

Newman and the Victorian Self: From *Loss and Gain* to the *Apologia*

John Peck

This essay started with the experience of teaching *Loss and Gain* to an English Literature research class. I was teaching a novel that illustrated an important aspect of the intellectual history of Victorian Britain; the class had been reading a psychological novel which they found (often simultaneously) both perverse and amusing. They were, of course, laughing at Newman rather than with him. I imagine that the response I encountered is not untypical: however *Loss and Gain* might have been regarded in the past, it is not going to be looked at in the same way today. And when we take account of the impact of critical theory, the picture becomes even more complicated: feminist and New Historicist critics, while not necessarily taking a hostile view of *Loss and Gain*, are inevitably going to discuss it in a way that challenges traditional approaches. This prompts the question I want to consider: whether current sceptical critical approaches can be reconciled with a sympathetic appreciation of the serious intent of *Loss and Gain*?

I

A split in criticism becomes apparent immediately if we consider a basic point: Newman is writing about a man's world. And why not? The Oxford of his day did not admit women. But times change, and even non-feminist readers today are likely to be struck by the effete remoteness of the university life he depicts, perhaps seeing it as an environment that encourages a fear of women. The problems are apparent in the breakfast party that the junior tutor, Mr Vincent, arranges for Charles Reding and other undergraduates. At one level the scene works brilliantly, for the insularity of Vincent is exposed with considerable satiric venom. Turning to one of the undergraduates, Vincent asks: 'what news from Staffordshire? Are the potteries pretty quiet now?'¹ His aside acknowledges the existence of the industrial unrest that characterised much of the 30s and 40s, but he rattles on with chatter about crockery, and within six lines has turned the conversation to vacation trips to Italy. Real life intrudes again, however, when he is asked if the Principal is about to marry. He stages a giggling retreat into his classical education: 'These are matters... which we should always enquire about at the

fountainhead; *antiquam exquirite matrem*, or rather *patrem*; ha, ha!’ (p. 56). Vincent then moves on to developments in science, which are again kept at a safe distance by his ironic humour, before introducing the one element in his conversation that is not a laughing matter. Acknowledging a painting in his room, he explains ‘it was given to me by my good old mother’ (p. 57).

Newman knows that this is the snug world of men who use words to keep the world at a distance. But, at the same time, Newman cannot really distance himself from this way of behaving and thinking. One of the most notable features of the kind of *Bildungsroman* that appears around 1850 is the extent to which many of the characters are reflections of the central character, possessing similar character traits but in an exaggerated or distorted form. In *David Copperfield*, for example, David not only has much in common with Steerforth and Uriah Heep but arguably develops into the kind of Murdstonean character he so detests at the outset.² It seems reasonable to see a similar impulse at work in *Loss and Gain*, that many of the protagonists are representations of the character Reding could have become.³ And it is certainly true that the criticisms that can be levelled at Vincent—he shies away from the reality of industrial Britain, he is uneasy with modern science, he is scared of marriage, and he is a mother’s boy—are criticisms that could be applied to Reding. Yet, whereas in *David Copperfield* we feel we are encouraged to see the negative aspects of David’s character, in *Loss and Gain* it is as if we are not meant to notice Reding’s shortcomings.

The problem is partly the absence of an ironic distance between the narrator and Reding. Who precisely is narrating when we are told that Vincent is ‘a clever man, and a hard reader and worker, and a capital tutor’ (p. 53)? In James Joyce’s *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, we would be in no doubt that Joyce is mocking the kind of language that Stephen might employ, but in *Loss and Gain* the narrator seems to share the ‘capital tutor’ discourse of the world he is describing. Consequently, when Reding enthuses about ‘the green of England’ (p. 57) we might see this as the language of a romantic young man with a fondness for Wordsworth, but we might also suspect that this is a way of talking that the novel never really separates itself from. A traditional reading of *Loss and Gain* might suggest that Charles puts this vapid romanticism behind him as he matures, but a more sceptical critic might argue that the novel never moves beyond its love of a safe world, that it always displays a fear of the ‘real’ England.

Not only fear, but contempt. There are many passages where Newman reveals more than he probably intends:

The Vacation passed away silently and happily. Day succeeded day in quiet routine employments, bringing inevitable but sure accessions

to the stock of knowledge and to the intellectual proficiency of both our students. Historians and orators were read for a last time, and laid aside; sciences were digested, commentaries were run through; and analyses and abstracts completed. It was emphatically a silent toil. (p. 159)

This is a gentleman speaking to gentlemen, assuming that we share a knowledge of the nature of academic work. But what is suspect in the passage is that the vocabulary of work—employments, stock, toil—is quietly commandeered for what could be regarded as a form of non-work. The inversion of values then becomes more pronounced as Newman contrasts the busy lives of Reding and Sheffield with the lives of those who are steaming from London to Bombay (p. 159), as if those involved in the work of the empire have all the time in the world whereas our hero needs every minute; indeed, it is as if the economic life of Britain and its empire is insignificant in comparison with the life of the mind. We are, it is clear, still in the delicate little world of Vincent.

What complicates the matter further is the attitude *Loss and Gain* reveals towards the body. Something that no present day reader of the novel can ignore is the presence of psychosexual imagery, particularly at those moments when Reding is on the verge of or participating in a religious experience. Food features prominently in the novel, for example, but most interestingly at the moment when Charles resolves that he will delay no longer, that he will go straight to the convent. But not quite straight: 'I'll get over my dinner, and then at once betake myself to my good Passionists' (p. 289). There is in fact a delay of about two hours while he visits the coffee-house. In *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* one would see this as a typical joke at the expense of Stephen, and it might be a comic touch in Newman, but it seems more like an unwilling admission (and the same is true of other food references in the novel) that the body continues to rebel against the spirit, with Reding sublimating sexual desire into physical appetite. Religion, in this context, becomes a tortuous confusion of desire and denial. In a massive aside, Newman describes the ascetic regime of Paul of the Cross, how 'in the cell of its venerable founder, on the Celian Hill, hangs an iron discipline or scourge, studded with nails' (p. 290). This is relevant in so far as it tells us something about the severe discipline Reding is about to embrace, but the aside continues for two more pages as Newman tells us in detail about those who are now scourging 'themselves with sharp knives or razors' (p. 290).

What is the purpose of this? Why is Newman so obsessed with the idea of self-punishment? The text might, of course, be acknowledging the psychosexual dimension of Charles's conversion, but such episodes in the novel feel more like moments when Newman's guard is down, where he

tells us something he does not realise he is telling us. And it is repeatedly the case that the text betrays itself in revealing terms. Charles, 'the only son of a clergyman' (p. 5), rejects what his father offers him, finds another father, continues to have an intense relationship with his mother, and redirects sexual desire into a desire for religious order. *Loss and Gain*, seen in this light, seems a hotbed of anxieties and neuroses. And, at all times, there is one dominant point: a fear of women. It is reasonable to draw attention to the fact that the worshippers present themselves for the sacrament with 'the men on the one side, the women on the other' (p. 293), but the detail becomes perverse when the point is returned to ten lines later: 'the only division being that of men from women' (p. 293). It is not just modern cynicism that insists on seeing something odd in such details; it is the existence of critical approaches that are especially attentive to such signs in a text. At one point, when Reding returns to Oxford, 'The College seemed to have deteriorated; there was a rowing set, a number of boys, and a large proportion of snobs' (p. 161). We are, presumably, meant to share Charles's feelings of horror, but most students of literature today are more likely to see this as yet another of his many wretched encounters with aggressive masculinity.

II

In one way, none of this is a problem: the novel is offering the kind of revelation of psychological motivation that we expect to see in Victorian fiction. We would also expect to see it in a Protestant spiritual autobiography, a form where the protagonist is stirred both by the word of God in the Bible and by the inner light of his or her own conscience. But it is a fundamental assumption of Newman's that Reding is moving towards God in a manner where psychological causality is irrelevant, for it is an external authority that takes control. There is a sense of surrender:

Charles's characteristic, perhaps above anything else, was an habitual sense of the Divine Presence... there it was—the pillar of the cloud before him and guiding him. He felt himself to be God's creature, and responsible to him God's possession, not his own. (p. 161)

The promptings of the individual—such things as family, background and temperament—are therefore immaterial. There is, though, something fundamentally inappropriate about choosing the novel as the medium in which to describe a conversion to Catholicism, as it is precisely the sense of psychological motivation that novels privilege. The problem with *Loss and Gain*, quite simply, is that it seems to deliver a sense of character that is at odds with its religious aim.⁴

Outside the novel, Newman, of course, had little time for the Victorians' love affair with 'the self'. In Charles Kingsley, in particular,

Newman saw ‘a leading example of that unbridled individualism which, “in taking man’s side and not God’s”, was knocking the life out of the institutions it had inherited’;⁵ and, more generally, he found fault with the way that Evangelicalism ‘was Protestant in its stress on religious experience, on the subjective reaction of the believer’.⁶ There are critics who claim that Newman controls the sense of the self in *Loss and Gain*. George Levine, for example, notes that ‘there is no detailed accumulation of experiences such as would cause the crucial change in Reding’s life’.⁷ The reason for their absence is that such things are beside the point:

Since *Loss and Gain* is concerned with the achievement of the true faith, which is a matter of divine grace and natural occurrence, Newman makes almost no attempt to connect the external events of the story. . . with the final conversion. These are simply the human and natural accidents which accompany Reding’s internal, rational, and spiritual progress towards God.⁸

In one sense this is an accurate comment: what any reader of *Loss and Gain* is most likely to remember are the conversations about belief. Yet, as I indicated in the first part of this essay, it is almost inevitable that a reader today will see other dimensions to the novel. Essentially, this change stems from a shift in critical assumptions. What Levine, writing about 30 years ago, expects from a novel is ‘an exploration of the labyrinths of the self’.⁹ In other words, he wants a novel in which the author is in control of the impression created; but the trend of recent criticism has been to read against the grain of the text, to pick up the marginal indications that the activity going on in the text is more complex than the surface design.

This, essentially, is why critics today are likely to find in *Loss and Gain* the psychological complexity that more traditional critics see it as lacking.¹⁰ But the shift towards reading in the margins gets us no further in coming to a balanced assessment of the novel. In fact, the effect is just the opposite. If we compare *Loss and Gain* with *David Copperfield*, we see that Dickens provides a retrospective narrative that explains, and puts in a larger context, the novel’s odd revelations about David. But the insights into Reding’s oddity are not framed in the same kind of way; indeed, they cannot be as they seem more like involuntary revelations than anything else. Consequently, an impression can easily be formed that it is an evasive and frightened book. Celibacy is, of course, the key issue here; Newman might want to keep Reding’s fondness for celibacy an intellectual issue, but it is difficult for the reader to accept such a restricted view. Indeed, because Newman offers no open discussion of a connection between the psychology of Charles and his commitment to celibacy, the reader is likely to judge it as an anxiety-driven preference, and to see much of the book as an unconscious exposure of secrecy and

secret motives.

Whatever view we take, however, something that is apparent to all readers is that the *Apologia* overcomes the problems inherent in *Loss and Gain*: it manages to be a personal testimony that is almost totally impersonal. The opening words immediately engage with the problem of the self:

It may easily be conceived how great a trial it is to me to write the following history of myself; but I must not shrink from the task.¹¹

The emphasis seems to fall upon personal testimony, but such confessional passages are few and far between in the *Apologia*, and carefully positioned as signposts, pointing us towards an account of Newman's intellectual life and development. In *Loss and Gain*, the human moments seem like vulnerable points in the text, where the author reveals more than he intended. In the *Apologia*, it is a controlled and calculated presentation of the self, in which virtually nothing is revealed of the man behind the public face. The obvious conclusion to draw is that Newman in the end managed to find an appropriate way in which to write about his faith. As a Victorian, he was drawn to the novel, but it did not really suit his purpose. The *Apologia*, on the other hand, through a reworking of the form of Protestant spiritual autobiography, permits him to reveal himself while preserving almost total reticence.¹²

Another way of looking at the issue, however, is to move away from the idea of Newman finding an appropriate form. It might prove more illuminating to consider the *Apologia* as a typical product of the 1860s, just as *Loss and Gain* is a product of the 1840s. Representations of the self changed more than once during the Victorian period, and the two works could be seen as reflecting the different ideas of two distinct decades. In the *Apologia*, to start with the easier example, the self presented is not just a controlled persona that Newman has constructed for his own purposes, but a persona that is consistent with a guardedness and self-possession that is typical of the mid-Victorian era. It is *David Copperfield* that provides the first anticipation of such a character: by the end of the novel, David has moved away from openness. He has hardened himself in order to protect himself. One way of putting this is to say that David, who is feminine-identified for much of the text, assumes a male toughness at the end.¹³ It is this self-possessed, self-disciplined individual that is so typical of mid-Victorian England, and it is this new bourgeois persona that Newman adopts in the *Apologia*.

III

The exciting corollary of this is that the self presented in *Loss and Gain* in the 1840s probably has more than a little in common with the David Copperfield we encounter during the greater part of Dickens's novel.

Mary Poovey has written about a new sense of the subject that evolved in fiction in the 1840s, something that we encounter in

a psychological narrative of individual development, which both provided individual readers with an imaginative image of what identity was and created a subject position that reproduced this kind of identity in the individual reader. . . one effect of the 'literary' in this period was the textual construction of an individualist psychology...¹⁴

On the face of it, this is exactly the sense of the individual subject that Newman opposes. And opposes in a way that goes beyond just 'the self', for, as Poovey explains, this sense of the subject is part of the process of legitimatisation of capitalist market and class relations; the bringing into existence of a new sense of the subject therefore underwrites an idea of the social and economic order of England with which Newman feels equally uncomfortable. But a key point to remember is that this new sense of the subject was not fixed by the 1840s, that novels were helping to create as well as to identify this new post-romantic self. And, as much as Newman might oppose this new individualism, he cannot write into existence his own distinctive nineteenth-century version of a conversion story without engaging in a real debate with this alternative, and ever more popular, discourse for structuring experience. The luxury of the *Apologia* is that it is written after the battle is over: Newman has defeated the self in a way that is remarkably similar to the manner in which other Victorians, such as George Eliot, bring egoism under control.

But *Loss and Gain*, in 1848, emerges from a period when, as we see in the Brontës' novels, a discourse of the self can teeter on the edge of unruliness. The way in which this might adjust our sense of *Loss and Gain* is that we can move beyond the idea of a psychological dimension to the novel that is at odds with its religious aim. It is possible to argue that the psychological elements need to be present, as an evocation of Charles's faith can only be meaningful, or credible, if we see it defined in the context of the competing impulses of the 1840s. Indeed, there would have been little impetus to write the book unless Newman was concerned to assert the superiority of his way of looking at the world to other contemporary ways of looking at the world; and this means making a proper acknowledgement of a sense of the self that is creeping out of control. The effect of this is that, although *Loss and Gain* may lack the polish of the *Apologia*, it manages to convey the fluid instability of the 1840s, and, more importantly, an uneasiness that the latter work lacks.

When we read *Loss and Gain*, therefore, we not only see Newman minimising the importance of the subject but also see him establishing his

version of the new Victorian subject. The novel starts by confronting what is meant by self, doing so in the way that novels have done so since their inception. Just as in *Robinson Crusoe*, the hero is defined in relation to his father, more specifically in relation to parental wisdom. In *Robinson Crusoe*, the father suggests to his son that he keeps to a steady, middle course in life. In *Loss and Gain*, the father's wisdom is more cryptic, for what he says is that 'There is no telling what is in a boy's heart' (p. 5). On its first page, therefore, *Loss and Gain* establishes an idea of interiority, of a secret area of the mind. The father then decides that his son will be educated at school rather than at home, for this will help discipline and shape the private consciousness. When we encounter Charles, we see a character who is in search of an identity, for like other Victorian novel heroes, particularly David Copperfield, he is a void waiting to be written into existence. In so far as he does define himself, he defines himself in relation to his father, and, indeed, when his father dies he resolves that 'he could not do better than imitate the life and death of his beloved father' (p. 112). But, in fact, when his father dies Charles begins to explore his own identity. We are being presented with an idea of self-definition and self-construction that is very much a concept of the 1840s. At one point the novel refers to Bateman as 'one of those composite characters' (p. 18), meaning that he is a mixture of clever and absurd qualities, but the phrase also suggests how the individual can mould and develop his or her personality. In a significant way, therefore, the novel is participating in the debate about personal identity that typifies the 1840s.

One aspect of this that runs through *David Copperfield*, *In Memoriam* and other texts from the period, is that the private self is feminine-identified. If we look at Charles's response to his father's death, for example, we see an emphasis on the feelings which would not have been at all out of place in the romantic period, but which by the late 1840s is beginning to seem unmanly. Possibly *Loss and Gain*'s most delicate moment in this area is Charles's response when Mr Malcolm urges him to marry. The text has not referred to the issue of celibacy up to this point, and at this stage there is no explanation of the comment that 'Charles slightly coloured' (p. 72). The detail, therefore, works on its own to suggest something about a feminine delicacy in the context of male assumptions and a certain view of masculinity. It is a point that is underlined when Charles twice refers to being frightened: 'we are so blest that I am sometimes quite frightened' (p. 74), and 'Ah, dear Mary, don't say so; it frightens me' (p. 75). What is most noteworthy about such details is not their uniqueness, but how consistent they are with other presentations of the self in literature from the late 1840s: a self is presented that is emotional, vulnerable and feminine-identified. Charles, who is sometimes 'in an excited state of mind' (p. 92), and who is given

to 'slightly colouring' (p. 106), is as such a typical hero of his time. As with David Copperfield, we have an immature hero who is feminine-identified, submissive, uncertain about his own identity, including his sexual identity, and who enjoys the cosy containment of warm rooms. For Charles, that means his Oxford rooms with 'a blazing fire to welcome him' (p. 83); as is the case for many Victorian heroes and heroines, the private room represents a safe sanctuary from the world.

The details I have drawn attention to are slight, but what they establish is a post-romantic sense of a hero with an interior life; but an interior life that needs to be disciplined and directed. For Charles, a change begins with the death of his father, for at that point he is forced to come to terms with the idea of manhood. In the central chapters of the book, however, there is a great deal of wavering between the private self and a rejection of the private self. As is often the case in the novel, it is blushing that reveals most: there is, for example, a moment where he confesses his 'kindness for celibacy', 'slightly coloured', laughs nervously and looks confused (pp. 135–6). It is a scene where the interrelated issues of identity, desire and sexuality are suddenly on display. But within a couple of chapters Newman moves to a point where, for Charles, 'the Catholic system comes home to his mind' (Pt. II, ch. VI); without comment, indeed without further relevant incident, a transition seems to have been made to an idea of the irrelevance of the individual mind.

This might seem to suggest an awkward discontinuity in the novel, that contradictory, and mutually exclusive, statements are being offered about the self and religious belief, but it is equally reasonable to take the view that the abruptness of the shift from one angle of interpretation to another is a central strength of *Loss and Gain*. Traditional criticism might have expected more in the way of a negotiation in the text between the two positions, but there cannot be any real negotiation between two incompatible views. The novel pays enough attention to the idea of the self for us to register that this is a text from the 1840s, but then shifts to another way of thinking about the self and its place in the scheme of things. In some Victorian novels characters are educated into a new way of thinking, but in *Loss and Gain* there is a simple, but effective, gap between a psychologically-based view of the self and a religious view of the self; they exist, incompatibly, in the same text. It is at the stage where Charles is moving towards a rejection of the Church of England that his mother and sisters begin to feature prominently in the text. Mary, his sister, is 'in a confusion of thought and feeling' (p. 182), and 'frightened and shocked' (p. 182). His mother is also presented as distraught. But the decision to present Charles's female relatives at this point—with a particular emphasis on their emotional responses—seems to underline the point that it is precisely the feminine-identified sense of the self that

Charles is now putting behind him, and that the text is turning its back on.

If we contrast *Loss and Gain* with the *Apologia*, obvious points can be made about the greater intellectual power of the later text, but its balanced self-possession is the very quality that *Loss and Gain* lacks and which makes the novel so interesting. We can consider, for example, the very different way in which the *Apologia* handles the issue of celibacy. As George Levine points out, the *Apologia* offers one moving paragraph on the subject. In Levine's words:

Newman makes us feel that this paragraph was torn from him painfully, as no doubt it was. His sense of decorum was violated by the need to talk about such deeply personal matters, and he set down his views as briefly, as feelingly, and as objectively as possible.¹⁵

Levine then goes on to suggest that the references to celibacy in *Loss and Gain* are less effective, but it is perfectly reasonable to take the opposite view, to suggest that the awkwardness of *Loss and Gain* in confronting the issue—in particular the way that Newman edges round and returns to the issue—gives the novel a dimension that the *Apologia* lacks. Levine chooses a revealing phrase when he says that, as reluctant as Newman was to discuss celibacy in the *Apologia*, 'the manly thing for him to do... was, simply, to face the problem directly'.¹⁶ In other words, by the 1860s Newman has adopted something of the manly stance of his most bitter opponent, Charles Kingsley. *Loss and Gain* is far less 'manly', far more open to the possibility that the self might be feminine, frightened and given to blushing.

The way in which *Loss and Gain* actually resolves matters is through privileging one discourse above all others (that is to say, above the discourse of the self, but also above the discourses of all the other religious factions in the novel). It is an aspect of Charles's character that he experiences 'a difficulty in finding language to express himself' (p. 228), but after his encounter with Willis he starts repeating the words 'O mighty Mother' (p. 229), asking himself 'where did I get these words? Willis did not use them' (p. 229). It is 'the external word of God' (p. 261), a language that is provided rather than anything that comes from the individual. We see the division again in his final encounter with Mr Malcolm:

Reding began to rouse himself; he felt he ought to say something; he felt that silence would tell against him. (p. 288)

But Charles has nothing to say: essentially, no dialogue is possible, for the word of God and the language of Victorian individualism exist alongside each other with no common ground. At this point it seems appropriate to return to the question with which I began: how can sceptical critical discussions be reconciled with a sympathetic

appreciation of Newman's serious intent? The answer, I think, is that recent critical approaches actually add to our sense of *Loss and Gain*, for, rather than being seen as a worthy but somewhat marginal work in Newman's career,¹⁷ it can now be seen as a novel that looks at the process of conversion in the full context of how the Victorians reconsidered and redefined themselves. It is a novel that is fully alert to, while never endorsing, the new early to mid-Victorian sense of the importance of the individual self.

- 1 John Henry Newman, *Loss and Gain: The Story of a Convert*, Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press, 1986, p. 55. All subsequent references are to this edition.
- 2 For a survey of critical interpretations of *David Copperfield*, see John Peck, '*David Copperfield* and *Hard Times*', London, Macmillan and New York, St. Martin's Press, 1995, pp. 1–30.
- 3 The manner in which characters echo the main character in novels of this period might help explain the fact that a number of critics identify someone other than Reding as a portrait of Newman in *Loss and Gain*. Charles Stephen Dessain, for example, suggests that 'Newman is Smith' (*John Henry Newman*, London, Nelson, 1966, p. 94).
- 4 Ian Ker, in his major biography of Newman, gets round this problem by discussing *Loss and Gain* exclusively as a novel of ideas, merely referring in passing to the fact that it 'contains a number of interesting autobiographical elements' (*John Henry Newman: A Biography*, Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press, 1988, p. 336).
- 5 John Coulson, *Newman and the Common Tradition: A Study in the Language of Church and Society*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1970, p. 142.
- 6 Dessain, *op. cit.*, p. x.
- 7 George Levine, *The Boundaries of Fiction: Carlyle, Macaulay, Newman*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1968, p. 219.
- 8 *Ibid.*, p. 229.
- 9 *Ibid.*, p. 222.
- 10 Alan G. Hill, in his introduction to the World's Classic edition, tends to invent a fully-rounded character who is not actually there in the text (*Loss and Gain*, Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press, 1986, pp. vii–xix.).
- 11 *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, London, Dent and Rutland, Charles E. Tuttle, 1993, p. 87.
- 12 See Linda H. Peterson, 'Newman's *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* and the Traditions of the English Spiritual Autobiography', *PMLA*, 100 (1985), 300–14, for a discussion of how Newman adopts and adapts the pattern of other works.
- 13 See Margaret Myers, 'The Lost Self: Gender in *David Copperfield*', in John Peck, ed., '*David Copperfield* and *Hard Times*', London, Macmillan and New York, St. Martin's Press, 1995, pp. 108–24, for a discussion of the idea of feminine-identified traits in the heroes of Victorian fiction.
- 14 Mary Poovey, 'The Man-of-Letters Hero: *David Copperfield* and the Professional Writer', in *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England*, London, Virago, 1989, p. 89.
- 15 Levine, *op. cit.*, p. 223.
- 16 Levine, *op. cit.*, p. 223. For a discussion of how Newman in the *Apologia* successfully confronts the aggressive manliness of Charles Kingsley, see Oliver S. Buckton, "'An Unnatural State": Gender, "Perversion", and Newman's *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*', *Victorian Studies*, 35 (1992), 359–83.
- 17 The majority of Newman's critics and biographers have very little to say about *Loss and Gain*. Ian Ker, for example, sums it up as 'essentially a sketch' (*op. cit.*, p. 336).