Fraser's Magazine and the Instability of Literary Fashion

Richard Salmon

Commencing a chapter on 'Literary Fashions' in his miscellaneous work *Curiosities of Literature* (1791-1807), the early-nineteenth century antiquarian writer Isaac D'Israeli declared: 'There is such a thing as Literary Fashion, and prose and verse have been regulated by the same caprice that cuts our coats, and cocks our hats' (218). He proceeds to record, in characteristically encyclopaedic manner, a series of 'memoranda toward a history of literary fashions', extending back as far as the sixteenth century, which reaches the following broad conclusion:

> Different times, then, are regulated by different tastes. What makes a strong impression on the public at one time, ceases to interest it at another; an author who sacrifices to the prevailing humours of his day has but little chance of being esteemed by posterity; and every age of modern literature might, perhaps, admit of a new classification, by dividing it into its periods of *fashionable literature* (219).

Conceiving literary history as a history of fashion thus simultaneously expands and contracts the possibilities of the field. On the one hand, the principle of fashion is differentiation: each historical 'period' manifests 'different tastes' and within each period there is scope for further sub-division of difference. Such a model of literary history admits all manifestations of form and genre into the exclusive realm of fashion. Yet, on the other hand, viewing history as fashion amounts to a principle of repetition and uniformity, by which each moment of change leads to more of the same. The statement 'Different times […] are regulated by different tastes' compresses the multifarious forms of fashion into a tautology. D'Israeli implies, moreover, that an author who commits to the demands of fashion is unlikely to break free from its constraints. Literary fashion, by definition an ephemeral, current phenomenon, has a limited appeal for 'posterity', the anticipated future moment when more enduring literary reputations are enshrined in memory. Though D'Israeli's 'memoranda toward a history of literary fashions' are motivated by an antiquarian impulse, their underlying assumption appears strikingly modern. The conception of literary history as a diachronic sequence of changes in fashion (or 'taste') emerged in a period when the expanding commercial

production of literature, and concomitant proliferation of authors, facilitated the development of a distinctively 'modern' system of fashion.[1]

D'Israeli continued to revise editions of *Curiosities of Literature* into the 1820s and 30s, by which time the notion of 'fashionable literature', and its relationship to fashionable society, was a prominent topic of critical debate. An article on 'Fashion in Literature' published in the *Athenaeum* in July 1833 pursues the analogy between fashion in literature and dress with greater depth and explicitness. The author posits: 'A people so mutable as the Europeans, and so fashionable as the English, must have, of course, changes in the fashion of their literature, as well as their dress' (440). Such changes, however, cannot be described as progressive or improving, only as instances of a 'transient' mode of beauty. The 'principle' by which fashion 'fluctuates' is unknown and inexplicable: 'It is needless to ask, for no one can tell, why a dress that is very becoming in 1820 should be very unbecoming in 1840. – But so it is. Thus also it is in literature'. A comparison between contemporary magazine literature and periodicals of the last century, for instance, reveals only that '[a] change has taken place, certainly; but whether an improvement, is questionable'. A diachronic narrative of literary fashion, then, is one which eludes attempts to understand processes of historical determination and causality. The authors of fashionable literature are also subject to the process of fashion in this account. Fashion offers the alluring, though ultimately unsatisfying, prospect of attaining transient visibility within the literary field, a 'currency' whose value (cultural and economic) typically decreases with the passage of time: 'The currency of living authors depends much on fashion; but the permanency of the deceased, on sterling merit and true talent […] So, as fashion changes, the gilding wears off, but the pure gold remains ever the same'. Hence, the condition of fashionable authorship is rendered equivalent to ephemeral 'celebrity', as opposed to more lasting 'fame': a distinction which also emerged within this period.

In this way, the writer for the *Athenaeum* connects the broad analogy of literary fashion, capable of extension throughout history, with the specific cultural resonance of 'fashionable literature' as it was discussed in the 1830s:

> In addition to the fashion of literature, which affords a kind of artificial and
> transient success, there is also the literature of fashion, which contributes greatly
> to a momentary fame. By this I mean that kind of literature which has for its sole
> topic, the manners, talk, dress, cookery, and gossip of persons of great opulence
> or high rank and fashion (440).

The 'literature of fashion' is here seen as an exemplary type of the 'fashion of literature': that is to say, a literary form which instantiates the temporal characteristics of fashion in a heightened manner. The article proceeds to discuss the particular sub-genre of fiction known as the 'fashionable novel' (or 'Silver Fork novel') which became popular from the late 1820s and throughout the 1830s, and was characterized chiefly by its detailed representation of the contemporary manners and material fabric of 'fashionable' upper-class society.[2] Fashionable novels of the period were widely perceived to be 'ephemeral and evanescent' both in their subject-matter – concerned only with the frivolous and external details of the lives of the social elite – and form – disposable print commodities produced and advertised in a transparently commercial manner. The genre also became associated with 'a certain sort of dandyism', a self-conscious display of the fashionable body (primarily, though not exclusively, male) in both its characters and authors, which was mediated by an ornate linguistic 'style of hyper-super-double-extra super-fineness' (440). Fashionable style in both language and clothing, then, operates as code for articulating class status at a specific historical juncture of societal development. As D'Israeli observed, the 'power of *Literary Fashion*' – being the authority to determine what constitutes fashionable taste in literature – was traditionally held by the aristocracy, the social group sometimes referred to in the early nineteenth century under the collective label of 'the fashion' (218). In his treatise on contemporary manners, *England and the English* (1833), the prominent fashionable novelist Edward Bulwer Lytton (also reputed for his dandyism) defined 'the fashion' as the current thought and taste of aristocratic society, equivalent to the popular 'opinion' of the middle and lower classes. The privileging of 'fashion', he suggests, leads invariably to a culture of ostentation and luxury, predicated on material resources, yet, as with aristocratic opinion more broadly, fashion 'affects to despise' mere wealth, distinguishing itself from bourgeois social aspiration (79).

The aim of this chapter is to explore the relationship between the 'fashion of literature' and the 'literature of fashion' in one of the most influential literary periodicals of the 1830s, *Fraser's Magazine*. First issued in February 1830, *Fraser's Magazine* was central to the debate on fashionable literature which preoccupied much of the periodical press during its first decade. Under the editorship of the Irish journalist William Maginn, in particular, *Fraser's* was characterized by a scathing satirical treatment of 'fashionable' literature in reviews, biographical sketches, and fictional parodies; the most notorious example being its relentless mockery of Bulwer-Lytton's supposed philosophy of dandyism. Through its editorial framing and coordination of regular features, *Fraser's* cultivated a collective posture

of hostility to literary fashion, which, as several critics have observed, was integrally related to its formulation of an alternative model of professional authorship.[3] The list of contributions to the magazine published during the 1830s which address the analogy between literature and fashion includes such familiar titles as Thomas Carlyle's 'Sartor Resartus' (serialized from November 1833 to August 1834) and William Thackeray's 'Yellowplush Correspondence' (November 1837 to July 1838), both of which express a more ambivalent fascination with the subject than their satirical mode initially suggests. In such texts, fashion in clothing and other material commodities becomes an ambiguous metaphor for considering the nature of literary production within an expanding industrial economy, characterized by the proliferation of periodicals themselves and other forms of literary ephemera. In the first instance, the numerous reviews of fashionable novels and other commentaries on fashion published by *Fraser's* during the 1830s and early 1840s indicate a pervasive preoccupation with the questions of generic and temporal instability which they foreground, extending beyond the motives of personal and political animosity usually attributed to the combative 'Fraserians'.[4]

Fraser's Magazine and the 'Silverfork school'

In a retrospective article, published at the end of its first decade (January 1840), *Fraser's Magazine* claimed, in characteristically immodest terms, to have played a decisive role in reforming the literary tastes of the period:

> We endeavoured to the utmost of our power to diffuse a manlier spirit among
> rising writers, than what the taste of those who had the gathering of authors in
> their hands seemed to dictate. It is no great triumph to say, that to us is in a great
> measure due the abatement of the nuisance of Annuals, or the plague of novels of
> the Silverfork school – that we curbed the invasion of namby-pambyism, at one
> time becoming dangerous in its forcible feebleness, under the guidance of those
> who counselled Colburn, or Bentley, or other purveyors of novelism progressing
> at railroad speed – that we have, if not demolished the noble art of puffmongery
> (which we believe is impossible), at least let the public know its full value, and
> imposed some decency upon the practice – that we have contributed to put down
> a set of dirty dandies, who, in their small way, were endeavouring to revive
> among us that class of profligate novel, in which religion is a butt for jest
> ('Preface to Our Second Decade' 18).

This statement conveniently assembles many of the familiar targets of *Fraser's* literary and cultural criticism during its first decade. At the beginning of the 1830s, the literary market, dominated by the publishers Henry Colburn and Richard Bentley, was flooded by print commodities which, for Maginn and his associates, embodied a disturbing decline of literary and cultural standards. Popular literary forms such as the Annual and the novel were both subject to, and vehicles for, aggressive yet surreptitious marketing campaigns ('puffmongery'), reflecting their intended status (on the part of publishers at least) as fungible products, produced and consumed 'at railroad speed'. In the process, such forms were associated by *Frasers* with qualities which threatened to diminish the masculine status of authorship: women writers were predominant contributors to the Annuals and formed the bulk of novelists in this period, hence male writers involved in these genres were presumptively feminized, rendered 'unmanly'. These conjoined anxieties are crystallized in the genre of the 'Silverfork school', a term used synonymously with 'fashionable novel', which is characterized as a 'plague of novels' and 'invasion of namby-pambyism', whose most celebrated practitioners are 'a set of dirty dandies'.

The concern of *Fraser's* reviewers, then, was to 'diffuse a manlier spirit among rising writers' through stringent critiques of fashionable literature. Often this Fraserian stance was complicated by the fact that periodical authorship was constrained by the same commercial pressures which shaped the literature of fashion by which it was repulsed. The contributor to *Fraser's* has 'the task of writing almost with the haste of the steam-engine', as the editorial retrospective for January 1840 acknowledged (19), replicating the 'mechanical' production with which fashionable novels were frequently charged. As Rebecca Edwards Newman has shown, the early *Fraser's* reviews of fiction were also concerned with exercising a quasi-judicial authority over the literary field, as shown through their propensity for labelling and 'policing' new 'sub-genres': not only fashionable novels, but also Newgate crime novels, historical romances, nautical and Irish tales, and so on (402). This 'taxonomical impulse', Edwards Newman suggests, represents the magazine's attempt to stand above a fluctuating commercial market of which it was in truth also a determinate product, susceptible to the same charges of ephemerality and contingent truth.

This strategy is inaugurated in the first generic reference to 'Fashionable Novels', a review of Andrew Picken's *The Dominine's Legacy* (attributed in the Wellesley Index to John Abraham Heraud, but probably co-authored with Maginn) in the third monthly issue of the magazine, dated April 1830. The header 'Fashionable Novels' is placed at the top of each page of the article subsequent to its formal review title, indicating its wider topic. The

reviewers launch into a scathing attack on 'the Colburn and Bentley school of novel-writing', whose popularity is attributed to the 'intricate and hidden machinery' of the publishers' advertising campaigns: 'The secret of success is involved in the right use of one grand, cabalistic word – PUFF; - ay – PUFF – PUFF - PUFF' (319). The reduction of the 'school' of 'Fashionable Novels' to a purely commercial enterprise provides one derogatory interpretation of the meaning of the generic descriptor. Such novels are 'fashionable' in the sense that their temporal existence as material commodities is intrinsically ephemeral, interchangeable not only with others in the same category, but also with different types of commodity. A later review of 'Novels of the Season' (August 1831) characterizes contemporary fiction as 'tinsel wares' produced 'for the market of frippery, foppery, and fashion': 'Books now are not written to the glory of the human intellect, and for the proud march of mental distinction; but for the passing calls of the stomach, for the payment of an upholsterer's, tailor's, or a milliner's bill' (8). Here the reviewer's emphasis on the gaudy spectacle of the ephemeral print commodity plays on the other meaning of 'fashion'. The novels described in both of these reviews (and many others) are 'fashionable' in the sense of being preoccupied with the external surfaces of life, in particular with reproducing the frivolous material excess and attention to visual appearances deemed characteristic of upper-class society. In this other, more familiar interpretation of 'fashionable' fiction, the minutiae of ephemeral differences are also reduced to a blank monotony: 'in the novel of manners in question there is one unvaried, eternal harping on high society – one and the same unvarnished routine of frivolity, folly, and nonsense' ('Fashionable Novels' 320). The 'fashionable' novel is thus uniform in its attention to ephemeral difference in both form and content. As Edwards Newman usefully summarizes, the term 'Fashionable Novels', as early as the April 1830 review-essay published under that title, is 'already a signifier for a complex of factors: commercial popularity – "fashionable" in the sense of currently desirable; the affectation of gentility, or the circulation of an upstart social mobility; and a manner of artistic product intimately connected to the means of its production' (403).

 Fraser's continued its attack on the genre two months later in the essay 'Mr Edward Lytton Bulwer's Novels; and Remarks on Novel-Writing', also attributed to Maginn and Heraud. The piece begins with the assertion that 'of all the classes of mediocre novelists, the most execrable, the most abominable […] is the pseudo-fashionable class' (510). Quoting Thomas Carlyle's characterization of the modern period as the 'mechanical age' (in his essay 'Signs of the Times' (1829)), the authors describe fashionable novels as a typical product of their social conditions: 'novels, like chickens, are now-a-days hatched by steam'. Although

Bulwer Lytton, they concede, is a cut above the average fashionable novelist in his intellectual capacity, his 'mechanical production' and aversion to the 'natural' and 'organic' epitomizes the genre (511). Besides the charge of moral deviance which *Fraser's* frequently levelled against him – in this instance, he is accused of being an 'intellectual libertine', indifferent to 'wholesome restraints' imposed on fiction - Bulwer's diverse literary output is read insistently in terms of literary fashion. His most celebrated novel (at this date), *Pelham, or the Adventures of a Gentleman* (1828) is derided as 'a most precious recommendation of fops and foppery', a notorious example of the 'Silverfork school' (516). The essay conflates the novel's author with its eponymous protagonist and first-person narrator, Henry Pelham, dismissing Bulwer's previous denial of such identification in response to earlier *Fraser's* criticism. Implicitly, Maginn and Heraud base their construction of Bulwer as a model of the fashionable author on the fictional character Pelham, a dandy figure whose narrative mode, it could easily be argued, is often ironic or ironized. In consequence, the moral ambiguity and suspicion attached to one figure is extended to the other: Pelham, for instance, is identified as a 'tailor-made' gentleman, rather than a 'natural' one. In Daniel Maclise's portrait sketch of Bulwer for *Fraser's* popular 'Gallery of Illustrious Literary Characters' (August 1832), the same conflation of author and text is reinforced: Bulwer is portrayed in elegant costume inspecting himself in a full-length mirror, a scene directly lifted from *Pelham*.

Bulwer's subsequent novels are also contained within the category of 'fashionable novels' in the June 1830 article, and read as variations on *Pelham*, despite their marked generic differences. His novels of eighteenth century life, *Devereux* (1829) and *The Disowned* (1829), for example, are dismissed as novels of contemporary fashionable manners projected onto the past, rather than placed within the Scottian category of 'historical romance', which, as Edwards Newman notes, was at the 'apex of *Fraser's* novelistic hierarchy' (412). Similarly, *Paul Clifford* (1830) was initially described by *Fraser's* as a 'novel of fashionable life', and only later in the decade predominantly associated with the 'Newgate novel'. In fact, despite their antithetical milieu, the Silverfork and Newgate genres - concerned with high society and low-life respectively – were associated in the minds of *Fraser's* reviewers, on the grounds that both evidenced an unhealthy aversion to the respectable middle class: 'it is a favourite notion with our fashionable novelists, to sacrifice the middle classes equally to the lowest and highest' (515). While the trend for 'fashionable novels' in the 1820s and early 30s was gradually superseded by that of 'Newgate novels' in the later 1830s and early 40s, for *Fraser's Magazine* the former was undoubtedly the more significant term. This is partly because the category of 'fashionable novel', at least as applied

to the work of Bulwer, subsumes that of other sub-genres within *Fraser's* taxonomy of fiction. Unlike other generic labels, the term 'fashionable novel' not only describes a particular narrative form and social content (that indicated by the synonym 'Silverfork' novel in this case), but also the very conditions under which all forms of fiction are produced within the burgeoning literary market of the period. Designating a mode of production oriented to the supply of 'currently desirable' but disposable commodities, the 'fashionable novel' encompasses all of the genres which became temporarily fashionable during these decades, and moreover expresses the mutability of genre – the movement between trends - characteristic of the period. In this sense, *Fraser's* understanding of the term 'fashionable novel' is more as a meta-genre of modern fiction than the discrete sub-genre fetishizing aristocratic manners by which it is commonly known.

Through the 1830s, *Fraser's* published an irregular series of collective reviews under the title 'The Novels of the Season', which highlights this encompassing analogy between modes of literary production and the cycle of fashion. The notion of seasonality in literary production replicates the marketing strategies of publishers' lists, which themselves suggest an equivalence between literary fashion and the social 'season'. While it was standard practice for literary periodicals to review novels in batches, the explicit identification of such products with the routine schedules of both the literary market and fashionable society predisposes the reader to view them as ephemeral items, regardless of generic context. Maginn used the two 'batches' of 'The Novels of the Season' published in 1831 (February and August) to launch further vituperation against 'fashionable novels', this time foregrounding the fiction of Catherine Gore as exemplary of the wider phenomenon. The February instalment makes its point mainly by resorting to the parodic strategy of quoting the 'puffs' for each of the 18 novels under review printed in publishers' journals without further commentary. The review exposes the promotional machinery of Colburn and Bentley's literary industry by simply reproducing it within *Fraser's* editorial framework. In the August instalment, however, Maginn offers a more discursive critique of fashionable literature. The immediately preceding generation of literary 'genius' – the generation of Southey, Wordsworth, Scott, and Coleridge – has been, or is being, superseded by a new generation of authors for whom '[q]uantity, and not quality, is the thing nearest to the author's heart' and of which 'the bookseller cares little what he publishes, since, from the present system of puffery, the vilest trash is sure of some sort of market' (9). Gore's novel *Pin-Money* (1831) is singled out as 'lamentable proof' of 'the absurdity […] of writing "fashionable novels,"' (12): 'Fashionable life is reduced to such forms and empty ceremonies, both here and

elsewhere, that to describe the deep effects of passion, or feeling, or vice, or criminality, or virtue, we must descend to the lower, or rise to the highest grades of society' (13). In addition, Maginn charged, Gore's novel is a vehicle for promoting other branded commodities through intratextual references to shops and clothing used by her characters, an advertising strategy supposedly orchestrated by her publishers Colburn and Bentley to increase sales (14).

In another occasional *Fraser's* series, 'On Manners, Fashion, and Things in General', first published in July 1834 under the pseudonyms 'Bombardinio' (John Mitchell) and Morgan O'Doherty (Maginn), literature of the 'silver fork school' is subsumed within a broader attack on the malign influence of 'fashion' on modern society. The word 'fashion' here does not specifically signify clothing, novels, or any other concrete medium of expression, but rather the ensemble of manners comprised of the various cultural preferences exercised within an acutely self-conscious class society. Fashionable manners are seemingly created by those at the apex of the social hierarchy – hence the linguistic equivalence of 'the fashion' with the aristocracy -, and filtered downward through the emulation of inferior classes. For the authors of the series, 'fashion' thus assumes the status of a false god naively worshipped by those excluded from its privileged domain: the 'people of Britain […] bow to the tyranny of fashion with a ready subserviency far surpassing, in abject submission, the blind obedience paid by slaves to eastern satraps' (97). This was a perspective later adopted for more comic purposes in several of Thackeray's fictional contributions to *Fraser's*, which feature hapless devotees of aristocratic fashion from the lower middle classes.[5] The pursuit of fashion is invariably presented as a worthless cause, since its attainment offers nothing of enduring substance:

> And what, after all is this spirit, essence, or mania, called fashion? Is it anything
> better than a false varnish, sought after, or applied, in order to raise persons,
> stuffs, or trinkets, to some fictitious value exceeding their real intrinsic worth?
> ('On Manners, Fashion, and Things in General' 98)

In this broader context, then, 'fashion' is conceived as a 'fictitious value' whose essence is hard to grasp, but whose effects are palpable. Fashion has the capacity to 'raise persons' beyond their 'real' value, or supposed 'natural' status in society, but without changing their intrinsic nature. Its agency is at once powerful, illusory, and superficial. Only the 'poor in mind and thought', the authors suggest, would wish to pursue such a goal. Yet, as they astutely note in a later instalment of the series (August 1835), it is those excluded from, or peripheral to, the social boundaries of the fashionable world who often invest most in

preserving its exclusivity and invidious distinctions. Beyond the 'pale of fashion' are the 'border tribes, who, uncertain of their own exact footing, set up exaggerated pretensions which they cannot support, and lead the way in that race of folly, affectation, and striving after distinction, which is now the bane of English society' (149). Echoing a charge that *Fraser's* often levelled at Bulwer Lytton and other fashionable novelists, the article concludes: 'It is from the ranks of the border tribes that spring the whole host of exclusives, exquisites, and all the heroes of the silver-fork school'. The insinuation, of course, is that authors and fictional characters who ostentatiously display the trappings of fashionable life may not, in fact, belong to the exclusive world which they represent.

Carlyle and the 'Dandiacal Body'

By far the most well-known *Fraser's* text concerned with the literature of fashion, though, was Thomas Carlyle's satirical and philosophical novel, 'Sartor Resartus', first published in serial form between November 1833 and August 1834. 'Sartor Resartus' is most frequently discussed in the context of Carlyle's engagement with German transcendental idealism and the writings of Goethe, and his influential role in transmitting German thought to a later Victorian readership. More recently, the 'Clothes-Philosophy' of Carlyle's fictitious German philosopher Diogenes von Teufelsdröch, which forms the central conceit of the novel, has come to the attention of theorists of fashion, Michael Carter arguing that 'Sartor Resartus' 'can be regarded as the founding text for the emergence of the serious and organized study of clothing' (Chapter 1). Yet, while the original publication context of 'Sartor Resartus' is familiar enough to scholars of Carlyle and early-Victorian literature, surprisingly little has been written about the relationship between the novel's core figurative motif and the surrounding discourse on fashion in the pages of *Fraser's Magazine*. Even relatively recent studies of Carlyle's satire on the 'cult' of Dandyism (located, most explicitly, in the celebrated chapter 'The Dandiacal Body'), such as James Eli Adam's *Dandies and Desert Saints: Styles of Victorian Masculinity* (1995), make no reference to the extensive discussion of this topic in *Fraser's* preceding 'Sartor Resartus'.

Carlyle's exposition of Teufelsdröch's 'Clothes-Philosophy', mediated through the text's fictive 'Editor', can be read both with and against the grain of the dominant discourse on fashion shaped by Maginn. On the one hand, 'Sartor Resartus' sits comfortably in the context of *Fraser's* established campaign against fashionable literature and society. In the

opening instalment (November 1833), the Editor suggests ironically that Teufelsdröch's treatise on 'Clothes, their Origin and Influence' may be of interest to the 'fashionable ranks' of British society; underlying the decorative surface of fashionable manners are the same corporeal and spiritual truths to which the philosopher draws attention (590). Teufelsdröch's philosophy insists that clothes are not merely useful in their function of covering the body, but also expressive and 'symbolic' in encoding cultural meaning: ornament, indeed, precedes utility, according to his account of the origin of dress in primitive societies. Clothes play a significant role in the formation and representation of individual and collective identities, yet if understood superficially they threaten to consume and replace the self: 'Clothes gave us individuality, distinctions, social polity; Clothes have made Men of us; they are threatening to make Clothes-screens of us' (December 1833: 671). To be absorbed by the minutiae of fashion is to become a species of 'Cloth-animal', embodied in its most extreme form by the figure of the 'Dandy': a mere consumer of clothes whose frivolous and privileged preoccupation with surface is detached from the productive reality of clothes, epitomized at the other extreme by the (commonly impoverished) figure of the 'Tailor' (or *Sartor*) (August 1834: 184). Where Carlyle challenges, or at least complicates, the anti-fashionable position held by other Fraserians, however, is in Teufelsdröch's insistence that clothes, even extending to transient differences of fashion, should not be dismissed as morally vacuous and without meaning. Teufelsdröch's philosophy teaches the importance of interpreting the symbolic meanings of clothes, for 'every snip of the Scissors has been regulated and prescribed by ever-active Influences, which doubtless to Intelligences of a superior order are neither invisible not illegible' (December 1833: 669). In modern parlance, his 'Clothes-philosophy' recognizes the semiotic function of dress, anticipating the work of Roland Barthes and other poststructuralist analysts of fashion. While Carter argues that a modern conception of 'fashion' – that of 'rapid and arbitrary changes in clothing style over time' (chapter 1) - remains absent from 'Sartor Resartus', Carlyle does incorporate a not entirely dissimilar understanding of the term into Teufelsdröch's philosophy. For Teufelsdröch, the changing nature of fashion is indicative of an inexorable 'Law of Progress': 'in Clothes, as in all other external things whatsoever, no fashion will continue' (December 1833: 673). Seen in this metaphysical context, 'fashion' is one element in the text's broader figurative system: 'Whatsoever sensibly exists, whatsoever represents Spirit to Spirit, is properly a Clothing, a suit of Raiment, put on for a season, and to be laid off' (December 1833: 682). Fashion is thus to clothing what mortality is to the body: in both cases, the tissue wears out.

Chapter X, 'The Dandiacal Body', was published in the final August 1834 instalment of 'Sartor Resartus', and contains its most explicit dialogue with the discursive environment of *Fraser's Magazine*. Though fully integrated into the metaphysical system of Teufelsdröch's philosophy of Clothes, as indicated above, Carlyle's satire on the contemporary cult of '*Self-Worship*' offers a more topical, worldly illustration, which broadens out into a critique of extreme social division between sections of the upper and lower classes (the 'Dandies' and the 'Drudges'). In Teufelsdröch's definition:

> A Dandy is a Clothes-wearing Man, a Man whose trade, office, and existence consists in the wearing of Clothes. Every faculty of his soul, spirit, purse, and person is heroically consecrated to this one object, the wearing of Clothes wisely and well: so that as others dress to live, he lives to dress (August 1834: 184).

The Dandy's reversal of a utilitarian understanding of the function of dress elevates clothing to a fetishized object of quasi-religious veneration. The 'Dandiacal body' becomes the 'parchment-skin whereon he writes', defined by – and substituted for - clothes. Dandyism is a 'Sect' whose chief 'Temple' is '*Almacks*, a word of uncertain etymology', and whose 'Sacred Books' are 'those they call *Fashionable Novels*' (185).[6] These obvious digs at the 'Silverfork school' are clearly drawn at second-hand from Carlyle's reading of *Fraser's*, rather than from direct familiarity with the original sources. Teufelsdröch amusingly informs the reader that whilst researching the topic he attempted to read a selection of fashionable novels, but was thereby rendered physically ill and incapable of finishing them (!). Fortuitously, the German professor comes across a magazine discussion of Bulwer's *Pelham* in the waste-paper packaging of the novels sent to him from England, and decides to read that instead.

Referring, though not explicitly, to Maginn and Heraud's scathing June 1830 critique of Bulwer, which quotes copiously from his early novels, including *Pelham*, it is this prior critical mediation of the fashionable novel on which Carlyle's depiction of the Dandy is based. From reading the article, Teufelsdröch claims to have learnt about the '[r]eligious physiognomy and physiology of the Dandiacal Body' through the figure of Pelham, a 'mystagogue, and leading Teacher and Preacher of the Sect', though not its 'true secret', which can only be revealed through his own philosophical insight (August 1834: 185). Though *Fraser's* is in part the butt of the joke here, since it has been reduced to waste paper in the fictional scenario, it is also the source of the key passage from *Pelham* which Carlyle cites in illustration of the Dandy's philosophy. Teufelsdröch 'arranges under Seven distinct Articles, and in very abridged shape' the advice on dress offered discursively by Pelham in Volume 2, Chapter VII of the first three-volume edition of Bulwer's novel. Though he claims

to 'quote literally from the Original', Teufelsdröch in fact reshapes Bulwer's text (as quoted by Maginn and Heraud) to present Pelham's Dandyism as a more codified philosophy, religiously adhering to such banal tenets as: '1. Coats should have nothing of the triangle about them' and '2. The collar is a very important point'. It is worth noting that Bulwer himself heavily revised this chapter in the second edition of *Pelham*, not only changing the content of the narrator's sartorial advice, but also presenting it in the codified form of twenty two 'Maxims' on dress. It is unclear whether Carlyle had access to the revised text of the novel, and unconsciously recollected it in his own reworking of the original first edition quoted in *Fraser's* 1830 essay. More significantly, though, it should be acknowledged that Bulwer also anticipated the critique of fashion used against him by both Maginn and Carlyle. In the equivalent chapter of the second edition, Pelham explains that his previous advice on fashionable dress has required revision since it is already out-of-date:

> Alas for the instability of all human sciences! A few short months ago, in the first edition of this memorable work, I laid down rules for costume, the value of which fashion begins already to destroy. The thoughts which I shall now embody, shall be out of the reach of that great innovator, and applicable not to one age, but to all. To the sagacious reader, who has already discovered what portions of this work are writ in irony – what in earnest – I fearlessly commit these maxims […] (Bulwer Lytton (1873) 173).

In place of concrete recommendations on the shape of coats and wearing of collars, Pelham codifies his philosophy of dress into a series of general propositions, such as 'Always remember that you dress to fascinate others, not yourself'. Bulwer is self-consciously aware within the text of the temporal 'instability' of fashion, which threatens to render a fashionable novel such as *Pelham* unfashionable within months of its publication. The narrator suggests that the perishable material of fashion can be elevated through the Dandy to the status of trans-historical truth, yet playfully hints at the underlying irony and comic wit of the novel, of which Carlyle seems oblivious. Nevertheless, Bulwer was wounded by 'Sartor Resartus' and *Fraser's* wider satirical campaign: as Ellen Moers notes, he later withdrew the offending chapter from the 1835 edition of *Pelham*, further revising the novel to tone down its association with Dandyism (69, 78).

Though Carlyle may not have read *Pelham* in its entirety, or understood that it offered a satirical reflection on fashion and fashionable society in its own right, he draws on *Fraser's* selective quotation from the novel to develop a more ambivalent response to the Dandy than is found elsewhere in the early issues of the magazine. Adams has convincingly shown how

Carlyle's figure of the 'hero' - of which Teufelsdröch is an early embodiment – appears to reject the flamboyant self-realization of the Dandy, but in fact re-incorporates elements of visual display: 'The dandy shadows the Carlylean hero as the mark of the theatricality from which Carlyle sought to dissociate his heroes, but which seems inseparably bound up with their vocation' (35). In Carlyle's doctrine of heroism, the manly hero is defined by his commitment to tireless and generally unseen work, a promise which Teufelsdröch appears to enunciate at the end of his autobiographical narrative (volume 2 of the later book publication of *Sartor Resartus*). Yet the Editor also hints at Teufelsdröch's shared characteristics with the Dandy, notably his 'habit of wire-drawing and over-refining […] his tendency to Mysticism and Religiosity, whereby in every thing he was still scenting out Religion': 'never perhaps did those amaurosis suffusions so cloud and distort his otherwise most piercing vision, as in this of the *Dandiacal Body*!' (August 1834: 189). The Professor's 'Clothes-Philosophy' offers both a moral rebuke to the wilful superficiality of the fashionable novel and an ironic echo of its fastidious, quasi-religious preoccupation with the oracular significance of external sensory perception.

Thackeray and the History of Fashion

William Thackeray's contributions to *Fraser's* during the late 1830s and early 1840s extended its campaign against fashionable literature, and the work of Bulwer Lytton in particular, beyond its first decade of publication. Prior to his involvement in the satirical magazine *Punch*, *Fraser's* was the primary periodical outlet for Thackeray's early fictional and journalistic writings, which often converged on illustrations of 'fashion' in literature and society. Thackeray was certainly more familiar than Carlyle with the cultural sources which he appropriated and sometimes lampooned in his sketches and stories. He took over from Maginn and Heraud as the magazine's chief book reviewer from 1837, commenting directly on numerous fashionable novels and other genres. Like Carlyle, though, Thackeray's immersion in recent and contemporary fashion reveals a more nuanced stance than the coruscating satire and critical severity for which *Fraser's* was renowned. In particular, Thackeray's fascination with the ephemeral materiality of fashion in clothing informed his approach to writing sustained narrative fiction from the late 1830s. Tracing material shifts in fashion over time offered a template for exploring the relationship between history and

fashion (or modernity), while at the same time the genre of 'historical fiction' can be seen as another instance of literary fashion.[7]

Thackeray's first major contribution to *Fraser's* was the episodic serial 'The Yellowplush Correspondence' (1837-8), a loose collection of sketches and reviews linked by the narrative persona of Charles J. Yellowplush, footman to an upper-class household who boasts of his inside knowledge of fashionable society in comically rendered Cockney dialect. The first instalment of the series, 'Fashnable Fax and Polite Annygoats', published in November 1837, is a dramatized review of John Henry Skelton's conduct-book, *My Book; or, the Anatomy of Conduct* (1837), which pokes fun at the author's banal social rules on the grounds of Yellowplush's claim to superior knowledge: for 'he who stands behind a fashionable table knows more of society than the guests who sit at the board' (16 (95): 649). Interjecting within the narrative, *Fraser's* fictitious editorial persona, Oliver Yorke, cuttingly remarks that Yellowplush's marginal perspective on high society draws on his personal 'experience' in the same way as the authors of fashionable novels who don't generally belong to the world which they describe with apparent intimacy. In the second instalment, 'Miss Shum's Husband' (January 1838), Yellowplush makes this jibe more explicit, declaring himself a more authentic witness to fashionable manners than Bulwer himself: 'only a juke or a juke's footmin can do fashnabble life justice' (17 (97): 40). Thackeray thus develops the Yellowplush persona into an irreverent yet demeaning parody of the fashionable author. The name 'Yellowplush' suggests that the footman's identity is defined by his prescribed occupational uniform: he informs the reader that he was named by his mistress 'in compliment to several noble families, and to a sellybrated coachmin whom she knew, who wore a yellow livry'. Rather than an example of modern fashion's privileging of individual self-expression, Yellowplush's name evokes the 'symbolic' power of clothes to emblematize social roles, as discussed by Teufelsdröch in 'Sartor Resartus'. The uniform of the footman expresses a presumed servility to his employers and social superiors, but in this instance functions disruptively as satire on the snobbery of the fashionable novelist. As Yellowplush declares in the fourth number of the series (March 1838), 'Fashion is the goddess I adoar' (17 (99): 353).

In the following year, Thackeray abruptly switched genres and social milieu for his second extended *Fraser's* serial - and first novel -, 'Catherine: A Story' (May 1839-February 1840). A parody of the 'Newgate novel', popularized by Bulwer Lytton, William Harrison Ainsworth, and, briefly, Charles Dickens, 'Catherine' reflects the shift from novels of high society to tales and ballads of criminal 'low-life' which Thackeray observed in a critical

review of 'Newgate' literature for *Fraser's*, entitled 'Horae Catnachianae', published in April 1839. Surveying the 'prevailing fashions of "the low,"' or, as he sees it, 'the sham low' rather than an authentic representation of the poor, Thackeray recognizes both 'Newgate' and 'Silverfork' schools as manifestations of literary 'fashion':

> At one time the literary fashion ran entirely on Grosvenor Square: at present it has
> taken up its abode in St. Giles's. Both fashions are equally strained and unnatural.
> A novel-writer may occasionally go both to Almack's and Newgate, but such
> visits should be exceptions (424).

Here, Thackeray protests self-consciously on behalf of the 'middling classes', the normative reading public to which both genres appeal, but by which it is excluded from representation. He goes to the unusual extent of praising Bulwer for not being exclusively immersed in one or the other of these polarized fictional worlds, even at the cost of authenticity. By flitting between Almack's and Newgate during the course of the decade, however, Bulwer's fiction seems to express the very process of 'literary fashion' which Thackeray decries.

In 'Catherine', Thackeray presents a parody of the Newgate fad at the level of generic style and language, the opening sentence of the novel being an obvious example:

> About the year One *Thousand Seven Hundred and Five*, that is, in the glorious
> reign of Queen Anne, there existed certain characters, and befel a series of
> adventures which, since they are strictly in accordance with the present
> fashionable style and taste; since they have been already partly described in the
> "Newgate Calendar;" since they are (as shall be seen anon) agreeably low,
> delightfully disgusting, and at the same time eminently pleasing and pathetic,
> may properly be set down here (19 (113): 604).

The effect of the parody is to reduce the Newgate novel to a repertoire of banal generic features and idioms, reproduced for no other reason than their 'accordance with the present fashionable style and taste'. Thackeray – through his authorial persona Ikey Solomons – insists, nevertheless, on the moral purpose behind this technique, which expresses his aversion to the romanticized treatment of criminality – the 'dandy, poetical, rose-water thieves' - which populate the Newgate novels of Bulwer and Ainsworth (19 (114): 701).

The process of 'literary fashion' observed satirically here by Thackeray chimes with reflections on fashion in clothing expressed elsewhere in *Fraser's* during this period. In a review of the *History of British Costume*, published under the title 'Dress, Dandies, Fashion, etc.' in February 1837, the author (unidentified in the Wellesley Index) ruminates on the 'instability of fashion', echoing the vocabulary of Bulwer's *Pelham*. The review traces

changing fashions in the attire of the 'gentleman' from the time of Charles II through to the nineteenth century, presenting the history of fashion as a process of dramatic reversals. In the same way that Almack's is replaced by its polar opposite Newgate as a fictional milieu, a fashion in clothes 'too absurd to last, was succeeded by one in a direct contrary extreme' (237). At the same time, the history of fashion is presented as a scene of naturalized struggle, where random movement between conflicting visual codes is made to appear organic: 'White neckcloths yielded to fancy stripes, which gradually became "small by degrees, and beautifully less," until blues, and reds, and greens, stood forth undisputed masters of the field'. The reviewer explicitly recognizes in such instances the emergence of a new conception of fashion as the practice of 'ephemeral production' for the purpose of individualized consumption:

> At the present day, when every man dresses according to his fancy, it is difficult
> to say what is the fashion; and the silk collars we have lately seen substituted for
> velvet, the bits of silk that appear on the fronts of the coats, the cut of the cuffs,
> and the turn of the waistcoat collar, &c., all bespeak the shifts tailors are put to, to
> devise something to make people get new clothes before their old ones are worn
> out (240).

Whereas, in earlier centuries, the 'gentleman' was easily distinguishable in dress from his social inferiors, as a consequence of the 'sumptuary laws', the logic of modern fashion destabilizes the presumed link between visual appearance and social status. What 'the fashion' is becomes harder to discern: a matter of individual 'fancy' rather than an emblem of collective rank, as in the yellow plush uniform of Thackeray's footman. Indeed, according to the reviewer:

> [N]ow, the only difference between a gentleman and his valet is, that the valet is
> frequently the better-dressed man of the two. Instead of its being necessary for a
> man to dress in accordance with his station, a new rule has been introduced,
> which says that, "when a man's character is established, he may wear an old coat"
> (239).

The 'instability' of modern fashion, then, operates on both a temporal and social level. By validating the production of disposable commodities for consumption beyond need - such that 'people get new clothes before their old ones are worn out' - fashion threatens to erode visible class distinctions. At the same time, when new (fashionable) clothes become available for consumption by those of lower social status, the logic of fashion can be extended to ascribe value to an 'old coat' in the service of preserving class distinctions.

Thackeray explored similar tensions between a modern consumerist experience of fashion and the use of clothes to signify distinct social identities in his *Fraser's* essay 'Men and Coats', published in August 1841 under the pseudonym Michelangelo Titmarsh. An 'essay upon new clothes and their influence', 'Men and Coats' humorously expounds an analogy between fashion in clothing and change within nature, equivalent to that already noted in *Fraser's* reviews of 'Novels of the Season' (209). As in nature, so in fashion change happens in a cyclical manner through transient but recurrent seasons: 'Coats have been, and will be in the course of this disquisition, frequently compared to the flowers of the field; like them they bloom for a season, like them they grow seedy and they fade'. Titmarsh characterizes the desire to wear a new coat as an 'irresistible spring impulse'; the 'influence of the season' leads him directly to an act of economic consumption. The artifice of fashion is thus naturalized and yet exposed by the incongruity of Thackeray's figurative language:

> Remark the trees; they have dragged through the shivering winter-time without so much as a rag to cover them, but about May they feel obligated to follow the mode, and come out in a new suit of green. The meadows, in like manner, appear invested with a variety of pretty spring fashions, not only covering their backs with a bran-new glossy suit, but sporting a world of little coquettish, ornamental gimcracks that are suited to the season (208).

Titmarsh is conscious, however, that wearing a new coat induces both a sense of 'exultation' and a 'feeling of shyness', the latter expressing his anxiety not to be 'mistaken for a snob' (209). In fact, no sooner has he purchased the new coat than he describes how it can be made to look older – an early example of the practice of 'distressing' clothes for aesthetic effect – in order to allay his unease. Wearing new clothes is associated with a vulgar form of social aspiration and display, embodied, for Thackeray, in the figure of the 'snob'.[8] Such 'ultra-fashionable costume' connotes ephemerality, a shallow social identity, recently adopted and unlikely to endure (211). By contrast, wearing old clothes – or at least a coat that is intentionally altered to appear older than it really is – signifies a subtle social distinction, connoting temporal duration and a more achieved gentility.

'Men in Coats' presents a comic, tongue-in-cheek articulation of a 'Philosophy of Clothes', which is hard not to read, at some level, as a riposte to Carlyle's earlier (and already famous) contribution to *Fraser's*. The essay ventures to demonstrate the Carlylean proposition that 'The coat is the expression of the man', but in such ludicrous terms that it may not be entirely serious (217). For example, Titmarsh declares his intention of writing the essay whilst separately wearing five different coats in order to test his hypothesis of the

influence of clothes on authorial style: he is 'convinced that the new frock-coat chapter will be infinitely more genteel, spruce, and glossy, than the woollen-jacket chapter; which, again, shall be more comfortable than the poor, seedy, patched William-the-Fourth's black-frock chapter' (209). In a subtle modification of Teufelsdröch's philosophy, Titmarsh suggests not only that clothes embody prior social meanings, thus bearing symbolic power, but also that the external shell has the capacity to mould the inner substance of the wearer, to such a degree that the author's mood is altered by the coat he chooses to put on. Nevertheless, his preferred code of dress is that of the 'gentleman' rather than the 'dandy', expressed in his preference for a 'jacket' over a 'dressing gown'. The dressing-gown is the iconic costume of the fashionable author or 'Dandiacal Body', considered slovenly, effeminate, and enervating: Bulwer and Benjamin Disraeli are among Thackeray's implied targets here. In contrast, the jacket is an emblem of manly simplicity, signalling honesty and endeavour: 'A man IN A JACKET is a man. All great men wore jackets', notably including Thomas Carlyle (216). Hence Titmarsh concludes his argument by advising 'all literary men' to 'get jackets'. In a final ironic twist, however, he reveals that the essay itself was written in order to pay the tailor's bill for his new coat: in other words, the text that we have been reading is rendered literally equivalent to clothing.

The collective identity of the Fraserians of the 1830s was, in large part, cemented through their anti-fashionable posture. In William Maginn's attempt to construct the image of the magazine, which accompanied Maclise's famous group portrait 'The Fraserians', in the January 1835 issue, the convivial and fraternal sociability of the contributors (and their associates) is explicitly contrasted with 'fashionable authors' of the day (1). Yet, as has been noted, this act of self-portraiture is somewhat misleading, concealing a more complex relationship between *Fraser's* and its declared antagonists.[9] Not only did several celebrated exemplars of Dandyism and fashionable authorship attend the dinner commemorated in Maclise's portrait of the Fraserians - most notably, Count D'Orsay, Theodore Hook, and Ainsworth – but, as I have argued throughout this essay, even those contributors who defined their own professional identities through the critique of literary fashion, such as Thackeray and Carlyle, were often nuanced and ambivalent in their response. The genre of the 'fashionable novel' was only one manifestation of a broader culture of literary fashion emerging within the period - a meta-genre, so to speak, of fashionable literature which encompassed both Silverfork and Newgate schools alike. Writing in a review of 'Recent Novels' for the April 1849 issue of *Fraser's*, Charles Kingsley declared that the genre of the 'fashionable novel' was 'approaching extinction': they are now 'most *un*-fashionable novels,

aping the tone of a school and a system of society which really died, once and for ever, to the honour of the English aristocracy, on the 10th of April last' (the date of the failed Chartist uprising of 1848) (418-9). Though the genre may, as Kingsley implies, have lacked relevance to the emerging cultural sobriety of the mid-Victorian period, nevertheless the broader system of literary fashion which it had briefly embodied in the 1820s and 30s was of more enduring significance. In identifying this larger process, as well as (or rather through) commenting on its ephemeral manifestations, *Fraser's* played an important role in tracing the convergence between literature and fashion in modern culture. As a monthly periodical, of course, it too was bound up in the same emergent literary economy as fashionable novels, leading 'an ephemeral existence, and […] soon forgotten' ('Influence of the Newspapers': 127). By reconnecting some of the formative texts of *Fraser's* early contributors to their original context of publication, we gain a clearer understanding of the history of literary fashion.

Notes

[1] The etymological association of fashion and modernity is famously discussed in Charles Baudelaire's essay on the artist Constantin Guys, 'The Painter of Modern Life' (1863). According to Roland Barthes, the temporal condition of fashion is resistant to historical narrative: 'as long as its rhythm remains regular, Fashion remains outside history; it changes, but its changes are alternative, purely endogenous: it is no more than a question of simple diachrony' (296). For a detailed account of the development of the literary market from the early-to-mid nineteenth century, see Erickson, especially chapter 6.

[2] The most substantial recent critical study of the genre is Copeland's *The Silver Fork Novel*, but see also Adburgham and Sadoff.

[3] On *Fraser's* campaign against fashionable literature see Latané (141-7); for the magazine's construction of an alternative image of professional authorship, see Leary and Fisher.

[4] *Fraser's* concerted attacks on Bulwer Lytton, for example, are usually ascribed to a mixture of personal and party political motives. With regard to the latter, Maginn explicitly positioned *Fraser's* as a staunch Tory periodical, whereas Bulwer was a high-profile pro-reform Whig Radical. See Adburgham (25) and Latané (147).

[5] See, for example, 'The History of Samuel Titmarsh and the Great Hoggarty Diamond' (September 1841).

---

[6] Almack's was an exclusive private club in London whose Assembly Rooms were viewed as an epicentre of fashionable Society during the early nineteenth century.

[7] For a broader discussion of the significance of fashionable authorship and literary ephemera for Thackeray's early career, see Salmon (2016). See also chapters 4 to 6 in *Thackeray in Time* (Ed. Salmon and Crossley) for varying discussions of Thackeray and historical fiction.

[8] Thackeray memorably defined the figure of the 'snob' in his *Punch* serial, 'The Snobs of England' (1846-7). An example of its association with the acquisition of new clothes can be found in his earlier Almanac story 'Stubbs' Calendar; or, The Fatal Boots' (1839): see Salmon (29).

[9] Leary, for instance, suggests that 'the imagined world of authorship as portrayed in the magazine is at variance with the role of its contributors' (118). See Thrall for further information on individuals included in Maclise's group portrait of 'The Fraserians' who do not fit comfortably within the magazine's professed collective identity.

Works Cited

Adams, James Eli. (1995) *Dandies and Desert Saints: Styles of Victorian Masculinity*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Adburgham, Alison. (1983) *Silver Fork Society: Fashionable Life and Literature From 1814 to 1840*. London: Constable.

Barthes, Roland. (1985) *The Fashion System*. Tr. Matthew Ward and Richard Howard. London: Jonathan Cape.

Baudelaire, Charles. (1964) *The Painter of Modern Life and other essays*. Tr and Ed. Jonathan Mayne. New York: Da Capo.

Bulwer Lytton, Edward. (1828) *Pelham; or, The Adventures of a Gentleman* [3 vols.] London: Henry Colburn.

----   (1873) *Pelham; or, Adventures of a Gentleman*. London: George Routledge.

----   (1874) *England and the English*. London: George Routledge.

Carlyle, Thomas. (1833-4) 'Sartor Resartus'. *Fraser's Magazine*, 8 (47): 581-92; 8 (48): 669-84; 9 (50): 177-95; 9 (51): 301-13; 9 (52): 443-55; 9 (54): 664-74; 10 (55): 77-87; 10 (56): 182-93.

Carter, Michael. (2003) *Fashion Classics From Carlyle to Barthes*. London: Bloomsbury.

Copeland, Edward. (2012) *The Silver Fork Novel: Fashionable Fiction in the Age of Reform*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

D'Israeli, Isaac. (1866) *Curiosities of Literature*. London: George Routledge.

'Dress, Dandies, Fashion, &c.' (1837) *Fraser's Magazine*, 15 (86): 232-43.

Edwards Newman, Rebecca. (2002) '"Prosecuting the Onus Criminus": Early Criticism of the Novel in *Fraser's Magazine*'. *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 35 (4): 401-19.

Erickson, Lee. (1996) *The Economy of Literary Form: English Literature and the Industrialization of Publishing, 1800-1850*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.

'Fashion in Literature'. (1833) *Athenaeum* [London], 297. 6 July: 440.

Fisher, Judith L. (2006) '"In the Present Famine of Anything Substantial": *Fraser's* "Portraits" and the Construction of Literary Celebrity; or, "Personality, Personality Is the Appetite of the Age"'. *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 39 (2): 97-135.

'Influence of the Newspapers'. (1831) *Fraser's Magazine*, 4 (20): 127-42.

Kingsley, Charles. (1849) 'Recent Novels'. *Fraser's Magazine*, 39 (232): 417-32.

Latané, David. (2013) *William Maginn and the British Press: A Critical Biography*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Leary, Patrick. (1994) '*Fraser's Magazine* and the Literary Life, 1830-1847'. *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 27 (2): 105-26.

Maginn, William. (1831) 'The Novels of the Season'. (1831) *Fraser's Magazine*, 3 (13): 95-113.

---- (1831) 'The Novels of the Season.- Batch The Second'. (1831) *Fraser's Magazine*, 4 (19): 8-25.

Maginn, William and Daniel Maclise. (1832) 'Edward Lytton Bulwer, ESQ'. No XXVII of 'The Gallery of Illustrious Literary Characters'. *Fraser's Magazine*, 6 (31): 112-14.

Maginn, William and David Brewster. (1835) 'The Fraserians; or, the Commencement of the Year Thirty-Five'. *Fraser's Magazine*, 11 (61): 1-27.

Maginn, William and John Abraham Heraud. (1830) 'The Dominie's Legacy' ['Fashionable Novels']. *Fraser's Magazine*, 1 (3): 318-35.

---- 'Mr Edward Lytton Bulwer's Novels; and Remarks on Novel-Writing'. *Fraser's Magazine*, 1 (5): 509-32.

Maginn, William and John Mitchell. (1834) 'On Manners, Fashion, and Things in General. A Work in Two Chapters by Bombardinio. With a Few Notes by Sir Morgan O'Doherty, Bart.' *Fraser's Magazine*, 10 (55): 97-104.

---- (1835) 'On Manners, Fashion, and Things in General'. *Fraser's Magazine*, 12 (68): 137-53.

Moers, Ellen. (1978) *The Dandy: Brummell to Beerbohm*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.

'Preface to Our Second Decade'. (1840) *Fraser's Magazine*, 21 (121): 1-31.

Sadoff, Dianne F. (2012) 'The Silver Fork Novel'. *The Oxford History of the Novel in English: The Nineteenth-Century Novel 1820-1880*. Ed. John Kucich and Jenny Bourne Taylor. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 106-21.

Salmon, Richard. (2016) 'Thackeray's Ephemera: Fashion, Modernity and the Sketch'. *Thackeray in Time: History, Memory, and Modernity*. Ed. Richard Salmon and Alice Crossley. London and New York: Routledge: 17-32.

Thackeray, William. (1837-8) 'The Yellowplush Correspondence'. *Fraser's Magazine*, 16 (95): 644-9; 17 (97): 39-49; 17 (98): 243-50; 17 (99): 353-9; 17 (100): 404-8; 17 (101): 616-27; 17 (102): 734-41; 18 (103): 59-71.

---- (1839) 'Horae Catnachianae. A Dissertation on Ballads, with a few Unnecessary Remarks on Jonathan Wild, Jack Sheppard, Paul Clifford, and – Fagin, Esqrs.' *Fraser's Magazine*, 19 (112): 407-24.

---- (1839-40) 'Catherine: A Story'. *Fraser's Magazine*, 19 (113): 604-17; 19 (114): 694-709.

---- (1841) 'Men and Coats'. *Fraser's Magazine*, 24 (140): 208-17.

---- (1841) 'The History of Samuel Titmarsh and the Great Hoggarty Diamond'. *Fraser's Magazine*, 24 (141): 324-43.

Thrall, Miriam M.H. (1934) *Rebellious Fraser's: Nol Yorke's Magazine in the Days of Maginn, Thackeray, and Carlyle*. New York: Columbia University Press.