

characters here are powerfully drawn. Chuzzlewit, naturally excessively selfish, but striving to restrain this weakness. Mark Tapley, his moral contrast, has a moral nature, and is a lesson of christian resignation and fortitude. Pecksniff, an immoral nature which he does not restrain, and yet hypocritically lays claim to moral sanctity, and is the very incarnation of falsity, conceit and selfishness. Jonas Chuzzlewit has no morality and wants none; he is the chief villain whose character and life are unsurpassed in fiction; the sayings and doings of Sairey Gamp and Betsy Prig, are known to everybody.

*Dombey & Son*, a character novel of high life, was his next novel. It is finished, and natural, and shows a wonderful delineation of character; every one of which has a separate individuality; the characters and story are made to teach a definite moral lesson. Dombey is the impersonation of stern and cruel pride. We feel the poetic justice of his misery. On the other hand we have the self-forgetful love of Florence, of Captain Cuttle, and of Mr. Toots; while the terrible Mrs. Macstinger and Susan Nipper, keep up the humor. Paul is equalled only by Little Nell, in appealing to our compassion, and yet there is a wonderful difference between the two children.

*David Copperfield* came next, and is one of his best. It is noted for its wonderful descriptive passages, and as being partly autobiographical. The chief character, Wilkins Micawber, always waiting for something to turn up, is quoted everywhere, and "Barkis is willing" is now a proverb.

But we need go no farther. The character of these novels is sufficient to justify the great popularity of Dickens as a novelist.

Dickens has been blamed for taking his characters from low life; but he believed in the true greatness of those he painted. He could say with Whittier,

"They are noble, they who labor,  
Whether with the hand or pen,  
If their hearts beat true and kindly  
For their suffering fellow-men."

But apart from the motive he had for taking such characters, this field gave him greater variety of character. Emotion and not intellect is the province of a novel, and away from the trammels of society, which tend to make all alike, each individual follows the bent of his own inclination. Hence the immense variety of his characters, equalled only by those of Shakespeare, and like Shakespeare's they are drawn so close to nature that they are constantly referred to as types of a class. A person listlessly waiting for something to turn up, will always be a Micawber. A hateful, selfish, tyrannical and ignorant pedagogue is a Squeers. A cunning, treacherous lawyer is a Meek. A sanctimonious, starched hypocrite is a Pecksniff. A "Pickwickian sense" is as well known as a Parliamentary sense. All this is owing to the fact that they are true to nature, and vividly described, or rather exhibited, for we would actually recognize them on the street. They are all outlined with a few bold strokes, and united to our sympathies by the abounding humor of the author. Thackeray's characters are more carefully delineated, but less familiar and less liked.

Let us now take a summary of the results so far.

Thackeray is more scholarly, neat and terse; Dickens, more dialectic, and has an easier flowing style; the style of the first is a sparkling brook, sweetly gurgling over rocks, ever assuming new forms and beauty; the style of Dickens is a meandering stream, winding through meadows and flowers, which it nourishes and beautifies. Thackeray as a satirist is a cold sneering cynic, who had eyes only for the vanities and defects of human nature; Dickens was the genial friend who pointed out the faults only to correct them. Thackeray, a critic of formal art, we admire as an artist; Dickens, a writer of creative invention, we wonder at as a genius. Thackeray's characters are more minutely delineated and his story more carefully constructed; Dickens' characters are of greater variety