ISSN 1753-2396 (Print)
ISSN 2753-328X (Online)

Journal of
Irish and Scottish Studies

Articles

Radical Satire, Politics and Genre: The Case of Thomas Moore

Author: Jane Moore

Volume 1, Issue 1
Pp: 145-159
2007
Published on: 1st Jan 2007

1 4 9 5

ABERDEEN
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Radical Satire, Politics and Genre: The Case of Thomas Moore

Jane Moore

The aim of this essay is to examine *The Fudge Family in Paris* (1818), the political verse satire by the Irish wit and poet Thomas Moore (1779–1852), not just for its obvious historical importance and the vividness which it imparts to the political panorama of a lost era, but also for its formal and generic significance. Understandably, given the decades of relative inattention to the poet's satire, recent Moore criticism, and my own included, has focused on restoring the political resonances of that verse, especially in relation to the plight of nineteenth-century Erin under British rule. Ireland, indeed, is the theme and impetus of much of the satire Moore wrote throughout his long career. He returned repeatedly to the troubles of his country, both before and after the granting of Catholic emancipation in 1829. Ireland had a defining impact on Moore's satire, whether as the point of explicit focus or, as in the satire under examination in this essay, as an important informing context and circumambient presence. However, though Moore engaged closely with radical ideas of emancipation, liberation, and freedom in his satire, he also endorsed a notion of formal satirical excellence in the Horatian tradition, the genre that he reinvented and in which he made his name as a satirist. Whilst Moore scholars have addressed the political-historical interest of his satire over the last decade, they have paid rather less attention to the formal and stylistic aspects of that rich body of work.[1] My essay seeks, through an analysis of Moore's mature epistolary Horatian satire, *The Fudge Family in Paris*, to discuss issues of form and genre and Moore's position in a long-standing satirical tradition of Pope and Anstey. As well as an outspoken Whig critic of British politics, Thomas Moore was a self-conscious participant in an established Horatian tradition, a tradition which he simultaneously utilized

[1] Landmark studies of Moore's satirical verse include Gary Dyer, *British Satire and the Politics of Style, 1789–1832* (Cambridge, 1997), Jefferey W. Vail, *The Literary Relationship of Lord Byron & Thomas Moore* (Baltimore and London, 2001), my own edition of *The Satires of Thomas Moore*, Vol. 5, *British Satire: 1785–1840*, 5 vols, gen. ed. John Strachan (London, 2003). An earlier work worth citing here is Irene B. Lurkis's unpublished PhD thesis, *Moore and Moderation: A Study of Thomas Moore's Political and Social Satires*, University of Southern California, 1979.

and renewed to serve his ideological purposes, fusing combative liberal politics with sprightly comic satire.

Publication of *The Fudge Family in Paris* on 20 April 1818 quickly confirmed Thomas Moore's reputation as the best-known liberal Whig satirist, Byron apart, of his day. Moore wrote the work under his pseudonym 'Thomas Brown, the Younger', which he had used earlier for the publication of his first extended Horatian satire, *Intercepted Letters; or, The Twopenny Post-bag* (1813), a hugely successful radical comic assault in a series of eight letters on the anti-Catholic Tory government and the apostate Regent, who, in 1812, had unexpectedly abandoned his commitment to Whig politics, betraying with it the great oppositional cause of Catholic emancipation. As with *Intercepted Letters*, *The Fudge Family in Paris* quickly became known as Moore's work and easily rivaled the popularity of its predecessor, reaching a ninth edition within the year.

The twelve verse epistles that comprise *The Fudge Family in Paris* recount the adventures in post-Waterloo Paris of an Irish but British-identified Protestant family keen to take advantage of the travel opportunities provided by the peace. The oleaginous father, Phil Fudge, a former rebel whose political opportunism now leads him to side with the British Tory government, heads the family party. He is in Paris at the behest of his mentor, the Irish hate figure Lord Castlereagh, to write a book in defence of the Holy Alliance. Joining Phil are his flighty teenage daughter Biddy, her elder brother Bob, a gourmand with pretensions to dandyism, and their third cousin, Phelim Connor, employed as Bob's private tutor. Connor's earnest Catholicism and tub-thumping Irish patriotism form a marked contrast with the decadence of his cousins, making him an unlikely mentor for the self-indulgent Bob and throwing into comic sharp relief the vacuity of his cousin's values. Moore also introduces an editor figure, and whose preface and mock-scholarly footnotes to the epistles add substantially to the satiric humour.

Biddy is the most fully developed of the characters; her letter opens the series, and, through providing information about the other family members, she comments indirectly on the political situation. A quixotic eighteen-year-old, who dreams of romance and adventure, Biddy's innocence is exploited by Moore to satirize her father's politics, her naivety proving an excellent foil for his cynicism. Her first letter, written to her friend Dolly back home in Ireland, reports on her father thus:

> As to Pa, what d'ye think?—mind, it's all *entre nous*,
> But you know, love, I never keep secrets from you—

Why, he's writing a book—what! a tale? a romance?
No, ye Gods, would it were!—but his Travels in France;
At the special desire (he let out t'other day)
Of his great friend and patron, my Lord C—STL—RE—GH,
Who said, 'My dear FUDGE'—I forget th' exact words,
And, it's strange, no one ever remembers my Lord's;
But 'twas something to say that, as all must allow
A good orthodox work is much wanting just now,
To expound to the world the new—thingummie—science,
Found out by the—what's-its-name—Holy Alliance,
And to prove to mankind that their rights are but folly,
Their freedom a joke (which it *is*, you know, DOLLY),
There's none', said his Lordship, 'if I may be judge,
Half so fit for this great undertaking as FUDGE!'
(Letter I, 67–82)[2]

In contrast to the ill-tempered assaults of his early Juvenalian satires, where Moore rails at his targets, evoking moral outrage in his American 'Epistles', for instance, over the well-founded rumour that Jefferson kept a slave as his mistress, or ranting at Castlereagh's iniquities in *Corruption and Intolerance* (1808), Moore's mature Horatian works see him developing the use of fictional character as means of attacking his targets by a more indirect mode than hitherto.[3] Biddy's letters in *The Fudge Family in Paris* enable Moore to ridicule Castlereagh's brand of anti-Irish Toryism through the irony of the praise awarded him by a young woman who is essentially ignorant of politics, her girlish innocence contrasting with the grotesque injustices taking place at the hands of her father's hero and the despised Holy Alliance. The Popean device of zeugma is used extensively here: in her naivety, Biddy links 'rights' and

[2] This and all subsequent references to *The Fudge Family in Paris* are from my edition *The Satires of Thomas Moore*.

[3] Moore's volume of poems on America, entitled *Epistles, Odes and Other Poems* (1806) includes the vitriolic satires, 'Epistle VI' and 'Epistle VII', which assault what he saw as Jefferson's hypocritical brand of democratic politics. 'Epistle VI' seizes on the rumour that he kept a black slave, Sally Hemings, as his mistress. The epistles are reprinted in *The Satires of Thomas Moore*, 6–17. *Corruption and Intolerance* (1808) takes the form of a savage reply in heroic couplets by an Irishman to an English *adversarius* who has been boasting of 'Britain's glorious rights'. The second satire, 'Intolerance', attacks British misrule in Ireland, damning Hawkesbury (later Lord Liverpool), Castlereagh and Camden for their part in Ireland's religious persecution. See *The Satires of Thomas Moore*, 22–45.

'folly', 'freedom' and 'joke', and greatness with 'Fudge' (her father). Similarly, Phil's moral bankruptcy turns his own praise for Castlereagh into its opposite, condemnation.

The jaunty anapaestic tetrameter lines used for Biddy's epistles create the appearance of a lighter feminine mode of speech, emphasizing her girlish playfulness. Her brother Bob's epistles are also in anapaestic tetrameter, and here the lightness of metre effectively ironizes his status as a representative of that class of young men destined by breeding, or, as in Bob's case, by paternal influence, to become pillars of the British establishment. Phil's first sycophantic missive to Castlereagh sneaks in a parenthetical reference to Bob: '(My son, my Lord, a youth of parts,/ Who longs to be a small place-holder)' (Letter II, 104–5). The gourmandizing, wine slugging, dandified Bob shares Biddy's blindness to the bleak reality endured by the French masses. As the representative of his class of hedonistic young gentlemen, and as a youthful caricature of that most royal dandy the Prince Regent, Bob is emblematically indifferent to the injustice of France's despoliation by the Holy Alliance. The obsequious Phil affects to worship his Tory lords and masters, his daughter Biddy bows before French fashion, her patriotic cousin Phelim vows allegiance to his country, whilst Bob genuflects at the high altar of French cuisine. Letter VIII in which Bob scornfully describes the foreignness of the Parisian boulevard

> Green-grocers, green gardens—one hardly knows whether
> 'Tis country or town, they're so mess'd up together!
> (Letter VIII, 24–5)

culminates in a mock-epic appeal to the 'Holy Allies' to save the one aspect of French culture Bob does appreciate, her cuisine:

> Forbid it, forbid it, ye Holy Allies!
> Take whatever ye fancy—take statues, take money—
> But leave them, oh leave them, their Perigueux pies,
> Their glorious goose-livers, and high pickled tunny!
> Though many, I own are the evils they've brought us,
> Though Royalty's here on her very last legs,
> Yet, who can help loving the land that has taught us
> Six hundred and eighty-five ways to dress eggs?
> (Letter VIII, 58–65)

The satire works of course through the elevation of Bob's favourite French dishes above the country's statuary and her currency, the two latter presumably being of debased value in the wake of wartime defeat. Moore undoubtedly is drawing on the influence of Pope in his use of antithesis, juxtaposition, and anti-climax. But he also borrows the Popean mock-epic model in the introduction of an editorial figure who annotates Bob's epistles, and those of the rest of the party, with comic solemnity. Thus Bob's mock-epic salute to a land that has 'taught us six hundred and eighty-five ways to dress eggs' prompts the over-scrupulous editor to vouchsafe the accuracy of Bob's information: 'The exact number mentioned by M. de la Reynière—"On connoît en France 685 manières différentes d'accommoder les oeufs; sans compter celles que nos savans imaginent chaque jour".'

The editor exists in *The Fudge Family in Paris* as a separate character who, though not as fully developed as Bob or Biddy, has his own identity – appropriately, that of the self-important, moralizing pedant. He writes a preface to the satire, signed 'Thomas Brown, the Younger', which distinguishes him from the various purported writers of the letters collected in his book, and from their actual author, Thomas Moore, in which he regrets having to omit some part of Bob Fudge's third letter on account of titillating references to contemporary French dancer: 'Marinette's thin drapery, which, it was thought might give offence to certain well-meaning persons'. Yet at the same time as the editor censors the racier parts of Bob's account, he admiringly annotates Bob's and Biddy's whirl of social activity (diligently footnoting the names of dressmakers, dining halls, theatres, pleasure gardens, and so on) which inadvertently calls into question both his own judgement and that of the characters epitomizing the values he professes to share. As Irene B. Lurkis observes:

> The editor's solemn footnotes serve to the highlight the foolishness of Bob's excessive enthusiasm for French dining customs and his accompanying disdain for those of the English. Thus, when Bob extols the virtues of 'dejeuner à la fourchette':
>
> > There, DICK, what a breakfast!—oh, not like your ghost
> > Of a breakfast in England, your curst tea and toast;
>
> the editor points out assiduously:
>
> > Is Mr. Bob aware that his contempt for *tea* renders him liable to a

> charge of *atheism*? Such, at least, is the opinion cited in *Christian*, *Falster*, *Amoenitat. Philog.*—[4]

The original footnote is at twice as long as the snippet quoted here, and is replete with Greek and Latin tags together with a mock ode to tea, translated from the Greek. Whilst the editor busily annotates Bob's frivolous predilections, he lets slip by him a number of the young buck's more off-colour remarks, including a comparison of his fashionable neck-cloth with the noose that circles a condemned man's neck, a statement verging on the licentious.

> I rise—put on neck-cloth—stiff, tight, as can be—
> For a lad who *goes into the world,* DICK, like me,
> Should have his neck tied up, you know—there's no doubt of it—
> Almost as tight as *some* lads who *go out of it*.
> With whiskers well oil'd, and with boots that 'hold up
> The mirror to nature'—so bright you could sup
> Off the leather like china . . .
>
> (Letter III, 31–7)

Bob is quoting from the advertising copy used in Robert Warren's famous contemporary campaign for his boot polish, which was illustrated with a cat jumping in fright at her reflection on a boot polished to a fine lustre. The jumbling of colloquial detail (neck-tie fashions and advertising campaigns for boot polish) with the reference to capital punishment, signals Bob's misplaced values and, by extension, those of the editor. It also hints at a nastiness lurking beneath Bob's apparently harmless hedonism, an attribute that is developed in *The Fudges in England* (1835), Moore's late sequel to *The Fudge Family in Paris*, which sees him having grown into a gouty, boorish and bad-tempered clergyman.

Moore's use of character and the verse epistle to construct a series of first-person satiric narratives has a formal antecedent in Christopher Anstey's witty eighteenth-century verse satire, *The New Bath Guide* (1766). Anstey's work is a good-natured satire on the follies of high society related in a series of fifteen verse-letters, eleven written almost entirely in anapaestic tetrameter, by a family of country innocents from the North of England during a visit to the fashionable spa town of Bath. So popular was Anstey's work that anapaestic

[4] Lurkis, *Moore and Moderation*, 147.

tetrameter couplets became known in the late eighteenth century as 'Anstey measure' or 'Bath Guide Verse'; similarly the success of *The Fudge Family in Paris* established that metre as Moore's trademark during the first half of the nineteenth century. As with Anstey, Moore uses the measure to create a lively conversational tone within the discursive framework of the verse epistle. Both satirists exploit the expansive nature of the anapaestic line in their development of entertaining characters, immediately recognizable as social types. And both rely too upon the use of external detail to create the effect of verisimilitude of character. The reader engages with Bob and Biddy Fudge, for instance, primarily through the detailed, almost theatrical, descriptions of their social activities, rather than through psychological narrative. Bob and Biddy whirl through Paris as through a fairground hall of mirrors, exaggerating and distorting, but also reflecting a truth about human character. In the context of satire that truth is invariably a social and political one, so that politics and social history, rather than forming the backdrop to the action, actively impinge upon and shape the lives of the characters. To borrow Maud Ellmann's description of character in the Anglo-Irish novels of Elizabeth Bowen, it is as if material objects and events take the place of psychology.[5] Character in *The Fudge Family in Paris* is shaped by descriptions of dresses and dances, gardens and romance, in Biddy's case, and pâté, and stays, wine and cutlets, boulevards and theatres in Bob's.

Moore's achievement in *The Fudge in Family in Paris* and his advancement on Anstey's *New Bath Guide* is to develop character as a means of giving his satire a radical point and a political focus. Whereas Anstey satirizes a social type, without singling out for scorn or ridicule a named or known individual, or providing serious moral condemnation, Moore deploys character to supply a radical analysis of the peace following the Napoleonic wars. The name of his chief political target, C—STL—RE—GH, is individualized by means of the long dash, or series of dashes, leaving the reader in little doubt over his identity. The much despised Castlereagh is one thing, innocent or foolish characters such as Bob and Biddy, however, are quite another, and I would argue that it is in the use of such minor anonymous characters to convey radical political meanings that Moore finds his forte as a radical Horatian satirist. Through experimenting with fictional personas and ironic voice, Moore blends combative liberal politics into light Horatian Satire. A character like Biddy, for example, is used to entertain and engage

[5] Maud Ellmann, *Elizabeth Bowen: The Shadow Across the Page* (Edinburgh, 2003), 42.

the reader (she has an independent existence as one of the satire's cast of dramatis personae) but she is also a conduit for the radical analysis of the political situation in post-Waterloo Paris. Indeed, I would argue that Moore's strength as a radical satirist lies in his almost novelistic use of portraiture and character to create political meaning.

The Fudge Family in Paris sees Moore borrowing the techniques of prose fiction imaginatively to reconstruct as poetic satire a set of messages and morals that are provocatively deferred, inferred, or ironized. It is a work with a strong novelistic vision. Ronan Kelly, in an important recent essay, has argued that Moore moved towards the novel form in the mid 1820s with the publication of his agrarian prose satire *Memoirs of Captain of Rock, The Celebrated Irish Chieftain* (1824).

> Moore regularly turned to prose express complex arguments. Indeed, from 1823, the mid-point of his writing life, he largely abandoned his career as a poet, and from this date became a prose writer of considerable repute.[6]

Moore did indeed move to the novel in the post-Napoleonic age, but this trend, I would argue, is already apparent in his decision to write satire in a novelistic tradition (evident in the vivid panorama of *The Fudge Family in Paris*). Moore was already a displaying a novelistic vision in co-opting the tropes and techniques of prose fiction for verse Satire as early as 1819 in *The Fudge Family in Paris*. Furthermore, Moore did not reject verse in favour of prose for the expression of complex arguments post 1823. Indeed, he continued to contribute occasional verse satire (in the precise sense of that term) to *The Times* and the *Morning Chronicle* for another two decades and he returned to epistolary verse satire in his final extended narrative poem, *The Fudges in England* (1835), his sequel to *The Fudge Family in Paris.*

Moore himself is on record as saying that Ireland was a subject uniquely suited to the novel form, and it is worth quoting at length from his essay on 'Irish Novels', published in *The Edinburgh Review* in February 1826, for its retrospective illumination of the novelistic tropes and techniques deployed in *The Fudge Family in Paris*. The essay, which opens with an acknowledgement of Scott's influence on the 'impulse towards Novel-writing which is, at present, all over Europe', proposes the thesis that Ireland, of all countries, is uniquely

[6] Ronan Kelly, 'Another Side of Thomas Moore', *History Ireland* (Autumn 2003), 39–43; 42.

suited to the novel.[7] Indeed, Moore had demonstrated this point in a mutated form in *The Fudge Family in Paris*. He argues, wryly, that the novel, the inferior sister of epic poetry, is in its debased literary standing better fitted to Ireland's 'wretched history', as he puts it:

> The same causes, however, that have embittered and degraded the history of Ireland, so as to render it incapable of furnishing any safe or worthy theme for the poet, have brought the character of its people, both moral and social, to a state which is eminently favourable to the more humble inspirations of the novelist. Though the nobler quarry of the Muse is wanting, there is plenty of small game for the satirist and observer of character. The anomalies necessarily engendered throughout the whole frame of society by the inverted and unnatural position of all the institutions of that country; the influence which such a state of things must have upon all ranks—those of the higher, in whose hands the execution of unequal laws is placed, being forced, by the very nature of the instrument which they wield, to be bad judges, bad magistrates, and bad citizens, in spite of themselves; while those of the lower class, placed by the same causes in habitual opposition to the law, seem, by riot and plunder, but to fulfil their allotted destiny, and to perform *the base*, as it were, in that great concert of discord which reigns throughout;—the vulgar arrogance of the small gentry, so long encouraged by the despotism thus *put in commission* among them;—the low, circumventing cunning, which is the only peaceable weapon left to their victims, and, which is so observable among the Greeks and other trampled-down nations, substituting the serpentine line of the slave for the straight-forward course of the freeman;—those habits of thoughtless and tasteless extravagance, which a long monopoly of the public purse engenders in the master, and that recklessness of comfort, and even of life, to which a long despair of justice reduces the slave!—all these are features, but too prominent in the condition of Ireland, to which a novelist might, in his portraitures of them, give unbounded variety of play.[8]

This exhaustive list, with no sentence break, of all that's corrupt in Ireland and corrupting of its people, brings to mind the powerful, metaphorically

[7] Thomas Moore, 'Irish Novels', *The Edinburgh Review*, Vol. 43 (February 1826), 356–72; 356.

[8] Moore, 'Irish Novels', 358–9.

extravagant denunciation of the Chancery with which Dickens opened *Bleak House* twenty-six years later. Unlike Dickens, Moore did not turn to the novel proper to inscribe the wrongs of his country but he does pre-empt some Dickensian techniques in his satiric representation of character. Dickens's comedy is often dependent upon grotesquerie and so too is the social criticism of his fiction. There is a similar use of grotesquerie in *The Fudge Family in Paris* in the figure of the odious Phil Fudge in his role of Lord Castlereagh's fictional surrogate. Biddy, meanwhile, is the embodiment of charming, sentimentalized femininity, the flip side of the Dickensian grotesque. Notwithstanding the putative parallels between the treatment of character by Moore and Dickens, I am not of course suggesting that the former writer directly influenced the latter. But I do wish to suggest that the two writers inhabited the same cultural orbit of late Georgian satire, that Dickens, if you will, is as much a late Georgian in terms of his literary humour as he is a Victorian social realist in his depiction of the horrors of contemporary London.

Both the earlier and the later Fudge satires adopt and adapt the tropes and techniques of prose fiction (the creation of a clearly delineated cast of characters who interact realistically within in a unified plot to produce the semblance of verisimilitude). Rather like the master of historical fiction, Scott, Moore uses little people to unfold a grand historical narrative. His narratives of political corruption in Ireland and Europe are told through the satirical portraiture of inconsequential figures: Biddy and Bob are representatives typical of their class; Phelim is an impoverished tutor, and Phil, though having pretensions to statesmanship, is a risibly pale imitation of his patron, Castlereagh. The historical novel, as described by Georg Lukács, developed in the hands of Scott through the narration of 'small encounters'; it can be said similarly of Moore's *Fudge Family in Paris* that the keen political-historical thrust of the narrative occurs in the 'small skirmishes' between the so-called little people. [9]

Phil Fudge is one such character. Indeed, he is a kind of hybrid character, existing as the inconsequential father to the fictional Fudge family, and serving as a fictional version of two actual historical figures, his hero, the former Chief Secretary of Ireland Lord Castlereagh on the one hand, and, on the other, the notorious informer Thomas Reynolds, who spied on the United Irishmen organization in 1798 and who testified in the ensuing treason trials, for which he was rewarded handsomely by the British government. The letters of Phil Fudge develop Moore's use of character to generate radical political sat-

[9] Georg Lukács, *The Historical Novel*, trans. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell (London, 1962), 43.

ire, which works by establishing Phil as Castlereagh's fictional surrogate (Phil's letters ape his mentor's well-known tendency to garble his words) so that in ridiculing the fictional character of Fudge Moore equally condemns his mentor. The editorial commentary is once again important here. When Phil copies his patron's habit of speaking in a thickly metaphorical style, saying of the political state of play in Paris, this ' "Demoraliz'd" metropolis'

> Where (still to use your Lordship's tropes)
> The *level* of obedience *slopes*
> Upward and downward as the *stream*
> Of *hydra* faction *kicks the beam!*
> (Letter II, 8 – 11)

the editor informs us:

> 'This excellent imitation of the noble Lord's style shows how deeply Mr. Fudge must have studied his great original. Irish oratory, indeed, abounds with such startling peculiarities. Thus the eloquent Counsellor B——, in describing some hypocritical pretender to charity, said, "He put his hand in his breeches-pocket, like a crocodile, and," &c. &c.'

The satire on Castelereagh works through the editor's representation of Fudge's (and Castlereagh's) metaphorically confused oratory as the desirable norm, and the political comedy of the situation is sharpened by the use of a sprightly iambic tetrameter that is inappropriately matched to Phil's aspirations to statesmanship, serving to draw attention to his fraudulent or 'fudged' politics, his inherent lack of gravitas or political integrity, and damning by association the ravening flock of Tory leaders he professes to admire.

The editor's misplaced approval of Fudge the elder and the latter's equally suspect respect for Castlereagh continues the theme of mistaken values, of post-war turmoil and disorder, which coheres the letters of the individual Fudge family members and lends a novelistic unity to the whole. In his treatment of that theme, Moore ensures that condemnation of British policies and the Holy Alliance remains at the forefront of the work and in this way he moves beyond the gentle social satire of his predecessor Anstey, who targets the follies of fashionable society without offering serious moral judgement. By contrast, even when *The Fudge Family in Paris* appears at its most humor-

ous, it never restrains the political anger aroused by what Moore sees as the injustice of British rule. Gary Dyer points out that Moore's Horatian satire is distinguished by an 'angry playfulness', so that whilst *The Fudge Family in Paris* is Horatian in tone and form, it is 'far from being as amicable as the term "Horatian" would suggest'.[10]

Indeed, Moore's achievement in the creation of the characters Biddy, Bob and Phil Fudge lies in retaining the political force of the satire without sacrificing the interests of character and dramatic action. An example is the treatment of the theme of mistaken identity, which is writ large in Biddy's story in a plot that is at once personal and political. In keeping with her character of the sentimental, quixotic heroine familiar from generic circulating-library fiction, Biddy sets out to find romance in Paris, the idea of a mysterious and foreign stranger appealing to her sense of adventure. Her dreams are shattered, in one of the funniest scenes in the satire, on the discovery that her Romeo is not the King of Prussia traveling incognito, as she had fondly imagined, and not even a Colonel, but a mere tradesman, a linen draper called Monsieur Calicot, meaning of course callicot, which she misreads as Colonel. She reports to her friend Dolly that it was nightfall when she received his card,

> the *name*, rather creas'd—
> But 'twas CALICOT—something—a Colonel, at least!
> (Letter X, 120–1)

In an earlier moment, Calico's 'Corsair expression' (a nod by Moore to the Byronic hero of that name, at which Byron reportedly took umbrage) is compared to that of a hyena. Biddy first meets her hero during an evening's entertainment at the Beaujon, a Paris pleasure ground, with a roller coaster. Breathless with excitement, she writes:

> There came up—imagine, dear DOLL, if you can—
> A fine sallow, sublime, sort of Werter-fac'd man,
> With mustachios that gave (what we read of so oft)
> The dear Corsair expression, half savage, half soft,
> As Hyaenas in love may be fancied to look
> (Letter V, 97–101)

[10] Dyer, *British Satire and the Politics of Style, 1789–1832*, 41.

Moore uses the romantic sub-plot to satirize contemporary sentimental fiction and its effect on young women readers who are incapable of distinguishing the figure of a Werter from a Corsair and a Corsair from a hyena, or, indeed, a shopkeeper from the King of Prussia. He also uses Biddy's inability to see the reality of her romantic hero as a metaphor for the more serious blindness of her father and brother to the injustices of the Holy Alliance. Indeed, Biddy's hero provides the opportunity for a political jab at the Alliance, as follows. Biddy reports in a postscript that her father, on espying her lover seated in one of the Beaujon roller-coaster cars, decides on the basis of his erect posture that he must be the King of Prussia:

> *Nota Bene*.—Papa's almost certain 'tis he—
> For he knows the Legitimate cut, and could see,
> In the way he went poising and manag'd to tower
> So erect in the car, the true *Balance of Power*.
> (Letter V, 146–9)

The upright posture of the linen draper, suspected the King of Prussia, visually represents what Moore took to be tyrannical powers of the Holy Alliance, punning on the word 'Legitimate' to mean the very opposite.

Phelim Connor, cousin to the younger Fudges, although represented by the morally confused editor represents him as the black sheep of the family, stands for political right and justice. In Connor, Moore presents a national hero for Ireland, who typically in this narrative of mistaken identities is not recognized as such. In her first letter Biddy innocently compares him to Napoleon:

> His nose and his chin—which Papa rather dreads,
> As the Bourbons, you know, are suppressing all heads
> That resemble old NAP's, and who knows but their honours
> May think, in their fright, of suppressing poor CONNOR'S?
> (Letter I, 97–100)

Connor's epistles reverberate with a political fury captured in thundering Juvenalian couplets that the editor is compelled to censor, as in the following attack on the arch-enemy of Ireland, Castlereagh, whose betrayal of those in his country who loved him is likened to the treachery of Hercules' jealous wife Hera who gave him a deadly shirt spread with the Centaur's blood believing this would act as a love ointment and keep her husband faithful to her. Unknown

to her, the shirt was adulterated with a poison and when Hercules put it on the poison ate through his flesh the bone, killing him. Connor declaims:

> 'Twas an Irish head, an Irish heart,
> Made thee the fall'n and tarnish'd thing thou art;
> That, as the centaur gave th' infected vest
> In which he died, to rack his conqueror's breast,
> We sent thee C——GH:—as heaps of dead
> Have slain their slayers by the pest they spread,
> So hath our land breath'd out, thy fame to dim,
> Thy strength to waste, and rot thee, soul and limb.
> Her worst infections all condens'd in him!
> * * *
>
> (Letter IV, 55–63)

Gary Dyer argues that radical satire in the Romantic period is typically Menippean, deploying a wide variety of verse forms, moving from the grandeur of the heroic couplet and elevated rhetoric of Augustan satire towards a 'more colloquial language but also intrinsically comic triple meters and iambic tetrameter couplets (hudibrastics)'.[11] Certainly this is true of *The Fudge Family in Paris*, which is written in a variety of metres, anapaestic tetrameter, iambic tetrameter as well as Connor's heroic couplets. Moore's satire is Menippean too in its fusion of characteristics of the novel form (characterization, verisimilitude, a unified narrative) with those of verse (rhyme, metre, imagery). This hybridity of form and tone, which Dyer identifies as a stylistic trait of radical satire in the Romantic period may also be explained as a national characteristic, as a feature specifically of Irish writing in the nineteenth century. In his essay on Moore's prose satire *Captain Rock*, Luke Gibbons suggests that the 'oscillation in the narrative voice(s)' which is one of the marked features of that text, is 'precisely the "literary difficulty" in explaining Ireland, or subjecting it to one authoritative point of view'.[12] Gibbons argues that what he calls the 'formal instability'[13] of *Captain Rock*'s narrative organization arises from the unstable position of Ireland under Britain in the early nineteenth century. As

[11] Dyer, *British Satire and the Politics of Style*, 40.

[12] Luke Gibbons, 'Between Captain Rock and a Hard Place: Art and Agrarian Insurgency', in Tadhg Foley and Seán Ryder (eds), *Ideology and Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin, 1998), 23–44; 30, fn.19.

[13] Gibbons, 'Between Captain Rock and a Hard Place', 42.

he puts it: 'The difficulties in establishing a framing narrative, ordering the disparate elements in a story or picture and subjecting them to a unified point of view, presented itself not simply as an aesthetic difficulty but as an intractable political problem'.[14] This interpretation of Moore's exploitation of a variety of forms and tones in *Captain Rock* makes questions of form and tone questions of ideology and politics.

Moore's technical achievement, which is the political strength of his satire, lies to a large degree in the hybridity of form (the combination of aspects of the novel and poetry together, the mixing of Horatian and Juvenalian tones, the creation of characters that are plausible and entertaining but are used as satiric objects). Whatever Moore's fondness for entertaining, captured in the popular image of him as the darling of English drawing rooms, in his role of author of the *Irish Melodies*, there is no question that in his satires he is passionately committed to addressing the wrongs of Ireland and of Europe savaged by the Tories and the Holy Alliance. His radical friend and poet Leigh Hunt once hymned him as

> A maker of sweets, busy, sparkling, and singing,
> Yet armed with an exquisite point too for stinging.[15]

neatly encapsulating the poet's practice of composing both drawing-room song and sharp political satire. In his Horatian satire too, Moore tickles while he stings, as it were. The satiric brilliance of *The Fudge Family in Paris* resides in the creation of entertaining characters and a compelling plot whilst sustaining a cutting narrative irony that keeps the larger radical political themes of the satire (the despoliation of Europe and the tyranny of government and, indeed, the wrongs of Ireland) firmly in view.

University of Cardiff

[14] Gibbons, 'Between Captain Rock and a Hard Place', 30.

[15] Leigh Hunt, 'To Thomas Moore', *The Selected Writings of Leigh Hunt*, gen. eds Robert Morrison and Michael Eberle-Sinatra, 6 Vols (London, 2003), Vol. 5, *Poetical Works, 1799–1821*, ed. John Strachan, 133–4.