

I. Trollope's Time and Clerical Abuse

In this short novel *The Warden*, Trollope highlights and satirizes clerical abuses in the 19th century Church of England. The story centers around a legacy that was intended for charitable purposes but which is now being used to provide a comfortable sinecure for a minor clergyman. However, rather than taking the easy route of painting the recipient, Mr. Harding, as a conniving exploiter, Trollope, instead portrays him as an innocent and gentle figure who lovingly cares for the Bedesmen of the charity and who innocently accepts his excessive income as a customary gift. As the story unfolds, another harsher figure, Archdeacon Grantly, aggressively defends the church's rights, but Mr. Harding is unwilling to accept the public odium of his position and also slowly comes to believe that he should not accept his income unless he can be certain it was what the long dead founder intended. Thus, Trollope succeeds in highlighting and attacking a common clerical abuse, but in a way that largely avoids attacking the clergy themselves.

The story concerns the impact upon Harding and his circle when a zealous young reformer, John Bold, launches a campaign to expose the disparity in the apportionment of the charity's income between its object, the Bedesmen, and its officer, Mr Harding. John Bold embarks on this campaign out of a spirit of public duty despite his romantic involvement with Eleanor and previously cordial relations with Mr. Harding.

The Warden, Rev. Septimus Harding gets eight hundred pounds a year for accepting the title in Hiram's Hospital established for the purpose of charity. Bedesmen living in the same hospital gets only few shillings. John Bold, a young reformer, begins a campaign against the hospital. Through these issues, Trollope questions follies, frailties, economic exploitation, injustice, so called harmony and self deceptions within religious

cultures of churches. Those of the bedesmen of the hospital who have allowed their appetite for greater income to estrange them from the warden are reproved by their senior member, Bunce, who has been constantly loyal to Harding whose good care and understanding heart are now lost to them.

Bold attempts to enlist the support of the press and engages the interest of *The Jupiter* (a newspaper representing *The Times*). Tom Towers, editor, pens editorials are supporting reform of the charity, and presenting a portrait of Mr Harding as being selfish and derelict in his conduct of his office. This image is taken up by the commentators Dr. Pessimist Anticant, and Mr Popular Sentiment, who have been seen as caricatures of Thomas Carlyle and Charles Dickens respectively.

To study such situation prevalent in Britain New Historicism has been chosen as a methodological tool. It is a concept that opposes the ideas of historicism. According to historicism, history is the main determining process. And so, historicism denies human agency and valorizes the past traditions over the present. But in the 1980s, there occurred a break from these assumptions of historicism, and thus, a movement termed "New Historicism" started in the United States. The major critics who supported this new movement were Stephen Greenblatt, Louis Motrose, Jonathan Goldberg, Jerome McGann and Marjore Levinson.

Following Michel Foucault's archaeological method, new Historicism rejects the traditional historicist notion of continuity, progress and underlying historical unity. Instead it makes a parallel study of history and literature, and gives equal weight to both genres. So, it neither evaluates literature at the coat of history, nor it goes the other way round. It puts both literary and non-literary texts on the same ground because both of

them are after all the product of the same ideology of the time. So, the main job of the New Historicists is to show the operation of ideology in the production of various cultural artifacts.

New Historicist method, therefore, turns all the texts into discourses and erases the boundary between fiction and non-fiction. For example, David DeLaura's *Hebrew and Helen* in Victorian England shows inter-textuality between fiction and non-fiction. Similarly, Rosemary Jann's *Art and Science of Victorian History* shows how history itself, to some extent, is the product of artistic imagination. Also, Gillian Beer's *Darwin's Plot* shows the interplay between science and imaginative literature. Thus, this recognition of inter-relations among apparently unrelated disciplines is the central tendency of New Historicist approach.

New historicism also has something in common with the historical criticism of Hippolyte Taine, who has argued that "a literary work is less the product of its author's imaginations than the social circumstances of its creation, the three main aspects of which Taine called race, milieu, and moment" (43). It is also a response to an earlier historicism, practiced by early 20th century critics such as John Livingston Lowes, which sought to de-mythologize the creative process by reexamining the lives and times of canonical writers. But New Historicism differs from both of these trends in its emphasis on ideology: the political disposition, unknown to an author himself that governs his work.

Anthony Trollope was one of the most successful, prolific and respected English novelists of the Victorian era. Some of his best-loved works — known as the *Chronicles of Barsetshire* (e.g., *Barchester Towers* [1857], *Framley Parsonage* [1861]) — revolves

around the imaginary county of Barsetshire. He also wrote penetrating novels on political, social, and gender issues, and on other topical conflicts of these days.

Trollope has always been a popular novelist. Noted fans have included Sir Alec Guinness (who never traveled without a Trollope novel), former British Prime Ministers Harold Macmillan and Sir John Major, economist John Kenneth Galbraith, American novelists Sue Grafton and Dominick Dunne and soap opera writer Harding Lemay. Trollope's literary reputation dipped somewhat during the last years of his life, but he regained the esteem of critics by the mid-twentieth century.

Barchester Towers concerns the leading citizens of the imaginary cathedral city of Barchester. The much loved bishop having died, all expectations are that his son, Archdeacon Grantly, also a clergyman, will gain the office in his place. Instead, owing to the passage of the power of patronage to a new Prime Minister, a newcomer, Bishop Proudie, his wife, Mrs. Proudie, exercises an undue influence over the new bishop, making herself unpopular with right-thinking members of the clergy and their families. Her interference in the reappointment of the universally popular Mr Septimus Harding (hero of Trollope's earlier novel, *The Warden*) as warden of the hospital is not well received, even though she gives the position to a needy clergyman with a large family to support.

The Way We Live Now is a scathing satirical novel published in London in 1875 by Anthony Trollope, after a popular serialization. It was regarded by many of Trollope's contemporaries as his finest work. One of his longest novels (it contains a hundred chapters), *The Way We Live Now* is particularly rich in sub-plot. It was inspired by the financial scandals of the early 1870s, and lashes at the pervading dishonesty of the age,

commercial, political, moral, and intellectual. It is one of the last significant Victorian novels to have been published in monthly parts. Augustus Melmotte is a foreign-born financier with a mysterious past. When he moves his business and his family to London, the city's upper crust begins buzzing with rumors about him - and a host of characters ultimately find their lives changed because of him.

Can You Forgive Her? is the next novel by Trollope, first published in serial form in 1864 and 1865. It is the first of six novels in the "Palliser" series. The novel follows three parallel stories of courtship and marriage and the decisions of three strong women: Alice Vavasor, her cousin Glencora Palliser, and her aunt Arabella Greenow. Early on, Alice asks the question "What should a woman do with her life?" This theme repeats itself in the dilemmas faced by the other women in the novel. Lady Glencora and her husband Plantagenet Palliser recur in the remainder of the Palliser series.

The Warden concerns Mr. Septimus Harding, elderly warden of Hiram's Hospital and Precentor of Barchester Cathedral. Hiram's Hospital is an alms house supported by the income from a medieval charitable bequest to the Diocese of Barchester. The income maintains the alms house itself, supports its twelve Bedsmen, and, in addition, provides a comfortable abode and living for its warden. Mr Harding has been appointed to this position through the patronage of his old friend the Bishop of Barchester, who is also the father of Archdeacon Grantly to whom Harding's older daughter, Susan, is married. The warden, who lives with his remaining child, an unmarried younger daughter Eleanor, performs his duties conscientiously.

The Warden has been analyzed from various perspectives: feminist, Marxist, existentialist, religious and psychological among the others. There are some critics who

also relate the novel in female centred idealism. Implementing the Marxist notion Tels Café writes, "*The Warden* is a subtle study of the clash between the individual conscience and the public persuasion" (21). Unlike him, in realistic or naturalistic views of Philip Collins:

In *The Warden*, Trollope refers briefly to 'the thickest of London smoke' and 'the Sullied Thames,' but not to pursue these matters with the familiar Dickensian resonances, reformist or symbolical; instead, these disagreeable features of London are mentioned for their contrast to the beauty and tranquility of the temple Gradens ('the medieval court of the metropolis. . . Where can retirement be so completed as here?' (187)

The Warden is totally a religious satire written by Trollope. The entire novel is based on the critical view to observe the exploitation of clerical abuse of the warden. Some high personnel are getting high rate of remuneration and some are drastically low incentives in the religious institution. Mia Lwama studies the novel through the New Critical approach in description and Setting in *The Warden*. She associates different kind of images and symbols with nature, characteristics, and ability of the characters:

And now let us observe the well-furnished breakfast-parlor at Plumstead Episcopi, and the comfortable air of all the belongings of the rectory. Comfortable they certainly were, but neither gorgeous nor even grand; indeed, considering money that had been spent there, the eye and taste might have been better served; there was an air of heaviness about the rooms which might have been avoided without any sacrifice of propriety; colors might have been chosen and lights more perfectly diffused; but

perhaps in doing so the through clerical aspect of the whole might have been somewhat marred; at any rate, it was not without ample consideration. (96)

Exploitation and injustice among the workers of church is clear in the above line. Certain staffs were highly privileged and some were underprivileged. Everything which were going along the church obviously is unfair. Outwardly, it was well furnished but inwardly it was highly corrupted. The level of corruption was so high in the church, they even redeemed the corrupted people by taking money.

In *What can She Know: Feminist Theory and the Construction of Knowledge*, Lorraine Code also focuses on the bad aspect of the norms of church and system that they used to conduct. Cofe focuses on:

The reading of Anthony Trollope's *The Warden* illuminates some implication of Kantian and Kantian derived autonomy with its inflexible rule of duty over inclination. John Bold, a zealous young reformer, takes upon himself a mission of reforming the Anglican clergy, particularly its members who seem to be abusing the privilege of their office for unwarranted financial gain. (74)

Clergy and churches were considered as higher and pure institution among all even now it is superior among all. It has power and blessing of god. No one could question the existence of god. This absolute power was in the grip of people, pop/clergy/pastor etc. They could even redeem people from their sin. This absolute power had corrupted the clergy man resulting the corruption of church.

Preceding the critics Fiona Jones writes and commented on this novel as a revelation of the foibles of the clergy man and darkness inside the church. She further writes:

I particularly enjoy *The Warden* because of the very gentle way in which Trollope exposes and satirizes human weaknesses. He avoids being harsh or critical and instead draws the reader into a gentle understanding that author, reader, and characters all share many of the same follies, frailties and self-deceptions. Archdeacon Grantly may often be pompous and foolish, but he is also very human. (9)

Apart from the above criticism, remarks and reviews made on *The Warden*, no one has even touched superficially the issue of New Historicism in the novel. The research in its inception tries to explore and examine the New Historicist issues in the novel. The present study attempts to explore the clerical abuse of the nineteenth century Church of England by applying New Historicism as methodological tool with special reference of Stephen Greenblatt, Louis Montrose and Michel Foucault.

This research has been divided into four chapters. First chapter deals with an introductory aspect of the study. It further comprises hypothesis, elaboration of statement of problem, general overview of tool analysis, writer's background, themes that the author dealt with and literature review. Second part investigates the theoretical log frame that is to be effectively applied in the analysis of the novel *The Warden*. New Historicism is the analytical tool. It further comprises its evolution, development, and its application. The third chapter of this thesis presents textual analysis of the novel, *The Warden* with the application of New Historicist technique in the pertinent and considerable length. And

finally, conclusion is the ultimate part of the thesis which concludes the proven postulates and hypothesis along with main points.

II. New Historicism: Blurring the line between Fact and Fiction

New Historicism is a school of literary theory, grounded in critical theory that developed in the 1980s, primarily through the work of the critic Stephen Greenblatt, and gained widespread influence in the 1990s. New Historicists aim simultaneously to understand the work through its historical context and to understand cultural and intellectual history through literature, which documents the new discipline of the history of ideas. Michel Foucault has based his approach both on his theory of the limits of collective cultural knowledge and on his technique of examining a broad array of documents in order to understand the *episteme* of a particular time. New Historicism is claimed to be a more neutral approach to historical events, and to be sensitive towards different cultures.

There are a numbers of similarities between this school and Marxism, especially a British group of critics making up a school usually referred to as Cultural Materialism. Both New Historicists and Cultural Materialists are interested in recovering lost histories

and in exploring mechanisms of repression and subjugation. The major difference is that New Historicists tend to concentrate on those at the top of the social hierarchy (i.e. the church, the monarchy, the upper-classes) while Cultural Materialists tend to concentrate on those at the bottom of the social hierarchy (the lower-classes, women, and other marginalized peoples). Also, though each of the schools practices different kinds of history, New Historicists tend to draw on the disciplines of political science and anthropology given their interest in governments, institutions, and culture, while Cultural Materialists tend to rely on economics and sociology given their interest in class, economics, and commodification.

New Historicists, like the Cultural Materialists, are interested in questions of circulation, negotiation, profit and exchange, i.e. how activities that purport to be above the market (including literature) are in fact informed by the values of that market. However, New Historicists take this position further by then claiming that all cultural activities may be considered as equally important texts for historical analysis: contemporary trials of hermaphrodites or the intricacies of map-making may inform a Shakespeare play as much as, say, Shakespeare's literary precursors. New Historicism is also more specifically concerned with questions of power and culture.

Part of the difficulty of introducing this school is that a number of different approaches to history and culture often get lumped together under the category of "New Historicism." The sheer number of historical and cultural studies that have appeared since the early 1990s, including the dominance of the still-larger umbrella term, Cultural Studies, makes the cordoning off of a group of critics as "New Historicists" difficult. The effort to do so is certainly not helped by the fact that some of the most prominent

New Historicists, like Stephen Greenblatt and Alan Liu, either reject or critique the very term, "New Historicism." Nonetheless, this critical school and those scholars commonly associated with the school have been hugely influential on scholarship of the last decade, so it's important to come to grips with some of the general trends and common practices of this critical approach.

In typical New-historicist essay, the Geertzian model of thick description is evident in the initial deployment of an exemplary anecdote as a strategy of cultural and historical estrangement. In some examples of new-historicist work, such anecdotes may be elaborated into the interpretive units from which a sustained argument emerges, in others, the method may seem merely fashionable and formulaic, a vaguely associative accumulation of historical curiosities. Thus, Walter Cohen characterizes new-historicist method as arbitrary connectedness: "the strategy is governed methodologically by the assumption that any one aspect of a society is related to any other. no organizing principle determines these relationships" (34). And in order to describe this phenomenon, Dominick Lacapra offers the generous choice of "facile associationism, juxtaposition, or pastiche. . . weak montage, or, if you prefer, cut-and-paste bricolage" (193). New Historicist work has been particularly susceptible to such responses because it has frequently failed to theorize its method or its model of culture in any sustained way.

Having first called his critical project a 'cultural poetics' in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, Greenblatt returns to and develops the term in *Shakespearean Negotiations*. This enterprise is now defined as 'study of the collective making of distinct cultural practices and inquiry into the relations among these practices'; their relevant concerns are:

how collective beliefs and experiences were shaped, moved from one medium to another, concentrated in manageable aesthetic form, offered for consumption and how the boundaries were marked between cultural practices understood to be art forms and other, contiguous, forms of expression. (5)

It is described, in conspicuously formalist and structuralist terms, as a study of distinction among contiguous forms of expression. Cultural poetics tends to emphasize structural relations at the expense of sequential process; in effect, it orients the axis of intertextuality synchronically, as the text of a cultural system, rather than diachronically, as the text of an autonomous literary history.

H. Aram Veeser, introducing an anthology of essays, "The New Historicism" (1989), noted some key assumptions that continually reappear in New Historicist discourse; they were: that every expressive act is embedded in a network of material practices; that every act of unmasking, critique and opposition uses the tools it condemns and risks falling prey to the practice it exposes. Literary and non-literary "texts" circulate inseparably; that no discourse, imaginative or archival, gives access to unchanging truths, nor expresses inalterable human nature. A critical method and a language adequate to describe culture under capitalism participate in the economy they describe.

Sub-literary texts and uninspired non-literary texts all come to be read as documents of historical discourse, side-by-side with the great works of literature. A typical focus of New Historicist critics, led by Stephen Orgel, has been on understanding Shakespeare less as an autonomous great author in the modern sense than as a clue to the conjunction of the world of Renaissance theatre. A collaborative and largely anonymous

free-for-all—and the complex social politics of the time are sprouting. In this sense, Shakespeare's plays are seen as inseparable from the context in which he wrote.

Influential historians behind the eruption of the New Historicism are Fernand Braudel and the Annales School.

In this shift of focus, a comparison can be made with the best discussions of the works of decorative arts. Unlike fine arts, which had been discussed in purely formal terms, comparable to the literary New Criticism, under the influences of Bernard Berenson and Ernst Gombrich, nuanced discussion of the arts of design since the 1970s have been set within social and intellectual contexts. Taking account of fluctuations in luxury trades, the availability of design prototypes to local craftsmen, the cultural horizons of the patron, and economic considerations—"the limits of the possible" in economic historian Fernand Braudel's famous phrase. An outstanding pioneer example of such a contextualized study was Peter Thornton's monograph *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France and Holland* (1978).

In its historicism and in its political interpretations, New Historicism is indebted to Marxism. But whereas Marxism (at least in its cruder forms) tends to see literature as part of a 'superstructure' in which the economic 'base' (i.e. material relations of production) manifests itself, New Historicist thinkers tend to take a more nuanced view of power, seeing it not exclusively as class-related but extending throughout society. This view has been derived primarily from Michel Foucault and his work in critical theory.

In its tendency to see society as consisting of texts relating to other texts, with no 'fixed' literary value above and beyond the way specific societies read them in specific situations, New Historicism also owes something to postmodernism. However, New

Historicists tend to exhibit less skepticism than postmodernists and to show more willingness to perform the 'traditional' tasks of literary criticism: i.e. explaining the text in its context, and asking how the text enforces the cultural practices that it depends on for its own production and dissemination.

New Historicism shares many of the same theories as with what is often called Cultural materialism, but cultural materialist critics are even more likely to put emphasis on the present implications of their study and to position themselves in disagreement to current power structures, working to give power to traditionally disadvantaged groups. Cultural critics also downplay the distinction between "high" and "low" culture and often focus predominantly on the productions of "popular culture" (7). New Historicists analyze text with an eye to history. With this concept in mind, New Historicism is not "new". Many of the critiques that existed between the 1920s and the 1950s also focused on literature's historical content. These critics based their assumptions of literature on the connection between texts and their historical contexts.

New historicism also has something in common with the historical criticism of Hippolyte Taine, who argued that a literary work is less the product of its author's imaginations than the social circumstances of its creation, the three main aspects of which Taine called race, milieu, and moment. It is also a response to an earlier historicism, practiced by early 20th century critics such as John Livingston Lowes, which sought to de-mythologize the creative process by reexamining the lives and times of canonical writers. But New Historicism differs from both of these trends in its emphasis on ideology: the political disposition, unknown to an author himself that governs his work.

New Historicism frequently addresses the critical theory based idea that the lowest common denominator for all human actions is power, so the New Historicist seeks to find examples of power and how it is dispersed within the text. Power is a means through which the marginalized are controlled, and the thing that the marginalized (or, other) seek to gain. This relates back to the idea that because literature is written by those who have the most power, there must be details in it that show the views of the common people. New Historicists seek to find "sites of struggle" to identify just who is the group or entity with the most power.

Foucault's conception of power is neither reductive nor synonymous with domination. Rather he understands power (in modern times at least) as continually articulated on knowledge and knowledge on power. Nevertheless, his work in the 1970s on prisons may have been influential on the New Historicists. In these studies Foucault examined shifts in the mechanisms of power in these institutional settings. His discussions of techniques included the panoptical, a theoretical prison system developed by English philosopher Jeremy Bentham, and particularly useful for New Historicism.

Bentham stated that the perfect prison/surveillance system would be a cylindrical shaped room that held prison cells on the outside walls. In the middle of this spherical room would be a large guard tower with a light that would shine in all the cells. The prisoners thus would never know for certain whether they were being watched, so they would effectively police themselves, and be as actors on a stage, giving the appearance of submission, even when they are probably not being watched.

Foucault included the panoptical in his discussions on the technologies of power in part to illustrate the idea of lateral surveillance, or self-policing that occurs when those

who are subject to these techniques of power believe they are being watched. His purpose was to show that these techniques of power go beyond mere force and could prompt different regimes of self-discipline among those subject to the exercise of these visibility techniques. This often meant that, in effect, prisoners would often fall into line whether or not there was an actual need to do so.

Although the influence of such philosophers as French Structuralist Marxist Louis Althusser, Marxists Raymond Williams and Terry Eagleton were essential in shaping the theory of New Historicism, the work of Foucault also appears influential. Although some critics believe that these former philosophers have made more of an impact on New Historicism as a whole, "there is a popularly held recognition that Foucault's ideas have passed through the New Historicist formation in history as a succession of *épistèmes* or structures of thought that shape everyone and everything within a culture" (24). It is indeed evident that the categories of history used by New Historicists have been standardized academically. Although the movement is publicly disapproving of the periodisation of academic history, the uses to which New Historicists put the Foucauldian notion of the *épistème* amount to very little more than the same practice under a new and improved label.

In so far as Greenblatt has been explicit in expressing a theoretical orientation, he has identified the ethnography and theoretical anthropology of Clifford Geertz as highly influential. Greenblatt further argues in *Redrawing the Boundaries* that, "History has been fictionalized by the historian in each and every moment" (9).

Foucault is quite possibly the most influential critic of the last quarter of twentieth century. His interest in issues of power, epistemology, subjectivity, and

ideology have influenced critics not only in literary studies but also political science, history, and anthropology. His willingness to analyze and discuss disparate disciplines like medicine, criminal science, philosophy, the history of sexuality, government, literature, etc. as well as his questioning of the very principle of disciplinarily and specialization have inspired a host of subsequent critics to explore interdisciplinary connections between areas that had rarely been examined together. Foucault also had the ability to pick up common terms and give them new meaning, thus changing the way critics addressed such pervasive issues as "power," "discourse," "discipline," "subjectivity," "sexuality," and "government."

Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison is a book written by the philosopher Michel Foucault. Originally published in 1975 in France under the title *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la Prison*, it was translated into English in 1977. It is an examination of the social and theoretical mechanisms behind the massive changes that occurred in western penal systems during the modern age. He, most of the time, talks about the history and its territory for example a power determines the history. He says in his book *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*:

Finally, he was quartered," recounts the *Gazette d'Amsterdam* of 1 April 1757. "This last operation was very long, because the horses used were not accustomed to drawing; consequently, instead of four, six were needed; and when that did not suffice, they were forced, in order to cut off the wretch's thighs, to sever the sinews and hack at the joints . . . (75)

Foucault challenges the commonly accepted idea that the prison became the consistent form of punishment due to humanitarian concerns of reformists, although he does not

deny those. He does so by meticulously tracing out the shifts in culture that led to the prison's dominance, focusing on the body and questions of power. Prison is a form used by the 'disciplines', a new technological power, which can also be found, according to Foucault, in schools, hospitals, military barracks, etc.

Stephen Greenblatt's brilliant studies of the Renaissance has established him as the major figure commonly associated with New Historicism. Indeed, his influence meant that New Historicism first gained popularity among Renaissance scholars, many of whom were directly inspired by Greenblatt's ideas and anecdotal approach. This fascination with history and the minute details of culture soon caught on among scholars working in other historical periods, leading to the increasing popularity of culturally- and historically-minded studies. This general trend is often referred to as Cultural Studies.

Self-fashioning, a term introduced by Stephen Greenblatt is used to describe the process of constructing one's identity and public persona according to a set of socially acceptable standards. Greenblatt described the process in the Renaissance era where a noble man was instructed to dress in the finest clothing he could afford, to be well versed and educated in art, literature, sports, and other culturally determined noble exercises, and to generally compose himself in a carefully intended manner. Additionally, the relationship between self-fashioning and the aesthetic mediums was a reciprocal one. He says:

Renaissance is the era to discover one' oneself. It is not only the epoch of self discovery but also the age of discovery and re-construction. It is said most of the invention and discoveries had been taken place in Renaissance. But history is percolated in power and the position of power

handler. Renaissance is not the re-birth itself but it is made self fashion.

(45)

Stephen Greenblatt sets out to explain his longtime fascination with the ghost of Hamlet's father. This daring and ultimately gratifying journey takes him through surprising intellectual territory. It yields an extraordinary account of the rise and fall of purgatory as both a belief and lucrative institution – as well as a capacious new reading of the power of *Hamlet*. He says:

I believe that nothing comes of nothing, even in Shakespeare. I wanted to know where he got the matter he was working with and what he did with that matter. And so the broad inquiry that had come to focus more and more sharply on one figure in a single play spread out once again to encompass a dauntingly large field. Many of the key features of this field—the 'poetic' of Purgatory in England and the struggle over its existence – do not align themselves conveniently with elements in *Hamlet* or in any of Shakespeare's play. (4)

Power is the main determining process in history. History is percolated in power. Since Hamlet was in power and history had been written on the behalf of Hamlet. Here, Darwin's theory of survival of the fittest is highly apt in the case of hamlet. The role of the Hamlet is fit with respect to history and context.

A pamphlet containing *A Supplication for the Beggars* by Fish and three others edited by J. Meadows Cowper titled: With a Supplication to our most Sovereign Lord Young Henry the Eighth; a Supplication of the Poor Commons; and the Decay of England by the multitude of sheep. He says,

In A Supplication for the Beggars, this gift leads Fish not only to speak on behalf of the poor but also to speak in their own voice, crying out to the king against those who have greedily taken for themselves the wealth that should otherwise have made England prosperous for all of its people. If his gracious majesty would only look around, he would see things far out of joint'. (413)

Fish, here has given the voice of beggars to express their problems and constraints. By giving the sentiments on the behalf of poor and downtrodden, Fish has given the life in the history of England. It means, England is not only the home of rich and privileged one but also it is abode of poor and beggars who have equal right and responsibility.

Stephen Orgel's *The Authentic Shakespeare* is a discussion of the history. It interrogates the validity of Shakespeare. History is determined by the historian and his sentiments. Is the so called Shakespeare is the real one or he is the disguised appearance of others? He says,

Modern scientific bibliography began with the assumption that certain basic textual questions were capable of correct answers: that by developing rules of evidence and refining techniques of description and comparison the relation of editions of a work to each other and to the author's manuscript could be understood, and that an accurate text could thereby be produced. Behind these assumptions lies an even more basic one: that the correct text is the author's final manuscript, which is sometimes interpreted to mean the last printed edition published during the author's lifetime. (1)

Writing the bibliography and work cited has been started to keep the record of history. And it is entirely based on to understand the past things and technique of the author. Even the tradition of keeping bibliography has maintained its standard of writings. Now it is more to avoid the plagiarisms.

The content of historical stories is real events that really happened rather than imaginary events, events invented by the narrator. By giving the emphasizing upon the history and narratives what Hayden Whit in an article "Narrative in Historical Theory" is equally important to mention here:

The form of the history told was supposed to be necessitated by the form of the story enacted by historical agents. After the historian had discovered true story of "what happened" and accurately represented it in a narrative. He might abandon narration manner of speaking and addressing the reader directly, speaking in his own ways, and representing his considered opinions as students of human affairs, dilate on what the story he had told indicated about the nature of the period, place agents, agencies, and processes that he had studied. (3-4)

Context plays a vital role to determine the history. History which we are reading and continuing is not a real form of history. It has some discontents. History is influenced by the position of historian. Context plays a vital role in determining history. Power is percolated every time in history.

According to new historicists, we can never possess objective knowledge of history because historical writing is always entangled much to the philosophers and the "Historian of other ways". However, Foucault shares a lot with that new historicist in his

Redrawing the Boundaries of history has had a central influence on the domain of the ideas like power, discourse and subject.

Foucault's concept is departing from the traditional concept. As a historian, he has a three fold task. First, while confronting the 'one' reality, a historian should be infamous of the use of history as a 'parody', second, he should be against a singular continuity of identity. And thirdly, the 'investigation' should be directed against truth.

Foucault racial concept of history manifest itself in three dimension – it rejects absolute truth or origin and argues for fictionalized history and historicized fiction, it confutes the linearity of history and exposes how a body is imprinted and inscribed by history. Foucault tells us what effective history is:

Effective history differs from rational history in being without contents. Nothing in man – nor human is body – is being sufficiently stable to serve as basis fro this. Self – reorganizations or for understanding other man. History becomes effective to the degree that it introduces discontinuity in to our very being – as it divides our emotions, dramatizes our instincts, multiples our body and sees itself against itself. (285)

Michael Foucault developed a theory of discourse in relation to the power structures operating in a society. His main thesis is that discourse is involved to power. He says that discourse is rooted in social institutions and that social and political power operates through discourse. The discourse, therefore, is inseparable form of power because discourse is the ordering force that governs every institution. This enables institutions to exercise power and dominate those who possess the authority to define discourse exclude others who are not in power. Discourse informs us of the state of

affairs. So it is informative or mis-informative. Discourse also tells us of the propriety or impropriety of something and consequently influences our attitude, opinion and behavior. The exclusive function of discourse is to serve as a transparent representation of things and ideas standing outside it. Therefore, it is directive too.

Nietzsche, a prominent new historicist believes that, the world runs with the individuals having 'a will to power'. He had found that the 'will to power' is at work in all sorts of human behavior and valuations. He views power as the only important thing in the world. Everyone desires it. "The only thing that all men want," for Nietzsche, "is power, and whatever is wanted is wanted, for the sake of power. If something is wanted more than something else, it must represent power"(Nietzsche 511). In his essay "Truth and Falsity in an Ultramoral Sense", he questions the relation of language to truth. According to Hazard Adams, Nietzsche secularizes the "truth in language that is lie" (628). In the essay, he views human intellect as wretched, shadow like, transitory, purposeless, and fanciful. For Nietzsche history is made by "superman" who has "will to power" and super historical vantage point (630). He formulates truth on his behalf and so truth differs from society to society and discipline to discipline. Possibly, therefore, he defines, "truth as a mobile army of metaphor, metonymy, anthropomorphism: in short a sum of human relations which becomes practically and rhetorically intensified metamorphosed, adored, and after long usage seems to a nation fixed, canonic and binding" (636). He opines that truths are illusions of which one has forgotten that they are illusions.

In general, history is bad. It's linear, heading in a single direction and never wavering from its pre-set course. It's teleological, concerned with beginnings and

endings. It's comforting, usually reinforcing the bourgeois "myth of progress." And its "metaphysical," confident of its ability to get at ultimate origins and truths.

Genealogy, by contrast, is good. It's not linear--it follows a kind of branching structure. It's not teleological--and indeed it considers the search for origins not just fruitless but laughable. It's not comforting--because it explicitly rejects the myth of progress. And it's trying real hard not to be "metaphysical," either. Instead of worrying about God or Truth or Human Nature (note the capital letters, please), the genealogist--as Foucault himself explains--"shortens [her] vision to those things nearest it--the body, the nervous system, nutrition, digestion, and energies" (89).

To get an even better sense of what Foucault has in mind, just look at his vocabulary: he's constantly returning to notions of incoherence, instability, discontinuity, constantly invoking ideas of the accidental and the haphazard. The conventional historian denies or ignores such things, in order to construct a tidy little story.

Nietzsche's skepticism about the notion of truth and linearity of history becomes influential in the postmodern era. In other words, he anticipated most of the central tenets of postmodernism. And aesthetic attitude viewing history as representation of truth no longer exists after Nietzsche because he says life can never be understood in terms of ultimate truths. He denies facts and essences, and celebrates plurality of interpretations and fragmented self. He views 'power' as the only important thing in the world. Everyone desires it. He states, "the only thing that all men want is power, and whatever is wanted is wanted for the sake of power. If something is wanted more than something else is must represent" (511).

The new historicists are interested to establish the relationship between literature and history. Moreover, they focus on examining how literature reflected, shaped, and represented history. Literature, according to New Historicism, does not "reflect history as a mirror." Literature, therefore, doesn't behave passively towards history. "It rather shapes and constitutes historical change literary text can have effects on history, on the social and political ideas and beliefs of their time" (170).

The putatively Foucauldian new-historicist argument for the dominant production and containment of subversion is pungently characterized by Frank Lentricchia as "a prearranged theatre of struggle set upon the substratum of a monolithic agency. It produces 'opposing' as one of its delusive political effects (Foucault's Legacy" 234). However, such a strict containment argument oversimplifies Foucault's subtle, flexible, and dynamic conception of power by suggesting that the volatile and contingent relations of power. It saturates social space are actually determined by the crystallization of power in the state apparatus. Foucault emphasizes that,

Power's condition of possibility . . . must not be sought in the primary existence of a central point, in a unique source of sovereignty from which secondary and descendent forms would emanate; it is the moving substrate of force relation which, by virtue of the inequality, constantly engenders states of power, but the latter are always local and unstable. (93)

For Foucault, power is never monolithic; and power relations always imply multiple sites not only of power but also of resistance. He writes that such sites of resistance are of variable configuration, intensity, and effectiveness.

Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn in *Redrawing the Boundaries* in introduction part commented on the reconstructing the history. They simply talk about the matter of history is a matter of presentation. They argue:

In general, we think of the ways in which the frontiers are places of highest tension, vigilance, delay. But we should add that all talk of boundaries sits in a complex relation to a recognition of the larger whole within which most of the profession operates. We do not generally identify ourselves as occupying one of the subgroups with which our volume is concerned. (7)

In his introduction to a 1982 essay collection, Stephen J. Greenblatt distinguished what he dubbed the New Historicism, from an older reflections, and positivist literary historical scholarship and from new critical formalism. He commented that "Renaissance literary works are no longer regarded either as fixed set that are set apart from all other forms of expression and that contain their own determinate meanings or as stable set of reflections of historical facts that lie beyond them" (Introduction 6).

We might now add that the very identities, expectations, and practices associated with the positions termed artist, audience, and reader are themselves made up and constantly redrawn by the discursive processes in which they are engaged and that condition their own engagement with texts. Such a reciprocal fashioning is emphasized in Tony Bennet's concept of the 'reading formation,' described as:

An attempt to identify the determinations which, in operations on both texts and readers, mediate the relations between text and context, connecting the two and providing the mechanism through which they

productively interact in representing context not as a set of extra discursive relations but as a set of intertextual and discursive relations which produce readers for texts and texts for readers. (74)

This concept implicates critics in historically and institutionally situated roles as privileged readers, whose specialized though hardly disinterested knowledge constitutes the past that they undertake to elucidate. From this perspective, a new historicism or cultural poetics must be positioned within our own reading formation.

III. Clerical Abuse in Trollope's *The Warden*

Literature doesn't occupy a 'trans-historical' aesthetic realm which is independent of economic, social, and political conditions specific to an era, nor is literature subject to timeless criteria of artistic value. Instead, a literary text is simply one of many kinds of texts – religious, philosophical, legal, scientific, and so on – all of which are formed and structured by the particular conditions of a time and place, and among which the literary text has neither unique status nor special privilege. A related fallacy of mainstream criticism, according to new historicists, is to view literary texts as an autonomous body of fixed meanings that cohere to form an organic whole in which all conflicts are artistically resolved.

History is not a homogenous and stable pattern of facts and events which can be used as the 'background' to the literature of an era, or which literature can be said simply to reflect, or which can be adverted to as material conditions that in unilateral way, determine the particularities of a literary text. In contrast to such views, a literary text is said by new historicists to be embedded in its context and in contrast interaction and interchange with other components inside the network of institutions, beliefs, and cultural power-relations, practices, and products that in their ensemble, constitute what we call history. Two of these scandals are mentioned in the second chapter of *The Warden: St Cross Hospital in Winchester and the struggles of Mr. Whitson, at Rochester* of the two, the St Cross case is closer to the situation in the novel.

Like Hiram's Hospital, St. Cross was an almshouse for the elderly poor funded in the twelfth century. In the fine old pre-reform traditions of clerical nepotism, north had been appointed to the Mastership by his father, the bishop of Winchester, in 1808. He held it in plurality with the Rectory of Old Alresford and a rich parish in Southampton, which brought him a combined annual income of nearly 3500. He drew another 1000 a year from perennial stall in Winchester Cathedral and some 2000 to 3000 a year from St Cross. Despite his wealth and pluralism, however, the Earl of Guilford seems to have been reasonably responsible in his management of the hospital. On becoming master he increased the salaries of the steward and chaplain. He saw to it that the old men were well fed and housed, paid their doctor's bill, and like Mr. Harding added to their allowance. All this cost him about 1000 years. What made St. Cross a scandal in the 1840s was not so much master's conduct of the hospital. By which the standards of the day was hardly outrageous, as his conduct of the properties belonging to the hospital, which he was

leasing on fines (i.e. granting long leases at low rents in exchange for a capital sum, or fine) and pocketing a proceeds.

Thousands of pounds which should have gone to expand the charitable work of the hospital were being misappropriated by its clerical master. The abuse was taken up by the newspapers; a resolution was passed in parliament, and the St. Cross case was referred to the court of chancery in 1849. Nearly for years later the master of the rolls found against the earl of Guilford. He was prevented from taking future fines and made to repay those taken since 1849, the master's salary was reduced to 250 and his clerical duties re-established, and the management of the hospital was transferred to a board of trustees.

The activities of a reformer (in this case a retired clergyman) and the newspapers in bringing the abuse to light was a better task. The most suggestive of all, Perhaps, the dramatic potential in the figure of a clergyman grown old in the comfortable and corrupt ways of the eighteenth-century church, blinking in the sudden light of reform and publicity. The case of Rev. Robert Whiston at Rochester is less immediately relevant to the action of The Warden. Whiston was the energetic and successful headmaster of the Cathedral Grammar School, who had fallen foul of the dean and chapter by his efforts to persuade them to increase the value of the allowances. They were required to pay for the maintenance of four exhibitioners at university and twenty cathedral scholars, and which had been little changed for centuries.

In 1849, he published a pamphlet on *Cathedral Trusts and Their Fulfillment*, which not only set out his complaint against the Rochester chapter but pointed the finger at other cathedrals. The clergy had enriched themselves at the expense of the charities.

They were bound by statute to maintain. The chapter promptly dismissed him, but Whiston bravely took his case to law, where after the usual slow progress through the courts he won rather grudging verdict in his favor and was reinstated.

It has been suggested that Whiston was a John Bold, but this can only be true in so far as he brought into the open the mismanagement of cathedral revenues. Trollope's point about Bold is that he sets out to perform an institution in which he has no personal stake, and of whose true workings he is largely ignorant.

The same cannot be said of Whiston: he had a direct, professional interest in improving the maintenance provided for his pupils, and his campaign on their behalf was entirely honorable, albeit intemperately conducted at times. There is, however, one aspect of his case that may have struck Trollope: Whiston's faith in, and resort to public opinion and the power of the press. After winning his case in 1852 he sent a letter of thanks to the various newspapers that had supported him, including *The Times*, in which he has written,

Without the support of the press, in forming, guiding and reflecting the irresistible supremacy of public opinion, I might have indeed appealed in vain for even that measure of justice which I have at least obtained.

Virtues of the cathedral have really been saved by means of press. I appreciate the role of press on spreading the factual message which was happened on the cathedral. (4)

It is just such a faith in the irresistible supremacy of public opinion. When applied to an ancient institution like the Church, that *The Warden* sets out to question. The case of the church was so worst that even personnel working in the church couldn't actually know

what was going inside the church. They blindly believed that questioning against the church is going against the god. But Mr. Bold dared to go against the church and found out the flaws undergoing inside the church.

The reformer was a Dorset clergyman, Sidney Godolphin Osborne, who like the fictional Bold was something of a busybody, taking up one abuse after another, and a favored correspondent with the editor of *The Times*, who published his letters and sometimes took up the issues they raised in leading articles. Moreover, he was known to Trollope, who had earlier written an article for the examiner criticizing the vies on Ireland which Osborne had expressed in a previous series of letters to *The Times*. In 1853, Osborne was concerned with a loophole in the Simony law.

Law and order is never made for the clerical institution rather it is made for the common and underprivileged people who are most vulnerable one. Clergy itself is the symbol of god and representing the god. For god there is no law and act to be acted upon the misuse of power by the clergyman and other higher personnel related to the church. Church can never be a part of law rather it is one step up from the domain of law. (25)

At that time it was legal for the patron, or owner, of a clerical living to sell it to a clergyman only in prospect. He could sell the next presentation to the living, but not a vacant living. If the incumbent died before the living had been sold, another clergyman had to be instituted. There was therefore a temptation for a greedy patron to institute an old or dying man, on the likelihood of whose early death the next presentation could be sold profitably. In *The Times* of 28 July 1853 Osborne cited the case of a very ill man who had recently been presented to the living of St Ervan's in Cornwall. He was said to

be paralytic, and at his induction had to be helped down the aisle and fortified with wine, yet even so was unable to read through the thirty nine articles. He never raised and shortly thereafter died. In a further letter published on 20 August, Osborne accused this clergyman of selling his infirmity for the brief enjoyment of an increased stipend.

Then in *The Times* of first September appeared a letter from one Alfred Cox, naming the clergyman in question as his relative, the Rev. John Pope Cox, and describing him as so peculiarly mild and benevolent. It seems impossible to conceive that through the whole of his life he could have ever found . . . anyone who could harbor an unkind thought about him'. Cox claimed that his relative had been neither 'paralytic' nor avaricious. He had accepted the living in good faith, expecting to regain his health and reside at St Ervan's. He accused Osborne of using the columns of *The Times* to harrow the feelings of the widow and relatives of his brother clergyman by dragging his name before the public, and holding up his memory to public reprobation. After two more letters from Osborne of a somewhat self congratulatory kind, and another in support of him signed 'pro Bono Publico', the correspondence closed.

There are several features of this case which make it a likely source for *The Warden*. The testimony of Escott, the fact that Osborne was known to, and possibly disliked from Trollope and the very striking contrast between the reformer's public view of the abuse, and the private character and feelings of the clergyman and his family. That likelihood becomes a probability when we consider a fact which has never been pointed out before. *The Times*, Trollope's Jupiter, took up the St Ervan's case in a leading article. On 10 September 1853, the second leader magisterially endorsed Osborne's view of the Rev. Cox ('a paralytic, or as good as one') and then turned the accusation against the

Church, first mocking the bishops for their powerlessness to prevent the institution of a 'paralytic':

The bishop is only performing a scene in the splendid melodrama of Church of England. And has no more to do with the personal qualifications of the man before him than if he and the man were a couple of scene shifters elevated for five minutes into mitered abbots on the floor of Drury Lane. More for the cathedral system, they are not responsible for the reformation of the cathedral system. (6)

Questioning their utility (What need of such great men, such learned men, such well paid men . . . why twenty six to do purely mechanical act?), and ending by pointing soberly.

The Times obviously saw as the real abuse, absenteeism: a form of corruption and irregularity by the warden. Thus, the warden was never punctual and did whatever he liked.

New Historicism in its obvious dimension has succeeded to delve inside the history of ancient church and dismantle the conviction of Christian creed. The violation of law and order by the bishop and priest has successfully exposed. It never believes in the linear history which is written by the historian and tries to search the real and hidden fact of history. In the course of doing so it is obvious that *The Warden* is one of the text which dismantles the path of so called linear history.

The greatest scandals in the church are those which are not only undeniable, but even confessed, not to say boasted. A man obtaining a living is instituted and induced, read in, and then informs the Bishop that the house is too damp for him, or the church too spacious, or the parish too

extensive; and he takes leave of his parish forever; only drawing 5000 a year for it, and paying 1000 to his curate. . . There is not an office under government in which such conduct would be tolerated. . . (6)

Misconduct and the system of bribery and scam was so high in the church that even there is no any government or public office and administration in United Kingdom that were taking such a huge amount for their household works without any topics. Drawing 5000 a year for it, and paying 1000 for the curate was really a scandal among the people. It is a matter of public shame for the clergy person. Despite this they were collecting large revenue in the name of church and the Hiram Hospital. They only paid few of its portions to the common personals of the church and hospital.

Here, clearly, is the link between the reformer, the accused clergyman and the pronouncements of the Jupiter which figures so largely in *The Warden*. And although the Rev. Cox is unlike Mr. Harding in that he did not live to read the accusation against of Dr. Pessimist Anticant and Mr. Popular Sentiment. No doubt the anti reformism of *The Warden* is partly a defense of privilege and the old ways by the back door. But there is more to it than that. Trollope's originality lay in perceiving the moral imperialism of the reforming temper and its tendency to lose a sense of the complexities of the individual case. Therefore of the supreme value of individual integrity and conscience – in the simplifying pursuit of an abstract justice is like a key role to reform the church. It is a perception which clearly owed a good deal to his reflection upon these topical matters discussed in *The Times*. Trollope says citing *The History and its Discontent*:

Hiram's hospital is the representative symbol of the late 15th century church and its flaws. The abuse of the hospital human resources as well as

the economic resources is intolerable for any one at that time. Personnel like Mr. Cathy is more submissive and vulnerable before the faith of god. Conviction upon the god prevents them to protest against the priest and other high officials of the church. The abuse of the money and other resources of the cathedral is not a matter of dignity but a public shame. God punished them they believed. (54)

The discontent of the history is obvious in *The Warden*. There are many eye witnesses of those abuses but it is not exposed by them. They believe by virtue and grace of god the abuser will be victim of the god's punishment. No one can conceal their flaws and crime before the god. God is supreme and we should obey the god. But it doesn't happen so as priest and pops are abusing and exploiting the resources and people in the name of god and agent of god. It's the matter of scandal according to Trollope.

The fate of the private life in an extrovert age of great public achievement. It is one of the principal concerns of Victorian literature, and in few works of the period can the sense of the private life seem quite embattled as it is in the early chapters of *The Warden*.

Our first sight of Hiram's hospital in its idyllic situation on the riverbank is from the bridge on the London road – appropriately, for it is from London that copies of the *Jupiter* will come to threaten Mr. Harding's retreat. Under the will of John Hiram, they were declared to be entitled. Formerly, indeed, - that is, still within some fifty years of the present time, - they received but sixpence a day, and their breakfast and dinner was found them at a common table by the warden, such an arrangement being

in stricter conformity with the absolute wording of old Hiram's will: but this was thought to be inconvenient, and to suit the tastes of neither warden nor bedesmen, and the daily one shilling and four pence was substituted with the common consent of all parties, including the bishop and the corporation of Barchester. (5)

Such was the condition of Hiram's twelve old men when Mr. Harding was appointed warden. Public and private life was in the great stake. The patches and butts which, in John Hiram's time, produced hay or fed cows, were now covered with rows of houses. The values of the property have gradually increased.

It is to London that he will go in the second half of the novel to see Sir Abraham Haphazard. The 'slight iron screen' which separates the rest of the hospital from the Elysium of Mr. Harding's dwelling is a deftly symbolic touch, suggesting at once the paradise within and its fragility, the slightness of the defense it will be able to put up against challenge from without. The developing symbolic resonance of the warden's garden hardly needs steering, as we see it first from the London road, then metaphorically in Mr. Harding's thoughts as he envisages the disruption of this peace in terms of the destruction of his retreat:

It was so hard that the pleasant waters of his little strum should be disturbed and muddied by rough hands; that his quiet paths should be made a battlefield; that the unobtrusive corner of the world which had been allotted to him, as though by providence, should be invaded and desecrated, and all within it made miserable and unsound. (45)

Not a sound came from the eleven bedesmen, as they sat listening to what, according to the archdeacon, was their intended estate. They grimly stared upon his burly figure, but did not then express, by word or sign, the anger and disgust to which such language was sure to give rise. The warden is no longer a warden but an agent of corruption. He used his best gut to accumulate the huge amount of assets.

Dismantling the sides of history means not dismantling the fact with fiction, rather it is the process of blurring the boundary between fact and fiction. History, according to Greenblatt is the form of fiction. It never occurs on the way it depicts to the reader. And the inerrability of the text is its significant mode. It means we are not going to bias the affirmative side of the history.

Mr Harding stands out from the other characters in the novel by virtue of his refusal to behave as if there were a divorce between his public role and his private life. The best defense of his sincere is not that he is entitled to it by law- which he may or may not be. But that he performs the duties of warden well and from the heart, providing the old men in his care with something that no salary can buy, 'that treasure so inestimable in declining years, a true and kind friend to listen to their sorrows, watch over their sickness, and administer comfort as regards this world, and the world to come!'

You get up early in the morning?

What's the use of your talk? Asked John Bold.

You are the man of no words in the sense of your bad reputation in the case of cathedral of London, aren't you?

You used your optimum wit to make your won room, right?

You have no responsibility of the Jesus god.

I will make you punish in the court. (28)

Each and every time Mr. Harding is accused of by the bribery and corruption of the church and the misuse of his power to exploit the economic resources of the Hiram's Hospital. It is his one side evaluation. But if we analyze his responsibility and duties in the hospital we can see a lot of change done on it. For example he has arranged great deed for the patients and the aged person who are taking shelter in the hospital. He really made the hospital as a hospital.

For Archdeacon Grantly and Tom Towers this is inadmissible evidence. The Jupiter can only see the matter remotely and statistically – 'Dons he ever ask himself, when he stretches wide his clerical palm to receive the pay of some dozen of the working clergy, for what service he is so remunerated?' The archdeacon only in terms of the institution. He provides the best legal advice money can buy. But he can 'give no comfort to Mr.Harding's doubts', who was not so anxious to prove himself right, as to be so.

Mr. Harding's demeanor certainly impressed Bold with a full conviction that the warden felt that he stood on strong grounds, and almost made him think that he was about to interfere with due warrant in the private affairs of a just and honorable man; but Mr. Harding himself was anything but satisfied with his won view of the case. (24)

In this first place, he wished for Eleanor's sake to think well of Bold and to like him, and yet he could not but feel disgusted at the arrogance of his conduct. What right had he to say that John Hiram's will was not fairly carried out? But then the question would arise within his heart, was that will fairly acted on? Did Hohn Hiram mean that the warden of

his hospital should receive considerably more out of the legacy than all the twelve old men together for whose behalf the hospital made?

A distinction which in its quiet firmness encapsulates the inner drama of the novel. And as his name suggests, the reformer John Bold is merely naïve and blundering in imagining that he can hope to maintain a distinction between the individual and the office, when dealing with a man like Mr. Harding.

Thank ye, thank ye, Mr. Bold, interjaculaled the precentor somewhat impatiently; "I'm much obliged, but never mind that; I'm much obliged, but never mind that; I'm as likely to be in the wrong as another man, quite as likely."

"But Mr. Hardin, I must express what I feel, lest you should think there is personal enmity in what I'm going to do."

"Personal enmity! Gong to do! Why, you're not going to cut my throat, nor put me into the Ecclesiastical Court!" (23)

The debate between Mr. Harding and Mr. Bold (reformer) is very strongly held. Mr. Harding being polite to Mr. Bold responded very politely as if there was no dispute at all. Bold tried to laugh, but he couldn't. He was quite in earnest, and determined in his course, and couldn't make a joke of it. He walked on a while in silence before he recommended his attack, during which Mr. Harding, who had still the bow in his hand, played rapidly on an imaginary violoncello.

Trollope skillfully avoids adjudicating between conservatives and reformers by shifting the terms of the debate and in effect putting them both with in the same camp.

"The ostensible issues matters very little,' (16) James Kincaid observes . . . because the

morality advocated is aesthetic and intuitive rather than argumentative and rationalistic. The reader is invited to see the similarities between Archdeacon Grantly and Tom Towers in the description of their respective rooms at Plumstead and in the Temple. The hoarding of luxury and comfort reveals a hidden hedonism in both men. Every appliance that could make study pleasant and give ease to the over-toiled brain was there. He further argues citing the line:

"I understand," said the archdeacon. "you've already had enough of it; well, I can't say that I am surprised; carrying on a losing lawsuit where one has nothing to gain, but everything to pay, is not pleasant."

Bold turned very red in the face. "You misinterpret my motives," said he; "but, however, that is of little consequence. I did not come to trouble you with my motives, but to tell you a matter of fact. Good-morning, Dr. Grantly." (104).

The dispute between Mr. Harding and Mr. Bold reaches to the apex of the novel but it still seems not like that. The boundary between the debate is exposed in such a way that there supposed to have no furry and anger at all between two antagonists. The parallel theme of the novel seems to be a balanced view of Trollope.

At Plumstead, while a parallel sentence describes Tower's room: every addition that science and art have lately made to the luxuries of modern life was to be found there. Modern and primitive acts have been played very playfully. Trollope, direct invading upon the past history of church has successfully received the gist of the abusing factors of the church.

Bold couldn't deny it, but though it was one of those cases which required a good deal of management before any real good could be done. It was a pity that he had not considered this before he crept into the lion's mouth, in the shape of an attorney's office

"It will cost you a good deal, I fear," said Towers.

"A few hundred" said Bold "perhaps three hundred; I can't help that, and am prepared for it." (122).

That's a matter of philosophy. It is quite refreshing to hear a man talking of his hundreds in so purely indifferent manner. It's a matter of shame for everyone. It injures a man to commence a thing of this kind, and not carry it through. Bold had not seen it nor heard of it but he was well acquainted with the author of it a gentleman whose pamphlets, condemnatory of all things in these modern days, had been a good deal talked about of late.

To dare to interrogate against the tyranny and corruption is the first step to dismantle the history which is written in the perspective of power. Power is concentrated in the king and then the clergyman in the past. Clergy man was more powerful than the king. Even the clergy person redeemed the king from his sin and clergy person used to do so by taking some commission from such high elite of the society. Clerical sin was most unforgivable crime in the society which is done by clergy person. But here Mr. Bold dare to question the abuse being done inside the church and its territory. Chadwick said:

"The upshot is," said Chadwick, "that there's a screw loose in their case, and we had better do nothing. They are proceeding against Mr. Harding

and myself, and Sir Abraham holds that, under the wording of the will, and subsequent arrangements legally sanctioned, Mr. Harding and I are only paid servants. The defendants should have been either the Corporation of Barchester, or possibly the chapter of your father." (69)

Mr. Harding and his fellow mates are very much startled from the case that has been registered in the court. They are commenting that Mr. Harding and Chatwick is only the appointed personal in the church and they have a right to take money from the church and hospital which is in the ownership of cathedral. They are confident on their legal money. But in fact, it was not legal money that they are getting such a huge amount which is quite more than they appointed for.

The archdeacon has his Rabealais in a secret drawer, Towers his Pre-Raphaelite painting. In contrast to Mr. Harding's Elysium, which is easily entered through the 'slight iron screen', these rooms are well defended snuggeries, confidently excluding the outside world. The lofty isolation implied in Towers's name is reinforced by the fact that the painting in his room is of a nun suggesting that the editor of the Jupiter is himself something of a hedonistic monk, insulated from the complexity of the human world. It is significant that he never visits Barchester to inspect the abuse he so easily denounces.

Grandly and Towers also balance each other in being pillars of what the novel presents as the old established and new secular religious. The heavily ironic portrayal of the newspaper editor as a pagan deity may seem rather overdone to a modern reader, but it reflects Trollope's fear (in which he was not alone) of the unprecedented nature of the authority which *The Times* enjoyed in the early Victorian period. 'No power in England is more felt, more feared, or more obeyed, Emerson wrote in *English Traits* (1856), "what

you read in the morning in the journal , you shall hear in the evening in all society" (23). Trollope put the daily circulation of *The Times* at 40000, but even that figure does not reveal the extent to which it dominated the newspaper market

John Stuart Mill saw it in *On Liberty* (1859), of the fact that the mass do not now take their opinions from dignitaries in church or state, from ostensibly leaders, or from books. Their thinking is done for them by men much like themselves, addressing them or speaking in their name, on the spur of the powerful newspaper editor became a god , hidden unaccountable, and therefore to Trollope pernicious. To be saved from the unhealthy tasks done on the church Mr. Harding wants her daughter Eleanor to be beloved of John Bold, a reformer of the church. But by defending herself:

Eleanor was going to make another speech, but a tear came to each eye, and she could not; so she pretended to blow her nose, and walked to the window, and made a little inward call in her own courage, and finding herself somewhat sustained, said sententiously: "Mary, this is nonsense."

(92)

Eleanor commenced turning sharply round to refute the charge. But the intended falsehood stuck in their throat, and never came to utterance. She could not deny her love, so she took plentifully to tears, and leant upon her friend's bosom and sobbed there, and protested that love or no love. It would make no difference in her resolve, and called Mary, a thousand times, the most cruel girls, and swore her to secrecy by a hundred oaths, and ended by declaring that the girl who could betray her friend's love, even to a brother, would be a black traitor as a soldier in a garrison who should open the city gates to the enemy.

The conservative cleric, the reformer, and the newspaper editor all speak and think in the abstract public language of rights and principles, which cannot begin to deal with the complex individual case of Mr. Harding. His language, on the other hand, is wordless and intuitive, the language of his beloved Cello, which is soon silenced by his troubles and turns into the soundless mime which is his constant consolation in conversational troubles:

"You remember how completely he put down that scoundrel Horseman about the Bishop of Beverley's income; how completely he set them all adrift in the earl's case." Since the question of St. Cross had been mooted by the public, one noble lord had become 'the earl,' par excellence, in the doctor's estimation. "How he silenced that fellow at Rochester. Of course we must have Haphazard; and I'll tell you what, Mr. Chadwick, we must take care to be in time, or the other party will forestall us." (39)

Literature, which should be able to link the public and the private languages, is shown in the case of Dr. Pessimist Indicant (Carlyle) and Mr. Popular Sentiment (Dickens) to merely a melodramatic form of journalism. Like the reformers and the conservatives, these writers can take only single minded and one dimensional view of the issue. The majority of Trollope's critics have found these parodies a mistake and blemish. My own view is that the parody of Carlyle, at least scores some palpable hits at the expense of writer who by the time of *Latter –Day Pamphlets*(1850) had shot his bolt and was starting to parody himself. But this, as Ruth Roberts wisely remarks, is not the point: 'whether these parodies succeed or not – whether they are good as parodies and whether

they are decorous – they are altogether functional. Trollope is defining, by negatives, what he himself would do.

The Warden, Henry James said, "is simply the history of an old man's conscience" (3). What gives that history dramatic shape is Mr. Harding's decision to go to London and see Sir Abraham Haphazard. The chapters describing his visit are the climax of the novel, and they enact a subtle reversal of its initial premise. From the London road in Chapter 1 Mr. Harding's Elysium looks and is a vulnerable paradise, and virtue seems to lie in retreat from the public world. But the moment he decides to take the London road the regains, not a lost paradise, but something better, control of his public destiny. Indeed, his decision to resign means that paradise is lost, and before he leaves that warden returned to his garden to make his last adieus to every tree, and shrub, and shady nook that he knew so well' Trollope commented:

Such is Mount Olympus, the mouthpiece of all the wisdom of this great country. It may probably be said that no place in this 19th century is more worthy of notice. No treasury mandate armed with the signatures of all the government has half the power of one of those broad sheets, which fly forth from hence so abundantly, armed with no signature at all. (116)

It was not Mount Olympus that Mr. Bold betook himself. He had before now wandered round that lonely spot, thinking how rand a thing it was to write articles for *The Jupiter*; considering within himself whether by any stretch of the powers within him. He could ever come to such distinction; wondering how Tom Towers would take any little humble offering of his talents; calculating that Tom Towers himself must have once had a beginning, have once doubted as to his own success.

Mr. Harding's trip to London can be seen as Trollope's ironic variation on the convention that brings the young heroes of Victorian fiction, the David Copperfield and Pips, to the metropolis to learn the ways of the world. Unlike them the warden is too old and too innocent to learn. There is a gentle comedy in his failure to read the signs of an unsavory night life in the London super house and in the contrast between his domesticated ways and the seedy cigar divan. Even his resort to Westminster Abbey and his disappointment with it reveal how deeply he belongs to the rural ways of Barchester.

"But if this income be not justly mine, what if she and I have both to beg?" said the warden at last, sharply, and in a voice so different from that he had hitherto used, that Sir Abraham was startled. "if so it would be better to beg."

My dear sir, nobody now questions its justness."

Yeas, Sir Abraham. (147)

One does question it the most important of all witnesses against him that he questions it himself. His god knows whether or not he loves his daughter; but he would sooner that she and he should both beg, than that she should live in comfort on money which is truly the property of the poor. It may seem strange to you, sir Abraham, it is stranger to himself, that he should have been ten years in that happy home, and not have thought of these things till they were so roughly dinned into my ears.

Yet Mr. Harding does succeed in confronting the public world in shape of Sir Abraham Haphazard and impressing the lawyers with the intensity of his own view of the case. When he at last finds words to articulate his decision to resign, the release of inner feeling finds expression in a triumphant mime on the imaginary cello:

He was standing up, gallantly fronting Sir Abraham, and his right arm passed with bold and rapid sweeps before him, as though he were embracing some huge instrument, which allowed him to stand thus erect; and with the fingers of his left hand he stopped, with preternatural velocity, a multitude of strings which range from the top of his collar to the bottom of the lapel of his coat. Sir Abraham listened and looked in wonder.

(155)

The lines clearly expose that the embarrassment of such a huge arm man's to abolish and reform the corrupted system of church. There were some instruments which is heavier to be carried out. To carry such a huge duty and responsibility one must have handsome money in their job and which should be enough for every personnel. Every one is getting little money in their job but related company must have its responsibility.

Like the authors who produce literary texts, their readers are subjects who are constructed and positioned by the conditions and ideological formations of their own era. All claims, therefore, for the possibility of a disinterested and objective interpretation and evaluation of literary texts. It not only does the analysis of fiction into its own accord but also dismantles its subject matter. Mr. Bold wanted to restructure the theme of the church which is prevailing till now. Supporting this statement Warden said,

"Oh, to Cox and Cummins," said the warden. It was quite a matter of indifference to him where his son-in-law went. The names of Cox and Cummins had now no interest in his ears. What had he to do with Cox and Cummins further, having already had his suit finally adjudicated upon in a

court of conscience, a judgment without power of appeal fully not disturb it. (155)

The archdeacon could go to Cox and Cummins, could remain there all day in anxious discussion. But what might be said there was no longer matter of interest to him, who was so soon to lay aside the name of warden of Barchester Hospital. Decision of the case put the greater meaning in determining the case of and conducting the church which was the pivotal point of power.

A fear that is actualized at the end of the novel when we learn that "The warden's garden is a wretched wilderness, the drive and paths are covered with weeds, the power beds are bare, and the unshorn lawn is now a mass of long damp grass and unwholesome moss" (183). The ruined garden is charged with a sense of irreparable loss, although we should not for that reason assume that Mr. Hardin's story is entirely one of loss. It is in fact moral victory, although not an easy or a painless one.

What is most distinctive in the new mode of historical study is mainly the result of concepts and practices of literary analysis and interpretation that have been assimilated from various recent post structural theorists. The central concept in deconstructive criticism that all texts involve modes of signification that war against each other, merged with Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of the dialogic nature of many literary texts.

History never remains usual as other things happen. It also changes in the course of time. The nature of changing history is as similar as the spinning of the earth. The abuse and corruption undergoing inside the church and other forms of religious institution are greatly changed. Mr. Bold stands as a reformer and re-drawer of history of the church. He is one of the people who question against the abuse of the church. It means

questioning god means reforming the history of church. He talks about the incentives of the bedesmen and high officials of the church like warden he argues:

John Bold sometimes thinks of this, when he is talking loudly of the rights of the bedesmen, whom he has taken under his protection; but he quiets the suggestion within his breast with the high-sounding name of justice: "Fiat justitia, ruat coelum." These old men should, by rights, have one hundred pounds a year instead of one shilling and sixpence a day, and the warden should have two hundred or three hundred pounds instead of eight hundred pounds. What is unjust must be wrong; what is wrong should be righted; and if he declined the task, who else would do it? (30)

Justice over the incentives of the bedesmen and the warden is quite different to each other. The disparity between the incentives of them is the overt example of the abuse of the church. Abuse of Hiram's property is one of the fine examples of the corruption of the clergy person. Above lines clearly expose that sixpence and eight hundred pound is the vast disparity of the incentives. Despite this no one dare to question over it as church is considered as a virtuous institution of the god.

Interrogation is the way to dismantle and redraw the history. To accuse and interrogate against the warden was not fair enough without valid testimony. Mr. Bold before diving inside the corrupted mechanism of the church he questioned himself like what right had he to say that Johan Hiram's will was not fairly carried out? But then the question would arise within his heart, was that will fairly acted on? Did John Hiram mean that the warden of his hospital should receive considerably more out of the legacy than all the twelve old men together for whose behalf the hospital was built? He was in

ambivalence whether he should condemn the warden for his abuse in church or not. Mr. Bold was in dilemma:

Mr. Harding's demeanour certainly impressed Bold with a full conviction that the warden felt what he stood on strong grounds, and almost made him think that he was about to interfere without due warrant in the private affairs of a just and honorable man; but Mr. Harding himself was anything but satisfied with his own view of the case. (24)

Bold, however, felt that he could not sit down at ease with Mr. Harding and his daughter after that had passed, and therefore excused himself with much awkward apology; and merely raising his hat and bowing as he passed Eleanor and the pony chair, left her in disappointed amazement at his departure. He even hesitated to go against the warden of the church despite he has great deal of testimony. But eventually he goes against the abuse of church.

Demand of the incentives by Mr. Harding was quite undeserving to his position. Even he was going to break the history of church by demanding eight hundred pound a year from the Hiram's hospitable. Where as the rate of incentives for bedesmen was quite low. Mr. Harding was interrogating himself of the validity of his incentives. Mr. Harding thought long and deeply over the things both before he went to bed and after it. He says:

All the world, - meaning the ecclesiastical world as confined to the English church, - knew that the wardenship of the Barchester Hospital was a sung sinecure, but no one had ever been blamed for accepting it. To how much blame, however, would he have been open had he rejected it! How mad would he have been thought had he declared, when the situation was

vacant and offered to him, that he had scruples as to receiving eight hundred pound a year from John Hiram's property, and that he had rather some stranger should possess it! How would Dr. Grantly have shaken his wise head, and have consulted with his friends in the close as to some decent retreat for the coming insanity of the poor minor canon! (25)

If he was right in accepting the place, it was clear to him also that he would be wrong in rejecting any part of the income attached to it. The patronage was valuable appanage of the bishopric; and surely it would not be his duty to lessen the value of the preferment which had been bestowed on himself. Surely he was bound to stand by his order. But somehow these arguments, though they seemed logical, were not satisfactory. Was John Hiram's will fairly carried out? That was the true question: and if not was it not his especial duty to see that this was done, his especial duty, whatever injury it might do to his order, however all such duty might be received by his patron and his friends.

With such a tower of strength to back both his arguments and his conscience, it may be imagined that Mr. Harding has never felt any compunction as to receiving his quarterly sum of two hundred pounds. Indeed, the subject has never presented itself to his mind in that shape. He has talked not infrequently, and heard very much about the wills of old founders and the incomes arising from their estates, during the last year or two he did even at one moment feel a doubt.

Lord Guildford was clearly entitled to receive so enormous an income as he does from the revenues of St. Cross; but that he himself was overpaid with his modest eight hundred pounds, he who out of that voluntarily gave up sixty two pounds eleven shillings and four pence a year to his twelve old neighbors. He who for the money does his

precentor's work as no precentor has done it before since Barchester Cathedral was built. Such an idea has never sullied his quiet or disturbed his conscience.

Nevertheless, John Bold is a clever man, and would, with practice, be a clever surgeon. But he has got quite into another line of life. Having enough to live on he has not been forced to work for bread. He has declined to subject himself to what he calls the drudgery of the profession by which he believe. He means the general work of a practicing surgeon and has found other employment. He frequently blinds up the bruises and sets and limbs of such of the poorer classes as profess his way of thinking, but this he does for love. Trollope will not say that the archdeacon is strictly correct in stigmatizing John Bold as demagogue, for Trollope hardly know how extreme must be a man's opinions before he can be justly so called; but bold is a strong reformer. His passion is the reform of all abuses; state abuses church abuses corporation abuses.

Bold is thoroughly sincere in his patriotic endeavors to mend mankind, and there is something to be admired in the energy with which he devotes himself to remedying evil and stopping injustice. But Trollope fears that he is too much imbued with the idea that he has special mission for reforming. It would be well if one so young had a little more diffidence himself, and more trust in the honest purpose of others, if he could be brought to believe that old customs need not necessarily be evil, and that changes may possibly be dangerous.

IV. Conclusion

Anthony Trollope has attempted to dismantle the history of the church of nineteenth century. The abuse and corruption were eroding the prestige of religious institution. And clerical institution was the most powerful institution representing the omnipresent power of god. And no one can question the existence of god and power of god. In the name of god and their powerful agent, priest, clergy person and pope used to abuse the property of the church.

In the mid nineteenth century there were a number of financial scandals in the Church of England including those of Rochester. The endowments which had supported the King's School Canterbury had been diverted to the Dean and Chapter and of the hospital of St Cross at Winchester. The Rev. Francis North, later the Earl of Guildford, had been appointed to the mastership of the hospital by his father the bishop. The revenues of the hospital were very considerable, the work involved minimal. The scandal soon broke.

The story of *The Warden* is based on the St Cross case, but in the novel the protagonist, Warden is a kindly, devoted, priest, beloved by all that knew him and is racked by fear that he is accepting money to which he is not entitled. His antagonist is his prospective son-in-law John Bold and his (somewhat unwelcome) ally is one of Trollope's strongest characters, the Archdeacon of Barchester, Dr. Theophilus Grantly.

Hiram's Hospital, a fifteen century foundation attached to Barcheste Cathedral, provided a home for twelve old men. Through the centuries the income of the foundation had greatly increased, and the wardenship was a handsome sinecure for the Precentor of the Cathedral. The incumbent, the Rev. Septimus Harding a gentle, Cello-playing old clergyman, lived near the hospital, with his younger daughter, Eleanor.

John Bold, a young surgeon of Barchester, although in love with Eleanor, becomes convinced that the financial affairs of the foundation were mismanaged and demanded a public accounting. Mr. Harding's son-in-law Archdeacon Grantly, enraged at this assault on clerical prerogatives, fought the case bitterly until Bold distressed by the uproar he had occasioned, withdrew his suit. Nevertheless the warden resigned, and after Eleanor and John Bold were married left his post and became Rector of St. Cuthbert's, a small parish in the Cathedral close.

Anthony Trollope, thus, succeeded to dismantle the history of church in the nineteenth century. Trollope not only goes beyond the history but also keeps the matter of context in his mind. Context and power construct the history and this history is not a true history. So we should not assimilate these histories without censoring.

Work Cited

- Adams, Hazard, ed. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Rev. ed New York: Harcourt, 1992.
- Bennet, Tony. *What My Heart has Seen*. London: Rizzoli Publication, 1982.
- Café, Teles. *The Warden Summary*. New York: Shvoong Ltd., 2008.
- Code, Lorraine. *What can She Know: Feminist Theory and Construction of Knowledge*, New York: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Cohen, Walter. *Don Quijote and the Intercontinental History*. London: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Collins, Philip. *The Warden Review*, Emeritus Professor of English, University of Leicester, 1989.
- Emerson, Thomas. *The Conduct of Life*. New York: Literary Press, 2004.
- Fish, Simon. *A Supplication for the Beggars*. New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1529.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Paris: Gillimard, 1977.
- Greenblat, Stephen. *Hamlet in Purgatory*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- - -. *Practicing New Historicism*. London: Chicago University Press, 2000.
- - -. *Renaissance Self Fashioning*. Chicago: Chicago University press, 2005.
- Greenblat, Stephen and Gunn Giles. *Redrawing the Boundaries*. New York: MLA Publication, 1992.
- Iwama, Mia. *Plumstead Episcopi: Description and Setting in The Warden*, Brown University, 2003.
- Jones, Fiona. "Clergy and their Foibles." *The Sunday Times*. 20 May 2004: 5.
- Lacapra, Dominick. *Modern European Intellectual History*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Mill Stuart, John. *On Liberty*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1859.

Murfin, Ross. *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms*. New York: Methodist University Press, 2009.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On Truth and Lies in Non-Moral Sense*. London: Stanford University Press, 1873.

- - -. *On the Genealogy of Morality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1887.

Orgel, Stephen. *The Authentic Shakespeare*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Taine, Hippolyte. *Aux Pyrenees*. Paris: Editions du Seuil Press, 1855.

Veeser, H. Aram. "The New Historicism." *Express* London: 1998: 18-21.

Whit, Hayden. *Metahistory*. New York: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

- - -, "Narrative in Historical Theory." *The Atlanta Journal* 22(1985): 15- 20.