BRITISH BOHEMIA AND THE VICTORIAN JOURNALIST

Christopher Kent

Bohemia was a needed word in early Victorian Britain, judging from how quickly it entered the journalists' vocabulary. Though the first use noted by *OED* is Thackeray's in *Vanity Fair* (1847) it is only one of several to be found in that year. The word came of course from France, then as now a privileged source of terminology for identifying the latest cultural and intellectual phenomena. Interestingly it was anglicised from the start, which didn't quite make sense since *bohème* means gypsy. French etymology locates the Gypsies' homeland in Bohemia, while English locates it in Egypt. The anglicisation conferred legitimacy on the word by naturalisation, and it may be that the term is now more widely used in English than French. Yet a contentious question in the literature from the very start is whether there really *was* a Bohemia in Britain—whether a British Bohemia was even possible, and not a cultural oxymoron. The word may have been naturalised, but was the phenomenon? Happily, British Bohemians could always justify their adoption of the term, and display their erudition, by citing Shakespeare's geographical mistake in *A Winter's Tale* where act 3, scene 3 takes place on the seacoast of "the deserts of Bohemia." Bohemia was even then a country of the mind.

But British Bohemia also had "as distinct a local existence as Leicester, and as much a population of its own" (Escott 272). Here took place one of the most significant aspects of its anglicisation—its gentrification. This was the process by which Bohemian became a term that cut across existing social divisions and in so doing became intimately connected with another term that was becoming socially amphibious—gentleman." At the centre of the physical geography of British Bohemia was the Garrick Club. The Garrick was founded in 1831 to, among other things, uplift the acting profession. Its location then and now is close to London's theatre district. It is also close to the book publishing quarter around Paternoster Square and fairly near the Law Courts—much nearer than the other gentlemen's clubs of Pall Mall and St James's. The club early collected a number of literary types, lawyers, and a contingent of army officers who were devotees of the theatre and enjoyed the gossip, wit, and racy talk for which the Garrick became known. Contact with these "*ci-devant* or *soi-disant* sons of Mars who are conspicuous figures in the economy of Bohemian London" ("Drama's Patrons" 8), and with other professional gentlemen, was supposed to be a socially elevating experience for the actors who remained a decided minority of the club's membership lest they excessively dilute its *ton*.

The Garrick was the clubhouse of the two lions of mid-Victorian literature, and the site of a dispute between them which was central to defining the character of British Bohemia. William Makepeace Thackeray was an early member of the Garrick, and it was here as well as in his writings that he pursued his campaign to broaden the definition of gentleman from its traditional aristocratic and landed exclusivity, to embrace the arts—to make it possible for a gentleman to become an artist (which

Thackeray tried to become), or even a journalist (which he did become), without losing caste (Ray, *Uses* 13). Thackeray had acquired a reputation as a minor wit, a clever comic journalist specialising in social and artistic topics, when quite unexpectedly his genius declared itself and he became a literary giant almost overnight with the publication of *Vanity Fair*. Suddenly he became a contender for the literary crown which Charles Dickens had worn almost uncontested for nearly ten years. So began a rivalry which neither openly acknowledged, but which, as Robert Patten points out, was widely recognised.

Thackeray had something that surprisingly few Victorian novelists, and no other major ones, possessed: the claim to a university education, perhaps the most solid justification one could have for gentlemanly status. Dickens was famously uneasy about his social location. He had no conventional claim based on either family or education to gentlemanly status and, of course, there lurked within his breast the secret stigma of the blacking factory. While he could not send his alter ego David Copperfield to Oxford or Cambridge, he at least made him a "dab hand at Latin verse" (Jenkyns 112). And he sent the son who bore his own name to Eton. More even than his genius it was his will to power, his urge to dominate, that made Dickens seize and exercise the position of literature's top dog in the 1840s. He taught his fellow authors how to beat publishers into submission—that is, they had his ruthless negotiating skills and a product publishers wanted on virtually any terms, which of course they hadn't. He fought for better copyright laws and championed the "dignity of literature," the right of the author to claim professional status and independence on exclusively literary grounds and to throw off the last remaining shackles of social patronage.

Here Dickens first clashed, by proxy of John Forster and Bulwer Lytton, with Thackeray who in his eyes failed to show solidarity with his literary brethren, as evidenced by his merciless lampoons of leading novelists in *Punch* and his deflationary remarks about literary genius and his emphasis on the bread-and-butter business of journalism. By the early 1850s Dickens had entered the most energetic and ambitious phase in his mission of uplift and independence with the Guild of Literature and Art. Launched with grandiose rhetoric and an energetic campaign of amateur theatricals, the Guild soon dwindled embarrassingly into a Dickensian coterie. Partly perhaps to draw attention from this failure Dickens then embarked on an attempt to take control of the Royal Literary Fund and wrest it from what he regarded as the feeble hands of establishment patronage. Here again he met with failure. Thackeray was pointedly uninvolved in both these Dickensian initiatives, and not being with him, or so Dickens tended increasingly to think, meant being against him.

Meanwhile Thackeray was indeed putting himself forward as the chief spokesman for his own somewhat different view of the literary and artistic professions, chiefly through *Pendennis* and *The Newcomes*. In these novels the artist and journalist are presented not as heroically autonomous both socially and professionally, but as gentlemen, as beneficiaries of an expanded version of that status which now, Thackeray claimed, conferred potential membership on practitioners of the arts. While Dickens was making his unsuccessful attempts to reorganise the literary and artistic professions he was also writing his great "dark" novels with their hostile characterisations of

gentlemen—cold, grey, cynical figures such as Richard Carstone of *Bleak House* and Henry Gowan of *Little Dorrit* (Moers 231). The majority of readers with literary aspirations choosing between David Copperfield and Pendennis as their model would have chosen Thackeray's uncertain but gentlemanly hero over Dickens's complacently bourgeois self-made hero.

What effectively brought the rivalry between Dickens and Thackeray into the open, and to a head, was the oft-recounted Garrick Club Affair of 1858 (see Ray, Johnson, Borowitz, Edwards). Edmund Yates, a thrusting young gossip columnist, published a sneering profile of Thackeray in a minor London newspaper. This article, while conceding that he was unquestionably a gentleman, suggested that this was a rather dubious distinction by accusing him of insincerity and heartless cynicism. Yates was Dickens's main literary spear-carrier at the time and Thackeray had reason to believe that he was in fact acting as Dickens's catspaw. Dickens's judgment was impaired by the life crisis he was going through—he was abandoning his wife for the young actress Ellen Ternan, an action difficult to square with his irreproachable self- and public image. In the event Dickens suffered yet another defeat when Thackeray put his complaint against Yates to the Committee of the Garrick Club on the grounds that the attack on him by Yates, a fellow member of the club, was an intolerable violation of its social sanctity. A majority of the club's members agreed with him and Yates was expelled.

The division within the Garrick over Yates's expulsion has usually been characterised as "the Gentlemen versus the Bohemians" (Ray, "Dickens versus Thackeray" 823; Borowitz 18) This may not be an appropriate description, though of course the vote was secret. Thackeray certainly argued that Yates was guilty of ungentlemanly conduct, and the club was considered, by its members at least, as a gentlemen's club. The problem is with the term Bohemian. It tended originally to carry a somewhat negative connotation suggesting intellectual troublemakers who misused their talents for socially or politically subversive purposes—quacks and demagogues, for example. As late as the 1860s Walter Bagehot refers to those "too clever by half people who live in Bohemia" (314). Karl Marx, no mean troublemaker himself, also used Bohemian as a term of contempt for intellectuals who did not share his views (Prawer 185, 354). Balzac greatly widened the word's currency in France when he made Bohemia a critical site in the elaborate social cartography of his *Comédie Humaine*—especially the febrile world of Parisian journalism depicted in *Illusions Perdues* . Then came Henry Murger the great populariser of Bohemia in his *Scènes de la Vie de Bohéme* (1845-49) which cast a veil of romantic glamour over the struggles for survival of a group of idealistic young artists. From Murger onward, the artistic life would be the central defining feature of the Bohemia of popular imagination. He famously declared that "Bohemia neither exists, nor can exist, anywhere but in Paris." Charles Dickens seemed to share this view. He was famously Francophile and loved visiting Paris. He seems to have embraced the French view of France's cultural superiority in the arts (Ormond 19), French painting was better than English in his opinion, and French theatre much better. In France too he could let his hair down, especially in the company of his new companion in dissipation, Wilkie Collins. In France Bohemia was predominantly

conceived as radical, oppositional, and idealistic. It was politicised, militantly anti-bourgeois, and tended to see the arts as charged with a socially transformative mission (Seigel 61-63). All of this fitted with important elements in Dickens's own thinking. Yet he did not consider himself a Bohemian and was hostile to the term in a British context where he associated it with improvidence and fecklessness—a too tempting alibi for inadequacy and failure, unredeemed by any of its positive French connotations. He had some reason for this prejudice since his father and brothers were Bohemians of this very type and a source of considerable embarrassment to him.

Despite Murger's prohibition, however, the English—their journalists especially—insisted on naturalising Bohemia and proclaiming its existence in England. This occurred chiefly under the auspices of Thackeray whose victory at the Garrick was not one of Gentlemen over Bohemians but of Bohemians *and* Gentlemen over the Dickensians. The Garrick stood for the very British, and Thackerayan, idea that one could be both—an idea that was central to the club's very existence. It needs to be noted that Dickens was not a clubman, whereas Thackeray quintessentially was. This may well have been the most important reason for Dickens's defeat in the Garrick Club Affair. Dickens had acceded to the club's flattering request to join it in 1837 when he gained celebrity status. But he resigned the following year. He rejoined in 1849, and resigned again in 1856 rejoining again the following year. He did not resign in 1858 over the Yates affair—to have done so would have been a public admission of defeat, and hence quite impossible. His final resignation came in 1865 over his failure to get his literary factotum W.H. Wills elected to the club. Dickens was not really happy as a member of any organisation or group that he could not dominate. Clubmen do not like to be dominated. Thackeray is sometimes described as the dominant figure at the Garrick in his later years, but he was not and knew it (Hough 59). The club was an important place of social interaction and observation for him as it was not for Dickens in whose novels there are no real clubmen except perhaps Mr Pickwick, founder and guiding genius of the Pickwick Club. The only club that really suited Dickens was the Dickens Club: it convened whenever he entertained, and its members delighted in submitting to the spell of his amazing powers.

Thackeray enjoyed one final victory over Dickens after the Garrick Club Affair. In addition to being great novelists both men were also editors, although perhaps only one of them was a great editor. In this endeavour as well Dickens initially rose faster than Thackeray. His *Household Words* was a notable success; characteristically he ran it with a very tight rein, impressing it heavily with the stamp of his personality. At a time when editorial anonymity was the rule "Conducted by Charles Dickens" in large type immediately following the journal's title was decidedly a statement. His contributors however, with a few distinguished exceptions, had to be content with anonymity. Some of the able young journalists who wrote for it such as Edmund Yates and G.A. Sala later hinted that Dickens's editorial hand was a bit too heavy for the good of their own careers and that their contributions were often assumed by readers to be his own work (Yates 310). Although journalistic anonymity was still the general rule in the 1850s, Dickens's aggressively assertive house style lent it an additional dimension.

The greater editor was not Dickens, but Thackeray, and this for the same reasons that he was a great clubman and the presiding genius of British Bohemia. During his brief, brilliant founding editorship of it before he died, he made the *Cornhill Magazine* a runaway success thanks to the quality of the contributors he attracted by the magazine's openness to contributors both amateur and professional, by its gentlemanly, unsectarian tone, and its genial, unoppressive editorial presence (Fisher 8). He was also fortunate in having an almost ideal publisher in the gentlemanly George Smith. The *Cornhill* conformed to Thackeray's ideal of a club. It is significant that he asked Sala, everybody's notion of an arch-Bohemian journalist and notorious for his unreliability, to contribute to it. He even got him elected to the Reform Club, though he could never have got him into the Garrick. In the *Cornhill* too appeared Thackeray's last novel, *Philip*, which contains his famous definition of Bohemia:

> A land of chambers, billiard rooms, supper rooms, oysters, a land of song, a land where soda flows freely in the morning . . . a land where men call each other by their Christian names; where most are poor, where almost all are young and where, if a few oldsters do enter it is because they have preserved more tenderly and carefully than others their youthful spirits and the delightful capacity to be ideal. I have lost my way in Bohemia now, but it is certain that Prague is the most picturesque city in the world. (148)

The *Cornhill* also carried an article in 1865 titled "Bohemia and Bohemians" by James Hannay, a self-identified Bohemian journalist. It is representative of several that appeared around this time offering definitions of a distinctively British Bohemia that shared a dominant Thackerayan spirit. "By Bohemian," Hannay wrote, "for the present purposes is meant a gentleman who, being no worse born or bred or educated than other folk, is yet through some strong peculiarity of temperament in the first instance, acted on by circumstances in the second, alienated from society in its established conventional, and certainly very convenient sense" (241). Hannay then proceeded to populate his Bohemia with a variety of types more diverse than the characteristically artistic and politically radical inhabitants of French Bohemia. These include naval officers of an unconventional stamp (Hannay had served in the navy), and classically educated Bohemians (Hannay was notorious for flaunting his Greek and Latin). He celebrates maverick scholars with unorthodox opinions and life styles who rejected a clerical career to end up in places like Australia serving as policeman, stockmen, and grog shop keepers. "The world knows nothing of the most useful Bohemians of all ages, and yet," Hannay declares, "what but the Bohemian spirit has made us a great maritime and colonial power?" (250). A dash of Bohemianism can be found in "your Spekes and Burtons" (naming two great Victorian explorers of Africa) "and many a good fellow both officer and private who fell before Sebastopol or Delhi was there because he belonged to the brotherhood" (251). Hannay's exemplary Bohemians are as likely to be Tories as radicals (Hannay prided himself on his Toryism), and some are even aristocrats, "feudal Bohemians" whose confident social tolerance makes them at ease in

any society, the more unconventional the better, for their amusement. Other journalistic anatomists of British Bohemia found a place for the Bohemians of commerce—businessmen of a highly speculative bent willing to risk their own, or preferably others', fortunes with bold joint stock investments in undug mines and unbuilt railways throughout the world, venture capitalists in today's terms. For such men access to publicity and journalists was the breath of life. As the Edinburgh newspaperman J.G. Bertram put it, "the symbolical Bohemia is unlimited in extent" (281).

British Bohemia was above all the journalist's realm. John North has estimated that over 125,000 periodicals were published in Britain during the nineteenth century (2389). A very high proportion of these, certainly of the most important, were published in London. Their number took off in the 1850s with the abolition of the advertising tax, the stamp tax, and paper duties which dramatically reduced production costs. All of this, of course, meant an increased demand for journalists and the possibility of gaining a far greater income from journalism than Grub Street ever offered. The careers of Edmund Yates and G.A. Sala would exemplify this. A distinctive variety of journalism that flourished in this period was the journalism of social exploration, a genre that owed much to the work of Dickens and of which his *Household Words* provided some of the best examples. Yates, Sala, and John Hollingshead were some of its most successful practitioners, along with Henry Mayhew the best remembered of them today for his interview-based reports of life and labour among London's lower orders. An established Bohemian persona was a valuable resource in the pursuit of such journalism: it signalled the bearer's freedom from the stiff conventions of respectability, facilitating access to different social strata, while the gentlemanly aura however sustained—by cues of speech, dress and bearing—provided some protection in doubtful quarters.

The journalist-anthropologist did not have to "go native," his Bohemian credentials certified his *bona fides* as a sympathetic yet detached observer. Bohemia was itself a marketable site. In addition to the various articles in which journalists pondered its existence and definition, it featured increasingly in novels and plays, following Thackeray's lead. Here again Yates and Sala were prominent, though Shirley Brooks and Mark Lemon of *Punch* also mined this vein. In such works Bohemia usually comes across as a somewhat raffish, convivial, masculine place where social boundaries are overcome by talent or sheer nerve, but where the social tone is generally maintained by the presence of some convivial aristocrats, and profitable information circulates for the upwardly mobile. Such an image helped to overcome the questionable social status hitherto associated with the practice of journalism and enhanced its charms. This expanding would-be profession was attracting a better educated and socially upscale intake with a significant leavening of the university educated, many of whom had read *Pendennis*. Thackeray had a considerably greater following among young university men than did his great rival, as evidenced by a debate at the Oxford Union in 1852 where he was declared superior to Dickens by twenty-one votes to eighteen.

This influx created greatly increased the demand for clubs, the quintessential and perhaps defining feature of British Bohemia. London's clubs fascinated foreign observers, especially the French, as ideological anomalies. Here in the world's centre of high capitalism, amongst the famously individualised and privatised British, were

highly successful self-governing gentlemen's communes—consumer collectives dedicated to making luxurious amenities available to members at surprisingly low cost. The clubs were inspired by two older types of gentlemanly commune, the Oxbridge college and the regimental mess. Though the new Bohemian clubs that met the demands of journalists in the 1860s were more modest than the Garrick—whose members, in the words of Lord Dunraven one of their number, formed the "aristocracy of Bohemia" (1: 184)—or the even more opulent Reform Club, they were also more tolerant of unconventionality. They generated a certain *esprit de corps* among their members and helped to integrate new arrivals into the journalist's guild. Commonly these were young men for whom the club provided an invaluable introduction into the mysteries of metropolitan masculinity and a support system for bachelorhood. One feature was common to all the clubs and essential to their survival: they did not offer their members credit, unlike their Parisian counterparts the Bohemian cafes. On the other hand the clubs' legally private precincts were a sanctuary from creditors and writ servers. An important difference between London's Bohemia and that of Paris was in its degree of organisation and practical utility to Bohemian professions, notably journalism.

Despite the business-like principles on which its clubs were operated, British Bohemia was not insensitive to the stresses of Bohemian life, the economic uncertainties of its professions, the toll that its irregular work rhythms and feast or famine life style took on the minds and bodies of their fellows and their families. The clubs of Bohemia often acted as agencies of support, both officially and unofficially. Club gossip monitored the circumstances of members; illnesses and absences were noted and informally looked into often resulting in a "loan" which might or might not be repaid. Many of Bohemia's more prosperous members viewed rendering such assistance as an obligation to be discharged with the greatest tact. Thackeray was exemplary in this respect (Pearson 266). Particularly deserving or distinguished victims of Bohemia's vicissitudes--more often their surviving families—might be the beneficiaries of an amateur dramatic production which Bohemians, many of whom were inveterate performers, would take part in or attend. Dickens of course delighted in organising and acting in such productions. Angus Reach and Douglas Jerrold were two notable Bohemian journalists whose sudden deaths left their families in difficulties and gave rise to theatrical benefits. The Fielding Club, a Bohemian dining club of the early 1850s, did several benefits in this line (Yates 158-64). The more formally established Savage Club continued the practice, its journalist members contributing to a volume of irregularly published *Savage Club Papers* to raise money to assist fallen brothers. Bohemian clubmen were also prominent promoters and supporters of the various artistic charities and funds that existed to assist distressed members of the various professions—the Artists' General Benevolent Society, the Royal General Theatrical Fund, and the Royal Literary Fund to name the more prominent. Each of these held an annual fund raising banquet that was well attended by the higher Bohemia, patrons of the arts, and by politicians sympathetic to the arts and appreciative of the benefits of standing well with the media. Journalists ensured that these events were well covered in the press as a good opportunity to put Bohemia in the public eye on the most favourable terms.

In raising funds these charities had to address the concerns of rich amateurs and the more prosperous practitioners of the arts that the publicity being given to the attractions of the artistic life style would swell the population of Bohemia with the untalented and incompetent, and the lazy and feckless. The artistic charities carefully investigated the circumstances and bona fides of applicants. Journalists applying to the Royal Literary Fund were disadvantaged by the prevalence of anonymity which created an additional incentive for them, beyond the obvious one of double remuneration, to try to reprint their articles in book form. Dickens's hostility to the financial irresponsibility of Bohemia was the theme of a *Household Words* article of 1851 in which the "true modern Bohemian" is described as "unprincipled": "he never robs, but his skill in creating debts and his powers of 'owing' are transcendent" (Blanchard 190). *Bleak House*, written at this time, caricatures the journalist Leigh Hunt as the dilettante Harold Skimpole, an aesthetic parasite who prides himself on his impracticality and unworldliness regarding it as society's responsibility to maintain him for the sake of his artistic sensitivities: "I owe as much as good natured people will let me owe. If they don't stop, why should I?" (586). Dickens had managed a theatrical benefit for Hunt in June, 1847 (Dickens, *Letters* 5: 692-93). He was now engaged in promoting The Guild of Literature and Art, to which he dedicated *Bleak House*. It was intended to encourage artists and writers in the habits of economic prudence by combining membership with life insurance.

A significant respect in which British Bohemia was thought to differ from its French counterpart—by many of the English, at least—was its superior moral tone. Justin McCarthy in a review comparing some French novels of Bohemia, including Murger's, with two English novels of Bohemia, the journalist E.M. Whitty's *Friends of Bohemia* (1857) and G.A. Sala's *Seven Sons of Mammon* (1862), noted the existence of a "thoroughly British Bohemia" (49) which was best described by Thackeray. Although he characterised Whitty and Sala as leaders of a "London School" of Bohemians more swaggering and sensational than that of Paris, he claimed that at least it "affects no moral eccentricities" (51). By this McCarthy presumably meant that it duly observed the rules of British literary hypocrisy in all matters pertaining to sex—"No *grisettes* please, we're British." Sala, who wrote pornography as a sideline, might well have been uneasy about McCarthy's smug pronouncement. The *Punch* illustrator George du Maurier, who along with several other young British artists spent some time as students in the Parisian Bohemia of the 1850s, shared McCarthy's doubts about its moral health. He was relieved to find "a clean, honest, wholesome, innocent, intellectual and most industrious British bohemia" among the circle of his fellow *Punch* artist, Charles Keene (du Maurier 278). Recalling his youthful experience of "British Bohemia" in the 1850s Edmund Yates described it as "less picturesque" and "more practical and commonplace, perhaps a trifle more vulgar" than Murger's (305).

Another commonly acknowledged difference between British and French Bohemia was British Bohemia's greater receptivity to amateurism. Of all the Bohemian professions journalism was the most accessible to permeation by the amateur, since unlike the practice of art, music, or even acting, it required no special training and had no controls over entry. Many amateur journalists were professionals in another field

such as law, the church, medicine, or education, which they considered their true profession even if journalism was in fact their prime source of income. The Savage Club prided itself on being a club for professional writers but it was happy to welcome Lord Dunraven as a member, the publication of some letters by him to a newspaper having made him a "war correspondent." Bohemia was no closed shop. Against the argument that such amateurs took bread from the mouths of needier and worthier "professionals," it could be urged that their presence conferred a benefit on journalism by elevating its prestige and social status. And a brandy and soda offered by the noble earl may well have had an additional savour for his brother Savages. Such hospitality to amateurism was another aspect of British Bohemia that prejudiced Dickens against it. In *Little Dorrit*, written when he was campaigning to reform the Literary Fund, he vented his spleen against Bohemia by creating Henry Gowan, a character who "though not a portrait of [Thackeray] in the sense that Skimpole was a portrait of Hunt, contained Dickens's opinion of him" (Pearson 227). This languid gentleman, an amateur painter "who sauntered into the Arts at a leisurely Pall-Mall pace" (*Dorrit* 250) disparages himself and all other artists as imposters, none of whose pictures are really "worth the money" (358). Significantly Dickens chooses the term Bohemian to identify the social location of Gowan's family, parasitic hangers-on of the aristocracy.

British Bohemia successfully created a social and psychological, as well as a physical site which offered distinct attractions to amateurs. Here they could act out artistic roles which allowed them to escape temporarily from the conventions which normally bound them. Of course it also continued to attract failures, would-be professionals who hoped somehow to make a living by the arts but could not for want of talent or application. But these were an essential part of the Bohemian *frisson*, the psychodrama of the arts. Bohemia became an increasingly profitable literary and journalistic property as the rising number of titles employing the word in the British Library online catalogue suggests. The 1890s Trilby craze created by du Maurier's best-selling novel of that title marked its peak (while maintaining the gratifying notion that the British Bohemian was morally superior to his French counterpart). The commodification of Bohemia was not confined to Britain, however. In France Bohemia quickly became a destination for cultural tourism, the Latin Quarter and Montparnasse cashing in on their reputations to the profit of some and the disgust of others. In fact the contrast between the French Bohemia and the British Bohemia—or non-Bohemia, as some would have it—is to an important degree an artifact of the traditional tendency in both countries to exaggerate their cultural differences into a polarity for their mutual gratification, constructing national self-images in which not being the other played an important part. Thus, despite the prevalent image of French Bohemia as more serious, more professional than its English counterpart, it too harboured from the beginning crucial amateur interests as Jerrold Seigel has shown (51). Nonetheless it remains true that British Bohemia was the more integrated, pragmatic, and amateur-oriented, in accordance with the Thackerayan ideal, and that journalists were importantly responsible for this tendency. In 1867 the Prince of Wales delighted the Garrick Club by agreeing to become a member, and President, of the club (Boas 19). In 1882 he was enrolled in the Savage Club as well, its members rejoicing to hail him as a true

Bohemian. One can only imagine how Thackeray, author of *The Book of Snobs* "By One of Themselves," might have responded to the news in his Elysium—with a wry smile, surely. After all, wasn't the Prince (like other Princes of Wales before and since, God's gift to journalists) "a bit of a Bohemian" in a sense that doesn't seem entirely strange to our present sense of the term?

Works Cited and Consulted

Bagehot,Walter. *The English Constitution. Collected Works.* Vol. 5. Ed. Norman St John-Stevas. London: Economist, 1974.

[Bertram, J.G.] *Glimpses of Real Life, As Seen in the Theatrical World and in Bohemia;Being the Confessions of Peter Paterson, a Strolling Comedian.* Edinburgh: Nimmo, 1864.

[Blanchard, Sidney Laman] "The True Bohemians of Paris." *Household Words* (22 November 1851): 190-91.

Boas, Guy. *The Garrick Club, 1851-1964.* London: Garrick Club, 1964.

Borowitz, Albert. "The Unpleasantness at the Garrick Club." *Victorian Newsletter* 53 (1978): 16-23.

"C" [Collins, Mortimer]. "Bohemia." *Temple Bar* 8 (1863): 551-61.

Dickens, Charles. *Bleak House.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971.

---. *Letters,Volume Five:1847-1849.* Eds Graham Storey and K.J. Fielding. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.

---. *Little Dorrit.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967.

"Drama's Patrons." *The World* (7 July 1875): 8.

Dunraven, Earl of. *Pastimes and Past Times.* London: Hodder, n.d.

Du Maurier, Daphne, ed. *The Young George Du Maurier. A Selection of his Letters, 1860-1867.* London: Davies, 1951.

Edwards, Peter. *Dickens's "Young Men": George Augustus Sala, Edmund Yates, and the World of Victorian Journalism.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997.

Ericksen, Donald H. "Harold Skimpole: Dickens and the Early 'Art for Art's Sake' Movement." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 72 (1973): 48-59.

Escott, T.H.S. *Club Makers and Club Members.* New York: Sturgis, 1914.

Fielding, Keith J. "Thackeray and the 'Dignity of Literature.'" *Times Literary Supplement* (19 September 1958): 536 (26 September 1958) :552.

Fisher, Judith L. "Thackeray as Editor and Author: The Adventures of Philip and the Inauguration of the Cornhill Magazine." *Victorian Periodicals Review* 33 (2000): 2-22.

[Hannay, James] "Bohemia and Bohemians." *Cornhill Magazine* 11 (1865): 241-55.

Richard Hough, *The Ace of Clubs: A History of the Garrick Club.* London: Deutsch, 1986.

Howes, Craig. "*Pendennis* and the Controversy over the Dignity of Literature." *Nineteenth Century Literature* 41 (1986): 269-98.

Jenkyns, Richard. *The Victorians and Ancient Greece.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1980.

Johnson, Edgar and Ray, Gordon N. "The Garrick Club Affair." *PMLA* 71 (1956): 256-63.

[McCarthy, Justin] "The Literature of Bohemia." *Westminster Review* n.s. 23 (1863): 32-56.

McKenzie, Judy, ed. *Letters of George Augustus Sala to Edmund Yates*. Queensland: Victorian Research Unit, U of Queensland, 1993.

[Milnes, Richard Monckton] "Fictions of Bohemia." *Quarterly Review* 103 (1858): 328-46.

Moers, Ellen. *The Dandy: From Brummell to Beerbohm*. London: Secker, 1960.

Murger, Henry. *Scènes de la Vie de Bohème*. Paris: Calmann-Levy, n.d.

North, John S., ed. *The Waterloo Directory of English Newspapers and Periodicals: 1800-1900*. Waterloo, Ontario: North Waterloo, 1997.

Ormond, Leonee. "Dickens and Painting: Contemporary Art." *Dickensian* 80 (1984): 2-25.

Oxford Union Society. *Proceedings: Lent Term, 1851-Easter Term*. Oxford: Vincent, 1878.

Patten, Robert L. "The Fight at the Top of the Tree." *Studies in English Literature* 10 (1970): 759-73.

Pearson, Hesketh. *Dickens: His Character, Comedy, and Career*. London: Methuen, 1948.

Prawer, S.S. *Karl Marx and World Literature*. Oxford: OUP, 1978.

Ray, Gordon N. *Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955.

---. "Dickens Versus Thackeray: The Garrick Club Affair." *PMLA* 69 (1954): 815-33.

[Sala, George Augustus] "A Tour in Bohemia." *Household Words* 8 July 1854: 495-500.

Seigel, Jerrold. *Bohemian Paris*. New York: Penguin, 1987.

Thackeray,William Makepeace. *The Adventures of Philip on his way through the world showing who robbed him, who helped him, and who passed him by*. London: Smith Elder, 1899.

Tinsley, William. *Random Recollection of an Old Publisher*. London: Simpkin, 1900.

Tydeman, William. *Society. Plays by Tom Robertson*. Ed. Thomas W. Robertson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982. 39-84.

Watson, Aaron. *The Savage Club*. London: Fisher Unwin, 1907.

Yates, Edmund. *Recollections and Experiences*. London: Bentley, 1885.