When Sir John, Sir Robert's heir, arrived at the estate to take his father's place, there was no account settled in the books

²¹ In this sense, Scott is evoking what Peter Brooks refers to as a "narrative impulse [that] is as old as our oldest literature: myth and folklore appear to be stories we recount in order to explain and understand where no other form of explanation will work" (3).

²² In the narrative Darsie keeps for Alan, he observes that Willie began the story "in a distinct narrative tone of voice, which he raised and depressed with considerable skill...turning his clear but sightless eyeballs upon my face, as if it had been possible for him to witness the impression which his narrative made upon my features. I will not spare you a syllable of it, although it be of the longest" (86).

²³ Sir Robert's death is not portrayed as a natural one. According to Steenie Sir Robert fell into a sudden fit, roaring for "cauld water his feet, and wine to cool his throat" (90), but placing Sir Robert's feet in the water only caused it to boil and the wine turned to blood in Sir Robert's mouth.

and no money attributed to the Steenson family in the Redgauntlet coffers. Steenie told Sir John what had happened upon his last visit, but Sir John gave no credit to protestations: “if there be a knave amongst us,” Sir John proclaimed, “it must be he that tells the story he cannot prove” (93). Driven to the end of his wits by Sir John’s relentless questions and demands for proof, Steenie finally responds to Sir John’s query regarding where Steenie thinks the missing money is with the impertinent—but honest—answer: “In hell, if you will have my thoughts of it...in hell! with your father” (94). Although Darsie appears content to regard Willie’s account as pure entertainment, Scott’s reader would do well to note this tale’s insistence upon evidence—an assertion that serves historians well, too.

Much to his lord’s displeasure, Steenie’s answer to Sir John is far closer to the truth than either of these men would like. Upon his second precipitous departure from Redgauntlet Castle, Steenie meets a stranger on the road: the ghost of Sir Robert. Now armed with both receipt and a message from Sir Robert that will allow him to find the payment from the Steenson family, Steenie returns once again to Redgauntlet castle. Sir John was doubly angered by Steenie’s tale and the newly-written receipt signed and dated by his father after Sir Robert’s death, but when the money was found he had no choice but to accept Steenie’s story, allowing that “this vision of [Steenie’s] tends, on the whole, to my father’s credit, as an honest man, that he should, even after his death, desire to see justice done to a poor man like you,” but also cautioned that, “you are sensible that ill-dispositioned men might make bad constructions upon it, concerning his soul’s health” (100) and convinces Steenie to stay quiet regarding the whole affair. Sir John also attempts to burn the receipt written out by Sir Robert’s ghost, but when the receipt was

thrown into the chimney it would not burn and instead “few up the lumm, wi’ a lang train of sparks at its tail, and a hissing noise like a squib” (100). Sir John—however he might wish otherwise—now has his incontestable proof.

Redgauntlet’s readers are not permitted to know Darsie’s immediate, direct reaction to Willie’s tale—Darsie ends the section of his letter to Alan containing Willie’s narrative by noting that, “I continue to scribble at length, though the subject may seem somewhat deficient in interest. Let the grace of the narrative, therefore, and the concern we take in each other’s matters, make amends for its tenuity” (102)—but his own love for narrative and literary elements does suggest that he has been moved more than he permits himself to demonstrate. “I will go on picking such interest as I can out of my trivial adventures, even though that interest should be the creation of my own fancy,” he writes to Alan, firmly declaring his intention that he shall not “cease to inflict on thy devoted eyes the labour of perusing the scrolls in which [Darsie] shall record [his] narrative” (102). Darsie makes good upon his promise and soon has another folktale to relate to Alan—although the circumstances in which he is regaled with this second story of the Redgauntlet family are not nearly as pleasant as the first. Not only has Darsie been kidnapped and placed in the custody by the mysterious Mr. Herries of Birrenswork, Mr. “Herries’s” decision to use this story to inform Darsie that he “descended from this unhappy race” (193) results in a rather traumatic revelation for Darsie. Before, when Willie spoke of the relationship between the Redgauntlets and his own family, Darsie was privileged with the perspective of an outsider; now that he is aware of his heritage, Darsie can no longer ignore the less pleasant implications of belonging to the House Redgauntlet.

As Darsie and Scott's readers are reminded, historical discovery is not always a pleasant process, and there can be times in which it is a painful one.

Unlike Willie (whose family decided to disassociate themselves from the Redgauntlets) and unlike Darsie (who is anything but certain that he wants to be related to the Redgauntlets) Hugh Redgauntlet has embraced the less savory natural and supernatural elements of his family's history. Hugh may not have Willie's eloquence, but the story he relates to Darsie is made all the more memorable by Hugh's straightforward recitation. Hugh's tale of the Redgauntlets also focuses on multiple generations within the family—but in this instance the relationship focused upon is the contentious one between the house's founder, Alberick Redgauntlet, and his son Edward. When Edward fled his father's household and joined the household of his father's enemy, Alberick cursed his "degenerate offspring" (190) and swore that "if they met, [Edward] should perish by [Alberick's] hand" (190). Indeed, Edward did die on a battlefield due to his father's actions—but it was not his father's weapon that killed him; instead, the mortal blow was actually struck by Alberick's horse's hoof, which kicked Edward's head after Edward was unhorsed. Yet while the fulfillment of Alberick's inadvertent prophecy is unnerving, it still falls short of the uncanny event that was to come: when Alberick's wife gave birth to a second son "even the iron-hearted soldiers were struck with horror to observe, that, by the mysterious laws of nature...the evidence of his father's guilt, was stamped on the innocent face of the babe, whose brow was distinctly marked by the miniature resemblance of a horse-shoe" (191). Moreover, according to Hugh Redgauntlet "the fatal sign" (192) has "been so handed down from antiquity, and is still believed" as the members of the Redgauntlet family are marked "by a singular indenture of the

forehead, supposed to be derived from the son of Alberick, their ancestor, and brother to the unfortunate Edward, who had perished in so piteous a manner. It is certain there seems to have been a fate upon the House of Redgauntlet,” Hugh concludes, “which has been on the losing side in almost all the civil broils which have divided the kingdom of Scotland, from David Bruce’s days, till the late valiant and unsuccessful attempt of the Chevalier Charles Edward” (192). As the spectacular ending of this tale and the obvious pride Hugh takes in his heritage demonstrate, it matters little to Hugh Redgauntlet that his ancestors allegedly dealt with the supernatural or that his family line is thought to be cursed—all he needs to know is that these tales are connected to his family. And because this folklore is associated with House Redgauntlet, Hugh reasons, it must follow that the Redgauntlets should take those elements that set them apart from the rest of the Scottish people and change the fate of House Redgauntlet, Charles Edward Stuart, and the whole of Britain.

But while Hugh is happy to claim that he is only playing the role he believes fate has decreed to be his—“Nothing,” Hugh tells Darsie, “nothing is the work of chance.... we play but the part allotted by Destiny, the manager of this strange drama, we act no more than is prescribed, say no more than is set down for us; and yet we mouth about free will, and the freedom of thought and action, as if Richard must not die, or Richmond conquer, exactly when the Author has decreed it shall be so” (193-94)—it does not take Scott’s readers long to realize that Darsie has utterly rejected the possibility of Hugh’s worldview and Hugh’s political agenda. Darsie and Scott’s readers are clearly encouraged to see the value in Scottish folktales and this type of narrative in Scotland’s history, but their vision of Scotland is based upon a different type of historical

narrative—one that prefers Scotland’s romantic tales confined strictly within the past as they, Scotland’s youth, look towards a future based on an ideology that has no room for resurrected Jacobitism.

Women and the History of House Redgauntlet

The second historical narrative recorded by Darsie and Alan is closer to the kind of narrative Scott’s readers might have expected after Darsie was properly introduced to Hugh Redgauntlet and reunited with his long-lost family. But when Darsie is finally given an overview of recent events within the Redgauntlet family history, this narrative comes from an unexpected corner: Lilius Redgauntlet, Darsie’s sister. While the revelation that Lilius is the mysterious woman who was first known as Green Mantle is a surprise for both Darsie and Scott’s readers, the decision that Lilius—a woman—is Darsie’s most detailed and precise source of historical information is even more remarkable. Although Lilius is a participant, witness, and a uniquely-positioned chronicler capable of recording the events experienced by members of her family over the past few decades, hers is a voice that would not typically be featured in histories of the Jacobite Risings—or, for that matter, many histories at all.

British women historians of the eighteenth century have been done a double disservice, first by their peers and then again in contemporary scholarship.²⁴ Like their fathers, brothers, and sons, eighteenth-century women were immersed in a culture

²⁴ While scholars have finally begun the long overdue assessment of women’s contributions to the historiography of eighteenth-century Britain, a great deal of territory has only been only cursorily explored. “A sustained look at British women’s writings of the ‘long eighteenth century’ ... illustrates that women were much more involved in the burgeoning genre of history than we have formally thought” (2) Devoney Looser notes in the introduction of her *British Women Writers and the Writing of History, 1670-1820* (2000).

determined to reshape and redefine history narratives. Yet unlike their male relations, women were expected to fill a specific role in this developing field of history: they were expected to serve as an appreciative audience. By deliberately disregarding culturally-dictated roles and acknowledging Liliás's expertise and Darsie's need to learn, Scott forces his readers to contemplate a small paradigm shift in thought even as he prepares them for the greater, counterfactual, and Jacobite-sponsored one that is yet to come in *Redgauntlet*: the genesis of a Third Jacobite Rising. The writing of history narratives—and co-counterfactual history narratives—requires constant reassessment. As this reading of Liliás Redgauntlet's work will determine, she has proven herself both as Darsie's staunchest ally and as an able chronicler of Redgauntlet family history.

While women historians were uncommon, they were hardly unheard of.²⁵ “History's improving qualities were beneficial to women readers as substitutes for experience, standing in for those parts of the world that ‘ladies’ should not see,” Devoney Looser explains; “Reading history provided a way for women to gain the benefits of understanding aspects of life they were not supposed to have access to without encountering problems of decorum in experiencing them” (18). Perhaps it is because of society's general encouragement that women should read history narratives to the exclusion of almost all other publications that little support was given or attention paid to those women who chose to participate actively in this historiographic transformation over the course of the late eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries. Knowing this, then, it is hardly surprising that many of these women who did write history chose to

²⁵ It is worth noting that there were few histories written from or featuring a woman's perspective during either of these centuries. A great deal more work has been done with nineteenth-century women biographers and historians than their eighteenth-century counterparts.

focus on foreign histories' translation or biographical inquiry.²⁶ In her chapter on nineteenth-century "Living Clios," Rohan Maitzen discusses the logic behind women historians' decision to work within this particular subgenre of history. In this piece, Maitzen argues that biographies and memoirs were the natural type of history text for women to write as they ascertained how to operate in an increasingly professionalized (i.e. male-dominated) discipline:

Memoirs and biographies exist mid-way between the public and the private, the general and the personal. They usually focus on public figures, but interpret their better-known aspects in the light of their personal experiences, sometimes to show them as exemplars, sometimes to show the 'real person behind a careful façade'.... Biographies break down the line between public and private by showing the private aspect of public affairs, or the public manifestations of private problems, or just by making the intimate details of someone's private life public fare. (Maitzen, "Living Clios," 35)

Lilias's keen insight into her family history is because of—rather than in spite of—her sex. As a child and a woman she has been and continues to be relegated to the background when familial politics are brought to the forefront. But as Lilias has learned over the course of her lifetime, being a secondary concern does result in a very good vantage point to gain a first-rate education in House Redgauntlet's internal and external affairs. As a result, Lilias is not only able to utilize her knowledge of the Redgauntlets for

²⁶ In his *History and the Early English Novel: Matters of Fact from Bacon to Defoe* (1997) Robert Mayer explains that "From a seventeenth-century perspective, the assertion that lifewriting is a historical form was entirely unremarkable. In the early modern period the two forms of writing were regarded not just as compatible but as essentially identical" (80).

her own purposes; she is also able to act as a kind of biographer for multiple generations of House Redgauntlet and compose a narrative for Darsie, who urgently needs these layers of intrigue explained. As the previous section of this chapter has demonstrated, Hugh Redgauntlet has already claimed the folklore associated with the more public aspects of the Redgauntlet clan to justify the manipulation of his niece and nephew's lives in order to further the Jacobite cause. Liliass's narrative offers a less biased framework through which Darsie and Alan—and Scott's readers—may view these events.

It is fitting that Liliass's historical narrative counterbalances Hugh's, since Liliass's own agenda is to compensate for Hugh's attempts to manipulate Darsie's personal and political allegiances. But while Liliass Redgauntlet may not have intentionally set out to become the Redgauntlet family historian, she proves to be an excellent one. (Darsie, Alan, and Dr Dryasdust serve as her scribes and compiler, respectively, but the words and perspective from which the narratives are structured are entirely Liliass's own.) Liliass touches only briefly on the family inclination to “[render] vain their courage, their talents, their ambition, and their wisdom” and the family tendency to “pretend to trace this fatality to a legendary history,” (299) choosing instead to focus on more pertinent proceedings that directly relate to the Redgauntlets' current troubles. She informs Darsie of their father's role and death “in the affair of 1745,” and Lady Redgauntlet's subsequent decision to flee “from the north of England, determined to break off all communication with her late husband's family, particularly his brother” (299) whom she blamed for her husband's death. Liliass then expounds further on their mother's feelings towards Hugh, noting that she “lived in continual terror...that she should see the author, as she thought him, of her husband's death, come armed with legal powers, and in a

capacity to use them, for the purpose of tearing her children from her protection” (300). After describing one narrowly averted kidnapping attempt, Lilius outlines the Lady Redgauntlet’s strategy to employ “every precaution her ingenuity could suggest, to keep [Darsie’s] existence concealed from the person whom she feared—nay, from [Darsie’s] very self; for she dreaded, as she is said often to have expressed it, that the wild-fire blood of Redgauntlet would urge [Darsie] to unite [Darsie’s] fortunes to those of [Darsie’s] uncle” (301). Within the space of a few pages Lilius neatly manages to educate her long-lost brother regarding their shared history, efficiently and concisely distilling new information and expanding upon the fragments of knowledge Darsie had gathered throughout the course of his travels and Hugh’s second (successful) abduction.

As a character, Lilius has received relatively little critical attention from scholars and a less history-conscious reading of her role in *Redgauntlet* could argue that she is nothing but a convenient source of information, courtesy of Sir Walter Scott—*auctor ex machina*, if you will. But Lilius’ brief autobiographical account works against this interpretation of her character. As Darsie swiftly learns, there is nothing simple about how Lilius has come by her opinions and knowledge of their family history. While their mother was able to hide Darsie from his uncle (and not so incidentally, Darsie’s origins from Darsie), Lilius was not so fortunate and was educated under Hugh’s patronage at a convent in France. Through Darsie’s questions, readers learn that Lilius deliberately chose to ignore the teachings of the Abbess—a person, she informs Darsie, who was “exactly after [Hugh Redgauntlet’s] own heart” (302)—and that she “felt a childish delight in setting her [the Abbess’s] control at defiance, and contradicting in my secret soul all that I was openly obliged to listen to with reverence. Freedom of religious

opinion brings on, I suppose, freedom of political creed” (303).²⁷ By explaining the methodology that has allowed her to formulate first her religious and then her political perspectives, Liliias explains how intellectual inquiry gives her history narratives greater credibility. Her integrity is strengthened further when considering the sympathetic manner in which she depicts the actions of each of her family members in her oration.

Although Liliias easily considers the actions of her mother and brother’s positions in a favorable light, she is not completely unsympathetic to her uncle’s plight even though she disagrees with both his desire and his plans to spark a Third Jacobite Rising. Furthermore, Liliias does appear to feel remorse for not making her own stance clear to him. Liliias confesses to Darsie that she deliberately hid her political convictions from Hugh Redgauntlet by taking “great care to keep my own secret; so that occasional censures for coldness, and lack of zeal for the good cause, were the worst I had to undergo; and these were bad enough” (303). But despite this pang of conscience, Liliias also has no illusions regarding Hugh Redgauntlet’s ambition: “it is the leading feature in my uncle’s character,” she explains,

that he has applied every energy of his powerful mind to the service of the exiled family of Stuart. The death of his brother, the dilapidation of his own fortunes, have only added to his hereditary zeal for the House of Stuart, a deep and almost personal hatred against the present reigning family. He is, in short, a political enthusiast of the most dangerous

²⁷ Liliias also cites her religious beliefs for assisting her to formulate her political position, crediting “an excellent old mother [in the nunnery] who had adopted the tenets of the Jansenists....The mysterious secrecy with which she included these tenets, gave them charms to my young mind; that I embraced them rather that they were in direct opposition to the doctrines of the Abbess, whom I hated so much for her severity...” (302-3).

character, and proceeds in his agency with as much confidence, as if he felt himself the very Atlas, who is alone capable of supporting a sinking cause. (302)

Lilias may credit her time at convent school for establishing her cognitive processes, but the narrative she confides to Darsie demonstrates that she has learned more from her uncle than she may consciously realize. Lilias was employed by Hugh in his schemes to advance the affairs of the Stuarts, and although she may not agree with Hugh's plans or approve of his methods, she appears to have learned much about plotting and hiding in plain sight. Her Green Mantle persona and her proud declaration that "Now, though I am a tamed Redgauntlet, yet I have still so much of our family spirit as enables me to be as composed in danger as most of my sex; and upon two occasions in the course of our journey—a threatened attack by banditti, and the overturn of our carriage—I had the good fortune to conduct myself, as to convey to my uncle a very favourable idea of my intrepidity" (304) reminds readers that she was under her uncle's tutelage and may adapt his strategies for her own means. Her plan of catching the interest and assuring the assistance of Alan Fairford, for example, suggests that she has taken her uncle's lessons in subterfuge to heart, as does her determination that she herself will be a worthy bearer of the Redgauntlet name. It is her loyalty to her uncle that prompts her to offer impetuously to be his "attendant and [his] comforter in exile" (376), but, as readers might

have foreseen, Hugh Redgauntlet wants no consolation in the defeat of his Rising, and Liliias stays in Scotland with Darsie and Alan.²⁸

Yet even without her uncle's rebuttal, Liliias's alignment with her brother and her friend had already been predetermined through her own actions as well as the narration provided by the omniscient narrator featured within the final volume of the novel: during the climax wherein it is revealed that Hugh Redgauntlet's Rising will not come to fruition, "Darsie, his sister, and Fairford, drew together, and held each other by the hands, as those who, when a vessel is about to founder in the storm, determine to take their chance of life and death together" (371). Scott's description of Liliias standing with Darsie and Alan against Hugh Redgauntlet is a visible rendering of Liliias's long-established political—and familial—position. The extremes to which she was driven to find, educate, and support her brother have been justified, and, together, Liliias, Darsie, and Alan can navigate the tumultuous political currents and guide Scotland's future away from the Jacobites' preferred course.

Although recounting the Redgauntlet family history is hardly Liliias' only contribution to Darsie's journey towards birthright, this simple act is one of Scott's most effective and subtly pedagogical uses of a history narrative in this text. There is no question that Liliias has performed an essential service for her brother and this novel's readers, but more important still is how Scott requires his audience to continually readjust their expectations. In this instance *Redgauntlet*'s readers must reconsider their views regarding women's authorship of historical narratives, just as they will be required to

²⁸ "The fatal doom," Hugh intones dramatically in what, fittingly, proves to be his final piece of dialogue in this novel, "will, I trust, now depart from the House of Redgauntlet, since its present representative has adhered to the winning side. I am convinced he will not change it, should it in turn become the losing one" (376-77).

reflect upon the Jacobites' place in Britain and the many implications of Jacobitism's rebirth in the not-so-distant past and its place in the present day and age.

Writing Legal Histories

While the law's place in *Redgauntlet* is a popular topic in literary criticism, far less attention has been given to the role of Scottish law as historical narrative in this novel.²⁹ By the time readers reach the end of this text it is evident that Scottish legal rulings—they themselves a very specific kind of history narrative—affect many characters within *Redgauntlet*. Amongst *Redgauntlet*'s most prominent examples are the idiosyncrasies of Scottish law that dictated Darsie's guardianship as well as the complications in *Peebles v. Plainstones* that prompt Peter Peebles' increasingly comic (and desperate) efforts to retain the services of Alan Fairford as his legal counsel. Yet what is slightly more opaque is the broader purpose of the legal rulings' place within the text and how Scott's consistent references to court cases are related to his use of the counterfactual in *Redgauntlet*.

The sovereignty of the Scottish legal system is of the utmost importance when considering Scotland's identity as a nation. Scotland's legal system remained as a separate entity from England's even after the Union in 1707, and from that point onward, Scotland's legal identity was one of the key factors distinguishing these two kingdoms from one another. "The independence (or, more correctly, the separateness, since independence implies a movement *from* a more significant body) of Scots law was

²⁹ Two pieces that focus exclusively on Scott's use of the law in *Redgauntlet* are Mark A. Weinstein's "'Law, History, and the Nightmare of Romance in Redgauntlet'" (1983) and Andrew Melrose's "Writing 'The End of Uncertainty': Imaginary Law, Imaginary Jacobites and Imaginary History in Walter Scott's *Heart of Midlothian* and *Redgauntlet*" (1998).

guaranteed in principle by the Act of Union which came into force in 1707,” Michael Gardner explains; “As far as Scots law is concerned, English law is foreign, even though in terms of citizenship England is in the same state and there are many areas, for example the transfer of property, where the systems must regularly negotiate” (100). Finally, Sir Walter Scott had a comprehensive understanding of the enormity of the historical narrative derived from legal rulings since he himself was part of the legal profession. Scott had passed his qualifications as an advocate in July of 1791, was appointed the Sheriff-Depute of Selkirkshire in 1799, and held this office until his death in 1832 (Sutherland 44, 71).

Many scholars have commented upon the similarities between Scott’s life as a young lawyer and his depiction of Alan Fairford’s trials and triumphs at the same stage in his career.³⁰ But Scott’s references to laws and legal cases in *Redgauntlet* are more than semi-autobiographical allusion; instead, Scotland’s unique formalized body of law should be viewed as an archival record of this nation’s history and culture as well as a guarantee of protection afforded to Scotland’s people. In *Redgauntlet* those who uphold, abide by, and contribute to the laws of Britain are favored over persons who would break the law. Consequently, even the counterfactual contemplation of a Third Jacobite Rising is a notion that runs contrary to the historical narrative formed by established legal precedent and, accordingly, is viewed as anathema by this novel’s protagonists. Not even the possibility of a Stuart king on Britain’s throne is prize enough to tempt anyone but

³⁰ For example, Arthur Melville Clark writes at length regarding the parallels between Scott’s life as law student and young lawyer and the experiences of Scott’s character Alan Fairford in his Scott biography, *Sir Walter Scott: The Formative Years* (1970).

characters like Hugh Redgauntlet and his supporters, most of whom are already guilty of breaking lesser laws.³¹ As a result, the Jacobites' efforts to utilize or thwart the law to bring about the violent insurrection that would inevitably accompany a Third Jacobite Rising is viewed not only as an offense against the tentative peace that has been forged between Scotland and England since the Rising of 1745, but also as an affront against all of civilized society.

If a familial unit can be seen as a microcosm of society, then it is hardly surprising that Hugh Redgauntlet's disregard for the legal rights of his relations is tied to his indifference towards the laws of his nation. As Lilius and Darsie learn all too well, Hugh Redgauntlet will only muster interest in legal rulings if they advance his Jacobite cause. As Lilius explains to Darsie, after their father's death, their mother, Lady Redgauntlet, was granted the custody of her children. This custodial arrangement was rather unusual, even in Scotland; despite having a slightly better chance of retaining custody of her children than an Englishwoman, a Scottish woman—even a Scottish noblewoman—was not necessarily granted automatic custody. As John Erskine describes at length in his overview of eighteenth-century Scottish law, mothers were only given custody of their sons in very specific circumstances: namely when no male guardian had been appointed by the child's father and when the child in question was under seven

³¹ While there is not space enough in this chapter to address the subject of resistance by legal and illegal means in eighteenth and nineteenth-century Britain in relation to *Redgauntlet* in full, this topic should be given further consideration in conjunction with the concepts explored in Toni Bowers' *Force or Fraud: British Seduction Stories and the Problem of Resistance, 1660-1760* (2011). Bowers' focus on "narratives of sexual pursuit, resistance, and capitulation" (xv) provides an intriguing platform for a future conversation regarding both Hugh Redgauntlet's efforts in protecting and guiding his Third Rising as well as Darsie's experiences in his uncle's custody.

years of age (117). “The mother, if she continue a widow, is preferred to the custody of the pupil [male child], so long as the pupil is *infantie proximus*, that is, till he be seven years of age, and sometimes longer, according to circumstances” (117) John Erskine writes in his *An Institute of the Law of Scotland* (1773).³² But while Lady Redgauntlet was grateful to be awarded her children’s custody, she was also aware that her husband’s brother Hugh was more than willing to circumvent the legal system in order to gain control of Darsie and control the future of House Redgauntlet. “In England alone,” Lilius explains to Darsie,

the claims of [Hugh Redgauntlet] to the custody of [Darsie’s] person could have been enforced, in case of his being replaced in the ordinary rights of citizenship either by the lenity of the government or by some change in it. In Scotland, where you possess no property, I understand his authority might have been resisted, and measures taken to put you under the protection of the law. (301-2)

Darsie’s brief speculation regarding the powers of the Chancery being invoked for his protection reinforce this notion that Lady Redgauntlet’s pragmatism won out over her idealism. Lilius informs her brother that in the end their mother “trusted more to secreting [Darsie] from [his] uncle’s attempts, than to any protection which law could afford against them” (301). Despite the irregularity of this course of action, Lady Redgauntlet is within her legal rights to hide her son’s identity from him and his whereabouts from his uncle. While it is entirely possible that the Scottish courts would have awarded a different

³² In this chapter Erskine also explains that both the age and the sex of the children in question play an important role in determining custody arrangements, and based on Erskine’s explanations, it is entirely possible that the Scottish courts would award a different verdict regarding Darsie’s guardianship once he turned seven (117), fourteen, or twenty-one (114).

verdict regarding Darsie's guardianship were he older at the time of his father's death—or, alternatively, after he reached these ages—his mother's death effectively prevents alteration in Darsie's custodial arrangements without actually breaking the law.

The heightened emphasis on the legal narrative within *Redgauntlet* is felt throughout the second half of the story as well, although Scott's focus has shifted away from Hugh's destructive relationship with the law and towards Darsie and Alan's more constructive one. Darsie may not be a lawyer himself, but he does have a close friendship with Alan Fairford and lived with Alan and his father after these young men completed their education at school. Alan can be credited for igniting Darsie's brief interest in law courses as well as a greater understanding with his legal rights—knowledge that gives him the confidence to protest his treatment when abducted by his uncle in the guise of Mr. Herris. Darsie's declaration that, "Every British subject has a right to know why he suffers restraint...nor can he be deprived of liberty without a legal warrant" (169) may ultimately prove fruitless (while justifying his mother's fears), but Darsie's failed attempts to free himself through legal redress aptly demonstrate how lawyers like Alan are needed to serve as champions in a society that has begun to favor litigation over violence when resolving conflicts. The growth of an increasingly-educated middle class has endowed its members with a new kind of power to guide the course of their nation, and it is through Alan's work as a lawyer that Scott's readers are reminded of this responsibility.

Alan is an extraordinarily ordinary man—and it is for this reason he is a brilliant exemplary figure when considering the power wielded by those who work with the law. It does not take Alan long to demonstrate that his will be a promising career. Despite his

initial consternation in being the twelfth counselor to represent Peebles in *Peebles v. Plainstones*, Alan's first time in court goes well.³³ In fact, Alan's first day in court goes so well that when Alan—upon receiving the news of Darsie's troubles—leaves abruptly, Peebles chases after him, furious in his belief that Alan has abandoned his client. "I wad hae him [Alan Fairford] brought back to the minding of my business and his ain" (331), Peebles proclaims. While readers are not meant to approve of the lengths to which Peebles goes to retain Alan's services, it is evident that regardless of these extremes, Peebles does actually have a point regarding the importance of lawyers' positions in contemporary society. In addition to contributing to the legal history of their nation, lawyers also act as intermediaries for disputing parties and effectively replace older and more martially-inclined champions. David Daiches has written at length explaining the purpose of the Peebles subplot in *Redgauntlet*, arguing that Peebles' mania for litigation is meant to serve as a parallel for Hugh Redgauntlet's preoccupation with his Jacobite cause. In doing so, Daiches maintains that "there is a sense in which Peter and Redgauntlet are the same character....Here again the contrast between the older Scottish nationalism manifesting itself in military action and the modern Scottish nationalism represented by Scots law is clear" ("*Scott's Redgauntlet*" 145).

By the end of *Redgauntlet* readers have witnessed two transferences of power: the first when Hugh Redgauntlet reluctantly relinquished the power of his name to Darsie, its

³³ Peeble's case is not one that Alan would have chosen for himself, and he writes to Darsie, proclaiming as much: "You must have seen this original, Darsie, who, like others in the same predicament, continues to haunt the courts of justice, where he has made shipwreck of time, means, and understanding. Such insane paupers have sometimes seemed to resemble wrecks lying upon the shoals on the Goodwin Sands, or in Yarmouth Roads, warning other vessels to keep aloof from the banks on which they have been lost; or rather scare-crows and potatoe-bogles [sic], distributed through the courts to scare away fools from the scenes of litigation" (118).

rightful and legal custodian, and then again as Darsie unequivocally rejects the Jacobite cause in favor of contributing to a more enlightened and less violent future for Scotland. There is no place for violence like that of the Second Jacobite Rising in *Redgauntlet*. Instead, as the novel draws to a close, the promise Darsie made to Alan in *Redgauntlet*'s first volume is all but guaranteed: "I step forth, Alan, and in a character, which even your father will allow may be more useful to you than had I shared this splendid termination of your legal studies. In a word, if I cannot be a counsel, I am resolved to be a *client*" (4; emphasis Scott's). And while Peter Peebles may equal Hugh Redgauntlet in terms of sheer single-mindedness, Peebles' obsession will be confined safely within the bounds of the Scottish judiciary system—an accessible public record whose very existence distinguishes Scotland's present from its past while simultaneously differentiating this country from England.

In reading *Redgauntlet*, readers are immersed in this country's legal system's history, its citizens' history, and its folklore. Although the counterfactual Jacobite Rising is the central history narrative within this novel, the emphasis placed on the other history narratives within this text reminds readers that by the time Scott's readers have finished

Redgauntlet, they too are also authorities on these historical narratives and more than qualified to consider the counterfactual possibilities Scott has daringly raised.³⁴

***Redgauntlet's* Reception in Nineteenth-Century British Literary Culture**

Unfortunately, Sir Walter Scott's foray into the counterfactual with *Redgauntlet* was not well received by his critics. Few reviewers were able to muster enthusiasm for *Redgauntlet* in its entirety, and more than one newspaper reviewer devoted column inches expounding on how this book fell short of readers' expectation by being disappointingly dissimilar to the preceding novels in the *Waverley* sequence.³⁵

³⁴ It is not mere happenstance that Scott decided to conclude *Redgauntlet* with Dr. Dryasdust's scholarly epilogue. By the time readers reach the end of *Redgauntlet*, they have been guided through a wide variety of historical accounts as well as a counterfactual third Jacobite rising—and yet it is only after these rather irregular history narratives that they are presented with a polished historical record penned by a scholar in this field. However, the report provided by Dr. Dryasdust (whose name provides readers with a fair idea of the forthcoming document's style and tone), does little more than wrap up the lives of *Redgauntlet's* characters in the traditional manner of novels—not histories—by informing readers of a birthright claimed, a marriage, and an eventual death in exile. More precisely: “Sir Arthur Darsie Redgauntlet was presented to his late Majesty” (378), “Miss Liliast Redgauntlet of Redgauntlet...intermarried with Alan Fairford, Esq. Advocate, of Clinkdollar” (378), and as for Hugh Redgauntlet, he died more quietly than he had live, wearing “Under his habit, and secured in a small silver box...a lock of hair, which the fathers averred to be a relic.... [and it was] doubtful whether, even in the quiet and gloom of the cloister, Father Hugo had forgotten the sufferings and injuries of the House of Redgauntlet” (379-80). Aside from gently mocking the conventions of nonfiction and academic history writing—Dryasdust, in all his pedantic glory, has been featured in other novels belonging to the *Waverley* sequence—Scott does not so much disparage the history narratives written and studied by academics as he does dismiss their special status. The scholarly conclusion to *Redgauntlet* offers this short text only as another type of history narrative; Dryasdust's is actually less privileged than the accounts penned by Darsie and Alan, the folk histories relayed by Wandering Willie and Hugh Redgauntlet, the oral history recited by Liliast Redgauntlet, and the records of Scottish legal precedent to which Alan contributes.

³⁵ Although a handful of *Redgauntlet's* reviews have been preserved in electronic newspaper archives, this literary review will focus on three in particular: the reviews featured in the *Caledonian Mercury*, *The Derby Mercury*, and *The Examiner*. Each of these reviews make a point of mentioning Sir Walter Scott as *Redgauntlet's* author, even though Scott would not publicly concede his authorship until 1827.

The review featured in the *Caledonian Mercury*, for example, does little to excite Scott's readers when it describes *Redgauntlet* as a tale that "does not contain perhaps such vivid exhibitions of Scots manners, nor is so rich in humorous or dramatic pictures as some others by the same author, [it] is nevertheless invested with an air of romance and mystery from which it derives a peculiar interest" ("*Redgauntlet*"). The introductory lines of the review featured in *The Derby Mercury* begin on an equally dubious note, observing that "The day for criticizing the productions of this great and fertile author has gone by, except when perhaps he may mistake his powers upon a subject, and fall short of his own high standard" before grudgingly acknowledging that, despite the reviewers' misgivings, "This Tale is not unworthy of the Author of *Waverley*" ("*Redgauntlet*. A Tale of the Eighteenth Century"). But while these two reviews manage to offer relatively tactful criticism of both novel and author, the reviewer—who is identified only as Q—for *The Examiner* is far less diplomatic in this periodical's assessment of Sir Walter Scott's latest novel:

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. We have never been very fastidious in relation to the too hasty concoction of the Scottish Novels, because the amusement and gratification afforded by them, if different in degree, being in all instances unequivocal, it is ungracious to be continually comparing a genius with himself, and moralising on the superiority of *Paradise Lost* to *Paradise Regained*. . . . *St. Ronan's Well* and *Redgauntlet* are not simply nods on the

part of our Scottish Homer, but sound slumbers—the author absolutely snores. (Q 441)³⁶

When reading these columns collectively one receives the impression that the reviewers (and presumably, their readers) are not certain of what to make of *Redgauntlet* since it is not enough like the previous novels in the Waverley sequence—according to the reviewers of the *Caledonian Mercury* and *The Derby Mercury*—and simultaneously—according to Q of *The Examiner*—too much like its predecessors.³⁷ While all the newspaper reviewers raise a valid point regarding the difficulty of reviewing an author's books without doing them the disservice of comparison to one another—especially when the books in question are meant to be read as a larger body of work—not one amongst them considers the possibility that readers' tastes could have changed since *Waverley*'s publication or that Scott might be deliberately attempting a different type of history novel with *Redgauntlet*. These reviewers' insistence in comparing *Redgauntlet* to the earlier novels in this sequence recognizes Scott as a source of history, but only at the expense of his reputation as an innovator. So while these reviewers' lackluster reactions to Scott's

³⁶ Q continues in this vein for a number of lines while working up to the suggestion that Scott's interest in writing was motivated more by financial gain than literary merit. "Foote observed of David Garrick, that he would never cease acting, while a guinea exhibited cross on one side and pile on the other; and it seems as if something of the same kind may be predicated of the writing of the gold-producing Sir Walter," Q comments before adding that, "Truly this recklessness of character, in comparison with money, is undignified: and if carried much further, even Sir Walter Scott will find an ebb in popular favour, which certainly no man on earth has less honourable temptation to encounter" (Q 441).

³⁷ Judging from Scott's correspondence, he had high hopes regarding *Redgauntlet*'s sales, but unfortunately, the novel's sales fell well short of his expectations. He wrote to James Ballantyne in July of 1824, noting "We must do what we can but the public is like the Lady in Goldsmith's Essays. She came to be displeased and displeased she was. The fact is I have written till I have taught others as Captain Bobadil proposed to teach fencing 'almost if not altogether as well as myself.' The World wants novelty more than superior excellence in what is now rather a less favoured [sic] stile [sic]. The wonder is that they have been constant so long. All this must be heedfully considered [sic]" (Scott, *Letters* 325). Later, Scott's son-in-law and biographer John Lockhart would note that *Redgauntlet* was "was received at the time somewhat coldly, though it has since, I believe, found more justice" (195) and that "had there been no *Waverley*, I am persuaded the fallen and faded *Ascanius* of *Redgauntlet* would have been universally pronounced a masterpiece" (196).

experimentation with counterfactual historical narratives is not initially as illuminating as one might hope, their determination to focus on archetypal characters is telling in its own right.

Given the size of the cast of characters within *Redgauntlet*, the reviews pay a disproportionate amount of attention to the novel's minor characters. By shifting their reviews to focus positively upon *Redgauntlet*'s more familiar archetypal figures, these reviews continually force a comparison between the earlier titles in the Waverley sequence and *Redgauntlet*—to *Redgauntlet*'s detriment. Q, in this reviewer's own inimitable fashion, admits to a fondness for these characters—namely the “admirable sketch of a pirate, not altogether original, but good; a Scottish Writer to the Signet, ditto; a tolerable blind fiddler, a passable Quaker, an amusing Flippertigibbet of a boy” (Q 441) but also damns them with faint praise by noting that “however comparatively inferior, are genuine Sir Walters” (Q 441). *The Derby Mercury* follows suit, referencing Wandering Willie's folktale of the Redgauntlets by noting how “The early part of the narrative gives one of the best ‘auld world stories’ which [Scott's] pen has produced; indeed it constitutes the germ, as it were, of the fabric he is about to raise” before waxing poetic regarding the

many characters [who] are equally well drawn throughout, true to nature, and affecting in their various bearings the progress and development of the story.... being all employed in bringing about the catastrophe in a manner of so skilful, [sic] that the upper agents, including Charles Stuart, Redgauntlet and his other adherents, and every principal personage who figures in the tale, are borne along by the force of the circumstances they

produce, and are placed by them in situations which utterly control their own determinations and actions. (“*Redgauntlet*. A Tale of the Eighteenth Century”)

While this admittedly colorful cast of characters is wonderfully entertaining, given *Redgauntlet*’s status as the final novel in the Waverley sequence and the marvelous adventures experienced by this novel’s protagonists, these are not the names one might expect to serve as the focus of these reviews. Nevertheless, the popularity of the minor characters within the novel is not a singular event. In 1838, well over a decade after *Redgauntlet*’s initial publication, a portion of the novel was dramatized for a theater production at the Adelphi in Edinburgh. The subsequent review published by the *Caledonian Mercury* took pains to inform readers that this adaptation was based only “on a portion of Sir Walter’s Scott’s novel of that name,” (“Adelphi Theatre”) and the stage production was framed in such a way as to give an actor named Mackay “an opportunity of adding to another laurel to his brow in the part of Peter Peebles” whom, the reviewer adds, “is the very life of the piece—on him the chief burden of the plot is made to fall; and excellently well does Mackay sustain the threadbare litigant” (“Adelphi Theatre”). But while it is evident that the reviewer enjoyed both the adaptation and the performance, by reframing this narrative from *Redgauntlet* to focus solely on the adventures of Peter Peebles, *Redgauntlet*—arguably Scott’s most interesting and inventive history novel—has been reduced to a character sketch in which the minor characters have entirely eclipsed the novel’s protagonists. In this adaptation *Redgauntlet* has become a caricature and not even a caricature capable of offering any type of commentary on Jacobitism, Scottish culture, or history narratives, much less counterfactual history narratives.

While it is always interesting to survey which features within a literary work garner the attention of reviewers and audience, these reviewers and public's pointed interest in minor characters' subplots and their general apathy towards Scott's experimentation with his fictitious Third Jacobite Rising are indicative of the tension that still existed between the English and the Scots as citizens of these respective kingdoms reassessed their relationship with one another as co-inhabitants of the growing British empire. As was noted earlier in this chapter, the aftermath of the Second Jacobite Rising definitively redefined the relationship between the Scots and the English. Determined to prevent a Third Jacobite Rising, the English severely punished the remnants of the Scottish Jacobite forces even as they enticed Scottish civilians to assist in the creation of a truly British nation—kingdoms united by cultural assimilation and not just political mandate. Linda Colley addresses this topic at length in *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (1992), noting that despite the numerous economic, martial, and cultural reasons for Scots to seek out lives beyond Scotland's borders, for many Scots it was

the *idea* of empire that proved most compelling. If Britain's primary identity was to be an imperial one, then the English were put firmly and forever in their place, reduced to a component part of a much greater whole, exactly like the Scots, and no longer the people who ran virtually the whole show. A British imperium, in other words, enabled Scots to feel themselves peers of the English in a way still denied to them in an island kingdom. (130)

As Scots ventured beyond their borders—or, alternatively, welcomed English customs and culture into their homes—the English endeavored to embrace Scotland and its culture.

For most English, it was not a difficult undertaking; as Colley has dryly noted, “both sides of the border came to recognise, there were senses in which Scotland was not England’s peer but its superior” (123). Scottish universities educated far more doctors, engineers, and architects than their English counterparts, and the British army welcomed Scottish recruits with great fanfare (Colley 123-24, 120). There were the literary contributions to take into account as well; not only did Scottish universities champion the study of English Literature (Gardiner 31), Scottish writers’ works were incredibly popular amongst English audiences.

But even as Scottish authors celebrated their homeland in poetry and prose, it is evident that the manner in which Scotland’s past was portrayed was shaped deliberately so as to not offend English sensibilities. The English preferred an idealization of Scotland wherein “Scottishness was a matter of the heart alone, of sentiment first and then of kitsch, of bothy ballads, douce ministers, strict dominies and all the characters of childhood memories served *réchauffé* as adult realities” (Pittock, *Scottish Nationality* 79-80) and Jacobitism was, in particular, a sensitive subject. Nostalgic renderings of Jacobites’ tragic end in literature were acceptable; a serious effort to revive the political momentum of the Jacobite movement and bring about a Third Rising—even if this Rising took place only in literary form—was another matter. Knowing this, then, it becomes easier to understand why *Redgauntlet*’s reviewers responded so positively to characters featured in subplots like Peter Peebles and Wandering Willie while remaining so dissatisfied with *Redgauntlet*’s counterfactual primary plot.

In a sense, Scott’s readers are in a situation not entirely dissimilar from that of Darsie Latimer Redgauntlet, who can only express puzzlement when confronted with

Hugh Redgauntlet's invitation to join the Rising. This invitation threatens to disrupt the established paradigm of Darsie's existence. Addressing his uncle, Darsie explains, "I look around me, and I see a settled government—an established authority—a born Briton on the throne.... All without and within the kingdom is adverse to encountering a hopeless struggle, and you alone, sir, seem willing to undertake a desperate enterprize" (317). This analogous comparison to Darsie's position is only strengthened when considering how the British audience—English and Scots alike—regarded Jacobitism as political ideology that belonged to the past. So like Darsie whose familiarity of "a little harmless treason" (187) was previously limited to "Old Ladies of families over their hyson, and grey-haired lairds over their punch... while the former remembered having led down a dance with the Chevalier, and the latter remembered with advantage the feats they had performed at Preston, Clifton, and Falkirk" (187) Scott's readers have neither the first-hand knowledge nor the desire to gain the acquaintance—even through a novel—of Jacobites like Hugh Redgauntlet. Already an ominous figure thanks to the infamy of his surname, Hugh Redgauntlet becomes even more terrifying after he is acknowledged as an active Jacobite who was "furnished with gold from Rome, moved disguised and secretly, through the various classes of society, and endeavoured to keep alive the expiring zeal of their party" (187). The suggestion that an active Jacobite movement exists beneath the sentimental portrayal of Jacobitism Scott's readers were familiar with is very much not to these readers' taste. Given the reviewers' general reaction to this novel, it is no wonder that the indomitable Q of *The Examiner* should voice "another objection to *Redgauntlet*; it is a Jacobite tale, and we have recently had somewhat too much in this strain; not to mention that, in the Author of *Waverley*, it must necessarily lead to a repetition of himself" (Q

441). Q's logic here is rather difficult to follow, seeing as the Waverley sequence is a series of novel is renowned for addressing Scotland's Jacobite history. It is far more likely that what Q is objecting to is Scott's suggestion of a counterfactual Jacobite Rising. And if Q is making this complaint, this reviewer is by no means the only one doing so.³⁸

Although the review featured within the *Caledonian Mercury* does not explicitly refer to or use the word *counterfactual*, it is evident that, like Q, its author did not enjoy the swift resolution of *Redgauntlet*'s ending, an ending that establishes *Redgauntlet*'s status as a counterfactual—opposed to an alternative—history novel. “The author drops the curtain whenever he is tired, leaving his audience to make what reflections they please on the unceremonious treatment received at his hands; and if one or two performers are in the way, he kills them off purely that he may no longer [be] troubled,” the *Caledonian Mercury*'s reviewer writes decisively before granting that the novel's conclusion is a “slight” but avoidable blemish “by a writer of such boundless powers” (“*Redgauntlet*”). Even discounting this reviewer's blatant use of metaphor and hyperbole—readers are granted an excellent summation of later events provided by Dr. Dryasdust and it is revealed that no major characters are murdered, only exiled—it is evident that this columnist for the *Caledonian Mercury* has misinterpreted the events serving as *Redgauntlet*'s climax. While there can be little doubt that this reviewer is referring to the scenes in which Charles Edward Stuart and Hugh Redgauntlet's hopes for

³⁸ Q's distaste for Jacobitism is not only limited to the very suggestion of the movement. Q also cites a dislike for *Redgauntlet* based on the belief that that Scott wrote *Redgauntlet* for financial—opposed to artistic—reasons. And in the final lines of this review Q also makes a point of explaining that “we half suspect that the *Redgauntlet* has been got up as an accompaniment to the restoration of their honours to the attainted Scottish families” he begins, before snidely concluding closing with the comment that “we have no sort of objection to the aforesaid act of favour...we think the restore Peers will scarcely be obligated to Sir Walter for his personification of the sense and magnanimity of their said forefathers, in his grim portraiture of the *horseshoe-headed Redgauntlet*” (Q 441; emphasis Q's).

a Third manifestation of the Jacobite Rising are visibly crushed—first by their followers’ refusal to support the Cause so long as Stuart maintains his mistress and then again by the subsequent arrival of English troops under the command of General Campbell—the actual moment in which this nascent Jacobite Rising experienced its most devastating defeat was when this novel’s young protagonists rejected Hugh Redgauntlet’s efforts to sway them to his cause. Without the support of the next generation—and according to Hugh Redgauntlet, without members of the Redgauntlet family—this Third Jacobite Rising is fated to founder long before mistresses and militias are cited as the cause of these Jacobites’ downfall. Indeed, as Scott determines, there is no possibility that this Third Jacobite Rising could ever have come to fruition since Hugh Redgauntlet’s vision was no longer welcomed by his fellow Scots. So while Scott’s readers may not have appreciated the suggestion of a Third Jacobite Rising, they have no grounds to protest the means by which Hugh Redgauntlet and his followers are vanquished as *Redgauntlet’s* conclusion ultimately foreshadows a future of English-Scottish relations readers have already embraced.

As *Redgauntlet’s* reviews have demonstrated, many of Scott’s readers were a reluctant audience for his experiments with the counterfactual and it is not difficult to understand why. What it meant to be a Briton had irrevocably changed in the nearly eighty years between the defeat of the Second Jacobite Rising and the publication of *Redgauntlet*. Furthermore, Scott himself had played a key role in shaping early nineteenth-century Britons’ expectations regarding Scottish culture and history novels, both collectively and individually. In fact, it was because of Scott’s success with novels like *Waverley* that he gained the reputation of a “brilliant pioneer in the invention of

tradition” (Devine 292).³⁹ That Scott’s readers should have trouble warming to the final work in the Waverley sequence, the novel in which Scott deviates radically from his established pattern of focusing on the factual past and actively questions the romantic Scottish ideology that is (partly) of his own creation, is not wholly unexpected.

Then again, neither is it entirely surprising that Scott should give his readers this moment of reflection when considering Jacobitism’s fate. The English had not treated Jacobites kindly in the aftermath of the Second Rising. But with Scott as the author of this counterfactual Third Rising it was within his power to write a more satisfying end for those with Jacobite political sympathies—an end in which the marginalized Jacobites’ voices are permitted to speak. And although Scott’s conclusion for the Jacobite Risings may have been bewildering for readers who preferred more conventional representations of the Jacobite movement in fiction, Scott’s resolution to do so is honest acknowledgement that the events recorded in history narratives are generally more complicated than standard literary tropes recognize.⁴⁰ While one can hardly categorize the *Redgauntlet*’s conclusion as a Jacobite victory, important distinctions can be made between the defeat of the historical Second Rising and the failed Third Rising Scott

³⁹ Devine likely borrows this phrase from Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger’s collection of essays *The Invention of Tradition* (1983) which, in turn, contains a piece written by Hugh Trevor-Roper entitled “The Invention of Tradition: The Highland Tradition of Scotland” where Trevor-Roper discusses Scott’s efforts in making Scottish culture palatable to the English.

⁴⁰ Scott’s private political convictions may have had a role in *Redgauntlet*, too. As David Daiches points out, “the young Scott considered himself both royalist and Jacobite. The mature Scott, the Scott of the Scottish Enlightenment, retained much of this youthful emotion, while his reason pronounced a very different verdict. He was quite aware of this ambivalence in his attitude” (“Scott and Scotland” 46). P.H. Scott has also commented upon this facet of Scott’s character while considering Scott’s beliefs regarding Scottish-English relations: “What, in fact, was Scott’s attitude to the Union? There are people who tell us, usually without any supporting evidence, that Scott supported it whole-heartedly....Once or twice Scott did express acceptance of the Union, but his acceptance was always reluctant, grudging and conditional. There is no sign in all his writing, or in the reminiscences of his contemporaries, which suggests enthusiasm or passionate belief” (73). And Christopher Harvie describes Scott as “emotionally at least, a Jacobite” (“Scott and the Image of Scotland” 28), even as Scott’s public persona actively sought to contribute to good relations between English and Scots.

chronicles in *Redgauntlet*. True, Hugh Redgauntlet may not be able to perceive these variances, but the Jacobite sympathizers amongst Scott's readers would certainly be able to do so—especially since the consequences of Third Rising, unlike the Second, could not prevent the Jacobites from representing their ideology in literary culture on their own terms.

By the end of *Redgauntlet* the Jacobite movement has been disbanded, and with it, the dissolution of Hugh Redgauntlet's life's work. With no choice but to abandon his secular vocation, Hugh finds little solace in turning towards what most readers would consider a more sacred one—although Hugh does not consider his situation in precisely this light. "I go to the house of another," he informs Lillas and Darsie shortly before his departure from Scotland, "If I leave it before I quit the earth, it shall be only for the House of God" (376). If there is anything Hugh worships it is the House of Stuart; even when the object of his idolatry fails him, he cannot find it in himself to reject it unconditionally. In his grief Hugh insists upon retaining custody of the Redgauntlet family sword, not as a relic of his former life, but because he is determined that it "shall never fight for the House of Hanover; and as my hand will never draw weapon more, I will sink it forty fathom deep in the wide ocean" (376). But by consigning this sword to

the ocean and voluntarily choosing exile, Hugh severs the ties between Darsie and Lillias's heirs and the Jacobite movement—a division that Scott seems to endorse on a textual level, too.⁴¹

The significance of ending the Waverley sequence with *Redgauntlet's* counterfactual Third Rising cannot be understated. In giving Jacobite characters like Hugh Redgauntlet the opportunity to live in exile rather than die at the hands of English soldiers, Scott effectively takes the literary legacy of the Jacobite political movement from the English—or the British—and restores it to the few remaining Scottish Jacobites who remained true to this cause. *Redgauntlet's* counterfactual premise has given faithful Jacobites a more satisfactory conclusion to their struggle than actuality had allowed while definitively reinstating their history into their safekeeping. In doing so, Scott has also opened up new avenues of exploration for history novelists and historians interested in contemplating means through which other marginalized voices might be heard while simultaneously ensuring that these writers would have a historically-conscious audience ready to receive their works. Although the Jacobite Rising featured in *Redgauntlet* did not achieve the kind of victory Jacobites desired, and Scott's final work in the Waverley

⁴¹ Interestingly, *Redgauntlet* is not the first text where Scott suggests that Britons' treatment of the Jacobites will ultimately result in these Scots' voluntary exile, and that these types of departure cause irrevocable damage to Scotland's historical and cultural well-being. In his 1816 "Culloden Papers" essay which describes the events of the Second Rising and how its aftermath affected the Scottish Highlanders, Scott ends his history lesson on a similarly poignant note: "Meanwhile, the highlands may become the faery ground for romance and poetry, or subject of experiment for the professors of speculation, political and economical.—But if the hour of need should come—and it may not, perhaps, be far distant—the pibroch may sound through the deserted region, but the summons will remain unanswered. The children who have left her will re-echo from a distant shore the sounds with which they took leave of their own—*Ha til, ha til, ha til, mi tulidh!*—' We return—we return—we return—no more!'"(333). There is a striking continuity in finding this sentiment echoed in the final novel of the Waverley sequence, especially as *Waverley* itself was published two years before the "Culloden Papers" was printed in *The Quarterly Review* and *Redgauntlet* would not be written for another eight years.

sequence may not have been the literary triumph he hoped for, *Redgauntlet* lays the groundwork for the revolutionary notion of the counterfactual history novels.

Closing

It is one of literary history's bittersweet ironies that *Redgauntlet* received so little critical acclaim when it was first published while twentieth and twenty-first century audiences eagerly consume counterfactual historical narratives and alternative history novels that speculate how the Jacobite Risings might have transformed British history as we know it. The writers of history narratives have come a long way since Scott first published *Redgauntlet*. Scholars and theorists like Alan Megill in his *Historical Knowledge, Historical Error: A Contemporary Guide* (2007) enthusiastically examine the counterfactual's place in the history discipline while cautiously endorsing its use. Students are routinely invited to consider alternative outcomes to historical events even when alternative histories are not the primary focus of monographs; Daniel Szechi provides an excellent example of such casual use of the counterfactual in the introduction of his *The Jacobites, Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (1994), informing readers that "Jacobitism is a fertile source of some of the great 'what-ifs' of British history" (1). And contemporary historians kindle counterfactual contemplation for readers' edification and entertainment by publishing essays like Jeremy Black's "Could the Jacobites Have Won?" (1995), which asks its readers to deliberate over "one of the great might-have-beens of history" (25). *Redgauntlet* may not hold much sway amongst these scholars as a counterfactual historiographical resource, but the underlying premise of this novel has garnered so much interest by contemporary novelists that many have bypassed the

counterfactual entirely in order to write full-fledged alternative history novels capable of exploring alternative endings for the Jacobite Risings

Popular series of books, ranging from Joan Aiken's middle-grade *The Wolves Chronicles* (1962-2005) to Diana Gabaldon's time-travelling *Outlander* novels (1991-present) have fascinated readers for decades as these authors share their visions regarding how life in eighteenth and nineteenth-century Britain would—or, in some instances, would not—have been altered should the Stuarts' campaign have succeed and James III ascend the throne. Of course these novels' purpose is to entertain first, leaving historical education as a secondary concern, but the spark of historical inquiry is still present in these books and may inspire readers to begin historical investigations of their own. And it is with this acknowledgement of the counterfactual's pedagogical implications that we transition from Scott's use of history in *Redgauntlet* to a wider view of historical studies' induction into academia by examining the effects the professionalization of this field had on young Britons, specifically the Brontë siblings of Haworth, Yorkshire.

CHAPTER TWO. PLAYING WITH HISTORY: THE BRONTË JUVENILIA'S WRITTEN WORLD

As Scott's global popularity shows, historical narratives—both history novels and nonfiction historical studies—were influential texts throughout the nineteenth century, but their power was profoundly felt than in the years between 1830 and 1850 when history was gradually integrated into the highest echelons of academia. The debates over the course of these decades regarding historical narratives' form and content noticeably affected British literary culture, as academics and historians considered the nature of the history discipline, the structure and content of its texts, and—most importantly as far as this chapter is concerned—how pedagogy would be shaped to teach history to British children. While scholars interested in Britain's historiography have documented the progress of the burgeoning history discipline through the works of historians and university students, less attention has been paid to how this discussion regarding history's increasing importance in academia may have been viewed by Britain's youngest citizens: the persons most immediately affected by their elders' suggestions regarding history's place within the elementary curriculum. "Until recently," Rosemary Mitchell explains, "most studies of nineteenth-century historiography merely scratched the surface of this historical culture. Most studies of nineteenth-century English historiography tended—and still tend—to concentrate almost exclusively on the texts of leading nineteenth-century

historians, marginalizing the popular, the fictional, and the visual aspects of the historical consciousness” (3). By focusing primarily on works written by British schoolchildren, this chapter establishes that the children of this period could do more than act as recipients of historical information—some were interested in becoming historiographers, too, showing the fundamental role history narrative and history play had even in quotidian domestic life.

This second chapter takes a slightly wider view of historical studies’ inclusion into academia by examining the effects a culturally-heightened awareness of historical studies had on young Britons. More specifically, this chapter is organized around a collection of texts written by Charlotte, Branwell, Emily, and Anne Brontë that will be referred to as the Glass Town Saga.⁴² Here, I argue that the Glass Town Saga demonstrates the Brontës’ appreciation of the close relationship between history narratives, literary narratives, and a nation’s cultural identity. The Brontës’ awareness of the synergistic nature of the bonds between these types of narratives was first formed when they were schoolchildren and then continually reinforced throughout adolescence and adulthood by their collective interest in the outpouring of periodicals, newspapers, and fiction produced by nineteenth-century literary culture. By exploring the narrative-rich environment the Brontës immersed themselves in as they wrote—and wrote about—the Glass Town Saga, readers can see how Charlotte, Branwell, Emily, and Anne Brontë were not only inspired to create a literary world founded upon and shaped by the narratives they read, but also why the Glass Town Saga is built upon counterfactual

⁴² Not every piece of the Brontës’ juvenilia is part of or related to the Glass Town Saga, hence the distinction.

history narratives. Age and inexperience may have initially barred the Brontës from participating fully in literary culture, but the counterfactual history narratives of the Glass Town Saga illustrate how even young Britons recognized the power wielded through history narratives, and that by writing history narratives of their own, the Brontës could harness this power for themselves.

When scholars examine the Glass Town Saga from historical, historiographical, and pedagogical perspectives they will see how these works reveal the Brontës' delight in being the literary and historical authorities of the Glass Town Federation.⁴³ Like Sir Walter Scott's third Jacobite Rising in *Redgauntlet* (1824), the counterfactual nature of this portion of the Brontës' juvenilia was deliberately crafted. But unlike Scott's singular use of the counterfactual, the Brontës' Glass Town Saga possesses an indeterminate number of counterfactual moments that operate on multiple levels. The first and most basic use of the counterfactual is what allowed the Brontës to play with the historical narratives of Britain and Africa—and play they did, shaping and reshaping stories and populating them with their favorite public figures. A secondary counterfactual layer is the result of Charlotte, Branwell, Emily, and Anne's maturation as writers and is visible in

⁴³ Apparently it was not uncommon for nineteenth and early twentieth-century British children to participate in their own private literary culture or create and document imaginary lands. Writers who are known to have done so as children include John Ruskin who "wrote over fifty pages of a little book, measuring only fifteen by ten centimetres, in a minuscule print similarly modelled on book print" (Barker 153), Catherine Winkworth—who would become a friend of Charlotte's—and her siblings who divided "up the realms of Nature among themselves and {developed} stories round their own special possessions" (Barker 153), Charles Lutwidge Dodgson contributed to and edited the magazines put together by the children of the Dodgson rectory, Mary Ann Evans penned her own version of Scott's *Waverley*, Charles Dickens' sons Henry and Alfred put together *The Gad Hill Gazette*, and the Stephen sisters—who would be later known to the world as Vanessa Stephen Bell and Virginia Stephen Woolf—wrote and illustrated *The Hyde Park News* (Alexander, "Elizabeth Gaskell and Victorian Juvenilia" 9-10). This chapter will quote from a great number of edited texts. In order to differentiate between editors' use of brackets and my use of brackets, regular brackets will be used to designate an editor's insertions or clarifications while curly brackets represent my own.

the histories and narratives of Glass Town Saga as the siblings continually added to the established history of the Glass Town Federation.⁴⁴ But like the writers of contemporary comic books, the Brontës rarely let a little thing like narrative continuity stand in the way of the next tale or series of tales they wished to write. While Scott's use of the counterfactual in *Redgauntlet* hinges upon a specific moment in the text, the Brontës' application of the counterfactual is more like a literary version of Schrödinger's cat: one never knows how each succeeding narrative will make use of or discard elements from a previous narrative's contributions to the Glass Town Saga.⁴⁵ Consequently, readers have no choice but to view all narratives associated with this collection of works as true and—simultaneously—untrue, so in both its earliest and its latest stages the Glass Town Saga existed in a permanent paradoxical state as its authors embraced its malleability.⁴⁶ As this

⁴⁴ There are many kingdoms, cities, and territories within the Brontës' counterfactual world. The Glass Town Federation (which would later be known as the Verdopolitan Federation) refers specifically to four kingdoms: Wellington's Land, Sneaky's Land, Parry's Land, Ross' land, and two islands—Monkey's Island and Stumps' Island—whose federal capital is Glass Town (later re-named Verdopolis). Angria—Charlotte and Branwell's best-known territory—is a kingdom tucked within the Glass Town Federation and is the desmesne of the Duke of Zamorna. Gondal is the name of one of the territories in Emily and Anne's keeping. For more on the Glass Town Federation's geography, history, and the divisions between siblings' counterfactual lands see "Glass Town Federation (Verdopolitan Federation)," "Angria, kingdom of," and "Gondal" entries in Christine Alexander and Margaret Smith's *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës* (2006).

⁴⁵ Erwin Schrödinger was the Noble prize-winning physicist who, when describing the nature of wave particles, uses the example of a cat, a Geiger counter, a vial of poison, a hammer and a radioactive substance in a box; according to Schrödinger, until the box is opened and the cat observed, cat must be considered both living and dead (Kramer). In the Glass Town Saga, readers must simultaneously consider how previous narratives may—and at the same time, may not—align with the current narrative they are reading just as they must consider how discussions and portrayals of Britain's history and heroes in the Glass Town Saga may or may not align with what Britons knew to be true.

⁴⁶ This secondary layer of counterfactual moments within the Glass Town Saga can be as slight as the switch of a character's name between narratives—Anne Brontë's Gravey, for example, is first renamed Captain Parry before finally becoming Sir William Edward Parry, the famous Artic navigator—or as overt as the dramatic actions undertaken by the Chief Genii, Tallii, Brannii, Emmii, and Annii, who are Charlotte, Branwell, Emily, and Anne's most powerful alter egos within these texts. For more information on the transformation of Gravey into Parry see the entries "Parry, Sir William Edward (fictional)" and "Parry, Sir William Edward (historical)" in *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës* (2006); for more on the Genii and the correlation between the Brontës and the Genii, see the entry "Genii, Chief (Little King and Queens)" in this reference text.

chapter's readings will make plain, historicity itself is constantly in flux as the Brontës consider how it can best serve the needs of the Glass Town Saga.

Unfortunately, the Brontës' early and untimely deaths meant that the histories and narratives of the Glass Town Saga never reached a mutually-agreed upon state of completion.⁴⁷ This combination of the Glass Town Saga's unfinished state and its authors' determination to maintain their privacy directly affected its treatment by the wider world after their deaths. While serving as Charlotte Brontë's biographer, Elizabeth Gaskell described the juvenilia in a letter to her publisher as "giv{ing} one the idea of creative power carried to the verge of insanity" (*The Letters of Mrs. Gaskell* 398).⁴⁸ Gaskell's assessment of the juvenilia was certainly not helped by the Brontës' decision to write many of the documents in a miniscule hand simultaneously meant to imitate book print and discourage outsiders' eyes venturing where they were not invited. The Brontës' juvenilia's status as a literary curiosity lingered for some time, and it is only within the past few decades that literary scholars have been able to reconsider this opinion, showing

⁴⁷ Although it is not the focus of this chapter's discussion of the counterfactual, it should be at least acknowledged that while many instances of the Brontës' use of the counterfactual are deliberate and collectively approved, others may be the result(s) of tensions between the siblings, and others still may simply be accidental—the Glass Town saga is essentially an incomplete work-in-progress. This chapter, however, is primarily concerned with the Brontës' deliberate uses of the counterfactual.

⁴⁸ Gaskell also includes a description of the juvenilia: "I came away with... a packet about the size of a lady's travelling writing case, full of paper books of different sizes, from the one I enclose upwards to the full ½ sheet size, but all in this \indescribably/ fine writing.—Mr Gaskell says they would make more than 50 vols of print,—but they are the wildest & most incoherent things, as far as we have examined them, *all* purporting to be written, or addressed to some member of the Wellesley family" (Gaskell, *The Letters of Mrs. Gaskell* 398).

that the Glass Town Saga is an intricate body of work worthy of study in its own right.⁴⁹ Thanks to Brontë scholars—most notably and most recently Fannie Ratchford, Carol Bock, Christine Alexander, Margaret Smith, Victor Neufeldt, and Heather Glen—who have painstakingly documented, edited, and written on the texts in the Glass Town Saga to make them accessible to nineteenth-century scholars and general audiences. This chapter contributes to these efforts by observing how Charlotte refined her vision of the Glass Town Federation’s past, present, and future by building later narratives upon the Glass Town Saga’s earliest stories and characters.

Although Charlotte, Branwell, Emily, and Anne all worked on the Glass Town Saga, this chapter will focus primarily on Charlotte’s writings since her Glass Town narratives and journal entries provide the most insight into the Brontës’ maturation as authors.⁵⁰ This chapter will explore the genesis of the Glass Town Saga during Charlotte’s early academic career as both student and teacher by highlighting the texts describing Glass Town Federation’s founding and the formation of its national identity

⁴⁹ To be fair, decades of irresponsible mismanagement meant literary scholars and biographers were not able to offer informed commentary on the body of the juvenilia until the late twentieth century when the works were collected and thoroughly annotated by responsible scholars. For an overview of Brontë juvenilia ownership and see Carol Bock’s chapter “‘Our plays’: The Brontë Juvenilia” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Brontës* (2002).

⁵⁰ The decision to focus on Charlotte’s work was helped by the fact that more of her prose narratives from the Glass Town Saga are available to study. After gifting Charlotte with sole editorship of *The Young Men’s Magazine* in 1829 Branwell began to focus more on his poetry (Alexander, *The Early Writings* 65-65;); he would continue to write pieces for the Glass Town Saga, but he also began to think of the possibility of submitting works for publication in England by 1832 and in 1836 sent *Blackwood’s* a poem under the name *Northangerland*—the name of a ruling house in the Glass Town Saga he favored (“Brontë, [Patrick] Branwell”). As for Anne and Emily, the younger pair of Brontë siblings began to break away from the written worlds controlled by Charlotte and Branwell in 1831 when they grew tired of their characters’ relegation to secondary roles (Alexander, *The Early Writings* 28). While the cultural differences between Charlotte and Branwell’s tropical territories and Emily and Anne’s more temperate lands in the kingdom Gondal are fascinating—this subject will be touched upon briefly with the close reading of “A Day at Parry’s Palace” (1830)—not much of Anne and Emily’s work with Gondal has survived. For more on the poetry and the remaining manuscripts centered on Gondal, see Christine Alexander’s “Introduction” in *Tales of Glass Town, Angria, and Gondal: Selected Writings* (2010).

through its literary culture. This chapter will draw to a close by addressing Charlotte's relationship with the Glass Town Saga as she began writing works set in Great Britain and Europe and intended for a wider readership. Although the shift between writing works intended for private and public consumption may initially appear to be an abrupt one, it—like every subsequent stage of Charlotte's career as a writer—is built upon the lessons she learned as a student, teacher, and author during her decade of writing the Glass Town Saga. And by doing so, this chapter will show how the counterfactual was not only wielded as a means of providing closure for those who had been marginalized in the past, but how its usage could make a tangible difference in the lives of those working to improve their futures.

“We wove a web in childhood”: The Genesis of the Glass Town Saga⁵¹

Over the course of nearly two centuries, tales of the Brontës' childhood have been elevated into British literary legend. Isolated by their widowed father's position as perpetual curate in the rural village of Haworth, West Yorkshire, the Brontë children lived in Haworth parsonage where they roamed the moors, made up stories of fabulous lands and dashing heroes to entertain themselves, and wrote until they produced some of the most beloved novels in the nineteenth-century British literary canon. But while the broad strokes of this biographical sketch are not incorrect, they also lack cultural context. Although the Brontës may have been geographically secluded, their goal of educating themselves—first as students, and then as future educators—was identical to that of many

⁵¹ “We wove a web in childhood” is the first line of an untitled poem written by Charlotte Brontë; the poem in its entirety can be found in on pages 151-56 of *Tales of Glass Town, Angria, and Gondal: Selected Writings* (2010).

of their peers. There were not many employment options for members of the English middle class, but teaching in a school or serving as a governess or tutor in a wealthy household were respectable options for the daughters and son of a clergyman.

What does set Charlotte, Branwell, Emily, and Anne apart from many of the future governesses and tutors who shared their socio-economic class, however, was how they applied what they learned from both educational texts and pleasure reading to create the counterfactual Glass Town Federation and, later in life, become published authors. For this reason there is a great deal of overlap when considering what the Brontës—voracious readers, all—read for entertainment and what they studied as part of their education (as both students and as future teachers). History narratives—in the forms of novels, biographies, dramas, poetry, and classical texts—were an important part of the children’s early instruction, and their introduction would ultimately lead to the creation of a counterfactual world via its literary culture.

Although Patrick Brontë was a trained scholar and a proficient tutor, his “particularly liberal view of education” (Alexander, *The Early Writings* 16) permitted his children to indulge their curiosity and focus on topics that interested them.⁵² In addition to overseeing his children’s lessons with his sister Elizabeth Branwell (“Charlotte Brontë”), he also gave Charlotte, Branwell, Emily, and Anne free access to the books and magazines in his library—an act that has been called one of Patrick Brontë’s “greatest gifts to his children” (“Charlotte Brontë”)—as they were educated at home from June of

⁵²That said, Patrick Brontë did possess the qualifications to teach; he had his degree from St John’s College in Cambridge and was the author of several books (Alexander, *The Early Writings* 13).

1825 until January of 1831.⁵³ The family's collection of books is known to have contained the novels, poetry, the plays of authors like Scott, Cowper, Byron, Wordsworth, Milton, and Shakespeare; books like John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, Hannah Moore's *Moral Sketches*, a translation of *The Arabian Nights' Entertainments*, Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, Aesop's *Fables*; and textbooks like J. Goldsmith's *A Grammar of General Geography* and Rollin's *History* as well as the formatively influential periodicals *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* and *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country* (Bock, "Our plays': The Brontë Juvenilia" 44). The Brontës also subscribed to the *Leeds Intelligencer* and the *Leeds Mercury* ("Books Read by the Brontës"), and local libraries were made accessible to the children by their father; Patrick Brontë joined the Keighley Mechanics' Institute after its founding in 1825, and Christine Alexander speculates that the Brontës may have had access to the private family library of their neighbors, the Heatons of Ponden House (Alexander, *The Early Writings* 20-21). The breadth and variety of texts the Brontës had access to would serve as a sturdy foundation for both the children's studies and as source material for their entertainment.⁵⁴

Even as young children the Brontë siblings made resourceful use of novels and histories, incorporating much of this material into playtime activities. Alexander has compared the Brontës' plays to role-playing games, explaining that, "Like all normal

⁵³ The elder Brontë daughters, Maria and Elizabeth, began attending the Clergy Daughters' School in July of 1824; Charlotte joined them in August, and Emily in November of that year (Barker 128-29, 134). Unfortunately, this school was not a healthy environment; Maria died of consumption in May of 1825 and Elizabeth died of what was probably typhus in June, the same month Charlotte and Emily were withdrawn as pupils (Barker 137-38). As for Branwell, Patrick had always intended to teach his son himself—as Julie Barker explains: "There was no one better qualified than himself to teach Branwell, either academically or morally" (133).

⁵⁴ While this is a lengthy list, it is by no means a comprehensive one. For more information on the texts and resources the Brontës had access to see the entries "Books owned by the Brontës" and "Books read by the Brontës" in Christine Alexander and Margaret Smith's *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës* (2006).

children, their earliest games were physical: they encountered the adult world by re-enacting historical stories or contemporary political events.... As their reading skills advanced, their play become literary rather than physical” (Alexander, “Elizabeth Gaskell and Victorian Juvenilia” 9).⁵⁵ In June 1825 Charlotte was nine years old, Branwell had turned eight that month, Emily would turn seven in July, and Anne was five years of age. Among their many games were activities referred to as “bed plays” that appear to have introduced even before the deaths of the Brontës’ elder sisters Maria and Elizabeth (“Bed Plays”; Barker 151) and are featured prominently in Charlotte’s short essay, “The History of the Year” (1829). According to Alexander, Maria was the Brontë who taught her younger sisters and brother how to adopt new identities with each new storyline, and according to Alexander the children were spoiled for choice: “Fairy stories, local legend, adult conversation, books and newspapers would supply the outline of a character; their imaginations could do the rest” (*The Early Writings* 25). Although, strictly speaking, “The History of the Year” is a precursor to the Glass Town Saga, this piece serves as both transition and foundation as the Brontës conceived how these playtime activities might be transformed into written works.⁵⁶ Perhaps even more importantly, however, the contents of “The History of the Year” also shows how the siblings made increasingly creative use

⁵⁵ Alexander continues this line of inquiry by adding (on a slightly darker note) that the games that would become the Glass Town Saga “infused their language and writing, and it absorbed its players over such a length of time and intensity of commitment that all happiness for two at least of the players was inextricably bound up with playing the game. Like some young computer whiz obsessed by the ‘Dragons and Dungeons’ {sic} games of today, Branwell Brontë never escaped his fictitious Angrian world; and Emily continued to play the Gondal game until the year of her death” (Alexander, “Elizabeth Gaskell and Victorian Juvenilia” 9).

⁵⁶ It should be noted that the word *play* is being utilized by the Brontës and contemporary scholarship in two overlapping (but compatible) contexts: *play* as in *playtime* and *play* as in *drama*. As this section should make clear, the Brontë children often enacted stories—plays—during the hours set aside as playtime.

of their lessons as they crafted the stories that would lead to the genesis of the Glass Town Federation.

Charlotte opens “The History of the Year” with scrupulous attention to detail. In the space of a few sentences she notes the location and activities currently occupying her father, her brother, her sisters, her aunt, and Tabby (the household servant) while Charlotte herself is “sitting by the table writing this in the kitchin {sic}” (3). She then continues by naming both the newspapers (the aforementioned *Leeds Intelligencer* and the *Leeds Mercury*) and the magazine (*Blackwood’s Magazine*) her family subscribes to, and listing the respective head editor of each periodical and his editorial staff.⁵⁷ After reaching this point Charlotte is finally ready to address the purpose of this essay—to document the plays she and her younger siblings created and staged. Here, Charlotte explains that that

Our plays were established: Young Men, June 1826; Our Fellows, July 1827; Islanders, December 1827. Those are our three great plays that are

⁵⁷ Bock addresses this topic in detail as she explores how nineteenth-century literary culture inspired and influenced the Brontës’ juvenilia. She writes: “Periodicals like *Blackwood’s* and *Fraser’s* played a key role in the formation of the middle-class reading audience during the early nineteenth century. Through their letterpress, illustrations, advertisements, prefatory and back matter, such magazines textually constructed a hypothetical group of readers—an imagined community of like-minded consumers of print—with which actual readers of the periodical learned to identify through the process of reading itself. At the same time, these literary magazines strenuously engaged in the process of defining authorship within their pages; they repeatedly confronted readers with verbal and visual images of popular authors of the day; they discussed the nature of various authorial types in reviews and ‘original papers’; they dramatised supposed authorial experiences in skits and ‘conversations’ between real and imaginary writers; and, not least of all, the producers of these magazines inscribed their own print personalities and practices within each issue published. In an important sense, then, such magazines directed a massive game of ‘making-up’ literary culture in the 1830s, and in that respect they were fundamentally similar to the ‘plays’ about literary life that the Brontë children were writing at the same time” (Bock, “‘Our plays’: The Brontë Juvenilia” 45). Heather Glen has also written on how, for Charlotte, “the influence of the multi-voiced *Blackwood’s* and *Fraser’s* is central” (10). “And it may be traced not merely in her mimicry of these journals’ protean contents, their quicksilver changes of tone,” Glen continues, “but in the sense that pervades all her youthful writings, of the literary world as a place not of artless self-expressiveness but of artful self-presentation, in which different roles may be tried out, contemplated, explored and satirized; a place of not monologic fantasy but heteroglossic and self-reflexive ‘play’” (10).

not kept secret. Emily's and my bed plays were established the 1st December 1827, the others March 1828. Bed plays mean secret plays. They are very nice ones. All our plays are very strange ones. Their nature I need not write on paper, for I think I shall always remember them. The Young Men play took its rise from some wooden soldiers Branwell had, Our Fellows from Aesop's Fables, and the Islanders from several events which happened. (C. Brontë, "The History of the Year" 3)⁵⁸

Although the plays themselves were not included in this essay beyond basic descriptions, her desire to preserve these early works—at least, in part—suggests that Charlotte, five weeks shy of her thirteenth birthday, may have already been considering the significance of historical narratives and recognizing the plays as narratives worthy of preservation. That she should devote an equal amount of space describing the plays as she does her family is certainly indicative of her belief in their worth. And her decision to begin to chronicle the plays' existence two years after their inception is telling, too. After all, there are advantages to shifting these playtime dramas to a text-based medium. Doing so would allow the expansion of each participant's contribution to the collaborative work while also permitting more complex stories to be told—and, as the following paragraphs in this essay indicate, the Brontës were developing increasingly inventive storylines in their plays.

Charlotte's overview of the plays gives readers insight into how she and her siblings incorporated their lessons and readings into other activities. One of the best-

⁵⁸ Alexander has commented on the curious nature of the secret bed plays and suggests that they originated from the fact that "since Charlotte and Emily shared the same small bedroom, their 'bed plays' were probably the result of conversations before they went to sleep" (*The Early Writings* 26).

known excerpts from the Brontë juvenilia is Charlotte's explanation of the origins of the "Young Men's" play, which Charlotte begins by noting that

Papa bought Branwell some soldiers at Leeds. When Papa came home it was night and we were in bed, so next morning Branwell came to our door with a box of soldiers. Emily and I jumped out of bed and I snatched up one and exclaimed, 'This is the Duke of Wellington! It shall be mine!' When I said this, Emily likewise took one and said it should be hers. When Anne came down she took one also. Mine was the prettiest of the whole and perfect in every part. Emily's was a grave-looking fellow. We called him Gravey. Anne's was a queer little thing, very much like herself. He was called Waiting Boy. Branwell chose Bonaparte. (C. Brontë, "The History of the Year" 3-4)

This passage encapsulates the multifaceted nature of the Brontë juvenilia. While the Brontës were still young enough to take pleasure in new toys, they were also wanted the toy soldiers to possess distinct identities—identities that were collectively inspired by a combination of their lessons and their own imaginations. Charlotte and Branwell's eagerness to name their soldiers after their military heroes and Emily and Anne's willingness to create new characters nicely foreshadow the fusion of fact, fiction, and counterfactual history the Brontës create in their Glass Town Saga, as do the additional creative liberties the Brontës took with Aesop's *Fables* and the lives of public figures populating the other bed plays Charlotte describes in the "The History of the Year." The siblings dabble with the fantastic in the "O'Dears," which features characters drawn from Aesop's *Fables*, each portrayed as giants "6 miles high" (C. Brontë, "The History of the

Year” 4), and the “Islanders” each takes possession of an island and decided who would live upon each one, choosing notable writers, politicians, and soldiers.⁵⁹

The collective agency of group authorship seems to have appealed to the Brontës.⁶⁰ Perhaps it was because they collaborated on their creative works, but it is also likely that they were inspired by certain models of authorship they found in the periodicals they read and re-read with great attentiveness.⁶¹ Since the Brontës had already had a taste of what it was like to play multiple roles in their bed plays, taking up multiple authorial personas must have been a natural transition as they began writing their stories down. And when consulting the dates in the juvenilia manuscripts, it is clear that the Brontës made this leap across literary genres swiftly and wholeheartedly. “The History of the Year” was written by Charlotte on March 12, 1829; by April 15 she had completed “The Twelve Adventurers,” the first tale of her contributions to the Glass Town Saga and

⁵⁹ The “O’Dears” play is described as follows: “We pretended we had each a large island inhabited by people 6 miles high. The people we took out of Aesop’s Fables. Hay Man was my cheif [sic] man, Boaster Branwell’s, Hunter Anne’s, and Clown Emily’s. Our cheif {sic} men were 10 miles high excep[t] Emily’s, who was only 4” (C. Brontë, “The History of the Year” 4). The “Islanders” play is given in slightly more detail: “It was one wet night in December We were all sitting round the fire and had been silent some time, and at last I said, ‘Suppose {sic} we had each an Island of our own.’ Branwell chose the Isle of Man, Emily Isle of Arran and Bute Isle, Anne, Jersey, and I chose the Isle of Wight. We then chose who should live in our islands. The chief of Branwell’s were John Bull, Astley Cooper, Leigh Hunt &c, &c. Emily’s Walter Scott, Mr Lockhart, Johnny Lockhart &c, &c. Anne’s Michael Sadler, Lord Bentick, Henry Halford, &c, &c. And I chose Duke of Wellington & son, North & co. 30 officers, Mr Abernathy, &c, &c” (C. Brontë, “The History of the Year” 4).

⁶⁰ Heather Glen has remarked upon Charlotte’s inclination to not take on the identities of their chosen protagonists, instead developing “a rather more complex play, which pivots on identification with power, but on its objectification—‘this is the Duke of Wellington’, not ‘I shall be the duke’. It is a play that offers its own distinctive and unexpected comment on that ‘language of power’ which Brontë herself found so enticing” (21). One could, however, also make the argument that the Genii characters are a general exception to this rule.

⁶¹ In the first half of “The History of the Year” Charlotte makes a point of listing each periodical’s editorial and writing staff, the most impressive list belonging to *Blackwood’s Magazine*, “the most able periodical there is. The editor is Mr Christopher North, an old man, 74 years of age. The 1st of April is his birthday. His company are Timothy Tickler, Morgan O’Doherty, Macrabin, Mordecai Mullion, Warrell, and James Hogg, a man of most extraordinary genius, a Scottish shepherd” (3). What makes this list of memorable names even more remarkable is that they are actually pseudonyms that allowed the authors in question to participate in a series of “boisterous imaginary conversations” (Alexander, *Tales of Glass Town* 499n3). The Brontës would make use of this multiple-pseudonym approach throughout the Glass Town Saga.

one of the *Two Romantic Tales*.⁶² The Brontës' meticulousness also resulted in manuscripts that looked as much like a professional publication as any document written out by hand could.⁶³ They sewed the pages of their tales and poems together in imitation of professionally published magazines, pamphlets, and books, all the while writing in "a miniscule hand, designed to look like bookprint, which allowed them to write many more words to the page" (Barker 152-53). And despite this extra work they seemed to enjoy the irony of this situation; for example, the title page of Charlotte's "The Search after Happiness A Tale" (1829) tells readers that this piece was written by "By Charlotte Brontë Printed By Herself And Sold By Nobody" (C. Brontë, "The Search After Happiness" 42) and is amongst the juvenilia's most memorable. But even as these alterations allowed the Brontës to create a written world whose appearance and contents were modeled on the literary culture of Britain, there was another reason for the adaption of this approach: modeling their handwriting on bookprint also helped the Brontës exercise greater control over who would be physically able to read these miniaturized texts.⁶⁴

The issues of artistic control and direction were growing increasingly important to the siblings as they dedicated themselves to expanding and redefining the world of the

⁶² The second story in the *Two Romantic Tales* was "An Adventure in Ireland" and is dated April 28. But because this is an Irish ghost story and "one of the few juvenile stories unrelated to the Glass Town and Angrian saga" ("*Two Romantic Tales*") it will not be discussed in our reading of the Glass Town Saga.

⁶³ Fannie Ratchford describes Charlotte and Branwell's first efforts in writing and binding miniature books earlier in 1829 in *The Brontës' Web of Childhood* (1941). According to Ratchford, the first of Charlotte's books was a "diminutive volume of six leaves measuring 2 ½ x 2 ¼ inches made up like Branwell's first volume, of a few words and many illustrations" (17-18).

⁶⁴ Julie Barker elaborates on the Brontës' motivation for doing so: "The writing cannot be read easily without a magnifying glass, but as all of the young Brontës were shortsighted, this would not have been so much of a problem to them. The tiny hand also had the advantage of being illegible to their father and aunt, so the children enjoyed the delicious thrill of knowing that the contents of the little books were a secret shared only among themselves" (153).

Glass Town Federation. It is not a coincidence that Charlotte's departure for Margaret Wooler's school at Roe Head in January of 1831 would coincide with Emily and Anne's resolution to focus more on their own writing partnership and stories set in their kingdom of Gondal ("Emily Jane Brontë") instead of continuing their characters' adventures under the leadership of their elder brother and sister.⁶⁵ Meanwhile, Charlotte—who would become infamous at her new school as "an invaluable story-teller" (Gaskell, *The Life of Charlotte Brontë* 133)—may have described the process of creating the magazines and booklets in which she and her siblings wrote their juvenilia but "no one wrote in it, and no one read it, but herself, her brother, and two sisters" (Gaskell, *The Life of Charlotte Brontë* 130). The Brontës' protectiveness towards and affection for the Glass Town Saga would remain consistent for the whole of their lives. They may have created it because they could not actively participate in Britain's literary culture as children, but they continued to work on and reference this counterfactual written world during both their adolescence and early adulthood. In the meantime, however, the Glass Town saga would begin to serve yet another purpose for Charlotte as she left her home and family to attend boarding school.

⁶⁵ A more definitive schism between the older and younger siblings would come two years later in March and April of 1833. Branwell appears to have been particularly offended by this desertion and Barker suggests that Emily and Anne's decision is what caused Branwell to scold his younger sisters for abandoning their characters in a "thundering" (Barker 193) editorial in the Brontës' *The Monthly Intelligencer*. In this eccentrically punctuated piece he informs his readers that "When a Parent leaves his children young and inexperienced, and without a cause absconds, never more troubling himself, about them those children according to received notions among men if they by good fortune should happen to survive, this neglect and b[e]come of repute in society are by no means bound, to believe that he has done his duty to them as a parent, merely because they have risen nor are they indeed required to own or treat him as a parent, this is all very plain, and we believe that 4 of our readers will understand our aim in thus speaking" (B. Brontë, "A Few Words to The Chief Genii" 250).

**“Miss Brontë, what are you thinking about?”: Student, Teacher, and
Writer⁶⁶**

New academic and social challenges occupied much of Charlotte’s time as she settled into life at Roe Head. Although Charlotte’s initial assessment went poorly—according to her instructors, she arrived at Roe Head “well-read, but not well-grounded” (Gaskell, *The Life of Charlotte Brontë* 129)—Charlotte rapidly gained a reputation as a good scholar both inside and outside of the classroom. Amongst her peers she was known for her story-telling and her great admiration for Arthur Wellesley, the Duke of Wellington (Gaskell, *The Life of Charlotte Brontë* 130-31). It is during this period of Charlotte’s life that Elizabeth Gaskell describes her as “an indefatigable student: constantly reading and learning; with a strong conviction of the necessity and value of education, very unusual in a girl of fifteen” (*The Life of Charlotte Brontë* 133). But in spite of Gaskell’s editorializing, Charlotte’s interest in her education and pedagogy may not have been quite as remarkable as Gaskell would have her readers believe.

As Brian Robert Morris, Lord Morris of Castle Morris, has reminded scholars, Charlotte, Emily, and Anne’s schooling was always intended to be “essentially vocational. You learned your lessons because you wouldn’t get a job unless you did. In their case, the {Brontë} sisters accepted early in life that they were fated to become governesses, or, at the best, teachers in their own school, and so you simply had to learn what you would later teach” (9). Charlotte’s early commitment to her education as a step towards her future as a governess and as a teacher can be seen in her behavior at home, at school, in

⁶⁶ The question quoted in this subtitle belongs to one of Charlotte’s students who had abruptly interrupted her vision of Glass Town; the passage in its entirety can be found in on pages 156-57 of *Tales of Glass Town, Angria, and Gondal: Selected Writings* (2010).

her juvenilia, and even her closest friendships attests to the veracity of Morris' observation. By the time Charlotte arrived at Roe Head she had already spent five and a half years studying under her father's direction as well as nearly two years of working on the Glass Town Saga with Branwell, Emily, and Anne. The transition between her education at Haworth and her education at Roe Head may not have been entirely frictionless, but the move between these two stages in Charlotte's education would be nothing compared to the next one when she discarded the role of pupil to become an instructor in her own right. Although Charlotte herself did not know it, the Glass Town Saga would serve as a safe haven when coping with the challenges of teaching.

While Charlotte may have spent the better part of her student years preparing to become an educator, the entries she wrote in what is now known as *The Roe Head Journal* between 1836 and 1837 while teaching at Margaret Wooller's school show that no matter how hard teachers in training work it is not possible to prepare for every aspect of life as an instructor and that some knowledge comes only with experience.⁶⁷ Eleven years later, in 1848, Charlotte would have cause to reflect upon this fact when writing to one of her publishers, W.S. Williams, in response to his commentary upon governesses and teaching. In her letter Charlotte elaborates upon the gap between a teacher's preparations and what she would face in actuality, explaining that "The young Teacher's chief anxiety, always is, to know a great deal [and] her self-control the requirement will be enormous; on her animal spirits (and woe be to her if these fail!) the pressure will

⁶⁷ Charlotte held several teaching positions over the course of her career. Her first job began in June of 1832 when she was hired to serve as the superintendent of the national Sunday school in Haworth ("Chronology"); she would return to Roe Head as a teacher in July of 1835 ("Brontë, Charlotte").

be immense” (C. Brontë, *The Letters* 2: 64).⁶⁸ Charlotte’s tone in this passage is characterized by calm certainty—by 1848 her voice was that of an experienced teacher. But as the entries in *The Roe Head Journal* indicate, this was not the case at the beginning of her career. Teaching can be a stressful experience, and the pressures Charlotte acknowledges in the letter written were very much evident in the entries written while she was employed as an instructor at Roe Head. Further complicating these circumstances is the tremendous contrast between Charlotte’s anxiety when interacting with her pupils and the far happier moments she reveals when considering the Glass Town Saga.

A journal entry written on August 11, 1836 illustrates Charlotte’s situation; she begins by exclaiming, “All this day I have been in a dream, half miserable & half ecstatic: miserable because I could not follow it out uninterruptedly; ecstatic because it shewed almost in the vivid light of reality the ongoings of the infernal world” (*The Roe Head Journal* 162). It seems that after completing a day of lessons with extremely taxing students, Charlotte sat quietly in her empty classroom, wondering whether she was “to spend all the best part of my life in this wretched bondage, forcibly suppressing my rage at the idleness, the apathy and the hyperbolic & most asinine stupidity of those fat-headed oafs, and on compulsion assuming an air of kindness, patience & assiduity?” (*The Roe Head Journal* 162). These gloomy musings were then interrupted by a most-welcome thought

⁶⁸ William Smith Williams was associated with Smith, Elder and Company, Charlotte Brontë’s publishers. For more on Williams’ relationship with Charlotte, see the entries “Williams, William Smith” and “Smith, Elder and Company” in *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës* (2006).

rushing impetuously, all the mighty phantasm that we had conjured from nothing to a system strong as some religious creed. I felt as if I could have written gloriously—I longed to write. The spirit of all Verdopolis, of all the mountainous North, off all the woodland West, of all the river-watered East came crowding into my mind. If I had had time to indulge it, I felt that the vague sensations of that moment would have settled down into some narrative better at least than any thing I ever produced before. But just then a dolt {a student} came up with a lesson. I thought I should have vomited. (C. Brontë, *The Roe Head Journal* 163)

The volatility of Charlotte's mood as she swings from misery to ecstasy and back to misery again explains why she would find solace in the Glass Town Saga. Although Charlotte and her siblings were not always in perfect agreement regarding their plans for their jointly-created narratives, Charlotte possessed an autonomy within the Glass Town Saga she lacked in life.

And while it is true that Charlotte had exercised this same control over the Glass Town Saga as a student, her need for control was not so great as it would be when she was finally employed as a teacher. As a young girl, Charlotte converted a playtime activity into a written narrative; as a student, Charlotte's studies enriched the Glass Town Saga as she gained confidence in her abilities as a writer; but now, having accomplished a goal she had spent the whole of her academic career working towards she found writing to be a more satisfactory challenge than teaching.

The Glass Town Saga remained an important constant throughout much of Charlotte's young life, even as her relationship with the juvenilia changed to reflect the

her transitions from child to adult, student to teacher, and eventually, from the creator of a counterfactual literary culture to a full participant in British literary culture.

Consequently, the Glass Town Saga is also a record of Charlotte's maturation as both an educated woman and as a writer since its contents reflect her interests; the benefits of her education; and her experiments with literary genres, narrative structures, character development, national identity, and authorship itself. Building upon our discussion of Charlotte's education, the next section of this chapter will consider the logistics of this written world and how the Brontës used of the counterfactual in the Glass Town Saga's construction.

“O Angria Arise!”: Charlotte Brontë's Glass Town Saga⁶⁹

As even a cursory examination of the manuscripts of the Glass Town Federation will reveal, the scope and scale of the Brontës' counterfactual world is breathtaking. Indeed, in creating the Glass Town Saga, the Brontës' vision could, at times, eclipse their sources of inspiration since their transformative counterfactual approach allowed them to create a written world that was—and was not—different from the Britain their fellow citizens were acquainted with. Yet had the Brontës shared the Glass Town Saga with their friends and neighbors it is not outside the realm of possibility that they would have recognized its central underpinnings too, as the Brontë siblings' fertile imaginations made good use of histories, novels, and periodicals to shape the Glass Town Federation. The Brontës' evocation of Britain's past and present facilitated the invention of a new

⁶⁹“O Angria Arise” is part of the final line of Branwell Brontë's poem “An Angrian Battle Song.” This poem is credited to Branwell's character-persona H. Hastings. To read this poem, see Christine Alexander's edited edition of *Tales of Glass Town, Angria, and Gondal: Selected Writings* (2010).

counterfactual society through a flourishing literary culture on African shores. Although the Brontës wrote many short stories, poems, and novellas in the Glass Town Saga, this chapter draws on nonfiction narratives that tell of Glass Town's founding, and pieces written for the *Young Men's Magazine* that provide a sampling of its leading citizens' characters and ambitions while also foreshadowing the Brontës' plans for the first great narrative arc of the Glass Town Federation's history.

Introducing Arthur Wellesley (and Eleven Other Adventurers)

The Brontës did not establish Glass Town within Britain, but the placement of this counterfactual realm was, nevertheless, largely influenced by accounts of British explorers, merchants, soldiers, and missionaries who turned their attention to lands and peoples beyond the shores of the British Isles. Great swathes of territories on the vast continent of Africa were still regarded as cartographic mysteries from the European perspective, but it was in the better known Gulf of Guinea that the Brontës envisioned the founding of the Glass Town Federation. As Patrick Brantlinger has noted, areas like Africa where European colonies were established were generally understood incorrectly by Europeans to be “virtually empty—‘waste places’” (25) and that “Wherever there are barbarians and backward peoples...a social vacuum exists into which the energies of progressive, industrious, white and preferably Protestant races can and should flow” (25-26). According to Charlotte Brontë's account, in the case of Glass Town's founding fathers, fate itself appeared to invite their presence—that is, if fate's guiding hand belonged to Charlotte herself as her narratives intervened in the biographical narrative of her personal hero, Arthur Wellesley.

Both Arthur Wellesley and the events that would lead to the founding of the Glass Town Federation are introduced in the tale of “The Twelve Adventurers” (1829). This narrative begins with the account of the British ship *Invincible* which set sail from England in 1793. The *Invincible* was in sight of Spain when it was suddenly blown off course by a great storm; after making landfall in Trinidad it headed eastward into the South Atlantic. The ship eventually anchored in a small, natural harbor on the coast of Africa where to the crew’s “great surprise we found it cultivated....We were greatly surprised at these marks of the land being inhabited. It seemed to be part of an immense continent” (C. Brontë, “The Twelve Adventurers” 7). It did not take long for these impromptu British explorers to meet the cultivators, and after the Ashantee refused the Britons shelter a brief battle—won by the British—ensued. In exchange for the return of the Ashantee chief, the Britons accepted a “proposition of peace....as it was on terms the most advantageous to ourselves” (C. Brontë, “The Twelve Adventurers” 8). From this point forward, the formation of the city of Glass Town seems all but inevitable. Having successfully subdued the native populace—and established their own superiority through a show of force as well as the tacit approval and assistance of the Genii—the business of creating governmental, social, and physical structure of Glass Town could now begin.⁷⁰

Although the men who sailed on *Invincible* are named at the beginning of “The Twelve Adventurers,” it is clear from the moment that the Britons meet the Ashantee that

⁷⁰ The Brontës’ depictions of Africa, the members of the Ashantee tribe, the Genii in general, and the Brontë Genii personas are (individually and collectively) all topics worthy of much more thorough discussion than what can be accomplished within this chapter. Some work with these subjects has already been accomplished by Tanya Llewellyn’s “‘The Fiery Imagination’: Charlotte Brontë, the *Arabian Nights* and Byron’s *Turkish Tales*” (2012), Christine Alexander’s “Imagining Africa: The Brontës’ Creations of Glass Town and Angria” (1996), and Meg Harris Williams’ “Book Magic: Aesthetic Conflicts in Charlotte Brontë’s *Juvenilia*” (1987) but further discussion as to how these topics intersect with the Brontës’ use of the counterfactual historical narratives would be an interesting project in its own right.

Arthur Wellesley is meant to stand apart from the rest. He may be described by Charlotte as only “a common trumpeter” (C. Brontë, “The Twelve Adventurers” 9), but it is Wellesley who takes the initiative to first speak with the Ashantee, and it is Wellesley who causes the Genii to rise from their thrones in their palaces and announce that the Duke of Wellington is among them, prophesizing Wellesley’s future victory over Napoleon.⁷¹ While there is no textual evidence that Wellesley recognizes himself as the figure in the Genii’s prophecy, Wellesley is singled out from the rest of his companions by taking the initiative in each scene; his decisiveness is most noticeable when it is his strategy that leads the sailors-turned-settlers to vanquish the Ashantee for a second time before Wellesley decides to return to Britain.

For readers primarily acquainted with Charlotte Brontë’s literary work through her novels, the insertion of Arthur Wellesley in the Glass Town Saga and the high esteem she held Europe’s most famous soldier, Field Marshal Arthur Wellesley, the first Duke of Wellington, may come as a shock. But the significance of Wellesley’s military career and his prominent place in the national consciousness made him a larger-than-life figure for many people much older than Charlotte Brontë was when she first learned his name and of his deeds. As contemporary military historian Philip Haythornthwaite has described him, Arthur Wellesley was

⁷¹ The prophecy recited was: “A prince will arise who shall be as a thorn in the side of England, and the desolator of Europe. Terrible shall be the struggle between that chieftain and you! It will last many years, and the conqueror shall gain eternal honour and glory. So likewise shall the vanquished, and though he shall die in exile his name shall never be remembered by his countrymen but with feelings of enthusiasm. The renown of the victor shall reach to the ends of the earth. Kings and Emperors shall honour him, and Europe shall rejoice in its deliverer. Though in his lifetime fools will envy him, he shall overcome. At his death renown shall cover him, and his name shall be everlasting!” (C. Brontë, “The Twelve Adventurers 11).

one of the greatest of all military commanders, and was arguably his nation's most outstanding personality during his lifetime....Although his most notable successes were in the field of arms, culminating with a crucial role in the final defeat of Napoleon, in succeeding years he held his nation's highest civil as well as military office, and, ultimately, despite his proverbially reserved exterior, won a place in the hearts of his countrymen.

(ix-x)

Charlotte's fascination with Arthur Wellesley can be observed throughout her life, in the counterfactual histories she crafted for her favorite hero within the Glass Town Saga as well as the opinions she shared with family and friends. Although Charlotte chose not to share the Glass Town Saga with her classmates, these girls would not have been astonished to learn of Wellesley's central role in this growing body of work since one of Charlotte's schoolmates at Roe Head noted that Charlotte "worshipped the Duke of Wellington....She would launch out into praises of the Duke of Wellington, referring to his actions... She said she had taken interest in politics ever since she was five years old" (Gaskell, *The Life of Charlotte Brontë* 131). Years later, while completing her education abroad in Belgium under the supervision of Constantin Heger, Charlotte's fondness for Wellesley is seen again, this time in an essay meant to address the death of Napoleon Bonaparte.⁷² And finally, even after Charlotte purposefully distanced herself from the Glass Town Saga to focus on other works of fiction, a conversation with and recorded by

⁷² The essay "The Death of Napoleon" concentrates on Bonaparte for approximately three-fifths of the piece before shifting its attention wholly to Wellesley's character, reputation, and—according to Charlotte—his rightful place in Europe's history. To read the essay in question, see Sue Lonoff de Cuevas' translation of Charlotte and Emily's works, complete with Constantin Heger's comments and corrections, in *The Belgian Essays* (1996).

fellow writer Harriet Martineau reveals that Charlotte's affection for Wellesley had not waned.⁷³ Charlotte's spirited public adulation for Wellesley and his many accomplishments was likely not unique, but the roles she earmarked for him within the Glass Town Saga are unparalleled even when compared to those he earned throughout his career.⁷⁴

Wellesley's inevitable return and rise to power in the Glass Town Federation does not take place immediately—at least not from the perspective of the other characters in the Brontës' "The Twelve Adventurers." For readers, however, the period during which Wellesley is away from Glass Town proceeds much more swiftly; the account notes that after Wellesley's ship returns to Britain the citizens of Glass Town "continued at war with the blacks, and then made peace, after which, for about ten years more, nothing happened worth mentioning" (C. Brontë, "The Twelve Adventurers" 13). This single sentence is all that separates Wellesley's departure from and his return to Glass Town;

⁷³ At some point between 1850 and 1851 Martineau read Charlotte an excerpt from the opening chapter of the history text she was writing, one that addressed the Peninsular War: "I read the page or two to her, as we stood before the fire, and she looked up at me and stole her hand into mine, and, to my amazement, the tears were running down her cheeks. She said, 'Oh! I do thank you! Oh! we are of one mind! Oh! I thank you for this justice to the man.' I saw at once there was a touch of idolatry in the case, but it was a charming enthusiasm {for Wellesley}" (Gaskell, *The Life of Charlotte Brontë* 610n2).

⁷⁴ In life, Arthur Wellesley held many positions, titles and honors. Wellesley entered the military in 1787 with a commission as an ensign in the Seventy-third Highland Regiment; he eventually achieved the rank of Field Marshal in 1813, and briefly served as Commander-in-Chief of the British Army in 1827 before relinquishing this position in 1828 to serve as England's Prime Minister (Haythornthwaite xi, xiv, xv; "Duke of Wellington"). Largely thanks to his military victories, Wellesley also managed to collect a number of aristocratic titles. Before he became England's Duke of Wellington in 1814 (Haythornthwaite xiv), Wellesley was granted his first titles in the British peerage as the Baron Douro of Wellesley and Viscount Wellington of Talavera and Wellington in 1809, and the Earl of Wellington and the Marquess of Wellington in 1812 (Haythornthwaite xiv, xiii). And these British peerages proved to be only the first of many more to come; with the permission of the British crown, Wellesley was awarded a number of European titles in honor of the service he had performed for the Continent. In 1811 Wellesley was made Portugal's Conde do Vimeiro, in 1812 Spain's Duque de Ciudad Rodrigo and Portugal's Duque da Victoria and Marques de Torres Vedras, and in 1815 Wellesley became the Netherlands' Prince of Waterloo (Haythornthwaite xiii, xiv; "His Grace the Duke of Wellington"). Yet despite Wellesley's exploits—or, alternatively perhaps it is because of them—Charlotte's plans for her hero in the Glass Town Saga surpass what Wellesley accomplished in his own name as a soldier, a statesman, and a peer of multiple realms.

the very next paragraph consists of an announcement made on May 16, 1816 by a voice whose words “passed through the city saying, ‘Set a watch on the tower which looks towards the south, for tomorrow a conqueror shall enter your gates!’” (C. Brontë, “The Twelve Adventurers” 13). While Charlotte clearly meant for this to be an ambiguous announcement, is hardly a surprise for readers when it is revealed that Wellesley has arrived and he is reintroduced as the Duke of Wellington. The population of Glass Town then gathers inside the Grand Inn—“a most superior building and large enough to accommodate 20,000 men” (C. Brontë, “The Twelve Adventurers” 14)—and the highlights of Wellesley’s career are made known to the public, the Genii’s prophecy of Wellesley’s triumph over Napoleon is reviewed and confirmed, and his elevation to the peerage is announced. These declarations are accompanied by a description of how “all the civilised world had rung...and how all the high sovereigns of Europe had honoured England with their presence on that grand occasion” (C. Brontë, “The Twelve Adventurers” 14) and it is clear that the narrative is building to a literary crescendo whose greatest height is reached when it is proclaimed that on June 14, 1827, Arthur Wellesley became the elected ruler of Glass Town.

The Many Counterfactual Layers of the Glass Town Saga

The introduction of and instrumental roles assigned to Arthur Wellesley in the Glass Town Saga neatly exemplify the two-fold counterfactual nature of the Brontës’ narratives. By writing Wellesley into their juvenilia the Brontës were also writing their way into the same literary culture that had educated them about Wellesley and, as a result, created a counterfactual history narrative that was aligned—at least in part—with

Wellesley's life. Although Charlotte had already made her preference for Wellesley clear when she claimed her toy soldier in 1826, dubbing him "the Duke of Wellington" (C. Brontë, "The History of the Year" 3), it is probably not a coincidence that Wellesley's ascension to Glass Town's throne occurred in "The Twelve Adventurers" only four months after Wellesley became Britain's Prime Minister in 1828.

But as further investigation regarding Arthur Wellesley's centrality in Charlotte's works in the Glass Town Saga demonstrates, it was not possible for the Brontës to make Wellesley's role as the destined ruler of Glass Town without deviating from this iconic public figure's documented life. More importantly, however, the Brontës' plans for Wellesley as the prophesized "conqueror" (C. Brontë, "The Twelve Adventurers" 11) meant that they could not interfere with Wellesley's early career as he gained the experience he would require to best Napoleon Bonaparte, "the desolator of Europe" (C. Brontë, "The Twelve Adventurers" 11). So rather than provide a complicated explanation or make use of overt Otherworldly implications—although the presence of the Genii could, arguably, be a gesture in this direction—the Brontës adopted an even more effective strategy: they simply allow the history of Glass Town to coexist with the historical narratives that had inspired the playtime activities recorded in "The History of the Year"—the foundation the Glass Town Saga was built upon. Through this process the counterfactual Wellesley could arrive in Africa on the *Invincible* in 1793 in the Glass Town Saga while Wellesley—in actuality—was serving first as a major and then as a lieutenant-colonel in the Thirty-Third Regiment and, in his private life, courting his

future wife, Kitty Parkenham (Haythornthwaite xi, Longford xix).⁷⁵ But even as the first layer of the counterfactual was created via Charlotte's "The Twelve Adventurers," the Brontës would soon begin introducing secondary counterfactual layers as additional narratives were added to the Glass Town Saga.

If much of the Glass Town Saga originated from the Brontës' willingness to treat their counterfactual world on equal footing with the world they actually inhabited, it was their practice of expanding their juvenilia without bringing each new narrative into continuity with the older narratives that allowed them to eventually develop a second counterfactual layer within the Glass Town Saga. As Charlotte, Branwell, Emily, and Anne expanded the Glass Town Saga it was not at all unusual for one sibling's latest work to contract, alter, or modify characters, events, or even the chronology of what another sibling had previously established. For example, almost seventeen months after Charlotte wrote "The Twelve Adventurers," Branwell wrote his own version of Glass Town's founding in his "The History of the Young Men from Their First Settlement to The Present Time" (1830-31). In this text readers are treated to Branwell's interpretation of the Brontë siblings' acquisition of the toy soldiers as well as Branwell's history of the founding of Glass Town. Branwell's account is both similar to and vastly different from Charlotte's record of these events, a fact that Branwell indirectly acknowledges near the end of this piece's introduction, noting "what is contained in this History is a statement of what Myself, Charlotte, Emily and Anne really pretended did happen ... during the period of nearly 6 years, though in some places slightly altered according to the form and

⁷⁵ For a more complete overview of the life of Arthur Wellesley, Duke of Wellington, and the Arthur Wellesley whom Charlotte and her siblings wrote about in the Glass Town Saga see the entries "Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of (historical)" and "Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, Duke of (fictional)" in *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës* (2006).

taste of the aforesaid Young Men. It is written by Captain John Bud the greatest prose writer they have among them” (B. Brontë, “History of the Young Men” 63). Through John Bud, Branwell reshapes and refocuses the history of Glass Town’s founding by adopting a more scholarly voice, offering additional insight into the victories of the *Invincible*’s crew, and revising the timeline and chronology of the events first described by Charlotte.

Although Branwell openly recognizes his shared responsibilities as an author of the Glass Town Saga, the heightened contrast between the narrative voices in “The Twelve Adventurers” and “History of the Young Men” is foreshadowed by these pieces’ respective titles. While Charlotte’s “The Twelve Adventurers” is, functionally—but not stylistically—a history, Branwell’s “History of the Young Men” is clearly written in imitation of the history texts the Brontës studied. Like Charlotte, Branwell begins with an overview of these lands’ pre-Glass Town history, but unlike his elder sister’s work which fuses fact with fantasy without additional interpretation, Branwell’s opening could be taken as an introductory text on European-African history.⁷⁶ In “History of the Young Men” Branwell begins by explaining that

Guinea or Ashantee is a large country, or rather a number of countries extending 1700 miles from East to West and 500 from North to South; it is bounded eastward by the immense deserts extending far into the interior of

⁷⁶ “The Twelve Adventurers” also opens with Charlotte describing the country of the Genii, but her depiction is told from a more mythic perspective: “There is a tradition that some thousands of years ago twelve men from Britain, of a most gigantic size, and twelve men from Gaul came over to the country of the Genii, and while there were continually at war with each other and, after remaining many years, returned again to Britain and Gaul. And in the inhabited [parts] of the Genii country there are now no vestiges of them, though it is said there have been found some colossal skeletons in that wild, barren land, the evil desert” (5).

Africa; to the Westward lies the north Atlantic sea; on the South it is bounded by the Gulf of Guinea, and on the North by the far extended range of the Jibble Kumri or mountains of the Moon. When and by whom this part of Africa was first peopled cannot at this distant period of time be fully ascertained, but the most likely conjecture seems to be that its first Inhabitants were the Ancient British and Gauls who some time about AM 2000 came over the country and peopled the south Eastern parts of it. What became of them is not now known; some assert, and among this number is the Author of the *Romantic Tale* published between 20 and 30 years ago, that after continual and ferocious wars among themselves, which lasted for many years, they returned again to their native countries, while other authors state that, for the noble and daring spirit they showed in resisting the cruel and infamous oppressions of the Genii, they were forever rooted out and destroyed by those heartless monsters. Which of these traditions may be correct it is useless at this time to determine, for who in A.D. 1830 can pretend with exactness to state what happened in A.M. 2000? (B. Brontë, "History of the Young Men" 64)

While the deviations from Charlotte's "The Twelve Adventurers" may at first seem trivial, Branwell accomplishes a great deal. Not only does he definitively establish Glass Town's geography and location, he also comments upon its pre-history—and in doing so, introduces one of the Glass Town Saga's clearest examples of internal counterfactual chronology. By referring directly to the *Romantic Tale* (which, properly, is actually Charlotte's *Two Romantic Tales*, the title of the two-part collection containing Charlotte's

“The Twelve Adventurers” and “An Adventure in Ireland”), Branwell deftly alludes to the earlier text outlining Glass Town’s history; this reference is, however, is even more ambiguous than his phrasing might make it seem. Branwell’s vague indication that *The Romantic Tales* was published “between 20 and 30 years ago” may initially read as an attempt to correct these discrepancies by offering a newly revised version of Glass Town’s history, but the problem with this interpretation is that Charlotte wrote and “published” *The Romantic Tales* in in April of 1829, only twenty months earlier in both actuality and in Glass Town’s internal chronology.⁷⁷

This chronological inconsistency might cause distress were it not almost immediately apparent that it is only the first of many. As one reads on, it becomes evident that there are many differences in “The History of the Young Men” that expand upon, contradict or alter the sequences of events featured in “The Twelve Adventurers.”⁷⁸ There are also a number of significant events in Branwell’s history that were not mentioned “The Twelve Adventurers”—such as a noticeable increase in conflicts between the English and the Ashantee, a British-born nobleman who ruled in Glass Town before Wellesley, and England’s request to Glass Town’s founders that one “come over and

⁷⁷ Carol Bock raises several good points regarding the subjective nature of truth found in all history narratives and the discrepancies in the factual information found within the narratives of the Glass Town Saga, noting that it was likely that “Charlotte {was} aware of the unstable and plural nature of the reality that she was trying to convey” (*Charlotte Brontë and the Storyteller’s Audience* 25)—an observation that can probably be applied to Branwell, Emily, and Anne’s contributions as well. She continues by suggesting that Charlotte “was conscious of the subjective nature of truth seems evident from the fact that she gives accounts that differ from those found in manuscripts and also presents conflicting versions of the same material within her own narratives. As a consequence of the unfixed nature of reality at the authorial level—whether due to disagreement between the collaborative authors or to Charlotte’s sense of truth’s subjective multiplicity—much of the fictitious Angrian storyteller’s effort goes into trying to discount other storytellers’ versions of events” (*Charlotte Brontë and the Storyteller’s Audience* 25). Ironically, in their attempts to write the authoritative history—or histories—of the Glass Town Federation, the Brontës actually strengthened the counterfactual nature of the written world they described in their histories.

⁷⁸ As this paragraph indicates, the changes from the outline of events in “The Twelve Adventurers” to those found in “The History of the Young Men” are too numerous and varied to provide more than a very basic overview.

assist his native country” (B. Brontë, “The History of the Young Men” 90) in opposing Napoleon Bonaparte who “seized on the supreme power and proclaimed himself in 1782 Emperor of France and King of Italy” (B. Brontë, “The History of the Young Men” 90).⁷⁹ And while Branwell’s history does eventually conclude by naming Arthur Wellesley as the ruler of Glass Town and its citizens, the observant reader will have already noted, the timing of this event—as well as Glass Town’s founding, Napoleon’s rise to power, and Wellesley’s triumph at Waterloo—are decades earlier than what both actual history books and Charlotte’s history relate.⁸⁰ Like Charlotte’s “The Twelve Adventurers,” Branwell’s “The History of the Young Men” serves as a means of gauging Branwell’s education and his interest in military history, but what is truly fascinating about pairing the elder Brontë siblings’ histories is how they help clarify scholars’ understanding of their use of the counterfactual to promote a sense of nationalism within the Glass Town Saga.

As this overview of Charlotte and Branwell’s histories suggests, the Brontës were deeply invested in using historical settings and public figures in their counterfactual juvenilia. Yet while the Brontës’ evocation of the past was a crucial component of the

⁷⁹ The nobleman in question was “Frederic Guelph Duke of York and second son of his majesty George III” (B. Brontë, “The History of the Young Men” 74), and he was nominated after Wellesley declared that “I can see no one who can claim an equal right with him to our throne. Are we not Englishmen? I he not the son of the King of England in whose dominions we were born and whose subjects we lately were? Has he not fought for use and headed our troops...?” (“The History of the Young Men” 74). As for York’s role in “The Twelve Adventurers,” Charlotte records York’s commands in such a manner that it could be argued he is a figure of authority, but there is no formal acknowledgement of said authority.

⁸⁰ Historians generally refer to the years between 1789 and 1799 as the period during which the French Revolution took place (Harvey 32); Napoleon Bonaparte was born in 1769, and in 1782—the year Branwell’s Napoleon of the Glass Town Saga is said to have made himself ruler of both France and Italy—he would have been a student enrolled in military boarding school (Schom 1, 3-5). In “The History of the Young Men” the ship *Invincible* departs England in 1770; this same ship leaves England in “The Twelve Adventurers” in 1793 (B. Brontë, “The History of the Young Men” 65; C. Brontë, “The Twelve Adventurers” 6).

Glass Town, the Glass Town Saga was also a platform where the Brontës could make use of their education while working to improve themselves as writers, their use of the counterfactual was an invaluable tool in this respect. So while it is intriguing to scrutinize the minutiae of conflicting chronologies and public figures-turned-protagonists' personal timelines, it is far more constructive to consider how the Brontë siblings used historical elements to tie their work to the literary culture they emulated—and more important still, to see what they would consider the next step after parallels between Glass Town and Britain were established to their satisfaction. Even in the earliest stages of the Glass Town Saga it was clear that the Brontës understood the relationship between a nation's literary culture and its national identity—and while this awareness was likely due in part to their critical approach to reading novels and periodicals, it was also likely affected by their interest in history itself. Gary B. Nash, Charlotte Crabtree, and Ross E. Dunn have written on the correlation among history, patriotism, and students' education, noting that, “In all modern nations, educators and political leaders have regarded history as a vehicle for promoting *amor patriae*, for installing in young people knowledge and attitudes that promote national cohesion and civic pride” (15). And although the Brontës grew up during the first half of the nineteenth century in Britain—opposed to the late twentieth century in the United States, the period from which Nash, Crabtree, and Dunn draw the majority of their examples—these scholars' observation remains relevant when considering the Brontës' fascination with Britain's heroes both at home and abroad. The primary difference, here, is that the siblings took up their work with history narratives upon their own initiative and in doing so not only attuned their interests to their own nation, but also began creating a patriotic base for the citizens of the Glass Town

Federation. By setting Glass Town's founding in the eighteenth century, the Brontës deliberately link Glass Town to the great European era of empire-building, even if their colony is made of words and borrowed heroes and not newly-constructed towns and Britons who emigrated overseas. Like the British colonies that flourished in actuality, Glass Town was also an imagined community, since "Communities are to be distinguished," as political scientist and historian Benedict Anderson writes, "not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined" (6). As students of Britain's history and keen observers of the British Empire's progress as chronicled in newspapers and periodicals, the Brontës "were part of a colonizing society which considered that it had a natural right to colonize and dominate," (Alexander, "Imaging Africa" 202), and its manifestation in the Glass Town Saga is a natural extension of this ideology. By combining the principles of colonialism with the heroism of British public figures, the Brontës made the most of Glass Town's British heritage in narratives like "The Twelve Adventurers" and "The History of the Young Men," but it would not take long for the Brontës to begin considering their plans for the Glass Town Federation's future as a sovereign nation, populated by citizens intent on creating a national identity and literary culture of their own.

**“Now I come to my own loved home”: The Voices of the Glass Town
Federation⁸¹**

The Brontës wrote many of the nonfiction works that make up the Glass Town Saga with an eye to the Glass Town Federation’s future. Having established the roots of the Glass Town Saga by anchoring them in the past through histories like “The Twelve Adventurers” and “The History of the Young Men,” the Brontës explored Glass Town’s future through both fictional and nonfictional installments, and among the most creative endeavors within the latter category is the periodical that came to be known as the *Young Men’s Magazine*.⁸² But unlike the short stories and novellas that traced the lives, loves, and enmities of the noble houses of the Glass Town Federation, the contents of the *Young Men’s Magazine* provided the siblings with the opportunity to expand the scope and growth of the counterfactual written world of their vision, while at the same time, helping them make the all-important leap between playing at being published authors to actually becoming published authors.⁸³ Described by Robin St John Conover as “the cornerstone of the juvenilia” (19), the *Young Men’s Magazine* was an invaluable vehicle for the

⁸¹ The line “Now I come to my own loved home” has been taken from the poem “A Traveller’s Meditation” a piece that was credited to Charlotte’s character-persona the Marquis of Douro in the Glass Town Federation’s *Young Men’s Magazine*. The poem can be read in its entirety in Christine Alexander’s edited edition of *The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë: Volume I, The Glass Town Saga 1826-1832* (1987).

⁸² Carol Bock credits the *Young Men’s Magazine* for helping the Brontës to learn “to think of themselves as participants in the exciting political and literary debates of their day.... One might say that they were writing to each other in the roles that they had adopted in reading *Blackwood’s*: as worldly, cultured personages familiar with the literati, royalty, and political greats who people their anecdotes and serve as objects of their commentary” (*The Storyteller’s Audience* 12).

⁸³ The first issue of the *Young Men’s Magazine* was “published” by Branwell in January of 1829 as *Branwell’s Blackwood’s Magazine*; Branwell, however, would soon cede editorial control to Charlotte who renamed the periodical *Blackwood’s Young Men’s Magazine* in August of 1829 before changing it once again in August of 1830 to the *Young Men’s Magazine* (Alexander, *The Early Writings* 36). (For simplicity’s sake, this chapter will continue to refer to the periodical as the *Young Men’s Magazine*.) It is not certain how many issues were produced—according to Alexander it is generally accepted that some of the issues written under Branwell’s editorship were lost (*The Early Writings* 36)—at least five issues of the *Young Men’s Magazine* penned under Charlotte’s direction have survived (“‘Young Men’s Magazine’ [‘Blackwood’s Young Men’s Magazine’]”).

Brontës to experiment with voices, literary techniques, narrative styles, and characters in shorter pieces before adopting them for or integrating them within the longer stories, histories, and novellas.⁸⁴ By including so many different types of pieces—which ranged from serialized stories, to the transcripts of Glass Town’s leading citizens’ meetings, to advertisements—the Brontës created a community through Glass Town’s literary culture. Among these many authorial personas, Charlotte Brontë shaped two of the leading voices born within Glass Town’s next generation.

Many articles in this periodical are attributed to residents of the Glass Town Federation, including those “written” by two of Glass Town’s most prominent citizens: Arthur Augustus Adrian Wellesley, Marquis of Douro, and Lord Charles Albert Florian Wellesley—the sons of Arthur Wellesley, Duke of Wellington.⁸⁵ And while Douro and Charles’ positions as Wellesleys matter every time they are mentioned in Glass Town Saga, the articles, poems, dialogues, and stories “published” under their names (or pseudonyms) in the *Young Men’s Magazine* offer Glass Town’s citizens a new perspective from which they might be viewed, and this shift in perception is a significant one. He may have been one of the founders of the Glass Town Federation, but within the

⁸⁴ It is worth noting that the *Young Men’s Magazine* also became a means of offering artistic criticism—criticism that the Brontës directed at British authors as well as each other’s individual contributions to the Glass Town Saga. An excellent example of such an instance can be found in the poems “Lines Spoken by a Lawyer on the Occasion of the Transfer of this Magazine” and “Lines by One who was Tired of Dullness upon the Same Occasion,” these works believed to have been written by together by Branwell and Charlotte as they voiced the siblings’ respective opinions regarding of the contents of the *Young Men’s Magazine* after Branwell ceded control of the periodical to Charlotte in the December 1829 issue (Alexander, *The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë: Volume I, The Glass Town Saga 1826-1832* 94n6, 95n8). The poems in question can be found in their entirety in *The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë: Volume I, The Glass Town Saga 1826-1832* (1987).

⁸⁵ Confusion may ensue when authors—or families—choose to pass a first name on from one generation to the next. In order to prevent this confusion, Arthur Wellesley will continue to be referred to as *Arthur*, *Wellesley*, or *Wellington*; his eldest son (who, through Charlotte, also gains the titles Duke of Zamorna and Emperor Adrian) will be referred to as *Douro*; and Lord Charles Wellesley (who, according to Charlotte, occasionally wrote under the pen name *Townshend*) will be addressed as *Charles*.

context of the Glass Town Saga Arthur Wellesley is strongly associated with Britain, Glass Town, and Europe; his sons, however, are linked more firmly with the second generation of Glass Town residents.

It cannot be a coincidence that much of the subject matter Charlotte chose for Douro and Charles Wellesley's character-personas generally conveys the virtues required in capable leaders, chief among them a willingness to act for the good of the Glass Town Federation. Benedict Anderson has noted that "the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship" (7), and Charlotte's literary versions of Douro and Charles were adept at fostering a sense of camaraderie, earning the trust of their fellow citizens through their literary efforts. Their father may have been an instrumental figure in the Glass Town Federation's formation, but the brothers Wellesley were the figures with whom Charlotte worked to shape a sense of nationalism amongst the Glass Town Federation's citizens. Douro wrote the "Adress {sic} to the Angrians," (1834-35), a speech given on the eve of battle, where he spoke to his people as "not as a monarch, but as a man," promising them he would "dedicate myself wholly and unreservedly to the task of earning for you're a higher fame, a fairer wreath, a mightier realm than any which the annals of history record since Alexander led his own Macedonians to victory" (C. Brontë, "Adress {sic} to the Angrians" 297, 300-01). And if Douro was his father's heir and the fixed point around which the Glass Town Federation would one day revolve, Charles Wellesley was Charlotte Brontë's means of offering criticism and the occasional look into the

unknown—whether through a tour of a neighboring nation or a glimpse of his homeland’s future.⁸⁶

As strange as the idea of gaining a preview of what the future may hold for Glass Town and its inhabitants may be, stranger still are the circumstances that brought the narrative “A Leaf from an Unopened Volume Or The Manuscript of an Unfortunate Author” (1834) into existence. As revealed in the narrative’s opening, Charles’ name might be associated with this work, but he is its scribe, not its author.⁸⁷ The events within “A Leaf from an Unopened Volume” take place during the aftermath of a particularly triumphant moment in the Glass Town Federation’s history. The moment in question is in 1858—twenty-four years after Charles Wellesley actually “publishes” this work—and the cause for the citizens of Glass Town’s celebration is the “conclusion of the war with Quashia {of the Ashantee} and the bloody extermination of his devoted people” (C. Brontë, “A Leaf from an Unopened Volume” 326). In addition to recording the particulars of the end of the war with Ashantee, the narrator of this future history also lays the groundwork for the next great arc in the Glass Town Federation’s history.

Descriptions of both the new city of Adrianopolis and Douro himself make it

⁸⁶ While pieces featuring or written by Wellesley were limited by what Charlotte believed Wellesley might do or believe, she had more room to experiment with his son’s personalities. Consequently, Douro becomes “a romantic and ideal hero, while his younger brother, Charles, more interestingly, becomes an increasingly wipish and sarcastic observer of events” (Barker 160). For a fair sampling of “Charles’s” writing at its most sardonic, see Charlotte’s article “A Day at Parry’s Palace,” featured in the October 1830 edition of the *Young Men’s Magazine*. Parry’s Land is, of course, Emily and Anne’s literary territory, so by writing this piece, Charlotte seized an opportunity to criticize her younger sisters’ creations.

⁸⁷ The unusual situation that led to the publication of “A Leaf from an Unopened Volume” is acknowledged twice on its opening page. The means by which Charles was made to serve as the anonymous author’s scribe are outlined in the first few pages of this work and Charles’ description of how he wrote “mechanically as it were and despite of my own opposing will” (325) does support his assertion of otherworldly influence. In the footnotes of *An Edition of the Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë, Volume II: The Rise of Angria 1833-1835: Part 1: 1833-1834* Alexander suggests that the true author is none other than “S’ death, the reincarnation of the Chief Genius Branni who is associated with the devil; {and that} this may imply that Branwell dictated the main events in this story” (324n6).

overwhelmingly clear that the Glass Town Federation and its ruler have finally fulfilled their potential. Emperor Adrian is the leader he promised his people he would become, and in turn, his victories on the battlefield led to the Glass Town Federation's growth. Indeed, the narrator tells Charles that his brother Douro will become "Emperor Adrian, surnamed the Magnificent" (C. Brontë, "A Leaf from an Unopened Volume" 325). But in spite of this impression of near perfection, this narrative also foreshadows a darker, final fate for both the Glass Town Federation and Douro.

Even as the narrator admires Adrianopolis, he drops hints that another great moment in the Glass Town Federation's future is approaching, and that unlike the narrative chronicling the events of 1858, whatever is coming next cannot conclude happily. Adrianopolis will have "no warning of the dark doom which destiny was preparing for it" (C. Brontë, "A Leaf from an Unopened Volume" 326) the narrator relates. Although he hesitates to name the cause of this desolation, there are worrying signs that Douro himself might be the reason for this city's future destruction. When the narrator describes Douro at his best, he admits that Douro had faults—"great and dark ones"—too (C. Brontë, "A Leaf from an Unopened Volume" 326). A more detailed assessment of these faults are revealed later in the narrative when the speaker reports that in Douro's countenance there was "an awful majesty, a stern decision and a superhuman pride which proclaimed the imperial despot. Hume, the most celebrated of the historians...say[s] It looked, observes he, as if heaven, being wrath with mankind, had sent Lucifer to reign on earth in the flesh" (C. Brontë, "A Leaf from an Unopened Volume" 361). Here, the mere suggestion that a historian of David Hume's reputation would take an interest in Douro's accomplishments is as admirable as it is worrisome

since Hume's attention supports the hypothesis denoting the magnitude of forthcoming events.⁸⁸ Furthermore, by likening Douro to Lucifer through Hume, the Brontës do more than shape a literary and religious allusion into a warning: they remind readers of the high cost of a fall from grace and that historical narratives must record nations' worst moments as well as their best. Although there is not enough information within "A Leaf from an Unopened Volume" to determine the precise sequence of events that led to Douro's meteoric rise in the Glass Town Federation between the 1830s and the 1850s—much less what will happen after this narrative set in 1858—Charlotte has outlined the broad strokes of the Glass Town Saga's future and have done so in such a way that the siblings still have room to improvise and improve upon their original vision.

Despite being one of the Glass Town Saga's more obscure works, "A Leaf from an Unopened Volume" is evidence of Charlotte's growing sophistication as a writer of fiction. Like so many of the pieces within this collection, this work is characterized by uncertainty: readers know nothing of the storyteller or whether they should interpret the recitation of the future history featured in "A Leaf from an Unopened Volume" as prophesized fact, tantalizing fiction, or something in between. But by evoking flexibility within the historical narrative of the future in addition to her use of it in Glass Town's past and present, Charlotte adds yet another twist to her use of the counterfactual, and in doing so offers a possible conclusion to one of the major narrative arcs within the Glass

⁸⁸ Presumably the David Hume Charlotte refers to in the Brontës' counterfactual world lived longer than the Hume whose work they read in actuality since that Hume died in 1776. Alexander has noted that Charlotte "knew of Hume as early as June 1833 since she calls him the greatest British historian in *The Foundling*," (*An Edition of the Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë. Volume II: The Rise of Angria 1833-1835, Part 1: 1833-1834* 361n67) a tale of the Glass Town Saga.

Town Saga even as she plants seeds for the next set of conflicts to challenge the Glass Town Federation and its leaders.

The final narrative in this discussion of the Glass Town Saga brings us from counterfactual historical fiction to the fictional future history of a counterfactual nation, showing readers that the Brontës' use of counterfactual narratives was as complex as it was critical to the formation of the Glass Town Federation. While the Brontës clearly recognized the value of history, their desire to participate in contemporary British literary culture meant that they could not be wholly constrained by either the events recorded within the format of historical nonfiction. Instead, by anchoring the counterfactual Glass Town Federation to the world the Brontës hoped to write for one day, the siblings employed their education and interests to serve as the foundation for over a decade of literary experimentation. Of all their accomplishments, the Brontë siblings' most remarkable feat might be their insistence in replicating Britain's interwoven literary culture and national heritage in the counterfactual world of the Glass Town Federation—an environment where they could not only participate, but through its literary culture control the destiny of the federation and surrounding lands. That the Brontës reached this understanding while still school children emphasizes how extraordinary they were and how history had become intertwined with quotidian life.

While Charlotte's contributions to the Glass Town Saga never did progress far enough to confirm the events projected in "A Leaf from an Unopened Volume," she would continue to add to the Glass Town Saga for the next five years. But when considering all that Charlotte and her siblings accomplished over the course of this decade it is not surprising that Charlotte would eventually look for new challenges. In her

everyday life Charlotte devoted herself to a series of teaching positions, her studies in Belgium, and the possibility of opening a school with her sisters. As a writer, however, she possessed a steadily growing desire to write novels published in Britain and set outside of the world of the Glass Town Saga.

A “Farewell to Angria”?

In 1839 Charlotte finally declared her intentions to turn away from the Glass Town Saga in the short essay, “A Farewell to Angria. “I have now written a great many books, & for a long time I have dwelt on the same characters & scenes & subjects. I have shewn {sic} my landscapes in every variety of shade & light which morning, noon & evening ...can bestow upon them,” she explains, “But we must change, for the eye is tired of the picture so oft recurring & now so familiar” (314). Although Charlotte acknowledges that it “no easy thing to dismiss from my imagination the images which have filled is so long,” she cannot but help “long to quit for a while that burning clime where we have sojourned too long” (314). Consequently, she has decided to “turn now to a cooler region, where the dawn breaks grey and sober & the coming day for a time at least is subdued in clouds” (314). Unlike her siblings who, when working on pieces meant for submission to periodicals and publishing houses in Britain, continued to work on the Glass Town Saga, Charlotte clearly believed that she should bestow her full

attention upon her new goal as an author.⁸⁹ But regardless of Charlotte's apparent sincerity, her novels set outside of Glass Town—published and unpublished alike—show that in spite of Charlotte's affirmation that she was ready to move beyond the counterfactual world that had commanded her attention for the past decade, the influences of the Glass Town Saga could still be found within her writing.

Although audiences outside of her family could not have known, Charlotte's early attempt to write novels relied heavily materials featured in the Glass Town Saga. Her first effort was the incomplete manuscript now referred to as *Ashworth*, whose three complete chapters are believed to have been written between December of 1840 and March of 1841 ("*Ashworth*"); *Ashworth* is a "transitional unfinished novel which serves as a bridge between the {finished Glass Town} novelettes and the concerns of *The Professor*, {and} was started soon after Charlotte's farewell to her literary past" (Monahan 30). Described by Alexander as "reminiscent of the juvenilia" and "another episode in the Percy/Douro-Northangerland/Zamorna relationship, thinly disguised by an English setting," Charlotte knew *Ashworth* probably was not destined for publication and admitted as much in a letter written to Hartley Coleridge in December of 1840 after he offered commentary (*The Early Writings* 205). "The idea of applying to a regular Novel-publisher—and seeing all

⁸⁹ Charlotte's siblings continued to work with the Glass Town Saga even as adults—although Emily and Anne may have done so in a slightly healthier manner than Branwell. According to Conover, "Branwell also left the African climes in 1839, but continued his Angrian saga, primarily in verse form, without interruption well into his young adulthood, becoming more deeply engaged with it and never fully quitting this dream-like realm. Instead, Angria invaded his real world and his young psyche, informing all his subsequent writings for the remainder of his short life. Although he successfully published over twenty poems, most under the pseudonym 'Northangerland'...over time he grew disappointed with the effort to have anything more ambitious published" (28). Although much less is known about Emily and Anne's work in Gondal overall, it seems to be a safe to say that their attitudes towards their counterfactual world were more whimsically inclined than their brother's—or at least the anecdote of Emily and Anne "whil{ing} away a train journey by pretending to by Royalist prisoners escaping from Gondal" (Barker 154) when these women were in their mid-twenties would suggest this to be true.

my characters at full-length in three Vols, is very tempting” Charlotte confesses, “but I think on the whole I had better lock up this precious manuscript—wait till I get some sense to produce something which shall at least aim at an object of some kind and meantime bind myself apprentice to a chemist and druggist if I am a young gentleman or to a Milliner and Dressmaker if I am a young lady” (C. Brontë, “‘Ashworth’: An Unfinished Novel by Charlotte Brontë” 129).⁹⁰ The foundation of Charlotte’s next fictional endeavor would be drawn from the Glass Town Saga too, but as Julie Barker has diplomatically phrased it, once again Charlotte’s “determination to put Angria behind her and write about the real and the ordinary was somewhat marred in the execution” as she began composing the story that would eventually become *The Professor* (1857) (Barker 500).⁹¹

Although *The Professor* was written before *Jane Eyre* (1847), *Shirley* (1849), and *Villette* (1853), it would be published posthumously, having been rejected by publishers nine times during Charlotte’s life (M. Smith, “Introduction” vii). In retrospect, and with access to the Brontë juvenilia, it becomes clearer for scholars to see how Charlotte’s perception of this novel was skewed by her familiarity with the citizens of Glass Town and how she was still learning how to write for audiences unacquainted with the contents and counterfactual nature of the Glass Town Saga. Margaret Smith believes that the Glass

⁹⁰ Charlotte sent the manuscript to Coleridge anonymously, signing it only with her initials and made no mention of her sex. She actually delighted in the fact that Coleridge could not determine whether she was a man or woman, stating “I am pleased that you cannot quite decide whether I belong to the soft or the hard sex—and though at first I had no intention of being enigmatical on the subject—yet as I accidentally omitted to give the clue at first, I will venture purposely to withhold it now.... Seriously Sir, I am very much obliged to you for your kind and candid letter—and on the whole I wonder you took the trouble to read and notice the demisemi novelette of an anonymous scribe who had not even the manners to tell you whether he was a man or woman or whether his common-place ‘C T’ meant Charles Tims or Charlotte Tomkins” (C. Brontë, “‘Ashworth’: An Unfinished Novel by Charlotte Brontë” 130).

⁹¹ *The Professor* originated in 1840 as a tale called *The Master* (“*The Professor. A Tale, and Related Manuscripts*”).

Town material is “responsible for some of the weaknesses of the first six chapters of *The Professor*. For Charlotte the Seacombs and Crimsworths had a substantial existence in Angria; but, not yet accustomed to a strange audience, she has failed to give them enough semblance of life in *The Professor*” (xii). Even in the face of these obstacles, Charlotte did not stop writing, nor did she give up on *The Professor*—and her perseverance paid off. Although the publishing house of Smith, Elder & Co. declined to publish *The Professor* upon its first submission—they would reverse this decision after Charlotte’s death—they indicated their interest in seeing more of Currer Bell’s writing, and that “a work in three volumes would meet with careful attention” (C. Brontë, “Biographical Notice of Ellis and Acton Bell” 177).⁹² Charlotte soon completed *Jane Eyre* and it received a much warmer reception—in his memoirs, George Smith recalls canceling his afternoon engagements so he might finish the manuscript before bed, and writing the next morning to Currer Bell to let the author know the novel had been accepted for publication (Smith 88).

Jane Eyre is Charlotte Brontë’s most famous novel and as such has commanded the attention of readers—and later, scholars—since its publication. Like Charlotte’s previous efforts, *Jane Eyre* also displays the influences of the Glass Town Saga, but while there are certain parallels between relationships and characters in this novel’s cast and the figures within the Glass Town Saga, these similarities remain largely quiescent. More overt are the instances in which Jane shares her counterfactual thoughts or

⁹² Charlotte’s joy in this news has been preserved in the essay revealing Emily and Anne’s identities after their death. Here, she wrote that when submitting *The Professor* to Smith, Elder & Co. she received a letter from the publishers informing her that while they “declined, indeed, to publish that tale, for business reasons, but it discussed its merits and demerits so courteously, so considerately, in a spirit so rational, with a discrimination so enlightened, that this very refusal cheered the author with better than a vulgarly-expressed acceptance would have done. It was added, that a work in three volumes would meet with careful attention” (C. Brontë, “Biographical Notice of Ellis and Acton Bell” 177).

counterfactual speculations with the novel's readers. In *Jane Eyre* the counterfactual is associated with Jane's welfare, and by extension, links the counterfactual to everyday life. Readers are introduced to Jane's use of the counterfactual in the very first chapter when she escapes—mentally, if not physically—from her bullying cousins by inventing imaginary worlds inspired by her reading materials. When Jane hides in the window-seat behind a red curtains she is free to study the contents of *Bewick's History of British Birds* and considers the Arctic where

Of these death-white realms I formed an idea of my own; shadowy, like all the half-comprehended notions that float dim through children's brains, but strangely impressive. The words...connected themselves with the succeeding vignettes, and gave significance to the rock standing up alone in a sea of billow and spray; to the broken boat stranded on a desolate coast; to the cold and ghastly moon glancing through bars of cloud at a wreck just sinking....

Each picture told a story; mysterious often to my undeveloped understanding and imperfect feelings, yet ever profoundly interesting....

With Bewick on my knee, I was then happy: happy at least in my way. I feared nothing but interruption, and that came too soon. (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 64-65)

This passage is very much reminiscent of Charlotte's entries in *The Roe Head Journal*. Like Charlotte, Jane's happiness is entirely reliant upon the moments she can consider imaginary scenes of her own devising. These vignettes, although not as complex as the Glass Town Saga—possess the same essential underlying purpose: to escape the

mendacity of reality and exert control over at least a portion of one's life. The ease with which Jane moves from scene to scene and figure to figure only emphasizes her absolute control over these images which are and, at the same time, are not, part of the book she is reading. "I cannot tell what sentiment haunted the quite solitary churchyard with its inscribed headstone; its gate, its two trees, its low horizon, girdled by a broken wall, and its newly-risen crescent, attesting the hour of even-tide," (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 65). Jane confides in the reader, and as for "The fiend pinning down the thief's pack behind him, I passed over quickly: it was an object of terror. So was the black, horned thing seated aloof on a rock, surveying a distant crowd surrounding a gallows" (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 65). The nature of Jane's musings are telling, too; rather than dwell upon a more welcoming setting or congenial company, she chooses strange figures, sublime settings, and a stark ambience. And despite these uncanny visions, Jane is free of fear until she is discovered by her cousins and punished by her Aunt Reed who orders the servants to lock her niece in the red bedroom. There, Jane's lively imagination leads her to believe that a "swift-darting beam" (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 73) of light it is "a herald of some coming vision from another world," (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 73) resulting panic and collapse into unconsciousness. As these passages reveal, the power of Jane's creativity is, demonstrably, a double-edged blade. The power of her imagination rebounds upon her when she is isolated and emotionally vulnerable. In creating this haven for Jane, Brontë seems to suggest the retreat to a counterfactual realm as a viable strategy—so long as the author of the counterfactual is able to maintain control over her vision and not permit it to control her.

The relationship between control and counterfactual speculation are linked once again near the end of the novel. After Jane has fled from Rochester and settled into life with her cousins, she receives an offer of marriage from St. John Rivers, who wishes to take Jane with him when he departs England to proselytize in India. Jane, who has gained a better understanding of her cousin's character after spending so much time in his company, is hesitant.⁹³ When considering what life would be like as St. John's wife, a series of thoughts pass through Jane's mind as she

fancied myself in idea, *his wife*. Oh! it would never do! As his curate, his comrade, all would be right: I would cross oceans with him in that capacity...my body would be under rather a stringent yoke, but my heart and mind would be free. I should still have my unblighted self to turn to: my natural unenslaved feelings with which to communicate in moments of loneliness. There would be recesses in my mind which would be only mine, to which he never came; and sentiments growing there fresh and sheltered, which his austerity could never blight, nor his measured warrior-march trample down: but as his wife—at his side always, and always restrained, and always checked—forced to keep the fire of my nature continually low, to compel it to burn inwardly and never utter a cry, though the imprisoned flame consumed vital after vital—*this* would be unendurable. (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 506-7)

⁹³ According to Jane, St. John had “acquired a certain influence over me that took away my liberty of mind: his praise and notice were more restraining than his indifference” (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 496) and she finally concludes that “He {St. John} wanted to train me to an elevation I could never reached: it racked me hourly to aspire to the standard he uplifted” (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 497).

It is clear that Jane's counterfactual speculation results from her willingness to work as St. John's partner, but not as his wife. As a child, Jane knew what it was like to endure her day-to-day existence while trying to find some happiness through "an idea of my own," (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 64) and she still values the freedom found in the privacy of her mind. But as an adult Jane could no more "keep the fire of my nature continually low, to compel it burn inwardly" (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 507) than she could give up those "recesses in my mind which would be only mine" (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 507). In short, Jane cannot agree to marry St. John because doing so would require her to give up the possibility of the counterfactual thought: the very act that would sustain her throughout this marriage.⁹⁴ Jane's knowledge of herself prevents her from seeking solace where it cannot be found. True happiness is her reward for her patience as she is reunited with the now-widowed Rochester, prompting the declaration "To be your wife is, for me, to be as happy as I can be on earth," (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 547) making Jane's need for counterfactual speculation from this point onwards entirely superfluous.⁹⁵ Jane's use of the counterfactual was largely circumstantial as this form of speculation served as a substitute for the home and family she longed for. But *Jane Eyre* was not the only novel featuring counterfactual speculation as a narrative device; *Villette* also makes effective use of the counterfactual—although for a different purpose and with a very different outcome for this novel's ending.

⁹⁴ She is forced to tell St. John as much when he persists in his courtship: "If I were to marry you, you would kill me. You are killing me now" (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 512). St. John's unsuitability as a partner is further demonstrated when he, upon hearing Jane's pronouncement, first scolds her for "violent, unfeminine, and untrue" (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 512) thoughts before lecturing her on the nature of forgiveness without actually forgiving her for what he perceives as an offense.

⁹⁵ Ten years after her marriage, Jane reaffirms this happiness: "we are ever together. To be together is for us to be at once as free in solitude, as gay in company" (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 554).

It does not take readers long to learn that Lucy Snowe, *Villette*'s protagonist, is a brilliant, provably unreliable narrator. When Lucy is asked, "Who *are* you Miss Snowe?" readers eagerly anticipate Lucy's reply, but her answer provides little illumination as she responds to this question with another question: "Who am I indeed? Perhaps a personage in disguise" (C. Brontë, *Villette* 341). Lucy's answer is typical of her character and her opacity permeates the novel. Throughout the text, Lucy's thoughts and feelings are deliberately shrouded in such a way that she cannot be wholly understood by readers, but when W.S. Williams, Charlotte's publisher, requested that Lucy's character be depicted more clearly, Charlotte politely refused:

You say that she may be thought morbid and weak unless the history of her life be more fully given. I consider that she is both morbid and weak at times—the characters sets up no pretensions to unmixed strength—and anybody living her life would necessarily become morbid...I might explain away a few other points but it would be too much like drawing a picture and then writing underneath the name of the object intended to be represented. (C. Brontë, *The Letters* 3: 80)

The ambiguity that characterizes Lucy—and by extension, the tale she tells—is not identical to Charlotte's previous uses of the counterfactual found in *Jane Eyre* and the Glass Town Saga, but there are common factors found between these three bodies of work. Like Jane Eyre who is "poor, obscure, plain, and little" Lucy Snowe has relatively little agency (C. Brontë, *Jane Eyre* 388). It is understandable, then, that Lucy would exercise authority where she does have influence and that this desire would affect the narrative of her life. But unlike Jane, who implicitly acknowledges she has no need for

counterfactual speculation when she is finally reunited with Rochester, Lucy actually chooses to heighten this ambiguity through her use of the counterfactual as the novel draws to a close.

Before the most explicit use of the counterfactual in *Villette* can be addressed, it is worth examining the circumstances from which Lucy shares these final insights into her life. The last chapter of the novel opens by proclaiming, “Man cannot prophesy. Love is no oracle. Fear sometimes imagines a vain thing,” and continues by presenting readers with hope and uncertainty in equal parts (C. Brontë, *Villette* 543). Optimism for Lucy and Paul Emanuel’s shared future can be found in the small revelations Lucy is willing to share—namely, that Lucy herself is finally content: she is mistress of both her own home and school, and has established her life in Villette. Better still is her announcement that she is on the cusp of being reunited with M. Paul as he returns from abroad after a three-year absence. “My school flourishes, my house is ready: I have made him a little library...I have cultivated out of love for him (I was naturally no florist) the plants he preferred,” Lucy tells her readers. But even as her audience begins to hope for the best, the reason for this chapter’s warning is revealed (C. Brontë, *Villette* 545). The news that M. Paul’s ship is caught in a “storm [that] roared frenzied for seven days” and “did not cease till the Atlantic was strewn with wrecks” is troubling, but what Lucy does next is even more so (Brontë *Villette* 546). Rather than confirming or alleviating readers’ fears, Lucy only states, “Here pause: pause at once. There is enough said. Trouble no quiet, kind heart; leave sunny imaginations hope. Let it be theirs to conceive the delight of joy born again fresh out of great terror, the rapture of rescue from peril, the wondrous reprieve from dread, the fruition of return. Let them picture union and a happy

succeeding life” (C. Brontë, *Villette* 546). Lucy’s refusal to offer additional information has generated discussion and debate since *Villette*’s publication.⁹⁶ The absence of definitive resolution is distressing for many readers since Brontë—via Lucy’s reticence—lets the reader decide how to interpret this closing. For this reason, *Villette*’s ending has much in common with the Glass Town’s Saga unorthodox relationship with narrative validity and continuity —although in the case of this novel audiences could also easily choose different endings with each reading. A reader might decide upon her first encounter with this novel that M. Paul drowns in the Atlantic, that M. Paul survives the storms and returns to marry Lucy during a re-reading of *Villette*, and that upon a third reading of the novel that M. Paul has returned but he and Lucy have ended their engagement instead of marrying.⁹⁷ There is textual evidence for all of these possibilities within the chapter, and because Lucy refuses to elaborate further they must all be regarded as equally true.

The ramifications of ending *Villette* on such an inconclusive note were not lost on Brontë’s readers. The distress felt by readers and critics has been preserved in letters—as has Charlotte’s response to inquiries regarding the novel’s conclusion. When writing to

⁹⁶ Actually, the ending prompted discussion before its publication, too. *Villette*’s final paragraphs may have been influenced—at least in part—by Charlotte’s father’s preferences. It seems that Patrick Brontë “was anxious that her new tale should end well, as he disliked novels which left a melancholy impression upon the mind; and he requested her to make her hero and heroine (like the heroes and heroines in fairy-tales) ‘marry, and live very happily ever after.’ But the idea of M. Paul Emanuel’s death at sea was stamped on her imagination till it assumed the distinct force of reality; and she could no more alter her fictitious ending than if they had been facts which she was relating. All she could do in compliance with her father’s wish was so to veil the fate in oracular words, as to leave it to the character and discernment of her readers to interpret her meaning” (Gaskell, *The Life of Charlotte Brontë* 484).

⁹⁷ When describing her relationship with M. Paul Lucy states outright her belief that in his absence “he is more my own” (C. Brontë, *Villette* 545)—an admittedly peculiar statement even before readers discover that they will be left wondering if M. Paul survives the stormy Atlantic. And for all that Lucy may credit M. Paul for her current state of contentedness, it could also be argued that in Lucy’s eyes her engagement to M. Paul is preferable to his return and the consummation of their marriage.

W.S. Williams Charlotte confides that she has received requests from readers “an application for exact and authentic information respecting the fate of M. Paul Emanuel!!” and that one lady had even gone so far as to declare that “whenever she married, her elect should be the counterpart of Mr. Knightly in Miss Austen’s ‘Emma’—had now changed her mind and vowed that she would either find the duplicated of Professor Emanuel or remain forever single!!!” (C. Brontë *The Letters* 3: 138). But despite this flurry of inquiries and questions, Charlotte declined to undercut *Villette*’s ambiguous counterfactual ending:

With regard to that momentous point—M. Paul’s fate—in case anyone in future should request to be enlightened thereon—they may be told that it was designed that every reader should settle the catastrophe for himself, according to the quality of his disposition, the tender or remorseless impulse of his nature. ‘drowning and Matimony are the fearful alternatives’ . . . {Some readers} will of course choose the former and milder doom—drown him to put him out of pain. The cruel-hearted will on the contrary pitilessly impale him on the second horn of the dilemma—marrying him without ruth or compunction to that person—that—that—individual—‘Lucy Snowe.’ (C. Brontë *The Letters* 3: 142)

This epistolary evidence of Charlotte’s decision to leave the ending of *Villette* to her readers’ imaginations demonstrates how much has changed since she and her siblings began recording their bed plays. No longer are family members the Brontës’ only readers, nor do they write collectively or deliberately overwrite each other’s contributions; instead, their audience is all of Britain, their literary identities are linked but wholly their own,

and the counterfactual—when used at all—is distilled down to very specific moments within the text. And along with the counterfactual’s diminished scale, the aim of these moments has been altered, too. When Charlotte began working on the Glass Town Saga she used the counterfactual to create a written world as a place where she and her siblings could freely and privately channel their creative impulses. Now, this same need for privacy—even if it is only in the space of the protagonists’ minds—drives Charlotte’s characters’ use of the counterfactual, neatly demonstrating how the counterfactual could serve be employed by readers, too. It is fitting that Charlotte should use the counterfactual in these works, as her novels’ publication mark her entrance into British literary culture—a goal she and her siblings had worked towards since Charlotte first recorded the contents of “The History of the Year” in 1829.

The Brontës’ contributions to this dissertation project’s study of the counterfactual as it relates to history novels written during the nineteenth century in Britain are subtle but significant in a broader context as well. Although the Glass Town Saga would not gain its wider readership until nearly a century after Charlotte’s death, its very existence provides insights into the Brontës’ understanding of and efforts to become active participants in British literary culture. Equally important, however, is how the narratives chronicling the Glass Town Saga’s history signal a marked shift in the nature and function of the counterfactual. While the counterfactual in Sir Walter Scott’s *Redgauntlet* was meant to give Jacobites a more satisfactory ending to this failed political movement, the Brontës’ strategy revolved around their collective desire to become published authors. As a result, the counterfactual narratives within the Glass Town Saga not only becomes the medium through which the Brontës may participate in a (closed)

literary society despite the obstacles of their age and inexperience, but their juvenilia also serves as the means to prepare themselves as writers until they are able to overcome these impediments. Both Sir Walter Scott and the Brontës' counterfactual history narratives make copious use of the past, but with different strategies to achieve their respective objectives; Scott wishes to attempt reconciling his readers in the present and the future with the events of the past while the Brontës use their knowledge of the past to propel themselves towards the future they hoped for.

CHAPTER THREE. POLITE FICTIONS: THE COUNTERFACTUAL
STRATEGIES OF MARY ANNE EVANS

In October of 1856, Mary Anne Evans published an essay titled “Silly Novels by Lady Novelists” in *The Westminster Review*. Within this nearly 10,000-word piece, Evans outlined the common weaknesses found in both the novels written by women and in the reviews women authors received from critics.⁹⁸ As severe with the former as she is with the latter, Evans describes a self-perpetuating cycle, noting that many of the novels in question lack “those moral qualities that contribute to literary excellence—patient diligence, a sense of the responsibility involved in publication, and an appreciation of the sacredness of the writer’s art”(Eliot, “Silly Novels” 323) and decries reviewers’ tendency to give “the extremely false impression that to write *at all* is a proof of superiority in a woman” (Eliot, “Silly Novels” 323), thus renewing the sequence that undermines all female writers’ work.⁹⁹ The problem, Evans argues, can be traced back to the fact that “In the majority of woman’s books you see that kind of facility which springs from the absence of any high standard” (Eliot, “Silly Novels” 323)—a weakness that Evans is

⁹⁸ According to Evans, the correlation between the quality of an author’s work and the validity of the criticism received is curious indeed: “By a peculiar thermometric adjustment, when a woman’s talent is at zero, journalistic approbation is at the boiling pitch; when she attains mediocrity, it is already no more than summer heat; and if ever she reaches excellence, critical enthusiasm drops to the freezing points” (Eliot, “Silly Novels” 322).

⁹⁹ For an overview on scholarly criticism pertaining to “Silly Novels by Lady Novelists” (1856), see Susan Tush’s *George Eliot and the Conventions of Popular Women’s Fiction: A Serious Literary Response to the “Silly Novels by Lady Novelists”* (1993).

determined to overcome in her own writing, especially in her novels. Yet as time would eventually prove, Evans did more to ensure her writing's reception than simply hold herself to a higher standard as a writer: she also chose to openly publish novels and essays under a counterfactual male pseudonym, challenging British literary culture's tendency to patronize women writers.¹⁰⁰

In the third chapter of this dissertation I examine Mary Anne Evans' complex relationship with the counterfactual. Here, I argue that Evans' motive for adopting a male pen name is rooted in her desire for her writing to be taken seriously by British literary culture. I also assert that while Evans may not have originally intended to admit that she was George Eliot, it was no accident that this pen name eventually became a counterfactual literary pseudonym. By remaining "George Eliot," Evans not only constructed a shield between her public and private lives, she also created a better position to comment on women's roles in British society. Mary Anne Evans may not have been the most visible advocate for women's rights in nineteenth-century Britain, but her employment of the counterfactual in both her own writing and in the British literary marketplace was persuasive in its subtlety as its presence challenging readers to acknowledge the veracity of women's intelligence and abilities.

Chapter Three adopts a chronological approach when examining the traces of the counterfactual in Evans' writing as well as the polite fictions regarding her identity that she, her family, and her readers maintained during her lifetime and after her death. The first section provides an overview of the different personas the reading public associated

¹⁰⁰ Mary Anne Evans is known by many names. For simplicity's sake, this chapter will address Evans by the name she was given at birth by her parents and will reserve the pen name George Eliot for discussion regarding Evans' literary pseudonym or counterfactual persona. Quotations and citations will use the name(s) chosen by the author of the material being referenced.

with Mary Anne Evans, the degree to which these personas overlapped, and how Evans' attitude towards the women's rights movement complicate contemporary scholars' understanding of her as a writer and proto-feminist. By moving on to a discussion of Evans' treatment of a woman's vocation in her first published novel, *Adam Bede* (1859), the second half of this chapter will consider how Evans' maintained the counterfactual persona of George Eliot to manage both the overlap of her public and private lives and her literary legacy—a legacy that continues well into the twenty-first century.

So far, this dissertation project has focused primarily on uses of the counterfactual solely within history novels and narratives. Chapter One examined Sir Walter Scott's bold endeavor to offer those with Jacobite sympathies a more palatable conclusion to this failed political movement in his *Redgauntlet* (1824). Chapter Two argued that Brontës' *Glass Town Saga*, a counterfactual written world founded during the siblings' childhood, was an instrumental factor in preparing the Brontës to participate in British literary culture as adults. While Chapter Three continues in this vein by exploring how Mary Anne Evans' writing quietly chipped away at misconceptions regarding women's place in British society, the majority of Evans' work with the counterfactual operates in conjunction with her fiction, not exclusively within it. While not as overt as the bold, broad strokes that characterize Scott's and the Brontës' use of historical events and personages in their respective works of historical fiction, Evans' counterfactual strategy is modeled on the concept of *fait accompli*. By simultaneously obscuring and highlighting her position as a woman writing fiction in nineteenth-century Britain Evans neatly circumvented readers' potential objections to her authorship even as her writing

exemplified women's ability to offer meaningful contributions to both the literary marketplace and British society as a whole.

When considering Evans' literary career it is important to keep in mind that for Evans, writing itself was a revolutionary act. But even though the radical nature of this act can be partly attributed to choices she made in her personal life, other progressive elements are found in the implicit challenge offered to her readers in the works themselves. While many novelists use the past to comment upon the present and the future, Evans' texts—whether novels or counterfactual personas like George Eliot—encourage her readers to consider the possibility of altering social expectations for the benefit of future generations. In *Adam Bede* she persuades her readers to consider more positive counterfactual outcomes to the historically-accurate events, and her counterfactual persona, George Eliot, serves an additional purpose as well. Because she was determined to maintain the division between Evans-the-woman and Evans-the-writer even after her death, the name George Eliot now holds even greater historical consequence than what it conveyed during Evans' own life time.

Mary Anne Evans, the Women Question, and Feminist Literary Scholarship

Mary Anne Evans' relationship with the women's rights movement and her place in the early history of the feminist movement is a fascinating, much-debated topic in literary scholarship. The mid-nineteenth century in Britain was an active period for the women and men campaigning for women's rights. Thanks to the efforts of Caroline Norton, Harriet Martineau, Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon and Bessie Rayner Parkes (Harrison 31), momentous legal milestones were reached with the passing of the 1839

Act to Amend the Law Relating to the Custody of Infants which allowed “a separated wife to petition the court for custody of her children under the age of seven” (“Act on Custody of Infants”) and the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857 which “legalized divorce and protected a divorced woman’s property and future earnings” (“Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857”). It is understandable, then, that feminist scholars would also be interested in Evans as she was not only one of the major authors publishing during this period, but also acquainted well-known members of the women’s rights movement, including Bodichon and Parkes. Yet despite her friendships with these women, Evans was more of a silent observer of than active campaigner when it came to issues related to women’s rights, unless the issue at hand was related to women’s education (Flint, “George Eliot and Gender” 162).¹⁰¹ As a result, Evans’ life and work has become of a particular interest to feminist literary scholars, fueling heated debates on a variety of topics ranging from the characterization of Evans’ reputation in nineteenth-century British literary culture to her portrayal of female characters in her writing (David 169).¹⁰²

Recently, however, some scholars have proposed a less dichroitic means of characterizing Evans’ relationship with the women’s rights movements. Alexis Easley argues that “rather than viewing Eliot strictly as a product of patriarchal definitions of the authorial role, we should view her as an example of a woman writer who—at least

¹⁰¹ Evans says as much in her letter explaining her stance on the Women Question: “women ought to have the same fund of truth placed within their reach as men have; that their lives (i.e. the lives of men and women) ought to be passed together under the hallowing influence of a common faith as to their duty and its basis. And this unity in their fundamental knowledge. It is not likely that any perfect plan for educating women can soon be found, for we are very far from having found a perfect plan for educating men. But it will not do to wait for perfection” (*The George Eliot Letters* 5: 58).

¹⁰² The essays “Critical Fortunes” and “Gender and the Woman Question” written by Juliette Atkinson and Kyriaki Hadjiafxendi in *George Eliot in Context* (2013) provide an excellent guide to literary written about Evans’ life and works between the late 19th and the 21st centuries as well as a summary of contemporary scholarship’s proto-feminist and feminist interpretations of Evans’ response to the Woman Question.

partially—was able to fashion her own public image in a way that defied the gender stereotyping associated with mid-Victorian authorship” (155). And Kyriaki Hadjiafxendi has suggested that instead of regarding Evans as a person against or disinterested in Britain’s women’s struggle, she might be viewed as a woman writer who has chosen to reserve her energy and attention for her literary endeavors (“Gender and the Women Question” 138).¹⁰³ While this chapter’s discussion of George Eliot as a counterfactual construct aligns with Easley and Hadjiafxendi’s arguments regarding Evans’ relationship with the women’s rights movement, I also propose that Evans’ usage of this pseudonym was first covertly—and later, overtly—a feminist act. And in order to demonstrate how and why Evans’ pseudonym was consciously transformed into a counterfactual persona, we must begin by examining the circumstances that lead to Evans’ pseudonym’s creation and her decision to continue to publish under her pseudonym even after the truth of her authorship was freely acknowledged.

Mary Anne Evans’ Many Names

Mary Anne Evans understood the power in names long before she began her literary career. As an infant Evans was christened *Mary Anne* by her parents, but during her childhood and early adulthood she experimented with her first name, going by *Mary Ann* and *Polly* before choosing to identify herself as *Marian* upon entering her thirties (Hughes, “George Eliot’s Life” 3). As an adult, Evans renamed herself yet again even though the ramifications of exchanging *Evans* for *Lewes* were far more profound.

¹⁰³Hadjiafxendi also argues that for Evans “gender could never be reduced to the Woman Question. With her commitment to a relational understanding of gender equality, she understood female enfranchisement as both a gender and a gendered question. For her the Woman Question was an already loaded term which made women, rather than patriarchal structures, the problem” (“Gender and the Woman Question” 138).

Because her relationship with George Henry Lewes had not and would not be sanctified by marriage, Evans' decision to live openly with a married man and take his surname for her own resulted in her ostracization from much of polite society.¹⁰⁴ A woman of strong principles, Evans was prepared to live with the consequences defying British cultural norms in nearly every respect but one—the judgments the public would preemptively pass on her writing (Ashton 164). As the excerpts quoted from “Silly Novels by Lady Novelists” at the beginning of this chapter suggest, Evans was very much aware that women writers faced serious obstacles; her decision to write both anonymously and under pen names was meant to encourage readers to focus more on the text, and less on the author. Her campaign in this direction had begun with this essay as it was published in October of 1856 (“Silly Novels by Lady Novelists’: Essay by George Eliot”). Evans would continue to guard her identity as an author of fiction up unto the point when the issue of her anonymity would begin to detract attention that could be paid to her writing.¹⁰⁵

Introducing George Eliot

Secrecy seems to have been the watchword of Evans' early career, and as a result her name rarely appeared on the texts she wrote, much less those she contributed to as a

¹⁰⁴ Evans' brother Isaac cut off all contact with his sister until after Lewes' death and Evans' marriage to John Cross in 1880 (Hughes, *George Eliot: The Last Victorian* 192-93, 340).

¹⁰⁵ In her essay “Male Pseudonyms and Female Authority in Victorian England” (1995) Catherine A. Judd suggests that women like Charlotte Brontë and Mary Anne Evans were likely aware of the fact that a literary pseudonym could only serve as a temporary shield. “As professional writers,” Judd notes, “both Brontë and Evans had some awareness of the significance of putting their names in the marketplace, and to believe that any sort of pseudonym would long protect an illustrious writer's identity from the curiosity of the press and the reading public would be an ingenuous hope at best” (255).

translator or an editor.¹⁰⁶ Indeed, although only a few members of her social circle were aware of her literary career to begin with, even fewer were made that she planned to transition from writing short articles and reviews to writing fiction.¹⁰⁷ Given this record then, perhaps it is not so surprising that Evans actually managed to avoid a definitive authorial identity as a writer of fiction until her publisher John Blackwood was forced to address the author of “The Sad Fortunes of the Rev. Amos Barton,” not once, but twice in letters as “My Dear Amos” (Ashton 164, 403n1).¹⁰⁸ The awkwardness of being addressed as by the name of her character appears to have prompted Evans to claim a name, even if the name was not her own, and from this point onward Evans identified herself as *George Eliot* when writing works of fiction.¹⁰⁹

The step from writing under no name at all to writing under a pseudonym may not seem to be a significant one, but given Evans’ caution when explaining her reasoning to her publishers—all without acknowledging either her sex or her name—it was clear from the beginning that Evans’ first priority was her writing; she would create a public identity as an author, but the value of this identity lay in her ability to discard it and assume

¹⁰⁶ According to Joanne Shattock, throughout the whole of Evans’ literary career only one text—her translation of Ludwig Feuerbach’s *The Essence of Christianity* published in 1854—featured the name *Marian Evans* on the title page (“Publishers and Publications” 14).

¹⁰⁷ A little less than two years after “Silly Novels by Lady Novelists” was published, Evans politely refused a request from her friend, the proto-feminist Bessie Parkes, to write in the new monthly *English Woman’s Journal*, explaining that “I have given up writing ‘articles,’ having discovered that my vocation lies in other paths. In fact *entre nous*, I expect to be writing *books* for some time to come” (*The George Eliot Letters* 2: 431; italics original).

¹⁰⁸ After their debut in *Blackwood’s Magazine*, “The Sad Fortunes of the Rev. Amos Barton,” “Mr. Gilfil’s Love Story,” and Janet’s Repentance” were published as *Scenes from a Clerical Life* in 1858 (Sutherland, “*Scenes of a Clerical Life*” 564).

¹⁰⁹ The male pseudonym was deliberately chosen, Evans’ biographer Kathryn Hughes explains, as this name places her work in “the domain occupied by male, that is genderless, writing” (*George Eliot: The Last Victorian* 187). While a number of theories have been developed as to how Evans chose her male pen name—and why she paired *George* and *Eliot* together—there is a posthumous explanation offered by Evans in the biography written by her husband John Cross: “I may mention here that my wife told me the reason she fixed on this name was that *George* was Mr. Lewes’s Christian name, and *Eliot* was a good, mouth-filling, easily pronounced word” (1: 310).

another should her first fictional endeavors fail. “Whatever may be the success of my stories, I shall be resolute in preserving my *incognito*, having observed that a *nom de plume* secures all the advantages without the disagreeables of reputation,” Evans wrote in a letter to William Blackwood in February of 1857, “Perhaps, therefore, it will be well to give you my prospective name, as a tub to throw to the whale in case of curious inquiries; and accordingly I subscribe myself, best and most sympathizing of editors, yours very truly, GEORGE ELIOT” (*The George Eliot Letters 2*: 292; italics and capitalization original). Another portion of this explanation would be soon offered to John Blackwood: “I am very anxious to retain my incognito for some time to come, and to an author not already famous, anonymity is the highest *prestige*. Besides, if George Eliot turns out a dull dog and an ineffective writer—a mere flash in the pan—I, for one, am determined to cut him on that first intimation of that disagreeable fact,” (*The George Eliot Letters 2*:309-10; italics original) Evans wrote, before unequally stating in yet another letter, that “I wish the book to be judged quite apart from its authorship” (*The George Eliot Letters 2*: 505).¹¹⁰ But despite Evans’ plan to use her pseudonym as a shield against the public’s preconceived notions regarding her private life and her writings, her efforts in maintaining her anonymity would ultimately be undone by the two factors she could not defend against: “George Eliot’s” popularity and the reading public’s insatiable curiosity.

¹¹⁰ Kathryn Hughes has expanded further on the logic of Evans’ decision to adopt a specific pseudonym for her fictional works, in addition to shielding her writing from undue criticism derived from Evans’ relationship with Henry Lewes, “Although her journalism appeared anonymously, everyone who mattered—editors, publishers, friends—knew who had written it,” Hughes notes, “If Marian were to produce novels under her own name which went on to fair, there was a danger that she might damage her reputation as a writer of serious non-fiction” (*George Eliot: The Last Victorian* 186-87).

Seeking George Eliot

The groundwork for this sudden swell in admiration had been laid in 1857 with the publication of *Scenes from Clerical Life*. First published individually in *Blackwood's Magazine*, a thousand copies the tales were printed, bound, and sold in two volumes the next year (Shattock, "Editions of George Eliot's Work" 25).¹¹¹ Samuel Lucas, the reviewer for *The Times*, was complimentary towards both the collection of tales and the talents of their author: "we have been most impressed with the series of *Scenes from Clerical Life* ... which are now claimed by Mr. George Eliot—a name unknown to us," he wrote, "It is quite possible that this may be a mere *nom de plume*, and we are not curious to inquire at all upon this point. But we should be greatly surprised to hear that the real writer was previously known under any appellation, for, like others who have speculated on his identity while these tales were publishing, we cannot assign his peculiarities to any living novelist. (14). Considering the care with which Evans wrote, and the reluctance with which she assigned any name to her work, the contents of this review must have been gratifying indeed. But while Lucas may have been content to leave the identity of this pseudonymous authors unquestioned, his was not an attitude universally adopted when Eliot's first novel, *Adam Bede*, was published the following year.

By the end of 1859 there could be little doubt that George Eliot's star was on the rise, and with eight printings—coming to a total of 14,350 copies of the *Adam Bede* sold in its first year (Levine xvi; Altick 385n31)—a certain degree of notoriety was now

¹¹¹ Shattock notes that while these thousand copies did not sell well initially, the publication and public fervor over *Adam Bede* (1859) did result *Scenes from Clerical Life* going into a third edition by April of 1860 ("Editions of Eliot's Work" 25).

associated with the novel's author.¹¹² Of course, while some forms of attention were welcome, others were far less so. Among the former were positive reviews in print: "first-rate" (Dallas 17) proclaimed E.S. Dallas *The Times*, and "a novel of the highest class" (Jewsbury 21) was Geraldine Jewsbury's assessment in *The Athenaeum*. And perhaps even more satisfying were the responses from her fellow writers of fiction, including Edward Bulwer-Lytton, Elizabeth Gaskell, and Charles Dickens. "I owe the author much gratitude for some very pleasing hours," (*The Journals of George Eliot* 301) Bulwer-Lytton wrote, sending the letter to Eliot and the Blackwoods—a letter Evans chose to copy in her diary so she might "keep in mind the generous praise of one author for another" (*The Journals of George Eliot* 300). She also made a point in recording Gaskell's compliments: "I must tell you how earnestly, fully, and humbly I admire [*Scenes of a Clerical Life* and *Adam Bede*]" (*The Journals of George Eliot* 81). Charles Dickens—who had written a letter to Eliot during the previous year earlier after reading *Scenes of Clerical Life*—took up his pen once again, and the contents of his second missive were even more admiring than the last: "Adam Bede [sic] has taken its place among the actual experiences and endurances of my life" (*The George Eliot Letters* 3: 114) Dickens informed Eliot rapturously.¹¹³ But even after receiving praise both reviewers and peers, Evans remained hesitant about her future as an author. Evans now

¹¹² 3,350 copies were printed and sold in the first three-volume edition and then another 11,000 cheaper copies were printed and sold in a two-volume edition (Altick 385n31). Interestingly, Laurence Lerner has noted that while "Praise of *Adam Bede* was almost universal" upon its publication and that during its author's lifetime "it was the most popular of George Eliot's novels Today this judgement is universally reversed" (Lerner 24).

¹¹³ Another notable topic covered in this letter was an invitation to publish in Dickens' own periodical—assuming, of course, that Eliot "ever have the freedom and inclination to be a fellow labourer with me" (*The George Eliot Letters* 3: 115).

needed to maintain her momentum as a novelist and complete her latest manuscript (*The Mill on the Floss* [1860]), but new obstacles were making themselves known.

Evans' apprehensive state is best illustrated by the contents of the journal entry she wrote on April 17, 1859. Here, she names her conflicting causes of joy, anxiety, and annoyance all in the same passage: "I have left off recording the history of Adam Bede [sic] ... the success has been so triumphantly beyond anything I had dreamed of" (*The Journals of George Eliot* 300) Evans begins, before moving on to less pleasant thoughts. Chief amongst these is her question "Shall I ever write another book as true as 'Adam Bede'?" since "The *weight* of the future presses on me and makes itself felt even more than the deep satisfaction of the past and present" (*The Journals of George Eliot* 300). Evans' uneasiness in regards to her works of fiction suggests that even as early as 1859 she was already beginning to view her writing from a wider perspective than that of individual works—each text was now a component of her legacy as a woman writer in nineteenth-century Britain. True, it was not yet known that "George Eliot" was, in fact, a woman, but by April 17, 1859 it is doubtful Evans could have preserved her anonymity much longer as the identity of George Eliot was becoming more than a matter of public speculation—there was also a chance that Mary Anne Evans would be forced to suffer the indignity of identity theft if she did not step forward and claim ownership of her pen name.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁴ More specifically, this speculation was fueled in part by individuals stepping forward to claim ownership of George Eliot as a pseudonym; in this same entry written on April 17, 1859 Evans names the most infamous offender and the fact that she had, during the previous week, "sent a letter to the Times [sic] denying that 'Mr Liggins' is the author" (*The Journals of George Eliot* 300). Liggins' refusal to recant will be addressed in greater detail in the following section.

Presenting a Genuine George Eliot

The process through which George Eliot was revealed to be Mary Anne Evans is a complicated narrative in its own right and could serve a case study for scholars examining nineteenth-century fraud as well as those interested in nineteenth-century counterfactual literary history.¹¹⁵ Viewed retroactively, it is relatively easy for scholars to sort Eliot's earliest readers into three basic categories. The first group was composed of individuals who may have suspected George Eliot was one Mary Anne Evans but had no interest in pursuing the matter further; the most prominent members found in this faction would probably be the Blackwood publishers who were more than happy to let this new, profitable addition to their stable of authors remain anonymous so long as Eliot kept producing books that sold.¹¹⁶ The second camp was the select group of persons who knew Evans both socially and as a writer and as a result possessed strong suspicions that "George Eliot" might be Mary Anne Evans.¹¹⁷ But as Evans and Lewes' collections of correspondence demonstrate, even the friendliest of inquiries regarding the likelihood of Evans as George Eliot filled Evans no little amount of trepidation, and it was for this reason Evans and Lewes disclosed the truth to few and actively mislead all others who

¹¹⁵ For a more complete overview of Joseph Liggins' role in Evans' decision to come forward publicly as George Eliot, see Pam Hirsch's *Ligginitis, Three Georges, Perie-zadeh and Spitting Critics, or 'Will the Real Mr Eliot Stand Up?'* (2001) and "What's In a Name: Competing Claims to the Authority of George Eliot" (2004).

¹¹⁶ "Although Blackwood may well have guessed who his new author was, he ran a conservative family magazine and was just as happy not to know the truth too exactly," Rosemarie Bodenheimer explains, "The trio [of Evans, Lewis, and Blackwood] maintained the fiction of a male George Eliot as long as possible in their correspondence, and Blackwood's patience and praise were enlisted in Lewes's efforts to keep Marian writing despite her all-too-ready descents into despair and fears of failure" ("A Woman of Many Names" 29).

¹¹⁷ Evans' brother Isaac was reported by her friend Sara Hennell to have said that "No one but his Sister could write the book [*Adam Bede*]'—and his impression has been the same for 'Clerical Sketches'" (*The George Eliot Letters* 3: 98).

inquired as to the possibility of Evans' authorship.¹¹⁸ The third and largest group consisted of persons who were desperately curious to know who George Eliot was—and with no information provided by either Evans or her publishers, they concocted many theories whose candidates ranged from the plausible to the incredible.

For the most part, Evans encouraged the perpetuation of multiple theories of authorship; after all, the more theories there were, the more easily the rumors attributing authorship of *Scenes of Clerical Life* and *Adam Bede* to Mary Anne Evans could be lost in the crowd. So it would have been with a lighter heart that Evans learned that Jane Carlyle, the wife of Thomas Carlyle, was so convinced of Eliot's clergyman-persona that she wrote to "Eliot," wondering "if the person I am addressing bears any resemblance, in external things to the Idea I have conceived of him in my mind—a man of middle age, with a wife from whom he has got those beautiful *feminine* touches in his book, a good many children, and a dog.... And [I] look forward with what Mr. Carlyle would call 'a good healthy, genuine desire' to shaking hands with you someday" (*The George Eliot Letters* 2: 26).¹¹⁹ It is also more likely than not that Evans viewed readers' belief that George Eliot was the pen name of Edward Bulwer-Lytton with a degree of equanimity as

¹¹⁸ "Despite her own and Lewes's avowed commitment to 'truth,'" Nancy Henry notes, "they showed a shared willingness to perpetuate falsehoods both as to the identity of George Eliot and the marital status of Mrs Marian Lewes. They were surprisingly willing to blur fact and fiction, to lie when the lie seemed necessary to their larger purposes" (Henry, *The Life of George Eliot* 104). Agnes Lewes, for example, had stated her belief that George Eliot was "the father of a family—was sure I was a man who had seen a great deal of society" (*The Journals of George Eliot* 290) and neither Eliot nor Lewes made any effort to correct her mistake either publicly or privately.

¹¹⁹ Interestingly, one of the authors who perceived early on that George Eliot was a woman was Charles Dickens, and he responded with gleeful pleasure and an invitation after his hypothesis regarding whether George Eliot was a woman's pseudonym had been confirmed to be correct: "I hope you will let me come to see you when we are all in or near London again," he wrote, "and tell you—as a curiosity—my reasons for the faith that was in me that you were a woman, and for the absolute and never-doubting confidence with which I have waved all men away from Adam Bede [sic], and nailed my colors to the Mast with 'Eve' upon them" (*The George Eliot Letters* 3: 115).

this implication, as Pam Hirsch has commented, “can only have been perceived as a compliment to an inexperienced writer of fiction” (Hirsch “Ligginitis” 81).¹²⁰ But Evans was not nearly as sanguine when one of the public’s prospective candidates for Eliot’s true identity, a Joseph Liggins of Nuneaton, Warwickshire, passively endorsed the false attribution.

Although Evans’ private correspondence suggests that she initially believed that Liggins to be merely another name bandied about by curious readers—as demonstrated by her letter written in early June of 1857 when she gently corrected her sister Fanny by informing her that “You are wrong about Mr. Liggins or rather your informants are wrong. We too have been struck with the ‘Clerical Sketches,’ and I have recognized some figures and traditions connected with our old neighbourhood. But Blackwood informs Mr. Lewes that the author is a Mr. Eliot, a clergyman, I presume” (*The George Eliot Letters* 2: 337)—matters had grown much more serious by April of the following year when Liggins’ friends were have rumored to have begun collecting funds to help support the man after the Blackwoods withheld his payment for *Adam Bede* (Bodenheimer *The Real Life of Mary Anne Evans* 138).¹²¹ By the end of the month Evans’ stance on anonymity was eroding and she wrote to John Blackwood to inform him that “I would willingly, if it were possible—which it clearly is not—retain my incognito as long as I live, I can suffer no one to bear my arms on his shield” (*The George Eliot Letters* 3: 60).

¹²⁰ John Blackwood once noted, when discussing the serial publication of the tales that would become *Scenes of Clerical Life*, that among readers “There is a very general tendency to attribute the series to Bulwer, of all people in the world. The notion I daresay has mainly arisen from the fact of Sir Edward having written so much in the Magazine, and when people have any such leading clue as that they flatter themselves by imagining that they detect resemblances of style” (*The George Eliot Letters* 2: 322).

¹²¹ Technically, this complaint was valid—the Blackwoods did not pay him for *Adam Bede*. Of course, Liggins did not write the novel, either, so there was no need to do so, despite what Liggins’ friends and supporters believed.

Judging from Evans' correspondence and journal entries there can be little doubt that these months contesting Liggins' authorship were a particularly difficult time for her. She had created the persona of George Eliot so she might pursue a career as a novelist in freedom, in privacy, and without misogynistic bias, but now the pseudonym that had made this new stage of her literary career both possible and profitable was a source of contention and Evans' best chance of silencing Liggins' claims was to step forward as Mary Anne Evans Lewes.¹²²

Evans had once stated her intention to John Blackwood that she was more than willing to do away with one pseudonym and try another should her fiction prove to be "a mere flash in the pan" (*The George Eliot Letters* 2: 309), but when forced to discard her pen name by circumstances rather than by choice Evans' response was heated. She wrote to the editor of the *Times*, expressing her displeasure regarding articles that continued to confuse the authorship question when "Mr. Liggins is, I know, perfectly aware of the delusion which exists concerning his claim to the authorship [of *Adam Bede*] and aware of the efforts made by myself and publishers to dispel it," (*The George Eliot Letters* 3:92-93) going so far as to declare Liggins both "*an imposter*" and "*a swindler*" (*The George Eliot Letters* 3:92-93; italics original).¹²³ Even when read from the distance of a century and half, Evans' outrage is unmistakable, and for good reason; the barriers she had built between her public and private personas were going to be irrevocably altered from this point forward and there was little she could do to protect her literary career.

¹²² Indeed, in his monograph *The Quest for Anonymity: The Novels of George Eliot* (1997) Henry Alley argues that Liggins was, in essence, blackmailing Evans although he never contacted her directly (128).

¹²³ According to Gordon S. Haight this letter was never published in the *Times* (Haight, *The George Eliot Letters* 3: 92-93).

A few days after Evans posted her letter to the *Times* Evans and Lewes wrote to their friend Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon, offering up the explanation for their actions he feared the public would ignore in favor of more sensational—if fictional—justifications for Evans' decision to write under a pen name:

It makes me angry to think that people should say that the secret has been kept because there was any *fear* of the effect of the author's name. You may tell it openly to all who care to hear it that the object of anonymity was to get the book judged on its own merits, and not prejudged as the work of a woman, or of a particular woman. It is quite clear that people would have sniffed at it if they had known the writer to be a woman but they can't now unsay their admiration. (*The George Eliot Letters* 3: 106; italics original)¹²⁴

Evans and Lewes probably would have preferred to be proven wrong in this respect, but their reading of the situation was accurate. By 1859 Evans—or Mrs. Lewes, as she insisted upon being publicly addressed—had become an infamous public figure thanks to her relationship with Lewes, but the revelation that she was George Eliot propelled her notoriety to new heights. While it should be noted that not all of Evans' friends and readers received the news badly, those who did take the information poorly tended to

¹²⁴According to Gordon S. Haight, this portion of the letter was written in George Henry Lewes' handwriting, as was a second postscript imploring Bodichon to not "write or tell Marian anything *unpleasant* that you hear unless it is important for her to hear it. She is so very sensitive, and has such a tendency to dwell on and believe in unpleasant ideas that I always keep them from her. What other people would disregard or despise sinks into her mind. She knows nothing of this second postscript, of course" (*The George Eliot Letters* 3:106; italics original).

overshadow those who did not.¹²⁵ And it did not help that Evans' relationship with the Blackwoods grew increasingly strained as it became known that the conservative publishers had forged yet another tie to the far more liberal Evans-Lewes household even as Evans was in the process of beginning negotiations to sell her next novel, *The Mill on the Floss* (Ashton 219, 227-31).

Adding, then, to these sources of tension were also the printed reactions found in periodical, magazines, and newspapers where literary critics and commentators could voice their opinions on Evans' Announcement. Of all the negative reactionary pieces written in response to Evans' public dismissal of the Liggins claim, the one featured in the *Athenæum* is probably the best known.¹²⁶ Here, in the "Weekly Gossip" William Hepworth Dixon informs readers that it was

time to end this pother about the authorship of 'Adam Bede.' The writer is in no sense a 'great unknown'; the tale, if bright in parts, and such as a clever woman with an observant eye and unschooled moral nature might have written, has no great quality of any kind. Long ago we hinted our impression that Mr. Liggins, with his poverty and his pretensions, was a mystification, got up by George Eliot,—as the showman in a country fair sets up a second learned pig to create a division among the penny paying rustics [sic].... The elaborate attempt to mystify the reading public,

¹²⁵ For example, it is difficult to determine whether Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon, was more delighted that she had been able to deduce Eliot's true identity from a review praising *Adam Bede* before actually reading the novel or that her friend's work was gaining such renown: "I can't tell you, my dear George Eliot how enchanted I am. Very few things could have given me so much pleasure. 1st That a woman should write a wise and *humourous* book... 2nd That YOU *that you* whom they spit at should do it!" (*The George Eliot Letters* 3:56; italics, capitalization, and repetition all original).

¹²⁶ William Hepworth Dixon, the editor of the *Athenæum*, wrote this piece. His hyperbole is also hypocrisy: Dixon is known to have written reviews of his books under a pseudonym in the *Athenæum* (Showalter 96).

pursued in many articles and letters at the same time, but with the same Roman hand observable in all, is itself decisive of the writer's power. No woman of genius ever condescended to such a *ruse*,—no book was ever permanently helped by such a trick. (*The George Eliot Letters* 3:109n1; italics original)

Although these excerpts from the *Athenæum*'s column do not address Evans by name, they do go beyond Evans' original fears by turning her into a figure of ridicule and derision. Dixon begins by dismissing the unbiased reviews written about *Adam Bede* when George Eliot was still relatively unknown, states that Evans was responsible for conducting a sock-puppet campaign with Liggins' assistance, and then concludes that if Evans actually was a genius she would never have countenanced such a strategy—thus leaving the column's readers with the unspoken conclusion that Evans should not be considered one. The ugliness of this commentary may be fueled in part by the public's frustration with the mystery of George Eliot's identity—a source of vexation for many persons, including Evans herself—but there is also a nastier tone running through this public diatribe.

Pam Hirsh has pinpointed multiple reasons for critics' blatantly negative response to Evans' announcement that she was George Eliot. According to Hirsh, the aggression displayed by many of these individuals stemmed in equal parts from their own cultural biases and a fear of looking ridiculous in front of their peers. For these reasons “they could not forgive Marian Lewes for failing to be a mature Oxbridge-educated man, the only body they could admit as the bearer of ‘genius’... an attribution that, try as they might, could not now be un-said” (“Ligginitis”93); in their mortification that “Marian

(with George Lewes' help) had fooled the London literati, the in-crowd who thought they could and should know everything" they be dismissed Evans' claim, "determined to flush the real 'George Eliot' out from cover" ("Ligginitis"93). Mary Anne Evans' decision to write was always an act of defiance because of because of her sex, her class, her relationship with George Henry Lewes, but most of all, because she had the temerity to write serious literature and she wanted this writing to be judged fairly by her peers. Hirsh's assessment of the resulting backlash neatly summarizes the intersection of sexism and classism that resulted when the public learned how Evans had once again defied nineteenth-century British cultural norms. And while it is easy enough to understand why certain individuals reacted with such surprise, given the predetermined expectations most literary critics maintained when it came to male and female authors' writing, their hostility only underscores why Evans initially chose to write anonymously and then under a male pseudonym.

Up unto this point this chapter's discussion of Evans' early career as a novelist has demonstrated the complexities of Victorian female authorship without taking her counterfactual persona into account. But it is imperative that the sequence of events leading to Evans' continued usage of her original pseudonym—and the ramifications of this usage—are fully understood since the transformation of Evans' pseudonym to a counterfactual persona was the amplification of Evans' efforts to improve women's place in British society, not its beginning. Evans had proven the validity of her arguments in "Silly Novels by Lady Novelists" regarding women's ability to write serious literature, but with her anonymity stripped away, new opportunities capable of making differences in the lives of more women now lay ahead. And chief among them was the chance to

continue the work she had already begun by reorienting contemporary conversations regarding what it meant to be a woman with a vocation in nineteenth-century Britain. Fortunately for Evans, she had already begun this work with the introduction Dinah Morris, one of the protagonists in *Adam Bede*. Although Dinah is not a writer like Evans, she is a woman with a strong religious calling whose role in the novel is inherently tied to her vocation as a Methodist lay preacher. By addressing Evans' treatment of Dinah's vocation, the next section of this chapter will lay the groundwork the final discussion of both Evans' counterfactual persona and her literary legacy.

Introducing Dinah Morris

From the first moment readers meet Dinah Morris in *Adam Bede*, she is acknowledged as one of this novel's moral and spiritual authorities. Indeed, so great is Dinah's vocation as a Methodist preacher that in the same scene readers meet her, they are also told by her admirer, Seth Bede, that "she's neither for you nor for me to win," (Eliot, *Adam Bede* 64) because of her vocation. And lest readers dismiss Seth's words as the besotted tribute of an infatuated man, Evans is swift to reinforce the legitimacy of Dinah's vocation by providing testimony from characters of all classes and temperaments, ranging from Seth Bede's querulous mother Lisbeth (Eliot, *Adam Bede* 172), to the misogynistic schoolmaster Bartle Massey (Eliot, *Adam Bede* 499), to the local Anglican rector, Mr. Irwine (Eliot, *Adam Bede* 154). Due to Irwine's position as an official spiritual leader, his observations regarding Dinah's ministry are particularly important as she is a Methodist who possesses only tenuous ties to his rural community. But after speaking with Dinah on the subject of her calling, Irwine became "deeply

interested” (Eliot, *Adam Bede* 154) and tells himself that ““He must be a miserable prig who would act the pedagogue here: one might as well go and lecture the trees for growing in their own shape”” (Eliot, *Adam Bede* 154). Irwine’s tacit approval of Dinah’s character and his use of a nature metaphor when describing her vocation emphasizes that Dinah’s abilities are as much as God’s work as the trees she is compared to.

In addition to the issue of Dinah’s abilities, Dinah and Irwine touch upon a second important topic during t their conversation: her sex, and how being a woman affects her calling. Although Dinah views herself as only a vessel for a Divine voice to speak through—she tells Irwine that “when God makes his presence felt through us, we are like the burning bush: Moses never took any heed what sort of bush it was—he only saw the brightness of the Lord” (Eliot, *Adam Bede*154)—Evans makes it clear via the reactions of the characters to whom Dinah ministers that the fact Dinah is a woman is significant. While the combination of Dinah’s sex and her vocation are initially viewed as a curiosity, people stay to hear her preach because they find her worth listening to. Dinah is able to forge a bond with some of the women she meets; for example, she forges a bond with Lisbeth Bede that neither Irwine nor Seth, the more religious of Lisbeth’s two sons, could ever manage.¹²⁷ Furthermore, Dinah’s relationship with Hetty Sorrel is what pulls Hetty back from her emotional, spiritual, and mental crisis when she is on trial for infanticide. Dinah is the only person Hetty is willing to speak with while she is imprisoned, it is because of Dinah Hetty confesses to her crime, and it is Dinah who sits with Hetty in the

¹²⁷ Lisbeth is able to accept Dinah’s assistance in part because she, too, is “a working’ woman!” (Eliot, *Adam Bede* 172)—and in part because of Dinah’s own character. When praying with Dinah, Lisbeth is said to have felt “a vague sense of goodness and love, and of something right lying underneath and beyond all this sorrowing life. She couldn’t understand the sorrow; but, for these moments, under the subduing influence of Dinah’s spirit, she felt that she must be patient and still” (Eliot, *Adam Bede* 177).

cart where Hetty “clung to her and clutched her [Dinah] as the only visible sign of love and pity” (Eliot, *Adam Bede* 503) while traveling to Hetty’s sentencing. Dinah offers solace to Lisbeth and Hetty when these women would have otherwise been left bereft, and by way of Dinah’s words and actions, Evans is able to prove the validity this novel’s implicit thesis: that women may have vocations and that when they are allowed to fulfill these vocations the whole of society benefits.

A Counterfactual Conclusion for *Adam Bede*

By the time readers have reached the final chapters of *Adam Bede* Dinah’s fitness as a spiritual leader has been thoroughly demonstrated and recognized by nearly every character within this novel. And by this point, readers have also been primed for a uniquely satisfying ending that combines both a proposal and Adam’s understanding that Dinah will continue to practice her vocation even after they are wed (Eliot, *Adam Bede* 546). Consequently, to learn in the novel’s epilogue that Dinah has voluntarily given up her role as a Methodist lay preacher is a devastating realization. And although it may initially appear counterintuitive, I argue that by diverting from the sequence of events outlined above, Evans actually fashions a more thought-provoking ending for the novel than had she stayed the course outlined in the chapters preceding the novel’s epilogue. By first foreshadowing this tantalizing ahistorical possibility before divesting Dinah of her chosen vocation, Evans deliberately vexes readers who may expect Dinah to defy the 1803 edict proclaimed by the Wesleyan Methodist Conference which discouraged women

from preaching (Waldron, *Adam Bede* 573n1).¹²⁸ In doing so, Evans subtly encourages her readers to consider first the possibility and then the altered outcomes of ahistorical events—thereby introducing the abstract concept of counterfactual scenarios—while also inspiring these same readers to consider women’s roles in society not only in the past, but the present and the future as well.

The published edition of *Adam Bede* does not end on an overtly feminist note, despite Dinah’s original assertion that she would remain unwed and Adam’s promise that he would not interfere with her spiritual work after their marriage.¹²⁹ Instead, Evans initiates a more pervasive strategy that requires readers to question the reasoning that resulted in Dinah’s exchange of public life of service for a private life centered in her home. The explanation for Dinah’s decision is prompted in the epilogue by Seth Bede’s expression of regret that he and Dinah did not leave the Wesleyans and join “a body that

¹²⁸ *Adam Bede* owes much to Evans’ Methodist Aunt Elizabeth Evans who, as Evans relates in her “History of ‘Adam Bede,’” once told a young Evans “an anecdote from her own experience.... How she had visited a condemned criminal, a very ignorant girl who had murdered her child and refused to confess—how she had stayed with her, praying, through the night ... [and how] My Aunt afterwards went with her in the cart to the place of execution, and she described to me the great respect with which this ministry of hers was regarded by the official people about the gaol. The story, told by my aunt with great feeling, affected me deeply, and I never lost the impression of that afternoon and our talk together” (*The Journals of George Eliot* 296).

¹²⁹ According to Evans’s “History of ‘Adam Bede,’” Dinah’s ending was prompted by George Henry Lewes’ enthusiasm for this type of conclusion for the novel (297). But not every reader or scholar has appreciated the novel’s ending to same degree. Henry James professed his doubts regarding the necessity of the “nun-like” (185) Dinah’s marriage, viewing it as “artistic weakness” (185) on Evans’ part, tracing its presence to Lewes’ undue influence; similarly, John S. Diekhoff vehemently voices his disapproval in his article “The Happy Ending of Adam Bede” (1936), where he describes the novel’s end as “George Henry Lewes’ mistaken judgment,” and goes so far as to say that “This ending has been thought out of harmony with the tone of the whole and untrue to character” (221). Bruce K. Martin’s slightly more recent “Rescue and Marriage in *Adam Bede*” (1972) examines the arguments presented by Diekhoff and other scholars regarding the suitability and purpose of Dinah and Adam’s marriage—and presents his own argument as well, noting that Evans “reversed her original intention quite early in the composition of *Adam Bede*, immediately after finishing the third chapter.... Because she began working in terms of this new conception so early in the composition, it seems foolish to speculate about the merits of a work (the ‘original’ novel) of which we no practically nothing” (757). While it would be fascinating to know more about Evans’ initial plans for Dinah’s fate and incorporate them into this chapter’s discussion of the counterfactual, Martin raises an excellent point about working only with the contents of the novel Evans published; for this reason, the contents of this entry have been acknowledged in an endnote rather than the body of this chapter.

‘ud put no bonds on Christian liberty,” (Eliot, *Adam Bede* 573) a Methodist sect that would allow Dinah to preach. But rather than allowing Dinah to respond to Seth’s comment, Adam steps in and corrects his younger brother by stating his own belief that Dinah “was right and thee wast [sic] wrong” because “Most o’ the women [preachers] do more harm nor [sic] good with their preaching—they’ve not got Dinah’s gift nor her sperrit [sic]...and she thought it right to set th’ example o’ submitting, for she’s not held from other sorts o’ teaching” (Eliot, *Adam Bede* 573).¹³⁰ Although this is an important passage, it is also a short one as neither Seth nor Dinah respond verbally to Adam’s statement. Readers are simply told that “Seth was silent” and that the issue “was a standing subject of difference, rarely alluded to, and Dinah, wishing to quit it at once” (Eliot, *Adam Bede* 573) asks Adam a question about an entirely different topic. Dinah’s muteness on the issue of her vocation is both noticeable and more than a little troubling, as her role as a lay preacher was once the center of her life. Accordingly, Dinah’s silence is left open to multiple interpretations, including one that requires a closer look at the underlying logic of Adam’s borrowed argument.

When considering the explanation as to why Dinah relinquished her vocation, Adam cites the possibility of women preachers doing more harm than good because most of these women would not possess Dinah’s aptitude for preaching and ministry. Many of Evans’ readers would have been aware of Methodism’s attitude towards women as the Methodists’ “complete exclusion of women preachers was probably only complete by 1850” (Stolpa 31), nine years before the publication of *Adam Bede*. While the Methodists

¹³⁰ Evans’ aunt, Elizabeth Evans, was one such Methodist who chose to work with a different group of Methodists rather than give up preaching (Stolpa 31).

who had enforced this ruling since 1803 may have had a point regarding the potential difficulties caused by untrained ministers, but the larger unspoken issue is the fact that in the intervening decades the Methodist church did not remedy this situation so female Methodists might receive the necessary education, training, and administrative support to be religious leaders. So while many Methodist women may not have been considered suitable for the positions of religious authority, it was the social, educational, and religious systems of nineteenth-century Britain that failed the British female population, and then continued to punish them for this failure. As a result, any dissatisfaction readers feel when contemplating the novel's ending can be traced to events in living memory and decisions made by actual, fallible individuals acting in the not-so-distant past. Although Dinah's restrictions are based on the precepts of her church and as such would not have been relevant to each of Evans' readers, Dinah's situation as a whole functions as an example of the systematic inequalities women faced when attempting to operate in the public sphere, whether the sphere in question was religious ministry or the literary marketplace.

The counterfactual functions differently in Evans' novel than it does in the texts by Sir Walter Scott and the Brontë siblings. Evans' use of the counterfactual in conjunction with *Adam Bede* is nowhere near as obvious as the counterfactual scenarios posed in *Redgauntlet* and the Glass Town Saga; instead, Evans' strategy aligns more neatly with Wai Chee Dimock's description of the counterfactual as "a world resting just below the threshold of actualization, made up of *could-have-beens* and *could-still-bes*. These counterfactuals are, by our common parlance, non-events" (242). But by ending Dinah's career as a lay preacher, Evans effectively takes *Adam Bede*'s historically-

accurate non-event and transformed it into one that will inspire a sense of loss in the readers who are invested in Dinah's vocation. Strictly speaking, Evans has not created a counterfactual conclusion for *Adam Bede*, it would be more accurate to say she promotes a counterfactual proto-feminist mode of thought in the minds of her readers, encouraging them to question women's place in British society. Evans' readers are the ones who must consider the ramifications of Dinah's unfulfilled vocation and decide whether the societal standards of the past should continue to be upheld in the present and the future. By adopting this delicate approach, Evans frames her questions so they must be answered by each reader—just as Evans herself attempted to do throughout her literary career.¹³¹

From Pseudonym to Counterfactual Persona: Mary Anne Evans' Polite Fictions in Life and After Death

It was not unusual for authors—especially women authors—to make use of pseudonyms in nineteenth-century literary culture, but the degree to which Evans

¹³¹ When viewed retroactively, it is easy to understand why Evans' ideas regarding women's vocations were framed in terms of the individual's choice and not as an ideology meant to appeal en masse to women's rights' campaigns. The notion of women claiming vocations in nineteenth-century Britain was a controversial subject to begin with because "Victorian women were not accustomed to *choosing* a vocation; womanhood was a vocation in itself" (Showalter 21; italics original). As a result, women writers needed to be able to fulfill their literary vocations without blatantly violating the feminine roles society assigned to them. Advocating unconventional behavior would almost certainly fall within this category, and it is for this reason that women writers' opinions regarding appropriate feminine behavior—both in life and in literature—generally fell on the conservative end of the spectrum. "Women novelists might have banded together and insisted on their vocation as something that made them superior to the ordinary woman, and perhaps even happier," Elaine Showalter explains, but "Instead they adopted defensive positions and committed themselves to conventional roles" (86). Having achieved both success and financial stability as a female novelist, it is understandable that Evans remained reserved when addressing matters related to women, vocation, and the women's rights' movement; hers was a precarious position and she needed to proceed carefully.

maintained her pseudonym sets her further apart from her peers.¹³² After Mary Anne Evans revealed that she was George Eliot she kept her pen name, transforming it into a full-fledged counterfactual persona. This polite fiction served multiple purposes: first, it acted as a psychological shield, allowing Evans to fulfill her vocation as a writer while readers and critics address focused their attention on her literary persona. Secondly, it allowed Evans the opportunity to build a more visibly unified literary legacy than had she chosen a second pen name or resumed writing anonymously. But because Evans possessed an eye for historicity, “George Eliot” not only became a subtle example of nineteenth-century British proto-feminist commentary capable of highlighting the inequalities British women dealt with in everyday life, its usage was also transformed into a Victorian practice that is still observed today.

George Eliot’s transition from pen name to counterfactual persona took place with the publication of *The Mill on the Floss* in 1860.¹³³ Evans felt no small amount of anxiety at the prospect of finally publishing a novel under a known pseudonym, despite the reassurances of her friends and family and the advice of her publisher, John Blackwood, who had informed her that his “opinion is that George Eliot has only to write her book quietly without disturbing herself about what people are saying and she can command

¹³² Charlotte Brontë, for example, refused to be addressed as *Currer Bell*. Once, at a gathering in the Thackerays’ home, Thackeray referred to Charlotte by her pen name and Charlotte reputedly “tossed her head and said ‘She believed that there were books being published by a person named Currer Bell ... but the person he was talking to was Miss Brontë—and she saw no connection between the two’” (Thackeray Ritchie qtd. in Barker 643).

¹³³ The degree to which people were made immediately aware George Eliot was a woman writer and George Eliot was Mary Anne Evans’ pen name is debatable, but there were printed notices in newspapers after Evans came forward, one of which was the Literary and Artistic Gossip column in *The Derby Mercury* which noted that “The great ‘Adam Bede’ secret is at length thought to be discovered, and the author is *not* ... Mr. Joseph Liggins, but simply a Miss Mary Anne Evans, already known in this strong minded generation as the translator of Strauss’s ‘Life of Jesus.’ Very well: and assuming that to be so, what then? And why all this mystery?” (“Literary and Artistic Gossip”; italics original).

success” (*The George Eliot Letters* 3: 222). Fortunately, Blackwood’s professional assessment of the situation proved to be correct—at least in terms of sales—and six thousand copies of the novel had sold by the third month of its publication (Altick 385n31). Critically speaking, matters were less straightforward. Responses to the novel ranged widely, but as a whole *The Mill on the Floss* “was met with decreased critical acclaim than her previous works” (Easley 154). It was during this period that Evans and Lewes developed additional strategies to prevent Evans (and Evans’ career) from being unduly affected by the attention her work generated; they deliberately scheduled trips abroad to Europe to coincide with weeks of post-publication media agitation, and Lewes shielded his partner from all negative literary criticism so these reviews’ contents would not disturb her creative process (Ashton 241; Hughes, *George Eliot: The Last Victorian* 248-49).¹³⁴ Although these coping methods did not always operate perfectly, they functioned well enough for Evans to write despite bouts of depression and anxiety; over the next decade she published a variety of poems, short stories, and essays as well as *Silas Marner* (1861), *Romola* (1863), and *Felix Holt, the Radical* (1866) (Bodenheimer, “A Woman of Many Names” 31).¹³⁵ And with this increased productivity came a larger

¹³⁴ After *Adam Bede*’s publication, Evans stopped reading reviews, depending on her partner to serve as a conduit for the public’s criticism (Hughes, *George Eliot: The Last Victorian* 248-49). Lewes was very protective of Evans and relayed only positive feedback; he also made a point of informing their friends of this arrangement so they might adjust their correspondence accordingly. “I ‘mislaide’ and suppressed that portion of your letter [referencing a review],” he informed Sara Hennell in September of 1862, “After the publication of ‘Adam Bede’ Marian felt deeply the evil influences of talking and allowing others to talk to her about her writing. We resolved therefore to exclude everything as far as we could. No one speaks about her books to her, but me; she sees no criticisms.... there is a special reason in [Marian’s] case—it is that excessive diffidence which prevented her writing at all, for so many years, and would prevent her now, if I were not beside her encourage her. A thousand eulogies would not give her the slightest confidence, but one objection would increase her doubts” (*The George Eliot Letters* 4: 58).

¹³⁵ Increased productivity also brought about came greater financial stability and social acceptability and the Evans-Lewes home in London hosted Sunday afternoon receptions for distinguished guests, including Charles Darwin, Henry James, Georgie Burne-Jones, and Princess Louise (Hughes, “George Eliot’s Life” 9).

audience whose fondness for Evans' writing translated into a fondness for her authorial identity.

British literary culture of the 1870s embraced Evans' George Eliot persona during her life, and mourned its passing with her death in 1880. By this point in her career most of Evans' readers were aware that George Eliot was Mary Anne Evans Lewes'—and later, Mary Anne Evans Cross'—public face, and addressed her accordingly. “When we have passed in review the works of that great writer who calls herself George Eliot, and given for a time our use of sight to her portraitures of men and women, what form, as we move away, persists on the field of vision, and remains the chief centre of interest for the imagination?” (164) Edward Dowden asks rhetorically in the opening sentence of his 1872 article on Eliot for *The Contemporary Review*. The answer is, “if not the real George Eliot...that ‘second self’ who writes her books, and lives and speaks through them” (164). Indeed, Dowden is so enthusiastic about Eliot that the first two full paragraphs of this essay on Evans' characters are devoted to the persona George Eliot—for readers “feel in reading these books that we are in the presence of a soul, and a soul which has had a history...” (165)—before Dowden turns his attention to the characters in Evans' novels.¹³⁶ Other literary critics may not have reached the heights of Dowden's zeal, but they did make a point of explicitly addressing the Eliot persona in even general essays on Evans' fiction. R.H. Hutton wrote an essay entitled “George Eliot's Heroines” (1876) for *The Spectator* where it is argued that “when GE paints a woman's character at all, she herself regards it with some very strongly marked feeling, and cannot, therefore,

¹³⁶ According to Lewes, he was “moved to tears by [Dowden's] noble essay” and “read aloud to [Evans] some of the passages which I knew she would most like to hear. They touched her very much” (*The George Eliot Letters* 5: 300).

paint it with a light hand” (170). When publishing a retrospective of Evans’ work in 1878, the anonymous author of an article in *The Westminster Review* “confess[es] at once to a much more deep and sincere admiration of George Eliot’s earlier than of her later writings” (176). And Sidney Colvin contrasted George Eliot’s writing to that of George Sand in his 1876 essay in *The Fortnightly Review*, declaring that “The art of fiction has reached its highest point in the hands of two women in our time” (174). As this small sampling of articles about Evans’ writing demonstrate, critics and readers considered her work to be a valued portion of British literary culture. Moreover, their attitude towards Evans’ counterfactual persona of George Eliot appears to be one of acceptance and, in some cases, partiality.

Like the reviews and articles that made copious uses of George Eliot’s name during Evans’ life, so too did the notices, obituaries, and columns written after her death on December 22, 1880.¹³⁷ This was a logical decision on the part of journalists and editors; George Eliot’s fame had long eclipsed the notoriety Mary Anne Evans’s name had acquired due to her relationship with George Henry Lewes—and in any case, her marriage to John Cross in May of 1880 meant her surname might not make her immediately identifiable to readers. But even taking the necessity of identifying Evans via her pseudonym into account, the name George Eliot is often used more frequently and with equal—if not greater—weight than the name Mary Anne Evans Cross in many of these columns and Announcements. For example, the December 24 edition of *The Pall Mall Gazette*’s “Epitome of Opinion” column included passages quoted from other major

¹³⁷ Even her gravestone reflects her dual identity; buried next to George Henry Lewes, Evans’ monument reads: “Here lies the body of ‘George Eliot,’” and beneath her pseudonym is “Mary Anne Cross” (Henry, *The Life of George Eliot* 264).

periodicals covering Evans' death, including *The Daily News*, *The Times*, *The Daily Telegraph*, and *The Spectator*. Of these four publications only *The Spectator's* excerpt alternated between referring to Evans as Mrs. Cross and George Eliot, while all the others referred to Evans exclusively as Eliot. The *Birmingham Daily Post* adopted a similar approach when focusing on how this loss would affect the holiday season: "This Christmas will be made sorrowful to many readers by the death of 'George Eliot,' the great novelist ... Mrs. Cross, better known by her maiden name of Marian Evans, and best of all by her literary name of 'George Eliot,' occupies amongst writers of fiction a place which no other novelist has ever taken: and now that it is left vacant there are none likely to fill it" ("News of the Day"). But while these periodicals focused primarily on loss and what Evans' (and Eliot's) absence would mean to the literary community, other journalists took a more factual approach.¹³⁸ *The Pall Mall Gazette's* own column on Evans' passing included a narrative of her life up until she moved to London since "Many inaccurate statements have been made respecting George Eliot's parentage and early life" ("George Eliot's Early Life"). Others focused on how little information was publicly known about Evans beyond her published work— while questioning how the

¹³⁸ Interestingly, this includes the gossip columnists. On December 29, the day of Evans' funeral, one columnist published an exquisitely malicious piece that informed readers that Evans' death was no surprise to anyone who had seen her since her return from Europe since "you could see that at a glance, and the feebleness which marked her at her Sunday afternoon receptions" and that while she was capable of clever conversation, one could "hardly believe [her writing] to be the work of a woman" ("London and Paris Gossip"). Readers were also informed that "the old lady was distressingly plain, plain even to homeliness... and George Eliot was so conscious of this that she refused to sit for her portrait to any of the Photographic Companies who are always on the look out for popular subjects" ("London and Paris Gossip"). Finally, the writer ended this entry by declaring "I do not envy the man who has the task of writing her life, if her life is to be written in anything like detail, if it is to be written, that is, as Stuart Mill's was written" ("London and Paris Gossip"). What makes this piece both more interesting and more horrifying is that the author only addresses Evans by her pen name, and the contents and tone of this column suggest its author was probably a casual acquaintance of Evans.

relationship between Evans and Eliot would unfold now that Evans was no longer alive to enforce the separation between her public and private lives.

The columnist for *The Athenaeum* declared that Evans herself “was her greatest work” (qtd. in Harris, “The Biographical Tradition” 41), and the writer of the piece published in the *Hampshire Telegraph Sussex Chronicle* equated Evans’ characters with Evans by asserting that readers “met her often in the printed book” and that she “did not so much paint characters as she created characters . . . so much so that they became as it were, living beings, and exercised an influence of their own, and, still more, became the companions and the examples warnings of the public” (“Funeral of ‘George Eliot’”). After Evans’ funeral G. A. Sala of *The Illustrated London News* described her as “an abstraction, an impalpability” (27). He also remarked upon her general absence from the social side of literary culture during her life—“No photographs of her . . . visible in the shop windows. Her name appeared on no committee lists, nor in connection with any literary or social enterprise” (Sala 27)—and that with her passing that it was unlikely readers might ever learn anything else about her unless her correspondence was made available, and “we . . . may have to wait twenty years before the letters of ‘George Eliot,’ if she have [sic] left any, are published” (Sala 27).¹³⁹ Unfortunately for Sala, his frustration with the lack of information available about Mary Anne Evans was only to be expected; Evans possessed strong opinions regarding both biographies and autobiographies, and it

¹³⁹ Despite Sala’s gloomy prediction, persons interested in reading Evans’ letters had only to wait five years, not twenty. John Cross would compile and edit his wife’s letters and papers, and published *George Eliot’s Life as Related in her Letters and Journals* (1885) in three volumes, although this text would receive a rather mixed critical reception (Harris, “The Biographical Tradition” 43). Contemporary scholarship, however, has not been so kind; Kathryn Hughes has argued in her biography of Evans’ life that “The version of George Eliot that Cross presents in his well-meaning work is heavy with Victorian righteousness. His Eliot is the Sibyl, the Sage, the earnest talking head who urges the world to try harder. . . . Cross pruned everything from Eliot’s letters that might sit badly with his authorised version. Anything catty, sexy or funny has disappeared completely” (345).

was “a conscious decision on [her] part to withhold biographical information from the public domain” (Harris, “The Biographical Tradition” 42) because she believed that “The best history of a writer is contained in his writings—these are his chief actions” (*The George Eliot Letters* 7: 230). But while Evans’ attitude is understandable, biographical information can only augment our understanding of the choices she made throughout her career. By examining both the contents of Evans’ writing and the counterfactual persona can her literary legacy as a proto-feminist author may be appreciated in full.

Evans’ use of history is generally discussed by scholars in the context of her fiction, and for good reason—nearly all of Evans’ novels rely heavily on accurate depictions of periods set at least a generation in the past.¹⁴⁰ But while Evans had a longstanding interest in the relationship between history, and this interest is expressed through her counterfactual persona, too. Although Evans’ counterfactual persona cannot be traced to a particular moment in the past, “his” conception was triggered by misogynistic cultural biases that Evans (and many others) believed to be outdated and hoped to eliminate. And as some of the reviews and articles written in response to *Adam Bede* and *The Mill on the Floss* demonstrate, there was a distinct difference in tone between those written before and those written after Evans claimed her pseudonym publically, their contents reinforcing what Evans already knew to be true: few members nineteenth-century British society were ready to acknowledge—much less eradicate—sexism in the literary marketplace. The tone and content of articles written after Evans’ death did not noticeably alter the situation, either; while some writers were content to

¹⁴⁰ *Daniel Deronda* (1876) is an exception as it is set in the 1860s. As for Evans and history, Neil McCaw has noted that “Eliot’s fiction goes beyond such a broad historical realism and achieves a new (for the time) degree of historicity. In this sense Eliot defines the parameters of what might be called the *historiographical* novel” (10; italics original).

relay the facts of Evans' death and focus on how her passing would affect her readers emotionally, other journalists took a more investigative approach by questioning how George Eliot—and Mary Anne Evans—would be regarded by British literary history, not realizing that Evans had already taken that first step when she chose to continue her literary career under the name George Eliot.

Evans was able to shape this portion of her legacy by looking towards the future with the same type of care she took when addressing the past.¹⁴¹ If the negation of Dinah Morris's vocation at the end of *Adam Bede* is meant to encourage readers to adopt a counterfactual proto-feminist mode of thought resulting in progressive action, the polite fiction that was George Eliot is an example of how one might go about doing so. George Eliot did and did not exist in nineteenth-century Britain, and Evans' took full advantage of her ambiguous position in both society and the literary culture by arranging her personal and professional lives to suit herself first and society second. Evans' own path as a woman writer took her on a route that ran largely parallel to that of organized nineteenth-century proto-feminism, only occasionally intersecting. But despite this distance, Evans' end goal for women was similar to that of most women's rights campaigners: equality.

Through George Eliot, Evans attracted an audience whose members included the next generation of Britain's writers, critics, historians, and social activists. These

¹⁴¹ It probably helped that she had begun thinking about the link between art and life early in her career as a writer. According to Joanne Wilkes, Evans' literary aesthetic was profoundly affected by the intellectual movements of the 1820s and 1830s, and as a result she believed "the focus of human beings' aspirations and activities should be the welfare of their fellow men and women" ("Historiography" 146). In 1856, when she was employed by *The Westminster Review*, Evans wrote: "Art is the nearest thing to life; it is a mode of amplifying experience and extending our contact with our fellow-men beyond the bounds of our personal lot" (Eliot, "The Natural History of German Life" 193).

individuals witnessed the highs and lows of Evans' career as it was spun out in periodicals and newspapers and put on display for public consumption, and they—along with Evans' family, friends, and publishers—reaffirmed the literary legacy Evans had built during her life as George Eliot by continuing to use her pen name after her death.¹⁴² In doing so, the custom of referring to Mary Anne Evans as George Eliot became more than a Victorian convention—it became a tradition that is still observed today. While this pseudonym will always be Mary Anne Evans' pen name, its continued usage also ensures that the elements of Victorian society that compelled its existence will also be remembered since it is not possible to discuss Mary Anne Evans' authorship without also exploring how the counterfactual persona George Eliot came to be.

¹⁴² To borrow Wai Chee Dimock's language concerning authorhood, George Eliot has been granted "beginnings and endings beyond [its] biological lifespan, feeding [its] words into a continuum of eventualities, distributed across different scales of time, across events both large and small" (244).

CODA

The counterfactual history novel invites the contemplation of possibility: possible versions of the past, the present, and the future. Nineteenth-century British counterfactual history novels were written with different underlying purposes, but all these texts were influenced by their authors' need for a narrative to temporarily deviate from established historical certainty in order for society's quieter voices to be heard more clearly. Doing so allowed both author and audience to explore the ramifications of past possibilities in addition to outlining hopes for the future. The nineteenth century was a particularly opportune moment for the development of this type of narrative in Britain as the professionalization of the academic history discipline helped create a more receptive audience for widely varying forms of historical fiction.

A sampling of the diverse strategies authors utilized between the 1820s and the 1870s have been addressed in this dissertation. Chapter One's examination of a counterfactual Third Jacobite Rising in Sir Walter Scott's *Redgauntlet* allows Scott's characters—and his readers—to consider where each individual draws the line between cultural partisanship and political reality as Scott brought his renowned Waverley sequence to a much more palatable close for the Jacobites than what Jacobites endured in actuality. Chapter Two addresses the Brontës' multi-layered counterfactual juvenilia to show how these siblings' playful approach to the literary culture of their Glass Town

Federation not only allowed these children to continually experiment with their writing, but also prepared them for participation in Britain's literary culture as adults. And Chapter Three's focus on Mary Anne Evans' public declaration of her vocation via her counterfactual literary persona highlights the obstacles she overcame to build a literary legacy on her own terms while subtly encouraging other women to do the same.

Although each these authors writing towards different purposes, an increasingly forward-thinking arc becomes visible when considering their collective application of counterfactual historical narratives: Scott's emphasis on counterfactual possibilities of the past reconcile readers with present circumstances, the Brontës' private literary endeavors eventually helped them make the transition to published authorship, and the continued usage of Evans' pen name testifies to Evans' eye for historicity as she created a counterfactual persona whose existence is both a reproach aimed at Victorian Britain's cultural biases and a testimony to women writers' talent. While the curve of this arc is a subtle one, its presence signals a progressive in terms of both accessibility and direction as history narratives gained new significance for many Britons. Moreover, the development of this arc also marks the internal shift in direction chapters added to this monograph at next stage of this project will take.

The forthcoming Chapter Four will examine how historical novelists experimented with the counterfactual during the final decades of the nineteenth century by setting their novels in Britain's future: thereby, uniting the literary subgenres of the history novel with speculative fiction. Exploring futuristic history narratives embedded in novels and novellas like Richard Jefferies' *After London* (1885) and H.G. Wells' *The Time Machine* (1895) and *A Story of Days to Come* (1897) will demonstrate the extent to

which the counterfactual historical novel had been transformed over the course of the century. It will also offer an innovative means of considering how Victorians viewed history being incorporated into people's daily lives, even if the lives in question were lived in the future rather than the present or the past.

The final and fifth chapter will address a selection of alternate history written by contemporary authors and set in alternative versions of nineteenth-century Britain, including Naomi Novik's *Temeraire* series (2006-present), Susanna Clark's *Jonathan Strange and Mr Norrell* (2004), Jo Walton's *Tooth and Claw* (2003), William Gibson and Bruce Sterling's *The Difference Engine* (1990). These alternate history novels are the literary descendants of the nineteenth-century counterfactual history novel and these texts offer a unique means of examining how literary culture now views the counterfactual, history novels, and nineteenth-century Britain in this postmodern age.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “Act on Custody of Infants.” *Branch Collective*. BRANCH: Britain, Representation, and Nineteenth-Century History. 2015. Web. 1 July 2015.
 <http://www.branchcollective.org/?ps_event=act-on-custody-of-infants>.
- “Adelphi Theatre.” Rev. of “Redgauntlet.” 8 September 1838: n. pag. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Web. 9 May 2012.
- Aiken, Joan. *The Wolves of Willoughby Chase*. The Wolves Chronicles. New York: Bantam Doubleday, 1987. Print.
- Alexander, Christine. *The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1983. Print.
- . ed. *The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë*. 2 vols. Oxford: Blackwell, for the Shakespeare Head P, vol. I: *The Glass Town Saga, 1826-1832*, 1987; vol. II, pt. 1: *The Rise of Angria 1833-1835*, 1991; vol. II pt. 2: *The Rise of Angria 1834-1835*, 1991. Print.
- . “Elizabeth Gaskell and Victorian Juvenilia.” *The Gaskell Society Journal*. 18 (2004) 1-15. Print.

- . "Imagining Africa: The Brontës' Creations of Glass Town and Angria." *Africa Today: A Multi-Disciplinary Snapshot of the Continent*. Ed. P. Alexander, R. Hutchinson, and D. Schreuder. Canberra: Humanities Research Centre, ANU, 1996. 201-19. Print.
- . "Introduction." *Tales of Glass Town, Angria, and Gondal: Selected Writings*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. iii-iii. Print.
- . ed. *Tales of Glass Town, Angria, and Gondal: Selected Writings*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. Print.
- Alexander, Christine and Margaret Smith. "Angria, Kingdom of." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Ashworth." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Bed Plays." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Books Owned by the Brontës." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Books Read by the Brontës." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Brontë, [Patrick] Branwell." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Brontë, Charlotte." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.

- . "Chronology." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Emily Jane Brontë." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Glass Town Federation (Verdopolitan Federation)." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Gondal." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Northangerland, Duke of (Alexander Augustus Percy, Rogue [Rouge], Lord Ellrington [Elrington])" *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Parry, Sir William Edward (fictional)." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Parry, Sir William Edward (historical)." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "*The Professor. A Tale, and Related Manuscripts.*" *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Smith, Elder and Company." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Two Romantic Tales." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, Duke of (fictional)." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.

- . "Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of (historical)." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . Williams, William Smith." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- . "'Young Men's Magazine' ('Blackwood's Young Men's Magazine')." *The Oxford Companion to the Brontës*. 2003. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- Alley, Henry. *The Quest for Anonymity: The Novels of George Eliot*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1997. Print.
- Altick, Richard D. *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900*. 1957. Columbus: The Ohio State UP, 1998. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. 1983. London: Verso, 2006. Print.
- Arnold, Thomas. "Rugby School—Use of the Classics." *The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold, D.D.* 1834. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1846. 340-54. Print.
- Ashton, Rosemary. *George Eliot: A Life*. New York: Penguin P, 1996. Print.
- Atkinson, Juliette. "Critical Fortunes." *George Eliot in Context*. Ed. Margaret Harris. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2013.63-90. *Purdue Libraries*. Web. 1 July 2015.
- Back to the Future*. Dir. Robert Zemeckis. Universal Studios. 1985. Film.
- Barker, Juliet. *The Brontës*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1994. Print.
- Bendix, Regina. "The Uses of Disciplinary History." *Radical History Review*. 84 (2002) 110-14. *Project Muse*. Web. 16 June 2012.
- Black, Jeremy. "Could the Jacobites Have Won?" *History Today*. 45.7. (1995): 24-9. Print.

- Bock, Carol. *Charlotte Brontë and the Storyteller's Audience*. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1992. Print.
- . "'Our plays': The Brontë Juvenilia." *The Cambridge Companion to the Brontës*. Ed. Heather Glen. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. 34-52. Print.
- Bodenheimer, Rosemarie. *The Real Life of Mary Ann Evans: George Eliot, Her Letters and Fiction*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994. Print.
- . "A Woman of Many Names" *The Cambridge Companion to George Eliot*. Ed. George Levine. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 20-37. Print.
- Bowers, Toni. *Force or Fraud: British Seduction Stories and the Problem of Resistance, 1660- 1760*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.
- Brantlinger, Patrick. *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990. Print.
- Brontë, Branwell. "An Angrian Battle Song." *Tales of Glass Town, Angria, and Gondal: Selected Writings*. Ed. Christine Alexander. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. 381-83. Print.
- . "A Few Words to The Chief Genii." *The Works of Patrick Branwell Brontë*. Ed. Victor A. Neufeldt. Vol.2. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1997. 250. Print.
- . "The History of the Young Men from Their First Settlement to The Present Time." *The Miscellaneous and Unpublished Writings of Charlotte and Patrick Branwell Brontë*. Vol. I. Oxford: Blackwell, for the Shakespeare Head P, 1936. 60-95. Print.

- Brontë, Charlotte. "Adress to the Angrians." *The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë*.
Ed. Christine Alexander. Vol. II. Pt. 2. Oxford: Blackwell, for the Shakespeare
Head P, 1991. 296-301. Print.
- . "'Ashworth': An Unfinished Novel by Charlotte Brontë." Ed. Melodie Monahan.
Studies in Philology. 80: 4 (1983), 1-133. *JSTOR*. Web. 23 April 2014.
- . "Biographical Notice of Ellis and Acton Bell." *Agnes Grey*. Ed. Robert Inglesfield
and Hilda Marsden. Oxford: Oxford UP, 175-80. Print.
- . "A Day at Parry's Palace." *The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë*. Ed. Christine
Alexander. Vol. I. Oxford: Blackwell, for the Shakespeare Head P, 1987. 229-33.
Print.
- . "The Death of Napoleon." *The Belgian Essays*. Ed. Sue Lonoff de Cuevas. Trans.
Sue Lonoff de Cuevas. New Haven: Yale UP, 1996. 270-80. Print.
- . "Farewell to Angria." *Tales of Glass Town, Angria, and Gondal: Selected Writings*.
Ed. Christine Alexander. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. 314. Print.
- . "The History of the Year." *Tales of Glass Town, Angria, and Gondal: Selected
Writings*. Ed. Christine Alexander. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. 3-4. Print.
- . *Jane Eyre*. Ed. Richard Nemesvari. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview P, 1999. Print.
- . "A Leaf from an Unopened Volume Or The Manuscript of an Unfortunate Author."
The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë. Ed. Christine Alexander. Vol. II. Pt. 1.
Oxford: Blackwell, for the Shakespeare Head P, 1991. 321-78. Print.
- . *The Letters of Charlotte Brontë*. Ed. Margaret Smith. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon P,
1995-2004. Print.

- . "On Seeing an Ancient Dirk in the Armory of the Tower of all Nations Bloodstained with Three Distinct Spots Which Marks None Have Yet Been Able to Erase." *The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë*. Ed. Christine Alexander. Vol. II. Pt. 1. Oxford: Blackwell, for the Shakespeare Head P, 1991. 260-61. Print.
- . "The Roe Head Journal." *Tales of Glass Town, Angria, and Gondal: Selected Writings*. Ed. Christine Alexander. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. 158-74. Print.
- . "The Search after Happiness A Tale." *The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë*. Ed. Christine Alexander. Vol. I. Oxford: Blackwell, for the Shakespeare Head P, 1987. 42-53. Print.
- . "A Traveller's Meditations." *The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë*. Ed. Christine Alexander. Vol. I. Oxford: Blackwell, for the Shakespeare Head P, 1987. 274-75. Print.
- . "The Twelve Adventurers." *Tales of Glass Town, Angria, and Gondal: Selected Writings*. Ed. Christine Alexander. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. 5-15. Print.
- . *Villette*. Ed. Helen M. Cooper. London: Penguin, 2004. Print.
- . "We Wove a Web in Childhood." *Tales of Glass Town, Angria, and Gondal: Selected Writings*. Ed. Christine Alexander. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. 151-56.
- Brontë, Charlotte and Branwell. "Lines by One who was Tired of Dullness upon the Same Occasion." *The Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë*. Ed. Christine Alexander. Vol. I. Oxford: Blackwell, for the Shakespeare Head P, 1987. 95-96. Print.

- . "Lines Spoken by a Lawyer on the Occasion of the Transfer of this Magazine." *Early Writings of Charlotte Brontë*. Ed. Christine Alexander. Vol. I. Oxford: Blackwell, for the Shakespeare Head P, 1987.94-95. Print.
- Brontë, Charlotte, Emily, Anne, and Branwell. *Tales of Glass Town, Angria, and Gondal: Selected Writings*. Ed. Christine Alexander. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. Print.
- Brooks, Peter. *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1984. Print.
- Clark, Arthur Melville. *Sir Walter Scott: the Formative Years*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1969. Print.
- Clark, Susanna. *Jonathan Strange & Mr. Norrell*. London: Bloomsbury, 2004. Print.
- Collins, William Joseph. *Paths Not Taken: The Development, Structure, and Aesthetics of Alternative History*. Diss. U of California, 2000. *Proquest*. Web.
- Colvin, Sidney. "The Fortnightly Review, 1 November 1876." *George Eliot and Her Readers; A Selection of Contemporary Reviews*. Ed. John Holstrom and Laurence Lerner. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. 171-76. Print.
- Conover, Robin St John. "Creating Angria: Charlotte and Branwell Brontë's Collaboration." *Brontë Society Transactions*. 24: 1(1999), 16-32.
- "Counterfactual." *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 2011. Web. 12 March 2011. <<http://www.oed.com/login.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/42781>>.
- Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1992. Print.

“Counterfactual.” *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 2011. Web. 12 March 2011.

<[http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/](http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/42781?redirectedFrom=Counterfactual)

42781?redirectedFrom=Counterfactual>.

Cross, John, Ed. *George Eliot's Life As Related in Her Letters and Journals*. Volume I.

New York: Harper & Brothers. 1885. *Internet Archive*. Web. 1 July 2015.

Daiches. “Scott and Scotland.” *Scott Bicentenary Essays: Selected Papers Read at the Sir*

Walter Scott Bicentenary Conference. Ed. Alan Bell. New York: Barnes & Noble,

1973. 38-60. Print.

---. “Scott’s *Redgauntlet*.” *Critical Essays on Sir Walter Scott: The Waverley Novels*. Ed.

Harry E. Shaw. New York: G.K. Hall, 1996. 137-48. Print.

Dallas, E.S. “The Times, 12 April 1859.” *George Eliot and Her Readers; A Selection of*

Contemporary Reviews. Ed. John Holstrom and Laurence Lerner. New York:

Barnes and Noble, 1966. 17-21. Print.

David, Deirdre. *Intellectual Women and Victorian Patriarchy: Harriet Martineau,*

Elizabeth Barrett Browning, George Eliot. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1987. Print.

Davies, Damian Walford. “Introduction: Reflections on an Orthodoxy.” *Romanticism,*

History, Historicism: Essays on an Orthodoxy. Ed. Damian Walford Davies. New

York: Routledge, 2009. 1-13. Print.

Devine, T.M. *The Scottish Nation: 1700-2000*. New York: Penguin, 2001. Print.

Diekhoff, John S. “The Happy Ending of Adam Bede.” *ELH*. 3.3 (1936): 221-27. Web.

24 July 2010.

Dimock, Wai Chee. “Subjunctive Time: Henry James’s Possible Wars.” *Narrative*. 17.3

(2009): 242-254. *Project Muse*. Web. 15 April 2011.

D'Israeli, Isaac. "Of A History of Events Which Have Not Happened." *Curiosities of Literature*. Vol 2. 1824. Ed. Benjamin Disraeli. London: G. Routledge & Co, 1858. 428-38. Print.

Doody, Margaret Anne. *The True Story of the Novel*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers UP, 1996. Print.

Dowden, Edward. "The Contemporary Review, August 1872." *George Eliot and Her Readers; A Selection of Contemporary Reviews*. Ed. John Holstrom and Laurence Lerner. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. 164-69. Print.

"Duke of Wellington (1769-1852)." *BBC*. British Broadcasting Corporation. 2014. Web. 18 May 2014. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/historic_figures/wellington_duke_of.shtml>.

Easley, Alexis. "Authorship, Gender and Identity: George Eliot in the 1850s." *Women's Writing*. 3:2, 145-60. *Purdue Libraries*. Web. 27 May 2015.

Edgeworth, Maria and Richard Lovell. *Practical Education*. Vol 2. 1798. New York: Garland Publishing Inc. 1974. Print.

Eliot, George. *Adam Bede*. Ed. Mary Waldron. 1859. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview, 2005. Print.

---. *The George Eliot Letters*. Ed. Gordon S. Haight. 9 volumes. New Haven: Yale UP, 1954-78. Print.

---. *The Journals of George Eliot*. Eds. Margaret Harris and Judith Johnson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print.

- . "The Natural History of German Life." *The Works of George Eliot: Essays and Leaves From a Notebook*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1883[?].188-236. Web. *Internet Archive*. Web. 1 July 2015.
- . "Silly Novels by Lady Novelists." *Essays of George Eliot*. Ed. Thomas Pinney. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963. 300-24. Print.
- "Epitome of Opinion. *The Pall Mall Gazette*. 24 December, 1880: n. pag. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Web. 8 August 2013.
- Erskine, John. *An institute of the law of Scotland. In four books. In the order of Sir George Mackenzie's Institutions of that law. By John Erskine, ... In two volumes. ... Vol1*. Edinburgh, 1773. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Gale. Web. 6 Nov. 2012 .
- Flint, Kate. "George Eliot and Gender." *The Cambridge Companion to George Eliot*. Ed. George Levine. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2001. 159-80. Print.
- Ferguson, Niall. "Introduction." *Virtual History: Alternatives and Counterfactuals*. New York: Basic Books, 1997. 1-90. Print.
- Fuchs, Barbara. *Romance*. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- "Funeral of 'George Eliot.'" *Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle*. 1 January, 1881: n. pag. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Web. 8 August 2013.
- Gabalton, Diana. *Outlander*. Outlander. New York: Delacorte Press, 1991. Print.
- Gallagher, Catherine. "What Would Napoleon Do?: Historical, Fictional, and Counterfactual Characters." *New Literary History*. 42.2 (Spring 2011): 315-36. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 April 2014.
- Gardiner, Michael. *Modern Scottish Culture*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2005. Print.

- Gaskell, Elizabeth. *The Letters of Mrs. Gaskell*. Ed. J.A.V. Chapple and Arthur Pollard. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1966. Print.
- “George Eliot’s Early Life.” *The Pall Mall Gazette*. 30 December, 1880: n.pag. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Web. 8 August 2013.
- . *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*. Ed. Alan Shelston. 1975. London: Penguin Books, 1985. Print.
- Gibson, William and Bruce Sterling. *The Difference Engine*. New York: Bantam Books, 1990. Print.
- Glen, Heather. *Charlotte Brontë: The Imagination in History*. New York: Oxford University P, 2002. Print.
- Hadjiafxendi, Kyriaki. “Gender and the Woman Question.” *George Eliot in Context*. Ed. Margaret Harris. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2013.137-144. *Purdue Libraries*. Web. 1 July 2015.
- Haight, Gordon S. Ed. *The George Eliot Letters*. 9 volumes. New Haven: Yale UP, 1954-78. Print.
- Harris, Margaret. “The Biographical Tradition.” *George Eliot in Context*. Ed. Margaret Harris. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2013.41-51. *Purdue Libraries*. Web. 1 July 2015.
- Harvey, Donald J. *France Since the Revolution*. New York: The Free Press, 1986. Print.
- Harvie, Christopher. *Scotland: A Short History*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.
- . “Scott and the Image of Scotland.” *Sir Walter Scott: the Long-Forgotten Melody*. Ed. Alan Bold. London: Vision, 1983. 17-42. Print.

- Haythornthwaite, Philip. *Wellington: The Iron Duke*. Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books, 2007. Print.
- Hellekson, Karen. *The Alternate History: Refiguring Historical Time*. Kent, Ohio: The Kent State UP, 2001. Print.
- Henry, Nancy. *The Life of George Eliot: A Critical Biography*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, Print. 2012.
- Hirsh, Pam. "Ligginitis, Three Georges, Perie-zadeh and Spitting Critics, or 'Will the Real Mr Eliot Stand Up?'" *Critical Survey*. 13.2 (2001): 78-97. Print.
- . "What's In a Name: Competing Claims to the Authority of George Eliot." *George Eliot Review: Journal of the George Eliot Fellowship*. 35 (2004): 7-17. Print.
- "His Grace the Duke of Wellington, KG, LVO, OBE, MC." *Debrett's*. 21 Jan 2013. Web. 22 July 2013. *archive.today*. <<http://archive.today/cxsyV>>.
- Howsam, Leslie. *Past into Print: The Publishing of History in Britain, 1850-1950*. London: British Library, 2009. Print.
- Hughes, Kathryn. *George Eliot: The Last Victorian*. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1998. Print.
- . "George Eliot's Life." *George Eliot in Context*. Ed. Margaret Harris. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2013.3-11. *Purdue Libraries*. Web. 1 July 2015.
- Hutton, R.H. "The Spectator, 12 February 1876." *George Eliot and Her Readers; A Selection of Contemporary Reviews*. Ed. John Holstrom and Laurence Lerner. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. 170-71. Print.
- It's a Wonderful Life*. Dir. Frank Capra. Paramount. 1947. Film.

- “Jacobitism” *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 2012. Web. 15 Nov 2012.
 <<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/view/Entry/100573?redirectedFrom=jacobitism>>.
- James, Henry. “*The Atlantic Monthly*, May 1885: ‘George Eliot’s Life.’” *George Eliot and Her Readers; A Selection of Contemporary Reviews*. Ed. John Holstrom and Laurence Lerner. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. 183-86. Print.
- Jann, Rosemary. *The Art and Science of Victorian History*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1985. Print.
- Jewsbury, Geraldine. “*The Athenaeum*, 26 February 1859.” *George Eliot and Her Readers; A Selection of Contemporary Reviews*. Ed. John Holstrom and Laurence Lerner. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. 21. Print.
- Judd, Catherine A. “Male Pseudonyms and Female Authority in Victorian England.” *Literature in the Marketplace: Nineteenth-Century British Publishing and Reading Practices*. Ed. John O. Jordan and Robert L. Patten. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. 250-68. Print.
- Kerr, James. “Fiction Against History: Scott’s Redgauntlet and the Power of Romance.” *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*. 29.3 (1987): 237-60. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 July 2011.
- Lascelles, Mary. *The Story-teller Retrieves the Past: Historical Fiction and Fictitious History in the Art of Scott, Stevenson, Kipling, and Some Others*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1980. Print.

- Kramer, Melody. "The Physics Behind Schrödinger's Cat Paradox." *Daily News*. NationalGeographic. 12 Aug 2013. Web. 1 May 2014.
<<http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2013/08/130812-physics-schrodinger-erwin-google-doodle-cat-paradox-science/>>.
- Lerner, Laurence. *George Eliot and Her Readers; A Selection of Contemporary Reviews*. Ed. John Holstrom and Laurence Lerner. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. Print.
- Levine, George. "Chronology." *The Cambridge Companion to George Eliot*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.xiv-xvii. Print.
- "Literary and Artistic Gossip." *The Derby Mercury*. 10 August 1859: n.pag. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Web. 8 August 2013.
- Llewellyn, Tanya. "'The Fiery Imagination': Charlotte Brontë, the *Arabian Nights* and Byron's Turkish Tales." *Brontë Studies*. 37.3 (2012): 216-26. EBSCO. Web. 11 April 2013.
- Lockhart, J. G. *The Life of Sir Walter Scott*. Vol 8. Edinburgh: T. and A. Constable: 1902, *HathiTrust Digital Library*. Web. 24 Feb. 2013.
- "London and Paris Gossip." *Trewman's Exeter Flying Post or Plymouth and Cornish Advertiser*. 29 December 1880: n.pag. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Web. 8 August 2013.
- Longford, Elizabeth. *Wellington: Pillar of State*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972. Print.
- Looser, Devoney. *British Women Writers and the Writing of History 1670-1820*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 2000. Print.

- Lucas, Samuel "The Times, 2 January 1858." *George Eliot and Her Readers; A Selection of Contemporary Reviews*. Ed. John Holstrom and Laurence Lerner. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. 14-15. Print.
- Maitzen, Rohan Amanda. "'A Clique of Living Clios': Nineteenth-Century Women Historians." *Gender, Genre, and Victorian Historical Writing*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc, 1998. 33-60. Print.
- Martin, Bruce K. "Rescue and Marriage in *Adam Bede*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*. 12.4 (1972): 745-63. Web. 24 July 2011.
- "Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857." *Branch Collective*. BRANCH: Britain, Representation, and Nineteenth-Century History. 2015. Web. 1 July 2015. <http://www.branchcollective.org/?ps_event=matrimonial-causes-act-of-1857 >.
- Mayer, Robert. *History and the Early English Novel: Matters of Fact from Bacon to Defoe*. Cambridge: UP, 1997. Print.
- McCaw, Neil. *George Eliot and Victorian Historiography: Imagining the National Past*. New York: St. Martin's, 2000. Print.
- McKnight, Edgar V. *Alternative History: The Development of a Literary Genre*. Diss. U of North Carolina. Proquest. Web. 1994.
- Megill, Allan, Steven Shepard, and Phillip Honenberger. *Historical Knowledge, Historical Error: A Contemporary Guide*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 2007. Print.
- Melrose, Andrew. "Writing 'The End of Uncertainty': Imaginary Law, Imaginary Jacobites and Imaginary History in Walter Scott's *Heart of Midlothian* and *Redgauntlet*." *Scottish Literary Journal*. 25.2 (1998): 34-44. Print.

Mitchell, Rosemary. *Picturing the Past: English History in Text and Image 1830-1870*.

Oxford: Clarendon P, 2000. Print.

Monahan, Melodie. ed. ““Ashworth”: An Unfinished Novel by Charlotte Brontë.” *Studies*

in Philology. 80: 4 (1983), 1-133. *JSTOR*. Web. 23 April 2014.

Morris, Brian Robert. “The Brontës and Education, Education, Education.” *Brontë*

Society Transactions. 22:1 (1987), 1-18. Print.

Nash, Gary B., Charlotte Crabtree, and Ross E. Dunn. *History on Trial: Culture Wars*

and the Teaching of the Past. 1997. New York: Vintage Books, 2000. Print.

“News of the Day.” *Birmingham Daily Post*. 24 December, 1880.: n. pag. *19th Century*

British Library Newspapers. Web. 8 August 2013.

Northcote, Stafford H. and C.E. Trevelyan. “The Report on the Organisation of the

Permanent Civil Service, Together with a Letter from the Rev. B. Jowett.”

London: George E. Eyre and William Spottiswoode, 1854. *How to Be a Civil*

Servant. 2011. Web. 27 Oct. 2011.

Novik, Naomi. *His Majesty’s Dragon*. New York: Ballantine, 2006. Print.

O’Brien, Karen. “The History Market in Eighteenth-Century England.” *Books and Their*

Readers In Eighteenth-Century England: New Essays. 2001. Ed. Isabel Rivers.

London: Continuum, 2003. 105-133. Print.

---. “History and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century Britain.” *The Uses of History in Early*

Modern England. Ed. Paulina Kewes. San Marino: Huntington Library, 2006.

389- 405. Print.

Pittock, Murray G.H. *Jacobitism*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998. Print.

---. *Scottish Nationality*. Houndmills: Palgrave, 2001. Print.

Q. "Redgauntlet, A Tale by the Author of Waverley." Rev. of *Redgauntlet*, by Walter Scott. *The Examiner*. 11 July 1824: 441. *19th Century British Library*

Newspapers. Web. 12 May 2012.

Ratchford, Fannie Elizabeth. *The Brontës' Web of Childhood*. New York: Columbia UP, 1941. Print.

"Redgauntlet." Rev. of *Redgauntlet*, by Walter Scott. *Caledonian Mercury*. 19 June 1824: n. pag. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Web. 12 May 2012.

"Redgauntlet." *The Walter Scott Digital Archive*. Edinburgh University Library. 19 Dec 2011. Web. 5 March 2012. <<http://www.walterscott.lib.ed.ac.uk/works/novels/redgaun.html>>.

"Redgauntlet. A Tale of the Eighteenth Century." Rev. of *Redgauntlet*, by Walter Scott.

The Derby Mercury. 7 July 1824: n. pag. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Web. 12 May 2012.

Rosenfeld, Gavriel. "Why Do We Ask 'What If?': Reflections on the Function of Alternate History." *Unconventional History* Theme issue of *History and Theory*. 41.4 (Dec. 2002): 90-103. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Jan. 2010.

Sala, G.A. "Echoes of the Week." *The Illustrated London News*. 8 January 1881: 27.

Google Books. Web. 1 July 2015.

Schom, Alan. *Napoleon Bonaparte*. New York: Harper Collins, 1997. Print

Scott, P.H. *Walter Scott and Scotland*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1981. Print.

Scott, Walter. "Culloden Papers." *The Quarterly Review*. January 1816. 283-333. Print.

---. *Redgauntlet*. 1824. Ed. G.A.M. Wood with David Hewitt. London: Penguin Books, 2000. Print.

- . *The Letters of Sir Walter Scott 1823-1825*. Ed. H.J.C. Grierson. Vol 8. London: Constable & Co., 1935. Print.
- . *Waverley; Or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since*. 1814. Ed. Claire Lamont. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998. Print.
- Shattock, Joanne. "Editions of George Eliot's Work." *George Eliot in Context*. Ed. Margaret Harris. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2013.23-33. *Purdue Libraries*. Web. 1 July 2015.
- . "Publishers and Publications." *George Eliot in Context*. Ed. Margaret Harris. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2013. 12-22. *Purdue Libraries*. Web. 1 July 2015.
- Showalter, Elaine. *A Literature of their Own: British Women Novelists from Brontë to Lessing*. 1997. Expanded edition. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1999.
- "Silly Novels by Lady Novelists': essay by George Eliot." *The British Library*. The British Library. 2015. Web. 1 July 2015. <<http://www.bl.uk/collection-items/silly-novels-by-lady-novelists-essay-by-george-eliot>>.
- Simmons, James C. *The Novelist as Historian: Essays on the Victorian Historical Novel*. Studies in English Literature. 88. The Hague: Mouton, 1973. Print.
- Smith, George. *George Smith: A Memoir, with Some Pages of Autobiography*. Ed. Elizabeth Smith. n.p. London, 1902. *The Internet Archive*. Web. 1 May 2014.
- Smith, Margaret. "Introduction." *The Professor*. 1987. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991. vii-xxiii. Print.
- Soffer, Reba N. *Discipline and Power: The University, History, and the Making of an English Elite, 1870-1930*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1994. Print.

- Stableford, Brian. "A Note on Alternate History." *Extrapolation*. 21.4 (1980): 395-99. Print.
- Stevens, Anne. H. *British Historical Fiction Before Scott*. Palgrave Studies in the Enlightenment, Romanticism and Cultures of Print. Eds. Anne K. Mellor and Clifford Siskin. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. Print.
- Stolpa, Jennifer M. "Dinah and the Debate over Vocation in *Adam Bede*." *George Eliot-George Henry Lewes Studies*. 42-43 (2002): 30-49. Print.
- Sutherland, John. "Scenes of a Clerical Life." *The Longman Companion to Victorian Fiction*. 1988. Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2009. 564. Print.
- Suvin, Darko. "Victorian Science Fiction, 1871-85: The Rise of the Alternate History Sub-Genre." *Science Fiction Studies*. 10.2 (1983): 148-69. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 Feb. 2011.
- . *Victorian Science Fiction in the UK: the Discourses of Knowledge and of Power*. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1983. Print.
- Szechi, Daniel. *The Jacobites, Britain and Europe, 1688-1788*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1994. Print.
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh. "The Invention of Tradition: The Highland Tradition of Scotland." *The Invention of Tradition*. Ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983. 15-41. Print.
- Tush, Susan. *George Eliot and the Conventions of Popular Women's Fiction: A Serious Literary Response to the "Silly Novels by Lady Novelists"*. New York: P. Lang, 1993. Print.
- Walton, Jo. *Tooth and Claw*. New York: Orb Books, 2003. Print.

Weinstein, Mark A. "Law, History, and the Nightmare of Romance in Redgauntlet."

Scott and His Influence. Aberdeen: Association for Scottish Literature, 1983. 140-48. Print.

"*The Westminster Review*, July 1878." *George Eliot and Her Readers; A Selection of Contemporary Reviews*. Ed. John Holstrom and Laurence Lerner. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. 176-78. Print.

Wilkes, Joanne. "Historiography." *George Eliot in Context*. Ed. Margaret Harris.

Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2013. 146-53. *Purdue Libraries*. Web. 1 July 2015

Williams, Meg Harris. "Book Magic: Aesthetic Conflicts in Charlotte Brontë's

Juvenilia." *Nineteenth-Century Literature*. 42.1 (1987): 29-45. *JSTOR*. Web. 14 Jan 2014.

VITA

VITA

Elizabeth M. Cuddy
 elizabeth.cuddy@hamptonu.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D., Literary Studies, Purdue University, December 2015
 Dissertation: "The Counterfactual History Novel in Nineteenth-Century British Literature"
 Committee: Manushag N. Powell (chair), Emily Allen, Dino Franco Felluga, Kristina Bross

M.A., Literary Studies, Purdue University, May 2009
 Thesis: "Illuminating *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*: Robert Louis Stevenson's Work With Artificial Light"
 Committee: Emily Allen (chair), Dino Franco Felluga, William J. Palmer

B.A., English, History; University of Minnesota Morris; May 2006

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

August 2014-present: Assistant Professor, English and Foreign Languages Department, British Literature, Hampton University

PUBLICATIONS

"Salvaging Wreckers: Sir Walter Scott, *The Pirate*, and Morality at Sea" in *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*. 53.4 (Autumn 2013)

PRESENTATIONS**Accepted Conference Presentations**

2016 "All I sought, I found there": Shakespeare and Nineteenth-Century Women's Education," Shakespeare and Our Times Conference, Old Dominion University, April 14-1

Papers Presented

- 2015 “Playing with History in the Brontë Juvenilia.” British Women Writers Conference, Round Table Discussion, Columbia University, June 24-27
- 2012 “Medievalism and the Victorian Family: Charles Dickens, Mr. Bull, and *A Child’s History of England*,” The Midwest Victorian Association Conference, Indiana University, April 20-22
- 2012 “Serializing History for the Victorian Family: Charles Dickens, Medievalism, and *A Child’s History of England*,” North American Victorian Studies Association Conference, Round Table Discussion, University of Wisconsin-Madison, September 27-30
- 2010 “Illuminating *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*: Robert Louis Stevenson, Light Engineering, and Theatricality,” The Nineteenth Century Studies Association Conference, University of Tampa, March 11-13
- 2009 “Rewriting *Tales of Old Times*: Susanna Rowson’s Use of the Pocahontas Myth in *Reuben and Rachel*” at the Early American Reading Group Colloquium, Purdue University, May 1

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Hampton University

2014-Present Instructor of record, English 101: Written Communication I (three sections Fall 2014, three sections Fall 2015). Designed and sole-taught all materials.

Instructor of record, English 102: Written Communication II (two sections Spring 2015). Designed and sole-taught all materials.

Instructor of record, English 203: English Literature I (two sections Fall 2014, one section Fall 2015). Designed and sole-taught all materials.

Instructor of record, English 203: English Literature I (one section Spring 2015). Designed and sole-taught all materials.

Instructor of record, English 322: Shakespeare (one section Spring 2015, one section Fall 2015). Designed and sole-taught all materials.

Purdue University

- 2012-2013 Instructor of record, English 106: Introductory Composition “Composing through Literature” (three sections). Designed and sole-taught all materials.
- 2009-2011 Instructor of record, English 106: Introductory Composition “Documenting Realities” (six sections). Designed and sole-taught all materials.
- 2010 Instructor of record, English 108: Advanced Introductory Composition “Documenting Realities” (one section). Designed and sole-taught all materials.
- 2006-2009 Instructor of record, English 106: Introductory Composition “You Are Here” (six sections). Designed and sole-taught all materials

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Service to the University

- 2015 Task Force for Administrative Efficiency and Effectiveness (Member)

Service to the Department

- 2015-Present Advisement Committee (Member)
- 2015-Present Committee on Research, Grantsmanship, and Scholarly Activity (Member)
- 2015-Present Committee on Student and Alumni Programs (Member)
- 2015-Present Composition and First-Year Writing Committee (Member)
- 2015-Present Sigma Tau Delta Chapter Adviser
- 2015-Present Writing Technology Lab (Tutor)

Service to the Community

- 2010-2014 Film Coordinator for the Wabash Area Lifetime Learning Association, an affiliate of the Elderhostel Institute Network

2010-2014 One Great Read Film Coordinator for West Lafayette
Public Library

GRANT APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED

2015 Hampton University Faculty Research Grant (Spring)

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

2013-Present Modern Language Association
2012-Present North American Victorian Studies Association