

LECTURE 13.

Theme: William Makepeace Thackeray

Plan: Realism in English literature and its peculiarities.

William Thackeray. His life and work.

W. Thackeray's satiric talent. "Vanity Fair".

William Makepeace Thackeray (1811-1863) is one of those Victorian novelists who felt the pulse of the Victorian people, where the emerging middle classes for the first time in the history of Europe needed an escape from the banal reality of the ever growing industrial society. The Victorian reader wanted to be entertained with a minimum of literary convention, a minimum 'esthetic distance.' As a professional writer who earned his living by writing, Thackeray experimented with Journalism, humor and satire in his novels and lay bare before the readers a society, the Victorian society at that, with all its psychological implications, habits, its shams and pretensions. In doing so, Thackeray employs what is often referred to as the intrusive narrator, who peeps into the psyche of the characters as a caustic observer, who moves slowly but with a certain wit and humor and objectivity that is so characteristic of Thackeray. Thus between 1837 and 1843 his writing focuses on the vices of the Victorian society just as other writers of the age did. He looks at his lower class characters in the most disparaging manner. It is in these years that he developed a talent for the burlesque and produced some of the finest satirical works ridiculing other writers of the time.

A significant change in Thackeray's technique and style of writing is quite discernable between 1843 and 1848. His writings of this period, mainly consisting of short stories, portray the injustices of the European society, its ill practices, its corrupt institutions and norms and perhaps came to believe that a reform and justice is the need of the hour. He became more involved in his works personally. However, Thackeray's first novel *Vanity Fair*, established him as a writer of some acclaim. The title which is taken from Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* gives a clue to the reader of the novelist's larger vision which is not bereft of satire, realism and criticism of sham deceptions, vanities, intrigues, snobbery, hypocrisies and cruelty.

Thus, in Thackeray we meet with a more homogeneous and less varied world which is peopled by individuals differing from one another in no vital respect except their personal beings. Most of them stand for the same values - or shall we say lack of values? They represent the same common weaknesses and trickeries with which the whole of Thackeray's cosmos is so plentifully fraught. Nonetheless they play their own roles and command attention in their own right - a picturesque although circumscribed world. This has been aptly brought out by David Cecil when he says "His (Thackeray's) creative power shows itself not in transferring the facts he has observed about life, but in arranging them. Dickens' imagination is a distorting glass turning to grotesque comedy or grotesque horror the world that it reflects; Thackeray's is a kaleidoscope,

shaking the colored fragments of his observation into a symmetrical order round the center of a common canon of conduct (61- 62).”

Thackeray’s Most Popular Novels Thackeray’s plots usually repeat themselves, although each time in a different guise. Their motives generally are the same. The main theme always turns on the struggle between selfishness, vanity, deception and instinctive goodness, honesty and humility. By common consent *Vanity Fair*, *Pendants*, *Esmond* are Thackeray’s widely read novels. *Vanity Fair* is at once the most admired as well as the most typical work of its author, which presents a survey of a section of the English society in the first half of the nineteenth century. Its two central figures, Becky Sharp and Amelia Sedley, represent the parallel lives of two contrasting school mates. From the *Paris Sketch Book* and *The Book of Snobs* there is a natural transition to the world of his *Vanity Fair*.

It is interesting to know that with the publication of *Vanity Fair* (1847–48) Thackeray shot up to a position, if not excelling, at least equaling that of Dickens who had by now risen high into the esteem of contemporary readers. This shows the power and the excellence of *Vanity Fair*. In his earlier works Thackeray had been consistently dealing blows at the snobs and the snobberies of his time. His earlier works had undoubtedly in them a ring of bitterness, and provoked certain critics into labeling him as cynic. A parallel has sometimes been drawn between Thackeray’s *Vanity Fair* and Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*. As one marches through the *Vanity Fair* one comes across various characters charged and saturated with all that goes by the name of sham, deceit, roguery and intrigue. Bunyan’s pilgrim also met with similar situations in his long journey. But whereas he encounters these evils only through a fraction of his journey and moves on to happier and brighter goals the traveler through *Vanity Fair* has to face this evil world both as a journey and as its goal. In his book *Thackeray’s Cultural Frame of Reference*, McMaster believes that all “Victorian writers, implicitly criticize the harshness and cupidity of contemporary society, and promotes charity and humility, the encompassing vision of Ecclesiastes produces an ultimate sense of ephemeracy, repetition and weariness (5).”

Why Thackeray presents such a uniformly bad picture of society unrelieved by any bright spots is best explained by the fact that he calls his *Vanity Fair* “A novel without a hero.” This is significant not merely as a description of the plot of his novel but more because it gives an indication of the mood of the writer when he wrote this novel. He had seen so much of falsehood and trickery and had seen them so often that he really started doubting the existence of unalloyed goodness in this world. For him there were no heroes of the kind and in the sense conventional literature depicted them. Slyness and charlatanism appeared so overpowering to him that he became convinced of the universality of these vices. It is in this background that the vast creation of his *Vanity Fair* is best appreciated. Even though one could dispute with the novelist’s vision, his exquisite rendering of it through the pages of the *Vanity Fair* can hardly evoke any adverse criticism. Here is a wonderful world bristling with life and emotion. The force behind its movement may be that of cunning and wickedness, but its

momentum is great indeed. Rachel Pietka rightly pointed out that “the Novel without a Hero suggests Thackeray’s determination to scrutinize gender norms.

While the Victorian age sought to create labels by which people were designated as either normal or abnormal, Thackeray creates characters who move in and out of these categories (241).” Like most of his works *Vanity Fair* also suffers from a certain looseness of construction. Up to the first half of the book the plot remains relatively well-knit; in the latter half all kinds of deviations dangle about and the structural compactness is sacrificed to a successful, and by no means, an uninteresting ending. Thackeray’s critics of 1960s and 1980s like Ray, the Tillotsons, and Lester set the stage for the New Critical analyses of the 1960s and 1970s, which would refute accusations of formlessness by finding unity, coherence, or design in Thackeray’s use of different literary conventions and genres, the parallels in the plot structure, and the overarching narrative discourse (80).” In this respect Thackeray further extended a tendency already begun by Fielding. The main interest in the story centers round the figure of Becky Sharp, who is by any standard one of the most powerful and exciting of literary creation. In the words of Legouis Cazamians: Never has there been a more thorough study of the instinctive trickery, the inherent duplicity, the supple energy of a certain type of the eternal woman - the actress, the adventures, who scandalizes and conquers the world, invincible in her defeats, insecure in her triumphs (106). It should, however, be pointed out that great as this creation of Becky is, it would have been greater had Thackeray not succumbed to the demands and the moral pressure of the Victorian society.

A subtle psychologist of human character, particularly of its intriguing behavior, Thackeray displayed a certain lack of consistency towards the end of the book so far as her character is concerned. Now although Becky’s character naturally demanded that in the end she should be triumphant in her subterfuge, for which an end is the most approximate to reality, yielding to the moral and social considerations of his age, Thackeray sought to make her a penitent and therefore self-reformed sinner instead. Here was an evident split in the personality of Thackeray. His sympathies drew him towards making Becky uniformly strong in her maleficent ways much in the same way as Milton’s sympathies lay with his Satan; but his conscious role of a moral preacher compelled him to go against the direction of his constitutional preference and artistic propriety. But with all these defects *Vanity Fair* is a monumental achievement worthy to be placed beside some of the best of its own kind.

Despite its loose construction it possesses an organic unity of a different but no mean order. Its unity is the unity of a common purpose - to expose and satirize sham, arrogance and subterfuge - which the diverse characters reveal under the all-pervading and common spell of their creator. Thackeray’s *Pendennis* (1848-50), was written immediately after *Vanity Fair*, and has a similar atmosphere of brooding disillusion, tempered by the most jovial of wits. In *Pendennis* a semi-autobiographical study of a young man’s career, we have a continuation of the satire on society begun in *Vanity Fair*. The novel traces the youthful career of Arthur Pendennis: his first love affair, his experiences at “Oxbridge University,” his employment as a London journalist, and so

on. Its importance is partly due to the fact that it reflects more of the particulars of its author's life than all his other works. But largely it commands attention because of its central figure George Pendennis.

Writing about this work W. J. Long remarks "Pendennis is a profound moral study, and the most powerful arrangement of well-meaning selfishness in our literature, not even excepting George Eliot's *Romola* which it suggests (15)". In Thackeray's own words his hero is "neither angel nor imp." Pendennis has drawn by Thackeray is a young man of the world, a curious mixture of good nature and carelessness, superimposed with a strong sense of self-interest. Now it is here that defect of Thackeray's character delineation, a reference to which has already been made above - his lack of power and courage in dealing with sexual matters — is most evident. Pendennis, in spite of his healthful vigor and necessarily unangelic and, therefore, human character with all its failings, is forcibly painted as a person completely immune to the urge for sex gratifications in the face of all temptations which he experiences.

This state of total virginity which he keeps right up to the age of twenty-nine is only a device to suit the moralist in Thackeray against all considerations of verisimilitude. Save for this defect Pendennis has been adequately and impressively treated and looks quite a convincing creation. In this novel we notice a definite, although slight trend on the part of Thackeray towards greater geniality and warm-heartedness, even romance. Here he grows less objective and shows a marked tendency to weave his situations and characters out of his heart and his dreams. This establishes the contention that his initial preference for the hard and the unlovely was more in the nature of a reaction to the excesses of romanticism indulged into by writers like Scott Lytton and even Dickens, and as an attempt to meet Dickens on a ground different from his own - an attempt dictated possibly by an unconscious admission on the part of Thackeray of Dickens' unrivalled and also not-easy-to-rival superiority as a novelist, - and not owing to any constitutional inclination for the unliked and the hard in him.

The following lines show the greatness of Thackeray's descriptive power is "Let the poor boy fling out his simple heart at the woman's feet, and deal gently with him. It is best to love wisely, no doubt; but to love foolishly is better than not to be able to love at all. Some of us can't: and are proud of our impotence, too (70)". In his introduction to his book *William Make peace Thackeray*, William Crary Brownell rightly points out that: Thackeray's picture of society is the most vivid, as it is incontestably the most real, in prose fiction. The temperament of the artist and satirist combined, the preoccupation with the moral element in character,—and in logical sequence, with its human and social side,—lead naturally to the next step of viewing man in his relations, and the construction of a miniature world. And in addition to the high place in literature won for him by his insight into the human heart, Thackeray's social picture has given him a distinction that is perhaps unique (3). In his third important novel, *Henry Esmond* (1852), there are two strands that run side by side in Thackeray's intellectual make-up, a keen penetration into the psychology of the vanity of human sentiment and a strong impulse of historical imagination. This latter side of

his personality is best discernible in *Hana Esmond*. Although to a lesser degree of perfection, it is equally present in *The Virginians: A Tale of the Last Century* also. The two impulses are not contradictory; in fact both are generally present together. The only difference between one novel and the other is that of preponderance of the one or the other of these two. Technically *Henry Esmond* is the most perfect of Thackeray's novels. Herein is a very lucid expression of a keenly felt and almost instinctive sympathy coupled with admiration for a bygone age - the age of Queen Anne. That Thackeray undertook the writing of the historical novels is a fact important for many reasons.

It will be, however, wrong to suggest that even as a species of a higher class it has not undergone various ramifications in substance and in style. On the contrary we can further sub-divide the historical novel into three broad types. First, that in which history predominates and antiquity is rediscovered almost as it is done in a bare chronicle. Second that in which romance is intermixed with history and in which the historical adventures and exploits recounted are but a salutary diversion into the past from tedium of the present. Third, that in which past is not indulged into for its own sake but only as a link with the present exemplifying the essential and enduring problems and motives running constantly through the flow of time. Joseph T. Shipley, editor of the *Dictionary of World Literature* has respectively termed these three sub-types as (1) The Period Novel, (2) The Historical Romance, and (3) The Historical Novel Proper. *Henry Esmond* belongs to the last category i.e. the historical novel proper.

To resume our examination of *Henry Esmond* we are first of all struck by the nature and method of its plot. Here is an old cavalier relating his own memoirs in the evening of his life with a daftness and skill hardly to be matched anywhere else in the whole range of English fiction. The author takes us to the courts and the inns and a wide variety of society of eighteenth century England. Thackeray had a more intimate knowledge of this past age than any other of his contemporaries and he employs his knowledge to the maximum advantage by reproducing the manners and the morals, the customs and the costumes, the tone and the tempo of Queen Anne's England vividly and exquisitely. The lore of the past coupled with the strangeness and the picturesqueness which necessarily go with its description bring Thackeray very near the romantic mood, and in *Henry Esmond* we have got the most definite and eloquent testimony to the repressed romanticism of Thackeray and his gradual return to romance. Although technically the most perfect of Thackeray's novels *Henry Esmond* is not the most widely read. There are many reasons for this. But perhaps the most important of them is the rather unfamiliar and unconventional development of its plot. *Henry Esmond* after having been for ten years passionately devoted to Beatrix, the daughter of Lord Castlewood, in the end marries her mother, Lady Castlewood, who herself in the beginning is shown to favor his marriage with Beatrix. Now the average reader, too much used to the conventional endings of such stories with the ringing of the marriage bells and the exchange of nuptial rings between his popular heroes and heroines, is not

likely to take kindly to such an unorthodox outcome of the plot as it happens in Henry Esmond. But here it should be noted that things do not always happen in the real world as we expect them and much less as we desire them.

Thackeray was a realist and he found nothing unnatural in depicting an incident that is not improbable. It required a great genius to manipulate such a plot convincingly and Thackeray proved quite equal to the occasion. From the very beginning when Esmond was a boy and a part and a protégé of the family of the Castle woods he was very much devoted and serviceable to Lady Castlewood. He even admired her and was himself liked by his mistress. At that time Beatrix was a charmer of sweet sixteen and it does not require any proof for the modern reader with his up-to-date knowledge of psychology to point out that the boyish passion of heightened adolescence is much more prone to gravitate towards a sexually ripe and mature woman than towards a girl possessing but the rudiments of womanhood. Further Lady Castlewood's marriage to the lover of her daughter does not in any way revolt against even the orthodox canons of moral propriety. It was never a case of her jealousy for her daughter. Instead it was a logical and even envyless judgment on her part finally to marry Esmond whom she had loved when she became quite convinced that Beatrix was in no mood to marry and had even declared her opposition against marrying Esmond whom she considered as but an humble swain.

References

- 1- History of English Literature. Vol.1. Iss.2. 1945..
- 2- Михальская Н.П., Аникин Г.В. История английской литературы. Учебник для гуманитарных факультетов вузов. – М.: Академия, 2012. – 516 с.
- 3- Михальская, Н. П. История английской литературы: учеб. Для вузов/ Н.П.Михальская. – 3-е изд. – М. : Академия, 2019. – 480 с.
- 4 - Гиленсон, Б.А. История литературы США : учеб. пособие для студентов филол. фак. ун-тов и высш. пед. учеб. заведений. – М. : Академия, 2019. – 703 с.
- 5-История литературы США / гл. ред. Я. Н. Засурский. – М. : ИМЛИ РАН : Наследие, 1997–.
- 6-Луков, Вл.А. История литературы : зарубежная литература от истоков до наших дней : учеб. пособие для вузов. – 7-е изд. – М. Академия, 2019. – 511с.