



PROJECT MUSE®

Greed, Generosity, and Other Problems with Unmarried Women's Property

Jill Rappoport

Victorian Studies, Volume 58, Number 4, Summer 2016, pp. 636-660 (Article)

Published by Indiana University Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/642642>

Greed, Generosity, and Other Problems with Unmarried Women's Property

JILL RAPPOPORT

That the Married Women's Property Acts of 1870 and 1882 have tended to be understood almost exclusively in terms of their significance for wives and marriage is unsurprising, but unduly limiting. Married women's newfound rights to earn, inherit, invest, and bequeath money under the common law transformed their economic reach and fractured the "one flesh" doctrine of coverture by which a husband's legal powers supplanted his wife's (Ablow, *Marriage* 10).¹ Yet these seismic shifts in property law shook far more than the conjugal dyad. Victorian fiction also registers discomfort with the ramifications of women's changing property rights through consanguineal family relations (maternal, sibling), portraying vexed transactions between mothers and their sons, unmarried sisters and their brothers. A sharpened focus on these other relational dynamics enables us to better assess the cultural aftershocks of these mid- to late-century property debates. It also provides us with models for interpreting female economic agency that do not depend primarily upon marriage and other sexual economies. Even as

ABSTRACT: This essay examines how blood ties motivate the financial choices of several unmarried women in Anthony Trollope's fiction. It both proposes a model for interpreting female economic agency that does not depend primarily upon sexual economies and suggests the significance of married women's property reform for relationships outside of marriage. The punitive plotlines I examine in *The Eustace Diamonds*, *Phineas Finn*, *Phineas Redux*, and *Can You Forgive Her?* highlight the similar threats posed by single women's greed and generosity. By challenging principles of inheritance and heterosexual exchange, depriving the very families they claim to help of support, and creating unacceptable burdens for their male kin, these characters underscore contemporary fears and fantasies about the intrafamilial stakes of women's independent financial choices.

JILL RAPPOPORT (jill.rappoport@uky.edu) is Associate Professor in English at the University of Kentucky, where she is currently at work on a study of married women's property reforms. She is the author of *Giving Women: Alliance and Exchange in Victorian Culture* (Oxford UP, 2012) and co-editor of *Economic Women: Essays on Desire and Dispossession in Nineteenth-Century British Culture* (Ohio State UP, 2013).

critics have complicated traditional accounts of heterosexual exchange and mapped women's financial actions onto diverse marital choices and erotic desires, scholarship continues to explain female economic agency primarily through sexuality and the desiring or desirable body.² In contrast, the following pages emphasize the importance of blood ties in depictions of women's financial activity. By attending to images of intrafamilial greed and generosity in several novels by Anthony Trollope, I highlight the generational dynamics of marital property law and show how two seemingly opposite arguments against women's financial rights rely on a shared understanding of their financial responsibilities.

Trollope is a key figure for assessing Victorian anxieties about married women's property rights not only because his novels endow so many women with a startling degree of financial control but also because so many of their financial transactions occur outside sexual economies. We might think of Jemima Stanbury supporting her niece in *He Knew He Was Right* (1869), or Aspasia Fitzgibbon paying her brother's debt in *Phineas Finn* (1868). Though some of Trollope's female characters seem eager to "give up the heavy burden of [their] independence" in marriage (*Barchester* 2:240), others evade the common law and maintain control of their wealth.³ Contemplating a second marriage, one widow assures her niece, "I shan't let any of the money go into his hands. . . . I know a trick worth two of that" (*Can You* 2:242).⁴ Trollope challenges the "one flesh" doctrine most explicitly in depictions of extreme marital discord; scenes between Robert and Laura Kennedy in *Phineas Finn*, for example, or Louis and Emily Trevelyan in *He Knew He Was Right* famously expose how the "even partnership" (*Phineas Redux* 565) or "terms of equality" (*The Duke's Children* 343) endorsed by his better marriages are ethical ideals, not economic or emotional realities.⁵ But Trollope undermines coverture just as steadily through the everyday economic conditions of his female characters, who are frequently granted separate estates and who often appear to be at least as savvy as men in the stewardship of their incomes. While characters such as Glencora Palliser, the Duchess of Omnium, showcase what marriage might look like when a wife's wealth remains "her own" (*The Prime Minister* 46), the rich widows and single women of means who interest me here suggest how the period's shifting property rights might have shaped the financial lives of women and their families outside of marital ties.

This essay explores the property problems of four unmarried female characters whose economic choices are divorced from marital or sexual desire and instead directed toward or against platonic blood relations. Alongside Trollope's generally sympathetic depiction of women's legal

position and his acknowledgment of their capacity for financial management, these novels' unusually punitive plotlines suggest the threat that single women's independent economic actions might pose to established family structures. Whether these women are condemned as "blood-sucking harpies," as Lady Lizzie Eustace is in *The Eustace Diamonds* (1873) (1:245), or praised like Lady Laura Standish in *Phineas Finn* for being "generous as the sun" (409), their greed and generosity present equal dangers to these novels' social worlds because they obstruct traditional forms of property transmission. By challenging principles of inheritance and heterosexual exchange, injuring the very families they claim to help, and creating unacceptable burdens for their male kin, these characters underscore contemporary fears and fantasies about the intrafamilial stakes of women's financial choices and also showcase the contested roles of female custodians and creditors that became salient during a time of increased agitation for married women's property rights.

"Greedy, Blood-Sucking Harpies": The Problem with Possession in *The Eustace Diamonds*

Since most work on married women's property reform focuses on wives or brides within the framework of marriage, we have missed how other relationships reflected or shaped women's economic standing during this period. In *The Eustace Diamonds*, for example, Lizzie Eustace's status as a widow and the diamonds' presence in a marital exchange have obscured the fact that her story also reveals anxieties about competing generational claims to property, compelling us to assess the relative claims of mothers and children. The novel questions whether wealth should travel along conjugal or consanguineal lines, to wives through heterosexual union or to sons through lineal descent. The eponymous diamonds embody the directional tension of these competing kinship priorities. By signaling marriage but also passing from one generation to another, they become the means for asking whether marriage or reproduction provides the right repository for wealth.⁶ Though the narrative conflict between legal and social opinions refuses an easy answer, many characters and the narrator himself respond by equating a wife's wealth with theft.⁷

From the start, Lizzie's story engages anxieties regarding married women's property laws, reminding us that legal tenets represented only one, gendered side of ownership. Unmarried, she borrows money on the prospect of a rich husband, despite her creditor's awareness that Sir Florian Eustace is not legally liable for her prenuptial debt. Both her status as underage and

the 1870 Married Women's Property Act absolve him,⁸ but the social world of the novel—in this instance and in the larger case that follows—trusts to honor as much as to the law. After her husband's death and despite his family's demands, Lizzie refuses to relinquish the diamonds he placed in her hands; the narrator accuses Lizzie of "endeavouring to steal" these jewels (1:55), which are valued at £10,000. Even though she commits no act legally punishable as a crime, her possession is repeatedly characterized as theft because she lies about the conditions under which she acquired the diamonds. Sir Florian presented her with the diamonds to wear and offered to have them reset for her, but—according to the narrator—his description of them as "family jewels" and his joke about a "future daughter-in-law who should wear them" (1:42) make it unlikely that he intended to legally gift them to her as her "own," "for always" (1:57), as she claims. Thus, for the novel's many indignant speakers, her repeated and fabricated assertion that they were a gift amounts to nothing more than an attempt to rob her husband's estate.

A lengthy discussion of gifts, heirlooms, and paraphernalia—the discourses through which male lawyers, suitors, and relations attempt to verify the proper relationship of people to property—determines that the Eustace diamonds are *not* the family heirlooms that would make Lizzie's possession of them theft.⁹ The novel even suggests, as property law confirms and literary critics have recognized, that, lying or not, Lizzie can legally claim the stones as her own under the title of "paraphernalia" (1:229):¹⁰ "jewels . . . which belong to the husband but which the wife is permitted to wear" and which belong to her after his death, permitting her to alienate them by sale, by will, or by gift (*Halsbury's Laws* qtd. in Roth 887). But, as Kathy Psomiades notes, the specific property laws cited matter very little (102). Trollope ignores the ramifications of his legal debate by maintaining that "this selfish, hard-fisted" woman's claims are illegitimate (1:43).

The law's "irrelevance" shifts focus instead to the diamonds' cultural and historical weight (Psomiades 102), which critics have viewed in terms of Victorian sexuality, contract-based ownership, Lizzie's "overattachment" to objects (Plotz 35), narrative and the literary trade, and the way that "possession not only defines social relations . . . [but] authorize[s] representations of truth" (A. Miller, 179-80).¹¹ Such arguments frequently echo the way that Trollope refutes but then insists upon Lizzie's so-called crime. Psomiades, for instance, suggests that the diamonds "to which Lizzie has no right . . . distract our attention from the property to which she does" (104). Yet pitting legitimate property against stolen goods confuses a key issue in *The Eustace Diamonds*: since Lizzie does have a legal "right" to the diamonds, the question becomes why

her desire to keep them should be treated so punitively. This is why I remain unsatisfied by D. A. Miller's influential Foucauldian argument about the novel. Although Miller, too, acknowledges that "the very status of [Lizzie's] 'theft' is open to question" (11), his argument depends upon her wrongdoing. Recast for his purposes as social "impropriety" rather than crime, Lizzie's misdemeanor nevertheless counts sufficiently as "one theft" to enable it to "lead . . . to another," in order to finally separate the novel's more legally legible thefts from the social world which has suffered from this "impropriety" (12). This reading, in which legal and disciplinary regimes correspond, accepts as a given that Lizzie is blameworthy for keeping hold of the diamonds.¹² In contrast, I find that by associating Lizzie's possession with greed and lies, the novel shows the gap between the law and social feeling and puts pressure on the very property laws that certain highly biased characters attempt to police. As Andrew H. Miller observes, *The Eustace Diamonds* constructs "dishonesty and theft" as "structurally analogous" (179). Whereas he understands the slippage between these terms as Trollope's response to the publishing industry (184-85), I focus on the ways in which this slippage undermines specifically gendered claims to property.

Trollope calls attention to the fact that many of his characters—and even his narrator—are unreliable sources of information about these diamonds. Mr. Camperdown, the indignant Eustace family lawyer, reflects that "he had never as yet heard of a claim made by a widow for paraphernalia. But then the widows with whom he had been called upon to deal, had been ladies quite content to accept the good things settled upon them by the liberal prudence of their friends and husbands,—not greedy, blood-sucking harpies such as this Lady Eustace" (1: 254). The lawyer's ignorance regarding "paraphernalia" reveals his general bias against women's property rights. Having dealt only with wives who were contented with "liberal" settlements, he could disregard the legal details governing women's independent claims. The distinction he draws between contented gift-recipients and "greedy, blood-sucking harpies" is a distinction between women satisfied to take what their husbands or fathers have given them and those ready to assert their own, individual rights—between those whose acceptance of coverture makes them grateful to receive anything at all, and those who look more carefully to their own interests. The crass insult signals, among other things, its speaker's prejudice. The lawyer, no friend to women's property, cares more about the case than his client does; Sir Florian's brother would "sooner replace the necklace out of his

own property, than be subject to the nuisance of such a continued quarrel" (1:249).

Like the legal debates, moral judgments about Lizzie's falsity or "greed" distract from the fact that authority figures in the novel work hard to represent Lizzie's legal possession of the diamonds as illegitimate. This vitriol is not a blanket condemnation of women's wealth. On the contrary, cameo appearances by Marie Goesler and Glencora Palliser, whose independent wealth features more prominently in other Palliser novels,¹³ remind us that the social world Trollope imagines includes and in many respects approves of other capable rich women. Depicting Lizzie's hold on the jewels as intra-familial greed or theft protests a very specific form of women's property ownership, one in which a wife's wealth appears to come at the expense of a child's.

After all, we cannot accuse Lizzie of "endeavouring to steal" her diamonds without reflecting on the identity of her (presumed) victim. The language of theft and the seeming "sacrifice" of Lizzie's forgiving brother-in-law (Ben-Yishai, *Common* 124) deflect attention from the fact that his benevolence is beside the point. Even discounting her claims of paraphernalia, the prospective owner whose rights Mr. Camperdown defends so fiercely is her "own child" (1:213), still a minor. No one contests her rights to that child. She is his legal guardian, so even if she were to have the "property of the heir . . . in her custody" (1:39), she would be the rightful guardian of that property until he comes of age. She indicates as much when she declares, truthfully or not, "I mean to—keep them—for—my child" (1:52) and reiterates, "It will be my pleasure, when my boy marries, to hang them round his bride's neck" (1:183). Lizzie's present possession of the diamonds outrages Mr. Camperdown less than her claim that they are her "own," "always" (2:30), with the right to give or sell them. Even her fantasy of a wedding gift to a future daughter-in-law posits a female succession that skips over the possibility of her son's birthright and affords his mother the freedom to alienate property according to her own wishes, a freedom that, as others have noted, "is a proof of ownership" (Blumberg 532). In this case, a wife or widow's possession appears as theft, regardless of the legal status of that possession, because it challenges patrilineal descent.¹⁴ When Lizzie insists, "My husband's diamonds were my diamonds" (1:52), she inserts herself in the line of inheritance, suggesting coverture's inverse: that a wife could be entitled to her husband's property.¹⁵ Though the Married Women's Property Act of 1870 granted women no such right, it was associated with similar challenges to the common-law doctrine that privileged men's possession.

Lizzie's hold on the diamonds is painted as "blood-sucking" because it is perceived as a drain on her nearest blood tie and forces lawyers and lovers to confront the possibility of wealth's lateral rather than vertical transmission.

Lizzie is seen as a thief, that is, partly because the novel's frustrated narrator, lawyer, and implied readers want property to pass through descent, not sexual exchange. Lizzie rejects that claim. Her status as a thief also depends upon her ignorance of property law, figured by the novel as a kind of gendered dispossession: "were she once to get hold of that word, paraphernalia, it would be as a tower of strength to her" (1:231). Hardly a reinforcement of legal power or its diffuse disciplinary power, this statement underscores the instability at the heart of married women's rights and the inability of either law or social feeling to protect women from public opinion. Finally, Lizzie's status as a thief hinges on her refusal to agree with the lawyer's "courteous" suggestion that "it would be for the advantage of all parties that the family jewels should be kept together." Lizzie, in keeping with women's increasing claims to separate property, recognizes "her own interests" apart from those of the collective Eustace family and questions how the lawyer's "arrangement" would further them (1:38).

Of course, the tension between an individual's "greed" and a family's larger "interests" appears elsewhere in Trollope; his novels protest against fathers who squander their sons' patrimony as well. The squire of Greshamsbury in *Doctor Thorne* (1858), for instance, regrets "injur[ing]" his son by not leaving him "the property entire" (47). Such plotlines, along with many others that question the justice of putatively legal inheritance—in *Castle Richmond* (1860), *Orley Farm* (1861-62), *The Belton Estate* (1865), and *Ralph the Heir* (1871), to name a few—reflect pervasive anxieties about changing property configurations and generational rights during this period. Still, the characters at fault in these novels are tolerated with greater equanimity than *The Eustace Diamonds*'s "blood-sucking harpy." Whereas Lizzie's friends and lovers turn against her, the squire's friends assure him (and *Doctor Thorne's* marriage plot guarantees) that his son "will do very well yet" (47). Many men who handle money poorly in Trollope's novels are forgiven their selfishness or ineptitude and even turned into objects of narrative solicitude and "tender feeling" (*Framley* 402). As we have seen, Lizzie's role as a "greedy" woman and mother is more problematic.

Outside of fiction, mothers with money feature prominently in contemporary Victorian debates about married women's property reform, but unlike Lizzie Eustace, these mothers generally have much less of it, reputedly living lives of "quiet self-denial" ("English" 85). Journalistic images of poor,

self-sacrificing mothers served as a rallying point for increasing the property rights of working women. The 1856 petition for married women's property rights inveighs against a legal state of affairs in which husbands might seize upon their wives' hard-earned provisions: "for a robbery by a man of his wife's hard earning there is no redress—against the selfishness of a drunken father, who wrings from a mother her children's daily bread, there is no appeal" (M. S. R. 236). In the wake of this petition, newspapers presented real and hypothetical case studies of "idle, heartless, and unprincipled" fathers ("Married" 72)—negligent or downright abusive, drunken or debauched—who return to their abandoned households only long enough to take bread out of their families' mouths before again leaving their wives "to the mercy of the wide world" ("Central") with no means to support their children and no legal recourse to prevent the scenario from replaying "at any moment" (M. S. R. 273; also "Divorce" 121). Examples of hard-working mothers, starving children, and paternal robbery abound: "the children had had no food that day nor had she herself, but now she had money to buy food . . . unluckily however she met her husband in the door-way. He forced her hand open and took away the money, as he had a legal right to do" ("Property Earnings" 273).¹⁶ Coverture joined with brute strength to force a mother's hand during her lifetime and even beyond, since wives were legally unable to create wills without their husbands' consent. "Should death come and release her," one paper protested, "she may not even bequeath to her own children the scanty portions of her often painful sacrifices" ("English" 85). Such conditions called for desperate measures, according to an article that described a wife's murder of her husband as the understandable "instinct of a mother to protect her young" when "the law refused to protect her or her children" ("Property Earnings" 273).

Popular opinion overwhelmingly sympathized with working mothers attempting to support their children, and the impulse to protect these children contributed powerfully to the fight for married women's property rights. The 1870 Act, which permitted married women to possess their own earnings and up to £200 in their own names, targeted these working wives and mothers. However, this impulse to protect children also appears to have provided a rationale for denying increased property rights to wealthier women, whose claims were portrayed as competing with, rather than reinforcing, those of their offspring, and whose common-law rights moved to the forefront of property debates between 1870 and the subsequent Married Women's Property Act of 1882. Accordingly, rich mothers who "rob" their children join poor thieving fathers as characters in popular fiction's

deliberations over women's property. Novels such as Trollope's, which were written during the height of the debates on married women's property, use children's needs as evidence for why women should not be granted independent property rights, reversing the more sympathetic journalistic cases. *The Eustace Diamonds* reveals the tension between the law and social order by asking onlookers to choose between the primacy of a wife's or a child's property rights, a choice that comes into view when we consider Lizzie's financial choices in terms of her role as a mother rather than solely in terms of her roles as wife and widow.

Generous to a Fault: The Problem with Giving in *Can You Forgive Her?* and the Phineas Novels

In the decades between the 1856 petition for married women's property rights and the 1870 and 1882 Acts that granted them, advocates fought to secure married women the same economic rights that unmarried women had: unlike a wife, the *feme sole* could earn, inherit, possess, or transmit considerable property. The portrayal of single females who possess and choose to alienate significant wealth thus stages another side of the property reform debate, one in which women's independent economic rights are undermined as much by generosity as they are by greed, and unmarried women are as significant as wives. Even to an author like Trollope, who was known for granting strong female characters economic protection and power, the overly generous *feme sole* poses an economic danger as great as that of the selfish mother or self-interested speculator when her unregulated generosity thwarts the expected movement of wealth.

If Lizzie Eustace's self-interested approach to marriage and motherhood makes her an easy target for opponents of women's property rights, the three characters I now turn to are more surprising because they err on the opposite side, seeking—against their own material welfare or marital interests—to share their wealth instead. In *Can You Forgive Her?* (1865), Alice Vavasor resolves to put “any portion” of her £400 a year or its principal at her cousin George's service (1:332); George's sister Kate also pledges first her own annual “mite” of £90 and then a larger income of £500 per year to him; and Lady Laura Standish of *Phineas Finn* and *Phineas Redux* (1873) uses her £40,000 fortune to discharge the debts of her brother Oswald, Lord Chiltern. Their open-handedness threatens to overturn both their own and their families' fortunes, and they are crushed in remarkable outlays of narrative energy, punished for what we still think of as the most socially

sanctioned form of female economic agency in Victorian England: being “generous as the sun” (*Phineas Finn* 409). As Deborah Denenholz Morse suggests, their plotlines reveal “the inadequacy of the feminine ideal of self-sacrifice” (*Women* 20). Yet the extreme generosity that these single female characters show to their male kin is as much an economic choice as a feminized virtue, and the extensive chastisement they receive for this generosity demands attention as a monetary matter as well as a moral one.

Attending to the *feme sole* in her single state instead of always seeing her as a potential bride means considering financial decisions—such as gifts to brothers and cousins—that do not easily fit into the frameworks of marriage or other sexual economies. These novels explicitly detach these female characters’ financial choices from matrimonial desires, but then punish their economic autonomy by accusing them of sexual transgression. Since these characters decide to give away their money under conditions that are clearly not erotic, the slippage between money and sex reads more as a cover-up than a correlation. Unable to overtly indict Laura, Alice, or Kate for generosity—that gendered ideal of economic selflessness—Trollope prosecutes them for sinning against romantic love. The novels thus shift their characterization of female agency from the economic to the sexual, and I will return to the problematic consequences of such a shift. But I also want to attend more fully to the specific economic practices that precede and even oppose this shift, and that Trollope undermines in economic as well as sexual terms.

Redirecting the focus away from sexual economies does not deny their significance. We have long recognized domestic fiction’s ability to consolidate class interests through marital choice, and more recent scholarly work has turned to finance and anthropology to explore the various sexual-financial arrangements available in Victorian novels, tracing money as it is funneled into either endogamous or exogamous unions; absorbed under the hierarchical, patriarchal bonds of coverture; or channeled into more equitable marital contracts.¹⁷ Trollope’s novels note the relative value of these alliances, underscoring the economic significance of sex as well as the eroticized nature of financial transactions. Even George’s devoted sister is shocked that Alice offers up her assets before marriage (*Can You* 1:398). When George contemplates “getting his hand into his cousin’s purse” (1:389), Trollope’s crude humor rests on the longstanding equation of women’s sexual virtue and economic value. His novels suggest additional reasons to safeguard women’s wealth, however. The men who vie for access are often scoundrels or at least scapegraces, and ends rarely justify the means. Thousands of pounds spent to secure George’s parliamentary seat can’t keep it for long; Laura’s life is beyond

repair by the time her brother repays her. Alice, Kate, and Laura are punished for being too free with their money, but we risk eliding those financial actions if we conflate them too narrowly with sexualized indiscretions.

Like the many other moneyed women who inundate Trollope's novels, these women pass significant parts of their plots unmarried, and in the 1860s and '70s their legal standing as single women makes their economic choices at least as meaningful as their erotic ones. By considering their financial decisions in terms of the *feme sole* status they had when they made them, we can better understand the economic actions they have in common as well as the ways in which contemporary debates about married women's property rights were being staged through depictions of single women. Blood ties, not marriages, are central to the gifts that Alice, Kate, and Laura make. Whereas Ruth Perry has argued that "consanguinity came to be replaced by conjugality as the primary principle of kinship" by the Victorian period (4), these fictional characters feel greater financial responsibility toward existing consanguineal kin than toward future conjugal ties. That they are punished for this first-family preference underscores the perceived challenge of their economic practices to traditional kinship arrangements and suggests a contemporary anxiety that women's increased economic rights might entail another revision of kinship patterns and principles.

Choosing consanguineal over conjugal ties, Laura pays her brother's debts and champions his marriage with far more care than she gives to her own. Though she describes her marriage to Robert Kennedy as the result of this transaction—her loss of fortune entailing a loss of romantic choice—never, even in her deepest marital sorrows, does she express regret for giving Chiltern her money. Similarly choosing blood kin over matrimony, Alice jilts John Grey, the man she claims to love, and engages herself to her cousin solely in order to give him £8,000. Acknowledging that she "could not love her cousin and marry him," she wishes "to spend her money in aiding his career in Parliament" (*Can You* 1:112). When George proposes, she readily accepts the financial union: "He is welcome to it all . . . whether he has it as my friend or as my husband" (1:326). She is not prepared to be his wife, however: "My money may be absolutely necessary to you within this year, during which, as I tell you most truly, I cannot bring myself to become a married woman. . . . You will take it" (1:339). Though the cousin relationship was not necessarily platonic during the nineteenth century (Corbett 13, 35-37), Alice welcomes her father's advice that she "give him [her] money without [herself]" (1:354) and shudders at George's embrace: "it was not in my bargain" (1:383). Critics make much of this revulsion, suggesting usefully that the proposed marriage offers Alice a

wife's vicarious political engagement, a vocational marriage, a sacrificial marriage, the allure of a contract-based marriage in place of a hierarchical one, a union with George's sister, a choice between marrying within or beyond the family, or a way to defer marriage itself.¹⁸ Yet foregrounding the proposed marriage in this way misses the pecuniary point: sexual exchange does not determine every economic transaction. Here, Alice attempts a consanguineal financial arrangement, one at odds with and independent of her romantic or marital interests.¹⁹

Kate pledges her smaller fortune of £2,000 to George. Like Laura, she puts a brother's interests first, courting a rich aunt and tending to her grandfather largely on George's behalf. "If I had my way I would spend every shilling of Vavasor money in putting him [in Parliament]" (1:57), she declares. As with Alice and Laura, critics remark on her gendered selflessness; her claim to be "nothing" without George echoes a long line of women, both fictional and historical, who were trained to "sacrifice everything to [a brother's] welfare" (2:161). As Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall have shown, sisters throughout much of the nineteenth century were "expected . . . to generally underwrite [their brothers'] economic ventures" (311). But Trollope's fiction notably reverses these historical expectations. For these characters, extreme lateral, intrafamilial support defies social convention and is punished accordingly. Rather than conforming to domestic ideals, Laura, Alice, and Kate are presented as challenging them in their attempts to "underwrite" men's "economic ventures."

Kate's financial decision to fund George has drawn less critical attention than the other nontraditional desires (political, homoerotic, incestuous) that appear to fuel that decision. However, the possibility of her brother's political success has little bearing on Kate's desire to support him. Whereas Alice, learning of George's lost election, thinks momentarily "of her money, and the vain struggle in which it had been wasted," Kate continues to offer "all my share" (2:299). Similarly, basing Kate's economic decisions in passionate, erotic attachments to Alice (Marcus 236-39) or to George (Morse, *Women* 36) does not explain why she remains ready to give George "my right in the property" (2:161) after his violent threats drive both women to conclude that they "never wished to see him more" (2:174). Ambition, selflessness, or passion for Alice or George cannot explain this unshaken resolve to fund the man who, in Kate's words, "should have starved" before accepting Alice's wealth (2:244), and with whom they both break: "If he wanted money I would send it to him, but I would not write to him" (2:244). What the critical focus on self-abnegation, ambition, or erotic exchange misses is that Kate's financial

decisions repeatedly reject the possibility of marriage as a cover. Her insistence on funding George aligns with the extreme, intrafamilial giving that occupies Alice and Laura and refuses even the most endogamous of marriages.

Despite “abundant evidence” that Victorian sisters and cousins contributed capital to family enterprises (Davidoff and Hall 279), Trollope’s fiction presents a different vision of intrafamilial giving, suggesting instead that it injures the families it is intended to help. Though we should be skeptical when Alice’s (negligent) father claims to “suffer” on her account (2:384), the complaint itself underscores Victorian understandings of women’s expenditures as family affairs. The familial costs of women’s financial activity come more clearly into view in Laura’s case, as her effort to support her brother threatens to detract from her family’s wealth. Chiltern repays her through the sale of family property, but since he does so after her marriage she cannot preserve it: “if it had been paid in the usual way at my marriage, settlements would have been required that it should come back to the family after Mr Kennedy’s death in the event of my having no child. But, as it is now, the money would go to his estate after my death” (*Phineas Redux* 140). Although Laura wonders “what use would it be . . . to have a sum of money to leave behind me,” her father’s anger that this arrangement “has robbed us all” (141) reminds us that a woman’s independent fortune was not necessarily considered her own. Whereas Laura’s focus on “use” privileges her present ability to spend, invest, or donate, her father’s belief that a woman’s money should be “le[ft] behind” privileges the future financial rights and uses of lineal descendants.

Trollope’s depiction of these two clashing, thwarted visions of property remains unresolved. Laura regains her property at her husband’s death, at which point she and her father again disagree about its use, her father advising her to invest her money so that it may “go to her brother’s child,” while Laura contemplates “a different destination” (*Phineas Redux* 374). Though the novel finally validates neither stance and certainly makes Laura the more sympathetic character of the two, the conflict is important to our understanding of Victorian property debates. When nineteenth-century women inherited property, they frequently received life interest in but not full ownership of it.²⁰ Such arrangements directed family wealth to the next generation, bypassing husbands in favor of vertical transmission to children (Davidoff and Hall 209). Under these provisions, women conveyed property to others rather than enjoying it themselves. We see this arrangement in Kate’s inheritance. Her grandfather, alarmed by her generosity toward George, leaves her his estate’s income but preserves the property for a future male heir (*Can You* 2:156). A similar spirit drives the “costly pre-nuptial settlements”

protecting Trollope's wealthiest female characters ("Married" 72). Such settlements provided a rationale against reforming women's property laws in general; they challenge "the very *commonality* of the common law" (Ben-Yishai 6) and demonstrate the much remarked upon friction between Trollope's liberal politics and his conservative values.²¹ Alice's mother's wealth "was settled very closely on herself and on her children, without even a life interest having been given to Mr. Vavasor" (1:2). Glencora Palliser has a considerable personal fortune, but chooses the path of dynastic wealth, securing some of it for the next generation: "her own property was separated from [her husband's] and reserved to herself and her children" (*Prime* 46). Along these lines, Chiltern's fiancée must choose whether to join her wealth to his—making it part of an eldest son's estate—or keep it for a second son (*Phineas Finn* 411). A woman's inheritance was preserved for her children; as one contemporary article describes such arrangements, the wife's funds enter "a state of dead lock. . . . Not even if the husband go to gaol or the wife be starving can a penny be got at, save the dividends at each quarter-day" ("Lady" 208).

Whereas trusts and settlements preserved wealth for future generations, Alice, Kate, and Laura provoke anxiety in part because they control their own funds. The extent of their gifts—in Laura's case, every shilling, and all but "enough . . . to prevent [her] being absolutely a burden" (*Can You* 2:141) in Alice's—underscores the claims that these single women have to their fortunes. Hence fathers and grandfathers threaten and resort to name-calling at the realization that these "independent" women (*Phineas Finn* 109) "might put [their] name[s] to any . . . number of bills, and for any amount!" (*Can You* 2:211). The prospect of such unfettered expenditure similarly worried opponents of the Married Women's Property Acts. Though the 1870 Act would not have directly affected women of Alice, Kate, and Laura's high economic status, it seemed to open the floodgates to women's independent control of property by breaking with traditional ideas about marriage.²² Since the economic status of single women was considered the legal model for what wives might hope to attain with greater property rights, the financial choices made by these three single women are relevant to contemporary discourses on marital property rights. Not only do their gifts contradict the forms of self-interest so crucial to most understandings of modern finance—indeed, they might exemplify what Lauren Goodlad sees as "Trollope's . . . dissatisfaction with possessive individualism" (446)—but their unsanctioned nature implies that, when left to their own devices, women's property decisions are likely to clash with social traditions and familial welfare.

Laura's legal right to her own fortune rests uneasily beside her father's claim that his family has been "robbed." While "greedy" Lizzie Eustace resists

generational transmission by keeping hold of her own wealth, Laura, Alice, and Kate stake their claims to property by showcasing their right to alienate it—a right that, as Jeff Nunokawa notes, is fundamental to the privileges of property (83). Without it, according to Trollope’s *Ralph the Heir*, one is “robbed of the true pleasures of ownership” (1:139). They actively transmit their money to the people they choose instead of becoming passive vehicles for property transmission. In this sense, their economic plots are echoed by that of Kate’s aunt, the widow Arabella Greenow, who similarly enjoys financial independence and resists the generational pull of money in favor of “liberality” (*Can You* 1:141) toward those she “like[s]”; but where she doesn’t “care much about what you call ‘blood’” (2:3), the characters I have discussed care deeply about consanguineality, privileging blood over marital or other ties. They emphasize the lateral circulation of wealth over vertical legacies, but the disastrous results of their efforts to consolidate family wealth in this way underscore the perceived difference between a patriarchal inheritance and gifts that pass through a sister’s or cousin’s hands. Refusing to acknowledge claims to wealth based on either heredity or heterosexual exchange, they are uninterested in their own or their family’s reproduction. They are guilty of “robb[ing]” their families, despite their gifts’ first-family financial commitments, because they disregard their wealth’s value for a future generation.

First-family blood ties had strong appeal during the nineteenth century, as recent studies have shown. Adam Kuper demonstrates the financial stakes of endogamous kin marriages (110), but Trollope’s novels suggest the importance of consanguineal transactions outside of sexual economies as well. If, as Mary Jean Corbett argues, the “affective dimension” of “first-family ties . . . intensifies” throughout the period (viii) and strong sibling attachments “constituted a significant norm” (115), then the passionate sense of financial duty Trollope’s characters feel toward brothers or cousins should be understood as signifying more than the second-place status assigned to sisters (Ellis 135–37). It speaks to a larger vision of women’s first-family financial management, one that had historical precedent in nineteenth-century women’s economic contributions to their families (Davidoff and Hall 197). In their depictions of consanguineal giving as both “waste[ful]” (*Can You* 2:299) and injurious, these novels explore but ultimately reject such contributions.

Can You Forgive Her? The Problem of Punishment

Generosity thus generates as much disapproval within these novels as Lizzie Eustace’s “greed.” Their stories begin with the question of whether

or not such women can be “forgive[n],” and Trollope leaves at least one of them “no escape, no hope, no prospect of relief, no place of consolation” (*Phineas Finn* 418). Their transactions result in broken lives and limbs. Kate suffers physical injury at George’s hands, while Alice blames herself for George’s violent rage, determining that she has been “punished” for “behav[ing] badly” (*Can You* 2:211). Laura’s punishment is displaced onto her marriage; although she considers her brother’s “affection to me [as] more than a return” for paying his debts (*Phineas Finn* 115), the novel stresses the emotional costs of this transaction, yoking her financial decision to what it terms “the fault of her life,” marrying for political motives rather than for love (*Phineas Redux* 461).

Laura’s independent financial action becomes the root of her painfully protracted misery. Having begun *Phineas Finn* “worthy of admiration” (29), she is, by the end of its sequel, “an old woman before her time” (361). The belabored “forgiveness” granted to Alice (and perhaps Kate) in 1865 turns into relentless narrative retribution for Laura in 1873, who concludes *Phineas Redux* “as though . . . going down into the grave” (549). Despite the narrative’s sympathetic take on her tragedy, the way Trollope draws out her decline seems to support her comment that “No woman was ever more severely punished” (*Phineas Redux* 139). In a literary lineup of loveless marriages, this punishment seems excessive—but only if we misunderstand the crime. Like Alice and Kate, Laura is chastened as much for her specific economic actions as for her marital choice.

As we have seen, Alice, Kate, and Laura refuse to steward future family wealth. But their transactions also put pressure on present-day family finances and relations. Intended as gifts, their contributions are quickly reclassified in more quantifiable terms, as loans—temporary affairs that the debtors hope to discharge. Chiltern hastens to repay his sister “to-morrow” (*Phineas Finn* 140), and even George convinces himself that he is merely “borrowing his cousin Alice’s money” (*Can You* 1:388) and that he will “repay her in full” (*Can You* 1:367). The men prefer the finite terms of repayment to the more indeterminate “burden” of reciprocity (*Phineas Redux* 349). Yet their debts are difficult to repay. Chiltern initially finds that Lord Brentford “won’t join me in . . . paying Laura her fortune” (*Phineas Finn* 139). George attempts to “acknowledge [his] debt” before asking for “another loan” (*Can You* 2:56) but finds borrowing hard to “endure” (113). His inability to discharge his debt makes him conscious that he has “robbed” his cousin (318).

Here and elsewhere in Trollope’s novels, financial obligations are painful and emasculating.²³ Although they lack the economic protections afforded

by contract, Alice and Laura hold the place of creditor to their male kin, who demonstrate profound discomfort with this scenario. Chiltern tries to keep his sister from “burden[ing]” another man with her wealth, while George finally flees to America. Whereas other men such as Phineas can “enjoy . . . his wife’s fortune” (*Phineas Redux* 559) in accordance with the understanding that “when [a woman’s hand] and all that it holds are your own, you can help yourself” (*Phineas Finn* 538), Chiltern and George face particularly painful situations because they borrow from women but—as a brother and an undesired cousin—cannot subsequently absorb these debts in marriage. Though such a state of affairs was hardly common, it threatened to become more widespread with the extension of married women’s property rights. If married women acquired independent financial status, marriage could no longer annul the financial obligations men might have to their brides. With the elimination of coverture, that is, a husband might find himself legally indebted to his wife. Just as idealized brother-sister relationships were often seen as prefiguring marriage,²⁴ portrayals of siblings’ financial relationships had stakes for marital economics as well. In Trollope’s fiction, consanguineal debt between siblings or cousins stands as a model for the potential tensions of marital debt in this period. Within close kin relations, even when money has been repaid, “the burden of the obligation” (*Phineas Redux* 349) cannot easily be discharged or, in financial terms, forgiven: cancelled, written off.

Can You Forgive Her? resolves this dilemma in part by reversing the status of debtor and creditor and shifting the terms of obligation; it asks us to “forgive” a woman’s sexual guilt rather than a man’s financial debt, setting the stage for similar slippage between men’s economic liabilities and women’s romantic indiscretions in the Phineas novels. Morse has argued that unworthy men are the real targets of the novels’ demands for forgiveness (*Women* 9); my point is that the terms of “forgiveness” differ along gendered lines. Though Laura and Alice are owed money, Trollope reverses the implications of their loans by requiring that their sexual transgressions, not their (unworthy) debtors’ obligations, be forgiven: “can you forgive her, delicate reader?” (*Can You* 1:384). Alice confesses to Grey, “though you may forgive me, I cannot forgive myself” (*Can You* 2:313); Laura, too, feels that she has done Kennedy “a grievous wrong” (*Phineas Finn* 529) and admits, “it has been my fault” (*Phineas Redux* 561). Whatever their feelings, this admission of guilt is a bait and switch, a disavowal of the economic structure in place.

These novels turn female creditors into debtors in need of forgiveness while cancelling men’s monetary obligations by displacing them onto the social world. According to this logic, Chiltern and George require forgiveness

for their ungentlemanly behavior, not for owing vast sums to their female kin; at least in Chiltern's case, Trollope grants that forgiveness (Cohen, "Palliser" 53). Laura never mentions Chiltern's financial indebtedness; after she spends her entire fortune on him, she refers to him as a debtor only once, to characterize his ineffective marriage proposals: "he almost flies at [Violet's] throat, as an angry debtor who applies for instant payment" (*Phineas Finn* 168). George is similarly taken to task for his lack of manners, not his monetary claims, when he threatens his sister and cousin and insists upon payment. Alice concedes that George's financial demand is "mainly right" but disapproves of his "hard, cruel manner" (*Can You* 2:142). Kate finds George's "conduct . . . mean and unmanly" (2:145) and feels "so ashamed of my brother!" (2:165). In accusing the men of bad behavior, the novel absolves them of their real economic obligations, forgiving or writing off their monetary debts by writing them into positions that require a different kind of forgiveness. Freed from the outcomes of their economic actions, these men retain the legal and social force of economic agency, while Alice, Kate, and Laura suffer remorse alongside the economic and social consequences of their financial dealings.

On the other end of the spectrum, Lizzie Eustace retains economic agency—appearing in *The Prime Minister* (1876) with "£4000 a year and a balance at her banker's" (418)—but suffers social chastisement at least in part because, unlike Alice, Kate, and Laura, she never accepts blame for her behavior, remaining "conscious of no special sins" (*Phineas Redux* 516). Though some characters want her "locked up" (*Eustace* 2:374), Chiltern, who makes a return appearance in *The Eustace Diamonds*, is less severe, perhaps remembering his own social and financial liabilities: "all that I can hear of her is, that she has told a lot of lies and lost a necklace" (2:375). Walter M. Kendrick has shown that these "lies" (141) trouble Trollope's vision of his "realistic enterprise" (156). Even after time transforms Lizzie's so-called "theft" into "that old story about the jewels" (*Prime* 69), the novels shift the terms of her blame to find her still guilty, because "she would still continue to . . . scheme, would still lie" (*Phineas Redux* 516). Although Kendrick argues persuasively that Lizzie's lies are Trollope's commentary on narrative policy and Andrew H. Miller similarly shows how her dishonesty reflects Trollope's view of the literary market (183-88), my point is that by aligning Lizzie's lies with her economic independence, the novels criticize both. Once again, blame and punishment slip easily between economic and social registers in order to find a female economic agent particularly culpable.

Legally speaking, Lizzie needs no financial forgiveness. Her economic liability rests on social expectation, rather than the law. But if we read her

“sins” and punishments together with those of the other characters I have discussed, we see a similar translation of independent economic actions into manners. The narrator’s exclamation—“Poor Lizzie Eustace! . . . Lizzie the liar! Poor Lizzie!” (*Phineas Redux* 516)—reiterates her social blameworthiness even as it expresses pity in ironically economic terms. (Whatever else she may be, Lizzie is not “poor.”) Unable to stop this woman’s “continue[d]” financial independence, the novels fuse even her legal economic claims with her “lies” to denounce her particular form of wealth acquisition, continuing to pit her unfavorably against her son and heir, a “child . . . who stood . . . high in repute” (*Phineas Redux* 516). In a doubly punitive measure, then, the novels both refuse to pardon her behavior and—as with Laura and Alice—punish her economic agency through sexual means. One fiancé dissolves their engagement when she refuses to give up the diamonds (*Eustace* 1:183), and her second marriage seems a form of narrative retribution. Her husband, firm in the “marital supremacy” that will prevent her intended prenuptial “settlements” (*Eustace* 2:369), is guilty of bigamy and suspected of murder (*Phineas Redux* 512). Although the law annuls their marriage, leaving her wealthy and “free from all marital persecution” (*Prime* 69), “decent” society leaves her “alone, weeping in solitude” (*Phineas Redux* 516).

D. A. Miller finds that the Palliser novels as a whole “portray a Parliament that, for all its politicking, has no politics” (116), but—as we have seen—Trollope enacts his visions of contemporary politics as much within the social plots and feelings of these novels as within their citations of the law. Although questions of female suffrage (granted for local elections in 1869) appear only long enough to be rejected in favor of vicarious political power,²⁵ the novels engage at length with the equally pressing question of reforming women’s property rights. Whether by taking or giving, the female characters discussed here lay claim to their property, struggling against even their most ardent well-wishers to control their own financial transactions. Alongside countless Victorian heroines better known for their financial disadvantages, Lizzie, Alice, Kate, and Laura present unresolved problems within these narratives not because they depend upon their male kin, prove overly acquisitive, or make the wrong marriage choices, but because in their most generous and greedy manifestations alike, single women’s independent possession and management of property threaten their first families’ economic longevity and their male kin’s peace of mind.

The novels I have discussed ask readers, pre-emptively, to forgive or punish *her* in the sexual terms most familiar to them, at least in part

because they are not ready to cede to women the new financial power to shepherd family wealth, to keep or cancel family debts, to demand repayment, or to refuse forgiveness to kin. Yet even the call for forgiveness, taken in its financial sense, reminds us that by the final decades of the nineteenth century, women were increasingly active economic players. Under the common law doctrine of coverture, a married woman could be neither debtor nor creditor. The property reforms of the 1870s and 1880s increased women's financial rights in part by increasing their fiscal responsibilities. As Trollope was writing these novels, even debt in need of forgiveness was becoming a welcome sign of economic responsibility for single and married women alike, a new economic possibility for an increasing number of female creditors and the men and women who owed them money.

University of Kentucky

NOTES

Many thanks to Sarah Hagelin, Ellen Malenas Ledoux, Deborah Denenholz Morse, and the editors and anonymous readers at *Victorian Studies* for their constructive feedback on this essay.

1. See Shanley 74; Ablow, "One Flesh" and *Marriage* 11, 119.

2. See, for instance, Corbett 13-24, Michie 10-13, and Marcus 193-204 for an expanded discussion of Victorian women's sexuality (endogamous and exogamous, homosexual); Psomiades shows how correlations between financial and sexual exchanges served primarily to undermine women's increasing rights. For the continued focus on sex in economics, see Jaffe 49 and Psomiades 112.

3. For Trollope's anxieties about unmarried women's economic position, see King 311.

4. On the social power of widowhood, see Noble 184.

5. On equal marriages, see Morse, *Women* 39, 77-79. For Trollope's opposition to the abuse of marital power, see Morse, *Reforming* 91, 107 and Gagnier 247. For readings of *He Knew He Was Right* and women's property, see Jones 129, 144-45 and Ablow, *Marriage* 119. For *He Knew He Was Right* and divorce law, see Sutherland, ed., *He Knew He Was Right* xviii and Raitt.

6. On diamonds' tainted connection to imperial plunder, see Kinsey, Plotz 41, David 146-47, Daly 70-72, and Arnold 77-80. For their relational status, see Markovits 597 and Pointon 509, 511.

7. On Trollope's narrator, see O'Connor 167-68.

8. The 1874 Amendment, known as the Creditors Bill, would restore husbands' liability. For married women's property legislation, a wife's pre- and postmarital debts, and the fear of wives colluding with tradespeople, see Shanley 104-09 and Rappaport 55-63.

9. On the legal world of *The Eustace Diamonds*, see Ben-Yishai, *Common* 119, 123 and McMaster 78–84.

10. For her rights through paraphernalia, see Roth 890–91, 894 and D. A. Miller 11.

11. For sexuality, see Cohen, *Sex* 161; for contract-based ownership, see Psomiades 102; and for narrative, see Kendrick 154.

12. See also Ben-Yishai, *Common* for the ways in which “the empirical truth of the novel is aligned not with the legal truth in the novel but rather with its gossip and propriety” (126).

13. Trollope leaves *The Eustace Diamonds* out of his reflection on the Palliser novels’ consecutive ordering (*Autobiography* 245–46), suggesting for Morse (*Women* 2) and others that he did not include it in the original series despite contemporary recognition of their shared characters (Hall 379).

14. See also Bresden 117 and Psomiades 102.

15. William Blackstone compared a wife’s rights to paraphernalia with a husband’s common-law rights: “as the husband may thus, generally, acquire a property in all the personal substance of the wife, so in one particular instance the wife may acquire a property in some of her husband’s goods. . . . These are called her *paraphernalia*” (qtd. in McMaster 80–81).

16. See also “Imperial” and “The Property of Married Women.” For the political stakes of depicting working men as brutes, see Lewis 537 and 541.

17. For class consolidation, see Armstrong 48 and 138–39; for endogamy and exogamy, see Corbett 24 and 37 and Michie 13 and 119; for contracts, see Psomiades 101–04 and Marcus 212–17, 232–39.

18. Regarding a wife’s vicarious action, see Maurer 150–56; for vocation, Schaffer 15 and 27; for sacrifice, Vlasopolos 221 and 223 and Tracy 64; for contract, Marcus 234–35; for a union with Kate, Marcus 236–39; for exogamy and endogamy, Michie 119–22; and for the deferral of marriage, Marcus 234.

19. My interest in extramarital economics dovetails with Schaffer’s argument that vocational drives “parallel” erotic desires (24) and that we should not “treat . . . vocation merely as a cover story for sex” (30).

20. See Green 140, 142; and Owens 305–06.

21. On Trollope’s politics, see Anderson 531 and Nardin 18 and 130.

22. See Shanley 74 and Ablow, “One Flesh.”

23. For example, in *Phineas Finn* 158 and 237 and *Prime Minister* 13 and 104–05.

24. See Ellis 134 and Davidoff and Hall 348.

25. See *Phineas Finn* 75, *Can You* 1:111, and Maurer 160. Some but not all advocates of women’s suffrage connected voting to property rights. See Turner 112 and Shanley 109–14.

WORKS CITED

Ablow, Rachel. *The Marriage of Minds: Reading Sympathy in the Victorian Marriage Plot*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2007.

———. “‘One Flesh,’ One Person, and the 1870 Married Women’s Property Act.” *BRANCH: Britain, Representation and Nineteenth-Century History*. Ed. Dino

- Franco Felluga. Extension of *Romanticism and Victorianism on the Net*. Web. 28 Feb. 2014.
- Anderson, Amanda. "Trollope's Modernity." *ELH* 74.3 (2007): 509-34.
- Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.
- Arnold, Jean. *Victorian Jewelry, Identity, and the Novel: Prisms of Culture*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2011.
- Ben-Yishai, Ayelet. *Common Precedents: The Presentness of the Past in Victorian Law and Fiction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013.
- Blumberg, Ilana M. "'Unnatural Self-Sacrifice': Trollope's Ethic of Mutual Benefit." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 58.4 (2004): 506-46.
- Bresden, Dagni. "'What's a Woman to Do?': Managing Money and Manipulating Fictions in Trollope's *Can You Forgive Her?* and *The Eustace Diamonds*." *Victorian Review* 31.2 (2005): 99-122.
- "Central Criminal Court, Jan. 14." *The Times* 15 Jan. 1869: 9. *The Times Digital Archive*. Web. 21 Sept. 2015.
- Cohen, William A. "The Palliser Novels." *The Cambridge Companion to Anthony Trollope*. Eds. Carolyn Dever and Lisa Niles. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011. 44-57.
- . *Sex Scandal: The Private Parts of Victorian Fiction*. Durham: Duke UP, 1996.
- Corbett, Mary Jean. *Family Likeness: Sex, Marriage, and Incest from Jane Austen to Virginia Woolf*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2008.
- Daly, Suzanne. "Indiscreet Jewels: The Eustace Diamonds." *Nineteenth-Century Studies* 19 (2005): 69-81.
- David, Deirdre. *Rule Britannia: Women, Empire, and Victorian Writing*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995.
- Davidoff, Leonore, and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780-1850*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- "Divorce." *John Bull and Britannia* 21 Feb. 1857: 121.
- Ellis, Sarah Stickney. *The Women of England, their Social Duties, and Domestic Habits*. New York: Appleton, 1843.
- "English Laws of Divorce with Regard to Women." *Englishwoman's Domestic Magazine* n.d. 82-86.
- Gagnier, Regenia. "Conclusion: Gender, Liberalism, and Resentment." *The Politics of Gender in Anthony Trollope's Novels: New Readings for the Twenty-First Century*. Eds. Margaret Markwick, Deborah Denenholz Morse, and Gagnier. Burlington: Ashgate, 2009. 235-48.
- Goodlad, Lauren M. E. "'Trollopian Foreign Policy': Rootedness and Cosmopolitanism in the Mid-Victorian Global Imaginary." *PMLA* 124.2 (2009): 437-54.
- Green, David R. "To do the Right Thing: Gender, Wealth, Inheritance and the London Middle Class." *Women and their Money, 1700-1950: Essays on Women and Finance*. Eds. Anne Laurence, Josephine Maltby, and Janette Rutterford. New York: Routledge, 2009. 133-50.
- Hall, John N. *Trollope: A Biography*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.
- "Imperial Parliament: The Property of Married Women." *Bell's Life in London and Sporting Chronicle* 16 Mar. 1856: 8.

- Jaffe, Audrey. "Trollope in the Stock Market: Irrational Exuberance and *The Prime Minister*." *Victorian Studies* 45.1 (2002): 43-64.
- Jones, Wendy S. *Consensual Fictions: Women, Liberalism, and the English Novel*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2005.
- Kendrick, Walter M. "The Eustace Diamonds: The Truth of Trollope's Fiction." *ELH* 46.1 (1979): 136-57.
- King, Margaret F. "Certain Learned Ladies: Trollope's *Can You Forgive Her?* and the Langham Place Circle." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 21 (1993): 307-26.
- Kinsey, Danielle C. "Koh-i-Noor: Empire, Diamonds, and the Performance of British Material Culture." *Journal of British Studies* 48.2 (2009): 391-419.
- Kuper, Adam. *Incest and Influence: The Private Life of Bourgeois England*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2009.
- "The Lady and Her Marriage Settlement." *Englishwoman's Domestic Magazine* 1 Mar. 1864: 207-11.
- Lewis, Michael D. "Pictures of Revolutionary Reform in Carlyle, Arnold, and *Punch*." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 34.5 (2012): 533-52.
- McMaster, R. D. *Trollope and the Law*. Houndmills: Macmillan, 1986.
- Marcus, Sharon. *Between Women: Friendship, Desire, and Marriage in Victorian England*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2007.
- Markovits, Stefanie. "Form Things: Looking at Genre through Victorian Diamonds." *Victorian Studies* 52.4 (2010): 591-619.
- "Married Women's Property." *Women's Union Journal: The Organ of the Women's Protective and Provident League* 1 Sept. 1882: 72.
- Maurer, Sara L. *The Dispossessed State: Narratives of Ownership in 19th-Century Britain and Ireland*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2012.
- Michie, Elsie B. *The Vulgar Question of Money: Heiresses, Materialism, and the Novel of Manners from Jane Austen to Henry James*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2011.
- Miller, Andrew H. *Novels Behind Glass: Commodity Culture and Victorian Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Miller, D. A. *The Novel and the Police*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.
- Morse, Deborah Denenholz. *Reforming Trollope: Race, Gender, and Englishness in the Novels of Anthony Trollope*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2013.
- . *Women in Trollope's Palliser Novels*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1987.
- M. S. R. "The Property of Married Women." *Englishwoman's Domestic Magazine* n.d. 234-38.
- Nardin, Jane. *He Knew She Was Right: The Independent Woman in the Novels of Anthony Trollope*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1989.
- Noble, Christopher S. "Otherwise Occupied: Masculine Widows in Trollope's Novels." *The Politics of Gender in Anthony Trollope's Novels: New Readings for the Twenty-First Century*. Eds. Margaret Markwick, Deborah Denenholz Morse, and Regenia Gagnier. Burlington: Ashgate, 2009. 177-90.
- Nunokawa, Jeff. *The Afterlife of Property: Domestic Security and the Victorian Novel*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.
- O'Connor, Frank. *The Mirror in the Roadway: A Study of the Modern Novel*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1957.

- Owens, Alastair. "Property, Gender and the Life Course: Inheritance and Family Welfare Provision in Early Nineteenth-Century England." *Social History* 26.3 (2001): 299-317.
- Perry, Ruth. *Novel Relations: The Transformation of Kinship in English Literature and Culture 1748-1818*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.
- Platz, John. *Portable Property: Victorian Property on the Move*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2008.
- Pointon, Marcia. "Intriguing Jewellery: Royal Bodies and Luxurious Consumption." *Textual Practice* 11.3 (1997): 493-516.
- "I.—The Property Earnings and Maintenance of Married Women." *Englishwoman's Review* 1 Oct. 1867: 263-75.
- "The Property of Married Women." *Lady's Newspaper and Pictorial Times* 7 Jun. 1856: 355.
- Psoniades, Kathy Alexis. "Heterosexual Exchange and Other Victorian Fictions: *The Eustace Diamonds* and Victorian Anthropology." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 33.1 (1999): 93-118.
- Raitt, Suzanne. "Marital Law in *He Knew He Was Right*." *The Ashgate Research Companion to Anthony Trollope*. Eds. Margaret Markwick, Deborah Denenholz Morse, and Mark W. Turner. Farnham: Ashgate, 2016.
- Rappaport, Erika Diane. *Shopping for Pleasure: Women in the Making of London's West End*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000.
- Roth, Alan. "He Thought He Was Right (But Wasn't): Property Law in Anthony Trollope's *The Eustace Diamonds*." *Stanford Law Review* 44.4 (1992): 879-97.
- Schaffer, Talia. "Why You Can't Forgive Her: Vocational Women and the Suppressive Hypothesis." *Victorians: A Journal of Culture and Literature* 128 (2015): 15-35.
- Shanley, Mary Lyndon. *Feminism, Marriage, and the Law in Victorian England*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989.
- Sutherland, John. "Introduction." *He Knew He Was Right*. By Anthony Trollope. Ed. Sutherland. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. vii-xxiii.
- Tracy, Robert. "Trollope Redux: the Later Novels." *The Cambridge Companion to Anthony Trollope*. Eds. Carolyn Dever and Lisa Niles. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011. 58-70.
- Trollope, Anthony. *An Autobiography*. Vol. 1. London: Blackwood, 1883.
- . *Barchester Towers*. Ed. John Sutherland. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.
- . *Can You Forgive Her?* Ed. Andrew Swarbrick. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.
- . *Doctor Thorne*. Ed. Simon Dentith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2014.
- . *The Duke's Children*. Eds. Katherine Mullin and Francis O'Gorman. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.
- . *The Eustace Diamonds*. Ed. W.J. McCormack. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.
- . *Framley Parsonage*. Eds. Katherine Mullin and Francis O'Gorman. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2014.
- . *He Knew He Was Right*. Ed. John Sutherland. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.
- . *Phineas Finn*. Ed. Simon Dentith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.
- . *Phineas Redux*. Ed. John Bowen. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.
- . *The Prime Minister*. Ed. Nicholas Shrimpton. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.
- . *Ralph The Heir*. Ed. John Sutherland. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.

- Turner, Mark W. *Trollope and the Magazines: Gendered Issues in Mid-Victorian Britain*. New York: St. Martin's, 2000.
- Vlasopolos, Anca. "The Weight of Religion and History: Women Dying of Virtue in Trollope's Later Short Fiction." *The Politics of Gender in Anthony Trollope's Novels: New Readings for the Twenty-First Century*. Eds. Margaret Markwick, Deborah Denenholz Morse, and Regenia Gagnier. Burlington: Ashgate, 2009. 221-33.