

This dissertation has been 63-7177
microfilmed exactly as received

WYATT, Sibyl White, 1908-
NINETEENTH CENTURY ENGLISH NOVEL AND
AUSTRIAN CENSORSHIP.

Rice University, Ph.D., 1963
Language and Literature, general

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

RICE UNIVERSITY

Nineteenth Century English Novel and Austrian Censorship

by

Sibyl White Wyatt

A THESIS SUBMITTED
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Thesis Director's signature:

W. L. Dauter

Houston, Texas

April, 1963

CONTENTS

I.	Metternich, His Empire and His Principles	1
II.	Novels Set in the Middle Ages	23
III.	Novels Set in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries	61
IV.	Novels Set in the Seventeenth Century	94
V.	Novels Set in the Eighteenth, Nineteenth, and Twenty-first Centuries	150
VI.	Conclusion	176
	Notes	200
	Bibliography	217

Chapter I

Metternich and His Principles

The extensive Austrian Empire under the Hapsburg rule of the early nineteenth century was directed by Metternich, an able statesman, for his country at no time enjoyed a greater prestige; a good diplomatist, for his ways were ways of pleasantness and peace; a great European, for a tired Continent had rest for a full generation.¹ Emperor Francis I and he realized that the Empire held together only because the masses were not organized for power. Francis once said, "My empire is like a worm-eaten house; if one part is removed, one cannot tell how much will fall."² Metternich, called "the pattern of the perfect statesman of the absolutist governments," was admired by the conservatives of all Europe as an infallible oracle and hated by the liberals as the incarnation of the spirit of obscurantism. Although he appears to have merited neither estimate, such exaggerated portraits of him have been developed that it is hard to estimate him with any degree of fairness. He has been declared a "political physician," "one of the nicest creatures of his time," "the brain of the victorious alliance" who liberated Europe from Napoleon.³ Contrasted with the violence of Napoleon's day is that well-balanced system, that equilibrium of forces, which in principle is opposed to attempts by any one state to secure predominance at the expense of the liberty and independence of another. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the balance of powers in Europe seemed to be

threatened from various quarters. There was need of a personality who could not only unite the forces opposing Napoleon, as well as prove equal to the Corsican in diplomacy, but could also restore and maintain as far as was considered feasible the political system which had been overthrown by the Revolution. Clemence Lothar Metternich, one of the most remarkable and most complex diplomats of all times, was that man. In the delicately balanced Hapsburg system, the German, Italian, Slav, and Magyar or Hungarian lands were all geared into a "central dynastic wheel in such a way that the introduction of democratic institutions or the recognition of national entities anywhere could easily upset the Hapsburg machine everywhere."⁴ The task of holding together such an empire, made up of half the races and religions of Europe, presented problems that challenged the powers of the man who by aptitude and training was a diplomat rather than an administrator. However, he guided Austrian policies with a masterly hand and obtained for Europe a most fruitful period. His success lay in the fact that he exercised a "continuous power of adjusting and re-adjusting his point of view to the course of events," says one of his admirers.⁵ Another says the ultimate failure of his system lay in his and Francis's failure to think of a way "of preserving what was except by preserving it as it was."⁶ Consequently, his name has become synonymous with extreme conservatism.

Metternich realized that he was living in an age of transition, in which his life's work was to hold Europe together until the power of the

Revolution should be spent. His rare grasp of international affairs and his leading features of statesmanship, finesse and friendliness, enabled him to accomplish this great objective. He is said never to have cared overmuch for power; at no time was his influence executive; he is accredited with the "system of Austria at the time of his power not because he ever held or sought to hold the post of Prime Minister, but because he stood intellectually head and shoulders above his fellows!"⁷

With his father as diplomatic agent in the lesser Rhineland states, Metternich had an opportunity early in life to observe the excesses of the French Revolution which accompanied the spread of the ideas of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity; consequently, he became an implacable opponent of those disturbing doctrines of France. Democracy and patriotism, sacrosanct to the present century, in his mind were identified with revolution. He spent his life opposing them in the individual countries that made up the State which he had maneuvered into the position of arbiter of European affairs and in the Empire wittily styled by Talleyrand "the European House of Lords." As Ambassador to France he studied Napoleon and his empire and determined to organize Europe against him. When Napoleon was overthrown, it was only natural that the man who had played the greatest role in his defeat should exercise a determining influence over the future of Europe.

From the Baltic to Sicily there was general exhaustion and a wide-spread desire for peace so that Napoleon's downfall was enthusiastically welcomed and Talleyrand's insistence upon a return to absolutism

was accepted. Peace and order seemed to the people to be worth any price; however, there remained the constant threat of revolution and a rising tide of nationalism made popular by the Revolutionary notions of individual freedom and national unity. This tide faced its greatest enemy in Austria. Her conception of the need for the European States was a tranquil communal life made possible by their geographical position, through the uniformity of their customs, their laws, their needs, their mode of life and culture. No important change in any one of them could be a matter of indifference to the others, especially to Austria, situated as she was, a State in the heart of the Continent, with interests in the German areas, on the Apennine Peninsula, in the Balkans, and in East Europe. The Metternich system tried to guarantee the necessary cooperation by the re-establishment of an absolute monarchy in the vast Empire.

It appears that the Liberals judge the era of Austrian history by the concepts of Francis, yet term the age that of Metternich. Francis's intellectual apathy, his love of ease, and his shrewd perception that Austria had little or nothing to gain by change, combined to make him a conservative of the narrowest type. Metternich, though less narrow than Francis, agreed that there was no value in change for change's sake. So the ultra-conservative tendencies of the Emperor's mind and the intelligent conservatism of his minister arrived at a philosophy of "govern and change nothing" in the foundation of the structure of the Austrian State.⁸ Artz says that the Chancellor's extraordinary

diplomatic skill enabled him to erect a complete system of European conservatism in harmony with his own convictions and "in consonance with the peculiar needs of the Hapsburg Monarchy."⁹

It is said that the Austrian "system" was held together by the unifying bond of Francis's absolutism, developed before his most valuable assistant, Metternich, had been given much voice, that Metternich was not the creator of the regime of state absolutism but was merely its agent in foreign affairs.¹⁰ Although Francis relied heavily upon Metternich's help, as he died "willing him" to his son as his most faithful servant and friend, he, nevertheless, determined the course of Austrian politics and thus is responsible for its negative aspect, as has been pointed out in an attempt to free Metternich from the charge of "stagnant statesmanship."¹¹

The essence of what is commonly called the "Metternich system" was to be found in the adoption of a preventive system in order to avoid a repressive one.¹² Kann says the system intended to establish the "equilibrium between a positive conservative principle of perseverance and a negative destructive principle of excessive motion." He continues that it did not intend to eliminate the force of motion completely, but it held that such concepts as revolution, nationalism, liberalism, inordinate individualism, constitutional monarchy, and popular sovereignty were excessive emanations of the Zeitgeist; it did not deny their raison d'etre as formative forces in history, without which the balance can never be established. Although the system affirmed slow evolutionary

progress, the emphasis upon the "excessive motion" concept has won for it the designation of "harsh" and "arbitrary."¹³

As early as 1797 Francis prohibited anti-revolutionary propaganda because it helped to spread revolutionary principles as well. Since it was evident after the overthrow of Napoleon that he was directing an empire without any genuine national basis, a mere governmental machine, he and Chancellor Metternich tried to ensure its stability by suppressing any revolutionary movements, whether in Germany, Italy, Austria, or more remote countries.

For the Hapsburg Empire liberal ideas were dangerous; not only would such ideas have destroyed the hold which Metternich hoped to exercise over the whole of Germany through the Diet of Confederation, but if applied to Austria herself, they would have spelled dissolution and impotence, as Webster points out. He adds that fortunately for Metternich there was at the time of his growing power little sign that the races of the Hapsburg Monarchy had become tainted by such doctrines. With the exception of the Hungarians and possibly the Poles, they were as yet unconscious of nationalist and liberal ideas. Metternich strove to keep them so, for with his diagnostic power, he saw that the first triumph of liberal, democratic, or nationalist ideas anywhere in Europe could stir up disruptive movements in Austria.¹⁴ Hence, revolutionary ideas in speech, books, or newspapers were a threat to Metternich's system, even if they appeared as far away as Spain, Sweden, or Sicily.¹⁵

It was only for his empire that Metternich objected to democracy and nationalism. He once observed that only democracy could have carried America forward with such speed, for only democracy created the necessary momentum of competition, but he added that it was bad for Europe.¹⁶

The two conservative leaders of Austria also feared nationalism,¹⁷ believing it fatal to Austria's position;¹⁸ Francis was afraid nationalism would lead to a deviation from the concept of absolutism, while in opposition to the equilibrium for which he strove, Metternich saw the danger of two main forces: liberal, democratic, Jacobin, or outright national mass movements.¹⁹ Cecil defends Metternich's fear of nationalism, quoting others whose opinions agreed with Metternich's: he says the Liberal historian Acton observed that among the three great revolutionary principles of which the French Revolution made use, that of nationalism was "the richest in promise of future power," richer than equality and communism; therefore, the Revolution concentrated on nationalism.²⁰ Taylor states that German and Italian nationalism were threats to the European system.²¹ The entirely unbiased work by Kann contains the statement that the results of the experiments of the two generations that followed Metternich in the field of Austrian nationalism cannot claim better results than Metternich's negative policy.²²

Unfortunately the Austrian policy with its conception of a balance of power and its close adherence to the social system of the ancien

régime stifled the need of the masses to expand and develop. Social liberal, and national forces were crying out for recognition and attempting to change the structure of state and society in accordance with the new theories and the requirements of the age. These new theories, which with elemental force laid hold of the popular imagination, could not long be successfully opposed by even the most carefully devised system. So in an eruptive fashion, opposition to the rigid policy which had been designed to preserve a balance of power against revolutionary movements sprang up.

It is said that there were some groups who had suffered from the revolutionary upheaval and had been turned against the changes promised by war; these groups were largely the monarchs, the clergy, and the aristocracy. To them the return of the Old Order was welcome. But there were some who were inclined to doubt the validity of the old way of thinking and living. Those most dissatisfied with the restored ancien régime were among the lesser nobility, some students and teachers, army officers, and commercial classes--largely that despised middle class, often led by lesser nobility or the lower clergy, or both.

The Manchester meetings of 1819 and other small outbreaks were the beginnings of rule by mob violence to those brought up in the horrors of the excesses of the Revolution. Metternich believed that they were the beginnings of a vast movement to overthrow the established order. He was convinced that a strongly organized movement existed; monarchs

were themselves organized; so he concluded that their enemies were also. Although it has never been proved that such a centralized organization as he imagined ever existed, there were many societies in different states, such as the Carbonari in Naples, and the Burschenschaften all over the Germanies, the two Sicilies alone having fifty to one hundred thousand members of such groups, all opposed to Metternich's repression of anything that suggested Liberalism.

The Austrian Chancellor's paid spies swarmed in all capitals of Europe. As early as 1811 there were ten thousand secret police at work.²³ Mail was said to have been re-routed through Vienna; letters were opened and a special force employed to decode messages contained in code. Torn-up letters in wastebaskets were pieced together and read. Intercepted ones were detained and copied before going on their way; the postal authorities attended to the inspection in a specially equipped "black cabinet."²⁴ The correspondence of the royal family was read.²⁵ A passport was needed to travel from one province to another or from a town into the country.

Webster reports a contemporary description of Metternich by Gordon in 1819:

Nothing can surpass Prince Metternich's activities in collecting facts and information upon the inward feelings of the people. With a habit of making these researches he has acquired a taste for them which gives no repose until he finds himself ignorant of nothing that was intended to be concealed. But it may be feared that the secrecy with which this taste is necessarily indulged leads him to attach too great importance

to his discoveries. Phantoms are conjured up and magnified in the dark, which probably, if exposed to light, would sink into insignificance; and his informers naturally exaggerate their reports, aware that their profit is to be commensurate with the display of their phantasmagoria.²⁶

While his spies and denouncers operated throughout Europe, naturally the center of gravity of Metternich's system was in the Monarchy itself, where an army of police spies under Baron Hager's direction operated at the time of the Congress in Vienna. In this gay est of cities from which the Hapsburgs directed the affairs of all Middle Europe, a government that "believed that men can read themselves into criminals" censored everything.²⁷ The police everywhere spent much time hunting down "a class called thinkers." Bohemian artists enjoying a riotous evening's amusement, or lovers beneath the garden wall were questioned by the prying police as suspected enemies of the State.²⁸ Even a desire for privacy might render one suspect in the eyes of the police.

Stendhal in his Chartreuse de Parme is said to have satirized the type of "perfect" courtier of Metternich's day in his hero Fabrizio, a man without honor or humor, who was suspected of Liberal leanings. He had to choose for his confessor, when he went to mass every day in order to clear himself, a man devoted to the monarchy; he was not to consort with any man who had the reputation of being clever, and when occasion offered, he was to speak of rebellion with horror; he was to express dislike of reading in general, and he was never to peruse any

works printed later than 1720, the only possible exception being Scott's novels (many of these we shall see in this study were forbidden or at least limited in their circulation); he must be simple, with no wit, no brilliance, no swift repartee. Everything which had been done since the death of Louis XIV in 1715 was at once a folly and a crime.²⁹

Back of all this spying and despotic control was plain fear, the dread that the horrors of the Revolution would suddenly begin again. Employers were said to be afraid of their workmen, nobles of peasants, and governments of everyone. Statesmen opposed all change lest it release unknown and destructive forces. They hated the revolutionary principle but rarely understood it.³⁰ Most of the restrictions by the government seemed calculated to irritate and estrange the self-respecting man, particularly the educated, for the Austrian bureaucracy have been accused of trying to keep the Empire intellectually quarantined.

Metternich wrote, "No government can pursue a firm and un-deviating course when it is daily exposed to the influence of such dissolvent conditions as the freedom of the Press."³¹ He kept a careful eye on both the home and the foreign press. Gentz wrote in 1819,

As a preventive measure against the abuses of the press, absolutely nothing should be printed for years . . . With this maxim as a rule, we should in short time get back to God and Truth.³²

Francis's insistence was that the intellectual growth of everyone over whom he ruled should be the affair of the police who were to exclude

all literature, ideas, and information of a modern or "dangerous" tendency from the books and journals that circulated in his wide domains. An account of modern history of any kind was enough to frighten the censors.³³

During the period of Metternich's greatest power, the 1820's and early 30's, the restrictions imposed by his regime were strong enough to bar almost completely from Austria the influence of as vigorous a movement as that of Young Germany and to curtail severely the free pursuit of historical and philosophical studies. The primary handicap felt by those of the Empire was in the field of education, where the spying actions of the "police state" were most manifest. University professors were subjected to the particular attention of the system under the supervision of an extraordinary state official, Count Sedlnitzsky,³⁴ a system which extended to a close watch over the kinds of books they borrowed from the libraries. Students were forbidden to participate in open discussions of contemporary political and religious issues. Metternich believed the Universities should keep out of politics, that a liberal education should be conducted on a level above current controversies. Problems that tax the brain and experience of those at forty should not be attempted by those of twenty, said the government. The Chancellor insisted that the Academies must regain the atmosphere of detachment, the preoccupation with study which is inherent in the very idea of a university. "My proposals," he wrote Gentz, "bear upon university

discipline and not at all upon the studies themselves. . . . If we meddle with the latter we shall get nothing done."³⁵ But Ward says his attitude was: "He who serves me must teach what I command,"³⁶ while Bury says that the supervised faculties before 1848 followed a strict routine using only state permitted texts, with no emphasis upon individual thought, only upon rote memory.³⁷

Fearing change as it did, the Franciscan regime recognized the value of orthodox religion as a basic foundation for a sound and stable political order, although Kann declares any general religious revival would have been viewed with alarm, as was any mass movement. It is known that some who were zealous lost their lectureships in the universities.³⁸ There was a "reconditioning" rather than "any immediate reconstruction of the dilapidated house of Christendom."³⁹

Although religion was interpreted in a rather mundane fashion in the Empire, it remained a primary aim of Metternich's policy, as well as a means of insuring the success of that policy.⁴⁰ Metternich was no bigot, still less an ultra-montane; in early life he "took kindly to" a Protestant teacher, and in later life read Luther's Bible daily, although he opposed the open Bible.⁴¹ He termed himself "a Churchman, a free and strong Catholic," but it was said that he was tolerant and considerate towards the members of other confessions.⁴² He had been much impressed by a visit to the Pope in 1819 as well as by the ritual of the Church, but not until his later life with Melanie, his third, rather zealous wife, did he appear personally concerned with religion.

However, he agreed with the many who believed that the Catholic Church was one of the most effective forces in Europe for holding the revolutionary spirit in check. As a matter of fact, the governments were not convinced that if the papacy, the oldest and most legitimate monarchy in Europe, were not reinstated, no other monarchy could count on saving itself. Artz states that the spirit of the time is in no way better shown than in the effort made by the three non-Catholic powers, England, Prussia, and Russia, to restore the papacy to a position of influence in European affairs.⁴³ These rulers believed there was a distinct connection between political radicalism and religious liberalism; so they strove for the restoration of the authority of the Roman Church.

Among the people a religious fervor mounted in the closing years of the Napoleonic epoch; they felt the need of divine aid in the struggle against the Corsican. A warm, consoling faith made an especial appeal to people sickened by years of strife and disorder. This need, as well as political motives, strengthened the hand of religion, and Catholicism regained much of its former power. Church properties confiscated during the Revolution were restored and concordates were negotiated by the papacy with the various Catholic states organizing the hierarchy and specifying the rights of the Church and her clergy. Missionary efforts spread Catholicism throughout the world. The Jesuits and their allies were said to have rendered futile the efforts for ecclesiastical independence.⁴⁴

Artz describes the attitude of the French Joseph de Maistre: he could not conceive of order, the first principle of all politics, without an absolute authority; there is no public authority without religion; no religion for Europe without Christianity, no Christianity without Catholicism, no Catholicism without the Pope, and no Pope without absolute sovereignty. Like many theorists he hated the Protestant Reformation as he did the French Revolution which had⁴⁵ overthrown every institution he cherished, tyrannized over his church, mocked his religion, and executed his King.⁴⁵ This attitude seems to be that of many following the French Revolution, even Chancellor Metternich himself, except that he held the Church as an instrument of government, a branch of civil service, that must be upheld and supported insofar as it strengthened the authority of the state;⁴⁶ so from one end of Europe to the other the churches and clergy were regarded as chief supports of the throne.⁴⁷

One of the dangers to the welfare of Europe, as the Church had contended, particularly since the beginning of the Middle Ages, was Judaism. The consensus was that since the early days of Christianity, the Jews were blamed for the death of Christ; for this reason they were hated, a feeling which spread throughout the years, finally becoming a matter of political and economic, as well as religious, concern. Gobineau's belief was that the Jew was simply an inferior race that invited suppression,⁴⁸ and there is no question that there was much discrimination in Europe against that race. In Austria, in the last decades of the eighteenth

century, the Jews had been expelled from Vienna, Maria Theresa ordering that no Jew be allowed to remain in Vienna without her special permission. She stated that the race was a great plague, which on account of its deceit, usury, and hoarding of money was driving her subjects to beggary.⁴⁹ While Napoleon had accorded Judaism an official status and France forced the emancipation of the Jews in land which she conquered, after the downfall of Napoleon the Jews were temporarily deprived of their recently won rights. Restrictive and discriminatory legislation was revived. At the Vienna Congress the Jewish question was considered one of general European politics. The Jews were far from the political equality they longed for. They were ousted in German commercial centers;⁵⁰ in Frankfurt, headquarters of the powerful international bankers, the Rothschilds, the Jews were confined to a quarter until 1824.

After the close of the Napoleonic Wars, all Europe needed money and facilities for transferring money. The Rothschilds were able to furnish both. In 1819 Gentz sought out these "vulgar, ignorant Jews," whom he found outwardly presentable and in time presented them to Metternich, in whose empire Absolutism moved warily or not at all in improving the condition of the Jews. Although Metternich needed their financial help, both private and public, and permitted some Jewish families in Vienna, they paid a special tax and lived without legal rights, subject to expulsion at a moment's notice.⁵¹ Quietly, little by little, he got for them extended privileges in exchange for their

assistance but there was a mark set which even the Rothschilds might not pass. There was no appreciable change in the status of the Jewish population before 1848.⁵²

The part clericals were to play in Metternich's Austrian Empire seems not very clearly defined, according to Artz,⁵³ but the Church, immediately after 1815, began to exert her power over the faithful to elect men favorable to the Church to educational and administrative posts (in Italy priests held all public offices),⁵⁴ and to work for the restoration of the privileges which the Church had enjoyed under the ancien régime, to recover lands, to control education, and to fight all forces that favored free thought and democracy.⁵⁵ May says that the clergy was granted the right of controlling education,⁵⁶ and Jászai states that the Roman Catholic Church held in its hands the whole spiritual and educational organization of the Empire.⁵⁷ With the re-admission of the Jesuits, Church supervision of education was gradually restored; however, Church and State worked harmoniously in primary education which had a definitely confessional character, according to Bury.⁵⁸ The parish priests regained supervision of village schools, the ecclesiastic deans that of school districts. They in turn were supervised by the diocesan bishops, but the over-all control was in the hands of the government.⁵⁹ After Francis's death in 1835, and as Metternich grew older and more and more subservient to Jesuit influences, clericalism and absolutism reached a climax in Austria, with the strong Jesuits teaching according to their own desires.⁶⁰

A field in which churchmen were known to have been very active was that of keeping schools loyal to the established system in church and state as they took a hand in that "great struggle against dangerous thoughts" in the police state of Austria.⁶¹ They were given the right of censoring all literature.⁶² Artz says that to the Church the words liberty, justice, and happiness of the greatest number are criminal; they give man's mind a habit of discussion and as a result, "He distrusts the commands of the church and the authority of the princes set up by God";⁶³ so the clergy, hunted down any suggestion of Liberalism in politics or religion. Certainly there must be nothing done or said that would in any way belittle Catholicism. This attitude reached the extreme in the Italian states when criticism of Catholicism was made a criminal offense.

Although there is no proof that there was any connection between Metternich's official state censorship and that of the Church in the form of The Index, there is reason to believe that, occupying as they did many prominent places in the Empire, the clergy would have had considerable influence upon the officials even if they were not themselves acting officially. It is known that The Index was reconstituted in many states;⁶⁴ however, it was employed by different monarchs with different degrees of conscientiousness. As eager as Metternich was for the power of the Catholic Church behind him, he would have been quick to follow her suggestions, making her rejections official for all

his Empire. He had dedicated himself early in his career to upholding "positive religion," the Catholic religion;⁶⁵ however, at least until he was an older man, he had used the powerful hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church largely as a counter-revolutionary measure.⁶⁶ So it seems clear that the Church played a major role in the control of the Empire. However the secret police were directly responsible for the intellectual quarantine of the land controlled by Prince Metternich, with the Church working in league with, but subservient to, the state.

The archives of European capitals contain hundreds of dossiers of the reports of the activity of the secret state police, from whom nothing could be hidden which they desired to know. Some of these reports were those made by the censors of literature. Although censorship lists were submitted periodically to Metternich and his top men in multiple form, all copies of these lists which were stored in the governmental archives were destroyed by fire in the 1840's. Only those copies which were deposited in the archives of the University of Vienna are extant.⁶⁷ From an examination of these lists of books which the censors would not allow to circulate freely in the nineteenth-century Empire, covering the years 1817 to February, 1848, it appears

that the customs guards, in their efforts to help carry out Metternich's quarantine, considered much written in the Romantic period of English literature dangerous to the Austrian Empire.

This is a fact one might expect if he considered the popularity of the Romantic historical novel, produced by Walter Scott and his imitators, in light of Metternich's fear of any account of history lest his subjects read of some dangerous precedent to the peace and order that he and his Emperor desired to maintain in their Austria. This popular genre of literature occupies a prominent position on the official lists, with Scott's name heading the lists of offenders. Several titles of authentic English novels appear more than once each on the lists of censorship, together with a number of falsely ascribed ones.

Perhaps the censors needed to concern themselves little with the untranslated English productions, for few people in the Austrian-controlled Empire could read English at that time. Those in French, German, or Italian were considered most dangerous; however there are some in the English language which were given rather strict censorship labels.

The state censors used two designations in their reports; the term verboten, meaning strictly forbidden or prohibited, was ascribed

to the most offensive; beschränkt, meaning limited or restricted, was the designation for those works considered less dangerous. The "forbidden" label appears often on the lists for the 1820's when Metternich was at the height of his power, as does the "restricted" or "limited" one, but, although the less severe designation was used on into the 1840's, the prohibited label does not appear after the 20's. It was not until the late 1830's that some appear on the lists without label, at the time when the mighty Chancellor's power was declining.

Julius Marx states in an article on the censorship exercised by Chancellor Metternich that there were no official rules laid down for the various censors to follow after the time when Metternich became powerful. The officials censored any material that they considered contained a threat to the established order, to the power of the Austrian government or the Church which was the Hapsburg's most powerful support. They exercised their own judgments both in deciding what should be censored and the degree of severity of the label attached. Marx insists that the official censors were inclined toward the strict rather than the liberal in order to avoid the displeasure of the Chancellor,⁶⁸ who, as was noted above, believed men could read themselves into criminality.⁶⁹ Webster states that the Chancellor's informers exaggerated their reports, for they were fully aware that their rewards

were to be "commensurate with the display of their phantasmagoria."⁷⁰ So it would appear that the censors judged according to their own personal whims.

Since there were no rules of censorship and nothing in the official lists to indicate why publications were censored by the government, it becomes a challenge to students to determine, in the light of Metternich's principles, the reasons for the censors' strict rejection of some works, while others were only limited or restricted in circulation, or even left without label, and why the novels of certain writers were severely censored while those by others were never heavily limited, as well as what effect this censorship had upon literature.

Chapter II

Novels Set in the Middle Ages

Each of the thirty-two English novels that constitute this study contains matter that would have encouraged those who might have objected to the police-state set up by the Austrian Prince. Suggestions favoring democracy, or nationalism, derogatory remarks about those in authority, or the nobility, accounts of rebellion in many forms, pro-Semitism, the breaking down of social barriers, or any such suggestions that, if acted upon by his subjects, might weaken the hold Metternich held over Western Europe were disapproved as reading matter for his empire, as well as was any material which might weaken the influence of Roman Catholicism.

The novels in this study range in setting from the time of the twelfth century in Sir Walter Scott's Ivanhoe to Mary Shelley's The Last Man, which is set in the years 2073-98. Each contains political or religious statements, and in most instances both, of sufficient offensiveness to secure itself a place on the lists of censorship of the Austrian Empire under the control of Metternich.

Many of Scott's novels were translated as soon as they were released, and nine were placed very soon afterward on the lists of censored books. As a result of his extraordinary popularity in the field of historical fiction, he was very often imitated, and many times his name exploited. Ten English writers whose works appear on the lists of censorship followed Sir Walter's lead and, in most instances, his

style as nearly as possible, in presenting their stories of fictionalized events of history. The most prolific of these was G. P. R. James, represented on the lists by five novels, three with French settings and two with English. Both Mrs. Eliza Bray and Mrs. Emma Robinson were close imitators of Scott; Mrs. Bray was given four places on the lists of books considered dangerous to the peace of Austria, and Mrs. Robinson was assigned two. Bulwer-Lytton, Allan Cunningham, William H. Ainsworth, Horace Smith, Thomas C. Grattan, Ann Radcliffe, Mary Shelley, and one anonymous author have violated once each the censorship rules of nineteenth-century Austria.

Probably because of his extreme popularity during the time of the height of Metternich's power, the novels of Sir Walter Scott were the principal targets for the official Austrian censorship. More than that of any other English novelist his name appears on the official lists of censorship. All of his censored works were given either a restricted or a forbidden label.

Since Scott was a Tory and a loyal monarchist, delighting in paying homage to his King, George IV, as well as in playing the laird himself, surrounded by his followers, one naturally questions what in his novels was considered dangerous to the security of the Hapsburg Monarchy. In spite of the fact that his loyalty to his Monarch and his freedom from advocacy of rebellion against political authority, as well as his aristocratic leanings, were in perfect harmony with the political principles

of Metternich, one soon discovers in his novels on the official lists many matters offensive to the Conservative Austrian Prince.

In his thirty-odd novels covering a period of eight centuries and the reigns of fifteen English rulers, Scott has made a special effort to present truthfully the persons of historical importance, both rulers and nobility, in their strengths and their weaknesses. He also reveals a sympathy for the common man, especially the conquered, often making him appear more admirable than the sovereign himself. These two characteristics alone would have made his works suspect with the Austrian censors operating under Metternich's "system." Add to them his general lack of respect for the church which Metternich chose to help him in the control of his empire and it is clear why almost one-third of his novels appear on the lists of censorship, as well as do many imitations of his works.

When one considers the fact that Scott's Ivanhoe¹ contains uncomplimentary remarks about Austrians, princes in general, and Catholics, as well as an account of the rebellion of the conquered Saxons against the conqueror Normans, he will see why the censors designated the book, in 1824, one forbidden to readers in the Austrian Empire of Metternich's day.² But the offenses do not stop with these. The fact that the Templars refused to recognize state control would have displeased the Austrians; eager as the State was for the power of the Church behind the government, Metternich insisted that the Church must be under State control.³ Still further matter in the

novel that would have caused displeasure to Austrians is the presentation of the case for the Jews in such an effective manner, as well as the remarks about some Catholic beliefs and practices.

The political aspect of Ivanhoe most dangerous for Austrians to read is the plan of the Saxons, the conquered, to rebel against the Normans, their conquerors. The Normans, with the usual policy of the conquerors, were jealous of permitting the vanquished Saxons to possess or use swords or spears, lest they use them against the rulers in an attempt to regain some of their lost rights. In the eyes of the twelfth or the nineteenth-century rulers, the conquered people had no rights for which to fight; theirs were only what the conquerors wanted to give.⁴ Nevertheless, the Saxons, represented in the story by Cedric, did resist just as the conquered of nineteenth-century Europe were, as Metternich suspected, beginning to prepare for rebellion against Austrian oppression at the time the book was censored in that land.

Scott's pictures of the governing officials of the land are uncomplicated: John was said to be licentious in pleasure as he was profligate in his ambition (I, 125), while his Chancellor Fitzurse realized that he was more powerful than was the King. The account of the situation at that time in England rather closely parallels that of the Austrian Empire when Metternich was in power. According to the

Chancellor's statement, John was like a fool or a child, and only

... one of the tools with which I labor; and proud as he is, should he presume to separate his interest from mine, this is a secret which he shall soon learn. (I, 210)

Scott secured sympathy for the conquered Saxons as he related incidents of the cruelties and dishonor to women at the hands of the conquerors, exemplified by old Ulrica's story of mistreatment by Normans (II, 3 ff). Such lawlessness on the part of the Normans was only overshadowed by the bold, "lawless but honorable" outlaw Robin Hood whom Richard assured, "No deed done in our absence, and in the turbulent times to which it hath given rise, shall be remembered to thy disadvantage." (II, 277)

Perhaps the most offensive element of this novel to the censors was the account of the conflict between Church and State seen in the Templars' rebellion against the established government. Metternich was not willing that his subjects should read of rebellion in any form, by anyone, not even the Church, against established authority. The Templars would not degrade or betray the Order by bowing to Richard. These churchmen were feared and dreaded for their cruelty to those who offended them, and the Grand Master was astonished when Richard had Albert of Malvoisin arrested. Even though the rebellion must be censured, Metternich must have been secretly pleased that Scott presents the Churchmen at fault, leaving the State supreme.

When Richard was taken captive upon his attempted return from the Holy Lands to England, Scott states that he was imprisoned by the

"perfidious and cruel Duke of Austria" (I, 86), at that time Leopold V of the House of Babenbergs. Any degrading reflection upon the Austrians would surely have been repugnant to the Austrian censors.

A religious offense to Catholic censors is the novelist's sympathetic treatment of the Jewish people about whom he says, "No race existing on earth, in the air, or in the water was more persecuted." Isaac of York said he was "dog Jew," "unbelieving Jew," until the nobles and petty sovereigns wanted to borrow money from him; then he became, "Friend Isaac." Rebecca insisted that it was considered by Christians a light fault, if not a merit, to wrong and spoil the Jewish nation (I, 249). Their degradation was relieved somewhat by their awareness that "The Gentiles, cruel and oppressive as they are," are in some sort dependent upon the dispersed children of Zion, whom they despise and persecute (I, 140). For, without the Jews' gold they could neither furnish their hosts in war nor their triumphs in peace. Metternich too found need for the Jew's gold, both private and public.⁵ Rebecca admitted that the Jews "trim their bark to take advantage even of an adverse wind," and that the gold they lent returned with increase to their coffer. However, she lamented the hour that had taught such art to the House of Israel. It is their curse, "deserved, doubtless, by our own misdeeds and those of our fathers" (II, 245). But she repeatedly proved her declaration that the Jew does love something beside his moneybags, that "A Jew may do good service to a Christian,

without desiring other guerdon than the blessing of the Great Father who made both Jew and Gentile" (II, 73). As she won the admiration of Ivanhoe and his friend King Richard, the reader too becomes completely sympathetic with her and her race, the "unresisting victims of hostile and military oppression" (I, 95), an oppression still found in Metternich's Austria.⁶

A part of the interesting paradox which this study reveals in the influence of Scott is that which he exerted upon Catholicism. His novels set in early eras, when Roman Catholicism was in great force, helped to bring about the Catholic revival of the Romantic period. It is said that no English novelist before him had written about Catholics seriously. Scott revived curiosity about Catholicism and paved the way for the acceptance of the Oxford Movement by interesting his readers in the Catholic past. He has been accused of knowing nothing about Catholicism, of making blunders, in his early books. However, he later learned to see advantages in the monastic system: it limited the power and wealth of the nobles, lessened the chances of internecine strife, and strengthened the authority of the king. Although he found himself feeling tolerant of the spirit of monastic life, he still managed to present the up-to-date political horror of "Popery" as a "depraving superstition,"⁷ and confided to his diary, in 1829, that

Unopposed, the Catholic superstition may sink to dust, with all its absurd ritual and solemnities. Still it is an awful risk. The world is in fact as silly as ever; a good competence of nonsense will always find believers.⁸

While he helped to bring about a revival of Catholicism through his stories, he must have caused many readers to lose respect for that faith and its clergy, for there are many uncomplimentary remarks about Catholics in his novels. In Ivanhoe Front-de-Boeuf suffered without having the "usual resource of bigots in the superstitious period." He thought the Church sold her wares too dear, stating that the spiritual freedom which she put up for sale was only to be bought with a great sum. Yet as he lay dying he asked,

Where be these dog-priests now who set such price on their ghostly mummery? . . . --where be the greedy hounds now? Swilling, I warrant me, at the ale, or playing their juggling tricks at the bedside of some miserly churl. . . ungrateful villains that they are!
(II, 103)

The churchmen were called lovers of the chase, of food, and of "other worldly pleasures still more inconsistent with their monastic vows" (I, 19), such as were their expensive dress and the jewels they wore. One prior said he was a shaveling only when his frock was on his back; yet it was said that he did have one redeeming trait where some had none--he was charitable--and men only shrugged their shoulders when they saw him creeping home at dawn from some rendezvous. This same "bonny monk" would hear "the matin chime ere he quitted his bowl" (I, 64), for he loved wine and a lady's smile (II, 160) and was expert at all matters of love. He preferred the wine-cup and bugle-horn to the bell and book (I, 40), and he would "drink, swear, and woo a lass with any blythe forester in the West Riding" (I, 267).

Bois-Guilbert spoke of the doting penitent's confessing freely to his ghostly father when placed in a "tricky confessional" (II, 247). A crippled peasant was afraid of Rebecca's bewitching him, but more afraid of the harm that would come to him from the priest at Easter if he helped a Jew. (II, 239)

Church fathers were said to come to the castles to "revel at the boards" rather than to try to comfort those in dire need. The church owed a large debt for the "good wine and ale that lay in store for many a secret carousal when ye pretend ye are but busied with vigils and primes!" (II, 49-50). When a minstrel said "a drunken priest" came to visit the sacristan at St. Edmund's, he was interrupted by a friar who said it did not please "his reverence" that there should be such an animal as a drunken priest and if there were, that such a layman should so speak of him. He urged that the minstrel conclude that the holy man was only "wrapt in meditation" (II, 317).

Brian de Bois-Gilbert, next Grand Master of the Templars, was voluptuous, despotic, cruel. The entire Order of "sons of Belial" (II, 81), were murderers and hypocritical robbers, less trusty than valiant, who violated every law of their order (II, 125), living with females, not only "of their own race but with the daughters of the accursed heathen and the more accursed Jew." (II, 188)

Much like the forbidden Ivanhoe in that it contains accounts of the battle between John and Richard over the throne of England and of that between the Saxons and the Normans who invaded their homeland,

very bold pro-Semitism, and a group of very detestable officials of the Roman Catholic Church, was Mrs. Bray's novel Henry de Pomeroy.⁹ It was entered in the list of censored books in 1845, in German translation, with a designation of limited.¹⁰ Perhaps there are two major reasons for its being given a less severe label than was given Ivanhoe, treating much the same material with basically the same attitude. First, Mrs. Bray's work was far less popular than was Scott's; therefore, her book would have been considered less dangerous than his. Second, and perhaps, primarily, the book was not translated until 1845, twenty-one years after Ivanhoe was placed on the forbidden list.

The accounts of rebellion against established authority form perhaps the chief offense of Henry de Pomeroy to the censors. The primary instance is that of John against Richard as John tried to hold his usurped throne. Another is that of Oswy and other Saxons against the invading Norman lords who took their property. This rebellious spirit of the conquered is further manifested in the young Saxon named Caedmon, Oswy's grandson, against his superior, Abbot Baldwin. This youth felt keenly the humiliation of the servitude he must endure. The reader's sympathy is with the conquered as Mrs. Bray indicates much sympathy for the conquered Saxons, particularly seen in the presentation of old Wulfred, faithful follower of Oswy, as he fought over his lord's body, and as he later kept alive loyalty to the Saxons in the heart of young Caedmon. The ritual of the burial of old Wulfred further arouses sympathy for the conquered. (p. 247ff.)

Instances are given in the novel of the shortcomings of the nobles of the land. Especially outstanding among those shortcomings is that which relates Lord de Pomeroy's betrayal of his best friend's trust, bringing sorrow and destruction upon the two houses De Beaumont and De Pomeroy. Another dastardly deception was that of Geoffrey de Malduit who accepted the royal hospitality of De Pomeroy for three days and then tried to take him prisoner for Richard (p. 334 ff.). John's treachery to those who had been his partisans in the rebellion against Richard is also alluded to.

There are various political intrigues by followers of both John and Richard. The most famous incident of duplicity related in the book was that of John, as he, in league with "the envious and malicious Phillippe of France," bribed the Emperor and the Duke of Austria to hold Richard prisoner while John occupied his usurped throne (pp. 97-98). The author reminds the reader of the detestable part the Duke of Austria, Leopold V of the House of Babenbergs, played in the imprisonment of Richard. (p. 29)

Besides the political offenses in Henry de Pomeroy, the novelist's kindly treatment of the "unhappy Jews" does not agree with Austrian policy. She adds to the "picture of the persecution to which the Jews were subjected during the twelfth century" in Ivanhoe, ridiculing beliefs in the evils of the Jew: that they were devils incarnate, that they were great necromancers, and that among other results of their wickedness was the permission given to foul spirits to gather in numbers

around the towns where they dwelled (p. 217). Mrs. Bray recalls that Holinshed mentions

...the dreadful manner in which some thousand Jews in England were robbed and murdered by certain knights, previous to their expedition to the Holy Land in the twelfth century. Their passiveness, their industry, their prudence and spirit for commercial enterprise, their determined adherence to the prejudices of their nation, with their wonderful command of money and credit, altogether made them so useful to their Christian tyrants, that they were alternately encouraged, tolerated, caressed, robbed, persecuted, and even murdered, as the predominant interest of those who so used them might prevail. (pp. 275-76)

Metternich and Gentz, too, found the Jews' gold helpful, although there was still prejudice against them.¹¹ Like Ivanhoe this novel contains praise of that race that Metternich and Gobineau thought inferior.¹²

Mrs. Bray says the "unhappy Jews" were not to be too severely censured for faults that arose from the ferocious prejudices, the inhumanity and injustice of the Christians (p. 275). She adds that she thinks it is to the honor of Cornwall that while they were maltreated, robbed, and murdered by Christians in almost every part of the kingdom, the Jews found a retreat of comparative safety in Market Jew across the causeway from St. Michael's Mount where the climactic events of the novel are laid.

Some men and practices of the Roman Church are presented in a bad light. The author states that her husband was a Protestant minister and her novels reveal a definite religious bias. In Henry de Pomeroy

the "wily abbot of Tavistock" sought revenge for Richard's failure to give him the primacy of England for which he had "plotted, served, toiled, betrayed." Abbot Baldwin's avarice dictated his advice to a repentant Alicia to dedicate her possessions to the Church as a penance, for he wanted the vast holdings for himself. Alicia noted the ungenerous mind of one cruel and calculating (pp. 204-206), haughty and repulsive, as she knew Baldwin to be. This haughty abbot never curbed his proud spirit; it was "gall and bitterness" to control himself to avoid repelling Pomeroy from John's cause. Pomeroy reflected upon Baldwin's treachery in his intrigues for John, his pride and self-conceit (p. 227). Yet the abbot worked equally hard for Richard upon his return in order to advance his own cause.

Not only the Abbot but the archdeacon and even the Pope are depicted as undesirables, as well as is the lowly priest Sir Simon. Baldwin said of the archdeacon that he was "a very chameleon," a tool of men in power, not a "searcher after truth" (pp. 44-45). The Pope, like Baldwin, changed sides with the changes of the reigns of the brothers. He secretly aided John during Richard's imprisonment, then in a zealous manner renewed his friendship with Richard.

The novelist satirizes the Church practice of "ordeals" in relating that of the cellarer, who passed things generally held contraband to monks through the window in his cell, who chose to eat a choice cheese and freshly baked bread as his "ordeal" instead of choosing an ordeal

of red-hot iron, boiling water, hot pitch, or molten lead. During the observance of his "ordeal" the author states that the Church itself was a place well suited for "such rites of superstition."

There is double offense to Austrian censors in the account of the huntsmen, noblemen, and clergy, who became as "savage and fierce as the very brutes they chase" (p. 140); one churchman is said to have made the chase the sole business of his life, leaving his diocese to take care of itself in spiritual matters. (p. 142)

Other practices of Catholics are indicted in the novel. Adela's removal to the convent to prevent her marriage, where she was to take vows her whole heart disclaimed, is called making her a prisoner for life. In the convent she experienced the severity of means employed by "a haughty and unsparing superior," a hard-hearted woman, of a temper as stern and cold as that of her abbot brother Baldwin (p. 213). The convent was celebrated from the earliest times as one chosen "for the rites of superstition"; reports were that there was a dungeon kept walled up, never broken open except when they took into it a novice who would not take the veil, or someone who had displeased the abbess; there the condemned person was left to die, walled up alive. (p. 216)

Set at a time just following that of the stories of Ivanhoe and Richard de Pomeroy is James's Philip Augustus. Despite the fact that G. P. R. James, author of fifty-seven works classified as romances, was a Tory whose "mind was formed" during the time of the terrors of

the French Revolution, and who was repelled by the democracy of America, which recalled the terrors of his childhood,¹³ five of his novels contain matter which Metternich's censors considered unsuitable for the Empire's perusal. Their offenses are both political and religious. Philip Augustus,¹⁴ which relates the story of Philip the Second of France and his fight with the Roman Church over the legality of his marriage to Agnes was not translated into one of the three languages most widely used in the Austrian Empire of the first half of the nineteenth century, but appeared in English on the list of censored books in that country.¹⁵ This fact may help to account for its being given the label of limited only, although it contains an account of rebellion of subjects against a king, depicts a King as a contemptible man, presents Roman Catholicism in a very bad light, and reflects rather unfavorably upon German soldiers.

The presentation of corruption among princes would tend to lessen respect for authority. John Lackland, King of England, is revealed as "more cruel even" than report had depicted him, "a bad and blood-thirsty monarch" (p. 304), a "weak and cruel monarch who sat upon his throne, the most abject thing that earth can ever produce - a despised and detested King" (p. 300). When he was called to answer to Philip, his feudal Lord, for the murder of his own nephew Arthur Plantagenet, war resulted, in which France had to meet the forces of John of England, Otho of Germany, and Ferrand of Flanders at the battle of Bouvines. Although in the novel, this is the most extensive

instance of rebellion, that action most detested by Metternich, even more dangerous for his subjects to read is the account of the domestic uprising of Philip's people as a result of the quarrel of their King and their Pope. When the Pope's interdict came setting aside Philip's divorce, the persons, "not the most priest-ridden of them all," declared the conduct of the Pope was scandalous and that the divorce should hold. Then the Church took action that caused a great falling off from Philip by his barons, who had made promises of loyalty, and of the bishops whom he called "the goodly, saintly, fickle, treacherous pack, frightened by the very hum of Rome's vulture wings!" (p. 215). Nothing was heard in all parts of France but revolt; in a hundred parts of the Kingdom the people were actually in revolt to compel the King to submission to the Roman decree or to dethrone him, for when even the right of burial was denied them by the Church, they felt they must act. Although they understood little else in religion than the ceremonies of the Church of Rome, these were revered and loved by all classes (p. 136). The King sympathized with the plight of his subjects, and his resentment grew against the Pope, for he knew the Church was making the people suffer because of his refusal to give up his wife. Philip stated that Innocent the Third acted only out of his anger over being ignored by Philip in the matter of his divorce from Ingerburge, granted by the Bishops of France. The King predicted that a time would come when the prelate would "tread upon the prince's crown." However,

Catholic Austria in the early nineteenth century boasted that no court was freer from the dictates of Rome than was theirs,¹⁶ although the leaders sought the help of the Roman hierarchy to rule the Empire.

Disrespect for the Pope is contained in the author's statement that the "irritable, insolent, and powerful Pontiff of Rome" hated Philip "with all the venom of a proud and passionate heart" (p. 308) and proceeded to anathematise and excommunicate according to the "terrible form of the Church of Rome, calling down the curses of the powers of Heaven" (p. 139). France was forbidden the worship of the Almighty; Church doors were closed; all religious rites and ceremonies and consolations of religion were to be denied to everyone. The author, good Protestant that he was, says the curse pronounced upon Philip was "to our ideas, unchristian and almost blasphemous":

May he be cursed in the city, and in the field, and in the highway! in living, and in dying! Cursed be his children, and his flocks, and his domaines! Let no man call him brother, or give him the kiss of peace! Let no priest pray for him, or admit him to God's altar! Let all men flee from him living, and let consolation and hope abandon his death-bed! Let his corpse remain unburied, and his bones whiten in the wind! Cursed be he on earth, and under the earth, in his life, and to all eternity! (p. 140)

When the priest concluded the awful denunciation,

... by announcing it in the name of the Holy Trinity "-- of the Father--of all mercy!--of the Son--the Savior of the world"--and of the Holy Ghost--the Lord and Giver of Life!" the people, instead of starting from the impious mingling of Heaven's holiest attributes with the violent passions of man, joined the clergy in a loud and solemn "Amen!" (p. 140)

If they had been allowed to read about such a drastic move on the part of his "true church," the Chancellor of the mighty Austrian Empire might have had trouble justifying to his people that action taken by the Pope against innocent Frenchmen in the "Old Order" of the twelfth century. Austrians, like Agnes, might have asked in disbelief,

And did he cast his curse upon this whole country--
spread misery, desolation, and sorrow over the nation--
stir up civil war and rebellion, and tear two hearts
asunder that loved each other so devotedly, for the
empty right to judge a cause that had been already
judged, and do away a sentence which he knew not
whether it was right or wrong? --and is this the
representative of Christ's Apostle? (pp. 278-279)

Philip gave Innocent the Third back his curse!

May pride and ambition be a curse on him and his
successors for ever! May they grasp at the powers
of others, till they lose their own! May nation after
nation cast off their sway! and itch of dominion with
impotence of means be their damnation for ever! (p. 272)

He added a threat to hurl the Pope from his chair and send him to tread the sands of Palestine.

Although it is said that minstrels and trouveres did not fear to attack, in the most daring of satire, the vices of the Church of Rome (p. 85), few monarchs dared, as did Philip, to defy openly a thing so much feared as was the power of the Pope. Philip's defiance was the result of the unjust use of the Pope's power against the unoffending subjects of France. But Philip is not the only one to rebel against the Roman Church; his political enemies, Otho of Germany, John of England, and Ferrand of Flanders, planned an attack upon the power

of the Church, hoping to divide her domains among the barons and knights and to seize the luxurious wealth of the clergy for themselves. (p. 377)

Rebellion of subjects against monarch, of monarch against the Pope, of vassal against monarch, plus a king shown in an abominable act of cruelty, a curse of the Church by a king, a plan to attack that Church, and many disparaging remarks concerning the Roman Catholic Church--all are the dangerous topics about which subjects of a Catholic Monarchy should not read, topics which make up the contents of Philip Augustus.

Of the novelists represented on the lists of censorship, Ann Radcliffe probably ranked, in popularity, second only to Scott. Although her Gaston de Blondville¹⁷ was not one of her most widely read books, it is carefully documented and professes to give an authentic picture of King Henry III of England and of his Court. That picture is one that belittles the King and some of his nobles. Because Mrs. Radcliffe was well known to have had democratic sympathies and to have expressed little sympathy for Catholicism in general and anti-sacerdotalism,¹⁸ her works would have been carefully scrutinized by the censors. Gaston contains matter, political and religious, which would have violated the policy of the Austrian police state at the time the book appeared there in 1826, one year after it was published in England, listed as a forbidden book on the official list of censored books. Although there are

two other entries said to be books by Mrs. Radcliffe, Mrs. Wieten says Die Priorin was falsely attributed to her. As was true of Scott, there was much imitation of the popular writer of Gothic novels as well as satires of her works. A third entry said to be Mrs. Radcliffe's was an Italian translation, Le Visioni del Castello dei Pirenei, which appears to be the falsely ascribed work listed by Mrs. Wieten as Les Visions du Château des Pyrénées and by the German title Die Erscheinungen im Schlosse der Pyrenäen.¹⁹ All three entries, Gaston, Die Priorin, and Le Visioni, appear in the lists of 1820's and all three were forbidden.²⁰

As is Mrs. Radcliffe's custom Gaston is filled with noble and royal figures, but her well-known sympathy for the lower classes,²¹ an attitude contrary to that of Chancellor Metternich, is seen in the portrayal of the Bristol merchant as the real hero of the story. Mrs. Radcliffe and William, her husband, were known "democrats"; on one occasion he was called a radical;²² and it is said that the inclinations of the two pointed "in the same direction." She revealed interest in various forms of government, but she concluded that it is not the particular system of government but the character of those who govern which determines the happiness of the people. She felt that the moral and intellectual character of a people would help to determine what form of government was best for them. Rank and power were not to be despised and might even contribute to happiness. She seemed to have thought that the revolutionary system of France would not have been utterly overthrown if it

had been administered by men of mildness, integrity, and benevolence,²³ an opinion quite contrary to that held by Metternich on the subject of the Revolution.

In spite of the fact that she expresses no political penchant in the novel, rather clearly in Gaston the author indicates the attitude that "power" was not bad, only weak. However, some of the "rank" were shown to be corrupt. Henry III was said to have had a good heart, but his weaknesses and passions prevented his acting with justice as well as did the cunning of those near him. "Thus it is if kingly power pertain to a weak head" (ii, 392). His superstitious nature is seen in his belief in the "art of magic" which convinced him that a ring that rendered him invincible had been conjured out of his strong box and given to his enemy, and that all the supernatural occurrences he saw happen about him were performed by magic. It is said he lived for the hour and "suffered the next to shift for itself" (II, 30). Belittling of this ruler as well as the accounts of the disrespect shown the Queen when the crowds shouted, "Away with the foreigners!" and on one occasion hurled stones at her (II, 332), and the remarks that Queen Elizabeth's wisdom "partook too much of craft and her policy of treachery," that her cruelty to "poor Mary is a bloody hand in her escutcheon that will ever haunt the memory of her" (II, 29) add further to the derogation of princes. Nevertheless, Catholic censors probably approved the sentiment they express.

Chief of all offenses to the Austrian police state is the account in Gaston of various rebellions and ignoble behavior of nobles. The King's

brother-in-law had turned his arms against the King, excited his subjects to rebellion, and led him prisoner through his own Kingdom (II, 360-361). Henry's own brother had nearly raised a rebellion in an attempt to possess the manor of Berkhamstead (II, 307). That rebellion was common is indicated by the reminder that the young Prince became the "queller of rebellion, corrector of abuses, restorer of general order" who bound up the wounds of his country, strengthened its sinews, and pruned away its exuberant vices, which the

...tyranny and weakness of King John had by turns provoked and encouraged, and which the incapacity of Henry had suffered to engraft themselves on and to encumber almost every useful institution. (II, 332)

In addition to criticism of nobles and princes, the book contains Mrs. Radcliffe's usual anti-sacerdotalism. The outstanding authority on Mrs. Radcliffe's works says that in her novels she never presented convent life in a favorable light; its restrictions and severity displeased her; the superiors rarely behaved in accordance with the rules laid down by their Church; they were ready to comply with the orders of any tyrant.²⁴ Her religious beliefs were closely woven into her works; however, though she did not approve such things as the relics made much of by Catholics, she approved even less the writers who described them in detail for the sake of ridiculing them²⁵ as do Mrs. Sherwood and Mrs. Bury in works treated in this study. As a result of her attitude, one finds in Gaston de Blondenville only statements rather belittling than condemning Catholics in general, such as that the monks all believed

in magic and witchcraft, that the venality of monks held the people of that remote age in a thralldom of superstition and that they practiced clumsy inventions upon the fears of the ignorant (I, 74). The novelist says the libraries of the monasteries had copies of Ovid, Guy of Warwick, and Robin Hood on the shelves with homilies, which "were tinged with the corruption of the papal school" (I, 61). There is one specific accusation of corruption found in the person of the Prior of St. Mary's, who had bought his place from the Pope. In addition, this evil prior uttered falsehoods, practiced "cunning dexterity" instead of wisdom, caused one old monk to die of starvation, engaged earlier in robbery and murder, and tried to kill the man who accused him of his crime, even at the foot of the altar of St. Mary's. Mrs. Radcliffe is much kinder to the Church here than in The Italian, an uncensored, non-political book; so one suspects that Gaston's censure resulted from matter other than religious.

The picture of those in high places of both Church and State presented in Gaston does not make the days of the ancien régime very appealing. Neither does Scott's The Fair Maid of Perth,²⁶ whose setting is Scotland in the last years of the fourteenth century. The Fair Maid of Perth was published in 1828; the translators lost no time, for in August, 1828, La Jolie Fille de Perth appeared on the official list of forbidden books, and again Das Mädchen von Perth appeared on the list for February, 1829, still classified as forbidden.²⁷

In his "wildest and darkest" novel Scott interweaves a love story with a picture of the conflict between commoners and nobles, as the townsfolk struggle to maintain individuality as a people, a town opposed to the State, an attitude much despised by Metternich. The reader feels that Scott had two objectives beyond that of telling a good story of feudal Scotland: to cast aspersions upon the entire Catholic faith, and to reveal political leaders and their counselors in a most despicable state.

Outstanding artistic achievements of the novel are the revelations of the young Highland Chieftain, Hector, who proved to be a coward, and of King Robert III in all of his weaknesses. This feeble-minded, weak King said he was prevented by counselors from "being good"; however, he had little check of conscience for what he did, since he followed the advice of the "wise counsellors" (I, 95). Prince Rothsay's "head was too giddy, his hand too feeble to wield the heavy sceptre" (I, 135); so he could not depend on him. Robert was like a chameleon, his feeble mind reflecting the color of the firmer character near him to whom he turned for counsel. The imbecility of the King and the "ill-regulated habits" of the Prince had led to a period of strife and upheaval. The clergy of the Catholic Church acquired influence over this "superstitious and timid mind," for he feared to differ with the churchmen even when he felt it would have been better for his country to change some of the Church practices, such as that of offering asylum to those in legal trouble.

The "fugitive amours and extravagant revels" of the young Prince who "would scruple no extremities which may promise to gratify an idle passion" (I, 238), were particularly reprehensible to the public since he was a married man. The licentious Prince surrounded himself with debauched young nobles who insulted peaceful citizens, knowing their fathers' favor at Court would free them from censure.

It is said, "A fouler household of defiers of God, destroyers of men, and debauchers of women are nowhere sheltered than are in Ramorny's band," the constant companions of the Prince. But the most deceptive and cruel of the royal family was the Duke of Albany, who aspired to the throne. He was "the head," and Dwining and Ramorny only "the hands," in the death of Prince David (II, 164). Against such leaders the citizens were rebellious. Their frequent riots were not new to the country, for they were said ever to have been proud and independent. Scott includes his usual Scottish chauvinism by having old Simon recall that Scotland had never been a land or a people over whom priests could rule in the name of Rome without their usurpation being controlled (II, 10). Their privileges had often been defended against the Pope himself by the good monarchs of old, and when he tried to interfere with their government, the Scottish Parliament told him his duty in a letter that should have been written in letters of gold (II, 10). They declared they were successors to the stout old Romans who built Perth, holding charters from them which

gave them rights and privileges not to be violated (I, 57-58) by those "rakehells," those knights and nobles of the "deboshed court." Such a nationalistic spirit would have been a bad influence upon Metternich's Empire,²⁸ and he would never have approved an attitude of independence on the part of villagers.²⁹ The Black Douglas characterized the times by stating that it was a time when subjects in all countries rose against the law, "when peasants challenged noblemen and nailed the hands of the gentry to their city Cross" (I, 208). The Prince was aware that "We shall sit but uncomfortably here at Perth, if we are at variance with the citizens" (I, 224), while Hector, the young leader of Clan Quhele, stated that the victors from the fight between the clans for supremacy would deal with the King of Scotland as with their equal, not as their superior. (I, 247)

The low morals of nobles and royalty, the weakness of the monarch, the murder of the Prince, the uprisings of the burgers against the government, their very attempt to gain "their rights," would not be tolerated by Metternich's censors; to him the people did not assert rights; they did what they were told; neither did they organize groups such as did the burgers and the clans in this novel.

As if these things were not enough to win for the novel the forbidden stamp of censorship, there is defamation of Catholicism to add to its condemnation. Scott has been accused of making many errors about Catholicism in this novel.³⁰ Certainly he does bring considerable

discredit upon that faith. Leading all offenses are the teachings of Father Clement, who led his few followers to detect the hypocrisies in the Church, the crime, the ignorance, the evils of its leaders, of a "backsliding priesthood" (I, 240). Most objectionable would be his insisting that he could find nothing in the scriptures concerning the "excellence of a state of celibacy," and that he doubted the powers of the Church after death. He was accused of heresy when he began "to display the pride, ignorance, and luxury of the Churchmen themselves, their thirst for power, their usurpation over men's consciences, and their excessive desire to augment their worldly wealth" (II, 4). He accused the churchmen of becoming wealthy as well by the gifts of pious persons as by the bribes which wicked men had given in their ignorance, imagining that they could purchase "that pardon by endowments to the church which Heaven has offered to sincere penitents" (I, 231-32). There is much emphasis upon the monks' love of money: "The pardon of popes and priests for old crimes and the indulgence which encourages priest-ridden fools to venture on new ones--all these holy incentives to vice may be purchased by gold" (I, 388). It was said that their "lives cry shame upon the doctrine they teach," and that the "cogging" priests and nuns, and "greasy monks" did not understand the Latin they repeated by rote (II, 138). One churchman is called,

A buxom priest that thinks more of good living than of good life tipples a can on Festern's Eve to enable him to face Lent, has a pleasant in principio, and confesses all the prettiest women about the town. (I, 44)

Monks were lenient with pretty maidens; an old woman might be in some danger, but not those like the Fair Maid of Perth (II, 99). The Monks were suspected of letting in women at a concealed postern gate, for the place "seems convenient for such games as bo-peep" (I, 183). The novelist says Prior Anselm's faults, which led him into grievous error and even cruelty, were those of his age and profession (I, 139). Even the Pope does not escape criticism, for he is said often to want a "scribe that can make one word record two meanings." (II, 96)

The charge of heresy brought against the Fair Maid of Perth and her father resulted from the desire of the fathers to get Simon's money for the Church; when they divided Dwining's ill-gotten wealth among the four monasteries, there was then no breath of suspicion concerning the orthodoxy of old Simon or his daughter. For, although the Church was said to "nod" at many things, she was alert to hunt out heresy, not because of the damage that might be done spiritually, but for the money paid to buy freedom from the attached penalty of death. (I, 298)

Few or none escaped the influence of these churchmen; the devout were slaves to "priest-craft" which practiced legerdemain and conjuring tricks (I, 394). The priest was taught above all to strive for the extension of the dominion and the wealth of the Church, and for the suppression of heresy. The Church had achieved her chief object, to extend her dominion and wealth, largely through taking bribes, by selling freedom from charges of heresy, from hearing confessions, and from exercising holds such as the one she was said to have over Richard III.

Any good Catholic would have reported The Fair Maid to his local Ordinaries as a book which contains obscene matter, for there is a rather lengthy conversation between Ramorny and the Prince over the approaching pleasure which the Prince would have when his passion for Catharine was consummated, a conversation greatly adding to the extensive disparagement of Prince Rothsay contained in the novel.

Disregard is shown for Church dogma in the two suicides in the book; Dwining took poison and Hector dived into a cataract. There was also dueling and violation of the Church ordinance declaring days of Passion Week to be holy and therefore to be kept free from combat; the clan combat took place on Palm Sunday, a profanity worthy of excommunication. (II, 165)

Scott observes, revealing his usual Protestant bias, that Father Clement's "absolute loyalty to the spiritual ideal" led him to become anti-Catholic; he had been "raised up by Heaven to manifest unadulterated Christianity" (II, 47). No Catholic censor could let that remark pass! to say nothing of all the other offenses The Fair Maid of Perth contains, both political and religious.

Like Scott, Mrs. Bray, the wife of a Protestant minister, has revealed some early Catholics as being far from admirable in her novel The Talba, a story of fourteenth-century Portugal during the reign of Alonso the Brave.³¹ In order to depict this powerful ruler, the novelist has used as a foil the Talba, the Moorish wise man called Hassan. In

every instance the Moor is depicted as far more honorable than are the Christian knights who stooped to any means of satisfying their desires.

Although Alonso was insensible to pity and the gentler feeling of a Christian, he was struck with admiration as he beheld Hassan ready to die for his Prince, and said in a "voice full of energy," "Can such generosity of spirit live in the bosom of a Moor?" (II, 136). Even the villain Gonsalez was shamed by the greatness of mind so often revealed that raised the Moor much above the Christian.

Hassan found his conception of truth different from that of the Christians. He asked Ines if she considered truth that which teaches cruelty, falsehood, oppression, and contempt of one's fellow man. For the sake of Him who made both Moor and Christian, he urged her to learn to honor truth (I, 197). These reflections upon Catholic Christians would tend to lessen respect for the "true Church" and, therefore, would be one definite reason for its being censored by Catholic Austrians, as would the depiction of the weak and evil monarch which follows.

Alonso's revolts against his late father, his murder of the bishop who reproved him for his rebellions, his persecutions of his brother, Don Sanchez--all were acts that showed the unbridled license of his evil passions and would ever remain fearful blots on the character of a king. Unlike the Talba whose virtues, arising from fixed principles, were uniform in their practice, Alonso did no act that was great except by fits and starts. (II, 141-142)

His friends could not decide whether Alonso was a great prince or a great tyrant (I, 92). He was a great politician in the worst sense of the word, for he never hesitated to sacrifice principles to policy when it suited his purposes to do so. He committed many acts that were unworthy of a Christian and a prince. He was cruel and treacherous, treating the Moors most harshly, oppressing them by heavy taxes and other "tyrannous imposts" although he had invited them to live in peace in his domain (II, 101-102). For the situation that caused most of the conflict in the novel, his self-love and pride caused Alonso to blame Ines de Castro and her influence with his own heir, Don Pedro.

The many uprisings in the plot of The Talba, plus the contrast between Moor and Christian in which the latter always comes off second best, the defamation of a monarch, and the disparagement of the Catholic faith and priests in that faith would have sufficed to secure the book a place on the list of Austrian-censored books in August of 1839. The remarkable thing is that it was given only the limited designation in one entry and no label at all in the other.³²

The Talba is filled with revolt. Insurrection of Moors became general; when Sanchez rebelled against the King, he was joined by many dissatisfied Portuguese who carried on intrigues in the dark (just the thing that the Austrian Chancellor feared was taking place in his own country when the book appeared there).³³ There was said to be rebellion throughout much of Europe: France held her king a captive; in

England there were factions; in Rome two popes caused fearful division; the Guelphs and Ghibellines rendered Florence a scene of war and fury; in Germany two emperors contended fiercely as rivals for a crown; Tamerland had overrun all of Asia.

In addition to these dangerous accounts of rebellion, there are in The Talba defamation of Catholic creed and many anti-sacerdotal remarks. The clergy had been instrumental in procuring an interdict that had humbled Alonso at Rome (II, 64); so he took every opportunity to vent his passion against the Church. As the novelist reminds us, at that time kings and kingdoms were compelled to bow the neck before Rome, whenever the sovereign pontiff chose to lay his foot on them, but like Henry the Third of England, Alonso resisted the yoke (II, 67). He refused to open his coffers to the Church. The King had the bishop murdered who threatened to denounce against him the thunders of the Church if he did not cease his rebellious acts toward the King, his father (II, 26). Alonso especially hated the prior of Evora, a proud and rich ecclesiastic, for his arrogance and pride as well as for his meddling in State affairs with Rome. He humiliated the Prior in public and cursed him bitterly in private; he would have no priests meddle in his affairs, so that they could find occasion to carry off land for the Church in the fray (I, 88). He would not be led like a hound on a leash by any monk, not even the Pope himself, for, like his father, he loved no priest so much as a wholesome law (I, 84). He no more spared a

priest than a layman, and made monks live soberly and observe the laws, "a thing not to be forgiven by three-fourths of those drones."

(I, 70)

The Prior would not deny an absolution, or even a dispensation, when the wine was old; morning often came before he drained the last bowl, although in public he never tasted more than the first cup (I, 80). He is revealed as greedy, selfish, and deceptive.

Comparisons in the book of the so-called "Christians" and Moors always show the shortcomings of the Christians. For example, when Ines faced the austerities of the cells at the convent St. Magdalen, it was said no mercy could be hoped for from the Church; the number of graves that filled the cemetery at St. Magdalen told the tale of sufferings there which were certain to end life (I, 169). Ines declared she would appeal to the patriarch and try to awaken mercy: "Though he is a churchman, yet he is a man; and the sorrows of a woman, of a daughter, will move him."

Her father answered,

Hope it not, He is not a father. Bound by his vows to feel no wedded tie, the churchman and the monk, grown old without one tender care, a solitary and childless man, is callous to human affection as to human weakness; his virtues are austerities; his mercies look beyond the grave, but are seldom shown in any touch of earthly pity. (I, 192)

Ines asked the help from the Moor which she said she could not hope to find in those "who profess a Christian's creed whilst they do acts that would disgrace a heathen." (II, 84-85)

The Moor Cassim said, "Give me anything but the Pope's mercy."

He told of the troubles of the Prince of Fex with the Pope: "He you call the Pope promised not to touch him," after he had given Rome gold, silver, and pearls. The Pope kept his word by having him put in a prison, giving him nothing to eat. The prince died of starvation, and all the priests said their Pope had no hand in his death, inasmuch as it came naturally. "Oh, the wisdom of you Christians!" the Moor exclaimed (I, 36). The greed and deception of the Church were remarked and the Church pilgrims called arrant beggars, thieves, and knaves. (II, 178)

One of the most serious and offensive accusations to a Catholic censor is that made by Hassan against

...the idolatrous Christian, who worships with as little sense as if he were a brute, those images, those stocks and stones carved by his own hands, and named after creatures like himself, whom he calls saints; whilst a simple virgin, the daughter of man, is more worshipped than Him at whose nod the waters rose, and the dry land, with all that therein lived, was no more found, saving the Prophet Noah and his sons. Such are Christians in their faith; and, O thou Creator of man! What are they in their works? (I, 16)

The Moorish princes criticized those who would give the "only true God partners in that worship, in that honour due to Him alone" (I, 136); they declared that images were idolatrous and abominable (I, 148). Hassan wished he could shut out from his sight those carved blocks which he saw some pilgrims carrying, for "Allah is the true God, and the only God of man; and thou shalt neither hew, nor make any other gods with

thy hands, nor honour them" (I, 29). Cassim assured the Wiseman that their waxen images melted at the sight of money, and they would grant a pardon to a sinner by being well paid for it (I, 30). These are serious aspersions upon Catholic creed which in a Catholic land would have caused the censure of any book that contained them.

In the second of her four novels censored by Austrians, Mrs. Bray writes of Catholics and noblemen of Gascony in their worst forms. The chief offenses of De Foix³⁴ to Austrian censors are the wars between factions of the land and opposition to their legitimate sovereign, as well as disparagement of Catholic churchmen and practices of that church.

The chief inhabitants of the Castle of De Foix, noble as they claimed to be, were not revealed as admirable. Sir Evan de Foix was contemptible, and his father, the Count, was a man of uncontrolled emotions, cruel and deceptive. By his cruelty he had driven his wife from his Court and either by accident or design struck his son with a knife in a vein of his throat, killing him instantly. He murdered Sir Peter de Bearn, an invited guest in his castle. The Count was led by the scheming Prior "to scruple not to violate the rights of humanity, when his passions interfered to call forth his angry and vindictive feelings" (II, 217-218). The depictions of the Lord of Armagnac, an outlaw nobleman, and of the would-be-murderer, the King of Navarre, further belittle noblemen.

The key figure and villain of the story was Prior Philip of the monastery of St. Mary's, who instigated many crimes. The presentation

of this Catholic alone would have aroused the ire of censors who were devoted to that faith.

Since De Foix is filled with accounts of those in high places who acted less nobly than they should, it was placed on the list of censored books in February, 1838, unlabeled.³⁵ It was said in the novel that some whispered that the Pope valued the useful agency of Philip's abilities and had employed him to carry on some unscrupulous private affairs for him. Ambition was the deity the Prior worshipped underneath the hypocritical sanctity of his gown and hood. For that he would sacrifice whatever he held most sacred on earth, and for that he had sacrificed his hope of heaven (I, 199). Although the Prior was devoid of any religious principle of action, being educated in the Church of Rome, he was not without "some share of superstition," and observed, therefore, certain forms and ceremonials that cost him neither the "sacrifice of a passion nor the forbearance of a vice." (II, 248)

The plot of the novel relates Philip's efforts to satisfy his greed for money. To achieve his goal this "prince of villains" made use of every means of treachery and deceit at his disposal. His was a repulsive temper with little feeling for any object of the world; he was cold, crafty, and selfish. He was accused of mocking the saints with his prayers, since he was a traitor and a villain. (II, 217-18)

There are the usual reminders in the novel of the monks' excessive love of wine and reflections such as one that someone must take up a

friar's trade and "with something more of honesty" (I, 10). A friar is said to be never more grave than when any of womankind is in the case, for then one can be sure he is plotting mischief and looking more toward earth than toward heaven.

The deception practiced by the priests is revealed. On one instance when the Church was accused of acquiring property from a dying man and asked to return the property, the Prior said they would leave it to the statue of the Virgin to indicate whether the money rightfully belonged to the Church. Philip said a long prayer; the gaudily dressed wooden image bowed her head and raised her right arm. The sprightly English page, Will of the West, laughed aloud as he saw Philip glide up beside the image and help her make her movements by the aid of a string. (II, 180-190)

The monks were said to love wine and money and to sell indulgences or absolutions for evil acts which their people desired to commit. They delighted in bestowing floggings and penances of sanctity, and the demons of purgatory themselves could not outstrip them in the flaying of a sinner (II, 37). Practices of Catholicism such as excommunicating, outlawing, and doing penance are condemned, as are faith in the virtues of relics and deceptions practiced by priests.

Although the account of the wars between factions and the occasional uprisings against their sovereign, as well as the relation of the story of a ruler so corrupt as was this Count, are serious offenses of

De Foix, the most damning contents of this novel in the eyes of Catholic censors is the depiction of the evil and intriguing Prior Philip and the ridicule of certain Catholic practices.

Chapter III

Novels Set in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries

The period of transition between the Middle Ages and the Modern Era is represented by five novels in this study. One of these is a story of Holland's domestic affairs; one treats Franco-Burgundian and one Franco-Swiss history; two are concerned with events of English political life. However, sixteenth-century England, filled with political and religious strife as it was, is represented by only one novel, which relates one of the many plots to secure the English throne for Queen Mary of Scots.

"Limited" is a very light sentence indeed for the censors to have passed upon a novel, written by an historian of some note, which exonerates civil war and regicide, presents abominable corruption among the princes and nobles of two lands, and contains numerous statements which would have the effect upon its readers of lessening respect for the Roman Catholic Church. But that is the label Thomas Cooley Grattan's Jacqueline of Holland¹ bears on the list of state-censored books.²

Philip "the Good" of the House of Burgundy is depicted in Jacqueline as unjust, tyrannical, deceitful, ambitious, unscrupulous--there is hardly a derogatory adjective that can apply to a sovereign which was not applied to Philip; yet he is called "the pride of chivalry and Europe's masterpiece" (III, 548). His efforts to obtain the duchies which his cousin Jacqueline inherited form the conflict in the novel.

A devoted subject admitted that Philip's morals were not exemplary: "There is scarce a bush from Dimant to Diyan out of which you might not beat a bastard of Burgundy's," not to mention the "sad things" said of his "doings with that English Countess," of Salisbury, his almost openly avowed mistress (II 116). The author implies that Philip poisoned his uncle, for he stood to profit most by the uncle's death. He is called vile, brutal, insincere. He tricked his cousin Jacqueline into captivity, intending to keep her a prisoner and childless so he would inherit her property.

Even more evil among the princes presented in the story is Jacqueline's mother, Countess Marguerite. She plotted, by the altar steps in the chapel, the deaths of both John and Philip. She cited "pleadings" to prove that it was lawful for any subject to slay a tyrant, declaring,

A subject who puts a tyrant to death does a work deserving praise; being lawful to put him to death, it is allowable to cheat him by flattering speeches; it is fair and just to cut him off suddenly by ambush, when it is to save the life and property of one's sovereign from the spoiler, and is not Philip a spoiler? Is not John a tyrant?

She cited several notable instances drawn from moral philosophers and from Scripture, promising the would-be assassin that just as God had rewarded and honored, so would she when he had released his lawful sovereign, Countess Jacqueline, from one or the other of the cruel tyrants who oppressed them all (I, 283 ff). This was a dangerous theory,

indeed, which the young student tried to consummate upon Philip as he hunted in the woods.

The novel contains also the complete degradation of noblemen in the person of Gloucester [sic], called the "good Duke" in his country's annals (I, 94). In Grattan's story the reader is allowed to witness his absolute moral and political debasement as he becomes involved with Elinor and her churchman magician. Gloucester resolved to pay court to both Jacqueline of Holland and Elinor Cobham of England, "the one on the high road of honourable connection, the other in the winding paths of illicit love" (II, 7). He succeeded in his designs on Elinor, "buying his triumph by the sacrifice of princely faith, royal dignity, and personal esteem" (II, 12), securing for himself an indelible stain on his character and public disgrace, and doing an irreparable injury to his country (III, 102). His illicit relationship reached a climax in the novel when he took a love potion. The effect of the drink upon Gloucester was unrestrained passion; on that night he married Elinor, completing his moral and political degradation. (II, 62-72)

An outstanding scene revealing the characters of men in high places is that of the domestic congress at the castle of Philip, as they quarreled among themselves over petty differences, each trying to subvert and thwart the designs of the others, with no thought for the good of the country and its people (II, 124 ff). Grattan occasionally reminds his reader that these were Germanic people.

Metternich had a "panic fear" of revolution and revolutionary movements;³ this novel is filled with revolt. Although the major conflict is that between the two factions of the House of Burgundy, a civil war between two clans, too extensive for a mere feud, occupies much of the book. A particularly objectionable passage is this eulogy of civil war, a domestic uprising:⁴

It is glorious work to slaughter our own countrymen--
real enemies--miscreants... Ah, how we thrust home
when we pierce the heart that hates us and that we hate!
(I, 159)

One clan raised a rebellion against Philip to force him to make concessions to Jacqueline (II, 263). Finally, to throw off the yoke of the House of Burgundy which she wore for a century, Holland was engaged in a general revolution and four years of war. (III, 230-231)

Both the churchmen and the practices of Catholicism are defamed by Grattan as well as are princes. There are such disrespectful remarks as that worse men than the evil Gloucester had quoted Scripture; that the "pitiless John of Liege" was a bitter foe of the Countess; that another churchman was "pernicious, wanton" (I, 28); and that a speaker had more respect for the monk's hunting suit than for sacredotal robes. (I, 29)

No single churchman is given good qualities, except one, who was no true Catholic, referred to as a "tainted priest," really "little better than a heretic," whose "tenets are Lollardry and Wickliffe-learning" (I, 213). One of the most despicable of all Roman Churchmen

enjoyed seeing his "base burgers" quail, "ungrateful slaves, who would not add a ruby to their prelate's mitre" (I, 26), he insisted. He was said to be filled with selfishness, meanness, poltroonery, sensuality, knowing as little of the honor of chivalry as the English knight Fitz-Walter did of "the guile of priestcraft" (I, 60). Another churchman's "bad opinion of mankind prepared him for acts of baseness, and he was delighted at every new proof that his own were borne out by general example" (II, 212). A mendicant friar demanded contributions by the rich and "wrung their hard earning from the poor, during perpetual rounds of imposture and beggary." (II, 255)

The worst of all churchmen was Bolingbroke, engaged in all the occult and forbidden sciences,

... a dark and desperate imposter; who, not content with the secret practice of his various arts, felt a moral longing for young and inexperienced converts, analogous to the desires of some juggling priest of old, for those innocent victims who bowed at the shrine of his false god. (II, 10)

Contrary to Catholic moral teaching are the duel fought between Philip and Gloucester and the divorce so earnestly sought by Jacqueline of Holland, as well as the account of a highly impassioned scene of the illicit love of Gloucester and Elinor following the administration of the love potion concocted by Bolingbroke, the magician.⁵

Religious offenses contained in Grattan's book are climaxed in the remark that "The acts of neither of the self-styled Popes is worth a straw" (I, 214). However, as strongly offensive to Catholics and, to

Metternich's Empire, even more dangerous politically than Jacqueline is Bulwer-Lytton's The Last of the Barons,⁶ in which there is a very strong argument for democracy and an account of an attempt to wrest a throne from a reigning sovereign, the two major grounds for the assignment of the limited label to the book.⁷ There are several offenses of a less serious nature.

Warwick, the King-maker, last of the mighty English barons, was rather the diplomat than the soldier, having little personal daring, but excelling in intrigue, treachery, and the contrivance of plots. Skillful and ruthless, he was a man with the name of "subject" but with the authority of a king, "an unpopular anomaly in England" (p. 547), and according to Metternich's biographers Auernheimer⁸ and Jászi,⁹ one might say, "and in nineteenth-century Austria also," where the subject of their discussions occupied a position similar to that of Warwick in England.

In addition to this unadmirable figure, those of King Edward, of his brothers Richard and Clarence, and of Hastings would have been distasteful to censors in a land determined to maintain absolutism and respect for the reigning Monarch, one in a position for which little respect is shown in this novel: "A King--a puppet of state and form; a King--a holiday show for the crowd to hiss or hurrah, as the humor seizes." (p. 241)

Warwick had "made" the King; too late he saw the result of his choice of the York family as rulers, resulting in

...a Prince dissolved in luxurious vices - a Nobility degraded by minions and blood-suckers - a People plundered by purveyors, and a Land disturbed by brawl and riot. But ye know not all: God makes man's hearth man's altar - our hearths were polluted - our wives and daughters were viewed as harlots - and lechery ruled the realm.

He continued that there was corruption in the laws, slaughter by the scaffold, falsehood on the ruler's lips, and shameless harlotry in the councils of ruthless power. (p. 588)

The "pollution of hearths" was an allusion to an insult given by Edward IV to the Earl's daughter Anne, of major concern in this story, for "King Edward spares not maiden honour" (p. 484). The King insisted, "A king's embrace never dishonours. A king's bastard is a house's pride" (p. 260). He soon acquired the "habit kings form of forgetting all things save the love or hate, the desire or anger, of a moment," and his promise meant nothing. "What man ever trusted Edward and was not deceived" (p. 588), said Warwick. He called him "coward" and "recreant," a "faithless man" who "cozened and deluded" at his pleasure (p. 493) and practiced hypocrisy and dissimulation; his gay and reckless presumption was worthier of a knight-errant than of a monarch (p. 492). This "false and crafty" temporizer craved excitement so that when he had wearied of pomp and pleasure, all that was left for him was what was unholy and forbidden. It was such a condition

that led him to the attack upon Anne, the favorite daughter of his mightiest subject, who had built a throne for him; "The more the reason warned, the more the conscience started, the more the hell-born passion" grew (p. 359). Thus he forgot "the arm and heart to which he owed a Kingdom" (p. 240). Whether it was weakness or falseness, no man could be sure of his King's favor from day to day (p. 194). However, to rid themselves of Edward, devoid of truth and honor, and take his brother Clarence, in line for the crown, would have been to exchange "a harlot-monger for a drunkard" (p. 317). So they forgot Edward's licentiousness, his falseness, and his cruelty.

The others of the York family were no more admirable than was Edward himself. The Duke of Clarence was known to be giddy, unprincipled, and vain. In France with Warwick, he betrayed his father-in-law and the Lancastrian cause by sending Edward a warning of the planned invasion. The reader is reminded by the novelist of the future murder of Edward's sons by Gloucester, while Richard, thinking of obtaining the Crown, said that kings are not "cozened from their thrones...you slay them not--they disappear!" and his face took on a sinister and dark expression. (p. 444)

The whole Court was pregnant with a spirit of intrigue; it was called "a spidery web--woman craft being the spider and soldier-pride being the wasp--in which the spider will devour the wasp, unless the wasp boldly breaks the web" (p. 268). The proud and cold Margaret

of Anjou had learned that there was "more true nobility in the blunt Children of the People, than in many a breast over which flows a Kingly robe." (p. 170)

The Earl declared the English but slaves, if, in giving crown and sceptre to a mortal like themselves, they asked not in return the kingly virtues (p. 588). When the people tried to take Edward's throne, they felt they had reason for rebellion against a ruler who wasted their substance on concubines and minions. They reasoned that one who himself betrayed could not call vengeance treason! (p. 493); when chiefs and suzerains are false and perjured, to obey them is not loyalty but serfdom; revolt is not disloyalty but a freeman's duty (p. 511). This form of reasoning Metternich and Francis would never brook. Even more offensive is the praise of liberty by the man to lead the uprising which the people planned; he had spent much time in the Hanse Town of Lübeck, where he had learned grave truths about how to win and guard liberty.

Later in life I saw the Republic of Italy, and asked why they were so glorious in all arts and crafts of civil life... I saw that when those republics fell a victim of some tyrant or podesta, their men still preserved rights and uttered thoughts which left them more free and more great than the Commons of England. (p. 122)

Both Francis I and Metternich would have agreed with Lytton, that the power of public opinion is at the bottom of all social change, and that the influence of public opinion is the primary revolutionary force and difficult to control. Even the most laudable expression of

public opinion that never deviated from the prescribed path was said to appear suspicious to the Austrian rulers.¹⁰ Therefore, they must prevent that privilege which Robin said makes men free and great--the right to utter their thoughts.

Robin, the raiser of rebellion, declared, "In peace I was active and astir, for my works inflamed the bosoms of labourers and peasants, and many of them, benighted as they were, thought with me" (p. 123). He insisted he would lead armies of rebellion as they sought justice for the people, not for a faction, with neither White Rose nor Red on his banner but the "gory head of the first oppressor they could place upon a pole" (p. 282). He would fight for no monarch but for the liberties and the welfare of the masses.

This novel contains the statement that in England, especially since the time of Edward III, strange, wild notions of some kind of liberty had floated loose through the land (p. 309). This concept is probably best represented in the book by the attitude of Robin who could not explain the changes he wanted to make, but they were coupled with his hatred of nobles, his deep and passionate sympathy with the poor, and his fanatical fancy of a republic, half-political and half-religious.

The masses had a champion among the nobility also: Warwick's whole life had been one long struggle against despotism in the Crown; he would have established a monarchy limited by the strength of an aristocracy endeared to the people; he would have secured and promoted

liberty by making the King only the First Nobleman of the Realm (p. 548). He defied Edward, and he and Robin with their followers tried to unseat him. The forces the Austrian administration feared most were such liberal, democratic, Jacobin, or outright mass movements, as well as intellectual programs leading potentially to such movements. The interests of the state were not to be disturbed by the influence of minority factions.¹¹ Such an advocacy as that of Robin for the liberty of speech and other rights of the people and that of Warwick to make of England a limited monarchy could never have escaped censure.

In addition to political offenses there are religious ones in The Last of the Barons, the account of Edward, the "Sinner Prince" who was ruled by the "Tyrant Priest!" (p. 321). When Edward IV ascended the throne, there was at least repose for the persecuted believers that God's Word was given to man to read, study, and digest into godly deeds (p. 321). Metternich did not approve the reading of the Bible by the masses; he thought it a dangerous epidemic, although he himself read the Luther translation, declaring it "the best which has ever been made in our country."¹² He saw as did Robin that with the religion of the "bold foes to priest-vice goes a spirit that asks why the people should be evermore the spoil and prey of lords and kings" (p. 122). The rebellion of these early Englishmen would never cease until they had redressed the wrongs of their countrymen, nor "till we have shortened the purple gown of the Churchman--not till abbot and

bishop have felt on their backs the whip wherewith they have scourged the godly believer and the humble saint" (p. 316). There were complaints among the people when they had placed upon the throne "Yon Monkpuppet," Henry VI, and had called on "brave hearts to worship a patterer of aves and a counter of beads." (p. 550)

The enlightened Catholic churchman is represented by the Earl's brother Archbishop, who had been trained by an Italian ecclesiastic in all the subtle diplomacy of the Church. The wily priest loved no human creature but had a calm and icy contempt for all. He plotted for himself and for the Church (p. 347); he was unscrupulously ambitious; someone said to him, "Ye churchmen never know what passes in the hearts of those who feel and do not scheme." (p. 345)

Friar Bungay was a churchman of the lowest rank, an atrocious knave, a ludicrous imposter, who had taken the Friar's robes for safety and for bread. He was fond of his own fat, impudent, cheating, burly carcass, and was "esteemed a man exceedingly good-natured because he did not always have the devil at his back" (p. 294). During a battle when he was in danger, he was said to have uttered a paternoster, for once, devoutly.

To the emphasis upon magic and witchcraft in the novel the Catholic censors would have objected, as well as to some of the instances of Edward's extreme passion for Lady Anne Warwick which tend to bring discredit upon a reigning Prince.

Although this book did not appear on the censorship lists until July, 1843, a mere five years before Metternich fled the city of Vienna it was given the limited label, the most severe designation given to English novels at the time it appeared. In the light of the Chancellor's policy, it would appear that the praise of democratic principles and the uprising of the people against the Crown are the primary offenses of this book. Of course, the depiction of princes and their moral corruption, and the bemeaning of Catholics added to the displeasure of the censors.

In this study, Scott is represented by two novels which are forays into the France of the fifteenth century. Dealing with the quarrel between Louis XI of France and Charles the Bold of Burgundy is Quentin Durward with emphasis upon the portrayal of Louis. A kind of sequel to this work is Anne of Geierstein, set in the vicinity of the Alps, during the reign of Edward IV of England, with emphasis upon the character of Charles.

One does not complete reading the "Introduction" to the novel Quentin Durward¹³ until he has found an expression of sympathy for the poor and underprivileged and a contempt for the wealthy, "the tribe which is ruined by peace and plenty." The statement of this democratic principle was another of the evidences of the paradox in Scott seen in this study, as well as one of the objections the censors would have had to his novels.

Some of his works would have been censurable for the nationalism they contain. Although there appears to be an inconsistency in Metternich's anti-national policy and his complete dedication to his own Empire, Kann states that the Chancellor avoided thinking of the "Austrian Nation" and thought of the "Austrian state," embracing many nationalities, bound by a German-directed cultural and administrative superstructure under the supreme union of the Austrian Crown.¹⁴ That control would have been weakened by any strong feeling of nationalism within the individual nations making up the Bund.

Through his colorful revival of the past, Scott sent the public back to reading history, thus reinforcing the national factors already in operation, factors Metternich was attempting to suppress. The novelist delighted in investing patriotism with the glamour of sentiment. He had no dislike for the social and political world as it existed, nor did he have any leanings toward revolution, but his ardent love for Scotland and sympathy for Scots, amounting almost to sentimentalism, make a dangerous appeal to one's love of country. Such national enthusiasm as that particularly evident in Quentin Durward in the presentation of Louis' famous Scottish Guard of which Quentin was a member, was to Metternich identical with insurrection, revolution, Jacobinism. Although the discrepancy between cultural standards of various national groups in the Austrian Empire hardly offered favorable conditions for widespread Jacobin uprisings, small radical circles

might set off movements that would grow powerful. These radical and national groups were forcefully discouraged by the "police state."

When Quentin went to Louis' Court, he observed that the King's counselors were evil-looking men who were called into a sphere for which their previous education and habits had qualified them but indifferently (I, 124). One said of Louis and his advisors, "The devil himself could scarce have summoned such a synod, or have been a better president among them" (II, 180). The portrayal of the historical King is so revolting that the entire princely class is degraded. He was accused of being accessory to his brother's murder; he admitted that if he had knowledge of the crime, it was that he knew of no better method of quieting the discontents of his subjects (II, 191). There is a suggestion that he considered parricide in his earlier days.

Quentin was revolted by the cold-blooded cruelty which the King required from him in the execution of his duty. It was said that the King's tyrannical disposition was less founded on natural ferocity and cruelty of temper than on cold-blooded policy and jealous suspicion; however he seemed to enjoy the pain he inflicted in private conversation (I, 169), as well as the sight of human suffering when it was ludicrously exhibited, as in the instances of the fall of the Cardinal near the wild boar and the chase of Hayraddin by the ferocious dogs. Scott says of him that a prince with sounder moral qualities would not have invited the familiarity that he did from his subjects (I, 179), while Quentin

suspected that he played "sport with God" (I, 128). The jealous Louis was said to have encouraged the slander of his first wife, an action which resulted in her death. He was so jealous that Prince Dunois, who had a claim to the throne, dared not look at the guard assembled about the King lest he be thought trying to ingratiate himself with them (I, 120). Anecdotes of his intrigues are numerous. The King is termed crafty and selfish, yet his avarice gave way to apparent profusion when it was necessary to bribe the favorite or minister of a rival prince. Quentin found particularly distasteful the King's manifest pleasure in the execution of his tortuous policy.

The popular conception of the king on his throne, wearing his gold crown, or feasting with his vassals, or "else charging at the head of his troupes. . . is all moonshine in the water. Policy--policy does it all," said a courtier. Policy is an art this French King had found out (I, 70) as had Metternich of Austria; there should be no disparagement of "policy" as employed by monarchs.

The cold and tyrannical policy of Louis was more to be feared than the violence of his enemy, the truly diabolical Duke Charles of Burgundy. Whereas Louis is shown as cunning and crafty, Burgundy is presented as one of rather low mentality, bloody and impulsive. Little respect is shown the princely class by such statements as that Edward IV of England was too much amused among the wives of the citizens of London to be concerned with the quarrel of Burgundy and

France, and that Louis resolved to trust no one, for he recalled that Louis of Orleans trusted John of Burgundy: he was murdered in the Rue Barbette and that John of Burgundy trusted the faction of Orleans: he was murdered on the bridge of Monterean. (I, 171)

There were organized groups acting in rebellion against vested authority in this historical account as well as an allusion to the "war of public good," but it is the insurrection of the citizens of Liege under the leadership of La Marck, who knew no authority, which is of most concern to the author and to the censors no doubt.

Scott's general condemnation of German manhood in his book is enough to arouse the ire of the Austrian censors. He says La Marck's Lanzknechts were "very devils at rummaging out the wenches" in the towns they attacked (II, 59), and that the Burgundians felt that it was a shame that the weapons of knights and gentlemen should be soiled by the blood of the "German swine," the Lanzknechts and the Black Troopers, who emulated their pedestrian brethern (II, 108). The Wild Boar of Ardenne himself was called the "most notorious robber and murderer on all frontiers." He was shown to lack any good quality, to be a man addicted to wine, a general accusation of Germans in Scott's work where they are mentioned. The Lady Hameline said the Germans spent their mirth over Rheinwein and then brought their staggering steps to the dance in the evening and their aching heads to the ladies' bowers in the morning (II, 5). The Wild Boar was called hasty and sanguinary in

temper and blunt in speech: "Few Germans are otherwise" (II, 312).

He was a deceptive, cruel, and drunken keeper of concubines who bore him natural children. This defamation of Germans would have displeased Metternich; he once declared in speaking to Napoleon, "You forget, Sire, that you are speaking to a German."¹⁵

That Louis XI professed to be such a good Catholic, "the Most Christian of Kings," and yet had such qualities as those noted is in itself an undesirable reflection upon Catholicism as well as upon ruling princes in general. It is said that Louis was more superstitious than religious, that superstition influenced greatly his "selfish temper and mind to which, from the consciousness of many crimes, the fear of death was peculiarly terrible" (II, 211). He was constantly trying to rationalize his actions, saying that royal policy cannot always be squared by the abstract maxims of religion and morality. That was why princes founded churches and monasteries, made pilgrimages, underwent penances, performed devotions--trying to relieve their consciences of the crimes they had committed for the good of their subjects. Scott's depiction of this selfish, cruel, even sadistic Roman Catholic King proves him to have been far from "Most Christian."

Cardinal Balué, that "vile priest" from whose head Louis determined to pull the Cardinal's cap "even if the scalp came with it," "groaned in a cage of iron for twelve years" for betraying Louis. The only churchman for whom Scott has a kind word in the book is the Bishop of Liege.

Even he admitted that when he was a young man and had fair ladies come to seek "ghostly consolation," they needed the privacy of a secluded garden and a group of apartments removed from the other buildings. Now that he was an old man this privacy, he said with a downcast look and a smile, "half simple and half intelligent," was no longer necessary. (II, 36)

The novelist informs his reader that there was little toleration in the spirit of Catholicism at that time. He satirizes that Church through Balafré's message to a jolly priest with whom he had lately caroused until midnight, until the father was no longer able to say "God save ye" in parting. Balafré bade the priest say masses for the souls of his sister's family as far as the money he sent would go. He asked that the priest do on trust what else might be necessary to free his relatives from purgatory. Since they were free from heresy and were just-living people, it might be, he said, that they were "well nigh out of limbo already, so a little matter may have them free of the fetlocks"; and in that case, "I desire to take the balance of the gold in curses upon a generation called the Ogilvies of Angus-shire." (I, 65-66)

Scott is far less critical of the Catholic Church in Quentin Durward than he is in some of the novels included in this study; however, the corruption of the Cardinal and Balafré's wine-drinking friend, the satire upon the practice of saying masses for the dead, and other disparaging remarks, when added to the degradation of a monarch and

the rebellion of subjects against their ruler, secured for Quentin a place on the list of state censorship in the Austrian Empire,¹⁶ along with Anne of Geierstein, its companion story.

In Scott's Anne of Geierstein,¹⁷ the people living in the vicinity of the Alps fought nobly and fiercely the attempt of Austria to bring them under her subjection. The Landamman, a highly respected leader of the men of the mountains, called Zurich's embracing an Austrian alliance "ill-advised" (I, 80), for one might as well expect lenity and justice in hell as from Austrian overlords (I, 213), a sufficient reason for censorship within itself added to the many derogatory remarks about noblemen, about Catholic clergymen, and about a reigning prince, all of which Anne contains.

Duke Charles of Burgundy is said to have lacked consistency of character, to be one who could not be trusted. One of his governors called him "a spiritless fool" from whom a rich prize would secure a good reception (I, 276). Although he would be pleased with any dishonor done the Swiss, if he afterwards found it convenient to disown the action, "He is a prince likely to give a lively colour to his disavowal by hanging up the actors" (I, 227). The lowest "tools" were chosen to do the prince's dearest offices (I, 251). Charles was called proud, uncompromising, impetuous, willful, haughty, unpersuadable, engaging in fits of passion with or without provocation, acting impulsively as his passions dictated rather than as a result of judicious consideration.

He is termed "the butcher Charles, an unworthy tyrant" who forced his people to rebellion against his oppression.

Not only does Scott reveal the limitations of Charles of Burgundy, but he further belittles reigning princes when he has Edward IV of England called a traitor who had usurped a title and become a sensual debaucher. His brother the Duke of Clarence is declared false, traitorous, dishonored; Richard is referred to as "blood-drinker," while his noblemen Hastings, Howard, and Stanley are termed traitors. (II, 67)

The feudal tyranny of the noblemen was exerted even at the expense of their own countrymen (I, 309), as the "robber chivalry," the "petty tyrants made war each at his own pleasure" (I, 6). As Scott writes of the secret order called the Vehmgericht, he remarks:

...in no other country than one exposed to every species of feudal tyranny, and deprived of every ordinary mode of obtaining justice or redress, could such a system have taken root and flourished. (I, 369)

For a century attention had been attracted by the Swiss who had won many victories over the German Chivalry. The Alpine fighters were shown to be far superior to the German soldiers fighting with Charles of Burgundy. The German Lanzknecht was said to resemble nothing so much as a chafed bear, a "brutish lanzknecht" who was guilty of the usual sin of the German soldier, drunkenness. The Landamman stated that he almost wished Noah had never planted the grape when he had seen in late years his own countrymen "swill wine like very Germans, till they were like gorged swine, incapable of sense, thought, or motion." (I, 59)

The Swiss hated the occupying Austrians, calling them robbers and thieves, who were drunken, cruel, and sluggish; they had even been known to put their own countrymen to death because they wore the peacock feathers in their caps, the badge of that hated house of Austria (I, 80). Here is a clear-cut case of nationalism which was feared by Metternich lest individual states decide to challenge the dominance of Austria. The Chancellor's entire "system" was designed to foster the supremacy of his own country, but he jealously feared any evidence of a feeling of nationalism among states under Austria's control.

The subject of the entire novel might be termed rebellion, a hateful word to anyone in authority, particularly so to Prince Metternich and Francis I. The German Chivalry had attempted suppression of insurrections among their Alpine vassals for a hundred years when the story began; Charles the Bold declared that the Swiss, flushed with victories over the "sluggish Austrians," had shaken off all reverence for authority, assumed airs of independence, formed leagues, made inroads, stormed towns, and doomed and executed men of noble birth (II, 102). They had grown tired of suppression, and determined to garrison themselves against the Duke of Burgundy's encroachments and exactions. The Swiss went as Charles's equals for a hearing, insisting that they did not seek a quarrel with him and were not inciting his subjects to revolt (I, 280-90). As long as Austria was a just and beneficent mistress, they had served her with their lives, but when

she became oppressive and tyrannical, they assumed independence and proved themselves determined to fight for their rights. Surely Scott must have been thinking of the situation of much of Europe in his own day, predicting what was to happen.

There are several instances of rebellion in Switzerland against the Duke, even against some governors, military leaders, even churchmen. Revolutions were said to be common at courts of princes. Also, the Lancastrian plot to unseat Edward IV from the English throne comprises a large section of the novel.

The comparison of the noble and brave Swiss with the drunken and ignoble Austrians and German soldiers whom they were fighting plus the subject widely treated in Anne, rebellion and insurrection, would themselves have been sufficient grounds for the censors' restricting the circulation of the book in 1829.¹⁹ But there is more. Little respect is shown for the Catholic Church or for her men; Charles told the priest and the entire Court that he might well find a way to heaven without the assistance of an ungrateful priesthood. Margaret of Anjou's funeral was "solemnised with the mournful magnificence due to the birth of the deceased, with which the Church of Rome so well knows how to affect at once the eye, the ear, the feelings" (II, 231), says the novelist. The Practice condoned by the Church of selling religious trinkets to the people of the "lower orders" was criticized (I, 310), as was her greed in regard to the Lou Garagoule. The abbots of St. Victorie had

denounced as criminal the consultation of Lou Garagoule and the spirit who was believed to reside there. However, since this sin could be expiated by presents to the Church, the door was "sometimes opened by the complaisant fathers" to the curious who would take the risk involved.

There is further danger of lessening respect for Catholicism in such remarks as that the people were deceived by ecclesiastics, "vendors of superstitious wares" (I, 310); that the chaplain for the Barons of Arnheim held his office by condoning practices contrary to his faith (I, 188); and that the face of the priest of St. Paul's, with its haughty smile and appearance of disdain revealed coldness, harshness, and severity of disposition (I, 333-34). He was a high officer in the dread secret society, dealing with matters of life and death, an action contrary to the Canons.

The fourth story of the fifteenth century, Richard of York,²⁰ told by an anonymous author, was censored because it relates the story of a youth called Perkin Warbeck, believed by some to be Richard, the real Duke of York, as he attempted to overthrow Henry VII and establish himself on the throne of England. Add to rebellion against the reigning monarch an account of a diabolical monk, and if the result had appeared in the 1820's in Austria, instead of in 1841, it would surely not have appeared on the official list of censorship without label.²¹

The picture of Henry VII is repulsive; he suspected a foe in everyone and, Metternich-like, placed spies throughout the land.

Father Lawrence, called "the devil" by those whom he opposed, had succeeded in bringing Henry to hate his Queen so that he wanted her death but could hardly countenance murder, as he vehemently assured the fiendish Lawrence (p. 26). Henry was cruel but too artful to revenge himself openly on his enemies; instead he planned their secret downfalls. Although he was terrified to see the ravages his cruelty had made on his prisoners, he allowed the men to recover before they were again "called to suffer, that the struggle might not be too short - the death-pang too easy - a refinement in cruelty not to be omitted on the part of Henry" (p. 248). The novelist observes that however historians may differ with regard to Richard, the case of Warwick itself is sufficient to attach tyranny and dishonor forever to the reign and name of Henry (p. 248), a man so ungrateful that he beheaded men who placed the very crown on his head. (p. 126)

Against such a ruler many were ready to join in the effort to overthrow him. In addition to this greatest rebellion in the book are several instances of insurrection: an insurrection in Cornwall and widespread rebellion against royal oppression in Saint Burieu in 1498 and in other Cornish towns. These towns had planned to march against Henry on their own; they gladly joined Richard's forces.

The single passage which would, alone, have caused the inclusion of the book on the lists of censorship is one relating the highly inflammatory speech to the rebellious townsmen made by one Daniel Flammond,

in which he called them mere slaves for submitting to such intolerable tyranny as the "iniquitous tax to fill the coffers of an avaricious miser," to assist him to maintain his mercenary spies, and to keep the throne from the lawful heir.

The evil monk Philip, now the wretched Monarch's tyrannical master, sought revenge upon Queen Elizabeth because in her youth she had chosen Edward IV instead of him. His bitterness and determination to ruin embraced the Queen and all her offspring; the artful Monk was slowly achieving his purpose through his power over the King.

The Monk had seen and despised the superstition of the day and had become an infidel although he still occupied his priestly office. Of him it was said, "If ever fiend wore a mortal's form, 'tis this same Father Lawrence... Ay, the devil! or at least his double, in the shape of a monk!" (p. 49). The author says that beneath his "cloak of sanctity and humility, three of the deadliest passions of the human breast were working--ambition--avarice--revenge!" (p. 92) The Monk knew that Henry hated him and feared him and believed that he could wrest his sceptre from him. In order to keep his hold over the wretched King, he must retain a hold upon his fears. To keep this control he planned Edward's death so that that "mean, suspicious slave, who calls himself King," must think himself the murderer of the young prince (p. 102). It was he who counseled Richard to do his dastardly deeds. As Edward died a slow and miserable death, Philip stood by glutting his "revenge

with his sufferings--cursing the hour he was born--the mother who gave him birth." (p. 102)

The revelation of a king like Henry and a monk like Lawrence would, understandably, displease a man determined to restore his empire to the Old Order with a revitalized Catholic Church to help him. But there is more which would provoke his censors. The good priest in the account, Father Felix, spoke to Agnes about the closed Scriptures, saying he had long believed that those thus debarred needed the comfort and instruction the sacred oracles convey. He declared the day would come when the people would read the Bible and the darkness that covered their minds would be dispelled. (p. 108)

Another anti-Catholic passage is the discussion of motives for nuns' entering convents:

...to atone for the errors of the past; to serve as sacrifices to the ambition or avarice of others, their hearts closed in bitterness for ever, left nourishing a spirit of discontent--envious of those who were more fortunate; at variance with themselves and all the world. Such has too often been the pitiable state of the secluded nun. (pp. 150-51)

It was said that Agnes could serve others as well while she was answering one great end of her existence, "by becoming the counsellor, the solace, the happiness of man" (p. 146), as by closing herself away from the world as a nun.

Upon being urged to buy some "relics" of the Church one non-Catholic said that he would not fancy being turned out in the cold while

some thieving pedlar cut up his coffin into crosses and nobody knows what! adding "Some parings from the toe-nails of his holiness the pope! famous for curing the gout and corns! Ah, that is better!" (p. 11).

Catholicism is called

...a dumb show, a form of heartless creeds uttered by the lips and of outward ceremonies still more heartless; a cleansing of the outside of the cup, while all within was unclean; a thing to be talked of and believed, but neither felt, nor practiced, nor enjoyed. (p. 153)

The monks are accused of sinning "with impunity," and their greed is remarked as well as their propensity for drinking and their stupidity. The devil was said to have "business in hand" when the monk entered to see the King; he seldom was in want of a job or a journeyman when abbeys and monks are plentiful (p. 24). It is remarkable that a book containing as much dangerous material as does Henry of York should have been given no label by the censors of Austria when they caused it to be placed on the official list of censorship.

Mrs. Bray's Fitz of Fitz-Ford²² was objectionable to the censors for all the political intrigue it contains as well as for its pro-Semitism. The designation might have been more severe if the subject had been the effort to take the throne from a Catholic instead of the account of one of the many efforts to seat Mary on Elizabeth's throne. Although Catholic censors would have seen Elizabeth as a usurper, they were far more concerned in 1836 in Austria with preventing any form of rebellion than with the religious question. In addition to the presentation of rebellion in several forms, this book, which appeared in

German translation on the list of censored books,²³ defames the nobility and disparages royalty and Catholicism.

George Standwich, long the medium through which a traitorous intercourse had been held by Spain with the disaffected in England, stood ready with an organized band waiting the time when an open rebellion might succeed in overthrowing Queen Elizabeth, "this heretical woman," who was "deceitful, vain-glorious, and ambitious" (II, 66). As long as Mary of Scots was alive, and until the defeat of the Spanish Armada crushed all hopes, there were innumerable such plots in the land, promoted by the secret emissaries who stirred up Mary's partisans.

Chief among those rebellions related in the book was that of a band of desperadoes, apparently of little consequence, which grew into a faction strong enough to attempt an insurrection against the throne. Metternich feared such small radical circles as this in Fitz of Fitz-Ford, which might set off movements that would grow into influences powerful enough to upset the control of the state.²⁴ It was to detect radical plots in the embryo that the Chancellor's censorship operated; the police and spies would discover any large-scale movement.

The novelist gives specific details of the plans of the conspirators against the Queen, who had sworn never to quit their "holy purpose till they had planted a dagger in the heart of Elizabeth" (III, 8). To allow subjects to read of regicide is always dangerous, especially in the eyes of a ruler who fears his position.

Mary Stuart is called by the novelist the "faggot-piler" and Henry VIII "the tyrant and butcher" (II, 174). More disrespectful still to those with established authority, and that a derogation of a Catholic, too, is Betsy Grimbald's response when Standwich called her a murderess:

Are not Kings all murderers? How many heads have
fallen to satisfy suspicion, when it is of royal birth?
Where is the husband of your Scottish Queen, for
whose sake you would risk your life? Who found
Darnley a grave? Had he not one devised by a wife?
(II, 91-92)

Not only are the royalty belittled, but also nobles are shown to have fallen to low moral levels, becoming deeply involved in crime and evil.

This book contains a sympathetic presentation of Levi the Jew. He risked his life and wealth to repay a debt to Standwich, venturing his own safety to free Standwich from jail, to show him that a Jew can be grateful to the Christian to whom he owes life (III, 91), showing in acts of individual kindness and gratitude a heart possessing "virtues not always found to dwell in Christian hearts." (III, 298)

In addition to the serious offenses to Austrian censors already pointed out, Mrs. Bray does a great deal to lessen the influence of Catholicism in Fitz of Fitz-Ford, an offense of considerable concern to Austrian rulers in addition to that of the great plot in this novel.

Judge Glandville hoped that he might cause Margaret to "renounce the errors of the Romish Church" (I, 128). This attempt to convert a Catholic to Protestantism would have been frowned upon by Catholic

Austrian officials. Standwich was associated with "that dangerous body of men, the Jesuits," learning from them their way of taking advantage of the weaknesses and passions of others to get them to do as the fathers wanted. They were said to have been dangerous and to have used sophistry as a weapon to subdue and enslave reason. (II, 179). The Jesuits who had been re-admitted to Metternich's Austria had considerable power in censorship, particularly in fields of education; they would not tolerate such an expression. If they were not themselves members of the official staff of censors, there were many denunciations by individual informers, we are told.²⁵ Others of the clergy are called "snivelling priests" and "blythe, red-faced" friars who looked as if they thought all water holy and therefore never drank a drop of it. (II, 63)

A very serious offense to any monarch is the advocacy of regicide, particularly so in a Catholic empire when the statement is made that the Pope would condone it. The sanction of regicide is alone reason enough to have won for the book a more serious designation than that given Fitz. Mrs. Bray includes a statement by Cuthbert that Cardinal Allen had written a book to "set forth the merits of destroying by open violence or any means whatever, an heretical sovereign" (III, 9). He adds that the Cardinal "should set about the thing himself, and not set others on a mad venture like this," although the Pope had promised "immediate admission into heaven to

whosoever succeeds in it, should he fall afterwards" (II, 10). To this statement a hearer answered that the Pope promised a "devilish deal" more than he could perform. However, Standwich believed he would find pardon for all sins he would ever commit if he could return England to the Church of Rome (III, 95). Levi, the accursed Jew, gave him a good answer, one which might have occasioned mixed reactions from Catholic censors, whose political leaders feared rebellion more than anything, yet did not like the Jew: "Alas! does thy faith teach that sin can be washed out by the blood that must flow from the sword of rebellion?" He declared the Catholic faith to be like "that which offered human victims to Moloch, Baalim, and Ashtaroth, to offend God" (III, 96). Standwich spoke of his hopes to a non-Catholic who said she had been taught better than "to fear the shadows of superstition": "Your hopes of heaven! strife, bloodshed, and rebellion are your hopes. Well, it may be so with those of your faith." (II, 91)

The Pope is spoken of as "the beast himself in his purples and his scarlets" and a seaman turned Catholic says he has taken up "the trade of serving the Pope and the Devil," declaring the Catholic religion "an easy chair to a tired man" where he may rest after "traveling the devil's own road" (II, 53). Catholic beliefs are considerably ridiculed throughout the book. Levi accused the English of being a fierce race destroying each other. The cross about the neck of Standwich was, he said, an emblem of destruction although the Master came to spread

peace upon earth. He concludes, "What is your Bishop of Rome, but a king of curses?" (I, 48)

It would appear that Mrs. Bray's novel of various rebellions, containing many offenses to Catholics, well deserved the label given it on the list of official censorships. However, the happy-hunting ground of the state censors proved to be the novels with settings in the seventeenth century.

Chapter IV

Novels Set in the Seventeenth Century

The seventeenth century was an age of conflict; the conflict between Catholicism and Protestantism was at the root of most of the rebellions and intrigues that took place. Twelve of the thirty-two English novels appearing on the lists of Austrian-censored books are set in that age. This fact might be expected if one considers the determination of the Chancellor and of the Emperor of Austria in the nineteenth century to prevent the occurrence of revolution in their country and to strengthen their "main support," the Catholic Church. They were fully convinced that the power of the Roman Church was a necessary support if their Empire was to stand, but they were equally determined that the Church must be kept strong so that she could aid, not dictate to the State, in political matters. It is logical that the censors would have suspected any historical story set in this period in England, for it was a well-known fact that the pet aversion of James I of England was Catholicism. Three English novels appearing on the lists of censorship treat the England of his reign: Guy Fawkes, Arabella Stuart, and The Fortunes of Nigel.

William Harrison Ainsworth states in his story of "popery and treason," entitled Guy Fawkes,¹ that plots were constantly hatched throughout the reigns of both Elizabeth and James, but the "greatest treason that ever was plotted in England" is the subject of his novel.

Any book which treats the subject Metternich and Francis most abhorred would have been censored, even this one which relates the attempt to gain supremacy for Catholicism in England in the seventeenth century. Ainsworth's attitude toward the attempt to destroy the royal court of England is definitely anti-Catholic so that his book contains much material that would weaken the influence of that faith among readers. One wonders why it was not given the most severe designation when it was placed on the lists of censorship in 1841 and 1842, appearing three times, twice in German translation and once in English.²

The novelist says that many Catholics in James's England, men of high intellectual powers, untiring energy, and unconquerable fortitude, able to make many proselytes, desired the utter subversion of the existing government, temporal and ecclesiastical, as they were taught by the Jesuits (p. 28). One of the most fanatical was Catesby, the contriver of the "hell-engendered plot" called the "Gunpowder plot," who had been engaged in all popish plots of the time, and had joined himself to the Spanish faction after the execution of Mary to try to secure the succession to a Catholic. He had all the requisites of a good conspirator: filled with religious fanaticism, he was eloquent, wily, resolute, and able to delude the powerful and intimidate the weak (p. 25). When Spain, France, and Rome had disappointed him in his expectation of help, he hit upon a project which he could carry out almost single-handed, to be followed by a general uprising of the Catholics. He and the five others

to whom he had revealed the plot reasoned that the King's destruction alone would be small gain to them; they must strike deeper to "hew down the baneful stock of heresy" (p. 135). So their mine of thirty-six barrels of gunpowder with pieces of iron, stones, and wood laid on them to intensify the charge, would destroy King, Prince, nobles--all the "heretical occupants" at once. They felt justified in their action, for breves from Pope Clement VIII stated that as soon as that "miserable woman" (Queen Elizabeth) died, no one should be allowed to ascend the throne who would not in every way support the Church of Rome. James had oppressed them even more than had the "remorseless Elizabeth." Since he was excommunicated, his subjects were released from any feeling of allegiance. (p. 136)

The Gunpowder Plot is the chief material that is censurable in Guy Fawkes, but there are other offenses such as the remainder of the plans by the conspirators to seize Charles and proclaim him king, or failing to get him, to secure Princess Elizabeth and declare her queen (p. 332). Accounts of the conspirators' rebellions against the rulers they had to face are numerous.

Catholic leaders are not the only ones shown to have faults. Although Ainsworth presents James much more sympathetically than does Scott in Nigel or James in Arabella Stuart, the King is shown to be a coward, a puppet manipulated by the shrewd Salisbury, who said that all great statesmen have contrived treasons so that they could "discover"

them afterwards. Although he had not contrived the Gunpowder Plot, he hoped to use it to gain more favor with the King and to crush the whole Catholic party. By his treatment of the man who gave him the secret of the plot he revealed his criminal character; afraid he himself might be incriminated, he threw Tresham into the Tower and had him poisoned. As Tresham died, Mounteagle disguised himself as a priest and heard the prisoner's confession in order to gain access to letters that would reveal the corruption of himself and Salisbury.

Metternich's Jesuits would have been highly offended by the depiction of Garnet, provincial of English Jesuits, who drove the conspirators on when they were convinced their plan would fail. It was he who decided all the Court must die, the innocent as well as the guilty, even some of his own faith, in order to destroy so many heretics. The Catholic Church was said to be always at war with heresy, and if it could not uproot it by gentleness, it authorizes, "nay, enjoins, the employment of force" (p. 462), the adoption of any means, however violent or obnoxious, to achieve the restoration of that Church.

It is implied that Anne Vaux and Garnet had had an "intimate relationship" for years, disregarding all calumny and reproach (p. 114). When Guy Fawkes tried to persuade Viviana's father against joining the plot, Garnet threatened to pronounce the Church's most terrible malediction against him for "thwarting their great and holy purpose" (p. 141). He became so highly incensed when the gunpowder plot had

failed that he cursed the heretics (p. 461), maintaining that the conspiracy was a righteous and praiseworthy project undertaken to overthrow an heretical excommunicated monarch and re-establish the true faith of the Most High throughout the land. (pp. 462-63)

Father Oldcorne, another Jesuit priest, knowing that Viviana detested Catesby, for the good of "the cause," first tried to persuade her not to give up the world and enter a cloister; failing this, he threatened to invoke a curse upon her in the name of her dead father when she refused to marry Catesby whom she knew to be already married.

Pope Clement VIII was asked this question:

Supposing a malefactor shall confess that he himself or some other has laid Gunpowder, or the like combustibile matter, under a building and unless it be taken away, the whole house will be burnt, the prince destroyed, and as many as go into or out of the city will come to great mischief or peril.

After a full discussion of whether the priest receiving the confession of the conspirator might make use of the secret to warn the government and save the lives of the King and his entire Parliament, the answer was that he must not (p. 38). Secrets obtained from private confession must not be divulged, even such a one as this. The attempted advancement of the Church at such a cost to the State as regicide, condoned by the Pope, forms a serious charge against Catholicism and would have created something of a dilemma for the censoring officials if they had been required to state their reasons for censure: they must prevent any

suggestion of a plot against the government, and yet they were to aid in strengthening the Catholic Church so that she might support the State.

In contrast to this extreme action is the incident of the penance Viviana had to endure for pleading with her father to refuse to join the conspiracy: she was to walk barefoot for several days on the way to the shrine of Saint Winifred, where she must lay a rich offering on the altar. She endured the penance until her tracks were bloody.

The novelist carefully includes many expressions of contempt for Catholics, such terms as "rank papist," "spawn of Antichrist," "priest-ridden papists," and "idolators." One man remarked that there would be no peace while one Catholic was left alive. He was sure the plot against the Court was a scheme of the papists, for "Who else could devise such a monstrous plan?" He declared it would never enter into the head or heart of a Protestant to conceive so detestable an action (p. 365). As one of the conspirators asked from the scaffold for the prayers of all good Catholics and of none other, several answered him, "Then none will pray for you" (p. 517). The lieutenant who received Guy Fawkes into the Tower seemed to sum up the general attitude of non-Catholics toward the teachings of Catholicism:

If anything could heighten my detestation of the pernicious creed you profess, it would be to witness its effects on such minds as yours. What a religion must that be which can induce its followers to commit such monstrous actions, and delude them into the belief that they are pious and praiseworthy! (p. 390)

The King decreed that November fifth be kept sacred as the day on which they were preserved from the Gunpowder Treason; it was said the ordinance would impress the nation with the "salutary horror of all papists and traitors--for they are one and the same thing." (p. 402)

The fanatical Catholic conspirators were accused of being of such superstitious natures that it was easy for them to believe in Dr. Dee's feats of magic. Of course the Catholic Church would object to all his work which is given considerable attention in Guy Fawkes, as well as to the belittling of the "good Catholics."

Regicide among all people of monarchies is most abhorred and particularly feared in the Austrian Empire of the nineteenth century. Ainsworth's account of details of the plan to murder the entire Court, which the Jesuit priest refused to allow the men to abandon, must have made Metternich wonder whether or not he had done the best thing for his own safety in allowing that order of churchmen to re-enter his country. Surely the people should not be allowed to read this account of actions of earlier Jesuits and be led to question the growing power of that Order in the Austrian Empire.

Revolution in any form was reprehensible to the Austria of the time of this study; when that revolt took the form of an attempt to dethrone the King and lodge him in the Tower, even though he was a persecutor of Catholics, the censors could not allow a record of it to go by without an indication of their disapproval of it. This they did by placing it

on the list of censorship as Arabella Stuart,³ to be limited in its circulation.

Metternich did not want to repel his people by such pictures of a monarch as that of James I given in James's novel, for he desired to return the land to the absolutism of the ancien régime; however, one feels he was secretly pleased to see one who hated Catholics presented in so unfavorable a light as is James I in this novel. It is stated that even if the sickening selfishness, vulgarity, and wickedness of the King himself had not affected greatly the comfort of all around him, the lightness of the Queen's manners, and the encouragement given to vice of every kind would have rendered the palace a painful and disgusting abode (p. 132), a place of dark and dreadful secrets. The novelist states that "the slovenly Scotch tyrant's" first act in England was to violate the laws of the land he came to govern; no law stood between James and his will. He believed that things criminal for a subject might be justified in a king (p. 47). This King is presented as a base, low-minded man whose very personal appearance was repulsive, "slovenly," "untidy," "slouchy"; he was said to have had the vulgar habit of sitting with his mouth open so that his tongue showed between his teeth, even lolled from his mouth. This "swine King," "Scotch porpoise," is said to have sworn many a blasphemous oath of a very terrible and disgusting sort. (p. 97)

A perfect example of James's cruelty and heartlessness, of his tyranny and injustice, was his treatment of the conspirators who were

all condemned to death. As each victim was at the very point of baring the neck for the stroke, James stayed the execution and returned the man to prison. These acts were called merciful by his supporters; the King acted not through mercy but in order to keep the prisoners for long periods in the worst of torturous imprisonment. Arabella found "His word is as unstable as a quicksand" (p. 205) when he ignored his signed permission and imprisoned both Arabella and Seymour for their secret marriage. When Arabella died in the Tower, her spirit was said to have passed from a tyrant's will to freedom. (p. 380)

The novelist insists that it would be no satisfaction to the writer or reader to look into "the pruriences of the most disgusting monarch that ever sat upon the English throne" (p. 123), whose course was a foul blot on the page of the history of England (p. 123). England had become one great prison under the rule of James I. (p. 347)

In addition to political corruption, there was a great laxness of moral standards at James's Court. Fond of scandal and of gossip, James encouraged the gross immorality and vice that reigned in his Court for the sake of the amusement which it afforded him to hear of all the intrigues going on around him. Nothing could be concealed from the cunning and astuteness of the low-minded king and unscrupulous men who surrounded him. The vile Countess of Essex, in seeking a precedent for the disposal of Sir Thomas Overbury, blackened the reputation of another of the ruling class:

I have heard that the late Queen Catherine of France was so well served in cases such as these that those whom she dreaded or disliked disappeared as if by magic. The smelling of a nosegay--a pair of scented gloves--a cup of fragrant wine--would clear her Court in a few hours of those who cumbered it. (p. 300)

Arabella sums up the attitude of the novelist toward princes when she rimes,

But colder than these iron walls
Hardest of earthly things,
Is that which dwells in courtly halls
Within the breast of Kings. (p. 353)

There is further belittling of those in authority in the statement that James's Queen lacked "higher qualities" (p. 162), and that her brother, the King of Denmark, was "a coarse-minded barbarian" whose presence in England tended to do anything but improve the morality or decency of the people. Such a monarch and such conditions were aided by courtiers as unprincipled as the King himself, men like his minion Robert Carr who, while engaged in a criminal affair with the Countess of Essex, deceived Overbury, securing his imprisonment and death.

Just as Metternich believed there was a deep plot against him, so did King James suspect some sinister design against him (p. 342). In both instances they were correct. There was wide-spread discontent; one plot against James was discovered soon after he crossed the border into England. It was to seat Arabella Stuart on the throne, after lodging James in the Tower. The conspirators were apprehended and punished.

Later, James declared Arabella's fleeing to her husband a plot of the papists (p. 340). He feared that the union of the two royal lines might result in "war, and rumors of wars, tumults and confusions. . . They might blow up a flame in a minute that would be difficult to put out again." (p. 210)

Prince Metternich would have agreed with James that "It is right that Kings and Judges should be informed, by discreet and dutiful subjects, of all that is taking place around them" (p. 185), and that "There is no telling what instruments Kings may see fit to use" to secure information. Metternich's Spy International was made up of recruits from lower classes of merchants, of domestic servants, or workers, "nay even of prostitutes," who formed a coalition that traversed the entire Viennese society. One could scarcely pronounce a word at Vienna which would escape them. One's own servants became within fourteen days, even against their own wills, his betrayer.⁵ The Prince would hardly allow his people to read condemnation of such a practice as this, much like the one on which his system depended so heavily.

Anything that suggested Catholicism James I detested; he insisted that "'Cloister' is a papish word," and therefore to be avoided. He once decided a "papistical priest has dared to intrude himself into our sacred presence," and committed the man to the Tower. (p. 45)

Although George Brooke as leader of the conspirators was heavily dependent upon Catholic help, he used such terms as "Papist

rabble" in speaking to their leader about them. He smiled at the assurance with which zealous Roman Catholics, although utterly intolerant of every religion but their own, "can assert that great principle of liberty of conscience which they deny to others," when they themselves might benefit by their action (p. 89). He was confident that the great body of the Church would join the conspiracy, ". . .for ambition is the great vice of the ecclesiastics, and the re-establishment of the Romish hierarchy must naturally open to them a thousand new roads to their end" (p. 60), just as Metternich believed that it would prove useful to him in achieving his ends.

Offensive to Catholic believers are the duel between the heroic Seymour and a knight, the divorce and re-marriage of the Countess of Essex, and her immoral behavior with Rochester, actions which would have been deemed a corrupting influence upon Austrian readers.

Arabella called a Jesuit a wicked, cunning man who would "fain have entangled me in things for my destruction" (p. 12). Almost without exception the Jesuits alluded to have been condemned in the novels which make up this study. This condemnation Austrian censors could not allow their people to read, for Jesuits held important places in the realm; some censors must have been Jesuits; many were teachers and public officers with whom the masses had to deal; it was necessary, to prevent dreaded domestic uprisings, that respect for these men be kept high.

King James is far more repulsive in Arabella than he is in Scott's The Fortunes of Nigel,⁶ which was translated into both French and German in 1822 and appeared on the official list of restricted books in November, 1822.⁷ In the book Scott treats that time when hostilities between the Scots and the English threatened to become a "general convulsion" causing disturbances in all classes (I, 2). There were many brawls at Court; King James had to take extreme steps at times to try to keep down such disturbances. However, dissention began during his reign which resulted in universal civil war. (I, 82)

Of the three novels in this study which treat the subject of James I, Nigel gives the only extensive character portrayal of the King. The portrait of James is Scott's "most convincing regal figure--an eccentric pedant with a strain of vulgarity crossed with kingly dignity."⁸ Nevertheless, Scott is much kinder to him than is James in Arabella or Ainsworth in Guy Fawkes.

There is evidence that his subjects lacked respect for James, perhaps basically as a result of the "ridiculous figure he cut," for the mass of men will respect a "monarch stained with actual guilt rather than one whose foibles render him ridiculous" (II, 158), the novelist insists. His unattractive figure was a result of a natural awkwardness of movement and clothes thickly padded to withstand the stroke of a dagger, added to fidgeting motions, a "circular mode of managing his legs" as he walked, and a habit of "fiddling with the bunches of ribbons

that fashioned the lower part of his dress." He "toddled" as he walked and sat trussed up in his saddle when he rode. He was accused by the novelist of having no useful knowledge or real wisdom, of uncertainty, of giving control of himself and his affairs to unworthy favorites, of being always outwitted in negotiations, of cowardice, of allowing undue familiarity, of loving flattery, of pedantry, of neglecting serious matters to work over trifles, and of profanity. Sully called him the wisest fool in Christendom. (I, 80-81)

Although a major offense to the censors in this novel is the belittling of James I, there are some very disparaging remarks about his counselors, such as that he had those about him that would corrupt an angel (I, 49); they "set his head against his heart and his heart against his head" (II, 168), for the King himself was well disposed to hold the scales of justice even, but those around him threw "their selfish wishes and base interests into the scale." (I, 63)

Prince Charles was called cold and stately in his manners, and very obstinate in his purposes, with more pride than prudence (I, 173); but it was the dread of "Steenie's" stormy passions which kept James from withdrawing Court favor from the powerful Duke of Buckingham, ambitious and impetuous, fiery, haughty, vindictive, "if not absolutely tyrannical." (I, 108)

Buckingham's intimacy with the married daughter of the Earl of Huntinglen, sister of Dalgarno, was a farther indictment against nobility

as was Dalgarno's shameful treatment of Lady Hermione. When Charles was lecturing Dalgarno on his misconduct, it was said to remind one of the old proverb of Satan reproving sin (II, 268-69). Certainly there was much "sin" to reprove on the part of Dalgarno, as he deceived Lady Hermione in marriage, led Nigel into serious offenses, and finally was killed fleeing London with the wife of a merchant. Princes and nobles alike are revealed in an uncomplimentary light.

There are occasional minor points that would not pass censorship, such as the account of Alsatia, for Metternich forbade any organization of groups or any assumption of power by such groups as the rogues and villains who formed their own government in Alsatia.

The statement is made that there were no longer daily insurrections and attempts at assassination as had been true earlier, and there are several allusions to the Gunpowder Plot. The Austrian leaders would also have objected to the breaking down of social barriers seen throughout the story as nobles and tradesmen mixed; even James himself forgot his position and fraternized with commoners.

Compared to Guy Fawkes, Nigel is only mildly offensive in the expression of James's hatred of Catholicism; however, he made several disparaging remarks such as that on the occasion of the goldsmith's bringing the King a magnificent salver from Italy about which James asked, "It has naething in it tending to Papistrie?" Geordie answered, "I were not wise to bring anything to your presence that had the mark of the beast." (I, 83)

Because Heriot had allowed the Lady Hermione to live in the Foljambe apartment once occupied by a nun, on one fifth of November there was talk of "rabbling him" for keeping a nunnery (II, 66); however it is the bitter story of Catholic oppression suffered by the Lady Hermione which might have caused the censoring of the entire book. Her father had realized the hazard that his widow and child would be exposed to upon his death "in a country so bigoted to Catholicism as Spain"; consequently he sent most of his fortune to England so that it would be saved from the "clutches of the Church." It is said that Catholic priests, and particularly the monks, besieged the beds of the dying in Spain to obtain bequests for the good of the Church (II, 37). Lady Hermione rejected with contempt the ceremonial of the Romish Church, loaded the astonished priests gathered about the bed of her mother with reproaches for their greediness and hypocrisy, and commanded them to leave her house. They returned with the Inquisitorial power to find only the corpse of her on whom they hoped to wreck their vengeance. Then they dragged the daughter from her mother's dead body and imprisoned her in a solitary cloister where she was treated with severity as they attempted to force her to become a nun or break her health, for upon her taking the veil or dying her estate would go to the Church.

Further derogation is contained in the statements about the nuns in the cloister; many of them were immured there because of their bad conduct. The Superior's early thirst for licentious pleasure had

been replaced in advanced age by covetousness and the love of power, as well as by a spirit of severity and cruelty. It was the actions of such as she that caused peasants to tremble at the idea of violating the laws of the Church. (II, 37)

There was a close parallel between the condition of seventeenth-century England and that of the Metternich-controlled Austrian Empire. Because they felt the need for rest under firmly established governments, in both lands the people were forgetting the very principle upon which swords had been drawn against kings as they passively submitted to the reigns of the Protector and of the Chancellor. That there were many factions of discontent in both lands, however, is also true. Scott's The Legend of Montrose and Woodstock and Emma Robinson's Whitehall are the three novels in this study which relate the stirrings of the feelings of rebellion against the Protector. These dangerous precedents should be kept out of the view of the Austrian Chancellor's subjects.

The Legend of Montrose,⁹ considered the most dangerous of the three to Austria's power, appeared twice on the lists of censored books: once in August, 1824, as one of the collected works of the author, translated into Italian; this edition was given a forbidden designation; again it appeared in February, 1824, as an adaptation by Müller, entitled Ritter Angus, this edition receiving only a limited classification.

In the novel the Marquis of Montrose led his related clans into battle for the King; however, they were primarily concerned with

overthrowing Argyle's powerful hold over themselves. This hold they succeeded in breaking with the help of the soldier of fortune Dalgetty and a few thousand Irish troops. Argyle and two other leaders of the Campbell clan sided with Parliament, but actually the entire struggle proved to have little relationship to the English war as the Scottish clans fought among themselves. It was insurrection among just such factions as these in Montrose which Metternich believed contained the greatest threat to the peace of Europe.¹⁰

The history of Scotland was one of deadly feuds, both Highlands and Lowlands a constant scene of war, foreign and domestic, primarily for the purpose of deriving temporary advantage or of deciding some immediate quarrel. During England's Civil War, Lord Montith challenged those of the Highlanders who wanted to throw off the base yoke of their clan leaders to lose no time in joining the King. The Covenanters had twice made war on Charles; again, without any real provocation, a group had raised an army to go to the assistance of those in rebellion. That action had led the King to commission the Earl of Montrose to assemble thousands of Scots and Irish to put down the present rebellion against the King. (p. 90)

Dalgetty, a soldier of fortune who had fought for years on the Continent during the Thirty-Years War of Germany, made several comments which, other than the fact that the story is one of rebellion against established authority, are the primary offenses of this book to

Austrian censors. There is great national pride seen among the Scots, particularly in Dalgetty's statement that it was "those valorous Scottish regiments that were the dread of Germany" (p. 17). Metternich considered it a danger to his regime to allow such expressions of advocacy of nationality or unity¹¹ as those in this novel and in Quentin Durward. Also censurable are the derogatory remarks about Austrians and German soldiers. Dalgetty accused the German Lanzknechts of having in mind only their pay, for he had seen whole regiments mutiny on the field of battle, like "base scullions," crying out "Gelt, Gelt, instead of falling to blows like the noble Scottish blades who ever disdained postponing of honour to filthy lucre" (p. 18). It was true that Austria never gave them more than one-third of the pay she promised them; the arrears were "always promised and always go for nothing!" (p. 66). He added to these insults an account of his social experiences during the wars in Germany, when "haughty Princes" of the Empire had found themselves frequently, when they could not satisfy the pecuniary claims of their soldiers, allowing them unusual privileges and familiarities. He had himself sat with princes at feasts made for monarchs (p. 145). Metternich was contemptuous of the middle and lower classes¹² and would have objected to any statement that his noble and royal countrymen had sat at feasts with them, or granted the "unusual privileges and familiarities."

The religious offenses in The Legend of Montrose are primarily statements by the central character Dalgetty, who insisted that the mass

was an act of blinded papistry and utter idolatry, which he was unwilling "to homologate" by his presence. A Dutch pastor of a Reformed Church told him he might lawfully go to mass in that the prophet permitted Naaman "to follow his master into the house of Rimmon, a false god or idol"; but since he received no recompense for any wrong he might do to his conscience, the mercenary Dalgetty refused to attend Catholic mass.

Scott's usual religious bias is seen in the statement that at the time of the story the Prelatists and the Presbyterians of the more violent kind had become as illiberal as the Papists, and would scarcely allow the possibility of salvation beyond the pale of their respective churches. He declares,

If the Author of our holy religion considered any particular form of church government as essential to salvation, it would have been revealed with the same precision as under the Old Testament dispensation. (p. 6)

Emma Robinson's Whitehall¹³ is a novel of religious and political plots and counterplots; for that reason it was placed on the list of Austrian censorship in 1845.¹⁴ The seventeenth century was a religious age in which persecutions helped to produce the revolutionary spirit characteristic of the time. Religion and not policy was the lever of the age. Because King Charles had crushed his parliament and established his power on the ruins of the common liberties, while pretending to use them as its foundations, proceeding rapidly on his way toward despotism, even in remote districts of England turbulence was felt, in spite of the fact that the masses had a profound and superstitious reverence for all

constituted authority. It would have been a danger to a monarch's power if his subjects had read of others who revered authority, yet rebelled against it.

His enormous crimes and weaknesses had rendered the King both odious and contemptible, and the contest soon became that of democracy against the royal and feudal forms of government which from the date of the Norman conquest had existed in England (p. 282) and which Metternich tried by his policing action to prevent in Austria. This is definitely censurable material, for the Austrian Monarch objected even to anti-democratic and revolutionary propaganda since it helped to spread democratic principles and revolutionary theories.¹⁵ One religious fanatic declared the democratic principle by saying, "All men are men, --the best is no better, the worst is no worse" (p. 83). Dethewarre saw both King and the parliament as tyrannies, whose only object was to enslave the masses. He exhorted the people that the time had come for them to arise and overwhelm their oppressors, bringing in a reign of brotherhood and equality. By Dethewarre's influence the army grew powerful and unified, so strong that even Cromwell was alarmed at first. Later, he made use of this same army to achieve his goal--the rule of the land--for the army wanted the King beheaded, a decision both Cromwell and Ingulph had helped them to reach.

Any talk of rebellion against established authority was forbidden by Austrian censors as was the advocacy of any form of democracy. In

this novel there is an account of the army's voting to demand a republic of Cromwell. When Ingulph discovered he was the natural son of the King and was about to become a parricide, he weakened in his efforts; Cromwell tried to spur him on with the reminder that the day was dawning when the land would be an oasis of freedom and equality, with no royalty or nobility "battening like greedy vultures on her liver," the government acting only as a rudder to the vessel to guide it cheerfully to the harbor of rest and riches. (p. 425)

Metternich would have disapproved of Cromwell's reminding Ingulph that although David of the Scriptures was only a poor herdsman, yet the Lord chose him in the place of Saul to found a line of kings. The Chancellor believed that the people were possessed of a desire to usurp the privileges of the royalty; this choice of David would be a dangerous precedent for them to consider.

Praise of democracy and plans for an ideal republic after overthrowing the King or even killing him are offenses bolstered by the defamation of the Monarch and many others, in Whitehall. Charles is said to have rewarded treason and apostasy (p. 19), to have engaged in Machiavellian intrigues (p. 333), to have been a rogue who was obstinate, treacherous, deceitful, weak, and perfidious (pp. 349-50), an utterly faithless man who could not be trusted, a "crowned malefactor," "brazen idol," "monstrous criminal" (pp. 364-65), a tyrant with a rotten heart (p. 211). The dreadful charges brought against the King, the

details of cruelty and oppression from the annals of his past despotism, his "monstrous want of mere human feeling" (p. 404), sharply contrasted with the beauty and glory of that poetical dream which was the meaning of the word "Republic." (p. 393)

This entire disparagement of the King and praise of democracy is dangerous material for public perusal in a monarchy as is such matter as that the country had fallen under the province of the army, usually the prop and stay of tyrannical princes, which became in this instance the means of bringing a tyrant King to justice even against the will of the people he oppressed. Objectionable also would be such statements as these against absolutism: Cromwell's son-in-law declared that the Bible proves that in a spiritual sense a monarchy is not desirable, and that the "infinite mischiefs and oppressions" the English had suffered under monarchy and by it proved that it was in no way conducive to the interests of the people of England (p. 345). So subjects condemned their sovereign, justifying their action in quoting from the Scriptures,

Let the high praises of God be in their mouths, and a two-edged sword in their hand...to bind their kings in chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron, to execute upon them the judgment written; this honour have all saints, praise ye the Lord! (p. 459)

Since it was religion which was the lever of the time, one finds much matter in Whitehall that would hinder the growth of the "true church," the Roman Catholic. Some statements are only slightly

tinged with contempt, such as that Ramona was to be converted from the "Romish errors" in which she had been brought up, turned from her idolatries, and all her "beads and crosses and relics and gilded trumperies taken away" (p. 176). John Milton declared in the story, "Me-thinks it is a popish fashion, then, to lay down the law thus absolutely" against divorce (p. 135). The betrothal of children was called "a popish ceremonial not to be tolerated in a gospel-walking church" (p. 19), free from "popish trammels of ancient superstition" (p. 168). At a feast mince pies and Michaelmas geese were called graven images or symbols of popish idolatries (p. 103), and the decorations and midsummer fires "the works of the devil and popish mummeries." (p. 249)

However, not all offenses were so mild. The devil is said to be as near to being a popist as any (p. 377). Ramona's gold carving was said to be the image of some demon which she worshipped, for "witchcraft, popery, and idolatry, go together" (p. 374). Praying for one near death was called "an accursed popish doctrine, akin to the misbelief of purgatory" (p. 458). Prynne observed that he would not have back his ears which had been cropped, for he was "a perpetual protest against the anti-Christian, inquisitorial, merciless tyranny" (p. 109). To top all offenses is the declaration of one fanatic that "the Antichrist is still enthroned at Rome, drunk with the blood of the saints." (p. 76)

In Walter Scott's story of incidents in 1652 in England, the grounds for censorship are many. The reader of Woodstock¹⁶ is ever aware

of the occurrence of 1649, that most serious of all offenses to censoring officers, the rebellion against a reigning monarch, resulting in his deposition and his beheading.

Metternich's censors would have read with alarm the accounts of discontent with existing government, allusions to rebellions by minor factions, disparagement of Prince Charles Stuart, the usual Scott practice of elevating a commoner to the position of noble hero, and comments that would undermine Catholicism and lessen respect for the Catholic clergy. The officials were being rather lenient when they only restricted the circulation of Woodstock.¹⁷

While the people forgot the principle which moved them to rise against their King, being too desirous of tranquillity to object to existing conditions, Scott emphasizes the dilemma of the thinking people of England who now found themselves living under intolerable conditions. The hero, Everard Markham, tried to decide what should be done to improve the situation. He had believed that his country was becoming a "prey of bigotry and tyranny," but as one of the Presbyterian Party he had opposed the great matter, as Cromwell called the trial and execution of Charles. After it was done, Markham could see that the Roundheads' real motive was self-interest and ambition. It was clear that Cromwell was growing too powerful, and that he and the Parliament would break and the country be thrown back into war. So Everard decided that he must choose to go along with Cromwell, although he

intended to impress upon the Protector that he was simply to head the executive government, his power derived from popular consent to prevent the natural proneness of power to become arbitrary (I, 103-106). An "Everard Markham" in Metternich's Austria might have felt the same way as he saw the Chancellor's power becoming arbitrary, so arbitrary that Scott's Woodstock was limited to circulation by that power. It is the suggestion of rebellion against such force that is one of the book's great threats to the Austrian power.

In the England of Scott's Woodstock there was quarreling over the division of spoils among those of the party that had committed regicide, and there were numerous contending parties inflicting wounds upon each other, that internal strife so very dangerous to the prosperity of a country.

There is considerable disparagement of Cromwell in the novel; although this derogation of one in authority would generally have violated Metternich's policy, since Cromwell is one who helped kill a king, one suspects that the Austrian official censors were secretly pleased at his being belittled. A Royalist messenger to Cromwell insisted he had rather give "Old Noll" three inches of his dagger than the packet he was to deliver; he had rather stretch a rope than talk to the "old king-killing ruffian" (I, 115). During his interview "Noll" became emotionally upset upon seeing a picture of Charles. The messenger knew it was dangerous to be a witness to the infirmities of men high in

power (I, 147); he departed, saying he had seen the devil (I, 149) and later that Noll was the devil's darling (I, 131). He prayed for confusion to "old Noll and his red nose!" (II, 53). Cromwell was aware that he was called "parricide" and "king-killer," "ambitious usurper," as well as

...that grand imposter, that loathsome hypocrite, that detestable monster, that prodigy of the universe, that disgrace of mankind, that landscape of iniquity, that sink of sin, and that compendium of baseness, Oliver Cromwell. (II, 139)

He had placed himself at the head of the English nation, a position he occupied for years. He held his commission from the Parliament at the time of the occurrence of events in this story; but Cromwell was a rebel leading rebels against their Monarch, and these rebels, under his leadership, were alone responsible for the "whole tragic conclusion," the deposing and executing of the King (I, 119). If the Army could have found and taken the young Charles, there might have been a renewal of that tragedy, according to Scott's account.

Cromwell's Commissioners were no less abnormal than he. Oliver's brother-in-law was one of the most "brutally ignorant men of that time," who had caused himself to be made head of a college at Oxford where he engaged in the rapine of everything possible. The "philosopher" Bletson professed atheism but was detected sleeping with a Bible under his pillow when the "ghosts" were bothering him. There was also the mentally deranged, cruel, and pitiless Harrison,

who had prisoners stabbed to death without mercy; he engaged in his "pourings forth" from the pulpits clothed in full uniform ready to "take the field to fight at Armageddon." These Commissioners moved to Oxford where they sat like vultures watching the disemboweling of a deer, waiting the parts that fell to their share. Here Bletson spent his time "vexing the souls" of all he could with his "most scandalous theses" of atheism. (II, 204)

Neither is Charles Stuart spared adverse criticism by Scott: the Prince's friends knew the foible of this good-humored but hard-hearted voluptuary, "wise except where his passions intervened" (II, 82), this "unclean son of the slaughtered tyrant" (I, 13), "this worthless boy who with his father and his father's house have troubled Israel for fifty years" (II, 242). His amours were a matter of habit and fashion, for his experience had taught him disbelief in the virtue of women and the honor of men. In the story of Woodstock, he reasoned that if he gave his host a "grandson with a title to quarter the arms of England, what did it matter if a bar sinister was drawn across them." He recalled that in France there was not a noble house where individuals would not cock their hats an inch higher if they could boast of such a left-handed alliance with the Grand Monarch (II, 98). As he tried to seduce Alice, "to let all pass with you to which Court ladies would give currency" (II, 147), he assured her that the world had been accustomed to, and attached no blame to, such a relationship as fair Rosamond ruling the heart of an affectionate monarch and consoling

him for the few hours of constraint and state he must spend with an angry and jealous Eleanor.

As a foil for Charles is the very honorable and noble commoner hero, Everard Markham, who attempted to teach the Prince correct moral behavior as he defended from Charles's passion another saintly commoner, Alice, the girl Everard loved. Throughout the narrative, the common people are good and noble while those representing both Church and State are generally shown to be much inferior to them. Here again is the usual Scott technique, the emphasis upon the worth of the individual man, commoner or prince.

In addition to the presentation of a libertine Prince and allusion to the "great matter," there are numerous rebellions alluded to in the novel, such as that Edward IV was dethroned more than once by Warwick, the Cromwell of his day (II, 62).

Although there are many disparaging remarks about Catholics and their faith, there are no severe attacks in this book. One spoke of "the blinded and bloodthirsty papist" (I, 49); and the "bouncing priests whose eyes were closed with fat" (I, 15); Cromwell called priests "calves of Bethel" (I, 137). The Presbyterian Everard declared that his religious principles were purer than those of Catholics in that they did not depend upon set forms (I, 77). A minister thought of texts he might use, "not in the wicked sense of periapts, or spells, as blinded Papists employ them, together with the sign of the cross and other fruitless forms" (I, 292-93), while one spoke of those "besotted and

blinded Papists who hold that bestowing of alms is an atonement and washing away of wrongs and oppressions" (I, 53). One other very slight violation of Catholic beliefs is the duel between Charles and Markham, and another displeasing statement is that Jews should not be scorned by the "fanatical Christians," for after all they were the "elder brethern." (I, 191)

In addition to an England torn by religious strife seventeenth-century France is represented in this study by G. P. R. James's two historical novels, Richelieu and The Huguenot. With such men representing her as Cardinal Richelieu, it is little wonder that there was so much opposition to the Roman Catholic Church during the seventeenth century. That high churchman and Minister of France is the subject of the novel Richelieu.¹⁸ A translation made in Paris in 1837 appeared that year on the Austrian list of officially censored books, with the indication that it was to be restricted in circulation.¹⁹

Cardinal Richelieu had taken so much of the power upon himself that Louis XIII's title was almost all he had left. Throughout France, that power was threatened by factions and attacked by continual conspiracies; the Minister was able to maintain it only by the very terror of his name and the favor of "a weak and irresolute monarch" (p. 19). The "jealous suspicion ever attendant upon usurped power" led this minister to set the trend of behavior followed two hundred years later by Prince Metternich of Austria: "It

is no secret to anyone nowadays that there are people in every situation of life, in every town of France, paid to give information of all that happens." (p. 85)

Among the discontented were many people who felt that they were acting in perfect security because no notice was taken apparently of the plans they were forming or the intrigues they were carrying on, "... while in reality, the hundred eyes of Policy are upon their every action, and the sword is only suspended over their heads, that it may eventually fall with more severity" (p. 85). It was said that the Cardinal had bribed the evil spirits of the air to be his spies on men's actions (p. 79). This might well be a page from a history of Metternich's Austria, as Jászai describes that Empire.²⁰ The author states that it is probable that fear alone prevented for a long time the attempts to carry out many schemes against Richelieu's tyranny, but finally a group of his noblemen dared to conspire against "the master of his Master and the king of his King," as the Queen called Richelieu (p. 47), with the King's favorite, Cinq Mars, to lead "this conspiracy, --if that can be so called which has a King at its head, and princes for its support" (p. 61). When they met to draw up the articles of alliance, they declared,

Every man in this kingdom, from the King to the peasant, has felt, and does now feel, the evils which we are met to present. It is no longer zeal, but necessity, which urges us to oppose the tyranny of this daring minister. It is no longer patriotism, but self-defence. In such a case all means are

justifiable; for when a man (as Richelieu has done) breaks through every law, human and divine, to serve the ungenerous purposes of his own aggrandisement; when he sports with the lives of his fellow creatures with less charity than a wild beast, are we not bound to consider him as such, and to hunt him to the death for the general safety. (p. 152)

When the plot was detected, the conspirators for the King were condemned to death by the instigation of the Minister and the order of the King for conspiring against Richelieu, not against France. Richelieu had known that there were many against him: "Singly, they are but reeds, and one by one I would break them like reeds." (p. 341)

Richelieu contains reflections unfavorable to the characters of those in high places. Noblemen were held in little respect by their inferiors; few of them merited respect. As the robbers' song states, "The great were made for the poor man's prey" (p. 31), an attitude not tolerated by Metternich's system. Cinq Mars, on the whole admirable, was shown to be quite remiss in his duties; Gaston of Orleans, the King's brother, had engaged in other unfortunate conspiracies that had already brought more than one of his friends to the scaffold" (p. 291). Chavigni, who befriended the hero, held that in politics nothing is mean. Lafemas, the judge who served Richelieu, is called as cruel and as bloody-minded as a famished tiger (p. 191). Thus are revealed the chief nobles. Even Queen Anne of Austria is shown in many ways lacking as a queen.

Louis, deeply imbued with all the superstitions of the age, "put full faith in every part of astrology and dreaded nothing more than the

effects of enchantment" (p. 362). He was well aware of the plight into which he had fallen; after he had ordered the executions of his chief supporters, he yielded to his ancient dread of Richelieu, "sending him exculpatory messages, calling him his best friend and his cousin" (p. 365). As his wiser men realized, only death could free him from the hold of Richelieu.

The Roman Church is not treated with reverence by James in Richelieu. To top the list, there is the cruel and evil Cardinal himself who is shown in a manner that would bring discredit upon the Church. A Norman disguised as a friar seemed to be "as goodly a friar as ever cracked a bottle" (p. 274). He declared himself a Jesuit and his wife traveling with him a fair penitent; for

... good Jesuit fathers very often traveled about in disguise for purposes best known to themselves, and very few of the good fathers, whether Jesuits or not, were adverse to a fair penitent. (p. 273)

Here is further derogation of Jesuits which could hardly have escaped the censor's eyes in a country in which that order was becoming powerful.

There is danger of lessening the effectiveness of the teachings of the Roman Church, as well as the influence of her priests, contained in the novel. It is said that one can buy salvation for a hundred crowns and "You shall have an indulgence to commit sins ad libitum, in which high treason shall be specified by name" (p. 156). The novelist states

that in those days eternal mercy was farmed by the Church "like a turnpike on the high-road, and none could pass but such as paid toll." (p. 121)

To be used in hearing a confession for the purpose of gaining some information he sought, the Norman "friar" composed extempore prayers in a language of his own manufacture which the innkeeper devoutly believed to be Latin (p. 274). When a quarrel arose over the correctness of the form used by "Pere Alexis," a neighboring cure took up the quarrel, and a violent controversy ensued, which raged for more than fifty years in Champagne, producing nine hundred pamphlets, three thousand letters, twenty public discussions, and four Papal bulls, until at length some one suggested they write to the Jesuits of Alencon and demand their authority for such a deviation from established rules; upon doing so they discovered the hoax (p. 276)--a clever bit of satire at the expense of a Catholic practice.

Just as Richelieu contains much politically offensive material and some religious criticism that violated Metternich's policy, so does The Huguenot,²¹ James's account of the French Protestants during the reign of Louis XIV. In the novel Louis is called "a vicious, voluptuous, tyrannical monarch" (p. xvi), who, since he required something that would afford occupation for his "bigoted zeal," tried to make all French people become members of the Roman Catholic Church. He was as impetuous in this endeavor as he had formerly been in "more gross and sensual pursuits" (p. 240), so that many a faithful and loyal subject

found his way to the Bastille or the block as a result of Louis' zeal.

Louis' Court was not one to inspire the confidence of his subjects or confidence in the courts of other monarchs, for it was said that rulers were prevented from hearing the truth, even from the most sincere (p. 225). The novelist declares that pomp and pageantry, luxury and feasting, music, games and revelry are for palaces and capitals, not the groans and tears of the wronged and injured nor the cries and murmurs of the oppressed (p. 260). The Count prayed, "Heaven deliver me from the intrigues of a court" (p. 218). Though Louis himself was above spying, his favorite, Louvois, was not, and unless one sent his letters by private couriers, every word was sure to be known. One could substitute "Metternich" for "Louvois" and this statement would apply to the Austrian Court of the time of Francis I and Metternich just as well as to that of Louis XIV in France.²²

But it was the King, the "lord of the persecution: the harlot-monger and the murderer, who calls himself the King of France," who was blamed for the persecutions of the Protestants (p. 245). Those who remained loyal had their heads filled with

...ideas of respect and veneration for the king simply because he is the king and wears a crown--when if the truth were known, he is not so much worthy of respect and veneration as any of our peasants who drive a team of oxen...A selfish, voluptuous, adulterous tyrant.
(p. 168)

In addition to these derogatory remarks about a ruler, the author further invites censure by comparing a German prince to a mountebank's

dancing bear that thinks itself the "pink of politeness when it hands round a hat to gather the sous, growling between its teeth all the time it does so." (p. 139)

There are uprisings in this novel; the leaders of them are presented as heroes fighting against "a galling and unjust decree" the demand that they say they believe that "which we are sure is false, and follow doctrines which our souls repudiate" (p. 45), as one said. The title of one chapter, "Conspirators," might alone have secured the book the designation of restricted which the censors gave it in the police state. When the Protestants, who asked merely for freedom to worship, were forced to stop assembling, on punishment of death if they disobeyed, the people rebelled. Their resistance took the form of direct disobedience of royal orders and even an attempt upon the life of the King.

The foundation of the Catholic creed is undermined in The Huguenot by people from all walks of life ranging from the lowly blacksmith to the heroine, a Catholic turned Protestant, who said,

I cannot insult God by the mockery of faith in things regarding which my mind was long doubtful, but which I am now well assured, and thoroughly convinced, are false. (p. 236)

The Protestants thought a man could serve God singing the psalms of the Protestant minister "perhaps better" than if he sang them in Latin without, perhaps, understanding them. (p. 27) An Englishman was being kept in the Bastille for differing with the King in regard to

transubstantiation and for thinking that he would go "to the devil" at once when he died, without stopping half-way at a "post-house, called Purgatory," which a "set of scoundrels have established to suit their own particular conveniences." (p. 300)

The author himself disparages Catholicism by stating that not only the higher orders but also the lower classes of French Protestants were at that time much more generally enlightened and accustomed to the use of their reason than were the Catholics (pp. 165-66), for those of the "reformed church" "acknowledge no authority against the operation of reason, looking upon no man as perfect but one who broke down the barrier of sin between God and man, and made humanity divine" (p. 68). They believed that resistance to the will of those bigots and tyrants who would crush out the last spark of pure worship of God and substitute in its place the gross idolatry which disfigures this land was a duty to the "Author of our faith" (p. 46). They insisted that the Master when He said, "On this rock will I build my church" meant the rock of Faith; He did not "mean the trumpery juggle, the buffoon-like playing on the name of Peter, which the disciples of a corrupt sect would attribute to Him." (p. 45)

The men of the Church are called "hellish priests," "greasy priest," "superstitious bigots," who use "cunning devices to bribe and buy to the dominion of Satan the weak and wavering" (p. 150). Those who are persecuted by them speak of "the fraudulent voice of monkish hypocrisy pouring into your dying ear insults to your religion

and to your God" (p. 108), and of the iniquitous dealings of "those mistaken men who persecute others for their souls' sake" (p. 340). The King is called a "popish rascal."

Catholics are accused of allowing every falsehood, every misstatement, every perversion, every deceit, to be just and right and righteous, "so that the object to be obtained is the promotion of their own creed" (p. 153). The novelist speaks of the attempt to establish the authority of "the idolatrous church," to make converts "from the pure to the corrupted faith" (p. 48), for the "Idolatrous priesthood of this popish land are determined not to suffer a purer faith to remain any longer as an offense and reproach unto them." (p. 47)

The attitude of the Protestants, including the author himself of this novel for which Metternich's censors thought "limited" a sufficient degree of censure,²³ is well summed up by one man's declaration:

I will not see the whole herds of my fellow-Christians slaughtered like swine, to please the bloody butcher on the throne. I will not see the weak and the faint-hearted driven, by terror, to condemn their own souls and barter eternity for an hour of doubtful peace. I will not see the ignorant and the ill-instructed bought by scores, like cattle at a market. I will not see the infants torn from their mother's arms to be offered a living sacrifice to the Moloch of Rome. (p. 246)

After presenting the disturbed state of France in The Huguenot, G. P. R. James returns in Russell²⁴ to English history, presenting that period in the reign of Charles II, when "from the smallest possible beginning a sort of epidemic madness was communicated to at

least two-thirds of the English people," so that they were driven to acts of insane fury, almost without parallel in history (I, 99). Russell is the tale of a man beheaded for conspiring against the lives of Charles II and the Duke of York, although he was proved guilty only of maintaining that, "Failing all peaceable means, it is lawful, under a limited monarchy, to resist by arms the attempt to establish an arbitrary power" (II, 297-98). The expression of this belief alone would have sufficed to cause the entire book to be banned from the country ruled by Prince Metternich, if it had been published twenty years earlier than 1847. The title appears on the official list for September, 1847, with a designation of "restricted" only.²⁵ The political movements it relates constitute the chief offense to censors; surprisingly, there are only a few statements disrespectful to the Catholic Church in this story of an age in which that Church was much despised in England.

Plots abound in the novel; a very concise account of the Rye House Plot is given in which Lord Russell was named as a conspirator; his lawyers knew that he had done nothing but incur the King's disfavor by his advocacy of a limited monarchy, with Parliament acting as a constitutional check upon the King. He considered the "worst service the friends of liberty can render to the cause of order is to rest unprepared to resist tyranny" (II, 32). In his reasoning he saw the monarch's denying the people a means of resistance in the

senate as an act throwing them back upon physical force (I, 231). He insisted that only when all other means failed should this force be used.

Russell had tried to help put down the so-called Popish Plot and punish those who had taken part in it. But "The wild horses of popular fury had the bit in their teeth, and ran away with justice and equity," and he had no more power to guide their course than a child has to stop an avalanche (I, 257). He insisted that popular fury is a terrible thing (one statement by Russell that Metternich would have applauded),²⁶ but the impulsive Republican Sydney declared that it was "the scourge of God for the punishment of tyrants, and if it were oftener wielded by the Almighty hand, we should have more blessings and fewer curses upon earth." Sydney continued that it is no wonder that when men have raised one of themselves to be bowed down to and worshipped, they have been led into trouble (I, 225). He recalled the displeasure of God when the children of Israel chose themselves a king; he wondered why nations have not taken that lesson to heart and done without the "dangerous superfluity." (I, 225)

The conspirators who were engaged in the Rye House Plot were planning a general insurrection and the assassination of the King and the Duke of York. Men in high places were involved; Russell was interested only in preparation for a time when the people could see that they endangered their liberties by "fawning upon a despotic and papistical court"; he felt that any other action than a preparation for the future would have been mere madness. (II, 127)

A man who led a rebellion against a sovereign is made a hero: the noble Russell met death courageously, unjustly suffering for the efforts made to procure or secure a people's liberty (I, 263). There was an "inconceivable" mass of corrupt scheming going on in England, the greatest danger any country could face. Of this scheming it is said,

It was not alone in the court or the cabinet, or the courts of law, or the houses of Parliament, but in the very mansion and in almost every family in the land. The objects were different, perhaps, but the means the same. Everyone was plotting to gain some end--power, gold, station, love, honour, fame--all by tortuous paths, by cunning, trick, artifice, knavery, violence, but rarely violence where corruption would do. There was no shame; for from the King to the link-boy everyone knew his neighbor to be a rogue. (I, 83-84)

Noblemen followed the example set them by the King as he maintained his Court in revelry and amusement in the midst of scenes of blood and massacre. (I, 102) Courtiers were seducers and betrayers, who stooped to any trick to gratify their passions.

Although the emphasis upon rebellion against the King is the chief offense of the novel, the weaknesses and irresponsibility of the King are emphasized. That he saw the road justice should take but stood by and allowed injustice to rule is a very dastardly action of which the novelist accuses him.

The basic conflict in the novel Russell is that between the King and the Roman Church. The novelist states that many hated Catholicism, which was fighting for supremacy in seventeenth-century England; two

hundred years later it was still fighting for that supremacy in Austria. This fact could have caused Austrian thinkers to question the wisdom of their being officially returned to that Church.

Double offense to the censors is contained in such remarks as, "Human nature only wants an excuse to do dirty tricks: a magistrate's excuse is the law; a doctor's his profession; a priest's the church" (I, 303) --a reflection upon vested authority, in Church and State. The Earl of Virpont spoke of the monks' gallery as leading to a place frequented by "fat and foolish hypocrites, who cheated the people on specious pretences, furnished to them by wiser heads than their own." (I, 311)

A second novel dealing with the same events as does Russell is Mrs. Robinson's Whitefriars.²⁷ The "Popish Plot" with its murderous sequel, the conspiracy led by Shaftesbury, and that conspiracy within a conspiracy called the Rye House Plot are the cardinal events in the action of this novel as well as in Russell. That detestable and infamous villain Titus Oates appears here also, as does the Merry Monarch in all his weaknesses. These weaknesses are given more attention in Whitefriars than in Russell as the King revels in disguise in Alsatia.

Conspiracies against the King and anti-Catholicism are the two chief subjects of this novel, with the result that it was placed on the list of censored books for 1844 without a label.²⁸ Shaftesbury's was the type of bold, restless, Machiavellian policy which had sprung from

the sanguinary school of Richelieu, which did not scruple to use violent means to achieve desired ends (p. 107). Those who followed him blindly wanted to see a monarchical but strictly constitutional government; this moderate party wanted to put the Duke of Monmouth on the throne. Monmouth's destructive tendencies and impetuous character inclined Shaftesbury to want to re-establish a republic, but his hatred of York forced him to give Monmouth his support. Four factions were united under him to constitute a solid and powerful engine, a union which was the chief threat to the power of Charles II of England.

Within the great conspiracy was the Rye House Plot, in which Sydney had no part, but it was known that he opposed Charles and advocated a republic; so he was beheaded. The expression of Sydney's republican theories alone would have condemned the book in which it appears in the eyes of the country where it was censored.

Topping the list of degradation of those in authority is the picture of Charles in all his corruption. As "Old Rowley" we see him reveling in a public house in Whitefriars, more popularly called "Alsatia." Allusions are made to his group of mistresses, including the famous Nell Gwyn. When the heroine, Aurora Sydney, scorned his offer, Charles stooped to trickery to secure her; finally by taking a sleep-producing drug creating a death-like state so that he believed her actually dead, Aurora escaped him. The effect of her narrow escape was that her father, almost with his last breath said, "The sun shall draw thy blood

to heaven, and from thence a crimson cloud shall descend in tempests on this king-cursed earth." (p. 487)

It is further said of Charles: "Put no faith in Charles's promise. He hath deceived all men, and broken all pledges" (p. 456). Shaftesbury said to Mervyn, who had been wronged by Charles, "I trust you have learned what faith to put in princes." Mervyn answered that when he put any, he would deserve the betrayal that was certain. (p. 398)

It is the "Popish Plot" which forms the backbone of this tale; "that terrible plot which was destined to shed so much blood ere it coiled itself up in peace" (p. 152) was a strenuous attempt by the Roman Church to crush the great northern heresy. The chief ministers and propagandists of the Catholic Church were the Jesuits, called the most prudent, subtle, ambitious, and successful of all the great societies forming the armies of Catholicism throughout the globe. Mrs. Robinson relates the attitude of the people of seventeenth-century England toward this society of churchmen whom they saw as

... little better than a direct emanation from the devil, and its members were endowed in the popular imagination with little less power and inclination to do evil than the fiends who surround the throne of Beelzebub himself. The vulgar hatred represented them as the cause of all the evils which befell the nation at home and abroad. It was the Jesuits who turned the swords of Catholic Spain and France against the great bulwark of heresy; the Jesuits who destroyed London by fire, and devastated its population with the plague; the Jesuits who caused the perpetual quarrels arising between Charles and his

subjects;--for it was tacitly understood by the masses that their king, his brother, and the Court were engaged heart and soul in the stupendous project of the re-establishment of popery. (p. 152)

Of course, the rascally Oates had nothing but scathing criticism for the Jesuits, calling them "sanctified hypocrites" and "Jesuitical rogues," engaged in "a pious robbery," "a popish and royal conspiracy" to root out the "northern heresy" (p. 161), called the "Popish Plot," in order to re-establish the dominion of the ancient Roman Church. The Jesuits never receive a kind word in the English novels making up this study.

In a newspaper account of the Earl d'Aumerle's murder in the Tower, the Earl was called "a popish lord" and the Catholic faith "a devilish religion (or rather atheistical pantheism)." There followed a tirade against the Pope and all the Cardinals, who were designated as the Antichrist and his devils. (p. 66)

When the young Mervyn acquired Boccaccio's works and read the satire upon churchmen,

...it seemed strange to him that in the period of her greatest grandeur and prosperity, such rottenness should be at the very heart of the church. This shook the foundation of all his beliefs. (p. 96)

So the young nobleman was lost to the cause.

Although there was much and bitter hatred of the Catholic Church in England before Oates's "grand assault on the Beast," as he called that Church (p. 333), it was his stirrings which constituted the heart

of the fight against the Roman Church as revealed in Whitefriars.

Among the many unkind things said about that Church, its men and its creed, are these:

I trow there is no man in England so arrant an ass as to believe anything a Jesuit can say or swear, considering the damnable power of absolving from all oaths alleged by your abominable church, and the Antichrist at its head.
(p. 321)

A dying Catholic was assured he faced "eternal damnation!--perishing soul and body in thy idolatrous misbelief!" (p. 300). As Algernon Sydney was facing immediate execution, he said he regarded God the sole judge between Himself and His creatures, that he needed no intercessor and placed no reliance upon exterior forms (p. 502). No Catholic would like this declaration; neither would he like the many, many times the expression, "popish," and "popery," "popisher," and "papist" are used in derision in the book. There is considerable talk of divorce, and the hero and heroine considered suicide; she mused, "God is not so merciless as man--He will forgive me. He knows how far He has made humanity to endure, and that I have reached the limit" (p. 480). Then as Mervyn faced the noose, the "unconvincing theology of the Jesuits," in which he had been well instructed, lost power for him (p. 465). The Earl of Essex said he would risk all--life, children, property--sooner than submit to arbitrary power and popish tyranny. (p. 169)

This no-popery mania which "insanified the whole English nation" during the reigns of Charles II and James II, and its specific effects

upon individuals and the nation are well revealed by Smith in his historical novel in three volumes, Arthur Arundel.²⁹ When it was published in 1844, little time elapsed before it appeared on the July, 1845, official list of books censored by the officials of the Austrian Empire, with the label of "restricted" in circulation.³⁰

Walter Scott's democratic custom of making commoners the heroes of some of his novels is followed by Smith, who has chosen the unknown son of a Colonel Arundel as his hero in order to reveal the story of the revolution of the late seventeenth century which resulted in the deposition of James II from the throne of England. Arthur, deformed by a fall resulting from his mother's fanatical hatred of Catholicism, had formed a strong conviction that his country was ready for a change of rulers. In the scene Arthur saw at Whitehall the author says,

He read the ominous hand-writing on the wall which announced that the Stuarts, unteachable even by execution and proscription, had been weighed in the balance and found wanting; and that the crown which they knew not how to wear should shortly be smitten from their heads. (I, 110)

Then Smith says of the Catholic James II,

True, he was uxorious and yet inconstant, a slave to the forms and dogmas, a stranger to the spirit of Christianity, a laborious plodder in the details of king-craft while utterly incapable of any comprehensive views of policy. (III, 295)

The revolutionists, Arundel, Sydney, and others, recapitulated all the arbitrary and unconstitutional measures of the King since his accession, noting the proofs of his intention to convert the monarchy

into an absolute despotism, both civil and religious, resulting in the growing disaffection of the people and his final overthrow. The hero observed as he watched James that he little knew that those around him, pretending loyalty and devotion, had already signed a document declaring their intention to overthrow him (II, 280). This is the thing Metternich ever dreaded as he was trying to maintain an absolute monarchy with which there was growing dissatisfaction.

In the story, Arthur Arundel went to visit William of Orange to propose that he come to England to occupy James's throne. William only awaited the right time, when the people under the rule of James II were ready to combine in a struggle against almost daily encroachments upon their liberties, something which did not exist in the eyes of the Austrian rulers of the early nineteenth century.

There is further criticism of princes. As Arthur went to petition William, he went by way of France where he saw Louis' Court and the countryside. He witnessed the almost famishing peasantry, and insisted it must be contrary to the intentions of Providence that so many must slave, yet starve, in order to supply the luxuries of one. He was repelled by the "adulation and gross idolatry" surrounding the French King (I, 161), a commoner repelled by the behavior at the royal court.

Although he sought him as a future ruler of his own land, Arundel found that William of Orange was not, himself, all that one should be who would serve as an example for the people to follow. During his

period of preparation to enter England, he sent to James II, his father-in-law, a signed letter stating that his armament was merely a defense against France, not intended for use against James's throne as rumor would have it; this was of course a great falsehood. (II, 11)

The author calls us away from "the poor magnificence of King and Kaiser, from the paltry palaces of crowned worms" (I, 234) to a subject equally detestable to the Austrian State censors: the "prevalent horror of Popery" (I, 4) seen throughout the book. Arthur's mother spoke for many seventeenth-century Englishmen when she could believe nothing good of any Catholic, that "All treachery, all perfidy, all deceit --the Pope and the devil are at the bottom of it" (I, 82). She said, "Crosses and crucifixions and any such monkish mummary...are marks of the beast" (I, 126). The plot against the King, she insisted, was his own fault, for "if he had no Popish plots there would have been no Protestant conspiracies." (I, 268)

The hero added to the belittling of Catholicism which is so prevalent in the novel (I, 151). He talked of the splendors of Versailles, saying that the construction of St. Peter's at Rome, plus the other extravagances of Julius the Second, had contributed as much to the Reformation as had the moral abuses of other Pontiffs. He wondered what would be the effect of Versailles where waste and profligacy combined. As he hastened from his visit in France towards the Hague, he observed that in the Dutch States where the reformed religion prevailed,

the appearance of the country as well as the population presented a marked contrast to those of France.

Here were no monasteries, and convents; no crowds of idle monks and friars; no privileged classes flaunting in finery and revelling in luxury, while the great bulk of the community were gaunt with penury; no crowds of beggars; no gaudy Court, whose outrageous extravagance was only to be equalled by its profligance. (I, 179)

Here is an account of a condition of which Catholic masses and subjects of a king should not read. The novelist himself observes,

Nay, have not men in all ages sought to buy heaven itself by donations to shrines, and purchased masses and posthumous charities, that are but so many attempts to throw blinding gold dust into the eyes of Omniscience. (II, 198)

Not only does Arthur Arundel contain derogation of princes, rebellion against authority, and anti-Catholicism, but also it degrades noblemen by revealing much immorality among those in high places and among the people in general, following the example of the lax morals of the courts. Typical of such immorality among the upper classes was the behavior of Lady Newhaven, who became the mistress in turn of several famous men, of whom one was Arthur's brother Rupert.

Arthur Arundel was an ardent friend of liberty, an impression which his reading had tended to conform (I, 110), but that is an expression of opinion which the censors working under the "Coachman of Europe" would never allow. In addition, the novelist adds to the offense by his observations at the close of the novel that "the national horror of

Popery" was inflamed into a perfect frenzy, and thus, for the first time perhaps in the history of the country, all the people, except a paltry and powerless section of Catholics, were united against the government. He insists that a bright halo encircles the heads of those brave patriots who hazarded their lives and fortunes to liberate their country from the civil and religious despotism with which it was threatened. (III, 291-92)

Smith concludes that by the Revolution several great questions had been decided and placed beyond the reach of future cavil: the divine right of kings and the duty of passive obedience in subjects were consigned forever to the burial place of untenable and exploded superstitions; the maxim of hereditary indefeasible right in the sovereign was renounced, and the power of the Crown was acknowledged to flow from no other fountain than that of a contract with the people; allegiance and protection were declared to be reciprocal ties, depending upon each other, thus making the executive power of the monarch a merely conditional trust. Metternich would not agree that these questions were settled for Europe, nor would he allow his people to read such heresy, stressing the love of liberty and rights of people, denying the rights of absolute monarchs.

Scott's The Pirate³¹ is the last of the novels included in this study which are set in the seventeenth century. It is the story of Zetland, a land of omens and superstitions just after the Bloodless Revolution in England.

The story is that of the pirate Cleveland, who had broken the law of every land, yet he was treated with great respect by the principal people of the island, when he was washed ashore and saved by young Mordaunt. Scott has made of him a hero, treating him entirely sympathetically. He makes a definite point in the story of the fact that on one of their pillaging sprees in Spain, Cleveland prevented his pirate band from doing physical violence to the people they robbed. The result was that his crew mutinied and deposed him. One of his loyal men reflected that in Queen Bess's time, or merry King Charles's, men were knighted for "plundering" countries; but all that was ended; piracy had become a crime. However, Scott ends the account of his protagonist with his being saved from death on the gallows in consideration of his kindnesses to the victims of his piracy. He was said to have gone to war and died a hero's death, a resolution prepared for by Scott's usual democratic interest in the lower classes of people.

The presentation of an outlaw seaman as such a noble creature would have been objectionable to the censors. Certainly all the talk about rebellion which the book contains, plus other faults, won for it a place on the list of forbidden books.³² Probably, had Metternich himself been doing the censoring, one allusion alone would have sufficed to procure for this work the forbidden label it was given; the reference was to one of the Bearded Men "who came forth at Versailles, on the memorable October 5, 1789, the delighted executioner of the victims

delivered up to him by a bloodthirsty rabble" of France (II, 278). This expression recalled what perhaps was the basis for the Chancellor's abnormal fear of rebellion in any form--the abhorred French Revolution. It has been said that the Metternich policy was designed to exorcise the ghost of Napoleon.³³

Magnus Troil, landlord of the territory of Jarlshof, and his older daughter were the two in the story who advocated resistance, showing a rebellious spirit arising from their exaggerated sense of patriotism, a spirit which Scott usually succeeds in instilling into at least one character in each novel. However, in this book the Scotsman with the exaggerated sense of devotion to country is Yellowley, a rather ridiculous figure, an unexpected twist on the part of the novelist, who is usually quite sentimental about his fellow Scots. The Udaller said, in discussion of the demand that they pay customs to Scotland as well as the King's dues, "It is the part of an honest man to resist these things. I have done so all my life, and will do so to the end of it" (I, 277). However, until the people quit pillaging wrecks and learned to regard the rights of those who suffered by the winds and the waves, he felt they deserved to be oppressed and "hag-ridden as we have been and are by the superior strength of the strangers who rule us" (I, 276). Minna hoped her father would soon be able to rise in resistance against their proud Scottish neighbors, while they were divided among themselves and engaged at home by fresh uprisings: the Highlands against the Lowlands, the Williamites against the Jacobites, the Whigs against the

Tories, and the whole kingdom of England against that of Scotland. She insisted the tame spirit of the Orcadians caused them to miss every chance which these incidents had given them to emancipate the islands from the Scottish Yoke (I, 278). Yellowley thought such talk against the King's customs and the King's crown could only end in the gallows. Metternich would have agreed.

By the nineteenth century when Austrian censors were in operation, their Church tried to dissuade belief in the occult arts, other than divine miracles. Consequently, the officers dedicated to advancing the spread of Catholicism would have objected to the presentation of the supernatural in The Pirate. Even Scott seems to have been aware that he had overdone preternaturalism, for in the introduction to The Fortunes of Nigel he promises in that work he will make no use of "dreams, or presages, or obscure allusions to future events." (I, xxiv-xxv)

The novelist carefully explains that those supposed to possess supernatural powers were venerated in the earlier stages of society. Since Zetland was in a little world by itself, among the lower and ruder classes much of the ancient northern superstition remained that venerated those affecting such supernatural abilities as power over the elements. They admitted that some magicians had power from Satan while they believed others dealt with spirits of a different and less odious class (I, 79). Supernatural occurrences in the novel were centered around one woman, Norna of Fitful-Head, who stated, "I am

taken from humanity to be something pre-eminently powerful, pre-eminently wretched" (I, 306-307). She insisted she had paid a great price for her power--her father, her lover, her child--and that she was not one of those who leagued themselves with the Enemy of Mankind or had her powers from him (I, 155). Her cousin Magnus Troil, the Udaller, a highly respected man of means who once planned to marry her, said

I pretend not to be a wiser man than my forefathers were in their time, and they all believed that, in cases of great worldly distress, Providence opened the eyes of the mind and afforded the sufferers a vision of futurity.(II, 94)

His respect for his country extended to its superstitions, and if he never "rendered a precise assent to Norna's high supernatural pretensions, he was not at least desirous of hearing them disputed by others." (II, 7)

Many of the lower classes feared her as they revered her. Among the young, more enlightened ones, who had seen many evidences of her arts, there were varying opinions of her powers. When a college man from Scotland witnessed the sudden quieting of a storm at her command, he was strongly inclined to believe in "the ascendancy of the occult arts over powers of nature" (I, 88). Young Brenda Troil doubted, yet feared, her powers, insisting she thought Norna a woman of extraordinary abilities very often united with a strong cast of insanity; she considered her better skilled in the signs of the weather than was any other woman in Zetland (I, 312). Cleveland told Norna he held

her as one who knew how "to steer upon the current of events, but I deny your power to change its course" (II, 270). Mordaunt doubted the very existence of the supernatural powers attributed to Norna, a high flight of incredulity in the country where they are generally received, but still his skepticism went no further than doubts. She was unquestionably an extraordinary woman, gifted with an energy above others, acting upon motives peculiar to herself and apparently independent of earthly consideration. Her intelligence, however acquired, had been always strangely accurate. (II, 279)

Scott is less critical of the Catholic Church in The Pirate than he is in many of his works. It was said that there were countries in which "the priests will sell you a portion of Heaven" (I, 105). The author speaks of the making of a vow to the kirk for the safety of the fishermen and boats as "an ancient Catholic superstition not yet wholly abolished." In a description of the ancient church at Thule are these observations by the novelist:

...that mighty system of Roman superstition which spread its roots all over Europe had not failed to extend them even to this remote archipelago, and Zetland had, in the Catholic times, her saints, her shrines, and her relics; which though little known elsewhere, attracted the homage, and commanded the observance, of the simple inhabitants of Thule. Their devotion to this Church of St. Ninian... was particularly obstinate, and was connected with so much superstitious ceremonial and credulity that the Reformed clergy thought it best to prohibit all spiritual service within its walls as tending to foster the rooted faith of the simple and rude people around in saint-worship and other erroneous doctrines of the Romish Church. (II, 71)

Chapter V

Novels Set in the Eighteenth, Nineteenth, and Twenty-First Centuries

Walter Scott's Waverley¹ is the only novel in this study representing the eighteenth century. It relates the attempt of the Young Pretender to regain the throne of England for the Stuarts. Here is an instance of a Catholic Prince's rebellion against a Protestant King. Again the Catholic censors must have had mixed feelings. However, rebellion it was, and accounts of rebellion by anyone anywhere must be censored. So the very fact that the novel presents the details of this insurrection would account for its being limited in circulation in the Austrian Empire in 1824.²

Although James II had willfully forfeited his crown and the House of Hanover had reigned in peace for four generations, there were hundreds of British ready to take arms against the government. Those people were encouraged by promises of help from abroad and threats of foreign invasion. Amidst such disaffection the slightest indication of sympathy for the Stuart cause might infer criminality just as did any indication of a tendency toward democracy in the Metternich regime.³ Scott was himself loyal to the Hanovers and shows clearly in the novel why the attempt to unseat them failed; as was his usual method, he attempts to present both sides of the situation, showing little bias.

Among the many who found fault with the existing Hanover government was a family of Waverleys, politically active nobles somewhat under

suspicion as a result of the memorable year 1716 when another attempt to unseat the Hanovers had been made. At that time there were reports of private musters of tenants and horses by Waverley and of cases of arms purchased in Holland directed to Everard Waverley. As a result of a series of occurrences the hero of the novel, Edward Waverley, formerly loyal to the Hanovers, inadvertently became a rebel against the reigning monarch.

The Hanover government was criticized by others as well as by the older Waverleys. The severity of this line of rulers was said to be the result of their being "harrassed by just apprehensions and a consciousness of their own illegality and insecurity" (I, 257). They were called by many "the rats of Hanover" (I, 89), who always deserved to be hanged for rascals (II, 188); by the time of the occurrences related in Waverley they had had time to show their native character (I, 231). However it was the implications by Talbot, a loyal and powerful friend to the government, which contains the worst of the indictments against the authorized government. Talbot resolved to save Waverley from death for treason by having him keep out of sight until the government had appeased their wrath, for it would be a matter of "first come, first served" with them (II, 216) until their anger was spent, rather than an honest trial and judgment of the offenders.

It is the relation of rebellion itself in this book which constitutes the greatest danger for Metternich's readers. Although he indicates that the attempt to unseat the Hanover King was ill-advised, the author

arouses sympathy for Edward, even justifying his entrance into the insurrection; he also presents the Pretender Prince himself as a noble young man. Prince Edward endeared himself to his followers by showing great kindness, generosity, sympathy, and understanding, as well as sound reasoning and good judgment. When Edward Waverley was presented to him, the Prince welcomed him to "a cause which has little to recommend it but its justice" (II, 37). No rebellion against a ruler was "just" to Metternich, even that of a Catholic against a Protestant.

However, there were as many seeds of intrigue at the Pretender's "court," all with separate objectives (II, 141), as might have done honor to the court of a large empire. Most of those rebels were like the Highlander who said the clansmen were for their leader's king; they did not care much which of them it was (I, 159). This tendency of the masses to follow radical leaders of factions is the thing which Metternich's whole system was designed to combat.⁴ In the novel one such radical leader was Fergus, whose brain was a perpetual workshop of schemes and intrigues of every possible kind, and this "brave, generous, exalted, high-souled man," thought it "little to cut a way for his master to the British throne." Scott approves his devotion to the cause if not his behavior. With his customary honesty in presenting characters truthfully, Scott says of this leader of insurgents that although he had many good qualities which made him the more dangerous in that these attributes enabled him to attract to himself more insurgents, he had

brought many hundreds of men into the field, who without him would never have broken the peace of the country (II, 270). Even more noble and equally determined than he was his sister; both zealots lived only "for the cause."

In addition to the great rebellion there are three others mentioned in the book, the first two being especially dangerous suggestions: there was that one in 1715 for the Stuarts which, like the one in 1745 failed; when the Pretender's army reached Carberry Hill, the reader is reminded that it was there that "the lovely Mary surrendered herself to her insurgent subjects" (II, 81). The civil war in the Low Country was mentioned (II, 12). That France was aiding even slightly the people of a land to rebel against those vested with authority over them was not a good example for those of nineteenth-century Western Europe, for liberal doctrines out of France had set off the revolutionary spirit, the spread of which was to be prevented.

Only a few minor offenses to the religion of the censors are contained in Waverley. There was a duel between the Baron of Bradwardine and the Laird of Balmawhapple. It was said that there would be a day when the land should give testimony against "popery... and a' the errors of the church" (I, 277). There was a general belief in magic among the Highlanders to which the Church would have objected. However, the statement most insulting to Catholics is an assurance to an Episcopalian,

...that your surplices, and your capes and vestments,
are but cast-off garments of the muckle harlot that
sitteth upon seven hills and drinketh the cup of
abominations. (II, 2)

These offenses to Catholic reviewers were slight compared to those by Mrs. Mary Sherwood in her two stories, The Nun and The Monk of Cimies,⁵ truly diatribes against the Roman Catholic Church; as a result of this fact, The Monk appears on the list of books censored in Austria, in September, 1840, but without label,⁶ for not one other offense, moral or political, appears in the entire book. The principal character told his story hoping to help others avoid mistakes like his. He insisted that residues of popery in the Church of England, namely, that dependence on faith alone would not suffice and that there were evidences to prove God was not the Maker and Preserver of all things (pp. 50-51), led him into popery by the help of a deep and calculating Jesuit.

Edmund declared that the ministers of popery were willing to move heaven and earth to make a proselyte, "nay, and even stoop to dabble with the politics of hell" (p. 96). He was led from "the belief of one lie to another of the absurdities of popery" (p. 135), for "Romish superstition provided itself with machinery to help work its will on the minds of men" (p. 172). He yielded his "soul entirely to superstition" and "the adulterous church had got me in her net" (p. 153), the church he called "that deepest conception and mightiest achievement of Satan; into which he hath admitted the whole cannon of truth and yet contrived that it should teach error" (p. 126). He had felt drawn to popery because it placed few obstructions to the gratification of his passions,

and he could obtain the Church's favor without paying the strictest attention to morality.

Here again is much material defaming Jesuits, who had become very powerful in nineteenth-century Austria, as well as many other criticisms of Catholics. Edmund observed that the base Jesuitical cunning that tied him by the "yoke of the papal Antichrist" in the Church of Rome, "Satan's work" (p. 127), was wholly consistent with "the leading principle of the Antichrist,"--that the end sanctifies the means (p. 140). There is much condemnation of practices of Catholicism such as doing penances, the "abominable custom of confession," and the requirement of a human mediator between God and man, as well as such remarks as that the monastery's "piazzas are fitted for such deeds as shun the eye of day."

The roses on the brow of a corpse were said to be as artificial as all else in the system to which she had been made the sacrifice" (p. 262). She had died of excessive cold and fasts, "ill-usage--some mysterious and terrible persecution often practised within those dark and shut-up abodes, falsely termed abodes of holy peace and joy" (p. 259). She calmly, but obstinately and determinately, threw away her rosary and cross and uttered blasphemy against the holy mother church and all its sacred ordinances by saying, "None but Christ--no, none but Christ!" If she had been permitted, she would have told the world "that which was not to be told"; the church officials took such measures as would render that impossible--they administered poison. (p. 289)

As Edmund fled from the "whole illusion of popery" he did not dare think of the deeds committed in those grottoes. He thanked God that this spirit of Antichrist had been robbed of its power in England (p. 181). He had found unbelief growing rapidly upon his mind as a result of being behind the scenes of such a "mighty piece of mummery as that of popery" (p. 253). The marble images were "touchingly, awfully alive, and showed what men could do in rendering idolatry acceptable even to a refined intellect" (p. 182). The narrator said,

They set up their church, their preacher, or their sect so high between themselves and their Redeemer, that the Divine Merits are continually hidden from their eyes by those of their saints, and they are induced to arrogate to these those health and life giving attributes which belong to God. (p. 78)

He declared the Catholic faith emphasizes the death and not the triumphant resurrection of Christ (p. 168) and substitutes the "doctrines of demons in the place of the doctrine of justification by Christ alone." (p. 78)

In the papal church, dull, brutish ignorance among the men was not rare, for they could go through the routine of form as well as could a bright man, yet they had as much power to forgive sins as did the Pope himself (p. 197). Edmund believed that many of his brethren had intimacies in the peasant houses nearby (p. 177), while in the monastery the priest was as jealous of a fair sister's regard as ever man was of woman (p. 187). The narrator recalls that the young priests are asked to give up women but are allowed to contemplate the loveliest

female forms art can create. The papists he knew seemed to delight in sending souls to hell, a place whose secrets they knew well and enjoyed using to torture their fellow-creatures (p. 175). For popery makes one uncharitable in regard to his fellows as would naturally follow where there is much profession and little reality. Nothing could be more contrary to nature, and to that social principle which the Almighty acknowledged when He said, "It is not good for man to be alone; I will make a help mate for him," than is the system of monastic life, but

Man must be wiser than God; he must cause man to live with men, and females to associate only with females. Oh! Who can tell the mischief which has been done by that power of which one of the leading marks is the forbidding them to marry! (p. 176)

Again he added that forbidding of marriage casts contempt upon parents, loosens all the sacred ties of life, and even

The Almighty himself is reproached for having established those laws of nature and inspired those affections, which, under submission to his will, form the happiness of this present life. (p. 256)

In conclusion of this subject may be placed his question of what has been the fruit of the Antichrist's "condemning as unholy the divinely appointed ordinance of marriage." (p. 29)

Also Mrs. Sherwood secured her account of the nun who escaped from the convent of Notre Dame de Misericord a place on the list of censored books⁷ by stating among other disparagements, that the "great Roman Catholic apostasy, with its power, splendor, and means

of exciting the passions to the utmost" possesses a "mystery such as is emphatically denominated in Scripture 'the mystery of iniquity.'" (p. 3)

Like The Monk, The Nun⁸ contains not the slightest material that could have been considered dangerous except that which would weaken the faith of the Austrians in the Roman Catholic Church. It is the story related by Sister Angelique of her observations and experiences as a pensionnaire before civil authorities raided her convent and she escaped. Creeds, practices, and clergy are indicted as she relates the crimes, the deceptions, the cruelties she knew. She declares that she soon saw that all the arrangements in a convent are made for effect, in that every ceremony forms a picture; and the Old Serpent, "the primum mobile of this great system, has retained his peculiar characteristic, that of fascinating by the eye" (p. 26). The nuns were trained to appear gay, happy, carefree, to impress visitors with the desirable life within (p. 19); the rulers of monastic orders skillfully fit their temptations to the state of mind of the person whom they wish to allure--"stooping to arts which would hardly be believed" (p. 18). The novice calls the ritual of taking the veil "leading the victim... to the shrine of superstition" (p. 29) and other ceremonies pieces of "jugglery" (p. 79), in that "frightful prison house" of the self-tortures inflicted and required by the Church, the most "severe tyrant" on earth, with all her gaudy external trappings, her "mummery and mystery." (p. 132)

Used in the "vain and blasphemous ceremonies," in which form is everything, she found many "superstitious devices" and emblems of idolatry with which the apostate church loves to adorn her sanctuaries" (p. 12), such as the paintings of the supposed life of the Virgin which she declared were "blasphemous absurdities" (p. 52). She questioned whether there can be "holiness inherent in images made by man's hand." (p. 69)

The depiction of Church officials would not have helped the Catholic cause in nineteenth-century Europe. Angelique began soon to doubt the veracity and sincerity of her spiritual guides.

If these spiritual rulers are right, I do not hesitate to say the Scriptures are false; but if the Scriptures are right, the Roman Catholic Church is idolatrous, corrupt, deceitful, and altogether abominable. (p. 204)

Monastic establishments were being destroyed in France (p. 194), and questioned in other countries as one nun was made to "feel the furious and unrelenting nature of popish bigotry" (p. 195), standing trial for heresy when she was caught with a Bible. During the trial the nuns heard the father descend to the most vehement and offensive language (p. 91) and the abbess pour upon the offender a torrent of expletives, which are "not unseldom in the mouth of a zealous Catholic" (p. 186). The helpless nun implored "mercy where mercy never was, -- from an offended and jealous member of the great papal anti-Christian church." (p. 212)

The novices wondered why there were dark subterranean chambers in the Convent at St. Siffren unless they were intended for concealing

transactions which would not bear the light (p. 84). The Nun declared it must ever be remembered that in the Church of Rome the end always sanctifies the means (p. 35). The rulers had locked the Sister Agnace in a concealed tomb-like cell for thirty years, and Clarice expected them "to exercise their will upon me in their secret councils in whatever way might suit them best" (p. 208), as punishment for her renouncing "that form of worship which had for ages maintained its influence over the earth by deeds of horror" (p. 212), such as those described by Mrs. Sherwood.

Objectionable as the observations cited were, worse still would be the many criticisms of the principles and dogmas of the Roman faith. Angelique found that the dominant principle was "the more pain the more merit" (p. 50), and that practices required of her were in many instances idolatrous in the highest degree, such as the Catholic misappropriation of scriptural passages, and the custom of calling those who take the veil the espoused of the Lord. She insisted,

It is manifest that such honour is paid to the Virgin and saints as is due only to God; and that when Mary is addressed as Mediatrix, as she is in all offices of the Virgin, the high prerogatives of our blessed Lord are violated, and his dignity as Mediator taken away from him and given to another. Also, it must be evident, that the man who assumes the rule and government of a pretended universal church on earth, with the unearthly attribute of perfectibility, is guilty of a grievous heresy. (p. 176)

The Nun and her companions in the convent suffered keenly the need of the assurance that salvation is the gift of God, not the reward

of works, when they were constantly reminded that through the imperfections of nature and their duties, they might be condemned to ages of suffering in the flames of purgatory, that their merits might be rendered null, even in their last hours of life, by some failure in the required forms (p. 111). She objected to the repetition of prayers in Latin or other foreign tongue which she did not understand. (p. 25)

The nuns wondered if their spiritual rulers were not taking more upon themselves than Scripture authorizes and were teaching nothing but what the Bible approves, why they were so determined to keep the Scriptures out of the girls' sights (p. 118). They were assured, "It is an interdicted volume; its tendency is all contrary to Mother Church and her ceremonies" (p. 174). If one asserts the privilege to judge and think for himself, he denies the authority of the Church and is justly chargeable with heresy (p. 189). "Reflection, intellectual light, and reason have ever been inimical to the doctrines of the apostate church" (p. 42). As Clarice read the sacred book, she was led to reject one popish error after another, although she was still a veiled and cloistered nun. Its truths set her free from all the terrors and fears she had known. The man who "was tempted to consider himself Prime Minister of Europe"⁹ would certainly have opposed this argument for an open Bible,¹⁰ as well as the mass of degrading remarks about Catholicism and its priests and practices contained in The Nun.

The inclusion of Lord Roldan¹¹ on the official list of Austrian

censored books¹² was the result of its containing much matter uncomplimentary to the Catholic Church, also, and very much material advocating those things most abhorred by Metternich, democracy and revolution which he considered equally great dangers.¹³

In his novel, Allan Cunningham tells of the Scottish people who had once or twice raised their banner against their own liege lords, not submitting without blows (I, 16); of Negroes and mulattoes who attacked the whites on the island of Hispaniola, the outbreaks of the revolution which ended in the sway of the blacks (I, 223); and of that far-reaching revolt, the French Revolution, the war which was the primary motivating force behind the entire "quarantine" action on the part of Metternich.

The illegitimate son of Lord Roldan, Morison Roldan, saw that the "evil spirit of hereditary rank" was the idol to which he and his mother had been sacrificed. He resolved that that idol should be cast down (II, 22); having heard that the French had not only tired "o' their king and chappit his head off, but hae preached a crusade against a' fawk wi' crowns and coronets" (I, 213), Morison joined them in the Revolution. Morison once told his Nobleman father to make the most of his advantages, for the nobility's

...lease is nigh run; the time is at hand, when sense, and worth, and genius will resume their sway, and hereditary rank whether of prince or of peer, will be thrown aside as a piece of rent apparel. (II, 110)

A victim of social inequality, Morison was a perfect tool for the revolutionists of France. From the time Camille Renault told him of his efforts to spread the idea of rebellion against tyranny and the establishment of democracy, until he saw Napoleon not only depriving his enemies of their freedoms but also of denying those same freedoms to the French, Morison fought bravely and successfully for what he thought would spread liberty and equality, the gracious things promised. Half the world expected the "highest genius in the highest places, to rule according to the purpose of the Creator." The poor expected to be rich; depressed genius hoped to be exalted; and the many who rejoiced in the downfall of those above them hailed the French republic, desiring to see a similar regeneration elsewhere.

Morison's "heart clung with a deeper throb to those heroic souls who had resisted oppression, and had triumphed or fallen in defense of their country's independence" (I, 232). He was filled with wonder and admiration to hear of the leveling of all ranks and degrees of men in France. He assured Robert Burns that it was his verse that first "poured this Solway-tide of freedom into my soul" (II, 50), for Burns was once told, "Whether it be verse or prose, you cannot abstain from a fling at the higher powers." (II, 51)

Morison saw that a spirit had arisen which kings could not charm down; the censorship of this novel was one effort to "charm down" that spirit. France had served her apprenticeship to freedom in America and returned home to throw off "at one gigantic effort" a ten centuries'

load of oppression from her back and stand erect and free. "France fought nobly; God justified the principles of creation, and gave victory to those who claimed freedom for their birthright" (II, 44). Morison was said to have leagued himself with those who had the power to pull down the titled of the earth, restore the order of nature, and fulfill the intentions of Providence, who had the sword in one hand for tyrants, and were holding out the other in a brotherly grasp for all who had souls to be free and equal. (II, 86)

The army of Napoleon insisted that they were on a crusade on behalf of liberty, and that compared to them, the highest prince was a reptile. All of the soldiers' talk and songs were about conquering kingdoms, crushing thrones, and setting the feet of freemen on the necks of kings (II, 100). With Morison they believed the time had come when the natural rights of men would triumph alike over the "blind dotage of priestcraft and the tyrannic and excessive privileges of those who call themselves the nobly born and the far-descended" (II, 66). "The earth must have a dynasty of intellectuals; she had too long endured the sway of the dunces" (I, 233). The Revolution had achieved good as well as evil (Metternich would not admit this point), for it had taught kings that thrones are not safe which are not supported by the people; it had told a hundred millions of men by how few they had allowed themselves to be enslaved; and it had proved that when princes become enemies and nobles leave the land, enough of worth and courage and genius can be

found in hut and cottage to save an empire and increase its glory (II, 123). Some of the world's best leaders are plowboys and grooms, and the world will see arise out of the rottenness and feculence of monarchy a pure republic in which there would be no hereditary princes to oppress them with their folly and monopolize all the honors (II, 81). Morison's Scottish friends re-echoed their hero's ideas, declaring they would show the lordlings the way to justice, as they assembled to plant the tree of freedom, swearing they would moisten it and make it prosper with the blood of tyrants (II, 32). As has been noted Metternich believed "the people" his greatest enemy.¹⁴

Not only does the book glorify democracy and the rebellion aimed at securing it, but it contains much anti-Catholic material. The reformed Kirk of Glengarnock was polluted by a relic of popery in the form of a repentance stool. Jeanie wondered why "one sae sensible" as the Catholic Nanse should "traffic and troke wi' the black delusions of papistry," and another was called "blind with the delusions of papistry" (I, 30). Winifred Roldan was called a "good woman; it's a pity she's a papist" (I, 34). A Cameronian said of her, "She lives among gods of stone and brass: will they save her? na, na!" (I, 34). Another "wadna bow the knee to Baal and worship their saints, whiek we ca' idols" (I, 90). When a Catholic drowned, it was said to be for adherence to the "scarlet church of erroneous Rome." (I, 148) One Protestant insisted,

And the Romish superstition is a patched and painted
 madam; lame, with made teeth and bought breasts;
 all scarlet and splendour without, all rottenness and
 filth within--she pollutes whom she loves, and she
 poisons whom she hates. (I, 38)

Many remarks belittled the clergy, such as that the people thought a church official must be the Pope of Rome and his "scarlet ladye come to pay the land a visit; it is awfu' to thole sic a thing to be done in a Christian land" (I, 192). A priest was said to excel in three points of Christian doctrine: rebuke, admonition, and denunciation. Lady Winifred had scarcely given her own priest "the credit for self-denial and abstinence" when he was accused of kissing a pretty maid. The priest tried to explain that there were two kinds of kisses, one after the flesh, one after the spirit, and that he had saluted the young woman in the latter sense, according to the rules of his order. The Protestant accuser insisted the "salute" was, as the playbook said, "a clamorous smack." Lady Winifred stated that the license of the order of the priest was likely to lead to error. The Catholics present highly resented this triumph by the Protestant because it humbled the Catholic Church in the person of one of its ministers.

When Lord Roldan, as ambassador to Napoleon, said he came commanded by the Pope in whose "hands are the keys of hell and heaven--at whose breath kings reign or cease to reign," he was answered,

Go tell the hoary imposter who holds in imagination the
 keys to apartments above and below, that we are on our
 march to Rome...I marvel, General Roldan, that you
 could submit to such a description of a mere mortal.
 (II, 109)

There is no respect shown for the Austrians in the book as Napoleon's forces swept one strong Austrian army after another from Italy. The "Child of Destiny" triumphed over them "by valour as well as by science." (II, 107)

Two short, non-historical works also contain dispraise of Catholics and praise of democracy. They are Charlotte Bury's novels, The Disinherited and The Ensnared,¹⁵ which appeared in Paris in 1837 in one volume which was entered on the list of censorship labeled "limited."¹⁶ Excepting the whims of the censors, and the fact that it is under one cover with the more dangerous The Ensnared, the only grounds for censorship of the brief social novel The Disinherited are remarks made by one wealthy nonconformist. These statements contain democratic ideas of the kind Metternich's entire system was designed to "prevent." Augustus stated that all creation ought to be alike blessed. He allowed servants to do exactly as they pleased, indulging their expensive tastes. But it is his stand against government which would condemn the book in the eyes of censors. He declared,

All governments are horrid; there has never been a government good for anything; hitherto the people have been humbugged, but now that won't do. The march of intellect, the flood of light, the discoveries of science, the powers of talent, all combine to make quite a new order of things, and we shall see very shortly everything changed, everything on an entirely new plan.(53)

It was to prevent this change that Austrian rulers quarantined their state. He also attacked government officials by saying, "Those fellows in office give themselves such airs. I would have them all sent to the

right-about directly till they knew their business better." He added, "My spirit rises against the tyranny of all government, and I cannot refrain from pouring out my indignation on all constituted authorities whenever I hear them named." (p. 72)

Perhaps the noble censors might have seen some insult to their class in the presentation of Lord Montagu in his sensual indulgences and in the statement that throughout life it is always the case that our humble friends, and not our great ones, prove the true ones.

The Catholic censors would find no offense in this short novel beyond the suicide of Montagu and his corrupt morals. It is The Ensnared with which they would have found fault. It too presents noblemen as a class whose morals are corrupt. But its chief offense is that in it both Church and priests are bemeaned. In one instance parents had engaged their daughter's confessor to help them force her to marry an old man they had chosen for her, with the consequence that the confessor had threatened the girl with the anathema of the Pope if she did not obey her parents. It was observed that "Thus, under the semblance of religion, this deception is working its evil work on the mind of this innocent girl." The action of the confessor was called a "deadly superstition, this blasting of the bloom of happiness! it is one of a thousand which is constantly practiced by priests." (p. 201)

Lindsay and De Courcy visited the convent of Santa Scholastica and found the place in great decay; upon observing its condition they reflected that whenever the moral greatness of man goes to decay, all that

is accessory to it quickly follows (p. 222). A monk showed them various relics, "with much mummary of affected devotion," such as a piece of the true Cross and a thorn from the Savior's crown (p. 223). They wondered whether bigotry or hypocrisy thus distorted the human mind, to cause it to believe such monstrous fables (p. 224). Such, the men observed, is the nature of this worship; where it cannot make dupes, it makes hypocrites; and if it cannot effect that, it is satisfied to receive a compensation in money for "whatever indignities may be shown to the false gods which it affects to venerate." (p. 224). The visitors noted that the "Evil spirit works his way," and noted the greed, envy, hypocrisy and grovelling meanness in the retreat, as the priests made a show of hospitality, prompted only by the hope of a large price for the services rendered.

The monks themselves were disparaged: one is called a "type of the wolf in sheep's clothing" (p. 214). On one occasion the visitors left a bottle of cognac in the refectory; the bottle was empty the next day although the monks had refused to drink when it was offered to them. The servant said he could not doubt where it had gone, for "The monks smell so of spirits that you might light a candle at their breaths." De Courcy remarked, "So much for conventual self-denial! they are all, I believe, hypocritical rascals."

To this Lindsay answered, "Not all, but theirs is a religion of impulse, not of principle, and must even at best tend to uncertain results"

(p. 216). However, he had earlier declared:

What hypocrites are most of these, and how they cumber the earth with their superstition and their duplicity! What weakness it is to think we should feel sorry were they no longer here! Yet can you figure Rome to look like Rome without them! Those rich cardinals, too, in their pomp--what mummary! Yet sweep them all away, and the picturesque romance of the place would lose much. But ought this consideration to weigh against the moral and religious advantage which would be the result of their abolition?... The Roman Catholic church was a spurious Christianity; and it is more consonant with a sane view of the subject to observe that every day in its course leads on to the moment when all this idle pageantry of Papal power must pass away, than to indulge in a romantic admiration of what pleases the eye. (p. 196)

The story of the illicit love affair and the insistence that such relationships were quite common among those of the upper classes degrades Noblemen, and these Catholic Noblemen acting as censors would object to the divorce of a couple in the minor plot.

Of all the English novels whose titles appear on the lists of censorship in Austria from the years 1818 to 1848, Mrs. Shelley's The Last Man¹⁷ contains one of the two strongest advocacies of democracy, a fact which secured for the Colburn edition of 1826 a designation of "forbidden."¹⁸ Into this novel of the twenty-first century Mary Shelley has woven much of herself and Shelley and of their essentially liberal social and political ideas. She was of the Godwin school, and views held by the Godwinites were considered "advanced"; but after Shelley's death she said of the Radicals, "They are full of repulsion to me."¹⁹ However, four years after his death she wrote her decided conviction that the best of governments is the republican form, entitling the novel The Last Man.

The last king of England willingly resigned his throne, allowing the nation to become a republic. His haughty Austrian queen, in spite of her dextrous management of her husband, failed to prevent his abdicating his throne and accepting the title of Earl of Windsor, first citizen of the land, or to teach their son Adrian to hate republicanism and take his seat upon the throne his father had abdicated. Adrian admired the fact that the nation asserted its right to govern itself, to be a republic, and declared he could not intrigue or work a tortuous path through the labyrinth of men's vices and passions in a monarchy (II, 180). He published his intention of using his influence to diminish the power of the aristocracy in order to effect a greater equalization of wealth and privilege and to introduce a perfect system of republican government into England. All agreed that his arguments were well supported and that which he planned was the "perfect system of government."

In their contest for the elective office of Lord Protector, Raymond and Ryland made speeches to the crowds: Ryland recalled past years to the people, the miserable contentions which led almost to civil war; he reminded them of the privileges the republic had given to each individual in the state to rise to consequence and even to temporary sovereignty. He compared the royal and republican spirits, showing how one tended to enslave the minds of men, while all the institutions of the other served to raise even the meanest among them to something great and good. He recalled how England had become powerful and her inhabitants valiant and wise by means of the freedom they enjoyed. Each heart swelled

with pride and each cheek glowed with delight to remember that each one there was a participator in that freedom. (I, 115-16)

England is presented as a country during the twenty-first century in which the change to a republican government had meant the amalgamation of the two houses of Parliament and the election of a Lord Protector who might be a man of the people or a member of the Old Nobility. The resulting society was a good one. Popular meetings could be held and the popular will expressed without fear of governmental or military interference. The arts of life and the discoveries of science had made great advances: men traveled rapidly through the air in flying balloons; all wants of the people were supplied with ease by machines; towns were busy and fields yielded abundant harvests; all people were healthful and happy.

The Austrian censors would have been offended by the portrayal of the Austrian princess married to the English king. She is called "haughty princess of Austria," "imperious consort," "hard, inflexible, persecuting woman," who hated her son Adrian when she found that she could not rule him. She was the slave of pride and anger, proud of heart, entirely made of mind, possessing a nature of fiery violence. Not only did she hate her son, she wronged, betrayed, and imprisoned him. She also planned to send her daughter to Austria "to prison, to marriage, to anything." The mother muttered over the girl, "In Austria at least you will obey. In Austria, where obedience can be enforced, and no choice

left but between an honourable prison and a fitting marriage" (I, 182).

Here was Mary Shelley's conception of Metternich's Austria.

There is very little of rebellion in the story. The English King's abdication was in compliance with the force of remonstrances of his subjects who wanted a republican government. The Greek struggle for independence from Turkey receives considerable attention in the story as Lord Raymond fought and died in that cause. Elizabeth Nitchie notes the irony of Greece's trying still in the twenty-first century to win her freedom from Turkey and of Constantinople's being finally conquered by plague and not by the Greek army in which Byron had planned to fight.²⁰

Austrian censors would have despised Mrs. Shelley's prediction contained in Verney's observing as he traveled south,

Beneath are the plains of Italy... The free and happy peasant, unshackled by the Austrian, bears the double harvest to the garner; and the refined citizens rear without dread the long blighted tree of knowledge in this garden of the world. (II, 113)

This is a passage that might stir up rebellious thoughts among the people who were the subjects of Austrian "shackles." After Verney had served as an ambassador to Austria for two years, he returned to England saying he was tired of the political intrigue, "the maze of passion and folly" (I, 72-73). Mrs. Shelley saw most heartening signs when she visited Milan in 1840 that this prediction of 1826 might soon be fulfilled, for the people were developing pride in their land and an overwhelming desire for freedom. Soon she felt they would

shake off Austrian domination and French interference and choose their leader from among themselves,²¹ the thing most feared by the Prince who caused the book containing these statements to be forbidden in his Empire.

In this novel are no disparaging comments about the men or the creed of Catholicism. Contrary to Catholic teaching are the two suicides which occurred in the plot. The hero's sister Perdita jumped overboard en route home from Greece where she had lost her husband. Verne declared it was better that she died so than that she drag on for long miserable years of repining and inconsolable grief. The other instance was that of Evadna's husband who was said to have suffered the "lethargic sense of changeless misery which for the most part produces suicide." (I, 314)

Any Christian, Catholic or Protestant, would object to what one desperate man said, who, in bitter scorn, declared he was among the "victims of His merciless tyranny" who had dared to "reproach the Supreme Evil. How can he punish me? Let him bare his arm and transfix me with lightning--this is only one of his attributes." (II, 311)

Mary Shelley believed a corrupt clergy had falsified the teachings of Jesus, but in later life she attended church services. When the request was made in 1838 that the publication of Shelley's poems exclude atheistic parts of "Queen Mab," she stated that she did not like atheism "nor does he now."²² The Last Man contains no indication of radical religious beliefs. In the time of the plague the novelist

says the teachers of religion exerted a tremendous "power of good, if rightly directed, or of incalculable mischief, if fanaticism or intolerance guided their efforts." She respected true religious feeling and found it in the youth like Lord Raymond's daughter Clara. It was organized religion, where power over the many and the simple is centered in the few, which she and Shelley distrusted. This attitude is contrary to Catholicism and therefore objectionable to Austrian censors, though perhaps far less so than either the idealized picture of a true republic or the disparagement of Austrian rule of Italy contained in Mrs. Shelley's book.

Chapter VI

Conclusion

The ghost of revolution was the motivating force during the Metternich regime in Austria. The Chancellor was said to place tranquility and order above all else in politics, but his peace had hardened into a rigid system of a ruling class which had "petrified from the head downward."¹ All forces were distrusted by the anti-intellectual political attitude; the middle-class ideologists, the thinkers, the professors of the universities--these enlightened demagogues corrupted the whole life of the state. Consequently they were kept under rigid surveillance by the Francis-Metternich government. Francis did not want progress for the people; he was once shown a plan for a new railroad; he would have nothing to do with it, "lest the revolution might come into the country." When the English philanthropist Robert Owen once tried to convince the government of a need for certain reforms to benefit the people, Metternich's leading adherent Frederich Gentz said the government did not want the masses to become well off and independent. They should be kept unenlightened; how otherwise could they be controlled? When Francis became old and sick, his Empress took up the fight against the enlightenment, even opposing the work of the Kindergarten because she feared the work might foster too much enlightenment among the lower classes,² and they would refuse to do what they were told without questioning. To try to prevent that, the government kept a close

watch upon foreign Courts as well as its own to prevent infiltration of "dangerous thoughts."

Prince Metternich was much concerned with preventing literary liberty, for he believed "literary liberty is the child of political liberty," and that no government can operate most effectively when it is daily exposed to the influence of the freedom of the press.³ As a result of his belief, censorship played a major part in his "system of prevention." This system was concerned with academic freedom and freedom of the press, and was effected primarily by a suppression of free intellectual communication between Austrian and foreign scholarship, by strict university control, by rigid preventive censorship enforced through police supervision under the administration of men of such dubious character as that of its chief, Count Sedlnitzsky,⁴ and through denunciations by confidential informers.

There might be liberal democratic ideas among the people, but the freedom of expression must be prevented according to Metternich's policy. Srbik's statement of Metternich's idea of freedom of expression, given in his memoirs of the Chancellor is significant:

I distinguish between thinking, speaking, writing. Thinking? Yes, that is free! Man is born free. Speaking? Here the distinction must be made as to whether one intends to exchange ideas or to teach. In the first case, one has to determine whether one speaks before many, in the second case (presumably that of talking before large audiences and teaching) the state always has to exercise rigid control. Writing is free like thinking; it is merely a recording of thought. Yet it is a different and quite peculiar thing with printing. There the state has to draw the narrow restrictions which we call censorship.

Nothing is between, as it exists abroad. When Louis XVIII proclaimed freedom of the press in the Charter, I said: "Either it is an inborn right or it is not; if it is the first, one need not expressly concede it; if it is not, one must not concede it." sic ⁵

In the Venetian Kingdom, literary censorship was so severe that even the works of Dante had to be expurgated. ⁶ Heine's poetry and his and Börne's political writings were practically unobtainable in Austria while they were secretly enjoyed by Metternich and Gentz. Trevelyan says that no daily newspaper might appear except the official gazette. Learned and literary magazines were numerous, but the censorship examined every book and periodical before it could be printed in the Austrian territory or introduced from over the frontier. ⁷ Artz relates that an English traveler in Spain said of the newspapers permitted in that country what might have been said of the press in the Austrian Empire and in the Italian States: they contained nothing but reports of the weather and "accounts of miracles wrought by different virgins, lives of holy friars and sainted nuns, romances of marvelous conversions, libels against Jews, heretics, and Freemasons, and histories of apparitions." ⁸

Artz quotes one writer of the time who says that except in the exact sciences there was not a single praiseworthy achievement, that clever heads were discouraged, and that all the geniuses of the whole glorious Empire were at least partially suppressed. ⁹ Grillparzer, Austria's leading poet at the time, had given up for lost one of his compositions which was kept in the censorship office for two years

then discovered by accident. One understands why this poet wrote a bitter complaint of censorship.¹⁰ Prothero says Grillparzer's originality was crushed by rigorous controls by the state.¹¹ Artz attests that works of Voltaire and writers of the Enlightenment¹² were burned in ceremonies.

In the execution of this system of prevention, assuming that the censors exercised consistently any principles of censorship, there seems to have been four determining factors in the choice of designation of censorship for each book: its contents, the time of its appearance on the Continent, the popularity of the author, and perhaps the language in which the novel appeared. Perhaps more regularly exercised than these factors are the whims of the censoring officials. That they were given a free hand seems obvious, just so long as they inclined toward the strict to be certain nothing dangerous passed.

As determined by the principles of the Metternich regime, the political ideas which the censorship in the police state would have considered most dangerous are these: any form of rebellion against established authority; organization and activity of minority groups; the degradation of those with vested authority; any unkind reflection upon Austrians or Germans in general, or upon the nobility; expressions of national enthusiasm; any advocacy of the democratic principles of freedom, equality, and fraternity. According to Artz the historical novels considered in this study set since the time of Louis XIV would have been censored regardless of their contents, since he insists that

any account of modern history frightened the censors.¹³

Religious offenses are those statements that in any way reflect unfavorably upon Catholicism, its creed, its practices, its priests, especially the Jesuits, since these accounts would tend to weaken the foundations and disciplines of the Church, and any expression of sympathy for the Jew since the Roman Church was opposed to Judaism.

As has been noted in citations from the individual novels, only two, The Last Man and The Disinherited, of the thirty-two that make up this study contain nothing which is disparaging to the Catholic Church or her priests; The Last Man appeared in 1826, labeled "forbidden," the The Disinherited in 1837 with a "limited" designation. Even these have instances of suicide and the latter an instance of divorce. The opposite extreme is found in Mrs. Bury's The Monk and The Nun which contain nothing of a political nature that could have brought about their censure but are bitter attacks upon Catholicism. Between these extremes range the other twenty-eight novels studied, all of which contain material derogatory to the men and creed of the Roman Church. Among offenses are Philip Augustus's defiance of the Pope and the depiction of corrupt churchmen of whom Prior Philip in De Foix, the Cardinal in Richelieu, Garnet in Guy Fawkes, and Prior Lawrence in Richard of York are the most extreme. Yet of the four books containing these figures, not one received a "forbidden" label; all appeared in the 1830's and 40's.

Mrs. Bray has belittled Catholics and their creed in all four of her novels which were censored. Her harshest criticism of priests is

that in De Foix, left unlabeled by the censors, with Pomeroy, labeled "restricted" running as a fairly close second, while her strongest attack upon creed is found in Fitz, also "limited." Her works all appear on lists for the late 1830's, with one in 1845. Generally the books surrounding these on the lists are left unlabeled, but with the one noted exception her works are "limited."

It would seem that G. P. R. James also was dedicated to the abuse of Catholics in French history, and he succeeded in Richelieu, Philip Augustus, and The Huguenot. But he did not confine his attack to French history; there are two novels in this study dealing with the fight against Catholicism in England: Arabella Stuart, a story of James I, and Russell, dealing with Charles II. All five novels appear on lists of censorship from 1837 to 1847 with the label of "restricted." Only Arabella and The Huguenot were translated into German; the other three appear in English.

Mrs. Robinson's two novels, Whitehall and Whitefriars, stories of Charles I and Charles II respectively, both contain anti-Catholic expressions, with the latter being much more damaging since its chief topic is "the Popish Plot." The religious strife in Whitehall is between Presbyterians and Independents, but there are many aspersions cast upon Catholics by the author in both this and Whitefriars. The second was translated, the first was not, but both were left unlabeled when they were placed on the censors' lists for 1844 and 1845.

Radcliffe, Grattan, Lytton, Smith, and Cunningham all added to the heap of material objectionable for religious reasons, in one novel each. Smith's Arthur Arundel is perhaps the most generally vehement in its treatment of Catholicism. Cunningham's Roldan is critical but less bitterly so, while Radcliffe's Gaston contains little offense except the depiction of one "no true son of the Church." Both Grattan's Jacqueline and Lytton's The Last of the Barons show contempt for the men of the Catholic Church, but their primary concern is with political matter. Of these only Radcliffe's Gaston, which appeared in 1826 and 1827, was given a severe label, yet it contains what is perhaps the least offensive religious matter of all these books.

This study points up an interesting paradox in Walter Scott. In spite of the fact that Scott's presentation of Catholicism in his novels aroused public interest in and helped to revive that faith during the nineteenth century, his works in this study, without exception, contain innumerable derogatory remarks about Catholicism in his own words as well as in the words put into the mouths of his characters, ranging from light, chance observations to bitter denunciations, which support the comment in his diary.¹⁴ It is obvious from the study of these novels that the critics who have said it is not clear how Scott felt about Catholicism have not read these works very carefully. His most specific and extensive criticism of Roman Catholic doctrine is that in The Fair Maid in which he has been accused of making errors about Catholicism.¹⁵ In all of the novels ecclesiastical figures abound. They

are somewhat conventional jolly friars or priors and priests who are more worldly than they profess; the novelist gently ridicules them. Only occasionally, as in the figure of the Templars in Ivanhoe, Balu^e in Quentin, or the Black Priest in Anne, does he paint a black picture of the "holy men." In general they are accused in a good-natured manner of loving wine, women, and the chase better than they did their ghostly duties; their greed for material things is never forgotten. They are usually selfish intriguers who leave much to be desired as spiritual leaders. Perhaps with the average reader of fiction, this insidious attack proves more effective and therefore, in the eyes of the censors, more damaging to their faith than does an avowed attack like that of The Monk or of The Nun. Certainly, for many reasons noted above, religious and political, the works of Sir Walter Scott outnumber all others of those given the most severe designations assigned to the novel by the censors.

How much of the offensiveness of the novels appearing on the lists of censorship lay in their derogation of the Church to which Metternich was dedicated cannot be determined. The fact that only once on the lists is the label damnatur used and that it is the designation given in May of 1847 to what appears to be a book on religion by Dr. William Channing, with the German title Gottähnlichkeit und Geistliche Freiheit, would indicate that the religious aspect of a book was of considerable consequence to the Austrian censors as they examined it.

Although just four of the novels studied have raised the question of Semitism, only Ivanhoe makes a very pointed appeal for the Jew while Henry de Pomeroy complements this appeal and adds something to it. Fitz of Fitz-Ford contains one truly admirable character who is a Jew, and Woodstock reminds one that Jews were the Christian's older brethren.

From sources consulted in this study, it would appear that Metternich's primary reason for the re-establishment of the Catholic Church to her earlier supremacy in Austria was that he needed her control of the masses to aid him politically. It was for this reason that he tried to protect her from the many derogatory remarks contained in the works of English novelists that reached the offices of the censorship.

In the light of Metternich's political principles, one can see that he was concerned chiefly with maintaining what he had, the peace and tranquility of Western Europe, a state of existence much desired by leaders and people alike following the extremes of the French Revolution, those horrid measures taken to secure "liberty, equality, and fraternity." Consequently, any recorded suggestion advocating the principles of democracy was completely opposed to the censorship policy of Austria. Walter Scott offends that policy in his emphasis upon the worth of the individual and upon nationalism. A further indication of paradox is seen in that he was a staunch Tory, a true monarchist

whose sympathies were aristocratic, almost feudal; yet he was a definite humanitarian who took the lower classes very seriously, showing universal sympathy for mankind. To him all men were kings in disguise; the world was not one of kings, lords, and commoners, but one where all men are at the same time kind, good, bad.

He chose to invent his hero, often of the lesser ranks of society, rather than invite criticism by adapting a world-famous figure as a key character for his story. His favorite people in the novels included in this study are clearly the noblemen like the Landamman in Anne of Geierstein or the Lord of Kinfauns in The Fair Maid of Perth who champion the cause of the deserving commoners. His favorites among the royalty, such as the pathetically weak Robert III, the paradoxical James I, and Richard the Lion-Hearted, are kings who show much concern for and are genuinely fond of commoners.

Metternich has been charged with a lack of understanding or sympathy for the "people," seeing them as bent upon usurping the positions and privileges of the ruling aristocracy.¹⁶ Although Cecil tries to clear him of the charge by quoting from the Prince's Memoirs, "The People is everywhere good but childish," Webster insists that he strove to make his land a confederation of Princes and to make the "rights of the people as ineffective as possible."¹⁷ His repeated focus upon the heroic commoner constitutes Scott's major "democratic" offense to the Austrian Empire, evident in this study in such characters as the following:

Quentin Durward, the Pirate Cleveland, Everard Markham in Woodstock, Henry Smith in Fair Maid, and Dalgetty in Montrose. There is a great appeal made in Ivanhoe for sympathy for the Jew. There is a breaking down of class distinctions seen in the marriage of the unknown Scottish lad Quentin Durward to the Countess de Croye, the Scottish nobleman's marriage to the shopkeeper's daughter in Nigel, and in the fraternizing of James I and of Richard I with the lower classes in Nigel and Ivanhoe. Again the barrier is forgotten in Prince Charles Edward's and Prince Rothsay's attempts at seduction of commoners in Woodstock and in The Fair Maid. The novelist's attempts at leveling all men, seeing the good and the bad in king and commoner, generally characteristic of his novels, is well exemplified in Ivanhoe in his presentation of John, Richard, and Chancellor Fitzurse, of the Saxons, of the Jews, of the Templars, and other churchmen, and in the portrayal of the outlaw Robin Hood.

It is in The Last Man, Lord Roldan, Arthur Arundel, Russell, Whitehall, and The Last of the Barons that the various authors have presented most positive and effective praise of the democratic form of government. In spite of this fact they were not given the "forbidden" label. This praise of democracy constitutes the chief offense of each of these novels to the censors acting for the administration of the Austrian Empire of Absolutism. There are evidences of the operation of the principles of democracy, as well as declarations favoring them in others of the works also, as was noted in The Disinherited, Whitefriars, and Montrose. Perhaps even more worthy of censure is Scott's emphasis upon love of country,

a nationalism which amounts to chauvinism, as seen in the following characters: Quentin Durward and his Uncle Balafre', Dalgetty in Montrose, Yellowley in The Pirate, the villagers in Fair Maid, the Swiss in Anne, Minna Troil in The Pirate, Markham in Woodstock, the Highlanders in Waverley and in Montrose, and Nigel in The Fortunes of Nigel--there is no exception among the nine censored. This factor alone would be a black mark against each of the books in the eyes of conscientious censors in Metternich's Austria.

Revolt was dreaded by the rulers of Austria in the first half of the nineteenth century.¹⁸ All novels appearing on the lists of censorship contain accounts of rebellion except two each by Mrs. Bury and by Mrs. Sherwood. Of the twenty-eight others the stories in which the basic conflict is the attempt to unseat a monarch are Fitz of Fitz-Ford, The Last of the Barons, Richard of York, Guy Fawkes, Arabella Stuart, Whitehall, Russell, Whitefriars, Arthur Arundel, and Waverley, while others such as Ivanhoe, Henry de Pomeroy, Jacqueline de Holland, Woodstock, Quentin Durward, Anne of Geierstein, Montrose, The Pirate, Lord Roldan, and Gaston de Blondeville are concerned directly or indirectly with warring against established authority. Perhaps of all those listed Gaston is least concerned with rebellion; yet it bears the designation of "forbidden," along with several of Scott's, the only ones found on the lists that are so labeled. In nine of the offending books the plots against authority go so far as plans to kill kings. Nothing is more horrifying to those in a monarchy than the thought of regicide. The attempt

is actually made in De Foix, Guy Fawkes, Jacqueline, The Huguenot, and Fitz; it succeeds in Whitehall, which has no label on the lists, and events in Woodstock and Montrose, limited and forbidden in circulation, occur immediately following Charles I's execution. There were bloodless revolutions in The Last Man and Arthur Arundel by which kings were deprived of their crowns; The Last Man was forbidden, while Arthur Arundel received the "limited" label only. Accounts of attempts of subjects to bring about changes in conditions which violated their rights range from Philip Augustus's defiance of the Pope, to the action of minor factions such as the pirates' objection to paying the duties imposed upon them by customs officials, to the participation of Lord Roldan in the Napoleonic Wars. Others containing factions which defy duties imposed, or other violations of their privileges, include The Fair Maid of Perth, Pomeroy, Talba, Anne, Guy Fawkes, Richelieu, Russell, The Huguenot, The Pirate, and so on throughout all novels of the study except the four which contain no political matter that could have been considered dangerous by the censors. Of these offenders only Scott's and Radcliffe's works were limited or forbidden.

Of the works containing political offenses only The Pirate and The Last Man lack damaging criticisms of rulers which would tend to weaken respect for the princely class. Even these two contain a point of view which is derogatory to leaders and those in high places. They were forbidden; they appeared in the 1820's. Only three are free of uncomplimentary remarks about nobles in the countries serving as

locations for the stories; they are Philip Augustus, The Pirate, and Montrose. However, Waverley, Anne, and The Last Man have fewer than do most.

Of the novels studied, ten contain disparaging observations concerning Germans or Austrians. The most extensive of these criticisms are those contained in Anne and in Quentin Durward, both limited in circulation, and in Montrose, forbidden any circulation--all three by Scott. In Ivanhoe there is the statement that the Duke of Austria who held Richard prisoner was "perfidious and cruel," while Mrs. Bray's Henry de Pomeroy contains the reminder of the sorry part the Duke had played in this imprisonment. Mary Shelley's The Last Man not only presents an Austrian as a cold, cruel queen and unnatural mother, but also looks forward to a day when the Italians would prosper after they had thrown off the stifling oppression of the tyrannical Austrian yoke, the very movement the Austrian "preventive system" was designed to guard against.

The time of the appearance of the work as well as the contents, was an important factor in determining the designation of censorship affixed by the censors, for political conditions much affected the policing action. From the time of Kotzebue's death in 1819, Metternich felt convinced that there was a deep-dyed plot against lives of German princes; so he tightened the reins of censorship. There might safely have been some slackening when that immediate danger seemed past, but in 1824 a new conspiracy against established order was discovered. In 1825, with the

ascension of Ludwig in Bavaria, the censorship law was repealed;¹⁹ the year 1830 brought the French July Revolution, and in 1831 occurred the Polish insurrection. In France preventive censorship was abolished; by 1828 Metternich had observed that France was lost.²⁰ The July Revolution was a signal for a revival of liberalism throughout the German states; the Polish national revolt helped arouse liberal enthusiasm. The Carlsbad Decrees had begun to lose power in the 1830's; then in 1832 most of the German governments accepted the Six Articles, asserting the monarchical principles that recalled the Carlsbad Decrees of 1819, and repression was strengthened.²¹ However, the enforcement of the decrees varied greatly from section to section, and according to Julius Marx, from censor to censor. He states that the designations of censorship were entirely arbitrary. In some cases scandalous things were permitted to pass, while in others, innocent matter was found to contain threats of colossal ruin and were handled with angry hairsplitting.²² This situation could account for the fact that there seems to be no exact principles applied consistently by the officers, as well as for their allowing any historical novels to circulate in the Empire.

By 1835, as has been noted, Metternich's controls were lessening and that of the Jesuits growing. Since the consensus of those consulted in this study seems to be that the more extremely conservative of the two Austrian leaders was Francis, who died in 1835, it may be that Metternich thereafter merely followed principles that he had held all along, less severely conservative than were those of Francis, and did not relax his

control as it might appear. Or perhaps the Chancellor simply felt he could not cope with the increasing number of movements toward liberalism throughout Western Europe in the 30's and 40's, culminating in the Revolution of 1848. In 1840 Melanie records in her journal that Metternich was very busy with foreign affairs and that insofar as possible, he left internal questions alone for the moment.

At any rate, no novel entered on the lists of censorship after the 1820's was given a forbidden classification; all novels given this designation appear on the lists from 1822-29. Only one book appears on the lists after that time with a more severe label than "limited"; that book was the non-fiction one of religion noted above, which was given the most severe of all labels--a damnatur. This fact would seem to prove the statement that the Church was largely in control of Austrian censorship after 1835. In the 1830's, appeared nine of the fifteen novels given the label of "restricted," with the other six of the fifteen listed in the 1840's. Five of the six entries without label appear in the 1840's, the other one in 1838. No novel is labeled less severe than "limited" until 1836; following that entry twenty-one appear as either "limited" or without any label. Whatever the reason for it, with advancing time there was a decrease in the severity of censorship designations.

The time of the appearance of English novels in the Empire surely was an important factor in determining the degree of censorship given these works. Of the thirty-two authentic English novels on the lists of

censored books, nine are those by Scott, appearing in the years from 1822 to 1829; five of the nine are forbidden in the Empire and four are to be limited in circulation. Mary Shelley's and Ann Radcliffe's books are the only others forbidden and they both appear on the lists for the 1820's. Six other novels, five of which were forbidden, were falsely attributed to Scott and Mrs. Radcliffe between the years 1822 and 1826. No other novelist's work was given a "forbidden" label on any of the lists, and all of those so labeled appeared within the decade of the 1820's.

The language in which an English novel appeared might help determine the degree of its danger to Metternich's Empire. Except for the fact that Mrs. Shelley's The Last Man and Scott's The Pirate, both banned books, were censored in the English editions, one would be inclined to say that books in the Italian and German languages were most severely designated. Nineteen of the censored editions were in German translations and twelve in English; five were in French and three in Italian. Two of those banned were English editions, two German, three Italian, and two French. So it would seem that the language in which the novel appeared had little, if any, effect upon the censorship of the work.

However, there can be little question that the authorship had much effect upon the official censors. Thirteen of the thirty-eight novels attributed by the censors to English authors are those ascribed to Scott; and his name appears on the censorship lists many other times since his works other than fiction were censored also. Excepting Mrs. Bury,

Mrs. Sherwood, Mrs. Shelley, and Mrs. Radcliffe, the writers represented on the lists of censorship are strongly imitative of Scott, and even Mrs. Radcliffe's Gaston is very similar to his in style. Since most of the works were by Scott, or attributed to him, and by his imitators, one can get a clear insight into the effectiveness of Austrian censorship upon the English novel by taking a close look at Scott. In numbers censored and the severity of designation, Scott leads the field; the nature of his novels and his popularity as well as the time at which they appeared would account for this fact.

Although Scott was a firm monarchist, in those novels set in the early centuries the presentations of the ancien régime are usually not appealing. Those of more modern settings would surely have been suspect if one can accept Trevelyan's word for it that modern history was enough to frighten the censors, or Artz's that anything done since the death of Louis XIV in 1715 was at once a folly and a crime.²³ Consequently, all Scott's novels were likely subjects for censorship.

There is in Scott's historical novels an almost sentimental awareness of the worth of the individual; his true heroes are often commoners (plain folk) who are ardently nationalistic, especially so if they are Scots, and he rather dispels the glamour which romance had thrown over medieval life. As this study proves, he was not very friendly toward Catholicism although his treatment of the early church had contributed greatly to the revival of interest in that faith. These attitudes, a sympathy for "the people" and a de-glamourizing of the Old Order, plus anti-Catholicism,

were dangerous ones to the safety of the Francis-Metternich regime. These, plus many other faults found in the novels by Scott and in the imitations of him, made him a prime target for the Austrian censors, especially in the light of his extreme popularity.

It has been declared that Scott had the ear of Europe, that his novels went everywhere in translations.²⁴ There were many of those translations, some of poor quality; for an example Dargan relates an instance in France of there being four translators for four volumes of one novel, three of whom knew no English. Soon Defauconpret became the regular translator; he had lived in England and knew the language well. From 1817 he translated the novels as they appeared and re-translated those poorly done earlier. Four editions of Scott's novels, complete, or nearly so, were done by this translator. The first and fullest edition ran to 165 volumes. A thirty-two volume edition appeared in 1830-33, handsomely illustrated. The sale of these works was estimated by the printer Gosselin at 200,000 copies by 1824; shortly after 1830, at one and one-half million volumes; by the time of the final edition of 1840, the number of volumes sold reached two million. The 1820's were the heyday of Scott in France. Scott approved Cadell's delivery of advance sheets to the translators with the results that French versions usually appeared very shortly after the publication of the English original. The Scott vogue was begun by cultivated readers but soon spread to masses; rich and poor, old and young, Parisians and provincials read Scott. Booksellers in France felt that the extreme popularity of Scott's novels was

prejudicial to their own trade.²⁵ So France's censorship apparently was not very effective, in spite of the fact that it was said that Metternich's system affected the whole of Western Europe. Austria censored four of Defauconpret's translations of Scott. There were other evidences that French works penetrated Austria.

Scott complained in the general preface to the 1830 annotated edition of his works that some of the novels attributed to him by the French were not his. Two of these, La Belle Sorciere de Glas--Llyn, 1821, and Le Château de Pontefract, 1823, appear on the lists of censorship in German translations as Die Circe von Glas--Llyn and Das Schloss von Pontefract, both forbidden works, attributed to Scott. Müller's two free translations of Scott's works appear on the lists: The Legend of Montrose he entitled Ritter Angus, and Waverley became Der Prätendent. A third entry attributed to Scott was Der Kreuzfahrer, but a note states that it was not by Scott, only an imitation. There is also an entry for a manuscript of Ivanhoe in Germany in 1825 by Böhmer, in three volumes. An attribution often alluded to by literary historians was entitled Walladmor, credited to the Germans.²⁶

Scott was so popular in Germany that his name was exploited there as in France for personal profit by indigent writers. A sequence of novels appeared between 1822-27, purporting to be translations or adaptations of Scott. Müller alone did five novels in 1823-24, all said to be based on works of Scott. In Germany novels said to derive from

England were generally more popular than their German rivals.²⁷

Kayser's Bücher-Lexicon for 1752-1832 lists thirty-six publications as by Scott.

Italy too was early in her homage to Scott; in 1821 translations were published in Milan, and from 1824 until his death, his name was constantly appearing in Italian journals. In Spain the recognition came more slowly, but by 1820 it was on its way. In his English Literature in Germany, Price quotes Julian Schmidt as saying that the influence of Scott in Europe was the greatest any author of the nineteenth century has exerted. The only one who had rivaled him was Byron, and the fever Byron had raised was quickly passing. Scott's influence was upon novelists and historians. He was more popular than the German historical novelists, who imitated him but omitted the democratic element found in Scott.²⁸ Elton says no literature dealing with the feudal past has ever had the circulation and universal success of Scott's,²⁹ and Beers says Scott made an impact upon the mind of Europe to which the romantic literature of the Continent had no counterpart.³⁰ Austria could not successfully censor the works of one with such popularity and influence. Consequently, many of the novels were not censored although they might have contained material as dangerous as that censored; again, one suspects the whims of the censors as a reason.

Ann Radcliffe was another so popular on the Continent that her name was borrowed by imitators. Her Gaston de Blondville, in French translation, was banned by the censors, but as is true of Scott's works,

several of her most popular works were not banned. However, they were not historical novels. Two other entries, in 1824 and 1826, both forbidden, are purported to be her work, but Mrs. Wieten says neither Die Priorin nor Le Visioni del Castello dei Pirenei is her work. She states that the existence of so many novels ascribed to Mrs. Radcliffe (and we might add Scott) points to the presence of a powerful reciprocal influence of the various literatures of western countries of Europe: England, France, Germany, Holland, and Italy. Nine of the novels falsely ascribed to Radcliffe appeared in France between 1798 and 1830, two in Holland between 1817 and 1820, and eight in Germany between 1801-1850.³¹ Her influence in the field of the Gothic novel was considerable. It is said the Gothic influence had reached its peak in England between 1796 and 1810, but in Germany between 1815 and 1840, indicating the English Gothic element in literature could have had considerable influence upon the German, which lagged by about ten years.³²

Beers states that in general Spain, Germany, and Italy were indebted to the English romantics, that Scott was the great romancer of Europe, and that the one point on which the English movement outweighed the German was Walter Scott, with his great impact upon European thought.³³ The translations and reprints of Burns passed through many editions in Germany, and the immense popularity of Byron, whose reputation German criticism compliments itself for establishing,³⁴ further attest to the extensive entry of English literature into Western Europe, in spite of the fact that the policing went on there, and that an attempt was made to bann these writers from the Austrian-controlled nations.

Therefore, the Austrian Empire was not so well sealed as Metternich had desired; made up as she was of many peoples, of many lands, Austria received external stimulation as well as interchange between the states forming the Deutscher Bund. If she felt no direct influence from England, it did reach her through other countries, second hand, as for example from Germany. For it is said that German Romanticism and Classicism stimulated literary activities in Austria, although Bury states that in the German lands of the Austrian Crown the same progress had not been made as in other German states as a result of the strict censorship.³⁵

No doubt one could take the instance, related by Professor Dowden in his article on Byron and the censors, which relates that bookseller Pfaff was suspected of selling contraband material,³⁶ as a representative occurrence in the Empire so carefully policed against "seditious material," indicating that the censorship orders were not enforced very effectively.

When Scott's active influence for democratic principles and nationalism, as well as his ridicule of Catholicism, was over in 1832; when new monarchs ascended to rule neighboring states; when his enemies became stronger than Metternich and refused to enforce the existing Austrian system of censorship; when the Austrians, including the Chancellor himself, were too busy with domestic upheaval to have time for literary censorship; when the Catholic Church reconstituted The Index and assumed ever increasing power in the Deutscher Bund; and when, in

spite of the censorship, the educated classes knew what was going on in the world, Metternich's system of "preventive" censorship steadily declined in power until 1848 when the Revolution removed all restrictions upon the press.

Although Taylor states that like the rest of the system, the Censorship was a nuisance rather than a tyranny,³⁷ the harm which was done by the policing cannot be measured, for one can never know what could have been. At least the restrictions prevented those of the Austrian Empire from reading all they wanted in the way they wanted.

Notes

Chapter I

- ¹Algernon Cecil, Metternich (3rd ed.; London, 1947), pp. 311-12.
- ²Frederick B. Artz, Reaction and Revolution-1814-1832 (The Rise of Modern Europe Series, Vol. XIV; New York, 1934), p. 238.
- ³Cecil, op. cit., p. 15.
- ⁴Artz, op. cit., p. 136.
- ⁵Cecil, op. cit., p. 93.
- ⁶Artz, op. cit., p. 137.
- ⁷Cecil, op. cit., pp. 261-70 passim.
- ⁸Ibid, p. 267.
- ⁹Artz, op. cit., p. 3.
- ¹⁰Robert A. Kann, A Study in Austrian Intellectual History (New York, 1960), pp. 268-70.
- ¹¹Cecil, op. cit., pp. 259-60.
- ¹²A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, and Stanley Leathes (eds.), The Restoration (The Cambridge Modern History Series, Vol. X; New York, 1930), p. 357.
- ¹³Kann, op. cit., pp. 268-70.
- ¹⁴C. K. Webster, The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh, 1815-1822; Britain and the European Alliance (London, 1925), p. 187.
- ¹⁵Artz, op. cit., p. 3.
- ¹⁶Cecil, op. cit., p. 314.
- ¹⁷Artz, op. cit., p. 80.
- ¹⁸Raoul Auenheime r, Prince Metternich (New York, 1940), p. 161.

- ¹⁹Kann, op. cit., pp. 274-90 passim.
- ²⁰Cecil, op. cit., p. 43.
- ²¹A. J. P. Taylor, The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809-1918 (London, 1960), p. 33.
- ²²Kann, op. cit., p. 292.
- ²³Oscar Jaszi, The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy (Chicago, 1929), pp. 76-77.
- ²⁴Auernheimer, op. cit., p. 90.
- ²⁵Taylor, op. cit., pp. 38-39.
- ²⁶Webster, op. cit., p. 184.
- ²⁷Artz, op. cit., p. 238.
- ²⁸Ernst Marboe, The Book of Austria, trans. G. E. R. Gedge (Vienna, 1948), p. 105.
- ²⁹Artz, op. cit., p. 4.
- ³⁰Ibid., p. 8.
- ³¹Ward, op. cit., X, 357.
- ³²Artz, op. cit., p. 67.
- ³³George Macaulay Trevelyan, Manin and the Venetian Revolution of 1848 (London, 1923), pp. 21-23.
- ³⁴Ward, op. cit., p. 357.
- ³⁵Cecil, op. cit., p. 192.
- ³⁶Ward, op. cit., p. 357.
- ³⁷J. P. T. Bury (ed.), The Zenith of European Power (The New Cambridge Modern History Series, Vol. X; Cambridge, 1960), p. 114.
- ³⁸Ibid., p. 271.
- ³⁹Cecil, op. cit., p. 13.

- ⁴⁰Kann, op. cit., p. 272.
- ⁴¹Ward, op. cit., pp. 357-58.
- ⁴²Cecil, op. cit., p. 274.
- ⁴³Artz, op. cit., pp. 11-12.
- ⁴⁴Arthur May, The Age of Metternich, 1814-1848 (New York, 1933), pp. 73-75.
- ⁴⁵Artz, op. cit., p. 71.
- ⁴⁶Kann, op. cit., p. 173.
- ⁴⁷Artz, op. cit., p. 20.
- ⁴⁸Le Comte de Gobineau, Essai Sur L'Inegalite des Races Humaines (2nd. ed.; Paris, 1933), I, 220.
- ⁴⁹Kann, op. cit., pp. 156-61.
- ⁵⁰Max L. Margolis and Alexander Marx, A History of the Jewish People (Philadelphia, 1947), pp. 619-56.
- ⁵¹Cecil, op. cit., pp. 154-55.
- ⁵²Cecil Roth, "The European Age in Jewish History (to 1648)," The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion, edited by Louis Finkelstein (New York, 1949), I, 268-69.
- ⁵³Artz, op. cit., p. 98.
- ⁵⁴Ibid., p. 144.
- ⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 14-15.
- ⁵⁶May, op. cit., p. 30.
- ⁵⁷Jaszi, op. cit., p. 155.
- ⁵⁸Bury, op. cit., p. 107.
- ⁵⁹Kann, op. cit., p. 272.
- ⁶⁰Jaszi, op. cit., p. 155.

⁶¹Taylor, op. cit., p. 38.

⁶²May, op. cit., p. 30.

⁶³Artz, op. cit., p. 4.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 12.

⁶⁵W. S. Dowden, "Byron and the Austrian Censorship," Keats-Shelley Journal (Winter, 1955), p. 74.

⁶⁶Cecil, op. cit., p. 275.

⁶⁷Dowden, op. cit., p. 74.

⁶⁸Julius Marx, "Die Zensur der Kanzlei Metternich," Osterreichische Zeitschrift für Öffentliches Recht. IV (1952), 236.

⁶⁹See note 29 above.

⁷⁰See note 28 above.

Notes

Chapter II

¹Sir Walter Scott, Ivanhoe, vols. 15-16, Works of Sir Walter Scott (Boston, 1913). Throughout this study all references to Scott's novels will be to this edition.

²On the list of censorship for August, 1824, appears an entry in Italian, stating that Walter Scott's novels translated at Pisa in 1823 by Nistri were forbidden in the Austrian Empire. A letter of inquiry to the national library at Florence, Italy, was answered by the director, who states that Ivanhoe, The Legend of Montrose, and Waverley were translated in Pisa that year, by Nistri.

³A. J. P. Taylor, The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809-1918 (London, 1960), p. 17.

⁴Frederick B. Artz, Reaction and Revolution-1814-1832. (The Rise of Modern Europe Series, Vol. XIV; New York, 1934), p. 148.

⁵Algernon Cecil, Metternich (3rd. ed.; London, 1947), pp. 154-55.

⁶Hugh Bieber, "Jews and Jewish Problems in German Literature," The Jewish People, Past and Present (Jewish Encyclopedic Handbook; New York, 1952), III, 239-48 passim.

⁷Una Pope-Hennessy, Sir Walter Scott (Denver, 1949), p. 80.

⁸Henry A. Beers, A History of English Romanticism in the Nineteenth Century (New York, 1910), pp. 40-41.

⁹Mrs. Eliza Bray, Henry De Pomeroy; or The Eve of St. John (London, 1846). In this study all references to this work will be to this edition.

¹⁰This work appears on the list of censored books for July, 1846, as a German translation from the English by W. A. Linden, published at Leipzig, by Kollmann, in 1845. The label was "limited."

¹¹See note 5, above.

¹²Le Comte de Gobineau, Essai Sur L'Inegalite des Races Humaines (Paris, 1933), I, 220.

¹³S. M. Ellis, The Solitary Horseman; or The Life and Adventures of G. P. R. James (Kensington, 1927), p. 166.

¹⁴G. P. R. James, Philip Augustus; or The Brothers in Arms, Vol. 5 of The Works of G. P. R. James (London, 1845). In this study all references to this work will be to this edition.

¹⁵Philip Augustus appears on the list of censored books in the Baudry's European Library edition, published in Paris but not translated from English. The entry is for the year 1837; the label is "limited."

¹⁶A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, Stanley Leathes (eds.), The Restoration (Cambridge Modern History Series, Vol. X; New York, 1911), p. 357.

¹⁷Anne Radcliffe, Gaston de Blondville; or The Court of Henry III (London, 1826). 3 vols. All references to this work in this study will be to this edition.

¹⁸Samuel C. Chew, "The Nineteenth Century and After (1789-1939)," A Literary History of England, ed. by Albert C. Baugh (New York, 1948), p. 1194.

¹⁹Alida Alberdina Sibbellina Wieten, Mrs. Radcliffe-Her Relation Towards Romanticism (Amsterdam, 1926), pp. 109-11.

²⁰On the list of censored books for October, 1826, Gaston de Blondeville is listed in French translation, in three volumes, published by Hume in Paris, in 1826. It appeared again in July, 1827, the same edition; both entries are labeled verboden. Also Les Visioni del Castello dei Pirence appears in June, 1826, forbidden. Die Priorin appears, forbidden, in December, 1824.

²¹Wieten, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

²²Aline Grant, Ann Radcliffe (Denver, 1951), p. 55 ff.

²³Wieten, op. cit., p. 90.

²⁴Ibid., p. 67.

²⁵Grant, op. cit., p. 71.

²⁶Sir Walter Scott, The Fair Maid of Perth, vols. 39-40.

²⁷This work appeared on the list of forbidden books for August, 1828, in French, translation by A. J. B. Defauconpret, published in Paris, in 1828. It is listed a second time for February, 1829, still forbidden, this entry in a German translation, published in Stuttgart in 1828.

²⁸Raoul Auernheimer, Prince Metternich (New York, 1940), p. 98.

²⁹Artz, op. cit., p. 80.

³⁰See note 7, above.

³¹Mrs. Anne Eliza Kempe (Stothard) Bray, The Talba; or The Moor of Portugal (New York, 1831). 2 vols. All reference to this work in this study will be to this edition.

³²This work by Mrs. Bray appears twice on the lists of censorship. The entry for September, 1838, does not give the title, only the statement that it is an historical novel, second edition of her works, and the volume numbers. The director of the Austrian National Library stated in answer to a letter of inquiry that there is evidence to support the belief that the volumes listed were those of The Talba although they no longer have the exact edition. This first entry bears the "limited" label, but the second one, for August, 1839, bears the title Der Talba von Portugal: or Schicksal der Inez de Castro, a German translation published in Augsburg, bearing no label.

³³Artz, op. cit., p. 148.

³⁴Anne Elize Bray, De Foix; or Sketches of the Manners and Customs of the Fourteenth Century (London, 1826). 3 vols. All references to this study to this work will be to this edition.

³⁵This work was translated into German by Bruckbran, published in Augsburg in 1838, by Jenisch, in three volumes. It appears on the list of censorship, with no label, in February, 1838.

Notes

Chapter III

¹Thomas Colley Grattan, Jacqueline of Holland (London, 1831). 3 vols. In this study all references to this work will be to this edition.

²This work appears on the list, in English, published in London, by Colburn, in 1838, in three volumes. The designation is "limited."

³Ernst Marboe, The Book of Austria, trans. G. E. R. Gedge (Vienna, 1948), p. 105.

⁴Robert A. Kann, A Study in Austrian Intellectual History (New York, 1960), pp. 274-75.

⁵Redmond A. Burke, What Is the Index? (Milwaukee, 1952), p. 27.

⁶Edward Bulwer Lytton, The Last of the Barons (New York, 1944). In this study all references to this book will be to this edition.

⁷The Last of the Barons appears on the list of Austrian censored books for July, 1843, in German translation, by O. von Czarnowski, published in Aachen and Leipzig in 1843 by Meyer. Its stamp of censorship is "restricted."

⁸Raoul Auernheimer, Prince Metternich (New York, 1940).

⁹Oscar Jaszi, The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy (Chicago, 1929).

¹⁰Kann, op. cit., p. 260.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 274-75.

¹²A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, and Stanley Leathes (eds.), The Restoration (Cambridge Modern History Series, Vol. X; New York, 1911), p. 357.

¹³Sir Walter Scott, Quentin Durward, vols. 29-30.

¹⁴Kann, op. cit., p. 290.

¹⁵Algernon Cecil, Metternich (3rd edition; London, 1947), p. 133.

¹⁶This work by Scott appears on the list as volumes 69-72 of the complete works of Scott, translated into French, published by Gosselin and Ladvocat, in Paris, in 1823, labeled "limited."

¹⁷Sir Walter Scott, Anne of Geierstein, vols. 41-42.

¹⁸Kann, op. cit., pp. 274-75.

¹⁹This work appears under two titles on the lists of censorship. Both entries have labels of "limited." The first entry is for July, 1829, under the title Charles the Bold, in French translation, by A. J. B. Defauconpret, published in Paris in five volumes, in 1829. The second entry was under its English title, published in Paris, in three volumes, in 1829.

²⁰Richard of York or The White Rose of England (New York, 1835). In this study all references to this work will be to this edition.

²¹This work appears on the list of censored books in the English edition of 1832, published anonymously by Fisher, in London.

²²Mrs. A. E. Bray, Fitz of Fitz-Ford; A Legend of Devon (London, 1830). 3 vols. In this study all references to this work will be to this edition, with specific sources given in parentheses following citations.

²³Mrs. Bray's Fitz of Fitz-Ford, in three volumes, was placed on the list of censored books, designated a "limited" work, in 1836.

²⁴Kann, op. cit., pp. 260-61.

²⁵Jaszi, op. cit., p. 77.

Notes

Chapter IV

¹William Harrison Ainsworth, Guy Fawkes, Vol. 10 of Novels by William Harrison Ainsworth (Philadelphia, nd.). In this work all references to this novel will be to this edition.

²Three times Guy Fawkes appears on the list of censorship, each time designated "limited."

1. On January 1, 1841, translated into German by Susemihl, published at Leipzig, in 1841, by Kollmann.
2. On September 2, 1842, the very same edition appears.
3. On January 1, 1842, an English edition appears published by Gaudry, in Paris, in 1841.

³G. P. R. James, Arabella Stuart: A Romance from English History, Vol. 19, The Works of G. P. R. James (London, 1849). In this study all references to this work will be to this edition.

⁴On December 2, 1844, G. P. R. James's Arabella Stuart was entered on the list of censorship in German translation by Susemihl, published at Leipzig, in 1844, by Kollmann. The label was "limited."

⁵Oscar Jaszi, The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy (Chicago, 1929), p. 77.

⁶Sir Walter Scott, The Fortunes of Nigel, vols. 25-26.

⁷Nigel appears on the list for November, 1822, as a French publication, published in Paris, in 1822, by Gosselin. It was to be limited in circulation. Again it appears on October, 1822, in German translation, still only limited.

⁸Samuel C. Chew, "The Nineteenth Century and After (1789-1939)" A Literary History of England, edited by Albert C. Baugh (New York, 1948), pp. 1215-16.

⁹Sir Walter Scott, The Legend of Montrose, vol. 14.

¹⁰Robert A. Kann, A Study in Austrian Intellectual History (New York, 1960), pp. 274-75.

¹¹Raoul Auernheimer, Prince Metternich (New York, 1940), p. 98, and Kann, op. cit., p. 290.

¹²Jászi, op. cit., p. 76.

¹³Emma Robinson Whitehall or The Days of Charles the First (London, nd.). In this study all references to this work will be to this edition.

¹⁴The entry is: Whitehall; or The Days of Charles I. An historical romance by the author of Whitefriars, published in Paris, in 1845, by Baudry. There was no label.

¹⁵Kann, op. cit., p. 260.

¹⁶Sir Walter Scott, Woodstock, vols. 37-38.

¹⁷On the list for August, 1826, to be limited in circulation, is Scott's Woodstock, translated into German by Michaelis, at Leipzig, in 1826, published by Herbig.

¹⁸G. P. R. James, Richelieu: A Tale of France (London, 1924). In this study all references to this work will be to this edition.

¹⁹James's Richelieu, A Tale of France published in Paris, in 1837, by Baudry, appears untranslated on the list with Philip Augustus in 1837, labeled "restricted."

²⁰See note 5, above.

²¹G. P. R. James, The Huguenot: A Tale of the French Protestants (London, 1839). In this study all references to this work will be to this edition.

²²C. K. Webster, The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh, 1815-1822; Britain and the European Alliance (London, 1925), p. 184.

²³The Huguenot by G. P. R. James appears on the list for 2 October, 1839, published in Leipzig, in 1839, and again on 1 February 1840, both editions being German translations. The label of each entry was "restricted."

²⁴George Payne Rainsford James, Russell: A Tale of the Reign of Charles II (Leipzig, 1847). 2 vols.

²⁵G. P. R. James's Russell, a tale of the reign of Charles II, vols. 1-2, published in Leipzig, by Tauchnitz, in 1847, appears on the list for September 1, 1847, labeled "restricted."

²⁶Kann, op. cit., pp. 260-75 passim.

²⁷Emma Robinson, Whitefriars; or The Court of Charles II (London, 1903). In this study all references to this work will be to this edition.

²⁸On the list for June 2, 1844, appears Whitefriars or The Days of Charles Second, an historical novel translated out of the English by J. G. Guenther, in three volumes, published by Wigand, in Leipzig, in 1844, with neither an author nor a label given.

²⁹Horace Smith, Arthur Arundel: A Tale of the English Revolution (London, 1844). 3 vols.

³⁰On July 1, 1845, an entry appears on the list as, "Smith, Horace; Arthur Arundel, a novel out of the time of the English Revolution, translated by W. A. Linden, in two volumes, published in Leipzig in 1845 by Kollmann."

³¹Walter Scott, The Pirate, vols. 23 and 24.

³²The censors listed this work on July, 1822, as a forbidden book, translated into German by Spiker, published in Berlin in three volumes, in 1822.

³³A. J. P. Taylor, The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809-1918 (London, 1960), p. 34.

Notes

Chapter V

¹Walter Scott, Waverley, Vols. 1 and 2.

²This work appeared, a book to be limited in circulation, on the list for March, 1824, under the title The Pretender, after or according to W. Scott, revised or elaborated on by H. Müller, in 1823, published by Caffé at Quedlay and Leipzig. This was no doubt a free translation, but on the list for August, 1824, as a forbidden book, it was one of those included in the novels published by Nistri at Pisa, in 1823.

³C. K. Webster, The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh, 1815-1822; Britain and the European Alliance (London, 1925), p. 187.

⁴Robert A. Kann, A Study in Austrian Intellectual History (New York, 1960), p. 274.

⁵Mrs. Mary M. Sherwood, The Monk of Cimies, Vol. 14 of The Works of Mrs. Sherwood (New York, 1837). All references in this study to this work will be to this edition.

⁶On the list for September 1, 1840, was Mrs. Sherwood's The Monk of Cimies, a free translation by Reitlinger, in German, published in two volumes in 1840, by Eutlin and Loublin. It bore no label.

⁷This work appears on the list of censored books for January 2, 1841. Mrs. Sherwood's The Nun was translated from English into German by Luise Marezole, published in two volumes, by Reutlingen in 1840. It had no label.

⁸Mrs. Sherwood, The Nun, Vol. 7 of The Works of Mrs. Sherwood (New York, 1834). All references to this work in this paper will be to this edition.

⁹Algernon Cecil, Metternich (London, 1947), p. 217.

¹⁰A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, and Stanley Leathes (eds.), The Restoration (The Cambridge Modern History Series, Vol. X; New York, 1930), p. 357.

¹¹Allan Cunningham, Lord Roldan (New York, 1836). 2 vols. All references to this work in this study will be to this edition.

¹²This work appears on the list for 1836, with a label of "limited," translated into German by W. A. Lindan, published in two volumes, by Kollmann, in Leipzig, in 1836.

¹³Webster, op. cit., p. 187.

¹⁴Oscar Jászi, The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy (Chicago, 1929), p. 76.

¹⁵Lady Charlotte Bury. The Disinherited and The Ensnared (Paris, 1837). In this study all references to this work will be to this edition, with specific sources given in parentheses following citations.

¹⁶In 1837 appeared with "limited" label two novels, The Disinherited and The Ensnared, by the authoress of Flirtation, published in Paris, in 1837, by Baudry.

¹⁷The Last Man, by the author of Frankenstein (London, 1826). 3 vols. In this study all references to this book will be to this edition.

¹⁸For June, 1826, under the "forbidden" label appears The Last Man by the author of Frankenstein, vols. 1-3, published in London, in 1826, by Colburn.

¹⁹Muriel Spark and Derek Stanford, My Best Mary (London, 1953), p. 224.

²⁰Elizabeth Nitchie, Mary Shelley (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1953), p. 35.

²¹Eileen Bigland, Mary Shelley (New York, 1959), p. 263.

²²Nitchie, op. cit., p. 162.

Notes

Chapter VI

¹Ernst Marboe, The Book of Austria, trans. G. E. R. Gedge (Vienna, 1948), p. 136.

²Oscar Jászi, The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy (Chicago, 1929), pp. 76-80 passim.

³Henry A. Beers, A History of English Romanticism in the Nineteenth Century (New York, 1910), p. 181.

⁴A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, and Stanley Leathes (eds.), The Restoration (Cambridge Modern History Series, Vol. X; New York, 1911), p. 357.

⁵Robert A. Kann, A Study in Austrian Intellectual History (New York, 1960), pp. 273-74.

⁶Frederick B. Artz, Reaction and Revolution - 1814-1832 (The Rise of Modern Europe Series, Vol. XIV; New York, 1934), p. 146.

⁷George Macaulay Trevelyan, Manin and the Venetian Revolution of 1848 (London, 1923), p. 23.

⁸Artz, op. cit., pp. 134-35.

⁹Ibid., p. 239.

¹⁰Marboe, op. cit., p. 137.

¹¹Rowland E. Prothero (ed.), The Works of Lord Byron (London, 1904), V, 171.

¹²Artz, op. cit., p. 3.

¹³Ibid., p. 4.

¹⁴Beers, op. cit., pp. 40-41.

¹⁵Una Pope-Hennessy, Sir Walter Scott (Denver, 1949), p. 80.

¹⁶C. K. Webster, The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh, 1815-1822; Britain and the European Alliance (London, 1925), p. 187.

¹⁷Algernon Cecil, Metternich (3rd. edition; London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1947), p. 300, and Webster, op. cit., p. 187.

¹⁸Kann, op. cit., pp. 274-75.

¹⁹Ward and others, op. cit., p. 371.

²⁰Ibid., p. 358.

²¹J. P. T. Bury (ed.), The Zenith of European Power (The New Cambridge Modern History Series, Vol. X; Cambridge, 1960), p. 493.

²²Julius Marx, "Die Zensur der Kanzlei Metternichs," Österreichische Zeitschrift für Öffentliches Recht, IV (1952), 172-237.

²³Trevelyan, op. cit., p. 23, and Artz, op. cit., p. 4.

²⁴Beers, op. cit., p. 193.

²⁵E. Preston Dargan, "Scott and the French Romantics," PMLA XLIX (1934), 599-605 passim.

²⁶Ibid., p. 602.

²⁷Lawrence Marsden Price, English Literature in Germany (Berkeley, 1953), pp. 330-32.

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Oliver Elton, A Survey of English Literature, 1780-1830 (London, 1912), I, 362.

³⁰Beers, op. cit., p. 158.

³¹Alida A. S. Wieten, Mrs. Radcliffe - Her Relation Towards Romanticism (Amsterdam, 1926), pp. 131-40 passim.

³²Price, op. cit., p. 307.

³³Beers, op. cit., pp. 158-239 passim.

³⁴Price, op. cit., p. 328.

³⁵Bury, op. cit., p. 114.

³⁶Wilfred S. Dowden, "Byron and the Austrian Censorship,"
Keats-Shelley Journal, IV (Winter, 1955), 71-73.

³⁷A. J. P. Taylor, The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809-1918 (London,
1960), p. 38.

Bibliography

- Ainsworth, William Harrison. Guy Fawkes. Novels by William Harrison Ainsworth. Vol. X. Philadelphia: The Rittenhouse Press, nd.
- Artz, Frederick B. Reaction and Revolution - 1814-1832. The Rise of Modern Europe Series. Vol. XIV, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1934.
- Auernheimer, Raoul. Prince Metternich. New York: Alliance Book Corporation, 1940.
- Beers, Henry A. A History of English Romanticism in the Nineteenth Century. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1910.
- Bernbaum, Ernest. Guide Through the Romantic Movement. New York: The Ronald Press, 1949.
- Bieber, Hugh. "Jews and Jewish Problems in German Literature," The Jewish People, Past and Present. Jewish Encyclopedic Handbooks. Vol. III, New York: Central Yiddish Culture Organization 1952, pp. 239-56.
- Bigland, Eileen. Mary Shelley. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1959.
- Blankenagel, John C. "The Dominant Characteristics of German Romanticism," PMLA, LV (1940), 1-10.
- Bray, Mrs. Anne Eliza. De Foix; or Sketches of the Manners and Customs of the Fourteenth Century. London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1826. 3 vols.
- Fitz of Fitz-Ford; A Legend of Devon. London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1830. 3 vols.
- Henry de Pomeroy; or The Eve of St. John. London: Longman, 1846.
- The Talba; or The Moor of Portugal. New York: J. and J. Harper, 1831. 3 vols.
- Burke, Redmond A. What Is the Index? Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1952.

- Bury, Lady Charlotte. The Disinherited and The Ensnared. Paris: Baudry's European Library, 1837.
- Bury, J. P. T. (ed.). The Zenith of European Power. The New Cambridge Modern History Series. Vol. X: Cambridge: University Press, 1960.
- Cecil, Algernon. Metternich. 3rd. edition; London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1947.
- Chew, Samuel C. "The Nineteenth Century and After (1789-1939). " A Literary History of England, edited by Albert C. Baugh. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1948.
- Clark, Chester Wells. Franz Joseph and Bismarck. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934.
- Cresson, W. P. The Holy Alliance. New York: Oxford University Press, 1922.
- Cunningham, Allan. Lord Roldan. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1836.
- Dargan, E. Preston. "Scott and the French Romantics," PMLA, XLIX (1934), 599-629.
- Dowden, W. S. "Byron and the Austrian Censorship," Keats-Shelley Journal (Winter, 1955), pp. 67-75.
- Ellis, S. M. The Solitary Horseman or The Life and Adventures of G. P. R. James, Kensington: The Cayme Press, 1927.
- Elton, Oliver. A Survey of English Literature, 1780-1830. Vol. I. London: Edward Arnold, 1912.
- Fairchild, Hoxie N. "The Romantic Movement in England," PMLA, LV (1950), 20-26.
- French, Gilbert Jr. An Enquiry into the Origin of the Authorship of Some of the Earlier Waverley Novels. Bolton: Jas. Hudsmith, 1856.
- Gobineau, Le Comte de. Essai Sur L'Inegalite des Races Humaines. 2nd. edition; Paris: Firmin-Didot Et Cil, 1933. 2 vols.
- Grant, Aline. Ann Radcliffe. Denver: Alan Swallow, 1951.

- Grattan, Thomas Colley. Jacqueline of Holland. London: Henry Colburn and Richard Bentley, 1831. 3 vols.
- Gray, W. Forbes (ed.). The Sir Walter Scott Quarterly. Edinburgh: H. & J. Pillans Wilson, 1927.
- Havens, George R. "Romanticism in France," PMLA, LV (1940), 10-20.
- History of the Ballantyne Press and Its Connection with Sir Walter Scott. Edinburgh: Ballantyne and Company, 1871.
- James, G. P. R. Arabella Stuart: A Romance from English History. The Works of G. P. R. James. Vol. XIX. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Company, 1849.
- Philip Augustus; or The Brothers in Arms. London: Smith Elder and Company, 1845.
- The Huguenot; A Tale of the French Protestants. London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1839.
- Richelieu; A Tale of France. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1924.
- Russell: A Tale of the Reign of Charles II. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1847. 2 vols.
- Jaszi, Oscar. The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929.
- Kann, Robert A. A Study in Austrian Intellectual History. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1960.
- Karfeld, Kurt Peter. Austria in Color, text by Gordon Shepherd. Vienna: Österreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1957.
- Landis, Paul Nissley. "The Waverley Novels or A Hundred Years After," PMLA, LII (1937), 461-73.
- Last Man, The. By the author of Frankenstein. London: Henry Colburn, 1826. 3 vols.
- Lockhart, J. G. Memoirs of Sir Walter Scott. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1914. 5 vols.

- Lovejoy, Arthur O. "On the Discriminations of Romanticisms," PMLA, XXXIX (1924), 229-53.
- Lytton, Edward Bulwer. The Last of the Barons. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1944.
- McKenzie, Kenneth. "Romanticism in Italy," PMLA, LV (1940), 27-35.
- Marboe, Ernst. The Book of Austria, trans. G. E. R. Gedge. Vienna: Austrian State Publishing Office, 1948.
- Margolis, Max L. and Alexander Marx. A History of the Jewish People. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1947.
- Marshall, Mrs. Julian. The Life and Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley. London: Richard Bentley and Son, 1889. 2 vols.
- Marx, Julius. "Die Zensur der Kanzlei Metternich," Österreichische Zeitschrift für Öffentliches Recht. IV (1952), 170-237.
- May, Arthur. The Age of Metternich, 1814-1848. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933.
- Mumby, Frank Arthur. Publishing and Bookselling. New York: R. R. Bowker, Company, 1931.
- Neill, G. Diana. A Short History of the English Novel. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952.
- Nitchie, Elizabeth. Mary Shelley. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1953.
- "Romantic Permutations and Combinations in England," PMLA, LV (1940), 46-53.
- Plant, Marjorie. The English Book Trade. New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1939.
- Pope-Hennessy, Una. Sir Walter Scott, Denver: Alan Swallow, 1949.
- Price, Lawrence Marsden. English Literature in Germany. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1953.
- Prothero, Rowland E. (ed.). The Works of Lord Byron. London: John Murray, 1904. Vols. 4 and 5.

Radcliffe, Mrs. Anne. Gaston de Blondville; or The Court of Henry III. London: Henry Colburn, 1826. 3 vols.

Renwick, W. L. (ed.). Sir Walter Scott Lectures. Edinburgh: University Press, 1950.

Richard of York; or The White Rose of England. New York: Wallis and Newell, 1835.

Robinson, Mrs. Emma. Whitefriars; or the Court of Charles II. London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1903.

Whitehall; or The Days of Charles the First. London: George Rutledge & Sons, Ltd., nd.

"Romanticism: A Symposium," PMLA, LV (1940), 1-60.

Roth, Cecil. "The European Age in Jewish History (to 1648)," The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion, edited by Louis Finkelstein. Vol. I, New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1949, pp. 216-49.

"The Jews of Western Europe (from 1648)," The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion, edited by Louis Finkelstein, pp. 250-86.

Scott, Sir Walter. Anne of Geierstein. The Works of Sir Walter Scott, Including the Waverley Novels and the Poems. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1912. Vols. 41-42.

The Fair Maid of Perth. Vols. 39-40.

The Fortunes of Nigel. Vols. 25-26.

Ivanhoe. Vols. 15-16.

The Legend of Montrose. Vol. 14.

The Pirate. Vols. 23-24.

Quentin Durward. Vols. 29-30.

Waverley. Vols. 1-2.

Woodstock. Vols. 37-38.

- Sherwood, Mrs. Mary M. The Monk of Cimies. The Works of Mrs. Sherwood. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1837.
- The Nun. The Works of Mrs. Sherwood. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1834. Vol. 7.
- Smith, Horace. Arthur Arundel. A Tale of the English Revolution. London: Henry Colburn, 1844.
- Spark, Muriel, and Derek Stanford. My Best Mary. London: Allan Wingate, 1953.
- Srbik, Heinrich Ritter von. Metternich. Munich: Hermann Rinn, 1956.
- Tarr, F. Courtney. "Romanticism in Spain," PMLA, LV (1940), 35-46.
- Taylor, A. J. P. The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809-1918. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1960.
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay. Manin and the Venetian Revolution of 1848. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1923.
- Tschuppik, Karl. Francis Joseph I. trans. C. J. S. Sprigge. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1930.
- Wagenknecht, Edward. Cavalcade of the English Novel. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1954.
- Ward, A. W., G. W. Prothero, and Stanley Leathes (eds.). The Restoration. The Cambridge Modern History Series. Vol. X. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911.
- Wellek, Rene. "The Concept of Romanticism in Literary History," Comparative Literature, I (Winter, 1949), 1-23, 147-72.
- Webster, C. K. The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh, 1815-1822; Britain and the European Alliance. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1925.
- Wieten, Alida Alberdina Sibbellina. Mrs. Radcliffe - Her Relation Towards Romanticism. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1926.