Charles Dickens and Literary Tourism: His Experiential Encounters and Legacy

Emily Vaila Smith

Royal Holloway, University of London

Submitted for Degree of PhD

Declaration of Authorship

I, Emily Smith hereby declare that this thesis and the work presented in it is entirely my own. Where I have consulted the work of others, this is always clearly stated.

Signed:  Date: 15/08/2021

Abstract

This thesis explores the connection between Charles Dickens and literary tourism, juxtaposing his own visits to literary tourism sites with an analysis of how his literary legacy has been presented in the Charles Dickens Museum, London. The thesis is divided into roughly two parts: the first investigates Dickens's own experiences at literary tourist sites and how these informed his career and his attempt to shape his legacy. The second half takes a larger museological approach. It surveys the founding and development of the Charles Dickens Museum within Dickens's former home, 48 Doughty Street, highlighting how Dickens became the subject of authorial tourism he had encountered.

This thesis will argue that Dickens's visits to other writers' houses as an author tourist significantly affected his career and personal development. Using Dickens's visits to the homes of Sir Walter Scott and William Shakespeare, it will be argued that his position as an author made his encounters with their homes more complex than other literary tourists. Moreover, Dickens's visits to literary heritage sites affected Dickens's plans for his legacy, shaping his response to the literary memorials of other authors and encouraging him to declare that no monument was to be erected in his honour.

Using Dickens's thoughts concerning literary tourism, the thesis will analyse the Dickens Fellowship's founding of the Charles Dickens Museum, previously known as the Dickens House. It will explore how Dickens's wishes shaped the Fellowship's justification for purchasing the house, showing the impact of Dickens's legacy on the presentation of the property. The thesis will illustrate that as the Fellowship's influence over the Dickens House waned, and the institution increasingly mimicked the display practices of other writers' house museums, a more well-rounded view of Dickens, his life and his works was presented within the house.

Acknowledgements

I am greatly indebted to my supervisor, Juliet John, who I would like to thank for her ever insightful feedback, patience and encouragement. Thank you also to Jane Hamlett for her invaluable feedback and support, as well as, Vicky Greenaway, Ruth Livesey and Adam Roberts for their criticism as the thesis developed.

My PhD was funded by AHRC and NPIF, which allowed me the irreplaceable opportunity to work closely with the Charles Dickens Museum. Thank you to all the staff for always being so welcoming but particularly to Louisa Price, Frankie Kubicki and Cindy Sughrue, for assisting and supporting me throughout, and giving me the opportunity to develop my career alongside my research.

Great thanks to Mary Horrell for pointing out this opportunity and to Sophie Bullen and Tim Manningmore, who offered motivation and laughter along the way. To Vic Smith, for always allowing me to bounce ideas off him, and to Angela, Gordon and Harriet for their reassurance and encouragement.

Lastly, to Rory Dunbar for his ceaseless support, understanding and humour, thank you.

Contents

List of illustrations

Introduction

Just over 150 years ago, Charles Dickens conjured his friends 'to on no account […] make me the subject of any monument, memorial, or testimonial whatever.'[1] Not long later, on 9 June 1870, Dickens died aged fifty-eight. Although his death was relatively sudden, Dickens had been contemplating the shape of his posthumous literary legacy for some time. As his authorial career progressed, he turned his attention to how other writers were commemorated and became interested in literary tourist sites, particularly writers' homes and monuments, which were increasingly preserved and erected in their honour. I will offer the first in-depth analysis of Dickens's visits to literary tourist sites. This thesis focuses on how Dickens's reactions to such sites influenced his own dying wishes and continues to shape the Dickensian literary tourism sites we encounter today.

The thesis begins by outlining Dickens's visits to author tourism sites and how they impacted his thinking about his own legacy. I will argue that Dickens's position as an author made his reaction to such sites more complex than those of a typical literary tourist. The second half of the thesis will then take a posthumous approach and analyse how Dickens's home, 48 Doughty Street, London has become the object of author tourism since its conversion into a literary tourist site in 1925. The site was originally known as the Dickens House but is now the Charles Dickens Museum. My AHRC-funded doctorate - which Royal Holloway established in partnership with the Charles Dickens Museum - focuses on this property and the juxtaposition of Dickens's lived experience of literary tourism with the creation of a site in his honour. Overall, the thesis emphasises Dickens's close connection with author tourism, a specific kind of literary tourism, and how essential this previously under-explored topic is to our understanding of Dickens the man and the author, as well as to his cultural legacy in the form of a literary tourist site.

Dickens the Author Tourist

[1] 'Charles Dickens's Last Will and Codicil, 12 May 1869 and 2 June 1870', *Letters of Charles Dickens,* Vol. 12*,* Appendix K, *The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.12: 1868-1870* ed. by Graham Storey et al., (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 732.

In 1847, Dickens, accompanied by his close friend John Forster, visited Victor Hugo's apartments in Paris. Dickens was enamoured by the visit, and described the experience in detail to the Countess of Blessington:

> We were at his house last Sunday week. A most extraordinary place, looking like an old curiosity shop, or the Property Room of some gloomy vast old Theatre. I was much struck by Hugo himself, who looks a Genius, as he certainly is, and is very interesting from head to foot. [2]

It is noteworthy that Dickens describes the apartments before he describes Hugo. Although struck by the author, Dickens goes on to describe the adornments of the room, noting how they found themselves 'sitting among old armour, and old tapestry, and old coffers, and grim old chairs and tables'.[3] Dickens believed that the room showed Hugo's creativity as he noted in another letter that the space 'looked like a chapter out of one of his own [Hugo's] books.'[4] This meeting demonstrates that Dickens believed a connection to a writer and their work could be strongly felt through an encounter with their space, and in particular their home. The visit had a lasting impression on Dickens, as fifteen years later he stated, 'Victor Hugo had the most fantastic of apartments, and stood in the midst of it, a little fine-featured fiery-eyed gallant fellow', prioritising again his description of the home before the man.[5] Dickens was

[2] Dickens to Countess of Blessington (27 January 1847), *The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.5: 1847-1849,* ed. by Kathleen Mary Tillotson et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), p. 15.
[3] Ibid. Strikingly this also mimics Dickens's description of *The Old Curiosity Shop* (1840): 'There were suits of mail […] fantastic carvings […] tapestry and strange furniture that might have been designed in dreams', made more striking by Dickens using 'old curiosity shop' to describe the apartments. Charles Dickens, *The Old Curiosity Shop,* ed. by Elizabeth M. Brennan (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. 10.
[4] Dickens to Countess of Blessington (27 January 1847), p. 15. It is difficult to know what Hugo Dickens had read as his works are not listed in the inventory of Devonshire Terrace and his early letters do not indicate his familiarity with Hugo's work.
[5] Dickens to Charles Lever (4 November 1862), *The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.10: 1862-1864*, ed. by Kathleen Mary Tillotson et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 155.

not alone in feeling that Hugo's home reflected his identity as an author; these very apartments are now the Victor Hugo Museum in Paris.[6]

Throughout his life, both at home and abroad, Dickens visited literary tourist sites associated with other authors. By 1841, Dickens had journeyed to a number of popular literary tourism sites including Green Arbour Court that was the home of Oliver Goldsmith, Poets' Corner in Westminster Abbey, and Eastcheap which had connections to Shakespeare, as he noted to fellow author tourist, Washington Irving.[7] Dickens explored Sir Walter Scott's home, Abbotsford and journeyed through Stratford-upon-Avon and its associations with William Shakespeare. He was also interested in authors' graves and the monuments created in their honour, often noting his thoughts on them in his letters and works.

Although his experiences at such literary sites may incline us to see him as a literary tourist, this thesis sees him as something more specific: an author tourist. Author tourists share many of the same characteristics as literary tourists, such as an interest in writers' works, an inclination to visit sites associated with literary creation and a desire to understand writers' lives and inspirations, which is why they are rarely designated separately in literary tourism scholarship.[8] However, author tourists should be considered as a distinctive category of visitor. As authors themselves, their interaction with literary sites is different, marked by a comparison between the author whose legacy they are encountering and their own position and career as a writer. Author tourists tend to be more interested in places associated with a writer's biography, as they visit such sites not only to learn more about another author and their works but also to discover more about themselves and their craft.

---

[6] Victor Hugo's Houses, Place Des Vogas, Paris, <http://www.maisonsvictorhugo.paris.fr/en/museum-collections/place-des-vosges-apartment-visit> [accessed 18 June 2020].

[7] Dickens to Washington Irving (21 April 1841), *The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.2: 1840-1841,* ed. by Madeline House (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 267.

[8] As discussed below, the term 'author tourist' is rarely, if ever, used in literary tourism scholarship.

Currently, the scholarship that does explore authors' visits to literary tourism sites presents them as literary tourists. Nicola J. Watson and Erin Hazard, among others, note that Washington Irving, for example, was a literary tourist during his travels in England.[9] Similarly, Elizabeth Gaskell's visits to sites associated with Charlotte Brontë have been surveyed, but Gaskell is often considered a tourist, and not even a literary one.[10] Particular attention has been paid to the tourist sites associated with Walter Scott, whose work and life inspired other writers.[11] Dickens's contemporary Jules Verne, for example, visited places in the Highlands associated with Scott's work.[12] However, Ian Thompson notes that although Verne's travels embodied his 'admiration for Walter Scott […,] it was the Trossachs that most stimulated his creative imagination', resulting in Verne setting multiple works in the Highlands.[13] Such scholarship focuses more on identifying the literary tourism which inspired other writers, rather than the authorial tourism sites they visited.

---

[9] Watson, for example, notes that Washington Irving was a literary tourist but does not explore how his position as an author affected his experience or his reflections. Nicola J. Watson, *The Literary Tourist* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 96-98. See also, Erin Hazard, 'The Author's House: Abbotsford and Weyside' *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth Century,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 63-73.
Other authors whose literary encounters have been surveyed include William Godwin in Paul Westover, 'William Godwin, Literary Tourism, and the Work of Necromanticism', *Studies in Romanticism,* 48:2 (2009), 299-319. Goldhill takes a different approach and explores what the Victorians who visited these sites would have experienced but does not separately designate how authors, or specifically Dickens, would have encountered the space. Simon Goldhill, *Freud's Couch, Scott's Buttocks, Bronte's Grave* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).

[10] Pamela Corpron Parker, 'Elizabeth Gaskell and Literary Tourism', *Literary Tourism and the Nineteenth Century,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 128-139. Gaskell's experiences are also explored in Alison Booth, *Homes and Haunts: Touring Writers' Shrines and Countries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016); Erin Hazard, 'Step Forth and Again Take Up Its Magic Pen: The Author's House as Informal Memorial', *From Page to Place: American Tourism and the Afterlives of Authors,* ed. Jennifer Harris and Hilary Iris Lowe (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2017), pp. 46-67.

[11] See, for example, Duncan Macmillan, 'Creating Scotland: Turner and Scott', *The Lancet,* 355:9205 (2000), 759-760; Ann Rigney, *The Afterlives of Walter Scott: Memory on the Move* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

[12] Explored by, for example, Ian Thompson, 'Jules Verne and the Trossachs: Experience and Inspiration', *Literary Tourism, The Trossachs and Walter Scott,* ed. by Ian Brown (Glasgow: Scottish Literature International, 2012), pp. 133-141.

[13] Ibid, p. 139.

An emphasis on Dickens as author tourist demonstrates that writers were aware that literary tourism affected an author's image and were interested in sites associated with authors' lives and not just in their work. I will challenge Nicola Macleod's passing statement that 'many authors remain unconvinced' of the value of literary heritage and highlight that authors had different expectations of these sites than other literary tourists.[14] Andrea Zemgulys has taken a similar approach in her exploration of E. M. Forster, T. S. Eliot and Virginia Woolf's literary tourist encounters.[15] She argues that Woolf, primarily through her visits to Thomas Carlyle's house, drew 'on the sites and texts of literary heritage to examine the making of literary heritage', and reflected this within a number of her essays such as 'Great Men's Houses' (1932) and within her fiction, namely *Orlando* (1928).[16] Although she does not categorise Woolf as an author tourist, Zemgulys highlights that Woolf felt there was a correct way to encounter literary sites, as the visiting author must be a 'good *reader* as well as a good writer' to appreciate them.[17]

This thesis will build upon Zemgulys's work, as many of Woolf's responses, such as an interest in how literary tourism is constructed and encountered as well as its effects on an author's legacy, will be explored in reference to Dickens, showing that these reactions to literary tourism sites are not only reserved for authors of the twentieth century. Moreover, due to her extensive exploration of literary places through her essays, Woolf is often noted as being particularly self-reflective about her position as an author.[18] This thesis aims to show that Dickens was also acutely aware of literary heritage's effect on an author's legacy and

[14] Nicola Macleod, Jennifer Shelley and Alastair M. Morrison, 'The Touring Reader: Understanding the Bibliophile's Experience of Literary Tourism', *Tourism Management,* 67 (2018), 388-398. For more studies of literary tourists' expectations see, Nicola Macleod, 'A Faint Whiff of Cigar: The Literary Tourist's Experience of Visiting Writers' Homes', *Current Issues in Tourism* (2020), 1-16; Shelagh J. Squire, 'The Cultural Values of Literary Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research,* 21 (1994), 103-120.

[15] Andrea Zemgulys, *Modernism and the Locations of Literary Heritage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

[16] Ibid, p. 146. Woolf was particularly interested in Thomas Carlyle's House see Virginia Woolf, 'Great Men's Houses', *The London Scene,* ed. by Hermione Lee (London: Daunt Books, 1975), pp. 29-41; Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own*, (London: Penguin, 1945), and Virginia Woolf, *Orlando,* ed. by Helen Dunmore (London: Penguin Random House, 2016).

[17] Ibid, p. 164, Zemgulys's italics.

[18] The Penguin short biography of Woolf states 'she maintained an astounding output of literary criticism', see front matter of Woolf, *Orlando,* p. i.

considered how this would affect his literary legacy. However, as will be seen, Dickens's reactions to literary sites are not easily identifiable, meaning that an insight into his thoughts must be teased out of an assortment of sources.[19]

Hitherto, when Dickens is mentioned by literary tourism scholars, such as Booth and Watson, their emphasis remains on his literary legacy and the heritage associated with him, rather than on Dickens's own experiences.[20] Much prominence is given to his literary creations; Watson states that in London, for example, 'Dickens and his characters jostle within the same contemporary urban space'.[21] Booth, in comparison, looks more at Dickens's authorial legacy, noting how his image has 'persisted', and that 'much of England's past is Dickensian', but does not explore Dickens's own experiences of literary tourism.[22] The few studies that note Dickens's visit to a literary tourist site do so in passing; Ann Rigney, for example, refers to Dickens's 1841 visit to Abbotsford, but within a single sentence, which also highlights other authors who visited Abbotsford. [23]

Within Dickens scholarship, the few studies that note Dickens's time at literary tourist sites have primarily been published by *The Dickensian*, such as William Miller's work, which succinctly summarises the literary sites Dickens visited.[24] However, Miller's focus on justifying the establishment of the Charles Dickens Museum prevents him from exploring these visits in

[19] Moreover, although Woolf visited the Dickens House herself, my focus for the latter half of the thesis is how Dickens became the object of author tourism, rather than an analysis of how authors experience the property.
[20] See, for example, Alison Booth, 'Time Travel in Dickens' World', *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth-Century Culture' Literary Tourism and Nineteenth-Century Culture,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 150-163.
[21] Nicola J. Watson, 'Rambles in Literary London', *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth-Century Culture,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 139-150, p. 143.
[22] Booth, 'Time Travel', p. 150.
[23] Rigney, *The Afterlives of Walter Scott: Memory on the Move*, p.153. Visit also mentioned in Aislinn Hunter, 'Evocative Objects: A Reading of Resonant Things and Material Encounters in Victorian Writers' Houses/Museum' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2014), p. 8. Despite Rigney's lack of extensive analysis, her work *The Afterlives of Walter Scott*, was a significant starting point for this study.
[24] William Miller, 'The Justification of the Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 27:1 (1931), 43-46, p. 44. This article is analysed in more detail in Chapter Four of this thesis.

more than passing detail. Instead, Dickens's actions as a literary tourist are most widely analysed by Dickens biographers. More recent biographies, such as those by Michael Slater, Claire Tomalin and Peter Ackroyd, offer details about Dickens's visits to literary heritage sites, and sometimes, in the case of Ackroyd, note the effects these places had on Dickens.[25] However, their brief explorations do not acknowledge how Dickens's actions diverge, or correspond to, established literary tourism tropes, and do not highlight how his position as an author tourist affected his encounters with literary tourist sites.

Although some of his accounts may not have survived, interestingly, Dickens only seemed to document the literary tourist sites associated with authors with whom he felt a strong affinity. John Forster describes in April 1840 how he and Dickens visited Dr. Johnson's house in Lichfield, and that in 1869 Dickens took his friend James T. Fields to the 'Johnson's Bolt Court and Goldsmith's Temple Chambers'.[26] Despite admiring these authors - he owned multiple copies of works by both Johnson and Goldsmith - Dickens himself does not note these visits in any of his surviving letters.[27] Similarly, Forster details that he and Dickens visited the author 'Hazlitt's "hut" at Winterslow, birthplace of some of his finest essays', during their trip to Salisbury.[28] Dickens again does not mention this visit, even in a letter to his wife Catherine, which detailed his experiences while he was away.[29] While Hazlitt, Johnson and Goldsmith were important enough to Dickens that he visited sites associated with them, these

[25] This work will utilise, in particular, Peter Ackroyd, *Dickens,* (London: Sinclair and Stevenson, 1990), Michael Slater*, Charles Dickens* (London: Yale University Press, 2011), and Claire Tomalin, *Charles Dickens: A Life* (London: Penguin Books, 2012).
[26] John Forster, *The Life of Charles Dickens* (Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1875), p. 121 and p. 528.
[27] The Devonshire Terrace Inventory states Dickens owned 12 volumes of Johnson's work, which appear to have been published in 1806. See also Dickens Library Online, 'Samuel Johnson, < http://www.dickenslibraryonline.org/author/325> [accessed 4 November 2020], and Dickens Library Online, 'Oliver Goldsmith' < http://www.dickenslibraryonline.org/author/247> [accessed 4 November 2020].
[28] Forster, *The Life of Charles Dickens,* p. 461. The hut was in fact an inn, hence the quotation marks.
[29] Dickens to Catherine Dickens (27 March 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.5: 1847-1849*, p. 265. Dickens appears to have been struck by the village where the house was situated, however, as Winterslow was the possible inspiration for Pecksniff's village in *Chuzzlewit* (1842). Dickens was aware of Hazlitt's work, owning over fourteen of his works. Dickens Library Online, 'William Hazlitt' <http://www.dickenslibraryonline.org/author/276 > [accessed 4 November 2020].

experiences do not seem to have been profound enough for him to note them within his letters or works, unlike his visits to Abbotsford and Stratford that will be explored here.

Dickens the Cultural Tourist

The first half of this thesis will utilise some wider cultural tourism studies (which explore heritage sites not linked to literature), as author tourism sits between cultural and literary tourism; authors visit both cultural and literary heritage sites and sometimes utilise these experiences within their writing.[30] Dickens is the prime example of this as his cultural heritage experiences, particularly those he encountered abroad, fed into his travelogues, *American Notes* (1842) and *Pictures from Italy* (1846). Literary tourism's links to wider tourism can be seen in Ousby's work *An Englishman's England*, as he specifically outlines what he terms 'literary shrines', as a distinct subcategory.[31] His comprehensive analysis of nineteenth-century literary sites will be used in the first half of this thesis, and built upon with specific reference to Dickens. In addition, the work of James Buzard and Paul Fussell on anti-tourists – tourists who were 'anxious to assert their difference from all other tourists' and present themselves as something other – will be used because Dickens, although a tourist, would never have described himself as one.[32]

There have been several studies that look specifically at Dickens as a cultural tourist when he travelled abroad. Maxime Leroy and Michael Hollington, for example, have conducted an in-depth analysis of Dickens's times in Europe and how these impacted both his fiction and non-

[30] For more about the cross over between literary and cultural tourism, see Ana Ferreira, Elisa Alén, Pedro Liberato et al., 'Literary Tourism: A Cultural Trip?' *Advances in Tourism, Technology and Smart Systems,* ed. by Alvaro Rocha et al. (Singapore: Springer Nature, 2020), pp. 505-515. Other cultural tourism studies include, *The Making of Modern Tourism: The Cultural History of the British Experience, 1600-2000,* ed. by Hartmut Berghoff et al. (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002).

[31] Ian Ousby, '*The Englishman's England: Taste, Travel and the Rise of Tourism* (London: Pimlico, 2002).

[32] James Buzard, 'The Grand Tour and After, 1660-1840', *Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing,* ed. by Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 49 and Paul Fussell, *Abroad: British Literary Travelling Between the Wars* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), p. 47.

fiction.[33] Dickens's frequent visits to France throughout his life have warranted detailed analysis.[34] Often Dickens's contribution to the travel writing genre is emphasised; Kate Flint's work, for example, pays close attention to Dickens's time in Italy, specifically her illuminating introduction to the 1998 Penguin edition of *Pictures From Italy,* while Clotilde De Stasio analyses Dickens's attitudes towards tourism.[35] Much focus is placed upon how Dickens's experiences informed *Little Dorrit* (1855) and *Martin Chuzzlewit* (1843), which were written during and following his trips to Europe and America.[36]

Yet Dickens's encounters with literary tourism sites are often not considered separately from his other tourist activities. Buzard's work, *The Beaten Track,* comes closest, as he analyses authors as tourists and demonstrates how Dickens's travels informed his writing.[37] However, Buzard's work remains very much a cultural tourism study as he also does not pay particular attention to Dickens's time at literary tourist sites. Similarly, Dickens's time in America is explored by Jerome Meckier and Slater, for example, but as Dickens visited few literary tourist

[33] For general studies see, for example, *Charles Dickens and Europe,* ed. by Maxime Leroy (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013); Michael Hollington and Francesca Orestano, *Dickens and Italy: Little Dorrit and Pictures From Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009); Clotilde de Stasio, 'Venice Preserved: Dickens and Italian Stereotypes Past and Present', *Imagining Italy: Victorian Writers and Travellers,* ed. by Catherine Waters (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010). For a more detailed look at Dickens's reaction to cultural tourism, particularly art, see Juliet John, 'Dickens's Global Art: Cultural and Ecological Legacy in Pictures From Italy', *E-Rea,* 13:2 (2016), 1-36.
[34] See, for example, John Edmonson, *Dickens on France* (Oxford: Signal Books, 2006) and Dominic Rainsford, 'Crossing the Chanel with Dickens', *Dickens, Europe and the New Worlds,* ed. by Anny Sadrin (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), pp. 3-14.
[35] Kate Flint, 'Introduction' in Charles Dickens, *Pictures From Italy* (London: Penguin, 1998), and Clotilde de Stasio, 'Venice Preserved: Dickens and Italian Stereotypes Past and Present', *Imagining Italy: Victorian Writers and Travellers,* ed. by Catherine Waters et al. (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010), p. 64. His time in Italy is also explored in *Imagining Italy: Victorian Writers and Travellers,* ed. by Catherine Waters et al. (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010); and *Dickens, Europe and the New Worlds,* ed. by Anny Sadrin (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999).
[36] See, for example, Michael Hollington and Francesca Orestano, *Dickens and Italy: Little Dorrit and Pictures from Italy* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2009); and Nancy Metz, 'The Life and Adventures of Martin Chuzzlewit: Or America Revised', ed. by Anny Sadrin *Dickens, Europe and the New World* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), pp. 77-89.
[37] James Buzard, *The Beaten Track: European Tourism, Literature and the Ways to Culture 1800-1918* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

sites while in the United States, he is analysed only as a cultural tourist.[38] Although these works give context to Dickens as an author tourist, they do little to acknowledge the importance of the distinction between an author tourist and a cultural tourist.[39]

Similarly, Dickens's interest in cultural heritage sites in England has been more extensively analysed in Dickens Studies than his encounters with specifically literary tourism. He visited heritage sites in England such as Stonehenge, and frequently attended the Royal Academy summer exhibition.[40] Dickens wrote about museums, discussing the Natural History Museum's creation within the essay 'Owen's Museum'.[41] Black, for example, has analysed Dickens's attitudes towards museums, and uses *Our Mutual Friend* (1864) to explore 'the dark underbelly of Victorian museum culture', yet does not note the impact such heritage experiences had on Dickens's life.[42] Victoria Mills, in comparison has argued that within *Little Dorrit* Dickens explores the ability of museums to 'provoke mesmeric, dazzling, visual experiences', and highlights that Dickens wrote this in response to his own time in Italy.[43] Although these studies contribute to a greater understanding of Dickens's relationship with

[38] Examples include Jerome Meckier, *Innocent Abroad: Charles Dickens's American Engagements* (Kentucky: Kentucky University Press, 1990); Michael Slater, *Dickens on America and the Americans* (New York: Harvester Press, 1979); *Dickens, Europe and the New World,* ed. by Anny Sadrin (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999); Juliet John, 'A Body Without A Head: Culture Shock in Dickens's American Notes', *Dickens and Mass Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

[39] Some general studies include Hartmut Berghoff, *The Making of Modern Tourism: The Cultural History of the British Experience, The British Abroad Since the Eighteenth Century, Vol.1: Travellers and Tourists,* ed. by Martin Farr and Xavier Guegan (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); John Urry and Jonas Larsen, *The Tourist Gaze* (London: Sage, 2011).

[40] He visited Stonehenge and the surrounding area on the 27 and 28 March 1847, see 'Biographical Table 1847-9', *Letters of Charles Dickens*, Vol.5, p. xix.

[41] Dickens was close friends with Professor Richard Owen, who ran the Natural History Department at the British Museum. Dickens supported his lobbying for this to be moved to a separate site in Kensington. For a thorough exploration of their friendship, see Victor Sage, 'Dickens and Professor Owen: Portrait of a Friendship', *Le Portrait,* 2 (2001), 87-101. Charles Dickens, 'Owen's Museum', *All the Year Round,* 8:179 (27 September, 1862), 62-67, Dickens Journals Online < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-viii/page-62.html> [accessed 13 June 2021].

[42] Barbara J. Black, *On Exhibit: Victorians and Their Museums* (Virginia: University of Virginia Press, 2000).

[43] Victoria Mills, 'The museum as "Dream Space": Psychology and aesthetic response in George Eliot's *Middlemarch*', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, 12 (2011), 1-17, p. 6.

heritage, they centre primarily on his literary interpretation of heritage. Similarly, Juliet John's work *Dickens and Mass Culture* analyses what she terms the 'heritage aesthetic' of Dickens's writing and highlights how this shows his awareness of the power of heritage.[44] Although John notes that Dickens 'consciously worked both to found a "Dickens Industry" and in his own words, '"lay the foundations of endurable retrospect"', there remains a gap in Dickens scholarship which notes Dickens's link and responses to specifically literary heritage.[45]

Authorial Tourism and Writers' Houses

Literary heritage, as a sub-category of cultural heritage, is a diverse field of study, encompassing both biographical and fictional links to literature, the literary landscape, writers' houses, and the connection between literary heritage and film and television.[46] Literary tourism, where visitors encounter sites relating to an author and their works, can be grouped into three categories: factual, somewhere which has a strong authorial and biographical link to the author, and the places, events and people associated with them; imaginary sites related to the imaginary worlds of the writer; and socially constructed encounters which largely encapsulate events that celebrate and are inspired by an author and their works, such as the Rochester Dickens festival.[47] This study will focus primarily on factual sites, with a specific focus on writers' houses, but some reference to imaginary and fictional places will be used where appropriate.

[44] Juliet John, *Dickens and Mass Culture,* p. 240.
[45] Juliet John, 'The Heritage Industry', *Charles Dickens in Context,* ed. by Sally Ledger and Holly Furneaux (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 74-81, see specifically pp. 75-76.
[46] The wealth of different examples can be seen in recent studies including *Literary Tourism and the British Isles,* ed. by LuAnn McCracken-Fletcher (London: Lexington Books, 2019). International examples include, *From Page to Place,* ed. by Jennifer Harris and Hilary Iris Lowe (Boston: University of Massachusetts, 2017); and Klara Szlezak, *Canonized in History: Literary Tourism and Nineteenth Century Writers' Houses in New England* (Regensburg: University of Regensburg Press, 2013).
[47] This designation is specified by Szlezak in *Canonized in History: Literary Tourism and Nineteenth Century Writers' Houses in New England,* p. 12.

Literary tourist sites and their contents can be divided again into those that link to the authorial, centred around the author's life, and the literary, connected to their work.[48] An example of the latter is The Dickens House in Broadstairs, which is credited as the inspiration for Betsy Trotwood's home in *David Copperfield* (1850). I will use the term 'literary house' to denote such properties and the phrase 'writers' houses' to describe places which authors lived in, although there is often some cross over between the two. I will not use the blanket term 'writers' house museum' in the same way as Watson and Young, because for much of the twentieth century, the Dickens House (now known as the Charles Dickens Museum) did not refer to itself as a museum.[49] In the first half of the thesis, emphasis will be placed on authorial literary heritage because Dickens himself noted authorial encounters in detail in his existing correspondence, further emphasising that his perspective was that of an author tourist. Despite the existence of other literary houses relating to Dickens's literary legacy, the latter half of the thesis will focus solely on 48 Doughty Street, to further the discussion of writers' houses. This allows for a comprehensive analysis of the development of the site and of how Dickens became the subject of author tourism himself.

Writers' houses have a particular draw for literary and author tourists, as they allow them to feel closer to an author by occupying their space and learning more about their life and inspirations. Julian North, Alison Booth and Harald Hendrix have aptly argued that such properties are a continuation of an author's biography, but they do not discuss how this adds to their appeal to other authors.[50] There has been much emphasis on such sites within literary

---

[48] This division was noted by Watson in *The Literary Tourist* and continues to be used as a divider in studies today in, for example, Macleod 'Faint Whiff of Cigar'. Authorial tourism is explored in more detail in Alison Booth, *Homes and Haunts.*

[49] Watson notes that the idea of writers' house museums is 'preserving the house because it is, as a result of its associations with an author, of especial communal importance'. *The Author's Effects,* p. 5. Young terms them a museum to enable a discussion of the 'function of museums' roles in society within the context of their history'. Young, 'Literature, Museum and National Identity', p. 229. Neither of them, however, note the complex nature of converting a property into and designating it as a museum, which is tackled in Chapter Five of this thesis.

[50] Julian North, 'Literary Biography and the House of the Poet', *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth Century,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 49-63. See also Julian North, *The Domestication of Genius* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Harald Hendrix ed. *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008); Alison Booth, 'Houses and Things: Literary House Museums as Collective Biographies',

heritage studies, and their popularity can be seen through Linda Young's comprehensive and illuminating study of tourist sites situated in the homes of famous individuals.[51] She notes that sixty per cent of these properties, the largest proportion, were dedicated to writers in 2015.[52] This thesis hopes to add further context to why writers' houses remain a popular tourist destination, while broadening the discussion by acknowledging how important these sites are to fellow authors.

As Hendrix outlines, literary heritage and tourism have a long history, spanning back to ancient times.[53] However, in terms of authorial literary tourism, the Romantic period is widely credited with popularising this form of literary heritage.[54] Although there will not be any extensive comparison between Dickens's experiences of literary tourism and Romantic tourism in this thesis, it is noteworthy that the development of literary tourism in the nineteenth century owes much to the Romantic period, which popularised the emphasis on authors' lives as well as their works.[55] In the late eighteenth century, the Romantic poets caused a shift within literature, and in turn literary tourism, as an interest in the author developed through a 'combination of autobiography and fiction [which] turned admirers into literary pilgrims'.[56] Although the Romantics did not invent literary tourism, they helped establish it as more than a trend and promoted a 'firmly author-orientated' approach to sites associated with the poets, and popularised authorial focused sites.[57] Saeko Yoshikawa has

---

Museums and Biographies, ed. by Kate Hill (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2012), pp. 231-247. She also gives passing reference to the Dickens House before its 2012 refurbishment, as noted in Chapter Five.

[51] See, for example, *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory*, ed. by Harald Hendrix (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), and more recently Nicola J. Watson, *The Authors' Effects.*

[52] Linda Young, 'Literature, Museums and National Identity; or why are there so many writers' house museums in Britain?', *Museums History Journal,* 8:2 (2015), 229-246, p. 230 and p. 233.

[53] Harold Hendrix, 'From Early Modern to Romantic Literary Tourism', *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth-Century Culture,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 13-25, p. 14 and Nicola J. Watson, *The Literary Tourist,* p.5.

[54] Noted by Watson in *The Literary Tourist.*

[55] See, for example, Carl Thompson, *The Suffering Traveller and the Romantic Imagination* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Jesus Sanchez-Garcia, 'The Cult of the Romantic Hero: Literature and Memorials', *Culture,* 10 (2015), 21-34.

[56] Hendrix, 'From Early Modern to Romantic Literary Tourism', p. 18.

[57] The practice can be traced back to Ancient Times. Alexander the Great spared the home of the poet of Pindar, for example, Ibid, p. 14.

convincingly argued, for example, that Wordsworth contributed to literary tourism in the Lake District.[58] He highlights how literary tourism already existed, but Wordsworth encouraged and welcomed tourists not only to his native lakes but also into his own home.[59] Wordsworth was so aware of tourism and how his reputation drew people to the Lakes, that he wrote his own guidebook in 1810.[60] By Dickens's lifetime, literary tourism and particularly author-focused sites, were already firmly established as popular tourist destinations, and an interest in them continues today.[61]

Monumentalising the Nineteenth Century

The nineteenth century is central to literary heritage and tourism studies. Watson extensively explores the development of literary tourism throughout this era in her two pioneering works *The Literary Tourist,* and her edited collection *Literary Tourism and the Nineteenth Century*.[62]

---

[58] Saeko Yoshikawa, *William Wordsworth and the Invention of Tourism* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), p. 9.

[59] Yoshikawa, *William Wordsworth and the Invention of Tourism,* p. 51.

[60] However, the most well-known edition of the work today is William Wordsworth, *A Guide Through the District of the Lakes in The North of England With a Description of the Scenery: For the Use of Tourists and Residents* (Kendal: Hudson and Nicolson, 1835). Other studies of Romantic Literary and author tourism include Christopher Donaldson's work such as 'Mapping Wordsworthshire: A GIS Study of Literary Tourism in Victorian Lakeland', *Journal of Victorian Culture,* 20:3 (2015), 287-307, which notes the literary tourist activities of Nathaniel Hawthorne, but Donaldson does not designate him as an author tourist. Similarly, Dekker notes the influence of tourism on the works of Radcliffe and Scott but does not explore them as author tourists, George Dekker, *The Fictions of Romantic Tourism: Radcliffe, Scott and Mary Shelley* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005). Other general studies include *The Making of a Cultural Landscape: The English Lake District as Tourist Destination, 1750 –2010,* ed. by John K. Walton and Jason Wood (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013); and Stephen Gill, *Wordsworth and the Victorians* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

[61] This was also aided by developments in wider tourism practice. As the railways developed, the cost of travel decreased and people could travel further easily, making it more accessible. When the Napoleonic Wars ended in 1815, Europe reopened to this new group of tourists. Although the Grand Tour ceased to exist as it once had, the places highlighted on the Grand Tour remained the chosen destinations for these new tourists. As Buzard has highlighted, the age of the Grand Tour was followed by the age of mass tourism. See Buzard, 'The Grand Tour and After, 1660-1840' p. 47. For more general studies see, for example, Farr and Guegan, *The British Abroad Since the 18th Century: Vol. 1,* and Berghoff, *The Making of Modern Tourism: The Cultural History of the British Experience.*

[62] Watson, *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth-Century Culture* and Watson, *The Literary Tourist.*

The prominence of the period is also noted in American literary tourism studies and analysed particularly in, for example, Szlezak's work, *Canonized in History: Literary Tourism in the Nineteenth Century.*[63] There has been much close analysis of the development of particular sites, namely Scott's Abbotsford and Shakespeare's Stratford, leading up to, and during the nineteenth century.[64] Both sites are widely considered as among the first writers' houses in Britain and were visited by Dickens. Rigney and Hazard's close analysis of Abbotsford's development were crucial for informing my investigation into Dickens's 1841 visit.[65] Similarly, Julia Thomas's pioneering work on Stratford's conversion into a literary tourism site informs my discussion of Dicken's visits and his subsequent involvement in fundraising for a curator at Shakespeare's birthplace.[66] I will build upon these studies to highlight how Dickens's visits to such sites can further boost our understanding of how they were encountered during the nineteenth century.

Dickens's interest in the literary legacy of other authors also included their graves and monuments erected in their honour, but this is rarely noted in current scholarship. He visited such sites both at home and abroad and developed strong opinions on how authors should be commemorated. Dickens believed that visiting the house associated with a literary figure, and then the grave, was 'a transition as natural to the visitor' as to the figure themselves.[67] There has been analysis of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century interest in the remains

---

[63] Szlezak, *Canonized in History.*

[64] Abbotsford is explored by Watson in *Literary Tourist,* pp. 93-105, and *The Author's Effects*, Chapter Eight. Stratford surveyed in Richard Schoch, 'The Birth of the Shakespeare Birthplace', *Theatre Survey,* 53:2 (2012), 181-201; Graham Holderness, *The Shakespeare Myth* (Manchester: Manchester University, 1988); Michael Rosenthal, 'Shakespeare's Birthplace in Stratford: Bardolatry Reconsidered', *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory,* ed. by Harald Hendrix (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), pp. 31-45.

[65] Rigney, *The Afterlives of Walter Scott*, Erin Hazard, 'The Author's House: Abbotsford and Weyside', *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth Century,* ed. by Nicola Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 63-73.

[66] Particularly, Julia Thomas, *Shakespeare's Shrine: The Bard's Birthplace and the Invention of Stratford upon Avon* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), and Julia Thomas, 'Bidding For The Bard: Shakespeare, the Victorians and the Auction of the Birthplace', *Nineteenth Century Contexts,* 30:3 (2008), 215-228. Watson's work on Stratford was also influential, see Nicola J. Watson, 'Shakespeare on the Tourist Trail', *Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Popular Culture,* ed. by Robert Shaughnessy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 199-126.

[67] Explored in Chapter Three in reference to Walter Scott and Juliet's tomb.

and graves of authors, including Samantha Matthews's work which explores the desire to visit places associated with dead poets.[68] Her analysis has encouraged more research in this area, such as Paul Westover's work on 'necromanticism', the impulse to visit and discover places associated with dead poets.[69] A fascination with literary remains continues today; Lorraine Brown has highlighted the importance of literary graves, not just poets' graves, to literary pilgrimage.[70] She finds that many visitors use burial sites as places of homage and closeness, to be in the presence of an author's greatness.[71] Mike Robinson concurs, stating that the author's tombstone 'allow[s] people to come as close to a famous author as they would get'.[72] These studies will form the backdrop for my discussion of Dickens's visits to gravesites.

This thesis also investigates Dickens's dislike of literary and authorial monuments, both those situated beside graves and in public thoroughfares, and utilises an interdisciplinary exploration to argue that Dickens's dislike of monuments stemmed from their associations with other authors' legacies. [73] It will explore the important division between 'tangible' and 'intangible' heritage commemoration in Dickens's approach to authors' legacies. I will utilise the UNESCO definition of tangible heritage and intangible heritage, where the former denotes something physical, while the latter, 'has no physical presence and is usually knowledge, a concept, feeling, practice or an idea'.[74] Although there is scholarly awareness that Dickens

---

[68] Samantha Matthews, *Poetical Remains: Poets' Graves, Bodies and Books in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

[69] For more, see Paul Westover, *Travelling to Meet the Dead 1750-1860* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012). And for more about the particular power of the body itself, see Lorna Clymer, 'Cromwell's Head and Milton's Hair: Corpse Theory in Spectacular Bodies of the Interregnum', *Eighteenth Century Theory and Interpretation,* 40:2 (1999), 91-112, p. 92.

[70] Lorraine Brown, 'Tourism and Pilgrimage: Paying Homage to Literary Heroes', *International Journal of Tourism Research,* 18 (2016), 165-75.

[71] Ibid, pp. 171-173.

[72] Mike Robinson, 'Reading Between the Lines: Literature and the Creation of Touristic Spaces', *Current Writing: Text and Reception in South Africa,* 14:1 (2002), 1-28, p. 12.

[73] The monumentamania of the nineteenth century will be discussed, as noted by Lars Berggren, 'The Monumentomania of the Nineteenth Century: Causes, Effects and Problems of Study', *Memory and Oblivion* (1999), 561-566.

[74] UNESCO, 'Intangible Cultural Heritage' < https://ich.unesco.org/en/what-is-intangible-heritage-00003> [accessed 30 January 2019]. See also Lucas Lixinski, *Intangible Heritage in Cultural Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 1-2. Rigney's discussion of novels as portable monuments will inform our understanding of Dickens's preference for being

strongly disliked monuments, particularly in relation to his opinions on commodifying death, the source of his dislike is rarely investigated in detail.[75] Catherine Waters's work, 'Materializing Mourning: Dickens Funerals and Epitaphs', for example, acknowledges Dickens's attitudes towards monuments, but offers no explanation as to *why* he disliked them.[76] I will argue that Dickens specifically disliked physical *authorial* monuments because he did not like immovable, tangible representations of authors and their work, instead advocating they be remembered through their works alone.[77] I argue it was specifically authorial monuments which caused him to proclaim, 'I conjure my friends on no account to make me the subject of any monument, memorial, or testimonial whatever.'[78]

The 'monumental' nature of writers' houses will form the basis for the latter half of the thesis. It is widely acknowledged in literary tourism studies that a house preserved in honour of an author is a type of monument; Hendrix pioneered this thinking in *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory*.[79] Hazard has explored this notion with a particular focus on the nineteenth century and Washington Irving's travels around Britain. She notes, for example, that the author's 'study often served as an informal monument'.[80] The monumental nature

---

memorialised through his work alone, Rigney, *The Afterlives of Walter Scott: Memory on the Move*.

[75] Catherine Waters, 'Mourning Dickens: Funerals and Epitaphs', *Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century,* 14 (2011), 1-20. Dickens's opinions on what Wood calls the 'business of death', form the basis for this discussion. Claire Wood, *Dickens and the Business of Death* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015). For more about the wider nineteenth century views on death and commemoration see, Paul A. Pickering and Alex Tyrell, *Contested Sites: Commemoration, Memorial and Popular Politics in Nineteenth Century Britain* (Ashgate: Aldershot, 2004); James Steven Curl, *Victorian Celebration of Death* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2001); Berggren, 'The Monumentomania of the Nineteenth Century: Causes, Effects and Problems of Study'.

[76] Catherine Waters, 'Materializing Mourning: Dickens, Funerals and Epitaphs', *Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century,* 14 (2011), 1-20. John also looks at Dickens's attitudes towards statues, Juliet John, 'Things, Words and the Meanings of Art', *Dickens and Modernity,* ed. by Juliet John (New York: Boydell and Brewer, 2012), 115-132. She also notes the fictional memorial of Mr. Dick, in 'Culture, Machines and Cultural Industry', in *Dickens and Mass Culture,* pp. 181-184.

[77] See Chapter Three for more detail.

[78] 'Charles Dickens's Last Will and Codicil, 12 May 1869 and 2 June 1870'*, Pilgrim Letters, Vol. 1,* Appendix K, p. 732.

[79] Hendrix, ed. *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory*.

[80] Hazard, 'Step Forth and Again Take up the Magic Pen', p. 57.

of 48 Doughty Street is specifically noted by Booth, who states it acts as a 'mesh [of] the biographical and memorial'.[81] Although it is correct for writers' houses and Doughty Street to be classed in such a way, my discussion will instead emphasise that Dickens opposed the monumental commemoration of authors, himself included, and the lasting effects this had on his legacy at Doughty Street. His opposition to monuments meant that after opening the Dickens House, the Dickens Fellowship spent many years justifying the site's monumental nature, showing the lasting impact of Dickens's wishes on his own legacy.

Housing a Literary Legacy

A critical gap remains concerning how Dickens's legacy is portrayed in a writer's house like the ones he visited during his lifetime. Most of the scholarship that analyses Dickens literary tourism concentrates on his exploration of, and subsequent impact on, London, as this is where he has made the largest impression on the literary landscape, due to the multiple works he set in the city.[82] This has caused some enthusiasts to 'map' Dickens's London, by linking sites to his life and works, creating in turn, a greater emphasis on Dickensian topography.[83] In Watson's pivotal edited collection, *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth-Century Culture,* two essays refer to Dickensian places, Watson's 'Rambles in Literary London' and Booth's 'Time Travel in Dickens's World'.[84] Booth has highlighted that Dickens's geographical links meant that he 'renamed the English tourist landscape and personified the Victorian age'.[85] More recently, some studies have focused upon the theme park-esque attraction, Dickens World in Chatham Kent, which opened in 2007 and closed in 2016, and explored how this specific site affected and represented Dickens's literary legacy.[86]

---

[81] Booth, 'Time Travel in Dickens World', p. 155.
[82] See, for example, Linda Keir Hinrichs, 'Where in the Dickens is Gad's Hill? Or a Comparative Review of Literary Guides in Britain', *Reference Services Review*, 10:3 (1982), 55-59; Zemgulys, *Modernism and the Locations of Literary Heritage.* See also Helena Kelly's upcoming work on Dickensian literary heritage in Kent.
[83] Macleod includes a list of the multiple places associated with Dickens, Macleod, 'The Touring Reader: Understanding the Bibliophile's experience of Literary Tourism', p. 389.
[84] Watson, *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth-Century Culture.*
[85] Booth, *Homes and Haunts,* p. 7.
[86] Patrick Fleming, 'After Dickens World: Performing Victorians at the Chatham Docks', *Neo-Victorian Studies,* 9:1 (2016) 12-31; and Marty Gould and Rebecca Mitchell, 'It Was the Worst of Times: A Visit to Dickens World', *Victorian Literature and Culture,* 38:1 (2010), 287-

I will focus on how Dickens's legacy was displayed within the Charles Dickens Museum, London, from its opening in 1925 until 2018.[87] This allows a comprehensive overview of Dickens's connection with authorial literary tourism and reveals how the literary legacy associated with him concurred with, and diverged from, his own ideals. Many studies of Dickens's legacy have a largely popular culture focus and show how Dickens, his works, and image have become engrained in different media, inspired other creators, and become part of our understanding of the Victorian era.[88] This study will juxtapose and compare Dickens's lived experience and wishes regarding his literary legacy to how he was presented posthumously via the Dickens House (now the Charles Dickens Museum). Few studies have taken such an approach to investigate an author's links to literary tourism; though there has been some exploration of Emily Dickinson through this kind of lens in Jane Wald's essay 'The Poet Hunters: Transforming Emily Dickinson's Home into a Literary Destination', which is revelatory about how Dickinson considered her own legacy.[89]

Booth has stated that Dickens's legacy is 'more than a specific house', which is an under-statement as Dickens is imprinted onto Britain's broader literary landscape.[90] However, a study of a specific house allows us to explore in a focused and detailed way how Dickens's legacy changed throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Furthermore, 48 Doughty Street is the only London house occupied by Dickens that has been converted into a fully operational literary tourism site, so a close analysis of how this site developed is warranted.[91] Furthermore, the site's history allows a comparison to be drawn between Dickens's commemorative wishes and how his literary legacy has been preserved and

293. Also noted in prominent works such as John, *Dickens and Mass Culture* and Booth, *Homes and Haunts.*

[87] My focus on a particular property was informed by Rigney's close study of Abbotsford in *The Afterlives of Walter Scott: Memory on the Move.*

[88] See, for example, Juliet John, *Dickens and Mass Culture*; Emily Bell, *Dickens After Dickens* (Leeds: White Rose University Press, 2020); and Jay Clayton, *Charles Dickens In Cyberspace* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

[89] Jane Wald, 'The Poet Hunters: Transforming Emily Dickinson's Home into a Literary Destination', *The Emily Dickinson Journal,* 26:2 (2017), 71-98.

[90] Booth, *Homes and Haunts,* p. 7.

[91] The only other authorial literary tourist site is the Charles Dickens Birthplace in Portsmouth. He was born there and lived there for only two years of his life.

promoted by the Dickens Fellowship, a Dickens society set up in 1902 which purchased 48 Doughty Street as their headquarters and a Dickens literary tourism site in 1922.[92] In addition, I will discuss Dickens's final home Gad's Hill and the chalet that was erected in the house's grounds, as Dickens anticipated that this property could become a literary tourist site after his death. However, to retain a detailed focus, other surviving properties that have been converted into tourist sites dedicated to Dickens will not be explored.[93]

Catherine Malcolmson has also written about the Charles Dickens Museum, but with a focus on 1900-1940.[94] Although she too explores the founding of the house, she pays particular attention to the sentimental language used by the Dickens Fellowship during their fundraising, surveying their emphasis on the property as a shrine to Dickens and his characters, which allowed them to construct and promote a 'selective public image of Dickens' as a society.[95] She argues that the Fellowship pushed the image of Dickens 'as a social reformer whose works also offered a nostalgic evocation of a past way of life', and that Doughty Street was chosen because of its 'personal associations with Dickens'.[96] Malcolmson references the commemorative nature of the property, arguing that the objects selected for display were intended to 'produce an emotional response in the museum's visitors, and serve as an act of commemoration to Dickens'.[97]

This study will build on Malcolmson's work by analysing the practicalities of fundraising for the house and how the Fellowship's actions were affected by Dickens's desire to have no monument erected in his honour after his death. Although I too investigate the positive image that the Fellowship promoted of Dickens, I take this further by analysing how this impacted

[92] They also have their own publication *The Dickensian* which explores different aspects of Dickens's life, works and legacy. The Dickens Fellowship, 'About' <https://www.dickensfellowship.org/> [accessed 26 March 2021].
[93] Existing properties with a literary focus include the Dickens House Museum in Broadstairs, the inspiration for Betsy Trotwood's house in *David Copperfield* (1850), and Eastgate House in Rochester, which was featured in both *The Pickwick Papers* (1836) and *The Mystery of Edwin Drood* (1870).
[94] Catherine Malcolmson, *Constructing Dickens 1900-1940* (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leicester, 2012).
[95] Ibid, p.47.
[96] Ibid, p. 48
[97] Ibid. p. 49.

the display of the property until 2018. Furthermore, my emphasis is on the space and display of the property rather than the collection and objects chosen for display. Overall, Malcolmson's focus remains more on the site's literary connections, rather than the author tourism associated with Dickens as will be conducted here.

Museology is not currently a strong methodological influence within literary heritage scholarship.[98] However, as museum themselves, museology dictates the way these sites operate, particularly as they have developed into accredited heritage sites. Due to lack of studies into writers and literary houses, the museological studies of historic houses and their development have been used to inform the later parts of this study in order to explore how the Dickens House developed compared to other heritage sites. Scholarship which analyses the creation of literary tourist sites emphasises how the property attempts to create an aura of authenticity, rather than the practical process.[99] Young rightly advocates that literary houses should be considered separately from historic homes, as 'house museums are not all the same'.[100] Yet there are distinct similarities, such as the connection between the house and its contents, which reveals more about the museological capabilities of literary homes.[101] Additionally, historic houses have been a subject of museum studies for much longer than writers' houses, enabling more analysis into their foundation, such as Monica Risnicoff's work, which helps to inform the structure of this study.[102] Jessica Foy Donnelley, Kim Christiansen

[98] Young also notes this and has attempted to explore writers' houses with a museological eye in 'Literature, Museums and National Identity', p. 229.
[99] See, for example, Jia Hongyan, 'The Construction of Literary Tourism Sites', *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal,* 57:1 (2009), 69-83; David Herbert, 'Literary Places, Tourism and the Heritage Experience', *Annals of Tourism Research,* 28:2 (2001), 312-333; C. Fawcett and P. Cormack, 'Guarding Authenticity at Literary Tourism Sites', *Annals of Tourism Research,* 28:3 (2001), 686-704.
[100] Linda Young, 'House Museums are Not all the Same', *Understanding Motivation to Guide Conservation* (ICOM, 2012), 1-10, p. 2.
[101] See, for example, Sherry Butcher-Younghans, *Historic House Museums* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993). The connection between a house and its content is also explored in Rosanna Pavoni, 'Towards a Destination and Typography of Historic House Museums', *Museum International,* 53:2 (2001), 16-21, p. 17.
[102] Moe explores the vast number of historic houses in his work Richard Moe, 'Are There Too Many House Museums?', *Forum Journal,* 27:1 (2012), 55-61. See also, Monica Risnicoff, 'Reality as Illusion: The Historic Houses That Become Museums', *Museum International,* 53:2 (2001), 10-15.

and Sherry Butcher-Younghans's works elaborate on the ways in which the displays inside house museums has changed over the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, allowing me to apply this methodology to the development of the Charles Dickens Museum.[103]

The story of a house's full conversion into a public recreated space is an under-researched topic within literary heritage studies. Much research focuses on the prominence of an author's study, and how its recreation helps to create resonance, but less attention is given to other rooms. [104] To fill this gap in the scholarship, where applicable, this thesis will refer to period room studies, which at present remains the area of scholarship that explores reconstructed historic rooms in the most detail. However, as Chapter Five highlights, these studies, because of their primarily architectural and art history background, are not wholly applicable to the recreation of literary spaces and thus will be used with care. An exploration of individual rooms helps to draw attention to the different ways Dickens has been presented, particularly in terms of his relationships with women and the exhibition of sex.

To analyse the contents of literary houses, I will utilise museological studies, such as those surrounding object theory in conjunction with thing theory.[105] This significant museological body of work, pioneered by Sandra Dudley, which highlights how important original objects are to creating an atmosphere in a museum setting, will be applied to writers' houses.[106]

---

[103] Jessica Foy Donnelly, ed. *Interpreting Historic House Museums* (Oxford: Altamira Press, 2002); Kim Christensen, 'Ideas Versus Things: The Balancing Act of Interpreting Historic House Museums', *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 17:2 (2011), 153-168; Butcher-Younghans, *Historic House Museums*.

[104] Dickens's study is, for example, explored by Miller. However, the emphasis is very much on spirituality within the room and less on the creation of such a space, as this thesis will explore. Andrew H. Miller, 'The Spectres of Dickens's Study', *Narrative,* 5:3 (2007), 322-341. Hunter also explores Dickens's desk and chair while discussing the importance of writing implements, in Aislinn Hunter, *Evocative Objects,* p. 199. Other studies include Watson exploration of Austen's desk in *The Author's Effects,* p. 93.

[105] The discussion will use, for example, Bill Brown, 'Thing Theory', *Critical Enquiry,* 28:1 (2011), 1-22 and Elaine Freedgood, *The Idea of Things: Fugitive Meaning in the Victorian Novel* (London: University of Chicago Press, 2006), to explore Dickens's relationship with tangible monuments, particularly statues.

[106] See, for example, *Museums Objects: Experiencing the Property of Things,* ed. by Sandra Dudley (London: Routledge, 2012); and *Evocative Objects: Things We Think With,* ed. by Sherry Tuckle (London: MIT Press, 2011). For more about objects in museums, see also *Interpreting Objects and Collections,* ed. by Susan Pearce (Routledge, London 1994).

There has been little application of these theories to specifically literary tourist sites, aside from Aislinn Hunter's thesis, *Evocative Objects*.[107] Clare Pettitt's study of some of the items within the Charles Dickens Museum, such as the porcelain monkey Dickens had on his desk, combines museological and literary analysis with a Dickens focus.[108] She analyses the juxtaposition in the museum's display of items Dickens owned with objects relating to his fiction, such as the midshipman sign, but focuses more on literary than authorial heritage.[109] Watson's latest study, *The Author's Effects,* takes a similar approach, noting the importance of items belonging to an author, but concentrating less on their contribution to recreating an author's space than I will do in this thesis.[110]

Approach and methodology

The collaborative nature of this AHRC-funded doctorate has encouraged an interdisciplinary methodology and shaped the project's outcomes.[111] The thesis is largely empirical rather than theoretical and utilises an extensive range of primary sources and considerable archival research.[112] Working closely with the Charles Dickens Museum's collection encouraged me to investigate the institution's foundations and motivated me to bring the project into the twenty-first century, juxtaposing Dickens's lived experience with his legacy. It also helped to set parameters for the project as the wealth of information within the collection dissuaded me from exploring other Dickens literary tourist sites, such as Dickens's Birthplace or Gad's Hill, in extensive detail, as I had originally intended. Moreover, the partnership enabled me to take a museological focus within the thesis and analyse how the house was presented after it opened to the public in 1925. In turn, this strengthened my curatorial interests in the

[107] Stephen Greenblatt, 'Resonance and Wonder', *Bulletin of the American of Arts and Science,* 43:4 (1990), 11-34; and Aislinn Hunter, *Evocative Objects.*
[108] Clare Pettitt, 'On Stuff', *Interdisciplinary Studies of the Long Nineteenth Century,* 6:19 (2008), 1-12.
[109] Ibid.
[110] Watson, *The Author's Effects*.
[111] The project was also part of NPIF (National Productivity Innovation Fund), which promoted the cross over between universities and institutions.
[112] Although my work touches upon author and biography studies, my empirical focus means these will not be explored in detail.

collection and led me to assist with the exhibition 'Global Dickens: For Every Nation Upon Earth' at the museum in 2019, which is explored within the conclusion.

My principal resource was the Charles Dickens Museum's collection, which houses over 100,000 items, making it the world's most comprehensive collection of material related to Dickens and his works. I explored the collection for evidence of Dickens's own literary and author tourism, analysing items such as the plaque he commissioned to honour his home's connection to Shakespeare, noted in Chapter Two.[113] I used the museum's collection to analyse sources relating to the founding of the property, such as the scrapbooks and minutes books used by the Dickens Fellowship.[114] These sources show the institution's development and reveal more about the Fellowship's motivations in establishing the house as well as their interpretation of the property. Similarly, I analysed the files that documented the museum's temporary exhibitions and developments in the collection to survey the institution's development.[115]

Tracing the changing presentation of the Charles Dickens Museum was the most challenging part of the thesis, as there are limited sources relating to this aspect within the museum's archive. Thus, it was difficult to establish a precise chronology of when changes to the museum display occurred. My main source was the visitor guides which gave background information on the property to visitors and were available from when the museum opened in 1925.[116] These enabled me to see how the museum developed, but did not include any context as to why these decisions were made and were often used for many years. To address these gaps, I also utilised the Fellowship's publication *The Dickensian*, which often includes

[113] See p. 106.

[114] Dickens Fellowship Council Minutes 1937-1971, Charles Dickens Museum, London; Dickens Fellowship Council Minutes Beginning 1972, Charles Dickens Museum, London; Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book, beginning 6 July 1923, Charles Dickens Museum, London; Dickens Fellowship Scrapbook: The Dickens House 1922-1929, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[115] Exhibitions 1970s/80s: History of 48/49 Doughty Street, Charles Dickens Museum, London; and Collection Group Meetings 2001-2010 Folder, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[116] Dickens House Guide no. 1 (1 December 1926), Charles Dickens Museum, London; Dickens House Guide no. 7 (1995), Charles Dickens Museum, London; as well as Museum Guide no. 8 (2012), Charles Dickens Museum, London; Museum Guide no. 9 (2018), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

news relating to the Dickens House and more of a 'behind-the-scenes' view into why changes to the house's presentation occurred; however, these too were not extensive. I then tracked discussions of the house in the Fellowship House Committee minutes book, which outlined some of the debates about developments to the house. While useful, these sources made it difficult to visualise any significant change. To combat this, I used archival images of the house to detail changes to the displays and room arrangements. Although the sources prevented me from thoroughly tracking all of the changes to the displays, I believe I have been able to provide a substantial overview of how the property developed over the twentieth century into the recreated property that is seen today.

In order to track the development of the Charles Dickens Museum, it was necessary to compare the property to the development of other authors' houses. To advance this discussion, I visited other writers' houses, such as the Jane Austen House Museum, Thomas Hardy's Cottage, and Beatrix Potter's Hill Top and corresponded with the curators of these properties to learn more about how these properties developed.[117] Although, as Watson states, 'every writer is different and every writers' house museum is different', such comparisons can and should be drawn to give a wider understanding of the Charles Dickens Museum's history and situate the institution within the broader literary tourism sector.[118] I have also explored the other houses Dickens lived in that are now open to the public, including Gad's Hill and his birthplace in Portsmouth, to understand how these developed, and have included aspects relating to Gad's Hill where relevant.[119]

To further develop the discussion of Dickens's own experiences of literary tourism sites I visited Abbotsford and Stratford and noted whether any aspects which Dickens encountered still remained. I corresponded with the curators of Abbotsford about Dickens's 1841 visit and

[117] As well as the curators of Charles Dickens Museum who I worked closely with, I also corresponded with collection managers and curators at Abbotsford, Brontë's Parsonage, and the Jane Austen House Museum.
[118] Watson, *The Authors' Effects*, p. 212.
[119] The birthplace will not be explored in detail because Dickens only lived there for around two years, and birthplaces are often noted as being challenging properties to infuse with an author's identity. For more about writers' birthplaces, see Nicola J. Watson, *The Literary Tourist,* esp. pp. 56-69. I also made use of the information held within Other Sites Connected to Dickens Including Graves Properties Towns/ Cities, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

examined the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust's links to Dickens via their online collection. To contextualise Dickens's visit, I also investigated how these properties developed into literary tourism sites and analysed the recollections of other contemporary visitors including William Wells Brown, Queen Victoria, and Washington Irving to see how Dickens's experiences corresponded to or differed from others' experiences.

I have utilised more traditional sources such as Dickens's writings, from his most popular fictional works to his journalism, travelogues and personal correspondence, many of which are already in the public domain. I analysed all of Dickens's novels and closely examined those that I deemed to have associations with literary heritage and tourist sites that Dickens had visited, primarily *Nicholas Nickleby* (1839), *Barnaby Rudge* (1841) and *Edwin Drood* (1870).[120] Dickens's travelogue *Pictures from Italy* (1846) proved to be the most illuminating as he explicitly noted the literary sites he visited while aboard. I used the *Pilgrim Letters* extensively to compare how Dickens wrote about these sites to friends, family and acquaintances. This cross-examination of Dickens's writing was necessary as he did not consistently note his recollections of literary tourist sites. My focus has enabled these sources, such as the letters, to be seen in a different light and helped to unearth the links between Dickens's lived experiences and his plans for his legacy.[121]

48 Doughty Street was saved in 1922 by the Dickens Fellowship and opened to the public in 1925. I will use this date as a starting point to explore the founding and presentation of the property. Although the Fellowship contributed to Dickens's wider, in many cases less tangible, literary legacy, this study will only concentrate on their relations with literary houses, in order to offer a comprehensive view of their connection to author-focused tourist sites. Other posthumous Dickens societies also existed, such as the Boz Club, which ran from 1900 to around 1918. The club will not be analysed because of its short history and because it did not

[120] Where possible Clarendon editions of the novels will be used, otherwise Oxford World Classics will be referenced.

[121] This study uses the Pilgrim editions which are the most comprehensive collection of the letters. John Butt, 'Dickens's Manuscripts', *Yale University Library Press,* 36:4 (1962), 149-161, p. 159.

create a lasting literary tourism site connected to Dickens.[122] Likewise, the Dickens Society, founded much later in 1970, though important in promoting Dickens studies in America and internationally, will similarly be omitted from this study.

Chapter Summaries

The thesis is divided into five chapters and a conclusion. It can be split into roughly two parts: the first explores Dickens's own experiences at literary tourist sites and how this informed his career and his attempt to shape his legacy. The second half takes a larger museological approach and surveys the founding and development of the Charles Dickens Museum within Dickens's former home, 48 Doughty Street. The first chapter analyses Dickens's visit to Sir Walter Scott's house, Abbotsford, in 1841, arguing that this visit significantly affected his career and personal development in the 1840s. I will show that Dickens was not a passive visitor of literary tourist sites, and instead actively considered their portrayal of an author, by comparing Scott's reputation to his own. The second chapter similarly explores Dickens's relationship with Stratford upon Avon and Shakespeare's birthplace. I analyse not only Dickens's visits to Stratford, with particular focus on his 1838 visit, but also his involvement in raising money for the curatorship of the birthplace. The chapter will reveal Dickens's complex relationship with the Shakespearian literary heritage housed in Stratford, and the deep interest he took in commemorating the Bard.

The third chapter adopts a slightly different focus, examining how authors were commemorated through monuments and graves in the nineteenth century. The chapter will act as a bridge between the two halves of the thesis. I will begin by exploring Dickens's reflections on literary monuments before showing that Dickens's plans for his legacy were affected by the literary tourist sites he had visited. I will argue that Dickens was aware of how literary heritage affects the public's perception of an author, and that his attitude towards physical memorialisation changed drastically after he witnessed the Edinburgh Walter Scott monument. His dislike spread to other literary monuments and caused him to advocate for

[122] For more about the history of the Boz club, see Emily Bell, 'The Dickens Family, the Boz Club and the Fellowship', *The Dickensian,* 113:503 (2017), 219-232.

more modest and private acts of commemoration. However, I will then explore how his legacy changed immediately after his death. The chapter will highlight how Dickens's explicit wishes concerning monuments and his grave were defied after his death when he was buried in Westminster Abbey.

Chapter Four will study the Dickens Fellowship's founding of the Charles Dickens Museum in London, known until 2012 as the Dickens House. I will analyse the Fellowship's justification for purchasing the house, including how Dickens's visits to literary tourism sites were wrongly used to justify creating a museum in his honour, and the subsequent issues caused by the promotion of the property as a 'memorial' to Dickens. Dickens's proclamations against monuments, as referenced in Chapter Three, make it highly unlikely that he would have anticipated that the house he lived in for just under three years at the beginning of his career would become a museum in his honour.[123] Yet Dickens's thoughts on memorialisation went on to shape the commemorative sites linked to his legacy.

Chapter Five looks at the changing displays of the Charles Dickens Museum from 1925-2018. Visitor guides from 1925 onwards will be used to illustrate how the house changed from a small museum with a limited eclectic collection to a recreation of Dickens's home. I will also explore the changing narrative of the museum and note which aspects of Dickens's life were highlighted or abridged. Comparisons to other writers' houses will be drawn to highlight how the museum's development was affected by the Fellowship's involvement. The thesis will then conclude with a brief exploration of the issues facing writers' houses today, analysing how the temporary exhibitions which have been on display within the Charles Dickens Museum have affected Dickens's legacy. Close attention will be paid to the 2019 exhibition, 'Global Dickens: For Nation Upon Earth', on which I worked as assistant curator. I will end by exploring the future of writers' houses and how they continue to evolve from what we, and Dickens, have experienced. Dickens, as an author tourist himself, was actively interested in how author legacies were shaped by literary tourism during his lifetime, so a study of the effects of such sites on his legacy is long overdue.

[123] Dickens had lived in Doughty Street from 1837 for around two and a half years, two of his children were born there, and it was where he hosted some of his famous dinner parties. For more about Dickens's time in the house, see Forster, *Life of Dickens.*

Chapter One: From 'Tumbled and Bent and Broken' to Inimitable: Dickens's Visit to Abbotsford

This chapter will argue for the first time that Dickens's 1841 visit to Sir Walter Scott's home, Abbotsford, was a significant turning point in his career. Although there have been studies of the connection between the two authors, these largely explore Scott as a literary influence on Dickens.[1] When the 1841 visit is discussed, it is not usually examined in detail.[2] Some biographers, such as Slater and Ackroyd, briefly note the Abbotsford trip and highlight its importance; Ackroyd, for example, states that Scott functioned as a 'warning' to Dickens.[3] However, neither biographer analyses the trip extensively. The following chapter will fill this critical gap by exploring the connection between Dickens and Scott through the lens of literary tourism and how Dickens as an author tourist was affected by what he encountered. It will expand on Dickens's brief recollections of Abbotsford and investigate the lasting effect of the visit. This will illustrate his attitudes towards literary tourism in the 1840s, and how the visit caused him to assess his career, move away from comparisons to Scott, and begin to see himself as 'inimitable'. Dickens's career development in the 1840s is often attributed to his first visit to America in 1842.[4] This chapter will argue instead that these changes in attitude can be traced earlier to Dickens's time in Scotland, and more specifically to Abbotsford itself.

---

[1] See, for example, Ian Duncan, *Modern Romance and Transformation of the Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); and Kathryn Chittick, *Dickens and the 1830s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

[2] Rigney mentions the visit to Abbotsford in *The Afterlives of Walter Scott,* p. 153. Dickens's trip there is only mentioned in some other biographies such as Forster, *Life of Charles Dickens*, and Claire Tomalin, *Charles Dickens: A Life.*

[3] Ackroyd references Abbotsford and Scott's hat and links this to how Scott showed Dickens 'what can happen to an author who writes too much'. However, he does no in-depth analysis of Scott's literary tourism and the direct effect it had on Dickens. See Peter Ackroyd, *Dickens*, pp. 332-3. Slater makes a similar analysis to this chapter, linking the Scotland trip to Dickens's anxiety about *Rudge*. Still, he does not explore this extensively nor dwell specifically on the importance of Abbotsford or Scott's literary heritage. See Michael Slater, *Charles Dickens,* pp. 169-170.

[4] See, for example, Jerome Meckier, *Innocent Abroad: Charles Dickens's American Engagements* (Kentucky: Kentucky University Press, 1990). Nancy Aycock Metz, 'Dickens in 1842: Coming to His Senses about America', *Journal of the English Association,* 63:241 (2014), 97-114, p. 100 and p. 113; as well as, Michael Slater, *Dickens on America and the Americans* (New York: Harvester Press, 1979).

The chapter uses Dickens's letters as a critical source to analyse his expectations and reaction to Abbotsford. I will begin with a close analysis of Dickens's brief recollection of the site and explore what he would have encountered at the property when he visited in 1841. Scott's conscious construction of Abbotsford and the development of the property after his death will also be surveyed to illuminate Dickens's expectations of the site and highlight how intrinsic the house was to the development of nineteenth-century literary tourism. I will take a greater biographical focus and survey Dickens's knowledge and connection to Scott to explain why he responded to Scott's literary tourism in a predominantly negative way. I will analyse Dickens's personal correspondence following the visit and highlight the lasting effects the visit had on Dickens. Although these letters have been analysed before, they have not yet been examined with such a distinct focus on Dickens's time at Abbotsford.

The Last Clothes Scott Wore and His Creation of Abbotsford

Dickens visited Abbotsford on 14 July 1841, nine years after Walter Scott's death. He wrote very little about his experience. The earliest account of his visit was recorded in the journal of Robert Henry Dana in 1842 when the two men met in America:[5]

> He gave a capital description of Abbotsford. It was eno' to make you cry. He described the hat Scott wore in his last illness, the dents & bruises there were in it from his head falling against his chair when he lost the power of his muscles. It was heart-sickening. 'And to think of a man's killing himself for such a miserable place as Abbotsford is', adds Dickens.[6]

The only other description of Abbotsford was written by Dickens a decade later in 1851. The similarities in tone and focus give credence to Dana's reported account:

[5] An American lawyer and writer whose work included *Two Years Before the Mast,* he met Dickens in America, see more in Dickens to John Forster (30 January 1842), Editor notes, *The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 3: 1842-1843*, ed. by Kathleen Tillotson and Graham Storey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 41.
[6] Ibid.

> When I was at Abbotsford, I saw in a vile glass case the last clothes Scott wore. Among them an old white hat, which seemed to be tumbled and bent and broken by the uneasy, purposeless wandering, hither and thither, of his heavy head. It so embodied John Lockhart's pathetic description of him when he tried to write, and laid down his pen and cried, that it associated itself in my mind with broken powers and mental weakness from that hour.[7]

These recollections reveal much about Dickens's attitudes towards both Scott himself as well as Abbotsford as a literary tourism site. The display of the last clothes that Scott wore was the most prevalent image in Dickens's recollections. As Watson highlights, clothes can be seen as 'traces of the authorial body' and help to create a connection between the visitor and author.[8] When Dickens visited, the location of Scott's clothes increased their symbolic nature. They were housed in a glass case upon a table in Scott's study, whereas Scott's other items of dress were displayed in the adjoining closet.[9] The way that the clothes were singled out and put on a pedestal near Scott's writing desk drew attention to them. It is not unusual for literary house museums to display an author's clothes and the presentation of them 'inevitably tends to encode the writer's body'.[10] However, the display of these clothes, separately and in the very room which usually represented an author's success, seems to have disturbed Dickens.[11]

Many of the nineteenth-century literary tourists who visited Abbotsford did not convey an aversion to the display of Scott's clothes. William Wells Brown and others saw it as a positive representation of Scott's literary career.[12] 'There was the broad-skirted blue coat, with its

---

[7] Dickens to Mrs Watson (11 July 1851), *The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.6: 1850-1852,* ed. by Graham Storey et al. *(*Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 427.

[8] Watson, *The Literary Tourist*, p. 103.

[9] John Menzies, *Menzies' Pocket guide to Abbotsford, Melrose and the Scottish border* (Edinburgh: J. Menzie, 1855), p. 38.

[10] Watson, *The Author's Effects*, p. 73-4. She specifically mentions Scott's clothes as 'relics of death' but goes into little detail and with no reference to Dickens.

[11] For more about the importance of authors' studies in literary houses, see Chapter Five.

[12] William Wells Brown visited Abbotsford not long after Dickens, and his diary documenting his visit still survives. Although Brown's circumstances were markedly different to Dickens, he was an African American who wrote one of the first published travel narrative authored

large buttons, the plaid trousers, the heavy shoes, the black vest and white hat'.[13] In this description, Brown made no mention of the battered state of the hat. In fact, he said that the clothes 'all looked the poet and novelist'.[14] Queen Victoria also mentioned the clothes in passing when describing her visit to Abbotsford in August 1867. She wrote how they 'went through same passages [sic] & into 2 or 3 rooms, where were collected fine pieces of old armour, & where in a glass case, are preserved Sir Walter's last clothes'.[15]

Dickens fixated most upon Scott's white top hat, not the shoes, stick, jacket, shirt, trousers, or gloves which were also displayed in the glass case. Hats were an important kind of clothing in nineteenth-century fashion and were often seen as reflecting the wearer's status within society.[16] Dickens was aware of their importance, as demonstrated in his article 'Arcadian London'.[17] Although it was written nearly two decades after he visited Abbotsford, the prominence of hats within the piece mirrors the significance Dickens attributed to Scott's headwear in his recollections of Abbotsford. In the article, he describes a hatter's shop and notes how different the butler looks when his master is away, as his 'low crowned straw hat' caused him to be 'translated into a new sphere'.[18] The top hat, in particular, was one of the most prominent choices of headgear throughout the century, and it underwent changes from Scott's to Dickens's time.[19] Scott's top hat was white and made of fur, most probably beaver skin, a popular style for the upper-class early nineteenth-century gentleman.[20] Yet as scholars

---

by a slave, he also visited Abbotsford because of an interest in Scott and his literary works. The timing of his visit also indicates what Dickens would have seen on his visit. See Christine Buzinde and Lyunolu Osagie, 'William Wells Brown: Fugitive subjectivity, travel writing and the gaze', *Cultural Studies,* 25:3 (2011), 407-415, and William Wells Brown, *Three Years In Europe: or, Places I have Seen and People I have Met* (London: Charles Gilpin, 1852).

[13] Wells Brown, *Three Years In Europe,* p. 191.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Queen Victoria, 'Journals', Thursday 22 August 1867, <http://www.queenvictoriasjournals.org/home.do> [accessed 10 October 2018].

[16] Asa Briggs, *Victorian Things* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1988), p. 261.

[17] Charles Dickens, 'The Uncommercial Traveller', *All The Year Round* (29 September, 1860), *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-iii/page-588.html> (accessed 13 June 2021), p. 588.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Fiona Clarke, *Hats* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1982), p. 40.

[20] Alice Payne, 'The Story of the Top Hat', *The Conversation* <https://theconversation.com/the-story-of-the-top-hat-26215> [accessed 10 February 2020].

including Asa Briggs have noted, by the mid-nineteenth century, the preference was for dark top hats made of silk as beaver skin was in short supply.[21] Scott's hat, particularly its material and colour, were outdated.

Dickens used the condition of Scott's hat, 'tumbled and bent and broken', to reflect and embody the misfortunes Scott had suffered towards the end of his life. Hunter highlights how the hat 'comes to stand for an individual', reinforcing the argument presented here that for Dickens, the hat symbolised Scott's life and career.[22] The hat has resonance for Dickens.[23] Greenblatt describes the resonance of an object as its ability to reach beyond its formal boundaries and cause the viewer to reflect on the object's origins and significance.[24] This is an extension of Brown's 'thing theory', which argues that 'we look through objects to see what they disclose about history […] but we only catch a glimpse of things'.[25] Dickens was not alone in emphasising Scott's hat and seeing it as symbolic of the author. When fellow author tourist Washington Irving visited Abbotsford in 1817, he highlighted that Scott wore 'a white hat that had evidently seen service,' showing that it was a well-worn piece of his wardrobe.[26] By 1877, the hat had become so symbolic of Scott that the newly printed edition of the *Waverley* novels was published with an illustration of Scott's chair, hat and walking stick from Abbotsford on the title page.

Yet Dickens did not seem to have considered the hat to be a positive symbol; instead he felt that it embodied the pressures weighing upon Scott's mind. The hat was a symbol of Scott's health and career, once worn so proudly but now battered and bruised by his misfortunes. For Dickens, Scott's problems did not weigh upon his shoulders but upon his hat. This is why the clothes and, in particular the dents in the hat, were recollected most vividly by Dickens on both occasions. The white hat in question can still be seen today within the Visitors Centre

[21] Briggs, *Victorian Things,* p. 266.
[22] Hunter, *Evocative Objects*, p. 8.
[23] This is also noted by Hunter, ibid, p. 78.
[24] Greenblatt, 'Resonance and Wonder', p. 19.
[25] Brown, 'Thing Theory', p. 1-22.
[26] Irving, Washington, 'Abbotsford and Newstead Abbey', <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/7948/7948-h/7948-h.htm> [accessed 30 March 2021].

at Abbotsford, but what is striking is that although the hat appears to be well worn, Dickens exaggerated its condition as it is neither bent nor broken.[27] The hat was a symbol through which Dickens could communicate the pity he felt for Scott, so he exaggerated its conditions to attach greater meaning to it. He increased the hat's resonance.

Dickens's emphasis on the pressure Scott had felt was justified as the latter had suffered a significant change in fortunes towards the end of his life. In 1825 there was a financial crash, the stock market collapsed, and Scott lost his investments in *Ballantyne and Co*, of which he was the sole partner.[28] As a result, he was one hundred and seventy thousand pounds in debt, the equivalent of ten million pounds today.[29] He stated, 'I am now like my namesake in the days of the crusades – Walter the Penniless'.[30] Scott's drastic change in financial standing was a turning point in his career. Yet he decided against filing for bankruptcy, as he did not want others to pay for his debts.[31] He instead tried to write as much as possible to reduce the deficit. He was no longer writing for the love of it, but out of necessity. Scott's financial problems were publicly known and had a long-term impact on his reputation.[32] Although many were sympathetic, giving offers of financial help, there was also criticism.[33] Scott was not as celebrated an author as he had once been and his health deteriorated; he suffered from a stomach ulcer and had a minor stroke during the Christmas of 1825.[34] Scott was, however, able to keep Abbotsford as he had already passed the property onto his son before the 1825 crash.[35] Scott continued to live there rent-free for the rest of his life.

Before his 1841 visit, Dickens considered Abbotsford to be a fundamental cause of Scott's change in fortunes. His image of Abbotsford and Scott was informed by Lockhart's biography

[27] Noted in a visit to Abbotsford in March 2018.
[28] Eileen Dunlop, *Sir Walter Scott: A Life in Story* (Edinburgh: N.M.S. Enterprise, 2016), p. 197.
[29] Ibid.
[30] John G. Lockhart, *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott, Bart* (Edinburgh: R Cadell, 1837), p. 394.
[31] Abbotsford display, Visitors Centre, Abbotsford, March 2018.
[32] This does not, however, seem to have affected the sale of his books, see Annicka Bautz, 'Scott's Victorian Readers', *Nineteenth Century Context,* 31:1 (2009), 19-29.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Dunlop, *Sir Walter Scott,* p. 196.
[35] Ibid, p. 198.

The Life of Sir Walter Scott (1837), as it included substantial descriptions of life at Abbotsford and details of the building. We know for certain that Dickens read the biography before he visited Abbotsford as in 1838, he wrote an anonymous review for *The Examiner* entitled 'Scott and his Publishers'.[36] It was primarily a critique of Lockhart's *Life of Sir Walter Scott* and debated the portrayal of Scott's relationship with his publishers Ballantyne & Co.[37] Dickens stated that Scott's 'embarrassments' were not due to his business deals with Ballantyne, as Lockhart portrayed it, but were caused 'wholly and solely by his love of improving Abbotsford'.[38] Dickens brought this view with him when he visited the property and his recollections of the visit, such as the description of the house as 'miserable', indicate that he did not change his mind on the matter.[39]

Scott's creation of Abbotsford had been a costly affair. Irving said the house 'was a drain upon [Scott's] purse […] and a weight upon his mind which finally crushed him'.[40] Dickens shared the same opinion as Irving and felt that the hat symbolised this notion. Scott had purchased the land in 1812, and for the next fourteen years, he made substantial renovations.[41] He converted the cottage into a castle, equipped it with turrets which he insisted on showing

---

[36] Charles Dickens, 'Scott and his Publishers', *Examiner,* (31 March and 29 September, 1839), *Miscellaneous Papers by Charles Dickens,* ed. by Bertram W. Matz (London: Chapman and Hall, 1908), 82-97.

[37] Although printed anonymously, it is now accepted that Dickens was the author, see K. J. Fielding 'A New Article by Dickens: Scott and His Publishers reprinted from the *Examiner', The Dickensian,* 46 (1950), 122-127.

[38] Dickens, 'Scott and his Publishers', p. 124. It is difficult to ascertain precisely what informed Dickens's view as he had not yet visited the property. It is likely he would have been influenced by the writings of Lockhart and Irving.

[39] Tourists bring expectations with them when visiting a site, and these expectations often affect the encounter. Thompson argues that when we travel, we are affected by the 'script' of our expectations which 'shape our experience significantly if not absolutely and form an important part of how we perceive ourselves and portray ourselves to others'. See Thompson, *The Suffering Traveller and the Romantic Imagination,* p. 10. Dickens to John Forster (30 January 1842), Editor notes, *Pilgrim Letters, Vol.3,* p. 41.

[40] Washington Irving, *Abbotsford and Newstead Abbey*, pp. 1-121. Dickens owned copies of Irving's work such as *The Sketchbook of Geoffrey Crayon, Gent.,* see Devonshire Terrace Inventory 1854, *The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.4: 1844-1846,* ed. by Kathleen Tillotson et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 719. See also Dickens Library Online, 'Washington Irving', <http://www.dickenslibraryonline.org/author/314> [accessed 4 November 2020].

[41] Lockhart, *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott.*

dinner guests, and increased the grounds from one hundred and fifty to one thousand acres.[42] Scott created a lairdship to match his early success as a writer, and he filled the house with so many items that Lockhart describes Abbotsford as a 'magnificent library and museum', where books outnumbered the shelves.[43] Additionally, there was an armoury displaying historical artefacts and weaponry.[44]

Scott consciously constructed his literary heritage at Abbotsford. He was genuinely interested in history and collected heritage. As many studies such as Hazard's have shown, he wrote about historical events and was also an avid collector of pieces linked to famous Scottish historical figures and occasions.[45] Scott imbued the very building of Abbotsford with tangible heritage that he had taken from elsewhere; he used stone from Melrose Abbey and the door of Edinburgh jail, the Old Tolbooth.[46] He infused his own history into Abbotsford. The hall, for example, is decorated with the shielded coat of arms of every historic family within Scotland. The shields on the ceiling document the Scottish families from which Scott was directly descended, allowing him to place his family into Scottish history.

Rigney has shown how Scott constructed his home at Abbotsford consciously in homage to his own writings and literary prestige.[47] Booth further explores this idea, stating that Scott built his own 'antiquarian pastiche', by creating an aesthetic based upon his *Waverley* novels.[48] The elaborate castle-like design still stands as a testament to this fact, with its turrets and sweeping grounds. There are similarities between Abbotsford and Scott's fictional

[42] Ibid, p.108 and p. 68.
[43] Ibid*,* p.218
[44] Ibid.
[45] Often highlighted by biographers. Lockhart calls the library a 'museum' because of the number of artefacts on display. See Lockhart, *Life of Sir Walter Scott,* p. 178. Dunlop similarly highlights this notion but calls it 'obsessive and indiscriminate hoarding' of artefacts. Dunlop, *Sir Walter Scott,* p. 156. This is incorrect, however, as many of the objects were consciously chosen for the key events in Scottish history they represented.
[46] Explored by Hazard, who states that the fabric of Abbotsford could be seen as a museum 'The Author's House: Abbotsford and Weyside', p. 64. Stephen Bann sees it as a 'gothic shrine in another place' in *The Clothing of Clio: A Study of the Representations of History in Nineteenth Century Britain and France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 101.
[47] Rigney, *The Afterlives of Walter Scott: Memory on the Move,* pp.127-154.
[48] Alison Booth, *Homes and Haunts,* p. 68.

settings, which help to infuse the literary tourism of the site with the authorial. Scott described the library at Waverley's home as a large gothic room with 'a gallery' which contained a 'miscellaneous and extensive collection of volumes'; this is reminiscent of Scott's study at Abbotsford.[49] Scott's fictional house of Tully-Veolan in *Waverley* (1814) is similar to Abbotsford, particularly in respect of the weapons and armour which were described as 'old useless things which hung in the hall', just as they do in Abbotsford. The property also shows Scott's interaction with the picturesque.[50] As Alexander Ross correctly argues, he used a picturesque aesthetic to 'fashion his home at Abbotsford, the landscape and grounds', showing his awareness of popular movements which drew visitors.[51]

Abbotsford has been the focus of many literary tourism studies, not only because it is one of the earliest examples of a museumised (the process of displaying something as if in a museum) writer's house in Britain, but also because it shows how an author can consciously construct their literary legacy.[52] The visit to Abbotsford allowed Dickens to experience Scott's

[49] Walter Scott, *Waverley,* ed. by Claire Lamont (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 14.

[50] Due to the complexity of the term, the picturesque will not be extensively explored. The formation of the picturesque movement is ultimately indebted to Edmund Burke who discussed in *A Philosophical Enquiry* the difference between a sublime and beautiful landscape, noting how the beautiful causes joy, whilst the sublime was the source of the terrible. See Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry Into The Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (Dublin: Cranberry and Campbell, 1779). Later his ideas were developed, and the idea of the picturesque was introduced by Gilpin in his works, including *Observation on the River Wye* (1782). He was fundamental in defining and popularising the Romantic ideas of the picturesque. See William Gilpin, *Three Essays on Picturesque Beauty (*London: Blamaire, 1792), p. 35. Sir Uvedale Price then took the argument further and stated that 'the picturesque appears to hold a station between beauty and sublimity', and he was one of the first to define it as its own category of landscape rather than just as a synonym for beauty. See Sir Uvedale Price, *Essays on the Picturesque as Compared with the Sublime and the Beautiful, Vol.1* (London: J. Mawman, 1810), p. 68 and p. 38.

[51] Alexander M. Ross, *The Imprint of the Picturesque on Nineteenth Century British Fiction* (Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1986), p. 68. Scott was aware of the tradition and had close connections with picturesque artists such as J. M. W. Turner. For more about Scott's picturesque links see, for example, J. R. Watson, *Picturesque Landscape and English Romantic Poetry* (London: Hutchinson Educational, 1970). Scottish Romanticism is specifically explored in Murray Pittock, *Scottish and Irish Romanticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

[52] Museumised means the process of displaying something as if in a museum, OED, 'Museumised' <

home and see *how* Scott created his heritage. The other literary tourism sites Dickens had previously visited, such as Shakespeare's birthplace (explored in the next chapter), had been converted into sites by other people. Abbotsford in comparison, had been transformed into a literary tourism site by Scott himself. One visitor in 1825 said that Abbotsford was a monument to Scott's 'tastes and fancies' and 'few poets ever inhabited such a place [and] none now ever created one'.[53] Scott was conscious that his home had an important role in the public presentation of his identity. Lockhart noted how Scott would receive strangers as 'he felt their coming was the best homage they could pay to his celebrity, and that it would have been uncourteous of him not to give them the fill of his talk.'[54] The idea of paying 'homage' indicates that Scott was aware of his position as an influential and popular author, respected by others. Scott was so inundated with visitors that he kept a form of 'open house'; as one group of people left another would arrive.[55] As Lockhart highlighted, seeing Scott was the 'one object of the Abbotsford pilgrims'.[56]

While Scott was aware that he and his house were attractions for tourists, he disapproved of the growing tourist industry in Scotland. After his stay at Abbotsford in 1817, Washington Irving recorded that Scott disliked how the locals made a trade 'of showing rocks and ruins'.[57] When Irving stated that Scott and his writings had also 'brought in an influx of curious travellers', Scott laughed and responded that he 'might be in some measure in the right'.[58] Scott was aware that his works had brought tourists to Scotland but was, as Buzard states, 'highly ambivalent about his role in packaging Scotland for touristic consumption'.[59] Scott

---

https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/245388?isAdvanced=false&result=1&rskey=7z3z2P&> [accessed 19 June 2021]. Scott's conscious construction is extensively explored within Watson, *The Literary Tourist,* pp. 93-205; and more recently within Watson, *The Author's Effects,* pp. 185-212.

[53] Anonymous Author, 'Abbotsford as Described by a Distinguished American', *The Anniversary or Poetry and Prose for 1829,* ed. by Allan Cunningham (London: John Sharpe, 1829), p. 86 and p. 100.

[54] Lockhart, *Sir Walter Scott,* p. 197-8.

[55] Ibid, p. 192.

[56] Ibid, p. 193.

[57] Washington Irving, *Abbotsford and Newstead Abbey*, p. 79.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Buzard, 'The Grand Tour and After, 1660-1840', p. 44.

considered his home to be individual and focused on him as an author, thus different from other tourist attractions, including literary sites relating to his own fiction.

As Scott aged, his attitude to visitors altered. He stopped entertaining strangers from 1825 onwards, as his personal life and reputation changed. Only visitors who had prearranged a visit were allowed into Abbotsford.[60] The number of tourists had become overwhelming; on one day, sixteen uninvited parties came to the house.[61] Moreover, Scott had been subjected to an 'infamous tourist' who stole a letter from Byron which had been on display in the library.[62] Yet the house continued to function as a literary tourist site as visitors could visit Abbotsford when the Scott family were away and were given a guided tour by a member of house staff.[63]

Following Scott's death, Abbotsford was preserved almost precisely how he had left it. In 1832 significant funds were raised in his honour.[64] Much of the money went towards paying off his substantial debt, but the English fund of £10,000 was initially intended to preserve the memory of Scott by leaving Abbotsford to his heirs forever.[65] However, it proved too small a sum of money to enable this wish. Instead, the money was used for 'the permanent preservation at least of the house and its immediate appurtenances as a memorial of the tastes and habits of the founder'. [66]

In the nineteenth century, authors' houses were already becoming places of commemoration and memorialisation, and the desire to preserve Abbotsford shows this growing appetite. Both Rigney and Hendrix correctly highlight the importance of place in preserving literary

[60] Lockhart, *Sir Walter Scott,* p. 353.
[61] Ibid.
[62] Anonymous Author, 'Abbotsford as Described by a Distinguished American', p. 98.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Lockhart, *Sir Walter Scott,* p.748.
[65] Dickens's visited before Scott's descendants made substantial changes to the property, such as building an extension and uprooting many of the trees which Scott had planted himself. These changes greatly disappointed some later visitors such as William Wells Brown, who visited soon after Dickens and documented his experience of Abbotsford in his book about his travels throughout Europe. Correspondence with Collections and Interpretation Manager of Abbotsford, December 2017.
[66] Ibid.

heritage.[67] Rigney has argued how Abbotsford, in particular, was both a site of memory and a 'portable monument'.[68] She notes that, like novels, literary houses are forms of heritage which allow the stories attached to them to be adapted to new contexts, helping to prolong their survival in cultural memory.[69] She shows how the existence of Abbotsford allows people to locate Scott's heritage as it stands as a monument to its creator.[70] Abbotsford stood as a symbol of Scott's literary career, while also being indicative of his financial rise and fall. It became a form of monument. Hendrix similarly argues that when an author dies, or leaves, literary houses change from mediums of expression to mediums of remembrance, as they become a 'repository of memories'.[71] By preserving or imitating what the house would have looked like when the author lived there, the heritage of an author becomes material, and the display suggests meaning relating to the author and their life.[72] Abbotsford in particular, due to Scott's substantial renovations, reflected his personality, and enabled the house to become a 'posthumous shrine'.[73]

Although laying the blame for much of Scott's financial misfortunes on Abbotsford, Dickens did, however, see the appeal of what Scott was trying to create. He wrote about how Scott would have wished his children to grow up in a place where 'every glen and rock and blade of heather bore the impression of his genius'.[74] He foresaw the appeal of Abbotsford as a literary tourist site where Scott's descendants could 'lead pilgrims […] and show them where he lived and died'.[75] The latter comment showed Dickens's awareness of literary tourism in 1838. He

[67] Hendrix, *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory,* and Rigney, *The Afterlives of Walter Scott.*
[68] Rigney, *The Afterlives of Walter Scott,* p. 138.
[69] Ibid*,* p. 17.
[70] Ibid, p. 146.
[71] Hendrix, *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory*, p. 1 and p. 5.
[72] Ibid, pp. 2-3.
[73] Hazard, 'The Author's House: Abbotsford and Weyside', p. 69.
[74] Dickens, 'Scott and his Publishers', p. 127.
[75] Ibid. Despite his critique of it, Dickens still owned his 1837 edition of *The Life of Walter Scott* in 1854 and became closely acquainted with Lockhart. He had spent time with him in 1853 while he stayed in Rome, and wrote in 1862, 'I knew him and he liked me'. See 'Devonshire Terrace Inventory', *The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.7,* p. 719; and Dickens to W. H. Wills (11 November 1862), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.10,* p. 158.

understood how people were drawn to the homes of authors, as he was himself.[76] His use of 'pilgrims' further highlights that he was aware of the religious connotations associated with literary tourism.[77] Dickens's other activities in Scotland further emphasise this awareness of tourism tropes.

Dickens's Scottish Tour and Becoming the Author Tourist

The visit to Abbotsford was the conclusion of Dickens's 1841 Scottish tour. Throughout the trip, he actively planned encounters with literary locations that linked to scenes from Walter Scott's works, and they were highly anticipated points of his itinerary. Although much of the tour was focused on literary sites, Dickens, as an author tourist, saw the visit to Abbotsford as a particular highlight; on the 9 July 1841, Dickens wrote to Forster saying how he had managed to rearrange his trip and leave earlier so 'we shall have a whole day for Scott's house and tomb'.[78] Dickens had initially planned a tour of Ireland as he was hoping to feel inspired by visiting another country.[79] However, as he detailed to John Forster on 18 March, he had received a letter from an acquaintance in Edinburgh who stated that there was 'a desire in that romantic town to give me greeting and welcome', so Dickens decided to change his destination to Scotland.[80] The planned trip to Ireland could suggest that Dickens was not as drawn to Scotland as other domestic travellers. Visiting Scotland was in vogue at the time as many believed the idea, promoted by Dr. Johnson and others, that ancient Scotland was

[76] He visited other author's houses, such as Shakespeare's birthplace and Johnson's house.
[77] 'Pilgrim' had been used jointly to refer to a secular and religious journey from the thirteenth century, also associated with making a journey to a place of significance from the sixteenth century. The term 'pilgrim' was actively used in the nineteenth century concerning trips to literary heritage sites. The concept of literary pilgrimage is explored in multiple literary heritage studies including Hendrix 'From Early Modern to Romantic Literary Tourism', pp. 1-13. Hendrix states it was a 'combination of autobiography and fiction that turned admirers into literary pilgrims'. See also Watson, 'Literary Places, Tourism and the Heritage Experience', *The Literary Tourist,* pp. 312-333.
[78] Dickens to John Forster (9 July 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.2,* p. 324. Dickens's itinerary had been dictated by Lord Murray. This seems to be a different Murray from the author of the Murray travel handbooks, but Dickens was acquainted with the latter as seen in Dickens to John Murray (17 November 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.2,* p. 423.
[79] Dickens to John Forster (18 March 1841), Editorial Notes, *Letters of Charles Dickens,* Vol. 2, pp. 238-9.
[80] Ibid.

disappearing.[81] After Culloden and the fall of the Scottish clans in 1746, the English became interested in seeing the remote Highlands, which encouraged the 'vacation hunter' of the late eighteenth century to visit Scotland.[82]

Scotland's popularity in the nineteenth century was indebted to Scott and his writings.[83] He actively imprinted the landscape of Scotland into his work.[84] His poetry and novels with their settings in the Highlands were most travellers' primary source of information about the landscape, and many wanted to visit spots that were the supposed inspiration for Scott's work. Although there were other factors driving tourists to Scotland, Scott's works were an 'accelerant'.[85] Buzard highlights that after its publication in 1810, *The Lady of the Lake* sent 'scores' of tourists to the North.[86] Queen Victoria (who we should consider a literary tourist) mapped her Highland journey around sites associated with Scott.[87] She wrote in October 1849, 'We passed many interesting places, both historically, & from their association with

[81] Barbara Korte, *English Travel Writing From Pilgrimage to Postcolonial Explorations,* trans. by Catherine Matthias (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), p. 75.
[82] Buzard, 'The Grand Tour and After, 1660-1840', p. 43, and John Glendening, *The High Road: Romantic Tourism, Scotland and Literature, 1720-1820* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), p. 230.
[83] There is a lot of scholarship on this subject, including more recently Stuart Kelly, *Scott-land: The Man Who Invented a Nation* (Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2011). And Ian Brown's comprehensive edited collection, *Literary Tourism, the Trossachs and Walter Scott* (Glasgow: ASLS, 2012).
[84] For more about this and the long-term effects Scott had on the cultural image of Scotland, see LuAnn McCracken Fletcher, 'Scotland and Outlander: Inventing Scotland for Armchair Tourists', *Literary Tourism and the British Isles,* ed. by LuAnn McCracken Fletcher (London: Lexington Books, 2019), pp. 191-221.
[85] Alastair J. Durie, 'Scott and Tourism', *Literary Tourism, the Trossachs and Walter Scott,* ed. Ian Brown (Glasgow: ASLS, 2012), p. 53.
[86] Buzard, 'The Grand Tour and After, 1660-1840', p. 44. The tourist boom following Scott's work is also explored within Gary Mackenzie, 'Writing Cross Country: Landscape Palimpsest and the Problems of Scottish Literary Tourism', *Green Letters,* 21:3 (2017), p. 282. For a more in-depth analysis of the poem and its links to the landscape, see Nicola J. Watson, 'Holiday Romances or Loch Katrine and the Literary Tourist', *Literary Tourism, the Trossachs and Walter Scott,* ed. by Ian Brown (Glasgow: ASLS, 2012), pp. 56-70.
[87] Glendening, *The High Road,* p. 230. Queen Victoria's journals can be found at Queen Victoria's Journals, < http://www.queenvictoriasjournals.org/home.do> [accessed 27 March 2020].

W. Scott's ever beautiful "Lady of the Lake"'.[88] Dickens was aware of the literary tourist sites relating to Scott's work before his visit, stating in a letter to Forster that he was pleased with the change in plan and looked forward to travelling to the 'Borders, Edinburgh, Rob Roy's Country'.[89] Rob Roy's country is probably a reference to Walter Scott's 1817 work of the same name. Rob Roy was a real Scottish outlaw who lived from 1671-1734, his historical name was Rob Roy MacGregor, and Scott played a considerable role in popularising his life and shortening his name.[90] The reference in the letter shows that Dickens, like other tourists, was charting the Scottish landscape through its literary connections.

Dickens's interest in visiting 'Rob Roy's Country' would have come from his knowledge of Scott's work. It is difficult to ascertain precisely when Dickens first encountered Scott's work as he did not highlight that he read him as a child. For example, Scott's work was not listed in Dickens's semi-autobiographical novel *David Copperfield,* nor did Scott's books appear to have been part of John Dickens's small library which Dickens utilised as a child.[91] This library informed Dickens's literary influences as it included some of the books which continued to fascinate him as an adult, such as *Arabian Nights* (1706) and *Robinson Crusoe* (1719).[92] However, Scott's works were extremely popular in Dickens's time, and he highlighted in a letter to George Cattermole in 1839, aged 27, that he had been reading 'with greater delight than ever' Scott's *A Legend of Montrose* (1819) and *Kenilworth* (1821).[93] The inventory of Dickens's house at Devonshire Terrace shows he owned eighty-eight volumes of Scott's work

[88] Queen Victoria's Journals, Vol. 48, (Friday 14 October 1859), p. 18 < http://www.queenvictoriasjournals.org/search/displayItem.do?FormatType=fulltextimgsrc&QueryType=articles&ResultsID=3170616147884&filterSequence=0&PageNumber=1&ItemNumber=40&ItemID=qvj09769&volumeType=PSBEA> [accessed 27 March 2020]. In turn, Victoria and Albert's interest in Scotland 'inaugurated a new phase in the popularity of the Highlands' – see Glendening, *The High Road,* p. 230.

[89] Dickens to John Forster (18 March 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 2,* p. 239.

[90] For more about the real Rob Roy and how Scott utilised the historic figure within his work, see David Stevenson, *The Hunt for Rob Roy* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 2004).

[91] Charles Dickens, *David Copperfield,* ed. by Nina Burgis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), p. 48. And Tomalin, *Charles Dickens: A Life,* p. 11.

[92] Ibid.

[93] Dickens to George Cattermole (21 August 1839), *The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.1: 1820-1839*, ed. by Madeline House and Graham Storey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 576.

in 1854, including both prose and poetry.[94] These particular editions were printed between 1830 and 1836, so it is highly probable that Dickens's interest in Scott's work began in his later teenage years and into his early twenties.

Scott's work profoundly influenced much of Dickens's Highland tour. He wrote accounts of his experience to his friend Forster and mentioned places associated with Scott.[95] On 5 July, he described how he visited Loch Katrine with Catherine and their servant Tom. 'We conveyed Kate up a rocky pass to go and see the island of the Lady of the Lake'.[96] Loch Katrine, with its connections to one of Scott's most famous poems, was a popular destination and had become a prescribed place to visit. Tourists had frequented the loch since 1759, particularly tourists who visited Scotland purely for its picturesque, romantic and sublime scenery.[97] Yet Scott's poem 'vastly amplified the earlier fame' and Dickens was aware that he was following in the footsteps of others.[98] Dickens stated that as they climbed a rocky pass to see the Lake, Catherine 'gave in after the first five minutes and we left her very picturesque and uncomfortable, with Tom holding an umbrella over her head while we climbed on'.[99] When Dickens reached the top of the pass he stated, 'it is impossible to say what a glorious scene it was'.[100] Dickens had a complex relationship with the term picturesque; later developing the idea of a 'new picturesque', however when he was in Scotland he used it in the conventional sense as somewhere that should be visited because of its aesthetic beauty.[101]

---

[94] Devonshire Terrace Inventory (May 1854), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.7: 1853-1855*, p. 719.
[95] See Dickens to John Forster (30 June 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 2,* p. 317 and Dickens to John Forster (9 July 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 2,* p. 323.
[96] Dickens to John Forster (5 July 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 2,* p. 322.
[97] Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs, 'Introduction' in Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs *Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 6.
[98] Glendening, *The High Road,* p. 234. Dickens was close friends with George Cattermole who was known for his sketches of buildings and scenery from Scott's work, which Dickens likely saw before his Highland tour. See Dickens to George Cattermole (13 January 1840), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 2,* p. 7.
[99] John Forster (5 July 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 2*, p. 322.
[100] Ibid.
[101] Dickens described a 'new picturesque', Dickens to John Forster (22 Feb 1845), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 4,* p. 271, which did not ignore the poverty which the picturesque often overshadowed. He continued to use both dual meanings of the word throughout his life. For more on Dickens and the picturesque see Ross, *Imprint of the Picturesque* p. 94.

Dickens was not only interested in fictional literary tourist sites relating to Scott but also those relating to Scott's life, highlighting Dickens's position as an author tourist. Robinson states that Scott helped to develop Scottish tourism and that part of it 'grew around the cult of Scott's personality'.[102] While staying in Edinburgh in 1841, Dickens wrote to Forster of 'how I breakfasted to-day [sic] in the house where Scott lived seven and twenty years'.[103] The house was situated in George Square and was where Macvey Napier then lived.[104] By detailing how the house was related to Scott, Dickens gave it an added layer of significance by highlighting the space's literary heritage. Booth rightly argues that a visit to an author's home is a way of learning more about that author, as the house and its interior stand as a form of biography, giving more information about the person who lived there.[105]

Dickens's interest in Scott's personal life predated his trip to Scotland. In 1838, Dickens quoted Scott extensively in his diary following his sister-in-law Mary Hogarth's death: 'in Scott's Diary [sic…] there are thoughts which have been mine by day and by night.'[106] He compared his own grief to how Scott felt after the death of his wife, May.[107] Referring to Scott at such a private time of grief shows the connection Dickens felt with him. Dickens seems to have initially used the diary as a way of coping with his grief for Mary, as he began it on New Year's Day 1838 with a lament for his sister-in-law.[108] He continued this diary format for fifteen days, writing on the 15 January: 'Here ends this brief attempt at a Diary. I grow sad over this checking off of days, and can't do it. CD.'[109] He began writing again, however, on the 2 February the same year, albeit in a less traditional diary format. He utilised the book as a

[102] Robinson, 'Reading Between the Lines', p. 3.
[103] Dickens to John Forster (30 June 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 2,* p. 317.
[104] Macvey Napier, editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, and acquaintance of Dickens. Editorial notes, Dickens to John Forster (30 June 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.2,* p. 318.
[105] Booth, *Homes and Haunts,* p. 3. This argument is generally accepted in literary heritage studies. The same premise is explored, for example, by North, 'Literary Biography and the House of the Poet', pp. 49-63.
[106] Dickens's Diary, (Sunday 14 January 1838), Appendix A, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.1,* p. 631-2.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Ibid.
[109] Ibid.

form of engagement record and to track expenses. Scott's diary-keeping may have inspired the first fifteen days, but Dickens was unable to maintain this habit.[110]

Dickens's interest in the life of Walter Scott was further encouraged by an indirect familial connection. In 1835, Dickens worked with George Hogarth and met his daughter Catherine. Hogarth had trained as a lawyer but gave it up in favour of editing and writing. He worked at a variety of publications, including *The Morning Chronicle* where he wrote on music and political matters.[111] It was here that Dickens met Hogarth, while he was writing under the pseudonym Boz. Dickens held Hogarth in high esteem, trusting him to read proofs of *Sketches by Boz* (1836).[112] Hogarth had been acquainted with Walter Scott from 1816 as his brother-in-law, James Ballantyne, was Scott's publisher, and the three of them jointly bought the *Edinburgh Weekly Journal* the following year. Hogarth was still practising Law at the time and soon became Scott and Ballantyne's trusted financial advisor.[113]

Catherine Hogarth's link to Scott may have encouraged Dickens's interest in her. In his biography, Slater states that Dickens had been impressed by Catherine's 'cultural connections' when he had first met her.[114] After marrying Catherine, in some of his letters focusing on the biographical details of his life, Dickens took pains to highlight Hogarth's connection to Scott. In 1838 he wrote, 'I am married to the eldest daughter of Mr. Hogarth' who was 'a great friend and companion of Sir Walter Scott's'. [115] Furthermore, in 1856, he wrote to Wilkie Collins repeating, 'I am married to the daughter of a writer […] who was the

[110] Only fragments of diary entries from 1838-41 survive, yet it appears he kept a form of diary throughout his life but destroyed them. See Editorial notes, Appendix A, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 644.
[111] John Warrack, 'George Hogarth (1783-1870)', *ODNB* <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-13463?rskey=wpvxgH&result=3> [accessed 10 February 2020].
[112] Dickens to John Macrone (17 December 1835), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 108.
[113] William J. Carlton, 'George Hogarth: A Link with Scott and Dickens', *The Dickensian,* 59, (1963), 78-90, p. 78.
[114] Slater, *Charles Dickens,* p. 68.
[115] Dickens to J. H. Kuenzel (July 1838), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.1,* p. 424.

great friend and assistant of Scott'.[116] In the letter to Collins, Dickens goes on to say that Hogarth was the man 'who first made Lockhart known to [Scott]'.[117] He was keen to establish Hogarth as an influential figure who forged the close friendship between Lockhart and Scott that resulted in Lockhart marrying Scott's daughter and becoming his biographer. Dickens wrote in such a way to not only connect Hogarth to Scott, but also himself to Scott.[118]

Dickens's attitude towards sites associated with Scott changed during, or immediately after, his time at Abbotsford, as Dickens's high expectations, shown through his desire to prolong his time at Abbotsford, were not met.[119] He wrote little about the house, especially compared to the many detailed letters he had written to Forster concerning the fictional places associated with Scott. Dickens instead saw the house as 'miserable', and this negative association tainted his recollections and encouraged him to be silent on the specifics of the house.[120] Watson highlights that the Victorians saw Abbotsford as 'a record of triumph and poignant disaster'.[121] Dickens instead focused only on the 'disaster'.

At Abbotsford, Dickens's reactions no longer publicly conformed to established literary tourism tropes, as he had maintained throughout the rest of his Scottish tour. He was no longer a literary tourist, but an author tourist. He never referred to himself as a 'pilgrim' when detailing his visit to Abbotsford, even though he had done so when referring to other visitors.[122] Although Dickens may have felt that his silence and differing terminology projected

---

[116] Dickens to Wilkie Collins (6 June 1856), *The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.8: 1856-1858*, ed. by Graham Storey and Kathleen Mary Tillotson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 131.
[117] Ibid.
[118] These networks between authors were not uncommon, Sutherland for example, has investigated the familial connections between Victorian novelists and argues that one of the predisposing factors to become a successful novelist was being related to someone who wrote novels. John Sutherland, *Victorian Fiction: Writers and Publishers* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995), p. 159.
[119] See Dickens to John Forster (9 July 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.2,* p. 323.
[120] Dickens to John Forster (30 January 1842), Editorial notes, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.3,* p. 42.
[121] Watson, *Literary Tourist*, p. 102. Kelly also looks at the atmosphere of the house and argues that it changed because Scott's death gave it 'a palpable sense of loss', Stuart Kelly, *Scott-land: The Man Who Invented a Nation* (Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2011), no page numbers.
[122] Dickens, 'Scott and his Publishers', p. 127.

a view that was distinct from the standard Abbotsford tourist, he was, in fact, conforming to an 'anti-tourist' sentiment, which developed after the Napoleonic wars, as mass tourism increased in the nineteenth century.[123] Buzard has highlighted that many 'modern travellers and travel writers identified themselves as anti-tourists' in the wake of the growing popularity of travel.[124] At Abbotsford, Dickens wanted to be seen as the 'sensitive traveller and not the vulgar tourist' and 'to show a uniquely meaningful relationship with visited places'.[125] This was a common feeling among author tourists; John Ruskin had greatly disapproved of Abbotsford in 1838, and like Dickens chose not to write about his experience there publicly.[126] Furthermore, Dickens helped to build an 'anti-tourism' reaction to Abbotsford as Macready later wrote in 1847 that the house was the 'most disagreeable exhibition'.[127] He echoed Dickens's distaste for Scott's clothes stating, 'everything seems as if he had died last week, and, in the worst possible taste, they show the clothes he last wore'.[128]

Dickens was silent on many aspects of Abbotsford that were stressed within contemporary travel books and other visitors' accounts. It is highly probable that Dickens would have read, or at least been aware of, Washington Irving's famous recollections as told through his pseudonymised-alias Geoffrey Crayon before he visited Abbotsford, as he was a great admirer

---

[123] James Buzard, *The Beaten Track,* p. 6. For more on this and the development of taste and effect of Romantic attitudes see Ian Ousby, *The Englishman's England* and Thompson, *The Suffering Traveller and the Romantic Imagination.* For more about the difference in terminology between traveller and tourist see Martin Farr and Xavier Guegan, 'Introduction' *The British Abroad Since the Eighteenth Century: Vol. 1 Travellers and Tourists,* ed. by Martin Farr and Xavier Guegan, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013). And Fussell, *Abroad: British Literary Travelling Between the Wars.*

[124] Buzard, 'The Grand Tour and After, 1660-1840', p. 49.

[125] Buzard, *The Beaten Track,* p. 6 and p. 12.

[126] See Christine Bolus-Reichert, *The Age of Eclecticism: Literature and Culture in Britain 1815-1885* (Columbus: Ohio University Press, 2009), p. 12. For more about Ruskin's thoughts on Abbotsford see Julie Lawson, 'Ruskin on Scott's Abbotsford', *Abbotsford and Sir Walter Scott: The Image and the Influence*, ed. by Iain G. Brown (Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 2003) pp. 161–6.

[127] The two men were very close, Macready and his wife looked after Dickens's children when he and Catherine went to America in 1842. William Charles Macready, 'Visit to Abbotsford' in Frederick Pollack ed., *Macready's Reminiscences and a Selection from his Diaries and Letters* (New York: Macmillan and co, 1875), p. 579.

[128] Macready, 'Visit to Abbotsford', p. 579.

of Irving and his writings.[129] These sources illustrate what Dickens would have seen when he visited. In the 1840s, Scott's descendants were still living in the house, and visitors were admitted every Wednesday and Friday between two and five if the family was at home.[130] Visitors were permitted to visit the hall, armoury, library, study and drawing room, as well as the grounds.[131] In the study, Scott's writing desk was often considered the high point of the tour as it was a 'representation and relic of Scott'.[132] Dickens did not mention anything in the study aside from the clothes. Visitors also had the opportunity to sit in Scott's chair and view some of his possessions, displayed in glass cases.[133] It is highly probable that Dickens would have conformed to these visitor practices, as aside from his signature in the guestbook, there is no other evidence within Abbotsford's collection about his visit, which implies that he did not receive special treatment.[134] His silence, however, prevents him from appearing like a typical literary tourist.

During the visit to Abbotsford, Dickens did not refer to the landscape as he had throughout the rest of his Scottish tour. Unlike other visitors, he did not indicate that he had explored the grounds of Abbotsford, even though much of his Scottish tour had centred on visiting picturesque landscape sites. One visitor in 1825 highlighted 'the picturesque points of view' with the 'charming waterfalls' and gardens that 'would make the heart of old Price of the Picturesque leap within him'.[135] Scott's landscape gardening of Abbotsford, much of which he

[129] He owned many of Irving's works and referred to them in his letters and also corresponded directly with Irving. In an excitable letter to Irving in 1841, Dickens details how much he enjoyed reading his works, including his collection of essays entitled *The Sketchbook of Geoffrey Crayon, Gent.,* which were written and serialised between 1819 and 1820. Dickens to Washington Irving (21 April 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.2: 1840-1841,* p. 268. Later in 1842 Dickens also stated, 'I do not go to bed two nights out of seven without taking Washington Irving under my arm upstairs to bed with me'. K. J. Fielding, *The Speeches of Charles Dickens* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), p. 29.
[130] Menzies, *Menzies' Pocket guide to Abbotsford, Melrose and the Scottish border.*
[131] Ibid.
[132] Watson, *The Literary Tourist,* p. 105.
[133] Correspondence with Collections and Interpretation Manager of Abbotsford, December 2017.
[134] Ibid.
[135] Anonymous Author, 'Abbotsford as Described by a Distinguished American' p. 84 and p. 87. This is a reference to Sir Uvedale Price, *Essays on the Picturesque as Compared with the Sublime and the Beautiful, Vol.1* (London: J. Mawman, 1810). Ross has highlighted how

did himself, was 'a genuine example of the work of an antiquarian-minded landscape'.[136] Dickens's recollections, by contrast, are purely centred on the house and its contents as he viewed the site through the eyes of an author tourist.

Combating Authorial Comparisons

Dickens's view of Abbotsford was affected by his position as an author tourist. He had frequently been compared to Scott and seen as following in his footsteps, and these comparisons set him apart from other visitors to Abbotsford. The glass case which housed Scott's clothes particularly offended Dickens, as a fellow author. He described it as 'vile', showing his distaste for the choice of display and an aversion to the glass itself. Dickens seemed to see the display at Abbotsford as a reflection on what his future life would look like, causing him to reflect on his own posthumous reputation.

The glass which encased Scott's clothes acted as a mirror, both literally and metaphorically. Isobel Armstrong's work *Victorian Glassworlds* explores perceptions of glass culture in the nineteenth century and argues that when glass was used to display an item, it was often 'a source of anxiety' because of its ability to produce an imbalanced relationship between the subject and the object.[137] The glass acted as both a medium and a barrier.[138] Armstrong shows that Dickens was conscious of glass culture and uses *Bleak House* (1852) as an example.[139] She further highlights how glass draws the eye and objectifies what lies behind the glass panel, giving it 'an aura of glamour'.[140] Dickens may have felt that the glass objectified a disembodied version of Scott. His childhood nurse once recounted a tale where a young

---

Price's writing influenced Scott and his own prose writing in Ross, *The Imprint of the Picturesque on Nineteenth Century British Fiction,* p. 17.

[136] Watson, *Picturesque Landscape and English Romantic Poetry,* p. 137.

[137] Isobel Armstrong, *Victorian Glassworlds: Glass Culture and the Imagination, 1830-1880* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 3 and 7.

[138] Ibid.

[139] Ibid, p. 246.

[140] Ibid, p. 7.

woman came out of a glass case and haunted a lady.[141] This story had a profound effect on Dickens, as he was still able to tell the story in 1860, and he stated that it caused him to recoil from glass cases in his home.[142] For Dickens at Abbotsford, a spectral form of Scott stood behind the glass, encouraging him to contemplate his own image.[143]

It was natural for Dickens to compare himself to Scott as he became established as an author, and in his early career he actively tried to emulate him.[144] His anonymous review published in the *Examiner* in 1838, shows how much he admired Scott.[145] Within it, Dickens wrote that Scott was 'foremost and unapproachable in the bright world of fiction'.[146] He stated that Scott's creative invention was 'scarcely equalled and never (but in the case of Shakespeare) exceeded'.[147] In 1843 he noted, 'I never dreamed of any of my own characters and I feel it so impossible, that I would wager Scott never did of his, real as they are'.[148] The comparisons he drew between himself and Scott were a method of self-praise when he felt he had exceeded the other author. In 1838, he highlighted in reference to writing *Oliver Twist* (1839), *Barnaby Rudge* (1841) and for the *Miscellany*, that 'the conduct of [writing] three different stories at

[141] Charles Dickens, 'The Uncommercial Traveller', *All the Year Round* (8 September 1860), p. 520, *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-iii/page-517.html> [accessed 19 June 2021].
[142] Ibid.
[143] For more about Dickens and glass, see Andrew H. Miller, *Novels Behind Glass: Commodity Culture and Victorian Narratives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995). Within it, Miller states glass was not widely used for display until the 1850s. When Dickens visited in 1841, the use of glass was still a relatively new concept, but it appears he already had a dislike for how it could be used as a form of objectification – even before the Great Exhibition a decade later. See also Watson, *The Author's Effects,* p. 140-163, for more about the use and effects of glass within literary houses.
[144] Scott was a hugely popular writer in Dickens's time. His sales figures were unprecedented, and he was seen as the most successful author of his day. See Dunlop, *Sir Walter Scott: A Life in Story*; and A. N. Wilson, *A Life of Walter Scott, The Laird of Abbotsford* (London: Random House, 2002).
[145] For proof that the piece was written by Dickens, see K. J. Fielding 'A New Article by Dickens Scott and his Publishers reprinted from the *Examiner', The Dickensian,* 46 (1950), 122-127.
[146] Dickens, 'Scott and his Publishers', p. 127.
[147] Ibid.
[148] Dickens to C. C. Felton (1 September 1843), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.3,* p. 550.

the same time, and the production of a large portion of each, every month, would have been beyond Scott himself'.[149]

Dickens was within his rights to make such comparisons to Scott, as others were also comparing the two men. Many perceived Dickens as following in his footsteps.[150] When visiting Edinburgh in 1841, in a toast to Dickens, Lord Robertson pronounced how 'with what delight and cordiality would the author of *Waverley* have hailed the advent of the author of the *Pickwick Papers'*.[151] Kathryn Chittick highlights how they were often compared because Dickens's earlier work was produced at the same time as the serialisation of Lockhart's biography of Scott, meaning that 'their narratives were ubiquitous'.[152] At this stage in his career, it was almost impossible to consider Dickens without thinking of Scott. Although Dickens's work was different, he was still seen as following in Scott's wake. Ian Duncan states that Dickens would have seen Scott as a 'shadow of a father-in-law' in a literary sense, largely due to their shared profession as novelists.[153] This may have caused him to feel an 'anxiety of influence' towards Scott.[154] Dickens was Scott's literary successor, and he may have felt the need to usurp Scott's position.

When he visited Abbotsford, Dickens was working on a novel that would encourage comparisons between himself and Scott.[155] In February 1841, Dickens published the opening instalment of his historical novel, *Barnaby Rudge*.[156] It was Dickens's first attempt at historical fiction, a genre for which Scott was renowned.[157] Kim Ian Michasiw, for example, uses the

---

[149] Dickens to Richard Bentley (10 February 1838), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1*, p. 370.
[150] Duncan, *Modern Romance*, p. 179.
[151] Dickens to John Forster (23 June 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.2*, p. 310.
[152] Kathryn Chittick, *Dickens and the 1830s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 114.
[153] Duncan, *Modern Romance,* p. 188.
[154] Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 8. Bloom defines this concept as the need for strong poets to overcome those who came before them to situate themselves as successful. He links it to Freud's theory of family romance; in particular, the sons need to usurp the father.
[155] Although he did not publish *Rudge* until three years later, he had been contemplating the novel, previously known as *Gabriel Vardon* since 1837. See Slater, *Charles Dickens*, p. 104-5. For more about Scott as the inspiration for *Rudge* see Ackroyd, *Dickens,* p. 332.
[156] The novel also has substantial Gothic influences.
[157] Ackroyd, *Dickens,* p. 332.

novel to show how Dickens experienced an anxiety of influence towards Scott, which resulted in some of the characters in *Barnaby Rudge*, such as Barnaby and his father, as well as Hugh and Lord Chester, to enact the struggles between father and son.[158] Jeffrey Jackson sees it differently, however, and believes that the serialisation of *Barnaby Rudge* was in fact 'a violent break from Scott's influence' as he moved away from the standardised idea of a three-volume novel.[159] *Rudge,* Jackson implies, allowed Dickens to rebel against his 'father' of literature.[160] Either way, *Rudge* is seen as a product of Scott's influence on Dickens.

Within the novel, the description of the Maypole Inn has been read as an insight into Dickens's views on heritage sites. John, for example, in her chapter on 'Heritage Dickens' links the passage to what she terms Dickens's 'heritage aesthetic'.[161] I argue that the importance of the novel, and specifically the Maypole Inn description, derives from its ability to show us that Dickens was contemplating the significance of heritage *before* he visited Abbotsford. Dickens was already aware of how heritage could become a form of tradition and how places could be imbued with importance from the people who had stayed within their walls, before he visited the house.[162] Furthermore, as the next chapter highlights, the Maypole inn description can be seen as an exploration of Dickens's experiences of Shakespearian literary tourist sites in Stratford-on-Avon in 1838.[163]

Yet since John's analysis, the passage has been linked to the literary heritage of Scott, and Dickens's 1841 visit has been misused as evidence for this.[164] Jackson, for example, argues that Dickens's description of the Maypole Inn is a 'criticism of Scott's model of private life' –

[158] Kim Ian Michasiw, '*Barnaby Rudge:* The Since of the Fathers', *ELH,* 56:3 (1989), p. 575.
[159] Jeffrey E. Jackson, 'Dickens's Rejection of Scott's Influence in *Barnaby Rudge*', *The Victorian,* 5:1 (2017), 1-19, p. 1.
[160] Ibid, p. 17.
[161] See Juliet John, *Dickens and Mass Culture,* p. 256.
[162] This argument can also be seen within *The Old Curiosity Shop*.
[163] See pp. 83-85 of this thesis.
[164] Michasiw also emphasises The Maypole as reflecting Scott's heritage, stating 'like Scott's history the inn has changed through the ages from the reign of Henry VIII to the present but in that present time has stopped'. Machasiw is apt in highlighting that the Maypole Inn, like other heritage sites, can seem frozen in time even when the visitor is aware of its long history. Michasiw, '*Barnaby Rudge*: The Since of the Fathers', p. 579.

an exaggeration of an already tenuous connection.[165] He goes on to state that through the 'lament for an old mansion that has become an inn', we see 'a lament for the similarly hybridized unheimliche space of Abbotsford'.[166] Jackson's emphasis on Dickens's 1841 visit to Abbotsford implies that Dickens took the inspiration for the Maypole Inn directly from Abbotsford. Although Dickens had considered Abbotsford back in 1838, he had not yet visited the house. By the time he did visit in 1841, he had already informed Forster, 'I have done all I can or need do in the way of *Barnaby* until I come home, and the story is progressing (I hope you will think) to good strong interest. I have left it, I think, at an exciting point, with a good dawning of the riots'.[167] The Maypole description cannot be a direct reflection on Dickens's visit to Abbotsford as he published the first instalment of *Rudge* in February 1841 but did not visit Abbotsford until July that same year.

Yet the trip to Abbotsford had a significant impact on Dickens's career, as it encouraged him to break away from the comparisons between himself and Scott. When he returned home, he continued to contemplate his visit; at this point, Dickens was twenty-nine and in the midst of his writing career. He had published five novels, a significant accomplishment compared to Scott, who although a famous author of poetry, only completed his first novel, *Waverley* (1814), when he was in his forties. However, Dickens's letters illustrate that following his trip to Abbotsford, he compared his own achievement to Scott's more than ever before, but now considered comparison to Scott as a form of criticism rather than self-praise. One month after the visit, he directly compared the two's sales figures in a letter to Thomas Mitton: 'I still command a sale wholly unprecedented and unknown, even in Scott's case'. [168] He was writing with particular reference to the success of the first instalment of *Master Humphrey's Clock* (1840), which sold 60,000 copies compared to Scott's highest first print run of 12,000 in 1819.[169]

[165] Jackson, 'Dickens's Rejection of Scott's Influence in *Barnaby Rudge*', p. 9.
[166] Ibid.
[167] Dickens to John Forster (9 July 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.2*, p. 325.
[168] Dickens to Thomas Mitton (23 August 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.*2, p. 365.
[169] Ibid, Editorial Notes.

The letter goes on to show Dickens's anxiety over his finances and sales: 'the sale is shaky, and trembles every day'.[170] Slater highlights that Dickens struggled financially in July 1841 and owed a substantial amount of money to his publishers.[171] With a growing family and frequent disputes with publishers, Dickens was worried that the comparisons to Scott would become a reality, resulting in his own financial ruin. This financial insecurity would have caused Dickens some anxiety, but it was exacerbated by his visit to Abbotsford, which had shown him the reality of Scott's financial misfortune: 'I remembered that Scott failed in the sale of his very best works'. [172] Dickens began drawing his own conclusion regarding the cause of this, stating: 'Scott's life warns me' against 'writing without cessation'.[173] Dickens felt part of Scott's failure came from writing too much and without allowing his readers to miss him; Dickens stated that Scott never recovered his 'old circulation' because '*he never left off*'.[174] Dickens now felt that he too had overexposed himself by writing so much.

Dickens then chose 'to stop - to write no more, not one word, for a whole year', regarding his novels. [175] He did not publish a novel for the whole of 1842; although he did continue to write, producing *American Notes* (1842) and the first instalment of *Martin Chuzzlewit* which would be published in January 1843. Dickens feared that, despite the quality of the work, if he overproduced, his sales figures would drop as his name and works lost their appeal. The sales of *Master Humphrey's Clock* encouraged this notion as they had fallen from an initial run of 70,000 to 30,000.[176] Dickens said, 'I am making myself too cheap'.[177] Furthermore, the historic fiction *Rudge* had not been as successful as *The Old Curiosity Shop* (1840), which seems to have added to his unease and desire to revert to his more popular writing style.[178] *Rudge* was

---

[170] Ibid.
[171] Slater, *Charles Dickens,* p. 154.
[172] Dickens to Thomas Mitton (23 August 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.*2, p. 365.
[173] Ibid.
[174] Ibid, Dickens's italics. Although the time it took Scott to write a new work varied, it appeared that every nine months, he produced a novel. David Hewitt, 'Sir Walter Scott', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,*<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-24928> [accessed 26 February 2018].
[175] Dickens to Thomas Mitton (23 August 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.*2, p. 365.
[176] Ibid.
[177] Ibid.
[178] More about the success of the book see Slater, *Charles Dickens,* p.169

described as 'too Scott like'.[179] As Slater highlights, in the author's note included in the final instalment of *Rudge*, Dickens was explicit that his next novel would be more in line with *Pickwick* (1837) and *Nickleby* (1839) and not another historical novel.[180] As well as this genre appearing to be unpopular with his audience, he may have felt that he was following too closely in Scott's footsteps. It was not until 1859 that Dickens would publish his only other historical novel, *A Tale of Two Cities* (1859).

Dickens's trip to Abbotsford should be seen as the catalyst for his 1842 visit to America. On 19 September 1841, Dickens wrote to his friend Forster that he had made up his mind to go to America as soon as possible.[181] A variety of reasons are often given for the trip: Dickens's need for a break from writing, his desire to produce something different, his existing interest in America, and a wish to see the differences between American and English society.[182] What critics do not note explicitly is that Dickens's visit to Abbotsford was the major stimulus for the trip and the cause of many of these anxieties. Furthermore, his Scottish experience gave him his first taste of travel writing; Slater sees the letters he wrote to friends and family during his Highland tour as his 'earliest specimens' of this genre.[183] His vivid descriptions of Scotland, and places associated with Scott, encouraged him to experiment in the genre of travel writing that would enable him to produce *American Notes*.

Patrick McCarthy argues that when Dickens was in America, 'just then particularly the failure of Sir Walter Scott haunted Dickens'.[184] McCarthy does not elaborate on this point, nor indicate why Dickens felt particularly 'haunted' by Scott at this time. This gap can easily be filled when his trip to Abbotsford six months before is considered. It was during his American visit that Dickens recounted his experience of Abbotsford to Dana.[185] The miserable view of

[179] See editorial notes concerning letter to Forster from Thomas Latimer Bulwer, (13 March 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.2,* p. 235.
[180] Slater, *Charles Dickens,* p. 172.
[181] Dickens to John Forster (19 September 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 2,* p. 387.
[182] See Ackroyd, *Dickens,* p. 334; Tomalin, *Charles Dickens,* p. 127; and Slater, *Charles Dickens,* p. 170.
[183] Slater, *Charles Dickens,* p. 167.
[184] McCarthy, 'Truth in American Notes', p. 70.
[185] Dickens to John Forster (30 January 1842), Editorial notes, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.*3, p. 38.

Scott Dickens had conjured through the description of Scott's hat, haunted Dickens throughout his time in America. He decided to use Scott as an illustration of the destructive nature of the lack of international copyright laws.[186] He felt very strongly about the lack of these laws and fought against the lack of legislation throughout his time in America. He stated, 'during my stay in America, I lost no opportunity of endeavouring to awaken the public mind to a sense of the unjust and iniquitous state of the law in that country in reference to the wholesale piracy of British works'.[187] In a speech in Hartford in 1842, Dickens pictured for his audience Scott, 'faint, wan, dying, crushed both in mind and in body by his honourable struggle, and hovering around him the ghosts of his own imagination'.[188] This probably refers to how Scott had suffered from the lack of copyright laws, as over 500,000 pirated copies of his work had been put into circulation.[189] The idea of Scott being 'crushed' is reminiscent of the words Dickens used to Dana to describe the hat at Abbotsford. By using his moment in the spotlight to conjure up images of a helpless Scott, Dickens proclaimed his progression above him and his determination that no other author, himself included, would experience the same hardship.

Dickens highlighted in the speech how, despite readers' love for the *Waverley* novels, there was 'not one grateful dollar-piece to buy a garland for [Scott's] grave'.[190] Following the speech in Hartford, he wrote to Forster that when he talked about Scott, 'my blood so boiled as I thought of the monstrous injustice that I felt as if I were twelve feet high when I thrust it down their throats'.[191] Following his visit to America, Dickens wrote to Forster in 1843, 'What would poor Scott have given to have gone abroad, of his own free will, a young man, instead of creeping there, a driveller, in his miserable decay!'. [192] Dickens openly pitied the way Scott's

[186] For more about his views on copyright, see Dickens to Charles Babbage (27 April 1843), p. 478.
[187] Dickens to British Authors and Journals (7 July 1842), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.*3, p. 257.
[188] Charles Dickens, 'Hartford 7 Feb 1842', *The Speeches of Charles Dickens,* p. 25.
[189] Fact found in Edward G. Hudon, 'Literary Piracy, Charles Dickens and American Copyright Law', *American Bar Association Journal,* 50:12 (1964), 1157-1160, p. 1158, he also explores more about Dickens's direct involvement in the movement.
[190] Dickens, 'Hartford 7 Feb 1842', p. 25.
[191] Dickens to John Forster (24 February 1842), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 3,* p. 81.
[192] Dickens to John Forster (2 November 1843), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 3,* p. 591.

life had progressed. Although he was unsuccessful in making any headway with changing international copyright laws, he was still able to voice his dissent, and in doing so, set himself apart from Scott. He had overcome his anxiety of influence, after the American trip, and no longer felt the need to compare himself to Scott.[193]

When he returned from America, Dickens's references to Scott in his letters diminished. This worked in parallel with his increased use of the phrase 'the Inimitable' to describe himself. Although the term 'inimitable' had been used by others to describe Dickens, the first recorded time he used it in reference to himself occurs while he was in Scotland in 1841.[194] He uses it in a humorous fashion about a stranger he had met, noting how the man 'cut such a figure as even the inimitable can't decipher'.[195] His trip to Scotland and the praise that had been accorded him had started to take hold. However, it was the following year that Dickens began to use the term 'the Inimitable' more widely. During his tour to America in 1842, he referred to himself as 'the Inimitable' in the third person in four different letters. This included a letter to Forster where he referred to himself in such a way three times in a single paragraph:

> I wish you could have seen the crowds cheering the inimitable in the streets. I wish you could have seen judges, law-officers, bishops, and law-makers welcoming the inimitable. I wish you could have seen the inimitable shown to a great elbow-chair by the Speaker's throne, and sitting alone in the middle of the floor of the house of commons. [196]

From then on, 'the Inimitable' appears numerously in Dickens's letters, showing that he truly began to feel unique in comparison to everyone else, including Scott. America had made him

---

[193] For more about Dickens's times in America, see for example, Meckier, *Innocent Abroad: Charles Dickens's American Engagements;* Juliet John, *Dickens and Mass Culture;* Metz, 'Dickens in 1842: Coming to His Senses about America', p. 100 and p. 113; Slater, *Dickens on America and the Americans;* Patrick McCarthy, 'Truth in American Notes', *Dickens, Europe and the New World,* ed. by Anny Sadrin (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999).
[194] For more about when he was called 'inimitable' by others see William F. Long and Paul Schlicke, 'When Boz Became Inimitable', *Dickens Quarterly,* 33:4 (2016), 315-316.
[195] Dickens to John Forster (5 July 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.*2*,* p. 322. Dickens had not yet capitalised the terms as he later would.
[196] Dickens to John Forster (21 January 1842), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 3,* p. 15.

feel like a commodity, as John has argued, so he strove to create a strong, unique identity for himself over which he had maximum control.[197] He would, however, continue to be compared to Scott, even after his death in 1870.[198]

Creating his own Abbotsford

Although Dickens seemingly tried to distance himself from Scott, there are many similarities between Scott's conscious construction of Abbotsford and Dickens's construction of his final home, Gad's Hill. However, it seems that Dickens initially planned to make Tavistock House his version of Abbotsford. He never revisited Abbotsford, but his thoughts strayed back to his time there in 1851, when writing to Mrs Watson about the suffering of their mutual friend William Haldimand and invoking Scott's hat and clothes.[199] The same year, he acquired Tavistock House in Tavistock Square.[200] Tavistock House was much larger than his previous homes, and he paid £1500 (around £200,000 today) for a fifty-year lease.[201] Tomalin rightly states that the long contract shows that Dickens intended it to be his home for the rest of his life.[202] It needed a great deal of renovation work, and in imitation of Scott, as soon as Dickens had signed all the paperwork, he sent in an 'army' of workmen.[203] Dickens was inspired by Scott's conscious use of place in cultivating his legacy, and was aware of the importance of houses to literary and cultural heritage.[204] He was not the only author who was influenced by Scott in this way, as others, including Washington Irving, were inspired by Scott's idea of 'literary property' after visiting Abbotsford.[205] Tavistock House, despite Dickens's first

---

[197] Juliet John, *Dickens and Mass Culture,* p. 92
[198] The comparisons continued and are present in Forster's biography of Dickens.
[199] For more about him, see J. G. Alger 'William Haldimand', *ODNB* < https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-11900> [accessed 13 January 2020].
[200] Dickens to Augustus Tracey (10 October 1851), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 6,* p. 517.
[201] Tomalin, *Charles Dickens: A Life,* p. 237.
[202] Ibid.
[203] Dickens to Augustus Tracey (10 October 1851), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 6,* p. 517.
[204] See previous section about Maypole.
[205] Booth, *Homes and Haunts*, p. 66. Also mentioned in Paul Westover, 'How America "Inherited" Literary Tourism', *Literary Tourism and the Nineteenth Century,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 184-196; and most recently in Watson, *The Author's Effects,* pp. 185-212.

intentions, would not become his Abbotsford, as fewer than five years later, Gad's Hill Place in Kent came on the market.

Both Dickens and Scott mythologised their final homes by creating a childhood story around them. Scott did so first, and may have inspired Dickens to create a tale of his own. Lockhart's biography stated:

> [Scott] has probably from his early days looked forward as the highest object of ambition, that of a Tweedside Laird […] I have often heard [Scott] tell, that when travelling in his boyhood with his father, from Selkirk to Melrose, the old man suddenly desired the carriage to halt at the foot of an eminence and said, 'We must get out here Walter and see a thing quite in your line'. [He] took him to a stone half a mile above the Tweed at Abbotsford as it was where the battle of Melrose 1526 was fought.[206]

This story demonstrates that Abbotsford was a place known to Scott from childhood and was connected to his father. As Lockhart stated, this sparked Scott's 'ambition' to live in that area and create his lairdship.[207] The tale shows that Scott's purchase and renovation of Abbotsford was an achievement of his childhood ambition, which he carried with him throughout his life.

Dickens similarly mythologised Gad's Hill. As Booth has highlighted, he 'established a home in a setting of personal and literary associations'.[208] The striking similarity between the premise of his tale and Scott's has not, however, been discussed in Dickens criticism. This new knowledge shows that Dickens may have been directly influenced by Scott when crafting his story about Gad's Hill. It is also of note that both Scott and Dickens told their stories to a close friend who later became their biographer. Forster noted the story in his posthumous biography of Dickens:

---

[206] Lockhart, *Sir Walter Scott,* pp. 334-336.
[207] Ibid.
[208] Booth, 'Time Travel in Dickens World', p. 153. For more about the house's Shakespeare connection, see the next chapter.

> Often had we travelled past it together, years and years before it became his home, and never without some allusion to what he told me when first I saw it in his company, that amid the recollections connected with his childhood it held always a prominent place, for, upon first seeing it as he came from Chatham with his father, and looking up at it with much admiration, he had been promised that he might himself live in it, or in some such house, when he came to be a man, if he would only work hard enough. Which for a long time was his ambition.[209]

Forster concurs with the tale Dickens publicised during his lifetime. The latter published an anecdote in April 1860 in his series 'The Uncommercial Traveller'. Within the piece, there is a meeting between Dickens's older and younger selves, and the story of the house connects them both.

> It used to be a treat for me to be brought to look at it […] And ever since I can recollect, my father seeing me so fond of it, has often said to me, if 'you were to be persevering and were to work hard you might someday come to live in it' […] I was rather amazed to be told this by the very queer small boy; for that house happens to be *my* house, and I have reason to believe that, what he said was true. [210]

By telling the tale in such a manner, Dickens adds to its mythological feel and highlights Gad's Hill's importance to him. Like Scott, he also writes the house into his fiction. The décor of Abbotsford, which was completed ten years after the publication of *Waverley* (1814), mirrored the inside of Scott's fictional property Tully Veolan.[211] Similarly, Gad's Hill became the schoolhouse described in *A Christmas Carol* (1843), as noted by Watts.[212] When the ghost

---

[209] Forster, *Life of Dickens,* p. 24.
[210] Charles Dickens, 'The Uncommercial Traveller', *All The Year Round* (7 April 1860), *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-ii/page-557.html> [accessed 19 June 2021].
[211] For more detail, see p. 40.
[212] Alan S. Watts, *Dickens at Gad's Hill* (Reading: Cedric Dickens and Elvendon Press, 1989), p. 19. There is some debate that the description may refer to Hall Place, also in Kent, which was a school Dickens might have known. However, the evidence is insubstantial, Dickensians more widely accept that the description denotes Gad's Hill, as is reflected here. For more

of Christmas Past takes Scrooge to his old school he sees, 'a mansion of dull red brick, with a little weathercock-surmounted cupola on the roof, and a bell hanging in it'.[213] This is an very accurate description of Gad's Hill, so it is highly probable the house inspired the description. Dickens wrote this description in 1843 over a decade before the house was put on the market, further evidencing that Gad's Hill was a significant property to Dickens throughout his life. His letters reiterate this, as he wrote to W. W. F. De Cerjet: 'I have always in passing, looked to see if it was to be sold or let; and it has never been to me like any other house, and it has never changed at all'.[214] When an opportunity to purchase the property did arise, Dickens was frantic to do so. In all of his letters to W. H. Wills in January 1856, there were references to the purchase of Gad's Hill, which had been halted by the stalling of the present tenant.[215] It took until Friday, March 14 for the purchase to be completed. Dickens paid £1790, and in his letter to Georgina Hogarth, he highlighted how when signing the cheque, he had exclaimed 'look at the day – a Friday!', which he believed was his luckiest day of the week.[216]

Both Dickens and Scott saw their own houses as symbols of their success as writers and as a fulfilment of their childhood fantasies. By the time Dickens had acquired Gad's Hill, he was at the height of his career. He told the fabled story of his interest in the house frequently in his letters to friends after he had started the process of purchasing it, more so than ever before.[217] Although Dickens went to great pains to buy the house, he did not originally intend to live in it all year round; he initially thought of it as a summer retreat from the city.[218] Forster records that Dickens stated, ' "I am improving it so much – yet I have no interest in the

about Hall Place, see David Burnell, 'Gad's Hill Place vs Hall Place', *The Dickensian,* 99:461 (2003), 213-222.

[213] Charles Dickens, *A Christmas Carol,* ed. by Robert Douglas-Fairhurst (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) p. 31.

[214] Dickens to W. W. F. De Cerjat (19 January 1857), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 8,* p. 266.

[215] Dickens to W. H. Wills (10 January 1856), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 8,* p. 20. Wills was a close friend and business partner of Dickens, who frequently took on secretarial duties. For more information see, Sandra Spencer, 'The Indispensable Mr. Wills', *Victorian Periodical Review',* 21:4, 145-151.

[216] Dickens to Miss Georgina Hogarth (14 March 1856), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 8,* p. 71.

[217] See Dickens's letters during purchase to Miss Burdett Coutts (9 February 1856), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 8,* p. 51, and after the purchase to W. W. F. De Cerjat (19 January 1857), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 8,* p. 266.

[218] Tomalin, *Charles Dickens,* p. 280.

place"'.[219] However, Dickens was so charmed by the house that after renovation work, he chose to use it as his primary residence.

Gad's Hill was Dickens's version of Abbotsford, moreover, partly because of the many changes he made to it. Some of these building works were due to problems with the property, such as the plumbing, but many were renovations, an extensive list of which is included in Forster's biography.[220] As Dickens's daughter Mamie stated, 'there were always improvements - as my father used to call his alterations - being made at Gad's Hill and each improvement was supposed to be the last'.[221] The changes were not small either; his two favourite 'improvements' were a conservatory and the chalet he had built across the road.[222] He had always been intensely interested in the presentation of his homes. As Mamie again described, he was a 'home-man in every respect', as he 'was full of the kind of interest in a house which is commonly confined to the women'.[223] Dickens took great interest in decorating each of his homes to reflect his taste. He also, as Booth highlights, ironically wanted Gad's Hill to reflect an image of 'happy domesticity' to his visitors.[224]

Abbotsford encouraged Dickens to construct a home that reflected his personality, and Gad's Hill similarly became a house which symbolised his literary success. Yet because Dickens did not suffer Scott's misfortunes, the property maintained a positive image. Gad's Hill was Dickens's Abbotsford, but just as he chose to stray away from the path set by Scott in terms of his writing, Dickens also did not want his home to become a monument to him after his death. In Chapter Three, I will explore Dickens's strong opinions on how to commemorate and memorialise authors. Elements of Scott's literary heritage would come to represent how Dickens did not want to be remembered as he attempted to make his own legacy inimitable.

[219] Forster, *Life of Charles Dickens,* p. 205.
[220] Ibid, p. 210.
[221] Mamie Dickens, 'My Father As I Recall Him' *The Ladies Home Journal* (April 1893) in Frederick Kitton, *Dickensiana Vol. 2*, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[222] Ibid.
[223] Ibid. This notion is extensively explored in Chapter Five.
[224] Booth, 'Time Travel in Dickens World', p. 153.

Chapter Two: That 'Delicious Creature': Curating and Commemorating William Shakespeare

Dickens was an avid reader of Shakespeare and visited Shakespearian literary tourism sites throughout his life. The most prominent studies of the connection between Dickens and Shakespeare analyse how Shakespeare influenced Dickens's work, as well as the latter's connections to the theatre.[1] What is currently missing from the scholarship is an investigation into Dickens's relationship with Shakespeare's literary tourism sites. Although there have been broad studies of the development of Stratford-upon-Avon during the nineteenth century, there is little reference to Dickens's experiences there.[2] This chapter will investigate Dickens's visits to Stratford and other Shakespearian sites, before exploring the subsequent impact such experiences had on his work. As will be argued here, Dickens, as an author tourist, had a complex attitude towards Shakespeare's literary legacy and the way he should be commemorated. This was highlighted when he helped to raise funds for a curator of the birthplace in the 1840s. Many have mistakenly seen Dickens as fundraising to purchase the property, rather than to fund the position of a curator.[3] Harland Nelson's statement that Dickens's fundraising 'came to nothing so far as the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust was

[1] See, for example, Daniel Pollack Pelzner, 'Dickens and Shakespeare's Household Words, *ELH,* 78:3 (2011), 533-556; Paul Schlicke, 'Dickens and Shakespeare', *The Japan Branch of the Dickens Fellowship,* 27 (2004), 84-98. This is largely because Dickens himself wrote more about Shakespeare's works and links to the theatre than he did about the Bard's life. See, for example, Charles Dickens, 'Private Theatre', *Sketches by Boz,* ed. by Dennis Walder (London: Penguin Classics, 1995).

[2] See, for example, Julia Thomas, 'Shakespeare and Commercialism', *Shakespeare in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. by Gail Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 251-269; Watson, *The Literary Tourist.* Nicola J. Watson, 'Shakespeare on the Tourist Trail', *Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Popular Culture,* ed. by Robert Shaughnessy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 199-226; Dennis Kennedy, 'Shakespeare and Cultural Tourism', *Theatre Journal,* 50:2 (1998), 175-188; Barbara Hodgdon, *The Shakespeare Trade: Performances and Appropriations* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998). Foulkes' article only very briefly mentions Dickens's time in Stratford, instead exploring Dickens and Thackeray's relationship. Dickens's time at Stratford is more explicitly explored in Richard Foulkes, 'Dickens and the Shakespeare Tercentenary', *The Dickensian,* 81:406 (1985), 72-78, but Foulkes's emphasis remains largely on the Tercentenary celebrations.

[3] See p. 91.

concerned', because the money he raised did not contribute towards the establishment of the Birthplace Trust, has not yet been embedded within Dickens criticism.[4] This study will build on Nelson's work and widen people's awareness of Dickens's involvement in raising money for the birthplace. Dickens's understanding that heritage can be constructed will also be explored, as well as his own attempts to shape the public consumption of Shakespeare's literary tourism. The chapter will conclude by highlighting how Dickens emphasised his own connection to Shakespeare through his home, Gad's Hill.

To analyse Dickens's visit to Stratford, the chapter will begin with a close analysis of his letters and diary entry that note his 1838 visit to Stratford. Supported by a biographical examination, I will then explore Dickens's interest in Shakespeare's life and legacy to provide context for Dickens's expectations of the site. When charting Dickens's subsequent reaction to Stratford, I will utilise extracts from Dickens's novels *Barnaby Rudge* and *Nicholas Nickleby* to highlight how he wrote his experience of the birthplace into his fiction. The latter half of the chapter will then return to Dickens's letters to track his involvement in the appointment of a curator of the birthplace, highlighting how the endeavour developed and eventually failed.

First Visit to Stratford

Dickens's interest in Shakespeare was so strong that he visited Stratford-upon-Avon at least three times throughout his life; his first recorded visit was in 1838.[5] The visit is sometimes noted in biographies and studies of Dickens and Shakespeare but has not been extensively explored.[6] By the time Dickens visited Stratford, he had commenced his career as a novelist;

[4] Harland Nelson, 'Dickens and the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust: "What a Jolly Summer!"', *A Humanist's Legacy: Essays in Honor of John Christian Bale,* ed. by Dennis M. Jones (Iowa: Luther College, 1990), 72–80, p. 72.
[5] See p. 108 for evidence of a possible fourth visit.
[6] Dickens's time in Stratford is only mentioned in passing by Forster in his *Life of Charles Dickens,* p. 223. This likely set a precedent in not emphasising his time there. It is briefly mentioned by Slater, *Charles Dickens,* as where Dickens 'stored up' material to use in *Nickleby,* p. 125. Also, very quickly noted in *Dickensian* article Richard Foulkes, 'Dickens and the Shakespeare Tercentenary'. The Stratford visit is not explored in Tomalin, *Charles Dickens*, p. 99, or Ackroyd, *Dickens,* p. 273, who both pay more attention to Dickens's illness following the trip.

he had published *Pickwick Papers* (1836-7) and was in the midst of serialising *Oliver Twist* (1837-39). The previous year he had described his career as 'brief', yet he was already immensely popular.[7] Dickens decided to go on a trip to find inspiration for his next work, *Nicholas Nickleby*, and to be out of London during the publication of *Twist*.[8] The Stratford visit was part of a wider tour around the Midlands, and he visited other historical sites such as Warwick and Kenilworth castles, with his friend and illustrator, Hablot Knight Brown (Phiz).[9] Kenilworth was also a literary tourist site, linked to Scott, who wrote *Kenilworth* in 1821, and Shakespeare who was influenced by its links to Henry V.[10] Dickens described the ruin as 'delightful – beautiful beyond expression', but does not explicitly link it to either Scott or Shakespeare.[11] They then made their way to Stratford.

Dickens's account of the birthplace highlights his awareness of literary tourism tropes. He wrote to his wife Catherine that, 'we sat down in the room where Shakespeare was born, and left our autographs and read those of other people and so forth'.[12] This appears to be Dickens's first visit to Shakespeare's birthplace but the use of 'so forth' shows that Dickens, and Catherine for that matter, were aware of the prescribed actions usually taken within the birthplace by visitors. It was common, for example, for all visitors to the birthplace to sit in Shakespeare's supposed chair.[13] Dickens played the part of the literary tourist, writing his signature as others had done. His participation in the ritual process established at Stratford

[7] For descriptions of his early career see, See Dickens to J. H. Kuenzel (Unknown day, July 1838), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1*, p. 423; Dickens to T. N. Talfourd (30 August 1837), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 299; and Dickens to William Howison (21 December 1837), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 346.
[8] Slater, *Charles Dickens,* p. 124.
[9] See Dickens's Diary (20 October 1838), Appendix A, Letters of *Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 1*, p. 634; and Dickens to Catherine Dickens (1 November 1838), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 447.
[10] Nicola J. Watson, 'Sir Walter Scott', *Great Shakespearians: Scott, Dickens, Eliot, Hardy, Vol. IV,* ed. Adrian Poole (London: Continuum International Publishing, 2011), 53-95.
[11] Dickens's Diary, 30 October 1838), Appendix A, *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 1*, p. 634. It may have inspired the Elizabethan connection of the Maypole Inn, see below. He also mentions Kenilworth in *Dombey and Son* highlighting again its popularity as a tourist destination. Charles Dickens, *Dombey and Son,* ed. by Alan Horsman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), p. 379.
[12] Dickens to Catherine Dickens (1 November 1838), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 447.
[13] Irving, *Sketchbook,* p. 320.

links to the idea that literary tourism is actively performed rather than passively consumed.[14] The anecdote is the only element of their visit to Stratford that Dickens detailed in his letter to Catherine, implying it was conceivably the highlight of his day.

Dickens also made a note of the visit in the diary which he kept from 1838-41.[15] It was a fragmentary diary in which he wrote intermittently.[16] During his tour around the Midlands with Browne, and later Forster, Dickens detailed his expenses within the diary.[17] For example, he stated that the Stratford section of the trip cost him two pounds and ten shillings.[18] He added a note about his time there, which echoed his letter to Catherine. The extract from Tuesday 30 October 1838, reads 'Stratford—Shakspeare[sic]—the birth-place, visitors, scribblers, old woman,—qy. whether she knows what Shakspeare did &c'.[19] This shows that the birthplace visit was important to Dickens because, as Ackroyd has determined, he was selective about what he noted within the diary, sometimes leaving out activities or whole days.[20] The 'old woman' may have been Anne Court, the owner, who had been left the property for life by her husband, Thomas.[21] It appears that Dickens and Browne questioned her about the house's connection to Shakespeare.

Dickens seems to have questioned her using his own extensive knowledge of the Bard. Throughout his life, Dickens was an avid reader of Shakespeare. As a child, he had watched performances of Shakespeare's works, including *Richard III* and *Macbeth,* and this interest continued into his adolescence.[22] From a young age, he was a keen amateur dramatist and wrote his own plays including a burlesque *O'Thello*, which was a parody of Shakespeare's

---

[14] Barbara Schaff, 'In the Footsteps of: The Semiotics of Literary Tourism', *Kultur Poetik,* 11:2 (2011), pp. 178.
[15] Dickens's Diary (30 October 1838), Appendix A, *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 1*, p. 634.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Ibid.
[20] Ackroyd, *Dickens,* p. 243.
[21] Dickens's Diary (30 October 1838), Appendix A, *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 1*, p. 634.
[22] Charles Dickens, 'The Uncommercial Traveller', *All the Year Round* (30 June 1860), p. 276, *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-iii/page-274.html> [accessed 19 June 2021].

original.[23] On 8 February 1830, the day after Dickens's eighteenth birthday, he acquired a ticket to the British Museum reading room and here he encountered many of the greats of English literature, including Shakespeare.[24] Only eight reading slips survive today written in Dickens's hand, informing us what he would have read. The slips demonstrate that he looked at a copy of Shakespeare's works multiple times.[25] Dickens continued to read Shakespeare throughout his life. By 1854, he owned twenty-one volumes of Shakespeare's work; and in 1842 Dickens wrote to Forster thanking him for the edition he had given him: 'I constantly carry in my great-coat pocket the Shakespeare you bought for me in Liverpool. What an unspeakable source of delight that book is to me'.[26] As with Scott, Dickens was not only interested in the Bard's work but also the man himself. He read the biography of Shakespeare written by his friend Charles Knight and described the work as a 'charming piece of honest enthusiasm and perseverance'.[27]

Dickens, like his contemporaries, held Shakespeare in the highest esteem.[28] Taylor, among others, has highlighted that by the Victorian era, 'Shakespeare's artistic supremacy had ceased to be debated, it was simply assumed'.[29] As has been well documented, by the nineteenth century Shakespeare's image was indebted to the work of Enlightenment men

[23] Slater, *Charles Dickens,* p. 32.
[24] Ibid, p. 26 and p. 38.
[25] Kathleen Mary Tillotson, 'Notes', *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 1*, p. 9-10.
[26] Devonshire Terrace Inventory, in *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.7,* p. 719; and Dickens to John Forster (22-3 March 1842), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.3,* p. 165.
[27] Dickens to Mr. Charles Knight (13 April 1844), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.4,* p. 101.
[28] Phillip Waller, *Writers, Readers and Reputations: Literary Life in Britain 1870-1918* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). p. 260. Shakespeare in the Victorian era is most comprehensively explored in the two edited volumes by Gail Marshall and Adrian Poole. These works study both Shakespeare on the stage and Shakespeare on the page, as volume one charts how the Victorians helped to restore the use of original texts in their performances and volume two focuses upon how Victorian authors actively utilised Shakespeare within their own works. See *Victorian Shakespeare Vol. 1: Theatre, Drama and Performance,* ed. by Gail Marshall and Adrian Poole (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); and *Victorian Shakespeare Vol. 2: Literature and Culture,* ed. by Gail Marshall and Adrian Poole (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).
[29] Gary Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History From The Restoration To The Present* (London: Vintage, 1990), p. 168.

such as Johnson, as well as the Romantics and Walter Scott.[30] Dickens himself held a particular interest in Shakespeare. He saw him as the most significant English author. In a speech in 1842, he stated, 'we know by reference all the bright examples of our literature, from Shakespeare downward'.[31] Dickens felt Shakespeare's popularity had stood the test of time and appealed to people of many different backgrounds. For example, he stated, 'I believe there are in Birmingham at this moment many working men infinitely better versed in Shakespeare and Milton than the average fine gentleman'.[32]

In her work *Shakespeare and Dickens: The Dynamics of Influence,* Valerie L. Gager highlights how Dickens was 'steeped in Shakespeare' throughout his life and that his works were greatly influenced by him.[33] She traces Dickens's allusions to Shakespeare within his published works and speeches and demonstrates how he could easily call to mind the words of Shakespeare in his day-to-day conversations.[34] Dickens felt a close connection to Shakespeare's words and sentiments both personally and professionally, more so it appears than to any other author, including Walter Scott. Within his letters, he frequently alluded to Shakespeare. As Dickens aged, his references to other authors often lessened, but his allusions to Shakespeare continued.[35] Shakespeare is mentioned an average of eighteen times per volume of the *Pilgrim Letters*, with the exception of Volume Five where he is mentioned forty-eight times,

---

[30] See for example Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare Adaptation and Authorship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); Stuart Sillars, *Shakespeare and the Victorians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); and Jonathan Bate, *The Romantics on Shakespeare* (London: Penguin, 1992). The influence of Scott and his work *Kenilworth* is explored in Nicola Watson, 'Sir Walter Scott', pp. 53-95 and Poole, *Shakespeare and the Victorians*, p. 7.

[31] Charles Dickens, 'Banquet in his honour Boston 1 February 1842', *The Speeches of Charles Dickens,* p. 20.

[32] Charles Dickens, 'Literature and Art Fund Birmingham 6 January 1853', *Speeches of Charles Dickens*, p. 157.

[33] Valerie L. Gager, *Shakespeare and Dickens: The Dynamics of Influence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 18. Reference to Shakespeare's works in Dickens's novels is also explored extensively in Adrian Poole and Rebekah Scott, 'Charles Dickens', *Great Shakespeareans: Scott, Dickens, Eliot and Hardy, Vol.IV,* ed. by Adrian Poole (London: Continuum International Publishing, 2011), pp. 53-95. Dickens's admiration of Shakespeare is also explored in the work of Paul Schlicke, 'Dickens and Shakespeare', *The Japan Branch of the Dickens Fellowship,* 27 (2004), p. 84.

[34] Gager, *Shakespeare and Dickens,* p. 44.

[35] See the previous chapter for his diminishing mentions of Scott.

largely due to Dickens's involvement in the curatorship of Shakespeare's birthplace, which will be explored in more detail below.[36]

Dickens's recollection of the birthplace shows that it was already a popular literary tourism site. By the nineteenth century, a visit to Stratford-upon-Avon was seen as an 'essential rite of passage to cultural maturity', so Stratford attracted large numbers of visitors.[37] The 'scribblers' Dickens describes most probably refers to the practice of graffitiing the birthplace.[38] Many visitors left their signatures, often written on the walls or carved into the windowpanes of the room where Shakespeare was born.[39] These included men that Dickens admired such as Walter Scott and Washington Irving.[40] Dickens's specific mention of 'visitors' highlights that he and Browne were not the only people in the birthplace, indicating that the site may have been busy.[41]

The birthplace had a long history by the time Dickens visited. Shakespeare's father, John, had owned the two adjoining properties on Henley Street and upstairs was the room where Shakespeare was supposedly born.[42] After John died in 1601, William became the owner of the properties.[43] He leased the houses to two tenants, one of which was his sister Joan, and on his death, Suzanna Hall, his daughter, who had inherited the property, continued to lease it.[44] In 1647, the larger property was converted into an inn, The Swan and Maidenhead and

---

[36] *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.5.*
[37] Sillars, *Shakespeare and the Victorians,* p. 17.
[38] Dickens Diary (30 October 1838), Appendix A, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 2,* p. 634.
[39] Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 'New Light Through Old Windows, <https://www.shakespeare.org.uk/explore-shakespeare/blogs/new-light-through-old-windows/> [accessed 28 March 2018].
[40] Noted in a speech he gave at a banquet held in his honour in New York on 18 February 1842, *Dickens Speeches* p. 30; and within Andrew Halliday, 'Shakespeare Mad', *All The Year Round,* (21 May 1864), *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-xi/page-345.html> [accessed 21 June 2021], p. 349.
[41] It is likely that Dickens, as many tourists do, disliked the number of people, reflecting the ideas of anti-tourism which were explored in the introduction.
[42] Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust, 'The House After Shakespeare', <https://www.shakespeare.org.uk/explore-shakespeare/shakespedia/shakespeares-birthplace/house-after-shakespeare/> [26 March, 2018].
[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid.

in 1747 the other property consisted of four terraced cottages.[45] The inn became reduced in size in 1793 and was from then on known as The Maidenhead; the other section of the old inn became a butcher's shop.[46] When Dickens visited in 1838, the west side of the property was a small residential home, with the butchers in the middle and the inn on the eastern side.[47]

It was during the eighteenth century that Shakespeare-related attractions grew in appeal.[48] In the 1710s, New Place, the last house Shakespeare had lived in and where he died, was renovated, and tourists frequently visited the mulberry tree in the garden.[49] In 1709, the story of Shakespeare stealing a buck from Charlecote park was first recorded.[50] By the mid-century, Shakespeare's popularity had grown so much that the monument to him in Westminster Abbey was restored.[51] These events added to Stratford-upon-Avon's reputation, which as Ousby and Watson among others rightly argue, also owes much to David Garrick's involvement in the Jubilee celebrations in 1769.[52] The Jubilee has been credited with 'fully establishing' literary tourism.[53] This statement is not wholly convincing, however, because as Hendrix argues, literary tourism has a much longer history.[54] Even from a purely European standpoint, literary tourism can be traced back to at least the fourteenth century, and globally it stretches back to ancient times.[55] However, it cannot be doubted that the Jubilee was a

---

[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust, 'The Purchase of Shakespeare's Birthplace', <https://www.shakespeare.org.uk/explore-shakespeare/shakespedia/shakespeares-birthplace/purchase-of-birthplace/> [26 March, 2018].
[48] This may have been due to the popularity of Shakespeare productions and the increase in textual criticism of Shakespeare's works. See Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet.* For more about the development of Stratford's sites see Ousby, *The Englishman's England: Taste, Travel and the Rise of Tourism*; and Julia Thomas, *Shakespeare's Shrine.* Balz Engler, 'Stratford and the Canonization of Shakespeare', *European Journal of English Studies,* 1:3 (1997), 354-366.
[49] Ousby, *The Englishman's England,* p. 31.
[50] Ibid.
[51] Ibid, p. 29.
[52] Ousby, *The Englishman's England,* p. 35 and Watson, *The Literary Tourist*, p. 63.
[53] Schaff, 'In the Footsteps of', p. 167.
[54] Hendrix, 'The Early Modern Invention of Literary Tourism', p. 15.
[55] Hendrix highlights Alexander the Great's understanding of literary heritage and also the popularity of Virgil's supposed grave. In terms of tracking early modern European literary

significant event in specifically shaping Shakespearian literary tourism. Garrick helped to organise the event, and the success of the celebrations meant that the 'town was now more established […] on the traveller's map of England than ever before'.[56]

Watson has highlighted how the Jubilee established the importance of the birthplace for the first time, although it would take some time to develop its significance as a literary tourism site.[57] Places of literary tourism linked to the birthplace of an author are rare as they rely heavily upon an agreed 'collective imagination' to help bring them to life.[58] Literary tourism is usually tied to places linked to authors' careers, as they are easier to give meaning to than a place of birth.[59] Watson aptly indicates that Garrick used the birthplace alongside Shakespeare's grave, which was already a place of pilgrimage, to establish 'a pair of bookends' through which Stratford-upon-Avon depicted and captured Shakespeare's life.[60] After the Jubilee, Stratford's popularity grew, and more Shakespeare associations in the town were emphasised such as Anne Hathaway's Cottage, which became a tourist destination in 1792.[61]

Shakespeare the 'Delicious Creature': Dickens's Literary Response to the Birthplace

As an author tourist, Dickens's engagement with literary tourism sites, including the birthplace was different from other literary tourists. Dickens sought an individual experience at such sites. His recollections of literary visits rarely refer to anyone else's experience besides his own. For example, when he visited Abbotsford, he did not indicate Catherine's opinion of the house, nor indeed that she was even present. Similarly, although Dickens refers to his time in Stratford in the plural, he does not record Browne's view. This may have been

tourism, Hendrix highlights how Petrarch, for example, through his own pilgrimages and how he was commemorated, helped to establish an 'author orientated approach' to literary heritage in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Ibid, pp. 14-16.

[56] Ousby, *The Englishman's England,* p. 35, and Harold Hendrix 'From Early Modern to Romantic Literary Tourism', p. 14.

[57] Watson, *The Literary Tourist*, p. 63.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Ibid*,* p. 58.

[60] Ibid, p. 59. Similarly noted by Barbara Hodgdon, *The Shakespeare Trade: Performances and Appropriations* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), p. 193.

[61] Watson, *The Literary Tourist*, p. 59.

encouraged by his separate position as an author tourist because, as Forster has highlighted, in the nineteenth century it became difficult for tourists to appear original in their accounts of Stratford; 'enthusiasm became ventriloquy, mimicry of stale convention'.[62] Dickens kept his reference to Stratford brief and did not indicate whether he visited any other Shakespearian sites during his time in Stratford.[63] This may have been influenced by his journalistic background, which allowed him to write as an observer and see cultural activities through a critical lens.[64] Dickens refrained from using any religious language, like other visitors. As many scholars have demonstrated, often a 'quasi-religious' form of worship is employed at literary tourist sites by 'literary pilgrims'.[65] This was particularly prevalent in Stratford where 'Bardolartry', the worship of Shakespeare as well as of places and objects related to him, was in full force by the nineteenth century.[66]

Dickens's visit to Stratford helped to inform his next novel, *Nicholas Nickleby*. He had started *Nickleby* in March 1838 so was in the midst of writing it when he underwent his Midlands tour. As Adrian Poole and Rebekah Scott highlight, Dickens dedicated the novel to his Shakespearean friend W. C. Macready, so it is 'comically rich in misprisions of Shakespeare'.[67] For example, within Chapter Forty-Eight, Nicholas criticises plagiarism and uses Shakespeare

[62] Shirley Foster, 'Americans and Anti-tourism' *Literary Tourism and the Nineteenth Century,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), p. 180.
[63] Other sites including Anne Hathaway's Cottage and Charlcoate park were visited by Irving, see *The Sketchbook of Geoffrey Crayon,* and Sillars has aptly described this route as a 'cut price version of the European grand tour' in Sillars, *Shakespeare and the Victorians*, p. 10.
[64] Paul Schlicke, *Dickens and Popular Entertainment* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), p. 4.
[65] Graham Holderness, 'Bardolatry or the Cultural Materialists Guide to Stratford upon Avon', *The Stratford Myth,* ed. by Graham Holderness (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), p. 11. For more about literary pilgrimage see Harold Hendrix et al. in Watson, *Literary Tourism and the Nineteenth Century,* and Herbert 'Literary Places, Tourism and the Heritage Experience', p. 313.
[66] Holderness has used this term and emphasises that 'everything in Stratford must be definitively assigned to the personal possession of the Bard or it becomes worthless and irrelevant', see Holderness, 'Bardolatry or the Cultural Materialists Guide to Stratford upon Avon', 2-15. This idea is also highlighted within Michael Rosenthal, 'Shakespeare's Birthplace in Stratford: Bardolatry Reconsidered', *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory,* ed. by Harold Hendrix (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), pp. 31-45.
[67] Poole and Scott, 'Dickens' in *Great Shakespeareans*, p. 63.

as an example of pure literary genius.[68] Mr. Snittle Timberry dismisses the importance of Shakespeare, who he familiarly refers to as 'Bill', by saying ' "human intellect is progressing, has progressed since his time, is progressing, will progress" '.[69] Nicholas however, probably reflecting Dickens's thoughts on the matter, highlights how Shakespeare 'brought within the magic circle of his genius, traditions peculiarly adapted for his purpose and turned familiar things into constellations which should enlighten the world for ages'.[70] The main point of the passage concerns how some theatre-makers plagiarise and 'finish unfinished works, hastily and crudely vamp up ideas not yet worked out by their original projector […] without his permission and against his will' and then put their 'name as the author'.[71] This very issue caused a problem for Dickens at the time, hence the proud proclamation.[72] Although not the main focus of the argument, the reference to Shakespeare emphasises that Dickens saw the Bard as the epitome of literary invention, praising his apt use of fables and other stories to animate his work.

Chapter Twenty-Seven of *Nickleby* was directly informed by Dickens's Stratford visit. Malcolmson has argued that this section of the book shows Dickens's thoughts on the birthplace.[73] She aptly states that within the passage, Dickens demonstrates how a writer's house can be 'imbued with a particular power'.[74] Her argument could, however, be taken further. Dickens uses the Wittiterlys and Mrs Nickleby to parody some common

[68] Charles Dickens, *Nicholas Nickleby,* ed. Paul Schlicke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 632.
[69] Ibid, p. 633.
[70] Ibid.
[71] Ibid.
[72] Dickens had extensive problems with copyright laws both at home and abroad. There were laws in place which attempted to protect authors' copyrights, but they did little to ward off plagiarism. See, for example, *Dickens and Victorian Print Cultures,* ed. by Robert L. Patten (Ashgate: Farnham, 2012); and Alexander Welsh, *From Copyright to Copperfield: The Identity of Dickens* (London: Harvard University Press, 1987). Most recently explored in Adam Abraham's *Plagiarising the Victorian Novel: Imitation, Parody and After text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), who dedicates a whole section to exploring the 'Pseudo Dickens industry'.
[73] Malcolmson, *Constructing Charles Dickens: 1900-1940,* p. 183. Poole and Scott have also investigated it and rightly highlight that Dickens uses the passage to display 'aborted allusions to Shakespeare – a ruse in which Dickens is expert'. Poole and Scott, 'Charles Dickens', *Great Shakespeareans,* p. 63.
[74] Malcolmson, *Constructing Charles Dickens,* p. 183.

proclamations that surrounded a visit to Shakespeare's birthplace, which Dickens disliked and may have witnessed during his own visit. Dickens portrays these characters' encounters with literary tourism as something to be ridiculed, implying that they represent precisely how *not* to view such sites. Through Mrs Wititterly, Dickens demonstrates the snobbery related to a visit to the birthplace. She states how she is so much more interested in Shakespeare's plays after visiting the ' "dear dull little house he was born in" .'[75] She then proclaims, ' "after you've seen the place and written your name in the little book […] it kindles up quite a fire within one" '.[76] This echoes Pierre Bourdieu's idea that taste regarding art and culture functions as a marker of cultural capital.[77] However, Dickens's portrayal of Mrs Wititterly clearly demonstrates Bourdieu's view that, 'possession of economic capital does not necessarily imply possession of cultural or symbolic capital'.[78]

As the Wititterlys are social climbers, Mrs Wititterly uses the birthplace as a way of boasting about their superiority. After stressing what a fan she is of Shakespeare's plays, describing him as a 'delicious creature', Mrs Wititterly drawls that Lord Frederick, her social superior, 'really […] ought to go' to the birthplace.[79] By emphasising her supposed greater understanding of culture and then encouraging others to follow her example, Mrs Wititterly is attempting to highlight her pre-eminence, as cultural capital causes certain practices to appear 'naturally superior […] even to those who do not participate'.[80] Fussell has revealed that tourist motivations often centre on raising one's social image by visiting sites posing as a member of a social class superior to one's own.[81]

In an attempt to impress Mrs Wititterly, Mrs Nickleby recalls her own visit to Stratford. She states that after 'we had seen Shakespeare's tomb and birthplace' she had dreamt of a 'gentleman', and after discussing it with her husband, she understood him to be

[75] Dickens, *Nicholas Nickleby*, p. 352.
[76] Ibid.
[77] Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste,* trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), p. 1.
[78] Ibid.
[79] Dickens, *Nicholas Nickleby*, p. 352.
[80] Ibid.
[81] Fussell, *Abroad: British Literary Travelling Between the Wars,* p. 42.

Shakespeare.[82] Malcolmson argues that the passage illustrates how a visit to the birthplace did not cause Mrs Nickleby to feel any affinity towards Shakespeare but instead produced a poor night's sleep.[83] Although Malcolmson's argument is correct, there is also a deeper meaning to this section. Mrs Nickleby turns an allusion to Shakespeare into an insult rather than a compliment, a direct contradiction of the respect many Victorians accorded to Shakespeare. By choosing to visit the birthplace with no knowledge of Shakespeare and not understanding the connection between her dream and the Bard, Dickens presents Mrs Nickleby as a hypocrite. Visiting the birthplace because it is important but without understanding why it is, was something that Dickens much disapproved of. To Mrs Nickleby it is a place to visit because everyone else does.

The passage has a deeper meaning when investigated through the lens of literary tourism, which is not mentioned within either Dickens or literary heritage scholarship.[84] Mrs Nickleby's dream image of Shakespeare is, in fact, a description of the memorial to Shakespeare which stands within Westminster Abbey. The full description of her dream reads: ' "I dreamt of nothing but a black gentleman, at full length, in plaster-of-Paris, with a lay-down collar tied with two tassels, leaning against a post and thinking" '.[85] The Westminster monument depicts a full-length Shakespeare leaning in contemplation while wearing a tasselled doublet. Ian Ousby has demonstrated how the Westminster monument encouraged 'romantic notions of what the great poet should look like'.[86] What is ironic is that the monument in question was not the one that stood in the church at Stratford-upon-Avon where Mrs Nickleby said she had visited, which is a bust of Shakespeare holding a quill and paper. Her inability to recognise the image of Shakespeare in her dreams, mere hours after she had visited a place intimately connected to him, allows Dickens to illustrate how despite being exposed to literary sites, some people can remain ignorant of an author and their significance.

[82] Dickens, *Nicholas Nickleby,* p. 353.
[83] Malcolmson, *Constructing Charles Dickens,* p. 183.
[84] The dream is not mentioned in Thompson's study of Mrs Nickleby's monologues and dreams for example, Leslie M. Thompson, 'Mrs Nickleby's Monologue: The Dichotomy of Pessimism and Optimism in *Nicholas Nickleby*', Studies in the Novel, 1:2 (1969), 222-229.
[85] Dickens, *Nicholas Nickleby,* p. 353.
[86] Ousby, *The Englishman's England,* p. 29.

The reference to Shakespeare being a ' "black gentleman" ' deserves attention. Although the statement has racial overtones and may be a way of ironising white canonicity, I argue that Dickens is implying that Mrs Nickleby did not recall the memorial itself but instead a sketch she may have seen of it, perhaps in a guidebook or in general publicity.[87] This is not implausible as Connell has highlighted how the Westminster Abbey monument became so iconic that there was a booming market for literary silhouettes of it for domestic use.[88] Dickens could be inferring that some people's impressions of heritage sites centre more on what they had read or seen publicised, rather than on their actual experience. There are, of course, other explanations for the passage. Perhaps the description may reflect Mrs Nickleby's dreamlike state or her hazy recollection of the statue. It may be that the figure was discoloured when she saw it. Dickens may be joking that Mrs Nickleby had misremembered Shakespeare's race, or it could be a reference to the monument to Shakespeare which stands in the Holy Trinity Church in Stratford, where Shakespeare's skin is of a darker tone. She may be projecting the image of Othello onto Shakespeare, however bearing in mind Mrs Nickleby's ignorance of Shakespeare in general, this is unlikely. Or maybe Mrs Nickleby had never visited Stratford and had made the whole recollection up to impress the Wititterlys. However, as the description directly reflects the Westminster monument, the idea that Dickens was implying that Mrs Nickleby recalled a sketch, and not the actual monument, remains the most likely explanation. Mrs Nickleby's ignorance of Shakespeare and his heritage is compounded by her statement that, 'it was quite a mercy […] that my son didn't turn out to be Shakespeare, and what a dreadful thing that would have been'.[89]

Dickens's time in Stratford also made him aware of how heritage sites could be constructed. He explored this idea in the opening of *Barnaby Rudge,* where he describes the Maypole Inn,

---

[87] For in-depth studies about Dickens's attitudes to race see Laura Peters, *Dickens and Race* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013); and Grace Moore, *Dickens and Empire: Discourses of Class, Race and Colonialism in the Works of Charles Dickens* (London: Routledge, 2004).

[88] Philip Connell, 'Death and the Author: Westminster Abbey and the Meanings of the Literary Monument', *Eighteenth Century Studies,* 38:4 (2005), 557-585, p. 572. For more about the reproduction of images of antiquities and historical objects in the eighteenth and nineteenth century see Katharina Boehm and Victoria Mills, 'Introduction: Mediating the Materiality of the past 1700-1930', *Word and Image,* 33:3 (2017), 233-9.

[89] Dickens, *Nicholas Nickleby,* p. 353.

'an old building with more gable ends than a lazy man would care to count on a sunny day'.[90] Although *Rudge* was not published until 1841, Dickens had originally agreed with his publishers that he would write the book in 1837, ready for publication in October 1838.[91] The time frame makes it very probable that the Stratford trip inspired the beginning of the book. The inn is given importance through its association with Elizabeth I, who supposedly stayed there and stood 'on a mounting block before the door with one foot in the stirrup' of her horse.[92] Dickens describes how not everyone initially believed the Maypole's tale, stating how some saw 'this tradition as rather apocryphal'.[93] However, when the mounting block itself was physically presented, it was enough evidence for 'the doubters […] to be put down by a large majority'.[94] John argues that Dickens's description shows how 'both heritage and history involve story-telling and willed fetishisation of objects'.[95] In other words, Dickens was conscious of how heritage narratives and authenticity could be constructed. Dickens further reiterates this when he states, 'whether these, and many other stories of the like nature, were true or untrue, the Maypole was really an old house, a very old house, perhaps as old as it claimed to be, and perhaps older'.[96]

Dickens was aware of this power and often used objects symbolically within his work.[97] They can absorb and represent the stories associated with them, much like Walter Scott's hat in the previous chapter. Although the block is not substantial evidence that the event occurred, its very materiality is all that is needed. The presence of the object stands as testimony to the story, even though both may be fabricated. Through the passage, Dickens is exhibiting his

[90] Charles Dickens, *Barnaby Rudge,* ed. by Clive Hurst (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 9. The Maypole's links to literary heritage are also explored in chapter two of this thesis but with a different focus.
[91] Slater, *Charles Dickens,* p. 109.
[92] Dickens, *Barnaby Rudge*, p. 9.
[93] Ibid.
[94] Ibid.
[95] John, *Dickens and Mass Culture,* p. 256.
[96] Dickens, *Barnaby Rudge,* p.10.
[97] Dickens has been described, for example, as a 'master metonymist' in Freedgood, *The Idea of Things: Fugitive Meaning in the Victorian Novel,* p. 17. Juliet John also relates this directly to Dickens's historical writing, highlighting Dickens's 'heritage aesthetic' and she uses the same passage as evidence, see John, *Dickens and Mass Culture,* p. 240.

awareness of the importance of objects in heritage even when their authenticity is debated, as at Stratford.

The contested legend surrounding Elizabeth I which is pushed down by the occupants of the inn, I argue, is also a play on the association between Shakespeare's birthplace and the neighbouring pub the Maidenhead. The similarity between the Maidenhead and the Maypole has not been explored, despite the overlap between Dickens's conception of *Barnaby Rudge* and his visit to Stratford. The Maidenhead associated itself with Shakespeare, as the Maypole did with Elizabeth I. Just as the locals shouted down any who doubted the authenticity of the mounting block and Elizabeth I, so too did the Stratford locals about the birthplace. The uneasy provenance of the birthplace was well known before Dickens visited, so it can be assumed that he knew the rumour that the inn had created the story about Shakespeare's birthplace.[98] Furthermore, the Maypole's Elizabethan link may have been inspired by Dickens's 1838 visit to Kenilworth the day before he went to Stratford.[99] Kenilworth's fame was increased by Scott's work of the same name which fictionalised Elizabeth I's stay there.

Despite the birthplace's popularity, there were some doubts over its provenance.[100] An anonymous article was published in 1848 in *Bentley's Miscellany*, for which Dickens had formally been an editor, entitled 'Hoax of the Shakespeare Birthplace'.[101] Written by 'A Warwickshire Man', it presents a convincing argument that the property was not the birthplace of Shakespeare and the notion had been created by the locals over many years to profit the adjoining butchers and inn.[102] The birthplace was not the idyllic countryside

[98] Washington Irving, for example, referred to it in his work the *Sketchbook of Geoffrey Crayon.* The rumours did not, however, prevent the pseudonymous narrator, Geoffrey, from enjoying his 'poetical pilgrimage' as he termed it. He wrote, 'I am always of easy faith in such matters and am very willing to be deceived where the deceit is pleasant and costs nothing'. Irving, *The Sketchbook of Geoffrey Crayon*, p. 317 and p. 320.
[99] Dickens's Diary (30 October 1838), *Pilgrim Letters*, *Vol. 1,* Appendix A, p. 634.
[100] This likely worked in tandem with the commercialisation of the birthplace throughout the nineteenth century, which is explored in Thomas, 'Shakespeare and Commercialism'.
[101] A Warwickshire Man, 'The Hoax of the Shakespeare Birthplace', *Bentley Miscellany,* 23 (January 1848), 279-288.
[102] 'The Hoax of the Shakespeare Birthplace', *Bentley Miscellany,* p. 287.

establishment which had been popularised in depictions of the property.[103] The author outlines how the inn was beset with questions about Shakespeare, so had created the myth that the Bard had been born next door.[104] The author also doubted the authenticity of objects supposedly related to Shakespeare, stating that most of the relics were fakes.[105] The property itself, he described as a 'shabby sausage shop'.[106]

Although many did believe this was the birthplace, the article highlights that not everybody trusted the authenticity of Shakespeare's Stratford heritage. Schoch's investigation into the history of the birthplace demonstrates that elements of fakery had been used during Garrick's Jubilee.[107] He emphasises that fake furniture was placed in the house, and phoney descendants of Shakespeare were used as tour guides to give the house a greater aura.[108] The birthplace was attempting to recreate the imaginative potential of New Place, which was demolished in 1759 and had been the more popular tourist site.[109] The problem was that although there was evidence that the Shakespeares owned the house, there was none which proved that William was born there.[110] From its very incarnation as a literary tourist site, the birthplace had attempted to create an aura of authenticity. As Balz Engler aptly states, the creation of a 'ritual process', the repetition of certain acts in regard to objects, 'isolated them from their mundane contexts and gave them the significance of cultural symbols.'[111] This can be seen at Stratford. Furthermore, as Thomas rightly argues, 'it was in the very articulation of doubts about the birthplace and the responses to these doubts that the property was authenticated'.[112] With enough encouragement, objects and places can be instilled with

[103] Richard Schoch, 'The Birth of Shakespeare's Birthplace', *Theatre Survey,* 53:2 (2012), p. 191.
[104] 'The Hoax of the Shakespeare Birthplace', *Bentley Miscellany,* p. 287.
[105] Ibid*,* p. 282.
[106] Ibid, p. 285.
[107] Schoch, 'The Birth of Shakespeare's Birthplace', p. 193.
[108] Ibid. The property had been purchased by Shakespeare in 1597, for more about the history of New Place see Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust, 'Shakespeare's New Place', < https://www.shakespeare.org.uk/explore-shakespeare/shakespedia/shakespeares-new-place/about-shakespeares-new-place/#> [accessed 4 June 2020].
[109] Schoch, 'The Birth of Shakespeare's Birthplace', p. 190.
[110] Rosenthal, 'Shakespeare's Birthplace in Stratford: Bardoltary Reconsidered', p. 35.
[111] Engler, 'Stratford and the Canonization of Shakespeare', p. 365.
[112] Thomas, *Shakespeare's Shrine,* p. 92.

cultural significance, some of which may be based on uncertain provenance, as occurred in Stratford, and with the mounting block in *Rudge*.

After his visit, Dickens had a continued interest in Shakespearian literary tourist sites. He revisited Stratford-upon-Avon and the birthplace in April 1840 accompanied by Forster and Catherine.[113] During the same trip, they also visited Johnson's house at Lichfield, but Dickens did not detail this experience in any of his writings.[114] He was aware that he was following in other author tourists' footsteps in his encounters with Shakespeare's literary heritage. In 1842, during his stay in New York, he mentioned his time at the birthplace and lamented that Washington Irving had been there before him. Dickens exclaimed 'why, where can we go that they have not been before us?'[115] A few years later, he imagined Shakespeare's literary heritage when he was in Venice in 1844. He stated in *Pictures from Italy*, for example, how he could imagine two of Shakespeare's Venetian characters in the city, 'old Shylock passing to and fro' and Desdemona 'leaned down through a lattice blind to pluck a flower'.[116]

Italy held another Shakespearean connection, Verona, and here Dickens visited the home of the Capulets in 1844.[117] Although fictional characters, both the Capulets and Montagues had been living families in Verona.[118] Dickens wrote to the Countess of Blessington in November

[113] Forster, *Life of Dickens*, p. 223.
[114] Biographical table, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 2*, p. xviii, and Forster, *Life of Dickens*, p. 223. See the introduction for more information.
[115] Charles Dickens, 'Banquet in his honour New York' (18 Feb 1842), *Dickens Speeches,* p. 30.
[116] Charles Dickens, *Pictures From Italy,* ed. by Kate Flint (London: Penguin Classics, 1998) p. 84. Shylock features in *The Merchant of Venice* (1605), and the events of *Othello* (1604) likewise occur in the city.
[117] It is called Casa de Guilietta and dates back from the thirteenth century. The house is decorated with the Capulet coat of arms, and in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it was decorated with mosaics of Shakespeare's play. The balcony was not attached until the 1930s. See Emilija Lipovsek and Smiljka Kesic, 'Communications of Culture in Fiction Induced Tourism', *TIMS,* 9:2 (2015), 108-9.
[118] For more about the sources used to show this, see Richard Hosely ed., *The Yale Shakespeare: The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917), p. 168. There is also a branch of literary tourism which centres around the places frequented by fictional characters, rather than the author. See, for example, Sarah Wylie Krotz, 'Places and Memory: Rethinking the Literary Map of Canada', *English Studies in Canada,* 40:2 (2014), 133-154, p. 140.

that he went to 'see the old house of the Capulets, with their cognizance still carved in stone, over the Gateway of the Court Yard'.[119] He did admit that he feared a visit to Verona would put him 'out of conceit with Romeo and Juliet', but, when he did visit, was pleased to find it was in fact 'fanciful, quaint and picturesque'.[120] Casa di Giuletta had not yet flourished as a tourist site, so Dickens was able to write about it with an air of originality, which he had set out to do in *Pictures From Italy*.[121] He initially described the house as 'a most miserable little inn' and felt 'there was nothing to connect it with the beautiful story'.[122] Although he did enjoy meeting 'a very unsentimental middle-aged lady […] who resembled old Capulet', overall Dickens seemed quite unimpressed by the visit.[123]

However, Dickens's opinion of the Capulet house changed over time, and with hindsight, he found the property worthy of its literary connection. When compiling *Pictures From Italy*, Dickens used the letters he had sent during his travels. He seems to have consulted the letter he had sent to the Countess for the entry within *Pictures From Italy* as the format is similar; he described the same areas and used the phrase 'a most miserable little inn'.[124] However, two years after sending the original letter, he added at the end of his description of the Capulet house that he was 'quite satisfied with it'.[125] He presented the house in the same way as in his previous letter, describing how the yard outside was full of carts and was 'ankle-deep in dirt' and inhabited by 'a grim visaged dog'.[126] Yet instead of these factors shattering the illusion of the house as they did in his first experience, they now enhanced it. He had previously felt there was 'nothing to connect it' with Romeo and Juliet, but Dickens now

---

[119] Dickens to Countess of Blessington (20 November 1844), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.4*, p. 225.
[120] Dickens, *Pictures from Italy*, p. 337.
[121] Casa de Giuletta become most popular in the twentieth century when the balcony was installed. See Lois Leveen, 'Juliet has no Balcony', *Atlantic,* 10 (2014) < https://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2014/10/romeo-and-juliets-balcony-scene-doesnt-exist/381969/> [accessed 27 July 2021]. For more about Dickens's desire for originality, see 'Reader's Passport', *Pictures From Italy,* p. 259-262.
[122] Dickens to Countess of Blessington (20 November 1844), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.4,* p. 225.
[123] Ibid.
[124] Dickens, *Pictures From Italy,* p.337.
[125] Ibid.
[126] Ibid.

imagined the dog would 'certainly have had Romeo by the leg'.[127] Imagination is a vital part of literary tourist activity, and with hindsight, Dickens attributed more significant meaning to the house as he envisaged it as the place where Romeo and Juliet became acquainted.[128]

Although Dickens now approved of the house, he did confess that 'it would have been pleasanter to find the house empty, and to have been able to walk through the disused rooms'.[129] His wish to enter the property shows that Dickens felt curious about the inside. His desire to see the house 'empty' emphasises his need for an individual encounter with a literary tourist site. It appears that he wanted to compare the house to the image of the property in his imagination, and the 'distrustful jealous-looking' view of the exterior satisfied Dickens that it was the 'veritable mansion of old Capulet'.[130]

Curating the Birthplace

Dickens's interest in Shakespeare's birthplace was rekindled in 1848 when he helped raise money to employ a curator of the site. His involvement highlights his complex concern for Shakespearian literary sites and his desire to have a hand in shaping the public's image of the Bard. Dickens's interest in the site is briefly noted by the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust and some scholars.[131] Nelson goes into the most detail about Dickens's involvement, and notes that Dickens's endeavour 'came to nothing'.[132] Nelson's work will be developed here to establish an understanding of Dickens's exact contribution towards the birthplace. He

[127] Ibid.
[128] For more about imagination in literary tourism, see Foster, 'Americans and Anti-Tourism', p. 178.
[129] Dickens, *Pictures From Italy,* p.337.
[130] Ibid, p. 337.
[131] See, for example, Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust, 'Purchase of the Birthplace' [accessed 26 March 2018]. Dickens's interest in the setting up a curator is mentioned in passing in biographies such as Slater, *Charles Dickens*; and within Tony Williams, 'Dickens as a Public Figure', *Oxford Handbook of Charles Dickens,* ed. by John Jordan et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 59-75, p. 67. Also mentioned in passing in some public forums such as Museum Crush, 'How the Victorians Saved the Birthplace for the Nation', <https://museumcrush.org/how-the-victorians-saved-shakespeares-birthplace-for-the-nation/ > [accessed 28/04/20].
[132] Nelson, 'Dickens and the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust: "What a Jolly Summer!"', p. 75.

emphasises Dickens's joy of performing whereas this study will instead explore Dickens's attitude towards literary tourism and the commemoration of Shakespeare.

Thomas conducts the most extensive study of the development and auction of the birthplace, and her work offers valuable context for Dickens's involvement.[133] Following the death of Anne Court, the house was put up for public auction on 16 September 1847.[134] In her chapter 'Bidding for the Bard', Thomas highlights the build-up and significance of the public sale.[135] She illustrates how the press emphasised the importance of the birthplace and circulated rumours that the American showman Phineas T. Barnum was hoping to purchase it.[136] Thomas also demonstrates how crucial it was to promote the idea that the birthplace was being acquired by the nation for the nation, even though this was a manipulation of the truth.[137] A birthplace committee had been set up with branches in Stratford and London, with the joint aim of raising funds to buy the house.[138] Many believed that the committee had been successful as the committee purchased the property at the auction for £3000.[139] However, this was more money than the committee possessed, and they were left owing £2000.[140] It was at this stage in the proceedings that Dickens became involved.

---

[133] Thomas highlights the importance of Shakespeare within Victorian culture, showing that 'Shakespeare's Birthplace is quite literally a Victorian construct', before detailing the auction and restoration of the birthplace. See Julia Thomas, *Shakespeare's Shrine: The Bard's Birthplace and the Invention of Stratford upon Avon* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012); Julia Thomas, 'Bringing Down The House: Restoring the Birthplace' *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth-Century Culture,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan 2009), pp. 73-84, p. 73; and Julia Thomas, 'Bidding For The Bard: Shakespeare, the Victorians and the Auction of the Birthplace', *Nineteenth Century Contexts,* 30:3 (2008), 215-228.

[134] Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust*,* 'Purchase of the Birthplace' <https://www.shakespeare.org.uk/explore-shakespeare/shakespedia/shakespeares-birthplace/purchase-of-birthplace/> [accessed 26 March 2018].

[135] Thomas, *Shakespeare's Shrine*, 'Bidding For The Bard', pp. 36-60.

[136] Ibid, pp. 56-58. This connection has recently been explored by Abigail Clayton, *Who Owns the Bard? P. T. Barnum, Charles Dickens, and the Shakespeare Birthplace Showdown of 1847,* (Bringham Young University, BYU Scholars Archive, 2020).

[137] Thomas, *Shakespeare's Shrine*, pp. 51-52.

[138] Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust*,* 'Purchase of the Birthplace' [accessed 26 March 2018].

[139] Thomas, *Shakespeare's Shrine*, p. 42.

[140] Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust*,* 'Purchase of the Birthplace' [accessed 26 March 2018] and Shakespeare Birthplace Collections online, 'What Happened Next' <http://collections.shakespeare.org.uk/exhibition/exhibition/saving-shakespeares-

Dickens has mistakenly been portrayed as 'saving' the birthplace.[141] Gary Taylor promoted the idea, which has been echoed by other academics such as Michael Rosenthal, that Dickens and Macready 'spearheaded a successful national campaign to purchase [the birthplace] by subscription for the nation'.[142] Dickens was not, however, raising money to purchase the house, but was in fact fundraising to support the appointment of a curator of his choice.[143] In a letter to Mrs Cowden Clarke on 14 April 1848, he stated:

> We do not play [sic] to purchase the house (which may be positively considered as paid for) but towards endowing a perpetual curatorship of it, for some eminent literary veteran. And I think you will recognise in this, even a higher and more generous object than the securing, even, of the debt incurred for the house itself.[144]

Dickens dismissed the importance of the historic house, although he was ultimately relying on its purchase for his own endeavours. His statement that the birthplace itself can be 'positively considered as paid for', is misconstrued. The committee was still attempting to raise the necessary funds even after the supposed purchase of the property.[145] Dickens would have known this as he was a member of the committee, but he seems to have turned a blind

---

birthplace/object/saving-shakespeares-birthplace-13-what-happened-next > [Accessed 26 March 2018].

[141] Peter Kirwin and Charlotte Mathieson, *A Tale of Two Londons: Locating Shakespeare and Dickens in 2012* (Nottingham: Nottingham University, 2015), <http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/32316/3/A%20Tale%20of%20Two%20Londons%20eprint.pdf> [accessed 19 June 2021], p. 1.

[142] Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare*, p. 216-7 and Rosenthal, 'Shakespeare's Birthplace in Stratford', p. 35.

[143] This is even openly proclaimed in some of the playbills, see, for example, DH472, Charles Dickens Museum, London. Images of other playbills can be found Shakespeare's Birthplace, 'Barnum and Dickens: Oh what a circus!' <https://www.shakespeare.org.uk/explore-shakespeare/blogs/barnum-vs-dickens-oh-what-circus/> [accessed 4 June 2020].
and at Museum Crush 'How the Victorians save Shakespeare's Birthplace for the Nation', <https://museumcrush.org/how-the-victorians-saved-shakespeares-birthplace-for-the-nation/> [accessed 4 June 2020].

[144] Dickens to Mrs Cowden Clarke (14 April 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* pp. 278-9.

[145] Dickens to John Forster (1 January 1848), Editorial Notes, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 222.

eye to the matter. He was more concerned about who would curate the property. Dickens wanted someone with a literary background to run the birthplace and desired it to be a charitable scheme where the legacy of Shakespeare would help support a struggling playwright.

Dickens's interest in securing a curator can be traced back to 7 December 1847, when the London Shakespeare committee, of which Dickens was a member, stated that they wished the birthplace to 'be placed under the superintendence of some Person honourably connected with Dramatic Literature.'[146] Dickens had been decidedly quiet on the subject of the birthplace in 1847 within his surviving letters, making barely any mention of it, which suggests that his interest was only piqued after the discussion about appointing a curator.[147] He appears to have found the right man by January 1848 and, after some initial indecision, the birthplace became of great importance to him, dominating much of his correspondence that year.[148]

In a letter to Forster, Dickens stated that James Sheridan Knowles had declared bankruptcy.[149] Knowles was a celebrated playwright at the time but was suffering financial difficulties due to his efforts to pay off his father's debts.[150] He was well acquainted with Dickens's Shakespearian friend Macready and known for his dramatic works, including *Caius Gracchus* (1815) which was a response to Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* (1609).[151] His dramatic endeavours, though successful, had provided little financial benefit.[152] Dickens envisaged that the best way to help Knowles out of his financial difficulties was to raise money to support him as curator of Shakespeare's birthplace. Not only would this aid a fellow writer, but it would ensure that the curatorship was given to a playwright with a keen interest in Shakespeare.

---

[146] Ibid.
[147] *Letters of Charles Dickens,* Vol. 5.
[148] Ibid.
[149] Dickens to John Forster (1 January 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 222.
[150] Oxford Dictionary National Biography, 'James Sheridan Knowles' <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-15770> [accessed March 29 2019].
[151] Ibid.
[152] Ibid.

Although Dickens had an interest in helping to secure the position for Knowles, he had initially been hesitant about becoming actively involved. In February 1848, he recounted how the Shakespeare House committee (a subcommittee of the London Shakespeare committee) was imploring him to help raise funds through his amateur dramatic company.[153] He stated that he was, 'not particularly anxious to take the needful trouble, and am holding off at present; but it is very possible that the thing may be done, because of the difficulty of getting out of it'.[154] Dickens had placed himself in a difficult position as his proclaimed interest caused others to presume he would act to help. Dickens was right that he would have problems 'getting out of it' as by April 1848, preparations were already underway for Dickens to raise money through theatrical means.[155] Dickens soon overcame his initial hesitancy and threw himself wholeheartedly into the endeavour. From April, the committee began to meet fortnightly wherever possible. He wrote to Mark Lemon on 21 April, 'I have sent (through the Post) a small red-hot poker for the stirring up of those gentlemen (meaning the committee)'.[156] Dickens, on the whole, seemed to be one of the driving forces behind the committee as he later wrote to Peter Cunningham, 'How are the archaeological dummies?' showing that he did not have the greatest faith in the abilities of the other twenty men.[157]

The concept of authors helping fellow authors was an appealing endeavour to Dickens. Indeed, aiding a living author appears to have taken precedence for Dickens over preserving a literary tourism site. Dickens took the appointment of Knowles very seriously; he stated, 'I have set my heart on seeing Sheridan Knowles installed at Stratford on Avon [sic]'.[158] When approached by others about the curatorial position, including the wife of Charles Cowden Clarke, who enquired whether her husband could be a potential candidate, he was strict about Knowles being 'the first custodian' of the birthplace, highlighting Dickens was the

[153] Dickens had formed an amateur dramatics company with some of his friends including Thomas Leech, Frank Stone and Mark Lemon in 1845. Alan S. Watts, 'Amateur Dramatics of Dickens', *Oxford Reader's Companion to Dickens,* ed. by Paul Schlicke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 12-14.
[154] Dickens to Emile de la Rue (29 February 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 255.
[155] Dickens to John Forster (1 January 1848), Editorial Notes, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 222.
[156] Dickens to Mark Lemon (21 April 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 286.
[157] Dickens to Peter Cunningham (28 July 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 380.
[158] Dickens to Miss Burdett Coutts (24 May 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 317.

driving force behind the appointment of Knowles.[159] Dickens later wrote to Andrew Dalglish, '[I] will take excellent care that this money goes to nobody else, by never handing it over (it is in my own possession) for the endowment of any first Curator but Knowles'.[160] He stated that if Knowles's appointment were unsuccessful, then the role would pass on to either John Poole or James Kenney.[161] Both men were also playwrights suffering financially in the late 1840s.[162] Although he was not alone in pushing for Knowles to become curator of the birthplace, it is likely that Dickens encouraged others in the committee to support Knowles. On 14 April, a meeting was called where Dickens and 'several Gentleman united with him' declared their 'decided wish that Mr. Sheridan Knowles should be the Gentleman recommended to the Government as Guardian of the House'.[163] The Government pledged that they would support the appointment of Knowles on the condition that the committee would help by raising £1,400.[164]

Dickens was actively attempting to shape Shakespeare's legacy by placing the property in the hands of men he thought would present it correctly. Dickens stated that it was his own stipulation that the house was placed under the supervision of someone 'connected with Dramatic Literature'.[165] He reiterated the notion some months later when he wrote that he wanted to 'ensure to literature (I will take good care of that) a proper expression of itself in the bestowal of an essentially literary appointment'.[166] Perhaps Dickens felt that by installing

---

[159] Dickens to Mrs Cowden Clarke (5 August 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 385.
[160] Dickens to Andrew S. Dalgish (12 June 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 332.
[161] Ibid.
[162] John Poole, like Knowles, was also a playwright who had come to fame through his adaptation of Shakespeare, in the form of *Hamlet Travestie* (1810). In 1845 Poole found himself unable to write and Dickens helped to raise funds to support him in 1846, 1847 and 1849, seemingly taking a break in 1848 to help Knowles. *ODNB*, Peter Tomson 'John Poole' <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-22515> [accessed 9 April, 2018]. Kenney was also a playwright, but his health deteriorated in the late 1840s and his family were struggling financially, he died in 1849. *ODNB,* Peter Tomson, 'James Kenney' <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-15405?rskey=Vmi8kz&result=1> [accessed 9 April, 2018].
[163] Ibid.
[164] Dickens to Rev James White (4 May 1848), Editorial Notes, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 296.
[165] Dickens to Mrs Cowden Clarke (5 August 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 385.
[166] Dickens to Alexander Ireland (22 May 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 5,* p. 316.

a playwright, the story of the birthplace would better reflect the importance of Shakespeare, and, in turn, be more in line with how he felt Shakespeare's heritage should be portrayed. He was orchestrating a form of literary succession.

By this time, the English social elite had already established amateur dramatics as a successful fundraising tool.[167] Dickens himself had written and starred in amateur dramatics during his childhood but started taking part in charitable theatrics in 1842.[168] When in Canada, he wrote to Colden, 'I am going to *act* at the Montreal Theatre […] for the benefit of a local charity. […] I am going to do Mr. Snobbington (a priggish bank clerk of the most tidy habits possible) in a piece called A Good Night's Rest. It is funny enough.'[169] For the curatorship fundraisers, he took on the role of stage manager as well as acting. One of the plays that was chosen was the *Merry Wives of Windsor* (1602). It seems fitting that it was through a performance of one of Shakespeare's own plays that money would be raised to help conserve his legacy. *The Merry Wives of Windsor* also featured the line, 'I cannot tell what the dickens his name is'.[170] Although 'dickens' in this context probably refers to the devil, the significance of using a Shakespearean work that featured Dickens's name should not go unnoticed.[171] It was another way of linking Dickens to Shakespeare. Some of the playbills for the 1848 productions still survive today. One is held in the Charles Dickens Museum's collection for the performance at the Theatre Royal Haymarket. The playbill clearly outlines that they were raising money for 'The Fund for the Endowment of a perpetual curatorship of Shakespeare's house', repeating that the fund was not for the purchase of the birthplace itself.[172] The previous year Dickens had performed the *Merry Wives* to provide the writer Leigh Hunt with a pension, so this may have influenced the production choice.[173]

---

[167] Noted by Eileen Curley in 'Tainted Money? Nineteenth Century Charity Theatricals', *Theatre Symposium,* 15 (2007), 52-73, p. 53.
[168] Watts, 'Amateur Dramatics of Dickens'.
[169] Dickens to David C. Colden (29 April 1842), *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 3,* p. 218.
[170] William Shakespeare, *Merry Wives of Windsor* (1602), Act 3, Scene 2.
[171] OED*,* 'dickens', <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/52264?rskey=7VTI5y&result=2&isAdvanced=false#eid> [accessed 16 May 2018].
[172] Charles Dickens Museum, DH472.
[173] Slater, *Charles Dickens,* p. 266.

The 1848 productions took up a considerable amount of Dickens's time as he organised rehearsals and the practicalities of finding performance spaces around the country. A letter to Andrew Dalglish illustrates Dickens's great, even obsessive, attention to detail.[174] He gave strict instructions about the organisation of the performance, right down to the colour of the tickets, 'Red for Boxes, Yellow for Pit, Green for Upper Boxes'.[175] He expressed a wish that the printer of the playbills should 'give no greater prominence to my name, than to the names of all the other gentlemen concerned', as he was also starring in the production, playing the character of Shallow.[176] The preparations were very time-consuming; he wrote in May 1848, 'I find myself at the Haymarket all day, and at Miss Kelly's half the night'.[177] Dickens appears to have taken on the brunt of the work as he wrote how the 'Shakespeare House committee not being good men of business, I have resolved to take the country arrangements into my own hands'.[178] Much of Dickens's correspondence from 1848 centred around writing to people to encourage support for the fund.

The company performed in major cities including London, Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, and Edinburgh.[179] Crucially, Dickens also took the cast to Stratford while they were on tour. It is difficult to know precisely which sites they visited, as Dickens makes no reference of the visit in his letters or writings, so we cannot be certain that they went to the birthplace itself. However, the names of the company can be found in the visitors' book of the Holy Trinity Church.[180] Dickens may have felt that a visit to Stratford would help to inspire the company and show the importance of their endeavour.

---

[174] Dickens to Andrew S. Dalglish (21 June 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 332.
[175] Ibid.
[176] Ibid.
[177] Dickens to Mrs Henry Burnett (9 May 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 302. 'Miss Kelly' refers to the actress Frances Kelly who owned a small West End Theatre that was used for rehearsals, see Slater, *Charles Dickens,* p. 266.
[178] Dickens to Charles Evans (19 May 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 310.
[179] Dickens to Miss Burdett Coutts (24 May 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 317; and Angus Fletcher (10 June 1848), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 329.
[180] The trip is included in Norman Page, *Dickens Chronology* (Basingstoke, Macmillan Press, 1988), p. 63, and mentioned in Gager, *Dynamics of Influence,* p. 107.

Although Dickens and the committee were able to raise funds for their cause, it was not enough, and they did not reach the target of £1,400.[181] The committees, one of which was raising money for the house and the other for the curator, were beset by debt and were £500 away from being able to secure both the house and curator.[182] For this reason, the birthplace was not taken over by the Government as had first been agreed.[183] Continued efforts were made but were stalled by changing governments.[184] The committee's debts were liquidated in 1855 and John Shakespeare, who claimed to be a descendant of the Bard, funded much of the subsequent restoration work.[185] The birthplace was officially given to the city of Stratford in 1866 and supervised by a body of trustees.[186] The endeavour was not a complete failure, however, as the house was placed under the custodianship of the Birthplace Trust. But despite his best efforts, Dickens was not able to appoint Knowles as curator. Dickens ultimately had no hand in the preservation of Shakespeare's Birthplace.[187] In 1869 he reflected on the endeavour, 'it was found quite a hopeless effort to bring any such thing to bear, and we divided the fund, by common vote, between him [Knowles] and Leigh Hunt. I forget its amount, but it lasted some time, discreetly handled, and did a world of good'.[188]

---

[181] Dickens to Rev James White (4 May 1848), Editorial Notes, *Letters to Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 296.

[182] *Shakespeare's Birthplace,* 'The Restoration of the Birthplace' <http://collections.shakespeare.org.uk/exhibition/exhibition/saving-shakespeares-birthplace/object/saving-shakespeares-birthplace-14-the-restoration-of-the-birthplace> [accessed 15 May 2018].

[183] Ibid.

[184] Ibid.

[185] Ibid.

[186] *Shakespeare' Birthplace,* 'The Legacy of the Purchase', <http://collections.shakespeare.org.uk/exhibition/exhibition/saving-shakespeares-birthplace/object/saving-shakespeares-birthplace-15-the-legacy-of-the-purchase> [accessed 15 May 2018].

[187] Some scholarship is not clear on this, often implying that the fundraising for the curatorship was a success. It cannot be described as such because Knowles was never appointed, although he was given financial aid. Dicken's involvement is mistakenly pronounced as 'successful' in Anthony Burton, 'Literary Shrines: The Dickens House and Other Writers' House Museums', *The Dickensian*, 72 (1977), 138-146.

[188] Dickens to Frederick Ouvry (11 May 1869), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.12: 1868-1870*, p. 353.

Dickens's involvement in fundraising for the Birthplace had a different legacy. He would continue to use amateur dramatics to raise funds for struggling writers through his involvement in the Guild of Literature and Art as it had proved to be such a successful fundraising vehicle.[189] He stated that the Guild intended to help authors and artists so that they would 'never have to compromise their independence', allowing writing and art to be seen as a profession.[190] The enterprise was largely successful, for example, on 16 May 1851, Dickens and the Guild performed *Not So Bad as It Seems,* attended by Queen Victoria.[191] The Queen was joined by over 130 other guests, including many dignitaries, raising in total £935 for the Guild.[192] Furthermore, Dickens was credited with making charity theatricals 'something of a fad' in England by the *New York Times* when theatre began to be used as a fundraising activity in America.[193]

Commemorating Shakespeare in His Own Way

Dickens actively commemorated Shakespeare throughout his life through his words and actions. He helped to promote Shakespeare and his works by frequently quoting him, and by using a Shakespearian quote when he established his journal *All the Year Round.* The subtitle of the journal, 'the story of our lives, from year to year', derives from a quote from *Othello* (1604) which reads: 'Her father loved me; oft invited me/ Still question'd me the story of my life/ From year to year, the battles, sieges, fortunes/ That I passed'.[194] As Daniel Pollack

[189] Dickens's friend Bulwer Lytton proposed the idea of the Guild in 1850, and it was established with the aim 'to encourage life assurance, and other provident habits among authors and artists, to render such assistance to both as shall never compromise their independence'. Dickens became involved the same year, and by June 1851, they had raised £2500. The Guild ran for the rest of Dickens's life and was disbanded in 1897. See Alan S. Watts, 'Guild of Art and Literature', Paul Schlicke ed. *Oxford Readers Companion to Dickens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 265.
[190] Charles Dickens, 'The Guild of Literature and Art', *Household Words* (10 May 1851), p. 145-147, *Dickens Journals Online,* < https://www.djo.org.uk/household-words/volume-iii/page-145.html> [accessed 19 June 2021].
[191] The Guild of Literature and Art Subscription book, 1851-1853, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[192] Ibid.
[193] 'Private Theatricals', *New York Times* (July 27, 1855).
[194] William Shakespeare, 'Othello', in John Jewett et al. ed. *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works,* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), p. 879. This connection is explored in

Pelzner has highlighted, Dickens 'kept Shakespeare in his countrymen's mouths'.[195] Dickens was also a founding member of the Shakespeare Club, which met every Saturday and hosted a monthly dinner.[196] The club started in early 1838, the same year as his first visit to Stratford, and ran until 7 December 1839.[197] Although short-lived, it had seventy members, and the meetings consisted of papers and discussions of Shakespeare.[198] The club's object was to 'combine intellectual with social enjoyment'.[199] Dickens was a contributing member, often stepping in as chair when the President, Talfourd, was away.[200]

After the club disbanded, Dickens became a member of the Shakespeare Society, paying his first annual subscription of £1 on 31 December 1840.[201] The Society was founded by many of those who had also been involved in the Shakespeare Club and could be seen as its continuation.[202] Dickens was again an active member, helping with accounts and sitting on the council.[203] On his death, Dickens owned forty-nine works published by the Society.[204] This involvement in clubs centred around the Bard indicates how Dickens wanted to discuss the greatness of Shakespeare with others and believed in promoting his importance. The Society disbanded in 1853 due to a forgery scandal, but Dickens upheld his interest in Shakespeare through his membership of the Garrick Club.[205] The club had been set up in 1831 and Dickens

---

Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust, 'All The Year Round', < https://www.shakespeare.org.uk/explore-shakespeare/blogs/all-year-round/> [accessed 29 June 2020].

[195] Daniel Pollack Pelzner, 'Dickens and Shakespeare's Household Words', *ELH,* 78:3 (2011), 533-536, p. 534.

[196] Dickens to John Forster (30 March 1838), Editorial Notes, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 393.

[197] Dickens to T. N. Talfourd (12 February 1838), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 371, and Dickens to James Hall (4 December 1839), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 610.

[198] Dickens to John Forster (30 March 1838), Editorial Notes, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 393.

[199] Ibid.

[200] Dickens to Frank Stone (23 March 1838), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 529.

[201] Dickens's Dairy, (31 December 1840), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.2,* p. 462.

[202] British Library, 'Prospectus for Shakespeare Society', <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/prospectus-for-the-shakespeare-society> [accessed 27 March 2018].

[203] Ibid.

[204] Ibid.

[205] Ibid.

was elected as a member in 1837.[206] He resigned in 1838 following the resignation of Macready, but rejoined in 1844.[207] However, he left again on 12 July 1858, due to a disagreement between himself, Thackeray and Edmund Yates.[208] Yates wrote a sketch about Thackeray to which the latter took great offence, and Dickens became embroiled in their squabble.[209] Although Dickens was invited to rejoin the club, he never did as his name does not reappear in the membership records.[210]

Despite his precarious relationship with some Shakespeare clubs and their members, Dickens kept the commemorative tradition of celebrating Shakespeare's birthday every year. Forster's biography highlights that Shakespeare's birthday was 'kept always as a festival'.[211] When he was a member, Dickens usually attended the Garrick Club dinner held to honour Shakespeare's birthday. He sometimes chaired these special events as he made speeches in both 1854 and 1858.[212] Dickens's link to Shakespeare was so strong that it appears the club was willing to set aside its difference with him in 1864, the year of the Shakespeare tercentenary. Dickens wrote that many members of the club were 'absurd enough to suppose that I seek the distinction of presiding on the Dinner Day'.[213] He avoided the club and its members during February and March and chose to celebrate with his friends.[214]

---

[206] Biographical Table 1812-1839, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. xliii.
[207] Dickens to James Winston (28 November 1838), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 462 and Dickens to R. H. Barham (12 December 1838), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 468.
[208] Dickens to the Committee of the Garrick Club (12 July 1858), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 8,* p. 603; and Dickens to W. M. Thackeray (24 November 1858), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 8,* p. 708.
[209] Dickens had published his 'Personal Statement' following his separation from his wife in June and Yates had supported him throughout it. For more about the disagreement see the notes of Dickens to Edmund Yates (15 June 1858), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 8,* p. 588; Edmund Yates (6 July 1858), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 8,* p. 595-6.
[210] Dickens to George Russell (11 January 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.10,* p. 339.
[211] Forster, *Life of Charles Dickens*, p. 101.
[212] Dickens to Mark Lemon (22 April 1854), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.7*; Dickens to Charles Dance (19 April 1858), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.8,* p. 547.
[213] Dickens to Unknown Correspondent (3 Feb 1864), *Letter of Charles Dickens, Vol.10,* p. 352.
[214] Ibid.

After 1848, Dickens was hesitant to take part in large public celebrations of Shakespeare. His commemorative activities surrounding Shakespeare primarily became individual and non-public. He satirised public celebrations of Shakespeare, as can be seen through his 1861 essay 'Birthday Celebrations'.[215] Within it, Dickens details how 'Dullborough', a reference to his 'boyhood's home' Chatham, wanted 'an Immortal somebody […] to dimple for a day the stagnant face of the water', so they chose to celebrate Shakespeare's birthday.[216] Dickens mocks this use of the Bard, highlighting the artificial debating society, the portrait of Shakespeare with a 'swollen' head and their belief that their town could compare to Stratford-upon-Avon.[217] He satirises how Shakespeare's birthday was sometimes used as an excuse for poor festivities. Dickens felt this most acutely in 1864, the tercentenary of Shakespeare's birth.

Dickens's involvement in the committee to appoint Knowles as curator appears to have discouraged him from being involved in other committees. In January, Dickens had rejected an offer to be part of the Shakespeare Committee which was raising funds for a monument to Shakespeare in Stratford as part of the tercentenary celebrations.[218] He wrote, 'I have a strong misgiving that the response may not be such as will enable its promoters to achieve a great national success. And anything falling short of a great national success, I should consider a failure.'[219] Dickens was not alone in this sentiment; *The Times* stated that they too were against the idea of a monument to Shakespeare.[220] Yet Dickens was also informed by his previous experience of being on a Shakespearian committee. He was right to anticipate that the committee would struggle. There was a rivalry between different committees, making a coherent fundraising attempt near to impossible.[221] Furthermore, the organisation was

[215] Charles Dickens, 'The Uncommercial Traveller', *All the Year Round* (16 June, 1861), p. 351, *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-ix/page-351.html> [accessed 20 June 2021].
[216] Ibid.
[217] Ibid.
[218] Dickens to Wilkie Collins (25 January 1864), Editorial Notes, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 10,* p. 349.
[219] Dickens to J. Stirling Coyne (2 July 1863), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 10,* p. 265.
[220] 'Shakespearean Monuments', *The Times* (20 January, 1864).
[221] There was the National Shakespeare Committee as well as the Tercentenary Committee. This rivalry is noted in Foulkes, 'Dickens and Shakespeare Tercentenary', p. 74.

troubled by its inability to agree on the best way to memorialise Shakespeare and on the final location of the monument, causing some of its members to resign.[222] Dickens seems to have delighted in their failure, as he wrote to Wilkie Collins that 'the Shakespeare Committee (of which I am ashamed, and which I have never attended) is tumbling to pieces. The best thing it could possibly do'.[223]

After the curatorship debacle, Dickens actively strove for a more private and individual connection with Shakespeare and stepped away from public celebrations of the Bard. By the 1860s, Dickens felt that authors were best commemorated through their works and disapproved of public events and monuments that did little to enhance an author and his/her reputation. He was not alone as Lee notes there was a general dislike among writers and actors for 'all outwards and visible commemoration of Shakespeare'.[224] George Yeats's work shows that leading up to the tercentenary, there was a 'strong re-emergence of the monumental metaphor', which emphasised that Shakespeare should be remembered only through his own words.[225] Dickens refused to take part in any public celebration of Shakespeare's tercentenary in April 1864. He detailed in a letter to F. G. Tomlins that he had rejected an offer to take part in the planting of a 'People's Oak' on Primrose Hill, London, in honour of Shakespeare, noting that he had 'declined several public invitations on the ground that I had resolved to take part in none.'[226] Dickens's key excuse was that they were 'public' celebrations, whereas he advocated for 'a quiet private remembrance of the occasion'.[227] Dickens did not attend the tercentenary celebrations held in Stratford.[228] He was invited to

---

[222] Ibid.
[223] Dickens to Wilkie Collins (25 January 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 10,* p. 349.
[224] Sidney Lee, *Shakespeare and the Modern Stage* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), p. 217.
[225] For more about Dickens's attitudes towards commemoration see the next chapter. George Yeats, 'Shakespeare's Victorian Legacy: Texts as Monuments and Emendation as Desecration in the Mid Nineteenth Century', *Victorian Literature and Culture,* 40:2 (2012), 469-486, p. 471.
[226] The event in honour of the Working Men's Shakespeare Memorial Committee is listed in the editorial notes of Dickens to F. G. Tomlins (13 April 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 10,* p. 382.
[227] Ibid.
[228] Foulkes looks at Dickens's attitudes towards the tercentenary in his article. However, more emphasis is given to the rivalry between Dickens and Thackeray and how this affected the National Shakespeare Committee. He states there is 'some speculation' about where

participate in a celebratory banquet but wrote that it was 'absolutely necessary' that he be in London that day; however, his letters prove that this was not the case and that he had in fact been available when the invitation was issued.[229] Dickens was adamant about the right way to celebrate this momentous year. He stated, 'I have declined several public invitations on the ground that I had resolved to take part in none and had bound myself to a few personal friends for a quiet private remembrance of the occasion.'[230] Moreover, he recorded that he was 'going out of town with Forster, Browning, and Wilkie Collins, to keep Shakespeare's birthday in peace and quiet.' [231]

Despite Dickens's personal dislike, the Stratford celebration was reported on by Andrew Halliday and featured in *All the Year Round,* most likely because it was a highly anticipated event.[232] Some have wrongly credited Dickens as the author of this article.[233] While the tercentenary celebrations were conducted in Shakespeare's honour, they did little to celebrate his achievements as an author and the legacy he had left behind. As Halliday reported, the idea that 'honour to the Bard had much to do with the celebration, I will not

---

Dickens's spent the tercentenary but concurs that it is highly unlikely that he was in Stratford. Foulkes, 'Dickens and the Shakespeare Tercentenary', p. 76.

[229] This is noted by the editors of the Pilgrim Letters who highlight that he had no plans on that day. See Dickens to Dr Henry Kingsley (2 April 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 10,* p. 379; and Dickens to W. P. Frith (13 April 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 10,* p. 381.

[230] Dickens to F. G. Tomlins (13 April 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 10*, p. 382.

[231] Dickens to W. P. Frith (13 April 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.10,* p. 381.

[232] Andrew Halliday, 'Shakespeare Mad', *All The Year Round,* 11:265 (1864), *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-xi/page-345.html> [accessed 21 June 2021], 345-351.

[233] Dickens is listed as the author of the piece by Ian Higgins within the collaborative article G. Marshall et al., 'Thinking Feeling at the Dickens Bicentenary', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century,* 19:14, (2012) 1-12, pp. 5-6. The confusion may be because Halliday was mentored by Dickens and has been described as a 'mini-me' of Dickens. Furthermore, Dickens was an exceedingly controlling editor and his journals, both *Household Words* and *All the Year Round*, were made to reflect his 'mind and purpose' so he may have had some input. He cannot, however, be credited with having authored it. Correspondence with John Drew from 22 August 2019. For more about Dickens as an editor, see Juliet John, *Dickens's Villains: Melodrama, Character and Popular Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 91. See also Anne Lohrli, *Household Words: A Weekly Journal 1850-59* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973); Gerald Grubb, 'Dickens's Editorial Methods', *Studies in Philology,* 40:1 (1943), 79-100; and Gerald Grubb, 'Dickens's Influence as an Editor' *Studies in Philology,* 42:4 (1945), 811-823.

pretend to declare'.[234] Dickens and Halliday appear to have felt that the event was more to profit the living than the dead, as in another article edited by Dickens the following year, 'In and On the Omnibus', the tercentenary celebrations were described as a 'lamentable failure'.[235] Dickens and the contributors to *All the Year Round* were, however, in the minority in their discontent with the tercentenary. Poole has highlighted how the celebrations helped to create the idea that Stratford was an essential location to visit for all English-speaking tourists.[236] It is estimated that there were thirty thousand visitors throughout the 1864 celebrations.[237] The tercentenary encouraged the idea that Stratford was a place of pilgrimage.

Dickens proposed a different, and what he considered a more apt, form of memorialising Shakespeare. He began to raise money to establish two Shakespeare Foundation schools for the children of actors.[238] He reiterated the same sentiment as he had expressed while trying to establish the curatorship that Shakespeare's legacy should help support future generations of actors. He stated in a letter, 'I believe that Shakespeare has left his best monument in his works, and is best left without any other'.[239] This statement echoes Shakespeare's own words; in sonnet 81, he states 'your monument shall be my gentle verse', and nineteenth-century Shakespearian scholars who advocated that the Bard's folio was his true monument.[240] As will be seen in the next chapter, Dickens had always believed this, but in the 1860s, he advocated more openly that an author's work were their greatest memorial. Dickens's priorities, however, were not mirrored by the donators and, as in the case of the curatorship campaign,

---

[234] Halliday, 'Shakespeare Mad', p. 350.
[235] Edmund Yates, 'In and On an Omnibus', *All The Year Round* (21 January, 1865), p. 567, *Dickens Journal Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-xii/page-567.html> [accessed 20 June 2021].
[236] Poole, *Shakespeare and the Victorians,* p. 217.
[237] Even so, not as many people came to visit as had been expected, however, causing lodgings to go cheaper as there was little demand. He stated that 'thousands were scared away by the false reports of overcrowded hotels and high charges.' Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare*, p. 217.
[238] Page, *Dickens Chronology*, p. 115.
[239] Dickens to W. P. Hepworth Dixon (15 January 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 10,* p. 341.
[240] William Shakespeare, 'Sonnet 81: Or I shall live your epitaph to make', *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works,* ed. John Jewett et al. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005) p. 789; Yeats, 'Shakespeare's Victorian Legacy', pp. 469-486.

this endeavour also failed to establish the planned schools.[241] Perhaps Dickens's own avoidance of public Shakespearian celebrations after the 1840s made it more difficult for him to raise money for appeals he deemed appropriate.

Dickens was able to privately commemorate the Bard through the Shakespearian literary heritage of his final home Gad's Hill. As explored in the previous chapter, Dickens had fostered a close interest in this property from childhood, when he used to walk past it with his father.[242] 'My father seeing me so fond of it, has often said to me, "if you were to be persevering and were to work hard you might someday come to live in it'' '.[243] The house had a Shakespearian connection because its location is mentioned in Shakespeare's play, *Henry IV* Part One (1600), as the location of Falstaff's robbery. Dickens was well aware of the connection and was interested in Falstaff. In a letter in 1853 he directly quoted Falstaff; 'I became quite an impersonation of Falstaff's wonderful simile, and my face was "like a wet cloak ill laid up"', and also owned Morgann's essay which analysed the character.[244] Dickens was not alone in his admiration and interest in Falstaff.[245] Irving, for example, detailed how Falstaff had 'vast regions of wit and good humour […] and bequeathed a never-failing inheritance of jolly laughter, to make mankind merrier and better to latest posterity'.[246]

The Shakespearian connection to Gad's Hill seems to have encouraged Dickens's interest in the property; it allowed him to own and control a piece of Shakespeare's heritage. After purchasing the house, Dickens often reiterated his home's Shakespearian connection. For

---

[241] Dickens to W. P. Hepworth Dixon and J. O. Halliwell (23 July 1864), *The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.11: 1865-1867,* ed. by Graham Storey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 412.
[242] See p. 67.
[243] Charles Dickens, 'The Uncommercial Traveller', *All The Year Round* (7 April 1860), *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-ii/page-557.html> [accessed 19 June 2021].
[244] Dickens to Mark Lemon (12 June 1853), *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 7,* p. 96. He owned Maurice Morgann, *Essay on the Dramatic Character of Sir John Falstaff* in 1844, see Dickens to T. J. Serle (29 January 1844), *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 4,* p. 36.
[245] Watson has highlighted how Falstaff also encouraged Shakespearian tourism, Watson, 'Shakespeare on the Tourist Trail', p. 219.
[246] Washington Irving, 'The Boar's Head Tavern, Eastcheap', *The Sketchbook of Geoffrey Crayon* (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1819).

example, in 1859 he wrote 'My Gad's Hill House is on the very scene of Falstaff's robbery' and how 'this country here is very little changed since Shakespeare's time', as he could see from looking out of his very window.[247] Although this could be considered a public way of commemorating Shakespeare, it is reminiscent of Dickens's 'private' celebrations of Shakespeare's birthday which only involved Dickens's close friends, and over which Dickens had full control.

Dickens further cemented the house's Shakespearian link by commissioning a placard that he hung in the entrance hall. It still survives today and is part of the Charles Dickens Museum collection. As Forster says, commissioning the piece 'was his first act of ownership'. [248] The placard reads, 'this house Gad's Hill Place stands on the summit of Shakespeare's Gad's Hill. But my lads, my lads, to morrow [sic] morning by 4 o'clock early at Gad's Hill'.[249] By describing it as 'Shakespeare's Gad's Hill' Dickens shows his awareness that authors can be linked to places, and imbues his property with a Shakespearean connection. Within his study he added more references to Shakespeare through the inclusion of three joke faux books on his shelves entitled *Had Shakespeare's Uncle a Singing Face Vols. I-V*, *Was Shakespeare's Uncle Merry? Vols I-VI* and *Was Shakespeare's Mother Fair? Vol. I-IV*.[250] Dickens appears to have specially commissioned these faux Shakespeare books when he moved to Gad's Hill, as they are not included in the original list of dummy titles he commissioned for Tavistock House.[251] These acts of commemoration enabled him to link two great writers, himself and Shakespeare. This

[247] Dickens to Francois Regnier (16 November 1859), *The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.9: 1859-1861,* ed. by Graham Storey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 163; Dickens to Archibald Michie (7 October 1867), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 11,* p. 449.
[248] Forster, *Life of Charles Dickens*, p. 208.
[249] Illuminated Inscription for Gad's Hill Place, Charles Dickens Museum, London. Shakespeare did not name the area himself and may have based the robbery on a ballad entitled 'The Robbery at Gad's Hill' from 1558. See Percy Society, *Early English Poetry, Ballads and Popular Literature of the Middle Ages* (London: Percy Society, 1844), p. 120.
[250] The first two were in the dummy door and the latter on the bookshelf. The dummy book door was originally commissioned by Dickens for Tavistock House in 1851 before it was moved to Gad's Hill in 1857. For more about the dummy books see 'The Dummy Books of Tavistock House and Gad's Hill', *Dickens Library Online*, <http://www.dickenslibraryonline.org/library/dummy> [accessed 6 November 2020].
[251] List of Imitation Book-Backs Sent to T. R. Eeles (22 October 1851), Appendix C, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.*6, p. 851.

was reiterated in 1870 when it was rumoured that Dickens was to be offered a baronetcy.[252] In a letter to Arthur Helps, the Queen's secretary, he joked, 'we will have of "Gad's Hill Place" attached to the title of the Baronetcy, please—on account of the divine William and Falstaff.'[253] The reference shows that he wanted his house to be associated with the names Dickens and Shakespeare.

The link between Dickens and Shakespeare at Gad's Hill still survives today. When given a Dickens themed tour of the house, visitors are informed of the Falstaff connection as well as an anecdote about the benches and post box which adorn the front steps of Gad's Hill. The timber of the benches and post box were supposedly from Shakespeare's birthplace in Stratford-upon-Avon and given to Dickens because he knew the curator.[254] There is no evidence to support this, and the wooden benches were already there when Dickens purchased the house.[255] However, the fable has become engrained in the house's story over the years, as it is part of the tour guides' information sheet. The idea that Dickens supposedly knew the curator is maybe a twisting of his attempts to install his friend Knowles in the position.[256] The retelling of this tale shows that, like the mounting block, objects and houses can be engrained with an authenticity that they do not wholly merit.

Dickens's encounters with Shakespeare's heritage had shown him the many ways an author could be remembered and commemorated. It showed him that authors could be remembered without their personal lives tarnishing their legacy, as had happened to Scott. Dickens's time at Stratford encouraged him to start advocating that an author should be

---

[252] Noted in the editorial notes of Dickens to Arthur Helps (3 March 1870), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.12*, p. 485. The baronetcy did not come into fruition. It is likely it was just a rumour, but Dickens's death three months later may also have prevented Queen Victoria from making the proposition.

[253] Ibid.

[254] Told to me during a tour around Gad's Hill place on 12 May 2018.

[255] Watts notes that the existing timber was supposedly made from Shakespeare's furniture but offers no evidence for this fact. Watts, *Dickens at Gad's Hill,* p.32.

[256] A curator was not installed in the birthplace during Dickens's lifetime as the house came under the stewardship of a trust and many years were spent renovating and conserving the structure. See Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 'Reinventing the House' <https://www.shakespeare.org.uk/explore-shakespeare/shakespedia/shakespeares-birthplace/reinventing-the-birthplace/> [accessed 30 June 2020].

remembered through their work alone. As he aged and became more revered, Dickens began to consider his own legacy and compared it to the literary legacy of Shakespeare. He became more critical of monuments to authors, as the next chapter explores, and was influenced by Shakespeare's grave. Although Dickens was not able to shape Shakespeare's legacy as much as he had hoped, the Bard had helped to forge the Dickens legacy still with us today.

There is no concrete evidence that Dickens ever revisited Stratford-upon-Avon after the disappointment of his fundraising campaign. However, he mentioned in a letter in 1869, 'I have a notion, if it will suit you, of supplementing the speechmaking with a small N excursion next Day to Stratford, or Kenilworth, or both, or somewhere else, in a jovial way.'[257] 'N' is a reference to Ellen Ternan, and it appears that he wanted to replicate part of his Midlands trip when he had first visited the birthplace with her.[258] Due to the ambiguous nature of their relationship and movements, it is not surprising that there is no record of their supposed visit. His suggestion, however, shows that his interest in Stratford remained throughout his life and that he had a desire to repeat a journey he made at the beginning of his career as a novelist. Perhaps due to his ill health during the last decade of his life, he was contemplating his own mortality and legacy, and by revisiting a place associated with Shakespeare, he was considering how he too wanted to be remembered.[259]

[257] Dickens to George Dolby (11 September 1869), *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 12,* p. 408.
[258] Ibid, see notes. As explained by the editors of the *Letters of Charles Dickens*.
[259] Dickens's ill health and many different ailments are extensively explored by Nick Cambridge, 'Bleak Health: Charles Dickens's Medical History Revisited', *The Dickensian,* 505:114 (2018), 117-133.

Chapter Three: 'The Monumental Question': Dickens and the Memorialisation of Authors

Dickens died on 9 June 1870. His death was unexpected: *The Sun* described his passing as a 'great and quite irrevocable loss', and the *Pall Mall Gazette* stated, 'the loss of such a man will be felt by millions as nothing less than a personal bereavement'.[1] Before his death, Dickens wrote his last will and testament, and included the line 'I conjure my friends on no account to make me the subject of any monument, memorial, or testimonial whatever.'[2] Some Dickens scholarship and biographies mention his death, dying wishes and thoughts on memorialisation; however, the source of his distaste for the latter is rarely, if ever, mentioned.[3] In order to answer what Dickens himself terms, 'the Monument question', Dickens's critique of the public and ostentatious memorialisation of authors will be used to show that he supported modest and private forms of commemoration.[4] I will demonstrate that Dickens's distaste for physical memorialisation began in the 1840s and the catalyst was the Edinburgh Walter Scott monument. His distaste grew in the 1850s and that by the 1860s, Dickens was firm in his dislike. His dislike grew in tandem with the growing ostentatious practice that accompanied the marking of death in the Victorian period.[5] Like many of his

[1] *The Sun* Evening Edition Friday (10 June 1870) and *Pall Mall Gazette* (10 June 1870) recorded in Scrapbook on Dickens's Death, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[2] 'Charles Dickens's Last Will and Codicil, 12 May 1869 and 2 June 1870', *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 12,* p. 732.
[3] Claire Wood states 'he rejected commemoration in material form' in 'Material Culture' in *Oxford Handbook of Charles Dickens,* ed. by John Jorden et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), p. 466. This quote from his Will is often used but not explored, for example in *The Dickensian* articles Richard Foulkes, 'Dickens and the Shakespeare Tercentenary'; and Jean Lear, 'Charles Dickens and His Garden at Gad's Hill Place', *The Dickensian,* 98:456 (2002). The connection is acknowledged in biographies, including Slater, *Charles Dickens*, p. 618. Dickens's dislike for monuments is recognised after a description of a monument in his honour within Peter Matthews, *London's Statues and Monuments* (Oxford: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2012), p. 76.
[4] Permanent memorials had been rare before the eighteenth century but grew in popularity over the nineteenth century due to the Gothic revival. For more about this, and the development of monuments away from graves, see Harold Mytum, *Mortuary, Monuments and Burial Grounds* (New York: Kulwer Academic, 2004); Dickens to Shirley Brooks (21 June 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 10,* p. 407.
[5] Like with wider literary tourism, the extravagant memorialisation of figures was encouraged by the Romantic period, for a detailed exploration see, Sanchez-Garcia, 'The Cult of the Romantic Hero: Literature and Memorials', pp. 21-34.

contemporaries, he was openly critical of expensive funerals, such as the Duke of Wellington's in 1852 which was considered the zenith of Victorian funerary practice and he held great contempt for what Claire Wood terms the 'business of death', which he explored within his fiction.[6] I will however retain a focus primarily on Dickens's attitudes towards authorial memorialisation and gravesites rather than the wider practices surrounding death. I will explain his dislike while also highlighting his contradictory nature of thought, by analysing the exceptions to Dickens's anti-memorialisation rule. Nonetheless, Dickens's opinions on memorialisation follow a general pattern of promoting commemoration of an author's works, rather than physical commemoration.

The second half of the chapter will then explore how Dickens approached his own memorialisation, and argue, for the first time, that he was influenced by the literary monuments and graves he witnessed during his life. Although Rosemarie Bodenheimer has noted that Dickens was self-aware about his legacy, a direct analysis of how Dickens's wishes related to the literary tourist sites he visited has not been conducted.[7] Dickens's interest in the graves and monuments of other authors was not unusual as during the nineteenth century, literary graves were becoming popular literary tourism sites.[8] The fascination with

[6] Curl has highlighted that it was common for commentators to deplore extravagant funerals. Curl, *Victorian Celebration of Death,* p. 197. Dickens himself wrote to Mrs Watson stating that he considered the state funeral 'altogether a mistake, to be temperately but firmly objected to'. Dickens to Mrs Watson (22 November 1852), *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol.6,* p. 808. See also 'The Duke of Wellington's Funeral', *Household Words* (27 October 1852), p. 259, *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/household-narrative-of-current-events/year-1852/page-259.html> [accessed 20 June 2021], and Trading in Death', *Household Words*, (27 November 1852), pp. 241-145, *Dickens Journal Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/household-words/volume-vi/page-242.html> [accessed 20 June 2021]. The journal's attitudes towards death are considered in Catherine Waters, *Commodity Culture in Dickens's Household Words* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008); and Claire Wood, *Dickens and the Business of Death* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
[7] Rosemarie Bodenheimer, *Knowing Dickens* (London: Cornell University Press, 2010), p. 56.
[8] Waller, for example, has written about the Victorian literary commemoration movement, with a particular focus on the period 1870-1918. Waller, *Writers, Readers and Reputations*. Although this was when the movement was in full force, it can be traced earlier, and Dickens's own correspondence stands as a testament to this fact. Much of the Victorian fascination with dead authors found its origins in the eighteenth century; and the popularising of the movement was largely due to the Romantics and was termed a 'necro-touristic impulse'. Westover's work *Necromanticism: Travelling to Meet the Dead 1750-1860*, comprehensively explores how literary heritage fed into this necromantic impulse.

literary burials, particularly authorial graves, has been thoroughly surveyed by Matthews in her work, *Poetical Remains.*[9] She outlines how a poet's tomb has primary power over readers and admirers because it holds the physical relics of the author.[10] These sites thus become central to the act of authorial worship.[11] Some of the literary monuments that will be discussed in the chapter are part of an author's gravesite, but much of the discussion will centre on large scale monuments that were placed in busy urban areas. Dickens's visits to literary graves and monuments add further evidence that he would not have wished to be buried in Poets' Corner, Westminster Abbey, despite this becoming his final resting place, and also contextualise his insistence that an author's work should be their only memorial. Additionally, his attempt to dismantle Gad's Hill so it could not be used as a commemorative site will be explored. Finally, I will note how Dickens came to be memorialised following his death and how this still affects how we encounter sites relating to him today.

I define a monument as 'a statue, building, or other structure erected to commemorate a famous or notable person or event', and will primarily focus on monuments to authors. Such monuments will be described throughout as tangible, in order to denote a physical form of commemoration. Intangible heritage, in comparison, has no physical presence and is usually knowledge, a concept, feeling, practice or an idea. [12] In regard to burial sites, although a form of tangible heritage, the grave will only be considered monumental if it is adorned with an elaborate structure and not a simple marker of who is buried there.[13] Statues, though considered a sub-category of monuments, will be analysed separately as Dickens himself paid particular attention to this form of memorialisation. They were also a popular method of external commemoration in the nineteenth century.[14]

---

[9] Matthews*, Poetical Remains.*
[10] Ibid, p. 11. For more about the particular power of the body itself, Clymer, 'Cromwell's Head and Milton's Hair', p. 92.
[11] Matthews, *Poetical Remains,* p. 74.
[12] Definition is taken from UNESCO, 'Intangible Cultural Heritage' < https://ich.unesco.org/en/what-is-intangible-heritage-00003> [accessed 30 January 2019]. See also Lucas Lixinski, *Intangible Heritage in Cultural Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 1-2.
[13] Headstones were already a popular form of grave adornment at this time.
[14] Mytum, *Mortuary, Monuments and Burial Grounds,* p. 58.

'Crushed' by His Own Image: Dickens's Response to the Scott Monument

Forster stated in his biography of Dickens, when talking about posthumous honours, that 'a dislike of all display was rooted in him', but Forster does not explore what caused this distaste.[15] I argue that Dickens's dislike can be traced to his visit to the Edinburgh Walter Scott monument in 1847. On Scott's death in 1835, money was raised in his honour throughout Scotland and England. The English fund was used to preserve Abbotsford whereas the Scottish fund was intended for 'the erection of monuments in his memory'.[16] The first monument to Scott was unveiled in Glasgow in 1837, consisting of an 80-foot column with a statue of Scott standing on the top.[17] There were plans for another monument in Edinburgh, but there were insufficient funds to complete it without further fundraising. A committee in Edinburgh donated £7000 to the memorial and in 1838 launched a public design competition.[18] George Kemp's design of a spire with space at the bottom for a statue of Scott was chosen from 54 entries.[19] However the committee was hampered by insufficient funds to complete the monument.

In March 1844, Dickens wrote to Charles Mackay that there 'is an idea abroad' for a London Committee to be formed to help raise the final funds for the Scott monument.[20] Dickens was asked to join the committee but declined. He did, however, note that he disliked the 'prejudice' that was 'created by the incompleteness of the testimonials to their two great men, Scott and Burns'.[21] He felt that failed fundraising attempts affected authors' reputations. Dickens was uneasy about joining the attempt to help the Scottish committee, as he thought that the wider Scottish populace would find it insulting as it gave the impression that the people of Edinburgh were 'requiring external assistance', to finish the monument of

[15] John Forster, *Life of Charles Dickens* (London: Cecil Palmer, 1872), p. 487.
[16] Lockhart, *Life of Sir Walter Scott,* p. 748.
[17] Ibid.
[18] *Chambers Edinburgh Journal* (21 April 1838), pp. 101.
[19] Ibid.
[20] Dickens to Charles Mackay (7 March 1844), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.4*, p. 66.
[21] Ibid. Dickens may have been referring to the monument to Burns on Calton Hill Edinburgh which also took time to come into fruition. The fundraising campaign began in 1819 but was not completed until 1831.

one of their 'great men'.[22] In this letter, Dickens did not appear to be against the idea of a monument in Scott's honour. He stated, concerning statues, 'I like one to be put up now and then, in honour of […] intellect.'[23] However, he felt the committee should only help if it had 'bright prospects of success' or they should not get involved.[24] In Scott's case, the monument appeal occurred twelve years after his death and followed numerous failed fundraising attempts.

Although Dickens was not involved in the committee, he was still interested in the result. The Scott monument was unveiled in 1844. Three years later while in Edinburgh, Dickens sent Forster a letter where he wrote, 'I am sorry to report the Scott Monument a failure. It is like the spire of a Gothic church taken off and stuck in the ground'.[25] Dickens's main problem was the monument's ostentatious design, which made it an object of spectacle.[26] He made no mention of the statue of Scott, and the leading cause of his dislike was the surrounding spire. He may have felt this was not a fitting monument to an author and his literary success, as the spire dwarfs the image of Scott, distorting the prominent image of the novelist. Dickens gave a speech in Hartford in 1842 which mirrors the design of the memorial. Within the speech, Dickens created for his audience the image of Scott being 'crushed' while 'hovering around him [were] the ghosts of his own imagination', his fictional characters.[27] The statue of Scott, surrounded by a vast spire engraved with his characters, mimics the image Dickens created for his audience. Dickens was, however, in the minority in his opposition to the design of the monument. Queen Victoria admired the work, describing it as 'really very beautiful'.[28] She

[22] Dickens to T. N. Talfourd (19 March 1844), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 4,* p. 77.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Dickens to John Forster (30 December 1847), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.5,* p. 216.
[26] The location of the monument may have also caused Dickens's dislike. Duncan has written about the Scott monument and highlights how its design and location went against the established general practice as, usually, monuments to writers were inside churches. As will be seen below Dickens was interested in the effect the location of a monument had on the reputation of an author. Ian Duncan, *Modern Romance and the Transformation of the Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 177-178.
[27] Charles Dickens, 'Hartford 7 February 1842', *The Speeches of Charles Dickens,* p. 25.
[28] Queen Victoria, Journals (Friday 30 August 1850). Journal accessible at Queen Victoria, Journals, <http://www.queenvictoriasjournals.org/home.do> [accessed 10 October 2018].

approved of it so much that she proposed the memorials to her Uncle Leopold and Prince Albert should be 'in the style of Sir W. Scott's monument in Edinburgh'.[29]

Figure 1: Walter Scott Monument, photograph, Emily Smith, 2020

The only other surviving reference Dickens made to the Scott monument was in 1868. In a letter, he wrote how on a Sunday, 'the usual pretty children are at this moment hanging garlands round [sic] the Scott monument, preparatory to the innocent Sunday dance round that edifice, with which the diversions invariably close.'[30] Although only a passing reference, Dickens appears to have approved of how the monument had become embedded in the culture of the city and was used as part of people's lives and of the celebration.[31] Dickens did not favour the look of the memorial, but he enjoyed the fact that its existence reminded people, even subconsciously, of Sir Walter Scott. However, Dickens's dislike of literary monuments would continue throughout his life, and he continued to view elements of ostentation as a problematic practice of commemoration.

---

[29] Queen Victoria, Journals (Friday 16 April 1880) and (Monday 21 May 1894), <http://www.queenvictoriasjournals.org/home.do> [accessed 10 October 2018].
[30] Dickens to Mrs Lehmann (6 December 1868), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.12,* p. 233.
[31] For more about Dickens's views on popular culture activities see Sally Ledger, *Dickens and Popular Radical Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Catalysts, Committees and Commemoration

A comparison between Dickens's commemorative activities before and after he saw the finished Scott monument suggests that it was the catalyst for his dislike of large acts of memorialisation. Elaborate monuments and burial practices were used at the time to emphasise one's wealth and social status.[32] Within Highgate cemetery, for example, the graves of the dead competed to illustrate their superior social status, as those who were buried higher up the hill were considered more successful in life.[33] However, as elaborate monuments grew in popularity, others, like Dickens encouraged simpler forms of commemoration.[34] In 1845, before he saw the Scott monument, Dickens was keen to have his name included as a member of the 'Committee of the Hood Fund, in honour of Thomas Hood'.[35] The two men had become acquainted in the early 1840s and developed a close friendship following Hood's review of Dickens's work.[36] The committee was fundraising for a monument to be erected over Hood's grave at Kensal Green. Dickens wrote, 'May all success attend it!'[37] The Hood monument, however, was not erected for some years due to mismanagement, and in this time, Dickens had witnessed the Scott monument and changed his stance on memorialisation.[38]

One week before the Hood committee contacted him in 1852, Dickens outlined his thoughts in a letter to W. H. Wills, 'my impression is that I shall not subscribe to the projected Hood

[32] George Nash, 'Pomp and Circumstances', in P. M. Graves-Brown ed., *Matter, Materiality and Modern Culture* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 112-131. Also noted by James Curl, *Victorian Celebration of Death,* p. 194.
[33] Ibid, p. 118.
[34] See for example, Pickering and Tyrell, 'The Public Memorial of Reform: Commemoration and Contestation'; John Garnett, 'Nonconformists, economic ethics and consumer society in mid-Victorian Britain', *Culture and the Nonconformist Tradition,* ed. by Jane Shaw and Alan Kreider (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1999), pp. 95-116.
[35] Dickens to F. O. Ward (12 July 1845), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.4,* p. 331.
[36] For more about the development of their friendship and Hood's review of *The Old Curiosity Shop* see the editorial notes in Dickens to Thomas Hood (Late February 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 2,* p. 220.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Dickens to F. O. Ward (12 July 1845), Editorial Notes, *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 4*, p. 331.

monument, as I am not at all favourable to such posthumous honours.'[39] When the committee did contact him, he stated in a letter to John Watkins on 18 October 1852, 'I have the greatest tenderness for the memory of Hood, as I had for himself. But I am not very favourable to posthumous memorials in the Monument way.'[40] His dislike of 'the Monument way' highlights Dickens's fear that an extravagant design would be picked for Hood if a new committee were to take over. He continued his letter to Watkins by stating:

> I should have a melancholy gratification in privately assisting to place a simple and plain record over the remains of a great writer, that should be as modest as he was himself; but I regard any other movement in connexion [sic] with his mortal resting-place as a mistake.[41]

Dickens's desire for 'a simple and plain' memorial shows that he believed the committee would create something else, an edifice that was ostentatious and similar to the Scott monument. Dickens explained further: 'I should exceedingly regret to see any such appeal as you contemplate, made public; remembering another public appeal that was made (and responded to) after Hood's death.'[42] Dickens was highlighting the same problem he had initially had with Scott's monument. As a public appeal had already occurred and been unsuccessful, Dickens believed it was wrong to continue pushing for money, especially as the public would have been aware of a failed fundraising attempt. Dickens felt that the fundraising attempt should not overshadow the cause. When Dickens had initially agreed to help, it directly followed Hood's death in 1845. However, seven years had passed, and the lack of money and proper management had done little to strengthen Hood's posthumous reputation.

Dickens did not want Hood's monument to seem like a charity case, as this would tarnish the latter's reputation. As Dickens stated many years later in 1864, in regard to fundraising for a

[39] Dickens to W. H. Wills (12 October 1852), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 6,* p. 777.
[40] Dickens to John Watkins (18 October 1852), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 6,* p. 779.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.

literary monument to Thackeray, 'to have to tout for it, would be to fail.'[43] Although Dickens has been linked to philanthropy, he was critical of certain charitable activities.[44] He did not like, for example, the way charities often asked for money.[45] In one letter he stated that he 'suffered' from charities, as 'Benevolent men get behind the piers of the gates, lying in wait for my going out'.[46] Although he may have been plagued by more requests for money because of his status, Dickens condemned fundraisers' behaviour, calling them 'bullies'.[47] He may have feared that the continued calls for more money would cause some resentment towards Hood. Although Dickens was more charitable with his time than with his money, he was willing to give, in order 'to alleviate *real distress'.*[48] It is unlikely he would have considered funding a large and seemingly unwanted monument as a truly charitable endeavour.

Dickens instead advocated for private forms of commemoration. Although he offered to write the inscription for Hood's memorial, Dickens insisted that his assistance should be private as he did not want to be publicly associated with the monument:[49]

> I think that I best discharge my duty to my deceased friend, and best consult the respect and love with which I remember him, by declining to join in any such public endeavour as that which you (in all generosity and singleness of purpose, I am sure) advance.[50]

Dickens was only willing to be a public member of the committee which would provide for Hood's widow and children. He felt this should be the charitable incentive, rather than the

---

[43] Dickens to Shirley Brooks (21 June 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.10,* p. 406.
[44] For a full look at his charitable activities, see Norris Pope, 'Charity and Dickens', *Oxford Reader's Companion to Dickens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 499-502.
[45] For more about the dominance of philanthropy in the Victorian period see, for example, Sarah Flew, 'Unveiling the Anonymous Philanthropist: Charity in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of Victorian Culture,* 20:2 (2015), 20-33; and Megan Clare Webber, 'Troubling Agency: Agency and Charity in Early Nineteenth Century London', *Historical Research,* 91:252 (2018), 117-136.
[46] Dickens to Edmund Yates (28 April 1858), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.8*, p. 553.
[47] Ibid.
[48] Pope, 'Charity and Dickens'. Dickens to W. H. Wills (14 January 1856), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 8,* pp. 24-5.
[49] Dickens to John Watkins (18 October 1852), Editorial Notes, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 6,* p. 779.
[50] Ibid.

purchase of a monument. *Memorials of Thomas Hood* (1860), edited by Hood's daughter, Frances Freeling Broderip, was commissioned after Hood's death and is a collection of letters and personal biography surrounding the later years of his life. The volume documents Dickens's actions regarding the Hood monument. Dickens is not listed in the passage thanking those for their involvement in the memorial, but he is noted later in the chapter where Hood's children offer their 'most sincere and grateful thanks' to their father's friends who supported them and 'assisted in the completion of these volumes'.[51] Dickens was willing to help commemorate Hood through literature rather than a monument. In addition, his impulse to help the family of dead authors is evident in his establishment of the Guild of Literature and Art, which financially supported writers and their families.[52]

Another reason for Dickens's inclination towards private commemoration was that he believed that public memorials did little to connect the living to the dead. This was his view, not only regarding authors, but also other figures of note. When approached to help raise money for a monument to Prince Albert in 1862, he replied that he had 'no faith in this kind of "Memorial"'.[53] His use of inverted commas implies that the monument, in fact, did little to memorialise Albert. One of Dickens's objections to Prince Albert's monument in Kensington Gardens was his disbelief that it would help preserve his memory among future generations. He wrote in the same letter:

> I have never yet observed it to do any good whatever, either towards preserving the remembrance of the virtuous Dead, or towards establishing any sort of concord or contentment (as to the accomplishment of the object in hand), among the Living.[54]

In Dickens's mind, large monuments did little to engrain the dead within cultural memory; by stating they do not establish 'concord' or 'contentment', he implies that memorials do

[51] Frances Freeling Broderip, *Memorials of Thomas Hood* (London: Edward Moxon and Co, 1860), p. 275 and p. 279.
[52] For more detail, see the previous chapter p. 95.
[53] Dickens to Henry Cole (10 April 1862), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 10,* p. 69.
[54] Ibid.

the opposite and create a negative relationship between the living and the dead.[55] Although Dickens died before the memorial's completion in 1872, he may have seen the plans or heard about the general idea of the design. The monument consisted of a statue of Albert housed within a spire, very similar in concept to the Scott monument which Dickens so despised, perhaps giving him more reason to avoid involvement.

Statuemania and Shakespeare

Dickens's had a specific dislike of statues, which are a subcategory of monuments. John argues that Dickens disliked statues because they elevate the figure 'out of the community'.[56] There was no assurance that a statue would encourage a passer-by to commemorate that particular person. Phillip J. Waller notes that at the end of the nineteenth century there was a general aversion to statues as they were 'the least satisfactory way of representing multiple meanings' as people 'have different visions of a writer'.[57] There is an inherent fixity to a statue that prevents them from being as open to interpretation as intangible forms of commemoration. Although it can be argued that a sculptor can engrain a statue with multiple meanings, the essence of Waller's argument that statues cannot express all that a writer, or other figures of note, meant to everyone, is in my view valid.[58]

---

[55] This was perhaps encouraged by the difference in how the rich and poor were commemorated in the nineteenth century. This notion is explored extensively in Nash, 'Pomp and Circumstances', pp. 112-131. General changes in attitudes to monuments during this period are explored in James Curl's work *Death and Architecture* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2002).

[56] Juliet John, 'Things, Words and the Meanings of Art', *Dickens and Modernity,* ed. by Juliet John (New York: Boydell and Brewer, 2012), pp. 115-132, p. 127. This links to Brown's 'thing theory', which makes things 'concrete yet ambiguous within the everyday', Brown, 'Thing Theory', p. 4. See also Jennifer Sattaur, 'Thinking Objectively: An Overview of Thing Theory in Victorian Studies', *Victorian Literature and Culture,* 40:1 (2012), 347-357.

[57] Waller, *Writers, Readers and Reputations,* p. 247.

[58] The reaction to the memorial in honour of Mary Wollstonecraft, in Newington Green, London highlights this issue. Although many praised the creation of a sculpture commemorating Wollstonecraft, particularly because women are honoured with far fewer monuments than men, there was substantial criticism concerning the nude female figure which adorns the top of the conceptual piece. The work sparked comment from other authors, with Malorie Blackman stating, 'Genuine question: Why present Mary Wollstonecraft as naked? I've seen many statues of male writers, rights activists and philosophers and I can't remember any of them being bare-assed'. Although raising

Dickens was actively considering the placement of statues in the 1840s, before he saw the Scott monument. In 1846, he made a speech where he referenced the statue of Shakespeare which stood outside the Drury Lane theatre.[59] Dickens continued to consider the placement of Shakespearian statues, as the following year, when writing *Dombey and Son* (1846), he described an encounter between Mr. Perch and Captain Cuttle. When the Captain raises a toast to 'Wal'r!' (Walter), Perch assumes he is toasting the poet Edmund Waller.[60] Perch then considers that 'if he had proposed to put a statue up – say Shakespeare's for example – in a civic thoroughfare, he could hardly have done a greater outrage to Mr. Perch's experience'.[61] Perch appears to reflect Dickens's growing misgivings about public literary monuments placed in the middle of busy areas and dreaded the same thing occurring to Shakespeare.

In 1860, after seeing the Scott monument, Dickens advocated that the location of the Drury Lane Shakespeare statue was no longer appropriate. The area surrounding a statue sometimes, unintentionally but significantly, affected the posthumous reputation of an author.[62] Dickens highlighted how the area around Drury Lane which from the 'days of theatres' had been 'prosperous', had now been transformed into 'mouldy dens.'[63] Dickens

---

importance questions about gender, it also highlights the subjective nature of statues. BBC, 'Mary Wollstonecraft Statue: 'Mother of Feminism' sculpture provokes backlash <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-54886813> [accessed 10 November 2020]. Malorie Blackman, Twitter post regarding Mary Wollstonecraft (@malorieblackman, 10 November 2020). More about the debate and wider public opinions can be seen in the responses to these Twitter threads by Fern Riddell, Twitter post regarding Mary Wollstonecraft (@FernRiddell, 10 November 2020) and Mona Eltahawy, Twitter post regarding Mary Wollstonecraft, 10 November 2020).

[59] Charles Dickens, 'General Theatrical Fund 6 April 1846', *The Speeches of Charles Dickens,* p. 70.

[60] Edmund Waller (1606-87) a royalist poet, Charles Dickens, *Dombey and Son,* explanatory notes, p. 954.

[61] Charles Dickens, *Dombey and Son,* p. 235.

[62] Pickering and Tyrell have highlighted that the interpretation of memorials can change over time and be affected by locations, Paul A. Pickering and Alex Tyrell, 'The Public Memorial of Reform: Commemoration and Contestation', *Contested Sites: Commemoration, Memorial and Popular Politics in Nineteenth Century Britain,* ed. by Paul A. Pickering and Alex Tyrell, (Ashgate: Aldershot, 2004). The same notions can be applied to statues.

[63] Charles Dickens, 'The Uncommercial Traveller', *All the Year Round* (25 February, 1860), *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-ii/page-416.html> [accessed 21 June 2021], p. 416. Drury Lane was a theatre which 'attracted a

stated that the change to the area, and the theatre itself, was, 'most ruefully contemplated that evening, by the statue of Shakespeare, with the rain-drops coursing one another down its innocent nose'.[64] The statue of Shakespeare, in Dickens's opinion, stood in an area of London, and next to a theatre, which did not reflect the Bard's literary status. The Theatre Royal had gone through a period of deterioration for much of the mid-nineteenth century.[65] It had passed through the hands of many managers, including Dickens's close friend Macready. Jim Davis and Victor Emeljanow convincingly argue that Dickens was probably disappointed in the state of this particular theatre as he had supported it during Macready's management period, which ended in 1851.[66]

By the 1860s Dickens was adamant about his dislike of memorials, especially statues. There was, as *The Times* termed it, a period of 'statuemania' during the 1850s, as statues were erected throughout London.[67] Dickens took issue with the sheer number of statues, as he expressed in 1861 that 'the existing abominations in that wise fill my soul with grief and despair. I will be one of any committee to take any public statue down, but cannot be a committee-man to set one up'.[68] He further ironised this practice by including ten volumes of the fake book *Catalogue of the Statues to the Duke of Wellington*, in his joke faux bookcase

---

cross-class audience' as stated by Jeffrey Richards, 'Drury Lane Imperialism' *Politics, Performance, and Popular Culture,* ed. by Peter Yeandle et al. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016), no p.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Britannia Academia, 'Drury Lane', <https://academic-eb-com.ezproxy01.rhul.ac.uk/levels/collegiate/article/Drury-Lane-Theatre/31263> [accessed 8 June 2020].

[66] For more about the management of the theatre, see Brian Dobbs, *Drury Lane* (Toronto: Cassell and Company, 1972). Dickens's relationship with the theatre is explored within Jim Davis and Victor Emeljanow, *Reflecting the Audience: London Theatre Going 1840-1880* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2001), p. 202.

[67] The prominence of statues and sculpture is explored in Pickering and Tyrell, 'The Public Memorial of Reform: Commemoration and Contestation'; and Angela Dunstan, 'Reading Victorian Sculpture', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*', 22 (2016), doi: 10.16995/ntn.776 . James Steven Curl also notes how the Victorians were 'prolific erectors of statues' in *Victorian Celebration of Death* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2001), p. 218.

[68] Dickens to W. Hepworth Dixon (31 January 1861), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.9,* p. 379. This statement calls to mind the tearing down of Colston's statue in Bristol. For a greater discussion about this see the conclusion.

at Gad's Hill.[69] He was not alone in his dislike of statues as others also felt that the value of monuments was becoming 'trivialised' as more were erected.[70] In a letter to Hepworth-Dixon in 1864 regarding a monument to Shakespeare, Dickens wrote, 'I dread the notion of a statue moreover—shiver and tremble at the thought of another graven image in some public place.'[71] The use of 'graven image' mimics one of the ten commandments, 'thou shall not make untee thee any graven image' and implies that Dickens was against these statues becoming public idols and used as a method of veneration.[72]

The same year Dickens stated regarding a request to be on the committee for a statue of the Earl of Dundonald, 'I have no faith in statues, and no desire to help towards the remembrance of any man in that manner'.[73] Dickens did not see statues as enduring monuments, and he referenced this idea within his fiction. In *David Copperfield,* when David walks through Canterbury he sees, 'statues, long thrown down, and crumbled away, like the reverential pilgrims who had gazed upon them'.[74] Similarly, Little Nell sees 'an empty niche from which some old statue had fallen or been carried away hundreds of years ago'.[75]

Dickens seems to have disliked literary statues depicting fictional characters. During the Great Exhibition, Robert Ball Hughes exhibited two statues, one of Oliver Twist and one of Little Nell. Dickens, however, made no effort to go and see them despite attending the exhibition.[76] It is difficult to ascertain whether he was against these statues because they

[69] This also mocked the commemorative practices surrounding the Duke, as there were eighteen statues and monuments to him around the UK and Ireland by the time Dickens died.
[70] Pickering and Tyrell, 'The Public Memorial of Reform: Commemoration and Contestation'.
[71] Dickens to W. Hepworth Dixon (15 January 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 10,* p. 341.
[72] The second commandment reads: 'Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them', Exodus, 20.
[73] Dickens to W. Hepworth Dixon (31 January 1861), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.9,* p. 379.
[74] Dickens, *David Copperfield,* p. 481.
[75] Dickens, *The Old Curiosity Shop,* p. 211.
[76] Dickens to Unknown (15 October 1851), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 6,* p. 521.

were of fictional creations or because they were of *his* fictional creations.[77] It is probable that he disliked the idea of concrete representations of his own work, which fixed the look of his characters and did not allow for fluidity of interpretation.[78]

Exceptions to the Monumental Rule

Dickens was not wholly against literary monuments, however. There were certain exceptions where he was willing to give money to some literary appeals. Two such exceptions concerned monuments to Chaucer and Shakespeare. It appears that, for Dickens, literary status was a determinant for warranting physical memorialisation. In 1850, he gave five shillings towards the upkeep of the monument that marked the site of 'brave old Chaucer's tomb' in Westminster Abbey, which required conservation work.[79] Although Dickens is less vocal about his respect for Chaucer in his letter than other authors, he does call him the 'father of English poetry' and in one letter offers an analysis of 'The Pardoner' in *Canterbury Tales*, showing his knowledge of Chaucer's work.[80] However, in 1851, Dickens received a letter regarding a new monument to Chaucer, to which he replied, 'he is not quite sure that the father of English poetry needs any Monument, or that—as Monuments and statues go—a new one would be very much to his honour.'[81] Dickens was unwilling to fund a supplementary monument when one already existed. Yet, his complex nature can be seen in March 1864, when he gave ten pounds to a memorial for Shakespeare but actively stated 'in which, or in any other such Monument, I don't believe!'[82] Furthermore, despite his own donation, he actively critiqued the ideas of the Shakespeare committee in 1864 when he wrote that it would be a 'poor act

[77] Dickens also often used 'statue' as a negative descriptor of some of his characters, primarily those who are considered cold and unmoving such as Mr. Dombey, Mrs Clennam and Estella. It is unlikely he would have considered the childhood innocence of Oliver and Nell in this way. Dickens, *Dombey and Son,* p. 530; Charles Dickens, *Little Dorrit*, ed. by Harvey Peter Suckersmith (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1979), p. 1030; Charles Dickens, *Great Expectations,* ed. by Margaret Cardwell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), p. 245.
[78] See the next chapter for more about this.
[79] Dickens to William J. Thoms (30 May 1850), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 6,* p. 108.
[80] Dickens to Miss Ryland (9 August 1851), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 6,* p. 456; and Dickens to Sir James Emerson Tennent (20 August 1866), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 11,* p. 235.
[81] Dickens to Miss Ryland (9 August 1851), *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 6*, p. 456.
[82] Dickens to W. Hepworth Dixon (18 March 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol. 10,* p. 372.

of homage to his memory and genius to set up a Memorial to him among the London statues.'[83]

There was one key exception to Dickens's dislike for monuments, and that was busts. Although busts can be incorporated into public spaces, they are subtler than a statue, making them a less ostentatious form of public commemoration. Busts of authors, particularly those of Milton and Shakespeare, were also found in some Victorian domestic settings.[84] Their situation within the home made them a more private form of commemoration, thus more appropriate in Dickens's mind. Dickens was aware of the popularity of domestic Shakespearian busts in particular. Within an engraving by George Cattermole given to Dickens of *The Old Curiosity Shop,* a bust of Shakespeare can be seen on top of the cluttered shelves within the shop.[85] Furthermore, after Dickens became friends with Wilkie Collins in 1851, Collins published his Christmas book *Mr. Wray's Cash Box* (1851). The tale follows a man who takes a cast of Shakespeare's bust in Stratford to make a fortune by selling the likeness; Collins was likely inspired by other sculptors who had cast the monument, such as George Bullock in 1814.[86] John Soane, among others, owned one of Bullock's casts and displayed it within his home.[87] Collins notes in his introduction that it 'may possibly happen that some of the readers of this story have in their possession a plaster 'mask' or face and forehead – of Shakespeare which is cast from the celebrated Stratford bust'.[88]

Dickens owned busts himself. In 1854, he possessed three, and two were depictions of authors; the bust of Walter Savage Landor stood on his staircase, and the representation of

---

[83] Dickens to John Bainbridge (6 September 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 10,* p. 426.
[84] The V&A collection outlines this with multiple examples of nineteenth century domestic Shakespearian busts within their collection.
[85] For more about this with images see Denis Moiseev, 'A Hidden tribute to Shakespeare', <https://dickensmuseum.com/blogs/charles-dickens-museum/112183174-a-hidden-tribute-to-shakespeare> [accessed 2 July 2020].
[86] Wilkie Collins, *Mr. Wray's Cash Box; Or the Mask and the Mystery* (London: Richard Bentley, 1852). Wray carried the cast in his cashbox, implying the value of Shakespeare was both in his works and the popularity of his image. Noted in Yeats, 'Shakespeare's Victorian Legacy', p. 480.
[87] 'Bust of Shakespeare', Sir John Soane's Collections Online < http://collections.soane.org/object-sc18> [accessed 12 August 2020].
[88] Collins, *Mr. Wray's Cash Box; Or the Mask and the Mystery,* p. v.

Basil Hall was situated on the landing in Devonshire Terrace.[89] He also modelled for a series of busts by the sculptor Patric Park; Dickens described Park as the 'modern Michael Angelo', and sat for multiple 'pleasant sittings' throughout 1840 and 1841.[90] Dickens's belief that busts were a more acceptable form of commemoration continued throughout his life. In 1854, he contributed to and later received a copy of a marble bust of his friend Sir Thomas Talfourd.[91] A few months later he was asked to be on the committee which was fundraising for a ten-foot-high statue of John Wilson, which he refused, re-enforcing his preference for busts over statues.[92]

Even later in life, such as in 1864, Dickens wrote that busts were 'infinitely preferable to a statue'.[93] He stated this in reference to a fundraiser for a monument to Thackeray. He reasons 'that you can almost dictate the terms of the subscription, and can certainly ensure its being a complete success.'[94] This sense of control and the strong likelihood of completion was important to Dickens. Furthermore, he wrote that 'the bust is a more modest memorial, and therefore seems to me in better taste'.[95] Lars Berggren in his analysis of nineteenth century sculpture states that busts were not considered 'true' monuments, as a certain size and complexity was required for something to be considered a monument in the nineteenth century.[96] Dickens's advocation for busts continued when he contributed £10 towards a bust of Thackeray in 1866.[97]

The 'Best Monument': An Author's Work

[89] Devonshire Terrace Inventory (May 1854), Appendix C, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 4,* p. 719.
[90] Dickens to Daniel Maclise (25 October 1840), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 2,* p. 138. Park (1811-1855) was a Scottish sculptor. Dickens to Patric Park (14 November 1840), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 2,* p. 150.
[91] Dickens to Peter Cunningham (7 June 1854), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 7,* Editorial Notes, p. 349.
[92] Ibid.
[93] Dickens to Shirley Brooks (21 June 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 10,* p. 407.
[94] Ibid.
[95] Ibid.
[96] Lars Berggren, 'The Monumentomania of the Nineteenth', p. 561.
[97] Dickens to Shirley Brooks (9 January 1866), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 11,* p. 134.

In the last decade of his life, Dickens had a clear idea of how he thought an author should be remembered, himself included. By 1860, Dickens actively asserted that an author was best commemorated through their work. When approached by Count Strzelecki about an undocumented fundraising attempt, Dickens replied: 'I have of late greatly considered the question of Testimonials to the memory of Writers […] their best Monument is in their own Works'.[98] He used Shakespeare as an example, 'I believe that Shakespeare has left his best monument in his works, and is best left without any other'.[99] He professed a similar notion regarding Milton, 'I cannot honestly say that I consider Milton in need of any Memorial, or that I am in the abstract enthusiastic in respect of that kind of remembrance of any great man, whose works remain to bear witness for him.'[100] Dickens applied the same notion to himself, as in his Will he stated, 'I rest my claims to the remembrance of my country upon my published works'.[101]

Dickens was, and is, not alone in championing that an author should be remembered through their works. Rigney has highlighted how novels can be seen as a form of 'portable monument' as they can be appropriated to different contexts and allow an author to be remembered through their work.[102] Michael D. Garval explores a similar topic, noting how in the nineteenth century literary works were seen as monuments and act as a form of 'mausoleum', while the author should be considered a 'sculptor'.[103] His study focuses primarily on French literary culture and Victor Hugo, but his arguments can be applied to Dickens and nineteenth-century England. He claims that the metaphor of literary works as

---

[98] Dickens to Count Strzelecki (20 April 1860), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 9,* p. 237.
[99] Dickens to W. Hepworth Dixon (15 January 1864), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 10,* p. 341. Dickens goes on to say he would consider scholarships as another form of memorial, for more about Dickens and the Shakespeare schools see the previous chapter.
[100] Dickens to William Miller (15 February 1862), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 10,* p. 36.
[101] 'Charles Dickens's Will', *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 12,* p. 732. Dickens's dislike of monumentalisation could be connected to Barthes's death of the author, as he did not want biographical elements of his life distorting the way readers encountered his works, however, this field of analysis will not be explored here. Roland Barthes, *Death of the Author* <http://www.tbook.constantvzw.org/wp-content/death_authorbarthes.pdf> [accessed 4 November 2020].
[102] Ann Rigney, *The Afterlives of Walter Scott,* p. 17.
[103] Michael D. Garval, *A Dream of Stone: Fame, Vision and Monumentality in Nineteenth Century French Literary Culture* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004), p. 37 and p. 42.

monuments began in 1820 and by the middle of the century 'had become inescapable' in popular culture.[104] Dickens may have been influenced by this idea during his own frequent trips to France.

Dickens showed his awareness of works as monuments within his novel *The Mystery of Edwin Drood*, which he, uncannily, was writing as he approached his death. Within the book, Durdles can be used to analyse Dickens's feelings towards monuments.[105] As the stonemason, Durdles is the provider of monuments to the people of Cloisterham. He has been read as a way of 'reviving the past', and a critique of the Gothic tradition, yet is not often the key focus of theories surrounding the supposed ending of the book.[106] What is not highlighted is how Durdles is also a personification of monuments. The stonemason's very appearance echoes a monument as he is described as 'The Stony One' and is 'covered from head to foot with old mortar, lime and stone grit'.[107] He speaks in the third person, imitating the monuments and graves he is surrounded by, and states that he is suffering from 'Tombatism'.[108] The joke is paraphrasing rheumatism, yet it implies that the tombs themselves have seeped into Durdles's very being. Although burial sites themselves are not monuments, the elaborate adornment of them often makes them monumental, and Durdles's profession as stonemason centres around converting graves into monuments.

Durdles's characteristics add to the notion that he is the personification of a monument. He is only encountered within the graveyard precinct of the Cathedral, implying a stationary nature like a monument. He lacks emotion and humour and remains motionless, even while he is damaged and disrespected through Deputy's repeated act of stoning him.[109] As he stays

---

[104] Ibid, p. 41.
[105] Brian Rosenberg has highlighted how characters can be used to reveal qualities of Dickens's own imagination, 'Character and Contradiction in Dickens', *Nineteenth Century Literature,* 47:2 (1992), 145-163, p. 149.
[106] Charles Kostelnick, 'Dickens's Quarrel with the Gothic: Ruskin, Durdles and Edwin Drood'. *Dickens Studies Newsletter,* 8:4 (1977), 104-108. Not mentioned often or in an intrinsic way in Peter Orford, *The Mystery of Edwin Drood: Charles Dickens's Unfinished Novel and Our Endless Attempts to End It* (Barnsley: Pen and Sword History, 2018).
[107] Charles Dickens, *The Mystery of Edwin Drood,* ed. by Margaret Cardwell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009), p. 35.
[108] Ibid, p.29, and p. 30.
[109] Ibid, p. 104, p. 214, p. 31.

motionless, sometimes hit by the stones, Dickens describes how 'Durdles seems indifferent to either fortune'.[110] His passivity and seeming inability to stop the abuse highlights the motionless nature of monuments. His only company is the other graves and monuments whom he speaks of as friends, and it is noted that 'with the Cathedral crypt he is better acquainted than any living authority'.[111] Durdles symbolises the solitary and disconnected nature of monuments. People only interact with him out of necessity, and he can be exploited at the whims of others, such as by Jasper, who seemingly plies him with drink to use his keys.[112]

Through Durdles, Dickens ironises the power of monuments and is self-reflective about authorship. Durdles declares that when stood among the stone memorials he is '"surrounded by his works, like a poplar [sic] author"', mirroring the idea that literature was seen as a form of memorial at the time.[113] However, Durdles's home is surrounded by 'unfinished tombs', reinforcing the fact that many physical monumental acts are not completed, and then lay forgotten.[114] This is echoed within *David Copperfield,* where Mr. Dick cannot finish his own memorial. Dickens seems to be subtly advocating that memorialisation was a process, whereas an author's work would last longer. Ironically, Dickens died leaving *Edwin Drood* unfinished.

Durdles's promotion of monuments demonstrates how Dickens continued to consider their importance within society as he approached his own death. Furthermore, Dickens uses Durdles to outline his dislike for the inherent elitism which is associated with memorialisation. Durdles is an advocate for monuments and believes that those without one deserve to be forgotten. He states, '"of the common folk that is merely bundled up in turf and brambles, the less said, the better. A poor lot, soon forgot"'.[115] As explored below, Dickens did not

[110] Ibid, p. 32
[111] Ibid, p. 28.
[112] Ibid, p. 108.
[113] Ibid, p. 33.
[114] Ibid, p. 37.
[115] Ibid, p. 33. A similar idea is noted by George Eliot in the last line of *Middlemarch* which reads: 'things are not so ill with you and me as they might have been, is half owing to the number who lived faithfully a hidden life, and rest in unvisited tombs'. Published from 1871-

believe this to be the case and felt that what people did in life, no matter their status, was more important than the tangible monuments they left behind. He felt this in regard to all memorials, not just literary ones.

Dying Wishes and Burying a Legacy

In 1869, Dickens wrote his Will and Testament. The document outlines the usual practicalities concerning his estate after his death and I will analyse how the document explicitly outlined Dickens's plans for his commemoration and memorialisation. John has argued that 'paradoxically it is in his Will that Dickens's will to shape his posthumous image is least visible'.[116] Although on the surface this does seem to be the case, the document can instead be read as a subtle critique of the bad practices, especially regarding literary commemoration and memorialisation, which Dickens had observed during his lifetime. He advocated that he was not to be made the 'subject of any monument, memorial, or testimonial'.[117] This not only reiterates his aversion to public commemoration but also indicates that he did not want to be the subject of a public fundraising appeal which would be necessary in order to fund a tangible monument, as he did not leave money for such a purpose. This prevented a memorial from being raised in his honour immediately following his death. However, Dickens's ambiguity when it came to the location of his grave was to change the shape of his literary legacy forever.

Dickens's grave was the only public, tangible site that he intended to leave behind. He did not want it to be monumental as within his Will, Dickens stated his desire for a plain grave; 'I direct that my name be inscribed in plain English letters on my tomb without the addition of Mr. or Esquire'.[118] The preference for a plain grave was a sentiment Dickens professed within *Household Words,* he wrote: 'the more truly great the man, the more truly little the

2, it is plausible that she may have been influenced by Dickens in this notion as *Drood* was published in 1870. George Eliot, *Middlemarch* (London: Vintage, 2007), p. 889.

[116] John, *Dickens and Mass Culture,* p. 248.

[117] 'Charles Dickens's Will', *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 12,* p. 732.

[118] 'Charles Dickens Will', *Pilgrim Letters Vol. 12,* p. 732.

ceremony' and 'undoubtedly […] the simple epitaph is the most perfect'.[119] His decision for a simple epitaph proclaims his own supposed modesty. His Will further stated, 'I emphatically direct that I be buried in an inexpensive, unostentatious and strictly private manner', echoing the statements he had advocated in commemorating others.[120]

Dickens's Will stated there was 'no public announcement to be made of the time or place of my burial.'[121] It seems likely that Dickens omitted any mention of where he wanted to be buried so he could guarantee that his burial would be a private affair. However, the absence of a burial location has led some, including Slater, to imply that Dickens secretly desired to be buried in Westminster Abbey.[122] It should be noted that Dickens's silence on the matter was in stark contrast to how specific he was about what he did *not* want, such as his desire that there was to be 'at the utmost not more than three plain mourning coaches be employed; and that those who attend my funeral wear no scarf, cloak, black bow, long hat-band, or other such revolting absurdity'.[123] However, as will be seen, the lack of specificity should not be used as an endorsement for his subsequent burial in Poets' Corner after his death on 9 June 1870.

Public pressure encouraged Dickens's burial at Westminster Abbey as *The Times* launched a petition to have Dickens buried in Poets' Corner, and other papers followed suit. *The*

---

[119] Charles Dickens, 'Trading in Death', *Household Words*, (27 November 1852) *Dickens Journals Online* <https://www.djo.org.uk/household-words/volume-vi/page-241.html> [accessed 21 June 2021], p. 242. This idea was similarly advocated by other contributors to the journal, for example in, Hannay, James, 'Graves and Epitaphs', *Household Words* (16 October, 1852), *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/household-words/volume-vi/page-105.html> [accessed 26 June 2021], p. 107. Hannay was a writer who also had connections to the *Morning Chronicle* and Thackeray. See D. J. Taylor, 'James Hannay, *ODNB* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/12213> [accessed 12/08/19].

[120] Ibid.

[121] Ibid.

[122] Slater, *Charles Dickens,* p. 618.

[123] Charles Dickens Will', *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 12,* p. 732. This is also a comment about the ostentatious nature of funerary practice. For more about general Victorian attitudes to funerals see: Patricia Jalland, *Death in the Victorian Family,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); James Walvin, 'Dust to Dust: Celebrations of Death in Victorian England', *Historical Reflections,* 9:3 (1982), 353-371; Gerhard Joseph and Herbert F. Tucker, 'Passing On: Death', *A New Companion to Victorian Literature and Culture,* ed. by Herbert F. Tucker (Oxford: Wiley & Sons, 2014), pp. 110-123.

Daily News, for example, stated, 'Charles Dickens must find recognition in Westminster Abbey with so many of the wisest, greatest and best whom England has ever known.'[124] Litvack has recently explored how Forster and Stanley, the Dean of Westminster, conspired to change Dickens's resting place for their own benefit.[125] I agree that Forster and Stanley had a hand in changing Dickens's burial site, and Leon Litvack's study aptly contributes to the understanding that Dickens did not want to be buried in Westminster Abbey, and reiterates that the arrangements surrounding Dickens's burial deserve more critical attention.

However, Litvack does not outline how these changes affected Dickens's legacy and literary heritage. Dickens did not want to be buried in Westminster Abbey but in a local churchyard, not far from Gad's Hill. Not only is Dickens's desired location usually overlooked within the scholarship but the rationale behind the location has not been investigated. Some biographers claim that he desired to be laid to rest in Rochester, which was not the case.[126] His daughter Mamie highlighted, 'as my father had expressed a wish to be buried in the quiet little churchyard at Shorne, arrangements were made for the interment to take place there'.[127] Her emphasis on 'quiet' implies a level of privacy that is in line with his modest requests in his will.[128] Forster reiterates this when he states that Dickens 'himself would have preferred to lie in the small graveyard under Rochester Castle wall, or in the little churches of Cobham and Shorne'.[129] Shorne churchyard stands less than two miles away from Gad's Hill. Although some scholars like Storey agree that Dickens

---

[124] *Daily News* (14 June 1870), Scrapbook on Dickens's Death, Charles Dickens Museum, London, p. 17.
[125] Leon Litvack, 'Charles Dickens: Newly Discovered Documents Reveal Truth About His Death and Burial, *The Conversation,* (2020) <https://theconversation.com/charles-dickens-newly-discovered-documents-reveal-truth-about-his-death-and-burial-130079> [accessed 27 July 2021]
[126] See Slater, *Charles Dickens,* p. 613. Tony Lynch, *Dickens's England: A Traveller's Companion* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1986), p. 95 and 188; Norman and Jeanne Mackenzie, *Dickens: A Life,* p. 390. Other biographers go into little detail about the burial arrangements. For example, Fred Kaplan, *Dickens: A Biography* (Sevenoaks: Hodder and Stoughton, 1988), and Ackroyd, *Dickens.*
[127] Mamie Dickens, 'My Father', (April, 1893) p. 50.
[128] Ibid.
[129] Forster, *Life of Dickens, Vol.2,* p. 417.

would have wanted to be buried 'near Gad's Hill', or, as Cedric Dickens states, 'in a little and secluded Kentish garden', what is missing is an exploration of *why* Dickens wanted this.[130]

Dickens chose this site because he had been influenced by the literary graves he had visited. Both Shakespeare and Scott had been buried close to their final homes, with Shakespeare in the Holy Trinity Church in Stratford-upon-Avon and Scott in Dryburgh Abbey near Abbotsford.[131] Westover argues that visiting places associated with dead writers was of particular interest to living authors as 'they engage with their dead predecessors and look to their own future fame'.[132] However, it should be noted that Dickens was more hesitant about describing his time at authors' graves than he was of recording his experiences of literary houses, often giving little description aside from noting his visit to the site.[133]

When Dickens did record a visit to an author's grave, he paid particular attention to its location. Many of the literary graves he wrote about were situated abroad, primarily in Italy, such as those described in *Pictures From Italy* (1846). He emphasises, for example, how Leghorn, now Livorno, was 'made illustrious by Smollett's grave'.[134] Smollett had died during his travels in Italy and been buried in the nearby English cemetery.[135] Dickens had read Smollett when he was a child, which may have encouraged him to visit the town. It appears that he was aware that areas surrounding literary tourist sites become more appealing to

---

[130] Graham Storey, 'Preface', *Letters of Charles Dickens*, *Vol.12,* p. xviii and Cedric Dickens, 'Postscript' in Alan S. Watts, *Dickens At Gad's Hill* (Reading: Elvendon Press, 1989), p. 109. Cedric Dickens's words are very reminiscent of Dickens's description of Juliet's grave. Dickens's burial arrangements are more recently explored by A. N. Wilson, but again no indication as to why Dickens's wanted a quiet burial is explored. A. N. Wilson, *The Mystery of Charles Dickens* (London: Atlantic Books, 2020).

[131] He visited Scott's grave in 1841, Dickens to John Forster (9 July 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.*2*,* p. 324. He had visited Shakespeare's grave by 1846, as he mentions it in Charles Dickens, 'General Theatrical Fund 6 April 1846', *The Speeches of Charles Dickens,* p. 70. He may have visited Shakespeare's grave during his 1838 visit, for more see Chapter Two.

[132] Westover, *Necromanticism: Travelling to Meet the Dead 1750-1860,* p. 9.

[133] See for example the only reference to his time at Scott's grave, Dickens to John Forster (9 July 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.*2, p. 324.

[134] Dickens, *Pictures From Italy,* p. 359.

[135] He was the only writer buried there at the time aside from Margaret King (1773-1835).

tourists because of these associations.[136] He does not, however, go into any detail about his response to the grave, which is marked by an obelisk, instead concentrating his description on the town, with no further mention of Smollett's grave.

In Rome, Dickens writes more explicitly about the literary graves he encountered there and their locations. The pyramid marking the tomb of Caius Cestius meant more to him as an 'English traveller' because it was a 'marker' of Shelley's and Keats's graves.[137] As at Smollett's resting place, Dickens emphasises the location of the tombs rather than his experience of visiting the graves themselves. This could be the reason why Keats's grave 'shines brightly in the landscape of a calm Italian night' to him, as it was a piece of home in the Italian landscape.[138] He perhaps also singles out Keats's grave as he had died so young while he was staying in Rome. Although Dickens went into little detail about these graves, the fact that he referenced these literary encounters in his writings at all shows the importance he attributed to them.

Dickens did visit some literary graves in Britain and was again affected by their location. When they were in close proximity to the writer's house, Dickens tended to visit the grave last. When he planned his visit to Abbotsford, Dickens stated, 'we shall have a whole day at Scott's house and tomb'.[139] It seems that Dickens felt this order, the house then tomb, was the appropriate way to encounter literary sites. Graves are key sites of authorial tourism as they complete the author's life story as: 'the author's history is incomplete without a final apotheosis that comes with death'.[140] The sequence is a way of encountering and imagining what the author would have been like while living, before experiencing the finality of the author's death, which can genuinely be felt at the grave.

---

[136] Smollett is mentioned in the list of childhood readings within the semi-autobiographical Charles Dickens, *David Copperfield,* p.48. For more about how Smollett inspired Dickens see, for example, Lionel Kelly, *Tobias Smollett: The Literary Heritage* (London: Routledge, 1987).
[137] Dickens, *Pictures from Italy*, p. 398.
[138] Ibid.
[139] Dickens to John Forster (9 July 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.*2*,* p. 324. For more about the visit see Chapter One.
[140] Westover, 'Godwin, Literary Tourism and the Work of Necromanticism', p. 308.

Dickens felt that this sequence also applied to fictional literary tourist sites. He noted when he visited the Shakespearian character, Juliet's, grave in Verona, 'from Juliet's home, to Juliet's tomb, is a transition as natural to the visitor, as to fair Juliet herself'. [141] Although a fictional character, there had been rival families the Montecchi and Cappelletti living in Verona in the thirteenth century, who Shakespeare most probably used as inspiration for the story.[142] Furthermore, as Richard Hosely has demonstrated, the play became 'accepted as history', causing literary tourist sites like Juliet's grave to emerge.[143] When he visited, Dickens was taken by a local guide to 'an old, old garden' and was shown 'a little tank, or water trough' which was proclaimed to be Juliet's tomb. Dickens then wrote, 'with the best disposition in the world to believe, I could do no more than believe that the bright-eyed woman believed; so I gave her that much credit and her customary fee in ready money'.[144]

Dickens did not believe the site was the inspiration for Juliet's tomb. However, he was not disappointed; he in fact felt elated. 'It was a pleasure, rather than a disappointment, that Juliet's resting-place was forgotten' and that she was able 'to lie out of the track of tourists'.[145] Despite having sought the grave himself, he appeared happy that the real resting place of Juliet was unknown. Like other anti-tourists, he took pleasure in identifying something different from the established tourist experience.[146] He highlighted this when he happily imagined that Juliet, in her genuine resting place, would have no visitors aside from the 'spring rain, and sweet air, and sunshine'.[147] His statement implies that for him the best form of literary grave was a private commemoration, as it was 'better' to lie off of the tourist trail as he hoped his body would in Shorne churchyard.[148]

---

[141] Dickens, *Pictures From Italy*, p. 338. And for more about Juliet's home see the previous chapter.
[142] For more about the sources, see for example, *The Yale Shakespeare: The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet,* ed. by Richard Hosely (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917), p. 168.
[143] Ibid.
[144] Dickens, *Pictures from Italy*, p. 338.
[145] Ibid.
[146] For more anti-tourism see p. 13 and pp. 51-2.
[147] Dickens, *Pictures From Italy*, p. 338.
[148] Ibid.

After Dickens's death and the smaller churchyards were unavailable, the family 'entertained' the idea that Dickens could be buried in Rochester after the Dean and Chapter of Rochester Cathedral made a proposition.[149] The idea was pushed by the press, for example, *The Illustrated Times* who defended Rochester as a suitable burial place, further engraining the suggestion that Dickens wished to be buried there. The paper noted that Rochester had 'ample room for the erection of a fitting memorial' and that 'literary pilgrims would have made their way thither from all parts of the earth, just as they do now to Stratford-upon-Avon'.[150] This too did not come into fruition because as Mamie stated:

> There was a general and very earnest desire that he should find his last resting place at Westminster Abbey [….] To such a tribute to our father's memory we could make no possible objection although it was with great regret that we relinquished the plan to lay him in a spot so closely identified with his life and works.[151]

By Dickens's lifetime, Westminster Abbey, and more precisely Poets' Corner, was already a notable literary tourist site. Through his illuminating study, Ousby has shown how important Westminster Abbey was as a literary shrine.[152] He highlights how this began with Chaucer's burial in 1400, which instigated a trend for other writers, including Spenser, to want to be buried there.[153] There was also a practice of memorialisation as well as entombing; for example, a monument to Shakespeare was erected after a campaign led by Alexander Pope succeeded in 1740. However, Ousby rightly argues that Westminster Abbey and its growing Poets' Corner quickly became commercialised.[154] It was promoted as a place of literary pilgrimage to rival Stratford-upon-Avon, as the 'monuments were intended for public gaze',

---

[149] Forster, *Life of Dickens, Vol.2,* p. 417. Mamie stated that these arrangements were 'abandoned in consequence of a request from the Dean and chapter of Rochester Cathedral that his remains might repose there', in Mamie Dickens, 'My Father', (April, 1893) p. 50. For more see Litvack, 'Charles Dickens: Newly Discovered Documents Reveal Truth About His Death and Burial'.

[150] *Illustrated Times*, 'Mr. Dickens's House at Gad's Hill', Scrapbook on Dickens's Death, Charles Dickens Museum, London, p. 10.

[151] Mamie Dickens, 'My Father', (April, 1893) p. 50.

[152] Ousby, *The Englishman's England,* p. 19.

[153] Ibid. Edmund Spenser (1553-98).

[154] Ibid, p. 22.

and 'such spectacles easily took on the trappings of a modern tourist attraction'.[155] By the nineteenth century, visitors had to pay for a tour of the Abbey and tip the guide.[156] Poets' Corner ultimately became 'an index to those writers whom the church of England could approve', and some seemingly immoral authors were refused.[157] Lord Byron, for example, was denied burial there because the 'open profligacy of his life' prevented him from being suitable for commemoration in the Abbey.[158] Despite the Abbey's best efforts, Watson underlines that the space 'has always been full of notable absences and indeed unwanted presences'.[159]

Dickens stated that he had visited Westminster Abbey, 'God knows how often', but in the last decade of his life, he openly proclaimed that he did not want to be buried there.[160] In a letter to Thomas Fairbairn in 1868, Dickens wrote regarding the memorial of Sir James Brookes, the 'posthumous honours of Committee, Subscription, and Westminster Abbey, are so profoundly unsatisfactory in my eyes'.[161] He concluded the letter with a statement of intent, to be 'quietly buried without any Memorial but such as I may have set up in my lifetime'.[162] The 'Memorial' Dickens had set up in his own lifetime refers to his work, which he continually reiterated as his preferred literary monument.

Dickens had been critical of the practices within Westminster Abbey for much of his life. Waters states that Dickens was aware of how commemorative objects became a way of 'expanding commercial society'.[163] In 1844, he explored the unnecessary expense of burials and memorials in Westminster Abbey in *Martin Chuzzlewit.* Mr. Mould the undertaker, when

---

[155] Ibid, p. 28 and p. 23.
[156] Richard Altick highlights how it was three pence to enter Poets' Corner and a further three pence to see the rest. *The Shows of London* (London: Harvard University Press, 1978), p. 452.
[157] Wilkie Collins and George Elliot were also refused. Ousby, *The Englishman's England,* p. 26.
[158] Westminster Abbey, 'Lord Byron', <https://www.westminster-abbey.org/abbey-commemorations/commemorations/lord-byron/> [accessed 22 November 2018].
[159] Watson, *The Literary Tourist*, p. 26.
[160] Dickens to Washington Irving (21 April 1841), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 2,* p. 267.
[161] Dickens to Thomas Fairbairn (24 June 1868), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 12,* p. 137.
[162] Ibid.
[163] Waters, 'Materialising Mourning', p. 16.

listing the many additions to a funeral that money could buy, including 'four horses to a vehicle', 'plumage of the ostrich' and 'any number of walking attendants', concludes by stating, 'it can give him a handsome tomb, it can give him a place in Westminster Abbey itself, if he chooses to invest it in such a purpose'.[164] He implies that anyone who had money, no matter their moral worth, could be buried in Westminster Abbey. By having the questionable undertaker advocate for burial in Westminster Abbey, Dickens is critiquing the practice of expensive burials and implies that Westminster Abbey is the worst culprit.

Dickens's distaste for the Abbey's memorialisation practices continued into his later years. In *Our Mutual Friend,* at the funeral of Betty Higden, Dickens describes a churchyard where none of the graves were marked. When Sloppy weeps over Betty's grave, the Reverend observes, 'Not a very poor grave […] when it has that homely figure on it. Richer, I think, than it could be made by most of the sculpture in Westminster Abbey!'[165] Dickens implies here that what genuinely matters is not the place of burial, or how expensive it was, but the sentiment and feeling that the dead inspire in the living.

Dickens was not the first author to be buried in Westminster Abbey against his wishes. The trend of changing the provisions of writers' burials so they would be interred in Poets' Corner appears to have begun with William Gifford in 1826. He had wished to be buried in South Audley Chapel in Mayfair, but he was instead laid to rest in the Abbey.[166] This created a chain of events where the Abbey tried to secure the remains of other authors.[167] Dickens's entombment in the Abbey encouraged the precedent for other well-known authors to be buried there and inspired others to change their burial arrangements so that their bodies could be given to the nation. Orwell states in reference to Dickens's burial that, 'Dickens is

---

[164] Charles Dickens, *Martin Chuzzlewit,* ed. by Margaret Cardwell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), p. 323.
[165] Charles Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend,* ed. Michael Cotsell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 516.
[166] Westminster Abbey, 'William Gifford', < https://www.westminster-abbey.org/abbey-commemorations/commemorations/william-gifford/ > [accessed 22 November 2018].
[167] They could not move Shakespeare as he was protected by the inscription on his tomb which reads: 'Good friend for Jesus sake forbeare, to dig the dust enclosed here. Blessed be the man that spares these stones, and cursed be he that moves my bones.' Although attributed to Shakespeare, its origins are debated, see Matthews, *Poetical Remains*, p. 43.

one of those writers who are well worth stealing' and describes the movement of Dickens's body to Westminster Abbey as a form of theft.[168] Robert Browning, who was a friend of Dickens, was similarly buried in Westminster Abbey against his wishes in 1889. He died while in Venice and wished to be buried alongside his wife, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, in a cemetery in Florence. The cemetery was closed, however, so alternative arrangements were made to bury him in Poets' Corner.[169] The defying of his express wish to buried alongside his wife caused some consternation, leading those at Westminster to suggest the reburial of Elizabeth Barrett Browning in the Abbey alongside him. The family objected and decided to leave both resting places in peace.[170]

The most contentious example concerns Thomas Hardy, who had wanted to be buried in Stinsford, Dorset, alongside his first wife and generations of his family. His wish was 'well known'; however, a proposition was put forward that he should be buried in Westminster Abbey, in Poets' Corner.[171] His second wife Florence wrote that 'after much consideration a compromise was found between this definite personal wish and the nation's claim to the ashes of the great poet'.[172] It was another key point that as an atheist, the Abbey would only accept the ashes of Hardy, who had it seems, never considered cremation.[173] The compromise which was finally agreed upon was that Hardy's heart would be buried in Stinsford while his ashes would be placed in the Abbey.

---

[168] George Orwell, 'Charles Dickens' in George Orwell, *George Orwell Essays* (London: Penguin, 1994), p. 35.
[169] Westminster Abbey, 'Robert and Elizabeth Barrett Browning', < https://www.westminster-abbey.org/abbey-commemorations/commemorations/robert-and-elizabeth-barrett-browning/#i12821> [accessed 22 November 2018].
[170] For more about her grave see Samantha Matthews, 'Entombing the Woman Poet: Tribute to Elizabeth Barrett Browning', *Studies in Browning and His Circle,* 24 (2001), 31-53.
[171] Florence Emily Hardy, *The Later Years of Thomas Hardy 1892-1928* (Cambridge University Press, 1930), p. 267.
[172] Ibid.
[173] Christopher Howse, 'The Burial of the Heart', The Telegraph < https://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherhowse/3557176/The-burial-of-the-heart.html> [accessed 22 November 2018].

Dickens's burial, aside from the location, did adhere to the wishes he had outlined in his Will: as Forster states, 'the public homage […] had to be reconciled with his own instructions'.[174] Only close friends and family attended the service, and he was buried in a plain oak coffin with a brass plate.[175] Over the grave was placed a plain inscription which reads, 'Charles Dickens/ Born 7th February 1812/ Died 9th June 1870'. It was a quiet affair; his friend Thomas Carlyle described it as a 'little memorial of the loved friend.'[176] However, when the intimate service was finished, the Abbey was opened to the public and 'from then on hundreds of mourners flocked to the open grave and filled the deep vault with flowers'.[177] Although many of these visitors may have had the best intentions, it meant that Dickens's open grave, thus his body and himself, became an object of public spectacle as people blindly 'flocked' to see it.[178] Forster highlights how following the burial, there 'came unbidden mourners in such crowds, that the Dean had to request permission to keep the grave open until Thursday'.[179] The burial was less about what Dickens wanted and more about what the nation desired. Alexis Easley has shown that popular authors were used in the Victorian period to create a 'coherent national history', and Joep Leerssen and Ann Rigney's edited collection demonstrates how writers were used as a nation-building tool.[180] The public was proud to call Dickens their own and wanted to demonstrate this to the world. As one newspaper stated, it was 'well that the mortal remains of England's greatest modern novelist should rest in her most honoured mausoleum'.[181]

The Other Monuments: Gad's Hill and the Chalet

---

[174] Forster, *Life of Dickens,* p. 417.
[175] *Daily News* (15 June 1870), Scrapbook on Dickens's Death, Charles Dickens Museum, London, p. 18.
[176] Letter from Thomas Carlyle to Georgina (25 August 1870), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[177] Mamie Dickens, 'My Father', (April, 1893) p. 50.
[178] Ibid.
[179] Forster, *Life of Dickens,* p. 418.
[180] Alexis Easley, *Literary Celebrity, Gender and Victorian Authorship 1850-1914* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011). *Commemorating Writers in Nineteenth Century Europe: Nation Building and Centenary Fever,* ed. by Joep Leerssen and Ann Rigney (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).
[181] *Graphic*, 'Poets' Corner' (2 July 1870), Frederick Kitton*, Dickensiana, Vol.2*, Charles Dickens Museum, London, p. 104.

His grave was not, however, the only tangible site that Dickens left behind. By the late 1860s, Dickens had been adamant that he would not be remembered through a physical site other than his grave. Although, as explored in previous chapters, he had created his own form of Abbotsford at Gad's Hill, and built upon the property's literary associations with Shakespeare, by 1869, he had decided that, unlike Scott, his iconic home would not be left open to the public. He made plans to dismantle the house, so that it could not be converted into a literary tourist site.[182] Dickens stated in his Will that his real estate should be 'converted into personalty upon my decease', the land sold, and the money raised should be used to pay for 'debts, funeral and testamentary expenses, and legacies'.[183] There was to be no preservation of his home; he left strict instructions that it was to be sold 'immediately' or as soon as the executors of his Will deemed appropriate.[184] Furthermore, he insisted that his possessions should be auctioned off.

Domestic auctions were commonplace within the period, often following a person's death or period of financial instability.[185] The auction of the contents of Gad's Hill, like other such sales, was advertised in the press and included a list of items to be sold.[186] Dickens himself mentions household auctions within his novels; at Satis House there is an auction 'of the Household Furniture and Effects', and in *Dombey and Son*, Dickens describes the aftermath of the auction of Dombey's property: 'Nothing is left about the house but scattered leaves of catalogues, littered scraps of straw and hay, and a battery of pewter pots behind the hall-door'.[187] Although Dickens is critical of the attendees of these auctions, describing them as 'herds of

[182] Dickens appears to have had a destructive side to him when it came to his possessions. When he finished his last public reading, he wanted to destroy his reading desk but was persuaded by his daughter, Kate, to give it to her instead. Ackroyd, *Dickens,* p. 1067.
[183] 'Personalty' is a dated legal term referring to personal belongings. 'Charles Dickens's Will', *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 12,* p. 732.
[184] 'Charles Dickens Will', *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 12,* p. 732.
[185] For more about household auctions in the nineteenth century see Elizabeth Coggin Womack, 'Nineteenth Century Auction Narratives and Compassionate Reading', *Victorian Review,* 43:2 (2017), 229-246.
[186] *Morning Post* (11 July 1870 Scrapbook on Dickens's Death, Charles Dickens Museum, London, p. 33.
[187] Dickens, *Great Expectations,* p. 469; Dickens, *Dombey and Son,* p. 791. David Trotter explores the prevalence of such auctions in Victorian Fiction within 'Household Clearances in Victorian Fiction', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century* (2008), 1-19.

shabby vampires', it appears that he understood the necessity of such sales.[188] His close friend the Countess of Blessington, for example, auctioned the contents of her home, Gore House, in 1849, and although Dickens saw the bills of sale with 'a very doleful eye', he still attended it.[189]

The Gad's Hill sale was contradictory to Dickens's private nature as it was a form of public spectacle; however it was also an efficient method of dispersing of his household goods and making money. The objects placed on sale took on a reverential quality as they were described as 'the relics of Charles Dickens', yet as John has argued the items for sale were, in fact, second rate.[190] The auction did not include many highly prized items; these were held by Georgina Hogarth and either given out to close friends or later sold to aid her financially. John states that Dickens understood 'that modesty and a perceived distance from the management of one's cultural legacy were the best forms of posthumous self-promotion'.[191] Although John is correct in questioning why Dickens allowed such a public sale to take place, what is emphasised here is that by dispersing his goods in such a manner, Dickens was preventing a collection of his possessions from being housed in one place, further preventing it from becoming a literary site. The public auction meant not all the items could be purchased by one person. Through the conversion of the objects into 'personalty' and the distribution of them, the auction helped to demolish the physical remains of Dickens and stripped the house of its, and Dickens's, character.

Despite Dickens's actions, Gad's Hill remained a place tied to his legacy. His son Charley defied the wishes of Dickens and Georgina by purchasing Gad's Hill for himself.[192] It appears that not all of Dickens's family were willing to follow Dickens's plan for his legacy. He and Charley had become distant after the separation from Catherine, with Charley choosing to remain close

[188] Dickens, *Dombey and Son,* p. 791.
[189] Dickens to John Leech (30 April 1849), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 5,* p. 530. The accompanying editorial notes explain his attendance.
[190] *Daily Telegraph* (6 July 1870), Scrapbook on Dickens's Death, Charles Dickens Museum, London, p. 34. John, *Dickens and Mass Culture*, p. 246.
[191] John, *Dickens and Mass Culture*, p.248.
[192] Charley retained Gad's Hill for the rest of his life. It was sold following his death in 1897. Tomalin, *Charles Dickens: A Life,* p. 403. Lynch, *Dickens's England,* p. 96.

to his mother. Through Charley the property retained its Dickens connection and became a site of literary pilgrimage; for example, a reporter from the *Daily News* visited in July 1870, and called himself a 'pilgrim'.[193] The resulting article records how coach parties would frequently stop to have a picnic beside Dickens's residence and peer over the garden wall.[194] By the turn of the nineteenth century, Dickens and his home were already becoming a significant part of the literary heritage landscape. The house was a highlight in books covering places associated with Dickens such as *A Week's Tramp in Dickens Land* (1891).[195] However, in 1924, Gad's Hill became a school, which it remains today. Although it remains a public Dickens heritage site as you can book a tour of the house on selected dates throughout the year, it is not a memorial in the same sense as Abbotsford as it is primarily a place of education, where Dickens's works are taught and valued.[196]

Charley's purchase of Gad's Hill enabled another potential literary tourist destination to remain intact. On Christmas Eve 1864, Dickens was given a wooden Swiss chalet as a present, by his friend Charles Fechter.[197] The chalet came dismantled and was built on a piece of land which Dickens owned across the road from Gad's Hill, for use as a study. He planned for the chalet to be dismantled following his death as he had arranged for the land it stood on to be sold.[198] However, after Charley purchased Gad's Hill, the chalet was preserved and later sold so that it could be exhibited to the public.[199] Although it was a temporary structure, Dickens himself feared that it would be 'blown away'; it instead became a permanent place connected

---

[193] *Daily News*, 'A Pilgrimage to Gad's Hill' (8 July 1870), Scrapbook on Dickens's Death, Charles Dickens Museum, London, p. 34.
[194] Ibid.
[195] *Literary World,* 'Tramps in Dickens Land' (December 1891), Frederick Kitton, *Dickensiana, Vol. 1*, Charles Dickens Museum, London, p. 81. Original book by William Richard Hughes.
[196] Grottos built by Alexander Pope in Twickenham are also on the land of a school, so the conversion of Dickens's house into a school is not an entirely unusual occurrence. See http://www.twickenham-museum.org.uk/detail.php?aid=9&cid=1&ctid=2 [accessed 12/08/19].
[197] Charles Fechter (1824-79) was an actor and playwright who became friends with Dickens in the early 1860s. The chalet is noted in Dickens to John Forster (7 January 1865), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 11,* p. 3.
[198] Dickens to Fredrick Ouvry (25 April 1869), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 12*, p. 344.
[199] Tomalin, *Charles Dickens: A Life,* p. 403. For more about the movement of the chalet see the next chapter.

to Dickens.[200] The chalet's very ability to be dismantled and moved made it ideal for redisplay. Moreover, Dickens's own mythologising of it, describing how 'my room is up among the branches of the trees; and the birds and the butterflies fly in and out' encouraged others, including Charley and later the Dickens Fellowship, to feel the structure was worth preserving.[201] This meant there were at least two tangible pieces of Dickens's literary legacy, in addition to his grave, still in existence after his death.

Dickens could not retain complete control of his literary legacy beyond the grave. He could not stop his legacy from reflecting some of the aspects that he had disliked about those of other authors. Despite Dickens's wishes, his grave in Westminster Abbey became a focus of attention after his death as it was converted into a shrine, where people come to pay their respects. Mamie wrote how 'every year on the ninth of June and on Christmas Day, we find other flowers screwn by other unknown hands on that sacred spot'.[202] This practice continued and was often recorded in the press, such as in 1897, twenty-seven years after Dickens's death, when a young boy of around ten years old came alone one day in December to lay a bunch of violets on Dickens's grave.[203] Today many still lay tributes on the gravestone every year, including the Dickens Fellowship who make it part of their summer activities.[204]

The longer Dickens was dead, however, the more calls there were to 'memorialise' him properly. For many, Dickens's modest grave was not enough. This opinion was present after Dickens's death, but it was often quickly quashed due to Dickens's own proclamations.[205]

---

[200] Dickens to John Forster (7 January 1865), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 11*, p. 3.
[201] This description of his chalet is first described in a letter to J. T. Fields, summer 1865, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 11,* p. 79, but a strikingly similar description is also in letter to Mrs J. T. Fields, 25 May 1868, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 12,* p. 119. See the next chapter for more about Dickens Fellowship involvement in preserving the chalet.
[202] Mamie Dickens, 'My Father', (April, 1893) p. 50.
[203] *Daily News*, 'In memory of Charles Dickens' (June 1897), Frederick Kitton *Dickensiana, Vol.2*, Charles Dickens Museum, London, p. 108.
[204] Dickens Fellowship, 'Central Fellowship', < http://www.dickensfellowship.org/central-fellowship> [accessed 4 November 2019]. Despite this, the Fellowship maintains that it has a 'neutral' interpretation of Dickens's attitude towards memorialisation. See the next chapter for more about the Fellowship's attitudes towards Dickensian memorialisation and commemoration.
[205] See for example, *Birmingham Daily Post,* (June 1870), Frederick Kitton, *Dickensiana, Vol.2*, Charles Dickens Museum, London, p. 107.

However, twenty-five years after his death, there were more appeals to memorialise him. Many of these calls for a monument in the British press came as a backlash to a decision made by the London County Council in 1892. The city was approached by the American sculptor Francis Edwin Elwell who proposed to give the city his sculpture of Dickens and Little Nell.[206] His offer, however, was refused, because Dickens's Will specifically stated that he would have disapproved of the scheme. His explicit wish to have no memorial was seen by the Council 'as solemn and imperious as those which are carved over the grave of Shakespeare at Stratford On [sic] Avon'.[207] Dickens's Will did offer some protection of his legacy. The article concluded with a statement Dickens would probably have approved of: 'as long as English is spoken, the name and memory of Charles Dickens can stand in need neither of bronze nor marble.'[208]

Slowly, Dickens's control over his posthumous legacy began to unravel as time went on. His dislike of memorials has largely slipped from public knowledge. Statues have been raised in his supposed honour, including one in Sydney, Australia. In 2014, a statue of Dickens was erected in Portsmouth. It is the only statue of Dickens in the UK and was unveiled on what would have been his 202nd birthday.[209] The statue is situated in the centre of the city, alongside the Guildhall. Slightly smaller than life size, Dickens sits proudly on a pile of his own works, representing his literary feat. There was, and still is, a debate about the statue as some of the press continue to promote the view that, despite it being over 150 years since his death, Dickens's advocation against monuments should still be respected.[210] Slowly, more physical forms of commemoration have been created in his honour, such as plaques, street signs and even the £10 note. Dickens came to be commemorated in different ways as the twentieth century progressed, some of which he would not have predicted himself, such as the

[206] The statue did not go to waste, however, as it toured America, winning awards at the World Columbian Exposition before it was purchased in 1896 and placed in Clark Park Philadelphia, where it still stands today. London County Council (1892),Frederick Kitton, *Dickensiana Vol.2*, Charles Dickens Museum, London, p. 107.
[207] Ibid.
[208] Ibid.
[209] BBC News, 'Dickens Statue Unveiled in Portsmouth' < http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-26072562 > [accessed 22nd November 2018].
[210] See newspaper articles such as http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-hampshire-26035450 for more information.

conversion of his former home, 48 Doughty Street, into a literary tourist site, which the next chapter explores.

Figure 2: Portsmouth Statue of Dickens, Emily Smith, 2020

Chapter Four: The Founding of the Dickens House

Charles Dickens's literary legacy developed throughout the twentieth century and was aided by the actions of the Dickens Fellowship. This group of enthusiasts helped to preserve and promote Dickens and his works, and also established the Dickens literary tourist site, 48 Doughty Street, London. The property is where Dickens had lived from 1837 to 1839, finished *The Pickwick Papers* (1836), written *Oliver Twist* (1837)*, Nicholas Nickleby* (1839) and started *Barnaby Rudge* (1841). The townhouse, spread over five floors including a basement, was Dickens's first secure property for him and his family, and he paid £80 for a three-year lease. The house was on a prosperous street and outlined Dickens's rise in status and the beginning of his authorial success.[1] After Dickens vacated the property in 1839, it remained in private hands and was subsequently a boarding house, until 1922 when the freehold for the house came on the open market.[2] It was then purchased by the Fellowship and became the Dickens House, or as it is known today, the Charles Dickens Museum.

This chapter explores the Fellowship's reason for buying the house and turning it into a public literary tourist site. Firstly, the fundraising campaign to purchase the property will be investigated; comparisons will be made to the foundation of other writers' houses, and particular attention will be paid to the involvement of American benefactors. I will emphasise how Dickens's dislike of tangible memorials affected the Fellowship's interpretation of the property, arguing that the Fellowship's fourth societal aim, 'to assist in the preservation and purchase of buildings and objects associated with [Dickens's] name or mentioned in his works', though well-intentioned, was at odds with Dickens's wishes.[3] The Fellowship's fourth

---

[1] For more detail about Dickens's time in the property, see John Greaves, *Dickens at Doughty Street* (London: Elm Tree Books, 1975).

[2] Owners included the Gosset family who lived there from 1856-1883, a diamond merchant Nerses Nersessian bought it in 1899 before it became a boarding house in 1903. Doughty Street was a prime location for boarding houses, with twenty out of the sixty-two properties offering residence to boarders. Exhibitions 1970s/80s: History of 48/49 Doughty Street, Charles Dickens Museum London,

[3] Dickens Fellowship, 'Constitution', <http://www.dickensfellowship.org/sites/default/files/basic/DF%20Constitution.pdf> [accessed 4 May 2020].

aim led to a questionable justification in purchasing the house and placed the Fellowship in an invidious position where they tried to respect Dickens's wishes whilst maintaining their aims as a society.[4]

Although it may be argued that it is of no importance whether Dickens might have viewed the Dickens House as a memorial or not, the Fellowship's continued defence of the monumental nature of the house shows that they felt a need justify their actions, and that Dickens's proclamations about monuments continued to affect how his legacy was preserved. As a society founded in Dickens's name, whose members prided themselves on their knowledge of his life and work, and in following his example, the monumental nature of the house was of great importance to them.[5] In order to justify the purchase of the property, the Fellowship created their own interpretation of what constituted memorialisation, which differed from Dickens's own wishes.

Dickens was against a standardised presentation of his work and his life. He did not believe it was his place to tell readers how they should interpret his works. This can be seen when he responded to George H. Lewes about a question regarding *Oliver Twist* (1838):

> I thought that passage a good one *when* I wrote it, certainly, and I felt it strongly (as I do almost every word I put on paper) *while* I wrote it, but how it came I can't tell. It came like all my other ideas, such as they are, ready made to the point of the pen—and down it went. Draw your own conclusion and hug the theory closely.[6]

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] The first three aims of the society are: 'To knit together in a common bond of friendship, lovers of that great master of humour and pathos, Charles Dickens. To spread the love of humanity, which is the keynote of all his work. To take such measures as may be expedient to remedy those existing social evils, the amelioration of which would have appealed so strongly in the heart of Charles Dickens and to help in every possible direction in the cause of the poor and oppressed.' Dickens Fellowship, 'History of the Fellowship' <https://www.dickensfellowship.org/history-fellowship> [accessed 28 August 2020].

[6] Dickens to George Henry Lewes (?9 June 1838), *Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.1,* p. 404. Dickens met Lewes in 1837 following his reviews of Dickens's work, and participated in Dickens's *Merry Wives of Windsor* productions to raise money for Shakespeare's birthplace.

Dickens acknowledges he has no control over what his readers take away from his work.

An exploration into the founding of the Dickens House not only contributes to our understanding of Dickens's evolving legacy but also to the field of literary heritage. Although there have been some studies into the founding of British literary house museums, many such studies tend to be broad theoretical explorations and few explore the practical founding and development of such properties.[7] Malcolmson's thesis *Constructing Dickens, 1900-1940*, included a study of the Dickens House. Her principal focus is the motivations of the Dickens Fellowship in founding the house, and she conducts an in-depth study into the language they used to support the fundraising campaign. She emphasises how the Fellowship made use of sentimentality and Dickens's image as a domestic man when they sought support for their project.[8] In addition, she argues that they engrained the house 'with a particular imaginative reverence as the birthplace, or home, of many of Dickens's most celebrated characters', as it was in Doughty Street that Dickens's career as a novelist blossomed.[9] She ultimately argues that the house was the Fellowship's way of 'extending their engagement with [Dickens] and his creations'.[10]

Malcolmson's argument is convincing, but still leaves a gap in the scholarship surrounding the practical development of Dickens's literary legacy. This chapter will have a greater museological focus and explore the practicalities of founding the house while comparing it directly to Dickens's views on commemoration, and the establishment of other writers' houses. I will stress how the Fellowship utilised their interpretation of the house as an appropriate monument to Dickens in order to justify their actions. The study will contribute

[7] See, for example, Linda Young 'Writers' House Museums: British Literature in the heart and on the ground', *Literary Tourism and British Isles,* ed. by Luann McCracken-Fletcher (London: Lexington Books, 2019), pp. 165-191. There are exceptions, but these are relatively small compared to the vast number of literary houses in existence. For example, Polly Atkin, 'Ghosting Grasmere: The Musealisation of Dove Cottage', *Literary Tourism and the Nineteenth Century*, ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006), pp. 84-95. American literary houses are explored in much greater detail see, for example, Szlezak's extensive study which focuses upon individual examples as well as general trends in New England, *Canonized in History.*

[8] Malcolmson, *Constructing Dickens, 1900-1940*, p. 188.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid, p. 203.

to Museum Studies and highlight the importance of studying literary houses as their own category of museum. Due to the relative lack of specific scholarship on the development of literary houses, the museumisation of historic homes will be used to provide a framework in which to analyse the establishment of a literary house.[11]

The story of the house's development needs to be told because museums not only house biographies but have a biography themselves.[12] Young has highlighted the importance of exploring the story of a historic house's museumisation (the transition into a museum). She argues that 'house museums are not all the same' and that this process of museumisation reveals much about the property as the original and shifting meanings of the house should be understood to 'maintain the cultural significance'.[13] This also applies to writers' houses. The decisions made by the Fellowship had a long-term impact on the public perception of the Dickens House.

Shillings and Farthings: Raising the Funds

The Dickens Fellowship was not the first club set up in honour of Dickens or his work.[14] While he was alive, he was already the subject of societies and was aware of them. In December 1837, Dickens was notified of the existence of the Edinburgh Pickwick Club, and he stated, 'I believe you that this is the first society of the kind, established North of the Tweed', showing that other Dickens societies had already been founded at this early stage in his career.[15] Furthermore, Dickens actively engaged with these clubs. On 21 April 1838, he was invited to visit the Pickwick Club in London, and although he could not attend the meeting they

[11] Monica Risnicoff de Gorgas, 'Reality as illusion, the historic houses that become museums', *Museum International,* 53:2 (2001), 10-15.
[12] Kate Hill, 'Introduction: Museums and Biographies', *Museums and Biographies,* ed. by Kate Hill (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012), pp. 1-10, p. 5.
[13] Young, 'House Museums Are Not all the Same', p. 2.
[14] There was also the Boz Club, set up in 1900. Emily Bell extensively explores their members and ethos in 'The Dickens Family, the Boz Club and the Fellowship', *The Dickensian,* 113:503 (2017), 219-232.
[15] Dickens to William Howison (21 December 1837), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 346. The original letter is in the Charles Dickens Museum collection.

proposed, he did visit the club more than once.[16] Dickens was not against the clubs or societies as a form of literary commemoration; as explored in Chapter Two, he was an active member of clubs and organisations created in honour of other authors and their legacies.[17]

However, after Dickens's death, it became popular for enthusiast groups to purchase literary houses in honour of an author.[18] Waller has examined how it was common at the beginning of the twentieth century for special interest groups to petition for the founding of a literary memorial, no matter how tenuous the link to the writer in question.[19] Booth highlights how 'much of the reception of authors was in the hands of amateurs'.[20] Dickens was soon coveted by such enthusiasts;[21] the Fellowship was founded in 1902, and established their publication *The Dickensian* in 1905. As they expanded and established more regional branches, they sought a building to use as their headquarters. The idea of Doughty Street as a potential solution was discussed from as early as 1910, but the Fellowship's interest in 48 Doughty Street was piqued in 1923 when the house came onto the market.[22] Doughty Street would provide not only a base for the Fellowship's operation but would also allow them to fulfil their fourth aim, preserving a building with Dickensian connections.

In the twentieth century, writers' houses were growing in popularity throughout England. As Kate Hill and Linda Young have noted, the early twentieth century was the period when many museums and heritage sites centred around a particular person, what Hill describes as

---

[16] Dickens to The Secretary of the Pickwick Club (21 April 1838), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 398.
[17] Chapter Two outlines his involvement in Shakespeare clubs.
[18] Hendrix states that the existence of a literary house tends to 'facilitate the rise of a cult' and these cults tend 'to invent and construct places'. This is an extreme reading but could in some ways be applied to the actions of the Fellowship regarding the Dickens House. Hendrix 'Writers' Houses as Media of Expression and Remembrance' p. 6.
[19] Waller, *Writers, Readers and Reputations,* p. 235.
[20] Booth, 'Houses and Things: Literary House Museums as Collective Biography', p. 239.
[21] Virginia Woolf famously stated that 'perhaps no one has suffered more than Dickens from the enthusiasm of his admirers, by which he has been made to appear not so much a great writer as an intolerable institution'. In the same study, she explores whether Dickens deserves his comparisons to Shakespeare. See Virginia Woolf, 'Dickens by a Disciple', *Times Literary Supplement* (17 March, 1919).
[22] B. W. Matz had suggested it, Exhibitions 1970s/80s: History of 48/49 Doughty Street Folder, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

'personality museums', were founded in Britain.[23] Young categorises historic houses more specifically and defines homes related to 'cultural heroes' as 'hero houses'.[24] She highlights the importance of writers within this category as the first hero houses in Britain were Walter Scott's Abbotsford and Shakespeare's birthplace. This interest in writers' houses has continued, and Young has shown that statistically, now the largest proportion of hero houses in the UK are dedicated to writers.[25]

The purchase of the house and its conversion into a tourist site would enable Dickens to have a permanent place in the literary landscape of London.[26] By the early 1900s, there were many literary sites established in the capital. The *Daily Telegraph* stated:

> Memorial houses are among London's best possession – not among her lions and show places – but among her intimate personalia. Already there are several of these houses where one can make sure of meeting the very best of literary company among the shades.[27]

However as of yet, there was no literary house dedicated to Dickens, and 'London without a Dickens museum was incomplete'.[28] The Fellowship pushed the idea that the purchase of Doughty Street would fill this gap. The President of the Fellowship and editor of *The Dickensian*, B. W. Matz was quoted saying 'there is no memorial to the greatest of Londoners

---

[23] Hill, 'Introduction: Museums and Biographies', p. 6 and Young, 'Literature, Museums and National Identity', p. 239.
[24] Young, 'House Museums Are Not all the Same', p. 2.
[25] Young, 'Literature, Museums and National Identity', p. 233.
[26] Dickens's literary heritage in London was primarily linked to topography, but there was no 'hub' for his literary heritage within the capital. Paul Westover, 'Inventing the London of Literary Tourists: Walking the Romantic City in Leigh Hunt's Wishing Cap Essays', *European Romantic Review,* 23:1 (2012), 1-19, p. 6; and Watson, 'Rambles in Literary London', pp.139-150. For more about general literary landscape see Jordi Arcos-Pumarola, Eugene Osacer Marzal and Nayra Llonch-Molina, 'Literary Urban Landscape in a Sustainable Tourism Context', *Human Geographies,* 12:2 (2018), 175-189.
[27] *Daily Telegraph* (10 June 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook*,* Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[28] *Sheffield Telegraph* (10 June 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

within the City'.[29] The press further promoted that there needed to be a place dedicated to Dickens, and more specifically, a literary house.[30]

To help justify the purchase of the house, Dickens's literary legacy was actively compared to other writers' literary legacies to highlight the omission of sites related to him. The secretary of the Manchester branch of the Dickens Fellowship stated, 'it is somewhat remarkable that fifty-three years after his death no national memorial exists to the most popular of English novelists. Shakespeare has his shrine at Stratford, Scott in Edinburgh, Burns at Dumfries, Carlyle at Ecclefechan, and Chelsea and Johnson in Lichfield'.[31] The sentiment was reiterated by Edwin Valentine Mitchell who said the Dickens House was a 'somewhat belated tribute […] belated I say because buildings with which the names of Carlyle, Johnson, Shakespeare, and Scott are associated were secured for commemoration in this way long ago'.[32] *The Birmingham Post* stated that the Fellowship 'intended to convert No 48 into a sort of Dickens shrine in the same way that Stratford on Avon possessed a shrine of Shakespeare, Cheltenham one of Carlyle and the birthplaces of Scott and Burns as memorials of those poets'.[33] The repeated references to Abbotsford and Shakespeare's birthplace show that Dickens's legacy was actively compared to the literary tourist sites that he visited during his life.[34]

Fundraising campaigns by enthusiast groups, did not always, however, 'elicit popular appeal'.[35] From almost the very moment they launched the public fundraising campaign, the Fellowship struggled to raise the much-needed funds. In 1923, they were only able to raise

[29] *Lewcastle Journal*, (20 September 1922), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[30] This trend is documented in a scrapbook of the newspaper cuttings referring to the campaign to purchase the house, Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[31] *Manchester City News* article by F. R. Dean secretary of Manchester Dickens Fellowship, Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[32] Edwin Valentine Mitchell's Book, (May 1923), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, London.
[33] *Birmingham Post,* (19 June 1922), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[34] See Chapters One and Two for his experiences of these sites.
[35] Waller, *Writers, Readers and Reputations,* p. 235.

£2000 of the £10,000 required.[36] Funding continued to be a problem when two years later they had only raised £3166 5s 6d.[37] Part of the Fellowship's financial problems came from the freehold obligation to purchase the adjoining property, 49 Doughty Street, as an even larger mortgage had to be raised.[38] There appeared to be general disbelief that the money was so hard to raise. Initially, the press blamed members of the Dickens Fellowship for failing to raise the money. *The Mirror* wrote how 'many of the names of donors of guineas and many other names of members of the Fellowship were down against very small sums. A man and his wife [for example] have five shillings or less between them'.[39]

The desperation and frustration felt by the Dickens Fellowship were echoed by the press in its calls for donations from the general public. Many newspapers chose to show how valuable Dickens was and how the house was a small tribute to the legacy he had left behind. *The Daily Graphic*, for example, wrote, 'the gift required from us is trifling compared with the gift he made to us […] We are not so poor that we cannot spare this £10,000 in honour of the man who bequeathed so rich and imperishable a heritage to humanity'.[40] There began to be louder calls suggesting that the preservation of Dickens's legacy was a general obligation. The public was also blamed rather than just the Dickens Fellowship; 'the fund is called a world's tribute

[36] *Morning Post,* (6 October 1923), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[37] Charles Wells, 'Written in the Library', *Bristol Times,* (14 February 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[38] The two properties were part of the same boarding house. After the successful purchase of both properties No. 49 was, 'altered at considerable expense to the Trustees and [was] let off in offices and so on and the rents will be added to the fees and sales money and go towards the expenses of administration […] It was estimated that the rearrangement of No. 49 would better the income of the Trustees by some £80 a year'. Later it was also used as a research site when the basement of 49 was converted into a research room. No. 49 fully became part of the house's operations in 2012, when the two properties were knocked into one. The museum staff now use 49 as offices, temporary exhibitions spaces, storage for the collection and research facilities. Leslie C. Staples, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 47 (1951), p. 94; Walter Dexter, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 31 (1935), p. 282; Michael Slater, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian* 66 (, 1970), p. 262; Malcolmson, *Constructing Dickens 1900-1940*, p. 183.
[39] *The Mirror,* (29 August 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[40] *Daily Graphic,* (6 February 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

to Dickens's memory. One feels that the world has not been over generous so far'.[41] As the *Bristol Times* despaired, 'surely if the world agreed to do this thing, it should have done it well and long ago'.[42]

The lack of funds led the Doughty Street campaign to imitate the fundraising attempts of other literary houses, particularly through the influx of American involvement in purchasing the property.[43] An American, Horace Fish, had lived in 48 Doughty Street before it was sold to the Fellowship.[44] He wrote how 'I had been puzzled as to why the house was not a museum which it ought to be', but that when the fund opened it 'seems to have fallen to the ground like a disabled balloon'.[45] Fish was probably perplexed because the preservation of literary houses in America had blossomed at the end of the nineteenth century, so writers' houses were a focal point of American interest.[46] Americans were interested in not only literary properties in the United States but also those situated abroad, particularly in Britain.[47]

---

[41] *Bristol Times* and *The Mirror* (29 August 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[42] Charles Wells, 'Written in the Library', *Bristol Times* (14 February 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[43] Americans were also interested in wider British heritage, which is a research area in its own right. American interest in European heritage following the Grand Tour is explored in William Merrill Decker, 'Americans in Europe from Henry James to the Present', *The Cambridge Companion to American Travel Writing,* ed. by Alfred Bendixen and Judith Hamera (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 128-145. For more about trans-Atlantic collaboration in, for example, in archives see Margaret Prochter, 'Consolidation and separation: British archives and American Historians at turn of Twentieth Century, *Archival Science,* 6 (2006), 361-379.

[44] Presumably, Fish was a resident of the boarding house, which was popular with Americans for its literary connections. Exhibitions 1970s/80s History of 48/49 Doughty Street, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[45] 'A Plea from Dickens Land: A letter from the American Mr. Horace Fish', *Evening News*, Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[46] For an American perspective on writers' houses see Anne Trubek, *A Sceptic's Guide to Writers' Houses* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), p. 3. An exploration of the American appetite for writers' houses from 1853-1940 is explored in Susann Bishop, 'The Allure of American Authors' Homes: Surveying Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Literary Guides', *From Page to Place: American Literary Tourism and the Afterlives of Authors,* ed. by Jennifer Harris and Hilary Iris Lowe (Massachusetts, University of Massachusetts Press, 2017), pp. 205-223.

[47] Colonial Americans seem to have felt particularly attached to British heritage, as explored by Westover, 'How America "Inherited" Literary Tourism', p. 184.

Westover has highlighted that Britain was 'an imaginary possession' for many Americans and they felt 'they knew it through literature', underlining that British literary heritage was often of particular interest.[48] The American desire to visit Britain, and to visit literary sites, is further explored by Foster.[49]

Fish was passionate that American involvement would be necessary to raise the funds. He stated, 'if it is a matter of money, I'm sure America will help, for in America Dickens is regarded with the greatest veneration', inferring that the lack of funds indicated that the English did not regard Dickens with the reverence he deserved.[50] Fish implied that there was a competition between the two countries through his statement, 'surely the English public would give a farthing and the American public would give at least a shilling'.[51] Ultimately Fish proposed a joint venture, as he concluded, 'I should like to see England and America joining hands to make this house a common memorial'.[52]

The push for a co-ordinated effort was mirrored by the Fellowship's endowment fund which advertised that it envisaged that the money would be 'readily subscribed by English, overseas and American enthusiasts'.[53] There were calls for donations in American publications. One wrote:

> If every lover of Dickens throughout the world would contribute to this world just $1 for every Dickens book read by him in his lifetime what a glorious sum would be got together, not only to free this memorial house from all encumbrance […] but to acquire the adjoining houses also and create one of the finest memorials in the world [….] The

[48] Ibid, p. 185. Further explored in Westover, 'Inventing the London of Literary Tourists', p. 11.
[49] Foster, 'Americans and Anti-Tourism', pp. 175-184.
[50] 'Interview with Horace Fish', *Evening Standard* (7 November 1923), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid.
[53] Advert for endowment fund (31 January 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

sum of $50,000 is required, and it is expected that one half of it will be raised in America.[54]

The British press, however, emphasised a rivalry between Britain and America. *The Daily Graphic* printed an article entitled 'Dickens Belongs to England' and discussed with horror that the American millionaire Cecil Palmer had offered to buy Doughty Street, before detailing that, luckily, his proposal was refused.[55] There was general distaste within the press at the idea of an American owning a property that had now been recognised as of national importance. *The Daily Graphic* advocated that Palmer should have contributed to the purchase of the property instead of attempting to buy it outright.[56]

There was a fear that the Americans would take away British heritage, specifically literary heritage.[57] *The Gentlewoman* reported regarding the purchase of Doughty Street, that 'if we don't do something about it, we may wake up one morning to find an American has arranged to take it brick by brick to New York - and we shall have deserved it'.[58] This mimicked the concern in 1847 when after the auction was announced, rumours circulated that Phineas T. Barnum would buy Shakespeare's birthplace and ship it to America.[59] Additionally, the owners of both Milton's cottage and Coleridge's cottage reported American interest in purchasing the properties before they were bought for the nation; there was supposedly a plan for Milton's Cottage to be dismantled and shipped to the United States.[60]

---

[54] *Christian Science* (6 April 1923), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[55] This Cecil Palmer was not the publisher who has been involved in printing Forster's *Life of Dickens*. *Daily Graphic* (7 November 1923), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[56] Ibid.
[57] Gregory Ashworth and Peter Howard acknowledge the strong European opposition to heritage being shipped to America in *European Heritage, Planning and Management,* (Exeter: Intellect, 1999), p.7.
[58] *Gentlewoman* (3 February 1923), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[59] See Thomas, *Shakespeare's Shrine*, pp. 56-58, and Clayton, *Who Owns the Bard?.*
[60] Milton's Cottage, 'About Milton's Cottage' < http://www.miltonscottage.org/miltons-cottage-about/#museum> [accessed 22 November 2018] and 'The purchase of Coleridge's Cottage', *Morpeth Herald,* 27 June 1908. Both these properties, like Doughty Street, had only been lived in by the authors for a short time; all three authors had only occupied these

Americans however, had frequently played a role in preserving British literary heritage, without the threat of shipping it back to America. For example, Catherine Payling has highlighted the prominent role of Americans in protecting the literary heritage of the Romantics, Keats and Shelley, in Rome. She shows how they had helped with the upkeep of Keats's grave even before they had a chance to preserve what is now the Keats-Shelley House.[61] The project to save the house was started in 1903 by a group consisting of eight Americans and one Englishman; President Theodore Roosevelt also backed it, and many of the most generous donors were American.[62] Additionally, when the Keats House in London, which Keats had lived in for seventeen months, was under threat of demolition in 1920, donations were gifted by Americans, allowing the house to be preserved and opened to the public.[63] American literary enthusiasts were not a threat, just more generous patrons of heritage, and this largely continues to be the case today.[64]

Ultimately, American involvement did little to jeopardise the purchase of these literary properties, and if anything, the competitiveness it encouraged may have helped to raise funds. This perceived rivalry ultimately worked as a marketing tactic for the fundraisers, and for the press; it was purely a good story. In terms of Doughty Street, the money to buy the freehold was eventually raised, and the house was purchased in time for the commemoration of Dickens's death in June 1925. American enthusiasm for the property continues today, with visitors from the United States making up nearly half of the museum's visitors.[65]

---

houses for two years. Perhaps the limited time the authors spent there was a deterrent for the British people to save this heritage, as a tenuous connection did not warrant preserving, whereas for the Americans tenuous connections seem to matter less.

[61] Catherine Payling, 'Memory Regained: Founding and Funding the Keats-Shelley Memorial House in Rome', *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory*, ed. by in Harald Hendrix (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), pp. 111-127, p. 113.

[62] Payling, 'Memory Regained', p. 116 and 120.

[63] City of London, 'History of the House' <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/things-to-do/keats-house/keats-history/Pages/History-of-the-house.aspx> [accessed 20 February 2019].

[64] Robert J. Janiskee, 'Historic Houses and Special Events, *Annals of Tourism Research,* 23:2 (1996), 398-414, p. 398.

[65] According to pre-COVID-19 figures. For example, statistics provided by London Leisure Pass shows that in 2019 42.44% of visitors were from the United States.

Making the Tangible Intangible: Justifying the Monumental Nature of the Dickens House

The Dickens house was officially opened to the public on 9 June 1925. Although it was a joyous occasion, Lord Birkenhead used his opening speech to justify the monumental nature of the Dickens House:

> The committee of this institution felt, however, that the house was not and could not have been the kind of memorial that Charles Dickens had in his mind. I suspect the memorial of which he was writing was the kind of statue or monolith, which would have been a material perpetuation of his name.[66]

By stating that Dickens would not have wanted a 'material perpetuation' in his honour, the speech shows that, despite presiding over a physical building, the Fellowship felt that the house constituted something other. However, as the previous chapter argues, Dickens was fundamentally against any form of tangible monument, aside from a plain grave, in his honour. Dickens explicitly stated in his Last Will and Testament that he did not wish to be made the 'subject of any monument, memorial or testimonial whatever'.[67] A monument can be defined as a 'statue, building, or any other structure erected to commemorate a famous person or notable event'.[68] The mention of 'building' shows that monuments were not restricted to graves and statues but that a house dedicated to the memory of a person also falls under this category.[69] In addition, a 'memorial' is defined as an 'object, or a festival instituted to commemorate an event or a person', whereas 'testimonial' refers to any 'a

---

[66] Quote of Lord Birkenhead speech in *Evening Standard* (9 June 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[67] Charles Dickens Will', *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol.12,* p. 732.
[68] OED, 'Monument', <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/121852?rskey=m7noTI&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid > [Accessed 17 December 2018].
[69] Houses are categorised in this way by Erin Hazard, 'Step Forth and Again Take Up Its Magic Pen: The Author's House as Informal Monument', *From Page to Place,* ed. by Jennifer Harris and Hilary Iris Lowe (Massachusetts, University of Massachusetts Press, 2017), pp. 46-67.

token, record, or manifestation'.[70] Dickens's use of these three words emphasises his dislike for the physical materiality of commemoration, where a person's memory is preserved within an object. He did not want to be remembered through something corporeal, and a house was no exception.

The Fellowship anticipated criticism, so they felt the need to justify their purchase of the house, given its monumental nature. It is unlikely this criticism would have come from the general public, who would probably have been unaware of Dickens's wishes since over fifty years had passed since his death. Instead, the Fellowship may have anticipated some animosity among fellow Dickensians, the press and the Dickens family. The Fellowship's inherently commemorative function had been noted by Dickens's son Henry, who specifically reiterated when the Fellowship was founded that Dickens 'neither desired, nor does he need, material monuments'.[71] The division between the family and the Fellowship was played upon in the press, when none of Dickens's surviving children attended the opening of the Dickens House, despite Dickens's daughter having a strong relationship with the club.[72] *The Daily Sketch* reported that 'both Sir Henry and Mrs Perugini are against the memorial to their Father seeing that his Will defiantly stated that no public memorial was to be erected in his honour as he desired to be remembered only in his work'.[73] Although other papers claim that Mrs Perugini, Dickens's daughter Kate, then aged 85, was too ill to attend, the lack of any representative from the Dickens family, implies that they were against the house, or that at very least was what some of the press wanted to suggest.

---

[70] OED, 'Memorial' <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/199745?redirectedFrom=testimonial#eid> [Accessed 17 December 2018].

[71] For more, see Emily Bell, 'Introduction', *Dickens After Dickens,* ed. by Emily Bell (Leeds: White Rose University Press, 2020), [no page numbers].

[72] Kate Dickens. There was some existing conflict between the family and the Fellowship, as the organisation was founded without notifying the Dickens family. Bell, 'The Dickens Family, the Boz Club and the Fellowship', p. 227. Their absence is noted in *Daily Dispatch* (10 June 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London; and none of Dickens's children signed their name in the first visitor books, further evidencing their absence.

[73] *Daily Sketch* (10 June 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

In their defence of the house, instead of denying the monumental value of the property, the Fellowship emphasised that Dickens would have approved of the house as a memorial. For example, Birkenhead stated that 'I am sure he would have desired it […] It will be a shrine in London to which all his admirers all over the world can come'.[74] He also stressed that 'the memorial which has been set up here is in some ways a modest one'.[75] This links to Dickens's wish for both commemoration activities and his own burial to be conducted modestly. In addition, Matz, the editor of *The Dickensian,* wrote an article entitled 'In Defence of the Dickens House', where he stated that the Dickens Museum in Portsmouth, the Boz Club and the Dickens Fellowship could each be interpreted as:

> Memorials or testimonials to Dickens or they could have no reason to exist at all; and each of them has had the wholehearted support of his family and friends. Why, therefore, any question should arise so late in the day over the best memorial of all, which is admittedly established for the encouragement of the study of his books and of the man himself, is difficult to comprehend.[76]

Matz aptly mixes tangible and intangible memorials in his interpretation of a memorial to justify the physicality of the Dickens House. Dickens may not have been against the Boz club and Dickens Fellowship, but to categorise them as the same form of memorial as literary houses is debatable.

The reference to the house in Portsmouth is noteworthy as the press had previously discredited the heritage site during the efforts to raise money for 48 Doughty Street. The *Daily Telegraph* had stated, 'the house at Landport in which he was born […] has few associations with the novelist save the one fact of his birth there'.[77] The house was opened and dedicated to Dickens in 1904, consisting of three rooms, a dining room, parlour and the room where

---

[74] Quotes for Lord Birkenhead speech, *Birmingham Post* (10 June 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[75] Ibid.
[76] B. W. Matz, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 21:3 (1925). For more about the Boz club see Bell, 'The Dickens Family, the Boz Club and the Fellowship'.
[77] *Daily Telegraph* (10 June 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

Dickens was born. It was filled with memorabilia and objects related to Dickens.[78] The Portsmouth Dickens Museum was used by the Fellowship to justify their fundraising for Doughty Street. The former was portrayed as an insufficient memorial, but its very physicality as a monument helped the Fellowship to justify their founding of a literary tourist site. As Portsmouth's links to Dickens were discredited, Dickens's relationship to Doughty Street was emphasised.

The monumental nature of the house continued to be a point of dispute during the first decade after the site opened. Within *The Dickensian,* an unusual, fictive article was published which imagined the caretaker of the Dickens House, showing a phantom Dickens around 48 Doughty Street after it opened to the public. It is entitled 'A Strange Story of the Dickens House, by Perhaps the Caretaker'.[79] The 'Caretaker' shows Dickens around the house and points out aspects of importance, 'step into the larger room Mr. Dickens, and cast your eye over the large number of books that it contains. As you see, it is used now as a library'.[80] It is a one-sided conversation, where Dickens's responses are not recorded but implied through the caretaker's replies. The monument question is stressed within the article:

> All that you see and much more every bit of it is your own work, your own memorial. A Memorial after your own heart in the veritable sense of the words that your own pen will write hereafter in your own Will. […] Permanently to preserve your published works in the house where many of them were written, for the benefit of your reader-friends and of their posterity, you'll agree, I hope, Mr. Dickens, that that will be a memorial after your own heart in the veritable sense of the words that you are going to put in your Will? "Of course!" We thought you'd say that, but thank you for saying it all the same.[81]

[78] 'Charles Dickens Birthplace', The Portsmouth Guide < http://www.portsmouth-guide.co.uk/local/cdbthp.htm> [accessed 22 October 2018].
[79] Anonymous, 'A Strange Story of the Dickens House by Perhaps the Caretaker', *The Dickensian,* 31 (1935), 280-283.
[80] Ibid, p. 281.
[81] Ibid, pp. 281-282.

The phantom Dickens's implied assent shows that the author desired to highlight that Dickens would have supported the house. Furthermore, the repetition of 'monument' emphasises that this was the object of contention, but just like Matz, the author combines the tangible with the intangible as justification. The author reiterates that because the house helps to preserve Dickens's 'published works', he would have approved of it. Although, as the previous chapter explores, Dickens felt the best memorial to an author was their works, it is a stretch to use this as justification for the preservation of a building. The article ends with Dickens agreeing to join the Fellowship and to attend the annual conference. Although comical, the article is a persuasive piece, which attempts to encourage readers of *The Dickensian* to support the Fellowship's interpretation and actions by reimagining Dickens's opinion of monuments.

The Fellowship continued to use the preservation of Dickens's work within the Dickens House as justification for its existence. From the outset, a library of books by or relating to Dickens was displayed in what would have been Dickens's drawing-room, and a bookplate was specially designed for the collection.[82] During the year of opening, the Fellowship declared, 'why, therefore, any question should arise so late in the day over the best memorial of all, which is admittedly established for the encouragement of the study of his books and of the man himself is difficult to comprehend.'[83] *The Dickensian* continually reiterates, 'what finer memorial to Dickens could we have then a well-endowed centre containing a unique library for the use of any student of Dickens.'[84] As explored in the previous chapter, Dickens had wished for there to be scholarships set up in authors' names as a form of memorialisation, and the Dickens House tried to achieve this, showing their awareness of his attitudes towards commemoration.[85] When the house opened in 1925, the library was open one evening per week for 'the approved student of Dickens only' and a reader's season ticket could be issued for those who wanted to make regular use of the library.[86] The Fellowship wanted to

[82] Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook and Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book, 1923-1935, (19 May 1925), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[83] B. W. Matz, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 21:3 (1925), p. 115.
[84] Leslie C. Staples, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 42 (1945), p. 161.
[85] See Chapter Two concerning Dickens and Shakespeare schools.
[86] Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook and Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book, 1923-1935, (2 October 1925), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

encourage the study of Dickens, which was waning in the first half of the twentieth century.[87] The sentiment of Doughty Street as the centre of Dickens study continued; in later years the house appointed 'Dickens scholars' and the house is now promoted as the international centre for research on Charles Dickens, frequently welcoming Dickens researchers.[88]

The Dickens Fellowship pushed forward the questionable justification that because Dickens had visited literary houses, he would have approved of the Dickens House. Six years after the house opened, there was an article in *The Dickensian* entitled 'The Justification of the Dickens House' by William Miller.[89] The article is short and goes into little detail about Dickens's literary tourist trips and his reactions to them.[90] However, Miller argues that because Dickens visited Abbotsford and both Johnson's and Goldsmith's houses, 'Dickens was much in favour of a monument such as we have in the Dickens House'.[91] Miller states, for example that, regarding Shakespeare's Birthplace, that because 'the object of preserving the house was to raise a monument to Shakespeare and Dickens wholly subscribed to that object by allowing his name to be associated with it', it can be assumed that Dickens would have approved of the Dickens House.[92] However, as Chapter Two outlined, Dickens's relationship with Shakespeare's birthplace was much more complicated than this, centred on instating a curator rather than preserving the house. Additionally, Miller states that Dickens was not 'inconsistent' in his views regarding literary houses.[93] However, as this thesis has outlined,

---

[87] Dickens's reputation as a literary great was critiqued throughout the twentieth century, and it would take until the turn of the twenty-first century for him to be considered a permanent member of the English literary canon. For more about his changing reputation see, for example, George H. Ford, *Dickens and His Readers: Aspects of Literary Criticism Since 1836* (New York: Norton Library, 1965); and *Dickens and the Twentieth Century,* ed. by John Gross and Gabriel Pearson (London: Routledge, 1962).

[88] The appointment of Dickens scholars seems to have been most prevalent in the 1970s and 80s. See Michael Slater, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 72 (1977); and Michael Slater, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 73 (1978). See Charles Dickens Museum, 'About Us' < https://dickensmuseum.com/pages/about-us> [accessed 16 July 2020].

[89] William Miller, 'The justification of the Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 27:1 (1931), p. 44. William Miller was an avid fan of Dickens and donated items to the Dickens House in the 1940s. It is unlikely that this is the same Miller who Dickens wrote to regarding the Milton house explored below.

[90] Ibid.

[91] Ibid.

[92] Ibid, p. 45.

[93] Ibid, p. 44.

Dickens was a complex author tourist; although Dickens visited these literary tourist sites, he did not necessarily endorse them, nor can it be assumed that he would have accepted one set up in his own supposed honour.

Miller's incorrect reading of Dickens's experiences of literary tourist sites is mimicked within some wider Dickens scholarship. Malcolmson, for example, uses Dickens's relations with Shakespeare's birthplace to justify the Dickens House and briefly notes the similarities in the creation of both sites.[94] Although her argument is valid, she does not fully examine the story of the birthplace's foundation, nor examine it directly in relation to Dickens. She gives passing reference to his refusal to be on the Shakespeare committee, but does not investigate Dickens's involvement in raising funds for a curatorship or his other visits to Stratford, as I do in Chapter Two. Malcolmson correctly notes that Dickens's writings about authors' houses were 'ambivalent'.[95] However she gives insufficient weight to the literary visits that Dickens undertook. As already shown within this thesis, Dickens was not a casual observer of literary tourist sites and in fact, actively considered the implications such sites had on an author's reputation.

Dickens held complex views about the preservation of literary houses. In 1862 he was approached regarding a fundraising appeal for a monument to Milton. Dickens wrote that he was against a monument, stating that he preferred Milton to 'be remembered through the 'works [which] remain to bear witness to him', but then concludes that 'the preservation of a grand old building is another matter'.[96] Dickens was most probably referring to Milton's sixteenth-century cottage, where the latter wrote *Paradise Lost* (1667).[97] Dickens does not elaborate in this letter, or seemingly anywhere else, why he considered the 'grand old building' an exception, adding to the ambiguity of his views. It may have been because the cottage itself was over three hundred years old, so it was the preservation of an existing

[94] Malcolmson, *Constructing Dickens 1900-1940*, p. 183.
[95] Ibid.
[96] Dickens to William Miller (15 February 1862), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 10,* p. 36.
[97] This house is the only property which belonged to Milton now in existence. In 1887 a formal fundraising began, and the house was bought for the nation, making it highly probable that this was the same property Dickens had referred to. Milton's Cottage, 'About', < https://www.miltonscottage.org/miltons-cottage-about/> [accessed 16 August 2019].

heritage site, which as Trubek argues, was difficult to argue against.[98] Although this remark could be read as an indication of Dickens's approval of literary houses, the letter is not referenced by Miller, the Fellowship or Malcolmson as a justification for the Dickens House, further highlighting that Dickens's attitudes to literary houses remain largely under-researched. The lack of elaboration, and the fact that this remark was made years before Dickens wrote his Will, allows me to maintain the argument that he was against extravagant tangible monuments, including literary houses, when he died.

The Fellowship's uneasy relationship with the definition of a Dickens memorial continues today, and remains a contentious issue among Dickensians. Within the frequently asked section on their website, the Fellowship include a response to the question 'What is the Fellowship's policy in relation to statues of Dickens?'[99] Intriguingly the emphasis is on statues and not monuments, although Dickens used both terms in his Will and the two are inexplicably linked.[100] Their response is:

> The question of whether there should or should not be public statues of Charles Dickens originates in the terms of Dickens's Will and how that Will is interpreted. Dickensians differ in their interpretations, and agree to differ. The Fellowship as an organisation accordingly holds no single corporate view on the issue. Individual members express their views as private individuals, for or against the case, but in so doing are not to be seen as representing the collective view of the Dickens Fellowship, which remains neutral on this issue.[101]

The Fellowship's inability to have a clear organisational opinion on the matter of Dickensian memorialisation infers a lack of clarity in Dickens's wishes and adds to the

---

[98] Trubek, *A Sceptic's Guide,* p. 8. Dickens expressed that he was happy to help conserve an existing memorial rather than create another, see the previous chapter regarding the Chaucer monument.
[99] Dickens Fellowship, 'Frequently Asked Questions', < http://www.dickensfellowship.org/frequently-asked-questions> [accessed 13 January 2020].
[100] See the previous chapter for more details regarding the definition of monuments.
[101] Dickens Fellowship, 'Frequently Asked Questions', < http://www.dickensfellowship.org/frequently-asked-questions> [accessed 13 January 2020].

uncertainly about the correct way to commemorate him. The Fellowship's silence on matters of monuments implies that they choose to interpret this as a separate issue from statues, which they consider to be the main object of Dickens's dislike. Meanwhile, the Dickens House continues to be promoted as something other than a monument. John Greaves, writing fifty years after the house opened to the public, urged visitors to try and think of it as, 'not a brick and stone memorial', encouraging people to turn a blind eye and not see Doughty Street for what it is: a tangible monument to Dickens.[102]

Gad's Hill vs Doughty Street: The Problem of the Fourth Aim

The Fellowship's fourth aim, to preserve Dickensian buildings, proved to be problematic and placed the organisation in an invidious position. Fundamentally, the Fellowship's finances, especially after the purchase of Doughty Street, were stretched too thin to be able to achieve this goal. The problem was enhanced by the fact that other Dickensian properties were still in existence, some of which had a more significant connection to Dickens and his works than Doughty Street.[103] As Malcolm Andrews notes, the Fellowship felt that the disappearance of buildings associated with Dickens 'threatened mysteriously to erode Dickens's presence in the national life'.[104] *The Dickensian* frequently featured photographs of places related to Dickens, and as Andrews correctly highlights, this was seen as 'a partial way of fulfilling the Fellowship pledge to preserve such sites'.[105] In response to people criticising the Fellowship for not intervening in the planned demolition of Dickens's previous home Devonshire Terrace, *The Dickensian* announced: 'no one regrets its passing more than the Dickens Fellowship which has been reproached from several quarters for not attempting its preservation […] We have the urgently needed Endowment Fund of the Dickens House to establish before we can

[102] Greaves, *Dickens at Doughty Street,* p. 118.
[103] For more information about the other houses Dickens occupied see Michael Allen, 'Homes of Dickens', *The Oxford Reader's Companion to Dickens,* ed. by Paul Schlicke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 279-282.
[104] Malcolm Andrews, 'Charles Dickens Walked Past Here: Dickensian Topography and the Idea of Fellowship', *Erea,* 13:2 (2016), 1-20, p. 5.
[105] Ibid. The sheer number of requests for Fellowship intervention to preserve Dickensian sites and the requests for photographs of such sites can be seen in, Other Sites Connected To Dickens Including Graves Properties Towns/ Cities**,** Charles Dickens Museum, London.

think, like Alexander the Great, of new worlds to conquer'.[106] Although saddening to lose places connected to Dickens's life, their destruction ultimately aided the Dickens House. It meant that it would become the 'only surviving London home of the novelist', as *The Dickensian* was keen to promote, and added to the justification of the house's existence.[107]

The Fellowship needed to justify their decision to preserve Doughty Street over other Dickensian properties. Their relationship with Gad's Hill, Dickens's final home, became the most contentious issue as it was, and still is, generally seen as the most appropriate house to preserve in Dickens's honour. As Robinson aptly states, it is usually the last home of an author that is preserved as it 'reflects an accumulation of fame and fortune, and not the less salubrious steps on the way'.[108] In 1951, *The Dickensian* revealed that the Fellowship had the opportunity to buy Gad's Hill, while they were preparing to purchase 48 Doughty Street. Dickens's Kent home came onto the market in 1923. The Fellowship was offered the opportunity to partake in a private purchase, but:

> The Council, already burdened with the heavy commitment of the uncompleted purchase of 48 Doughty Street, thought that it ought not to embark on such a big undertaking and, very reluctantly, decided to decline the suggestion; there was also the sentimental consideration that Doughty Street was Dickens's first real home on leaving chambers.[109]

The fact that the purchase of 48 Doughty Street was 'uncompleted' implies there had been a chance for the Fellowship to back out of the purchase and buy Gad's Hill instead. The Fellowship's minutes book highlights that they were offered the property at a reduced price before the auction, but the Fellowship chose not to submit a bid as they needed more time to fundraise.[110] Young argues how often 'the duration of a writer's inhabitation of a

[106] Leslie C. Staples, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 41 (1944), p. 165.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Robinson, 'Reading Between the Lines', p. 8.
[109] Leslie C. Staples, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 47 (1951), p. 95.
[110] Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London; Doughty Street Sub Committee minutes book (23 October 1923), Charles Dickens Museum, London; Fellowship

museumised house is secondary to availability.'[111] This was not the case for the Fellowship, which had the opportunity to purchase Gad's Hill, occupied by Dickens for longer, and at the pinnacle of his career. In 1936, another chance to buy Gad's Hill arose and the Fellowship decided 'unanimously' that they did not see any purpose in taking steps to secure the property at the present moment.'[112] Gad's Hill was instead converted into a school.

There may have been practical reasons for the Fellowship's decision; for example, Doughty Street was a more appealing location than Gad's Hill. The house's situation within Bloomsbury, in central London, an area already famous for its prestigious literary connections, meant that the Fellowship would be able to attract more interest and visitors to the site. [113] These close literary associations were noted in the press: 'opposite the Dickens House is the house where lived Sydney Smith […,] within two minutes' walk Benjamin Disraeli [lived], Lord Beaconsfield was born, Ruskin lived a few streets away and around the corner lives Mr. Jacob Epstein'.[114] In addition, literary guides of London were using Dickens as the characterising author of the nineteenth-century metropolis, so it felt natural to have a site in London dedicated solely to him.[115] Gad's Hill, in comparison, was outside of the capital, and although associated with Shakespeare, was less attractive to tourists, who would find a broader range of sites to visit in London.

Minutes Book, 1923-1935 (6 July 1923), (3 August 1923), (7 August 1923), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[111] Young, 'Literature, Museums and National Identity', p. 233.

[112] Dickens Fellowship Minute Book, 1935- 1937 (1 May 1936), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[113] For more about literary and cultural associations within the area, especially before the advent of the Bloomsbury group, see Rosemary Ashton, *Victorian Bloomsbury* (London: Yale University Press, 2012). Blair shows how the Bloomsbury group added to the international prestige of the area at the beginning of the twentieth century. Sara Blair, 'Local Modernity, Global Modernism: Bloomsbury and the Places of the Literary', *ELH,* 71:3 (2004), 813-838. For more on the Bloomsbury group's impact see S. P. Rosenbaum, *Edwardian Bloomsbury: The Early Literary History of the Bloomsbury Group* (London: Macmillan Press, 1994).

[114] *Sunday School Column,* (18 June 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[115] See, for example, Hinrichs, 'Where in the Dickens is Gad's Hill?', p. 58, which compares literary guides of the twentieth century.

It will be argued here, however, that the Fellowship chose to preserve Doughty Street over Gad's Hill because it allowed them to present a more positive image of Dickens's life. Dickens had only lived in Doughty Street for around three years, at the beginning of his career. The Fellowship stated that the house was of 'sentimental' importance, because as Malcolmson has outlined, Dickens spent his 'formative years' there.[116] This idea has become engrained within the scholarship of the house; Graves wrote in his comprehensive book, *Dickens and Doughty Street,* that the house is 'a permanent reminder of a brilliant young man, making his way in life and beginning to get to the top'.[117] The association of Doughty Street with a younger Dickens was summed up by the *Weekly Dispatch,* which reported:

> No. 48 has the happiest of associations […] one of the chief interests in this property lies in the fact that it was here that he awoke one morning to find himself famous [….]This lofty, three stories house seems to me to stand there symbolical of Dickens's remarkable confidence in himself at the very beginning of his career.[118]

The emphasis on this early stage in Dickens's life enabled his career to be the focus instead of his later more scandalous personal life, and for his image to remain untarnished by his separation from his wife, Catherine and relationship with Ellen Ternan. In an article by 'A Londoner' regarding the Dickens House, it was stated: 'I like better to remember the chapter in which Mr. Dickens inhabited Number 48 than that other one of his life at Gad's Hill place in the country of Kent', as this was when Dickens was 'the eager young man, gay in the first sunshine of prosperity'.[119] Doughty Street also mirrored the domestic settings of some of Dickens's creations. As Frances Armstrong highlights, 'many of Dickens's happiest homes are those in which the occupants are young and enjoying their first independence'.[120] This allowed the Fellowship to emphasise his fictional works over the events of his life.

---

[116] Leslie C. Staples, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 47 (1951), p. 95. Malcolmson, *Constructing Charles Dickens,* p. 196

[117] Greaves, *Dickens at Doughty Street,* p. 118.

[118] *Weekly Dispatch*, (30 August 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[119] 'The Dickens of a Museum' by a Londoner, *Evening News* (7 February 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[120] Frances Armstrong, *Dickens and the Concept of Home* (London: UMI Research Press, 1990), p. 27.

The decision to purchase Doughty Street, with its more tenuous connection to Dickens had consequences. The house was continually compared to Gad's Hill, which appears to have lived on in the public imagination as the more appropriate Dickens home, and was difficult to imbue with Dickens's presence. Fifty years after the museum was opened, an article in *The Dickensian* stated regarding the Doughty Street house, 'it must be admitted that it does not have a strong aura of Dickens about it'.[121] The author explains that the reason for the lack of aura within the house was because 'he did not live there long enough to impress his personality upon his surroundings. Later in life, he lavished love and care upon Gad's Hill for fourteen years, and upon that house, his personality does seem firmly stamped'.[122] This links to Walter Benjamin's theory that auras in art refer to an object's context, 'its presence in time and space'.[123] In a literary house, auras can be generated by the house itself and the objects on display. As a place Dickens had lived in relatively fleetingly, the context of Doughty Street meant it did not have a lasting aura.

Auras in museums tend to manifest in the space between a resonant object and the viewer.[124] An aura is exceedingly important within an author's house, because as Young states, 'traces of the hero's physical presence inspire loyalty to his or her cause'.[125] One reviewer stated, 'in

[121] Burton, 'Literary Shrines: The Dickens House and Other Writers' House Museums', p. 142.
[122] Ibid. Armstrong also shows how much care Dickens took in presenting his homes as places of self-expression, in *Dickens and the Concept of Home,* p. 35.
[123] Walter Benjamin, 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction', *Illuminations,* ed. by Hannah Arendt, trans. by Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), pp. 218-22.
[124] I concur with Dorrian's argument that auras manifest in this space, creating a feeling that 'something is always about to happen', in other words, it is a feeling of anticipation caused by objects. Mark Dorrian, 'Museum Atmosphere: Notes on Aura, Distance and affect', *Journal of Architecture,* 19:2 (2014), 187-201, p. 190.
[125] Young, 'House Museums are Not all the Same', p. 2. Seaman explores how connections are established within literary places, although her study focuses more on fictional places than biographical. Alana N. Seaman, 'Making Literary Places', *Literary Tourism: Theories, Practice and Case Studies,* ed. by Ian Jenkins and Katrín Anna Lund (Wallingford, CABI, 2019), pp. 140-149. Auras also link to the generation of feelings, Victoria Mills notes the importance of feelings within displays exploring the nineteenth century, see for example, Victoria Mills, 'Curating Feeling' *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, 23 (2016), 1-9. Also explored in the 2015 conference hosted by Birkbeck, noted by Kristina

spite of the fact that the Dickens House contains an almost complete library of books about the novelist, the personal touch is lacking'.[126] Initially, there were significant gaps in the collection, especially items concerning Dickens's life, as the emphasis on the house as the origin of Dickens's creativity meant many of the items collected were centred around his works.[127] The Dickens House, unlike most writers' homes, did not feel 'haunted' by Dickens's presence.[128]

The Dickens Fellowship struggled to fill the house with Dickens related artefacts because of financial hardship. The ownership of both 48 and 49 Doughty Street created a substantial mortgage which drained their resources, and the house had not yet maintained a steady flow of visitors.[129] The house featured in an article by the *Evening Standard* entitled 'London's Little-Known Museums', where it reported that 'No. 48 is one of London's most neglected

McClendon, 'Curating Feeling: Emotions and the Exhibition Space in Displays of Nineteenth-Century Art and Culture', *Journal of Victorian Culture,* 26:2 (2015), no page numbers.

[126] 'Personal Dickens relics are wanted for Dickens House, Doughty Street, London', (11 January 1926), *Daily Mirror,* Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[127] Explored in more detail in Malcolmson, *Constructing Dickens,* pp. 169-203. Within literary heritage, there was a general interest in places of origin. Judith Roberts and Linda Radford, 'The Private Uses of Quiet Grandeur: A Meditation on Literary Pilgrimage', *Changing English,* 16:2 (2009), 203-9, p. 204.

[128] Burton, 'Literary Shrines: The Dickens House and Other Writers' House Museums', p. 143. Hancock rightly argues that to conjure up the presence of the significant person who owned the house there must be a 'leap of the imagination, triggered by immersion in the suggestive space of the commemorative house', Nuala Hancock, *Charleston and Monk's House: The Intimate House Museums of Virginia Woolf and Vanessa Bell* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012), p. 26. This is also noted by Magaly Cabral, 'Exhibiting and Communicating History and Society in Historic House Museums', *Museum International,* 53:2 (2001), 42-3.

[129] Detailed in the Fellowship minutes books, a loan was issued to Dickens House by Fellowship in 1932 to cover the expense of 49 Doughty Street. Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book, 1923-1935 **(**5 August 1932), Charles Dickens Museum, London. After the money was raised and the property opened, media coverage about the house had dropped, and it appears few visitors knew of the house's existence, and even if they did, they struggled to find it. *The Islington Gazette* recorded a plea from the Dickens House for a direction plate to be placed on a 'lamp standard at the end of the street' as 'visitors experience considerable difficulty in locating the premises', *Islington Gazette* (26 April 1926), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London. The signs were erected in 1926.

museums.'[130] It highlighted how the visitors' book 'is a handsome book but each day it only gives hospitality to the pens of a score of visitors'.[131] Although the Fellowship had loaned the house some of its collections relating to Dickens, and there was the significant donation of B. W. Matz's collection, the collections were still too limited to fill the space.[132] The gravitas of the issue can be seen through the Fellowship's desperation to set up an Endowment Fund. Fundraising events were held, including a Dickens Ball in 1926 to raise £6000 in order 'to endow the Dickens House and so perpetuate the memory of the great novelist', as 'lack of money prevents us from acquiring a complete collection of Dickens rarities'.[133] In the years following the opening of the house, the Fellowship dedicated all their financial resources to filling 48 Doughty Street's walls, making it harder to preserve other Dickens sites.[134]

The fourth aim meant that the Fellowship could not separate themselves entirely from Gad's Hill. Although they had no intention of purchasing the property, the Fellowship did help to preserve it. They stated that they wanted to help preserve Gad's Hills 'as a memorial to Dickens' while stressing again that this would be within the parameters of Dickens's wishes as a 'live memorial of this sort is far superior to any lifeless museum and one with which Dickens would have heartedly agreed'.[135] In 1975, they decided to assist the present owner in maintaining the building and conducting essential restoration work.[136] A more formal scheme was established in the late 1980s, under the name of the 'Gad's Hill Preservation Society', which set out to help maintain the building and its Dickens connection. An earlier attempt to create the society had been prevented by an uneasy relationship with the previous

[130] 'London's Little Known Museums' (16 May 1928), *Evening Standard*, Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[131] Ibid.
[132] Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book, 1923-1935, (3 April 1925), Charles Dickens Museum, London. Not all of the Fellowship's collection was given for the opening as on 1 June 1928 fifty-three more objects were given to the house.
[133] *Daily Times* (18 January 1926), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[134] *The Dickensian* recorded all of the gifts and loans gifted to the house over this time.
[135] Letter from John Greaves to Miss Burt (3 July 1962), Other Sites Connected to Dickens Including Graves Properties Towns/ Cities, Gads Hill (Dph), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[136] Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book, 1972-2005 (5 October 1991) and (5 October 1996), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

headteacher, but the Fellowship secured a closer relationship with her successor in 1991; and from then on, they had a more active role in preserving the building, including, for example, restoring the conservatory.[137] This arrangement allowed the Fellowship to achieve their fourth aim whilst also distancing themselves from close association with the latter parts of Dickens's life. The Fellowship remained adamant that they would not purchase the property; following rumours of a potential auction of the property in the 1990s, the Committee stated, 'all in all, the present school was as good a caretaker as could be desired, and deserved the support of the Dickens Fellowship'.[138] This attitude continued; in the year 2000, there were plans to move the school to a purpose-built site and hopes that Gad's Hill would become 'a dedicated Dickens Heritage site', but the site would not have been presided over by the Fellowship.[139] The scheme did not come into fruition and the property remains a school.

Despite their fourth aim, the Fellowship were consistent in their refusal to own another site relating to Dickens. This can be seen through their relationship with the chalet that Dickens used as a study when he lived at Gad's Hill.[140] The Fellowship had been approached to purchase it in 1929 but had refused stating, 'after discussion it was agreed that no provision need be made for that purpose'.[141] However, in 1959, when they had more funds, they agreed to help raise money to move the chalet to a safe location as it had been vandalised in the grounds of Cobham Park. The endeavour was successful, and the chalet was moved to Eastgate House Museum, where it was open to public view by prior arrangement.[142] The

[137] Ibid. Other Sites Connected to Dickens Including Graves Properties Towns/ Cities, Gads Hill (Dph), Charles Dickens Museum, London, notes the uneasy relationship with the headmaster who wanted to preserve the integrity of school.
[138] Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book, 1972-2005 (5 October 1991), (5 October 1996), (2 October 1993), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[139] Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book, 1972-2005 (5 October 1991), (5 October 1996), and (29 April 2000), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[140] For more about the chalet, see Chapter Three.
[141] Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book, 1937-1971 (? April 1959), (25 March 1961) and (7 October 1962), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[142] Leslie C. Staples, 'Dickens's Chalet', *The Dickensian,* 58:336 (1962), 5-7, pp. 6-7. The chalet had previously been exhibited at the Crystal Palace before being gifted to Lord Darnley who placed it in Cobham Park. Although the chalet could be seen as a temporary structure, it in fact, required a brick foundation. The lack of a solid foundation in Cobham Park caused some of the wood to rot. The wood was later conserved when the chalet was moved to Eastgate House. The chalet remains largely the original structure which stood in

Fellowship raised £1000, which was used to furnish the upper room in imitation of Dickens's study.[143] This was based on a photograph taken two days before Dickens's death and informed them of the placement of the furniture and mirrors.[144] The Fellowship would not, however, allow the original desk Dickens had used in the chalet to be removed from the Dickens House, so a reproduction was created. The Fellowship's donation gave their members exclusive access to the inside of the property, but their refusal to own the structure even when they had reached a point of financial security shows they were hesitant to own more than one monument to Dickens, especially one associated with the latter stages of his life.

Doughty Street remains the only Dickens property, fully funded and owned by the Dickens Fellowship, which is open to the public. Despite the problems which 48 Doughty Street had faced in its formative years, slowly the institution became more stable and recognisable as a successful literary tourism site. As time passed, Dickens's dying wishes faded from public memory, and the monumental nature of Doughty Street stopped being so contentious. Gradually, the house became an accepted part of the London literary landscape and appeared less like a monument and more like a museum, a story that will be explored in the next chapter. Visitor numbers steadily grew over the twentieth century and the collection extended to include some 'treasures' such as a small portrait of Dickens, a lock of his hair, a tortoiseshell card case, a walking stick, an Elizabethan chair from Gad's Hill, a rose from the body of Dickens on burial, a cut glass scent bottle, a copper tea urn, a reading desk, a pair of candelabra, and Dickens's desk from when he worked at Ellis and Blackmore of Gray's Inn.[145] Although the house did not own all of these items, they went some way to equipping the house with relics of Dickens's life. It was a step towards the 'triple power' of successful literary museums which are simultaneously real places, related to a real person, and filled with real things.[146] Although the Fellowship ultimately defied Dickens's dying wishes and created a

---

Dickens's garden. See Amy Butler, 'Dickens's Swiss Chalet', *The Dickensian,* 78:383 (1977), 147-148.

[143] Ibid. The lower room was to be converted into a museum space, but this did not come into fruition. Staples 'Dickens's Chalet', pp. 6-7.

[144] Ibid.

[145] Walter Dexter, 'Some Treasures of the Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 24:3, (1928), 233-236

[146] Moore, *Museums and Popular Culture*, p. 135.

monument in his honour, they helped to keep Dickens's legacy alive. Ultimately, Dickens's own thoughts on memorialisation did not stop the Fellowship from shaping his posthumous legacy but they did have some effect on their actions. As the next chapter highlights, the Dickens House became central to his literary heritage, and the Fellowship continue to play a pivotal role in shaping his posthumous image based on their own desires as a society.

Chapter Five: Housing Dickens's Legacy

The Dickens Fellowship had a substantial influence on the workings of the Dickens House throughout the twentieth century. The Fellowship promoted a positive image of Dickens which was in line with their beliefs as a society, and actively attempted to engrain this image into the display of the house.[1] Although there have been studies of the Dickens House, none of them explores the changing narrative and display of the institution in detail.[2] This chapter will analyse the display of the museum and how Dickens became the subject of authorial tourism. My museological approach is unique and will allow me to comprehensively illustrate that as the Fellowship's influence over the Dickens House waned, and the institution increasingly mimicked the display practices of other writers' houses, a more well-rounded view of Dickens, his life and his works, was presented within the house. I will show that the display slowly changed throughout the twentieth- and twenty-first centuries into a reconstructed space, which imitated how it would have looked when Dickens lived there. Furthermore, I will make comparisons with other writers' houses to highlight the growing preference for recreated spaces within writers' house museums, allowing for greater understanding of how these display methods were implemented across the literary heritage sector. The importance of reconstruction within historic homes is already accepted: 'it is important, almost vital, to place the object as much as possible in its original setting';

---

[1] Their aims were to 'knit together in a common bond friendship, lovers of that great master of humour and pathos, Charles Dickens' and to 'spread the love of humanity' at the heart of Dickens's work. Dickens Fellowship, 'History of the Fellowship' <https://www.dickensfellowship.org/history-fellowship> [accessed 28 August 2020].

[2] For more about narratives in writers' house museums, see my MA dissertation *Sense and Sensibility in the Old Curiosity Shop: A New Understanding of Narrative in Literary House Museums* (2017) <https://dissertations.le.ac.uk/xmlui/handle/2381/665>. Within this work, I outline how a narrative should be employed to utilise both the story and space. However, in this study, as it is challenging to get a clear sense of the way space was used throughout the history of the Dickens House, only the story narrative will be explored. Some attention will be paid to the spatial narrative but only where appropriate. Narrative in museums is studied extensively within Macleod's *Museums Making,* with articles including Tricia Austin, 'Scales of Narrativity', *Museum Making,* ed. by Suzanne Macleod (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 107-119; and Tom Duncan, 'A Narrative Journey', *Museum Making,* ed. by Suzanne Macleod (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 288-298. See also Mieke Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1985).

however, more could be done to apply this notion to writers' houses in particular.[3] Although Paola Colaiacomo highlights how this form of interpretation helps the visitor to see and feel the author at work, few studies explore the timeline during which writers' houses made these changes.[4]

The study will focus primarily on the physical presentation of the rooms. The focus on the physical space is because house museums allow visitors 'to engage with the past in embodied ways', so the presentation of the room is particularly important.[5] Due to the nature of the records available, the display of the different rooms will be sourced primarily from the house guides that were published for visitors, and articles in *The Dickensian*. The earliest surviving visitor guide is from 1926, one year after the house opened to the public.[6] It was a crucial piece of interpretation as the subsequent guides continued some of the narrative's themes and omissions, meaning that the original leaflet largely dictated the interpretation of the house for the next seventy years.[7]

Spaces that are reconstructed interiors within a museum context are usually termed period rooms. The study of such spaces is largely interdisciplinary, utilising fields such as architecture,

---

[3] Monica Risnicoff de Gorgas, 'Reality as Illusion: The Historic Houses that Become Museums', *Museum International,* 53:2 (2001), p. 11. For more about the placement of objects and their ability to create an atmosphere in museums, see Sandra Dudley, *Museum Materialities: Objects, Engagements and Interpretations* (London: Routledge, 2010); Sandra Dudley, *Museum Objects: Experiencing the Properties of Things* (London: Routledge, 2012); Mark Dorrian, 'Museum Atmosphere: Notes on Aura, Distance and Affect', *Journal of Architecture.* 19:2 (2014), 187-201.

[4] Paola Colaiacomo, 'The Rooms of Memory: The Praz Museum in Rome', *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory*, ed. by Harold Hendrix (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), pp. 127-139, p. 127.

[5] Caroline Claisse et al., 'Multisensory Interactive Storytelling to Augment the Visit to a Historical House Museum', *Digital Heritage International Congress* (2018), 1-8, p. 1.

[6] Dickens House Guide no. 1 (1 December 1926), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[7] Interpretation, in a museum context, is generally used to refer to the different methods of communicating a narrative to the visitor, it is primarily used to refer to the text used to interpret the space. This is often displayed on text panels or in a guide. See, for example, Museums and Galleries of Scotland, 'Introduction to Interpretation' <https://www.museumsgalleriesscotland.org.uk/advice/collections/introduction-to-interpretation/> [accessed 8 October 2019]; Stuart Frost, 'A Question of Interpretation', *British Museum Blog* <https://blog.britishmuseum.org/a-question-of-interpretation/> [accessed 8 October 2019].

museology and the history of art. I will utilise studies of period rooms, as there is a lack of studies focusing on reconstructed spaces within writers' houses. However, the latter should be considered separately, as the largely conventional timeline regarding the display of period rooms is not consistent with the adoption of such display techniques within literary tourist sites. For example, the Victoria and Albert Museum (V&A) is widely credited with collecting one of the first period rooms for display in the West in 1869, whereas reconstructed rooms were displayed in Abbotsford from as early as 1833.[8] Yet some period room analysis can be applied to a writer's house. Jeremy Aynsley, for example, outlines three different categories of period room: the first which denotes interiors that are removed from their original setting, the second which encompasses interiors preserved in situ and the third which represents an imaginary or imagined space.[9] Where appropriate, I will primarily utilise studies which examine the latter two types of period room and only compare to period rooms which are considered historical and not artistic, as artistic rooms are more experimental and tend to be full reconstruction attempts.[10] Often period room studies explore the contentious authenticity of such spaces; this study will not do this as the historical records are limited.[11]

The chapter will begin by exploring the practical issues which prevented the rooms from being reconstructed within the Dickens House, and how initially this allowed the Fellowship to imbue Doughty Street with their positive image of Dickens. I analyse the omission of Catherine Dickens and Ellen Ternan from the museum narrative, and how this prevented the marriage separation and the idea of Dickens as sexually promiscuous from becoming a focus. I will approach this in an interdisciplinary manner which allows for greater comparison to other

[8] For more about the timeline of period rooms see Julius Bryant, 'Museum Period Rooms for the twenty-first century: salvaging ambition', *Museum Management and Curatorship,* 24:1 (2009), 73-84.
[9] Jeremy Aynsley,'The Modern Period Room: A Contradiction in Terms?' *The Construction of the Exhibited Interior 1870-1950,* ed. by Penny Sparke (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), pp. 8-31, p. 10.
[10] Bryant sees artistic rooms as dressed settings which discuss a period, whereas historical rooms are an 'actual place with objects of shared provenance'. Bryant, 'Museum Period Rooms for the twenty-first century: salvaging ambition', p. 80.
[11] For more about the question of authenticity regarding period rooms, see Trevor Keeble, 'The Modern Period Room: Introduction', *The Construction of the Exhibited Interior 1870-1950,* ed. by Penny Sparke (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), pp. 1-8; and Bryant, 'Museum Period Rooms for the twenty-first century: salvaging ambition'.

museum practices in respect of underrepresented voices and taboo topics. I will then examine how the Fellowship emphasised Dickens's fiction and their desire to promote Doughty Street as a site of creativity. Following this, I will explore how the development of the collection, financial equilibrium and the influence of other writers' houses, shifted the display, so the property came to represent the house as Dickens would have lived in it.

Making a House a Headquarters

The Dickens house was not only a literary tourist site, but also the Dickens Fellowship's headquarters, and this dual function affected the house's usage and display throughout the twentieth century. In the lead up to the opening of the house, much attention was paid to converting the space into offices for the Fellowship's needs, as it was decided that *The Dickensian* should be published and controlled entirely from Doughty Street.[12] Basic facilities were installed, such as a phone line, an adequate lavatory, and replacement central heating; an 'offensive smell' permeating from the scullery was investigated to make the house 'habitable'.[13] The dual function of the house caused the Fellowship to feel that they had created something different from other literary house museums, and they thus shied away from categorising Doughty street solely as a museum. Until 2012, the site was called The Dickens House, which implied that it was something other than a museum.[14] *The Dickensian* stated:

> We don't call it a Dickens Museum; that connotes tidiness, often lifeless, and a general smell of floor-polish and disinfectants. We don't call it a Dickens Library; that raises mental pictures of dustiness and the smell of musty leather and of bookworms with two legs and neglected clothes. […] We don't call it a Dickens Memorial, as that means something quite dead. […] We do call it the Dickens House, for a house is something

[12] Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, beginning 6 July 1923 (31 May 1926), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[13] Interestingly Dickens also complained of a foul smell emitting from the same place when he had lived in the property. Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, beginning 6 July 1923, (18 November 1924), (17 January 1925), (14 March 1925) and (31 March 1925), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[14] It was rebranded as the Charles Dickens Museum following the 2012 renovations.

alive, a Home where members of a family gather and enjoy all the delights of intimacy and friendship.[15]

The sentiment that the house was different from other institutions was echoed in the press. *The Saturday Review* stated, 'now this house in Doughty Street is to be full of his books and memories, not a museum, we hope in the dead sense the term holds to-day [sic] but a living warmth of reminiscence'.[16] This was further heralded by *The Times,* which in 1927 wrote that the Dickens House was a pleasant exception to the 'chilly atmosphere' which surrounds museums.[17] Furthermore, the name 'Dickens House' may have been used to prevent confusion with another Dickens heritage site, the house in Portsmouth where Dickens was born, which was then called 'The Dickens Museum'.[18]

From its inception, the Fellowship largely dictated the running of the Dickens House. The 'majority' of the Board of Trustees were members of the Dickens Fellowship.[19] These included the President, Honourable Secretary and Honourable Treasurer, and three other Fellowship members. They stipulated that two members should be appointed from bodies outside the Fellowship, for example, from either the Corporation of the City of London or London County Council.[20] In addition, it was decided that the appointed caretakers and librarian should 'recognise the instructions of the Executive Committee or Museum and Library Committee', therefore enabling the Fellowship to have a hand in shaping the interpretation of the house.[21] Furthermore, the first curator, Miss Minards, who served for forty-three years, was close to

[15] Leslie Staples, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* (1945), p. 186.
[16] *Saturday Review* (14 February 1925, Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[17] *Sunday Times* (3 February 1927), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[18] Although the museum in Portsmouth officially opened to the public in its present state in 1953, its existence was referenced by Matz in 1925. B. W. Matz, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 21:3 (1925).
[19] Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, beginning 6 July 1923 (7 November 1924), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Ibid, (29 October 1924).

the Fellowship, becoming assistant secretary of the society in 1929.[22] The presence of the Fellowship became evident within the presentation of the house. The space which had once been Dickens's dressing room was for many years 'devoted to portraits of Presidents and Officers of the Dickens Fellowship and benefactors of the Dickens House'.[23] The display firmly embedded and displayed the Fellowship alongside Dickens's legacy; it was a reminder that the actions of the Fellowship had made a visit to the house possible.

Initially, the Fellowship's display of the house was largely dictated by a lack of money and the need to purchase objects relating to Dickens and his life. In the late 1920s, one visitor highlighted that it was 'a half-arranged museum' where 'the collection has its own gaps'.[24] The visitor booklet of 1929 included a section entitled 'A Walk Through Dickens's House', which gave the impression that the house was established enough and contained sufficient artefacts for a trail through the property. The walkthrough, however, concentrated much more on the items on display as the rooms were filled with miscellaneous objects, sometimes loosely grouped around a theme, rather than the room's function. In the front room, for example, there was a letter from Dickens to his sister Fanny, a playbill, lock of Dickens's hair, a tortoiseshell card case, inkstand, walking stick, some table silver, a Pickwick clock and an empty chair.[25] Although, as Kevin Moore states, historic houses are most successful when they combine the 'real place and the real thing', the disorder and lack of theme or interpretation about these objects made their connection to Dickens less powerful than, for example, the recreated interpretation at Abbotsford [26]

---

[22] Miss Minard was curator from 1925-1968. I will not explore the impact of the different curators in detail as the historical records do not allow this, but also reconstructed spaces, as Montebello highlights, 'are the product of many hands', so it would be an injustice to attempt to credit these changes to individuals. Phillipe de Montebello, 'Introduction', *Period Rooms in the Metropolitan Museum of Art,* ed. by Amelia Peck (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), p. 13.

[23] Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, beginning 6 July 1923 (29 October 1924), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[24] *New Statesmen* (19 September 1925), Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[25] Walter Dexter, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 24:3 (1928), p. 233.

[26] Kevin Moore, *Museums and Popular Culture*, p. 137. Hancock notes the power of objects in house museums stating, 'such privileged encounters bring us into closer contact' with the person who owned them'. Nuala Hancock, 'Virginia Woolf's Glasses: Material Encounters in

Figure 3: AC.I.1114, Dickens House Appeal Items from Matz Collection, Copyright Frederick Hopwood, Charles Dickens Museum, London

At this stage in their development, the Dickens House's display was not vastly different from that of other writers' houses. The lack of a comprehensive collection was a common problem for recently established writers' houses, although the room-by-room display at Abbotsford, seems to have been the ultimate aim. The Jane Austen House Museum, which opened in 1949, only had a few rooms open to the public and a mixed collection. Still, there was always the intention to display objects related to Austen and her family as naturally as possible to give the impression that the family had lived there.[27] However, this process often took time, especially if the property and its contents were scattered after the author's death. Furthermore, this form of interpretation required financial security and many writers' houses, including the Brontë Parsonage, struggled in the first few years of opening.[28]

---

the Literary Artistic House Museum', *Museum Materialities: Objects, Engagements, Interpretations,* ed. by Sarah H. Dudley (London: Routledge, 2010), pp. 114-128, p. 119.

[27] Correspondence with Collections and Interpretation Manager at Jane Austen House Museum, (5 March 2019).

[28] For more about the incarnation of the parsonage as a heritage site, see Ann Dinsdale, *At Home with the Brontës* (Stroud: Amberley Publishing, 2013).

Instead, the mixture of house and exhibition space became standard practice for many writers' house museums and was not necessarily detrimental. In Butcher-Younghans's, handbook about the display of historic houses, she highlights that thematic exhibition rooms are sufficient if it is not possible to recreate the space.[29] The Keats House, which opened five years after the Dickens House, found it challenging to present all the objects within the house, so like Doughty Street, the interior seems to have remained a mix between house and museum until 1974.[30] This appears to have been common in houses relating to an individual. The Freud Museum, which opened in 1986, was a combination of recreated rooms, such as the study and library, and exhibition spaces.[31] Even now, the Charles Dickens Birthplace in Portsmouth remains a mixture of recreated and exhibition spaces.

Yet as the twentieth century developed, more writers' houses began to create reconstructed settings within their walls.[32] The actions of the National Trust helped to popularise this method of display within writers' houses, as they utilised the period room displays already in use within their historic homes.[33] The Trust was aided in this form of presentation by the acquisition of Beatrix Potter's home, Hill Top. Potter had supported the Trust from 1929 and bequeathed her house and its contents to them following her death in 1943.[34] The collection of her possessions meant that the property looked as it had when she lived there, allowing it to be a 'time-capsule'. [35] The Trust continued to recreate settings within the writers' houses

[29] Butcher-Younghans, *Historic House Museums*, p. 205.
[30] City of London, 'History of the House' < https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/things-to-do/keats-house/keats-history/Pages/History-of-the-house.aspx> [accessed 20 February 2019].
[31] See David L. Newlands and Steve D. Neufield, 'An Enchanted House? The Freud Museum, London', *Social History Curators Group,* 15 (1988), 14-17.
[32] As Pavoni explains, 'the house is "real" because it reflects a cognitive code that has been applied and tested in real life'. Rosanna Pavoni, 'Towards a Definition and Typology of Historic House Museums', *Museum International,* 53:2 (2001), p. 19.
[33] The Trust owns eight properties with strong literary connections and state that their preservation helps visitors 'to discover the inspiration behind the words'. See National Trust, 'Literary Connections'< https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/lists/literary-connections> [accessed 20 February 2019]. For more about the Trust's adoption of period rooms see Aynsley, 'The Modern Period Room: A Contradiction in Terms', p. 10.
[34] National Trust, 'Hill Top' < https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/hill-top> [accessed 20 February 2019].
[35] Ibid.

they acquired, implementing similar displays in Rudyard Kipling's home, Bateman's, and George Bernard Shaw's home, which was opened to the public four months after his death in 1950.[36] This method of display became more widely popular as the twentieth century developed.

Maintaining a Positive Dickens Image

The display of the Dickens House was heavily influenced in the early years by the positive image of Dickens that was embedded within the Fellowship's ethos.[37] The first visitor booklet emphasised the importance of Doughty Street to Dickens's career and utilised Forster's biography, extracts from Dickens's diary, and Dickens's letters as its sources of information, all of which were vetted to give a curtailed, positive view of Dickens's early life.[38] The booklet largely dictated the interpretation of the house, and similar incarnations of the information were used in the booklets for the first seventy years of the museum's history.

One crucial omission from the first published booklet was Dickens's wife, Catherine; she is mentioned only briefly, as the mother of Dickens's children.[39] Her relationship with Dickens was not explored, even though Doughty Street was the first house they had lived in as a married couple. The invisibility of women in historic house interpretation is not, however, unusual, as the roles of women, including wives, as well as of servants and children, have often been left out of the narrative in museums.[40] However, the exclusion of Catherine

[36] Rudyard Kipling's widow Carrie bequeathed the house to the Trust following her death in 1939. National Trust, 'Bateman's' < https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/lists/literary-connections> [accessed 20 February 2019] and National Trust, 'Shaw's Corner' < https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/shaws-corner> [accessed 20 February 2019].
[37] The previous chapter explores this in more detail.
[38] Dickens House Guide No. 1 (1926), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[39] Ibid.
[40] It was not until the end of the twentieth century that 'the house museum movement faced criticism for interpreting almost exclusively the history of famous men, most of whom were wealthy and white'. Jessica Foy Donnelly, 'Introduction' *Interpreting Historic House Museums,* ed. by Jessica Foy Donnelly (Oxford: Altramira Press, 2002), p. 7. Even now, sometimes the wives of authors are erased from displays of their literary heritage. At the 'Pratchett: His World' exhibition which explored his life from childhood to death, his wife was not mentioned. Christensen, 'Ideas versus Things: The Balancing Act of Interpreting Historic House Museums', p. 159. See also *Gender, Sexuality and Museums,* ed. by Amy K.

allowed the Fellowship to present a 'fixed uncomplicated image of the past household's life', and shy away from the more negative aspects of Dickens's life.[41] Catherine's absence was largely due to the marriage breakdown in 1858, which left Dickens's reputation as a domestic, family man, tarnished. It appears that the easiest way to hide the more controversial aspects of Dickens's life was to hide his wife almost entirely from view.

The absence of Catherine left a considerable gap in the narrative of the home. There have been calls for more inclusivity within the interpretation of historic houses. As Joshua G. Adair has shown, in house museums, the 'realities of the life of the owner or owners must remain an integral facet of the narrative'.[42] He highlights that by excluding and silencing voices, house museums do themselves and their narratives a vast disservice.[43] He argues this in reference to gay men's homes, but it can also be applied to Catherine's absence. The removal of her story leaves an extensive hole in the interpretation, not only of her, but of her relationship with Dickens, and the practical running of their home. While at Doughty Street, the house was very much her sphere of influence. Lilian Nayder has highlighted her essential role as she supervised the staff and organised dinner parties.[44] Catherine even published her own cookbook, *What Shall We Have For Dinner?* in 1851, showing her knowledge of household matters, and Dickens wrote the preface.[45]

However, over time, Catherine's domestic influence was reduced as Dickens took greater control. Nayder and Slater have emphasised that this was not because, as Dickens liked to portray it, Catherine was inept, but because 'he was a micromanager who wanted to control the details of their lives'.[46] When the Dickens family were away on holiday, Dickens arranged

---

Levin (London: Routledge, 2010). Lucy Delap investigates the growing interest in domestic servants and the growth of this narrative in culture, in *Knowing Their Place: Domestic Service in Twentieth Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[41] Christensen, 'Ideas versus Things', p. 160.

[42] Joshua G. Adair, 'House Museums or Walk in Closets? The (Non)Representation of Gay Men the Museums They Called Home', *Gender, Sexuality and Museums,* ed. by Amy K. Levin (London: Routledge, 2010), pp. 264-279, p. 269.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Lilian Nayder, *The Other Dickens* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011), p.64.

[45] Written under the pseudonym Lady Maria Clutterbuck.

[46] Nayder, *The Other Dickens*, p. 66.

for Devonshire Terrace to be repainted, writing 'I should like to have the hall and staircase painted inside, to the top of the house—a good green', as well as 'new paper in the drawing-room' and a 'wreath of flowers to be painted round the lamp'.[47] He said 'nothing about this to Mrs. D, wishing it to be a surprise'.[48] The following month, however, he wrote to his friend Thomas Mitton, 'Kate thinks with you, that Green for the hall and staircase is quite out of the question', showing that Catherine did try and maintain some control of the household.[49] Although middle-class men in the Victorian period were involved in domestic affairs, instead of managing the home through Catherine, Dickens commandeered many aspects of the household organisation.[50] This seems to have been more prevalent among middle-class men who worked from home, as their presence increased the need to divide the home into gendered spaces.[51] By taking control in such a way, Dickens was not allowing Catherine to thrive within her environment, and by erasing Catherine's story, the Dickens House provided a distorted view of the Dickenses' home life.

The lack of recreated spaces within the Dickens House encouraged Catherine's absence, especially within more personal areas such as her bedroom. Although the space was referred to as a bedroom from the late 1960s, it did not become a recreated space until 2012. Before this, it was devoid of Catherine's presence and was known as Dickens's bedroom, not the Dickenses' bedroom, even though Dickens had described it as 'Kate's bedroom'.[52] The 1969

[47] Dickens to Thomas Mitton (14 April 1845), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 4,* p. 297.
[48] Nayder, *The Other Dickens*, p. 66.
[49] Dickens to Thomas Mitton (20 May 1845), *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 4,* p. 312.
[50] See more on household roles in Judith Flanders, *Inside the Victorian Home* (London: Harper Collins, 2003); and Janet Howarth, 'Gender, Domesticity and Sexual Politics', *The Nineteenth Century, 1815-1901,* ed. by Colin Matthew (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 163-190.
[51] See Jane Hamlett, 'The Dining Room Should be the Man's Paradise, as the Drawing Room is the Woman's: Gender and Middle-Class Domestic Space in England 1850-1910', *Gender History,* 21:3 (2009), 576-591. For more about Victorian gender roles see Frances Armstrong, *Dickens and the Concept of Home* (London, UMI Research Press, 1990), p. 71; John Tosh, *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England* (London: Yale University Press, 2007), p.60. The work of Furneaux, for example, Holly Furneaux, 'Victorian Masculinities , or Military Men of Feeling: Domesticity, Militarism and Manly Sensibility*', The Oxford Handbook of Victorian Literary Culture,* ed. by Juliet John (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 211-233.
[52] Dickens's diary (6 January 1838), Appendix A, *Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1,* p. 630.

guide highlighted that the bedroom was 'devoted to photographs and other pictures of places described in the novels or associated with his life'.[53] The interpretation and display of the room, and the adjoining dressing room, changed in 1971 when the vast collection of Dickens collector and previous Dickens Fellowship president, Comte Alain De Suzannet, was displayed within the room.[54] The decision not to recreate this space meant that the room was devoid of a bed. As Armstrong highlights, traditionally the bed 'symbolises responsibility to husband and family'.[55] It was a marriage bed, which was evidently in use for more than sleeping, as both Mamey and Katie Dickens were born during the Dickenses' time at Doughty Street. The lack of a bed prevented a physical representation of the Dickenses' relationship at the beginning of their marriage.

Figure 4: AC.I.1100-1 Dickens's Bedroom, November 1971, Charles Dickens Museum, London

[53] Dickens House Guide no. 3 (1969/70), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[54] The gift was bequeathed following Suzannet's death. The house guides following this donation state that as it was a 'magnificent gift, [and] the Trustees resolve that the treasures so acquired should be displayed in rooms dedicated to the memory of the Comte one of the greatest and most generous scholar-collections the Dickens world has ever known', Dickens House Guide no. 7 (1995), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[55] Armstrong, *Dickens and the Concept of Home,* p. 17.

Figure 5: A.I.117.09 Dickens's Dressing Room, Charles Dickens Museum, London

The acquisition of the Suzannet collection in the 1970s did allow for more of Dickens's love life to be explored in the interpretation of the bedroom. It was not, however, his love for Catherine, which was emphasised, but his relationship with Maria Beadnell. The collection contained, alongside many items relating to Dickens's amateur dramatics, Beadnell's album, a scrapbook documenting letters and keepsakes given to her by potential suitors, including a young Dickens. Dickens presented her as his first love and parroted their turbulent relationship within his works.[56] Dickens's letters to her were displayed, allowing visitors to examine their relationship through his words.[57] The display allowed the image of a younger Dickens to be upheld within the interpretation, while correspondingly pushing his turbulent relationship with Catherine to the side-lines.

The lack of a bed also prevented any representation of Dickens as a sexual being (though we know this was the case as he fathered ten children), and in turn any indication of his later affair. Bedrooms in writers' houses cause the public and private to clash most intensely, as they provide 'a symbolic feeling of intimacy with the author', causing them to be contentious spaces.[58] To prevent contention, the Dickens House narrative echoed traditional Dickens scholarship, where Dickens's sex life had, in the main, only been subtly referenced through

[56] Slater, *Dickens and Women*, p. 55. Maria is meant to be the inspiration for Dora in *David Copperfield.*
[57] Dickens House Guide no. 7 (1995), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[58] Robinson, 'Reading Between the Lines', p. 10.

the number of children he had. As Dickens had become a symbol of Victorian domesticity more conservative views regarding sex have always been tied to his name, his work can be associated with as 'domestic idealisations'. [59] Openly exploring his sex life remains somewhat taboo, although there are now studies which analyse his works for references to sex and the body.[60]

The Dickens House is not alone in avoiding an author's sexual exploits, as sex is absent from many writers' houses, and indeed many museums in general.[61] This seems to be due to a perception of more conservative visitor tastes.[62] Stuart Frost has correctly argued that 'museums appear to have dealt with sex and sexuality by denying its existence to the public'.[63] However, often the lack of sex in the interpretation of some writers' houses is largely because it cannot be easily explored. For example, in Abbotsford, Scott's bedroom is not open to visitors. This is because the room is now used for administration and may also be a legacy of how Scott's family adapted the house into a visitor site while they continued to live there after his death.[64] Thomas Hardy's cottage in Dorchester tells the story of Hardy's childhood

[59] Lilian Nayder, 'Introduction', *Dickens, Sexuality and Gender,* ed. by Lilian Nayder (London: Routledge, 2012), p. xiv.
[60] William A. Cohen, *Sex Scandal: The Private Parts of Victorian Fiction* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996), and William A. Cohen, 'Interiors: Sex and the Body in Dickens', *Critical Survey,* 17:2 (2005), 5-19; Holly Furneaux, *Queer Dickens: Erotics, Families, Masculinities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009). See also Furneaux's latest work 'Domesticity and Queer Theory', *The Oxford Handbook of Charles Dickens,* ed. by R. Patten, J. O. Jordan, and C. Waters, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 372-387. Tomalin has also helped to emphasise Dickens's relationship with Ternan, and sex life in *The Invisible Woman* (London: Penguin 1991).
[61] Although the absence of sex has been addressed regarding historic houses, little criticism has explicitly referred to literary houses. For more on sex in museums, see Levin, *Gender, Sexuality and Museums,* and more recently, Jennifer Tyburczy, *Sex Museums: The Politics and Performance of Display* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016), who states 'all museums are already sex museums', p.3.
[62] As Tyburczy aptly states, 'museums organise exhibits that assume that patriarchal heterosexuality and traditional structures of sexual intimacy and gender performance represent national sexual culture for their visitors'. Ibid, p. 2.
[63] Stuart Frost, 'The Warren Cup: Secret Museums, Hidden Histories of Sex and Sexuality', *Museums and Social Issues,* 3:1 (2008), 29-40, p. 31. He does, however, show this is beginning to shift and that sex and sexuality are now more openly acknowledged.
[64] Abbotsford, 'The House', <https://www.scottsabbotsford.com/visit/the-house> [accessed 5 November 2020].

until he left to be married, making the bedroom a tale of childhood, rather than marriage and sex.[65] The lack of any sexual references in Doughty Street, the first home he lived in as a married man, distorts his relationship with Catherine.

Even in the case of authors who are famously sexually promiscuous, the subject of sex is mostly ignored in the literary sites associated with them. Public writers' houses associated with sexually promiscuous authors tend to be related to their childhood, pre-sexual years; for example, the D. H. Lawrence birthplace, and John Steinbeck's childhood home.[66] Occasionally, the site may give a small indication of their owner's sensual exploits, but this is often not explored within the walls of their home. For example, Virginia Woolf's relationship with Vita Sackville-West is not studied extensively in the context of Monk's House, but is referenced online.[67] One exception is Ernest Hemingway's property in Key West America, which although not explicit about the details of his sex life, lists Hemingway's many wives and relationships publicly.[68] However, it should be mentioned that the interpretation of the Hemingway museum is unusual as it also houses over forty cats.[69] Many authors whose sex lives are famous, such as Oscar Wilde, have no writers' houses in their honour.[70] It may be because acquiring a property they occupied has been difficult, but it is telling that there is no domestic space related to them that is currently open to the public.

Dickens's sex life was further suppressed in the narrative by the erasure of any reference to Ellen 'Nelly' Ternan throughout the early twentieth century. It was not until 1986 that the house guide alluded to her relationship with Dickens. The guide states, 'continuing up the

---

[65] In contrast, Hardy's later home, Max Gate, notes Hardy's rift with his wife, Emma, within the interpretation.

[66] Ileisure, 'About D H Lawrence' <https://www.lleisure.co.uk/d-h-lawrence-birthplace-museum/about-d-h-lawrence/> [accessed 26 September 2019], and Steinbeck House, 'Home' <http://steinbeckhouse.com> [accessed 26 September 2019].

[67] National Trust, 'Who Was Vita Sackville-West', <https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/features/who-was-vita-sackville-west> [accessed 26 September 2019].

[68] Hemingway Home, 'Wives', <https://www.hemingwayhome.com/wives/> [accessed 26 September 2019].

[69] Hemingway Home, 'Cats', <https://www.hemingwayhome.com/cats/> [accessed 26 September 2019].

[70] Wilkie Collins and Christopher Marlowe also have no houses in their honour.

stairs, note the striking photograph of Ellen Ternan whom Dickens met when they both were acting in *The Frozen Deep* in 1857. Biographers have disputed the exact nature of their relationship'.[71] Although elusive about the nature of their relationship, the presence of the photograph, purposefully highlighted within the guide, is significant. It shows that by the late 1980s, over a century after his death, Dickens's relationship with Ellen was acknowledged in the public sphere and mirrors an increase in scholarship relating to the subject such as Slater's pioneering work *Dickens and Women*, published in 1983.[72] By displaying Ternan's portrait, a more comprehensive image of Dickens was presented to the public, rather than the rose-tinted complimentary view of him which had been established by the Fellowship. Furthermore, by giving very little detail about 'their relationship' within the interpretation, the house opened a new topic of discussion while also leaving it up to the visitor to find out more about Ternan. It was a diplomatic way of alluding to their relationship and gave the visitor a choice of how they wished to view Dickens.

However, the next guide in 1990 no longer referenced Ternan and the subsequent house guides give no reference to her. The Fellowship Minutes Books show that the portrait had been the cause of some contention. It had initially hung in Mary Hogarth's room but many 'objected strongly to the photograph being shown in that room, and particularly to the wording of the caption'.[73] The portrait was then moved to the landing, but 'the wording on the revised caption was read and great exception was taken to the last sentence reading "Biographers have disputed the degree of intimacy between Ellen Ternan and Dickens". It was resolved to strongly recommend to the Trustees that this sentence be deleted'.[74] This change took time, as the wording was still the same the following year. However, the subsequent

[71] Dickens House Guide, no. 5, (c. 1986), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[72] Slater's work could have influenced the Dickens House interpretation as he was editor of *The Dickensian* from 1968-1978 and became President of the Dickens Fellowship in 1988. He went on to have a close relationship with the museum, advising on display and helping with acquisition and networking through his role as head of the board.
[73] Dickens Fellowship Council Minutes, Beginning 1972 (4 April 1981), Charles Dickens Museum, London. Dickens's mythologisation of Mary's innocence, explored below, may have also contributed to the Fellowship's rebuff of Ternan's portrait being displayed in her room.
[74] Dickens Fellowship Council Minutes, Beginning 1972 (3 October 1981), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

removal of the portrait and reference to Ellen shows that the Fellowship still had a hand in shaping and controlling Dickens's legacy, in line with the positive image they, and Dickens, were invested in promoting.[75]

Not all the women in Dickens's life were absent from the narrative of the Dickens House: Catherine's sisters, Mary and Georgina, played a very prominent role, perhaps because their virginal qualities distracted from Dickens's own sexual exploits. Mary had a room named after her, and there were many items in the collection linking to Georgina.[76] The erasure of Catherine and Ellen and the emphasis on Mary and Georgina mimics Dickens's public portrayal of his relationships with these women, showing that his own presentation of these relationships largely become engrained within Dickens scholarship and in turn the Dickens House interpretation. Catherine has been described by scholars as 'dull and lethargic' whereas Mary was 'bright and vivacious'.[77] Dickens himself had taken to referring to Catherine as 'that figure' and 'it' after their separation.[78] Dickens's close relationship with the Hogarth sisters was peculiar, but their importance to Dickens has, strangely, mostly gone unquestioned and become a generally accepted part of his life. John Greaves, for example, defines Dickens's relationship with Mary as an 'obsession', but does not see this as negative.[79] Some scholarship now questions the portrayal of these relationships; Slater highlights that Dickens exaggerated and dramatised his relationships with women, especially Mary. She was portrayed by Dickens as the 'shining ideal of maidenhood', whereas, in reality, her relationship with Dickens was 'far less intense and more normal than has normally been supposed', as Slater shows by analysing their letters. [80] However, Dickens's presentation of these relationships prevailed within the Dickens House for much of the twentieth century.

---

[75] The portrait was eventually rehanged, but it remained unnamed until 2003 according to Holly Furneaux, *Homoeroticism in the Novels of Charles Dickens* (London: UCL, 2003), p. 14.
[76] Mary, in the 'Notes on Dickens's residency', is mentioned immediately after Dickens's dates of residency are listed. She had a room named after her, which was filled with objects related to her, such as her letters and a green pendant that Dickens gave her. Georgina Hogarth was also obvious in the house as in 1986 the drawing-room contained many photographs and drawings of her. Dickens House Guide, no. 5, (c.1986), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[77] John Greaves, *Dickens at Doughty Street* (London: Elm Tree Books, 1975), p. 27.
[78] Dickens to Miss Burdette Coutts (5 April 1860), *Letter of Charles Dickens, Vol. 9,* p. 230.
[79] Greaves, *Dickens at Doughty Street,* p. 33.
[80] Slater, *Dickens and Women,* p. 80.

From the Basement to the Study: Locating the Fictional

As well as emphasising a positive image of Dickens, the Fellowship wanted to retain an emphasis on Dickens's fictional works within the house.[81] Their focus on fictional literary heritage led the Fellowship to implement a mostly unconventional vehicle of display, the Dingley Dell Kitchen.[82] In 1925, it was reported that there was a 'basement which has been fitted up as an old-world kitchen with oak beams and quaint furniture to represent a room at the Manor Farm, Dingley Dell mentioned in *Pickwick*'.[83] The display had been decided on following the purchase of the property, but was seen as a 'temporary' change, and one member of the committee wished it to be recorded that they strongly opposed the scheme.[84]

Figure 6: AC.I.1110 Kitchen Dickens House 1931 by W.M. Clark and A125.22 Dingley Dell Kitchen, Charles Dickens Museum, London

[81] See the previous chapter for the Fellowship's motivations and aims for the property.
[82] Kitchens, if explored, usually focus on 'family life' and 'social roles and relations', Klara Stephanie Szlezak, *Canonized in History: Literary Tourism and Nineteenth Century Writers' Houses in New England* (Regensburg: University of Regensburg Press, 2013), p. 66.
[83] *Yorkshire Herald* (10 June 1925), Fellowship Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London; AC.I 1108 and 1110, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[84] Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book, beginning 6 July 1923 (29 October 1924) and (2 January 1925), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

The Fellowship were aware that the kitchen hosted an unusual method of display and described the Dingley Dell kitchen as 'a remarkable contrast of fact and fiction'.[85] There is little record of any other biographical focused writers' house containing a room dedicated to a fictional place at this time. Although a similar display was implemented in the kitchen of the Harriet Beecher Stowe Centre in Connecticut, that created a kitchen which was a reproduction of how Stowe advised kitchens should look in her popular advice book, *American Woman's Home* (1869); this was not an imaginary location as the advice manual was based on reality.[86] The recreation may have been a nod to a wider establishment of period rooms within magazines and department stores.[87] Although the Dingley Dell kitchen was popular among Dickensians (the *Westminster Gazette* stated, 'Dickens lovers are always specially attracted by the Dingley Dell kitchen'), its fictional representation was sometimes missed by visitors; 'few Londoners know that the kitchen of Dickens House has been designed to represent the old kitchen at Dingley Dell'.[88]

Malcolmson has explored the unusual recreation of the kitchen and its distinct fictional focus. She highlights that the space was a 'means of engagement with Dickens's texts' and was one of the Fellowship's attempts to 'superimpose the feelings associated with Dickens's writings about domestic spaces into his biographical home'.[89] The display shows the Fellowship's high regard for *The Pickwick Papers* (1836).[90] These arguments seem the most plausible explanation for this choice of display. What is also of note, however, and is not mentioned by Malcolmson, is that the kitchen was converted after a donation by two anonymous Americans.[91] It is unclear whether they requested the Dingley Dell recreation, or if the Board

[85] Dickens House Guide no. 4 (1977), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[86] Hilary Iris Lowe, 'Dwelling in Possibility: Reimagining the Historic House Museum', *The Public Historian,* 37:2 (2015), 42-60, p. 57.
[87] The impact of such widespread representations of period rooms is noted by Aynsley, 'The Modern Period Room: A Contradiction in Terms', p. 9.
[88] *Westminster Gazette* (8 February 1926), and *Daily Times* (18 January 1926), Fellowship Scrapbook, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[89] Malcolmson, *Constructing Dickens 1900-1940,* p. 200.
[90] Ibid.
[91] Fellowship Scrapbook, *Yorkshire Herald* (10 June 1925) and *The Times* (13 June 1925), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

decided how to spend the money, but the donation again highlights American involvement in British literary heritage, as mentioned in the previous chapter. [92]

Imaginary places have become a key part of Dickens's literary legacy, so it could be argued that the Dingley Dell display was in keeping with the common thread of his literary legacy following his death. Andrews has noted that Dickens was asked throughout his career 'where exactly in the real world he had located scenes and characters' and that Dickens himself strove to give his locations, particularly in London, a 'concrete identity'.[93] Booth has also highlighted how even before his death, his readers were mapping out 'Dickens country', places locations and events related to his fiction, onto the real landscape.[94] It meant that Dickens 'colonised certain real locations through acts of imagination'.[95] If 'colonised' is replaced with mythologised, then this a more convincing statement, re-emphasising John's argument that 'Dickensian place is place mythologised'.[96] By the time the Dickens House was established, locating such places had become a popular pastime of fans of his books.[97] Although the kitchen display was unusual, it is evidence of the prominence Dickens fans gave to his fictional locations.

The Dingley Dell kitchen could be seen as ahead of its time as there are now literary tourist sites dedicated to imagined fiction. The emphasis on imaginary interaction with literary heritage is partly indebted to films based on literary works.[98] It is, for example, possible to walk through Hogsmede and Diagon Alley from *Harry Potter* (1997) and to visit the Shire from

---

[92] Ibid.
[93] Andrews, 'Charles Dickens Walked Past Here: Dickensian Topography and the Idea of Fellowship', p. 1 and p. 8.
[94] Booth, 'Houses and Things: Literary House Museums as Collective Biography', p. 239.
[95] Andrews, 'Charles Dickens Walked Past Here', p. 19.
[96] Juliet John, 'Dickens's Global Art', *E-rea,* 3:2 (2016), 1-36, p. 7.
[97] See Other Sites Connected to Dickens Including Graves Properties Towns/ Cities, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[98] For more on this form of literary tourism, see for example Sheela Agarwal and Gareth Shaw, *Heritage, Screen and Literary Tourism* (Bristol: Channel View Publications, 2018); Graham Busby and Julia King, 'Movie Induced Tourism: The Challenge of Measurement and Other Issues', *Journal of Vacation Marketing,* 7:4 (2001), 316-332; Noelle O'Connor and Sangkyun Kim 'Pictures and Prose: Exploring the Impact of Literary and Film Tourism', *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change,* 12:1 (2014), 1-17.

The Lord of The Rings (1954). These are recreations of film sets, but they explore imaginary and fictional literary settings and make them real by allowing visitors to interact with the space. Furthermore, there are literary museums that mix the real and imagined, often related to the authors of children's books, such as the Roald Dahl Museum, which 'takes Dahl's characters and stories as its theme'.[99] The museum additionally infuses the real by displaying Dahl's writing shed, which was dismantled and rebuilt inside the museum.

One of the only literary museums solely dedicated to the imaginary in the UK is the Sherlock Holmes Museum in London. It thrives on the imaginary, pretending that the premises at 221b Baker Street was where a real-life Sherlock Holmes lived. The museum opened in 1990, and the Conan Doyle family was against its creation. The imaginary was such a strong foundation of the site that the museum sold its collection of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle possessions and instead filled the space with fictional relics and objects. This form of interpretation and display in museums is still very scarce,[100] but seems to be a growing form of literary tourism within museums.[101]

As well as an emphasis on the imaginary, the Fellowship were keen to stress Doughty Street as a site of Dickens's creativity. However, this was curtailed for much of the early twentieth century by the house's limited collection. It was only in 1969 that the location of Dickens's study was explicitly referenced in the visitor guide for the first time.[102] This was because Dickens's desk and chair from Gad's Hill had been given to the house on 'long loan' by Dickens's great-great-grandson in 1967.[103] Although by 1929, the house had possession of

[99] Roald Dahl Museum, 'About the Museum', < https://www.roalddahl.com/museum/about-the-museum/history-of-the-museum> [accessed 22 November 2018].
[100] For general museums and the imaginary see Rachel Morris, 'Imaginary Museums: What Mainstream Museums Can Learn From Them', *Paulo Simoes Rodrigues,* 4 (2014), 2-30; and Susan A. Crane, 'Curious Cabinets and Imaginary Museums' *Museums and Memory,* ed. by Susan A. Crane (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), pp. 60-81.
[101] Other literary tourist sites utilise the imaginary more extensively, such as walking tours. See Lee Jackson, *Walking Dickens's London* (London: Shire Publications, 2012).
[102] Dickens House Guide no. 3 (1969/70), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[103] Dickens House Guide, no. 5 (c.1986), Charles Dickens Museum, London; Leslie C. Staples, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 63 (1967), p. 81. As will be seen, the desk was frequently moved in and out of the museum as the loan agreements changed. As Watson

two of Dickens's desks, one he used when he wrote *The Mystery of Edwin Drood,* there had been no recreation of Dickens's creative space.[104] After acquiring the Gad's Hill desk, the booklet proclaimed that the room beside the drawing-room was 'probably' the study and detailed that Dickens wrote *Oliver Twist* (1838) and *Nicholas Nickleby* (1839) in that very room.[105] As *The Dickensian* rightly stated, 'this is a most exciting addition to the very interesting exhibits in this museum and will no doubt be a centre of attraction for all visitors to the Dickens House this year'.[106]

The room's main focus became Dickens's writing practice. Although Dickens had not used this specific desk in Doughty Street, it was a more realistic form of display than before; Dickens's china monkey, which he placed on his desk while working, was exhibited to imitate his writing space. As Booth highlights, 'one of the most important categories of items in authors' houses represents the act of writing' because there is a desire to see 'a site of creativity', to bring the visitor closer to the source of that writer's inspiration.[107] The writing table from the chalet was also displayed in the room to re-emphasise the theme. The placing of both desks in one room, although detracting from the 'realistic' display, highlights the fact that Pillars, the curator, understood that the author's desk was often considered a 'physical memorial to the imagination' and the study seen as the 'sanctum'.[108] The study contained some of the original manuscripts of Dickens's novels, including *Edwin Drood,* as well as portraits, photos, and the first known piece of Dickens's writing. The room's narrative was now firmly centred around creative writing and was more in line with other writers' houses.

states, the desk has been 'lent around as much as Shakespeare's chair', showing it was a popular item of literary heritage. Watson, *The Author's Effects,* p. 109.

[104] The other desk was the one he had used when he had worked at Gray's Inn. Dickens House Guide no. 2 (1929), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[105] Dickens House, Guide no. 3 (1969/70), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

[106] Leslie C. Staples, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 63 (1967), p. 81.

[107] Booth, 'Houses and Things', p. 237.

[108] Watson, *The Literary Tourist,* p. 105, and Klara Stephanie Szlezak, *Canonized in History,* p. 64. Marjorie Pillars became curator in 1968.

Figure 7: A210.01 Dickens's Study, Charles Dickens Museum, London

This display did not last for long, however, as the following year, 1970, marked the centenary of Dickens's death. The house wanted to emphasise the theme of death, and the study was chosen as the location.[109] More prominence was given to *Edwin Drood*, the novel Dickens was writing when he died, and two images painted following Dickens's death were displayed with the room, Fildes's 'The Empty Chair' and Buss's 'Dickens's Dream'.[110] The focus may seem morbid, especially in a room which had celebrated what he had produced in life, but it placed two central themes of writers' house museums, writing and death, in one room. As Watson has shown, 'the paradoxical death of the author lies at the heart of the writer's house museum'.[111] There is a desire to know the details of a person's death in order to fully understand their life.[112] Unlike other writers' houses, Doughty Street could not show where precisely Dickens died, so they instead tied the story of his death to the one place in the house

[109] Dickens House Guide no. 4 (1977), Charles Dickens Museum, London; AC. I. 1093. Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[110] Ibid. Hunter has investigated how the latter picture, in particular, engrained that specific desk and chair in the popular imagination but does not emphasise the relationship this painting has with death, Aislinn Hunter, *Evocative Objects,* p. 217.
[111] Watson, *The Authors' Effects,* p. 24.
[112] Walter looks at the idea of bereavement and mourning within social history, see Tony Walter, 'Bereavement, Biography and Commemoration, Social Exclusion', *Social History in Museums,* 25 (2000), 9-17.

that produced the strongest personal connection to Dickens because it was where he wrote.[113]

Death is intrinsic to the creation of writers' house museums. Booth rightly states that 'the author must be gone for this private place to become a public museum'; it is what allows the author to become subject to the tourist gaze.[114] This is shown by the inclusion of details surrounding an author's death in places where they did not physically die. Chawton House, for example, mentions Austen's death at the end of the house tour as she died two months after leaving the house. Similarly, the Charles Dickens Birthplace museum displays the couch on which Dickens died. Although this display and interpretation may seem ironic within a birthplace museum, it also sates the desire to know about an author's death and is an apt way to provide closure at the end of a visit. Similarly, Anne Trubek has demonstrated that writers' houses often remind the visitor of death, and that there is a strong feeling of loss within the space.[115] This is sometimes deliberately emphasised as, for example, the dining room in Abbotsford, despite its function as a place of socialising, is emphasised in the interpretation as the location of Scott's death.

Authors' deaths continue to fascinate literary visitors, like authors' burial places.[116] Christine Alexander's study of the Brontë's parsonage emphasises that the objects mentioned most by visitors are those relating to the site of death, for example, the reproduction of the bed where Branwell died and the sofa on which Emily suffered before her death.[117] Alexander highlights that the reason for this is because the artefacts 'reinforce the Brontë myth of tragedy'.[118] Similarly, death is very prominent in the Keats-Shelley House in Rome, as this is where Keats

[113] The theme of death was further accentuated in the study when the Gad's Hill writing desk was removed in 1987 when the loan ran out. Joan Dicks, 'The Friends of the Charles Dickens Museum', *The Dickensian,* 105:479 (2009), 281-284, p. 283. Object record records how it was loaned to other institutions including Rochester Dickens Heritage Centre.
[114] Booth, 'Houses and Things', p. 236 and Robinson, 'Reading Between the Lines', p. 11.
[115] Anne Trubek, 'The Irrational Allure of Writers' Houses', *Chronicles of Higher Education* (2010).
[116] See Chapter Three for more information regarding this.
[117] Christine Alexander, 'Myth and Memory: Reading the Brontë Parsonage', *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory*, ed. by Harald Hendrix (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), pp. 93-111, p. 102.
[118] Ibid.

tragically died at the young age of twenty-five. The only recreated room is the bedroom where he died, whereas the rest of the space is a mixture of museum and library. The recreation allows the bedroom to become an immersive space and increases the visitor's contemplation of Keats's demise.

Adjusting to the Times

As we have seen, in the first half of the twentieth century, the Fellowship largely dictated the image of Dickens presented to the public within the walls of Doughty Street. However, as the century progressed, the Dickens House became more comparable to other writers' house museums, and by the 1960s, the Fellowship's influence over the Dickens House was beginning to wane. This was because the adjustment in management had a sustained impact on the display and interpretation of the site. The Fellowship remained financially involved, but the governance of the Dickens House was placed primarily in the hands of the Trustees, who, although members of the Fellowship, saw it as a separate responsibility. There was some disquiet in the 1960s when some Fellowship members complained that they had been told that 'Dickens House matters were not [the Fellowship's] concern'.[119] Certain members insisted that because seven out of the nine trustees were members of Fellowship, there should be greater communication about the house with the wider Fellowship members.[120] The Trustees were adamant, however, that 'once elected, [they] should be allowed to deal with the affairs of the Dickens House without interference from the Fellowship'.[121] They also referenced the Trust Deed 'which made the house a charity apart from whatever might happen to the Fellowship'.[122]

The display and interpretation of the house further benefitted from an increased and more diverse collection that was achieved when the Dickens House reached a point of financial equilibrium in the 1970s. From then on, any fundraising was used for specific work and

[119] Dickens Fellowship Council Minutes (1937-1971)**,** 8 April 1967, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[120] Ibid.
[121] Ibid, (6 April 1968).
[122] Ibid.

reinterpretation, rather than for developing the collection and keeping the house afloat. There were several significant objects added to the collection such as the large mahogany sideboard placed in the dining room, the clock from Gad's Hill which was placed in the downstairs hallway, and the statue of the Midshipman which was situated at the top of the stairs.[123] By the second half of the century, the collection had increased so much that one visitor in 1965 wrote that the Dickens House was 'cluttered'.[124] The expanded collection led the 1977 Guide to include a list of 'must-see items'.[125] The highlights were the china monkey Dickens had on his desk while he was writing, the blacking pot which related to Dickens's time at the factory, a copy of *David Copperfield* (1850) that went on the Scott Antarctica Expedition, and the earliest known example of Dickens's handwriting.[126] This guiding interpretation technique is still used in museums today and helps to narrow visitors' focus and encourage them to engage with some of the items on display. It has been aptly termed 'scenography' and seen as an effective way to communicate with visitors.[127] The use of this technique marks a key step towards the house becoming a more conventional museum, as it illustrates that the Dickens House was actively thinking about the visitor experience.

Some of the newly acquired items allowed for a more rounded view of Dickens to be presented to visitors. The addition of the blacking bottle enabled Dickens's childhood to be explored and for comparisons to be drawn between his experiences and *David Copperfield* and *Oliver Twist*.[128] The 1986 house guide highlighted the acquisition of the Marshalsea prison bars which not only linked to *Little Dorrit* but also to John Dickens, Dickens's father, who had been imprisoned for his debts.[129] The bars were placed in the passage leading to the library on their own, giving them prominence. The Guide highlights that it was during his father's time in jail that Dickens served at the Blacking factory, which 'was the most painful and formative episode of his early life'.[130] Although Dickens enthusiasts may have been aware of

[123] Dickens House Guide, no. 4 (1977), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[124] Donald M. Murray, 'The Balcony, the Pond and the Literary Traveller', *The Antioch Review,* 25:2 (1965), 333-336, p. 333.
[125] Dickens House Guide, no. 4 (1977), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[126] Ibid.
[127] De Gorgas, 'Reality as Illusion: The Historic Houses that Become Museums', p. 11.
[128] Dickens House Guide, no. 5 (c.1986), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[129] Ibid.
[130] Dickens House Guide, no. 6 (1990), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

these facts, it was an additional way to enlighten less knowledgeable visitors about Dickens's life and stress the authorial connections of these objects.[131] The increased emphasis on the biographical did not please all visitors however; one stated 'the entire place seems to lead away from the remembered works toward Dickens artefacts, not back into the works, and definitely leaves nothing for the literary traveller to bring to it'.[132] Some literary tourists, including the visitor in question, were seeking greater engagement with Dickens's work rather than with the authorial tourism associated with his life. The reviewer went on to state that 'obviously a commercialised literary museum is not likely to enrich one's response to the literature it is supposed to garnish'.[133] Although critical, these comments highlight that the Dickens House was becoming comparable with other 'commercialised' writers' houses with its increased focus on the authorial.

Developments in other writers' houses informed the display of the Dickens House. In the late 1950s, the Brontë Society had reached a level of financial stability which allowed them to begin converting the parsonage into a recreation of the Brontës' house; this included fitting contemporary pieces such as a range and a marble mantelpiece.[134] These advances were pushed further by the 1960 extension to the parsonage that created a separate exhibition space, allowing more room in the house for the display of original furniture.[135] There were attempts to present it as the Brontës' home, with a specific focus on the 1850s, as Charlotte had put a 'strong stamp' on the interior of the house and there were surviving records reflecting the décor.[136] Similarly, the Jane Austen House Museum had benefited from sizeable donations and set about recreating the space as Austen would have experienced it by arranging furniture in a naturalistic manner.[137]

[131] The blacking factory and his father's debts are recorded in Forster's biography and have been mimicked in subsequent Dickensian biography and scholarship.
[132] Murray, 'The Balcony, the Pond and the Literary Traveller', p. 333.
[133] Ibid, p. 334.
[134] Correspondence with the principal curator of the parsonage (28 February 2019).
[135] Dinsdale, *At Home with the Brontës,* p. 73.
[136] Ibid, p. 90.
[137] Jane Austen House Museum, *Making The Museum 1949-2019*, exhibition panel.

Following the example of these institutions, the second curator of the Dickens House, Marjorie Pillars, began to experiment with reconstructed displays.[138] In 1972, Pillars and the housekeeper Mrs E. Robinson restored the basement to its 'original state'.[139] They reinstalled the wash house and used the records from the fitment list of 1837 to replicate what would have been in the room.[140] The next curator, David Parker, built on this work and collaborated with a local wine merchant to recreate Dickens's wine cellar; filling it with 'fine Victorian bottles', and from 1980 it was open to public view.[141] The bottom of the house was beginning to look much more like Dickens's own. The changes underlined the functionality of the house and showed the inner workings and lives of the servants who worked there.[142] This also reflected a wider shift in historic house interpretation where importance began to be placed on the working lives of all within the house, not just the owner.[143] It was a step closer to Butcher-Younghan's argument that historic houses should not be romanticised and that the different roles within the home, including those of servants, should be highlighted.[144]

[138] Marjorie Pillars, curator 1968-1977. It should be noted that many of the more modern interpretation techniques were applied after Miss Minard's retirement in 1968.
[139] Michael Slater, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 68 (1972), p. 66. See AC.I.1111, Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[140] Ibid. The 1977 guide shows that there was now an emphasis on the scullery downstairs and how it was the place where clothes were washed, Dickens House Guide no. 4 (1977), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[141] Andrew Sanders, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 76, (1980), p. 59. Parker became curator in 1978.
[142] There were recorded as installed by 2 October 1971 and were supposed to look as they had when Dickens was in residence, Dickens Fellowship, Council Minutes (1937-1971), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[143] Lucy Delap investigates the growing interest in domestic servants and the growth of this narrative in culture, in *Knowing Their Place: Domestic Service in Twentieth Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
[144] Butcher-Younghan, *Historic House Museums*, p. 188.

Figure 8: AC.I.1111 Reconstructed Wash House, Charles Dickens Museum, London

Despite the desire of some visitors to retain a focus on Dickens's work, the Dingley Dell kitchen was dismantled. Due to the plans to reinterpret the drawing-room, the kitchen was renovated to make room for the library. *The Dickensian* stated that 'many Dickensians have an affection for [the kitchen] in its present state, but it is anticipated that few will prefer an imaginary representation of a setting much better imagined between the covers of a novel, to a scholarly reconstruction of Dickens's own milieu'.[145] There was a shift towards valuing 'real' displays as the removal of the kitchen allowed for Dickens's own spaces to be recreated upstairs.[146] By the 1980s, many of the rooms were designated by function in the house guide. These are listed as follows: dining room, morning room, hall and stairs, study, drawing room, Mary Hogarth's room, Dickens's bedroom, dressing room, passage and library, still room, washroom, and wine cellar.[147] Many of these names are still used today.

[145] Sanders, 'The Dickens House', p. 17.
[146] Ibid, some original furniture such as Dickens's dresser were also placed in the room.
[147] Dickens House Guide, no. 5 (c.1986), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

Figure 9: Old Drawing Room 1 and 3, Charles Dickens Museum, London

A major step in recreating Dickens's space occurred in the drawing room. In 1979, *The Dickensian* recorded how the trustees had decided to 'accept the curator's proposal to work towards the eventual reconstruction of Dickens's drawing-room'.[148] It was helped by 'an enormously generous offer, from a collector who wishes to remain anonymous, to lend the house appropriate furniture for such a reconstruction'.[149] There was an extensive article about the renovation in 1982 within *The Dickensian,* written by the curator David Parker, who was notably less involved with the Dickens Fellowship than his predecessors.[150] In his article, Parker stated that 'up till now no attempt has been made to offer literary tourists an experience of Dickens's domestic environments'.[151] Parker highlights how this is unusual compared to other authors' literary heritage, as he writes that one of the most popular ways for literary tourists to understand an author was 'by enabling visitors to experience the

[148] Sanders, 'The Dickens House', p. 61.
[149] Ibid. The Dickens drawing-room project was funded by an anonymous collector, the Heritage of London Trust and from donations, Parker, 'The Reconstruction of Dickens's Drawing Room', p. 10.
[150] Noted in Exhibitions 1970s/80s: History of 48/49 Doughty Street**,** Charles Dickens Museum, London, which occurred while he was curator, so this comment must have been with his endorsement. It may have been due to wider administration changes and also because he did not hold a formal position on the Fellowship's organisational committee like his predecessors.
[151] David Parker, 'The Reconstruction of Dickens's Drawing Room', *The Dickensian,* 79 (1982), p.9.

domestic environment of a writer'.[152] It seems there was a demand for this more conventional form of display, even though some scholars state that the popularity of period rooms in museums was waning towards the end of the twentieth century.[153] But according to Parker, 'It is not only Dickensians who would like to see a scholarly reconstruction of the room. There is a gap in knowledge about English middle-class domestic interiors of the William IV and very early Victorian period which students of furniture and interior decorations would like to see filled'.[154]

The drawing-room was 'reconstructed with great care as near as possible to the way it was in 1839'.[155] Correspondence, inventories, microscopic evidence and expert advice, were used to recreate the room.[156] The space was redecorated in pink and red with a whitewashed ceiling, zigzag carpet, wallpaper, wall panelling, Holland blinds with net curtains, mirrors, polished French furniture, and prints on the walls.[157] A breast-high perspex barrier was installed, which helped control visitor flow and security.[158] The extensive investigation was ahead of its time, as the Brontë parsonage conducted no serious archaeological research into the design of its interior until 2011. Their investigation led to the installation of specially designed wallpapers in 2013, which imitated the interior decoration of when the Brontës lived there.[159]

[152] Ibid.
[153] Noted, for example, in Bryant, 'Museum Period Rooms for the Twenty-first Century: Salvaging Ambition'. The increase in reconstructed rooms in writers' houses shows they should not be considered in complete conjunction with wider period room trends.
[154] Parker, 'The Reconstruction of Dickens's Drawing Room', p. 10.
[155] Dickens House, Guide no. 5 (c.1986), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[156] Ibid. The accuracy and authenticity of period rooms is a wide subject of debate, for more see *The Construction of the Exhibited Interior 1870-1950,* ed. by Penny Sparke (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006).
[157] Dickens House Guide, no. 5 (c.1986), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[158] Ibid.
[159] Dinsdale, *At Home with the Brontës,* p. 91.

Figure 10: A169.03 Drawing Room of 48 Doughty Street, Charles Dickens Museum, London

The drawing-room was reopened in 1984, and *The Dickensian* proclaimed, 'we hope it will bring to the house a greater sense of the presence of Dickens'.[160] They stressed that the house now aimed to satisfy visitors interested in Dickens the man, as well as his works: 'We hope that our visitors will follow Dickens's progress from domestic commonplace to the farthest limits of exuberant fantasy and tragic insight. From the drawing-room to the novels themselves'.[161] Since then, the display of this room has changed relatively little. The drawing room now stresses Dickens's love of amateur dramatics as it was where he enjoyed reading aloud.[162]

[160] Sanders, 'The Dickens House', p. 61.
[161] Ibid.
[162] Museum Guide, no. 8 (2012), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

Figure 11: A158.04 Drawing Room at Dickens House after the 1990 redecoration, Charles Dickens Museum, London

After the reconstruction work, the division between the Dickens House administration and the Fellowship grew. In April 1984, there was a considerable administrative change as the Dickens House staff were no longer responsible for the practical running of the Fellowship. It was decided that:

> The House staff would continue to perform some services for the Fellowship, but these would be minimal. They would, however, necessitate some contributions towards their cost. These changes would not affect the close relationship between the House and the Fellowship. Thus, the Fellowship's headquarters would still be 48 Doughty Street, Fellowship members would still have free access, The Fellowship would still be able to use (in moderation) the research facilities available at the House.[163]

Although the close relationship between the Fellowship and the Dickens House continued, the operational management moved away from the Fellowship's control, and the house started to mirror the contemporary administration norms of the museum sector. In 1989, the institution published its new acquisitions policy, showing it was aware of and taking part in

[163] Charles Dickens Museum, Dickens Fellowship Council Minutes, Beginning 1972 (7 April 1984). In moderation as the House tried to encourage the use of the facilities to Dickens scholars outside of the Fellowship.

broader museum practices.[164] At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the Fellowship took a further step back when the Museum and Fellowship accounts were officially separated.[165] At this time there was also greater collaboration with other literary tourist sites, when the Dickens House implemented a new digital collection management scheme.[166] They discussed the matter with Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust, as well as the operators of Wordsworth's Dove Cottage and the Brontë Parsonage, citing that they felt that these institutions were successful in documenting a biographical collection.[167] Later in 2009, the Dickens House applied to become an accredited institution as it had reached the agreed standards for museums and galleries.[168] This helped the house to implement further necessary policies, including acquisition and disposal guidelines, emergency plans and sufficient levels of security, collection care and accessibility.[169]

Renovation and Addressing Issues

As the twentieth century drew to a close, there were plans to significantly shift the display of the Dickens House by extending and reinventing the institution into a recreated space, in line with other writers' houses. The scheme was first made public in 1992 in an article entitled 'The Future of the Dickens House' published in *The Dickensian*.[170] It proposed that 48 and 49

[164] Margaret Reynolds, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 85 (1989), p. 192.
[165] Charles Dickens Museum, Dickens Fellowship Council Minutes, Beginning 1972 (11 April 1992) and (21 April 2001).
[166] Some of the staff, for example, went to visit Shakespeare's Birthplace which they found to be 'a very impressive organisation, well-funded and with complex links to other bodies', Charles Dickens Museum Collection Group Meetings 2001-2010 Folder (24 January 2006), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[167] Ibid.
[168] Charles Dickens Museum Collection Group Meetings 2001-2010 Folder (23 July 2009), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[169] For more about accreditation requirements see Arts Council, *Accreditation Standard 2018*, < https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Accreditation_Standard_Nov2018_0.pdf> [accessed 9 October 2019].
[170] Malcolm Andrews, 'The Future of the Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 88 (1992), 179-184. This idea had also been raised in as early as 1930 but it seems there was insufficient funds and need to do so then. Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book, beginning 6 July 1923 (29 August 1930), Charles Dickens Museum, London. Many of the plans, such as opening up the attic rooms, using 49 as the main visitor entrance and installing a larger shop, can be seen in the museum today.

Doughty Street should become one as the Dickens House had grown substantially by this time and was suffering due to lack of space in which to store and display the collection.[171] Significantly, the plans expressed the desire to present the house and 'its décor as far as possible [according] to its probable design during the period when Dickens lived here'.[172]

It was initially hoped that the museum would be reinterpreted by 2002, in time for the Fellowship's hundredth anniversary, but due to funding problems, this did not happen.[173] It would take twenty years for the renovation plans to come to fruition. The management was not idle, however, and during this time key steps were made to turn the Dickens House into a more conventional museum. Significantly, from 2001, the Dickens House changed its identity, and *The Dickensian* no longer listed it as the Dickens House, but as the Dickens House Museum.[174] They also created facilities usually offered in other museums and heritage sites, such as a landscaped garden, café, and an audio tour.[175]

By 2010, the house remained largely a mixture of recreated rooms and exhibition spaces.[176] Booth described the house before its renovations as 'a cabinet of curiosities, not a restored home'.[177] The drawing room, scullery and washroom remained the most thoroughly recreated spaces. Meanwhile, other rooms such as Dickens's study and Mary Hogarth's rooms straddled recreated and exhibition space; the former housed a desk and chair but alongside a range of other objects, and the latter although equipped with a bed, explored the women in Dickens's life, with Maria Beadnell's album exhibited. The most explicit exhibition space

---

[171] See for example, Charles Dickens Museum Collection Group Meetings 2001-2010 Folder (20 January 2010), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[172] Malcolm Andrews, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 94 (1998), p. 230.
[173] Ibid.
[174] Carroll, Jean 'About the House', *The Dickensian,* 97:455 (2001), 269-271.
[175] Dicks, 'The Friends of the Charles Dickens Museum', p. 185.
[176] This can be seen through online sources from the time such as *The Guardian* website which shows some images of the house and through a YouTube video by a visitor in March 2010. The museum's own archive of what the house looked like is sadly lacking. 'Charles Dickens World of Interiors, *The Guardian,* <https://www.theguardian.com/books/gallery/2012/jan/24/charles-dickens-interiors-in-pictures> [accessed 27 May 2020]. Leisha Camden, 'London 2010: Charles Dickens Museum', *Youtube* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CJe2q0bNvAw> [accessed 27 May 2020].
[177] Booth, 'Houses and Things', p. 231.

was in what had been Dickens's bedroom, then the Suzannet rooms. The displays examined different themes in Dickens's life and work including his theatrical endeavours, the legacy of *Oliver Twist,* his time at the blacking factory, his friendship with Angela Burdett Coutts, Urania Cottage, the impact of *Nicholas Nickleby* (1839) and his opinion on public hangings. The lack of coherent interpretation made it a less effective visitor experience; a tourist stated there 'was no common thread to the rooms' and 'no explanation for why they were there and what they were'.[178] Others likewise reiterated there was 'a lack of cohesion and explanation' and that the museum was 'not particularly well laid out'.[179]

The museum needed to redevelop to keep up with the interpretation and display of other writers' houses. In 2011, the National Trust reopened Coleridge's Cottage, which had been converted to look as if 'Coleridge and his young family had just stepped out the door'.[180] The Trust prided themselves on this form of display; they noted, for example, that Leonard and Virginia Woolf's Monk's House has such an extensive collection that visitors can 'get the sense that the couple have just stepped out for a walk', and were proud of Agatha Christie's Greenway which is filled with the family's collection of china, books and archaeological artefacts.[181] Where it was not possible to fill writers' homes with original belongings, the Trust often filled them with contemporary furniture and used extensive records to make it as close to authentic as possible. This can be seen in Wordsworth House and Garden and Thomas Hardy's cottage.[182] Even among other writers' houses not owned by the Trust, the

[178] Trip Advisor Review August 2007 < https://www.tripadvisor.co.uk/Attraction_Review-g186338-d188889-Reviews-or960-Charles_Dickens_Museum-London_England.html#REVIEWS> [accessed 27 May 2020].
[179] Ibid, February 2008 and Jan 2012.
[180] National Trust, 'Coleridge Cottage' < https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/coleridge-cottage> [accessed 20 February 2019].
[181] National Trust, 'Monk's House' < https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/monks-house> [accessed 20 February 2019]. National Trust, 'Greenway' < https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/greenway#Overview> [accessed 20 February 2019].
[182] National Trust, 'Wordsworth House and Garden' < https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/wordsworth-house > [accessed 20 February 2019], and National Trust, 'Hardy's Cottage' < https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/hardys-cottage> [accessed 20 February 2019].

representation of an author's space had become the established norm, although there was some variation in form due to the nature of the collections each institution held.[183]

Eventually, the money for the redevelopment project was secured and was pushed for by the then director Florian Schweizer, who helped to raise the funds and awareness of the project. *The Dickensian* announced that the £3.2 million renovations would occur so the museum could reopen in line with the bicentenary of Dickens's birth in 2012.[184] By knocking into the adjoining property, 49 Doughty Street, the library and collections would be moved out of the historic house, leaving more room for recreated spaces. The additional space allowed for a larger shop and café, which had become an essential part of a museum visit.[185] There were also political changes as the Fellowship had a less prominent role in the running of the museum as only one of them was a member of the Board of Trustees.[186] No mention of the Fellowship featured in the guidebook or the house's interpretation.

After the 2012 reopening the majority of 48 Doughty Street, for the first time since its inception, was a recreated space and the interpretation was adapted with the creation of a new house booklet. The design of the guide was based around Dickens's iconic monthly parts, imitating the front cover of one of his periodicals, and the first pages contained a map of the museum with a clear key as to what the function of each room was.[187] Although the museum continued to host exhibitions, as the next chapter explores, these were instead housed within the walls of 49 Doughty Street, and their separation from the house narrative allowed greater exploration of aspects relating to Dickens's life.

One of the most significant changes following the 2012 renovation occurred in Dickens's bedroom. A bed dominated the room, and it was decorated in a Regency style. The new

[183] See, for example, Austen's Chawton House, and Wordsworth's Dove Cottage.
[184] Dicks, 'The Friends of the Charles Dickens Museum', p. 108.
[185] For example, shops and other public facilities are seen as basics in the book Timothy Ambrose and Crispin Paine, *Museum Basics* (London: Routledge, 2012).
[186] Dickens Fellowship, The Charles Dickens Museums < https://www.dickensfellowship.org/charles-dickens-museum> [accessed 28 November 2018].
[187] Museum Guide, no. 8 (2012), Charles Dickens Museum, London.

display and interpretation allowed for a more intimate view of Dickens's life and more attention was paid to Catherine. The guide stated, 'this bedroom has been recreated to evoke an ambience of privacy and personal space' and emphasised it as the place where Catherine gave birth to her daughters.[188] It was noted that 'by 1852 she had given birth to 10 children, often suffering from post-natal depression'.[189] Although this developed Catherine's story more than before, it still denoted her primarily as the mother of Dickens's children, like the first house booklet. However, the separation was also referenced: 'in the 1850s the marriage became increasingly unhappy and in 1858 Dickens separated from Catherine'.[190] The most recent reinterpretation of the room guide now reads: 'while living here, Catherine Dickens gave birth to Mary and Katey. She would go on to have ten children by 1852. Dickens separated from Catherine in 1858. But when they lived here, they were largely contented and shared this bedroom.'[191] Although fully acknowledging the house as a shared space, the room was still described as 'Dickens's bedroom' not 'The Dickenses' Bedroom', continuing to make Catherine's story less prominent within the house narrative.

Catherine's story is still mostly absent in the house, but attempts have been made to rectify this through the use of temporary exhibitions, which the 2012 renovations helped to facilitate.[192] Catherine's cookbook inspired the temporary, collaborative exhibition, 'What Shall We Have For Dinner?' in 2014.[193] Moreover, Nayder's critically acclaimed biography of Catherine led to the major exhibition 'The Other Dickens: Discovering Catherine Dickens', which Nayder helped to curate in 2016.[194] The exhibition was the first time Catherine's story was explored in detail within the museum.[195] More attempts should be made, however, to integrate Catherine's story sufficiently into the narrative of the house, as for nearly a century

[188] Ibid.
[189] Ibid.
[190] Ibid.
[191] Museum Guide, no. 9 (2018), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[192] For more about the museum's temporary exhibitions see the next chapter.
[193] 'What Shall We Have For Dinner?' Artful Dickens: Inspiring and Engaging Local Young People, at Charles Dickens Museum, 22 August 2014.
[194] 'The Other Dickens: Discovering Catherine Dickens', at Charles Dickens Museum, 3 May to 20 November 2016. The biography was critical because it placed Catherine at the centre of the story and used other source material which was not written by Dickens to give the most comprehensive account of her life yet. Nayder, *The Other Dickens,* p. 2.
[195] See p. 222 for more about the response to the exhibition.

Dickens's voice and experiences dominated the interpretation, even though she lived there too.

In 2012, the décor of the Mary Hogarth room also changed to further reflect what a young girl's bedroom would have looked like, to add to the realism of the house.[196] The walls were repainted, and a bed and other appropriate furniture were installed.[197] The interpretation of the room were adapted to explore the theme of death, which seems the most appropriate place to display the topic as Mary had died in this room.[198] Additionally, Dickens's death was explored, allowing the study to become a place to celebrate his literary achievements and works. The study's walls were lined with bookshelves filled with early editions of his books which 'form part of the National Dickens Library which is held here at the Museum', putting his works and the place he wrote them together to add to the significance of the room.[199]

Figure 12: AC.I.1095 Mary Hogarth Room c.1930 and AC.I.1096 Mary Hogarth Room c.1970, Charles Dickens Museum, London

[196] Dicks, 'The Friends of the Charles Dickens Museum', p. 186.
[197] Ibid.
[198] Malcolm Andrews, 'The Future of the Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 88 (1992), p. 179.
[199] Ibid. The National Dickens Library refers to the collection of Frederick Kitton which was first deposited at the Guildhall before it was moved to the museum when it opened in 1925. The term is no longer used by the museum. An image of the study in February 2012 <https://gerryco23.wordpress.com/2012/02/29/in-dickens-footsteps-1-doughty-street/> [Accessed 20 September 2020].

The upstairs attic rooms of the house that had previously been used as administration rooms and closed to the public were opened. These rooms were the least successful in achieving a recreated space. The nursery examined 'how a traumatic childhood experience of poverty and child labour shaped Dickens as a man and author' and displayed the blacking bottle and prison bars.[200] Similarly, the servant's bedroom gave passing reference to how Dickens's servants read his works but principally explored how his writings still speak to us today.[201] More could have been made of this space to draw attention to the other residents who lived with and served Dickens during his time at Doughty Street. Some attempts to fill this gap occurred in the basement where the traditional Victorian kitchen emphasised how the room was at the 'centre of servants' life', and was usually one of the least pleasant areas in a Victorian house; 'the result was a dark and overheated basement infested with vermin and pests'.[202] This reinterpretation was more in line with the interpretation usually found in historic houses, although more could be done to display these differences in social class.

By 2012, the Charles Dickens Museum had turned the majority of 48 Doughty Street into a reconstruction of Dickens's home; however, the house was still not considered to have a powerful 'presence'.[203] One review from 2013 stated, 'given the slightly spartan furnishing and lack of other information visitors are largely left to fend for themselves'.[204] The reviewer drew a comparison with Carlyle's house, which they saw as bulging with items related to the author. In regard to the Charles Dickens Museum, they stated 'slightly more effort could have been made to make this house feel lived in'.[205] Some of the narrative changes were not considered substantial enough; there was still a desire to learn more about Dickens's treatment of his own domestic servants, the theme of death in Mary Hogarth's room was not examined 'deeply', and there were recommendations for a better visitor route.[206] The reviewer was further disappointed that the museum 'coyly draws a veil' over Dickens's

[200] Dickens House Guide, no. 6 (1990), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[201] Museum Guide, no. 8 (2012), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[202] Ibid.
[203] Jonathan Conlin, 'Charles Dickens Museum, London', *Museums Journal,* 113:04 (2013), 50-53.
[204] Ibid.
[205] Ibid.
[206] Ibid.

relationship with Ternan.[207] There was still some way to go before the museum could pride itself on having one of the most inclusive narratives within a English writers' house.

The story of the museum's display interpretation is still changing, however, and more acquisitions have helped to develop the narrative of the house. Significantly, in 2015 the museum purchased Dickens's desk and chair from Gad's Hill, which meant it could be permanently housed in the study and this stopped the constant re-display and reinterpretation which had occurred within the room.[208] The continued changes have been pushed forward by progressive staff such as the current Director Cindy Sughrue and recent curators such as Louisa Price and Frankie Kubicki. The museum was rebranded again in 2018, and the length of the house guide was shortened.[209] The display and overarching interpretation remained much the same as in 2012, with similar themes and emphasis. But the room descriptions functioned instead as introductory panels to each room, with much of the interpretation occurring in the rooms themselves through object labels. It allowed for more of Dickens's story to be told as the diverse objects allowed different parts of Dickens's life to be explored, rather than just the few years he spent at Doughty Street.

The Fellowship had helped preserve a positive image of Dickens throughout the twentieth century, but as their influence over the Dickens House waned, so did their ability to retain the polished image of Dickens. His legacy was also affected by cultural and societal shifts in values. There was a growing tolerance within the public for subjects that had previously been taboo, like sex and adulterous marriages, but these changes take time to implement within museums without controversy. These changes in societal preferences have allowed the Dickens Museum, and other writers' houses, to examine previously hidden elements of authors' lives. Furthermore, Dickens's critical reputation underwent changes which revealed more about his life and works then perhaps he would have desired.[210] For example, during the bicentenary

[207] Ibid.
[208] Object records highlight it was purchased with help from the National Monuments Trust and Dickens Fellowship, in 2015.
[209] Museum Guide, no. 9 (2018), Charles Dickens Museum, London.
[210] For a comprehensive look at Dickens's changing critical reputation see Laurence W. Mazzeno, *The Dickens Industry: Critical Perspectives 1836-2005* (Rochester: Camden House,

celebrations of Dickens's birth in 2012, an international 'Four Cities' conference was held and one of the four locations was at Condette in France. This was where Dickens and Ellen Ternan often spent time together, showing that his relationship with her had become acceptable to reference publicly - so much so, that an exhibition referencing Dickens and Ternan's relationship was the focus of an exhibition at the museum the following year.[211] Although there is still some way to go to give a more realistic, well-rounded image of Dickens and his home life, the recreated spaces at the Charles Dickens Museum have taken considerable steps to reveal more about Dickens, his life and works.

2008); and Emily Bell's edited collection, *Dickens After Dickens* (Leeds: White Rose Press, 2020).

[211] Exhibition entitled 'The Invisible Woman', see Dickens Museum, 'Past Exhibitions' <https://dickensmuseum.com/blogs/exhibitions/tagged/previous-exhibitions> [accessed 16 October 2019].

Conclusion: Exhibiting Dickens

This thesis has shown that Dickens, as an author tourist, was not a passive observer of literary tourist sites; instead he was actively interested in how authors were commemorated and memorialised. Dickens's experience of literary tourist sites led him to campaign against physical memorials to authors, promoting his preference for commemorating them through their works alone rather than a focus on their tangible authorial legacy. Yet, as the latter chapters of this thesis have shown, Dickens could not retain control over his posthumous legacy, and 48 Doughty Street developed into the authorial literary tourist site we experience today. However, Dickens's reservations about physical authorial memorialisation and the disadvantages he often anticipated regarding this form of commemoration continue to affect how we encounter his legacy today.

In this Conclusion, I hope to briefly summarise how the temporary exhibitions hosted by the Charles Dickens Museum, particularly those that focus on Dickens's authorial legacy, exemplify the problems that physical commemoration can entail. Although Dickens himself did not experience temporary exhibitions focused on an author and their works, his reservations about memorialising authors can be applied to these displays. An author's image, especially one encapsulated within the confines of an exhibition, is less fluid than their works, and the rigidity of their image generates challenges to how visitors encounter their legacy within a physical space. Temporary literary exhibitions have received very little critical attention, despite being a crucial way for the public to experience an author's literary legacy, and they offer an insight into the contemporary challenges of commemorating an author.[1] This Conclusion will explore some of these issues before looking ahead to the future of writers' house museums and literary tourist studies.

[1] John does briefly mention the Museum of London, 'Dickens and London' exhibition in her work 'Stardust, Modernity and the Dickensian Brand', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies of the Long Nineteenth Century,* 14 (2012), 1-7, but aside from reviews temporary exhibitions do not gain extensive analysis into their effect on audience perceptions. This gap in the scholarship may be because literary culture is largely a marginalised area within Museum Studies. Few studies directly explore temporary exhibitions, aside from, for example, Sue M. Davies, 'The Co-production of Temporary Museum Exhibitions', *Museum Management and Curatorship,* 25:3 (2010), 305-321.

As this thesis has highlighted, when the Dickens House first opened, the Dickens Fellowship attempted to honour Dickens's wish to be remembered through his works by emphasising 48 Doughty Street's literary links. As well as trying to engrain this literary emphasis within the narrative of the house, as I analysed in Chapter Five, the Fellowship also strove to do this through the temporary exhibitions, thus supplementing the inherently authorial focus of the house.[2] In 1926, a year after the Dickens House opened, they hosted their first temporary literary exhibition. It centred on *A Christmas Carol,* displaying Dickens Christmas-themed books and paintings that were 'much appreciated' by the public.[3] This marked the beginning of a long-standing tradition of emphasising Christmas within the Dickens House. Even today, the property is decorated for Christmas from November to January every year. The literary emphasis continued within the temporary displays for much of the twentieth century, largely due to the frequent centenaries of Dickens's individual works. In 1936, a display celebrated the centenary of *The Pickwick Papers*, where 'every item related to *The Pickwick Papers* and was of first-class importance'.[4] The Fellowship worked with other heritage sites to commemorate Dickens's works, such as in 1949, when they collaborated with the V&A to celebrate one hundred years of *David Copperfield.* They released special edition copies of the work and put on an exhibition containing original monthly parts, as well as letters Dickens wrote referring to the book.[5]

The emphasis on Dickens's works within the temporary exhibitions continued after the 2012 redevelopment, when there was a dedicated space for temporary exhibitions. In 2015, the 'A Dickens Whodunnit: Solving the Mystery of *Edwin Drood*' exhibition explored not only the

[2] Although the museum only had a dedicated temporary exhibition space following the 2012 redevelopment, temporary displays had been used by the Dickens House from 1926 and were often 'pop up' exhibitions in different areas of the house where space allowed.
[3] B. W. Matz, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 22:3 (1926), p. 57. Similarly, in 2019-2020 the museum held the exhibition 'Beautiful Books: Dickens and the Business of Christmas', which is reminiscent of this earlier exhibition.
[4] Walter Dexter, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 32 (1936), p. 159.
[5] Leslie C. Staples, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 45 (1949), p. 116.

legacy of the novel but also allowed an 'interactive investigation into the mystery'.[6] Visitors were given all the evidence and were encouraged to decide what they thought would have been the resolution of Dickens's unfinished novel. Similarly, Dickens's links to the festive period continue, helped by the sustained popularity of *A Christmas Carol* (1843), which has become Dickens's most adapted works and, for many, synonymous with Christmas.[7] In 2015, the museum hosted the exhibition, 'A Christmas Carol Reimagined', which exhibited props and costumes used in Dickens film adaptations alongside historical objects relating to the work.[8] Similarly, in 2017, the exhibition 'Ghost of an Idea: Unwrapping a Christmas Carol', displayed items from the film, *The Man Who Invented Christmas* (2017), which examined Dickens's creation of *A Christmas Carol*.[9] The festive period remains the busiest season for visitors to the Charles Dickens Museum.[10]

The sustained focus on Dickens's works has occurred because he is one of the most widely adapted authors for the screen; so many visitors have encountered his works through this medium instead of or, as well as, reading his work.[11] The many recent adaptations of his works have led to temporary exhibitions that explore these on-screen versions. For example, the museum worked with the production company Red Planet which produced the TV show *Dickensian,* on the exhibition, 'Dickensian: Behind the Scenes of the BBC Drama Series'. The display weaved 'its way through the author's own rooms', and was an 'arresting combination of costumes, props, production material and parts of the set, illustrating the craft involved in

[6] CDM digital records, accessed 6 September 2018, and Dickens Museum, 'Past Exhibitions' <https://dickensmuseum.com/blogs/exhibitions/tagged/previous-exhibitions> [accessed 16 October 2019]. The academic advisor was Peter Orford.
[7] John, for example, highlighted the growth in adaptations of the work throughout the twentieth century, *Dickens and Mass Culture,* p. 212. It is now widely acknowledged that screen adaptations are another form of literary heritage, see Sheela Agarwal and Gareth Shaw, *Heritage, Screen and Literary Tourism* (Bristol: Channel View Publications, 2018).
[8] 'A Christmas Carol Reimagined', 1 December 2015 to 6 January 2016.
[9] The exhibition ran from 29 November 2017 to 25 February 2018.
[10] This is particularly of note when for many other museums the winter months are often a quieter period in terms of visitor numbers.
[11] Juliet John, 'Forward', *Dickens After Dickens,* ed. by Emily Bell (Leeds: White Rose University Press, 2020).

creating the settings, building the atmosphere and realising the characters of the BBC series *Dickensian*.'[12]

However, in recent years, the temporary exhibitions have instead come to focus more on Dickens the man, exploring his authorial legacy and stepping away from the specifically literary legacy that Dickens, and the Fellowship, wanted to promote. It is now part of the museum's 'mission to revitalise the idea of Dickens and show different sides of the author that are not so well known', emphasising how key authorial tourism is to the institution.[13] The temporary exhibition galleries, particularly because they are now situated in the adjoining property, offer a separate space from the narrative of 48 Doughty Street and allow these different sides of Dickens's character to be highlighted. The exhibition 'Charles Dickens: Man of Science', for example, showed how forward-thinking, aware and interdisciplinary Dickens was, representing him 'not only as a scientific enthusiast but as the key communicator of science in the Victorian age'.[14] The emphasis on unearthing more about an author further reflects a wider development in temporary literary exhibitions. The Bodleian library, for example, hosted the 'Which Jane Austen?' exhibition of 2017, which aimed to change the public perception of the writer. The display was conceived thematically to draw the visitor's attention to Austen's dynamic personality, exploring her as a national treasure, professional writer, businesswoman, London shopper, and progressive thinker.

The focus on authorial exhibitions has meant that areas of Dickens's life that he did not want to be publicly explored, and had remained quietly in the background of the house's narrative for much of the twentieth century, could now be investigated. For example, the 'The Invisible Woman' exhibition - organised in collaboration with the production company which had created a film of the same name – surveyed the relationship between Dickens and Ellen Ternan. Although the exhibition was more about 'the design of the film', utilising set dressing, concept sketches, props and costume, it was an open acknowledgement of Dickens's

[12] 'Dickensian: Behind the Scenes of the BBC Drama Series' <https://dickensmuseum.com/blogs/exhibitions > [Accessed 5/11/2020].
[13] Correspondence with curator, 27 July 2020.
[14] Dickens Museum, 'Past Exhibitions' <https://dickensmuseum.com/blogs/exhibitions/tagged/previous-exhibitions> [accessed 16 October 2019].

relationship with Ternan, which had rarely been explicitly stated in the museum.[15] Despite opposing Dickens's wishes to keep his private life separate from his literary legacy, this exhibition helped establish a more realistic interpretation of his life to visitors.

However, the emphasis on Dickens's authorial legacy presents its own challenges. Dickens's reservation about monuments was derived from their inability to fully represent an author; the same can be said for temporary exhibitions, which inherently present a curtailed image of Dickens. The very nature of a museum display means that there is limited scope and space to explore topics in detail; Chapter Five noted this in reference to the narrative of the Dickens house, and the smaller parameter of a temporary display means there is even less ability to examine topics extensively. The complexity of Dickens's character makes this more challenging. Due to this, exhibitions often have a very narrow field of focus and are designed with an audience who are typically fans of Dickens in mind.[16] The museum has attempted to broaden the narrative of their exhibitions, through, for example, the exhibition 'The Other Dickens: Discovering Catherine Dickens', which helped to unearth a more realistic view of Catherine Dickens's life.[17] However, the exhibition attracted fewer visitors than the site's other temporary exhibitions, suggesting that visitors remain more interested in Dickens's story than Catherine's.

The issues facing temporary authorial exhibitions can be seen through responses to the recent exhibition, 'Global Dickens: For Every Nation Upon Earth', in 2019. The institutional partnership between the museum and Royal Holloway, as well as AHRC and NPIF funding, enabled me to be the assistant curator on the project, and my supervisor was the co-curator. The focus of this exhibition was on Dickens's thoughts and experiences of travel, twinned with the global dissemination of his work. The knowledge that Dickens enjoyed travel and had

[15] Dickens Museum, 'Past Exhibitions' <https://dickensmuseum.com/blogs/exhibitions/tagged/previous-exhibitions> [accessed 16 October 2019]. See the previous chapter concerning the removal of a caption below a picture of Ternan, on p. 187-8.

[16] For more about visitors to the museum, Macleod surveys Trip Advisor reviews of the museum in 'A Faint Whiff of Cigar'.

[17] See the previous chapter for more about this exhibition. The academic advisor was Lilian Nayder.

ventured throughout Europe and America has an established base within Dickens scholarship, but this knowledge is only just beginning to permeate into the public understanding.[18]

The global topic of the exhibition was influenced by the political events of 2016 as 'the project reflected the Brexit debate and was influenced by this idea of the national and international'.[19] Although this was to be a focus, the curatorial team decided that they did not want the project to be 'drowned' out by this contemporary issue.[20] We divided the exhibition into two, firstly by exploring Dickens's own travels and then the dissemination of his works. In the first room, a large graphic of a world map illustrated the countries Dickens's had visited during his lifetime, alongside a letter which showed his intention to travel even further to Australia. The introductory section looked at him as a travel writer and how he tapped into the popular travel writing genre, with his travelling writing desk, complete with pens and ink bottles, on display. Then Dickens's travels in America were analysed to show how these trips and experiences directly affected his authorial career. Another area focused upon Dickens's relationship with Europe and emphasised how his travels were reflected within his works, including, for example, in *Little Dorrit*, *David Copperfield* and *Martin Chuzzlewit*. A range of objects were on display, from letters Dickens wrote while abroad, and gifts he was given before travelling to souvenirs he brought back with him.

[18] See, for example, *Global Dickens,* ed. by John Jordan and Nirshan Perera (London: Routledge, 2012). For existing scholarly studies of his international reception, see *The Reception of Charles Dickens in Europe, Vol. 1,* ed. by Michael Hollington (London: Bloomsbury, 2013); *The Oxford Handbook of the Victorian Novel,* ed. by Lisa Rodensky (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); and Regenia Gagnier, 'The Global Circulation of Charles Dickens's Novels', *Literature Compass,* 4 (2013), 82-95.
[19] Noted in correspondence with the curator.
[20] Ibid.

Figure 13:: Global Dickens Map Graphic, Emily Smith, 2019

Figure 14: Display from Global Dickens exhibition featuring souvenirs and gifts, Emily Smith, 2019

The other room explored how Dickens's works travelled, both before and after his death. It began with a cartoon of Dickens showing him crossing the channel holding editions of his books which was published in 1868. There were examples of foreign translations, such as a Dutch monthly part, and international adaptations of his work, including a Manga edition of *A Christmas Carol*, and a Russian playbill of a performance of *The Pickwick Papers*. A copy of

David Copperfield that had travelled to Antarctica with Robert Falcon Scott's expedition was also displayed and proved to be a highly popular object.[21] Following the same theme, a timeline of when specific Dickens works were translated into other languages was on display downstairs. In addition, a house trail ran alongside the exhibition, highlighting the artefacts already on display in the house that linked to the theme of Dickens and travel.

The response to the exhibition showed that many people were intrigued by how well-travelled Dickens was, just as the exhibition had intended; one visitor described it as 'terrific, informative and revealing', highlighting that the exhibition helped to change peoples' views of Dickens.[22] Another visitor stated, 'Dickens really is a global celebrity' even though we often think of him as 'the quintessentially Brit writer'.[23] The exhibition helped contribute to this understanding and attract the public's attention to this area of scholarly interest. The team anticipated that the exhibition would provoke questions about Brexit, but surprisingly this aspect was not greatly picked upon in the publicity or feedback.

One area of the exhibition which did prove controversial concerned the issue of Dickens and racism. One reviewer wrote in response to the exhibition:

> Dickens may have been well travelled and exposed himself to new cultures and people. His work may well have a global influence but his opinions and ideas are more complex than this exhibition portrays. Perhaps it is time to explore Dickens in a more rounded way, particularly when an opportunity presents itself in an exhibition on 'Global Dickens', rather than glossing over his prejudices.[24]

---

[21] This object was used most frequently by the press in their review and publicity of the exhibition, for example, the *Evening Standard*, *I News* and the *Guardian*. Described as the 'star object'. Fine Books and Collections, 'Global Dickens', <https://www.finebooksmagazine.com/blog/global-dickens> [accessed 2 November 2020].
[22] Adrian Wootton, 'Tweet regarding the Global Dickens exhibition], (@aojwFL_BFC, 15 May 2019).
[23] Gursimran Oberoi, 'Tweet regarding the Global Dickens exhibition', (@gursimOberoi, 29 May 2019).
[24] Tincture of Museum, 'Global Dickens, Dickens Museum, May 2019', <https://tinctureofmuseum.wordpress.com/2019/05/20/global-dickens-dickens-museum-may-2019/> [accessed 2 November 2020].

Dickens's racial prejudices were briefly acknowledged in the exhibition. The text caption of a painting depicting the steamship Dickens travelled to America on noted:

> This image shows the *Great Western* arriving in New York surrounded by crowds, including a racist depiction of African Americans. Dickens like many people in the period held racist views. Although he advocated for the abolition of slavery, Dickens also presented disturbing depictions of other races in his works.[25]

However, this was the only mention of the subject, and the extent of his views was not explored in extensive detail; much more could have been done to survey this sufficiently.

Behind the scenes, how to represent Dickens's racism was a subject of debate. As previously stated, it is difficult for complex topics to be explored sufficiently within the parameters of a temporary exhibition, particularly when they are not the key focus. Furthermore, Dickens's links to racism are not simple. Grace Moore has stated, for example, that following the 1857 Indian Revolt Dickens displayed 'a growing belief in the inferiority of non-white races which was never to leave him', but 'he was far from being a systemic racist'.[26] How racist Dickens was, however, remains a subject of debate.[27] There were further discussions within the team about the most nuanced way to show Dickens's discriminatory views. We debated including Dickens's own words on the subject. However, when we discussed some passages from Dickens's writing, it became clear that this would involve displaying discriminating and upsetting racist language, which the museum did not feel was appropriate to show visitors without proper exploration and trigger warnings. This led to the compromise of acknowledging Dickens's attitudes but with little extensive exploration.

---

[25] Caption from Global Dickens exhibition

[26] Moore, *Dickens and Empire,* p. 131.

[27] Explored in *Charles Dickens in Context,* ed. by Sally Ledger and Holly Furneaux (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Laura Peters, *Orphan Texts: Victorians, Orphans, Culture and Empire* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013); Laura Callanan, *Deciphering Race: White Anxiety, Racial Conflict and the Turn to Fiction in Mid Victorian English Prose* (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2006), has a chapter about Dickens and Wilkie Collins.

In the wake of the resurgence in the Black Lives Matter movement following the widely publicised racial violence against black men and women in America at the beginning of 2020, particularly the murder of George Floyd on 25 May 2020, the lack of sufficient acknowledgement, and condemnation, of Dickens's racial attitudes within an exhibition which could have allowed it, has been thrown into even starker contrast. The toppling of the Edward Colston statue, for example, which was then defaced and thrown into Bristol harbour, emphasises the issues of commemorating racist figures.[28] The removal of this statue, prompted renewed discussions about the commemoration of other racist figures, including authors such as H. G. Wells. A petition was created to remove the statue of Wells in Woking, due to his 'love [of] eugenics'.[29] Similarly, English Heritage received calls to remove blue plaques commemorating authors with xenophobic and colonialist views, including Enid Blyton and Rudyard Kipling.[30] English Heritage stated they would not remove the plaques but instead add more information regarding 'aspects that people may find troubling' to their website, which provides background information about each plaque, highlighting the importance of addressing these issues in the interpretation that accompanies commemorative acts. [31]

---

[28] Occurred on 7 June 2020, the statue is now in safe storage following the actions of the Bristol City Council. The removal of his image allowed his involvement in the slave trade to be explored more widely in the public sphere, and his symbolic burial in the harbour and subsequent removal has garnered conversations about whether the statue should be re-displayed elsewhere and, if so, with what contextualisation. The iconoclasm of monuments has occurred all over the world for centuries, Katherine Verdery, *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies: Reburial and Post-colonist Change* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), pp. 5 and 12. Modern iconoclasm, including the Colston statue, is explored in Alex von Tunzelmann, *Fallen Idols* (London: Headline Publishing, 2021). Siblon, has also explored how memorialisation has affected minority communities in John Siblon, 'Monument Mania?', *People and Their Pasts,* ed. by Paul Ashton and Hilda Kean (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 146-162.

[29] *Woking News and Mail,* 'Petition to Remove H. G. Wells Statue Divides Public Opinion', <https://www.wokingnewsandmail.co.uk/?p=27257> [accessed 1 August 2021]. See previous calls for it removal, Yarden Katz, 'It's Time To Take The "Great" White Men of Science Off Their Pedestals' <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/sep/19/white-supremacist-statues-must-fall-scientists> [accessed 1 August 2021].

[30] BBC, 'Enid Blyton: English Heritage Has No Plans To Remove Plaque' <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-57517254> [accessed 1 August 2021].

[31] Ibid. These aspects are acknowledged in each author's biography, see English Heritage, 'Rudyard Kipling', <https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/blue-plaques/rudyard-

Dickens's own questionable attitudes did not go unnoticed during the July 2020 BLM movement as the words, 'DICKENS RACIST DICKENS RACIST', were graffitied onto the walls of the Broadstairs Dickens house, which was supposedly Dickens's inspiration for Betsy Trotwood's home.[32] As we have seen, writers' houses are a form of monument so this act is comparable to the defacing of other statues and monuments around the country. Writers' houses, as monuments themselves, are accountable for, and targets of, criticism regarding the author they seek to represent. Although some may argue that it is not necessary for writers' houses to acknowledge an author's connection to racism or controversial topics and is political to do so, these institution's physical and commemorative nature make them inherent targets. Silence on such matters is not a neutral stance, for as Richard Sandell's extensive work shows, museums are inherently political places, and should be places of education and debate.[33] As broadcasters of an author's image and reputation, writers' houses are accountable for acknowledging the questionable aspects of the figure they celebrate and should implement an institutional policy regarding such topics. [34]

---

kipling/> [accessed 1 August 2021], and English Heritage, 'Enid Blyton', < https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/blue-plaques/enid-blyton/> [accessed 1 August 2021]. In 2019, there was an exhibition at the American Natural History Museum which debated what to do with the Theodore Roosevelt statue on display outside the museum. The temporary exhibition gave a comprehensive overview of Roosevelt's racism and the many ideas of what to do with the statue. It has now been decided that the statue will be removed, The New York Times, 'Roosevelt Statue to be Removed from Museum of Natural History' < https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/21/arts/design/roosevelt-statue-to-be-removed-from-museum-of-natural-history.html> [accessed 15 November 2020].

[32] Sky News, 'Man charged after "Dickens racist" graffiti found on Kent Museum', 1 July 2020 <https://news.sky.com/story/police-arrest-man-after-charles-dickens-museum-in-kent-targeted-with-graffiti-12018094> [accessed 24 September 2020].

[33] Richard Sandell and Eithne Nightingale, *Museums, Equality and Social Justice* (London: Routledge, 2012); and Richard Sandell, Jocelyn Dodd, Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, *Re-Presenting Disability: Activism and Agency in the Museum* (London: Routledge, 2010).

[34] However, there are still some institutions that shy away from addressing the controversial views of those they commemorate. Despite the public announcement from Roald Dahl's family acknowledging his racism, the Roald Dahl Museum does not openly address the issue on their website. However, reference to it can be found under Roald Dahl, 'Family Notice' <https://www.roalddahl.com/global/rdsc-and-family-notice> [accessed 25 March 2021].

As Chapter Five explored, writers' houses need to adapt their displays in order to keep up with developments in the museum and heritage sector. The emphasis is now on the content of the space, rather than the aesthetics, and how objects, particularly those representing dated ideals, are presented. There is a general move within museums to be more inclusive and to display the history and stories of marginalised groups[35]. The Charles Dickens Museum is now making more steps to address Dickens's racism within its displays. Within the temporary exhibition 'More! *Oliver Twist*, Dickens and Stories of the City', Dickens's use of 'prejudiced and stereotypical characteristics and mannerisms', when describing Fagin is acknowledged.[36] Although scholars have explored this aspect of *Twist*, the use of a separate interpretation panel labelled 'The Trouble with Fagin' helps to draw the visitor's attention to the explanation and allows Dickens's antisemitism to be explored.[37] The panel acknowledges how Dickens changed his mind about his depiction of Jews and later attempted to instil a more positive Jewish character, Riah, within *Our Mutual Friend* (1865).[38]

Although the museum does note questionable objects and connections within the interpretation of the house - for example, a smoking Turk figurine owned by Dickens is noted as being a 'naïve and patronising' representation of Turkish culture - more can and should be done to situate and explore Dickens's racism. The curators could work alongside stakeholders from diverse groups to give a well-rounded view of the impact that his opinions and depictions have had on various communities and cultures. This should then influence the interpretation of the museum, both onsite and online. There is now a widespread move

[35] Advocated by heritage bodies including the Museums Association and funders such as Arts Council England, see for example, Sharon Heal, 'Putting Inclusion at the Heart of our Institutions', *Museum Association* <https://www.museumsassociation.org/campaigns/workforce/inclusion/putting-inclusion-at-the-heart-of-our-institutions/> [accessed 13 August 2021]. Arts Council England, 'Creative Case for Diversity', <https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/diversity/creative-case-diversity> [accessed 13 August 2021].

[36] Charles Dickens Museum, 'More! *Oliver Twist*, Dickens and Stories of the City' (July 2021).

[37] Ibid. The antisemitism within the novel was explored in the 1980s by Mark H. Gelber, *Aspects of Literary Anti-Semitism: Charles Dickens's Oliver Twist and Gustav Freytag's Soll und Haben* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980). It continues to be explored by, for example, Susan Meyer, 'Anti-Semitism and Social Critique in Dickens's *Oliver Twist'*, *Victorian Literature and Culture* (2005), 33:1, 239-252.

[38] Charles Dickens Museum, 'More! *Oliver Twist*, Dickens and Stories of the City' (July 2021).

within museums to decolonise collections, and explicitly call out links to unsavoury and hidden pasts.[39] However, this is not without challenges and controversy. The Museum of the Home were pressured by the Government to retain the statue of Sir Robert Geffrye after considerable public pleas for its removal.[40] The culture secretary, Dowden, left the museum feeling 'extremely compromised' after he intervened to promote leaving the statue in situ.[41] As a government-funded organisation, this placed the museum in an invidious position, and demonstrates how museum's interpretation can be heavily affected by governmental regimes. Heritage organisations must also balance public opinion; the National Trust's new interpretation plan, which outlines their ninety-three properties that have connections to colonialism and historic slavery, led to political and public backlash with some visitors terminating their memberships.[42] Yet, it is hoped that in time decolonised and more inclusive heritage and collections will become the norm in museums, and within the political and public spheres they sit within, allowing for a greater understanding and discussion of these issues.

Covid, Closure and the Future

One of Dickens's key concerns regarding memorialisation was how a failed attempt to produce and retain a physical act of commemoration would reflect on an author's reputation. Due to the economic effects of Covid-19 heritage sites, including literary houses, are in danger

[39] Decolonising collections advocated by the Museums Association, 'Decolonising Museums', <https://www.museumsassociation.org/campaigns/decolonising-museums/> [accessed 13 August 2021]. Heritage bodies such as Collection Trust promote resources which help museums to decolonise their collections, Collections Trust, 'Decolonising Practice',< https://collectionstrust.org.uk/resource/decolonising-practice/> [accessed 13 August 2021].

[40] Jonathan Knott, 'Museum of the Home Director Laments Politisation of Heritage', *Museums Association* < https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/news/2020/10/museum-of-the-home-director-laments-politicisation-of-heritage/> - accessed 14 August 2021].

[41] Ibid.

[42] National Trust, 'Addressing the Histories of Slavery and Colonialism' <https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/features/addressing-the-histories-of-slavery-and-colonialism-at-the-national-trust> [accessed 25 March 2021]. The Independent, 'National Trust Slave Trade and Colonialism Links' <https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/national-trust-slave-trade-colonialism-links-cancel-membership-twitter-a9685026.html> [accessed 25 March 2021].

of closing. In 2021, it was reported that sixty per cent of UK museums 'fear for their survival', particularly smaller institutions.[43] Some smaller museums dedicated to individuals have already been under threat, such as the Florence Nightingale Museum, which was saved from closing indefinitely.[44] Many writers' houses, including the Charles Dickens Museum, launched a plea for support and applied for government emergency funding.[45] As an independent museum, The Charles Dickens Museum's revenue streams were severely affected by the lockdowns, as fifty per cent of their funding comes from visitor admission, thirty-five per cent from café and shop revenue, and the rest from event hire and film facilitation.[46] The museum was successful in its bid for Cultural Recovery Fund money, and used some of the funds to build relationships with the local community, as can be seen through the exhibition 'More! *Oliver Twist*, Dickens and Stories of the City', which utilised local stories inspired by the novel.[47] However, the long-term ramifications of the pandemic are yet to be understood, and with a significant percentage of the museum's visitors coming from overseas, the negative effects look set to continue for a number of years.[48]

The Charles Dickens Museum may look towards an uncertain future, but 2025 will mark the centenary of its establishment and would provide an apt opportunity for the museum to explore its history and impact on Dickens's legacy. One of the ways the museum may celebrate the occasion is to recreate the opening of the museum in 1925 and have a street party to celebrate the event.[49] An event such as this, bringing together the Dickensian

---

[43] Geraldine Kendall Adams, 'New Lockdown Leaves Museums "Fighting for Survival"', <https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/news/2021/01/new-lockdown-leaves-museums-fighting-for-survival/> [accessed 1 August 2021].
[44] Museums Association, 'Florence Nightingale Museum Closes Indefinitely' <https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/news/2021/01/florence-nightingale-museum-closes-indefinitely-to-safeguard-its> [accessed 25 March 2021]. The museum has no confirmed it can reopen.
[45] Museums Association, 'Writers' Museums and the Covid 19 Crisis', <https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/analysis/2020/04/27042020-writers-museums-covid-19-crisis/> [accessed 25 March 2021].
[46] Ibid.
[47] Charles Dickens Museum, 'More! *Oliver Twist*, Dickens and Stories of the City' <https://dickensmuseum.com/blogs/all-events/more-oliver-twist-dickens-and-stories-of-the-city> [accessed 1 August 2021].
[48] Ibid.
[49] Conversation with the museum Director, July 2021.

community and celebrating the history of the museum, would be an apt way to, hopefully, celebrate the end of some difficult years for the heritage industry.

Writers' houses, like the Charles Dickens Museum, now face increasing competition regarding literary exhibitions. Such displays are no longer confined to within the walls of writers' house museums and are now often part of wider museums' 'blockbuster' exhibition programmes. For example, in 2012 the Museum of London hosted the sizeable temporary exhibition 'Dickens and London' which examined how his life and works connected to the city. In addition, 2017 and 2018 marked a substantial development in large scale, popular exhibitions focused on authors and their works in larger heritage organisations, including for example 'Harry Potter: A History of Magic' at the British Library, 'Winnie The Pooh' at the V&A, and 'Good Grief Charlie Brown' at Somerset House.[50] It is noteworthy that a number of these literary exhibitions were many institutions' most popular exhibits of the year, or, in some cases, ever.[51] The popularity of blockbuster literary exhibitions is set to continue with temporary exhibitions exploring not just the author and their works, but also their legacy. The V&A's 'Alice: Curiouser and Curiouser' exhibition displays *Alice in Wonderland's* (1865)

[50] This is not the place to explore the reasons behind this, but the sheer number of large-scale, successful temporary literary exhibitions is worth mentioning in this study. During the same period, a considerable number of films exploring authors and their works were also released. Examples include *The Man Who Invented Christmas* (2017) which explored Charles Dickens and *A Christmas Carol*; *Mary Shelley* (2017); *Colette* (2018); *All is True* (2018) about the life of Shakespeare; and *Tolkien* (2019).

[51] The British Library hosted their 'most popular exhibition', 'Harry Potter: A History of Magic Exhibition' from 20 October 2017 to 28 February 2018. Likewise, the Bodleian's 'Tolkien: Maker of Middle Earth' exhibition was seen by more than 100,000 people from all over the world and was the Bodleian's 'most popular summer exhibition to date'. Emily Sharpe and Jose De Silva 'Art's Most Popular: 2018 Most Visited Shows and Museums', *The Art Newspaper* <https://www.theartnewspaper.com/analysis/fashion-provides-winning-formula> [Accessed 11 May 2020]; Maeve Kennedy, 'Record breaking Harry Potter magic exhibition goes online', *The Guardian* <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2018/feb/27/record-breaking-harry-potter-magic-exhibition-goes-online> [accessed 11 May 2020]; 'Last Chance to View Hugely popular Tolkien Exhibition', *The Bodleian* <https://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/bodley/news/2018/sep-19> [accessed 11 May 2020].

'origins, adaptations and reinventions over 157 years' and how it went 'from manuscript to global phenomenon', reflecting expanding scholarly studies concerning authors' legacies.[52]

Although writers' houses have tended to maintain a degree of separation from wider museums due to their nature as a largely recreated space that allow the visitor to experience an author's space, literary exhibitions held in non-authorial sites have started to mimic their practices. The Bodleian's 'Tolkien: Maker of Middle Earth' exhibition in 2018, for example, displayed Tolkien's desk, covered with pens to illustrate the way that he worked. The exhibition explored Tolkien's life thematically and displayed many of his illustrations which are rarely seen by the public.[53] Similarly, another breakthrough exhibition, 'Terry Pratchett: His World', held at The Salisbury Museum from 16 September 2017 to 13 January 2018, recreated the author's study, with Pratchett's original desk and a vinyl impersonation of his bookshelves. The space gave the impression that a phantom Pratchett was busy at work, with sound effects of him writing and playing video games coming from his computer. This highlights how temporary exhibitions held away from an author's biographical spaces often mimic the display practices of writers' houses to create a meaningful, experiential visit. The Pratchett exhibit was a huge success, especially for a smaller scale, provincial museum, and brought visitors from all over the world, making it one of the museum's most successful exhibitions. The museum now intends to hold another literary exhibition focused on Thomas Hardy in 2022.[54]

Similarly, there are literary exhibitions hosted in non-heritage sites, largely based on adaptations of literary works.[55] The Harry Potter studios, housed within the Warner Brothers studio lot in London, displays the recreated sets from the films and exhibits props in museum-

---

[52] 'Alice Curiouser and Curiouser', *V&A*, <https://www.vam.ac.uk/exhibitions/alice-curiouser-and-curiouser> [accessed 11 May 2020]. Meant to be held in 2020 but was pushed back to 2021 because of COVID-19.
[53] 'Last Chance to View Hugely popular Tolkien Exhibition', *The Bodleian* <https://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/bodley/news/2018/sep-19> [accessed 11 May 2020].
[54] *Wessex Museums*, 'Hardy's Wessex', <https://www.wessexmuseums.org.uk/what-we-do/exhibitions-events/thomas-hardy-exhibition/> [accessed 14 August 2021].
[55] As they are adaptations of literary works and often utilise descriptions in the works themselves, they remain a form of literary heritage.

esque cases. The studio attracts up to six thousand visitors a day. In addition, a recent touring exhibition displayed costumes, props and recreated scenes from the popular TV show adaptation of *Game of Thrones,* and was housed within large exhibition centres, including the O2 in London. As awareness of the popularity of literary exhibitions continues, writers' houses will need to do more to stand out from the crowd.

Despite the increase in literary tourism destinations, the scholarly field of literary heritage itself is only beginning to become a designated field of research within museum studies and deserves more attention. Although more works are published every year, it is such a vast international and interdisciplinary field that many studies have only skimmed the surface of the discipline's potential. There is a broad range of literary tourist sites, from museums to houses, to walks, landscapes, and fictional worlds. All these areas deserve attention as they show the very different ways that literary tourism can be experienced. This study has centred primarily on writers' houses, those which Dickens visited and the Charles Dickens Museum, and has hoped to show the wealth of new knowledge that can be discovered in this area. However, there is much more to be unearthed, such as the history and impact of other literary houses dedicated to his memory, including the Charles Dickens Birthplace. In addition, this thesis has only briefly examined the dual function of Gad's Hill as a school and literary tourist site, which is a topic that would benefit from greater analysis. Furthermore, although there have been more studies about Dickens's literary heritage in London and some attention is now being paid to Kent, particular in relating landmarks link to his novels, this is a wide field that could profit from more research and comparison to other authors.

As this thesis has shown, to explore an author's literary heritage thoroughly, you cannot be constrained to working within a single discipline. An interdisciplinary approach is beneficial to many different fields of research, but especially to literary heritage studies which utilise literature, history, museology, tourism studies, creative and cultural industries, to name but a few. The inherent interdisciplinarity of the area is further encapsulated by the collaborative nature of this project. This partnership was highly beneficial as it allowed me to employ both institutions' expertise and resources to conduct a thorough study of Dickens's links to literary heritage using original research. I was able to bridge the gap between academia and museological institutions and bring to light new perspectives. This collaborative method of

working should be utilised more frequently in the future as it helps to make academic work more applicable to wider industries, enabling research to have a more significant impact. It allowed me to work on the 'Global Dickens' exhibition, which enabled me to contribute towards museology/curatorial strategy as well as academic knowledge.

My work has further highlighted how enlightening the development and history of a house museum can be. However, more research could be conducted into the function and running of literary houses. Although these sites are similar to historic houses, they are distinct due to their links to literary tourism and pilgrimage, as well as their connections to the biographical and imaginary.[56] Literary houses deserve further museological distinction. More studies should compare the differences between specifically literary tourist sites and other heritage sites, or even between literary tourist sites themselves. Such studies would aid the operators of such sites to share knowledge and develop the site's visitor experience and management.

This thesis hopes to have unearthed more about Dickens and his own understanding of literary tourism. By designating Dickens as an author tourist, I have highlighted that authors are not passive visitors to literary tourist sites, but often are influenced by the heritage they encounter there. Furthermore, by juxtaposing Dickens's lived experience and wishes regarding his literary legacy with the founding and development of the Charles Dickens Museum, I hope to have shown how Dickens's wishes regarding his literary heritage are still applicable to the Dickens literary tourism we experience today.

Literary tourism studies is a growing field of research. As more literary works become popular and are in turn adapted into TV and film, the number of literary tourist sites will rise.[57] Despite the difficulties during Covid-19, a fundraising campaign to purchase the property occupied by J. R. R. Tolkien while he wrote *The Hobbit,* was established and backed by a number of high-profile lenders.[58] The more sites that are created, the more competition there will be to

[56] See introduction, p. 18, for more detail.
[57] More literary heritage sites are being created especially due to the popularity of TV adaptations of books such as *Game of Thrones* (1996) and *Outlander* (1991), causing more literary heritage sites in Ireland, Scotland and even further afield in Croatia.
[58] Project Northmoor, 'About'< https://www.projectnorthmoor.org/> [accessed 3 April 2021]. Sadly, this project was unable to raise the necessary funds in time and the house will

attract visitors.[59] Just as Dickens considered how authors were commemorated after their death, we too need to think about what the future of the literary landscape will look like, and the effects it will have on literature, history, museology and society.

instead be sold to a private buyer, but the support shows the continued appetite for writers' houses.

[59] The last in-depth study into the number of writers' houses was conducted by Linda Young, 'Literature, Museums and National Identity'.

Bibliography

'Abbotsford as Described by a Distinguished American', *The Anniversary or Poetry and Prose for 1829,* ed. by Allan Cunningham (London: John Sharpe, 1829), pp. 81-100

Abbotsford, 'The House', <https://www.scottsabbotsford.com/visit/the-house> [accessed 5 November 2020]

Abraham, Adam, *Plagiarising the Victorian Novel: Imitation, Parody and After text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019)

Ackroyd, Peter, *Dickens,* (London: Sinclair and Stevenson, 1990)

Adair, Joshua G., 'House Museums or Walk in Closets? The (Non)Representation of Gay Men the Museums They Called Home', *Gender, Sexuality and Museums,* ed. by Amy K. Levin (London: Routledge, 2010), pp. 264-279

Adams, Geraldine Kendall, 'New Lockdown Leaves Museums "Fighting for Survival", <https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/news/2021/01/new-lockdown-leaves-museums-fighting-for-survival/> [accessed 1 August 2021]

Agarwal, Sheela and Gareth Shaw, *Heritage, Screen and Literary Tourism* (Bristol: Channel View Publications, 2018)

Alexander, Christine, 'Myth and Memory: Reading the Brontë Parsonage', ed. by Harald Hendrix, *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), pp. 93-111

Alger, J. G., 'William Haldimand', *ODNB* < https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-11900> [accessed 13 January 2020]

Allen, Michael, 'Homes of Dickens', ed. by Paul Schlicke, *The Oxford Reader's Companion to Dickens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 279-282

Altick, Richard, *The Shows of London* (London: Harvard University Press, 1978)

Ambrose, Timothy, and Crispin Paine, *Museum Basics* (London: Routledge, 2012)

Andrews, Malcolm, 'Charles Dickens Walked Past Here: Dickensian Topography and the Idea of Fellowship', *Erea,* 13:2 (2016), 1-20

Andrews, Malcolm, 'The Future of the Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 88 (1992), 179-184

Armstrong, Frances, *Dickens and the Concept of Home* (London: UMI Research Press, 1990)

Armstrong, Isobel, *Victorian Glassworlds: Glass Culture and the Imagination, 1830-1880* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Arts Council, *Accreditation Standard 2018*, < https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Accreditation_Standard_Nov2018_0.pdf> [accessed 9 October 2019]

Atkin, Polly, 'Ghosting Grasmere: The Musealisation of Dove Cottage', *Literary Tourism and the Nineteenth Century*, ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006), pp. 84-95

Aynsley, Jeremy, 'The Modern Period Room: A Contradiction in Terms?', *The Construction of the Exhibited Interior 1870-1950,* ed. by Penny Sparke (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), pp. 8-31

Bal, Mieke, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1985)

Bann, Stephen, *The Clothing of Clio: A Study of the Representations of History in Nineteenth Century Britain and France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)

Barthes, Roland *Death of the Author* <http://www.tbook.constantvzw.org/wp-content/death_authorbarthes.pdf> [accessed 4 November 2020]

Bate, Jonathan, *The Romantics on Shakespeare* (London: Penguin, 1992)

Bautz, Annicka, 'Scott's Victorian Readers', *Nineteenth Century Context,* 31:1 (2009), 19-29

BBC News, 'Dickens Statue Unveiled in Portsmouth' <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-26072562 > [accessed 22 November 2018]

BBC News, 'Pratchett's Unpublished Works Crushed by Steamroller', <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-dorset-41093066> [accessed 22 November 2018]

BBC, 'Enid Blyton: English Heritage Has No Plans To Remove Plaque' <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-57517254> [accessed 1 August 2021]

BBC News, 'The Empty Grave of Charles Dickens' <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-kent-16834429> [accessed 22 November 2018]

BBC, 'Mary Wollstonecraft Statue: 'Mother of Feminism' sculpture provokes backlash <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-54886813> [accessed 10 November 2020]

Bell, Emily, 'Introduction', *Dickens After Dickens,* ed. by Emily Bell (Leeds: White Rose University Press, 2020)

Bell, Emily, 'The Dickens Family, the Boz Club and the Fellowship', *The Dickensian,* 113:503 (2017), 219-232

Benjamin, Walter, 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction', *Illuminations,* ed. by Hannah Arendt, trans. by Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), pp. 218-22

Berggren, Lars, 'The Monumentomania of the Nineteenth Century: Causes, Effects and Problems of Study', *Memory and Oblivion* (1999), 561-566

Berghoff, Hartmut, et al., ed., *The Making of Modern Tourism: The Cultural History of the British Experience* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002)

Bishop, Susann, 'The Allure of American Authors' Homes: Surveying Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Literary Guides', *From Page to Place: American Literary Tourism and the Afterlives of Authors,* ed. by Jennifer Harris and Hilary Iris Lowe (Massachusetts, University of Massachusetts Press, 2017), pp. 205-223

Black, Barbara J., *On Exhibit: Victorians and Their Museums* (Virginia: University of Virginia Press, 2000)

Bloom, Harold, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

Bodenheimer, Rosemarie, *Knowing Dickens* (London: Cornell University Press, 2010)

Boehm, Katharina and Victoria Mills, 'Introduction: Mediating the Materiality of the past 1700-1930', *Word and Image,* 33:3 (2017), 233-239

The Bodleian, 'Last Chance to View Hugely popular Tolkien Exhibition' <https://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/bodley/news/2018/sep-19> [accessed 11 May 2020]

Bolus-Reichert, Christine, *The Age of Eclecticism: Literature and Culture in Britain 1815-1885* (Columbus: Ohio University Press, 2009)

Booth, Alison, *Homes and Haunts: Touring Writers' Shrines and Countries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016)

Booth, Alison, 'Houses and Things: Literary House Museums as Collective Biography', *Museums and Biographies,* ed. by Kate Hill (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012), pp. 231-247

Booth, Alison, 'Time Travel in Dickens' World', *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth-Century Culture',* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 150-163

Bourdieu, Pierre, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste,* trans. by Richard Nice (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984)

Briggs, Asa, *Victorian Things* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1988)

Britannia Academia, 'Drury Lane', <https://academic-eb-com.ezproxy01.rhul.ac.uk/levels/collegiate/article/Drury-Lane-Theatre/31263> [accessed 8 June 2020]

British Library, 'Prospectus for Shakespeare Society', <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/prospectus-for-the-shakespeare-society> [accessed 27 March 2018]

Broderip, Frances Freeling, *Memorials of Thomas Hood* (London: Edward Moxen and Co, 1860)

Brown, Bill, 'Thing Theory', *Critical Enquiry,* 28:1 (2011), 1-22

Brown, Lorraine, 'Tourism and Pilgrimage: Paying Homage to Literary Heroes', *International Journal of Tourism Research,* 18 (2016), 165-75

Brown, William Wells, *Three Years In Europe: or, Places I have Seen and People I have Met* (London: Charles Gilpin, 1852)

Bryant, Julius,' Museum Period Rooms for the Twenty-First Century: Salvaging Ambition', *Museum Management and Curatorship,* 24:1 (2009), 73-84

Burnell, David, 'Gad's Hill Place vs Hall Place', *The Dickensian,* 99:461 (2003), 213-222

Burton, Anthony, 'Literary Shrines: The Dickens House and Other Writers' House Museums', *The Dickensian*, 72 (1977), 138-146

Busby, Graham and Julia King, 'Movie Induced Tourism: The Challenge of Measurement and Other Issues', *Journal of Vacation Marketing,* 7:4 (2001), 316-332

Butcher-Younghans, Sherry, *Historic House Museums* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993)

Butler, Amy, 'Dickens's Swiss Chalet', *The Dickensian,* 78:383 (1977), 147-148

Butt, John, 'Dickens's Manuscripts', *Yale University Library Press,* 36:4 (1962), 149-161

Buzard, James, 'The Grand Tour and After, 1660-1840', *Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing,* ed. by Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 37-52

Buzard, James, *The Beaten Track: European Tourism, Literature and the Ways to Culture 1800-1918* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993)

Buzinde, Christine and Lyunolu Osagie, 'William Wells Brown: Fugitive Subjectivity, Travel Writing and the Gaze', *Cultural Studies,* 25:3 (2011), 405-425

Cabral, Magaly, 'Exhibiting and Communicating History and Society in Historic House Museums', *Museum International,* 53:2 (2001), 42-3

Callanan, Laura, *Deciphering Race: White Anxiety, Racial Conflict and the Turn to Fiction in Mid Victorian English Prose* (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2006)
Cambridge, Nick, 'Bleak Health: Charles Dickens's Medical History Revisited', *The Dickensian,* 505:114 (2018), 117-133
Carlton, William J., 'George Hogarth: A Link with Scott and Dickens', *The Dickensian,* 59, (1963), 78-90
Carroll, Jean 'About the House, *The Dickensian,* 97:455 (2001), 269-271
Charles Dickens Museum, 'Dickensian: Behind the Scenes of the BBC Drama Series'<https://dickensmuseum.com/blogs/exhibitions> [Accessed 5 November 2020]
Charles Dickens Museum, 'More! *Oliver Twist*, Dickens and Stories of the City' <https://dickensmuseum.com/blogs/all-events/more-oliver-twist-dickens-and-stories-of-the-city> [accessed 1 August 2021]
Charles Dickens Museum, 'Past Exhibitions' <https://dickensmuseum.com/blogs/exhibitions/tagged/previous-exhibitions> [accessed 16 October 2019]
Christensen, Kim, 'Ideas Versus Things: The Balancing Act of Interpreting Historic House Museums', *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 17:2 (2011), 153-168
City of London, 'History of the House' < https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/things-to-do/keats-house/keats-history/Pages/History-of-the-house.aspx> [accessed 20 February 2019]
Claisse, Caroline, 'Multisensory Interactive Storytelling to Augment the Visit to a Historical House Museum', *Digital Heritage International Congress* (2018), 1-8
Clarke, Fiona, *Hats* (London: B T Batsford, 1982)
Clayton, Abigail, *Who Owns the Bard? P. T. Barnum, Charles Dickens, and the Shakespeare Birthplace Showdown of 1847*, (Bringham Young University, BYU Scholars Archive, 2020)
Clayton, Jay, *Charles Dickens In Cyberspace* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)
Clymer, Lorna, 'Cromwell's Head and Milton's Hair: Corpse Theory in Spectacular Bodies of the Interregnum', *Eighteenth Century Theory and Interpretation,* 40:2 (1999), 91-112
Coggin Womack, Elizabeth 'Nineteenth Century Auction Narratives and Compassionate Reading', *Victorian Review,* 43:2 (2017), 229-246
Cohen, Deborah*, Family Secrets* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)
Cohen, William A., 'Interiors: Sex and the Body in Dickens', *Critical Survey,* 17:2 (2005), 5-19

Cohen, William A., *Sex Scandal: The Private Parts of Victorian Fiction* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996)

Colaiacomo, Paola, 'The Rooms of Memory: The Praz Museum in Rome', *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory,* ed. by Harald Hendrix (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), pp. 127-139

Collections Trust, 'Decolonising Practice',< https://collectionstrust.org.uk/resource/decolonising-practice/> [accessed 13 August 2021]

Collins, Wilkie, *Mr. Wray's Cash Box; Or the Mask and the Mystery* (London: Richard Bentley, 1852)

Conlin, Jonathan, 'Charles Dickens Museum, London', *Museums Journal,* 113:4 (2013), 50-53

Connell, Philip, 'Death and the Author: Westminster Abbey and the Meanings of the Literary Monument', *Eighteenth Century Studies,* 38:4 (2005), 557-585

Corpron Parker, Pamela, 'Elizabeth Gaskell and Literary Tourism', *Literary Tourism and the Nineteenth Century,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 128-139

Crane, Susan A., 'Curious Cabinets and Imaginary Museums', *Museums and Memory,* ed. by Susan A. Crane (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), pp. 60-81

Cumming, Alan, *The Anniversary or Poetry and Prose for 1829* (London: John Sharpe, 1829)

Curl, James Stevens, *Death and Architecture* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2002)

Curl, James Stevens, *Victorian Celebration of Death* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2001)

Curley, Eileen, 'Tainted Money? Nineteenth Century Charity Theatricals', *Theatre Symposium,* 15 (2007), 52-73

Davies, Sue M., 'The Co-production of Temporary Museum Exhibitions', *Museum Management and Curatorship,* 25:3 (2010), 305-321

Davis, Jim, and Victor Emeljanow, 'Victorian and Edwardian Audience', *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian and Edwardian Theatre,* ed. by Kerry Powell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 93-109

Davis, Jim, and Victor Emeljanow, *Reflecting the Audience: London Theatre Going 1840-1880* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2001)

De Stasio, Clotilde, 'Venice Preserved: Dickens and Italian Stereotypes Past and Present', *Imagining Italy: Victorian Writers and Travellers,* ed. by Catherine Waters et al. (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010), pp. 63-78

Dekker, George, *The Fictions of Romantic Tourism: Radcliffe, Scott and Mary Shelley* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005)

Delap, Lucy, *Knowing Their Place: Domestic Service in Twentieth Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)

Dexter, Walter, 'Some Treasures of the Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 24:3 (1928), 233-236

Dickens Fellowship, 'Aims and Powers' <https://www.dickensfellowship.org/sites/default/files/basic/Dickens%20Fellowship%20Constitution%20amended%202017.pdf> [accessed 29 January 2019]

Dickens Fellowship, The Charles Dickens Museum < https://www.dickensfellowship.org/charles-dickens-museum> [accessed 28 November 2018]

Dickens Library Online, 'Oliver Goldsmith' < http://www.dickenslibraryonline.org/author/247> [accessed 4 November 2020]

Dickens Library Online, 'Samuel Johnson, < http://www.dickenslibraryonline.org/author/325> [accessed 4 November 2020]

Dickens Library Online, 'The Dummy Books of Tavistock House and Gad's Hill' <http://www.dickenslibraryonline.org/library/dummy> [accessed 6 November 2020]

Dickens Library Online, 'William Hazlitt' <http://www.dickenslibraryonline.org/author/276> [accessed 4 November 2020]

Dickens, Charles, *A Christmas Carol,* ed. by Robert Douglas-Fairhurst (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Charles Dickens, *Barnaby Rudge,* ed. by Clive Hurst (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008),

Dickens, Charles, *Bleak House,* ed. by Stephen Gill (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Dickens, Charles, *David Copperfield,* ed. by Nina Burgis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980)

Dickens, Charles, *Dombey and Son,* ed. by Alan Horsman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974)

Dickens, Charles, *Great Expectations,* ed. by Margaret Cardwell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993)

Dickens, Charles, 'The Guild of Literature and Art', *Household Words* (10 May 1851), *Dickens Journals Online,* < https://www.djo.org.uk/household-words/volume-iii/page-145.html> [accessed 19 June 2021]

Dickens, Charles, *Little Dorrit,* ed. by Harvey Peter Suckersmith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979)
Dickens, Charles, *Martin Chuzzlewit,* ed. by Margaret Cardwell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982)
Dickens, Charles, *The Mystery of Edwin Drood,* ed. by Margaret Cardwell (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 2009)
Dickens, Charles, *Nicholas Nickleby,* ed. Paul Schlicke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
Dickens, Charles, *Oliver Twist,* ed. by Kathleen Mary Tillotson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966)
Dickens, Charles, *The Old Curiosity Shop,* ed. by Elizabeth M. Brennan (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)
Dickens, Charles, 'Owen's Museum', *All the Year Round,* 8:179 (27 September 1862) *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-viii/page-62.html> [accessed 13 June 2021]
Dickens, Charles, *Our Mutual Friend,* ed. Michael Cotsell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
Dickens, Charles, *Pictures From Italy,* ed. by Kate Flint (London: Penguin Classics, 1998)
Dickens, Charles, 'Scott and his Publishers', *Examiner,* (31 March and 29 September 1839), *Miscellaneous Papers by Charles Dickens,* ed. by Bertram W. Matz (London: Chapman and Hall, 1908), pp. 82-97
Dickens, Charles, *Sketches by Boz,* ed. by Dennis Walder (London: Penguin Classics, 1995)
Dickens, Charles, 'The Uncommercial Traveller'*, All the Year Round* (25 February 1860), *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-ii/page-416.html> [accessed 21 June 2021]
Dickens, Charles, 'The Uncommercial Traveller', *All The Year Round* (7 April 1860), *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-ii/page-557.html> [accessed 19 June 2021]
Dickens, Charles, 'The Uncommercial Traveller'*, All the Year Round* (16 June 1861), p. 351, *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-ix/page-351.html> [accessed 20 June 2021]

Dickens, Charles, 'The Uncommercial Traveller', *All the Year Round* (30 June 1860), p. 276, *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-iii/page-274.html> [accessed 19 June 2021]

Dickens, Charles, 'The Uncommercial Traveller', *All the Year Round,* (8 September 1860), p. 520, *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-iii/page-517.html> [accessed 19 June 2021]

Dickens, Charles, 'The Uncommercial Traveller', *All The Year Round* (29 September, 1860), *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-iii/page-588.html> (accessed 13 June 2021)

The Dickens Fellowship, 'About' <https://www.dickensfellowship.org/> [accessed 26 March 2021]

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 21:3 (1925), 3

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 22:3 (1926), 57-58

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 25:1 (1930), 162-3

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 25:3 (1929), 391-195

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 29:1 (1933), 172

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 31 (1935), 70-71

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 32 (1936), 57-58

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 34 (1937-38), 221-224

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 36 (1939-40), 199

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 37 (1941), 65-68

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 41 (1944), 105

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 42 (1945), 218-219

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 45 (1949), 56-59

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 47 (1951), 94

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 52 (1956), 46-47

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 56 (1960), 190

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 63 (1967), 191-192

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 65 (1969), 206

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 66 (1970), 131

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 67 (1971), 188-191

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 68 (1972), 66-67

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 72 (1977), 54

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 73 (1978), 55-58

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 75 (1979), 60-61

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 79 (1982), 11-12

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 80 (1984), 163-165

'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian*, 94 (1998), 229-230

Dicks, Joan 'The Friends of the Charles Dickens Museum', *The Dickensian,* 102:469 (2006), 185-190

Joan Dicks, 'The Friends of the Charles Dickens Museum', *The Dickensian,* 105:479 (2009), 281-284

Dinsdale, Ann, *At Home with the Brontës* (Stroud: Amberley Publishing, 2013)

Dobbs, Brian, *Drury Lane* (Toronto: Cassell and Company, 1972)

Dobson, Michael, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare Adaptation and Authorship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992)

Donaldson, Christopher, 'Mapping Wordsworthshire: A GIS Study of Literary Tourism in Victorian Lakeland', *Journal of Victorian Culture,* 20:3 (2015), 287-307

Donnelly, Jessica Foy, 'Introduction', *Interpreting Historic House Museums,* ed. by Jessica Foy Donnelly (Oxford: Altramira Press, 2002), pp. 1-18

Dorrian, Mark, 'Museum Atmosphere: Notes on Aura, Distance and affect', *Journal of Architecture,* 19:2 (2014), 187-201

Drew, John, *Dickens the Journalist* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

Dudley, Sandra, *Museums Objects: Experiencing the Property of Things* (London: Routledge, 2012)

Dudley, Sandra, *Museum Materialities: Objects, Engagements and Interpretations* (London: Routledge, 2010)

Duncan, Ian, *Modern Romance and the Transformation of the Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)

Dunlop, Eileen, *Sir Walter Scott: A Life in Story* (Edinburgh: NMS Enterprise, 2016)

Dunstan, Angela, 'Reading Victorian Sculpture', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*', 22 (2016), 1-14

Durie, Alastair J., 'Scott and Tourism', *Literary Tourism, the Trossachs and Walter Scott,* ed. by Ian Brown (Glasgow: ASLS, 2012), pp. 45-56

Easley, Alexis, *Literary Celebrity, Gender and Victorian Authorship 1850-1914* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011)

Edmonson, John, *Dickens on France* (Oxford: Signal Books, 2006)

Engler, Balz, 'Stratford and the Canonization of Shakespeare', *European Journal of English Studies,* 1:3 (1997), 354-366

English Heritage, 'Enid Blyton', < https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/blue-plaques/enid-blyton/> [accessed 1 August 2021]

English Heritage, 'Rudyard Kipling', <https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/blue-plaques/rudyard-kipling/> [accessed 1 August 2021]

Fawcett, C., and P. Cormack, 'Guarding Authenticity at Literary Tourism Sites', *Annals of Tourism Research,* 28:3 (2001), 686-704

Ferreira, Ana, et al., 'Literary Tourism: A Cultural Trip?' *Advances in Tourism, Technology and Smart Systems,* ed. by Alvaro Rocha (Singapore: Springer Nature, 2020) 505-515

Fielding, K. J., 'A New Article by Dickens: Scott and his Publishers reprinted from the *Examiner', The Dickensian,* 46 (1950), 122-127

Fielding, K. J., ed. *The Speeches of Charles Dickens* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960)

Fine Book and Collection 'Global Dickens', <https://www.finebooksmagazine.com/blog/global-dickens> [accessed 2 November 2020]

Flanders, Judith, *Inside the Victorian Home* (London: Harper Collins, 2003)

Fleming, Patrick, 'After Dickens World: Performing Victorians at the Chatham Docks', *Neo-Victorian Studies,* 9:1 (2016) 12-31

Flew, Sarah, 'Unveiling the Anonymous Philanthropist: Charity in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of Victorian Culture,* 20:2 (2015), 20-33

Flint, Joy, 'Thomas Hood', *ODNB,* <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-13681 > [accessed 28 January 2019]

Ford, George H, *Dickens and His Readers: Aspects of Literary Criticism Since 1836* (New York: Norton Library, 1965)

Forster, John, *The Life of Charles Dickens* (Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1875)

Foster, Shirley, 'Americans and Anti-tourism' *Literary Tourism and the Nineteenth Century,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 175-184

Foulkes, Richard, 'Dickens and the Shakespeare Tercentenary', *The Dickensian,* 81:406 (1985), 72-78
Freedgood, Elaine, *The Idea of Things: Fugitive Meaning in the Victorian Novel* (London: University of Chicago Press, 2006)
'The Friends of the Charles Dickens Museum', *The Dickensian,* 108:486 (2012), 108-110
Frost, Stuart, 'A Question of Interpretation', *British Museum Blog* <https://blog.britishmuseum.org/a-question-of-interpretation/> [accessed 8 October 2019]
Frost, Stuart, 'The Warren Cup: Secret Museums, Hidden Histories of Sex and Sexuality', *Museums and Social Issues,* 3:1 (2008), 29-40
Furneaux, Holly, 'Domesticating and Queer Theory', *The Oxford Handbook of Charles Dickens,* ed. by R. Patten, J. O. Jordan, C. Waters (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 372-387
Furneaux, Holly, *Homoeroticism in the Novels of Charles Dickens* (London: UCL, 2003)
Furneaux, Holly, *Queer Dickens: Erotics, Families, Masculinities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
Furneaux, Holly, 'Victorian Masculinities, or Military Men of Feeling: Domesticity, Militarism and Manly Sensibility*', The Oxford Handbook of Victorian Literary Culture,* ed. by Juliet John (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 211-233
Fussell, Paul, *Abroad: British Literary Travelling Between the Wars* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980)
Gager, Valerie L., *Shakespeare and Dickens: The Dynamics of Influence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
Gagnier, Regenia, 'The Global Circulation of Charles Dickens's Novels', *Literature Compass,* 4 (2013), 82-95
Garnett, John, 'Nonconformists, Economic Ethics and Consumer Society in Mid-Victorian Britain', *Culture and the Nonconformist Tradition,* ed. by Jane Shaw and Alan Kreider (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1999), pp. 95-116
Garval, Michael D., *A Dream of Stone: Fame, Vision and Monumentality in Nineteenth Century French Literary Culture* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004)
Gelber, Mark H., *Aspects of Literary Anti-Semitism: Charles Dickens's Oliver Twist and Gustav Freytag's Soll und Haben* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980)
Gill, Stephen *Wordsworth and the Victorians* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)

Glendening, John *The High Road: Romantic Tourism, Scotland and Literature, 1720-1820* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997)

Goldhill, Simon, *Freud's Couch, Scott's Buttocks, Bronte's Grave* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011)

Gould, Marty, and Rebecca Mitchell, 'It Was the Worst of Times: A Visit to Dickens World', *Victorian Literature and Culture,* 38:1 (2010), 287-293

Greaves, John, *Dickens at Doughty Street* (London: Elm Tree Books, 1975)

Greenblatt, Stephen, 'Resonance and Wonder', *Bulletin of the American of Arts and Science,* 43:4 (1990), 11-34

Gross, John and Gabriel Pearson, *Dickens and the Twentieth Century* (London: Routledge, 1962)

Grubb, Gerald, 'Dickens's Editorial Methods', *Studies in Philology,* 40:1 (1943), 79-100

Grubb, Gerald, 'Dickens's Influence as an Editor' *Studies in Philology,* 42:4 (1945), 811-823

Halliday, Andrew, 'Shakespeare Mad', *All The Year Round,* (21 May 1864), *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-xi/page-345.html> [accessed 21 June 2021], 345-351

Hamlett, Jane, 'The Dining Room Should be the Man's Paradise, as the Drawing Room is the Woman's: Gender and Middle-Class Domestic Space in England 1850-1910', *Gender History,* 21:3 (2009), 576-591

Hancock, Nuala, 'Virginia Woolf's Glasses: Material Encounters in the Literary/ Artistic House Museum', *Museum Materialities: Objects, Engagements, Interpretations,* ed. by Sarah H. Dudley (London: Routledge, 2010), pp. 114-128

Hancock, Nuala, *Charleston and Monk's House: The Intimate House Museums of Virginia Woolf and Vanessa Bell* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012)

Hannay, James, 'Graves and Epitaphs', *Household Words* (16 October, 1852), *Dickens Journals Online* < https://www.djo.org.uk/household-words/volume-vi/page-105.html> [accessed 26 June 2021]

Hardy, Florence Emily, *The Later Years of Thomas Hardy 1892-1928* (Cambridge University Press, 1930)

Harland Nelson, 'Dickens and the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust: "What a Jolly Summer!"' *A Humanist's Legacy: Essays in Honour of John Christian Bale,* ed. by Dennis M. Jones (Iowa: Luther College, 1990), pp. 72–80

Hazard, Erin, 'Step Forth and Again Take Up Its Magic Pen: The Author's House as Informal Memorial', *From Page to Place: American Tourism and the Afterlives of Authors,* ed. by Jennifer Harris and Hilary Iris Lowe (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2017), pp. 46-67

Hazard, Erin, 'The Author's House: Abbotsford and Weyside' *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth Century,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 63-73

Heal, Sharon, 'Putting Inclusion at the Heart of our Institutions', *Museum Association* <https://www.museumsassociation.org/campaigns/workforce/inclusion/putting-inclusion-at-the-heart-of-our-institutions/> [accessed 13 August 2021]

Hemingway Home, 'Cats', <https://www.hemingwayhome.com/cats/> [accessed 26 September 2019]

Hemingway Home, 'Wives', <https://www.hemingwayhome.com/wives/> [accessed 26 September 2019]

Hendrix, Harold, 'From Early Modern to Romantic Literary Tourism', *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth-Century Culture,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 13-25

Hendrix, Harald, 'Writers' Houses as Media of Expression and Remembrance', *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory*, ed. by Harald Hendrix (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), pp. 1-15

Hendrix, Harold, 'The Early Modern Invention of Literary Tourism', *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory,* ed. by Harold Hendrix (London: Routledge, 2008), pp. 15-31

Herbert, David, 'Literary Places, Tourism and the Heritage Experience', *Annals of Tourism Research,* 28:2 (2001), 312-333

Hill, Kate, 'Introduction: Museums and Biographies', *Museums and Biographies,* ed. by Kate Hill (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012), pp. 1-10

Hipple, Walter John, *The Beautiful, the Sublime and the Picturesque in Eighteenth Century Aesthetic Theory* (Carbondale: University of Illinois Press, 1957)

Hodgdon, Barbara, *The Shakespeare Trade: Performances and Appropriations* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998)

Hogarth, Georgina, and Mamie Dickens, *The Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 1, 1833-1856* (London: Amazon)

Holderness, Graham, 'Bardolatry or the Cultural Materialists Guide to Stratford upon Avon', *The Stratford Myth,* ed. by Graham Holderness (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), pp. 2-15

Hollington, Michael and Francesca Orestano, *Dickens and Italy: Little Dorrit and Pictures From Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009)

Hongyan, Jia, 'The Construction of Literary Tourism Sites', *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal,* 57:1, (2009), 69-83

Hosely, Richard, *The Yale Shakespeare: The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917)

Howarth, Janet, 'Gender, Domesticity and Sexual Politics', *The Nineteenth Century, 1815-1901,* ed. by Colin Matthew (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 163-190

Howse, Christopher, 'The Burial of the Heart', *The Telegraph* <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherhowse/3557176/The-burial-of-the-heart.html> [accessed 22 November 2018]

Hudon Edward G, 'Literary Piracy, Charles Dickens and American Copyright Law', *American Bar Association Journal,* 50:12 (1964), 1157-1160

Hulme, Peter, and Tim Youngs, 'Introduction' *Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing,* ed. by Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 1-14

Hunter, Aislinn, *Evocative Objects: A Reading of Resonant Things and Material Encounters in Victorian Writers' Houses/Museum* (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2014)

Ileisure, 'About D H Lawrence' <https://www.lleisure.co.uk/d-h-lawrence-birthplace-museum/about-d-h-lawrence/> [accessed 26 September 2019]

Imagining Italy: Victorian Writers and Travellers, ed. by Catherine Waters et al. (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010)

The Independent, 'National Trust Slave Trade and Colonialism Links'<https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/national-trust-slave-trade-colonialism-links-cancel-membership-twitter-a9685026.html> [accessed 25 March 2021]

Irving, Washington, 'Abbotsford and Newstead Abbey', <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/7948/7948-h/7948-h.htm> [accessed 30 March 2021]

Irving, Washington, 'The Mutability of Literature: A Colloquy in Westminster Abbey, 1819' *The Oxford Book of American Essays,* ed. by Brander Matthews (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1914)

Irving, Washington, *The Sketchbook of Geoffrey Crayon (*New York: G. P. Putnam, 1861)

Jackson, Jeffrey E., 'Dickens's Rejection of Scott's Influence in *Barnaby Rudge*', *The Victorian,* 5:1 (2017), 1-19

Jackson, Lee, *Walking Dickens's London* (London: Shire Publications, 2012)

Jalland, Patricia, *Death in the Victorian Family,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996)

Janiskee, Robert J, 'Historic Houses and Special Events, *Annals of Tourism Research,* 23:2 (1996), 398-414

John, Juliet, 'Dickens's Global Art: Cultural and Ecological Legacy in Pictures From Italy', *E-Rea,* 13:2 (2016), 1-36

John, Juliet, 'Forward', *Dickens After Dickens,* ed. by Emily Bell (Leeds: White Rose University Press, 2020)

John, Juliet, 'Stardust, Modernity and the Dickensian Brand', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies of the Long Nineteenth Century,* 14 (2012), 1-7

John, Juliet, 'The Heritage Industry', *Charles Dickens in Context,* ed. by Sally Ledger and Holly Furneaux (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 74-81

John, Juliet, 'Things, Words and the Meanings of Art', *Dickens and Modernity,* ed. by Juliet John (New York: Boydell and Brewer, 2012), pp. 115-132

John, Juliet, *Dickens and Mass Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)

John, Juliet, *Dickens's Villains: Melodrama, Character and Popular Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

Johnson, Samuel, 'Preface', *The Plays of William Shakespeare* (1765)

Jordan, John and Nirshan Perera, *Global Dickens* (London: Routledge, 2012)

Joseph, Gerhard and Herbert F. Tucker, 'Passing On: Death', *A New Companion to Victorian Literature and Culture,* ed. by Herbert F. Tucker (Oxford: Wiley & Sons, 2014), pp. 110-123

Kaplan, Fred, *Dickens: A Biography* (Sevenoaks: Hodder and Stoughton, 1988)

Katz, Yarden, 'It's Time To Take The "Great" White Men of Science Off Their Pedestals' < https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/sep/19/white-supremacist-statues-must-fall-scientists> [accessed 1 August 2021]

Keeble, Trevor, 'The Modern Period Room: Introduction', *The Construction of the Exhibited Interior 1870-1950,* ed. by Penny Sparke (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), pp. 1-8

Keir Hinrichs, Linda, 'Where in the Dickens is Gad's Hill? Or a Comparative Review of Literary Guides in Britain', *Reference Services Review*, 10:3 (1982), 55-59

Kelly, Lionel, *Tobias Smollett: The Literary Heritage* (London: Routledge, 1987)

Kelly, Stuart, *Scott-land: The Man Who Invented a* Nation (Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2011)

Kennedy, Dennis, 'Shakespeare and Cultural Tourism', *Theatre Journal,* 50:2 (1998), 175-188

Kennedy, Maeve, 'Record Breaking Harry Potter Magic Exhibition Goes Online', *The Guardian* <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2018/feb/27/record-breaking-harry-potter-magic-exhibition-goes-online> [accessed 11 May 2020]

Kirwin, Peter and Charlotte Mathieson, *A Tale of Two Londons: Locating Shakespeare and Dickens in 2012* (Nottingham: Nottingham University, 2015)

Knott, Jonathan, 'Museum of the Home Director Laments Politisation of Heritage', *Museums Association* < https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/news/2020/10/museum-of-the-home-director-laments-politicisation-of-heritage/> - accessed 14 August 2021]

Korte, Barbara, (trans. Catherine Matthias), *English Travel Writing From Pilgrimage to Postcolonial Explorations* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).

Kostelnick, Charles 'Dickens's Quarrel with the Gothic: Ruskin, Durdles and Edwin Drood'. *Dickens Studies Newsletter,* 8:4 (1977), 104-108

Lawson, Julie, 'Ruskin on Scott's Abbotsford' *Abbotsford and Sir Walter Scott: The Image and the Influence,* ed. by Iain G. Brown (Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 2003), pp. 161–6

Lear, Jean, 'Charles Dickens and His Garden at Gad's Hill Place', *The Dickensian,* 98:456 (2002)

Ledger, Sally, *Dickens and Popular Radical Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Lee, Sidney, Shakespeare and the Modern Stage (New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1906)

Lettis, Richard, *Dickens on Literature: A Continuing Study of His Aesthetic* (New York: AMS Press, 1990)

Leveen, Lois 'Juliet has no Balcony', *Atlantic,* 10 (2014) < https://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2014/10/romeo-and-juliets-balcony-scene-doesnt-exist/381969/> [accessed 27 July 2021]

Levin, Amy K., 'Introduction', *Gender, Sexuality and Museums,* ed. by Amy K. Levin (London: Routledge, 2010), pp. 1-13

Lipovsek, Emilija and Smiljka Kesic, 'Communications of Culture in Fiction Induced Tourism', *TIMS,* 9:2 (2015), 105-113

Litvack, Leon, 'Charles Dickens: Newly Discovered Documents Reveal Truth About His Death and Burial, *The Conversation,* (2020) <https://theconversation.com/charles-dickens-newly-discovered-documents-reveal-truth-about-his-death-and-burial-130079> [accessed 27 July 2021]

Lixinski, Lucas, *Intangible Heritage in Cultural Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Lockhart, John G., *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott, Bart* (Edinburgh: R Cadell, 1837)

Lohrli, Anne *Household Words: A Weekly Journal 1850-59* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973)

Long, William F., and Paul Schlicke, 'When Boz Became Inimitable', *Dickens Quarterly,* 33:4 (2016), 315-316

Lowe, Hilary Iris, 'Dwelling in Possibility: Reimagining the Historic House Museum', *The Public Historian,* 37:2 (2015), 42-60

Lumsen, Alison, 'Walter Scott', *Cambridge Companion to English Novelists,* ed. by Adrian Poole (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 116-131

Lynch, Tony, *Dickens's England: A Traveller's Companion* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1986)

Mackenzie, Gary, 'Writing Cross Country: Landscape Palimpsest and the Problems of Scottish Literary Tourism', *Green Letters,* 21:3 (2017), 275-286

Mackenzie, Norman and Jeanne, *Dickens: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979)

Macleod, Nicola, 'A Faint Whiff of Cigar: The Literary Tourist's Experience of Visiting Writers' Homes', *Current Issues in Tourism* (2020), 1-16

Macleod, Nicola, Jennifer Shelley and Alastair M. Morrison, 'The Touring Reader: Understanding the Bibliophile's Experience of Literary Tourism', *Tourism Management,* 67 (2018), 388-398

Macmillan, Duncan, 'Creating Scotland: Turner and Scott', *The Lancet,* 355:9205 (2000), 759-760

Macready, William Charles, 'Visit to Abbotsford', *Macready's Reminiscences and a Selection from his Diaries and Letters,* ed. by Frederick Pollack (New York: Macmillan and co, 1875)
Malcolmson, Catherine, *Constructing Dickens 1900-1940* (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leicester, 2012)
Marshall, Gail, et al., 'Thinking Feeling at the Dickens Bicentenary, *Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century,* 19:14 (2012), 1-12
Marshall, Gail, 'Introduction', *Victorian Shakespeare Vol. 1: Theatre, Drama and Performance,* ed. by Gail Marshall and Adrian Poole (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 1-13
Matthews, Peter, *London's Statues and Monuments* (Oxford: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2012)
Matthews, Samantha, 'Entombing the Woman Poet: Tribute to Elizabeth Barrett Browning', *Studies in Browning and His Circle,* 24 (2001), 31-53
Matthews, Samantha, 'Making Their Mark: Writing the Poet's Grave', *Literary Tourism and the Nineteenth Century,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 25-37
Matthews, Samantha*, Poetical Remains: Poets' Graves, Bodies and Books in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)
Mazzeno, Laurence W., *The Dickens Industry: Critical Perspectives 1836-2005* (Rochester: Camden House, 2008)
McCarthy, Patrick 'Truth in American Notes', *Dickens, Europe and the New Worlds,* ed. by Anny Sadrin (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), pp. 67-76
McClendon, Kristina, 'Curating Feeling: Emotions and the Exhibition Space in Displays of Nineteenth-Century Art and Culture', *Journal of Victorian Culture,* 26:2 (2015), no page numbers
McCracken Fletcher, LuAnn, 'Scotland and Outlander: Inventing Scotland for Armchair Tourists', *Literary Tourism and the British Isles,* ed. by LuAnn McCracken Fletcher (London: Lexington Books, 2019), pp. 191-221
Meckier, Jerome, 'Dickens Discovers America, Dickens Discovers Dickens, The First Visit Reconsidered', *The Modern Language Review,* 79:2 (1984), 266-277
Meckier, Jerome, *Innocent Abroad: Charles Dickens's American Engagements* (Kentucky: Kentucky University Press, 1990)

Menzies, John, *Menzies' Pocket guide to Abbotsford, Melrose and the Scottish border* (Edinburgh: J. Menzie, 1855)

Metz, Nancy Aycock, 'Dickens in 1842: Coming to His Senses about America', *Journal of the English Association,* 63:241 (2014), 97-114

Metz, Nancy, 'The Life and Adventures of Martin Chuzzlewit: Or America Revised', *Dickens, Europe and the New Worlds,* ed. by Anny Sadrin (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), 77-89

Meyer, Susan, 'Anti-Semitism and Social Critique in Dickens's *Oliver Twist'*, *Victorian Literature and Culture,* 33:1, 239-252

Miller, Andrew H., 'The Spectres of Dickens's Study', *Narrative,* 5:3 (2007), 322-341

Miller, Andrew H., *Novels Behind Glass: Commodity Culture and Victorian Narratives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Miller, William, 'The justification of the Dickens House', 27: 1, *The Dickensian*, (London: Dickens Fellowship, 1931), 43-46.

Mills, Victoria, 'Curating Feeling' *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, 23 (2016), 1-9

Mills, Victoria, 'The museum as "Dream Space": Psychology and aesthetic response in George Eliot's *Middlemarch*', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, 12 (2011), 1-17

Milton's Cottage, 'About Milton's Cottage' <http://www.miltonscottage.org/miltons-cottage-about/#museum> [accessed 22 November 2018]

Moe, Richard, 'Are There Too Many House Museums?', *Forum Journal,* 27:1 (2012), 55-61

Moiseev, Denis, 'A Hidden Tribute to Shakespeare', <https://dickensmuseum.com/blogs/charles-dickens-museum/112183174-a-hidden-tribute-to-shakespeare> [accessed 2 July 2020]

Montebello, Phillipe de, 'Introduction', *Period Rooms in the Metropolitan Museum of Art,* ed. by Amelia Peck (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), pp. 9-17

Moore, Grace, *Dickens and Empire: Discourses of Class, Race and Colonialism in the Works of Charles Dickens* (London: Routledge, 2004)

Moore, Kevin, *Museums and Popular Culture* (London: Leicester University Press, 1997)

Morris, Rachel, 'Imaginary Museums: What Mainstream Museums Can Learn From Them', *Paulo Simoes Rodrigues,* 4 (2014), 2-30

Murray, Donald M, 'The Balcony, the Pond and the Literary Traveller', *The Antioch Review,* 25:2 (1965), 333-336

Museum Crush 'How the Victorians save Shakespeare's Birthplace for the Nation', <https://museumcrush.org/how-the-victorians-saved-shakespeares-birthplace-for-the-nation/> [accessed 4 June 2020]

Museums and Galleries of Scotland, 'Introduction to Interpretation' <https://www.museumsgalleriesscotland.org.uk/advice/collections/introduction-to-interpretation/> [accessed 8 October 2019]

Museums Association, 'Decolonising Museums', <https://www.museumsassociation.org/campaigns/decolonising-museums/> [accessed 13 August 2021]

Museums Association, 'Florence Nightingale Museum Closes Indefinitely' <https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/news/2021/01/florence-nightingale-museum-closes-indefinitely-to-safeguard-its> [accessed 25 March 2021]

Museums Association, 'Writers' Museums and the Covid 19 Crisis', <https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/analysis/2020/04/27042020-writers-museums-covid-19-crisis/> [accessed 25 March 2021]

Museums of Scotland, 'Introduction to Interpretation',<https://www.museumsgalleriesscotland.org.uk/advice/collections/introduction-to-interpretation/> [accessed 11 March 2019]

Mytum, Harold, *Mortuary, Monuments and Burial Grounds* (New York: Kulwer Academic, 2004)

Nash, George, 'Pomp and Circumstances', *Matter, Materiality and Modern Culture,* ed. by P. M. Graves-Brown (London: Routledge, 2000), 112-131

National Trust, 'Addressing the Histories of Slavery and Colonialism' <https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/features/addressing-the-histories-of-slavery-and-colonialism-at-the-national-trust> [accessed 25 March 2021]

National Trust, 'Coleridge Cottage' <https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/coleridge-cottage> [accessed 20 February 2019]

National Trust, 'Greenway' <https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/greenway#Overview> [accessed 20 February 2019]

National Trust, 'Hardy's Cottage' <https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/hardys-cottage> [accessed 20 February 2019]
National Trust, 'Monk's House' <https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/monks-house> [accessed 20 February 2019]
National Trust, 'Who Was Vita Sackville-West', <https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/features/who-was-vita-sackville-west> [accessed 26 September 2019]
National Trust, 'Wordsworth House and Garden' < https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/wordsworth-house > [accessed 20 February 2019].
Nayder, Lilian, 'Introduction', *Dickens, Sexuality and Gender,* ed. by Lilian Nayder (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. xiii-3
The New York Times, 'Roosevelt Statue to be Removed from Museum of Natural History < https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/21/arts/design/roosevelt-statue-to-be-removed-from-museum-of-natural-history.html> [accessed 15 November 2020]
Newlands, David L., and Steve D. Neufield, 'An Enchanted House? The Freud Museum, London', *Social History Curators Group,* 15 (1988), 14-17
Newsom, Robert, 'Religion', *Oxford Reader's Companion to Dickens,* ed. by Paul Schlicke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 499-502
North, Julian, 'Literary Biography and the House of the Poet', *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth Century,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan 2009), pp. 49-63
North, Julian, *The Domestication of Genius* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
O'Connor, Noelle and Sangkyun Kim, 'Pictures and Prose: Exploring the Impact of Literary and Film Tourism', *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change,* 12:1 (2014), 1-17
ODNB, 'James Sheridan Knowles' <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-15770> [accessed 29 March 2018]
ODNB, Peter Tomson 'John Poole' <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-22515> [accessed 9 April 2018]

ODNB, Peter Tomson, 'James Kenney' <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-15405?rskey=Vmi8kz&result=1> [accessed 9 April, 2018]

OED, 'dickens', <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/52264?rskey=7VTI5y&result=2&isAdvanced=false#eid> [accessed 16 May 2018]

OED, 'Memorial', <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/116351?rskey=WAJlMT&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid > [Accessed 17th December 2018]

OED, 'Monument', <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/121852?rskey=m7noTI&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid > [Accessed 17 December 2018]

Orford, Peter, *The Mystery of Edwin Drood: Charles Dickens's Unfinished Novel and Our Endless Attempts to End It* (Barnsley: Pen and Sword History, 2018)

Orwell, George, 'Charles Dickens', *George Orwell Essays* (London: Penguin, 1994), pp. 35-78

Ousby, Ian, '*The Englishman's England: Taste, Travel and the Rise of Tourism* (London: Pimlico, 2002)

Page, Norman, *Dickens Chronology* (Basingstoke, Macmillan Press, 1988)

Parker, David, 'The Reconstruction of Dickens's Drawing Room', *The Dickensian,* 79 (1982), 8-18

Patten, Robert L., *Dickens and Victorian Print Cultures* (Ashgate: Farnham, 2012)

Pavoni, Rosanna, 'Towards a Definition and Typography of Historic House Museums', *Museum International,* 53:2 (2001), 16-21

Payling, Catherine, 'Memory Regained: Founding and Funding the Keats-Shelley Memorial House in Rome', *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory*, ed. by Harald Hendrix (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), pp. 111-127

Payne, Alice, 'The Story of the Top Hat', *The Conversation* <https://theconversation.com/the-story-of-the-top-hat-26215> [accessed 10 February 2020]

Pearce, Susan, *Interpreting Objects and Collections* (Routledge, London 1994)

Peters, Laura, *Dickens and Race* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013)

Peters, Laura, *Orphan Texts: Victorians, Orphans, Culture and Empire* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013)

Petitt, Clare, 'On Stuff', *Interdisciplinary Studies of the Long Nineteenth Century,* 6:19 (2008), 1-12

Pickering, Paul A., and Alex Tyrell, 'The Public Memorial of Reform: Commemoration and Contestation', *Contested Sites: Commemoration, Memorial and Popular Politics in Nineteenth Century Britain,* ed. by Paul A. Pickering and Alex Tyrell (Ashgate: Aldershot, 2004)

The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.1: 1820-1839, ed. by Madeline House and Graham Storey, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965)

The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.2: 1840-1841, ed. by Madeline House and Graham Storey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969)

House, Madeline, Graham Storey and Kathleen Mary Tillotson, *The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.3: 1842-1843* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974)

The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens, Vol. 3: 1842-1843, ed. by Madeline House, Kathleen Tillotson and Graham Storey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974)

The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.4: 1844-1846, ed. by Kathleen Tillotson and Graham Storey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977)

The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.5: 1847-1849, ed. by Graham Storey and Kathleen Mary Tillotson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980)

The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.6: 1850-1852, ed. by Graham Storey, Kathleen Mary Tillotson and Nina Burgis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988)

The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.7: 1853-1855, ed. by Graham Storey, Kathleen Mary Tillotson and Angus Easson ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993)

The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.8: 1856-1858, ed. by Graham Storey and Kathleen Mary Tillotson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.9: 1859-1861, ed. by Graham Storey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.10: 1862-1864, ed. by Graham Storey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)

The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.11: 1865-1867, ed. by Graham Storey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

The Pilgrim Edition of the Letters of Charles Dickens Vol.12: 1868-1870, ed. by Graham Storey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Pittock, Murray, *Scottish and Irish Romanticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Pollack Pelzner, Daniel, 'Dickens and Shakespeare's Household Words', *ELH,* 78:3 (2011), 533-536

Poole, Adrian and Rebekah Scott, 'Charles Dickens', *Great Shakespeareans: Scott, Dickens, Eliot and Hardy, Vol.IV,* ed. by Adrian Poole (London: Continuum International Publishing, 2011), pp. 53-95

Poole, Adrian, 'Introduction', *Victorian Shakespeare Vol. 2: Literature and Culture,* ed. by Gail Marshall and Adrian Poole (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 1-14

Poole, Adrian, *Shakespeare and the Victorians* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2004)

Pope, Norris, 'Charity and Dickens', *Oxford Reader's Companion to Dickens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 84-88

The Portsmouth Guide, 'Charles Dickens Birthplace', <http://www.portsmouth-guide.co.uk/local/cdbthp.htm> [accessed 22 October 2018]

Price, Uvedale, *Essays on the Picturesque as Compared with the Sublime and the Beautiful, Vol.1* (London: J. Mawman, 1810)

Queen Victoria I, *Journals,* <http://www.queenvictoriasjournals.org> [accessed 3 October 2018]

Rainsford, Dominic, 'Crossing the Chanel with Dickens', *Dickens Europe and the New Worlds,* ed. by Anny Sadrin (Basingstoke, 1999), pp. 3-14

Reynolds, Margaret, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 85 (1989), 192

Richards, Jeffrey, 'Drury Lane Imperialism', *Politics, Performance, and Popular Culture,* ed. by Peter Yeandle et al., (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016)

Rigney, Ann, *The Afterlives of Walter Scott: Memory on the Move* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Risnicoff de Gorgas, Monica, 'Reality as Illusion: The Historic Houses that Become Museums', *Museum International,* 53:2 (2001), 10-15

Roald Dahl Museum, 'About the Museum', <https://www.roalddahl.com/museum/about-the-museum/history-of-the-museum> [accessed 22 November 2018]

Roald Dahl, 'Family Notice' <https://www.roalddahl.com/global/rdsc-and-family-notice> [accessed 25 March 2021]

Roberts, Judith, and Linda Radford, 'The Private Uses of Quiet Grandeur: A Meditation on Literary Pilgrimage', *Changing English,* 16:2 (2009), 203-9

Robinson, Mike, 'Reading Between the Lines: Literature and the Creation of Touristic Spaces', *Current Writing: Text and Reception in South Africa,* 14:1 (2002), 1-28

Rodensky, Lisa, *The Oxford Handbook of the Victorian Novel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Rosenberg, Brian, 'Character and Contradiction in Dickens', *Nineteenth Century Literature,* 47:2 (1992), 145-163

Rosenthal, Michael, 'Shakespeare's Birthplace in Stratford: Bardolatry Reconsidered', *Writers' Houses and Making of Memory,* ed. by Harald Hendrix (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), pp. 31-45

Ross, Alexander M., *The Imprint of the Picturesque on Nineteenth Century British Fiction* (Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1986)

Rugg, Julie, 'From Reason to Regulation 1760-1850', *Death in England an Illustrated History,* ed. by Peter C. Jupp and Clare Gittings Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), pp. 202-230

Sage, Victor, 'Dickens and Professor Owen: Portrait of a Friendship', *Le Portrait,* 2 (2001), 87-101

Sale, Roger, *Closer to Home: Writers and Places in England 1780-1830* (London: Harvard University Press, 1986)

Sanchez-Garcia, Jesus, 'The Cult of the Romantic Hero: Literature and Memorials', *Culture,* 10 (2015), 21-34

Sandell, Richard, and Eithne Nightingale, *Museums, Equality and Social Justice* (London: Routledge, 2012

Sandell, Richard, Jocelyn Dodd, Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, *Re-Presenting Disability: Activism and Agency in the Museum* (London: Routledge, 2010)

Sattaur, Jennifer, 'Thinking Objectively: An Overview of Thing Theory in Victorian Studies', *Victorian Literature and Culture,* 40:1 (2012), 347-357

Schaff, Barbara, 'In the footsteps of: The Semiotics of Literary Tourism', *Kultur Poetik,* 11:2 (2011), 166-180

Schlicke, Paul, 'Dickens and Shakespeare', *The Japan Branch of the Dickens Fellowship,* 27 (2004), 84-98

Schlicke, Paul, *Dickens and Popular Entertainment* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988)

Schoch, Richard 'The Birth of Shakespeare's Birthplace', *Theatre Survey,* 53:2 (2012), 181-201

Scott, Walter, *Waverley,* ed. by Claire Lamont (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015)

Seaman, Alana N, 'Making Literary Places', *Literary Tourism: Theories, Practice and Case Studies,* ed. by Ian Jenkins and Katrín Anna Lund (Wallingford, CABI, 2019), pp. 140-149

Shakespeare Birthplace Collections Online, 'What Happened Next' <http://collections.shakespeare.org.uk/exhibition/exhibition/saving-shakespeares-birthplace/object/saving-shakespeares-birthplace-13-what-happened-next > [Accessed 26 March 2018]

Shakespeare, William, 'Sonnet 81: Or I Shall Live Your Epitaph to Make', *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works,* ed. by John Jewett et al., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), p. 81

Shakespeare, William, *Merry Wives of Windsor, The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works,* ed. by John Jewett et al., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), pp. 511-537

Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust, 'New Light Through Old Windows, <https://www.shakespeare.org.uk/explore-shakespeare/blogs/new-light-through-old-windows/> [accessed 28 March 2018]

Shakespeare's Birthplace Collections Online, 'The Legacy of the Purchase', <http://collections.shakespeare.org.uk/exhibition/exhibition/saving-shakespeares-birthplace/object/saving-shakespeares-birthplace-15-the-legacy-of-the-purchase> [accessed 15 May 2018]

Shakespeare's Birthplace Collections Online*,* 'The Restoration of the Birthplace' <http://collections.shakespeare.org.uk/exhibition/exhibition/saving-shakespeares-birthplace/object/saving-shakespeares-birthplace-14-the-restoration-of-the-birthplace> [accessed 15 May 2018]

Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust, 'All The Year Round', < https://www.shakespeare.org.uk/explore-shakespeare/blogs/all-year-round/> [accessed 29 June 2020]

Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust, 'Barnum and Dickens: Oh what a circus!' < https://www.shakespeare.org.uk/explore-shakespeare/blogs/barnum-vs-dickens-oh-what-circus/> [accessed 4 June 2020]

Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust, 'The House After Shakespeare', <https://www.shakespeare.org.uk/explore-shakespeare/shakespedia/shakespeares-birthplace/house-after-shakespeare/> [26 March, 2018]
Shakespeare's Birthplace Trust, 'The Purchase of Shakespeare's Birthplace', <https://www.shakespeare.org.uk/explore-shakespeare/shakespedia/shakespeares-birthplace/purchase-of-birthplace/> [26 March, 2018]
Sharpe, Emily, and Jose De Silva 'Art's Most Popular: 2018 Most Visited Shows and Museums', *The Art Newspaper* <https://www.theartnewspaper.com/analysis/fashion-provides-winning-formula> [Accessed 11 May 2020]
Siblon, John 'Monument Mania?', *People and Their Pasts,* ed. by Paul Ashton and Hilda Kean (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 146-162
Sillars, Stuart, *Shakespeare and the Victorians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)
Sir John Soane's Collections Online, 'Bust of Shakespeare', <http://collections.soane.org/object-sc18> [accessed 12 August 2020]
Sky News, 'Man charged after "Dickens racist" graffiti found on Kent Museum', <https://news.sky.com/story/police-arrest-man-after-charles-dickens-museum-in-kent-targeted-with-graffiti-12018094> [accessed 24 September 2020]
Slater, Michael, *Dickens on America and the Americans* (New York: Harvester Press, 1979)
Slater, Michael*, Charles Dickens* (London: Yale University Press, 2011)
Slater, Michael, *Dickens and Women* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1983)
Smith, Emily, *Sense and Sensibility in the Old Curiosity Shop: A New Understanding of Narrative in Literary House Museums* (University of Leicester, English Department, 2017) <https://dissertations.le.ac.uk/xmlui/handle/2381/665> [accessed 2 January 2021]
The Speeches of Charles Dickens, ed. by K. J. Fielding (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960)
Spencer, Sandra, 'The Indispensable Mr. Wills', *Victorian Periodical Review,* 21:4 (1988), 145-151
Squire, Shelagh J., 'The Cultural Values of Literary Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research,* 21 (1994), 103-120
Staples, Leslie C. and John Greaves, 'The Dickens House', *The Dickensian,* 57 (1961), 149-150
Staples, Leslie C., 'Dickens's Chalet', *The Dickensian,* 58:336 (1962), 5-7
Stedman, Jane W, 'William Henry Wills', *ODNB,* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/29609> [accessed 8 April 2020]

Steinbeck House, 'Home' <http://steinbeckhouse.com> [accessed 26 September 2019]
Stevenson, David, *The Hunt for Rob Roy* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 2004)
'A Strange Story of the Dickens House by Perhaps the Caretaker', *The Dickensian,* 31 (1935), 280-283
Sutherland, John, *Victorian Fiction: Writers and Publishers* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995)
Szlezak, Klara, *Canonized in History: Literary Tourism and Nineteenth Century Writers' Houses in New England* (Regensburg: University of Regensburg Press, 2013)
Taylor, Gary, *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History From The Restoration To The Present* (London: Vintage, 1990)
Thomas, Julia, 'Bidding for The Bard: Shakespeare, the Victorians and the Auction of the Birthplace', *Nineteenth Century Contexts,* 30:3 (2008), 215-228
Thomas, Julia, 'Bringing Down The House: Restoring the Birthplace', *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth-Century Culture,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan 2009), pp. 73-84
Thomas, Julia, 'Shakespeare and Commercialism', *Shakespeare in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. by Gail Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 251-269
Thomas, Julia, *Shakespeare's Shrine: The Bard's Birthplace and the Invention of Stratford upon Avon* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012)
Thompson, Carl, *The Suffering Traveller and the Romantic Imagination* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)
Thompson, Ian, 'Jules Verne and the Trossachs: Experience and Inspiration', *Literary Tourism, The Trossachs and Walter Scott,* ed. by Ian Brown (Glasgow: Scottish Literature International, 2012), pp. 133-141
Thompson, Leslie M., 'Mrs Nickleby's Monologue: The Dichotomy of Pessimism and Optimism in *Nicholas Nickleby*', *Studies in the Novel,* 1:2 (1969), 222-229
Tincture of Museum, 'Global Dickens, Dickens Museum, May 2019', <https://tinctureofmuseum.wordpress.com/2019/05/20/global-dickens-dickens-museum-may-2019/> [accessed 2 November 2020]
Tomalin, Claire, *Charles Dickens: A Life* (London: Penguin Books, 2012)
Tomalin, Claire, *The Invisible Woman* (London: Penguin 1991)
Tosh, John, *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England* (London: Yale University Press, 2007)

Trotter, David, 'Household Clearances in Victorian Fiction', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century* (2008), 1-19

Trubek, Anne, 'The Irrational Allure of Writers' Houses', *Chronicles of Higher Education* (2010)

Trubek, Anne, *A Sceptic's Guide to Writers' Houses* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011)

Tuckle, Sherry, *Evocative Objects: Things We Think With* (London: MIT Press, 2011)

Tyburczy, Jennifer, *Sex Museums: The Politics and Performance of Display* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016)

UNESCO, 'Intangible Cultural Heritage' <https://ich.unesco.org/en/what-is-intangible-heritage-00003> [accessed 30 January 2019]

Urry, John, and Jonas Larsen, *The Tourist Gaze* (London: Sage, 2011)

The V&A, 'Alice Curiouser and Curiouser', <https://www.vam.ac.uk/exhibitions/alice-curiouser-and-curiouser> [accessed 11 May 2020]

Verdery, Katherine, *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies: Reburial and Post-colonist Change* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999)

Victor Hugo's Houses, 'Place Des Vogas, Paris' <http://www.maisonsvictorhugo.paris.fr/en/museum-collections/place-des-vosges-apartment-visit> [accessed 18 June 2020]

Von Tunzelmann, Alex, *Fallen Idols* (London: Headline Publishing, 2021)

Wald, Jane, 'The Poet Hunters: Transforming Emily Dickinson's Home into a Literary Destination', *The Emily Dickinson Journal,* 26:2 (2017), 71-98

Walder, Dennis, *Dickens and Religion* (London: Routledge, 2007)

Waller, Phillip J., *Writers, Readers and Reputations: Literary Life in Britain 1870-1918* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Walter, Tony, 'Bereavement, Biography and Commemoration, Social Exclusion', *Social History in Museums,* 25 (2000), 9-17

Walton, John K, and Jason Wood ed. *The Making of a Cultural Landscape: The English Lake District as Tourist Destination, 1750 –2010* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013)

Walvin, James, 'Dust to Dust: Celebrations of Death in Victorian England', *Historical Reflections,* 9:3 (1982), 353-371

A Warwickshire Man, 'The Hoax of the Shakespeare Birthplace', *Bentley Miscellany,* 23 (January 1848), 279-288

Waters, Catherine, 'Materializing Mourning: Dickens, Funerals and Epitaphs', *Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century,* 14 (2011), 1-20

Waters, Catherine, 'Mourning Dickens: Funerals and Epitaphs', *Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century,* 14 (2011), 1-20

Waters, Catherine, *Commodity Culture in Dickens's Household Words* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008)

Watson, J. R., *Picturesque Landscape and English Romantic Poetry* (London: Hutchinson Educational, 1970)

Watson, Nicola J., 'Rambles in Literary London', *Literary Tourism and the Nineteenth Century*, ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2009), pp. 139-150

Watson, Nicola J., 'Shakespeare on the Tourist Trail', *Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Popular Culture,* ed. by Robert Shaughnessy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 199-126

Watson, Nicola J., 'Sir Walter Scott', *Great Shakespearians: Scott, Dickens, Eliot, Hardy, Vol.IV,* ed. by Adrian Poole (London: Continuum International Publishing, 2011), pp. 53-95

Watson, Nicola J., *The Authors' Effects on Writers' House Museums* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020)

Watson, Nicola J., *The Literary Tourist* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006)

Watts, Alan S., 'The Amateur Dramatics of Dickens', *Oxford Reader's Companion to Dickens,* ed. by Paul Schlicke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 12-14

Watts, Alan S., *Dickens at Gad's Hill* (Reading: Cedric Dickens and Elvendon Press, 1989)

Watts, Alan S., 'Guild of Art and Literature', Paul Schlicke ed. *Oxford Readers Companion to Dickens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 265

Webber, Megan Clare, 'Troubling Agency: Agency and Charity in Early Nineteenth Century London', *Historical Research,* 91:252 (2018), 117-136

Welse, Alexander, *From Copyright to Copperfield: The Identity of Dickens* (London: Harvard University Press, 1987)

Wessex Museums, 'Hardy's Wessex', <https://www.wessexmuseums.org.uk/what-we-do/exhibitions-events/thomas-hardy-exhibition/> [accessed 14 August 2021]

Westminster Abbey, 'Lord Byron', <https://www.westminster-abbey.org/abbey-commemorations/commemorations/lord-byron/ > [accessed 22 November 2018]
Westminster Abbey, 'Robert and Elizabeth Barrett Browning', < https://www.westminster-abbey.org/abbey-commemorations/commemorations/robert-and-elizabeth-barrett-browning/#i12821> [accessed 22 November 2018]
Westminster Abbey, 'William Gifford', <https://www.westminster-abbey.org/abbey-commemorations/commemorations/william-gifford/ > [accessed 22 November 2018]
Westover, Paul, 'How America "Inherited" Literary Tourism', *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth-Century Culture,* ed. by Nicola J. Watson (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006), pp. 184-196
Westover, Paul, 'Inventing the London of Literary Tourists: Walking the Romantic City in Leigh Hunt's Wishing Cap Essays', *European Romantic Review,* 23:1 (2012), 1-19
Westover, Paul, 'William Godwin, Literary Tourism and the Work of Necromanticism', *Studies in Romanticism,* 48:2 (2009), 299-319
Westover, Paul, *Necromanticism: Travelling to Meet the Dead 1750-1860* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)
Williams, Tony, 'Dickens as a Public Figure', *Oxford Handbook of Charles Dickens,* ed. by John Jordan et al., *(*Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 59-75
Wilson, A. N., *A Life of Walter Scott, The Laird of Abbotsford* (London: Random House, 2002)
Wilson, A. N., *The Mystery Of Charles Dickens* (London: Atlantic Books, 2020)
Woking News and Mail, 'Petition to Remove H. G. Wells Statue Divides Public Opinion', <https://www.wokingnewsandmail.co.uk/?p=27257> [accessed 1 August 2021]
Wood, Claire, 'Material Culture' *Oxford Handbook of Charles Dickens,* ed. by John Jorden et al., (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 452-467
Wood, Claire, *Dickens and the Business of Death* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)
Woolf, Virginia 'Great Men's Houses', *The London Scene,* ed. by Hermione Lee (London: Daunt Book, 1975), pp. 29-41
Woolf, Virginia, 'Dickens by a Disciple', *Times Literary Supplement* (March 17, 1919)
Woolf, Virginia, *A Room of One's Own*, (London: Penguin, 1945)
Woolf, Virginia, *Orlando,* ed. by Helen Dunmore (London: Penguin Random House, 2016)

Wordsworth, William, *A Guide Through The District of the Lakes in The North of England With a Description of the Scenery: For the Use of Tourists and Residents* (Kendal: Hudson and Nicolson, 1835)

Wylie Krotz, Sarah 'Places and Memory: Rethinking the Literary Map of Canada', *English Studies in Canada,* 40:2 (2014), 133-154

Yates, Edmund, 'In and On an Omnibus', *All The Year Round,* (21 January 1865), *Dickens Journals Online* <https://www.djo.org.uk/all-the-year-round/volume-xii/page-567.html> [accessed 21 June 2021], 567-569

Yeats, George, 'Shakespeare's Victorian Legacy: Text and Monuments and Emendation as Desecration in the Mid Nineteenth Century'*, Victorian Literature and Culture,* 40:2 (2012), 469-486

Yoshikawa, Saeko, *William Wordsworth and the Invention of Tourism* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014)

Young, Linda, 'House Museums are Not all the Same', *Understanding Motivation to Guide Conservation* (ICOM, 2012), 1-10

Young, Linda, 'Literature, Museums and National Identity; or Why Are There So Many Writers' House Museums in Britain?', *Museums History Journal,* 8:2 (2015), 229-246

Young, Linda, 'Writers' House Museums: British Literature in the Heart and on the Ground' *Literary Tourism and British Isles,* ed. by Luann McCracken-Fletcher (London: Lexington Books, 2019), pp. 165-191

Zemgulys, Andrea, *Modernism and the Locations of Literary Heritage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Material from the Charles Dickens Museum

Collection Group Meetings 2001-2010 Folder, Charles Dickens Museum, London

Dickens House, Guide no. 1 (1 December 1926), Charles Dickens Museum, London

Dickens House, Guide no. 2 (1929), Charles Dickens Museum, London

Dickens House, Guide no. 3 (1969/70), Charles Dickens Museum, London

Dickens House, Guide no. 4 (1977), Charles Dickens Museum, London

Dickens House, Guide no. 5 (c. 1986), Charles Dickens Museum, London

Dickens House, Guide no. 6 (1990), Charles Dickens Museum, London

Dickens House, Guide no. 7 (1995), Charles Dickens Museum, London
Dickens Fellowship Council Minutes (1937-1971), Charles Dickens Museum, London
Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book (Beginning 6 July 1923), Charles Dickens Museum, London
Dickens Fellowship Council Minutes (Beginning 1972), Charles Dickens Museum, London
Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book (1923-1935), Charles Dickens Museum, London
Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book (1935- 1937), Charles Dickens Museum, London
Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book (1937-1971), Charles Dickens Museum, London
Dickens Fellowship Minutes Book (1972-2005), Charles Dickens Museum, London
Dickens Fellowship Newspaper Scrapbook (1922-1929), Charles Dickens Museum, London
Dickens Fellowship Scrapbook, The Dickens House (1922-1929), Charles Dickens Museum, London
Dickens, Mamie, 'My Father as I Recall Him' in *The Ladies Home Journal* (November, 1892), Frederick Kitton, *Dickensiana Vol. 2,* Charles Dickens Museum, London
Dickens, Mamie, 'My Father as I Recall Him' *The Ladies Home Journal* (April, 1893), Frederick Kitton, *Dickensiana Vol. 2,* Charles Dickens Museum, London
Exhibitions 1970s/80s: History of 48/49 Doughty Street, Charles Dickens Museum, London
The Guild of Literature and Art Subscription book (1851-1853), Charles Dickens Museum, London
Kitton, Frederick *Dickensiana, Vol. 1,* Charles Dickens Museum, London
Kitton, Frederick, *Dickensiana, Vol.2,* Charles Dickens Museum, London
Museum guide, no. 8 (2012), Charles Dickens Museum, London
Museum guide, no. 9 (2018), Charles Dickens Museum, London
Other Sites Connected to Dickens Including Graves Properties Towns/ Cities Folder, Charles Dickens Museum, London
Scrapbook on Dickens's Death, Charles Dickens Museum, London