

Trollope's Irish Fiction: *Castle Richmond* and *The Landleaguers*

Haruno Kayama

Summary

In general, Anthony Trollope's Irish novels have been undeservedly neglected on account of their alleged "ideological naivety"; actually the problematic descriptions of Irish characters and their difficulties in Trollope's works are often attributed to the novelist's own prejudices and tentativeness as a middle-class Englishman. The purpose of this paper is, however, to demonstrate that this is only an aspect of Trollope's by focusing on his two works written after 1860, *Castle Richmond* and *The Landleaguers*. Indeed, the novelist's attitude towards Ireland's (often distressing) condition arguably grew more and more ambivalent in his later years. As far as the two novels above are concerned, this is closely reflected in subversive operations in the narrative through which, against the conservative, "official" voice of the narrator, the alternative, suppressed viewpoint comes to express itself and withstands or even erodes the former's authority by revealing its injustice and limitation.

Ireland plays a very important role in Trollope's career as a novelist. In 1841, he was sent to Connaught as a surveyor's clerk by the Post Office, which might be viewed as a turning point in his life. Indeed, it is Ireland where he began to write novels; he used Ireland for the setting of his first and second novels, *The Macdermots of Ballycloran* (1847) and *The Kellys and the O'Kellys* (1848). Also, it may be recalled that he ended his literary career as he had started—with a novel about Ireland, *The Landleaguers* (1883). Having escaped from the miserable life as a "pariah" in English middle-class society, ⁽¹⁾ Trollope found much pleasure in living in Ireland. In the posthumous *An Autobiography*, he made interesting observations upon the lives of the people he had encountered in the country. In the fifth chapter, he said with confidence that he knew Ireland "perhaps better than any other person" (87).

Despite the author's love for and knowledge about the country, however, Trollope's novels have

been often criticised for the “ideological manoeuvre” (Eagleton, 15) in which they allegedly engage. In fact, at first glance, the reader cannot overlook the prejudices and tendentiousness of the narrators, which may be rather imputable to Trollope’s own view of Ireland and its people. In this sense, it seems reasonable to assume that the books are written “very much from the perspective of the middle-class English reader” (Hamer, “Introduction”. *Castle Richmond*, xii). For example, except for in *The Macdermots of Ballycloran*,⁽²⁾ the Irish peasant-characters are generally peripheral to the main characters of the English or Anglo-Irish landlords. Also, in “Trollope’s Irish Fiction”, E. W. Wittig, taking note of the melodramatic language and “malapropism” of some characters in *The Kellys and the O’Kellys* (including the Widow Kelly and the old servant, “Prophetic Sally”), discusses in a condemnatory tone that the Irish people are presented in terms of farcical “stereotypes” rather than as real individuals (104).

Also, the indigenous Irish are more often than not described as “others”, barbarous, backward and potentially dangerous in Trollope’s novels (Tracy, “‘The Unnatural Ruin’”, 377). In particular, the Irish characters who question and resist colonial rule from England are all condemned to satire and criticism (Johnston, 87-92). To cite an example, in the early chapters of *The Macdermots of Ballycloran*, the ignorance and the unseemly appearance of a nationalistic Catholic curate, Father Cullen, are recurrently emphasised: “he...was perfectly illiterate-but chiefly showed his dissimilarity to the parish priest by his dirt and untidiness”; “...in language he was most violent and ungrammatical-in appearance most uncouth-in argument most unfair” (44).

Besides, it is interesting to consider how the ruptures between the two worlds, the Irish and the English, are presented in this novel. In the story of *The Macdermots of Ballycloran*, the Irish girl, Feemy Macdermot, is made pregnant and deserted by her English lover, Captain Ussher. Some critics including Robert Lee Wolff, taking the episode rather symbolically, acknowledge in it “an allegory of England the aggressor and Ireland the helpless victim” (qtd. in Johnston, 92). However, as Conor Johnston suggests, it seems to me that Trollope does not particularly see the story in political terms (92). Nor does he present in the calamitous affair of Feemy and Ussher “the powerful indictment of colonialism” as Robert Polhemus discusses it (16). Regarding the differences and clashes between the two worlds as rather inexorable, Trollope never delves into the problems of social organisation or class relations in Ireland lying at the root of the tragedy.

Thus, in a way, there seems to be some truth in Eagleton’s assertion that Trollope’s Irish novels are ideologically naive; nevertheless, I would like to stress here that this is only a phase of the novelist’s. Indeed, by manipulating the narrators, Trollope does often appear to ally himself with his middle-class English readers to confirm the dominant, conservative values of the Establish-

ment. However, it is also important to observe that after around 1860, Trollope's vision, or rather, his treatment of Ireland became increasingly subtle.

Discussing Trollope's Irish novels in general, E. W. Wittig indicates that after *The Macdermots of Ballycloran*, the novelist's view of Ireland grew more and more "distanced"; a vision sensitive to the harsh and complex realities of Irish life is no longer presented in his later fiction (99-109).

On the face of it, one might say that this is a pertinent observation; for example, in *Castle Richmond* (1860) and *The Landleaguers* (1883), the narrators' standpoints as defenders of the British institution are seemingly more explicit than those in the preceding novels. However, on the whole, I cannot bring myself to accept the critic's view; in the above two works written after 1860, the reader perceives that against the narrator's conservative, "official" voice, an alternative "unofficial" viewpoint manifests itself, resists and undermines the authority of the former. Actually such a subversive force causes discrepancies in the narrative, which renders the visions of the whole novels far more complex and interesting than they might apparently seem. In the following pages, I would like to demonstrate this by focusing on the conflicting voices discernible in the narrative of *Castle Richmond* and *The Landleaguers*.

It may be said in a sense that Trollope's purpose in writing *Castle Richmond* is to defend British government policies during the Irish great famine of 1845-49. Indeed, judging from the narrator's statement, Trollope appears to see the famine as a part of the Providential scheme: that is, God used the calamity as a means of removing surplus population, which was, in the long run, necessary for social improvement (66-68). It goes without saying that such an idea, presumably influenced by Malthus's *Essays on the Principle of Population*, testifies to the narrow perspective, or rather, the bigoted view of a middle-class Englishman.⁽³⁾ Besides, in Chapter 7, "The Famine Year", the narrator self-righteously speaks about the government policies and the relief efforts of the ruling, landed classes in Ireland: "...in my opinion the measures of the government were prompt, wise, and beneficent; and I have to say also that the efforts of those who managed the poor were, as a rule, unremitting, honest, impartial, and successful" (69). Perhaps the reader recognises in this what Overton calls the "official", or "institutional thinking" (41) of the novelist.

One may recall here that about a decade before the novel was written, Trollope publicly expressed his support for the governmental measures regarding the Irish famine in a liberal paper, *The Examiner*. In practice, this is supposed to be a "reply" to the argument of Lord Sidney Godolphin Osborne, who criticised the government's relief policies during the disaster in *The Times* (Glendinning, 183-86). For instance, in his first letter to *The Examiner* on August 25, 1849, Trollope wrote: "The question is, could an equal amount of life have been saved at a less expense, and

with fewer ill consequences? I have heard no one mention a feasible plan which would have done so" (King, 75-76). It is not hard to imagine that a lot of critics today have attacked such a dogmatic view of the novelist's regarding the famine. Bill Overton, pointing out Trollope's underestimate of casualties, ⁽⁴⁾ poignantly remarks: "He doesn't ask whether more lives could have been saved; the need, as far as possible, to save money seems just as strong" (23). Also, in *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger*, Terry Eagleton levels scathing criticism at the "moral crassness" (15) in Trollope's general attitude towards the famine.

However, the point I particularly wish to emphasise is that, in this case, there seems to be a fundamental difference between "fiction" and "nonfiction". Viewed in this light, what Christopher Morash says in *Writing the Irish Famine* deserves careful attention. Discussing *Castle Richmond*, Morash observes that while Trollope participates in the discourse of Ireland's "disease" (to be "remedied" by the famine), as a writer of realistic fiction, he was compelled to create individual characters, whose suffering makes him uncertain about his own position (185). Indeed, there are several points in the book which may belie the "official" pronouncement of the narrator and the novelist (Overton, 23-24).

To illustrate this, let me discuss a passage from Chapter 33, "The Last Stage". In this scene, the hero, Herbert Fitzgerald, runs into a shabby, dilapidated cabin to shelter himself from an unexpected rain. There he finds a dying woman⁽⁵⁾ with a baby and the naked corpse of a child lying at his feet. "'Was she your own?' asked Herbert, speaking hardly above his breath. 'Deed, yes!' said the woman...But there was no tear in her eye or gurgling sob audible from her throat" (371). Herbert goes on to ask:

'And when did she die?'...'Deed, thin, and I don't jist know—not exactly; ' and sinking lower down upon her haunches, she put up to her forehead the hand...tried to make an effort at thinking. 'She was alive in the night, wasn't she?' he said. 'I b'lieve thin she was, yer honour. '
(371)

Significantly, the moving picture of starvation and death in this scene seems to be almost incompatible with the novelist's "institutional thinking" about the famine (Tracy, "The Unnatural Ruin", 369-70). Indeed, as Robert Polhemus suggests, the quoted passage exposes both the horror of the catastrophe and the futility of the relief efforts in which Herbert is rather "complacently" engaged; the "priggish" hero serves on the committees, runs the Soup Kitchen, and exhorts people to work hard, which proves to be utterly ineffectual in avoiding the disaster (65). For example, the words "yer honour" (last line) sound pathetically ironic, for it is quite doubtful how much the wealthy landowning classes, to which the Fitzgeralds belong, have practically done to relieve the tenants

from their suffering. Moreover, such a sense of irony is furthered by a contrast of images between the famished infant and the "silk handkerchief" the hero later uses to cover the little corpse (Morash, 45). A few pages after, the reader sees Herbert giving some money to the dying woman, which could really be taken as a challenge to the governmental policy that "there should be no giving away of money to chance applicants for alms" (*Castle Richmond*, 192): the basic principle is that people must work to earn their own food. Several critics including Robert Tracy perceive here intense conflicts between "principles" and "sympathy" in the hero, in which the latter eventually overweighs the former ("The Unnatural Ruin", 370). More importantly, Herbert's deeds are by no means described negatively in the story; indeed, Trollope rather sees them as "human reaction" and portrays them in such a manner as to endorse them ("The Unnatural Ruin", 370) and rouse the reader's strong compassion for the nameless Irish woman and her family. Thus, the graphic, harrowing picture of the catastrophe disrupts the narrative of "social improvement" (Morash, 30-31) and jeopardises the validity of the government policies the narrator "officially" defends in the earlier chapters.

Furthermore, this kind of conflict between the opposing forces in the narrative is even more complex in the last unfinished work, *The Landleaguers*; in this novel, Trollope's "institutional" view of Ireland is most subtly interweaved with his concern about the predicament of the country.

In *Landlords and Tenants in Mid-Victorian Ireland*, W. E. Vaughan shows in detail that conditions in Ireland had become extremely distressing by the early 1880s: the agricultural slump in the late 70s, rural agitation, and tenants' resistance to their landlords (including refusals to pay rent, boycotts, homicides, and calls for the abolition of the ruling landed class itself) all led to a volatile, tense atmosphere in the country (177-216). Seeing such conditions for himself, ⁽⁶⁾ Trollope arguably became less optimistic about Ireland's problems. In *The Landleaguers*, there is a clearly recognisable "sense of urgency" (Knelman, 67), which naturally intensifies the "official" voice of the narrator who supports the Anglo-Irish landed proprietors. On the other hand, however, one may perceive that Trollope's uncertainty about the issues he was raising also expresses itself in the course of the narrative (Tracy, "Introduction", 15). In this sense, Tracy rightly observes that Trollope even seems to "struggle with his arguments" ("Introduction", 15). Indeed, what was consciously hidden or suppressed in the early works, that is, the novelist's growing suspicion about the justice of the Irish social structure, is brought to light in an interesting manner.

As has already been suggested, Trollope's Irish novels generally deal with the relation between the Anglo-Irish "Ascendancy" and the Irish peasantry. Like what is called the "Big House" novels by writers such as Maria Edgeworth (1767-1849) and William Carleton (1794-1869), they are

concerned to celebrate the lives of the governing “Ascendancy” and sanctify landlordism in Ireland.⁽⁷⁾ Basically, this stance is also true of *The Landleaguers*; nevertheless, it is crucial that in this novel, the barrier between the two classes, the Anglo-Irish landlords and the Irish tenant farmers, is no longer so secure as in Edgeworth’s *Castle Rackrent* (1800). To take an example, in *The Landleaguers*, the episode of the destruction of the Galway Hunt, or rather, the furious peasants’ incursion into the hunters’ coverts in Chapter XI, can be seen as prefiguring the collapse of the existing social order (Tracy, “Introduction”, 24). Certainly, as Tracy suggests, while Trollope strives to justify the traditional, hierarchical society in Ireland, he also appears to be keenly aware of the dawning of transformation in the country and the limitation of his own attempt to stifle it in his fiction (“Introduction”, 15).

Interestingly, this kind of the novelist’s ambivalence, or sense of dilemma, about the state of Ireland seems to be made explicit in the movement of the “eccentric” characters, the O’Mahonys; practically, they are considered to propel the subversive force in the narrative and impair the authority of the accepted “official” values extolled in the book. Gerald (the father) and Rachel (the daughter) O’Mahony, who are Irish-Americans, belong to neither of the classes, the Anglo-Irish “Ascendancy” or the indigenous Irish peasantry. However, what is singular about these characters is that as outsiders, they freely transgress the boundary between the two separate worlds and potentially link or mediate with the different values. Indeed, it is not too much to say that on behalf of the voiceless Irish peasants, the O’Mahonys indicate the limitations of the “official” reign of the “Ascendancy” and offer the prospect of alternative, regenerated social structures. Below, I am going to see closely the confrontation between the “Ascendancy” and the Irish peasantry and how the subversive outsiders, the O’Mahonys, are involved in their contests for power.

It is obvious that deploying the “official” authority of the narrator, Trollope aims to vindicate the “time-honoured” (327) landlord system under attack from the Land League. Throughout the book, for instance, the narrator sympathetically depicts the plight of the Joneses of Morony Castle, while underscoring the atrocity and cruelty of the Land-league agitators; indeed, there are a lot of appalling scenes in which conscientious people such as Florian Jones and Robert Morris are assassinated without provocation. Also, at some points in Chapter XLI, “The State of Ireland”, the narrator expatiates upon the array of the wrongs of the Land League and expresses his own strong wish to wipe out the organisation (“let the sinner be murdered. We all know...in how many cases the sentence has been pronounced and the judgment given, and the punishment executed” [352]). In the meantime, the indigenous Irish characters are commonly deprived of inner voices or chances to express their views about various issues such as the system of land tenure and the political

activities of the Landleaguers. This kind of void in the novel itself seems to be rather attributable to the elaborate, "official" scheme of the narrator. The truth is that by stressing the dishonesty ("simple lies" [382]) and intellectual backwardness ("without any gifts of education [162]) of Irish people in general, the narrator makes a clear-cut distinction between them and "we Englishmen" (162) and shrewdly excludes the former's viewpoint from the centre of the novel. In this way, he advocates the racial, or class privileges of the "Ascendancy" and their right to rule the helpless native Irish, who are symbolically designated as "boys".

Ironically, however, despite the ingenious tactics of the narrator, the movement of the whole narrative points towards the disclosure of what it "officially" suppresses, that is to say, the problems of fundamental relations between the Anglo-Irish landlords and the Irish tenants. To take one illustration, a number of tragic cases of murder in the book plainly tell of the peasants' long-nurtured enmities against the landlords and the irrecoverable isolation between the two worlds (Tracy, "Introduction", 15). In addition, the picture of the genteel society of the "Big House" represented by the bright scene of the "Galway Ball" (Chapter XXV) throws into relief the contrast between the affluent "Ascendancy" and the impoverished native Irish, who are living in small hovels roughly built out of turf. Thus, there is "an uneasy relationship" between the narrator's "official" voice and the development of the story (Tracy, "Introduction", 8). While Trollope clearly supports the "decent" landlords through the mouth of the narrator, it is also implied in the narrative that there is a great disparity in wealth between the two classes, which induces the reader to wonder about its justice.

Interestingly, in *The Landleaguers*, it is the "eccentric" outsiders, the O'Mahonys, who reinforce this unacknowledged subversive vision. In "A Note on Trollope's *Landleaguers*", John Hynes discusses the characters of John and Rachel O'Mahony in terms of the "comic relief" they provide (18-19); nonetheless, in my view, they seem to assume an even more significant role in the novel. In fact, the O'Mahonys are to be regarded as the only characters who have sufficient vitality and flexibility to survive and introduce a new perspective into the disturbed state of Ireland.

As for the father, Gerald, he believes in the cause of the Land League and vehemently denounces the land tenure system as well as British colonial authority over Ireland. As an Irish-American, he has a sort of privilege that only an outsider might enjoy: that is to say, whatever he says about the problems of Ireland, he is not to be severely blamed for it. People only laugh at his simple political opinions now and then. In fact, in the first half of the novel, manipulating the narrator's voice, Trollope, too, tries to laugh away the "amiable and philanthropic gentleman" who is utterly ignorant of "all political truths" (41). It seems that by doing so, the novelist, who generally dis-

approves of American influence on the Home Rulers,⁽⁸⁾ cautiously precludes the potential threat that this outsider might bring to the centre of the book. As the story progresses, however, Gerald O'Mahony releases his subversive energy to the full and almost repels the "official" check of the narrator and the novelist. Indeed, ridiculous as his conduct might sometimes look, the readers, who perceive sincerity and a certain kind of dignity in this character, are more and more attracted by him. In Chapter XXXV, for example, there is an impressive scene at Parliament in which Gerald's strong political conviction and conscience about Ireland's grievances expose the hostile prejudice that the English members tend to hold towards their Irish colleagues (Tracy, "Introduction", 22).

...the absurdity, the selfishness, the absence of all good qualities, are taken for granted as matters admitting of no dispute. But here was Mr O'Mahony, as hot a Home-Ruler and Land-leaguer as any of them, who was undoubtedly a gentleman, -though an American gentleman.

Can it be possible that we are wrong in our opinions respecting the others of the set? (298)

Importantly, at this point, there is a shift of balance between "we" (the "official") and "them"/"others" (the "unofficial") in the narrative. That is, by calling what is taken for granted into question, Gerald the "eccentric" suggests the possibility of an alternative relationship between the English and the Irish ("Can it be possible...?"). It is interesting that later in Chapter XXXVIII, Lord Castlewell, who is puzzled about Gerald's singular behaviour, calls him "an honest fool" (324). Truly, in a sense, the character of Gerald appears to function as a "fool" in the novel: going between the world of the Anglo-Irish/English and that of the native Irish, he offers the prospect of an "upside-down" society (Hamer, "Introduction", *The Landleaguers*, xix), in which the central, "official" authority of the governing classes might be upset by the peripheral, "unofficial" force of the oppressed.

One should not forget here that his daughter, Rachel O'Mahony, also bears an important part in such "unofficial" operations. It would be no exaggeration to say that Rachel is the "newest" woman Trollope created. As a professional singer, she builds a brilliant career for herself. In this sense, she moves from the domestic sphere to enter public life, which might possibly be seen as a "transgression" against the Victorian bourgeois definition of respectability and female dependency (Hamer, "Introduction". *The Landleaguers*, xxi. Nead, 31). As Hamer points out, particularly at the outset of the novel, one can sense Trollope's conservative fear about the novelty of this emancipated heroine in the recurrent account of her diminutiveness and fragility, which were commonly attributed to "ladies" in those days ("Introduction". *The Landleaguers*, xx): "she looked as though she might be blown away. She was very fair, and small and frail to look at" (48). It may safely be assumed that the narrator's conservative rhetoric is employed so as to confine Rachel within the

pale of the genteel society in spite of her attempt at a stage career⁽⁹⁾ (Hamer, "Introduction". *The Landleaguers*, xx). As the story unfolds, however, the reader soon finds that Rachel's "eccentricity" cannot easily be checked by the "official" control of the narrator and the novelist; as a matter of fact, the ebullience of the vitality and the independent spirit she displays resists and overshadows the conservative, dominant values of the novel.

It appears that Rachel's subversive attractiveness is fully manifest in her relationship with two men around her, Gerald O'Mahony (the father) and Lord Castlewell (the fiancé). For example, in the singular relation between Rachel and Gerald, the reader sees the collapse of the patriarchal order that the conservative Jones family believe in (Hamer, "Introduction", *The Landleaguers*, xviii): the daughter enjoys earning money to support her penniless father; she also holds the authority to decide important matters including their residence in London. Naturally, this reversal of the conventional roles in a family leads to the problems of fundamental relations between men and women. Rachel similarly takes the initiative in her brief romance with Lord Castlewell; after a long consideration, she accepts his marriage proposal, postpones the wedding on account of her contract with a theatre, and finally resolves against marrying him. The fact is that according to her "American view", "a wife ought to be equal to her husband" (293); from such a viewpoint, lord as he is, she cannot tolerate her future husband calling her father, Gerald "an ass". To put it shortly, Rachel comes to realise that the "reflected honours" (303) of the noble lover are not necessarily conducive to her happiness; at one point in the novel, we are told that Rachel rather takes joy from the success gained by "her own efforts" (289). Indeed, it is not surprising that such a spirit of independence in Rachel appeals to many readers today. For instance, perceiving in the "eccentric" heroine a reflection of the changes of women's social status in those days,⁽¹⁰⁾ Hamer asserts positively that "nothing in the novel is more fascinating than the representation" of Rachel ("Introduction", *The Landleaguers*, xix).

Certainly, in the world of *The Landleaguers*, the subversive attractiveness of Rachel virtually outshines the ideal of the "Angel in the House" represented by Edith and Ada Jones. Some critics such as Tony Bareham, who pay much attention to "the quietly self-denying" Edith, might take a different view. Bareham writes: "Edith's altruism, her quiet domestic courage, and her humour through emotional and practical adversity, stand out as far more endearing qualities than the gaslit playacting of Rachel's life" (316). Admittedly, Edith has some good, "endearing" qualities; yet I would suggest that her passive virtues are fairly ineffective in changing or regenerating the confused society in Ireland. In the meantime, Rachel inverts the conventional relations between the sexes and classes, and by doing so, indirectly suggests the limitations such as closedness and in-

flexibility, of the conservative order of society that the Joneses struggle to preserve (Hamer, "Introduction". *The Landleaguers*, xix)

Viewed from this angle, Hamer seems to be correct when she suggests that in writing about the "eccentric" characters of John and Rachel O'Mahony, Trollope had no scheme to condemn them, though he was somewhat bound by his own conservative view as an English middle-class man ("Introduction". *The Landleaguers*, xviii-xix). It is conceivable that the subversive movement of these characters substantially reflects the novelist's growing awareness of pressures for transformation in Irish society: traditional values are indeed in the process of being challenged, undermined, and possibly overthrown. Set against the disquieting scenes of the land agitation, the "topsy-turvy" world of the O'Mahonys the eccentric outsiders, amusingly indicates the potentiality of disrupting the status quo and reorganising the basic social structure (Hamer, "Introduction". *The Landleaguers*, xviii). In effect, as far as the main plot is concerned, the descriptions of the son (Florian Jones) betraying the father, the servants leaving their masters, and the peasants boycotting the landlords, all seem to point to the inevitable collapse and reformation of the old, fixed order of society (Hamer, "Introduction". *The Landleaguers*, xviii).

Thus, the development of the narrative often seems to run counter to the "institutional" view that the novelist strives to promote. This kind of inconsistency produces in the narrative characteristic discrepancies between the conservative, "official" voice of the narrator and the alternative, "unofficial" viewpoint reinforced by the subversive characters, John and Rachel O'Mahony. Ultimately the reader finds that such discrepancies, or conflicts between the "official" and the "unofficial", are not to be resolved to the end. It is fairly evident that in this unfinished novel, Trollope was gesturing towards a conventional happy ending by killing off Terry Lax, the ringleader of the Landleaguers, and uniting Captain Clayton (the constabulary officer) and Edith Jones to fortify the power of the "Ascendancy". Besides, it should be recalled that towards the end of the book, the narrator makes an "official" statement that attempts to confirm England's supremacy over Ireland: "It is necessary, -necessary at any rate for England's safety, -that Ireland should belong to her. This is here stated as a fact, and I add my own opinion that it is equally necessary for Ireland's welfare" (343). However, we have already seen that the authority of such an "official" voice cannot completely suppress or contain the "unofficial" force in the narrative: the revolutionary views of the world the O'Mahonys potentially present as well as the suggestion of the tenants' ineradicable animosity against the landlords imply fundamental injustices in Irish society, question the acknowledged rule of the "Ascendancy", and erode the apparently harmonious conclusion of the novel.

The Landleaguers has long been dismissed as merely political propaganda against the land agitation of 1879-82 and William Gladstone's Irish policies. For instance, according to an unsigned notice in *Spectator* on December 15, 1883, the book is no more than "a long pamphlet" upon Irish troubles "under the guise of fiction" (Smalley, 518). More recently, several critics such as Bill Overton regard the novel as a failure on account of its expression of "raw ideology" (3). Nevertheless, as I have tried to demonstrate, the novel's "official" statement is frequently in discord with what it actually reveals; to this extent, the book is strained by inconsistencies (Tracy, 20-22). Indeed, the reader discerns in its narrative the process in which the opposing voices, namely, the "official" and the "unofficial", are perpetually competing for authority. Moreover, as has been indicated above, such conflicts between the different voices are rather ascribed to the novelist's increasingly ambivalent view of Ireland's condition. Thus, the complex, subtle vision of *The Landleaguers* allows us to glimpse the "other" side of Trollope, who is generally regarded as a faithful supporter of conservative, bourgeois ideology: the novelist's growing perception of the injustice or arbitrariness of the values he embraces is progressively in the foreground in the later novels.

Notes

- (1) For details of the author's unhappy life in London, see Chapter III of *An Autobiography*, 34-59.
- (2) Unlike the other Irish novels of Trollope, *The Macdermots of Ballycloran* is concerned about the ruin of the Irish Catholic gentry.
- (3) See Christopher Morash's discussion, "Malthus and the Famine Novel". *Writing the Irish Famine*, 30-51. Also, in connection with the Malthusian view, Terry Eagleton writes in *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger* that there were plenty in Victorian London, who, like Trollope, regarded the famine as "providential" (15).
- (4) For instance, Trollope wrote in the third letter published on April 6, 1850: "I am glad to say that men, even in Ireland, are beginning to be agreed that the deaths from absolute famine were, comparatively speaking, few"; "...the deaths from disease consequent on the sudden alteration in the nature and bulk of the food far outnumbered, probably quadrupled, those which were attributable to starvation." See King, "Trollope's Letters to the *Examiner*", 82.
- (5) In the first chapter of *The Feminization of Famine* (29-57), Margaret Kelleher demonstrates that in the Irish novels of writers such as Trollope and William Carleton, the spectacle of famine is frequently constructed through female figures.
- (6) In 1882, in the last six months of his life, Trollope visited Ireland twice to experience the situation at first hand with a view to writing *The Landleaguers*. See Victoria Glendinning's biography, *Trollope*, 494-496.
- (7) In "The Unnatural Ruin: Trollope and Nineteenth-Century Irish Fiction", Robert Tracy discusses Trol-

- lope's Irish novels in terms of the tradition of the "Big House" novels represented by Edgeworth's *Castle Rackrent* (1800) and *The Absentee* (1812) and Carleton's *Valentine M'Clutchy, the Irish Agent* (1845).
- (8) It is not without significance that the Fenian Brotherhood was founded in New York by a man named John O'Mahony on March 17 in 1858. See Hamer's "Explanatory Notes", 423.
- (9) In *Victorian Feminism 1850-1900*, Philippa Levine stresses the double standard whereby "a man's earnings were honest and honourable and a woman's degrading": a loss of respectability and caste were the rewards for women's wage labour (85-86). Also, see the first chapter of Lynda Nead's *Myths of Sexuality*, "The Norm: Respectable Femininity", 12-47.
- (10) For an important general account of feminist struggle for equality in the half-century before 1900, see *Victorian Feminism 1850-1900*.

Works Cited

- Bareham, Tony. "First and Last: Some Notes towards a Re-appraisal of Trollope's *The Macdermots of Ballycloran* and *The Landleaguers*." *Durham University Journal* 78 (1986). No. 2: 311-317.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger: Studies in Irish Culture*. London: Verso, 1996.
- Glendinning, Victoria. *Trollope*. London: Pimlico, 1992.
- Hamer, Mary. Introduction. *Castle Richmond*. By Anthony Trollope. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992. ix-xxii.
- . Introduction. *The Landleaguers*. By Anthony Trollope. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993. ix-xxii.
- Hynes, John G. "A Note on Trollope's *«Landleaguers»*." *Etudes Irlandaises*. 11 (1986): 65-70.
- Johnston, Conor. "Parsons, Priests, and Politics: Anthony Trollope's Irish Clergy." *Eire-Ireland* 25 (1990). No. 1: 80-97.
- Kelleher, Margaret. *The Feminization of Famine: Expressions of the Inexpressible?* Cork: Cork UP, 1997.
- King, Helen Garlinghouse. "Trollope's Letters to the *Examiner*." *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 26 (1965): 71-101.
- Knelman, Judith. "Anthony Trollope, English Journalist and Novelist, Writing about the Famine in Ireland." *Eire-Ireland* 23 (1988). No. 3: 57-67.
- Levine, Philippa. *Victorian Feminism 1850-1900*. Florida: UP of Florida, 1994.
- Morash, Christopher. *Writing the Irish Famine*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Nead, Lynda. *Myths of Sexuality: Representations of Women in Victorian Britain*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988.
- Overton, Bill. *The Unofficial Trollope*. Sussex: Harvester, 1982.
- Polhemus, Robert M. *The Changing World of Anthony Trollope*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1968.
- Smalley, David. *Trollope: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Tracy, Robert. Introduction. *The Landleaguers*. By Anthony Trollope. New York: Arno Press, 1981. 1-26.

Trollope's Irish Fiction: *Castle Richmond* and *The Landleaguers*

———. "'The Unnatural Ruin': Trollope and Nineteenth-Century Irish Fiction." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 37 (1982): 358-382.

Trollope, Anthony. *An Autobiography*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.

———. *Castle Richmond*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.

———. *The Landleaguers*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993.

———. *The Macdermots of Ballycloran*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.

Vaughan, W. E. *Landlords and Tenants in Mid-Victorian Ireland*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Wittig, E. W. "Trollope's Irish Fiction." *Eire: A Journal of Irish Studies* 9 (1973): 97-118.