

“THE INTERCOURSE BETWEEN THE SQUIRE AND HIS SON”: THE FATHER-SON MARRIAGE PLOT AND THE CREATION OF THE ENGLISH GENTLEMAN IN ANTHONY TROLLOPE’S *DOCTOR THORNE*

By *Helena Gurfinkel*

It was hard work being manly; it was harder work still being a manly
man’s father – or son.

— Peter Gay, *The Cultivation of Hatred*

Trollope’s Gentleman: Gentle Revisions

“HE IS (NOT) A GENTLEMAN” is a verdict that we frequently encounter in Trollope’s novels. The writer’s concern with defining the English gentleman is virtually obsessive; however, his effort is fraught with numerous frustrating contradictions, reflecting the Victorians’ struggle to decide what constitutes exemplary masculinity.¹ In some instances, Trollope’s gentleman is a product of a certain class, while in others such elusive and intangible criteria as physical appearance and moral conduct come to define him. Despite the perennial identification of the name “Trollope” and Trollope’s writing with thoroughly conventional ways of constructing gender, I argue that his gentleman is an expression of his nostalgia for an ideal of manhood that possesses traditionally feminine characteristics.²

On the origins of the word “gentleman” David Castronovo writes:

The range of definitions and distinctions must begin with the denotative value of the word *gens*. Behind the word *gens* is *genere*, which is the etymological root from which a cluster of words emerge. The member of the tribe (*gens*) was the man who was well begotten (*genere*). The Latin word *gentilis*, meaning belonging to a good family, is an offshoot of *gens* and appears in Old French as *gentil* – highborn, noble. The next step in the etymological opening out is the Old French *gentil hom*, which begins to appear in English as “gentile man” (1275) and “gentil men” (1297) The word *gentility* came into English and also denoted gentle birth. *Genteel* was the adjective that later corresponded to the word *gentleman*: originally in the sixteenth century it denoted good birth; its connotation of respectability came much later. The idea of the gentleman thus had its roots in words that denoted good birth and membership in a family. (5)

Accordingly, the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* defines a gentleman as “a man of noble or gentle birth,” “a man belonging to the landed gentry,” and “a man who combines gentle birth or rank with chivalrous qualities” (1). But in addition to the more archaic “chivalrous,” “honorable,” and “distinguished,” the adjective “gentle” also means “tractable, docile,” as well as “soft,” “delicate,” and “free from harshness, sternness, or violence” (1). “Gentle” is also part of the idiom “the gentle sex,” describing women (1).

In terms of gender, then, the word “gentleman” is a paradox, insofar as it refers both to gentleness (as in “the gentle sex”) and manliness, qualities that are presumably mutually exclusive. Although the etymology of the word “gentleman” makes no automatic connection between the gender and class denotations of “gentle,” the implications of this duality for the model of masculinity that I am creating here are worth dwelling on. My analysis centers on the male characters of Trollope’s novel *Doctor Thorne*. Squire Gresham, a descendant of an ancient aristocratic family, and his son Frank obviously fit into the first, class-related definition of gentleness by virtue of their noble birth; however, their position in the novel’s socioeconomic and romantic exchanges and their very characterization make them gentle in another sense as well.

Squire Gresham is an obedient husband to a strong-willed wife, while his son, Frank Gresham, is a “tractable” and “docile” object of exchange on the marriage market, looking to marry rich. To be sure, such characterization does not turn either male character into a female one. Nonetheless, both Gresham men bring into sharp focus the rarely-noticed relationship between the two meanings of the word “gentle,” nobility and docility, that ties class and gender in the word “gentleman” into such a complex knot. The idea of English gentlemanliness and a gentleman’s code of behavior in their various definitions and permutations, from rural squires to Kingsley’s muscular Christians and Brummell’s dandies, are far too complex to conform to a unified pattern of manly behavior. Moreover, gentleness may also refer to an entire aggregate of moral rules and educational requirements to which the gentleman was subject, and which had little to do with softness and tractability of demeanor. By the same token, softness and femininity are by no means synonyms. But it is also undeniable that in the conventional discourse on gender, which, as I will demonstrate below, was partly endorsed by Freud, and to which Trollope’s novels are no strangers, submissive, tractable, gentle behavior is identified with womanhood. My analysis of the Gresham men therefore draws attention to the relevance of gender-specific definitions of gentleness and suggests that Trollope’s aristocratic gentlemen constitute a special, separate, non-normative, female-identified mode of Victorian masculinity: gentle manliness.

By allowing the class and gender implications of gentleness to merge, Trollope also produces an idiosyncratic combination of a regressive class and national ideology and a transgressively non-normative masculinity. Given the capitalist spirit of its times, the novel’s somewhat anachronistic privileging of the Greshams, English squires and the scions of an old landowning family, and its rejection of self-made entrepreneur Roger Scatcherd and his offspring Louis Philippe, are co-extensive with its valorization of feminized, or gentle, men, who participate in the father-son marriage plot.³ The resulting paradox is that Trollope’s unique normative man, the gentleman, is rendered normative by his very feminization.

Another upshot of this reversal is the redefinition of the “English” in the English gentleman. Contrary to the familiar critical argument, it is the quintessential Englishman, not the Other, foreign man who undergoes feminization.⁴ Though they exhibit traits that contravene conventional ideas of manliness, Frank Gresham the father and Frank Gresham

the son in *Doctor Thorne* embody Englishness. Their counterparts, Roger and Louis Philippe Scatcherd, cannot attain this exalted position and are both figuratively and literally foreign to the social and national landscape of England. The novel denies these characters a sense of national belonging and the reward of social advancement precisely because of their aggressively manly pursuit of both.

Freud and Trollope

MY READING OF *DOCTOR THORNE* makes a case for gentle men. They constitute a patriarchy in which, contrary to the mainstream psychoanalytical narratives that have come to define our understanding of masculinity, the fathers do not enforce the law, and the sons do not become fathers.⁵ Feminist and queer criticism often contends that the obligatory marriage plot reinforces the fathers’ domination and perpetuates patriarchy by making fathers out of sons. A wedding at the end of a novel restores its social order and validates the heterosexual relations that help produce and maintain it. But although weddings and childbirth have their place in *Doctor Thorne*, heterosexual marriage co-exists in the novel with a union that involves fathers and sons. And it is the latter, which the novel’s narrator calls the affectionate “intercourse between the squire and his son” (528; ch. 67), that produces and sustains the gentle patriarchal lineage.

In order to foreground the concept of the father-son marriage plot, I will deploy Freud’s “From the History of an Infantile Neurosis,” better known as the case history of “The Wolf Man” (1918). At the center of this study is one of the principal tenets of Freudian psychoanalysis, the Oedipal conflict. The psychoanalytic paradigm based on “The Wolf Man” that I am proposing here is to be seen primarily as the foundation of an unconventional narrative (the father-son marriage plot) that structures and drives an ostensibly conventional Victorian novel.

But while the link between history, social and cultural contexts, and psychoanalysis is never unproblematically direct, I would like to establish an additional connection between Freud’s theory and Trollope’s work that goes beyond the constitution of the narrative. In *Freud and the Culture of Psychoanalysis*, Steven Marcus observes that, “Freud’s specially favored mode of explanation was almost always historical. For Freud the privileged explanation of an event tends regularly to be a coherent account of its historical existence, and the innermost meaning of a phenomenon is likely to be inseparable from a hypothetical demonstration of how it came to be” (166). Marcus also suggests that Freud’s writing is historical in “what may be thought of as more normative senses of the term,” because it records the chronological, teleological development of an individual psyche in “stories, as in his case histories” (166, 167).

In my own discussion, however, I would like to posit a way of tying together “The Wolf Man” and *Doctor Thorne* that is more specific than that achieved by noting Freud’s general awareness of history, either as a context or as a method of organizing a text.⁶ Both writers belonged to the Victorian age; further, both arguably lived to observe the crucial moment of consolidation of the middle-class (European) family and its rigidly defined gender roles and the final dying out of a social order based on the primacy of landed aristocracy and its accompanying definitions of masculinity and femininity. In *Doctor Thorne*, Trollope watches the division of England between the industrial North and the agrarian West and South and attempts to restore the dignity of the landed gentry and its gentle men. In “The Wolf Man,”

Freud, the genesis of whose work lies in his tireless observation of the Victorian family, scrutinizes with a more detached, clinical eye the demise of a Russian landowning clan and its neurotic offspring, whose submissive, mother-identified masculinity needs to be “cured” and replaced by a less gentle, more domineering model. Put in a historical context, then, both texts produce a similar tension: one between the disappearing aristocracy and its gentle manliness and the increasingly more mainstream, socially and sexually, middle-class ideal of rough, competitive, father-identified manhood. Each text resolves this tension differently: Trollope ensures the triumph of the old order, while Freud makes a concerted, though not entirely successful, effort to make the Wolf Man a normative, that is, father-identified, man. It is this salient connection between class and masculinity that makes Freud’s case history a suitable theoretical paradigm for Trollope’s novel.

“The Wolf Man” is one of the few Freudian texts that provide an extended definition of the so-called negative Oedipus complex. The more popular positive Oedipus complex offers a narrative of a rivalry between the father and the son over the mother’s body and the son’s identification with the father’s position in relation to this body. Conversely, the negative one makes the son compete with the mother for the affections of the father. In this scenario, the son experiences a desire to be penetrated by the father and assumes a feminine, that is, the mother’s, position in relation to him.

While the case history also relates the Wolf Man’s multiple heterosexual attractions (his seduction by a governess, an attraction to his sister, and liaisons with female servants), the description of the son’s desire for the father is the text’s most groundbreaking achievement. Witnessing intercourse between his parents (one of Freud’s most daring reconstructions of the primal scene)⁷ at an early age has, Freud argues, an indelible effect on the son’s sexual development. As evidenced by the Wolf Man’s numerous neurotic symptoms later in life, his childhood voyeurism resulted, on the level of the unconscious, in his seeking sexual satisfaction from the father and his concomitant identification with the mother’s “passive” sexual position.

The trajectory of the Wolf Man’s desire for the father is always seesaw-like. The young man’s sexual development fluctuates between the normative and the non-normative, the positive and negative Oedipus: “In his sadism he maintained his ancient identification with his father; but in his masochism he chose him as a sexual object” (222). The portrayal of the father is equally ambivalent. In the mind of Freud’s patient, the punishing, castrating father co-exists with “his father as the person castrated and as calling, therefore, for his sympathy” (246). The young child’s reaction to the primal scene is thus an expression of his sympathy for the father. The stool that he passes when observing his parents having sex is meant, Freud suggests, to compensate the male parent for the castration that presumably results from intercourse with his wife.

Throughout the case history, Freud emphasizes the importance of faeces and links them consistently to matters of father-son desire and childbirth. After the father’s death, the adult Wolf Man competes with his mother for the deceased’s money and affection, a conflict that results for the Wolf Man in intestinal disturbances. For Freud’s subject, faeces had the significance of the money; the money was his father’s “gift” to him, or to continue the association further, the child he wanted from the father (240–41). The Wolf Man’s desire to present the male parent with the child underscores his “feminine” position in relation to him and inevitably renders the child’s mother a rival for the father’s love: “In his identification with women (that is, with his mother) he was ready to present his father with a child, and

was jealous of his mother, who had already done so and would perhaps do so again” (241). The significance of the child is dual: for the father, it is the son’s “gift” or reparation for castration, and for the son it is the “gift” of the gratification of his desire for the father.

Freud insists, however, that insofar as it is constitutive of non-normative sexual development, this desire cannot be gratified. “From the History of an Infantile Neurosis” is, above all, a narrative of a young man’s problematic but ultimately relatively successful incorporation into the regime of heterosexuality. Not unlike a Trollope novel, his is also a story of a young man from a landowning family coming of age and into an inheritance on the eve of major sociopolitical changes.⁸ Freud’s narrative takes place, in large part, on the father’s estate, and the matters of estate (land and money) constitute a significant part of it. As a young boy, the Wolf Man “was always declaring that he would like to be a gentleman like [his father]” (173), and Freud’s study of his youth and childhood sheds light on the process of coming into the father’s estate.

In order to become such gentleman, the Wolf Man eventually disavows the “feminine” position in relation to the father. Freud thus formulates male sexuality in terms of a strict dichotomy, the understanding of which, coupled with the fear of castration, leads the Wolf Man to redirect his sexual aim: “He discovered the vagina and the biological significance of masculine and feminine. He understood now that active was the same as masculine, while passive was the same as feminine” (204). The Wolf Man’s refusal to continue to occupy the place of the mother signals his development into a father. He invests his libidinal energies in heterosexual encounters, notably with women of lower classes with whom his position is dominant both literally and figuratively: it reflects his superior class status and the “active” masculinity of the penetrator. His redirected desire makes him the father in his own right, which according to Freud mandates both rejecting feminization and reaffirming a traditional class hierarchy.

While the Wolf Man nearly manages both, his desire for the father and the unhappy, unconsummated father-son marriage plot remain behind the formation of his heterosexual masculinity.⁹ At one point in the case history, the Wolf Man links his “re-birth” (Freud 261), or recovery from an illness, with consummating his desire for the father and having his child. I argue that the marriage plot in *Doctor Thorne* is based precisely on such father-son desire, and that the “re-birth” of the social order depends, to a large extent, on its consummation. In the process of creating the lineage of gentlemen, Trollope’s novel resurrects, and even privileges, the submerged father-son marriage plot of “The Wolf Man.”¹⁰ Consequently, his gentlemanly characters also represent a masculinity to which identification with femininity is fundamental, and not subject to repression and disavowal. The pleasure of consummating this union lies partly in the relinquishing of the traditional father-son rivalry, essential to the formation of the normative man. The gentle fathers are eager to forego the exercise of patriarchal power, and the gentle sons do not aspire to take over their position as patriarchs. On the contrary, as I will demonstrate, the novel’s happy ending demands that the younger men assume in their careers, matrimonial pursuits, and filial obligations, the stereotypically female, passive role.

Crucially, like Freud’s case history, the novel also contains a link between desire and property. Trollope’s Squire Gresham illustrates the powerless, “sympathetic” facet of the Wolf Man’s father, and while he does not undergo castration, his status as a patriarch is substantially weakened over the course of the narrative. The property restored to the father by his affectionate son, Frank Gresham, is, in Freudian terms, the “gift” that both

supports Trollope's favored landowning gentry and symbolizes the consummation of the unorthodox marriage plot. In contrast, the Scatcherds, who epitomize the capitalist ethos that Trollope's writings seek to eradicate or at least contain, follow the conventional, positive Oedipal scenario of masculinity: they are their fathers' perennial rivals and occasional killers. They also actively and aggressively seek upward mobility and social and sexual domination. However, despite (or precisely because) of such an ostensibly manly demeanor, these characters have no place in the marriage plot and are extinct at the end of the novel.

Fathers and Sons: Trollope's Odd Marriage Plot

DOCTOR THORNE (1858) CONTAINS the portraits of two fathers:¹¹ Frank Gresham Senior, an impoverished local squire, and Sir Roger Scatcherd, an ex-stone-mason, whose brilliant career brings him both a considerable fortune and peerage. The novel's happy ending, however, includes only the squire Gresham and his son Frank, who are gentle in both senses of the word. Herein lies the novel's gender and class politics. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the notion of gentlemanliness had been complicated significantly. Both professional men like the eponymous Doctor Thorne and men of business like Roger Scatcherd could stake a claim to the title. But the selection of a squire and his son as exemplary gentlemen demonstrates the remarkable clarity and unflinching consistency of the novel's ideology. Importantly, the Greshams are Tories, and Trollope's partiality to them and to the agricultural England suggests that the novel espouses what Nigel Everett calls "the Tory idea of landscape," "a point of view opposed to a narrowly commercial conception of life and associated with a romantic sensibility to the ideas of continuity and tradition felt to be embodied in certain kinds of English landscape" (1). According to this ideology, the land also stands for English national identity, firmly embedded and rooted in the English rural landscape. The seemingly outdated Tory vision of the English land that echoed the Romantic reverence towards nature experienced a vigorous revival in mid- to late-Victorian England. *Doctor Thorne* became a mouthpiece of a prominent intellectual and cultural movement that celebrated the return of the "gentlemanly ideal" and sought "the containment of industrial values" (Wiener 30–31).¹²

From the outset of the novel, Trollope's narrator expresses his anti-commercial, pro-aristocratic sentiment:

England is not yet a commercial country in the sense in which that epithet is used for her; and let us still hope that she will not soon become so. She might surely as well be called feudal England, or chivalrous England. . . . England a commercial country! Yes; as Venice was. She may excel other nations in commerce, but yet it is not that in which she most prides herself, in which she most excels . . . Buying and selling is good and necessary . . . ; but it cannot be the noblest work of man; and let us hope that it may not in our time be esteemed the noblest work of an Englishman. (12–13; ch. 1)

The passage locates "buying and selling" simultaneously at the bottom of the class hierarchy and low on the list of England's national priorities. Engaging in commerce is neither particularly noble nor truly English. And though the narrator compares England to the cosmopolitan, commerce-driven Venice, with all the attendant connotations of its racial and national heterogeneity, he finds these characteristics disconcerting. In England, he insists, the "feudal" and "chivalrous" are tantamount to the "noblest." Though not identical, both

“noble” and “gentle” suggest being well-born, but, given the double meaning of “gentle” previously discussed, nobility and chivalry may also refer to a certain gentleness, softness, or “femininity,” of the men of Trollope’s preferred social class. The patriarchal power of the Gresham family is diminished by its economic woes and less than felicitous matrimonial alliances. The loss of power does not, however, lead to ruin. On the contrary, these tractable, pliable men survive and thrive precisely because they relinquish their power.

In the description of Greshamsbury, the Greshams’ ancient seat, *Doctor Thorne* also combines its valorization of the gentle (feminized) manliness of the gentry with its traditionalist, anti-industrial leanings:

There is a county in the west of England not so full of life, indeed, nor so widely spoken of as some of its manufacturing leviathan brethren in the north, but which is, nevertheless, very dear to those who know it well. Its green pastures, its waving wheat, its deep and shady and – let us add – dirty lanes, its paths and stiles, its tawny-coloured, well-built rural churches, its avenues of beeches, and frequent Tudor mansions, its constant county hunt, its social graces, and the general air of clanship which pervades it, has made it to its own inhabitants a favoured land of Goshen. It is purely agricultural; agricultural in its produce, agricultural in its poor, and agricultural in its pleasures. (3; ch. 1)

This passage contrasts the ominous air of the “leviathan” manufacturing North with the idyllic West, which is associated with the Biblical land of plenty. The Biblical allusions are significant. Whereas the “leviathan brethren” of the North are sinister, isolated, and given to brutal, individualist competition, the agricultural paradise of the West draws its strength from the “general air of clanship.” The land of Goshen, the land which Joseph, one of the Old Testament’s gentler patriarchs and devoted sons, gives to his brothers (Gen. 45.10–11, cited in Trollope 529), is cultivated by a closely-knit male community whose stronghold is a father-son relationship.

Indeed, the decline of the Greshams begins with a son’s betrayal of his father, an exchange of all-male “clanship” for heterosexual bonds. The squire Gresham, a staunch Tory, marries Arabella de Courcy, the daughter of an equally staunch Whig, and thus undermines the patriarchal political structures that had made East Bassetshire idyllic:

Not only had Frank Gresham so wedded, but having thus improperly and unpatriotically chosen a wife, he had added to his sin by becoming recklessly intimate with his wife’s relations. It is true that he still called himself a Tory, belonged to the club of which his father had been one of the most honoured members . . . ; but, nevertheless, it was felt by the good men . . . of East Bassetshire, that a constant sojourner at Courcy Castle could not be regarded as a consistent Tory . . .” (5; ch. 1)

The position of the squire as the foundational figure of the community depends on the father-son lineage and its exclusion of women. The elder Frank Gresham’s marriage disrupts the continuity of the community of the “good men . . . of East Bassetshire,” betrays its deeply entrenched Tory creed, and weakens his own position as his father’s successor. The narrator defines Gresham’s acts as “unpatriotic,” and although this charge is somewhat facetious, it nonetheless underscores the connection the text makes between the idea of the fatherland and the father. While a strong father-son bond places the land in the father’s hands, a marriage can take it away. Far from making Frank Gresham Senior a stronger patriarch, marriage effectively renders him powerless.

As such, Frank Gresham, heir to the pre-industrial paradise, “could not fill his father’s shoes; they were too big for him. [He] was . . . so lukewarm, so indifferent, so prone to associate with the enemies of the good cause, so little willing to fight the good fight, that he soon disgusted those who most dearly loved the memory of the old squire” (5; ch. 1). Gresham Senior, the backbone of the traditional English socioeconomic order, cannot live up to the memory of his father. He becomes, in other words, the pitiable, weak father of Freud’s “The Wolf Man,” and not the almighty, castrating patriarch of the positive Oedipus.

As an indication of this loss of power, Frank Gresham Senior takes a back seat to his wife, the ambitious Lady Arabella de Courcy who, like many of Trollope’s rebellious female characters, is more involved in politics than is fitting for a woman: “[S]he cared for politics, or thought that she cared for them, more than her husband did: . . . she had been attached to the Court, and had been made to believe that much of the policy of England’s rulers depended on the political intrigues of England’s women” (5–6; ch. 1). The role reversal between the “lukewarm” husband and the “fashionable” (5; ch. 1) wife is obvious: while she engages in unacceptably “manly” pursuits, he assumes a feminized position. *Doctor Thorne* is not the only novel in which Trollope expresses his disapproval of women like Lady Arabella de Courcy, domineering and inappropriately involved in male affairs. The novel calls on the Gresham men to restore a patriarchal lineage interrupted by an “unpatriotic” marriage and a bossy woman. And while there is nothing unusual about the task, it is the way in which the male characters accomplish it that sets *Doctor Thorne* and its marriage plot apart. The two Frank Greshams are not compelled to prove their virility by “fighting a good fight,” showing women their place, and enforcing their political authority. It is the gentleness and reticence of the father and the obedience of the son that help reinstate the social order. These men’s identification with women, according to the terms delineated in “The Wolf Man,” translates into their assumption of the position of the female subject in socioeconomic and gender relations and ultimately saves the day in East Barssetshire.

Throughout the novel, Frank Gresham, the squire’s son, shows an attachment to and closeness with his feeble patriarch of a parent; he is, in turn, “the darling of his father’s heart” (8; ch. 1). They have the same name and are both frequently described as boyish: the squire is “young” (4–5; ch. 1) and Frank is “very boy” (98; ch. 8). The father therefore does not constitute an authority figure for the son. Navigating the complexities of his parents’ relationship, the young man consistently chooses his father’s side and always demonstrates his fondness for the silenced parent: “[A]nd with his father he had always sympathised” (488; ch. 64). When told by his cynical cousin John that one’s “governor’s” early death can be a “stroke of luck,” Frank is visibly upset, and his face “gr[ows] dark . . . instead of red” (47; ch. 4), at the very thought of his father’s possible death. In keeping with the Freudian model, Frank also expresses resentment towards his mother and her treatment of Squire Gresham. When admonished by her not to repeat his father’s financial follies and, instead, to make an advantageous match, Frank exclaims, “Do not speak against my father” (484; ch. 44). He resists, in his own ineffectual way, the de Courcy matriarchy: “My mother and aunt are always down on the governor, always; but the more they are down on him the more I’ll stick to him” (63–64; ch. 5).

For the son, stick[ing] to the father means restoring the latter’s financial viability, or, in Freudian terms, compensating him with a gift for the loss of patriarchal power. In order to salvage the father’s estate, Frank must effectively sell himself into marriage, and my contention is that this necessity feminizes him, or more precisely, constructs his masculinity in

terms traditionally applied to women. The exchange of a fetching male body for a substantial sum of money or a career was common in Trollope’s time (and in his novels), but his attitude towards this particular transaction is ambivalent. In *Doctor Thorne*, the heiress Miss Dunstable, young Frank’s potential wife, voices this gender quandary. Addressing Frank, she exclaims, ““Sell yourself for money! Why, if I were a man I would not sell one jot of liberty for mountains of gold. . . . Have you forgotten your soul, your spirit, your man’s energy, the treasure of your heart?”” (230; ch. 20)

Although the heiress to “the ointment of Lebanon” fortune (77; ch. 6) is independent and assertive, the sentiment that she expresses is utterly conventional: “selling out” is betraying one’s “man’s energy,” an essentially unmanly act. Critical readings of Trollope’s novels often echo Miss Dunstable’s sentiment, maintaining that it is women who function as tradable commodities and circulate as objects of exchange on the marriage market. In his reading of *The Eustace Diamonds*, for example, William Cohen writes that the novel “elucidates the ideology that directs women to imagine their desires on the heirloom model and yet treats them as commodities, condemning them when they seek to govern their own value in the exchange economy in which they really do circulate” (171). Christoph Lindner, in “Sexual Commerce in Trollope’s Phineas Novels,” makes a similar point: “Marriage, in turn, assumes the form of a marketplace for the enactment of a sexual commerce. In the binds and byways of the Victorian marriage market, women are relegated in Trollope’s writing to the category of commodity” (343–44). *Doctor Thorne* evinces a more complex relationship between the demands of the marketplace and gender roles. The following passage discusses the matrimonial prospects of two middle-class upstarts, Mr. Moffat and Miss Dunstable, who plan to marry, respectively, Augusta Gresham and her brother Frank:

The aristocracy, said Mr. Moffat, were not a people to allow the light of their countenance to shine forth without looking for a *quid pro quo*, for some compensating value. In all their intercourse with the Dunstables and Moffats, they would expect a payment. It was for the Dunstables and Moffats to see that, at any rate, they did not pay more for the article they got than its market value. The way in which she, Miss Dunstable, and he, Mr. Moffat, would be required to pay would be by taking each of them some poor scion of the aristocracy in marriage. . . . (212; ch. 18)

The aristocrats, whether male or female, are so positioned in this peculiar mix of sex and money that they must demand a payment for “intercourse,” and the children of the bourgeoisie, whether male or female, must pay up if they desire this “intercourse.” Moreover, while aristocratic “articles” have the “light of . . . countenance,” that is, an external, visual appeal, their middle-class suitors have the financial power. Clearly, the Gresham sister and brother, who are about to sell their “countenance” and “intercourse” for hard-earned bourgeois money, assume the traditionally female role of a commodity in this matrimonial exchange, whereas both Miss Dunstable and Mr. Moffat take on the male one of a buyer.

It follows from Trollope’s excursion into the Victorian marriage market that male aristocrats are mere bodies for sale. They thus acquire, in the logic of the marriage plot, conventionally feminine traits. The young Frank Gresham is, to use William Cohen’s phrase, “Trollope’s trollop” (159), though one without the spunk and independence of a Lizzie Eustace or a Madame Max Goessler, Trollope’s more famous female gold diggers. While there is a hint of censure in this passage regarding the idea that a gentleman can be bought and sold, the underlying sexual and social ideologies of the novel grant legitimacy to such

transactions. The feminization of the son, that is, his location in what Freud defines as the submissive position of the woman (mother), ensures the consummation of the father-son desire and hence the triumph of the aristocratic gentle patriarchy.

To save his father from ruin, the young Frank Gresham “must marry money” (102; ch. 8); he becomes the family’s only valuable commodity, the best body the Gresham-de Courcy clan has to offer for interclass intercourse. His sister Augusta possesses the qualities that, in the Victorian economy of gender, frequently characterize a gentleman: she is no beauty or wit, but “strong-minded” and “useful” (54; ch. 4). It is on her brother that Trollope’s admiring narrative gaze, remarkably sexually fluid and attuned to physical beauty, both male and female, fixes itself. Frank is the best-looking and healthiest of all the Gresham offspring: “He did not share his sisters’ ill-health, and though the only boy of the family, he excelled all his sisters in personal appearance. The Greshams from time immemorial had been handsome” (8; ch. 1). Health and beauty make Frank a delectable marriage market “article” and firmly establish his position as the passive object (the specter of “The Wolf Man” again) of the multiple desires coursing through the text.

Frank’s aunt de Courcy urges her attractive nephew to secure his future by making a good match: ““Yes, Frank. I know no man whose position so imperatively demands it; and luckily for you, no man can have more facility for doing so. In the first place you are very handsome”” (102; ch. 8). In response, Frank “blushed like a girl of sixteen” (102; ch. 8). The future squire’s boyishness thus spills into “girlishness,” and although he makes attempts at asserting independence, they are as feeble and lightly treated as those of a marriageable daughter.

Frank’s academic aspirations are a case in point. Desperate to defer being married off to Miss Dunstable, Frank pleads with his aunt de Courcy, ““But, aunt, just at this moment I have to read for my degree like anything. I go up, you know, in October”” (103; ch. 8). The de Courcy women deem his passion for knowledge eminently impractical: ““Degree!” said the countess. ““Why, Frank, I am talking to you of your prospects in life, of your future position, of that on which everything hangs, and you tell me of your degree!”” (103; ch. 8). Frank Gresham is no scholar, and we are not to take his stab at education any more seriously than the countess does, but the sheer improbability of the young man’s intellectual ambition is precisely the point. Frank Gresham’s “prospects in life” and his “future position” depend on his looks even more than on his aristocratic status. More importantly, the choice between finishing his course work and fulfilling the de Courcy ambition is not his to make. The lot of Trollope’s gentle sons is that of any number of female characters in the Victorian novel.

In the end, “marry money” is precisely what Frank Gresham does: a happy plot reversal makes his sweetheart Mary Thorne the owner of Boxall Hill and his bride. He consents to his family’s efforts to marry him off and the concomitant narrative pull to feminize him, thereby establishing and strengthening his identity as a normative man – heterosexual, English, productive, upper-crust – by redefining that role in non-normative terms. As I have suggested, the disavowed father-son desire in Freud’s case study structures a narrative of masculinity in which men identify with the mother. But unlike Freud’s case history that, in the end, cannot brook the Wolf Man’s feminization, *Doctor Thorne* propels the gentle squire into eminence. Most crucially, by marrying well Frank Gresham can give his father the compensatory gift of land and hence bring about what I term the father-son marriage plot, a species of loving, familial, homosocial bond that simultaneously redefines patriarchy and keeps it intact.

Like many of Trollope’s novels, *Doctor Thorne* ends with a wedding. The young Frank Gresham marries the niece of the eponymous doctor. However, an equally joyful event accompanies the requisite narrative closure: “Nothing can be more happy than the intercourse between the squire and his son. What their exact arrangements are, we need not specially inquire; but the demon of pecuniary embarrassment has lifted his black wings from the demesne of Greshamsbury” (528; ch. 47). Remarkably, the joy resulting from this “intercourse” not only equals but exceeds that of the heterosexual nuptials. And while the happy ending of the novel does not exclude heterosexual marriage, it certainly diminishes its importance. Though Frank Gresham attempts to disobey his mother’s injunction to “marry money,” the plot insists on the completion of this transaction: “And thus after all did Frank perform his great duty; he did marry money” (514; ch. 46).

This sentence shifts the emphasis from “marrying” to “marrying money,” thereby suggesting that the young man’s duty is not to enter into a marriage as a requisite rite of passage from “very boy” to man, from son to father. His duty is, first and foremost, to his father. If Frank Gresham does establish a degree of authority of his own, it is not significant. The narrator is quite skeptical about the young man’s potential as a patriarch: “And thus Frank married money, and became a great man. Let us hope that he will be a happy man. At this time of the story . . . it is not practicable for the novelist to tell much of his future career” (527; ch. 47). Frank plans to run for an office, but “there is no chance of any opposition” (527; ch. 47), and his principal occupation will be hunting and keeping the hounds at Boxall Hill.

The change in the young man’s marital status does not necessarily equal his unconditional incorporation into the regime of virility predicated on father-son rivalry and the son’s identification with the father. Rather, Frank’s marriage is, to use his own words, a way of “stick[ing] to the governor.” By sticking together and not to their wives, the father and the son both retain their gentleness and reconstitute themselves as financially and politically viable patriarchs: “Frank should be lord of Boxall Hill in his own right; and as to those other *liens* on Greshamsbury, let Frank manage that with his father as he might think fit” (523; ch. 47). “The intercourse between the squire and his son” is, then, happier and certainly more significant than the intercourse between Frank Gresham and Mary Thorne: it restores an all-male lineage interrupted by Frank Senior’s treacherous residency in the de Courcy Castle and ensures the survival of the “chivalrous” agricultural England and its Tory gentlemen.

A Touch of Class: The Demise of the Self-Made Man

IN ORDER TO RECLAIM THEIR lawful place on the fatherland of East Bassetshire, the Greshams must also defeat Roger and Louis Philippe Scatcherd. The two families’ clash for the title of the English gentleman is also a clash between two ideologies (Tory landowners and politically radical entrepreneurs). More importantly, however, it is a competition between two models of the father-son relationship, and hence of masculinity. The Scatcherds, a *nouveau-riche* family, claim the possession of Boxall Hill, an estate that had belonged to the Gresham family for generations. Roger Scatcherd seeks to establish himself and his son as legitimate members of the country gentry: “But any way, my son shall be my heir. I’ve had the gumption to make the money, but I haven’t the gumption to spend it. My son, however, shall be able to ruffle it with the best of them. I’ll go bail he shall hold his head higher than ever young Gresham will be able to hold his” (122; ch. 10). Scatcherd’s

crusade against the squire's family is, however, doomed. The principal reason for his debacle is not the illegitimacy of his claim to Boxall Hill. Rather, he fails, in large part, because of the conventionality of both Roger's and Louis Philippe Scatcherd's masculinities and their relationship as a father and a son. Both follow the dynamic of the traditional Oedipus complex rather than the counter-normative permutation seen in Freud's "The Wolf Man." The Scatcherd family includes men whose characterization appears to be completely consistent with the Victorians' idea of manly behavior. Sir Roger Scatcherd is a man who has "gumption" to make his way in the world and produce children and money. Although he comes from "a low rank of life" (20; ch. 2), his professional skills and leadership enable him to cross class barriers:

He was known for the best stone-mason in the four counties, and as the man who could, on occasions, drink the most alcohol in a given time in the same localities. As a workman, indeed, he had higher repute even than this: . . . he had a gift of knowing what a man could and should do; and, by degrees, he taught himself what five, and ten, and twenty – latterly, what a thousand and two thousand men might accomplish among them. (20; ch. 2)

Scatcherd is equally peremptory in his family life. Unlike Frank Gresham, the reticent father who, almost happily, resigns himself to the manipulative de Courcy women, Roger Scatcherd elicits unconditional loyalty and submission from his wife, Lady Scatcherd. To her he is "a harsh tyrant" (268; ch. 24), thereby proving once more his patriarchal status and normative maleness.

In the course of his career, Scatcherd "conquer[s] the world" (105; ch. 9). "A hard-working hero" and "powerful beyond the power of ordinary men" (106; ch. 9), he is the antithesis of the "lukewarm" squire Gresham. Trollope introduces Roger Scatcherd by remarking that he "had also a reputation, but not for beauty or propriety of conduct" (20; ch. 2). Although a reference to "beauty" and "propriety of conduct" serves as an ironic transition between the description of Roger Scatcherd and his sister Mary, the mention of these two traditionally desirable female qualities establishes a contrast between the manly but unruly Scatcherd and the beautiful, well-behaved Greshams, the gentlemen whom the novel favors.

Sir Roger's physical description reveals his anxiety-provoking excess of virility: "The apron he had abandoned, but not the heavy prominent thoughtful brow, with the wildly-flashing eye beneath it" (105–6, ch. 9). A godlike figure, he has a "school of worshipers," for whom he becomes a "superhuman, miracle-moving, inspired prophet" (106; ch. 9). The portrait of Roger Scatcherd intimates a connection between conventional, phallic masculinity and the biblical presence of God the father; it also makes him, as a patriarch, the complete opposite of the gentle, passive Frank Gresham. To Trollope, however, phallic masculinity represents transgression rather than the norm, lawlessness rather than the law, foreignness rather than Englishness. Roger Scatcherd, whose first name alludes to phallic penetration, is an aberration in the world of East Barseshire: his penchant for violence, physical and verbal, as well as his alcoholism and his physical unfitness for survival, erase him from its map.

Scatcherd's career begins with breaking, not making, the law. To avenge his seduced and abandoned sister Mary, Scatcherd kills Henry Thorne, her lover and the doctor's brother: "With manly wrath, however, he set forth first against the man, and that with manly weapons. He took nothing with him but his fists and a big stick as he went in search of Henry Thorne" (21; ch. 2). The references to Scatcherd's manliness, "fists," and a "big stick" are

ironic. Describing a character as “manly” is usually Trollope’s highest compliment, but here he betrays an aversion to phallic masculinity, associating it with physical and emotional excess.

Scatcherd’s ferocious revenge on his sister’s seducer spills over into his later political efforts. He habitually directs his aggression against the gentlemen by espousing radical political views: “One thing further must be told of Sir Roger. In politics he was as violent a Radical as ever, and was very anxious to obtain a position in which he could bring his violence to bear” (108; ch. 9). Political radicalism and an “anxious” effort to achieve political legitimacy are, for Trollope, an equivalent of a violent nature; hence the incompatibility of radicalism and gentlemanliness. This early episode of violence positions Sir Roger permanently beyond the pale of the law and brands him as an outsider. The sole reason for his short-lived success in politics is that he is an “extreme demagogue” who talks “in a manner dangerous to himself and others” (20; ch. 2). Delineating various performances of Victorian masculinities, Peter Gay describes “the virile male” who uses “verbal brutality” and “militant postures” (115) to prove his virility. Scatcherd’s violent political rhetoric appears to be a legitimate, indeed quite routine, manifestation of patriarchal power. Yet for Trollope, such rhetorical prowess is frequently suspect. A true Englishman, he points out again and again, subscribing enthusiastically to the common nineteenth-century view, does not have a way with words; a skillful orator is both unmanly and un-English.

The text links Scatcherd’s virility, verbal and otherwise, with the politics of class and national identity. In spite of his success, Sir Roger’s aspiration to become a member of the Parliament encounters resistance: “He had made so much of the power of walking into that august chamber, and sitting shoulder to shoulder in legislative equality with the sons of dukes and the curled darlings of the nation” (251–52; ch. 22). Power does not make Roger Scatcherd fit to be included in the society of gentlemen, “the curled darlings.” Trollope’s commitment to the Liberal idea that class borders are porous and fluid is well known. However, his belief in the natural rights of “the sons of dukes” and “the curled darlings of the nation” belies the convictions widely attributed to him. The manly politics of the capitalist enterprise, the virile rhetoric of political radicalism and, the attendant powerful and violent masculinity of a self-made man make the narrator more anxious than the gentleness of the landowning gentry. The narrative urge to kill Roger Scatcherd betrays a substantial degree of class and gender anxiety. The “master[y]” and “brute power” (252–53; ch. 22) that this upwardly-mobile character exhibits constitute an illegitimate performance of masculinity in the context of the novel, whereas gentleness (female identification) is virtually the only possible one. Similarly unacceptable is a career in commerce, to which this model of masculinity consistently corresponds.

Significantly, “the curled darlings of the nation” is a quotation from *Othello* (1.2.66–67). At the beginning of the novel, Trollope draws a parallel between England and Venice, and so profound is Sir Roger’s national, social, and gender dislocation that his comparison to the unwelcome guests of Shakespeare’s Venice becomes ineluctable. James Kincaid argues that the railway contractor is, “Trollope’s version of Shylock” (xix). Though Shylock’s alienation echoes Scatcherd’s, the allusion to *Othello* draws a more urgent and evocative connection between race, nationality, and masculinity. The insistence on his “wild,” “brute” power racializes Scatcherd, as it does the Moor, and it certainly casts him aside as a foreigner. The “curled darlings,” in turn, bring to mind the Gresham men, entitled to the English land and a seat in the Parliament. Scatcherd’s exclusion from both is inevitable and permanent.

The very idea that a Scatcherd could conceivably obtain a legitimate place in the British political system comes from outside of England, namely from France. Sir Roger names his son Louis Philippe after a French king, and Trollope takes another dig at the Scatcherds' unwarranted ambition in his discussion of Louis Philippe Scatcherd's "royal" name: "If one wishes to look out in the world for royal nomenclature, to find children who have been christened after kings and queens, or the uncles and aunts of kings and queens, the search should be made in the families of democrats" (121; ch. 10). The predilection for French "royal nomenclature" is meant as a testament to the hypocrisy of Scatcherd and the likes of him, whose true aspiration is mastery, not equality. However, Sir Roger's attachment to France, with its double threat of cosmopolitanism and revolution, also solidifies his status as an outsider and stresses his lack of belonging and entitlement to the English soil.

Louis Philippe Scatcherd, Sir Roger's son, is punished and banished in a similar way. As evidenced by the royal name, Roger Scatcherd pins all his hopes for the triumph of democracy and commercial enterprise on his feeble and dissipated son. However, it is precisely the predictability of this paternal sentiment that prevents him from fulfilling these hopes. The difference between the Greshams' and the Scatcherds' respective father-son relationships is subtle, but worth heeding. The gentle patriarchy hinges on an affectionate "intercourse between the squire and his son," neither of whom exercises his patriarchal authority. The relationship between the Scatcherd men is in many ways more traditional, that is to say, more consistent with Freud's normative Oedipal paradigm.

Unlike the young Gresham, not only does Louis Philippe defy his father's authority, but in keeping with the Oedipal narrative of a normative man, he also establishes himself as a figure stronger than his father, a father in his own right. Louis Scatcherd "in some matters was more than a match for his father" (272; ch. 24). While Sir Roger cannot escape his predilection for alcohol and self-destruction, the younger man "was not a fool, nor was he naturally, perhaps, of a depraved disposition"; he is "not ill-made by Nature" (272–73; ch. 24). Despite his "debauchery" (271; ch. 24), Louis Philippe is "acute, crafty, knowing" (273; ch. 24); when compared with the ever boyish Frank Gresham, the young Scatcherd looks "four years the other's senior" (269; ch. 24), although they are of the same age.

Louis Philippe establishes his patriarchal supremacy at a young age. He "kn[ows] . . . the value of a shilling" and becomes a "close-fisted reprobate" who rules the underworld of "blacklegs and suchlike" (273; ch. 24) with the same authority as his father rules the world of railway contracts and radical politics. Not only does he compete with the father for power and influence, but he also effectively kills Roger Scatcherd by complying with the latter's death-bed request for "a drop of brandy" (275; ch. 24) and hence enacts the traditional Oedipal drama. After his father's death, Louis Philippe seeks to reclaim the power his father wielded over women. He is just as tyrannical towards his mother, Lady Scatcherd, and in an effort to establish himself as a local squire, he unsuccessfully woos Mary Thorne, whose social position he mistakenly assumes to be inferior to his. However, the young Scatcherd fails to endear himself to either woman; they reserve their affections for Frank Gresham. Lady Scatcherd has her heart "fixed . . . with almost a warmer love on Frank Gresham. . . . There was, too, a joyous, genial luster about Frank's face which always endeared him to women" (274; ch. 24). One of our most fundamental assumptions about patriarchy is, of course, its exertion of power over women. But Louis Scatcherd's exercise of paternal authority fails, while the Greshams manage to sustain and amplify their power by means of their identification with women. Louis Scatcherd does not emerge as a normative man

precisely because his body is not attractive and desirable; however, as I argued above, his gentle counterpart succeeds due to his docile charm and his ability to use his appealing body to his economic advantage.

The pursuit of power fails to earn Louis Philippe a place in the gentlemanly world of East Barssetshire. Though more educated than his father, Louis Philippe Scatcherd is subject to the same social limitations: “Be that as it may, two years at Eton, and three terms at Cambridge, did not make a gentleman of Louis Philippe Scatcherd” (121; ch. 10). Like the older man, he cannot make friends with “the sons of the dukes”; in Cambridge, for instance, he keeps the company of the “men who imitated grooms in more than their dress, and who looked on the customary heroes of race-courses as the highest lords of the ascendant on earth” (270; ch. 24).

While attempting to fulfill his father’s dream of upward mobility, Louis Philippe invariably winds up on the wrong side of the tracks. He is also a national misfit, though unlike his father, his alienation from England does not acquire tragic, Shakespearean proportions. Whereas the Gresham men come from true English stock and are “broad browed, blue eyed, fair haired, born with dimples in their chins, and that pleasant, aristocratic, dangerous curl of the upper lip which can equally express good humour or scorn” (8; ch. 1), Louis Philippe has the visual traits of a lowly-born foreigner. Like his name, his appearance and speech are outward manifestations of his unfitness for the role of English squire: “His hair was dark red, and he wore red moustaches, and a great deal of red beard beneath his chin, cut in a manner to make him look like an American. His voice also had a Yankee twang, being a cross between that of an American trader and an English groom” (273; ch. 24). He looks and sounds like an American, but his name, it bears repeating, is distinctly French. The heir to the Scatcherd fortune is named after Louis-Philippe, the “Citizen King” of France, known for his sympathy for “the common man” and popularity with British radicals. The Franco-American axis that this very English young man comes to embody quickens the novel’s deepest anxieties: the ethos of capitalism, a threat to the agricultural, chivalrous (or gentlemanly) England, and a challenge to its social order. The rough descendant of stone-masons from the West of England therefore becomes cosmopolitan and un-English.

Louis Philippe endeavors to obtain the status of an English gentleman, as well as his control over the land, through marriage. But even as he attempts to be a patriarch in his own right, the Scatcherd heir fails to perform a patriarch’s foremost duty, that of marriage and procreation. Rejected by Mary Thorne, Louis Philippe dies of hereditary alcoholism, a bachelor and an outcast, and with him dies a line of patriarchs brutal in their ambition. The title of one of the concluding chapters of the novel announces, with a degree of satisfaction in its tone, that “[t]he race of Scatcherd becomes extinct” (471; ch. 43). This statement intimates the essential otherness of the Scatcherds as a separate race; it also conveys the triumph of the gentlemanly line of fathers and sons and the social and sexual order in which gentleness (or feminine identification) is constitutive of normative masculinity. The Gresham line of landowning gentlemen who partake of the joys of the father-son marriage plot inherits the fatherland, while the ambitious and conventionally masculine Scatcherds, who do not, are banned from fatherhood, marriage, and ultimately the novel’s idyllic, rural England.

Anxiety-Free: Towards a New Model of Victorian Masculinity

MUCH LIKE “THE WOLF MAN,” the study of masculinities in general and Victorian masculinities in particular is a case study of a neurosis. Invariably, it tells the story of

desire, anxiety, disavowal, masking, and fear. The critical consensus is that in order to conceal or reconcile the contradictions that threatened to erode his authority, the Victorian man had to maintain the costly and forced spectacle of manliness. Torn apart by conflicting identities, he knew that he must “get it right” and “be a man,” often at the cost of overcoming incapacitating psychic and physical hurdles. Violence purported to cover the loss of authority and askesis eliminated nameless but dangerous desires; sometimes the two traded places.

The critical discourse on Victorian masculinities is, however, as anxiety-ridden as its subjects. Like Freud, who when confronted with the complicated masculinity of the Wolf Man, tries to beat the contradictions into submission and invent a model that can help his patient function, the scholars of the Victorian period seek to come up with a workable model of maleness that would discipline its neuroses by exposing them. Though there are many ways of approaching the subject, the omnipresence of anxiety and strife unite all of them.

The uniqueness of Trollope’s model of masculinity is its comparative freedom from such anxiety. Trollope lacks his contemporaries’ suspicion of or cerebral distance from the body. He is, as Christopher Herbert argues persuasively in *Trollope and Comic Pleasure*, no stranger to pleasure, and it is precisely on pleasure that his paradigms of father-son relationships are based. For Trollope’s men, identification with femaleness is virtually effortless and does not constitute the loss of power: it is, in fact, power. The fathers and sons whom I examine above are not the typical products of mid-Victorian England, whose passions, tamed and concealed by the somber black suit of bourgeois respectability, only occasionally manifest themselves in violence.

As I suggested earlier, Trollope’s attachment to the squire and the English land goes back to the ideas of Romanticism. Yet this connection does not make the Greshams Heathcliffs or Rochesters, throwbacks to the Romantic period, whose performances of masculinity, though edgier and more variegated than those of the Victorians, still need to be disciplined by marriage or death. Rather, by pointing to the presence of the father-son marriage plot in the Victorian novel, I would like to propose a different paradigm of Victorian masculinity, one in which pleasure lies in relinquishing power and identifying with femininity without the usual anxiety. But paradoxically, pleasure-oriented, transgressive patriarchy participates in plots driven by tremendous national and class anxieties. Radically non-normative masculinity is therefore in the service of resistance to progress, and pleasure is in the service of fear. As *Doctor Thorne* demonstrates, unorthodox performances of masculinity such as gentlemanliness underwrite both well-known sociopolitical developments and traditional novelistic structures, such as the marriage plot.

Tufts University

NOTES

1. In particular, see some of the best recent critical works on Victorian masculinity by Sussman, Gay, and Adams. Sussman contends that Victorian masculinity should be seen “[N]ot as a consensual or unitary formation, but rather as fluid and shifting, a set of contradictions and anxieties so irreconcilable within male life in the present as to be harmonized only through fictive projections into the past, the future, or even the afterlife” (2–3). Gay makes a similar point by defining Victorian masculinity as “a potentially

volatile compound of desperate restraints and ferocious desires barely held in check, the whole ready to burst into flame if combined with other alibis for aggression” (115). Finally, Adams, in his study of the performativity of Victorian masculinity, asserts that “[t]he masculine, in short, is as much a spectacle as the feminine” (11). I share with these critical studies the fundamental theoretical assumption that Victorian masculinity is a volatile, complex construct, and not a stable, essential notion. I look at a particular way of constructing the English gentleman, using the seemingly obvious conflation of class and gender in the word itself. Trollope’s nostalgia for the “feminized” man is itself illustrative of the fluidity of gender characteristics. In addition to the theoretically rigorous explorations of Victorian masculinities, some earlier texts that attempt to define Trollope’s gentleman and the gentleman in general from a historical perspective are of interest. For example, Newsome and Pollard are useful, informative sources.

2. For an interesting analysis of Trollope’s feminized man, see McDermott. He writes, “In polarized Barchester, among so many dogmatic adherents to gender and ideological absolutes, Trollope’s androgynous warden comes to signify the open, considered debate now lacking, and the measured, centrist political action this debate will sponsor” (71). He also suggests, in relation to the protagonist of *The Warden*, that “[t]o get a sense of Harding’s distinctiveness it is useful to note that, despite the remarkable hugeness of Trollope’s body of fiction . . . there does not appear to be another male character with such consistently feminine traits”(79). My psychoanalytic reading contests this claim and puts Trollope’s feminized men in the somewhat more far-reaching, both ideologically and theoretically, context of the father-son marriage plot. I argue that his gentleman is not androgynous; rather, he is normative precisely because of his feminine identification.
3. My reading of patriarchy draws partly on Sedgwick’s theory of male homosocial desire. I consider this theory, to use Sedgwick’s own formulation in *Epistemology of the Closet*, “axiomatic” (1). However, my argument shifts some of its emphases, particularly the centrality of the female body to the homosocial triangulation and the inevitability of violence that this triangulation occasions. Though women are certainly not beside the point in my reading of Trollope, the gentle fathers and sons of his novels assume a feminized position voluntarily and without contention, thus eliminating the necessity of violence over or towards a woman’s body.
4. The concept of the gentleman is also a response to Boyarin. Boyarin’s work first alerted me to the connection between Freudian psychoanalysis, masculinities, and the constructions of national identities, and I develop some of its claims further. Specifically, I maintain that the “femininity” (“gentleness”) of men is not, as Boyarin’s argument suggests, exclusively a condition of ethnic/national alterity (Jewishness in his case). I will therefore explore the potentialities of “gentler patriarchy” (Boyarin 157) for the formation of Victorian Englishness.
5. Stone offers an insightful reading of father-son relations in Trollope’s novels:

Yet despite the negative portraits – of domineering, devouring, or absent fathers and of greedy, venal or inattentive sons – Trollope also presents positive images of loving fathers, of fathers learning to love and to yield, and of sons learning to understand their parent and forming strong bonds of friendship with him. Daniel Caldigate, Archdeacon Grantly, President Neverbend and Plantagenet Palliser all join, eventually, in responding to that “heart in [a father’s] bosom which is more powerful than law or even custom” (*The Fixed Period*, ch. 7) – something more potent than primal myth – and their sons respond in kind. (43–44)

Stone is correct in pointing out that in Trollope’s novels, the fathers and sons frequently “yield” to each other and do not partake in the father-son rivalry over the body of the mother, contrary to the presuppositions of the “primal myth,” a phenomenon which he explains in biographical terms. Stone maintains that Trollope’s fathers are the reflection of the author’s affection for his own ineffectual parent, as well as his love for his equally ineffectual sons. It is useful, however, to take Trollope’s fathers and sons outside the biographical context and consider the theoretical implications of these non-traditional father-son relationships.

6. Marcus's book also contains a compelling discussion of various connections between psychoanalysis and the Victorian age; my goal, however, is to highlight a specific intersection of the Wolf Man's case and Trollope's explorations of gentlemanliness.
7. I look at Freud's case history as a paradigm on the basis of which I produce a reading of a novel. It is not therefore my primary goal to contest the meaning and interpret the symptoms of Freud's bold primal-scene *tableau*, or discuss his position in relation to the analysand. For the definitive reading of the Wolf Man's primal scene as Freud's attempt to "limit in relation to the primal scene . . . a recognition of the metaleptic structure that marks psychoanalysis as a coming from behind" (179), see Edelman's "Seeing Things: Representation, the Scene of Surveillance, and the Spectacle of Gay Male Sex" in *Homographesis: Essays in Gay Literary and Cultural Theory*. The metaleptic structure of psychoanalysis, or its "(be)hindsight," with its confusion of cause and effect, is associated with "the sodomitical encounter" represented by the primal scene (Edelman 176). Though Freud stands by this primal scene as the explanation of the Wolf Man's neuroses, he "has great difficulty indeed in allowing himself and his psychoanalytic practice to be implicated in the scene at all. The '(be)hindsight' of psychoanalysis produces a correspondence too close for comfort" (Edelman 180). Edelman argues that Freud's discomfort with the primal scene his analysis (re)produces has to do in large part with his unwillingness to be accused of wanting to "use [his patient] from behind," both by his patient and his critics (qtd. in Edelman 181). The case history positions Freud as his patient's father and questions the analyst's own gender identifications and desires. In the reading that follows, however, I would like to shift the focus from Freud and the Wolf Man as a father and son to Trollope's fathers and sons.
8. The Wolf Man is Sergei Pankeev, the son of Konstantin Pankeev, an early twentieth-century Russian liberal politician, lawyer, and wealthy landowner.
9. In a section of *Gender Trouble* entitled "Freud and the Melancholia of Gender," Butler writes about a child's post-Oedipal melancholia that results from the loss "dictated by a *prohibition* attended by a set of punishments" (81). She argues that Freud's theory of the Oedipus complex issues a "prohibition" against the child's desire for the parent of the same sex, because for him, "the taboo against homosexuality must *precede* the heterosexual incest taboo" (82). Therefore, according to Butler, the formation of (heterosexual) masculinity is always attended by the mourning of the lost object of desire, the father. My reading of Freud is in part influenced by Butler's.
10. For an important analysis of father-son eroticism implicit in "The Wolf Man," see Leo Bersani's *Homos*, particularly the chapter entitled "The Gay Daddy."
11. One could certainly argue that the novel has three father figures; after all, the presence and authority of the eponymous character, Doctor Thorne, is also crucial. Despite his insufficiently high social standing and reluctance to be included in the heterosexual marriage plot, Doctor Thorne also establishes a pattern for the emerging gentle, feminized patriarchs. My analysis, however, concerns itself primarily with father-son relations in which the doctor does not participate directly.
12. For an informative analysis of the resistance of industrialization and commercialism in mid- and late-nineteenth-century England, as well as Trollope's contribution to the debate, see Weiner.

WORKS CITED

- Adams, James Eli. *Dandies and Desert Saints: Styles of Victorian Masculinity*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995.
- Bersani, Leo. *Homos*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995.
- Boyarin, Daniel. *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Castronovo, David. *The English Gentleman: Images and Ideals in Literature and Society*. New York: Ungar, 1987.
- Cohen, William A. *Sex Scandal: The Private Parts of Victorian Fiction*. Durham: Duke UP, 1996.

- Edelman, Lee. *Homographesis: Essays in Gay Literary and Cultural Theory*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Everett, Nigel. *The Tory View of Landscape*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1994.
- Freud, Sigmund. “From the History of an Infantile Neurosis.” (“The Wolf Man”). *Three Case Histories*. Ed. Philip Rieff. New York: Macmillan, Collier, 1993. 161–280.
- Gay, Peter. *The Cultivation of Hatred*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1993.
- “Gentleman.” *Merriam-Webster Online*. 26 February 2005 <<http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?book=Dictionary&va=gentleman>>.
- Herbert, Christopher. *Trollope and Comic Pleasure*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1987.
- Kincaid, James. “Introduction.” *Doctor Thorne*. Ed. Hugh Osborne. London: J. M. Dent, 1997. xvii–xxiv.
- Lindner, Christoph. “Sexual Commerce in Trollope’s Phineas Novels.” *Philological Quarterly* 79.3 (Summer 2000): 343–63.
- Marcus, Steven. *Freud and the Culture of Psychoanalysis: Studies in the Transition from Victorian Humanism to Modernity*. Boston: George Allen & Unwin, 1984.
- McDermott, Jim. “New Womanly Man: Feminized Heroism and the Politics of Compromise in *The Warden*.” *VII: Victorians Institute Journal* 27 (1999): 71–90.
- Newsome, David. *Godliness and Good Learning: Four Studies on a Victorian Ideal*. London: John Murray, 1961.
- Pollard, Arthur. “Trollope’s Idea of the Gentleman.” *Trollope Centenary Essays*. Ed. John Halperin. New York: St. Martin’s, 1982. 86–94.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia UP, 1985.
- . *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: U of California P, 1990.
- Stone, Donald D. “Prodigals and Prodigies: Trollope’s Notes as a Son and Father.” *Victorian Perspectives*. Ed. John Clubbe and Jerome Meckier. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1989. 42–67.
- Sussman, Herbert. *Victorian Masculinities: Manhood and Masculine Poetics in Early Victorian Literature and Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Trollope, Anthony. *Doctor Thorne*. Ed. Hugh Osborne. London: J. M. Dent, 1997.
- Weiner, Martin. *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850–1980*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.