

HONORING ENEMIES AND AMIABLE ANTAGONISTS: MEDIEVALISM'S
INFLUENCE ON MODERN RELATIONSHIPS IN THE EARLY NOVELS
OF G.K. CHESTERTON

A thesis presented to the faculty of the Graduate School of Western Carolina University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

By

David Wheeler Cathcart

Director: Brian W. Gastle, Ph.D., Professor of English
Department of English

July 2005

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Dr. Brian Gastle for his willingness to take on the persons of G.K. Chesterton and D. W. Cathcart; the first a prolific and, unfortunately, often unread author, the second a passive and deservedly unread author. He has been gracious, and encouraging, opening the door to his office and home and I am sincerely thankful.

I would also like to thank Dr. Marsh Lee Baker, who from my first semester has encouraged my character and provoked my thinking. What else could a student want from a teacher?

Finally, I would like to thank both Dr. Elizabeth Addison and Dr. Mary Adams; Dr. Addison for working with me on the proposal and throughout this M.A. endeavor; Dr. Adams for taking on my thesis right at the end, and for staying thirty minutes after a three hour class to help me understand how to scan meter.

Shelly, I would hope you already know.

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Abstract..... | iv |
| Introduction: Paper Castles: The State of Medievalism in Chesterton's England and Home | 1 |
| Chapter One: Make Mine Medieval: Chesterton Challenges Modernism..... | 19 |
| Chapter Two: <u>The Napoleon of Notting Hill</u> : The Future of Medievalism..... | 38 |
| Chapter Three: <u>The Man Who Was Thursday</u> : St. George and Anarchy | 62 |
| Chapter Four: <u>The Ball and the Cross</u> : Duel into Camaraderie | 83 |
| Conclusion | 102 |
| Works Cited | 108 |

Abstract

HONORING ENEMIES AND AMIABLE ANTAGONISTS: MEDIEVALISM'S INFLUENCE ON MODERN RELATIONSHIPS IN THE EARLY NOVELS OF G.K. CHESTERTON

David W. Cathcart, M.A.

Western Carolina University, August 2005

Director: Dr. Brian Gastle

This thesis analyzes the influence of nineteenth-century medievalism upon the work and character of G.K. Chesterton. Chesterton witnessed major cultural and philosophical shifts between the Victorian and Modern eras and much of his writing, whether in the form of essay, poetry, fiction, biography, criticism, or drama, addresses these sociological changes. Chesterton often used medieval ideals and symbols as his lens for examining various cultural trends.

Frequently criticizing the developing modern philosophies that he viewed as destructive, Chesterton both attacked and was attacked by many public figures of a more modernist mindset, most notably George Bernard Shaw and H. G. Wells. Chesterton was well known for his sharp wit and robust humor which he displayed through his writing and public debates with these contemporaries. Yet, as often as Chesterton was in disagreement with his peers, underlying these confrontations was an undeniable amiability, especially in the case of G. B. Shaw. It is the argument of this thesis that the medieval ideals and images, which so saturated the United Kingdom at the end of the nineteenth-century, provided a key ingredient for Chesterton's adversarial friendships.

The introduction explores the development of medieval study and interest by the time of Chesterton's birth. The first chapter examines how these influences are represented in Chesterton's personal and public life, specifically addressing the manifestations of chivalric ideals in his religious debates with Robert Blatchford and his various debates with Shaw. The final three chapters analyze the medieval presence in his first three novels The Napoleon of Notting Hill (1904), The Man Who Was Thursday (1908), and The Ball and the Cross (1909), focusing primarily on how medieval attributes and symbolism create relationships of mutual respect between adversaries. Throughout, I also explore how these attributes can simultaneously provide a source of division, yet ultimately become the means for synthesis.

Introduction

Paper Castles: The state of Medievalism in Chesterton's England and Home

If men should arise and return to the noise and time of the tourney,
The name and fame of the tabard, the tangle of gules and gold,
Would these things stand and suffice for the bourne of a backward
journey,

A light on our days returning, as it was in the days of old? (Collected Works vol. X 552)

G (ilbert) K (eith) Chesterton poetically raises a question that had been on the collective mind of England for well over a hundred years. Even with the Romantics prior to 1800, Englishmen were returning to “the noise and time of the tourney” to bear back the light of an idealized medieval era to shine on their own turbulent times. A variety of authors, scholars and artists over many centuries did return to “the time of the tourney,” men such as Sir Walter Scott, F.J. Furnivall, and Dante Gabriel Rossetti. These men and others were instrumental in both continuing and renewing interest in the Middle Ages. Each helped to grind the romantic lens under which 19th century England was to view medievalism.

This lens was firmly in place when G. K. Chesterton was born on May 29, 1874 in Campden Hill, London. Chesterton was raised in a quiet middle class home and he

points out in his Autobiography, “I regret that there was nothing in the range of our family much more racy than a remote and mildly impecunious uncle; and that I cannot do my duty as a true modern, by cursing everybody who made me whatever I am” (22). In this environment he grew, attending St. Paul’s for his education. He studied art at the Slade School between 1892 and 1895, a period of time where he found himself in “the darkest depths of the contemporary pessimism” (89) against which he revolted for the rest of his life.

Chesterton entered the literary world at the end of his school career as he began writing reviews and criticisms on art books and artists in The Bookman (96). This experience began his journalistic adventure in which he was engaged for the rest of his life, writing thousands of articles, essays and reviews for the Speaker, The Daily News, The Illustrated London News and his own G.K.’s Weekly. His first published work appeared in 1900 with Greybeards at Play, a series of poems, and with this publication the floodgates were opened. From 1900 to the time of his death in 1936, except for the years 1918 and 1921, G.K. Chesterton was published every year. Most years he published more than one book, often as many as four and up to seven, which included novels, social criticism, collections of essays or poems, plays, histories and biographies. Chesterton also contributed hundreds of introductions, many of which were collected in G.K.C. as M.C. (1929).

Chesterton is now perhaps best known as the creator of the priest-detective, Father Brown, and for his lighthearted yet insightful essays such as “On Lying in Bed” and “On Running After One’s Hat” often found in collections. He is also known for his

apologia for the Christian faith, particularly Roman Catholicism, to which he converted in 1922. Chesterton's prolific pen never seemed to rest, and in the years following his death many more collections of his essays and other writings have been published, making the task of finding a topic Chesterton did not write on more difficult than finding the ones he did. Medieval themes and ideals pervade most of his writings in one form or another and their influence can find its root in Chesterton's earliest memory.

The influence of romantic medievalism found its way into Chesterton's home by way of his father's hobby constructing Toy-Theatres. Chesterton's Autobiography details the importance of this hobby, revealing the theatre and principally one of the paper cutout actors to be the source of Chesterton's first visual memory (24-25). He recalls:

[He] was a young man walking across a bridge. He had a curly moustache and an attitude of confidence verging on swagger. He carried in his hand a disproportionately large key of a shining yellow metal and wore a large golden or gilded crown. The bridge he was crossing sprang on the one side from the edge of a highly perilous mountain chasm [...] and at the other end it joined the upper part of the tower of an almost excessively castellated castle. (Autobiography 24)

The theatre exhibits not only the imaginings of a devoted father but also the pervasiveness of the romance of medievalism in England by the late 1800s. Chesterton's father did not limit his interest in medievalism to the construction of paper puppets and theatres, for Chesterton later elaborates on his father's hobbies that included "[...] stained glass and fretwork [...] and mediaeval illumination" (34-35). The interests of the father

soon became those of the son, reflecting how a nation's interest in its past found its way into a home on Kensington street and influenced one of the most prolific authors in England whose career bridged the chasm between the Victorian and Modernist eras.

Chesterton's medieval ideologies were built as a pinnacle atop a long and varied production of medievalism in England. By the time Chesterton added to the "castellated castle" many hands and minds had been involved in its production. To trace this ideological fortress to its foundation would be too extensive for the purposes of this introduction. Instead, this section seeks only to examine the fundamental stones immediately preceding Chesterton's additions, and how he refers to those influences in his own work. In the following Chapters, I will examine how Chesterton manifests those influences and beliefs within his encounters with Modernist philosophies in his life and relationships as well as in the characters of his early novels, The Napoleon of Notting Hill (1904), The Man Who Was Thursday (1907), and The Ball and The Cross (1909). Specifically, I will analyze medievalism's influence on relationships between his adversaries, both real and fictional, and how Chesterton's admiration of the Middle Ages and chivalric ideals shaped his rhetorical tactics.

One of the key catalysts in the revival of medievalism in the 18th and 19th centuries was an increased passion for collecting. Clare A. Simmons in her book, Reversing the Conquest: History and Myth in Nineteenth-Century British Literature, traces antecedents of collecting back into the 1600s, but in the 18th century the purchase of artifacts was perhaps best identified with the author Horace Wapole (44). Mark Girouard's The Return to Camelot: Chivalry and the English Gentleman argues that on

Wapole's mansion was built specifically to house his medieval armour and portraits (21). Wapole's enthusiasm was not singular. The artifact collecting craze was so prevalent that it became the source of satire in Sir Walter Scott's The Antiquary, a novel about a character so engaged with collecting that he rarely questions a relic's authenticity. (Simmons 44-45).

As Simmons points out, this type of collecting can be enjoyed only by a select few of Englishmen, those with extraneous wealth. But in 1765 Thomas Percy published Reliques of Ancient English Poetry, and this collection offered another, more economically viable, form of collecting.

Collecting ballads and verses became a popular and accessible form of antiquarian pursuit. Percy's Reliques inspired and influenced many in his day, most significantly, Sir Walter Scott. Jerome Mitchell's Scott, Chaucer, and Medieval Romance argues that romantic medievalism would not have spread as quickly as it did had it not been for Percy's volume. Mitchell illustrates the impact of the book upon Scott by quoting from the first chapter of Scott's biography; "The first time ... I could scrape a few shillings together [...] I bought unto myself a copy of these beloved volumes, nor do I believe I ever read a book half so frequently, or with half the enthusiasm" (Quoted in Mitchell 5). Percy's collection appears to have influenced Scott's sense of romantic medievalism, as Scott's own writing influenced Chesterton.

Early in his Autobiography, Chesterton recalls an episode from his early school days that illustrates his resistance to a formal education; in doing so he shows his intimate familiarity with Scott: "I can remember running to school in sheer excitement repeating

militant lines of 'Marmion' with passionate emphasis and then going into class and repeating the same lines in the lifeless manner of a hurdy-gurdy [...]" (65). This is not the only case of Chesterton's preoccupation with Scott while traversing London. Later in the Autobiography, Chesterton discusses his thoughts prior to his composition of The Napoleon of Notting Hill; "I was one day wandering about the streets in that part of North Kensington, telling myself stories of feudal sallies and sieges, in the manner of Walter Scott, and vaguely trying to apply them to the wilderness of bricks and mortar around me" (106). Those verses of "Marmion" apparently lodged firmly in the mind and heart of Chesterton.

Chesterton's appreciation for Scott is expressly seen in his essay "The Position of Sir Walter Scott," collected in Twelve Types (1906). Chesterton argues against those of Scott's critics who condemn Scott's prolonged descriptions and rambling narratives. In the course of his argument he admits, "He will never be understood until Romance is understood, and that will be only when Time, Man and Eternity are understood" (182). Chesterton then posits that no one has "lived a sense of the romantic" (183) as has Scott, claiming this lack of experience results in faulty criticism of Scott's literature. Chesterton maintains, "No genuine criticism of romance will ever arise until we have grasped the fact that romance lies not upon the outside of life but absolutely in the centre of it" (183). In defending Scott's understanding of Romance, Chesterton also defends his own. The presence of romance in the center of Chesterton's life especially as influenced by Scott is seen in an episode Chesterton includes in his Autobiography.

Before World War II, Chesterton visited Germany to lecture on English Literature to a group of German schoolmasters. The scene is congenial in the beginning, “We discussed Walter Scott’s *Marmion* and other metrical romances; we sang English songs over German beer [...]” (129). But his hosts misinterpreted his stance against colonialism as apathetic or even anti-English, and openly discussed the possibility of German invasion. Chesterton feared his German hosts liken his stance to that of a British, Nazi sympathizer, such as Houston Stewart Chamberlain. Offended, Chesterton retorts: “Well, gentlemen, if it ever came to anything like that, I think I should have to refer you to the poem of Scott that we have been discussing.’ And I gravely repeated the answer of *Marmion*, when King James says that they may meet again in war as far south as Tamworth Castle” (129-131). Chesterton quoted the passage in “*Marmion*” that refers to Nottingham’s strong archers and the fact that many knights will die before Scotland’s king crosses the Trent.

In this instance Chesterton displays both the tact and resolve of the knights of his beloved “feudal sallies.” Chesterton, instead of offering an indignant and volatile response to his host’s political offense, still clearly shows his own patriotism by quoting from a poem he knows his hosts to understand. He stays true to his own political convictions, declares his intentions to stand firm and fight if need be, and yet uses a literary reference to provide common ground on which he and his hosts might both stand. Scott’s literature influenced not only Chesterton’s career but also his character.

But Scott was not the only source of medievalism to which Chesterton was exposed, nor was Percy’s Reliques the only fuse leading to the medieval explosion of the

19th century. Because medievalism's area of influence was overlapping, one realm, such as literature, would often be connected to another, such as art, academics, and/or politics. Simmons argues that in Percy's editing of his collection, he was not just assembling a volume of poetry but "he was asserting the value of heritage" (Reversing 45).

To illustrate this claim Simmons discusses the 1812 sale of the duke of Roxburghe's library. She argues that this sale, which included a collection of nearly 3,000 manuscript and print ballads, evinced not only an interest in ballads, but also "a more general wish to rediscover historical remains" (45). As a result of this sale a group of collectors formed the first historical publishing society, the Roxburghe Club. Many similar clubs arose with the primary goal being to generate a greater interest and understanding, not of an archeological past as had been the previous focus of history, but of a literary past, specifically an English speaking past (45-47).

The Roxburghe club still existed 49 years later and Peter Faulkner's "The Paths of Virtue and Early English": F.J. Furnivall and Victorian Medievalism" points out its members were still involved in the uncovering of early English literature and documents. In 1861 F. J. Furnivall prepared a fifteenth century Arthurian epic, the Seynte Graal, for the Roxburghe Club. This was the first of many such texts prepared by Furnivall, who three years later began the Early English Text Society (Faulkner 146). Faulkner's essay quotes the Society's 1892 publication:

The Early English Text Society was started by Dr. Furnivall in 1864 for the purpose of bringing the mass of Old English Literature within the reach of the ordinary student, and of wiping away the reproach under

which England had long rested, of having felt little interest in the monuments of her early language and life. (147)

The study of English Literature, especially Old and Middle English, was no longer just an endeavor to explore history and literature alone; it was also a comment on one's chauvinism and pride in a nation's past. At the same time this exhumation of a buried body of literature was also an effort to find guideposts for a society sailing into new and troubling waters. Faulkner points out the Roxburghe club members "felt that an increased knowledge of the past would help unity in the future" (147), a belief he qualifies as "—a romantic and simplifying view" (147).

Myth and National Identity in Nineteenth-Century Britain: The Legends of King Arthur and Robin Hood, by Stephanie L. Barczewski, describes the Victorian ethos bending towards the past as it seeks the future, particularly in its embrace of Arthur and Robin Hood, but many of the Victorian sentiments are the same concerning a more generalized medieval re-identification in hopes of national unification. "In this period, [18th century through the Napoleonic Wars]" Barczewski argues, "the selective mobilization of the past —and the medieval past in particular— acted to overcome the tensions created in the present by the often tempestuous relationship among the nation's constituent communities" (7). By exploring the documents of its past, England celebrated its linguistic place in history, which became the source of a potentially unifying pride.

Language as nationalism reached back into the 16th century, when England began to take pride in their literary place established through past author's such as Chaucer as well as their current authors such as Thomas More, Philip Sidney, and Edmund Spenser

(Barczewski 83). Through the next two centuries their pride steadily grew, and was one of many forces moving medievalism forward. Barczewski points out that the increased affection for medieval texts helped to move the study out of the hands of amateurs into a more professionalized arena of academic study. Those scholars, ironically, made the materials more accessible to the general public through the works of groups such as the Early English Text Society, which created editions in modernized language and with glossaries. Medieval texts had so thoroughly saturated the English mainstream that by the late 1870s many examinations for civil or professional service included portions of medieval texts within the English subject (87-91).

In this way, medieval literature became a significant resource for the visual artists of the time, as the themes popular to read became the themes popular to paint.

Barczewski includes a table that shows the number of paintings with Arthurian themes that were exhibited at the Royal Academy, Royal Society of the British Artists, and Royal Scottish Academy between 1800-1899; from 0 in the first decade of the century to 31 in the last, the apex of Arthur's artistic reign was achieved between 1860 to 1869 with 63 pieces (61). Such numbers show how thoroughly medieval subjects such as Arthur preoccupied the nineteenth-century imagination. Chesterton was born in 1874, just five years after the zenith of Arthur's depiction in paintings, into a collective English mindset richly fertilized with medieval imagery.

One of the most influential art movements in the mid eighteenth century, was the Pre-Raphaelite movement. The Pre-Raphaelites were a group of artists who sought to re-achieve the passion and purity of art, exemplified by artists before Raphael. This notion is

chiefly expressed in the writings and lectures of Victorian critic John Ruskin. Many of their subjects featured scenes from Scripture, Shakespeare, and the Romantic poets, but also Arthurian and other medieval themes. Dante Gabriel Rossetti was perhaps the most influential member of the “Brotherhood” but many others, artists such as Edward Burne-Jones and William Morris, are associated with its style.

Alicia Faxon, in her book Dante Gabriel Rossetti, briefly introduces the role of medievalism on Rossetti’s generation; “The Middle Ages created by the Pre-Raphaelites [...] provided an escape from a material to a spiritual realm, a glorification of collaborative efforts in an era preoccupied with the survival of the fittest [...] a romantic vision of glowing colors and fantastic raiment to outshine the drabness of Victorian fashion” (85). Chesterton’s novels endeavor to create a similar world, spiritual, collaborative, and full of romantic vision, glowing colors, and fantastic raiment. Such features play a significant role in the conclusion of The Man Who Was Thursday, but where the Pre-Raphaelites may have been painting an escape, Chesterton’s medievalism was an antidote to the nightmare he saw Modernism presenting. This argument will be specifically addressed in discussion of The Man Who Was Thursday.

Chesterton’s debt to the Pre-Raphaelites is discussed in Marshall McLuhan’s “The Origins of Chesterton’s Medievalism.” McLuhan argues that the Pre-Raphaelites offered not only a visual representation of similar tastes in medieval themes, but also a similar taste in philosophies, more specifically an appreciation of “the aesthetics of toil and work” (49). McLuhan later claims, “It is this doctrine of artistic work and involvement which underpins the Distributist programme of Chesterton as much as it

directed his medieval interest" (50). The Distributists were a social reform party to which Chesterton belonged. This party advocated the equal distribution of land and property throughout the commonwealth, which would then be privately owned and maintained.

Chesterton's knowledge of Rossetti's work is also indicated by his repeated references to both the painter and his style. One such reference is in Chesterton's Robert Browning. Chesterton comments on critics of Browning whom in a passing phrase of criticism show themselves to not understand the work at all. He argues:

We feel about it as we should feel about a man who said that the plot of *Tristram Shandy* was not well constructed, or that the women in Rossetti's pictures did not look useful and industrious [...] The man who objects to the Rossetti pictures because they depict a sad and sensuous day-dream, objects to their existing at all. (163)

This analysis illustrates Chesterton's knowledge of not only of Rossetti's art but also of Rossetti's intent. Chesterton, well aware of the subject matter and tone of Rossetti's paintings, knows that his women were supposed to convey not industriousness, as the ignorant critic supposes, but a sense of languid daydream and melancholic contemplation.

Medievalism was powerfully felt not only in art, academia, and literature but also in the political and religious realms. Prince Albert spoke admiringly of Alfred, Lord Tennyson's Arthurian epic Idylls of the King, and in the 1863 version, two years after Albert's death, Tennyson added a dedication to him. Many read this dedication as a

linking of Albert to Arthur, a link so strong, Simmons notes, that the poet Algernon Swinburne suggested the Idylls be called "Morte D'Albert" (178).

Medievalism even affected religion. In his The Return to Camelot: Chivalry and the English Gentleman, Girouard remarks that in 1865, Queen Victoria's favorite preacher "expressed a sentiment which Victoria warmly endorsed. 'The age of chivalry is never past [...] so long as there is a wrong left undressed on earth, or a man or a woman left to say I will redress that wrong or spend my life in the attempt'"(130). This attitude, Girouard poses, was one favored by the Queen (130) but it was also favored by a majority of the English, and begins to illustrate that medievalism was no longer confined to antiquary collections, literary interpretation, linguistic nationalism, artistic representation, or political hyperbole, but was now firmly entrenched in a nation's psyche. It had bored its way from the material world into the psychological and behavioral world of the nineteenth century English.

Mark Girouard's book The Return to Camelot deals directly with the phenomenon of medieval ideals finding their way into 19th century behavior; especially those attributes of chivalry, such as respect and honor, which would figure heavily in Chesterton's treatment of adversarial relationship. Girouard points out that though Victorians periodically tried to articulate a code of chivalry they generally patterned it after medieval literature. Among the list of examples Girouard mentions are the stories of King Arthur and the Chanson de Roland (16), works well known to Chesterton as will be shown in the following chapters.

Another source of chivalric inspiration mentioned by Girouard are two paintings by Benjamin West “The Black Prince receiving King John of France after Poitiers” and “Edward II entertaining his Prisoners.” The key element which Girouard points out concerning these paintings, and which relates to Chesterton’s treatment towards his adversaries, both real and fictional, is that the paintings “illustrate one of the archetypal virtues of chivalry, courteous consideration of the vanquished by the victors” (20). Although not always necessarily the victor, Chesterton shows a remarkable amount of courtesy to those he is opposing and this trait will be examined through his connection with Victorian author, Kenelm Henry Digby.

Girouard traces a great portion of the nineteenth-century’s chivalrous attitudes to Digby. In 1822, Digby anonymously published his book The Broad Stone of Honour with the subtitle “Rules for the Gentleman of England.” Girouard continues that by 1877 three years after Chesterton’s birth, Digby’s book published under his own name had been expanded to five volumes (56). Girouard argues that Digby’s book was not a history of chivalry, but a guide and instruction book into the ways of chivalry. Digby maintained two stances in particular that would have corroborated with Chesterton’s philosophies, that man was in a continual struggle between good and evil and that one of the key elements within medieval chivalry, in its historical sense, was its connection with Christianity. Among Digby’s enthusiasts were John Ruskin, William Morris and Edward Burne-Jones. Burne-Jones was such an admirer he kept a copy on his bedside table (63-64).

Chesterton was also well aware of Digby and his work, as his essay "A Grammar of Knighthood" shows. "A Grammar of Knighthood" is found in Chesterton's collection The Well and The Shallows published a year before Chesterton's death and of a more somber tone than most of his previous work. In his essay, Chesterton defends the work of Digby from the criticism of Victorian historian Thomas Macaulay. Chesterton does not provide the source of this criticism, but in summarizing Macaulay, Chesterton argues, "He set himself to belittle certain old tales of courtesy, which is the wedding of humility with dignity. He scoffed at such stories as that of the Black Prince waiting like a servant on his helpless captive [...]" (215). Chesterton references the very episode that Girouard stressed in the paintings of Benjamin West. Again, the virtue at which Macaulay scoffs, prompting Chesterton to criticize Macaulay, is the medieval ideal of treating ones enemies with honor and respect. As following chapters will show, Chesterton consistently enacted this ideal, and as his essay shows, Digby may have been one of the influences on that attribute.

Later in the same essay, Chesterton again proves his familiarity with Digby while dismissing Macaulay's criticism, "What would Macaulay have said if after writing his epigram [...] he had made the bold experiment of opening the book at random, as I did, and reading a paragraph like this [...]" (216). Chesterton proceeds to quote over twenty lines from Digby's Broad Stone of Honour. Chesterton was apparently, not only familiar with Digby, but was also in possession of Digby's work.

Chesterton's experiment of opening Digby's Broad Stone of Honour at random, could have resulted in finding many passages dealing with the chivalric virtue of

courteous treatment towards ones enemies, as found in Volume IV. Digby begins, “The examples of humanity and courtesy in war abound in our ancient annals” (123).

Consistent with Digby’s format, he then proceeds to retell various examples from history that illustrate these customs. He includes examples such as Alphonso the Magnanimous whom, rather than continue a siege against a town at the expense of the inhabitants health, “caused provisions to be distributed among them” (123). Jehan of Helenes in the battle of Poitiers, after learning the name and station of the person he has just stabbed through the thighs with a sword, personally attends to his wounds and provides refuge until the man can be safely taken home (126-127). It is also in this volume where Digby retells the story of the Black Prince hosting his newly conquered enemies to supper (126-127). Digby introduces this vignette with the claim, “The courtesy of the Black Prince to his prisoners has extorted the admiration of all men” (126). The courteous Black Prince may have “extorted the admiration” of Chesterton as well, by way of Digby. And while Chesterton did not serve supper to his prisoners, he did serve his philosophical opponents praise and courtesy, while displaying those virtues he mentions in his essay on Digby, humility and dignity.

Mark Girouard provides one final piece of information concerning Digby that introduces an area of speculation between Digby’s connections with Chesterton. Girouard points out that in his old age Digby lived within Kensington, until his death in 1880, where he would often watch children play (66). One of those children may have been Chesterton himself, as Chesterton was born in a house on Camden Hill in Kensington, and would have been six years old at the time of Digby’s death.

Each of these issues, from Percy's Reliques, as Jerome Mitchell indicates, to Digby's Broad Stone, was elemental in creating the atmosphere into which Chesterton was born; an atmosphere infused with medieval images and stories, not the least of which came from Chesterton's own father. This environment had its influence on Chesterton as he himself acknowledges through his quotations of Scott and instances such as his introduction to his biography Chaucer. In that introduction, written in 1932, Chesterton raises issue with a problem he sees in the Modern era:

The presence of the Guild or the grades of Chivalry, the presence of the particular details of that day, are not of course necessary to all human beings. But the absence of the Guilds and the grades of Chivalry, and the absence of any positive substitute for them, is now a great gap that is none the less a fact because it is a negative fact. (ix)

Much of Chesterton's career dealt with pointing out the negative facts and gaps that he saw in modernism, and he repeatedly used tools and elements from the medieval past in an effort to repair them. This exchange between the Modern and the Medieval found itself played out in a highly combative but chivalrous, and often comical, verbal joust between G.K. Chesterton and George Bernard Shaw. In the following chapter, their relationship as well as Chesterton's encounters with other contemporaries will be explored as a living example of Chesterton's medieval attitudes towards adversaries, both in the flesh and fiction, and the spirit of Modernism. The subsequent chapters will investigate medievalism's influence within his three earliest novels: Chapter Two will examine the overt presence of medievalism within The Napoleon of Notting Hill,

Chesterton's first and most explicitly violent novel of the three discussed; Chapter Three uncovers medieval ideals expressed within The Man Who Was Thursday and how those ideals are a response to Modernist philosophies; Chapter Four will expose the medieval principles at the heart of the duel found in The Ball and The Cross. Throughout this thesis, the role of medievalism and violence will also be examined, as Chesterton presents a significant shift from the heroic and bloody medieval battle in The Napoleon of Notting Hill, to a heroic and bloodless medieval balance by the time of The Ball and the Cross.

Chapter One

Make Mine Medieval: Chesterton Challenges Modernism

“Of course you are superlatively clever; no one denies that. And the cleverest thing you ever did in your life was to hang out the signboard of mediaevalism” (George Bernard Shaw to G.K. Chesterton, “Duel at Dusk” 509).

Chesterton’s life spanned two distinct areas of cultural thought and influence, from the end of the Victorian era to the beginning of the Modernist era. Chesterton’s thoughts were also steeped in two even more distinct eras, the Middle Ages and the 20th Century. Chesterton’s prolific writings, which at present are collected in thirty-five volumes with more volumes projected, repeatedly rely on medieval thought and customs, and just as consistently debate various aspects of Modernism; to cover them all would be an exhaustive endeavor beyond the scope of this thesis let alone this chapter. Therefore, I will examine a sample of Chesterton’s writings about personal encounters with Modernism, and argue that medievalism’s influence has tempered both his argument and his rhetoric. First, I will show how the two views, Chesterton’s medievalism and his adversary’s modernism, manifested themselves in Chesterton’s non-fiction writings and personal debates. I will then show how this same engagement with the two ideologies is represented within Chesterton’s early novels. Throughout, I will argue that because of the medieval influence on Chesterton, the philosophical and theological conflicts he

encountered were marked with a respect and often an admiration for and from his adversaries, both fictional and real, seldom seen in ideological debates of today.

This chapter explores 1) a sample of Chesterton's philosophical disagreements with Modernism in his essays; 2) his theological disagreements with the Modern trend in his debates with Robert Blatchford; 3) his sociological and economic disagreements with Modernism through his debates with George Bernard Shaw.

Often in Chesterton's writing, where there is a confrontation with Modernism, there is a corresponding response from his medieval ideal. This pairing is seen in many of his essays. Throughout his journalistic career, from his earliest assignment writing reviews for The Bookman, to his weekly essays for The Speaker and Daily News, to his contributions for his own G.K.'s Weekly, Chesterton wrote hundreds of essays on everything from "Cheese" to "Social Reform versus Birth Control." The views and opinions of Chesterton were ever available to the readers of England from the turn of the century until his death in 1936. Many were collected in volumes published during his lifetime. One of these collections, All I Survey, was published in 1933 and contains "On Turnpikes and Mediævalism," which vividly illustrates Chesterton's medieval confrontation with modernism.

In this essay, Chesterton responds to an article he had read recently, titled "A Relic of Mediævalism." The relic of which the article speaks is a turnpike, but Chesterton uses the piece to launch into what he saw as the more pressing issue, the modern notion that medievalism was negative and only modern progress positive. In the process of debating that thought, he comments:

For though today is always today and the moment is always modern, we are the only men in all history who fell back upon bragging about the mere fact that today is not yesterday. I fear that some in the future will explain it by saying that we had precious little else to brag about. Mediæval people never worried about being mediæval; and modern people do worry horribly about being modern. (13-14)

Chesterton argues that this line of thinking mistakenly removes the more important issue of whether or not the subject is good or bad, by prioritizing the judgment of whether or not something is old or modern.

Chesterton believes that too many ideas were being cast aside because they failed to be modern, and points out in this essay the trouble which might arise if such thinking were applied to a broader scale: “We should express some regret if somebody blew up Westminster Abbey [...] Doubts would trouble us if the Government burned all existing copies of Dante’s *Divine Comedy* and Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales* [...]” (14). Chesterton demonstrates his well-known wit as he also shows the lasting importance of medieval works. He concludes his essay by returning to the modern as he addresses the issue of whether or not a turnpike really is a bad thing, which he points out should have been asked first. Surmising that the absence of a turnpike may increase driving fatalities, he concludes “And about this, I for one still have a scruple; which is probably a relic of mediævalism” (18). Throughout the essay Chesterton uses medieval ideas and “relics” to speak against modern ideas on progress, ways of thinking (old versus new rather than

good versus bad) and priorities (“motorcars” before “mankind”). Chesterton treats these last two issues in his essay “On Misunderstanding.”

“On Misunderstanding,” included in his collection Generally Speaking, was published in 1929. In this case, the catalyst for Chesterton’s essay was a critic’s misinterpretation of one of his earlier articles. In that previous article Chesterton comments that music during meals interrupts conversations, but the comment had been “misunderstood” to mean that music during meals interrupts digestion. This misunderstanding prompts Chesterton to proclaim “[it] has given me the momentary illusion of having really got hold of what is the matter with modernity [...] all the dullness, baseness, vulgarity, and fear that make up so much of the practical philosophy of this enlightened age” (103). Within the next few lines we see Chesterton refer to aspects of medieval custom and culture to counteract the modern mistake. He corrects:

What I complained of was not that music interfered with animal assimilation, but that it interfered with human speech, with the talk of taverns like the Tabard and the Mermaid [...] with all the ancient Christian custom of men arguing each other’s heads off and shouting each other down for the glory of reason and truth. Those great talkers no more thought about their digestion at dinner than the heroes of the *Illiad* or the *Song of Roland* felt their own pulses and took their own temperatures in the thick of battle. (104)

Here we see Chesterton not only perturbed with the misconstrued modern prioritizing, but we also see Chesterton harkening back to the classics of Homer and the medieval

Song of Roland. In the two groups of examples from the past that Chesterton uses against the modern mindset, one is engaged in shouting for the glory of truth, the other is involved in battling for it. In both cases the priority is not digestion, but something higher. The focus on digestion brings the attention to, as Chesterton said earlier, the dull and the base, and this is why Chesterton says, the moderns have gotten wrong what those of the medieval (and classic) period had right; namely, the notion of what is important (conversation) and what is trivial (digestion).

Chesterton continues arguing that the Moderns have reversed the proper order of priority. Chesterton prioritized this way: digestion is for health, health for life, and life for music “or beautiful things” whereas the moderns would say music is for digestion (107). Chesterton supports his arrangement with a medieval reference, “I think it was a great mediæval philosopher who said that all evil comes from enjoying what we ought to use and using what we ought to enjoy. A great many modern philosophers never do anything else” (107). That “great mediæval philosopher” was St. Thomas Aquinas, whose biography Chesterton was to write four years later in 1933. The quote was taken from Aquinas’s Summa Theologica and his discussion of human virtue and order. Aquinas himself is quoting an earlier work by St. Augustine, Eighty-Three Different Questions. Augustine comments, “[...] good order (also called virtue) consists in the desire to enjoy what ought to be enjoyed and to use what ought to be used” (56). All three authors address the importance of order. Chesterton credits Aquinas and the medieval for having the correct order as he lambastes the moderns for their disorder. Once again he couples the medieval to the modern in effort to bring balance back to his world.

Chesterton not only argues against the moderns for their misplaced values, he often also criticized them for their misplaced sense of levity, as will be seen in Napoleon on Notting Hill. His essay "On Flags," also found in Generally Speaking, while lamenting modern simplicity, also evidences a sincere pleasure for the medieval pageantry perhaps tied to his childhood memories of his Toy Theatre. This enthusiasm introduces one of the first medieval tactics found in Chesterton's style of confrontation; joy. Chesterton draws joy from the pageantry of medievalism, but also joy from the chivalric notion of battle and engagement often seen in the romances of Scott:

With all their banners bravely spread,
 And all their armor flashing high,
 Saint George might waken from the dead,
 To see fair England's standards fly. (Scott, Marmion VI.XXI.632-635)

The joy of arguing his ideals can be seen in one of Chesterton's earliest public debates, which took place on the field of newsprint, and represents Chesterton's theological arguments against a growing modern mindset. In 1903 Robert Blatchford, editor of a socialist newspaper Clarion, wrote a series of articles in response to a book titled The Riddle of the Universe. Blatchford's articles argue against the validity of religion and that any foundations on which religion had been built were now soundly destroyed by science (Dooley 195-196). Blatchford's stance represents a growing shift from the adherence to an orthodox Christianity as held by most Victorians to a more naturalistic evolutionary view of the cosmos and a position of religious doubt found in many Moderns.

Chesterton was beginning his career as a journalist when the debate arose, and he mentions it in his Autobiography:

I had just had a very pugnacious public argument with Mr. Blatchford, which, as I was then a comparatively young though relatively rising journalist, was naturally a landmark in my life [...] What I was defending seemed to me a plain matter of ordinary human morals [...] It was the question of Responsibility, sometimes called the question of Free Will, which Mr. Blatchford had attacked in a series of vigorous and even violent proclamations of Determinism [...] (180- 181)

Chesterton's responses to Blatchford, as well as other Christians who had written to the Clarion, were collected in The Religious Doubts of Democracy edited by George Haw in 1904. David Dooley, editor of Volume I of the Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton, highlights the letters between Blatchford and Chesterton that appeared in the Clarion preceding the Chesterton essays found in Haw's collection. Dooley's examination of those early letters is found in his essay "Chesterton in Debate with Blatchford: The Development of a Controversialist" and sheds light on the medieval influence within Chesterton's debating style.

As Blatchford was publishing articles against Christianity in his Clarion, Chesterton began writing rebuttals in his weekly Saturday column published in The Daily News and in six articles for Commonwealth between July and December 1903. Chesterton also submitted letters to the Clarion and of these Dooley especially notices Chesterton's August 28th reply. Chesterton expresses the joy of debate as he exclaims, "I

am sure you are enjoying this argument as much as I am, and it was like your chivalry to answer me at such length” (Quoted in Dooley 204). Here is an example of Chesterton fully engaged in a topic of utmost importance to him, the faith on which his worldview is built, and in the midst of defending that faith he pauses to speak of the joy found in the ideological battle and to honor his adversary for being chivalrous. In this type of statement Chesterton shows a confidence and pleasure in the engagement, and while he is sincere in his endeavor to win the argument, he still acknowledges joy in the theological joust.

Blatchford’s and Chesterton’s debate focuses on the idea of Determinism, held by Blatchford, and the idea of free will, held by Chesterton. The story of Adam became the symbolic figure for both sides of the argument, first used by Blatchford as quoted by Dooley, “Now, then, did God make Adam? He did. Did God make the faculties of his brain? He did [...] Then, if this man Adam was so made that his desire would overcome his obedience, was it not a foregone conclusion that he would eat the apple? It was” (202). Blatchford’s argument is concise, devoid of the sense of fun Chesterton assumes they are both having. But when Chesterton approaches the same topic he expresses the mirth he admits having:

What is the point of insisting that a man cannot say that Adam fell, when by the same argument a man cannot even say, ‘Please pass the mustard’? For ‘please’ means ‘if you please,’ and this is free will: the Blatchfordian formula would be ‘if God has so constructed your psychology.’ (Quoted in Dooley 203)

Chesterton's playfulness manifests itself even in his logic. Both his tone during his debate and his outright admission of enjoying the argument, display his romantic nostalgia for combat, valor, and the glory of the battlefield. They bring to mind the image of the young G.K. Chesterton on his way to school, "repeating militant lines of 'Marmion' with passionate emphasis and exultation [...]" (Chesterton, Autobiography 65).

But while Chesterton clearly displays a confident joy in his Blatchford debate, he also demonstrates in the course of their dialogue a sincere appreciation and respect for his opponent as well as a humility often unheard of in any modern debates of this sort, and both of these traits can find antecedents to the medieval ideal of chivalry.

The trait of admiration for his enemy is found in the first essay found in the collection edited by George Haw.¹ In that essay, Chesterton begins by "offering to Mr. Blatchford our [gra]titude, and something which is [bet]ter than gratitude, our congratula[tio]ns, upon the very magnanimous [act]ion which he has taken in thus [pu]tting his paper into the hands of [his] religious opponents. In doing so [he] has scored, in a generous unconsciousness, a real point" (17). Before Chesterton even begins to discuss where Blatchford's argument may have fault, he first points out the positive attributes of his adversary. Not only does he pay tribute to his theological adversary, he also draws attention to a weakness on his own side of the argument; "It certainly is a fair point scored against a religion that the people who seem to be most interested in it are

¹ Due to the fragile nature of the 1904 edition, the pages are broken from the spine making some text illegible, but can, in most cases, be safely inferred by context. The text was verified by cross-examination of the essay as it appeared in "The Blatchford Controversies" from The Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton: Vol. 1: Heretics, Orthodoxy, The Blatchford Controversies.

those who believe it to be a fraud [...] Mr. Blatchford's magnanimity, like all magnanimity, is profoundly philosophical and wise" (17). As Chesterton concedes, "a fair point scored," he then goes a step farther and continues to praise his assailant. This is a characteristic that will appear throughout Chesterton's life and work.

On the surface these attributes may appear only to be a rhetorical ruse, used to soften up the opponent before the metaphorical attack, were it not for Chesterton's consistency of temperament. Were this only subterfuge, it would seem that at some point within the argument a more aggressive tone would become manifest, yet Chesterton maintains the same level of benevolence towards his opponent even as he begins dismantling his opponent's argument. He speaks of Blatchford in the same way during the debate as he does after the debate. Martin Gardner's "Levels of Allegory in *The Ball and the Cross*" discusses the relevance of the debate to Chesterton's novel The Ball and the Cross. Gardner goes so far as to assert, "Indeed, Chesterton had more respect for him [Blatchford] than Blatchford had for Chesterton" (39). Chesterton's lasting friendship with Blatchford would imply sincere sentiment as opposed to a subtle rhetorical device of humility.

In the course of Chesterton and Blatchford's debate, Chesterton continues to reveal this quality. During the course of the debate as it appeared in each of their respective newspapers, Chesterton comments on the argument in a way that could be interpreted as being callous. Dooley's essay includes Chesterton's phrase, "No, Mr. Blatchford, you will not cease your war against Christianity; but Christianity (being otherwise employed) will cease its war against you" (200-201). The idea of Christianity ceasing its war

against Blatchford, “being otherwise employed,” is noticeably incongruous to the reality of Chesterton’s columns and letters, which are fully employed in defeating Blatchford’s philosophy. Blatchford justly points out this inconsistency, and at the same time takes issue with the condescending tone of Chesterton’s remark (201).

Chesterton’s response to this fallacy is not an effort to fill holes in his argument; instead it is a very open apology for what his earlier comment had been taken to mean.

Chesterton writes:

Dear Mr. Blatchford,— I should be genuinely grateful if you would insert this letter in the CLARION, but chiefly because this would give me the opportunity of publicly correcting what appears to be a possible interpretation of my personal tone. If any phrases of mine have been so clumsy as to convey the idea that I thought you, or pretended to think you, “incompetent and stupid,” they expressed the very reverse of my thoughts. I think of you what I have always thought—that you are an honor to England and to journalism, and that I am proud to be of the same people and the same trade. (Dooley 201)

Chesterton makes every effort to mark the distinction between his feeling towards his opponent’s character and his opponent’s position of argument. When the sword appears to strike not the position but the man, Chesterton retreats, lays down his arms and asks forgiveness.

This type of action could stem from two distinct points. The one as expressed by Chesterton is an attempt to clarify his comment and show that he does indeed hold his

opponent in high regard. The other point, not chiefly expressed, is that by doing so Chesterton makes clear the intent of the dialogue: the achievement of truth. If the dialogue shifted, or broadened its focus to include character smearing, then the objective of truth becomes diluted or dissipated. For Chesterton, the object of the debate is not about the destruction of the man, but the destruction of falsity. In "On Misunderstanding," Chesterton seems to desire the "shouting each other down for the glory of reason and the truth" (104), but not merely to win, and certainly not by debasing the character of his opponent. The goal is reason and truth, and Chesterton seeks to attack his not opponent's character but his opponent's opinion. And where Chesterton finds himself crossing that line of distinction, he retreats to apologize.

Chesterton displayed these attributes in one of his first public debates, but he continued to use them throughout his career. His use of medieval tropes was noticed and mentioned by one of his greatest friends and most vigilant sparring partners, George Bernard Shaw.

The relationship between Shaw and Chesterton has received much attention, and although each author wrote often of the other, neither gives a specific time or place as to how their initial meeting occurred. What is emphasized in their accounts is a genuine respect for the other's abilities, even when speaking critically.

The areas of disagreement between Chesterton and Shaw are given an overview in his Autobiography, "I began arguing with Mr. Bernard Shaw in print almost as early as I began doing anything [...] I have argued with him on almost every subject in the world; and we have always been on opposite sides, without affectation or animosity" (229, 231).

Chesterton devotes three pages to outlining the range and reasons for several of those arguments, which included subjects as diverse as war and vegetarianism.

For Chesterton, as he explains in his Autobiography, the debates served their relationship better than agreement, “[...] I can testify that I have never read a reply by Bernard Shaw that did not leave me in a better and not a worse temper or frame of mind; which did not seem to come out of inexhaustible fountains of fair-mindedness and intellectual geniality [...] (233). He goes on to say, “It is necessary to disagree with him as much as I do, in order to admire him as much as I do; and I am proud of him as a foe even more than as a friend” (233).

Fortunately for Chesterton he had ample opportunity to encounter Shaw as his foe. The two had known each other for nearly ten years and had publicly commented on each other’s work, especially with Chesterton’s 1908 biography George Bernard Shaw, before their first public debate in 1911. William Furlong details the encounter in his book, GBS/GKC: Shaw and Chesterton. The debate is more rightly described as a series of lectures to the Heretics Club of Cambridge. The first address was given by Shaw and was titled “The Religion of the Future.” The address generated a vast amount of controversy in the press, and Chesterton was asked to respond (73-75). Their selection of Chesterton was apropos.

By this time Chesterton had published Heretics (1905), with a chapter devoted to Shaw, which is his argument against the negative spirit of the age as espoused by various aspects of society such as art, literature and politics. Chesterton references his opponent and friend in his “Introductory Remarks”: “I am not concerned with Mr. Bernard Shaw

as one of the most brilliant [...] and honest men alive; I am concerned with him as a Heretic—that is to say a man whose philosophy is quite solid, quite coherent, and quite wrong” (22). Chesterton follows this critique by giving his motives for the book, motives which find their foundation once again in medieval philosophy; “I revert to the doctrinal methods of the thirteenth century, inspired by the general hope of getting something done” (22-23). Responding to criticism of Heretics, which was criticized for outlining the negative thought of his age without giving a positive alternative, Chesterton soon wrote a companion entitled Orthodoxy (1908). This work is Chesterton’s defense for the validity of, and his belief in, Christianity. The Heretic Club was well aware of Chesterton’s positions concerning both Shaw and religion when they chose him as their speaker.

The press specifically emphasized two of Shaw’s comments from his speech for the Heretic Club; the ideas that God had died in the 19th Century and that the attempt of Christ to achieve the realization of God had failed (Furlong 74, 84-85). The press focused on these comments, but failed to report on the rest of Shaw’s argument, that while he thought Christ “had helped, the work of at least attempting to realize God” (85), Christianity “had been to a great extent a failure” (85). It would be nearly six months later, on November 17, 1911, before Chesterton responded at the Heretics club, during which time the press had devoted much space to Shaw’s “God is Dead” and “Jesus a Failure” statements.

The opening response by Chesterton, an “orthodox” Christian, was quite different from what many would expect. In response to the notion that God had died in the nineteenth century, Chesterton fully agreed. He went on to argue that in fact God “had

died many times before, had died in fact in parts of the Middle Ages [...]” (75), and to ask what would be the more interesting question “of how in hell or heaven God had managed to come back to life so many times” (75). Chesterton’s response is similar to his debate with Blatchford in that he begins with acknowledging a “fair point scored.” By this concession, Chesterton is able to clear the field of false targets and realign his focus on what he considers to be the more central issue of truth.

Responding to Shaw’s other comment concerning the failure of Christ, he takes an opening stance similar to his introduction to Shaw’s “God is Dead” remark. He asks, “How could Mr. Shaw blaspheme by saying that Christ or the Christian or the Christian religion had failed in England when the remark is obviously true” (87). He then points out governmental work policies, which he likens to slavery, and suggests that many leaders of government believe in no religion at all, in order to emphasize the areas of truth in Shaw’s comment. Chesterton continues this defense of Shaw’s comment by asserting that to accuse Shaw of blasphemy would be like St. Peter accusing Tiberius for the same offence (87). Chesterton finishes his vindication of Shaw, “Mr. Shaw is living in a comparatively Pagan world. He is something of a Pagan himself and like many other Pagans, he is a very fine man” (87).

With both comments, Chesterton manifests similar views as seen in the Blatchford debates. He opens by assenting to the points where he agrees with Shaw, similar to his concession to Blatchford in regards to the weakness evident in his side’s argument. Also, in both cases before Chesterton begins dismantling his opponent’s argument he acknowledges their strengths, magnanimity, and wisdom. In the case of Shaw, he

recognizes the validity of his cultural insight as well as Shaw's being "a very fine man." Chesterton's words parallel the visual action of the fencer saluting before the dual, expressing courtesy and respect for the opponent. Edward Furlong's description of the rest of Chesterton's rebuttal is consistent with the behavior he demonstrated when arguing with Blatchford. Furlong notes, "Then [Chesterton] proceeded to make a point by point attack on Shaw's speech but only in areas where he thought G.B.S. might be validly attacked" (95). Furlong's comment again bears similarity to the fencer who may only receive the point for striking in the target area; in the same way Chesterton begins by declaring what areas of dispute are valid points of contention. Both actions find their antecedents in the chivalry of medievalism.

Shaw often spoke of Chesterton's medievalism, accusing him of hanging out the medieval signboard. In the debate from which that originates Shaw continues to point out, in an unfavorable light, how Chesterton has used medieval themes and ideology in his career.

Denis J. Conlon, editor of The Collected Works of G. K. Chesterton Vol. XI: Plays, Chesterton on Shaw, provides an introductory note for "A Duel at Dusk" giving the circumstances for this debate. On July 30, 1922, in the home of a mutual friend, Shaw encounters Chesterton, on what may be the first time in person since Chesterton's acceptance into the Roman Catholic Church. Hesketh Pearson, who would later write a biography of Shaw, was present for the event and took a verbatim report (577). Conlon's note also asserts that those present for the debate "were of the opinion that Shaw was none too pleased with his friend [...]" and "Shaw made his opening remark in an

accusatory tone” (Editor’s Note 577). Shaw opened by asking what excuse he had for not being drunk (577)?

After this curt introduction, and some ambling banter between the two on just why Chesterton was not drunk, Shaw comments on Chesterton’s medieval signboard. Shaw follows up his remark on Chesterton’s brilliant move by giving his reason for his medieval tactics; “You suddenly realized with a shock that there was no room for a second Shaw among the modern intellectuals” (578). This is the reason Shaw gives for Chesterton’s embrace of the medieval. Shaw further explains, “You talked about Guilds, about Peasant Proprietorship [...] and by carefully evading every knotty point in the Socialist case [...] annihilating logic of the Fabians which cropped up at every turn, you managed to rally all the wild romantic idiots in the country round your banner” (578). Shaw uses the medieval language employed so often by Chesterton to argue against Chesterton’s position. Although Shaw is speaking negatively of Chesterton’s medieval tactics, he clearly demonstrates the reality of their presence in Chesterton’s thought and actions. Shaw also brings up an issue on which many of their debates focused, governmental reform.

Both men espoused socialist views, but each was a staunch supporter of his own particular brand. In their many debates on the subject, characteristics of Chesterton’s debating style, which have been discussed, can be seen.

Chesterton’s political thought stood on the platform of Distributism, which seeks to distribute land and property equally, like socialism, but then allow individual, rather than governmental, ownership. Shaw’s political allegiance was with the Fabian’s, an

organization that sought socialist reform through a gradual yet sustained influence in government. Each political view will be further explored as they appear in Chesterton's novels, particularly in Napoleon of Notting Hill, but these were the areas of argument in one of Chesterton and Shaw's more popular debates.

The debate, titled "G.B.S. Versus G.K. C" also collected in Vol. X of The Collected Works, was held on November 30, 1911, in Memorial Hall, London, and is reprinted from Christian Commonwealth of the same date.

Shaw opens the debate by giving his arguments for the validity of socialism, especially as opposed to collectivism. He then presents his definitions for those terms and finishes by arguing against the Democrat. Chesterton's response is immediately in line with his chivalric nature as he opens with his customary salute to his opponent, "I approach this question with all the more diffidence and difficulty because of the extraordinarily brilliant and interesting address Mr. Shaw has delivered upon a totally different subject" (491). Not only does Chesterton again honor his opponent by highlighting Shaw's intelligence, he also shows his mirth in the engagement through the wit of his opening, simultaneously showing respect, joy, and an effective offensive lunge in the debate.

Of Chesterton's three responses to Shaw in this debate, he opens each argument with a similar approach, paying tribute to Shaw, before happily refuting him: "I cannot understand why so dexterous and brilliant a debater as Mr. Shaw should have wasted so much time in attacking the present system of industrial England" (495); and "Mr. Shaw has favored me with another definition of Socialism—equality in the possession of

property. This is not the normal definition of the term" (496). Chesterton's style remains consistent whether the argument is turnpikes, Faith, or Government, a medieval mix of respect for his adversary, a joy of engagement, and commitment to an objective truth, even when that means conceding to his enemy. Chesterton's debates with Shaw and Blatchford exemplify the same philosophies and tactics he employs within his essays as he attacks emerging modern ideology. His character enacts his argument whether in print or in person as his convictions and his courtesy derive from the same source, medieval ideals concerning religion, society and character.

Medieval philosophy provides the motivation for his attacks against modern views of government, a growing trend towards solipsism, and deteriorating faith in the validity of the Church. Medieval ideals provide the avenues for his engagement and attitude for him to embody in his attack; foremost is a profound respect for his adversary. The arguments Chesterton makes against modern thought as seen in his personal debates and essays are also manifest in his novels. Chesterton's characters express strikingly similar attitudes toward and approaches to their adversaries as their creator has shown in his own life. The exploration of these themes and similarities will next be addressed as they appear in his first novel The Napoleon of Notting Hill.

Chapter Two

The Napoleon of Notting Hill: The Future of Medievalism

“Mr. Gilbert Chesterton has done a wonderful thing; out of the dull drab ore of modernity he has struck a new vein of romance” (Bettany “G.K.C.’s Strange Story of a Duel” 87).

According to Massie Ward’s biography Gilbert Keith Chesterton, before beginning work on what was to be his first novel The Napoleon of Notting Hill, Chesterton took his last ten shillings, got a shave, went to one of his favorite pubs and ordered a massive lunch and a bottle of wine. Afterwards, he proceeded to his publisher with the outline of his novel. When Chesterton left the office he had twenty gold sovereigns to bring to his wife (174). Commenting on the incident, Ward quotes Chesterton as saying, “What a fool a man is, when he comes to the last ditch, not to spend the last farthing to satisfy the inner man before he goes out to fight a battle with his wits” (174).

The romantic spirit and resolve Chesterton displays in his own life manifest themselves in many of the characters of his The Napoleon of Notting Hill. The novel also displays more overtly than any of his other novels Chesterton’s love of medieval ceremony and romance. Within this spectacle of a reincarnated middle ages, the reader finds how Chesterton’s chivalric idealism tempers individual relationships, and how his

nostalgia for pageantry and spirit argue against Modernism as a pessimistic and dulling philosophy of life.

The novel is set in an England 80 years in the future, 1984.¹ Scientifically and materially England is hardly changed from England of 1904. Men still wear frockcoats and top hats; the streets are still lined with gas lamps. The most significant change is political. England and most of the world have given up on revolutions because as the narrator explains, "it stands to common sense that you cannot upset all existing things, customs, and compromises, unless you believe in something outside them, something positive and divine. Now, England, during this century, lost all belief in this" (226).² The despair of the positive and divine causes a government apathetic towards its leadership, therefore the despot "king" is chosen at random much like a jury member, "No one cared how, no one cared who" (226).

Because of this political system Auberon Quin, a whimsical government worker who cares only about a good joke, is elected King. One of his first acts as King is to proclaim his "Charter of the Cities" which divides London into its separate boroughs. Quin assigns detailed histories and distinct medieval regalia to each borough as an elaborate farce. The conflict of the novel arises when one of the inhabitants of Notting Hill, Adam Wayne, takes the joke seriously. As a result when the neighboring boroughs attempt to build a road through Pump Street, a road at the heart of Notting Hill, Wayne is

¹ Many have speculated and disputed this novel's influence on George Orwell's futuristic novel set in the same year. For a detailed examination of the connection between the two see: Burkhardt, Louis C. "G.K. Chesterton and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*."

² All quotes from the novel are taken from *G. K. Chesterton: The Collected Works Vol. VI*, and will hereafter be referred to by page numbers in this edition. This collection uses the 1927 edition as it appeared in the Chesterton Omnibus, published by Methuen and Company.

ready to defend to the death, with as many halberds as he can muster, his borough protected by royal dictum.

Chesterton's novel was published in 1904 to mixed reviews many of which are collected in G.K. Chesterton: The Critical Judgments, Part I: 1900-1907 edited by D.J. Conlon. Many praised the novel as F. G. Bettany's review from The Sunday Times of March 27, 1904 shows in his comment concerning Chesterton striking a new vein of romance. Yet, an unsigned review from Today 6 April 1904 illustrates the range of responses as expressed by just one reviewer, "I cannot honestly say whether it is very clever, very fantastical, very purposeful, or very ridiculous" (91). More modern commentary generally concedes that the novel is clever, fantastic and ridiculous in a positive light, but offers various views on the novel's purpose and meaning.

Most criticism acknowledges the political significance of The Napoleon of Notting Hill; even Chesterton comments on this connection in his Autobiography. In his chapter "Nationalism and Notting Hill" Chesterton relates his impressions and views of the Boer War. He adamantly opposed Imperialism as England expressed it during this conflict. He declares, "I hated its confidence, its congratulatory anticipations [...] I hated its vile assurance of victory" (110). When the Boers began experiencing small victories Chesterton comments, "all this swelled up within me into vague images of a modern resurrection of Marathon or Thermopylae; and I saw again my recurring dream of the unscalable tower and the besieging citizens; and began to draw out the rude outlines of my little romance" (110). The little romance became The Napoleon of Notting Hill, and

this is a sentiment most evident within his novel; the spirit of a small patriotic province withstanding the advance of far greater numbers assured of victory.

Chesterton's novel forcefully derides all that he hates about England's attitude during the Boar War. On the opposing side of England's attitude, Ian Boyd in The Novels of G.K. Chesterton comments that Chesterton "celebrates the superiority of the human spirit to mere force and numbers." This indomitable human spirit is most clearly expressed through Adam Wayne, and Wayne is significantly the one most attached to the medieval pageantry, which for Chesterton best symbolizes this ideal.

The presence of medievalism within this novel generally receives attention in terms of its socio-political implications. Quentin Lauer in G.K. Chesterton: Philosopher without Portfolio argues that Chesterton was not advocating a return to a medieval society. Instead, Lauer contends that Chesterton "quite clearly rejects the romantic notion that such a social order should or could be restored" (76). The outcome of the novel supports this claim, as Auberon Quin's implantation of a neo-medieval social structure results in multiple wars and blood "running [...] in great red serpents, that curl into the main thoroughfare and shine in the moon" (Napoleon 348-439). The distinction should be made that Chesterton is rejecting medievalism as a social order, not ideologically, and he is rejecting medievalism as it is managed under the auspices of Auberon Quin and interpreted by Adam Wayne, whose individual faults will be examined.

Chesterton's poem "Mediaevalism" supports Lauer's comment. The first verse asks whether, if men returned to the Middle Ages, they would be able to bring back "The

name and fame of the tabard, the tangle of gules and gold" (Collected Works Vol. X 552). In the second verse he answers:

Nay, there is none rides back to pick up a glove or a feather,
Though the gauntlet rang with honour or the plume was more than a
crown:

And hushed is the holy trumpet that called the nations together

And under the Horns of Hattin the hope of the world went down. (553).

Chesterton is referencing the battle of Hattin in 1187, which led to the Christians loss of control of Jerusalem. This sentiment echoes Lauer's in that, materially, medievalism cannot be reintroduced to modern society.

Yet Chesterton's poem places the absence of medievalism's return not on medievalism, but on Modern society's abandonment of the past. Aidan Mackey, editor of The Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton: Vol. X: Collected Poetry, dates the poem between 1918 and 1921. The poem consists of eight quatrains rhyming A, B, A, B and is written in dactylic hexameter. Chesterton's choice of form is appropriate for "Mediaevalism" as it is also known as Homeric hexameter, the form of The Iliad and The Odyssey and a form often used by poets of the Middle Ages. Chaucer's Canterbury Tales even discusses the form in "The Monk's Prologue." The form was especially associated with chivalry for Chesterton as seen in his discussion of Troy in The Everlasting Man, published in 1925. Chesterton discusses the everlasting quality of Troy in spite of, rather because of its fall. He argues:

And as with the city so with the hero; traced in archaic lines in that primeval twilight is found the first figure of the Knight. There is a prophetic coincidence in his title; we have spoken of the word chivalry and how it seems to mingle the horseman with the horse. It is almost anticipated ages before in the thunder of the Homeric hexameter, and that long leaping word with which the *Iliad* ends. It is that very unity for which we can find no name but the holy centaur of chivalry. (80)

Chesterton associates of the closing line of The Iliad, in Homeric hexameter, and the funeral of Hector, who tamed horses, with the advent of chevalier and chivalry.

Chesterton uses the “thunder of the Homeric hexameter” to explore the absence of medievalism.

In Chesterton’s poem, while “none rides back to pick up the glove or the feather,” it is not because the glove or feather is not worth riding back for. The reason is found in stanza three, lines ten and eleven:

Because you have sought new homes and all that you sought is so,
 Because you had trodden the fire and barred the door in departing [...]
 (553)

Chesterton’s verse carries the same sentiment as his essay “On Turnpikes and Mediævalism,” concerning how “modern people do worry horribly about being modern” (14), and in always looking forward seeking the new, they have barred the door of the past. Yet, despite seeking the new, trodding the fire, and barring the door, the specter of medievalism haunts the modern world:

But now, at your new road's end, you have seen the face of a fate,
 That not as a child looks back, and not as a fool remembers,
 All that men took too lightly and all that they love too late.
 It is you that have made no rubric for saints, nor raiment for lovers
 Your caps that cry for a feather, your roofs that sigh for a spire [...]
 Have ye not known, ye fools that have made the present a prison,
 That thirst can remember water and hunger remember bread? (553)

These lines echo the opening image of The Napoleon of Notting Hill: a dull, monochromatic, and apathetic London void of rubrics, doctrines, and raiment, until Auberon Quin and Adam Wayne.

Auberon Quin may have been experiencing a subconscious desire for the medieval past of Chesterton's poem, and have been responding out of this desire, but Ian Boyd's "Chesterton's Medievalism" points out "The medieval scheme of The Napoleon of Notting Hill turns out, after all, to be only a joke. The scheme originates with Auberon Quin who knows nothing about the real medieval past and cares nothing about the success of [sic] failure of medieval politics" (245). Auberon admits this point in the last chapter when he concedes, "Wayne, it was all a joke. When I made these cities, I cared no more for them than I care for a centaur, or a merman [...] or any other absurdity" (Napoleon 376). Since the medieval cities and ceremony are all a joke, and since as a political system it ends in catastrophe, does the presence of medieval ceremony and ideology offer any redeeming qualities? The transformation of certain characters within the novel and Wayne himself, as will be discussed, asserts that it does. Lauer also argues

that while Chesterton rejects a medieval social order “What he does think [...] is that the medieval ideal is still valid and worthy of better realization” (76-77).

The area of focus where medieval ideals find better realization within the novel is the spirit of man³. Specifically, Chesterton uses medieval pageantry to confront what he perceived as an oppressive pessimism and apathy located within Modern philosophy. This view is expressed in the narrator’s comment concerning the absence of revolutions in the future due to the loss of belief in the positive and divine. Chesterton comments on this opinion in his Autobiography, “I did not so much mind the pessimist who complained that there was so little good. But I was furious, even to slaying, with the pessimist who asked what was the good of good” (99). This pessimistic attitude appears to be the same one conveyed in Chesterton’s *England of 1984*; “That vague and somewhat depressed reliance upon things happening as they have always happened, which is with all Londoners a mood, had become an assumed condition” (226). The assumed condition, more than the assumed politics, is what is most at stake within the novel. Quin admits as much when speaking of the conflict his medieval “Charter” has created. He declares, “For me it’s the one joke that may save me from pessimism” (311).

The ability of medieval romanticism as a way to battle this condition is given a preliminary expression in Auberon’s visual experience with frockcoats. Early in the novel, before Auberon is selected King, he is walking to work behind his companions, “the short Government official looked at the coat-tails of the tall Government officials,

³ Men are the only gender given expression in the novel. Chesterton’s position on feminism has received more criticism than the absence of female voice in The Napoleon of Notting Hill. For criticism concerning Chesterton and Feminism see: Philip Jenkins’ “Feminism: Or, Chesterton’s Mistake about Women”, and Alice Von Hildebrand’s “G.K. Chesterton on Feminism.”

and through street after street, and round corner after corner, saw only coat-tails, coat-tails, and again coat-tails [...]" (227). The unvarying dress corresponds to the "depressed reliance upon things happening as they have always happened" (226). But at this point Auberon encounters a transformed and transforming image, "Two black dragons were walking backwards in front of him" (227). The buttons of the coat tails become the dragon's eyes, and the slit between the tails becomes the dragon's nose. Auberon's ability to imagine dragons in coat tails establishes the first medieval crack into the mind-numbing Modern mood of future England. Chesterton expresses the shift in this way, "When the chord of monotony is stretched most tight, then it breaks with a sound like song" (228). The song heralds the coming of one of the first spots of color into the monochromatic landscape.

This color appears in the form of Juan del Fuego, exiled President of Nicaragua, the last country to resist and fall to an Imperial power. His entrance is complete spectacle, and begins the revitalizing of dreary England, "The weather, though cold and blank, was now quite clear and across the dull brown of the wood pavement and between the dull grey terraces was moving something not to be seen for miles around—not to be seen perhaps at that time in England—a man dressed in bright colours" (231). Del Fuego appears like the Green Knight as a tall man in a bright green uniform, a green furred cloak, wearing medals and a long sword (231-232). His actions are no less wonderful than his clothing, as the first thing he does, before addressing the crowd that has gathered around him, is to cut a section from a Coleman's Mustard advertisement with a pen knife. After asking if anyone has any red, and finding that no one does, he cuts his own hand;

“The blood fell with so full a stream that it struck the stones without dripping” (234). Del Fuego soaks his handkerchief with his blood, and pins the handkerchief and the yellow strip of the advertisement to his chest (233-234). These are the colors of Nicaragua.

Del Fuego explains the significance of his actions when Quin and his companions, James Barker and Wilfrid Lambert, gather for lunch. Del Fuego addresses the fact that, politically, Nicaragua has been conquered, “Nicaragua has been conquered like Athens. Nicaragua has been annexed like Jerusalem [...] The Yankee and the German and the brute powers of modernity have trampled it with the hoofs of oxen. But Nicaragua is not dead. Nicaragua is an idea” (235). The idea of Nicaragua, an independent and valorous nation, takes root in Auberon Quin’s imagination; although primarily as a farce, the idea is then engrafted into the young Adam Wayne who grows into the Provost of Notting Hill, whose colors are none other than yellow and red, the same as Nicaragua.

Symbolically, colors best represent the *idea* of Nicaragua, as Del Fuego explains this during his lunch conversation; “Can you not understand the ancient sanctity of colors? The Church has her symbolic colours. And think of what colours mean to us—think of the position of one like myself, who can see nothing but those two colours, nothing but the red and the yellow [...] Blood and a splash of mustard can be my heraldry” (235-236). The sanctity of Del Fuego’s colors, of Del Fuego’s idea and heraldry, are in direct contrast to Barker’s modernism, as Barker declares, “We moderns believe in a great cosmopolitan civilization, one which shall include all the talents of all the absorbed peoples” (237). The colors of an absorbed people would ultimately be gray;

Del Fuego points out that Baker's claim is false, for all the talents of the absorbed people, such as catching wild horses, are not included in the moderns, which Barker must admit is a talent he does not have.

The colors Del Fuego introduces are symbolically significant throughout the rest of the novel. Yet a greater understanding of their significance can be seen when viewed in connection to Chesterton's social criticism found in What's Wrong with the World (1910), published six years after The Napoleon of Notting Hill. In his discussion of the education of the child, Chesterton uses the role of color to illustrate modern society's deficiency of meaning and misguided thinking.

Chesterton observes, "realists [talk about] the gray streets and the gray lives of the poor" (65). Yet, Chesterton counters whatever else the lives and streets of the poor may be they are anything but gray. He elaborates on the abundance of colors a poor child finds on the streets, mostly in the form of advertisement posters; "There is no blue much bluer than Reckitt's Blue and no blacking blacker than Day and Martin's; no more emphatic yellow than that of Colman's Mustard" (65). This last example is the same advertisement from which the President of Nicaragua tears his swath of yellow. The deluge of color in Modern London also parallels the sprawling nature of the empire. Only after the small patch of yellow is affixed to the former President of a small nation, does the color gain any romantic value. After showing that it is not an absence of color the child is missing, Chesterton argues it is the philosophy of colors the child lacks. The profusion of colors presented in modern society is also to blame for color's loss of

meaning; "But to look at these seas of yellow is to be like a man who should swallow gallons of mustard. He would either die, or lose the taste of mustard altogether"(65).

After establishing the errors of the modern presentation of colors, Chesterton looks again to the Middle Ages for proper instruction:

Now suppose we compare these gigantic trivialities on the hoardings with those tiny and tremendous pictures in which the mediaevals recorded their dreams [...] The difference here is not merely that poster art is in its nature more hasty than illumination art [...] It is that the old artist contrived to convey an impression that colors really were significant and precious things, like jewels and talismanic stones. (66).

The importance of proportion leads to the importance of meaning; Chesterton continues to juxtapose the modern to the medieval to show that the moderns again are found lacking. Chesterton continues in exploration with color's symbolic relevance to clothing. He argues that the variety of colors worn by people of the Middle Ages compared to modern society would be similar, "There would be brown frocks of friars in the first scene as well as brown bowlers of clerks in the second" (66); the problem is what those colors represent. He argues, "The real difference is this: that the brown color of the monk's coat was instinctively chosen to express labor and humility, whereas the brown color of the clerk's hat was not chosen to express anything" (66). Chesterton closes with the proposal, "[...] this abundance of colors and loss of color scheme is a pretty perfect parable of all that is wrong with our modern ideals and especially with our modern education" (67). An overabundance of material items, and yet a deficiency in meaning

and spirit, are the two issues being explored in Chesterton's criticism. Chesterton is working with the same argument in his novel. He uses various characters to represent their various understanding of the symbolic power of color.

Juan del Fuego is the first character to appear who has a true appreciation for the symbolic power of color. Del Fuego's fuller appreciation for color correlates to his fuller appreciation of his country as well as a richer, more passionate spirit, especially as compared to the "depressed reliance" and "assumed condition" of England.

Del Fuego's enthusiasm and proper understanding of color apparently affect Auberon Quin. Quin's conversation with Del Fuego and a chance encounter with a boy playing King of the Hill, inspires the newly made King Auberon to create "The Charter of the Cities." Although Quin ascribes color to each borough, in connection to Chesterton's social criticism, he still appears to be the modern spreading colors everywhere and not the medieval ascribing meaning. The result is Quin appears to still be trapped in the "assumed mood" of the despondent modern.

Quin illustrates this mood in a discussion with his equerry, Bowler. Quin has been King for ten years now and his medieval farce has been in effect for nearly as long. The surrounding boroughs against Provost Wayne propose war, because Wayne refuses to turn over Pump Street. Quin, alone with Bowler, asks if he has every longed for a miracle to which Bowler, "who was an evolutionist, and had been carefully brought up" (313), responds that he has not. Quin replies, "I have walked along a street with the best cigar in the cosmos in my mouth, and more Burgundy inside me than you ever saw in your life, and longed that the lamppost would turn into an elephant to save me from the

hell of blank existence” (313). Although Quin is surrounded by the medieval colors of heraldry, he has not assign the colors medieval symbolic meaning, and so he is still trapped in a modern hell of blank existence.

Quin’s desire for a miracle could be spoken by the figure described in Chesterton’s poem “The Modern Manichee” who is “blind, frustrate, hollow at the core” (Collected Works Vol. X 401). This phrase also does well in describing Quin’s entire scheme of “The Charter of the Cities” as Ian Boyd pointed out; the whole concept is a joke, void of any meaning, “hollow” for Quin and the majority of London. Through Auberon’s actions it appears that medieval pageantry, regalia, and ceremony alone offers no value; only when meaning is affixed do these material manifestations of the middle ages take any intrinsic value. This value occurs for the one character who takes Quin’s joke seriously, and therefore gives meaning to the pageantry, Adam Wayne. Wayne in turn inspires the whole of Notting Hill to find meaning in their little province.

The episode illustrating Wayne’s ability to attribute meaning can be seen in his first meeting with King Auberon and the other Provosts to discuss the problem of Pump Street. The King asks, “Don’t you really think the sacred Notting Hill at all absurd?”(278)? To this Wayne responds, “Notting Hill [...] is a rise or high ground of the common earth, on which men have built houses to live, in which they are born, fall in love, pray, marry, and die. Why should I think it absurd?” (278). Wayne is completely prepared for a revolution because he believes in something positive and divine in the meaning he attributes to Notting Hill. Wayne demonstrates an attitude completely opposite to Quin’s “blank hell of existence” and England’s “assumed condition” of a

“depressed reliance.” Wayne’s attitude matches closely with the President of Nicaragua, of whom he is an ideological descendent through Quin as a surrogate. The association of Wayne to Juan del Fuego can be seen in Wayne’s violent opposition to annexation, just as Nicaragua was one of the last holdouts against Imperialism, but more symbolically in the use of color and Wayne’s recognition of their “sanctity.”

The correlation between Wayne, Del Fuego, and colors is demonstrated during the final battle of the novel. Notting Hill, after winning the battles for Pump Street twenty years earlier, has enjoyed a period of peace and posterity. During this time, in the words of Adam Wayne, “the soul of Notting Hill [has] gone forth and made men realize what it is to live in a city. Just as we inaugurate our symbols and ceremonies, so they have inaugurated theirs [...]” (365). Yet, while the other boroughs have been inaugurating their provinces with ceremonial meaning, Notting Hill has been developing Imperialist tendencies towards those other boroughs. For this reason, the other boroughs once again attack Notting Hill, and for this reason Notting Hill will be defeated.

During the last battle the image of Juan del Fuego once again appears. Adam Wayne, whose banner has been taken by the enemy, tears a section from his stolen flag and declares, ““Here is one colour”” (371)! He is given a terrific wound on his shoulder, and pointing to his blood he cries ““Here is the other”” (371)! His actions and colors, yellow and red, match the Nicaraguan President’s from the second chapter. Therefore, symbolically Wayne and Juan del Fuego, appear to be of one mind. This would include one mind in terms of patriotism and anti-Imperialism, and one mind in giving colors sanctified, positive meaning.

The transfer from Quin's state of medieval, ceremonial meaninglessness to Wayne's state of meaning illustrates Chesterton's political ideas concerning empire versus smaller independent states. Politically speaking, the violent breakdown of Notting Hill in the end appears to be the fault not so much of medieval ideals, but of Colonial ones. Once Notting Hill begins to express these notions and loses sight of its sacred smallness, it is defeated and Wayne concedes, "[...] because we ought to be defeated"(365).

As the final battle illustrates Chesterton's use of medieval ceremony and nationalism to express his political ideas, the dialogue that closes the novel also illustrates how Chesterton uses medieval ideals of meaning to argue against modern society's spiritual futility and "blank hell of existence."

The final chapter begins with two voices speaking out of darkness, with no indication to whom the voices belong. The voices discuss the purpose and usefulness of Notting Hill: "'So ends the Empire of Notting Hill. As it began in blood, so it ended in blood, and all things are always the same' [...]' 'If all things are always the same, it is because they are always heroic'" (373). The violent campaigns for and against Notting Hill give way to the beginning of true resolution, for now the two lone voices begin a dialogue that soon broadens from Notting Hill's social and political implications to its theological significance: "'Suppose I am God [...]" one voice begins, "'and suppose I made the world in idleness [...]' Suppose the sun and moon, to which you sing alternately, are only the two eyes of one vast and sneering giant, opened alternately in a never-ending wink [...]' Suppose I am God, and having made things, laugh at them'" (375). To this

question the other voice responds, ““And suppose I am man [...] Suppose I do not laugh back at you, do not blaspheme you, do not curse you [...] Suppose I praise you, with a literal pain of ecstasy, for the jest that has brought me so terrible a joy”” (375)? As this discussion is developing, the dawn is rising as well and by the end of this portion of the conversation, the speakers become recognizable as Quin and Wayne.

It is at this time that Auberon Quin admits to Adam Wayne that his creation of the cities and their medieval ceremony was all a joke. Adam Wayne responds much as his earlier voice of Man had responded to Quin’s earlier voice of God, by proclaiming “‘I will not stop to thank you,’ he said with a curious joy in his voice, ‘for the great good for the world you have actually wrought’” (378). Through this discussion the two protagonists show not only how they have been responding to the medieval “Charter of the Cities” but also how they have been responding existentially. Quin, by creating his own political mockery, demonstrates his view of life as farce; Wayne, through his embrace of the medieval pageantry, demonstrates his view life as of the utmost importance, and meaning. The two extremes of thought provide Chesterton an opportunity to expound on his own view of life as finding balance between the two

This idea is expressed by Adam Wayne at the novels end as he explains, “We are mad, because we are two lobes of the same brain, and that brain has been cloven in two [...] you, the humorist, have been in these dark days stripped of the joy of gravity [...] I, the fanatic, have had to grope without humor” (378). Had Wayne and Quin been able to function as two lobes of the brain united, Notting Hill might not have become the seat of so much destruction, and the lives of the two men might have been more complete.

Massie Ward points out that Adam Wayne's comments are, "very important to the understanding of Chesterton. With him, profound gravity and exuberant fooling were always intermingled and some of his deepest thoughts are conveyed by a pun" (Gilbert 177). The conflict of the The Napoleon of Notting Hill appears to be the fact that the pun is separated from serious reality, and this too illustrates one of Chesterton's arguments against Modernism. Ian Boyd's "Chesterton's Medievalism" argues "Chesterton believed that the ideological fanaticisms of the modern age are largely a result of failure to achieve a synthesis of many virtues" (249). For Wayne and Quin those virtues are humor and gravity, as neither man has allowed for the presence of the opposite virtue, and the result of their failure leads to violent battle.

Balance of extremes is also important in understanding Chesterton's view of medievalism. In the same essay, Boyd maintains, "For Chesterton, medievalism was a state of mind which was always seeking to balance varied elements in an existing social order" (248). Boyd elaborates that romantic medievalism, for Chesterton, was false because it denies the "complex and sacred materiality of ordinary human life" while "realists [...] ignore the transcendental element which gives unity and meaning [...]" (248). Just as Chesterton's view of medievalism seeks synthesis, Boyd argues that his characters are seeking the same, as Wayne and Quin illustrate. Boyd continues, "Everyone has something valuable and necessary to contribute to his [Chesterton's] elaborately balanced philosophy [...] Chesterton's fiction may be regarded as a metaphor for what he meant by medievalism" (249).

The fault of Napoleon Hill's medievalism lies in the fact that it is created by one extreme, that of a jester, and embraced and advanced by the other extreme, a humorless fanatic. Yet by the novel's end the two are approaching synthesis, as they discover the errors and attributes of their extremes. Whether the two have survived from their wounds and are reconciling in the material world, or, due to mortal wounds, are reconciling in a spiritual afterlife, is undefined, but: "In the blank white light Auberon hesitated a moment. Then he made the formal salute with his halberd, and they went away together into the unknown world" (379). Despite the physical or spiritual setting, the two have begun resolution. Auberon's action of saluting with the halberd indicates that he has begun to accept the seriousness of medieval ceremony, for there is no indication of humor in his salute. If the novel extended beyond this point it would be safe to assume that soon Wayne might return the salute with a pun, and the two lobes of the brain begin operating in balanced unity.

Every character having something valuable to contribute also helps to explain why Chesterton's fictional adversaries consistently demonstrate chivalrous traits of respect towards each other. In the case of Wayne and Quin, while the two do not blatantly disagree and while Wayne is always loyal to Quin's Kingship, the closing dialogue shows that they belong to two ideological extremes that are in need of reconciliation, which has begun. Wayne's embrace of medieval ideals, while in part leading to political division, also demonstrates a contagious courtesy and respect for adversaries, which leads to, if not reconciliation, at least admiration, where balance and unity are more likely to occur.

One clear example of Wayne's chivalric influence takes place during the initial meeting of the Provosts of London to discuss the problem of Pump Street. Mr. Buck, the consummate businessman and antithesis to Wayne's romantic embrace of medieval ceremony, energetically disputes Wayne's unwillingness to turn over Pump Street. In the process of arguing, Buck speaks improperly before the King for which he is reprimanded. Wayne intercedes for his adversary, claiming "I fear I was more than equally to blame with the Lord Provost of North Kensington. We were debating somewhat eagerly, and we both rose to our feet. I did so first I am ashamed to say" (306). Wayne admits that Mr. Buck spoke disrespectfully, "But the rest of the discussion he seems to me to have conducted with great good temper" (306). Wayne's courteous words take effect on Mr. Buck, who moments before calls Wayne a madman, now concedes, "Mr. Wayne is a gentleman and has spoken up for me" (307). Despite this courtesy, Wayne declines to sell rights to Pump Street and demonstrates the chivalric ability to simultaneously respect the person and refrain from compromising his opinion.

The encounter apparently had a lasting effect on Mr. Buck. Later, for as he prepares to lead a second attack on Notting Hill he claims, "I am sorry for poor old Wayne, I really am [...] He spoke up splendidly for me at that Council. And he blacked old Barker's eye [during the first unsuccessful attack] with considerable spirit" (325). Buck is at least demonstrating a move towards respect for Wayne that would not have been likely had not Wayne first demonstrated chivalrous behaviour. Yet Buck is still under the delusion that his arithmetic of greater numbers will defeat the greater spirit of

Wayne's defenses and his lack of understanding is in part responsible for the advent of war.

Wayne's demonstration during the council also appears to have influenced the King who displays similar behaviour towards Mr. Buck. Wayne has left the council and Mr. Buck proposes physical force against Notting Hill. Quin responds, "I beg your pardon, for a number of beautiful and sacred thoughts, in which you were generally classified as a fool" (309). In this comment we also see Chesterton's playful style of mixing praise while undercutting the opponent's argument, which he so often displayed in his own debates, as in "G.B.S. Versus G.K.C" where he responds to Shaw's argument with "I approach this question with all the more diffidence and difficulty because of the extraordinarily brilliant and interesting address Mr. Shaw has delivered upon a totally different subject" (491). Chesterton and Auberon, before pointing out discrepancies in thought or character, first highlight the virtue surrounding the fault as though seeking as much synthesis or balance as they can while still holding to their own positions.

Quin seems to best represent the joy of debate that Chesterton manifests, as moments later Quin asserts, "Do you know, Mr. Buck [...] the admirable clearness of your reason produces in my mind a sentiment which I trust I shall not offend you by describing as an aspiration to punch your head" (310). Although Quin speaks this while "staring gloomily at the table" (310), there is no doubt that humor is at the heart of the comment.

One of the most startling displays of respect for adversaries is one of the most violent. During the battle that wins Notting Hill her independence, Wilfrid Lambert, one

of Auberon Quin's least patronizing companions from the beginning of the novel, is now one of the most heroically involved combatants. Lambert vigorously attacks Wayne with his sword, but Wayne, using the spear-blade at the end of his banner, counter attacks Lambert. Just before driving the banner through Lambert's body, Wayne declares, "The banner of Notting Hill stoops to a hero" (348). After Lambert falls, Wayne proclaims, "Notting Hill, Notting Hill [...] Her banner is all the holier for the blood of a brave enemy" (348). This openly violent passage illustrates the romantic notions of personalized medieval battle between two heroic and courageous knights each respectful of the other's valor. It also clearly raises the issue of the place of violence in Chesterton's rhetorical search for unity among his adversarial characters.

Two arguments should be raised at this point of discussion. The first is that this is Chesterton's first novel and the extreme violence it contains appears less and less aggressive within the next two novels to be addressed. The second is that the physical conflict can consistently be seen as a narrative device symbolizing the ideological conflicts that Chesterton was personally experiencing in print and behind debating lecterns. In translating his personal rhetorical experiences into fiction, Chesterton provides physical vistas of conflict to activate his philosophical discourse. In both the physical and philosophical arenas, Chesterton's goal is revolution of false thinking into the resolution of true unity. The conflict is always illustrative of disunity and the conflict is never his final goal. The Napoleon of Notting Hill's achievement is not at the moment of Lambert's impalement; it is in the quiet discussion of Auberon and Wayne as

they realize their mutual faults and strive for solidity. Yet, Chesterton is also showing that even in the midst of the disagreement, courtesy and admiration can still be employed.

With these examples of courtesy, or admiration of adversaries, we see three elements that were present in Chesterton's personal debates. Wayne's concession of his own fault during his debate with Mr. Buck is similar to Chesterton's concession of fault in his debate with Robert Blatchford, while both Chesterton and Wayne speak admiringly of their opponent's abilities. Auberon Quin's encounter with Mr. Buck parallels most closely Chesterton's debates with Shaw where joy and humor are employed to praise the speaker while defaming the speech. And Wayne's violent show of respect for Lambert illustrates Chesterton's respectful refusal to compromise his deepest beliefs, whether in the case of Chesterton's encounter with the German schoolmasters, or with Robert Blatchford, or with George Bernard Shaw.

Medieval ideals of chivalry, and Chesterton's ideal of medieval balance as espoused by Ian Boyd, are central to the political developments and breakdowns of The Napoleon of Notting Hill. Notting Hill succeeds in its first two battles because Adam Wayne infuses the medieval pageantry and property with an indomitable spirit of purpose and meaning. Notting Hill falls twenty years later because that same meaning has grown into the pride of an Empire, disallowing the other boroughs to manifest their own pride of medieval pageantry and property.

Ideals of chivalry and medieval balance are also central to the personal relationships expressed within the novel. Chivalry as influenced by Wayne tempers a variety of relationships, both amiable and adversarial. Lack of medieval balance explains

the error of Wayne and Quin's dichotomy, which is as much at fault for Notting Hill's ultimate destruction as Colonial inclinations. Politically and personally Chesterton explores relationships of governments and humanity through his interpretation of the medieval ideal, and argued that political and personal respect are fundamental to their cohesion and balance.

Chapter Three

The Man Who Was Thursday: St. George and Anarchy

The Paris police arrested, yesterday [...] three men who are said to be Anarchists [...] Six detectives got wind of this plan and were at the place of rendezvous, watching from a house close to the station. The men arrested had with them eleven dynamite cartridges in one parcel, and twelve in another, besides a Bickford fuse. They were identified at the anthropometric department of the prefecture as dangerous Anarchists (“Arrest of Anarchists Near Paris.” The Times. 11 April 1908)

In Chesterton’s “Some Policemen and a Moral” published in Tremendous Trifles in 1909, but written earlier as an essay for the Daily News, he describes an experience he had while on vacation in Yorkshire.¹ Chesterton is honing his abilities as a knife thrower by throwing a large Swedish knife at a tree, when two police officers approach curious about his activities. After he explains himself and provides identification, the police become amiable and are about to let Chesterton go on his way. Chesterton responds, “‘But,’ I said, ‘what of this mangled tree? It was to the rescue of that Dryad, tethered to the earth, that you rushed like knight-errants’” (212).

About the same time Chesterton wrote this essay for the Daily News, he was also writing what would become one of his most acclaimed works of fiction, The Man Who Was

¹ As stated, the essay is collected in Tremendous Trifles, which was published in 1909. The “Preface” to that work states that all of the pieces in this collection appeared originally in the Daily News, but the original publication date for each essay is not given.

Thursday, published in a pilot edition in 1907, with its first principal edition published in 1908. I have shown how Chesterton relies on medieval imagery and ideology, both biographically and literarily. Yet the presence of medievalism's influence within this novel may appear questionable. The outward manifestations of medieval pageantry, such as that found in The Napoleon of Notting Hill, are absent, as are the clear adversarial boundaries that will be discussed with The Ball and the Cross. Still, the novel admired by J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, W.H. Auden, Jorge Luis Borges, and T.S. Eliot (Wills, "The Man Who Was Thursday," 335) has failed to escape Chesterton's medieval influences. One key to understanding its presence and how it operates is through understanding Chesterton's view of modern police officers as descendents of both the Crusaders and as knight-errants.

The novel centers on poet-detective Gabriel Syme. Syme, hired by an unknown voice in a darkened room, joins a new and covert branch of Scotland Yard devoted to the capturing of those who commit "intellectual fanaticism and intellectual crime" (80).² In this secret role he encounters Lucian Gregory. After having Syme swear an oath of secrecy, Gregory takes Syme to a (literally) underground anarchist meeting. As a result of another oath to secrecy, Syme reveals his true role as a detective to Gregory. Due to each man's oath and a debate of rhetorical subterfuge during the anarchist's meeting, Syme is elected as Thursday, district representative to the seven member Central European Council of anarchists where each member takes the code name of a day of the week.

The rest of the novel concerns Gabriel Syme's adventures in trying to stop a plot to assassinate the Russian Tsar in Paris. In the process, Syme systematically discovers that five of the other members of the Council, unbeknownst to each other, are also

² All quotes are taken from The Man Who Was Thursday: A Nightmare. Special Annotated Edition by Martin Gardner. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999.

undercover detectives; each man hired for the same purpose as Syme by the gargantuan and mercurial Sunday, head of the Central European Council as well as the source of the voice in the dark room where each had been hired.

The Man Who Was Thursday: A Nightmare was officially published in 1908, and while the events are located during that time, the mood of the novel is mostly dependent on the Fin de Siècle ethos. Drawing philosophically from Nietzsche and Schopenhauer, scientifically from Darwin and artistically from the Decadents and aesthetes such as Oscar Wilde, the mood of this time bent towards a solipsistic pessimism and was a forebearer to the modern philosophies of the early 1900s. Chesterton encountered this modern philosophical mindset as an art student at the Slade School between 1892 and 1895 and refers to it repeatedly as the darkest period of his life, a period to which the rest of his life was a response. Chesterton alludes to these points in the dedicatory poem that precedes the novel and is addressed to his childhood friend Edmund Clerihew Bentley.

Chesterton recalls the atmosphere of their youth:

A cloud was on the mind of men, and wailing went the
weather,

Yea, a sick cloud upon the soul when we were boys
together.

Science announced nonentity and art admired decay [...]

This is a tale of those old fears, even of those emptied hells,

And none but you shall understand the true thing that it

tells— [...]

Oh, who shall understand but you; yea, who shall

understand? (25-28)

He also elaborates on this dark period of his life in his Autobiography, "[...] it is true that there was a time when I had reached that condition of moral anarchy within, in which a man says, in the words of Wilde, that 'Atys with the blood-stained knife were better than the thing I am'"(89).³ The moral anarchy to which Chesterton refers finds fictional embodiment in the political anarchists of this novel. Yet, rather than giving over to the pessimism of this time, Chesterton wills himself into a more positive outlook, using the works of Robert Louis Stevenson and Walt Whitman as a literary anodyne for his existential despair. He explains his transition further in his Autobiography:

[...] my eyes were turned inwards rather than outwards; giving my moral personality, I should imagine, a very unattractive squint. I was still oppressed with the metaphysical nightmare of negations about mind and matter, with the morbid imagery of evil, with the burden of my own mysterious brain and body; but by this time I was in revolt against them; and trying to construct a healthier conception of cosmic life, even if it were one that should err on the side of health. I even called myself an optimist, because I was so horribly near to being a pessimist. (98-99)

³ Chesterton is quoting from Oscar Wilde's poem "The Sphinx." The poem concludes with the narrator commanding the Sphinx, on which he has been meditating, to leave; "[...] Go thou before, and leave / me to my crucifix, / Whose pallid burden, sick with pain, watches / the world with wearied eyes, / And weeps for every soul that dies, and weeps for every soul in vain" (70).

He concludes these reflections with the humble admission, "All this part of the process was afterwards thrown up in the very formless form of a piece of fiction called *The Man Who Was Thursday*" (98).

Fin de siècle pessimism is the primary antagonist of this novel. Once again while physical violence is present, to a lesser extent than The Napoleon of Notting Hill, the violence is primarily the characterization of two ideological forces; a medieval determination for life and order encountering the modern pessimism and anarchy that took Chesterton near suicide as a student. As Chesterton revolts against the period in his youth to "construct a healthier conception of cosmic life" so too does Gabriel Syme fight against the anarchist agenda with the resolve of a medieval Crusade. It is in this way that Chesterton's medieval ideologies most influenced the novel.

The medieval figure of St. George appears as the badge on Syme's standard as he battles against modern anarchy. Karin Youngberg's "Job and the Gargoyles: A Study of the Man Who Was Thursday" notices, "Clearly the detective Chesterton has in mind is a romantic figure engaged in a quest that is somehow bigger than life, a kind of intellectual St. George going forth on a journey into the heart of a modern city to confront the Dragon of Mystery" (243). Youngberg focuses primarily on the figure of the detective as knight-errant, a topic that will be explored shortly, but her choice of metaphor for the quest, St. George, finds direct reference in the novel as well.

Chesterton provides his own understanding of St. George in A Short History of England (1917). In his chapter, "The Age of the Crusades," Chesterton begins:

The last chapter began [...] with the name of St. Edward; and this one might very well begin with the name of St. George. His first appearance, it is said, as a patron of our people, occurred at the instance of Richard Cœur de Lion

during his campaign in Palestine; and this, we shall see, really stands for a new England which might as well have a new saint. (71)

Chesterton then explores the meaning behind England's acceptance of a martyred Roman Soldier as their Saint. In his examination, Chesterton begins with a quote from a recent newspaper debate that argued, "'Salvation, like other good things, must not come from outside'" (71). In his usual style, Chesterton responds to this modern quote with the medieval ideal. He continues,

To call a spiritual thing external and not internal is the chief mode of modernist excommunication. But if our subject of study is mediæval and not modern, we must pit against this apparent platitude the very opposite idea. We must put ourselves in the posture of men who thought that almost every good thing came from outside—like good news. I confess that I am not impartial in my sympathies here [...] (71-72)

Chesterton, after continuing his argument against the modern idea of internal salvation, returns to the medieval practice of accepting outside influences and ideas, which brings his discussion back to St. George. Chesterton contends that England, in its development as a nation, passed over the Saxon Saints, Edward, and Alfred, "and invoked a half mythical hero, striving in an eastern desert against an impossible monster. That transition and that symbol stand for the Crusades" (73). Chesterton also applies that "symbol" to his Crusade against anarchy and modernist thought in his novel.

Although Chesterton published A Short History of England ten years after The Man Who Was Thursday, his discussion of St. George as well as the medieval ideal of good things coming from external sources, find embodiment in his novel. In two cases Chesterton uses the figure of St. George symbolically. One of those appearances occurs in the chapter "The Conduct of Professor de Worms,"

According to Stephen Medcalf's "Introduction" to the Oxford University Press edition, Professor de Worm (Wednesday) is a parody of Arthur Schopenhauer (xv). Chesterton mentions this philosopher specifically in the "Introduction" to his sister-in-law's three-act play, which she wrote based on his novel. The introduction is included in the "Appendix" of Martin Gardner's edition of the novel. Chesterton comments, "I can remember the time when pessimism was dogmatic, when it was even orthodox. The people who had read Schopenhauer regarded themselves as having found out everything and found that it was nothing" (271). Chesterton's comment regarding Schopenhauer and those who read him finds a voice in the Professor who speaks a parallel thought during the first Council; "The old Professor was staring at the ceiling with dull eyes. 'Every man knows in his heart [...] that nothing is worth doing'" (107).

The Professor, representation of the orthodox pessimism and pursuant of Syme, is quickly approaching the hero midway through the chase. Yet Syme has recently seen the cross atop St. Paul's Cathedral and this external image has inspired Syme internally with a new courage. The narrator comments on Syme's new state of mind, "He knew that that evil figure, his shadow, was creeping quickly or slowly behind him, and he did not care. It seemed a symbol of human faith and valour that while the skies were darkening that high place of the earth was bright. The devils might have captured heaven, but they had not yet captured the cross" (125-126). Seeing the cross while being pursued by such a figure of evil may have instilled the image of St. George in Syme's mind, for the narrator points out, "Syme waited for him as St. George waited for the dragon, as a man waits for a final explanation or for death" (126).

In this case, Chesterton's view of modern philosophies are represented by an aged "worm"/dragon who is about to encounter opposition in the symbolic form of St. George, patron Saint of England and the Crusaders. Syme, in the dual role of St. George and Crusader, also finds parallel in the episode where Syme is given his interview and

assignment to the detective force. In a dark room, alone with the voice of the chief of a new intellectual branch of Scotland Yard, Syme hesitates over his ability to accomplish the task. He points out, “‘I don’t know any profession of which mere willingness is the final test.’ ‘I do,’ said the other—‘martyrs. I am condemning you to death’” (85). As a final touch to firmly establish the connection between Syme’s position with the police force and his role as Crusader, as Syme leaves the building he is given a blue identification card on which is written, “The Last Crusade” (86).

Syme recalls this scene as a flashback as he proceeds with anxious anticipation towards his first meeting with the council, shortly after his election as Thursday. It is also shortly after this flashback that the first mention of St. George occurs, and while the reference does not directly associate Syme with the martyr, it occurs in a scene with the several references to medieval ideals and emblems.

Whereas in the latter episode Syme takes courage from the vision of the cross before facing the Professor de Worms head on, in this instance Syme, before meeting the council for the first time, takes courage from the objects he has in his possession and he gives them medieval meaning to help instill him with bravery. The narrator describes the transition from dread to valor:

But the more he felt this glittering desolation in the moonlit land, the more his own chivalric folly glowed in the night like a great fire. Even the common things he carried with him—the food and the brandy and the loaded pistol—took on exactly that concrete and material poetry which a child feels when he takes a gun upon a journey or a bun with him to bed. The sword-stick and the brandy-flask [items given to him when elected Thursday; included also was a thick cloak], though in themselves only the tools of morbid conspirators, became the expressions of his own more

healthy romance. The sword-stick became almost the sword of chivalry, and the brandy the wine of the stirrup-cup (87).

Syme, as he approaches his introduction to the other "days," especially the formidable Sunday, ascribes medieval importance to his situation. Twice, the notion of chivalry is mentioned. First, his "chivalric folly glowed in the night like a great fire" bringing both light and warmth to his dark and isolating fear. Second, his sword-stick becomes a "sword of chivalry," an appropriate weapon for the modern knight about to face the dragon of modernism. The passage continues, "For even the most dehumanized modern fantasies depend on some older and simpler figure; the adventures may be mad, but the adventurer must be sane. The dragon without St. George would not even be grotesque" (87). This is the first reference to St. George in the novel, and it too associates Syme's adventure, rather than Syme directly, with the Saint so important to medieval England. This passage of chivalry also highlights objects directly associated with Chesterton himself, and brings to issue the importance he gave to common things.

The cloak and sword-stick, which Syme takes as Thursday, are two items most associated with Chesterton himself and often seen in caricatures; the only article lacking would be a crumpled hat. Massie Ward's Gilbert Keith Chesterton provides the following impression reporters received when visiting Chesterton at his home, "Journalists coming down from London describe the 'jolly' welcome, beer poured, the sword-stick flourished, conversation flowing freely as the beer" (254). Chesterton references his notorious appearance in his Autobiography, "In short, the reader (if any) must not be misled at this stage by that Falstaffian figure in a brigand's hat and cloak, which has appeared in many caricatures" (135). Syme's provisions have the distinct mark of Chesterton upon them.

The encouragement that Syme takes from his implements can also find explanation in Chesterton's writings on the significance of ordinary things. His collection of essays Tremendous Trifles, published in 1909 but taken from essays published earlier in the Daily

News, includes two essays that focus on this theme, "A Piece of Chalk" and "What I Found In My Pocket." Yet, in Chesterton's essay on Scott, "The Position of Sir Walter Scott" in Twelve Types published in 1906, the romantic aspect of Syme's items is more clearly illuminated. Chesterton defends Scott against a particular critic who has argued that Scott spends too much time on descriptions. Chesterton responds:

The only thing to be said about that critic is that he had never been a little boy. He foolishly imagined that Scott valued the plume and dagger of Marmion for Marmion's sake. Not being himself romantic, he could not understand that Scott valued the plume because it was a plume, and the dagger because it was a dagger.
(191)

Chesterton's defense of Scott's applying romantic importance to the object for the object's sake can also be applied to Syme's transforming of his sword-stick into a "sword of chivalry." The apotheosis of ordinary objects into relics of valor provides Syme with his source of courage.

Syme's ability to draw courage from outside sources has been seen in his experience with the cross atop St. Paul's and to a greater extent from his personal possessions. Music also provides a wellspring of bravery for Syme during two key episodes. The first appears as the "feast of fear" draws to a close. This is the breakfast where Syme first meets the other six members of the Council. Sunday has ordered everyone into a private room for further discussion. Having been in the presence of the Council where each member looms as a figure of horror and dread, Syme is under the impression that the terrible and enormous person of Sunday is about to expose his ruse. Syme believes the apex of his "nightmare" is at hand when "A barrel-organ in the street suddenly sprang with a jerk into a jovial tune" (107). The music rekindles the glow of his "chivalric folly" and he finds his courage once again, "Syme stood up taut, as if it had been a bugle before the battle. He found himself filled with a supernatural courage that

came from nowhere" (109). Syme begins to contemplate the scene around him from the vantage of the outside balcony where the breakfast meeting had taken place. As he does, the importance of his task, fighting the modern philosophies of anarchism and nihilism, becomes clear to him with resolve:

[...] he did not think of himself as the representative of the corps of gentlemen turned into fancy constables [...] But he did feel himself as the ambassador of all these common and kindly people in the street, who every day marched into battle to the music of the barrel-organ. And this high pride in being human had lifted him unaccountably to an infinite height above the monstrous men around him. (109)

The music of the common people lifts Syme out of the darkness of his modern company. Joseph B. Connors' examination of this scene in "The Starry Pinnacle of the Commonplace" argues, "Syme and his fellow recruits for the Last Crusade do not just represent a defense of good against evil. They represent a defense of the human and popular against the inhuman and the élitist; of the natural against the perverse; of order against chaos" (50). As Syme is defending the human and the popular in the Last Crusade, the inspiration of the barrel-organ and all it represents brings him to a medieval conclusion:

All was swallowed up in an ultimate certainty that the President [Sunday] was wrong and that the barrel-organ was right. There clanged in his mind that unanswerable and terrible truism in the song of Roland:

'Païens ont tort et Chrétiens ont droit,'

which in the old nasal French has the clang and groan of great iron. (110)

As Syme is about to face what he believes will be defeat by the anarchists, he equates his situation with the medieval epic The Song of Roland. Syme's recollection of Roland's retort to Oliver, reflects not only his theological standpoint, in this case Anarchist-Pagans

are wrong and Christian-Detective's are right, but also the odds of surviving the battle, as the context of the quote reflects Syme's physical position as much as his spiritual position.

The line from Roland of which Syme is reminded occurs at the point just after Oliver has spotted the advancing Saracens progressing towards Roland's rear guard, which is protecting the retreat of King Charlemagne. Roland, declining the offer of half the King's army, is accompanied by 20,000 troops. The Saracen army Oliver observes numbers 100,000. It is at this point that Roland proclaims:

Let's hear no songs that mock us to our shame!

Pagans are wrong, the Christian cause is right.

A bad example I'll be in no man's sight. (The Song of Roland

LXXXIX.1014-1016)

Roland, thinking of the songs that might be sung of his cowardice, sets an example for Syme, who gains his courage through the song of a barrel-organ reminding him of the people he is defending, and each stand steadfast in their role.

Strains of the barrel-organ echo in a later episode, preceding one of the most physically direct adversarial confrontations in the novel. The Professor de Worms and Dr. Bull (Saturday) have both been found to be Agents with the same blue card Syme was given when he joined the police force, identifying members of the Last Crusade. The three are now working together in an effort to stop the Marquis de Saint Eustache (Wednesday) who they believe is on his way to Paris to assassinate the visiting Tsar. Deciding to challenge the Marquis to a duel, Syme believes he will be able to prolong the duel long enough for the Marquis to miss his train, thereby foiling the assassination.

Syme and the others have spotted the Marquis dining outside of a café in Calais. As Syme approaches the Marquis he hears a band playing nearby, "On Syme's heated head the bray of the brass band seemed like the jar and jingle of that barrel-organ in Leicester Square, to the tune of which he had once stood up to die" (169). As Syme prepares to

challenge the Marquis, the music of the brass band instills the same courage as the barrel-organ. Again, Syme stands up to die, or at least provide death an invitation. Syme's challenge is offered in a comical way, as he must trump up the charges against the Marquis. Even through the farcical banter Syme exhibits chivalrous behaviour in their dialogue.

The Marquis, catching on to Syme's intent, suggests they fight that evening; "Syme bowed with a quite beautiful graciousness. 'Marquis,' he said 'your action is worthy of your fame and blood. Permit me to consult for a moment with the gentlemen in whose hands I shall place myself'" (171). In this remark, Chesterton's chivalrous trait of honoring his opponent before open conflict is shown. The comment does not appear to be solely for the purpose of flattering the Marquis, but a genuine sentiment as moments later while speaking with the Professor and Dr. Bull away from the Marquis presence he praises the Marquis swordsmanship (172). The following morning on the field of honor Syme again praises his opponent while selecting weapons, "'To a man of the well-known skill and valour of Monsieur de St. Eustache [...] it must be a matter of indifference which method is adopted [...]'" (173). Syme's repeated praising of his enemy is a trait fully owned by Chesterton.

As the blades of the two swordsmen first engage, Syme reviews his encounters with the great fears of his adventure so far. His review also clearly indicates Chesterton's symbolic meaning behind the Professor and Dr. Bull:

[...] the fear of the Professor had been the fear of the tyrannic accidents of Nightmare and how the fear of the Doctor had been the fear of the airless Vacuum of Science [...] But he saw that these fears were fancies, for he found himself in the presence of the great fact of the fear of death [...] he knew that his enemy was a terrible fighter, and that probably his last hour had come. (174-175)

Still, in spite of the fear of each of these men, Syme holds fast to his course and his commitment to his role as detective. Encountering the Marquis, perhaps the one closest to a physical death, results in an intense joy. A great appreciation for life overwhelms Syme in the midst of battle; "He felt a strange and vivid value in all the earth around him, in the grass under his feet; he felt the love of life in all living things" (175). Syme's seems to reflect Chesterton's own joy of engagement.

Syme's beliefs and values are reinforced as a direct result of the conflict. Battling for his life, Syme more fully appreciates life. As Syme and Chesterton battle for their ideals, they more fully appreciate what is at stake within those philosophies. So while Syme engages the Marquis in a duel to the death, his awareness of what life offers is heightened and more clearly apposes the anarchist's goal as expressed by Lucian Gregory "To abolish God [...] We dig deeper and we blow you higher" (54); a philosophy where " [...] more valuable is one burst of blazing light, one peal of perfect thunder, than the mere common bodies of a few shapeless policemen" (39). Gregory's image directly contrasts the life Syme awakens to during his duel. But Syme's euphoria for life does not last long as the nightmare of his adventure reclaims dominance.

Syme's quick shift from *joie de vivre* to fear is the result of the Marquis' unnatural invulnerability to Syme's sword. Syme repeatedly strikes the Marquis, but to no effect. Syme fearfully ascribes diabolical influence to the Marquis' immunity to the blade. The real reason for the Marquis resistance to physical wounding leads to one of the most graphic transformations from anarchical enemy into governmental colleague. The Marquis has been wearing a costume, which has worked also as a protective padding. At the duels end, with no mortal wounds given or received, the Marquis removes his counterfeit and

bloodless disguise of anarchy, proving to be in the legitimacy of flesh, Inspector Ratcliff, card-carrying member of the Last Crusade.⁴

This transformation of the Marquis into Inspector Ratcliff continues to foreshadow the continuing resolution of the enemy into the friend, which will be discussed momentarily. The entire duel also provides a narrative agent for Chesterton's rhetorical constructs. For though the two characters turn out to be on the same side of the argument, it appears that they could not have known that unless the duel had occurred. Perhaps this aspect of engagement is another source of joy for Chesterton. He expresses the idea that confrontation to some extent, appears as a negative circumstance is also one of the only ways of finding resolution with an apparent enemy. While physical dueling in reality would lead to resolution through the destruction of the enemy, Chesterton's duel prefers a better end; only the destruction of false and harmful ideas, represented in the false costume of anarchy. Once the confrontation has achieved this aim, Inspector Ratcliff appears as man unified with Syme's purpose.

Ratcliff is the third member of the anarchist council revealing himself to be in fact a colleague. As the membership of the "Last Crusade" grows, so too does the impression of the detective force as band of knights-errant. Karen Youngberg in "Job and the Gargoyles: A Study of The Man Who Was Thursday," explains, "[...] Chesterton seems to have imagined the adventure, danger and mystery of detective investigation as something akin to the perilous realms of knight-errantry" (243). The combined force of the Professor, Dr. Bull, Syme and now the Marquis, present this image as they eventually flee the pursuing Secretary and a mob of masked men, newly arrived from the train that Ratcliff was supposedly going to catch.

⁴ For a more detailed discussion on the role of disguise, see Calanchi, Alessandra. "The Spies That Were Used Up; Vulnerability and Disguise in *The Secret Agent* and *The Man Who Was Thursday*."

After escaping through the forest the group of detectives receives provisioning from an innkeeper, an old man of whom “Everything about him, his pipe, his pot of beer, his flowers, his beehive, suggested an ancestral piece” (195). Like the fictional knights-errant of King Arthur’s court who received provisions from hospitable strangers along their journeys, so too do these Crusaders.

The Crusader’s provisions sharply contrast the anarchist’s modern weaponry spoken of so passionately by the Secretary at the first meeting of the Council; “‘Dynamite is not only our best tool, but our best symbol [...] It expands; it only destroys because it broadens; even so, thought only destroys because it broadens. A man’s brain is a bomb’” (106). This would be the most frightening weapon to the Chesterton who comments in his Autobiography, “All my life I have loved edges [...] All my life I have loved frames and limits [...]” (25). Therefore, against the Secretary’s dynamite and bombs, the detectives are outfitted with objects with edges, frames and limits; horses, food and wine, “and keeping their dueling swords as the only weapons available, they clattered away down the steep white road” (196) and to borrow from Youngberg, into “the perilous realms of knight-errantry.”

The notion of the detective as knight-errant appears to be one firmly held by Chesterton and finds evidence in several of his essays as seen in “Some Policemen and a Moral.” He provides an even more explicit example of this view in “Phonetic Spelling” published in All Things Considered in 1908. In his discussion, Chesterton explores the origin and meaning of the terms “polite” and “police.” He ultimately claims, “A policeman should often have the functions of a knight-errant. A policeman should always have the elegance of a knight-errant” (220). Here again, in an essay written approximately within the same time as The Man Who Was Thursday, Chesterton displays his view of modern police operating the same, in principal, as the medieval knight. The Man Who Was Thursday begins with just the one knight-errant, Gabriel Syme. By its finish a veritable

round table forms as six days of the week, each members of the Last Crusade, sit at a banquet with the one who first “knighted” them in the dark, Sunday.

On many occasions Chesterton explained his thinking behind the novel’s unique plot twist. Massie Ward includes an excerpt from an interview with Chesterton wherein he explains his intent.⁵ Chesterton explains, “In an ordinary detective tale the investigator discovers that some amiable-looking fellow who subscribes to all the charities, and is fond of animals, has murdered his grandmother [...] I thought it would be fun to make the tearing away of menacing masks reveal benevolence” (Gilbert Keith Chesterton 192). This is specifically seen in the case of the Marquis, who literally tears away his mask as an anarchist revealing himself to be a detective. It is also seen with Dr. Bull whose dark eyeglasses worn as an anarchist invoke a sinister presence, but when removed as a detective reveal “a very boyish-looking young man, with frank and happy hazel eyes [...] and an unquestionable breath about him of being very good and rather commonplace” (158).

In the interview, Chesterton continues to elaborate on his meaning, “Associated with that merely fantastic notion was the one that there is actually a lot of good to be discovered in unlikely places, and that we who are fighting each other may be all fighting on the right side” (192-193). This particular viewpoint is expressed in almost every piece of work he wrote or dictated. In the case of The Man Who Was Thursday, his comment can be seen as an allegorical refusal of anarchical pessimism to an ordered optimism. Chesterton finds biblical expression with the formless void of pre-Genesis becoming the seven days of creation, which the six detectives and Sunday come to represent. His comment, “we who are fighting each other may be all fighting on the right side,” also gives insight into his view of adversarial relationships. In the case of the six detectives, Syme finds each to be ultimately fighting on the right side against anarchy and pessimism.

⁵ Ward does not give any information concerning where the original interview was published.

Yet, one character refuses to join the ranks of the detectives, Lucian Gregory. At the final banquet in the costume symbolizing the significance of that day of creation, each of the six days of the week gathers together with Sunday. The Secretary finally asks the of the mysterious character Sunday “‘Who and what are you?’” (259). Sunday responds, “‘I am the Sabbath [...] I am the peace of God’” (260). Each of the other six members takes Sunday’s comment as an opportunity to raise a specific issue against God with varying degrees of objection and passion; from the Secretary’s argument, “‘Oh, I can forgive God His anger, though it destroyed nations; but I cannot forgive Him His peace’” (260), to Dr. Bull’s admission, “‘I understand nothing, but I am happy’”(260). Ultimately, each member stays in the council and apparently relents authority to Sunday. Yet Lucian Gregory, the poet of Saffron Park who first introduced Gabriel Syme to the underground anarchists, appears at this banquet proclaiming, “‘Yes [...] I am the real anarchist [...] I am a destroyer. I would destroy the world if I could’” (261). Chesterton even associates Gregory with the devil through his name, Lucian/Lucifer and Bull’s quote from the book of Job concerning Satan’s appearance at the council of God, after Gregory has declared himself a real anarchist (261).⁶

In an interview from The Illustrated Sunday Herald of January 24, 1926, collected in the “Appendix” of Ignatius Press edition annotated by Gardner, Chesterton offers his reason for Gregory’s appearance at the end of the novel; “[...] I was convinced then, and I am convinced still, that there are people who have definitely taken sides with the devil, and in my book [...] there is one character, the real anarchist, Lucien [sic] Gregory, who does stand for the forces of evil and despair” (276). Chesterton admits that Gregory stands for

⁶ Stephen Medcalf’s “Introduction” to the Oxford UP edition of the novel expands on Gregory’s appearance as a Satanic figure. Medcalf also further explores the novel’s relationship to the book of Job. Gary Wills’ “The Man Who Was Thursday” collected in G.K. Chesterton: A Half Century of Views, also examines the novel’s relationship with Job, as does Karin Youngberg’s “Job and Gargoyles: A Study of *The Man Who Was Thursday*.”

evil and claims this is the reason for his appearance at the banquet, but this is not Gregory's final appearance in the novel. Gregory may be the representation of evil at the banquet, but Chesterton gives a different impression of Gregory with the novel's conclusion.

At the banquet with Sunday, Syme blacks out under the pressure of the presence of Sunday's immensity. His drop into unconsciousness reinforces the "Nightmare" aspect of the novel, as though the whole episode had indeed been a dream. Syme's transition from the episode with Sunday into lucidity is vague. The narrator comments, "For while he could always remember afterwards that he had swooned before the face of Sunday, he could not remember having come to at all. He could only remember that gradually and naturally he knew that he was and had been walking along a country lane with an easy and conversational companion" (264). Syme's companion is none other than Lucian Gregory and "They were walking like old friends [...]" (264). Thus, Gregory is presented in two ways in the two endings of the novel: Gregory as an unrepentant anarchist at the conclusion of the "nightmare," and Gregory as Syme's friend at the conclusion of the novel.

The purpose of Gregory's apparent duality could be used to argue Chesterton's view of relationships. By assigning evil to Gregory in the nightmare portion of the narrative, Chesterton could be commenting that adversaries who prove to be unapproachable, irredeemable, and wholly unbending in positions of ideology are truly assigned to nightmare, and that which is to be feared. By ending the novel on a genial note, perhaps Chesterton is arguing the scenario to be hoped for, where even one who ideologically represents anarchy and evil may yet become, on some level, an affable acquaintance.

Gregory is also associated with goodness through his relationship to the redheaded girl who appears at both the beginning and end of the novel. The novel begins with the redheaded girl approaching Syme, concerned about her brother Gregory's sincerity as an anarchist. Her character appears briefly, but her importance to Syme is clearly indicated; "In the wild events which were to follow this girl had no part at all [...]" And yet, in some

indescribable way, she kept recurring like a motive in music through all his mad adventures afterwards [...]" (45). The girl reappears with the novel's closing, and again Syme is in the company of Gregory when he notices her. The novel concludes with, "There he saw the sister of Gregory, the girl with the gold-red hair, cutting lilac before breakfast, with the great unconscious gravity of a girl" (265). And in this statement the medieval influence may also be argued when viewed in connection to a comment Chesterton made concerning Chaucer.

Chesterton wrote biographies, or biographical sketches, of three leading figures of the middle ages, St. Francis of Assisi (1923), Chaucer (1932), and St. Thomas Aquinas (1933). In "The Moral of the Story," his concluding chapter of Chaucer, Chesterton draws the conclusion, "The meaning of Aquinas is that medievalism was seeking a centre of gravity. The meaning of Chaucer is that, when found, it was always a centre of gaiety" (298).

Chesterton wrote and published this idea over twenty years after the publication of The Man Who Was Thursday. While Chesterton may not have fully developed the idea at the time of the novel's writing, the conclusion of the novel gives expression to his idea. For with the novel's conclusion, focused on "the great unconscious gravity of a girl" (265), there can be seen Aquinas' seeking the center of gravity.

Chaucer's centre also presents itself as the novel also closes with the stroll of two men. As they walked "in the middle of a conversation about some triviality [...]" (264), Syme "felt he was in possession of some impossible good news, which made every other thing a triviality, but an adorable triviality" (264). In this relationship, and in Syme particularly, there can be seen a Chaucerian center of gaiety in his possession of "impossible good news" that turns everything else into an "adorable triviality."

Through the last sentence of the novel there appears to be a fusion of the two author's medieval centers: the gravity of Aquinas, as seen in the "unconscious gravity of a girl" [italics mine] and the gaiety of Chaucer in that it was "*the* girl with the gold-red hair,

cutting lilac before breakfast” [italics mine]. Chesterton’s synthesis of the philosophies also finds meaning when viewed against Massie Ward’s discussion of Chesterton’s Chaucer in her biography. Ward also highlights Chesterton’s comment concerning Chaucer and Aquinas. Interpreting Chesterton’s meaning in her introductory comment she argues, “Healing must come from a recovery of the norm, of the balance, of the equilibrium that mediaeval philosophy and culture were always seeking” (Gilbert Keith Chesterton 618). The conclusion of The Man Who Was Thursday provides a recovery of the norm through trivial conversation, and a girl cutting lilac before breakfast; balance in the friendship of Poet-of-Order Syme and anarchical Gregory; and equilibrium in the joining of all three characters, proving Syme to be genuinely healed from his nightmare.

Halberds and heraldry may not run through The Man Who Was Thursday as they did through The Napoleon of Notting Hill, but the influence of medieval ideals still clearly permeates Chesterton’s novel. Written as an affront against the pessimism of the 90s, Chesterton’s heroes appear cognitive of their role as Crusaders and St. George is still their patron saint. As knight-errants in an effort to combat anarchy, they find unity where they expected to find the enemy, commenting on Chesterton’s view of adversaries. As characters, they give expression to Chesterton’s own medievalism, as Chesterton would later express the medievalism of Aquinas and Chaucer.

Chapter Four

The Ball and the Cross: Duel into Camaraderie

“All duellists should behave like gentlemen to each other” (The Ball and the Cross 29).

Two Scottish men, Evan MacIan from the highlands, and James Turnbull from the lowlands, cross swords in one of the most interrupted swordfights in the world of fiction, a work John Coates labels a, “Philosophical Novel” (“*The Ball and the Cross* and the Edwardian Novel of Ideas” 49). The catalyst for their violent dispute is nothing less than a debate over God. The relationship that evolves echoes Chesterton’s own dueling friendships and provides further insight into Chesterton’s debating tactics, sociological, philosophical, and theological viewpoints. Within the Ball and the Cross, Chesterton offers his most explicit expression of adversaries fighting themselves into friendship, and medieval ideals, still less visible than The Napoleon of Notting Hill, continue to flow as an undercurrent beneath their duel, guiding them to resolution.

Also, once again Chesterton uses the physical battle of a duel as the fictional skin for the philosophical spirit of the debates in which he was constantly engaged. D. J. Dooley’s “The Ball With or Without the Cross: How the Great Debate is Resolved in Chesterton and Orwell” quotes from Paul Jennings’ introduction to a 1984 edition of the novel, wherein Jennings exclaims, “As well try to make a novel out of the old Penny

Catechism!” (29), but also “that this may be the best novel ever made out of an argument” (29).

The argument was first presented to readers in a serialized version between 1905 and 1906 in The Commonwealth, A Christian Social Magazine. The serialized version is included in The Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton, Vol. VI. Denis J. Conlon compiled and introduced this edition. In his, “A Note on the Texts,” he comments that between volume 10, number 3 to volume 11, number 11 of that magazine the story appeared regularly, always ending, “To be continued.” Then the story appeared in April and June with the last episode appearing in the November 1906 edition, still with the ending “To be continued.” Yet no other additions appeared (11). Conlon also claims, “This early version varies slightly in detail from the 1909 version that was published by John Lane of New York” (11). Conlon’s comment is true, in that the first nine chapters of the serialized version and the final novel have very little variation, but the significant difference between the two versions is that the later adds 12 chapters, one of which “The Dream of McIan,” contains the most overt medieval imagery found in the narrative.

The novel’s publishing history is also significant when viewed in context to his other works. The serialized version of The Ball and the Cross appeared just after The Napoleon of Notting Hill (1904), and during the same time as Heretics (1905), Chesterton’s work which criticized many contemporary views and those who held them such as Rudyard Kipling and Bernard Shaw. The completed novel appeared after The Man Who Was Thursday (1907), and Orthodoxy (1908) —Chesterton’s defense of his orthodox Christianity— and in the same year as his study of his most famous

philosophical sparring partner George Bernard Shaw (1909). Each of these works contains elements that are also explored in both versions of The Ball and the Cross.¹

In both the serialized version and the published novel the story opens with Professor Lucifer and a Bulgarian monk named Michael in Lucifer's flying machine. Flying near St. Paul's Cathedral, the two men begin to discuss the symbolic importance of the architecture of the steeple, a ball beneath the cross affixed to the top of the Cathedral. Lucifer maintains the ball is the perfect symbol of reason and unity and the cross a symbol of contradiction and unreason. Michael holds that man is also unreasonable, "That cross is, as you say, an eternal collision; so am I [...]"(5). Lucifer then argues that the ball deserves the place of prominence on top of the cross, to which Michael responds that could never be, as the ball would always fall off. Lucifer in a fit of frustration flings Michael from the airship, and Michael must cling to the cross for his life. After scaling down St. Paul's, the second story opens when Michael hears a crashing window and sees a crowd gather around the scene of violence.

Evan MacIan, a devout Roman Catholic, has just smashed the print shop window of James Turnbull, editor of "The Atheist," due to a pamphlet pasted on it, which compared the Virgin Mary to a Mesopotamian myth. This accusation prompts the rest of the story's action. MacIan and Turnbull are taken to court and there MacIan challenges Turnbull to a duel. While in court Turnbull declines, but as soon as the two are both outside, the duel is accepted. From this point on, whenever the two characters engage in

¹ This chapter will be quoting from the completed novel as it appears in the 1995 Dover edition, which uses the 1910 Wells Gardner, Darton & Co. Ltd. Edition as its text. Any reference to the serialized version found in The Collected Works, Vol. VI, will be noted.

the duel they are soon interrupted by the police or some figure that enables the characters to expound on their reasons for fighting. As Ian Boyd notes in The Novels of G.K. Chesterton,

Clearly the interruptions are more important than the duel they interrupt. The sentimental pornographer, the Tolstoyan pacifist and the Nietzschean decadent, who interfere with the quarrel between science and religion, are introduced not as individual characters but as individual features of the Edwardian age which Chesterton wishes to satirize. (21)

MacIan and Turnbull encounter each of these characters in both the serialization and the novel. The point at which the novel begins to add material not in the original serialized version occurs after the chapter "The Village of Grassley-in-the-hole," the two combatant's most sustained dialogue over their differences. In the chapters that follow in the novel, the duelists encounter more policemen, and love interests; for MacIan a possible, but evidently doubting, believer, and for Turnbull a pious Catholic. The most significant difference between the two forms of the story is the fact that Michael and Lucifer are reintroduced in the novel's final chapters.

MacIan and Turnbull inadvertently find themselves captive in an insane asylum run by none other than Professor Lucifer. Michael is one of the principal inmates and is the key figure at the novel's end. Quite clearly Chesterton has added several new layers of meaning to the finished novel, but rather than focus on the added elements I would like to address the adversarial relationship between MacIan and Turnbull and its development,

as well as the medieval imagery and thought that proves significant to these two characters.²

Of the three novels examined so far, Chesterton spends the least time on The Ball and the Cross in his Autobiography. In discussing his abilities as an author of fiction he speaks very humbly and of The Ball and the Cross he argues:

I think the story called The Ball and the Cross had quite a good plot, about two men perpetually prevented by the police from fighting a duel about the collision of blasphemy and worship, or what all respectable people would call, 'a mere difference about religion.' I believe that the suggestion that the modern world is organized in relation to the most obvious and urgent of all questions, not so much to answer it wrongly, as to prevent it being answered at all, is a social suggestion that really has a great deal in it; but I am much more doubtful about whether I got a great deal out of it, even in comparison with what could be got out of it. (297)

Here, Chesterton provides insight into the comments on modern society his novel makes, such as preventing the discussion at all, but any autobiographical background to the novel's production, such as he provided for The Napoleon of Notting Hill and The Man Who Was Thursday, is found lacking. Yet, the biographical influences upon this work are easily and often inferred.

² John Coates' "The Ball and the Cross and the Edwardian Novel of Ideas" from the Chesterton Review Vol. 18, Issue 1 (49-81) explores the narrative conventions of the novel in relationship to its time period, but he also examines the philosophical influence of H.G. Wells, and G.B. Shaw upon Lucifer and Turnbull.

Placing the production of The Ball and the Cross first in 1905, means the story quickly followed Chesterton's debates with Robert Blatchford, and both Martin Gardner and D. J. Dooley comment on this connection. Martin Gardner's "Level of Allegory in *The Ball and the Cross*" makes this assertion:

On the lowest level of allegory, Chesterton is celebrating a vigorous verbal duel which he had fought with Robert Peel Glanville Blatchford [...]
Chesterton considered him a worthy opponent and, for two years, the two men, as Chesterton put it in a letter, crossed 'intellectual swords.' (38)

D. J. Dooley points out Chesterton was refuting Blatchford's arguments between July of 1903 and the end of 1904, concluding "Religious issues were very much on his mind, therefore, and it is no wonder that they were reflected in the two novels which were written about this time" (33). The other novel to which Dooley refers is The Napoleon of Notting Hill.

The importance of the novel in relationship to The Napoleon of Notting Hill is explored in Ian Boyd's The Novels of G.K. Chesterton. Boyd notes, "The points of similarity between the two novels make the two works companion pieces which throw considerable light on each other [...] there is a sense in which the conflict between MacIan and Turnbull continues the conflict between Wayne and Quin. MacIan's religious idealism is substituted for Wayne's political fanaticism, and Turnbull's disbelief is substituted for Quin's ironic detachment" (22). Ian Boyd's comment in "Chesterton's Medievalism" concerning medievalism as a state of mind seeking the balance of "varied elements in an existing social order" (248) can also be applied to this novel as well as

The Napoleon of Notting Hill as many similar motifs are at work between the two novels. Yet, the medieval influence within The Ball and the Cross must first be established before arguing that it seeks social balance, and this identification is not as overt as in his first novel.

As stated earlier, the most manifest mention of medieval elements appears only in the 1909 novel version of The Ball and the Cross. Still, in both the serialization and the final published novel medieval themes are present. The association of the Deist with the Middle Ages is established in the first chapter during Professor Lucifer's discussion with the old Bulgarian monk, Michael. Michael raises a question concerning the reason for his abduction in the Professor's flying machine, to which Lucifer responds, "An entertaining retort, in the narrow and deductive manner of the Middle Ages [...]" (2). The Professor's connection of the middle ages to Michael's argumentative technique quickly puts the religious character, Michael and later MacIan, in the medieval realm, and conversely the anti-religious such as Lucifer, or the atheist such as Turnbull, in the modern realm, especially since Lucifer is the inventor of the steel flying machine.

The narrative supplies the ideological territory for each participant of the argument, and while each position associates with either the modern or the middle age, the atmosphere within which the duelists engage appears to be under the influence of the medieval. The medieval atmosphere appears first in the chapter "The Other Philosopher," which appears in both the serialization and the novel. In the midst of another interruption, MacIan and Turnbull have come across what they think is an abandoned summer home, but is inhabited by Nietzschean lover of violence. The

narrator describes the entrance of the home owner with the following, “Against the heraldic background of sprawling crimson and gold offered him by the expiring sunset, the figure of the man with the stick showed at first merely black and fantastic” (48). Fighting a duel for the honor of their beliefs, the chivalric actions of MacIan and Turnbull affect the weather and even the sunset becomes “heraldic.”

This type of description is reinforced in a later version that appears only in the published novel, “The Dream of Turnbull.” Again the narrator is describing the natural environment, “[...] the clouds were breaking up and losing even their large heraldic shapes” (136), and moments later “[...] the red tails of the sunset were dragged downward like red dragons sucked down to death” (136). In all three cases, the natural setting for the protagonists has taken on medieval aspects of either heraldry or dragons. The mood these elements evoke parallels the proceedings of MacIan and Turnbull, and as the two fly the heraldry of their beliefs through their dialogue the very clouds take on heraldic shapes. As MacIan and Turnbull attempt to defeat the illogical dragons of each other’s argument, the clouds become the slain and dying fallacies of their opponent.

MacIan may have been witnessing one of these heraldic sunsets at the advent of their first duel in the garden of the antique dealer’s shop, of which the two have just bound and gagged the proprietor so they may fight in peace. Before the first thrust or parry, MacIan announces, “I see Jerusalem [...] all covered with the shields and standards of the Saracens” (25). MacIan’s inaugural vision preceding their first duel clearly indicates the way MacIan views his argument, and immediately identifies MacIan in the role of the Crusader battling the Saracen. A parallel between this work and The

Man Who Was Thursday is quickly drawn with this image, for MacIan's vision closely resembles Syme's recollection of Roland's refrain. In both cases, MacIan and Syme associate their battle with the medieval Crusades. Yet later in The Ball and the Cross, after the duel has encountered several interruptions and the duelists have been in each other's company for well over twenty-four hours, MacIan still associates himself with a Crusader, but he no longer associates Turnbull as the Saracen. Instead, one of the most clear and important transformations has taken place in MacIan's symbology. While MacIan still thinks of his position as likened to a medieval epic, he views Turnbull in a strikingly different light. He considers: "Legends of the morning of the world which he had heard in childhood or read in youth came back upon him in a cloudy splendour, purple tales of wrath and friendship, like Roland and Oliver, or Balin and Balan, reminding him of emotional entanglements" (46). In this case, MacIan still recalls the crusades through the name of Roland, but now Turnbull has become Oliver, with whom Roland argues, but within the more complicated framework of friendship.

MacIan's second choice of legends to represent his adversarial relationship is also of medieval importance. Balin and Balan are Arthurian knights who kill each other, but the significance to MacIan and Turnbull's position is the fact that Balin and Balan are brothers. MacIan's legendary associations speak directly of the type of relationship the adversaries are developing, and it also shows the medieval influence upon MacIan's thought. MacIan's shift also moves Turnbull away from the directly violent attack of the Crusader against the Saracen, into the more complex and even compassionate relationship of friends or brothers. While MacIan's association with these medieval tales

still keeps him in the realm of impending violence, his transformation of Turnbull puts them both in a place where an ideological relationship is more viable, and it indicates a bold move forward towards the chance for resolution.

The medieval influence upon MacIan is most evident during “The Dream of MacIan,” which appears only in the novel version of The Ball and the Cross. MacIan and Turnbull are trapped together in a lunatic asylum run by Professor Lucifer.³ While wandering in the garden MacIan has a dream of being taken up in a silver flying machine that “gleamed like the armour of Sir Galhad” (130) piloted by a man who identifies himself only as the law. Law transports MacIan to what would appear to be a utopian world and it is fully under the influence of the medieval. MacIan’s guide informs, “The people are once more taught and ruled as is best; they are happy knights, happy squires, happy servants, happy serfs, if you will [...]” (131). MacIan’s utopian dream world is given full symbolic expression in the reconstructed dome of St. Paul’s Cathedral:

Round the second gallery [...] ran a second rank of such images [...]
 When they came closer he saw they were figures in complete armour of steel or silver, each with a naked sword, point upward; and then he saw one of the swords move. These were not statues but an armed order of chivalry thrown in three circles round the cross. MacIan drew in his breath, as children do at anything they think utterly beautiful. For he could imagine nothing that so echoed his own visions of pontifical or

³ For a detailed exploration of the symbolic meaning behind the asylum and its inhabitants, see: Lynette Hunter’s G.K. Chesterton: Explorations in Allegory; specifically pages 61-64, wherein she explores the function of the asylum being inhabited by lunatics who believe themselves perfect, while it is here that MacIan and Turnbull have dreams of perfected societies that are indeed mad.

chivalric art as this white dome sitting like a vast silver tiara over London, ringed with a triple crown of swords. (132)

With this vision MacIvan's ideals of medieval chivalry and religion are idealized, but since the visionary guide is in the same ship as Lucifer and happens to have the same cleft chin, the ideal cannot last long. MacIvan's utopia is perverted through extremity and totality.

MacIvan observes the police force, now garbed as knights, "with spur and plume whose smooth and splendid armour glittered like diamond rather than steel" (132), enforcing the law with severity. A police-knight strikes an old man for not crossing the street fast enough. When MacIvan questions this action, his guide answers, "Discipline for the whole society is surely more important than justice to an individual" (133). This response awakens MacIvan to the evil nature underlying his utopia and the vision is quickly shattered.

While this brand of medievalism appears perverted, it still shows the importance of medieval ideals to MacIvan, and the schism in the utopia does not necessarily discount medievalism's worth. Ian Boyd points out in The Novels of G.K. Chesterton:

It might of course be argued that Chesterton is concerned with pointing out the dangers of something which in theory he might still regard as very good indeed [...] the transformation of MacIvan's dream of chivalry into an authoritarian nightmare does not necessarily call into question the dream which has been transformed. (26-27)

The dream does show how MacIvan lies fully under the influence of medieval ideology and can now recognize when that ideology may go too far, which brings him closer to

Boyd's assertion of Chesterton's medievalism as a search for balance. The most evident search for balance presents itself in MacIan and Turnbull, and here again medieval aspects transform their relationship.

MacIan and Turnbull begin the novel with every intention of fighting each other to the death, by the novel's end the two would be willing to fight just about anyone else except each other. The single most important attribute held by both characters that allows for this transformation is the fact that both are absolutely adamant about their individual beliefs. In What's Wrong with the World, published one year after The Ball and the Cross, Chesterton provides a key insight into his philosophies for what allows this adversarial camaraderie and he positions his thinking directly within the Middle Ages. He explains:

There are two things, and two things only, for the human mind, a dogma and a prejudice. The Middle Ages were a rational epoch, an age of doctrine. Our age is, at its best, a poetical epoch, an age of prejudice. A doctrine is a definite point; a prejudice is a direction [...] It is not merely true that a creed unites men. Nay, a difference of creed unites men—so long as it is a clear difference. A boundary unites. Many a magnanimous Moslem and chivalrous Crusader must have been nearer to each other, because they were both dogmatists [...] 'I say God is One,' and 'I say God is One but also Three,' that is the beginning of a good quarrelsome, manly friendship. (21-22)

The same line of thinking is at work within the novel, MacIan believes that "God is," and Turnbull believes that "God is not." The extreme opposition of their thought does allow for an underlying unity. Turnbull expresses just how similar their views are in explaining their positions to the disciple of Nietzsche. Turnbull clarifies, "This man and I are alone in the modern world in that we think that God is essentially important. I think He does not exist; that is where the importance comes in for me. But this man thinks that He does exist, and thinking that very properly thinks Him more important than anything else" (49). The difference in their beliefs, because it is defined and clear, creates first their need to duel, but operating within that need there is also a respect for the other's viewpoint because it is held so definitely as opposed to the patronizing indifference expressed by their society.

Throughout the novel Chesterton indicates their position of solidarity through their adherence to spiritual and material creeds. MacIan's first violence, of smashing Turnbull's window, shows that MacIan's anger respects Turnbull's comments more than the indifference of the rest of London. The narrator points out, "Year after year went by, and at last a man came by who treated Mr. Turnbull's secularist shop with a real respect and seriousness. He was a young man in a grey plaid, and he smashed the window" (14). Shortly after this incident, MacIan's fiery anger is juxtaposed against the flippant indifference of the court, annoyed more by MacIan's strong belief than by his violence, and this callousness is more isolating to MacIan than Turnbull's atheism. During the court proceedings the narrator comments:

Any punishment or suppression he would have felt as natural; but the sudden juncture between the laughter of his judge and the laughter of the man he had wronged [it is soon learned that Turnbull behaved in the manner of the court so that the two could escape this environment and engage in the duel proper], made him feel suddenly small, or at least, defeated. It was really true that the whole modern world regarded his world as a bubble. (20)

Chesterton's choice of words for describing the modern world's view of Maclan's belief finds a parallel again in What's Wrong with the World. In Chesterton's discussion of family and the growing trend of divorce his thoughts on marital vows could easily be translated to The Ball and the Cross comments on dogma, "[...] anarchy (or what some call liberty) is essentially discouraging. If we all floated in the air like bubbles, free to drift anywhere at any instant, the practical result would be that no one would have the courage to begin a conversation" (67). The courts treatment of Maclan's beliefs as a bubble, something not to be spoken of in a court of law, finds its antithesis in Turnbull's courage and conviction to accept Maclan's challenge to a duel. Both men have the courage to begin a duel and as a result both men have the courage to begin a conversation. Maclan recognizes this point when just after escaping the police for the first time, he comments, "[...] I know exactly what it all means. It means us. This whole civilization is only a dream. You and I are the realities" (28). Turnbull and Maclan are the realities because they recognize each other as realities and not as the indifferent bubbles of the modern world.

Only because of the clear difference of creeds is there any chance for the other aspects of medieval behavior to affect MacIlan and Turnbull's relationship. The two men take this notion even further when it is realized that they might not clearly understand those differences, and rather than continue fighting in a fog of prejudice, Turnbull argues, "Do not by any means let us drop our intentions of settling our differences with two steel swords. But do you not think that with two pewter pots we might do what we really have never thought of doing yet—discover what our difference is" (56)? At this point the two men replace their dueling swords for dialogue and deepen their respect for each other's position, although respect is an attribute that appears early in their argument. The medieval characteristics most often named by the two characters are honor and chivalry. From the first mention of a duel, MacIlan claims, "I will fight him like a gentleman; I will fight him as our fathers fought" (19).

MacIlan and Turnbull are each adherent to a creed and each man at the onset of the duel in effect exchange vows to adhere to their creed of the duel. MacIlan swears by all the things sacred to his belief, "[...] by the God you have denied, by the Blessed Lady you have blasphemed [...] by the seven swords in her heart [...] by the Holy Island where my fathers are, by the honour of my mother, by the secret of my people, and by the chalice of the Blood of God"(21). Turnbull also swears, but simply, "And I [...] give my word"(21). Their exchange of vows gives them another united purpose, the duel.

MacIlan and Turnbull will tie men up, such as the shopkeeper, to stay true to their vow, and they will continually evade police, but the commitment to the duel does not undermine their commitment to their notions of chivalry. During the first duel in the

shopkeeper's garden, MacIan hears a noise that delays his defense in the midst of the fight. Turnbull's actions exhibit his ideals, "Turnbull, perhaps from an equal astonishment, perhaps from chivalry, stopped also and forbore to send his sword through his exposed enemy" (25). Later, MacIan demonstrates similar behavior when the two men are fighting in enclosed area of beach with an encroaching tide. The tide begins to overtake Turnbull when MacIan exclaims, "Turnbull [...] I can't help it—fair fighting is more even than promises. And this is not fair fighting [...] You'll be washed away like seaweed before it's above my breeches. I'll not fight foul for all the girls and angels in the universe" (86). For both men the justification of their beliefs is not superior to their loyalty to chivalric notions of battle and neither man will win this duel at the cost of dishonor.

Yet, Chesterton's narrative technique is also at work within these passages, and because the duel is continually interrupted, as Boyd has pointed out, the dialogue between the duels becomes the emphasis. In this way, *The Ball and the Cross*, both the serialized version and the published novel, is not focused on the physical confrontation of the duel; the physical violence, what little there is, becomes merely the narrative platform on which the characters can stage their debate. In both their physical and rhetorical engagement, MacIan and Turnbull exhibit deep-seated notions of chivalry and honor,

As MacIan and Turnbull respect each other during the duel, the two men at the onset are also determined to respect each other when the duel is interrupted. Turnbull expresses this sentiment during their first escape from the police. He suggests, "I understand that we have now definitely settled that in the conventional language honour

is not satisfied [...] Until the event comes off, therefore, I should suggest that quarrelling would be inconvenient and rather inartistic; while the exchange of politeness between man and man would be not only elegant but uncommonly practical” (29). MacIan immediately accepts Turnbull’s suggestion and they each hold true to this amendment to their fight.

Therefore the environment in which the two combatants have created for themselves is one that is bound by and infused with respect, with the intention of not only satisfying the honour of their beliefs, but also clearly understanding what those beliefs are. Under these circumstances a relationship of amiability is almost inevitable and certainly so in the case of Turnbull and MacIan. The two happen across what they believe is France (but what is really a small British island). The fact that the island is in fact British also indicates that the flower of chivalry (chevalier) has been uprooted from its original French soil and is now firmly implanted in Britain. On this soil of gallantry Turnbull declares, “Courage my friend, we have come to the country of honour”(90). The narrator points out that MacIan does not even notice the term “friend,” as though it were most appropriate for their relationship as duelists. The language used against each other’s ideals become more like terms of endearment than terms of accusation, as in the case of MacIan’s assurance to Turnbull that he is not dreaming while in the asylum, “No, you good atheist [...] no, you clean, courteous, reverent, pious old blasphemer” (166).

Because respect for each other has been applied since the beginning and has grown throughout their duel, the environment allows for humility as well. MacIan expresses this trait while trying to understand Turnbull’s ploy to escape the asylum. He

concedes, “I am awfully stupid, Mr. Turnbull; you must be patient with me” (125). Each of these attributes allows for the possibility of Chesterton’s medieval balance, and Ian Boyd points out, “Turnbull’s eventual conversion does imply that the closed world of the rationalist should be open to the supernatural values of the Christian” (22), but also “One misreads the novel if one fails to see that [MacIan’s] romantic other-worldliness is finally transformed and humanized by the values of intellectual honesty and social awareness which Turnbull expresses through his atheism” (22). The transformation takes place because each man has enacted the principles set forth by Chesterton in his criticism What’s Wrong with the World. Continuing from his discussion of creeds and prejudices, Chesterton maintains, “A creed is a collective thing, and even its sins are sociable. A prejudice is a private thing, and even its tolerance is misanthropic [...] For the sincere controversialist is above all things a good listener. The really burning enthusiast never interrupts; he listens to the enemy’s arguments as eagerly as a spy would listen to the enemy’s arrangements” (24-25). MacIan and Turnbull are steadfast enemies who exhibit the chivalrous trait of respect, and they each listen to the other’s arguments because they have the conviction of their creeds and the courage to engage. While The Ball and the Cross does not overtly display medieval themes, there are enough manifestations of their influence to indicate important roles. These traits create the catalyst for MacIan and Turnbull’s dispute, yet they also provide them with the tools for resolution as Chesterton’s love of the Middle Age’s adherence to doctrine also brings about his medieval search for balance.

Chesterton provides a symbol for this transformation at the novel's end as the two swords of the combatants have fallen haphazardly, forming the shape of the cross. His choice of symbol not only evokes the spiritual elements which figures so heavily in this novel, it also provides a clear symbol of two men achieving equality, as the cross can also be seen as a symbol of a scale in balance. It is important to note that this symbol is not provided at the end of the serialized version, which ends with MacIan and Turnbull in the midst of discussion as they come to "the eternal waters" of the sea (The Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton: Vol. VI 466).

The most significant difference between the two endings is the fact that in the serialized version there is the open-ended possibility that the two men may find somewhere else to fight, for the dialogue of absolute resolution is absent. Also the opportunity for the two men to see the weakness of their ideals would be lacking. But Chesterton's completed novel shows the total transformation of the two characters. A transformation fully removed from violence and into a position of deep understanding. In the published novel, the two men have their separate epiphanies and their mutual accord, declared by the peaceful state of their fallen swords. It is here that Chesterton chooses to close his debate.

Conclusion

“Of all the modern poets there is only one whose verse is always full of the voice of battle, and that is Mr. Chesterton” (Williams, Poetry at Present 97).

“Chesterton (1874-1936), the great English essayist, journalist, and philosopher, was a man of singular good will, engaging charm, and broad interests. From all eye-witness reports about him, he never really had any enemies” (Schall, “On the Enemies of the Man Who Had No Enemies” par. 1)

The fact that both statements could be spoken of Gilbert Keith Chesterton is appropriate for the man who so loved paradox. Chesterton’s verse, and prose, is often “full of the voice of battle” and yet somehow “he never really had any enemies.” Both traits can find symbolic representation in the two purchases Chesterton made on the day of his wedding. He shares in his Autobiography; “It is alleged against me, and with perfect truth, that I stopped on the way to drink a glass of milk in one shop and to buy a revolver with cartridges in another” (30). He goes on to say that he purchased the revolver because “it was the great adventure of my youth” (30) and with the idea of protecting his wife from pirates, “doubtless infesting the Norfolk Broads” (30). The

milk he purchased because it was from the shop where he would stop with his mother as a boy.

In each item there is seen a strong aspect of Chesterton's character, a strong love for adventure and combat, and yet a deep sensitivity full of compassion and humility. Chesterton found representations for both traits in his love for the Middle Ages and medieval ideals. Again, Ian Boyd's observation clarifies Chesterton's wedding day purchases, "For Chesterton, medievalism was a state of mind which was always seeking to balance varied elements in an existing social order" ("Chesterton's Medievalism" 248). Medievalism also appears to represent Chesterton's search to balance varied elements of his character as well as the varied elements of his confrontations in person and in print.

This is the search for balance the reader witnesses in his three earliest novels, The Napoleon of Notting Hill, The Man Who Was Thursday, and The Ball and the Cross. It is no coincidence that the episodes of violence occur when ideological balance is farthest from equilibrium, when the mind of Auberon Quin is severed from the mind of Adam Wayne, when anarchy threatens to dynamite order, when the humanism of James Turnbull is excommunicated from the spiritualism of Evan MacIan. Only when these characters begin to exhibit the medieval trait Chesterton highlights in A Short History of England, does reconciliation occur; "And in nothing were the mediævals more free and sane than in their acceptance of names and emblems from outside their most beloved limits" (72-73).

Each of these novels represents characters exhibiting a sociological, philosophical, and theological stance encountering a viewpoint outside of its limits.

Violence, or threat of violence, occurs when that character is least willing to accept anything from beyond its own limits. This idea also explains one of Chesterton's great fears of Modernism, that it clouded all limits or more specifically, put a fog over those limits, which is the language he uses in What's Wrong with the World.

As quoted in the last chapter, Chesterton argues that the Middle Ages were an age of doctrine (21), and also "It is not merely true that a creed unites men. Nay, a difference of creed unites men—so long as it is a clear difference. A boundary unites" (22). Chesterton then argues the dangers of blurred differences, "Our political vagueness divides men, it does not fuse them. Men will walk along the edge of a chasm in clear weather, but they will edge miles away from it in a fog" (23). He continues in the same vein when he asserts, "[...] prejudices are divergent, whereas creeds are always in collision. Believers bump into each other; whereas bigots keep out of each other's way" (24). The attribute of creeds, which Chesterton associates with the Middle Ages, allows for the clear distinction of boundaries that is seen in these three novels; cynic against fanatic, law versus anarchy, humanist versus deist, and as a natural result there is conflict.

Yet, throughout these novels the violence acts primarily as a narrative device to represent the ideological engagement, it is never exhibited as the idyllic state of relationship, and apart from The Napoleon of Notting Hill, which includes a great deal of bloodshed but was also Chesterton's youngest work, the physical conflict appears to operate only as the means for getting the characters close enough for dialogue to occur while avoiding physical injury. It also allows for a clearer demonstration of another medieval attribute admired by Chesterton, chivalry.

Chivalrous character runs consistently throughout each of Chesterton's works, and as is seen, in his own debating style. He never hesitates to compliment his opponent's virtues, or offer humility when shown to be in the wrong. One reason for this behaviour can be seen in Chesterton's essay "The Mediæval Villain" collected in A Miscellany of Men. Chesterton discusses the difference between a modern villain and the medieval villain, arguing:

The Byronic spirit was really a sort of operatic Calvinism. It brought the villain upon the stage; the lost soul; the modern version of King John. But the contemporaries of King John did not feel like that about him, even when they detested him. They instinctively felt him to be a man of mixed passions like themselves, who was allowing his evil passions to have much too good a time of it. They might have spoken of him as a man in considerable danger of going to hell; but they would have not talked of him as if he had come from there. (272-273).

Chesterton displays the same trait in his debates and through his characters. In both, the arguments maintain the clear distinction; damnable thoughts or passions but not damned persons. This position not only allows for but also encourages the chivalrous traits of courtesy, respect, honor, and even admiration of those "mixed passions" which are not evil. This attitude acts as a conduit for the balance or resolution to be achieved.

Through the entire process Chesterton appears to express joy, and through the insights of his essays and Autobiography it is easier to understand why. His innate sense of adventure and romanticism is no doubt the driving force behind his joy, but it was

clearly encouraged through the hobbies and character of his father, as seen in the toy-theatre. He also expresses this joy in engagement because through his debates and through the conflict of his characters, the lines of his creeds are more clearly drawn. This would help to explain why Chesterton could have such a close relationship with Shaw, claiming in his Autobiography, “I am proud of him as a foe even more than as a friend” (233). This statement finds a correlation in his essay “The Maid of Orleans” from All Things Considered, “If I disbelieved in Christianity, I should be the loudest blasphemer in Hyde Park. Nothing ought to be too big for a brave man to attack; but there are some things too big for a man to patronize” (268). Under this bias Chesterton would prefer the outright attacks of Shaw and Blatchford, rather than patronizing indifference.

Patronization could substitute for Chesterton’s examination of prejudice, as both serve more as a means to avoid that with which they disagree, rather than engage it head on as Chesterton and Shaw, and Chesterton’s characters do again and again. Chesterton is much more likely to appear joyous at the boundary where creeds meet, because he is aware that this is the place where the opportunity for synthesis begins.

Through this thesis I have been exploring the ways medieval ideals influenced Chesterton’s ability to maintain amiability with adversaries, and I have no doubt at my conclusion that they did. But the violence often associated with medievalism also appears to raise its dragon’s head. I have tried to address some peaceful explanations for the development of this paradoxical thought, medievalism as cause of peace yet medievalism as cause for war. I believe these explanations are valid, especially when applied to Chesterton’s narrative, but I don’t know that these explanations would serve as

Works Cited

Works Cited

- "Arrest of Anarchists Near Paris." The Times. 11 April 1908; 5d.
- Augustine, Saint, Bishop of Hippo. Eighty-Three Different Questions. Trans. David L. Mosher. The Fathers of the Church. 70. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1982.
- Barczewski, Stephanie L. Myth and National Identity in Nineteenth-Century Britain: The Legends of King Arthur and Robin Hood. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.
- Bettany, F. G. "G.K.C.'s Strange Story of a Duel." Rev. of The Ball and the Cross by G. K. Chesterton. The Sunday Times 27 February 1910. G. K. Chesterton: The Critical Judgments; Part I: 1900-1937. Ed. D.J. Conlon. Antwerp: Antwerp Studies in English Literature, 1976.
- Boyd, Ian. "Chesterton's Medievalism." Studies in Medievalism. 3.3 (1991): 243-255.
- . The Novels of G. K. Chesterton: A Study in Art and Propaganda. New York: Harper-Barnes & Noble, 1975.
- Burkhardt, Louis C. "G.K. Chesterton and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." George Orwell. Eds. Courtney T. Wemyss and Alexej Ugrinsky. Contributions to the study of World Lit. 23. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1987.
- Calanchi, Alessandra. "The Spies That Were Used Up; Vulnerability and Disguise in The Secret Agent and The Man Who Was Thursday." Merope. 9.20 (Jan. 1997): 105-21

- Chesterton, Gilbert Keith. The Autobiography of G. K. Chesterton. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1936.
- . The Ball and the Cross. 1905-06. The Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton. Vol. VI: The Club of Queer Trades, The Napoleon of Notting Hill, The Ball and the Cross, The Man Who Was Thursday. Compiled and Intro. Denis J. Conlon. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991.
- . The Ball and the Cross. 1909. New York: Dover, 1995.
- . "The Blatchford Controversies." The Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton: Vol. 1: Heretics, Orthodoxy, The Blatchford Controversies. Ed. David Dooley. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1986.
- . Chaucer. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1932.
- . "Christianity and Rationalism." The Religious Doubts of Democracy. Ed. George Haw. London: MacMillian, 1904.
- . The Collected Works of G. K. Chesterton. Vol. X: Collected Poetry Part I. Comp. Aidan Mackey. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1994.
- . "A Duel at Dusk." The Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton. Vol. XI: Plays, Chesterton on Shaw. Comp. and Intro. Denis J. Conlon. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1989.
- . The Everlasting Man. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1926.
- . "Forward." The Man Who Was Thursday. The Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton. Vol. VI: The Club of Queer Trades, The Napoleon of Notting Hill, The Ball and the

- Cross, The Man Who Was Thursday. Compiled and Intro. Denis J. Conlon. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991.
- . "G.B.S. Versus G.K.C." The Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton Vol.X The Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton. Vol. XI: Plays, Chesterton on Shaw. Comp. and Intro. Denis J. Conlon. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1989.
- . Heretics. 6th ed. New York: John Lane, 1905.
- . "Maid of Orleans." All Things Considered. New York: John Lane, 1909.
- . The Man Who Was Thursday: A Nightmare. Special Annotations by Martin Gardner. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999.
- . "The Mediæval Villain." A Miscellany of Men. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1912.
- . The Napoleon of Notting Hill. The Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton. Vol. VI: The Club of Queer Trades, The Napoleon of Notting Hill, The Ball and the Cross, The Man Who Was Thursday. Compiled and Intro. Denis J. Conlon. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991.
- . "On Flags." Generally Speaking. 1929. Freeport: Books For Libraries Press, 1968.
- . "On Misunderstanding." Generally Speaking. 1929. Freeport: Books For Libraries Press, 1968.
- . "On Turnpikes and Mediævalism." All I Survey. 1933. Freeport: Books For Libraries Press, 1967.
- . "Phonetic Spelling." All Things Considered. New York: John Lane Company, 1909: 215-220.

- . Robert Browning. 1903. New York: St. Martin's, 1967.
- . A Short History of England. New York: John Lane Company, 1917.
- . "Some Policemen and a Moral." Tremendous Trifles. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1910.
- . "The Position of Sir Walter Scott." Twelve Types. 1906. New York: AMS Press, 1976.
- . The Well and The Shallows. 1935. Great Neck, New York: Core Collections Micropublications, 1986.
- . What's Wrong with the World. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1910.
- Coates, John. "The Ball and the Cross and the Edwardian Novel of Ideas." The Chesterton Review: The Journal of the Chesterton Society 18.1 (Feb. 1992): 49-81.
- Conlon, D. J. ed. G. K. Chesterton: The Critical Judgments, Part I: 1900-1937. Antwerp: Universitaire Faculteiten Sint-Ignatius, 1976.
- . "A Note on the Text." The Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton. Vol. VI: The Club of Queer Trades, The Napoleon of Notting Hill, The Ball and the Cross, The Man Who Was Thursday. Compiled and Intro. Denis J. Conlon. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991.
- Connors, Joseph B. "The Starry Pinnacle of the Commonplace." The Chesterton Review: The Journal of the Chesterton Society 5(1978-79): 48-61.
- Digby, Kenelm Henry. The Broad Stone of Honour: or, The True Sense and Practice of Chivalry: The Fourth Book, Orlandus: In Two Vols.-Vol.1. London: Bernard Quartich, 1877.

- Dooley, David. "Chesterton in Debate with Blatchford: The Development of a Controversialist." G.K. Chesterton and C. S. Lewis: The Riddle of Joy. Eds. Michael H. Macdonald and Andrew A. Tadie. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Dooley, D. J. "The Ball With or Without the Cross: How the Great Debate is Resolved in Chesterton and Orwell." The Chesterton Review: The Journal of the Chesterton Society 12.1 (Feb. 1986): 29-47.
- Faulkner, Peter. "'The Paths of Virtue and Early English': F. J. Furnivall and Victorian Medievalism." From Medieval to Medievalism. Ed. John Simmons. New York: St. Martin's, 1992.
- Faxon, Alicia Craig. Dante Gabriel Rossetti. New York: Abbeville, 1989.
- Furlong, William B. GBS/GKC: Shaw and Chesterton; The Metaphysical Jesters. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1970.
- Gardner, Martin. "Levels of Allegory in The Ball and the Cross." The Chesterton Review: The Journal of the Chesterton Society 18.1(Feb. 1982): 37-47.
- Girouard, Mark. The Return to Camelot: Chivalry and the English Gentleman. New Haven: Yale UP, 1981.
- Hunter, Lynette. G.K. Chesterton: Explorations in Allegory. New York: St. Martins, 1979.
- Jenkins, Philip. "Feminism: Or, Chesterton's Mistake about Women." The Chesterton Review: The Journal of the Chesterton Society 21.1-2 (1995): 69-87

- Lauer, Quentin, S.J. G. K. Chesterton: Philosopher without Portfolio. New York: Fordham UP, 1988. NetLibrary. OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc. 12 May 2005. <<http://www.netlibrary.com>>.
- McLuhan, Marshall. "The Origins of Chesterton's Medievalism." The Chesterton Review: The Journal of the Chesterton Society 1 (1975): 49-50.
- Medcalf, Stephen. "Introduction." The Man Who Was Thursday, and Related Pieces. Oxford; New York: Oxford UP, 1996.
- Mitchell, Jerome. Scott, Chaucer, and Medieval Romance: A Study in Sir Walter Scott's Indebtedness to the Literature of the Middle Ages. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1987.
- Schall, James V. "On the Enemies of the Man Who Had No Enemies." Schall on Chesterton: Timely Essays on Timeless Paradoxes. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2000: 226-41. 29 June 2005 <<http://www.georgetown.edu/faculty/schallj/3.htm#enemies>>.
- Scott, Walter. Marmion. Ed. and Notes. William J. Rolfe. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1885.
- Simmons, Clare A. Reversing the Conquest: History and Myth in Nineteenth-Century British Literature. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1990.
- The Song of Roland. Trans. Patricia Terry. New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- Von Hildebrand, Alice. "G.K. Chesterton on Feminism." The Chesterton Review: The Journal of the Chesterton Society 13.4 (1987): 443-453.
- Ward, Massie. Gilbert Keith Chesterton. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1943.

- Wilde, Oscar. "The Sphinx." The Best Known Works of Oscar Wilde: Including The Poems, Novels, Plays, Essays, Fairytales and Dialogues; Six Volumes in One. New York: Blue Ribbon Books, 1927.
- Williams, Charles. Poetry at Present. London: Oxford UP, 1930.
- Wills, Gary. "The Man Who Was Thursday." G. K. Chesterton: A Half Century of Views. Ed. D. J. Conlon. Oxford; New York: Oxford UP, 1987.
- Wren-Lewis, John. "Chesterton as a Sage of Aquarius." The Chesterton Review: The Journal of the Chesterton Society 19:1 (Feb. 1993): 33-37.
- Youngberg, Karin. "Job and the Gargoyles: A Study of The Man Who Was Thursday." The Chesterton Review: The Journal of the Chesterton Society 2 (1976): 240-252.