"A Champion of the Sex"

Eliza Haywood's Contribution

to the

Development of the English Novel

Thesis submitted for the degree of Ph.D.

at the

University of Kent at Canterbury

by

Sherry Lynn Mayrent

Abstract

Eliza Haywood was Defoe's counterpart in every respect, and even exceeded his achievement in the internal coherence and dramatic symmetry of her novels. Yet because of a serious distortion of the novel's history, while he is acclaimed, she has been dismissed. The main reason for this distortion is modern criticism's emphasis on "realism." Haywood based her novels on the tradition of heroic romance. Using and adapting many of its conventions and devices, both thematic and stylistic, she developed a mode of fiction which was perfectly suited to reflect the problems of the newly literate women who made up a large proportion of her audience. Conventions such as the insertion of letters and the analysis of emotion enabled Haywood to depict with unusual clarity the inner lives of her heroines; her "realism" was psychological rather than material. Consequently, critics have been blinded by the outward forms of romance, and have dismissed these novels as vulgarized versions of the ungainly French works, without perceiving that she used those forms with conscious skill.

Haywood focused almost exclusively on women, and, using the techniques gleaned from the romances, developed a fictional "formula" which allowed her to express, almost symbolically, the potential tragedy of women's lives. Her novels of the 1720's, all closely based on this formula, are hyperbolic in order to reveal the fundamental reality of the conflicts she portrays. When Richardson and Fielding began to write, they both chose to deal with similar conflicts, and Haywood's formula became the basis of a literary dia-

lectic which resulted in Clarissa and Tom Jones. As tastes changed in the 1730's and 1740's, Haywood realized that her formula could prove even more serviceable as the basis of a more uniformly realistic fiction, dealing in the compromises of ordinary life rather than the dramatic confrontations of tragedy. Betsy Thoughtless is her finest work in this vein, and the one which is most congenial to modern tastes. Fielding and Richardson soon followed in the same direction with Amelia and Grandison, and the stuff of Eliza Haywood's fiction became the very heart of the English novel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface iii

Acknowledgements iv

Part One: Introduction and Background 1

I. Introduction 2

II. Eliza Haywood's Life. 42

III. The Heroic Romance. 80

Part Two: The Beginning: Love in Excess 118

IV. The Heroine as Ideal. 119

V. The Hero as Lover 147

VI. The Novel as Romance. 170

Part Three: The Haywood Formula 197

VII. Realism and the Psychology of the Heroine 198

VIII. The Heroine as Hero 241

IX. The Novel as Tragedy. 274

X. Anti-Romance: Philidore and Placentia 304

Part Four: Haywood and the Literary Dialectic 337

XI. Richardson, Fielding and the Formula. 338

XII. Domestic Romance: Betsy Thoughtless 376

XIII. The Novel as "Novel". 412

Part Five: Conclusion 457

Appendix: Plot Synopses of Haywood's Novels 466

Bibliography 508

Preface

The nature of the subject of this thesis has necessitated a certain unorthodoxy in my treatment of it. The most obvious problem for anyone dealing with an obscure author is the unavailability of texts. To circumvent the difficulties arising from the reader's probable unfamiliarity with Eliza Haywood's works, I have quoted extensively wherever quotation seemed expedient. In this way, I felt, the reader could best be given a sense of the vitality of the novels. I have tried to provide other assistance in the peripheries of the thesis. The Appendix consists of fairly detailed plot synopses for all the works I have discussed at any length, and in the footnotes I have supplied an elaborate network of cross-references. However, I have also been compelled to include a great deal of summarizing within the text itself; without it, many of my points would have been confusing and obscure. The result of this method, which is inevitable when the works themselves are not widely read, is an unavoidable prolixity in certain sections of the thesis. In the interests of demonstrating Haywood's style and techniques, I have similarly found it necessary to include close readings and, in some cases, blow-by-blow explications of particular passages, which add to the long-windedness of my analysis. Although I have tried to be as direct and concise as possible, in any instance, justice to Haywood's writing has been my primary consideration.

In an attempt to atone for the amount of quotation I have included, I have facilitated the reader's task by eliminating much

of the inconsistent capitalization, the italicization of proper names, and the annoying contraction of past participles ("fir'd" for "fired") when quoting from Haywood's works, except for quotations from poetry. Her punctuation has been preserved as in the originals, for I believe that it contributes a great deal to the rhythm of her prose.

Acknowledgements

I should like to thank G. Linnell and E. Dixon of the University of Kent library, D. K. Lowe of the University Library, Cambridge, S. A. Roberts, and the staffs of the British Museum Reading Room, the Rare Books Room of the University Library, Cambridge, and the University of Kent library, whose assistance has been constant and invaluable. J. Gooder of Newnham College, Cambridge, J. Young, S. A. Roberts, J. Scoon, L. Wachob and the University of Kent have provided considerable financial aid, for which I am very grateful. I should also like to thank T. Brown, A. Culverwell, S. A. Roberts and A. Waters for helping with proofreading. And my most heartfelt thanks to Michael Irwin, under whose excellent supervision this thesis was composed.

PART ONE

Introduction and Background

I

INTRODUCTION

Although one of the most popular and prolific of early English novelists, in output rivalling even the tireless Defoe,[1] Eliza Haywood has been consistently underestimated. My study of works dealing with the early development of the novel leads me to believe that the reason for this failure to appreciate her achievements is what one critic has called "the tyranny of literary history."[2] I would suggest that she is the victim of an evolutionary view of literary development which works backwards from a predetermined goal, examining a body of evidence which is, in effect, preselected. Critics who hold this view tend to have an extremely narrow preconception of what "the novel" should be, of its aims and its methods.[3] These critics also regard the development of the novel as a direct and linear progression, usually beginning with Richardson or Fielding, sometimes with Defoe; from the major works of these writers, the historians derive a definition of the genre which they then seek to substantiate with examples of earlier literature. Any work which is not immediately recognizable as an "influence" is disregarded. Because Haywood's fiction does not seem

[1] In W. H. McBurney's Checklist of English Prose Fiction 1700-1739 (Cambridge, Mass., 1960), Haywood's entry in the index is nearly twice as long as Defoe's. [2] M. E. Novak, "Fiction and Society in the Early Eighteenth Century," in England in the Restoration and Early Eighteenth Century, ed. H. T. Swedenberg, Jr. (Los Angeles, 1972), p. 52. [3] Novak takes Ian Watt's Rise of the Novel as a prototype of this sort of criticism (p. 53). Watt himself repudiates this view in "Serious Reflections on The Rise of the Novel," Novel, 1 (1968), 205-18.

to accord with any of the standard conceptions of the novel, her productions have been seen as fit only for studies like The Light Reading of Our Ancestors or Popular Fiction Before Richardson.[4] Both titles imply that the works to be discussed fall outside the mainstream of fiction and are therefore of secondary importance. I would contend that literary development is far more complex a process than that view implies, and that the contribution of the type of novel which Haywood wrote has never really been examined. Although the realistic strain in fiction has been fully documented,[5] and although the popular literature of the early eighteenth century is sometimes grudgingly acknowledged[6] as a presence, if not as an influence, the legacy left to the early English novel by the heroic romance has been almost entirely overlooked.[7] Haywood's fiction draws heavily on this tradition. She adopts, or adapts, almost all of its conventions, and as a result her works have been misconstrued as vulgar imitations of an out-moded form, and disregarded along with her literary models themselves.

[4] Rowland Prothero, Lord Ernle, The Light Reading of Our Ancestors (London, 1927); J. J. Richetti, Popular Fiction Before Richardson (Oxford, 1969). It is interesting to note, however, that Haywood seems to be mentioned, at least, in almost every work dealing with early eighteenth-century literature, from books on literature and politics or theatrical criticism, to collections of essays and letters.

[5] See below, p. 84, note 6.

[6] Richetti's book is one of the few which takes popular literature seriously in this early period; Robert A. Day's Told in Letters (Ann Arbor, 1966) is another. Ernle's attitude is more characteristic. See below, p.34.

[7] Charlotte Morgan's Rise of the Novel of Manners (New York, 1911), treats the romance tradition in considerable detail, but her study concentrates on defining it as an antecedent rather than on tracing its influence systematically. Standard one-volume histories of the English novel tend to discuss the romances only to dismiss them as inferior to realistic fiction. See, for example, Walter Raleigh, The English Novel (London, 1903) or George Saintsbury, The English Novel (London, 1924).

There are two further reasons for critical neglect of Haywood's long and prolific career: she wrote for money rather than for the sake of literature, and she was a woman. Because it lacked the classical rules and precedents which dignified the arts of poetry and drama, fiction was regarded as an essentially frivolous form of writing. Novels were increasingly popular in the early decades of the century, and the genre was attracting a growing number of authors. Unfortunately for Haywood's reputation, most of them were anonymous figures obliged to be prolific by economic need, rather than literary "artists" such as Richardson or Fielding, who went to a great deal of trouble to justify what they wrote. Consequently, until the emergence of the two great men, novels were not taken seriously, even by those who read them most avidly.[8]

That Haywood suffered because of her gender is an assertion more difficult to prove. In the early eighteenth century, women writers were regarded with great suspicion, and any woman bold enough to publish ran the risk of being ridiculed, slandered and personally abused. Society ladies, such as Dorothy Osborne or Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, could avoid censure by confining their writing to elegant letters and verses for the exclusive perusal of their friends. An enterprising hack like Aphra Behn, dependent on her pen for her livelihood, could achieve some measure of acceptance by adopting the "masculine" style and tone of her male coun-

[8] See, for example, Lady Mary's letter to Gilbert Burnet in The Complete Letters, ed. R. Halsband (Oxford, 1965), I, 44-45.

terparts. If necessary, she could even adopt their point of view. Haywood chose a third course, writing books--and novels, at that--which appealed specifically to the rapidly increasing female readership. As a woman, she knew that any pretentions she made to artistic ambition would be condemned by hostile critics, but she elected to capitalize on her sex rather than try to succeed in spite of it. She realized that the women who were newly literate would be receptive to the sort of work she wrote. That she was a woman herself, and an unconventional one, made her more perceptive of their emotional demands even than the ordinary hack, dependent as he was on audience approval for his income. Haywood's consciousness of herself as a woman, her receptivity as a commercial author, and her basis in the romance tradition were positive assets to the development of the novel. It is my intention in this study to assess the ways in which these three factors combined to produce Haywood's unique contribution to that development, and to redress the balance of literary criticism in her favour.

I

The early eighteenth century was a particularly difficult time for upper and middle class women. It was in many ways a transitional period, and one of the most important social changes taking place was the establishment of marriage as a fundamentally economic institution. Marriage settlements, especially among the landed gentry, affected the future not only of the married couple

themselves, but also of whatever children they might have, from the all-important eldest son to the youngest daughter requiring a dowry of her own. With the growth of a wealthy commercial class whose daughters were substantial heiresses, "property marriage"[9] became one of the most important methods by which estates were consolidated and new capital injected into the fading fortunes of the aristocracy.[10] With reference to the treatment of women at this time, the most significant aspect of the settlement was

> the relation between the size of the portion or dowry which the wife brought with her from her father, and the size of the jointure, the annual income which her husband settled on her to provide for her in case she survived him. . . . In marriage settlements made in the early eighteenth century the portions are normally substantially larger, in relation to the jointures, than in settlements made a century earlier.[11]

Thus, in effect, the husband was able to pay smaller dividends on a larger capital investment; as Habakkuk puts it, "a larger share of the burden of maintaining the wife was being borne by her father."[12] The "marriage market" was becoming increasingly competitive as mercantile heiresses vied with less well-endowed gentry. The relative shortage of marriageable men intensified competition even more.[13] After analyzing all the factors surrounding the changes in marriage settlements, Habakkuk concludes

[9] Christopher Hill, "Clarissa Harlowe and Her Times," Essays in Criticism, 5 (1955), p. 321. [10] E. N. Williams, Life in Georgian England (London, 1963), p. 29. [11] H. J. Habakkuk, "Marriage Settlements in the Eighteenth Century," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 32 (1950), pp. 20-21. [12] Habakkuk, p. 21. [13] Habakkuk, p. 24.

> that the relative increase in portions reflects a change in the conditions of supply and demand in the marriage market; that, in crude terms, but not much cruder than contemporaries were apt to use in negotiating marriage settlements, it represents an increase in the price of husbands. . . . It . . . also represents a change in the attitude of landed families to marriage itself, an increasing subordination of marriage to the increase of landed wealth, at the expense of other motives for marriage.[14]

The economic metaphor may be crude, but it is accurate; advertisements in newspapers reveal that what we now call the lonelyhearts column in that period resembled a marketplace. The following example is typical:

> A young gentleman twenty-three years of age, of an ancient and honourable English family and of a person not disagreeable, must in a few weeks, if not unexpectedly assisted, be obliged to leave England on account of some disappointments in his affairs, which tho' improper to mention are no impeachment of his honour. Therefore, any Lady whose affairs are so happily circumstanced so as to enable her to assist him at this juncture, may lay an embargo upon him, if she thinks a marriage tie a sufficient security and inducement, and he flatters himself that his character upon enquiry will prove such as to give her the justest reason to expect all the happiness which so generous an action as that of preserving a gentleman from ruin /merits/.[15]

It is significant both that the young gentleman in question himself uses the terms of trade, and that the young lady is expected to invest in a husband who sounds a dubious bargain, with no particular advantage to herself. A cursory glance at The Spectator

[14] Habakkuk, p. 24. [15] Quoted in C. J. S. Thompson, Love, Marriage and Romance in Old London (London, 1936), p. 59. No original source is given.

reveals the same preoccupation, with questions from prospective brides and bridegrooms regarding all the financial aspects of the state of wedlock.[16]

This development in the nature of marriage, which fully established itself in the first half of the eighteenth century, had two serious implications for wealthy women. The first, obviously, is that the woman's happiness or preference would have little weight in normal matrimonial negotiations, property being the primary concern of both husband and father. In this context the probable contentment of most parties to arranged marriages is irrelevant; what is important is that the woman had no right to demand personal satisfaction. The second implication is that those negotiations revealed the terrible power of "parental authority, which had its economic basis in the father's ability to grant or withhold marriage portions to his daughters."[17] When a father denied his child a suitable dowry, he condemned her at once to poverty and social isolation. Lacking training suitable to a profession or trade, the genteel young lady could never live completely independent of her family; without money or land it would be difficult for her to achieve the companionship and spiritual support promised by the Puritan ideal of marriage.[18] Women who were disinherited or impoverished "had no marketable commodity but their sex, which they could trade either in the open marriage market . . . or on the black market like Roxana and Moll Flanders."[19]

[16] See, for example, Number 199 (Oct. 18, 1711) and Number 522 (Oct. 29, 1712). [17] Hill, p. 329. [18] Hill, p. 333. [19] Hill, p. 334.

The sexual marketplace was no more accommodating to women than the economic one. There seems to be a deep confusion in eighteenth-century male attitudes towards women. There were two important questions: whether women were capable of sexual passion, and whether, if they were, that capacity were desirable. An anonymous "poetical essay" in The Gentleman's Magazine sums up conventional wisdom on this subject.

> How hard is the fate of poor womankind,
> Forever subjected and always confined;
> Our parents controll us until we are wives,
> Our husband's enslave us the rest of our lives.
>
> Tho' fondly we love, yet we dare not reveal,
> But secretly languish, compelled to conceal;
> Deny'd every freedom of life to enjoy,
> We are shamed if we're kind, and blamed if we're coy.[20]

Like medieval Christians, men in eighteenth-century England saw woman as both virgin and whore, saviour and temptress.[21] The prude is a standard figure of satire, the woman who pretends to be so pure in thought and deed that she looks down on everyone around her, but is secretly having a torrid affair with a man of inferior degree.[22] The obverse of the prude is the coquette, who is outwardly as obsessed with men as the prude is indifferent, and in actuality is as pure as the other is unchaste.[23] Both types of women are hypocrites and are condemned by society, ostensibly for

[20] Gentleman's Magazine, May 1733, p. 263.

[21] See Spectator, Number 510 (Oct. 15, 1712).

[22] There are countless examples of this sort of woman throughout the period; the most complete occurs in The Prude (London, 1726).

[23] See Spectator, Number 591 (Sept. 8, 1714), ed. D. F. Bond (Oxford, 1965), V, 24.

not being honest about their sexual feelings. However, women were also supposed to be free from the animal demands of passion, or at least to be more easily able to control their desires than men. Steele included in The Tatler the case of an unhappy gentlewoman whose husband "is no more a husband . . . than one of the Italian singers." She comes to Bickerstaff for advice on obtaining a divorce; instead, he cautions her to keep the matter private, warning her that if it becomes public knowledge, aspersions will be cast on her character. "How little (will they say) could that lady command her passions!"[24] Chastity, modesty and delicacy run as a theme throughout the writings of Mr. Spectator; and Ian Watt suggests that the denial of sexuality in women is one of the main reasons that marriages between ladies of rank and fortune and impoverished commoners were frowned upon, even though marriages between men of rank and impecunious maidens were tolerated. Using the example of Pamela, he says:

> Mr. B can properly follow his fancy and marry beneath his station because it is an undeniable and irremedial fact that men are subject to the sexual passion; but for a woman to do so would amount to an admission that she has lost her immunity from sexual feeling. . . .[25]

Reversing the roles, if the prude declared her passions openly, she

[24] Tatler, Number 20 (May 26, 1709), in British Essayists, ed. R. Lynam (London, 1827), I, 119-20.

[25] Ian Watt, The Rise of the Novel (London, 1957), p. 164. There is evidence to support this claim in the popular novels as well. For example, in Haywood's Philidore and Placentia (1727), the hero tells the heroine that if she married beneath her, people would accuse her of giving way to passion and lust. See below, p. 323.

would be ridiculed at best, ostracized at worst. Yet even her discretion and hypocrisy would not be enough to save her from scorn. A similar victim of society's divided mind was the fallen woman. The popular view was that once a woman throws off self-restraint and gives way to passion, the carnality unleashed will compel her to the life of a whore in a never-ending pursuit of pleasure.[26] Yet social attitudes towards a woman who slipped, for whatever reason, from the extremely narrow path of virtue, practically insured that she would degenerate even further. Unless she were sufficiently discreet to avoid detection, and sufficiently lucky to be spared pregnancy, she had little recourse but to the life of the streets, or to some "higher" form of concubinage.

According to conventional wisdom, sex for a woman was regarded as strictly procreative, not to be indulged in for recreation, as it was for men. The need for this restriction of the sexuality of unmarried women is obvious. With no reliable method of contraception available to her, a woman who was "loose" risked not only losing her reputation, but also bringing into the world a child for which that world had no place. For such women, the free indulgence of sexual feelings was dangerous both to themselves and to society at large. However, Bickerstaff's advice to the lady with the impotent husband suggests that sex within marriage was also regarded, on the woman's side, at least, as primarily if not exclusively functional. It is as if society was so afraid of the

[26] This is the obvious message of Flora Mellasin's history or that of Miss Forward in Haywood's Betsy Thoughtless (1751). See below, pp. 428-435.

results of widespread promiscuity among the unmarried, that it attempted to repress all sensuality in young women, and succeeded so well that the frigidity produced by that repression lasted into marriage. And when men were not complaining about the passivity and coldness of their mistresses, they were justifying sexual repression with the pious belief that women were the gentler, more refined sex, "formed to temper mankind, and soothe them into tenderness and compassion."[27]

The conflict between the view of women as inferior physically, socially and politically, and that which saw them as morally superior, is the most interesting and significant aspect of the eighteenth-century war between the sexes. Whether a man believed that "ev'ry woman is at heart a rake,"[28] or that she was completely immune from the "base" desires he felt himself, his attitude denied her the right freely to determine the nature and extent of her own feelings. Both reverence and rape constitute a denial of her full humanity. On a more mundane level, the idealization of women amounted to a sentimental camouflage of grim reality. What we now call the double standard provides a perfect example. Comparing female and male virtue, Mr. Spectator writes that

> the great point of honour in men is courage, and in women chastity. . . . A slip in a woman's honour is irrecoverable. . . . Chastity, with its collateral attendants, truth, fidelity, and constancy, gives the man a property in the person he loves, and consequently endears her to him above all things.[29]

27
28 Spectator, Number 57 (May 5, 1711), I, p. 242.
29 Alexander Pope, Moral Essays, Epis. ii, line 215.
Spectator, Number 99 (June 23, 1711), I, 416-17.

Addison reveals more, perhaps, than he intended when he used the word "property." Chastity was not entirely a moral question, as this advice from a mother to her jealous daughter makes clear:

> And consider, besides, my Betsey, that your case, from an unfaithful husband, is not near so bad as his would be from an unfaithful wife: For, child, he cannot make the progeny of a bastard race succeed to his and your estate or chattels, in injury of your lawful children. If any such he should have, the law of the land brands them: whereas a naughty wife often makes the children of another man heirs of her husband's estate and fortune, in injury of his own children or family.[30]

Here is a lucid explanation of the double standard based not on pious moralizing about the spiritual values of female chastity, but rather on the economic need for continence in an age which lacked efficient birth control. All the other feminine virtues extolled by the moralists had a similar foundation in pragmatism. Were she too learned, or unsuccessful in hiding the extent of her knowledge, a woman would never catch a husband. If she were immodest, she might risk a divorce or social ostracism, a fate which would probably lead to a life of shame and disgrace. Lacking her husband's protection, she would be prey to every libertine. If she failed to be discreet and sweet-tempered when she discovered her husband's infidelity, she again was in danger of losing him, which would mean losing her social definition as well. Even the notorious injunction to women not to reveal, or even to feel, any

[30] Samuel Richardson, Familiar Letters, ed. B. W. Downs (London, 1928), Letter 55, p. 63. Quoted in Katherine Hornbeak, Richardson's Familiar Letters and the Domestic Conduct Books (Northampton, Mass., 1938), p. 10.

love for a man until he had offered himself in the proper form,[31] was extremely prudent and practical advice in an era when a woman's feelings were entirely subject to her father's will. Despite Halifax's reassurances that what seems harsh and unfair treatment is really glorious moral superiority,[32] a woman's lot was a hard one. Whatever she did, she was subject to restrictions and held responsible not only for virtue itself, but also for her reputation for virtue in an environment extremely hostile to it. Marriage was regarded as her best, if not her only, means of protection.

A woman of middling rank in the early eighteenth century had few economic alternatives to marriage. The type of education provided for most middle-class girls consisted of "accomplishments"--music, drawing, Italian, French, dancing--rather than of solid academic skills or any sort of vocational training. Trades, such as millinery or sewing, would also require a certain amount of financial backing, even if a woman were sufficiently skilled to set up on her own. So eminent a scholar as Elizabeth Elstob,[33] who knew eight languages and wrote the first Anglo-Saxon grammar, could hardly make a living as a governess and teacher.[34] Apart from teaching, there were no other professions open to "ladies" but acting and writing. Of the two, acting was perhaps even more uncertain than literature, but women had already established a place for themselves in the theater. Grub Street was unknown territory. Consequently, "writing was something for a woman of wit

[31] See Richardson's essay, Rambler Number 97 (Feb. 19, 1751).

[32] George Savile, Marquis Halifax, Advice to a Daughter (London, 1700), pp. 13-18.

[33] Elstob (1685-1756) is almost exactly contemporary with Haywood (1690-1756), and only slightly more genteel by birth.

[34] See Alison Adburgham, Women in Print (London, 1972), p. 45.

to turn to when all other means of livelihood short of manual labor--including concubinage--had failed."[35]

II

The world which she entered when she did take up her pen was far from welcoming, to authors of either gender. The London book trade was controlled by a small group of printers and booksellers, known as "the Trade," who were well aware that the hacks who wrote for them were totally dependent on them for a living. Consequently, they were virtually able to dictate the conditions in which their authors lived. Although a fairly effective copyright law was passed in 1710, it was primarily for the protection and profit of the bookseller who purchased a work, not for the writer who sold it. The law was intended to prevent cheap pirated editions of a book which, as there were no royalties paid during this era, threatened the authorized bookseller rather than the author.[36] In Grub Street the only patronage was that which a flattering dedication to someone of wealth and prominence might earn; eventually, even the rates for such prefatory matter became standardized.[37] Most of the authors who wrote for a living were employed by a particular bookseller, who would assign whatever tasks needed doing. Savage's Iscariot Hackney, a fictional member of Edmund Curll's stable, of-

[35] Day, p. 81. [36] A. S. Collins, Authorship in the Days of Johnson (1927; rpt. Clifton, N.J., 1973), pp. 8-9.
[37] See H. B. Wheatley, The Dedication of Books to Patron and Friend (London, 1887), p. 34, and Collins, pp. 180-84.

fers a picture of his life which, though obviously exaggerated for the purpose of satire, is probably fairly accurate:

> 'Twas in his service that I wrote obscenity and profaneness, under the names of Pope and Swift. Sometimes I was Mr. Joseph Gay, and at others Theory Burnet, or Addison. I abridged histories and travels, translated from the French, what they never wrote, and was expert at finding out new titles for old books. When a notorious thief was hanged, I was the Plutarch to preserve his memory; and when a great man died, mine were his remains, and mine the account of his last will and testament.[38]

"The Trade" were enormously powerful in the first half of the eighteenth century. They operated on the same principles as a small and exclusive businessmen's club. Edward Cave, for example, first attempted to establish his Gentleman's Magazine by offering shares to "some half of the London Booksellers." They declined, fearing either the originality of such a venture, or the threat it represented of an alternative source of employment for their labour force. With unusual perseverance Cave proceeded, and

> when "the trade" saw this remarkable success within their sacred preserve, they at once opposed it with the London Magazine the next year (1732). . . . But, as a rule, their opposition soon stifled such attempts.[39]

[38] Richard Savage, An Author to Be Lett (London, 1729), pp. 3-4. This pamphlet includes a bitter attack on Haywood; see below, pp. 24-25. Even his title is a burlesque of the title of her comedy, A Wife to Be Lett (1723).

[39] Collins, p. 17. He goes on to cite several examples of their successful stratagems. One of the most effective ways of maintaining their monopoly was to send catalogues of forthcoming copyright sales, which were supposed to be open to public bidding, only to their select number.

They also regulated rates of pay, which were deplorably poor, especially for fiction. Boswell quotes an estimate "that thirty pounds a year was enough to enable a man to live /in London/ without being contemptible," but that entailed the strictest economy; living in a garret, "breakfast on bread and milk for a penny, and do without supper."[40] Johnson was paid five guineas for his first work, a translation from the French, in 1733.[41] In 1725 William Rufus Chetwood received fifteen pounds for the Life and History of Robert Boyle, an exceptionally long work for those days, and ten guineas in 1730 for his Lover's Opera,[42] As late as 1747, Haywood received only £14 3s 6d for the two parts of her translation, Memoirs of a Man of Honour, and her total income from writing for that year, according to extant records, was £34 8s 6d.[43] Compare these sums paid for hack productions with the two hundred pounds Swift received for Gulliver's Travels in 1726 and the seven hundred pounds which Tom Jones earned for Fielding.[44] If an author objected to the payment offered or refused to accept an assignment, labour was so plentiful that a bookseller was free to eliminate the troublemakers from his work force.

From even this brief picture, it is obvious that Grub Street was not a particularly savoury environment. It was the seediest neighbourhood of the literary world, being "a last resort of the

[40] James Boswell, The Life of Samuel Johnson LLD, (London, 1931), p. 56. [41] Boswell, p. 43. [42] From a clipping in the British Museum copy of Thomas Whincop's Scanderbeg, with a List of the English Dramatick Poets (London, 1747), p. 192. The notes and clippings in this work (C.45.d.12) were compiled "by Haslewood, etc." [43] Original assignments of Mss. Between Authors and Publishers 1703-1810, British Museum Add. Mss. 38728, I, folios 112-13. [44] Collins, p. 33.

shifty, needy, and incompetent."[45] In a literal sense, it was located in the poorest, dirtiest section of London.[46] The near desperation of the hack writers themselves insured that intolerable conditions would persist, for "the penury and squalor" or their lives were "the natural result of such power being concentrated in the hands of a few booksellers and the number of writers being so great. . . . "[47] The literary trade was, in effect, a ghetto industry which employed cheap "immigrant" labour from the other realms of literature, simultaneously making sure of a plentiful work force by maintaining a monopoly. These economic factors certainly had their effect on the literature itself, at least in the case of fiction, because of the pressures they brought to bear on the authors.

> Since the stream of influence at that time was still from consumer to producer, with the bookseller playing a key role as economic focus of public taste, the problem of a beginning author was to hit upon a product which either capitalized upon a current taste or . . . pleased by novelty.[48]

In many cases, pay for an individual work may have been so low as to compel authors to produce a steady stream of writing simply to subsist; if they could not discover a formula of their own which hit current taste, they had to learn to replicate the original ideas of others. Consequently they

[45] Collins, p. 14. [46] See Pat Rogers, Grub Street (London, 1972), for the topography of the area. [47] Collins, p. 23.
[48] W. H. McBurney, "Mrs. Penelope Aubin and the Early Eighteenth Century Novel," Huntington Library Qtly, 20 (1957), p. 249.

> were not in a position to work in a leisurely manner, developing background or character, even if their abilities permitted them to do so. It is remarkable that they wrote as well as they did. There was no incentive for them to write long and complex pieces of fiction; the need for ready money at short notice was too great, and the requirements of sensationalism could be fulfilled with a minimum of time and effort.[49]

In such circumstances people could not afford the kind of precise revision Pope lavished even on his private letters,[50] let alone the years he spent on his Homer. Moreover, the wretched physical conditions and the fierce competitiveness of Grub Street resulted in an ambience particularly suited to slander, back-biting, dung-slinging and a multiplicity of literary factions. Many of those who wrote for a living, including Aphra Behn and Mary Manley, were employed by the Whigs or the Tories, thus making themselves extremely vulnerable to a kind of opprobrium typified by this attack on Defoe:

> His papers contain malicious insinuations, and false suggestions, he is a man of great rashness and impudence, a mear mercenary prostitute, a state mountebank, an hackney tool, a scandalous pen, a foul-mouthed mongrel, an author who writes for bread, and lives by defamation. . . .[51]

However, even among writers whose party affiliations were not in question, malicious personal attacks were common, as we shall see when we examine Haywood's own life. It is this aspect of literary

[49] Day, p. 82. [50] See George Sherburn's introduction to The Correspondence of Alexander Pope (Oxford, 1956), I, xi-xviii.
[51] Quoted by M. E. Novak in "Defoe's Use of Irony," in Stuart and Georgian Moments, ed. Earl Miner (Los Angeles, 1972), p. 192.

London which Pope has made familiar to all students of the eighteenth century: "the petty squabbles and dirty intrigues of Grub Street, with its foul dung- and mud-impregnated atmosphere all too palpably put before us in Book II /of the Dunciad/--a book which extravagantly stinks. . . . "[52]

Fiction was one of the mainstays of Grub Street. During these years before Pamela, when Haywood began to write, the novel was an increasingly popular form, but one which lacked the rules and formal distinctions of the classical genres. This liberty, or anarchy, causes considerable difficulty for literary historians, Day refers to the period between 1600 and the emergence of Richardson as

> an uncharted waste. Two considerable prominences called Bunyan and Defoe are indicated, while some writers hesitantly include smaller landmarks--Oroonoko and Incognita. But around these spreads a vast desert of popular literature, scarcely studied and mostly unremembered. In the standard one-volume histories of the English novel one can almost hear the author sighing with relief as he approaches the crucial date of 1740, after which he can proceed in detail and with confidence.[53]

The "vast desert" was an interesting conglomeration of forms. "Between 1700 and 1739 approximately one-third of all prose fiction appearing for the first time on the English market was translated from the French."[54] Before Haywood, many of the original works were scandal memoirs or rogue biographies. Although Sarah

[52] Bonamy Dobrée, English Literature in the Early Eighteenth Century (Oxford, 1959), p. 533. [54] McBurney, Checklist, introduction, p. viii.

Butler and Jane Barker attempted to improve the moral tone with "instructive novels,"[55] these were far outnumbered by such titles as The Scotch Rogue (1706), Turkish Tales (1708), The Love Lottery (1709), and The Secret History of Europe (1712).[56] Most of these early works were short; the average length between 1710 and 1720 was 150 pages,[57] compared with the standard three or four volumes which became common later in the century. Even this figure is deceptively high, for it amalgamates many books under 100 pages with several of 300 or more. It was quite common for a "novel" during this period to come to as little as fifty or sixty pages. Lacking the depth which we have come to associate with the novel, and written in haste, these early works of fiction are easily dismissed by critics who take Richardson or Fielding for models.[58] Nor is it surprising that the genre was fundamentally disreputable, because its lack of classical antecedents made the educational qualifications which pertained to poetry and drama unnecessary, even undesirable. Virginia Woolf, among others, suggests that the miscellaneous nature of the form is what drew women, who were for

[56] Listed respectively by McBurney, Checklist; Arundel Esdaile, A List of English Tales and Prose Romances Printed Before 1740, Part II (London, 1912); Morgan, and McBurney. I have not seen copies of these works. [57] These figures are computed from those given in McBurney's Checklist. [58] For example, E. A. Baker, The History of the English Novel (1929; rpt. New York, 1967), III, 114-115 and 117; Dobrée, p. 409; Ifor Evans, A Short History of English Literature (Harmondsworth, 1940), p. 222; or A. S. Collins, "The Growth of the Reading Public During the Eighteenth Century," in Review of English Studies, 2 (1926), p. 291.

the most part "uneducated," to fiction:

> There is no reason to think that the form of the epic or of the poetic play suits a woman any more than the sentence suits her. But all the older forms of literature were hardened and set by the time she became a writer. The novel alone was young enough to be soft in her hands. . . .[59]

Of the 329[60] works published between 1700 and 1740, eighty-seven, or about twenty-six per cent were signed by women; seventy-four, or twenty-three per cent by men; and 158, almost half, remain anonymous. Of these 158 books, ninety-seven fall into the categories of "romance," "secret history" and "unclassified," in which identified women writers outnumber identified men by about four to one. If the same proportion of women to men is applied to the number of anonymous works, approximately seventy-six more novels can fairly safely be credited to women. These calculations show that women were responsible for at least fifty per cent of pre-Richardsonian fiction. The statistics also make evident women's dominance in the area of love and marriage, or "romance," while men dominated travel literature, satire and rogue biography.

This overview of Day's "uncharted waste" does little to dispel critical confusion. As he suggests, the most common reaction

[59] A Room of One's Own (London, 1935), p. 116. This same view is held by B. G. MacCarthy in Women Writers, Their Contribution to the English Novel 1621-1744 (Cork, 1946); J. Horner in The English Women novelists and Their Connection with the Feminist Movement (Northampton, Mass., 1930); Day; Richetti; and G. F. Whicher in The Life and Romances of Eliza Haywood (New York, 1915).

[60] These figures are from my own compilation, based on Esdaile, Morgan and McBurney, and do not include translations, or ostensible translations, or the reprints of earlier works which comprised the bulk of fiction, especially before 1723.

has been to ignore the "vast desert" of Grub Street fiction, despite the fact that the works themselves "were so popular that some editions have been literally read out of existence. . . ."[61] There are several reasons for this neglect or misjudgment of the early eighteenth-century novel, not the least of which is that it was, from the outset, a bastard genre, combining elements primarily from those literary types which were already considered disreputable in some respect. The French romance and the Italian novella, from which the form descended most directly, were both considered immoral and corrupting. The novel was also easily accessible to the reading public at large, who did not need Latin and Greek or theological knowledge to enjoy fiction. To established men of letters, like Pope, the growth of such a form was particularly repugnant.

> Pope, no doubt because he lived at the beginning of a new era of popular publishing and weekly journalism, took a firm stand against the upstarts he saw invading the enclosed territory of literature.[62]

This stand manifested itself in the Dunciad, which was more than merely the instrument of Pope's revenge on people who had insulted him. It is also his means of assaulting Grub Street, which he believed to be encroaching dangerously on his own province. His attack on the novel in general, of which he makes "Eliza" the representative, purports to be based on his abhorrence of its tendency to scandal. Writing of the competition for which Haywood

[61] Day, p. 4. [62] James Sutherland, introduction to the Twickenham edition of The Dunciad (London, 1963), pp. xlv-xlvi.

was first prize, Scriblerus says:

> In this game is exposed in the most contemptuous manner, the profligate licenciousness of those shameless scribblers (for the most part of that sex, which ought least to be capable of such malice or impudence) who in libellous memoirs and novels, reveal the faults and misfortunes of both sexes, to the ruin of publick fame or private happiness.[63]

The "libellous memoirs and novels" are her "secret histories" or "chroniques scandaleuses," similar to the "romans à clef" prevalent in France and made popular in England by Mary Manley. They are the source of Haywood's infamy, in her century and in ours.

However, despite Pope's claims, it is difficult to avoid feeling that the scandal was, at least in part, only an excuse for a more serious literary attack. The Dunciad itself is ample proof that he, too, was an effective and experienced scandal-monger. But Pope evidently believed that his own actions were a thing apart. Savage must have been aware that the poet was vulnerable to counteraccusations of slander, for he defended him in words which Pope might have written himself:

> It is true that he has used dung; but he disposes that dung in such a manner, that it becomes rich manure, from which he raises a variety of flowers. . . . The chymist extracts a fine cordial from the most nauseous of all dung, and Mr. Pope has drawn a sweet, poetical spirit from the most offensive and unpoetical objects of creation. . . .[64]

Beyond the libel and gossip which ostensibly moved him to write so

63 Dunciad, p. 157. See below, p. 64.
64 An Author to Be Lett, publisher's preface.

venomously of Grub Street novelists, Pope objected to the fact that those "offensive and unpoetical" authors wrote to please a growing audience of minimally educated tradesmen, their wives and their daughters, and that they wrote unabashedly for money.

> The tastes of a broad new class of readers, barely literate by Pope's standards, were being satisfied, and pandered to, by writers who appeared to be, if not totally ignorant of a great literary tradition, at least irresponsible in their obligations toward /it/. . . .[65]

His view was that in order to make money an author had to please the crowds, and in order to please the crowds, classical standards had to be abandoned. An author thus became a "vile hireling."[66] When such authors were "asked why they abuse such and such persons, their answer is, they are obliged to write for want of money, and to abuse for want of other subjects."[67] Pope was not alone in his condemnation of professional authors. His contemporary and friend, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, expressed similar disapproval:

> The greatest virtue, justice, and the most distinguishing prerogative of mankind, writing, when duly executed do honour to human nature, but when degenerated into trades are the most contemptible ways of getting bread.[68]

65 Aubrey Williams, Pope's Dunciad (London, 1955), p. 10.
66 Pope in a letter to Aaron Hill, June 2, 1738. In A Collection of Letters Never Before Printed (London, 1751), p. 28.
67 An Author to Be Lett, publisher's preface.
68 Quoted by Robert Halsband in "Ladies of Letters in the Eighteenth Century," in Miner, p. 278. See also Lady Mary's Letters, III, 68.

It is hardly surprising that some twentieth century critics,[69] holding the view that nothing which has not survived was worthy of survival, concur in Lady Mary's view of "subliterary London." Consequently, popular fiction, before Richardson and Fielding elevated the status of the novel to that of "literary" literature, is largely disregarded.

III

If Grub Street offered men a grim welcome, it was positively hostile towards women. In the general atmosphere of gossip and scandal, a woman's reputation was particularly vulnerable to the malice of envy or even simple dislike.[70] Moreover, despite the theoretical idealization of women into refined, exalted creators of paramount importance to civilization, the actual conventional masculine attitude towards women during the early part of the century was extremely patronizing. They were regarded as delightful, even necessary, but somehow not to be taken seriously. And it was not only men of the world, like Steele and Lord Chesterfield who adopted this point of view. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, though herself one of the era's most colourful, strong-willed and independent women, disliked the idea of women publishing almost as

[69] See Ernle, p. 185; Austin Dobson, "Polly Honeycombe," in Eighteenth Century Vignettes, 3rd Series (Oxford, 1923), p. 92; or R. B. Johnson, The Women Novelists (London, 1918), p. 5.

[70] See Pope's attack on Haywood, Dunciad, II, lines 149-56. In Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia (London, 1725), Haywood herself accused Martha Sansom of getting Curll to publish her verses by bribing him "with all the favours she is capable of conferring" (I, 47).

much as she condemned people writing for money.[71] The proper place for such trifles as might flow from a female pen, even if held by as distinguished a woman as the Duchess of Newcastle,[72] was to circulate elegantly in manuscript among admiring friends and relations. The women novelists were acutely aware of the sexual prejudice from which they suffered, as well as the literary elitism which plagued all the inhabitants of Grub Street. Almost all their prefaces are peculiarly defensive about inadequate education and economic necessity. Occasionally, these apologies are abject, politely begging that the author be excused her ignorance and the mediocrity of her style. More frequently, they verge on defiance, using jocularity as a shield against hostile criticism:

> The most prevailing motive /for publishing/ is what will be allowed to be unexceptionable, being no less than that on whose hinges all sublunary affairs turn; to whose omnipotent guidance and direction all the designs and actions of mankind owe their rise, being, and continuance . . . MONEY.[73]

That that particular motive was anything but "unexceptionable," we have already seen; only by ascribing all actions to financial interest could the author attempt to avoid condemnation as a writer. Mary Davys, widowed early in her life, turned to writing when she could no longer support herself with the Cambridge coffeehouse she had run for many years. The preface to her collected works is more pointedly defiant, calling society to account for

[71] See Adburgham, pp. 86-87. [72] Dorothy Osborne remarked of her, "Sure the poor woman is a little distracted, she could never be so ridiculous else as to venture at writing books." Adburgham, p. 22. [73] Love Upon Tick (London, 1725), p. 4.

the impossible position into which it forced women like herself:

> Perhaps it may be objected against me, by some more ready to give reproach than relief, that, as I am the relict of a clergyman and in years, I ought not to publish plays, etc. . . . Let them . . . consider that a woman left to her own endeavours for twenty-seven years together may well be allowed to catch at any opportunity for bread which they that condemned her would very probably deny to give her.[74]

She feels that she has been trapped between two impossible alternatives, and forced to choose a way of life considered by many to be immodest and inappropriate.

Haywood's own prefaces are characterized by her modesty. She makes no vast claims for herself or her achievements, generally referring to them in diminutives. "This little novel"[75] and "the following little history"[76] are typical terms by which she designates "the trifles"[77] she wrote. However, her humility frequently appears to be an assumed protective cover as much as it is genuine self-assessment:

> As I am a woman, and consequently deprived of those advantages of education which the other sex enjoy, I cannot so far flatter my desire, as to imagine it in my power to soar to any subject higher than that which Nature is not negligent to teach us. Love is a topick which I believe few are ignorant of; there requires no aids of learning, no general conversation, no application; a shady grove and purling stream are all things that's necessary to give us an idea of the tender passion. This is a theme, therefore, which while I make

[74] Reprinted in Four Before Richardson, ed. W. H. McBurney (Lincoln, Neb., 1964), p. 237. See also Adburgham, p. 72.
[75] Lasselia (London, 1723), p. iv. [76] The Rash Resolve (London, 1724), p. viii. [77] All of the dedications to her early works use this term.

> choice to write of, frees me from the imputation of vain or self-sufficient:--None can tax me with having too great an opinion of my own genius, when I aim at nothing but what the meanest may perform.. I have nothing to value myself on, but a tolerable share of discernment: it is neither in my power to be partially blind to my own defects, nor to the perfections of another.[78]

Although she says here that love is within the range of "the meanest," it is not particularly easy to portray it with sensitivity and in depth, as a look at some of these early novels will illustrate.[79] Moreover, "a tolerable share of discernment" is less common than this preface seems to assume. Haywood knew when she wrote this that, from a woman, any literary claim, however modest, would be regarded as presumption.[80] Therefore, in order to make her point, which is that she is, in fact, competent at her work, she must set that work outside the concern of men of letters, reserving it for herself and for any other women who similarly chose to live by writing. In this way she was forced to conspire against herself. By deliberately trivializing her subject, she provided a convenient excuse for critics who took umbrage at her presuming to write at all. How could they be blamed for ignoring her when she herself felt unworthy of attention? Here again, women seem to be trapped between two alternatives, each of which is attended by the same consequences. If a woman writer claimed serious attention, she was ridiculed and belittled in her-

78 The Fatal Secret, in Secret Histories (London, 1725), III, 203-4.

79 For example, Love in All Shapes (1732), Penelope Aubin's Life of Madam de Beaumont (1721) or Life and Adventures of the Lady Lucy (1726), or Mary Hearne's The Female Deserters (1719).

80 J. M. S. Tompkins notes an instance, later in the century, of a woman who used so innocent a literary convention as the editorial plural and met with the response: "We suppose the lady is pregnant and the unborn child shares her emotions." The Popular Novel in England (London, 1932), pp. 17-18. Note his own use of the editorial plural.

self, and her works were ignored. If she set her works outside the "important" concerns of literary criticism, she was simply ignored.

Haywood was well aware of the particular difficulties she faced as a female inhabitant of Grub Street.

> It would be impossible to recount the numerous difficulties a woman has to struggle through in her approach to Fame: if her writings are considerable enough to make a figure in the world, envy pursues her with unwearied diligence; and if, on the contrary, she only writes what is forgot, as soon as read, contempt is all the reward, her wish to please, excites; and the cold breath of scorn chills the little genius she has, and which, perhaps, cherished by encouragement, might, in time, grow to a praise-worthy height.[81]

As a woman writer she was particularly vulnerable, both to the envy of her colleagues, and to the outrage of society at large. Her prefaces and dedications reveal an acute sensitivity to gossip and misrepresentation.[82] The freedom and unconventionality of her chosen way of life laid her morals open to question. MacCarthy echoes contemporary opinion when she says that "the literary women were not loose because they were writers. They were writers because they were loose."[83] However, no matter how much her independence exposed her, Haywood could not refrain from speaking up in her own defense. By leading an unconventional life herself, and by portraying the inner lives of women with a depth and seriousness

[81] Memoirs of the Baron de Brosse (London, 1725), p. vi. These sentiments echo the dedication to The Fair Captive (London, 1721), pp. vi-vii.

[82] See especially The Masqueraders (1724), The Injured Husband (1723), The Fair Captive and Baron de Brosse.

[83] MacCarthy, I, p. 24. See also D. E. Baker's defensive assessment of her character in Biographia Dramatica (London, 1812).

hitherto unknown to fiction, she inevitably became "a Champion of the Sex."[84] Even if she had never concerned herself directly, in her writing, with women's problems, that writing itself was a challenge to conventional beliefs.

> Let tyrant man, with salic laws, submit,
> Nor boast the vain prerogative of wit:
> See! from Eliza in a flood of day
> With vast effulgence streams the pow'rful ray.[85]

Haywood defied both "salic laws" and moral strictures to become one of the century's most prolific[86] and most popular authors. Her popularity was virtually instantaneous; one author even capitalized on it by using Haywood's name to help sell her own book.[87] But perhaps the greatest tribute to her influence was that in 1726 a novel was dedicated to her by a woman who had obviously received inspiration and encouragement from her example.[88] She certainly could not have expected to receive any great financial benefit from flattering Haywood; therefore, her dedication stands as sincere and unsolicited testimony to Haywood's strength as a force in the world of fiction.

[84] "By an Unknown Hand, To the Most Ingenius Mrs. Haywood," verses prefixed to Love in Excess (1720), part II. [85] James Sterling, "To Mrs. Eliza Haywood on her Writings," prefixed to vol. IV of Secret Histories (1725). [86] She is singlehandedly responsible for 41% of the 96 original works published between 1723 and 1729. [87] The Pleasant and Delightful History of Gillian of Croydon . . . The Whole done much after the same method as those celebrated novels, by MRS. ELIZA HAYWOOD (London, 1727). See Whicher, p. 200. [88] The Prude, by Ma. A.

IV

In 1723, in his prologue to A Wife to Be Lett, Theophilus Cibber pleaded with the literary establishment to give Haywood a fair hearing:

> Critics! be dumb tonight--no skill display;
> A dangerous woman-poet wrote the play:
> One, who not fears your fury, though prevailing,
> More than your match, in everything but railing.
> Give her fair quarter, and whene'er she tries ye
> Safe in superior spirit, she defies ye:
> Measure her force, by her known novels, writ
> With manly vigour, and with woman's wit.[89]

Unfortunately, the men of letters in question seem to have taken his first line literally, and with a few exceptions, from that day to this, have either ignored her writings or dismissed them as unimportant. Even when she is given some consideration, the result is often equally unsatisfactory. Serious histories of the early English novel almost always begin with an apology for the triviality of the subject. G. F. Whicher's study, the only published work devoted exclusively to Haywood, concludes that her writing has scant value as entertainment, shows little conscious skill, and is of minimal interest even to literary historians, although presumably she was sufficiently interesting and important to merit his monograph.[90] Even John Richetti, who acknowledges her skill and pre-eminence among popular novelists, continually undercuts his own seriousness. His thirty-one page analysis of the

[89] In Works, II, p. v. [90] More recently, the same point of view is expressed in James Erickson's unpublished dissertation, "The Novels of Eliza Haywood" (Minneapolis, 1962).

themes and techniques of Love in Excess, is interlarded throughout with condescending remarks about her "hectic style" and general romantic extravagance. Though his essay is obviously intended to illustrate the great skill with which she handled the tools of her craft even in her first novel, he, too, somehow denies that her books have much about them that is valuable or good.[91] Josephine Grieder's introductions to the Garland reprints of some of Haywood's works[92] are useful and perceptive, but she seems to be apologizing for Haywood's inadequacies as much as she is pointing out her achievements. The only published criticism which consistently treats Haywood with respect is Margaret Doody's recent study of Richardson.[93] To students of the earlier novelist, her treatment is a great relief from the flippancy and condescension of other writers,[94] but because she regards Haywood almost exclusively as an influence on Richardson, her evaluation is inevitably limited. There have been critics, most of them writing during the upsurge of feminism between the world wars, who have tried to evaluate the specific contributions of the eighteenth-century women novelists to fiction.[95] Unfortunately, these works are for the most part oversimplified, concentrating on sociological justifica-

[91] See Popular Fiction Before Richardson, pp. 179-210, and below, pp. 119, 123.

[92] See bibliography, p. 522.

[93] A Natural Passion (Oxford: 1974). An important unpublished work is J. S. Rudolf's dissertation at the Univ. of California, "The Novels That Taught the Ladies" (San Diego, 1972), which deals primarily with her later works and is especially good on Betsy Thoughtless. See below, pp. 429-37.

[94] For example, William Forsyth, The Novels and Novelists of the Eighteenth Century (London, 1871), p. 174; Myra Reynolds, The Learned Lady in England (Boston, 1920), pp. 214-15; Whicher and Erickson.

[95] The studies by Reynolds, Horner and MacCarthy fall into this category.

tion for the inferiority of the authors rather than on the works themselves. In their appreciation, Doody, Richetti and Grieder are exceptions. Most of the people who study Eliza Haywood seem to agree with Lord Ernle, that "none of the writers /between 1720 and 1740/ . . . contributed anything to the advance of the novelist's art."[96]

I have already suggested several reasons for this neglect. The novel's illegitimacy, the mercenary professionalism of Grub Street which aroused the hatred and disdain of "literary" authors, and the enforced humility of women writers all contribute to the failure of critics to accord Haywood's works serious and respectful treatment. But beyond these "sociological" reasons, there is another which has to do with the literature itself. Although I would contend that society's understanding of women and attitudes towards popular--that is, "non-literary"--literature had a direct and significant effect on the kind of novels which writers like Haywood produced, this effect cannot be defined and analyzed without a thorough examination of the novels themselves, and the various themes and techniques employed in their composition. This is what, for the most part, criticism has failed to provide. Her works have been consistently misread by critics who are unaware or scornful of the "women's fiction" conventions Haywood employed until Richardson and Fielding "discover" them and "masculinize" them into common use. In this context, the breakdown I have given[97] of the different types of fiction and their authorship assumes par-

[96] Ernle, p. 185.

[97] See above, p.22.

ticular importance. Thirty-seven per cent of the works published between 1700 and 1740 can be classified as "romance," dealing in some way with love or the tribulations of lovers. The category with the next highest percentage of works (13%) is "secret histories," which includes both scandal novels and historical fiction, and the third highest (11%) consists of works which I have been unable to classify by title alone. In all three categories, women authors outnumber men.[98] The types of fiction in which men predominate, which include political and social satire, rogue literature and adventure tales, are almost completely devoid of female participation. Men seemed to gravitate to politics, crime and travel even as women were drawn to the affairs of the heart. A perfect example of this division of interests along gender lines is the series of works on Duncan Campbell written by the period's two most popular authors, Defoe and Haywood. Campbell was a deaf mute who acquired the reputation of a seer. Throughout the early part of the century, fashionable people flocked to him for advice. As might be expected, Defoe's History of the Life and Adventures of Mr. Duncan Campbell (1720) was anything but "romantic." He included

> disquisitions upon the method of teaching deaf and dumb persons to read and write; upon the perceptions of demons, genii, or familiar spirits; upon the second sight; upon magic in all its branches; and upon the laws against false diviners and soothsayers. . . . Those who came to consult the seer on affairs of the heart . . . received only the scantiest mention . . . and never were the languishing and sighing of Mr. Campbell's devotees described with any romantic glamour.[99]

[98] Again, I am referring to revealed authorship. Proportions of men to women among the anonymous authors can only be surmised.

[99] Whicher, pp. 77-78.

Defoe deliberately refrained[100] from describing those aspects of Campbell's life which were closest to Haywood's own interests, and in 1724 she published A Spy Upon the Conjurer to fill in the blanks left by her predecessor. Haywood's work concentrates on the fortune-teller's replies to women asking his advice or desiring to know the outcome of their love affairs. Evidently her approach to Campbell was as popular as Defoe's, if not more so, and the next year, 1725, she published The Dumb Projector on the same theme.[101]

The Duncan Campbell literature conveniently provides an interesting and accurate reflection of the divergent sensibilities of male and female authors in the early eighteenth century. All novelists, regardless of gender, write of human beings in relation to society and reflect the reality they see, but the society confronting a woman was almost inevitably less inclusive than that which confronted a man. Women in this period were barred from full participation in the areas of life which male writers chose to portray. For most women, a felicitous match was the only accomplishment to which they might reasonably aspire, and a bad one would mean a lifetime of wretchedness, loneliness or boredom. Love and marriage were the most important aspect of women's lives, and the only one over which they had even a chance to assume control. In this lustier half of the century which was to see the solidification of social strictures on their personal and political freedom, women were demanding a dominant place in their fan-

[100] Whicher, p. 79. [101] For a thorough discussion of the Duncan Campbell literature, see Whicher, pp. 77-91.

tasies to compensate for their submission in real life. Newly literate, they formed an audience with special needs which had never arisen before. Haywood perceived those needs and looked to the woman-oriented fiction of seventeenth-century France for a model. Using settings, situations, and all the other conventions of the heroic romance and the other romantic fiction available to her, Haywood was able to focus attention on the psychology of her heroines. By consciously and skilfully adapting those conventions to reinforce the impact of her message, she wrote books which offered "a full and authentic report of human experience"[102] to that section of the reading public which was largely ignored by male writers in the first half of the century, and which was destined to become the major audience for fiction in the second.

The difficulty which arises when a writer adopts devices from other literature is that it is extremely easy to mistake the convention, which is being used in a particular way, for the technique which is manipulating it. For example, when Haywood sets her stories in undifferentiated foreign lands, critics immediately cry out that her works are "romantic" and unrealistic[103] without stopping to realize that she might be using the exotic landscape in a positive way.[104] Another example is the "inflated diction" occasionally used by her characters. Critics have not seemed to notice that not all her characters speak alike; they see only

[102] Watt, p. 32.

[103] Critics who pass this judgment include Ernle, p. 185; Dobree, pp. 409-10; Reynolds, pp. 214-15; Baker, III, 107; John Dunlop, The History of Fiction (London, 1924), III, 369-70; and Saintsbury, The English Novel, p. 136.

[104] See below, p. 201; pp. 275-80.

the instances when she employs romantic speech and condemn her "style" as bombastic.[105] In effect, she is condemned without a hearing, for there is a universal prejudice against anything romantic in the seventeenth-century sense, and literary historians cannot see past the façade to appreciate the actual architecture of her novels. A survey of fiction criticism quickly reveals that realism is the single major qualification a narrative must possess if it is to be considered a "novel."[106] However, "realism" is a term which is interpreted in as many ways as there are interpreters. Most definitions revolve around a requirement for details of "everyday life,"[107] such as topography, furnishings, fashion, names, finances, etc. It is in looking for these external trappings that critics fail to notice the different sort of realism practiced by Haywood in her "women's fiction." Blinded by the romance conventions, which they accept at face value, they overlook the psychological realism Haywood offers. The experiences which she chooses to record are internal rather than external. In his massive history of the English novel, E. A. Baker defines the genre as "the interpretation of human life by means of fictitious narrative in prose."[108] If we accept this more liberal definition, then Haywood's works are novels indeed, and added an important dimension to fiction as it was developing.

105 See below, p. 182.

106 H. S. Canby, The Short Story in English (New York, 1909), p. 170; Wilbur Cross, The Development of the English Novel (New York, 1899), p. xv; Arnold Kettle, An Introduction to the English Novel (London, 1951), I, 28; Ernle, pp. 2-3; Horner, p. 32; and Watt, pp. 10-11, 26-27 and 32. This list is by no means exhaustive.

107 Kettle, I, 28.

108 Baker, III, 5.

V

Throughout her life, Eliza Haywood was "a champion of the sex," an often unobtrusive yet persistent defender of the feminist faith who radically affected the development of the novel and, in doing so, touched the deepest sensibilities of her female readers.

> /What she/ did was quietly to transform the accepted role of women, not by claiming it should be something else, but by seeing it in a different way. In presenting woman and her reception of experience, her knowledge, her moral choices, her attempt to understand the nuances of situations and her own fluctuation of feeling--her endeavour, in short, to comprehend experience--/Haywood/ implicitly denied an attitude which held women incapable of important experience.[109]

The pages of her novels are filled with the passions and adventures of women like those who formed her audience. It is not often that she spends much time analyzing the palpitations in a male bosom. Her heroes and villains exist primarily to arouse the emotions of her heroines, as her "luscious" erotic descriptions are included to stimulate the imagination and sympathy of her female readers. At the same time, her fiction challenges basic contemporary assumptions about and attitudes towards women, the most obvious being the belief that females are either virgins or whores, Most of Haywood's heroines are neither; rather, they are ordinary women, members of a nebulous upper middle class, who experience life with intensity and act with dignity and resolution. In some of her novels, such as The Distressed Orphan (1726), The British

[109] Doody, pp. 21-22.

Recluse (1722), The City Jilt (1726) and her later masterpiece, Betsy Thoughtless (1751), she even allows herself the luxury of an open challenge to the legal and moral restrictions on her sex. Yet on the whole, her attitude is nothing like the militant feminism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The male tyranny she decries is primarily psychological rather than political, and throughout her works, she attempts to present more equitable relationships, marriages which are partnerships, and men who prefer having a friend and companion to owning a slave.

Using and modifying the various conventions of the romance, including the stereotypes it offered of heroes and heroines, Haywood evolved a fictional formula which allowed her to express what she perceived to be reality for her female readers. This formula proved extremely adaptable. In the first half of her career, she based novels on all the different permutations of it, including role reversals and unconventional endings along with more typical versions of relations between men and women. After Richardson and Fielding had exaggerated the comic and tragic aspects of the formula into a kind of perfection, Haywood was able to adapt it to pioneer a new form of novel more closely related to the compromises and accomodations of everyday life. It is my purpose in this study to examine the ways in which she was able to collect the themes and devices of earlier works and shape them into a pattern which allowed her to portray the psychological realities of love.

Defoe's realism has earned him a considerable reputation among historians of the novel. Haywood, his female counterpart in output, in ingenuity, and in popularity, has been virtually ignored. I would contend that through her portrayal of women, in particular,

she developed a kind of realism which exactly complimented his. If Defoe, as some have claimed, is the father of the modern novel, then Eliza Haywood is certainly its mother, and should be given a prominent place on that genre's family tree.

II

ELIZA HAYWOOD'S LIFE

The relationship of an author's life to his or her writing is generally of dubious critical relevance; the two are obviously related, but what is significant is the writing itself. In the case of Haywood, or of anyone whose contributions, like hers, have been largely overlooked, the circumstances of her life can be valuable additional evidence in building a case for critical reappraisal. Haywood's biography in particular, her unconventionality, her seriousness, and her resilient perseverance over the thirty-five years of her career, adds weight to whatever claims I might make for her importance as an author. She was so prolific that any catalogue of eighteenth-century fiction offers ample documentation of her professional activity; the details of her personal life are more difficult to trace. The era in which she lived has been called "the age of scandal,"[1] and, as we have seen, Grub Street was a particularly scandalous locale. Consequently, it is almost impossible to untangle rumour and slander from fact. Her first biographer, David Erskine Baker, was hampered with more than the usual obstacles, having

> been credibly informed that, from a supposition of some improper liberties being taken with her history, she laid a solemn injunction on a person who was well acquainted with all the particulars of it, not to communicate to anyone the least circumstance relating to

[1] By T. H. White in The Age of Scandal (London, 1950).

her.[2]

Given the temper of the age, Haywood would have been wiser to stop the gossip by allowing the truth to be revealed. Unfortunately, she chose otherwise, and we have very little actual information on which to base a biography. Over the years, several scholars have researched various aspects of her history, but their valuable discoveries have never been amalgamated. In this biographical essay I propose to bring together for the first time everything that is known about Eliza Haywood's life, and to add a few discoveries and deductions of my own. The relationship of her life to her works will become evident when we begin to examine the novels themselves.

The date and circumstances of Haywood's birth are the first mystery with which her biographer is confronted. Baker gives no date, and adds "that her father was in the mercantile way; that she was born at London; and at the time of her death, which was, I think, in 1759, she was about sixty-three years of age."[3] The later edition of Baker's work corrects the date of her death,[4] but adds nothing regarding her birth or parentage. Working backwards from her stated age at death, we arrive at the year 1693 for her birth year, and that has become commonly accepted, though it is

[2] D. E. Baker, The Companion to the Playhouse (London: 1764), vol. II. This edition is unpaginated. The 1812 revision by Stephen Jones is entitled Biographia Dramatica; the passage quoted is found on I, 321.

[3] Companion to the Playhouse, II.

[4] Biographia Dramatica, I, 321.

frequently quoted with a question mark.[5] However, two years after the Biographia Dramatica, Alexander Chalmers contributed the information that she "was the daughter of a tradesman in London, of the name of Fowler. . . . "[6] Where he obtained this information is not known, for he lists as his primary source the Biographia Dramatica, and in all other respects the two sketches are almost identical. Moreover, the last edition of the biographical dictionary of which Chalmers' work is a substantial revision does not mention any name.[7] However, if Chalmers is correct in calling her father Fowler, then according to the research of G. F. Whicher, her first biographer in this century, she was born in 1690. Combing the parish registers for the years around 1693, he found an entry for 21 January 1689/90, recording the christening of "Elizabeth dau. of Robert ffowler and Elizabeth his wife" at St. Peter's, Cornhill.[8] Although Whicher prefers the later date, despite his own evidence, Haywood's other major biographers accept 1690.[9] As the truth of the matter depends entirely on Chalmers' information, and as his source of information is unknown, the mystery of her birth cannot yet be solved.

Of Haywood's early life we know next to nothing. Her father,

5 See, for example, Sidney Lee's article on Haywood in the DNB, or Dobree, p. 647.
6 The General Biographical Dictionary (London, 1814), XVII, 443.
7 A New and General Biographical Dictionary (London, 1798), VIII, 93.
8 Whicher, p. 2.
9 Walter and Clare Jerrold, in Five Queer Women (London, 1929), p. 204.

if he was in fact Robert Fowler of Cornhill, was a hosier by trade.[10] In the vague biographical sketch in the first number of The Female Spectator, Haywood claimed "a genius tolerably extensive, and an education more liberal than is ordinarily allowed to persons of my sex. . . ."[11] If her impeccable translations from the French and her wide-ranging literary allusions are an accurate reflection of her knowledge, her education was also much better than the daughter of a hosier would ordinarily have received. Nothing further is known of her during these early years, though several critics have suggested that Steele painted her portrait, as "Sappho," in The Tatler, number 6 (April 23, 1709).[12] This is a fairly disparaging picture of a frivolous "fine lady, who writes verses, sings, dances, and can say and do whatever she pleases, without the imputation of anything that can injure her character; for she is so well known to have no passion but self-love; or folly but affectation. . . ."[13] The Jerrolds disagree with this identification:

> If Sappho had been anything more than a figment of Steele's imagination, the original could obviously not have been the daughter of a London tradesman and a girl of sixteen, as she would have been if the commonly accepted year of her birth as 1693 is correct, and it is but little more likely if we are right in putting her birth back three or four years earlier. . . . Certainly the ascription to Eliza Haywood may be dismissed.[14]

[10] Whicher, p. 2. [11] The Female Spectator, 7th ed. (London, 1771), I, 3. [12] The identification is made by J. Nichols in his edition of The Tatler (London, 1786), I, 54; and is repeated verbatim by Chalmers in his edition (London, 1806), I, 54-55.
[13] Richard Steele, The Tatler, in British Essayists, I, 38-39. See also Number 40 (July 12, 1709). [14] Jerrold, p. 205.

Another reason for dismissing Nichols's identification of Sappho is that it seems to be based on Haywood's having "appeared before this time upon the stage in Ireland."[15] Actually, her earliest association with the theatre is not until 1714, five years after the appearance of the reference in question. But what makes the ascription even more unlikely is that Eliza had married, sometime before spring, 1711, the Reverend Valentine Haywood, rector of Baconsthorpe and Bodham in Norfolk, and newly appointed lecturer of St. Matthew's, Friday Street.[16] The christening of their son Charles is recorded in the parish register of St. Mary Aldermary on 3 December, 1711.[17] Valentine was fourteen years (or seventeen) older than his wife, and staunchly conservative; his main claim to fame is that in 1719 he published An Examination of Dr. Clarke's Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, with a Confutation of it.

> The work is a paragraph by paragraph refutation from the authority of scripture of the Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity (1712) by . . . Dr. Samuel Clarke, whose unorthodox views prevented Queen Caroline from making him Archbishop of Canterbury. The Reverend Mr. Haywood was upon safe ground in attacking a book already condemned in Convocation.[18]

It seems highly unlikely that an aspiring cleric with extremely conservative views would marry a woman with a well-established reputation as a coquette and a fool, especially if her folly had been publicized in a popular periodical publication.

[15] The Tatler, ed. Nichols, I, 54. [16] Joseph Foster, Alumni Oxonienses 1500-1714 (Oxford and London, 1892), II, 683.
[17] Whicher, p. 2. [18] Whicher, p. 2.

However, the Reverend Mr. Haywood did marry a woman who, with extraordinary boldness and temerity, cherished an ambition to appear on the stage. Eliza's life at this point takes an almost incredible turning. Although her husband's duties presumably carried him no further afield than Norfolk, and although he resided in London, his wife followed the example of many other aspiring thespians and put herself under the tutelage of Joseph Ashbury, the director of the Smock Alley Theatre-Royal in Dublin.[19] Ashbury was renowned throughout Britain as a teacher of acting, and had recently established the Smock Alley theatre as the semi-official training ground for actors and actresses hoping to work on the London stage.[20] Haywood arrived in Dublin early in 1714 and probably remained until the spring of 1717, although according to extant records she appeared in only one play.[21] She took the part of Chloe in Shadwell's adaptation of Timon of Athens.[22] While in Dublin, she met several people who would later figure more importantly in her life. William Rufus Chetwood, later the prompter at Drury Lane as well as an author and bookseller, was one of Ashbury's assistants;[23] James Quin[24] and Ashbury's son-in-law, Thomas Elrington,[25] were members of the troupe, and the poet James Sterling had just begun what became a fourteen-year association with Smock Alley.[26] Upon her return to London in 1717, one of

[19] [20] William Clark, The Early Irish Stage (Oxford, 1955), p. 149. Charles Dibdin, A Complete History of the English Stage (London, 1797-1800), IV, 432. [21] Clark, pp. 160, 208. Records are particularly scanty for this period. [22] W. R. Chetwood, A General History of the Stage (Dublin, 1749), p. 57. See also Whicher, p. 5. [23] Clark, p. 148. [24] Clark, p. 150. [25] John R. Elwood, "The Stage Career of Eliza Haywood," Theatre Survey, 5 (1964), 108. [26] See also Joseph Knight's article on Elrington in the DNB. La Tourette Stockwell, Dublin Theatres and Theatre Customs (1637-1820) (1938; rpt. New York, 1968), p. 56.

these connections proved immediately useful. On 23 April of that year, the playbill for John Banks's The Earl of Essex at Lincoln's Inn Field lists "Nottingham--Mrs. Haywood, lately arrived from Ireland." The only other player mentioned is Elrington, who may have helped her to obtain the part.[27] Nothing is known of her activities between this single performance and the publication of her first novel late in 1719. John Elwood proposes that she may have become a strolling player, as Richard Savage and Bonnell Thornton both suggest.[28]

The state of Haywood's marriage during these years is another mystery, and a greater one. It is impossible to imagine a union between a staid, middle-aged clergyman and a strong-minded young woman intent on a career in the theatre. In the early years of the century the stage was not yet wholly respectable for a woman. There were individuals, like Mrs. Oldfield and Susannah Centlivre, whose stature in the theatre earned them a certain respectability; however, on the whole, actresses were still regarded as little better than prostitutes. As a clergyman Valentine was dependent upon the good opinion of others for his advancement and had to be careful of his reputation. It seems scarcely possible that he would have given his wife permission to com-

[27] Elwood, "Stage Career," p. 108. See also The London Stage, ed. Emmett L. Avery (Carbondale, 1960), Part II, vol. i, 446; and J. Doran, Annals of the English Stage (London, 1888), I, 407 and II, 102 for details of Elrington's possible influence in the theatre. He was also associated with Chetwood. See W. J. MacQueen Pope, Theatre Royal Drury Lane (London, 1945), p. 139, and the article on Elrington in the DNB.

[28] Elwood, "Stage Career," p. 109 and p. 115 note 6.

promise him so publicly. His orthodoxy makes it even less likely that he would consent to her abandoning her family (her son would only have been three at the time) for the pursuit of disreputable fame. C. A. Moore has discovered an interesting advertisement in Mist's Weekly Journal for 24 September, 1715. "It is there announced that one week later . . . will be published 'The Crosses and Disappointments of Love, Entitled, A Tragi-Comedy Dialogue between Mr. Andrew Yeatman and Mrs. Elizabeth Haywood, in 3 vols.'"[29] No copy of this work has been found; Moore speculates that it may never have been published, and that "the Advertisement was inserted merely to expose the lovers or to extort blackmail."[30] He argues that the advertisement indicates that Haywood had taken a lover as early as 1715, and that Andrew Yeatman was the first in what may have been a long line of lovers leading to her eventual elopement.[31] Moore's argument is not convincing. Haywood was in Dublin in 1715; Yeatman was still an apprentice in Cheapside.[32] Moreover, improbable as it seems, there is evidence that Eliza and Valentine resumed conjugal relations on her return to London. A letter from her to an unknown correspondent, dated 20 August, 1720, suggests that she may even have turned from actress to author at his request:

> Sir The stage not answering my expectation, and the averseness of my relations to it, has made me turn

[29] C. A. Moore, "A Note on the Biography of Mrs. Eliza Haywood," Modern Language Notes, 30 (1918), 249. [30] Moore, p. 249.
[31] Moore, p. 250. [32] Moore, p. 249. It is possible that, like the Earl of Egmont, Moore is confusing the author with an Elizabeth Haywood who ran a bagnio in Covent Garden. See Edward C. Fletcher, "The Date of Eliza Haywood's Death," Notes and Queries, 166 (1934), 385.

> my genius another way; I have printed some little things which have met a better reception than they deserved, or I expected: and have now ventured on a translation to be done by subscription, the proposals whereof I take the liberty to send you. . . .[33]

If they were reconciled, as the reference to her "relations" implies, their domestic harmony was not long-lived; Eliza eloped from Valentine three months later:

> Whereas Elizabeth Haywood, wife of the Reverend Mr. Valentine Haywood, eloped from him her husband on Saturday the 26th of November last past, and went away without his knowledge and consent: This is to give notice to all persons in general, that if any shall trust her either with money or goods, or if she shall contract debts of any kind whatsoever, the said Mr. Haywood will not pay the same.[34]

It is the particularity of this advertisement, specifying an exact day and date, which leads me to believe that until the time he mentions, Valentine and Eliza maintained at least some semblance of a marriage. This disclaimer of responsibility should also establish once and for all that Eliza was not abandoned by her husband.[35] Nothing more is known of their relationship, except that Valentine gave up the rectorship of Baconsthorp some time in 1721, perhaps because of the notoriety surrounding his failed marriage, though he remained rector of Bodham till the year of his death.

[33] This letter (State Papers, Dom. George I, Bundle 22, Number 97) is given in full in Whicher, pp. 10-11, and in Jerrold, p. 211.

[34] Post-Boy, 7-10 January, 1720/21. This advertisement is also given in Whicher, p. 3 and in Jerrold, p. 212.

[35] This is a frequent error, and is repeated even as recently as 1972, in Adburgham, p. 73.

He was moderately successful in his career, if not in his domestic affairs, becoming minister of Great St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, in 1729 and lecturer to Lady Moyses in 1736. He died in 1744 at the age of sixty-eight.[36]

If Haywood did not turn to fiction at her husband's instigation, she was almost certainly encouraged to write by her colleague from Dublin, William Chetwood. By 1719 he was back in England; he established himself as a bookseller, and he undertook to launch his friend's career.[37] The first part of Love in Excess came out anonymously. It included a dedication to Mrs. Oldfield, the actress, signed not by the author, but by the bookseller himself. In it, he tells her that

> the author of the following lines is a young lady, whose greatest pride is in the patroness I have chose her; but she's fearful in not pleasing one who I am well assured is a real critic without their ill nature.[38]

Mrs. Oldfield was probably acquainted with Chetwood from his activities in the theatre; he also thanks her for "your late goodness to me."[39] On his personal appeal she might be expected to be generous to the fledgling author. The picture that we get of Haywood hiding behind her publisher is not consistent with the image of a woman eloping from safety and conventionality to the uncertainties of literature. However, her trepidation did not last;

[36] Francis Blomefield, An Essay Towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk (London, 1807), VI, 513 and IX, 369. See also Foster, p. 683. [37] The DNB article on Chetwood records his first appearance as a bookseller in 1720 [38] Love in Excess (London, 1719), pp. ii-iii. [39] Love in Excess, pp. i-ii.

the first part of Love in Excess proved such a success that "By Mrs Haywood" appeared on the title page of Part II. Part III followed on 25 February, 1720. The novel was extremely popular, reaching its fifth edition by August, 1723; it was evidently this success which encouraged her to undertake to publish a translation by subscription later in the year. Love in Excess also brought her a new circle of friends. Prefixed to the second installment was a poem by Richard Savage, "To Mrs. Eliza Haywood, on her Novel, call'd Love in Excess, etc." The poem is extravagant in her praise. "Since a complimentary poem would normally be printed in the first volume, it is likely that Savage made her acquaintance only after it appeared."[40] Savage also met Aaron Hill in 1720;[41] whether Hill introduced Haywood to Savage or Savage introduced her to Hill, we have no way of telling. But it is certain that this is the beginning of their coterie, which also consisted of Miranda Hill, John Dyer, David Mallet, and Martha Fowke Sansom, who was known to everyone as "Clio." Haywood quickly christened Hill "Hillarius," and Savage became "Riverius," from his putative father, Earl Rivers. Haywood herself remained simply "Eliza."

Haywood's relations with this coterie between 1720 and 1725 are the third great mystery in her life. Few of the verse tributes they wrote to each other can be dated with any certainty; allusions are vague, and gossip clouds the picture even further. Aaron Hill contributed an epilogue to her first play, The Fair

40 Clarence Tracy, The Artificial Bastard (Toronto, 1953), p. 60.
41 Tracy, p. 59.

Captive, in March, 1721; he also wrote three other poems in her praise. "On Eliza's designed Voyage to Spain" was first printed in Savage's Miscellaneous Poems and Translations by Several Hands, which came out in 1726, but like many of the other pieces in the collection, it had probably been written several years earlier.[42] Hill's poem, though brief, is typical of the group's effusions:

> To Spain! forbid it, Heav'n oh, think no more,
> To bless, profusely, that abounding shore!
> It can, to souls like thine, no pleasure yield,
> To waste manure, on the too fertile field:
> Our beggared soil, at home alone, should share,
> The generous influence of Eliza's care!
> Since Spain, high-treasured grasps the golden West,
> Oh! let thy Indies, be, by us, possesst![43]

Besides what seems now like mindless flattery, this poem contains one of the few shreds of evidence we have for believing that Haywood may actually have visited some of the scenes of her novels.[44] Hill's metaphors are strange; there seems to be an undertone of sexual innuendo, or even nastiness, in his images of fecundity. However, in the same collection he printed a long poem called "The Vision," in which Eliza becomes the earthly incarnation of virtue, constancy, wisdom and imagination. He writes of her in terms which recall some of her own heroines: "Where all that's manly, joins with all that's sweet."[45] The one quality which Hill seems to emphasize especially is her humility:

> Her worth no conscious pride of merit strains,
> O'er her wide soul impartial reason reigns;

[42] See Savage's Poetical Works, ed. Clarence Tracy (Cambridge, 1962). [43] Miscellaneous Poems (London, 1726), p. 90. [44] See Whicher, p. 22 and note 29. [45] Miscellaneous Poems, p. 75. See below, p. 247.

Blind to her beams, she feels not her own flame,
And over-winning, undervalues Fame![46]

This is especially interesting because Haywood also wrote a poem called "The Vision," in which she bemoans her inability to thank him and praise him for his encouragement.[47] The third and last poem by Hill, "On occasion of some verses, from Eliza," is even more useful in terms of what it tells us about her early excursions into literature:

I

Charmer! no more, by partial friendship led,
To humble themes, mis-tune thy heav'nly lyre!
Wide as the poles, thy sweeping pinions spread,
And soar to subjects, worthy of thy fire!

II

Chain'd short, by fortune, I unwinged, remain,
A fruitless meaner, far beneath thy praise:
Warm'd by thy heat, I poorly wish, in vain,
For means, to fan thy earth-enlight'ning blaze.

III

O! were the world not deaf, and fortune blind,
How would thy Joy-drest Muse, encouraged, shine!
How would the gen'ral chorus of mankind,
To prove their wit, concur in praising thine.

IV

If poets prophets are, the time shall be,
When I, by means unguessed, shall reach the pow'r,
To stretch the world's eye wide, thy muse to see,
With star-bent flight, like some new Juno tow'r.

V

Mean while, what other theme deserves thy pen,
But death-edged satire, on this stupid age?
Where Poetry, un-nerved, in worthless men,
Has given a woman all Apollo's rage![48]

[46] Miscellaneous Poems, p. 37. [47] Eliza Haywood, Poems on Several Occasions, in Secret Histories (London, 1742), II, 280-83.
[48] Aaron Hill, Works (London, 1753), III, 364-65.

Is this Hill's answer to "The Vision"? Was it written in 1721 after The Fair Captive, launched with his aid, had failed to establish Haywood as a dramatic poet? Although Hill's poem cannot answer these questions, it offers ample proof that Haywood's literary ambitions were extremely important to her, and that they were taken seriously by at least one not inconsiderable man of letters.[49]

Haywood's relationship with Richard Savage is even more significant, and it is complicated by the omnipresent Clio. We know that in 1720 Savage painted "the wonders of Eliza's Praise";[50] in 1722, he wrote a poem, "Unconstant," to Clio.[51] In neither case is his relationship with the subject of his verses made explicit. In mid-December, 1723, Savage printed another poem to Haywood, this time on The Rash Resolve, which was about to be published. Fulsome effusion is mingled with more sober praise:

> Doomed to a fate, which damps the Poet's flame
> A Muse, unfriended, greets thy rising Name!
> Unvers'd in Envy's, or in Flatt'ry's Phrase,
> Greatness she flies, yet merit claims her praise;
> Nor will she, at her with'ring Wrath, repine,
> But smile, if Fame, and Fortune cherish thine.[52]

These lines seem to communicate the same respect for Haywood's seriousness of purpose that we found in Hill's verses. The rest of this poem is sheer extravagance. In May, 1724, Savage was writing of Clio in the same vein.[53] Then, on 8 September of that

[49] See below, pp. 74-79.
[50] "To Mrs. Eliza Haywood," reprinted in Poetical Works, p. 22.
[51] Poetical Works, pp. 80-81.
[52] The poem, prefixed to The Rash Resolve (London, 1724) is reprinted in Poetical Works, p. 50.
[53] See Poetical Works, pp. 52-54.

year, Haywood published Part I of her most notorious "secret history": Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia, which contains both a detailed, sympathetic account of Savage's version of his parentage, and a particularly virulent, many-pronged attack on Clio. She complains of Riverius's unkindness, and ascribes his change of heart to her rival, a woman who pretends

> to have an intimate acquaintance with the Muses--has judgment enough to know that ease and please make a rhyme, and to count ten syllables on her fingers. This is the stock with which she sets up for a wit, and among some ignorant wretches passes for such; but with people of true understanding, nothing affords more subject of ridicule, than that incoherent stuff which she calls verses.[54]

Later in the work, Haywood is more abusive, and more candid about the cause of her hatred.

> The monster whose soul is wholly composed of hypocrisy, envy and lust, can ill endure another woman should be esteemed mistress of those virtues she has acted with too bare faced an impudence to pretend to, and is never so happy as when by some horrid stratagem she finds the means to traduce and blast the character of the worthy. To assist a disposition therefore so near of kin, and so pleasing to the infernal potentate, a thousand busy fiends are always at her call to furnish mischief. . . . 'Tis enough for her to lay the scheme of mischief, the executing it she leaves to others, who, if detected, must bear the blame. . . . With how much readiness the easily deceived Riverius has obliged her in spreading those reports, coined in the hellish mint of her own brain, I am sorry to say; but as his adhering too much to the interest of so detestable a creature has been the only

[54] Memoirs of a Certain Island (London, 1725), I, 47. Quoted in Whicher, p. 108 and in Jerrold, p. 238. Their discussions of relations between Savage and the two women have been invaluable.

> crime he has hitherto been guilty of, 'tis to be hoped his good sense will in a short time get the better of her infatuations. It cannot be doubted but that he has lost many friends on her account, in particular one there was who bore him a singular respect, though no otherwise capacitated to serve him than by good wishes. This person received a more than common injury from him, through the instigations of that female fury; but yet continuing to acknowledge his good qualities, and pitying his falling into the contrary, took no other revenge than writing a little satire. . . .[55]

This satire, "To the Ingenius Riverius, on his writing in the praise of Friendship," calls him a Thersites and a Pandarus, but relates how his poetic gifts still her indignation and rekindle admiration in her "ravish'd heart."[56] Whicher and the Jerrolds conclude from this passage that Haywood was the one particular friend whom Savage injured at Clio's instigation. They also infer that Haywood was eager to forgive him and "to keep in the good graces of Savage while addressing his 'Clio' in her best Billingsgate,"[57] which included charges of promiscuity and incest.[58] This interpretation is supported by the fact that the passage and poem are spoken, in the book, by the God of Love himself, which would seem to suggest that Haywood had been Savage's mistress. However, the damage to their relationship was evidently irreparable; a few months later Savage added insult to injury when, in "The Authors of the Town," he praised Clio as "the life of loveliness, thou soul of song," and ascribed to her the same power to command the

[55] Memoirs of a Certain Island, I, 184-85. Quoted in Jerrold, pp. 238-39 and in Whicher, p. 107. [56] Memoirs of a Certain Island, I, 185-86. [57] Jerrold, p. 240. [58] See Memoirs of a Certain Island, I, 43-44; p. 45; pp. 47-49.

emotions with which he had previously credited Haywood.[59] Eliza is degraded to

> A Cast-off Dame, who of Intrigues can judge,
> Writes scandal in Romance--A Printer's Drudge!
> Flush'd with Success, for Stage-Renown she pants
> And melts, and swells, and pens luxurious Rants.[60]

This poem was only the first in a series of personally abusive poems and pamphlets Savage was to direct at a woman who had probably been his lover. Clio took her own revenge, appealing to Hillarius to protect her from "the scorpion Haywood," "this tigress who delights in my misfortunes, and pursues me in all that is dear and sacred to me. . . . "[61]

In Memoirs of a Certain Island, Haywood offers a clue to Clio's influence over Savage, suggesting that his attraction to her "was motivated less by love than self-interest";[62] she further speculates that Clio had been the mistress of John Manners, the third Duke of Rutland, who may have forced Arnold Sansom to marry her as a blind for their affair.[63] Savage's biographer concludes that Clio did introduce Savage to the Duke, and also to the Duchess, to whom he dedicated the Miscellaneous Poems in 1726. Rutland may also have become an informal patron of the Volunteer

59 Poetical Works, p. 73. See also Jerrold, p. 240 and Whicher, p.109.

60 Poetical Works, p. 73; Whicher, p. 110; Jerrold, p. 240. See also Tracy, p. 61.

61 Martha Fowke Sansom, Clio; or a Secret History of the Life and Amours of the Late Celebrated Mrs. S-N-M (London, 1752), p. 47, p. 48. Quoted in full in Jerrold, p. 244. The British Museum copy of this work (1418.c.51) includes an interesting series of hand-written notes in pencil, comparing Haywood's account of her life with Clio's own.

62 Tracy, p. 64. See Memoirs of a Certain Island, I, 183.

63 Tracy, p. 65.

Laureate.[64] It is probably in contrast to these supposed services that Haywood refers to herself as "no otherwise capacitated to serve him than by good wishes." In the light of these relationships, one of her occasional poems may loom with particular significance. Among several pieces relating to Hillarius, there is a series of three poems "translated from the French." All three are the lamentations of a woman cast off by her lover and afraid that there is no hope of his return. Such a subject is not unusual in itself; love in all its forms was rapidly becoming Haywood's livelihood. But Poems on Several Occasions was first published late in January, 1724, which was just at the time that the quarrel between Haywood and Savage was erupting; moreover, the other four poems are all autobiographical in some respect. Turning then to the ostensible translations, it is difficult to avoid concluding that the love affair described is her own, and that "thou God of my desires" is none other than her Riverius. She speaks of her hope of reconciliation, which we also found expressed in Memoirs of a Certain Island; she also speaks of her desolation. But the most interesting, from a biographical standpoint, is the first of the series, "Climene's Complaint to Mirtillo," which seems to indicate most explicitly her own affairs:

> Return, return, my faithless dear, return!
> No longer let the poor Climene mourn!
> Climene! who for thee the world despis'd;
> Climene! once by thee so justly priz'd!
> . . . . . .
> Chang'd is your mind since Paris' choice you praised,

[64] Tracy, pp. 65-66.

> Who, by the hope of love and beauty raised,
> Adjudged the long-contested golden prize,
> Alone was due to Venus' conqu'ring eyes.
> Juno would now the envy'd preference claim,
> And Love be thought an empty airy name.
> For greatness you forsake the shady grove,
> And to the loud tumultuous town remove.[65]

If Haywood believed that Savage chose Clio out of self-interest rather than love, then her accusation of "Mirtillo's" change of mind is an accurate reflection of her own predicament. The identification is strengthened further by her speaking in the persona of the God of Love, Venus's son, in Memoirs of a Certain Island. If she is writing truthfully of her own affairs in this part of the poem, it seems likely that she is equally truthful earlier, when she says that for his sake she "the world despis'd." She met Savage early in 1720; by the end of November she had eloped from her clergyman husband, a singular instance of despising the world. Was it for Savage's sake that she eloped?

If Haywood was abandoned by Savage, she had several other associations during this period of her life which proved more rewarding. In 1725, James Sterling prefixed a poetic tribute to Volume IV of Secret Histories, Novels and Poems. Her other friend from Ireland, William Chetwood, remained her publisher until 1723, when he became prompter at Drury Lane,[66] at which time his successor, J. Roberts, became her principal bookseller. His influence at the theatre may have helped her get her comedy produced there that same year. Chetwood's next known meeting with Haywood took

65 Poems on Several Occasions, in Secret Histories (1742), II, 272.
66 DNB, Joseph Knight's article on Chetwood.

place in the pages of the Dunciad.[67] Whatever their personal relations may have been, Chetwood remained friendly towards his protegee, for his assessment of her in A General History of the Stage is extremely kind:

> Mrs. Haywood has made herself Eminent to the polite world by her writings; she is still alive. Her numerous novels will be ever esteemed by Lovers of that sort of amusement. . . . As the pen is her chief means of subsistance, the world may find many books of her writing, tho' none have met with more success than her NOVELS. . . . Her Dramatick Works have all died in their first visiting the world, being exhibited in very sickly seasons for Poetry. Mr. Pope has taken her for his Goddess of Dulness in his Dunciad, but she need not blush in such good Company.[68]

Haywood may also have had friends in more elevated stations. In 1721 she dedicated The Fair Captive to Thomas, Viscount Gage, an Irish peer who had recently been created a Baron;[69] in this dedication she again offers a tantalizing whiff of autobiography:

> The noblest performances stand in need of more than their own merit to support 'em; and the most celebrated authors, I mean of those whose Muse is their dependence, are obliged to seek the protection of some powerful name. But how melancholy a reflection this must be, to a person who has neither merit to deserve, nor good-fortune to obtain the favour of a patron illustrious enough to disappoint the efforts of ill-nature? For my own part, who, I confess, Have little pretences to the one, and never had much reason to rely on the latter; I suffered all that that apprehension could

67 See below, p. 64. 68 Chetwood, p. 57.
69 G. E. Cokayne, The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, ed. V. Gibbs and H. A. Doubleday (London, 1926), V, 596.

> inflict, and found that I wanted many more arguments than the little philosophy I am mistress of could furnish me with, to enable me to stem that tide of raillery which all of my sex, unless they are very excellent indeed, must expect when once they exchange the needle for the quill.
>
> It was in this condition your Lordship's pity found me; and by an excess of goodness, taught me that those very misfortunes which would bar the gates of favour against my hopes, addressed to those of a less elevated mind, were pleas sufficient to introduce me here.[70]

Although he may have met her first in Ireland, from what she says it seems more likely that Gage befriended her in some way after she first began to write. He may even have been moved to assist her especially because she was a woman. He may also have been the recipient of the letter from which I have already quoted,[71] which claims a previous relationship in the same way:

> I have been so much used to receive favours from you that I can make no doubt of your forgiveness for this freedom, great as it is, and that you will also become one of those persons, whose names are a countenance to my undertaking. I am a mistress of neither words nor happy turn of thought to thank you as I ought for the many unmeritted favours you have conferred on me, but beg you to believe all that a grateful soul can feel, mine does. . . .[72]

Although Gage's name is conspicuously absent from the subscription list of Haywood's "undertaking," Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier, that omission might have been the result of discretion. On the other hand, the recipient could have been Aaron

[70] The Fair Captive (London, 1721), pp. vii-ix. Quoted in Jerrold, pp. 218-19 and Whicher, p. 20 note 26.

[71] See above, pp. 49-50

[72] State Papers, Dom. George I, Bundle 22, Number 97. Quoted in Whicher, p. 11 and Jerrold, p. 211.

Hill, whose name does appear on the list of 310, which also includes seven Baronets, four Ladies, two Lady Dowagers, a pair of Doctors a Marchioness and a Viscount. Among the notable names appear those of Middleton, the actor; the eminently respectable novelist Jane Barker; the bookseller Osborne, who would later be pilloried with Haywood in the Dunciad; Charles de la Faye, an Undersecretary of State, and "that universal patron of minor authors, George Bubb, Esq., later the Doddington to whom Thomson dedicated his 'Summer.'"[73] This list is proof that Haywood was making a name for herself among readers of considerable quality. The Fair Captive also offers evidence of her personal associations. Hill wrote the epilogue; James Quin, her acquaintance from Ireland and now a prominent actor, played one of the major roles. In March, 1721, the play died after three nights, earning its author roughly seven pounds,[74] but it was acted again on 16 November of that year "at the desire of several persons of quality"to benefit the author.[75]

All the facts that we have about Haywood's life during these early years of her career testify to her extraordinary energy and determination. In 1722 she published two novels. 1723 brought three new novels, a new play, and the first three volumes of her collected works; she also appeared at Drury Lane, probably under Chetwood's direction, in one of the main roles in that play.[76]

[73] Whicher, p. 11. [74] The London Stage, Part II, vol. ii, 618. Total receipts for the night were £46 16s 6d, from which the management would probably have deducted a standard charge of £40. London Stage, II, i, lv. See also John Genest, Some Account of the English Stage (Bath, 1832), III, 59-60. [75] London Stage, II, ii, 647. Unfortunately, Haywood probably lost money on the performance, receipts coming to less than £33. [76] London Stage, II, ii, 731-32. See also Whicher, pp. 7-8; Jerrold, p. 220; Elwood, "Stage Career," p. 109; and Genest, III, 113-14.

1724 and 1725, when her quarrel with Savage was at its peak, were also her busiest years, bringing forth, between them, thirteen novels; one periodical; three translations, one in three volumes; and two separate four-volume collections of her works. 1726 and 1727 were only slightly less productive, claiming thirteen novels, one volume of translation, and two additional volumes of collected works. During the last two years of this first stage of her career, she published six or seven novels, one translation, and her third play. She also gained new notoriety by becoming the "heroine" of the Dunciad:

> See in the circle next, Eliza plac'd;
> Two babes of love close clinging to her waste;
> Fair as before her works she stands confess'd,
> In flow'rs and pearls by bounteous Kirkall dress'd.
> The Goddess then: "Who best can send on high
> The salient spout, far-streaming to the sky;
> His be yon Juno of majestic size,
> With cow-like udders, and with ox-like eyes.
> This China-Jordan, let the chief o'er-come
> Replenish, not inglorious, at home."
> Chetwood and Curll accept the glorious strife. . . . [77]

This passage, besides offering an example of Pope's dung and of the venom which Haywood's works were capable of inspiring, again provides us with a brief glimpse of her private life. Edmund Curll's Compleat Key to the Dunciad explains that "the two babes of Love . . . the scandalous chronicle records to be the offspring of a poet and a bookseller."[78] Some versions claim paternity not for a poet

[77] The Dunciad (London, 1963), pp. 119-24. This passage is from the Dunciad Variorum of 1728, lines 149-59. [78] Edmund Curll, A Compleat Key to the Dunciad (London, 1728), p. 12. This work is also reprinted in the Garland Publishing series Popeiana, VI (New York, 1974).

but for a peer.[79] The few facts we do have offer examples of all three: Savage, the poet; Chetwood, the bookseller; and Viscount Gage, the peer. There is no way of assessing the truth of what Pope suggests, but as most of the other abuse in the Dunciad seems to be founded at least partially in fact, there is little reason to doubt that Haywood was at least strongly rumoured to have had two illegitimate children. If Chetwood was, in fact, the father of a "babe of love," it is particularly ironic that he loses "Eliza" to Curll, Pope's greater enemy but no connection of Haywood.

The new decade heralded a new stage in Haywood's career. The pace at which she had been working since 1723 could not last indefinitely, and it was broken in rather a startling way; the extraordinary output I have described dropped to practically nothing. This period is often disregarded by Haywood's biographers. The standard explanation for her minimal productivity during these years--only two original works and one translation are ordinarily attributed to her between 1730 and 1740--is that the shame of being humiliated by Pope in the Dunciad drove her underground.[80] Such an explanation in an age which thrived on scandal is surely not satisfactory, for the more notorious an author became, for whatever the reason, the better her or his sales would be. If any-

[79] See The Works of Alexander Pope, ed. W. Elwin and W. J. Courthope (London, 1881-2), IV, p. 330. This account is repeated in the DNB.

[80] Whicher's, pp. 127-30, is the most complete exposition of this point of view, which is adopted by many of the historians of the novel who discuss Haywood; see, for example, Oliver Elton, A Survey of English Literature 1730-1780 (London, 1928) I, 161, or Josephine Grieder's introduction to the Garland reprint of Eovaii (New York, 1972), p. 5. "A possible alternative explanation is that Mrs. Haywood . . . 'went into keeping.'" (Day, p. 79).

thing, Haywood became more audacious than ever, dedicating her tragedy, Frederick, Duke of Brunswick-Lunenburgh to the Prince of Wales in 1729. When, perhaps deterred by the furor surrounding Pope's attack on her, the royal family conspicuously withheld their patronage, Haywood published a preface to the play which takes them to task for their neglect:

> The high expectations the town had conceived of this performance, on account of the theme, gave the fairest prospect of success; but the indifferent reception it has since met with, lays me under the necessity of writing a preface. . . . At first I imagined it was wholly owing to my own deficiency; but have since been informed, that the unthinking part of the town, perceiving the Royal Family had not vouchsafed to honour it with their presence, readily fell into the belief, that I . . . had drawn so ill a picture of the hero . . . that those descended from him, thought proper to testify their dislike by their absence. This opinion gained the more ground, as . . . mine was the only new performance this season, which had not received a sanction from some of that illustrious line.

The preface concludes with magnificent disdain of Pope: "I know myself beneath the censure of the Gyant-Criticks of this age. . . ."[81] The truth is that Haywood did just the reverse of going underground; obviously still panting for "stage-renown," as Savage put it,[82] she again turned to the theatre for her livelihood, and according to one critic, "she played roles well suited to, indeed occasionally capitalizing on her licentious reputation. . . ."[83] She appeared at the Haymarket Theatre with William Hatchett in his

[81] Frederick, Duke of Brunswick-Lunenburgh (London, 1729), preface.

[82] See above, p. 58.

[83] Marcia Heinemann, "Eliza Haywood's Career in the Theatre," Notes and Queries, 218 (1973), 9. This article and John Elwood's (cited on p. 47) represent the major recent research into Haywood's life. Both refer extensively to The London Stage and add other details of her performances, etc.

play, The Rival Father, in April, 1730;[84] in 1733 they collaborated in transforming Fielding's Tragedy of Tragedies into The Opera of Operas, with music by Thomas Arne. This was a particularly successful venture, being performed throughout the 1733-34 season; it even received a rival production, with music by J. F. Lampe.[85] Haywood is actually listed on the roster of the Haymarket for the 1731-32 season,[86] although according to the archives she only appeared in one play. This was a fairly successful comedy by Samuel Johnson of Cheshire, entitled The Blazing Comet; it was played intermittently during March and April, 1732. Haywood turned to theatrical criticism in 1735, earning £16 4s for "a book entitled the History of the British Theatre . . . containing an account of forty-five plays" popular in the first decades of the century.[87] On 21 January, 1736, in a single performance of Arden of Feversham, Mrs. Arden was played "by Mrs. Haywood, the Author."[88] Whether that identification referred to her profession in general,, or to the authorship of the play itself, is uncertain; it was not performed again.

Haywood's theatrical career culminated in the 1736-37 season, when she was one of the mainstays of Fielding's company at the Haymarket. It was a small troupe, consisting of eleven men and five women,[89] and it is likely that Haywood appeared in most of the productions, cast lists for some of which have not been disco-

[84] London Stage, III, i, 48, 53. [85] London Stage, III, i, 305-309; 331-63. [86] London Stage, III, i, 157.
[87] Original Assignments of Mss. Between Authors and Publishers, 1703-1810, Brit. Mus. Add. Mss. 38728, folios 112-13. She was paid £20 5s for a second volume in 1747. [88] London Stage, III, i, 545.
[89] London Stage, III, ii, 598.

vered.[90] She definitely performed in the season's three anti-Walpole plays: the anonymous Rehearsal of Kings, and two of Fielding's own pieces, The Historical Register and Eurydice Hissed.[91] It is also extremely likely that she wrote three of the afterpieces played that season: Sir Peevy Pet, The Female Freemason, and The Sailor's Opera. As none of these plays has apparently survived, it is impossible to prove Haywood's authorship. Cross credits her with Sir Peevy Pet simply because "it was a farce in one act, such as Mrs. Haywood might have written. . . ."[92] There is no further evidence to support that claim. The Sailor's Opera is a ballad opera, a form familiar to her after her experience with the Tragedy of Tragedies, and is said in its advertisements to be "Written by a Female Politician."[93] After Haywood's attack on Walpole in Eovaii (1736), she could perhaps pretend to that title with some justice. There is most evidence to suggest that she wrote The Female Freemason. It was performed at a benefit night for her close friend Hatchett, at which "Tickets for Mrs. Haywood's benefit" were also welcome.[94] Haywood may have become interested in freemasonry through Chetwood, who wrote a play called The Generous Freemason, or the Constant Lady in 1731;[95] the next year she satirized the institution at her benefit performance of The Blazing Comet, which included "an additional scene of the ceremony of Lady Flame's being made a Free Mason wherein the grand mys-

[90] Pasquin, for example, which was performed in May 1737, has a cast including four women, and Fatal Curiosity, played in March and April, involves three female parts. London Stage, III, ii, 650-51.
[91] London Stage, III, ii, 640-75. [92] Wilbur Cross, The History of Henry Fielding (New Haven, 1918), p. 209. [93] London Stage, III, ii, 666. [94] London Stage, III, ii, 662. [95] DNB, IV, 211.

tery is discovered."[96] It is possible that she expanded this scene into the later afterpiece.[97] All this evidence, largely overlooked in the past, reveals that what is usually considered Haywood's dullest and least active period was one of her busiest and most varied.

In the 1740's, when she was in her own fifties, Eliza Haywood began the last and most "respectable" stage of her long career.[98] She produced a variety of longer works, ranging from Anti-Pamela, a rather heavy-handed satire of the materialistic nature of Richardson's "Virtue,"[99] through the domestic economy of A Present for a Servant-Maid, to morally didactic works such as Life's Progress Through the Passions or Epistles for the Ladies. She never regained the pace of her earlier years as a writer, but she published consistently throughout this last period of her life. Little is known of her other activities. In 1742, she may have become one of the century's few women booksellers; the following announcement appears in the Virtuous Villager (1742):

> New books, sold by Eliza Haywood, Publisher, at the sign of Fame in Covent-Garden.
> I. The Busy-Body; or Successful Spy; being the entertaining history of Monsieur Bigand. . . . The whole containing a great variety of adventures, equally instructive and diverting.
> II. Anti-Pamela. . . . The Second Edition[100]

[96] London Stage, III, i, 207. Haywood played the part of Lady Flame in Johnson's play. [97] Elwood, whose article I read only after I had written this paragraph, comes to an identical conclusion, in "Stage Career," p. 111. [98] Whicher suggests, on the evidence of a writer in the Monthly Review, that Haywood was imprisoned for Letter from H--- G---g; this seems to me unlikely. See Whicher, p. 25.
[99] See below, pp. 351-52. [100] Quoted in Whicher, pp. 200-1 and Jerrold, p. 257.

Both books had been published originally the previous year; both were probably her own productions. This advertisement seems to be the only evidence that she ever even intended to become a publisher. Perhaps it was never more than an intention; no copy of a book with her imprint has been found.[101] Perhaps her attempt proved immediately unsuccessful. However, short-lived as it may have been, it is further proof of the courage and versatility Haywood manifested throughout her life. Of her friends during this period, we know almost nothing. William Hatchett, a figure even more obscure than Haywood, was probably one of her closest friends. He may even have been Baker's informant for the article on Haywood in the Companion to the Playhouse.[102] She obviously was well-acquainted with Fielding, though their later relations were strained, to say the least, by the gossip and nastiness requisite to any eighteenth century literary rivalry.[103] She may even have met Richardson, who printed an edition of A Wife to Be Lett in 1735.[104] Perhaps her most prestigious association, ironically, was the result of her appearance in the Dunciad. A gentleman reported to Notes and Queries that he had in his possession

> a copy of an edition (without date) . . . for title The Dunciad, with Notes Variorum, and the Prolegomena of Scriblerus, Written in the Year 1727, . . . on the

[101] However, D. F. Foxon's English Verse 1701-1750 (Cambridge, 1975) includes the following entry: "The Equity of Parnassus: a poem. . . . Sold . . . at Mrs. Haywood's, 1744." I, 248, entry E449. Interestingly, this poem is a satire of Walpole.

[102] See above, pp. 42-3.

[103] See Jerrold, p. 268. John R. Elwood's "A Critical Edition of Eliza Haywood's The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless"(Diss. Illinois 1962), discusses their feud in detail. I have not been able to obtain a copy of this work, but see Dissertation Abstracts, 24 (1962), 2462.

[104] Doody, p. 138. See also W. M. Sale, Jr., Samuel Richardson: Master Printer (Ithaca, N. Y., 1950), pp. 173-74.

> flyleaf of which is the following in the handwriting of the hero: "Lewis Theobald to Mrs. Heywood, as a testimony of his esteem, presents this book called The Dunciad, and acquaints her that Mr. Pope, by the profits of its publication, saved his library wherein unpawned much learned lumber lay."[105]

It would seem that Theobald had more of a sense of humour than is ordinarily believed; under the circumstances, the scholar is one of the few people from whom such a gift would have been a joke rather than an insult. Finally, there is an undated letter from Haywood to Sir Hans Sloane, founder of the British Museum and its national library, in which she requests him to subscribe to some volumes which, she assures him, "are the productions of the best genius's of the present age; and that nothing will be contained in them less becoming the closet of the philosopher and divine, than the fine gentleman."[106] Whicher associates this letter with her publishing venture;[107] it also seems possible that she was requesting him to subscribe to The Beauties of the English Stage (1737), a work which contains "a remarkable number of selections from Mrs. Haywood's plays, . . . almost all of them from Frederick, Duke of Brunswick-Lunenburgh,"[108] or a similar anthology.

Haywood's involvement with the literary professions, once she had committed herself and her fortunes to them in 1719, was total. Her dedication lasted to the very week she died. The final issue of The Young Lady, dated 17 February 1756, contains a terminal note:

> The authoress of this undertaking cannot discharge her duty as she ought, did she not acknowlege the obligation she is under to those who mean to favour her

[105] W. J. Thoms in Series I, X (1854), 109-10. See Whicher, p. 126 and note 15. [106] Brit. Mus. Sloane Mss. 4059.h.9, XXIV, folios 144-45. [107] Whicher, p. 23. [108] Elwood, "Stage Career," p. 115 note 11.

> with their encouragement through the course of it; and to acquaint them that she was unhappily taken ill, just at the commencement of it, which illness has increased so much as to incapacitate her for going on with it. She hopes, however, that if Providence, in his goodness, should restore her to health, to endeavour at making them amends by employing her time in something that may more immediately merit their protection and encouragement.[109]

Providence, however, chose otherwise, and Eliza Haywood died eight days later. Her obituary corroborates that she was already ailing when she wrote the first number of the periodical. It is her perseverance while under considerable difficulty which moved Adburgham to refer to her as "the gallant old lady, scribbling away to the last."[110] Haywood's contemporaries were similarly responsive to her energy and courage, for this obituary appeared in the White-Hall Evening Post, the Publick Advertiser, and the London Evening Post:

> Yesterday morning died, in the sixtieth year of her age, after a very severe illness of three months, which she bore with great fortitude and resignation, Mrs. Eliza Haywood, the celebrated Authoress of some of the best moral and entertaining pieces that have been published for these many years. The great hand she had in those elegant productions the Female Spectator, and Epistles for the Ladies; together with her Histories of Miss Betsy Thoughtless, Jenny and Jemmy Jessamy, her Invisible Spy, and the Fortunate Foundlings, will ever remain as living monuments of her merit.[111]

Baker reports a similar judgment of her character:

109 The Young Lady (London, 1756), p. 42.
110 Adburgham, p. 108.
111 Quoted by D. M. Walmsley in "Eliza Haywood: A Bicentennary," Times Literary Supplement, 24 February 1956, p. 117.

> I cannot help observing, as to her personal character, that I was told by one, who was well acquainted with her for many years before her close of life, that she was good-natured, affable, lively, and entertaining. . . . She was, during the whole course of his knowledge of her, remarkable for the most rigid and scrupulous decorum, delicacy, and prudence, both with respect to her conduct and conversation.[112]

It is difficult to reconcile this image of Haywood as decorous, delicate and prudent with the impression gleaned from the facts of her life. Her writings after Betsy Thoughtless do tend to be more pious and less spirited; perhaps, in her sixties, she was growing tired. The universal opinion that she was a model of good sense and decorum in her later years, and a reputation completely free from any taint of scandal seem to suggest that perhaps much of the gossip and malice she provoked when younger was the result not of faulty morals, but of an inadequate respect for her "proper" place. To an age which had no conception of social revolution as we know it now, a woman who rebelled in any area of life was risking a ruined reputation. Haywood rebelled in them all.

Haywood's literary career is most remarkable for its versatility; she produced respectable specimens of almost every literary type prominent in the first half of the century, from drama in both modes, to political satire complete with Scriblerian footnotes, periodical essays and conduct books. Although her fecundity and her agility in adapting to new forms and techniques are sometimes praised,[113] sometimes blamed,"[114] historians almost invariably

[112] Companion to the Playhouse, 1764. [113] Q. E. Leavis, Fiction and the Reading Public (London, 1932), pp. 126, 131; Day, p. 193. [114] Walter Raleigh, The English Novel (London, 1903), p. 139; Reynolds, pp. 213-15.

comment on the broad range of her facility. Her biography suggests that Haywood began this career with a serious literary ambition not ordinarily credited to her. In the letter which she wrote to announce her intention of giving up the stage, she says that she has decided to turn her "genius another way."[115] That she here refers to herself as having a "genius," which at that time meant a "natural ability or capacity; quality of mind; the special endowments which fit a man for his peculiar work,"[116] is remarkable in itself. The use of that particular term implies that she regarded herself as gifted, and that she felt "called" to writing by some innate feeling for the work. It would have been more common for her to have spoken of her "accomplishments." This outspoken avowal of ambition is in marked contrast to her later modesty in prefaces and dedications. It seems likely that she set out on her "career" with the same ambition and seriousness of purpose that any professional man would have felt, and only later became convinced of her uniqueness, and the hostility which it provoked. Love in Excess, the longest and most complexly structured of her early works, is equivalent in length to two or even three of her other novels, indicating that she probably spent considerable time in its composition. Moreover, she began to publish nearly a year before she eloped from her husband, which disproves the theory that she turned to writing in desperation when she found herself on her own.[117] Finding the stage unsatisfactory

115 See above, pp. 49-50. 116 Oxford English Dictionary.
117 Josephine Grieder, in the introduction to the Garland reprint of Memoirs of a Certain Island (New York, 1972), p. 5; Adburgham, p. 73.

as a career,[118] she then turned to writing in earnest, composing her first works with great care and lavishing on them more thought than was usual in the domain of popular literature. My supposition is supported by several additional facts relating to her second published work, Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier (1721), which is a translation from the French of Edmé Boursault. Haywood was soliciting subscriptions for the work three months before she left Valentine, and it was published even before he had advertised her elopement, on 26 December 1720, exactly ten months after the final installment of Love in Excess. This is a longer interval between works than any in her career until 1730. Her seriousness in undertaking the translation appears in her preface; like Dryden, Pope, L'Estrange and countless other eighteenth-century translators, she had no particular allegiance to the literal, but she did attempt to justify her style and methods:

> I should not have troubled my reader, with offering any thing in my own defense, if the liberty I have taken, in many places, of adding, and in others of diminishing (where I thought so doing would render the whole more entertaining) had not made it highly necessary. I am very sensible that, to those who consult the French what I have done will appear to be more properly called a paraphrase than a translation; and perhaps, may be judged rather to proceed from a want of true knowledge of my author than any amendment I could propose by making alterations. . . . I have, in every letter, kept close to the business of the original, and . . . I have made it my care not to exceed the meaning, wherever I have heightened the expression, as well as not to retrench anything but what was entirely superfluous.[119]

[118] See above, pp. 49-50. [119] Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier (London, 1721), pp. iv-v.

A comparison of her translation with the original[120] reveals that her claims for herself are accurate and just. Further proof of Haywood's literary aspirations is that she chose to publish Letters from a Lady of Quality by subscription,[121] a method more lucrative, if successful, than constant hacking, and certainly more respectable. Ordinary translation was hack work of the worst sort. It was cheaper for the bookseller to secure a copy of the latest French novel and pay a translator (the lowest class of hack),[122] than it was to pay for the rights to an original work of fiction.[123] But a translation undertaken by subscription was authorship by patronage and a task which any woman of letters would welcome.

At the end of Letters from a Lady of Quality, William Chetwood advertised the forthcoming publication of

> a Book entitled, The Danger of giving way to Passion, in Five Exemplary Novels: First, The British Recluse, or the Secret History of Cleomira, supposed dead. Second, The Injur'd Husband, or the Mistaken Resentment. Third, Lasselia, or the Unfortunate Mistress. Fourth, The Rash Resolve, or the Untimely Discovery. Fifth, Idalia, or the Self-abandon'd. Written by Mrs. Eliza Haywood.[124]

These were, in fact, her next five novels, and they appeared more or less exactly as advertised.[125] However, they were published separately, and the first two did not actually appear until April and December, 1722, with the rest coming out the following year. Moreover, between Idalia and Lasselia, Haywood issued the first three volumes of her collected works, and wrote and acted in A Wife

[120] For example, Letters from a Lady of Quality pp. 16-17 with Boursault, Treize Lettres de Suite d'Une Dame à un Cavalier in Lettres Nouvelles, II (Paris, 1738), 346-47. [121] See above, pp. 62-63.
[122] See Lintot's remarks to Pope, quoted in A. Beljame, Men of Letters and the English Public in the 18th Century (London, 1948), pp. 352-53.
[123] Day, p. 28. [124] Quoted in Whicher, p. 12. [125] Lasselia and Idalia exchanged subtitles, and Idalia was published third in sequence.

to Be Lett. The long interval between her announcement of the novels and their publication is further proof that Haywood wrote, at least initially, as much out of ambition as out of need. She evidently had conceived the plan of five exemplary novels, and found that her subjects demanded lengthier treatment, thus necessitating more time to complete. Her progress in fiction was also interrupted by her work on her first play, The Fair Captive. This was the revision of a tragedy by Captain Hurst, and Haywood had been commissioned to do the work by John Rich, the manager of Lincoln's Inn Field.[126] In what the Jerrolds describe as a "curiously frank address to the reader,"[127] Haywood reveals the same seriousness of purpose, giving the history of the work and expressing dissatisfaction:

> To attempt any thing in the vindication of the following scenes, would cost me more time than the composing 'em took me up. . . . This tragedy was originally writ by Captain Hurst, and by him delivered to Mr. Rich, to be acted soon after the opening of the new House; but the season being a little too far elapsed, for the bringing it on then, and the author obliged to leave the kingdom, Mr. Rich became the purchaser of it, and the winter following ordered it into rehearsal: but found it so unfit for representation, that for a long time he laid aside all thoughts of making any thing of it, till last January /1721?/ he gave me the history of his bargain, and made me some proposals concerning the new modelling it: but, however I was prevailed upon, I cannot say my inclination had much share in my consent. . . . On reading, I found that I had much more to do than I expected; every character I was obliged to find employment for, introduce one entirely new, without which it had been impossible to have

126 Whicher, p. 6; Jerrold, p. 216; London Stage, II, ii, 647.
127 Jerrold, p. 219.

> guessed at the design of the play; and in fine, change the diction so wholly, that, excepting in the parts of Alphonso and Isabella, there remains not twenty lines of the original.[128]

Although both Whicher and the Jerrolds consider Haywood's statements naive,[129] it seems to me that they stem from simple discontent with what she had written, and with the inferior material she had been given. Her concern at her responsibility for the play reflects the strength of her self-respect and the depth of her literary ambitions. The Fair Captive was Haywood's only attempt at the sort of hack work on which her Grub Street neighbours lived; perhaps because the play was a failure, perhaps because of her instantaneous and overwhelming popularity as a writer of fiction, she was able to select more carefully what she wrote. Although her translations were probably commissioned, the originals were all books congenial to her natural talents and interests, and each of her productions exhibits touches of her own distinctive style. And even if her fictions were commissioned as well, they remain entirely her own: she was above the sort of assignment which included not only subject matter, but also style and persona.[130] Other authors, who met with a less enthusiastic reception from their audience, were forced to write whatever would earn them a pittance; they remained anonymous.

Although the facts of Haywood's life are relatively scarce, and though we have none of her personal letters or diaries to pro-

[128] The Fair Captive, in Works (London, 1724), II. Advertisement to the Reader, pp. xi-xii. Quoted in Whicher, pp. 6-7; Jerrold, pp. 219-20.

[129] Whicher, p. 6; Jerrold, p. 220.

[130] See above, p.16.

vide the memorabilia which modern readers have almost come to expect, I think it is possible to form a vivid impression of the kind of woman Eliza Haywood must have been. Although her career was long and extremely diversified, although her fame and fortunes rose and fell with the passing decades, she remained remarkably consistent. Always taking herself and her work seriously, always looking on the foibles of her fellows with deep perception and fair-minded compassion, she successfully challenged all of the most formidable restrictions on women's freedom. She was dedicated to her work, and even more dedicated to the education of her sex, whether it took the form of conduct books and popular philosophy, or only the implicit commentary of her novels on the society in which she lived. Using her exceptional sensitivity and linguistic skill, exploiting her "genius" to the full, Haywood was able to blend the conventions of past literature with her perceptions of every day reality, and in doing so she created the enormously successful formula on which her books were based. Her works are indeed her monument. This essay will attempt to clear away the moss and let them once again be seen.

III

THE HEROIC ROMANCE

In order to understand Haywood's achievements in fiction, it is necessary to examine what was available to her by way of conventions and themes. There were two main traditions on which she could draw. The first, essentially comic, derived from the Italian novella and contributed relatively little to her novels beyond length and a certain straightforwardness of plot. However, because Haywood's works have been identified with these stories, it is necessary to discover what, if anything, she may have derived from them. The second tradition, that of the French heroic romance, is in contrast absolutely vital to an understanding of Haywood's writing. By distinguishing the conventions which she later adapted and by analyzing the basis of the romance's appeal, it is possible to gain a valuable insight into the skill with which she transformed an outmoded form of writing into something promising and new.

Throughout the century, though particularly during the first sixty years, there existed much confusion about what to call works of fiction. Because the novel, as it was developing, had no precedents which could be easily identified, people tended to put all fiction into two main categories, "romance" and "novel." The situation was further complicated by the fact that respectability often required an author to claim that his or her work was, in fact, a "history." It is not always clear what the distinctions

are among these three names, particularly at the beginning of the century. At first the difference seems to be simply a matter of length.

> A Novel, an ingenius relation of a pleasant adventure, or intrigue; a short romance, or pretty story.
> Romance, a feigned story about amorous adventures, or warlike atchievements expressed in fine language; also a tale of a tub, a meer fiction, or lye.[1]

However, even here there are glimmerings of what would become the decisive factor--a requirement of realism. A novel is merely "ingenius," while a romance amounts to a "lye." A novel is a story (and a history would be a true story), but a romance is a "feigned story." By the end of the pre-Richardsonian period, this difference has been made explicit.

> Novel: a pleasant, ingenious story, in which the relater dresses up an invention of his own as a real fact, with all the embellishments of art, to render it agreeable and instructive. . . .
> Romance: a feigned story . . . commonly upon the subject of love or arms, where in abundance of enthusiastical flights are introduced, which renders the reading of them in general prejudicial by mispending of time, and giving an ill tincture to the imagination, and stuffing the memory with rubbish, painting good qualities out of character, and giving false images of life, and thereby teaching young people to be indiscreet in friendship, love and the other passions, and thereby not only vex and disappoint their parents and guardians, but frequently bring upon themselves

[1] Edward Phillips, A New World of Words (6th ed., 1706), quoted in Walter Greiner, ed,, English Theories of the Novel (Tübingen, 1970), II, 12.

misfortunes not to be recovered all their life time.[2]

These definitions illustrate the two separate traditions of fiction which were established in England when Haywood began to write. Those works called novels presumably descend from the Spanish and Italian novella, particularly as it was made popular in England by translations of Cervantes and Bandello. In Samuel Croxall's Select Collection of Novels (1720-22), nine of the twenty-five tales are translations of stories by Cervantes: seven of the Exemplary Novels, and the two "novels" included in the first part of Don Quixote. Bandello, widely read in sixteenth and seventeenth century England in translations by Geoffrey Fenton and William Painter, gained a new generation of readers when Mary Manley published The Power of Love (1720), versions of Painter's translations. Haywood's Love in Its Variety (1727) and several of the stories in Croxall were probably based on equally popular French versions of the Italian tales. These short stories are responsible for carrying a strain of realism to the novels of Behn, Haywood, and their followers. The romances, on the other hand, trace their ancestry ultimately to medieval chivalric literature,

[2] Dyche and Pardon, A New General English Dictionary (3rd. ed., 1740), quoted in Greiner, II, 40. This definition restates in stronger terms that given by Jeremy Collier in 1721 (see Greiner, II, 29). A look at the definitions in a current dictionary reveals how closely this last conception of the two forms is to our own. Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary, ed. A. M. MacDonald (Edinburgh, 1973) defines a novel as "a fictitious prose narrative or tale presenting a picture of real life, especially of the emotional crises of the men and women portrayed," and a romance as "a tale of chivalry, . . . any fictitious and wonderful tale; a fictitious narrative . . . which passes beyond the limits of ordinary life."

though most specifically to the heroic romances of La Calprenède and Madeleine de Scudéry in seventeenth century France. As the 1740 definitions make clear, romances were regarded as all that was immoral, distracting and corrupting in fiction, all that was not realistic, "agreeable and instructive." "History" seems to imply either a relation of facts, or simply any story. Haywood uses "novel" and "history" (or "secret history") interchangeably,[3] but she never once calls a work of hers a "romance." Significantly, critics seem, on the whole, to do exactly the reverse; they persist in labelling her books "romances," in most cases with the obvious intention of denigrating them.[4] Clara Reeve describes the sort of prejudice which is at work here in The Progress of Romance: "Mankind in general are more biassed by names than things; and what is yet stranger, they are biassed by names to which they have not affixed an absolute and determinate meaning."[5] When "romance" is invoked in descriptions of her books, Haywood loses what little chance she might have had to be considered seriously and carefully. Because romance continued, well into the present century, to mean the extravagant tales of love and adventure, which had invaded England from France, to identify a work as belonging to that particular genre was to call it dangerous, if perhaps pleasant, rubbish and disregard it intellectually as beneath contempt.

[3] For example, Fatal Fondness, The Force of Nature, Idalia, The Injured Husband, Lasselia, The Rash Resolve and The Unequal Conflict are "novels," while Persecuted Virtue, The Double Marriage, Fantomina, The Fair Hebrew, The City Jilt, Cleomelia and The Arragonian Queen are all "histories." The British Recluse is called both.

[4] See, for example, Whicher's Life and Romances of Eliza Haywood, or Lee's article on Haywood in the DNB.

[5] Clara Reeve, The Progress of Romance (London, 1785), pp. 5-6.

The realistic strain in the fictional tradition available to eighteenth-century novelists has been fairly well documented;[6] the works of Cervantes and Bandello would ordinarily be classified in this category. However, despite the kinship of the novella with rogue literature, anti-romantic satire, chap-books and other "realistic" forms, they also left a legacy of more "romantic" or "literary" conventions to writers like Haywood, possibly by way of Aphra Behn.[7] Although at least half of Bandello's stories are either obscene practical jokes or "honourable cozzenings" of wayward husbands by virtuous and inventive wives, and others are so short that they are mere anecdotes, the longer tales and some of Cervantes' "novels" bear a striking superficial resemblance to the short fiction of the early eighteenth century. Perhaps the most outstanding feature of the novella, especially in comparison with the heroic romance, is the simplicity of its story line. In a short tale where all details and actions have the single end of describing the progress and result of a particular intrigue, there is no room for intercalated stories, elegant letters, or set conversations on topics of general interest. Plot is everything, and the reader's interest is maintained by the skilful unfolding of details and events. This simplicity is probably the major contribution of the novella to the English novel.

Fairly frequently in his tales, Bandello includes long soliloquies which are meant to reveal the perplexities of a lover's

[6] See, for example, F. W. Chandler's The Literature of Roguery (Boston, 1920), or Ronald Paulson's Satire and the Novel in Eighteenth Century England (New Haven, 1967). E. A. Baker and Morgan also discuss this tradition.

[7] Erickson, especially, disregards all influences on Haywood other than Behn, on the assumption that Behn amalgamated the various traditions in her fiction.

mind at a crucial point in the plot. Soliloquies always suggest the possibility of psychological analysis and realistic characterization; however, in these works such expectations are disappointed. When these passages of self-revelation are examined more carefully, it can be seen that in almost all cases the language is generic and the lovers two-dimensional. Consider, for example, the following passage, in which Giovanni is thinking about Lionora, who has been refusing him consistently for several years:

> Nay, all I view in her most divine aspect, warrant me that she is a woman. And being a woman, and so fair, so charming, how cometh it she is cruel, . . . barbarous? . . . Were she but pitiful, what particular might ever be desired in a woman that is not in her? But she will say . . . that I am much mistaken in my judgment, for that what I call cruelty is very honesty and modesty, nay, is love of honour and not cruelty. Marry, what thing other than honest did I ever ask of her? What did I ever seek of her save the sunshine of those her fair eyes? What otherwhat have I ever required of her than that she should at least deign to suffer me love and serve her. . . . What doth it profit me that I have these three years past most fervently loved, nay, adored this woman, that I have wasted so much time, that I have jousted so oft, waked so many a night, shed so many tears, scorned a thousand other nobles and ladies and lost so many chances? What can I think of her save that she thirst for my blood and desires over all that I should become mine own murderer? . . . I am resolved to banish her from my heart and become another man than I have hitherto been, being abundantly assured that I am grown through her the byword of the common folk. It shall no more be true that I love her: nay, why should I love her, an she hate me?[8]

This monologue, which is, if anything, more personal and to the point than most,[9] illustrates several important characteristics of

[8] "Signor Giovanni Ventimiglia. . . ." in Bandello's Novelle, trans. John Payne (London, 1890), III, 273-74.

[9] For example, see IV, 11-12, where Adelasia's soliloquy includes a catalogue of classical lovers who followed their men around the world, or pp. 16-17, where her lover, Aleramo, gives forth a similar list of great men ruined by tenacious women.

Bandello's fiction. First of all, the emphasis Giovanni here places on "service," on jousting and distant adoration, reveals the courtliness of the love he feels.[10] Noble men and women compete for each other's love outside the bounds of marriage, and although fidelity to a husband is discounted and frequently deplored, fidelity to an accepted lover is paramount. It is a love which remains aloof from the real world, even from real feelings of lust or affection, for surely this same, archetypal lover in Bandello's more vulgar stories is not content with only "the sunshine of those her fair eyes." Secondly, this speech is more a debate on the efficacy of loving from a distance than it is a heartfelt outpouring of specific injuries and torments. Bandello's lover is not moved to this speech by any particular crisis. The plot demands that his feelings change; consequently, they are instantly transformed. If her rejection could not discourage him or make him a "byword" for the previous three years, why should they suddenly affect him so now? The expediency of this alteration for purposes of plot is corroborated by the fact that he immediately finds "another noble woman" to whom he can affix his ardours, and we hear no more of her or of his passion.

One other point needs to be emphasized, and that is the relatively low importance of passion itself, particularly in women. I have already suggested that love in these tales is usually either courtly and somewhat academic, or simply vulgar lust. Very little time is spent describing acts of love; all interest is reserved for

[10] It should be noted that Lionora is married, and that her later change of heart towards Giovanni is occasioned by a service he does her husband.

the various maneuvers necessary to bring the two lovers together. If a story begins with questions of passion and intense feelings of admiration and longing, it usually soon shifts to more material concerns.[11] This is particularly evident in "An Accomplished Young Lady . . . ." (Part II, Number 40), in which very little happens apart from a series of debates and conversations. Camillo and Cinzia, after living together adulterously for several years (her husband is conveniently in exile), are driven apart by the spiteful gossip of a servant, who accuses Cinzia of seducing Camillo's closest friend, Giulio. On hearing this accusation, Camillo immediately believes it and renounces Cinzia forever. All inward and outward musings which are reported concern the possible end of the friendship between the two men, rather than the end of the love affair. Finally, Camillo decides that a lascivious woman is too insignificant an object to stand in the way of true manly love, and he attempts to amend his relations with Giulio. The latter, to whom Cinzia appeals for aid in recovering her lost lover, actually protests to Camillo only on the grounds that he is too honourable to hurt his best friend; Cinzia, and her innocence, are neglected by everybody, not least by Bandello. Later, she applies to an apothecary for poison with which to kill herself, and he warns Camillo, fearing that she means to revenge herself on him. Camillo has a placebo sent instead, and then all concerned are

[11] For example, in the story of Adelasia and Alaremo (see above, note 9), once the lovers run away together the emphasis shifts to the way in which her father discovers them again through recognizing his grandson. Of the lovers, we are told only that they are poor but prolific, having seven sons in fifteen years.

summoned to her bedside. Meanwhile, the servant, for no reason whatsoever, has confessed to Camillo, who nevertheless continues his resolve to give up Cinzia in order to see what she will do. She takes the "poison," imagines herself dying and is violently sick, is persuaded by his eventual reluctant capitulation to drink an antidote, is even more violently sick, and they all live happily ever after. The narrator, however, concludes with a denunciation of "desperate" women. It is difficult to interpret this story, as it so easily could become either tragic or slapstick.

Cervantes' short "novels" exhibit many of the same characteristics as Bandello's, and have been called, by one translator, "romantic and Italianate."[12] The plots are similarly straightforward and uncluttered, and Cervantes replaces the Italian soliloquy with rhetorical monologues serving the same functions.[13] Passion remains subservient to intrigue, and Cervantes exhibits the same scorn for women and reverence for male loyalties that characterized the tale of Cinzia and Camillo. The most famous of these novels, "The Curious Impertinent" from Don Quixote, is typical. The friendship of Lothario and Anselmo has become legendary, though Anselmo is more gay and amorous than his companion. When Anselmo marries Camilla, Lothario, like the honourable man he is, visits his friend less often so as not tocause scandal. Anselmo not only reproaches him for this, but proposes that he assist in a trial of Camilla's virtue. When Lothario protests, quite reasonably, that the idea is insane, Anselmo insists that he can ne-

[12] C. A. Jones in his introduction to the Penguin Classics edition of Exemplary Novels (Harmondsworth, 1972), p. 11. [13] See, for example, "The Jealous Extremaduran," p. 149.

ver be happy until he has discovered whether Camilla is corrupt, as he believes all women are. Although Lothario agrees, to save Anselmo from public humiliation, he only pretends to have made the requested advances. Eventually, however, he is forced to honour his promise, and Anselmo leaves town to provide him with an opportunity. When Lothario makes his first tentative overture, Camilla writes to her husband asking him either to return or to allow her to stay with her father. He forbids her to leave, and in their mutual confinement, Lothario soon finds himself in love in earnest. They have an affair, but in due course, after both the wife and the friend have shown themselves practiced in the arts of cheating and betrayal, they are in turn betrayed. Anselmo dies of grief, Lothario dies in battle, and Camilla becomes a nun.

Underlying the moral of this story, which is that happy husbands should leave well enough alone, is the same deeply cynical attitude towards human nature which is found in the works of Bandello. With regard to women, this cynicism expresses itself in the belief

> that woman is an imperfect creature, and that one should not lay stumbling blocks in her way, to make her trip and fall, but rather remove them and clear the way before her, that she may without hindrance advance towards her proper perfection, which consists in being virtuous.[14]

This notion is substantiated in "The Curious Impertinent," for in

[14] Cervantes, Don Quixote, trans. Charles Jarvis (London, 1899), p. 178.

order to keep her lover and dupe her husband, Camilla even goes so far as to wound herself with a knife. Of the three, she is certainly the most skilled in deceit. If the gender were changed in that quotation and "honourable" substituted for "virtuous," the sentiments would apply equally well to the notion of male friendship presented in this novel. Both attitudes are part of what Morgan saw as the main characteristic of the novella: the glorification of intrigue.

> The wife deceives the husband, the son cheats his father, the maid betrays her mistress, the apprentice cheats his master, and we are called upon to laugh with the cheater. "To the victor belong the spoils," and no sympathy is wasted on the victim.[15]

If these tales can be said to be didactic at all, the lesson that they teach is an early version of social Darwinism: human nature is easily corruptible and those who will survive are those who can deal with that corruption on its own terms.

As I have suggested, the debt of the English novel to the shorter, more "realistic" fiction of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries has frequently been documented. What the eighteenth century received from romantic fiction, although often condemned, is demonstrated very rarely. The conventions, both moral and literary, which were available to Eliza Haywood at the beginning of her career are crucial to an understanding of her significance as a novelist. Consequently, a fairly detailed examination of the ro-

[15] Morgan, p. 62.

mance tradition is necessary before moving on to Haywood's own fiction. Morgan lists seven different varieties of romance,[16] but the two most important are the classical and the heroic. The classical romance, particularly the works of Heliodorus, provided the seventeenth-century French writers with the "ancient" precedent so dear to French neo-classicism. In plot, structure, setting, characterization and style, these two types of romance are identical; the heroic romancers merely injected elements of their own society into the form they obtained from the Greeks. Thus it is actually only the French romances which are important to a study of eighteenth-century English fiction. The Greek narratives are significant only insofar as they provide an historical background for the later form. The works of the French writers, however, had, as we shall see, a tremendous impact on the development of the novel.

There is a great deal of evidence for the popularity of the heroic romance in England. Charlotte Morgan points out that "from 1625 or earlier to about 1700, the literary fiction consisted almost exclusively of translations and imitations of the continental narratives. . . ."[17] Much of the correspondence between Dorothy Osborne and William Temple is an ongoing discussion of the romances then current, and Mrs. Pepys used to annoy her husband by narrating her favourite episodes from them at great length.[18] In

[16] Morgan, p. 3. [17] Morgan, p. 121; quoted by Irma Eareckson, "Mrs. Eliza Haywood's Fiction in Relation to the Heroic Romance," Diss. Chicago 1929, p. 1. [18] Most discussions of the heroic romance mention Osborne and Pepys; see especially Dorothy McDougall's biography, Madeleine de Scudéry (London, 1938), which includes a chapter on the popularity of the romance in England.

the eighteenth century, witnesses to the popularity of the works of La Calprenède and Scudéry include Mr. Spectator, who noted "Cassandra, Cléopatre, Astréa, The Grand Cyrus, . . . /and/ Clelia" in the library of the fashionable Leonora,[19] and the young Lady Mary Pierrepont, who had read The Grand Cyrus as early as 1705 and had it in her library as late as 1739.[20] Even Pope, ordinarily esteemed an enemy of such frivolous productions, thought it appropriate to sanction at least The Grand Cyrus. In November, 1716, he wrote to Martha Blount:

> Madam,--It is usual with unfortunate young women to betake themselves to romances, and thereby feed and indulge that melancholy which is occasioned by the want of a lover: As the want of money is generally attended with the want of what I have mentioned, I presume it may be so far your present case, as to render the five volumes of the Grand Cyrus no unseasonable present to you.[21]

"In addition to two abridgements, there appear to have been at least four complete reissues of Cassandra" alone after 1675, one as late as 1737.[22] However, by 1705 Mary Manley marked the beginning of the decline of their popularity, ascribing it to "the brisk and impetuous humour of the English, who have naturally no taste for long-winded performances."[23] She continues, summarizing the opinion of romances which persisted throughout the century:

[19] Spectator, number 37 (April 12, 1711). Quoted by J. Jusserand, The English Novel in the Time of Shakespeare (London, 1890), p. 396.
[20] Robert Halsband, ed., The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, I, 123 (note).
[21] The Correspondence of Alexander Pope, ed. George Sherburn, I, 375.
[22] Thomas P. Haviland, The Roman de Longue Haleine on English Soil (Philadelphia, 1931), p. 131.
[23] Preface to The Secret History of Queen Zarah (London, 1705). Quoted in Ioan Williams, ed., Novel and Romance 1700-1800 (London, 1970), p. 33.

> The prodigious length, . . . the mixture of so many extraordinary adventures, and the great number of actors that appear on the stage, and the likeness which is so little managed, all which has given a distaste to persons of good sense, and has made romances so much cryed down, as we find 'em at present.[24]

They were indeed cried down, and have been satirized and laughed at for the past 275 years. This ill repute proved a major obstacle to the achievement of respectability for the novel. Despite differences in length, approach, style, and characterization, not to mention her careful avoidance of the term "romance," Haywood's fictions have been called derivatives, even imitations of such works, and dismissed with them in the same breath. Raleigh, for example, asserts that Placentia, representing all Haywood's early heroines, "is a kinswoman of Clelia and Parthenissa, whom she exactly resembles in life, in love, and in epistolary style--only differing for the better in the brevity and dramatic symmetry of her history."[25] This claim is absurd. Parthenissa exists only as inspiration; Placentia is a lively, humorous, passionate woman, capable of aggressively pursuing what she wants, yet not an immodest wanton. She is at the center of a highly charged emotional dilemma, in which the feelings and personalities of herself and her lover precipitate the various incidents of the plot.[26] Moreover, it is irresponsible to dismiss the "dramatic symmetry" of Placentia's tale, which is a characteristic of Haywood's books. In this glib assessment, Raleigh has completely mistaken the nature of Haywood's novel and denied her any chance of a fair reading.[27]

[24] Quoted in Williams, Novel and Romance, p. 33. [25] Raleigh, p. 139.
[26] See below, Chapter Ten.
[27] See above, pp. 37-38.

To a great extent the French romances merit the criticism heaped on them by the English. The characters generally never rank below the level of prince or princess, and the stories could run to as many as twenty volumes.[28] Because of this prodigious length, they have been referred to as "romans à longue haleine";[29] "it was sometimes six months, including Sundays, before they could get quit of their Clelias, their Cyrus's, and Parthenissas."[30] One of the reasons for such length is that there are no inherent demands for a work to conclude. The plot of an heroic romance does not resemble the precise, well-organized storyline we have come to expect from novels.

> The story which begins on the first page is often simple enough in itself, were it not that every character introduced has also a story of his own to unfold, which story again may contain characters equally interesting and equally desirous of relating the whole of their romantic adventures. . . . The stories are arranged one within another, as if they had swallowed one another in succession, and it is not until they are successively disgorged that the reader can get back to the enveloping story, which after all may disappoint him by proving itself to be the merest covering with no particular structure or object of its own.[31]

In this way, pages are multiplied without actually allowing the main plot, such as it might be, to develop. Adventure, arising from ambition, either military or amatory, is one of the two main concerns of such romances, and coherence and characterization are cheerfully sacrificed to the pursuit of it. The main character

[28] For The Grand Cyrus. George Saintsbury, A History of the French Novel, vol. I (London, 1917), 180.
[29] Raleigh, p. 89.
[30] Isaac Disraeli, Curiosities of Literature (London, 1881), I, 106.
[31] Raleigh, p. 91.

rarely grows, learns more about himself or his world, or even ages. He simply subjects himself to various trials of his honour, courage, generosity and love, and exchanges histories with every fellow traveller he encounters. His ambition and his love for some grand lady are motive enough for him to begin his adventures, but because he is infinitely strong, courageous, heroic, etc., he always betters his opponent and never dies. And because a true love of adventure and an heroic desire for honour and glory can never be fully satisfied, there is no particular reason for his wanderings ever to cease.[32] As far as the heroine is concerned, her function is to wait until external circumstances are most suitable for marriage, only in her case "external circumstances" could mean the publishing requirements of the author.

> If marriage spelt the fall of the curtain, then that final scene had to be evaded. If the hero is brought within appreciable distance of winning the heroine before the number of volumes envisaged by the author is completed, then the lady must be removed. It is not difficult to arrange in these . . . tales where nothing depends on any kind of relation to real life. . . . . The villain comes, the heroine is abducted, the sail hoist and she is gone. . . . The stage has been cleared for a prolongation of the piece to any desired length.[33]

The result of these various devices is that "paralysis of the story is so common a disease of the heroic romance as almost to serve for definition."[34] It is no coincidence that the only such romance written in English, Parthenissa by Roger Boyle (1664), was never

[32] In The Grand Cyrus, for example, there are three or four points in the action at which the appropriate marriages could take place, one of them at least six volumes from the actual conclusion. See Saintsbury, The French Novel, who gives a vol. by vol. synopsis of the plot.

[33] McDougall, p. 92.

[34] Raleigh, p. 99

completed. It simply stops, as though the author were exhausted. Nothing has been resolved, but then, very rarely is any conflict presented other than episodic ones concluding in a battle or a debate.

If Parthenissa's lack of conclusion is typical of the heroic romance, so is the fact that Parthenissa herself appears in person only once or twice. Although love is ostensibly the major concern of all the characters, and presumably of the author as well, that concern is largely abstract. Love is "the ruling passion, and military exploits are chiefly performed for the sake of a mistress,"[35] but there is very little actual interplay between heroes and heroines. They rarely meet, and much of their communication is epistolary. When they do come together, all is formal, stylized, and infinitely decorous, the conversation consisting primarily of nicely turned compliments. Consider this meeting between Oroondates and Statira:

> Oroondates kneeling . . . at his Princess's feet, and taking her fair hands, whereon he passionately imprinted many lasting kisses: "Madam, (said he) you would do me wrong, if you were not most assured that your griefs are at least as sensible to me as to your self: but if in the happiness which separates me from you, I might yet hope for any good fortune, O Gods! how infinite a one would it be to me, if I could pretend to any share in the tears which I see you shed. . . . " "You were ungrateful (answered the Princess) if you should anyway doubt my friendship, after the proofs I have given you of it. . . . Ah! . . . Oroondates, how much more reason have I to fear that absence will wipe these light ideas out of your memory, and make you repent the pains you have taken for one whom you had only seen by night, and in a sudden passage; and in

[35] Dunlop, III, 180.

> whom since, time and long frequentation have made you observe defects, which that darkness had concealed from you." "There is so little probability in that (answered he coldly) that I will not make you any new protestations, to put you out of an opinion, which I am confident you are very far from believing. . . . Since your fair mouth assures me of a happiness, which I never ought to have hoped for, I beseech the Gods to keep you still in the same mind, and that they would never open your eyes, to let you find how little I deserve so great a blessing." "And I (added the Princess) beseech them to preserve you from all dangers; and command you with all the power I have, not to hazard that, but to very good purpose, which is no longer yours, unless you will revoke the gift you made me of it; and if you love my life have so much care of your own that you may be able to give me an account of it when I please. . . ."[36]

The formality of their speech and the circumlocution of the last exchange, in particular, clashes violently with Oroondates' passionate gestures. It is difficult to imagine him ever holding Statira in his arms. It would also be difficult to determine from the text alone that the lovers are about to be parted, and that he is going off to risk his life in battle. The situation is highly charged emotionally, but the language is totally flat. If love is, as so many critics claim, the major concern of these romances, it certainly does not manifest itself in the same way as it would in eighteenth-century England. Encounters tend to be either these highly stylized exchanges, loaded with compliments and convoluted declarations of restrained passion or, more commonly, philosophical discussions of the nature of love.

Characters spend many pages debating the merits of different resolutions to love triangles, rectangles, or still larger poly-

[36] La Calprenède, Cassandra. Quoted in Haviland, pp. 62-63.

gons;[37] these are the famous "set conversations" which were Scudéry's particular contribution to the romance. Some of the subjects were: "a comparison between love and ambition; the opposition or agreement of love and reason; the equality and inequality in conditions of loving; the comparative merits of brunettes and blondes . . . the difference between friendly (aimable) and passionate (aimant) intercourse; between the pleasing . . . and the beautiful. . . . "[38] Haviland quotes an exchange from Clelia which amounts to a practical treatise on the etiquette of letter-writing.[39] Even soliloquies, which might be expected to reveal some sort of forthright emotion, tend towards generalized philosophy. When Artamène leaves Mandana, he reflects on his situation in language which is, though "elevated," far from impassioned.

> Ye gods! . . . if, when she is so lovable, it should chance that I cannot make her love me, what would become of the wretched Artamène? But . . . since she seems capable of appreciating glory and services, let us . . . do such great deeds that, even if her inclination resisted, esteem may introduce us, against her will, into her heart! For, after all, whatever men may say, and whatever I may myself have said, one may give a little esteem to what will never earn a little love. Let us hope, then; let us hope! let us make ourselves worthy to be pitied if we are not worthy to be loved.[40]

Although Artamène has been treated by his mistress with every possible sign of favour, he here decides that he must combat her hardness of heart, and he resolves to go forth and win not her

[37] See, for example, the long passage from Scudéry's Grand Cyrus which Saintsbury quotes in The French Novel, pp. 206-8. Cyrus is presiding over a Court of Love to decide the resolution of a configuration of no less than six people. [38] McDougall, p. 41.
[39] Haviland, pp. 58-59. [40] Grand Cyrus. Quoted in Saintsbury, The French Novel, p. 184.

love, but her pity, even before he has ventured to ask what her feelings really are. His use of the first person plural is particularly revealing. He speaks not of "me," but of "us"; he is not a specific, individual man in love with a specific woman, but a representative of all noble, ambitious lovers. Mandana is not an individual, but Womankind, an ideal to aspire to and despair of in his knowledge of man's unworthiness.

The nature of love peculiar to the French heroic romances is perhaps their single most significant feature. Today, if Madeleine de Scudéry's name is familiar it is because of the "Carte de Tendre" affixed to Clelia,[41] which delineates the various aspects of love, the paths leading to it and the pitfalls which lovers must try to avoid. However, long before she drew its contours, both Scudéry and La Calprenède were describing those same things in their actual fiction. The picture that emerges is that of "a highly idealized and disciplined love, with its external and internal manifestations fixed in advance."[42] Love, or "tender friendship," is a Platonic ideal rather than a passion, "abstracted from all corporeal gross impressions and sensual appetite, but consists in contemplations and ideas of the mind; not in any carnal fruition."[43] Passions are under the control of reason:

> Lover's attitudes are masked by gallantry, unflinching

[41] A reproduction of the "Carte de Tendre" is included in McDougall.

[42] M. Ratner, Theory and Criticism of the Novel in France (1938; rpt. New York, 1971), p. 26.

[43] James Howell, Historiographer to Charles II, in a letter quoted by Eareckson, p. 4 and Haviland p. 23.

> constancy and strict regard for prescribed formalities; that of the heroine by modesty, fidelity and a circumspection which conserves her honor in the most trying situations.[44]

Closely related is the notion that love must abide by Christian rules of conduct; the amoral, adulterous love of chivalry is taboo.[45] Men in the romances are always constant, unlike their eighteenth and nineteenth century brothers; moreover, they are able and even willing to sublimate baser drives into a desire to serve. To begin with, the hero is not even permitted to confess his love until he has passed some tests of his worth. Mandana, heroine of The Grand Cyrus and prototype of romance heroines, is so delicate that she "could not indure a declaration of love from one of the greatest princes upon earth, after ten years service, respects, sighs, and submissions!"[46] Such a premature avowal often results in banishment from the lady's presence.

Related to this extreme delicacy on the part of the heroine is the hero's humility; "love is not love unless it is intense to the point of worship."[47] The attitude of Artaxerxes, in Cassandra, is typical:

> That perfect knowledge I had of her admirable qualities, checked my aspiring hopes, and I could not consider Berenice, in that sublime degree of perfection to which the gods had raised her, without remembering my self to be but a man, and therefore utterly unworthy to serve her.[48]

[44] Ratner, p. 19. [45] Ratner, p. 26. [46] Quoted by Margaret Dalziel in notes to Charlotte Lennox's The Female Quixote (London, 1970), p. 397. [47] Margaret Dalziel, "Richardson and Romance," AUMLA, no. 33, 1970, p. 11. [48] Quoted by Dalziel in notes to The Female Quixote, p. 409.

The love that he feels for her is hardly even a human emotion. He believes her to be so far above him that any sort of normal relationship would be impossible. Frequently heroes feel themselves to be so unworthy that they despair completely and have to be prevented from committing suicide by the commands of their mistresses, usually in a letter, to live.[49] However, the hero at least has the compensation of action; through his courage and diligence he can either win the heart of his lover or sublimate his despair in glorious deeds. His lady has no such alternative. Although Dalziel asserts that"Mademoiselle de Scudéry . . . makes the experience of her heroines very important,"[50] that experience invariably consists of being abducted and rescued, discussing the nuances of passion, and trying to avoid direct declarations of love. Certainly they are at least as idealized as the noble heroes who suffer for their sakes. The villains never really attempt their virtue. Rivalries are frequently "generous," with each party recognizing his opponent's equal merit; consequently, the abductor must abide by the same code of behaviour as that followed by the hero. "Of whatever creed or race . . . each captor /treats/ the lady with the uttermost consideration and respect. That would be taken for granted."[51] Therefore, even the heroine's trials demand nothing of her but her presence. She does not have to struggle, in any physical sense, to protect her honour. A list of the adventures of some typical heroines reveals their essential passivity:

KENT LIBRARY UNIVERSITY

49 See Eareckson, p. 34.

50 In her introduction to The Female Quixote, p. xliii.

51 McDougall, p. 90.

> /The persecutions of Elisa/ included capture in war by pirates, being married against her will . . . and a long separation from Artaban, whom she believed to be dead.
>
> /Bellamira is/ an outstandingly harassed heroine from Pharamond. Her distresses included being three times carried away, a long period of imprisonment in a castle, the necessity to pull from its sheath the sword of a would-be ravisher, whom she forthwith kills, and nearly being burnt to death in the place of her third incarceration.
>
> The sufferings of Parisatis included capture in war; the loss, either in war or through natural causes, of grandmother, both parents, and(apparently) her brother; marrying one man when she loved another; loss of that husband; and long delays before a final union with the man of her choice.[52]

Cleopatra is forced by her father to consider two suitors other than the man she loves, thereby causing that lover to be jealous; one of her suitors causes her to suspect the fidelity of her lover, later trying to abduct her, and a fourth man actually succeeds in doing so.[53] And the famous Mandana is abducted no less than eight times. Bellamira is the only one of these women who is actively involved in a "trial," and that is only a small part of what she undergoes. The rest of the time, she, like the others, merely waits and endures.[54] Personally, the heroine is a model of female beauty and virtue,

> With her beauty there generally went an aloofness, an indifference to her lover's sufferings. . . . Heroines of romance were exempt, as a rule, from all the vulgar

[52] Dalziel, in notes to The Female Quixote, p. 416. [53] Dalziel, in notes to the Female Quixote, p. 416. [54] It is curious that the grammatical construction Dalziel uses in describing Bellamira's troubles implies that her distress was not the attempted rape, but rather having to act to prevent it.

> feelings of passion: their office was merely to accept the love of others. . . . They are "virtuous," "noble," "excellent," but the evidence of these qualities is chiefly in the author's word. There is an uncertainty, too, about the intellectual gifts of the heroine. She has always, vaguely, "mind."[55]

In order for anyone so perfect, so delicate and so passive to survive, the world which she inhabits must be similarly perfect. The lack of aggressive sexuality I have described in hero and villain alike is a large part of that perfection. Poetic justice, which in literary terms means a long series of happy endings, is another.

Generally speaking, where there is a systematic reward of virtue and punishment of vice in literature, there is usually also a fundamental didactic intent, and despite English criticism to the contrary, the heroic romances are no exception. Throughout their many volumes they offered

> models of conversation, of letter-writing, and, in particular, of love technique, which were the indispensable arts of cultured "honnêtes gens" . . . . Besides teaching good manners, the novel also presumed to teach good morals, and it is this preoccupation with morality that to a large extent determined both subject matter and character portrayal.[56]

Obviously, to achieve these aims, the characters had to be of the noblest possible ancestry and greatest virtue, "cast in the mold of the reigning ideal of the 'honnête homme' and the 'honnête femme.'"[57] Moreover, "good manners" (bienséance)"enjoined the author not to ascribe unworthy qualities to crowned heads," as well

[55] Horner, p. 110. [56] Ratner, p. 24. [57] Ratner, p. 18.

as to restrict his or her cast of characters to the nobility. When Scudéry wrote, in Ibrahim, of characters below the rank of king, she felt obliged, by "bienséance," to apologize for her lapse in the preface.[58] Presumably the ordinary aristocrats for whom she wrote would only look to reigning royalty, not to their peers, for social and moral guidance. What is significant about this didacticism is the effect it has on characterization. "The analysis of emotions" which many critics regard as the most important contribution of the heroic romance to modern fiction,[59] is really not a function of psychology at all, but rather a forum for the dissemination of ideals. Because the individuals who engage in these dialogues or monologues are representative, regarding themselves as prototypes, it is not actually emotion that is being analyzed, or the workings of an individual lover's mind. Rather, it is the conventions themselves which are under scrutiny, and the ways in which they allow--or compel--a category of individual to respond to the vicissitudes of fortune. "Attitudes being fixed in advance, obstacles being for the most part external, all conflict /is/ excluded, and characterization /becomes/ stereotyped and conventional."[60] Thus the various couples in a romance (Saintsbury counted as many as sixty) will be virtually identical, and the catastrophes preventing the final happy marriage multiply with no particular logic.

[58] Ratner, p. 18. [59] See Eareckson, p. 12, and J. W. Scott, "Prose Fiction," in French Literature and Its Background, ed. J. Cruickshank (London, 1969), p. 153. Jusserand suggests, along these same lines, that much of the French romances, particularly the set conversations, satisfied the same needs as The Spectator would do in England several generations later. See below, pp. 111-116.
[60] Ratner, p. 19.

In a genre with convention as its subject, there are inevitably many important literary conventions as well. These devices, even more than the actual matter of the romance, form its main legacy to the eighteenth-century novel, and are most important to the study of Haywood's fiction. Some of these I have discussed already: the inclusion of "histories" within the framework of the main story; the conventionalized, idealized characters; and the poetically just "happy" endings, where everything is concluded to the satisfaction of both readers and characters. Others, such as the lavish use of poetry and the fulfilment of oracles, are irrelevant because they are never present in Haywood's fiction, or in the fiction of her contemporaries. And another convention which was very important to Scudéry and her readers, the "key" interest of contemporary portraits included under romantic names, is important in Haywood's works only in relation to her scandal chronicles, which are not the concern of this study. However, there are four further devices which demand more detailed examination.

As might be expected from a form which attempts to delineate and recommend fine shades of meaning and delicate distinctions in behaviour, the characteristic style of the romances is extremely artificial. People who comment on this early fiction almost invariably describe the language as "inflated" as well.[61] The following speech, for example, would earn both labels:

> How shall I receive him whom I have used so ill?
> And how shall I use myself if I receive him other-

[61] For example, Eareckson, pp. 9, 18; Haviland, p. 157; Whicher, p. 63.

> wise than as being the wife of Alexander? Shall I banish him once again, him to whom I am engaged with so much affection, by so many oaths, and by so fresh obligations; and if I cannot banish him, how shall I see him? How shall I suffer him, whom I can neither see, nor suffer without mortally offending my husband, and mortally offending myself? How shall I love him without blame whom I neither can nor will hate; and how shall I hate him without blame, whom I neither ought nor can lawfully love?[62]

The syntax is extremely involuted, the distinctions in sentiment "précieuses." The emotions expressed reveal a dilemma which causes great suffering, even while Statira is speaking; however, the language is unemotional in the extreme, greatly resembling the rhetoric of philosophy. In this respect it is "inflated," filled with the hot air of French salon Platonism until it floats well above the plane of ordinary human pain. It would with equal accuracy be termed "deflated," having allowed, in its desire for mathematical precision, all additional connotations and resonances to escape.

A related convention is the frequent insertion of "letters (which are always given in full as if they were documents of state)."[63] Frequently, these letters take the place of direct contact between hero and heroine, thus contributing to the Platonic tone of the whole. Despite their frequency and length,[64] they are "ornaments to the plot rather than essentials to its development."[65] Consider the following letter from The Grand Cyrus:

[62] Cassandra, quoted in Eareckson, p. 36. [63] Jusserand, p. 361.
[64] Day notes that "Astrée contains 129 letters, Cyrus 117, Clélie 121, and Almahide 116." He also states that in the case of Astrée, " the letters were accorded the distinction of a separate index." Told in Letters, p. 216. [65] Eareckson, p. 26.

> Madam, I could not chuse but tell you at parting, that since fortune and love could make people miserable, they never left any in such cruel uncertainty as you and I: For Madam, you stay in Issedon, not knowing whether you shall be queen, though you have a most ambitious desire of being so: and I depart out of it not well knowing whether I can hinder my rival from being king, nor whether I can banish you out of my heart, as you banisht me out of yours: But I am sure only of this, that if I do continue loving you, it shall be against my will: and though I should love you as long as I lived, with the same zeal . . . . yet I will never tell you so as long as I live: This, Madam, is the very last testimony of my love you shall ever receive from me: But my going into the service of Thomiris, shall not be the last testimony of hatred, which my rival shall receive. Adieu, Madam, I know not whether Fortune will ever give you any subjects; but I am sure Love gave you a slave that deserved to be kept, and the chains he wore would have been more glorious to you than the crown you hope to wear will be. Agatherses.[66]

Like the speeches I have quoted, this letter is artificial and "inflated," dealing with a highly charged emotional situation, the plight of a seemingly rejected lover, in the blandest possible way. Agatherses is witty rather than impassioned, playing on words rather than on the emotional responses of his mistress. On a more elementary level, the letter conveys little beyond the fact of his departure for foreign wars. This letter is the predictable expression of delicate sentiments in a problematic situation, nothing more. Were it omitted, the unfolding of the plot and the reader's understanding of Agatherses would scarcely be affected.

The other two conventions are more material: the use of exotic settings, and the frequent use of disguise. Regarding disguises, the two important points are that they are so common--

[66] Quoted in Eareckson, p. 26.

Eareckson notes six instances in Clelia alone[67]--and that usually women do not assume men's attire. "This device, so frequent in comedy, is very unusual in French romances."[68] An incident from Cassandra is typical:

> Orithia is telling the story of her life to the Amazon Queen, Thalestris, recounting to her a daring escape. Orithia, ordered to marry a man she hated, escaped disguised as a man. Although Thalestris is not aware of the fact, Orithia is in reality Orgontes . . . masquerading under womanly disguise.[69]

It is in keeping with the submissive nature of a hero's love for him to assume a "passive" character in order to obtain access to his mistress. Sometimes, princes seem to assume disguises gratuitously;[70] frequently, disguises are essential to the fulfillment of mystifying, paradoxical oracles.[71] In almost all cases, disguises are put on only to facilitate the action of the plot, not to reveal character or to titillate.

The use of exotic foreign settings in the heroic romance, though completely justified by an elaborate theory, is one of the conventions most condemned by literary historians. It is important to remember that the characters in a romance are also the great men and women of history: Alexander the Great, Cleopatra, Cyrus, Statira, etc. Therefore, the countries in which their actions take place must be the actual countries they conquered or inhabited.

[67] Eareckson, p. 11. [68] Dalziel, in notes to The Female Quixote, p. 413. [69] Eareckson, p. 28. [70] Dunlop, III, 167.
[71] As in The Grand Cyrus, Cassandra, Arcadia and Astrea. See Dunlop for plot summaries.

Historical accuracy was vital to Scudéry's theory of the novel:

> For when names of countries are employed, which all the world hears of, and wherewith geography is exactly acquainted; and when great events are made use of, which are sufficiently known, the mind is wholly disposed to suffer itself to be seduced, and to receive the fiction together with the truth, provided it can be handsomely interwoven, and the writer takes pains to study the age well he makes choice of, . . . and to conform to the customs of places he treats of . . . Though they may with judgment be drawn to the usage of the present age, to the end they be more delightful. . . .[72]

The more "realistic" a romance was, in its outer accoutrements, the more readily would the audience be able to accept unrealistic actions and dialogues. Such was the theory. In fact, most details of setting are as stylized as descriptions of the paragons that populate them. Grottos appear frequently, as do forests; Asia and Africa are favoured continents. And although the stories usually range over several countries or continents, it rarely makes any difference to the action itself where it is set at any given time.

It is extremely easy to ridicule, and consequently to dismiss, the heroic romances, as most modern criticism demonstrates. To a twentieth-century mind, in particular, the extravagant adventures, the stilted, unspontaneous style and the formal, severely restrained relationships are as uncongenial and repugnant as our own explicit confessional fiction would have been to an Augustan. Yet their appeal to seventeenth and eighteenth century readers is undeniable, as is the seriousness with which they were read and discussed in

[72] Scudéry's Clelia, quoted in Eareckson, p. 13.

their own time. And although it would be untrue to assert that this appeal in itself proves the importance of the genre to later fiction, it seems justifiable to say that those aspects of the romance which were responsible for its tremendous popularity constitute its significant contribution, a contribution which has been for the most part neglected in standard histories of the novel. The key to the appeal of the heroic romance lies, I think, in that aspect of it which is most often mocked, its idealism.

> What was gained . . . was not merely entertainment. . . . The long conversations of Clélie were separately published in a small format so that readers could study the discussions on the passions and the virtues without being forced to page through the formidable tomes of the original romance in search of them.[73]

If one examines the various conventions I have described, it becomes apparent that what they have in common is an intention to illustrate, unlike the novella, what is best both in human nature and in civilization itself. The royalty or nobility of the characters, their unfailing "generosity" to each other, their intricate philosophical discussions and their close adherence to high moral standards at all times, are all calculated to provide the reader with good examples. In the way that a story from the Bible might provide spiritual guidance, a romance would provide social guidance. If a work in which men never impose their sexual desires on the women they love is in one sense fanciful and ridiculous, it is in another sense extremely admirable, revealing its

[73] Hazel Mews, Frail Vessels (London, 1969), p. 23.

unwillingness to accept sordid "reality" as the inevitable human condition. Dunlop defends the romance's lack of realism in a way which makes clear the idealistic basis of its appeal:

> In the process of forming the garden, the savage finds that it is not enough merely to collect a variety of agreeable trees or plants; he discovers that more than this is necessary, and that it is also essential that he should grub up from around his dwelling the shrubs which are useless or noxious, and which weaken or impair the pure delight which he derives from others. He is careful, accordingly, that the rose should no longer be placed beside the thistle, as in the wild, but that it should flourish in a clear, and sheltered, and romantic situation, where its sweets may be undiminished, and where its form can be contemplated without any attending circumstances of uneasiness or disgust.[74]

Removing the weeds allows the splendour of the flowers full prominence. In the case of the romances, it is clearly more than simple "good manners" to remove petty, unpleasant or vicious qualities from characters represented; rather, such "weeding" results from a basic faith in human perfectibility, and from a belief that the presence of models of human virtue will in some way contribute towards that perfection.

If the idealism and didacticism of the romances are interpreted in this way, their appeal to the Augustans is immediately apparent. The early part of the eighteenth century, the period commonly known as the "age of reason,"[75] saw several kinds of idealism flourish as a result of common faith in rational thought, and this idealism made the heroic romance a particularly congenial form of diversion.

[74] Dunlop, I vi-vii.

[75] Dobrée uses the dates 1688-1740.

The growing popularity of Deism, "a religion of essentials discoverable by all men through the light of reason,"[76] is a good indication of the implicit faith men were coming to have in their own abilities to think and to learn; the optimism of Benjamin Whichcote and Shaftsbury is another. Writing in 1703, Whichcote wrote that vice

> is contrary to the nature of man, as man; for it is contrary to the order of Reason, the peculiar and highest principle in man; nor is any thing in itself more unnatural or of greater deformity, in the whole world, than that an intelligent agent should have the truth of things in his mind, and that it should not give law and rule to his temper, life and actions.[77]

To people of this persuasion, the value of a good example is immeasurable. When confronted with the correct feeling, idea or action for a particular situation, a rational person will immediately recognize the "truth" of the exemplum and adapt his or her own behaviour accordingly. In this way, as Addison saw it, a man's soul would make "perpetual progress" towards perfection.

> To look upon the soul as going on from strength to strength, to consider that . . . she will still be adding virtue to virtue and knowledge to knowledge, carries in it something wonderfully agreeable to that ambition which is natural to the mind of man.[78]

Virtue was defined, particularly by Locke, as social and practical;

[76] Francis Gallaway, Reason, Rule, and Revolt in English Classicism (1940; rpt. New York, 1965), p. 7. [77] Moral and Religious Aphorisms (Number 212), quoted in A. R. Humphreys, The Augustan World (London, 1954), p. 191. [78] Spectator, no. 111 (July 7, 1711), I, 458.

"Man was impelled by self-interest to seek pleasure and to avoid pain,"[79] and "good and evil are the same as pleasure- and pain-producing actions."[80] Thus, according to Locke, a man will be happiest and most virtuous when he is doing the most good to his society. Shaftsbury, believing in the natural benevolence of human nature, came to the same conclusion. The heroic romances, containing as they did portraits of

> the "honnête homme" . . . who had . . . won his place in polite society by his desire to please rather than to shine, by his consideration for others, his willingness to listen as well as talk, his tact and sympathy. . . .[81]

as well as his infinite consideration for women and for other men less fortunate than himself, and his stoical resignation to the calamities brought him by Fortune, provided a perfect primer for those men of reason whose highest conception of virtue was working for the common good.

Two other aspects of the romances particularly recommended them to the Augustans. The first, and most straightforward, is their emphasis on reasonable behaviour. Eighteenth-century rationalism meant not the absence of powerful feelings, as is sometimes believed, but self-restraint and the subjection of passion to the dictates of reason.[82] Locke wrote that

[79] Gallaway, p. 13.
[80] Humphreys, p. 187.
[81] Ernle, p. 143.
[82] See Humphreys, p. 189.

> the great principle and foundation of all virtue and worth is placed in this: that a man is able to deny himself his own desires, cross his own inclinations, and purely follow what reason directs as best, tho' the appetites lean the other way.[83]

Morgan describes the foundation of the romances in very similar terms:

> Conduct, if not the heart, is invariably controlled by the head. No matter what the emergency, you may depend upon the hero to show a judgment "natural and proper," and the heroine never to sin against the social code.[84]

Seen in this way, Cyrus and Oroondates, Mandana and Statira are men and women of the Enlightenment, strictly rational and prudent in all their actions and, consequently, fitting examples of perfect social behaviour. There is no room in the lives of such exemplary beings for the intrusion of realism. Mary Manley objected that "it would in no wise be probable that a young woman fondly beloved by a man of great merit, and for whom she had a great reciprocal tenderness . . . could always resist his addresses,"[85] but her criticism is almost irrelevant. If the men and women of the romances were projected as real people, if their struggle was the conflict between sexual attraction and physical virtue which became a staple of the eighteenth-century novel, then her objection would carry some weight. But the conflicts in the romances are

[83] Some Thoughts Concerning Education (1693), p. 28. Quoted in Gallaway, p. 251. [84] Morgan, p. 31. [85] Preface to Queen Zarah. Quoted in Williams, Novel and Romance, p. 35.

cerebral rather than physical. Love is opposed not to chastity but to duty, to a social or moral obligation with much broader implications than the maidenhead or reputation of an individual woman. Affairs of state, war and peace are what she stands to sacrifice, and the moral order that they represent. In this the romance is very close to the heroic drama, to which it probably owed much of its own popularity in England. The tragedies of Dryden, especially, had accustomed people to seeing emotional turmoil, usually involving the same sorts of conflict as the romance, displaced to strange, exotic countries and couched in lofty language, the intention of which was to instruct and to uplift. Heroic tragedy offered a much simplified version of the idealism of the French works; in neither genre was realism even an expectation. Pastoral poetry appealed on similar grounds. The pastoral consisted, in effect, of "set pieces" like those in the romance, either descriptions of nature, lovers' elegant laments or displays of wit and poetic skill.[86] In all three of these popular forms of writing, art was not so much an imitation or reflection of life as an attempt to ennoble it.

The final aspect of heroic romance which was likely to appeal to an Augustan audience was its almost unalterable convention of rewarding virtue and punishing vice. In this respect the romance was perhaps even more congenial than heroic tragedy, for believing in a world which was ultimately orderly and harmonious, readers seemed to demand that authors reflect their own optimism. "The

[86] See Dobrée, pp. 135-36.

profoundly ethical feeling of the age wedded morality to art and blessed their principal offspring, poetic justice."[87] Although men like Rymer, Dryden, Sidney, Bacon and Addison, and later Hawkesworth and Johnson, recognized that, on earth at least, life was not always efficient in dispensing awards and penalties, and that in the "real world . . . the virtuous and vicious suffered indifferently,"[88] they remained firm supporters of the principle of poetic justice. The function of the artist was still defined as the portrayal of "Nature," but"Nature" was reinterpreted to mean not that real world, but ideal nature. In this way, the writer performed a morally useful function, providing, as I have suggested, models of behaviour and thought, and also keeping the chimera of human perfection always in sight as an aspiration. The heroic romance presented a world perfectly formed for the accommodation of idealism. It thus fulfilled a deep need of Augustan readers for perfect, larger-than-life heroes and heroines, to admire and imitate, and at the same time satisfied both their rational desire to see justice done and their moral certainty that God was in His heaven and all was right with the world.

Yet despite these affinities between the romance and the Augustan temperament the form was, as the early definitions I have quoted testify, widely condemned. Outbalancing all its idealism and delicacy, the unreal dominion of the heroines and the equally fanciful docility of the heroes were regarded as dangerous and inflammatory. Many believed that by presenting a world in which

[87] Gallaway, p. 147.

[88] Gallaway, p. 151.

women ostensibly had the power of life and death over their lovers, in which they had some form of choice in their emotions if not in their actions, the romance tended to give the women who read it a warped sense of their own importance. In this far more than in the elements of the supernatural or of the superhuman, the genre was guilty of "giving false images of life."[89] The conventions of the romance provided Haywood with a technical foundation for her own fiction, and I have discussed them at some length because the presence behind it of a strong tradition tends to add weight to a body of literature which has hitherto been regarded only as trivial and minimally influential. But in addition to these reasons, the romance is vitally connected to Haywood's novels by a similar attitude towards women. Adapting many of the conventions to suit the particular demands of her work, she, too, presented "false images of life." Although very different in kind and degree from the experiences of romance heroines, the adventures of Haywood's women are equally important, both to the world portrayed in the fiction, and to the fiction itself. The remainder of this study will consist of an analysis of Haywood's novels in relation to the conventions, both literary and thematic, that she derived from the heroic romance. In that way her significant contribution to the development of the novel can best be assessed.

[89] Dyche and Pardon. See above, p. 82.

PART TWO

The Beginning: *Love in Excess*

IV

THE HEROINE AS IDEAL

The best place to begin a study of Eliza Haywood's fiction is with an examination of her first novel, Love in Excess (1720), not only because it was her first, but also because it is in many ways closest to the romance tradition from which all her works ultimately descend. It was one of her most popular novels, going through four editions by 1722, and in its fifth, two years later, forming the first volume of her collected works.[1] It was also the longest of her early novels, and as such it makes use of all the themes and fictional devices which would become her special trademarks throughout her long career. Although Richetti observes that the book seems at first glance to be three novelle strung loosely together by the continuing presence of the hero, D'Elmont,[2] Love in Excess is actually a highly crafted, internally coherent novel which demonstrates its author to be both a formidable artist and "a Champion of the Sex."[3] My analysis is in three parts: Haywood's presentation of the ideal woman; her portrayal of D'Elmont's growth into the ideal man; and her use of specific conventions and techniques. The foremost of these, role-reversal, is in itself a conscious use of expectations engendered by the conventions of older literature, and it simultaneously establishes her link with the tradition of heroic ro-

[1] See Whicher, p. 190. [2] Richetti, p. 183. I am indebted to his essay on Love in Excess, pp. 179-210, for stimulating the thinking which led to this section of the thesis. [3] See above, p. 31.

mance, and indicates the new direction in which she helped fiction to move.

As I have suggested,[4] one of the major problems a woman in the early eighteenth century had to confront was society's ambivalent attitude towards her sexuality. Common belief was that she was either a virgin or a whore. One of D'Elmont's major functions as hero is to arouse sexual passion in half a dozen women, each one responding in a different way to the feelings that are kindled within her. Although each of the six women in his life feels strong physical attraction to him--a basic component of all love in Haywood's novels, however spiritual it might be as well--there are delicate distinctions in their behaviour under its influence. As a psychologist, Haywood was shrewd enough to discard both extremes. Women who, like Mandana, are virtuously spiritual at the onslaught of love are not the heroines of her narratives, but neither are the aggressive, truly libertine women who approach sex with the irresponsibility of hedonism. Both virgin and whore are represented in Love in Excess, and both are eliminated. And from her portrayal of the states in between, Haywood evolves a new womanly ideal.

Violetta, the virgin, is introduced indirectly in the third part of the novel. She is first mentioned by her opposite, Ciamara, who describes her as "that malicious trifler, Violetta, perhaps envious of my happiness,"[5] because she has interrupted Ciamara's seduction of the hero. She is next mentioned, again in-

[4] See above, pp. 9-12. [5] Love in Excess, in Secret Histories (1725), I, 187. For the remainder of this section, page references will be given in the text.

directly but in a totally different context, when Frankville is relating his story to the Count. Even then we are told very little about her apart from her generosity in aiding Frankville and Camilla, his mistress and her friend. Although Violetta sees D'Elmont when he also engages to help the lovers, her reactions to his personal magnetism are not reported. Later, when D'Elmont discovers that Melliora, his ward and lover, has been abducted, he decides to search for her; to demonstrate her good will, Violetta sends him a young page to attend him on his journey. D'Elmont is understandably distraught, and he finds the page, Fidelio, a great comfort. They talk of many things, and a strong bond of friendship grows between them. When they hear that Violetta has run away from home and that her father has died of grief, Fidelio falls into a swoon, then into a fever, which grows worse when they take shelter from a storm at the house of Melliora's abductor. Just after the lovers are reunited, Violetta/Fidelio staggers in, reveals her true identity, explains that she disguised herself to be near D'Elmont and possibly to be of service to him, and dies of a true excess of love. The details which make this scene plausible are handled with a great deal of skill. From the introduction of Violetta, everything relating to her is very low key, almost incidental. She is a shadowy figure who rarely appears on stage until she assumes a disguise. The only hint of her love for D'Elmont is her melancholy when he is about to leave. Since his passion for Melliora is common knowledge, her melancholy, in retrospect, could indicate two things. Either she only then realizes that she has no chance of winning him, or she is more concerned with being near the object of her affections than with being ack-

knowledged by him and is consequently distressed at his impending departure. She has already shown that she is capable of selflessness, having tried to help Frankville, originally her own intended bridegroom, to marry her friend Camilla. Consequently, it seems reasonable to favour the latter explanation, which presents her love as unselfish and undemanding. In either case, she says nothing, only confessing her passion when she is on the point of death.

> This is too kind, said she, I now can feel none of those agonies which render death the King of Terrors, and thus, thus happy in your sight,--your touch--your tender pity, I can but be translated from one Heaven to another, and yet, forgive me Heaven if it be a sin, I could wish, methinks, to know no other Paradise than you, to be permitted to hover round you, to form your dreams, to sit upon your lip all day, to mingle with your breath, and glide in unfelt air into your bosom. . . . Oh D'Elmont, receive in this one sigh my latest breath--it was indeed her last, she died that moment, died in his arms, whom more than life she prized, and sure there are none who have lived in the anxieties of Love, who would not envy such a death. (p. 321)

This is sheer romance. Violetta's vision of haunting her lover from beyond the grave is as fantastic as the selflessness which manifests itself in every aspect of her behaviour; she is, truly, the idealized romantic heroine. Although Haywood says that to die in the arms of one's beloved is better than "the anxieties of Love," Violetta is presented as the object of pity rather than envy. Her dying speech is moving, but it is hardly probable, and, certainly not as satisfying to the reader, or to Violetta herself, as the connubial bliss reserved for Melliora. Such a death, sur-

rounded by the tender friendship of a man who could never love her properly, is very likely preferable to suffering, but it can in no way take the place of the happiness of sexual fulfillment and reciprocal affection.[6] Violetta has never been a flesh and blood woman; it is just that her reward should be ethereal and idealized.

Ciamara represents the other end of the spectrum. "She had seen the charming Count, was taken with his beauty, and wished no farther than to possess his lovely person, his mind was the least of her thoughts" (p. 260). Her very first action is an age-old gesture of availability: as the Count is promenading pensively outside St. Peter's in Rome, she drops a jewel at his feet. When he returns it, she leads him into a retired grove and nearly seduces him, despite his misery over his wife's death and Melliora's self-imposed exile to a convent. Overcoming the temptation, D'Elmont is about to inform his unknown admirer why he is not interested in her advances, when a commotion near by interrupts them. The classic configuration is totally reversed; the typical scene of seduction, which appears repeatedly in this very work, is here played with the actor and actress switching parts. And, as is

[6] Richetti offers the interesting suggestion that Violetta's death, coming precisely at the moment of reunion between D'Elmont and Melliora, serves as a sort of sexual climax; "her death is, in a sense, an orgasm, a suitably violent and spectacular end to the story. It is the orgasm we have been waiting for, the one we have approached so often throughout the story in the many near consummations" (Richetti, p. 207). This observation seems to me a valid and interesting way of interpreting the conjunction of events.

common after such a scene, the two soon meet again to renew the struggle. This time, he overhears her as he is hiding from a mob. She is describing him to her confidante, her passion obvious in every salacious phrase:

> Oh! with what pain did I restrain myself from flying to him! from rushing into his arms! from hanging on his neck, and wildly uttering all the furious wishes of my burning soul!--I trembled--panted--raged with inward agonies. . . . (p. 186)
>
> He must--he shall be mine! cried the lady in a rapture. My love, fierce as it was before, from hope received addition to its fury; I rave--I burn--I am mad with wild desires--I dye, Brione, if I not possess him. (p. 188)

Just as she names his name (we still do not know hers), he steps forth to undeceive her in her expectations, but this time is prevented by a servant who announces that the police want to search her garden for D'Elmont. She promises to spirit him away if he consents to a later assignation, which of course he does. At their next meeting, the violence of her passion compels Ciamara to impersonate Camilla, whom the Count has come to see on Frankville's behalf. Naturally, D'Elmont recognizes her as the lady from the garden, and after all he has heard from Frankville regarding Camilla's fidelity, he is deeply shocked. At last he completes the revelation of his preengagement, and Ciamara/Camilla has hysterics. Though D'Elmont pities her, he leaves her at once.

Finally, after her true identity is revealed, the two meet and their relationship comes to a crisis. This scene, in which D'Elmont gradually realizes the quality of woman he is dealing with,

is a reversal, almost a parody, of Haywood's most torrid seductions, and a vivid portrait of her female rake.

> Heavens, (cried she, with an air full of resentment) are then my charms so mean, my darts so weak, that near, they cannot intercept those, shot at such a distance? and are you that dull, cold Platonist, which can prefer the visionary pleasures of an absent mistress, to the warm transports of the substantial present: the Count was pretty much surprized at these words, coming from the mouth of a woman of honour, and began now to perceive what her aim was, but willing to be more confirmed, Madam, said he, I dare not hope your virtue would permit.--Is this a time (interrupted she, looking on him with eyes which sparkled with wild desires, and left no want of further explanation of his meaning) Is this an hour to preach of virtue?--Married --Betrothed--Engaged by love or law, what hinders but this moment you may be mine, this moment well improved, might give us joys to baffle a whole age of woe; make us, at once, forget our troubles past, and by its sweet remembrance scorn those to come; in speaking these words, she sunk supinely on D'Elmont's breast. . . .
> (pp. 258-59)

A closer examination of the seduction itself will reveal the author's perspicacity, and her deftness in creating mirror images. In an ordinary seduction, the male lover has two tactics which he can use in his efforts to achieve gratification: one a psychological ploy, an appeal to her area of greatest vulnerability, and one a more direct, physical method. In most cases the first is not entirely successful, though it weakens the woman and lowers her resistance to the second. The following passage from Haywood's Idalia illustrates, in part, the usual progression:

> At first, with sighs, with tears, with humble adorations, the amorous Ferdinand sought to melt her into fondness; but they failing, the burning passion threw off all restraint, his every action spoke his resolution, and told her he would not be denied--plainly she

> read it in his fiery eyes, and felt it in his eager graspings.[7]

The appeal here is to the tender-hearted sensibility of the weaker sex; no woman can withstand the sight of a weeping lover about to expire on her account. However, this ruse often fails, for virtue and considerations of reputation are the watchful, and able, guardians of sympathy. It is then that the lover is forced to more direct, possibly violent means of persuasion. In Haywood's gentler fictions, the force used primarily entails "liberties," usually taken while the heroine is trying to dissuade her seducer from further assault. These liberties arouse the woman into consent, and the seduction is complete:

> He began now to mingle kisses and embraces with his vows: my hands were the first victims of his fiery pressures; then my lips, my neck, my breast; and perceiving that, quite lost in ecstasy, I but faintly resisted what he did, far greater boldness ensued!--My soul dissolved! Its faculties overpowered!--and reason, pride, and shame, and fear, and every foe to soft desire, charmed to forgetfulness! my trembling limbs refused to oppose the lovely tyrant's will. . . .[8]

While rape certainly has its place in Haywood's works, her seductions are truly seductions; the defenses of the victim are "charmed into forgetfulness" by overpowering waves of sexual desire. The element of physical appeal is the seducer's insistence on doing what he knows his victim would want, but for the restraints of custom and conventional morality. Therefore, when appealing to

7 Idalia (3rd ed.), in Works (London, 1725), III, 11.
8 The British Recluse (London, 1722), pp. 112-13.

one basic instinct fails, he simply appeals to another, stronger instinct and generally succeeds in getting what he wants.

Differences in physiology as well as in supposed sexual temperaments and characteristic modes of behaviour make it impossible for the procedure to be exactly the same when a woman seduces a man. However, the female seductions do follow the same pattern and progression. Ciamara's first appeal is psychological; she challenges D'Elmont's virility. To call a young, healthy male in his prime a "dull, cold Platonist" is tantamount to denying his manhood. Only a fool could resist the opportunity of enjoying flesh in preference to mental images. Partly because the Count is so shocked at such wanton behaviour in a lady--he seems to have remained oblivious to the heavy sexual overtones of their previous meetings--the barb does not stick, and he does not succumb. Nevertheless, it does destroy the barrier of his honourable expectations, thus making him ready for a further onslaught. She continues the attack, as would her male counterpart, by direct, physical overtures. Obviously, being a woman, she cannot force him, but she can try to arouse his lust to the point where he participates actively in his own "ruin." She does this by invoking his prior passion, simultaneously reminding him of the uncertainty and improbability of its consummation. She offers herself as an antidote to his sadness and concern, substituting a real joy for the troubles in his mind.[9] She expects him to be flattered by her attention, grateful for her concern, and curious about the delights

[9] This tactic is used frequently in Haywood's fiction. Cf. The Injured Husband (London, 1723), p. 40, or Betsy Thoughtless (London, 1751), II, 246-61.

she has in store for him. Her appeal is quite basic; she is offering him a bird in the hand, as it were, to make him forget what he lost in the monastery bush.

As though the case against Ciamara's unnatural behaviour were not already overwhelming, Haywood adds a crowning touch. She includes a scene as near to female rape as it is possible to imagine in the politer literature of the period. Moreover, as her erotic scenes go, it is one of the least abstract, one of the most visual and explicit. D'Elmont, though he has lost respect for Ciamara, is not unwilling to stay; his blood has been fired by her careful seduction. On the threshold of victory, Ciamara is transported:

> Lost to all sense of honour, pride, or shame, and wild to gratify her furious wishes, she spoke, without reserve, all they suggested to her, and lying on his breast, beheld, without concern, her robes fly open, and all the beauties of her own exposed, and naked to his view: mad at his insensibility, at last she grew more bold, she kissed his eyes,--his lips, a thousand times, then pressed him in her arms with strenuous embraces,--and snatching his hand, and putting it to her heart, which fiercely bounded at his touch, bid him be witness of his mighty influence there. (pp. 260-61)

By this time, D'Elmont is nothing but a man, no longer the virtuous and unshakable lover of Melliora, and he responds to her advances.

Despite that response, which would seem to reward her persistence, Ciamara does not remain unjudged. Up until this last meeting with her, D'Elmont has pitied her ill-placed love for him. Even after he discovers that she has been the cause of the near

estrangement between Frankville and Camilla, he still feels only grief at causing her the torment of unrequited love. He identifies her feelings for him, at this point, with his own for Melliora, and he regards her with the same sort of sympathy he later feels for Violetta. He even risks losing Frankville's friendship by hesitating to exploit her affection for him to help his friend. However, Ciamara feels none of his honourable love; she "wished no further than to possess his lovely person, his mind was the least of her thoughts." As she reveals that it is simple lust which motivates her, and as she becomes progressively more bold, he gradually loses his sympathy for her. After she unveils her meaning and rests her head confidently against his chest, we are told that "tho' he was not so ill natured, and unmannerly as to repel her, this sort of treatment made him lose all the esteem, and a great part of the pity he had conceived for her" (p. 259). It is not proper that a woman should behave in such a fashion. D'Elmont is deeply shocked that a lady could demean herself to the point of demanding dishonourable commerce with a man, especially with a man who made no secret of his inability to return her love. She has gone too far, even for Haywood's more permissive code of love, and justice swiftly intervenes. Ciamara and her reluctant lover are interrupted before she can enjoy the fruits of all her plotting, and no more is heard of her until D'Elmont receives word of her death. She poisons herself out of frustrated desire. It is interesting that she and Violetta, the two representations of popular conceptions of womanhood, both die for love. Yet Violetta's death, perhaps similarly self-induced, is gentle, Ciamara's death is violent and lonely. Instead of the tender, almost reverential

reaction of D'Elmont and the others to Violetta's demise, Ciamara's passes without further notice. It is simply another disaster to add to the heap of wreckage caused by the too-attractive Count, and he accepts it as almost inevitable. The reader responds more comprehensively, feeling that Ciamara deserved no better fate for her ruthlessness.

Melantha, the sister of D'Elmont's friend Baron D'Espernay, occupies a place just beneath Ciamara on the scale of female types. She is, in her way, just as grasping and just as lustful, but she is considerably less wicked, especially since her misconduct saves the heroine from "ruin." When D'Elmont first meets her, they are engaging in polite conversation with Alovisa, Melliora and the Baron on the various aspects of Love. This is the perfect setting in which to introduce Melantha, for if she can be defined by any single characteristic, it is her love of diversion. As she soon demonstrates, she is the sort of woman whose love of intrigue and light-hearted pleasure leads her into situations which have far more serious consequences. At this initial meeting she appears pleasant, even likable, though she is obviously flirtatious and shallow. Her first act on the fictional stage is to interrupt D'Elmont and Melliora at one of the many "crucial" moments in Part II. She has been kept awake by thinking of

> a lover, that . . . I have some thoughts of discharging tomorrow--another that I design to countenance, to pique a third--a new suit of cloaths, and trimmings for the next ball--half a hundred new songs--and--a thousand other affairs of the utmost consequence, (p. 108)

and has seen the Count sneaking back into the house. She wants

Melliora to come down to the garden with her in order to tease him about his midnight ramblings. At her insistence, they play hide and seek in the garden, which gives D'Elmont another chance to seduce Melliora. When Melantha again interrupts he is understandably annoyed, and he cannot conceal his coldness. This vexes her, and when she learns the next day of a plot by the two men to deliver Melliora to the Count's room during a masquerade, she arranges to substitute herself. D'Elmont, as is typical throughout the fiction of the century, does not seem to notice the substitution, and the lovers actually manage to complete an act of intercourse before the Baron bursts in. Despite D'Espernay's willingness to contribute to Melliora's ruin, he is outraged at his sister's dishonour. He marries her off to a man of inferior rank and she is banished to a just obscurity.

Although Melantha's motives for losing her virginity are not clear, there does not appear to be any suggestion of all-consuming passion on her part. The driving force of her character seems to be a reckless devotion to her own amusement. When Melliora refuses to come down to the garden with her, Melantha's response reveals a great deal about the kind of person she is.

> Was there ever any thing so young, so formal as you are! (rejoined Melantha) but I am resolved to teaze you out of a humour so directly opposite to the Beau-Monde, and, if you will not consent to go down with me: I will fetch him up to your chamber--Hold! hold, (cried Melliora, perceiving she was going) what do you mean, for Heaven's sake stay, what will Alovisa think?--I care not (replied the other) I have set my heart on an hour's diversion with him; and will not be baulked, if the repose of the world, much less, that of a jealous, silly wife, depended on it. (p. 109)

When she mentions bringing the Count to Melliora's room, little knowing how delighted he would be at such a move, she thinks only of coercing Melliora into joining her frolic. She does not stop to consider possible consequences whether to Melliora's person, or to both their reputations. She will not be crossed; consequently, when D'Elmont adamantly refuses to play her games, she resolves to get even with him. Apparently without thinking about her honour or dignity, she forces him to make love to her, an act for which she knows he has no inclination. The true satisfaction she expects is not sexual pleasure, which she does achieve, but the joy of seeing his face when he wakes up beside her and discovers her trick. This, of course, is denied her because of her brother's untimely intrusion. Melantha is not vicious, like Ciamara, nor is her sin carnal lust. She is a silly, thoughtless and frivolous woman who thinks only of diversion. Appropriately, her punishment is social obscurity and a life which offers little opportunity for the amusements of which she is so fond.

Alovisa, like Ciamara, takes an overtly sexual initiative, but she remains within certain bounds of modesty. At all times, though she is occasionally immoderate in the force of her love, she keeps within the literal limits of honour, and is not without a strong sense of decorum. She is the first of D'Elmont's victims; on the second page of the novel she is already falling "into ravings, sometimes cursing her own want of power, sometimes the coldness of D'Elmont." Both these obstacles faced Ciamara as well, and the latter was a problem for Melantha, but Alovisa manages to overcome them with less violence to society's rules. The night before a huge ball which she knows he will attend, she sends him an anonymous letter, telling him to watch for her, his adorer, in the eyes

of all the ladies present. He is naturally intrigued, but believes that Amena is his anonymous admirer. Alovisa, seeing them together, falls into fits and goes home, where she decides that D'Elmont had not dared assume it was she because of her superior rank and fortune. She sends to tell him to aim higher in his search for her identity. Then, overcome by passion, she begins another letter.

> She was not long writing, love and wit suggested a world of passionate and agreeable expressions to her in a moment; but when she had finished this so full a discovery of her heart, and was about to sign her name to it, not all that passion which had inspired her with a resolution to scruple nothing that might advance the compassing her wishes, nor the vanity which assured her of success, were forcible enough to withstand the shock it gave her pride; No, let me rather die! (said she, starting up, and frightened at her own designs) than be guilty of a meanness which would render me unworthy of life, Oh! Heavens to offer love, and poorly sue for pity! 'tis insupportable! What bewitched me to harbour such a thought as even the vilest of my sex would blush at? To pieces then (added she tearing the paper) to pieces, with this shameful witness of my folly, my furious desires may be the destruction of my peace, but never of my honour, that shall still attend my name when love and life are fled. (pp. 9-10)

From the extravagance of her speech, one would assume that she had just been contemplating taking her own life rather than merely signing a letter. However, the comparison is apt; to a virtuous woman, such immodesty would be moral suicide.

Alovisa remains within the bounds of decency, as far as sex is concerned, until she dies. She never reveals her passion for D'Elmont; he learns of it from Amena, who recognizes Alovisa's handwriting in one of her anonymous letters. Nor does she commit adultery with D'Espernay when he tries first to blackmail and then to force her into submission. D'Elmont marries her out of his own

ambition, thus sanctifying the love that she feels for him. Yet she, too, sins aggressively against love. She persists in thwarting every desire of his which is not directed at herself. She ruins his affair with Amena, ruining Amena's life in the process. She prevents his attempt to apologize to Amena and perhaps save her from taking vows. She endeavours to prevent her sister from marrying his brother until D'Elmont gives up his adulterous activities. And more than once she ruins his attempts to ravish Melliora. Her desires are immoderate and entirely selfish. Although technically within the bounds of decorum, her actions violate the first and foremost condition of love, which is that passion must be mutual. Haywood will not insist that the woman wait for the man to act first,[10] but she must be certain that he can love her. Alovisa persists, though she knows that he is unable to return her feelings with the same intensity, and in the end she runs on his sword in a confusion she herself has created.

D'Elmont's relationship with Amena, her proper place on the spectrum of female types, is the most problematic of the six. She remains as virtuous as Melliora, and her love is perhaps even more honourable, as he is unmarried when he becomes involved with her. Yet Amena gains the convent while Melliora wins the Count. The distinctions which Haywood draws between the situations of the two women, both beautiful and virtuous, are extremely subtle, and reveal that the author had a very specific notion of love in mind when she wrote. Amena's downfall, like Alovisa's, is the result

[10] In this same work, Camilla's successful overtures to Frankville are proof of this assertion. See synopsis, p. 494.

of a violation of Haywood's rules of love; their passion may be mutual, in a way, but it is not spontaneous. Amena is D'Elmont's first actual conquest. When he believes her to be his anonymous admirer, he is charmed. His response is to flatter her, pay her all manner of assiduities--in short, to treat her with gallantry sufficient to win her, only for the sake of dalliance and intrigue. She reacts to each of his advances as they come, conceiving no passion for him independent of his initiative. When he discovers that she is not his mysterious lover after all, he confers with himself and decides, finally, that he has invested too many "fine words," too much energy, to give up the chase. By this time, Amena's passion, if not her true and honourable affection, has been well and truly roused. To his credit, D'Elmont almost convinces himself that he loves her, though not enough to sacrifice his ambition to her happiness. Amena, on her part, has obeyed the social code which bid a woman love when someone loves her. Their relationship is, in fact, seduction from beginning to end, motivated solely by the sport of conquest. D'Elmont does not even enter the game on his own initiative; it is suggested to him by Alovisa's letter. With artificially induced passion as the source of the energy for the chase, and self-induced love as its justification, it is hardly possible for any relationship between him and Amena to be mutual and genuine.

Having seduced himself, D'Elmont must in turn seduce his mistress. And when he does, with every trick in the libertine's book except drugs, Amena's character slips just a bit from the ideal virtue and chastity which remain Melliora's despite her own near ruin. What foils their first assignation is Amena's father's in-

sistence on trying the nature of the Count's intentions. He dictates a letter to D'Elmont, as from Amena, implying that his addresses would not be admitted unless he proposes to marry her. Amena is too honourable herself to suspect anything evil in her lover, but the Count is not about to sacrifice either his ambition to his supposed love, or his pleasure to his ambition. In short, he carries on his seduction because it is an opportunity too good for a young man of spirit to waste. Sensing her own weakness, Amena warns him not to force her into a compromising situation:

> Press me then no more I conjure you, to such dangerous interviews, in which I dare neither trust my self, nor you . . . the way thro' honour is open to receive you; religion, reason, modesty, and obedience forbid the rest. (p. 25)

It is at this point that D'Elmont betrays his lack of true feeling, for he ignores "the way thro' honour." With the skill of a practiced seducer, he plays upon her honour and trust, as well as on the weakness she has revealed to him. He looks at her, during the above speech,

> with eyes so piercing, so sparkling with desire accompanied with so bewitching softness, as might have thawed the most frozen reservedness, and on the melting soul stamped Love's impression. 'Tis certain they were too irresistible to be long withstood, and putting an end to Amena's grave remonstrances, gave him leave to reply to 'em in this manner. Why my life, my angel, said he, my everlasting treasure of my soul, should these objections now be raised? how can you say you have given me your heart; nay, own you think me worthy that inestimable jewel, yet dare not trust your person with me a few hours; What have you to fear from your adoring slave, I want but to convince you how much I am so, by a thousand yet uninvented vows. (pp. 26-7)

Amena, who has sworn not to see him again, is seduced from her resolve by what appears to be true love. However, this is a greater mistake than she knows, because she puts herself in a position in which, aware that he has chosen not to take the honourable course so easily available, she is entirely at his mercy.

> What now could poor Amena do, surrounded with so many powers, attacked by such a charming force without, betrayed by tenderness within: Vertue and Pride, the guardians of her honour fled from her breast, and left her to her foe, only a modest bashfulness remained, which for a time made some defence, but with such weakness as a lover less impatient than D'Elmont would have little regarded. (p. 28)

Although it is possible to assume that she has been totally deceived by the various excuses he offers for not marrying her, it seems much more likely that by this time she at least suspects that his intentions are not as honourable as they ought to be, and she no longer cares. In this scene, specifically, her passions are kindled, and she responds with hesitant yet ardent gestures of welcome to the "liberties" he presumes to take.

> The heat of the weather, and her confinement having hindered her from dressing that day, she had only a thin silk night gown on, which flying open as he caught her in his arms, he found her panting heart beat measures of consent, her heaving breast swell to be pressed by his, and every pulse confess a wish to yield; her spirits all dissolved, sunk in a lethargy of love; her snowy arms unknowing grasped his neck; her lips met his half way, and trembled at the touch; in fine, there was but a moment betwixt her and ruin, when the tread of some body coming. . . . (pp. 28-29)

It is after this discovery and the Count's less than devoted behaviour when she finds herself in terrible trouble that Amena is

forced to recognize his true design.[11] She has been saved from the ultimate rashness, but has betrayed her virtue and honour for less than the genuine love they deserve. She can therefore never be his, but she does become, in Part II, the touchstone by which he recognizes his own salvation.

As I have suggested, the similarity of character between Amena and Melliora would imply that much of the difference between them lies in the circumstances surrounding their affairs. Melliora is eager, passionate, and self-aware, yet virtuous above all. She is the perfect innocent, having been raised almost in seclusion, in a convent sheltered from the various frivolities and depravities of the social world. Because Haywood emphasizes Melliora's total ignorance of the complicated intrigues and conventions of love, as well as of the more primitive gratifications, the reader is assured of the genuine and spontaneous generation of love in her young breast. She cannot, like Alovisa or Ciamara, plan her passion in advance, nor is she the victim of vain egotism, as is Melantha. She is not seduced, like Amena, and because she has the good fortune to be loved in return, she need not languish like Violetta. Circumstances are exactly right; her heart, at her father's death-bed, is susceptible to tenderness, and her body, newly liberated from the convent, is extremely sensitive to the bombardment of sensations she meets beyond its walls. She and D'Elmont, into whose care her father has consigned her and her fortune, exchange a glance across the bed, and true love is ignited in them both.

[11] See synopsis for details, p. 492.

> Their admiration of each other's perfections was mutual, and tho' he had got the start in love . . . yet the softness of her soul made up for that little loss of time, and it was hard to say whose passion was the strongest. (p. 61)

As was so often the case, from Chrétien de Troyes to Haywood's other novels, this truest and purest of passions is engendered outside what is legally and morally permissable. However, Melliora falls in love before she knows that he is married. Due to some ambiguous words of her father's and D'Elmont's own loving glances, she even believes "that she was in a possibility of calling the charming . . . /D'Elmont/ by a name more tender than that of guardian. . . . " (p. 60). Her predicament is intended to evoke only sympathy from the reader, a sympathy which never wavers throughout the rest of the novel, even when D'Elmont's unworthy behaviour calls the wisdom of her feelings temporarily into question.

Haywood intensifies the pathos of the situation in which Melliora finds herself at the onset of love by emphasizing her total helplessness and her dependence on the honour of her new guardian, who is also the person from whom she most needs protection:

> Indeed there never was any condition so truly deplorable as that of this unfortunate lady; she had lost a dear and tender father, whose care was ever watchful for her, her brother was far off, and she had no other relation in the world to apply her self to for comfort, or advice; not even an acquaintance at Paris, or friend, but him who newly was become so, and whom she found it dangerous to make use of, whom she knew it was a crime to love, yet could not help loving; the more she thought, the more she grew distracted, and the less able to resolve on any thing; a thousand times she called on death to give her ease. . . . (p. 63)

Despite the use of the loaded word "crime," it is clear that this passage is a call to readers to shed a metaphysical tear (or perhaps even a real one) for the plight of the tenderhearted innocent. Yet it is not merely an excuse for tearful pathos; it also sets the scene for the ensuing siege, making Melliora's position all the more vulnerable to D'Elmont's attack. Her brother remains far away throughout, and eventually becomes D'Elmont's friend. Her guardian, despite some honourable moments, has a strong desire to win her maidenhead at the expense of her honour, since he cannot have both. The wife of that guardian and, consequently, the chief obstacle to the consummation of her love, becomes the girl's one friend. Her only other acquaintances are the society which frequents the Count's house. And, finally, her innocence is besieged as well by the tumultuous passion, both physical and spiritual, which is aroused by her protector/seducer. It is a trial by fire which both her love and her chastity must undergo, and she manages to triumph, fulfilling the one and preserving the other. In the process, she also provides the goal of D'Elmont's own quest.

Virtue, or chastity, is, as I have suggested, of paramount importance in the ideal woman. Decency and moral propriety are necessary to the lasting gratification of passion. D'Elmont is married; therefore, Melliora's love is extra-legal, a "crime" against both society and God. Later, when Alovisa is accidentally killed by her husband in a generally confused convocation of major characters, Melliora feels that she is morally responsible. Consequently, she returns to her convent, resolving never to see her lover again. It would be an unforgivable breach of decorum and a mortal sin for a Christian to rejoice at the death of her rival,

or even to take immediate advantage of her demise. And, perhaps even more important than these conventional restraints, is Haywood's notion that a woman's virtue alone is not enough to bring about mutual satisfaction in love. At the conclusion of Part II, when Alovisa dies, Melliora has undergone her trials, but D'Elmont has not yet entered upon his. She indirectly demands, by her removal to the convent, that he prove himself to be her equal. As a human woman, rather than a male-fantasy figure of Grace and Forgiveness, Melliora does not accept a double standard, and it is only when the Count overcomes his all too understandable desire to maintain his greater privilege to roam, that the two can unite as equals. With regard to male virtue, Haywood's stance in Love in Excess is similar to Richardson's in Clarissa. In a characteristic scene, Clarissa tells Lovelace, who has been expressing a desire to reform his rakish ways, that "I shall endeavour to keep you up to this spirit. I shall measure your value of me by this test. . . . "[12] She refuses to admit him into her affections until he proves that he is as good a man as he can be, and although Clarissa's refusal is a conscious, stated decision, whereas Melliora's is only implicit, the underlying ideal is identical.

Virtue may be the paramount requirement in a woman, but it is not the sexually immune, physical chastity of the romance heroines. Unlike her predecessors, Haywood allows her heroine to feel love in return, and even to reveal physical passion and tenderness. After much inner struggle, by which Melliora's feelings are made

[12] Samuel Richardson, Clarissa (London, 1967), II, 61.

known to herself and to the reader, she discovers them to D'Elmont in the first of their tempestuous love scenes:

> Love, tho' it may be feigned, can never be concealed, not only the eyes (those true and most perfect intelligencers of the heart) but every feature, every faculty betrays it! It fills the whole air of the person possessed of it; it wanders around the mouth! plays in the voice! trembles in the accent! and shows itself in a thousand different ways! even Melliora's care to hide it, made it more apparent. . . .
> (pp. 81-82)

Her tenderness is expressed by the look in her eyes; that her desires are more than platonic is revealed continually in the physical passion she manages in the near consummations of Part II. She first gives herself away in a dream, crying out in her sleep and flinging her arms around a presence in her mind's eye. As is frequently the case in Haywood's fictions, that presence is only too real,[13] and she ends up "embracing him yet closer,--O! too, too lovely Count--extatick Ruiner!" (p. 104). Naturally, this revelation of her desire excites him as well. After an interruption by Melantha, the lovers meet again in the garden, and he greets Melliora passionately, and

> printing burning kisses on her neck, reaped painful pleasures, and created in her a racking kind of extasy, which might, perhaps, had they been now alone, proved her desires were little different from his.
> (p. 112)

She cannot dissemble any part of her feeling for him. Consequently,

[13] As in The Masqueraders (1724), The Fatal Secret (1724) and The Fruitless Enquiry. See below, pp. 264-67.

she cannot pretend that she is unmoved, like her aloof French ancestors, by his intense desire for her or untouched by a desire for sexual union equally intense. Certainly, in Haywood's fictional world, sex is not something simply for a woman to suffer; it is both a pleasure and a need.

It is her attempt to strike a balance between active sexuality and the resulting conflict of love and morality which calls forth Haywood's highest drama. In this climactic scene in the relationship between hero and heroine, Melliora even slips into concealed verse, the prosody of heroic tragedy. Appealing to D'Elmont's own honour and love, she tells him:

> but now's the time to prove yourself the hero,
> subdue yourself, as you have conquered me,
> be satisfied with vanquishing my soul,
> fix there your throne, but leave my honour free!
> (p. 114)

Moreover, in this scene the balance between love and honour is actually achieved, and Haywood presents us with her view of ideal love. Melliora's appeal does not pass unnoticed by her lover:

> Life of my life (cried he) wound me no more by such untimely sorrows: I cannot bear thy tears, by Heaven they sink in to my soul, and quite unman me, but tell me (continued he, tenderly kissing her) Couldst thou, with all this love, this charming--something more than softness--Couldst thou I say, consent to see me pale and dead, stretched at thy feet, consumed with inward burnings, rather than blest, than raised by Love, and thee, to all a Deity in thy embraces. . . . No more, no more (said she, letting her head fall gently on his breast) too easily I guess thy sufferings by my own. But yet, D'Elmont, 'tis better to die in innocence than to live in guilt. O! Why (resumed he, sighing as if his heart would burst) should what we can't avoid, be called a crime? Be witness for me Heaven!

> how much I have struggled--But in vain, the mounting flame blazes the more, the more I would suppress it --My very soul's on fire--I cannot bear it--Oh Melliora! Didst thou but know the thousandth part, of what this moment I endure, the strong convulsions of my warring thoughts, thy heart steeled as it is, and frosted round with virtue, would burst its icy shield and melt in tears of blood to pity me. Unkind and cruel! (answered she) do I not partake in them then? --Do I not bear, at least, an equal share in all your agonies?--Hast thou no charms--Or have not I a heart? --A most susceptible, and tender heart?--Yes, you may feel it throb, it beats against my breast, like an imprisoned bird, and fain would burst its cage! to fly to you, the aim of all its wishes!--Oh, D'Elmont! --With these words she sunk wholly into his arms unable to speak more: Nor was he less dissolved in rapture, both their souls seemed to take wing together, and left their bodies motionless as unworthy to bear a part in their more elevated bliss. (pp. 114-16)

Although D'Elmont goes on to attempt Melliora's virtue on several occasions subsequent to this scene, and although on most such occasions that virtue is preserved by interruptions from outside rather than by any physical resistance or persuasion on her part,[14] in this case quite clearly she appeals to their common deprivation, invokes love, and dissuades him. Though her success is only momentary, in this single interchange Melliora actually communicates with her lover and triumphs over their more impetuous emotions.

Melliora's sentiments on this occasion are obviously not prudery, or she would not invoke their common desire. Nor is hers the cold and inhumane chastity, of which he sometimes accuses her. She obviously loves him, body and soul, and precisely because of that love, she cannot barter a moral, peaceful, eternal union for

[14] Once, however, she thwarts an attempt by stuffing bits of her handkerchief in the keyhole to her chamber so that he is unable to insert his key (p. 123). See below, pp. 172-73.

transient gratification. She is not simply worried about society's judgment for its own sake; she is concerned with the preservation of her integrity and of the purity and intensity of her love. She realizes, in Haywood's terms, that soon enjoyed is soon forsaken. If, by giving in now, she limits her love to a physical relationship without the spiritual obligations of marriage, she destroys all possibility of D'Elmont's remaining true to her in his heart despite his bodily bondage within his marriage to Alovisa. Later in the novel, Haywood explains this platitude and elevates it into a philosophy.

> That passion which aims chiefly at enjoyment, in enjoyment ends, the fleeting pleasure is no more remembered, but all the stings of guilt and shame remain; but that, where the interior beauties are consulted, and souls are devotees, is truly noble, Love, <u>there</u> is a divinity indeed, because he is immortal and unchangeable, and if our earthly part partake the bliss, and craving nature is in all obeyed; possession thus desired, and thus obtained, is far from satiating, <u>Reason</u> is not here debased to <u>Sense</u>, but <u>Sense</u> elevates itself to <u>Reason</u>, the different powers unite and become pure alike. (pp. 259-60)

It is Melliora's firm adherence to this belief which distinguishes her from Amena, whose reason was, in fact, debased to sense. Although elsewhere in this novel Camilla surrenders her maidenhead to Frankville without being abandoned, they intend to marry as soon as it is financially possible.[15] D'Elmont's inability to marry Melliora makes a similar leniency in their case impossible.

This gallery of women, similar to the patterned relationships

[15] See synopsis for details, p.494.

not only in Haywood's later works,[16] but in Richardson's and Fielding's as well,[17] allows her to display all the aspects of female psychology and sexuality which convention tended to deny women, in literature and in life. Haywood's heroine is as passionate as her male counterpart, though necessarily more concerned about social and material security in a world where she is obliged to be dependent on others. She is not the reticent, delicate figurine who inspires awed submission from her lovers and whose immunity from the baser demands of passion compels her to suppress her desires. Even sexual and social ignorance are not strong enough to prevent her from recognizing and acknowledging her love. That feeling itself is far more than the strange combination of adoration and physical "burning" found in romance. As D'Elmont says, "Friendship and Love, where either are sincere, vary but little in their meanings; but their essentials are still the same. . . . " (p. 94). For those who love with both "sense" and reason, there is a "more elevated bliss" which combines the best of friendship and love. Of the six women, it is Melliora who achieves happiness in marriage. Hers is the kind of love which deserves reward in the poetically just world of romantic fiction, and, by implication, hers is Haywood's ideal of womanhood.

16 Especially in Betsy Thoughtless. See below, pp. 437-38.

17 See Doody on Richardson, pp. 307-9. For Fielding, see Robert Alter, Fielding and the Nature of the Novel (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1968), and Michael Irwin, rev. of Alter and of The Art of Joseph Andrews, by Homer Goldberg, Review of English Studies, 22 (1971), 89-93.

V

THE HERO AS LOVER

The heroes of heroic romance were a singularly modest race of men. As we have seen,[1] they are only too willing to believe themselves unworthy of love, and the impetus behind the narrative of the French works is their quest to prove themselves to their mistresses. The hero's love is awe-inspiring and ennobling, yet also incapacitating when all it inspires is despair. But perhaps the most interesting aspect of the romantic hero is that the way he proved his merit was a combination of warrior aggression and polite submission, even servility. The hero was an example of human perfection, and his "trials" were mere form, motions he had to go through to allow his mistress to acknowledge her love. In Love in Excess, Haywood takes that form and gives it meaning. All the conventions about the effects of love in a man are rendered literally and made to make sense in a realistic situation. D'Elmont is far from perfect; only through love is he ennobled into an ideal. Like his predecessors, he is awed by the force of love, but that awe translates itself not into empty servility, but into respect for his lover's integrity. Like them, he undergoes a series of adventures in order to prove himself worthy of his mistress, although those experiences are on a much more ordinary level of existence than heroic combat. And, finally, D'Elmont's

[1] See above, 98-99.

quest to become worthy of love is the driving force behind the narrative, leading him from intrigue to intrigue and, eventually, to his happy second marriage. Unlike the heroes of romance, the Count must make mistakes and grow, and Haywood must mark that growth. The main way in which she does this is by leading him through a series of relationships, and his moral state at any given time can be accurately measured by his treatment of the women currently occupying his attention. By providing him in each case with both a chance to act and an opportunity to reflect upon his actions, Haywood creates a character rather than a simple stereotype. D'Elmont, who is "a combination of the scintillating hero and the aggressive libertin-seducer,"[2] cannot be rewarded until he, too, knows persecution and suffering, and until he becomes strong enough to resist social pressures, ambition and lust. Haywood draws in him a portrait of the second half of an ideal couple, and in doing so she reduces the vast gulf between hero and heroine. Ultimately, she seems to demonstrate, men and women should strive for the same virtues.

Immediately after the novel begins, D'Elmont is subjected to the role reversal which forms the foundation for his trials. He returns to Paris from a long time at war, and he finds himself the center of attraction. He is inundated with flattery and all the other small attentions usually reserved for women.

> The fame of the Count's brave actions arrived before him, and he had the satisfaction of being received by the King and the Court, after a manner that might gra-

[2] Richetti, p. 184.

> tify the ambition of the proudest. The beauty of his person, the gaiety of his air, and the unequalled charm of his conversation, made him the admiration of both sexes; and while those of his own strove which should gain the largest share in his friendship, the other, vented fruitless wishes, and in secret cursed that custom which forbids women to make a declaration of their thoughts. (pp. 1-2)

Parisian high society regards D'Elmont with the peculiar reverence and excitement it normally accords "sex objects"; he is avidly courted and becomes the figure of a thousand fantasies. Yet in the midst of all the havoc his physical attractiveness creates, he remains a "heretic to love's deity."[3] He

> had never yet seen a beauty formidable enough to give him an hours uneasiness (purely for the sake of Love) and would often say, Cupid's quiver never held an arrow of force to reach his heart; those little delicacies, those trembling aking transports, which every sight of the beloved object occasions, and so visibly distinguishes a real passion from a counterfeit one, he looked on as the chimera's of an idle brain, formed to inspire notions of an imaginary bliss, and make fools lose themselves in seeking; or, if they had a being, it was only in weak souls, a kind of disease with which he assured himself he should never be infected. (pp. 51-52)

Love is "a passion which he esteemed a trifle in itself, and below the dignity of a man of sense" (p. 7). Such hubris cannot go long unpunished. His insensibility is first exposed in his affair with Amena, which Haywood then uses as a touchstone with which to measure the sincerity of his passion and his conversion to "love's deity" after he meets Melliora. He begins his dalliance with Amena

[3] Richetti, p. 184.

for no other reason than that he believes, as it happens mistakenly, that she is eager for the sport. The anonymous letter he receives flatters his vanity and virility. "He began to consider a mistress as an agreeable, as well as fashionable amusement, and resolved not to be cruel" (p. 5). When he discovers that Amena is not the woman who wrote the letter, he carries on, rather ruthlessly, because

> he had said too many fine things to be lost, and thought it as inconsistent with his honour's inclination to desist a pursuit in which he had all the reason in the world to assure himself of victory. . . . (pp. 12-13)

His attitude is simple opportunism. Having made an investment of gallantry and attentions, he would be foolish not to collect the expected dividends, especially as they promise to be large and immediately forthcoming. By this time, as we have seen, his great personal beauty and charm have captivated Amena; and "by making a show of tenderness he began to fancy himself really touched with a passion he only designed to represent" (p. 13). He is given ample opportunity to satisfy his "love"; both Amena and her father indicate to him that a proposal of marriage would be most welcome. She is his for the asking. His reply to these proposals, as well as his subsequent behaviour, are more than sufficient to prove that he is only further offending against Love.

> As well as he liked Amena, /he/ found no inclination in himself to marry her. . . . I would willingly, said he coldly, come into any proper method for the obtaining the person of Amena, as well as her heart; but there are certain reasons for which I cannot make

> a discovery of my designs to her father, 'till I have first spoken with her. (p. 19)

Quite obviously, the "reasons" he mentions are that he has no desire to marry her, nor yet any wish to put an end to his affair. When his further attempts to gratify his lust fail, his only emotion on ridding himself of responsibility for Amena is relief. He leaves her with Alovisa, resolving not to interest himself further in her future.

Following Amena's removal to a convent, D'Elmont commits the cardinal sin against Love: he takes advantage of Alovisa's love for him, though feeling nothing for her in return. He continues to regard love as

> a kind of disease with which he assured himself he should never be infected. Ambition was certainly the reigning passion in his soul, and Alovisa's quality and vast possessions promising a full gratification of that, he ne'er so much as wished to know, a farther happiness in marriage. (p. 52)

Appropriately, this most serious offense results in the single material obstacle between him and true happiness in love. For a time after his marriage D'Elmont is reasonably content. Alovisa is unthreatened in her supremacy over his heart and is thus secure in the gratification of her passion. He himself has as yet escaped the vengeance of "love's deity" and knows nothing better than Haywood's vaguely described conjugal felicity.

Then, when he meets Melliora, his whole existence is transformed. When he sees her at her father's deathbed, he feels, for the first time,

> the power of Beauty, and that heart which had so long been impregnable surrendered in a moment, the first sight of Melliora gave him a discomposure he had never felt before, he sympathized in all her sorrows, and was ready to join his tears with hers. . . . (p. 61)

It is here that we are given our first insight into the nature of love, and into D'Elmont's worthiness as a lover. His immediate reaction to Melliora is not lust, or a desire to possess her. Rather, he finds himself moved at what moves her, and distressed not only for the death of <u>his</u> friend, but for the death of <u>her</u> father. The change in him, for the moment, is radical, and he is able to see his former conduct in its true colours. He reflects on his two previous affairs, no longer triumphant in his conquests, realizing that they have made true happiness impossible for him.

> Real sighs flew from his breast uncalled: and Melliora's image in dazling brightness! in terrible array of killing charms! fired him with (impossible to be attained) desires; he found by sad experience what it was to love, and to despair. He admired! adored! and wished, even to madness! Yet had too much honour, too much gratitude for the memory of Monsieur Frankville, and too sincere an awe for the lovely cause of his uneasiness, than to form a thought that could encourage his new passion. What would he not have given to have been unmarried? How often did he curse the hour in which Alovisa's fondness was discovered? and how much more, his own ambition which prompted him to take advantage of it? and hurried him precipitaly to a Hymen, where Love (the noblest guest) was wanting. (pp. 65-66)

The volte-face he here executes would be sheer literary extravagance were D'Elmont's basic humanity not substantiated by two further incidents. In the height of his torment, he compares his own predicament with that of his former "victim":

> It was in these racks of thought that the unfortunate Amena was remembered, and he could not forbear acknowledging the injustice of that doom, which inflicted on him, these very torments he had given her. (p. 66)

Shortly after this soul-searching, he receives a letter from her, written from the convent where she is about to take her final vows. In it she confesses that despite her resolution, she still loves him and desires his blessing. His reaction to this letter reveals the depth of his transformation.

> Had this letter come a day sooner, 'tis probable it would have had but little effect on the soul of D'Elmont, but his sentiments of Love were now so wholly changed, that what before he would but have laughed at, and perhaps despised, now filled him with remorse and serious anguish. (p. 69)

In his newly serious frame of mind, he sits down and writes her a sad, tender letter, imploring her forgiveness, promising her his friendship for the rest of his life. He explains to her what has happened to him and readily confesses how appropriately fate has disposed of him.

> I am no more the gay, the roving D'Elmont, and when you come to Paris, perhaps you will find me in a condition more liable to your pity than indignation. . . . my crime is my punishment, I have offended against Love, and against thee, and am, if possible, as miserable as guilty. (p. 73)

He urges her to give up the monastery, not to ruin her life by secluding herself from the world on his account. Unfortunately, this good impulse is thwarted by the consequences of his chief

"offence" even as is his love; the jealous Alovisa intercepts the letter and Amena, hearing nothing from the Count, takes her vows and reproaches him for heartlessness.

The second incident which adds verisimilitude to Haywood's portrayal of her hero is his actual, as opposed to initial, reaction to meeting Melliora. When he first sees her, his intentions are wholly honourable, and he is obviously sincere. Like the heroes of romance, his love inspires in him both humility and awe. Even when he begins, almost immediately, to backslide into his former errors, vestiges of his nobler feelings remain. His first attempt to overcome her virtue is still very much inhibited by his true love and respect for her. When he discovers Alovisa's treacherous confiscation of his letter to Amena, they quarrel violently, and D'Elmont storms out of the room in a rage.

> And going hastily through a gallery which had a large window that looked into the garden, he perceived Melliora lying on a green bank, in a melancholy posture, directly opposite to the place where he was; her beauties appeared, if possible, more to advantage than ever he had seen them, or at least he had more opportunity thus unseen by her, to gaze upon them: he in a moment lost all the rage of temper he had been in, and his soul was taken up with softness. . . . (p. 80)

> The transported D'Elmont, not considering where he was, or who might be a witness to his rapture, could not forbear catching her in his arms, and grasping her with an extasy, which plainly told her what his thoughts were, tho' at that time he had not power to put 'em into words. . . . (p. 82)

At this point his actions are spontaneous, unconcealed, and unpresumptuous. D'Elmont is restrained and awed, as he was at their first meeting, by the very depth and force of his love; his desire

gives way to"respect, the constant attendant on a sincere affection" (p. 82). However, during an ensuing period of domestic peace, D'Elmont's passion grows until he becomes obsessed. He stoops to using his position as Melliora's guardian to persuade her to go into the country with him and Alovisa. She wants to go back to the convent, which would protect them both from temptation, but he insists. At his country estate he is furthered in his downward course by the true libertine, Baron D'Espernay. The Baron's philosophy of life (or, more properly, of sex) is "that the most rigid Virtue of 'em all, never yet hated a man for those faults which love occasions" (p. 99). In other words, a man can rape any woman he pleases, pleading urgent adoration, and she will, eventually, thank him for it. This blasphemy against "love's deity" reveals that D'Espernay is the devil's advocate, and no fit companion for the Count. Believing the Baron to be his friend, D'Elmont confides his spiritual conflict:

> But O her father's memory! My obligations to him! her youth and innocence are daggers to my cool reflections--would it not be pity D'Espernay . . . even if she should consent, to ruin so much sweetness? The Baron could not forbear laughing at these words, and the Count who had started these objections, only with the hope of having them removed, easily suffered himself to be persuaded to follow his inclinations; and it was concluded betwixt them, that on the first opportunity, Melliora should fall a sacrifice to Love. (pp. 99-100)

Regardless of this resolution, and lacking the encouragement of this evil genius at the first opportunity, D'Elmont is far from precipitate. He hesitates, and since he is no villain, these hesitations manifest his essential worthiness."[4] He steals

[4] Richetti, p. 195.

into her chamber and finds her asleep. Despite her provocative state of undress, he struggles valiantly with his baser nature:

> The resistless posture he beheld her in, rouzed all that was honourable in him, he thought it a pity even to wake her, but more to wrong such innocence, and he was sometimes prompted to return and leave her as he found her. (p. 103)

As he bends over to kiss her, "possibly designing no more than to steal a kiss from her, unperceived, . . ." she flings her arms around his neck in her dream and reveals that her desires are as imperative as his own.

D'Elmont's reaction to her unconscious gesture reveals at once the depth of his passion and, by implication, the intensity of his struggle between love and lust.

> He tore open his waistcoat, and joined his panting breast to hers, with such a tumultuous eagerness! seized her with such a rapidity of transported hope-crowned passion, as immediately waked her from an imaginary felicity to the approaches of a solid one. . . . I am D'Elmont (cried the o'erjoyed Count) the happy D'Elmont! Melliora's, the charming Melliora's D'Elmont! (p. 104)

His exuberance would be delightful in its extravagance, were it not for the seriousness of the situation for Melliora. As he is driven to greater and greater liberties by the excitement of the moment, her arguments call forth a discovery of what is perhaps the primary motivation for his violence. She begs him to leave her, and he replies:

> What, when I have thee thus! Thus naked in my arms, trembling, defenceless, yielding, panting with equal wishes, thy love confest, and every thought, desire! How justly wouldst thou scorn my easie tameness; my dulness, unworthy of the name of Lover; or even of Man! (pp. 104-5)

In this elaborate rationalization he ascribes to her sentiments and accusations which the Baron, or, more significantly, which he himself might level at such unmanly submissiveness. The ethic of the heroic romance is here exactly reversed. This scene, interrupted in the nick of time, brings D'Elmont back to where he started. He is acting on an impulse to live up to a libertine image, as he did when he decided that taking a mistress was "a fashionable amusement" he could not do without. It is this falsification of his feelings and his mechanical obedience to convention which are condemned. Although to some extent calculated, D'Elmont's second attempt on Melliora's virtue in the garden, arises from the heat of the first rather than from external provocations. Because it is in this case sincere, his passion can be subdued by her honesty and ingenuousness, and once again they can achieve a sympathy as intense as the feelings generated at their first encounter. Haywood includes this second scene not only to reveal Melliora's state of mind,[5] but also to remind the reader of D'Elmont's basic worthiness, and the disinterestedness of which his passion is capable.

Unfortunately, D'Elmont falls again into the hands of the Baron, whose designs on Alovisa make him anxious to incite his friend to adultery as well. He arranges the trap for Melliora by which his own sister is ensnared. That the Count is not yet worthy of

[5] See above, pp. 143-44.

love is demonstrated by his reactions to this incident. On being discovered just after making love to Melantha, his first emotion is chagrin at being caught in the act, stark naked and confused. His second feeling is vexation at learning that he has ravished the wrong woman. And finally, he is annoyed that Melliora has seen him in such a shocking situation, surprising him taking his pleasure with another woman, not even his wife, after he has sworn eternal devotion to her. Never once does he feel any remorse for Melantha, presumably ruined forever by his action. Never once does he regret the impulse which would have tricked his beloved into an action he knew she deplored, or the force he was willing to use to obtain that which she would have given him gladly had it been proper to give. D'Elmont has by this time receded far from the nobility he revealed at his first meeting with Melliora. All that remains to complete his degradation is some catastrophe caused by his impure feelings, and that crisis soon occurs. Melliora discovers that Alovisa is engaged with the Baron and D'Elmont's brother, Brillian, in a plot which she fears will end in bloodshed. She whispers to D'Elmont in passing, asking him to find a pretext for coming to her room before nightfall, as she has something of great import to relate. She intends to warn him and urge him to intervene. In his lust, however, he hears only the word "night" and, as darkness can mean only the time for sex to a person in his inflamed state, he assumes that she is inviting him to consummate their mutual passion.[6] This fatal mistake indirectly causes the Baron's death at the hands of Brillian, and it leads to Alovisa's running on her husband's sword in the confusion after the murder. Consequently, it is also the cause of

[6] See below, p. 184.

Melliora's retreat to the convent and D'Elmont's own voluntary exile to Italy. He is not banished to do penance for killing his wife; his position earns him a royal pardon for the crime almost immediately. Rather he must expiate all his sinning against love and, like the heroes of romance, make himself worthy of his mistress.

The first stage of his initiation into the ranks of the faithful is a renewal of the remorse he felt earlier, in the first innocence of loving. He has ample cause: Amena is a nun; Melantha is ruined; Alovisa is dead by his own hand; and his beloved Melliora has resolved never to see him again. All this has happened because he has inspired them with love in excess and has not himself known how to deal with that love.

> He grieved at the powerful influence of his own attractions; and had there not been a Melliora in the world, he would have wished himself deformed, rather than have been the cause of so much misery as his loveliness produced. (p. 242)

Although D'Elmont is quite sincere in his lamentation, the relative superficiality of his insight, as well as the absurdity inherent in this particular sort of role reversal, tend to undermine the seriousness of this first stage of his reformation. In fact, he is still caught up in the vanity of his position; though he truly regrets what has happened to the women he has charmed, he blames only his sex appeal, not his own conduct. His major source of grief is Melliora's resolution against him despite their freedom now to marry, and he chooses the standard method of trying "to forget." He sets off for Italy, a land perhaps even more ex-

otic to Haywood's readers than France. Clearly, he hopes that her resolution will not last forever, for he corresponds with her frequently and chastely, telling her about his travels. Haywood is careful to point out that the Count, mindful of his past errors, returns all letters from the Italian ladies who write in admiration of his various charms, as Alovisa had done. He spends his time meditating on all that has passed and avoiding those admirers who would intrude into his peace, as much as possible.

Richetti's interpretation of D'Elmont's passivity throughout this section of the novel is based on the assumption that his greatest sin against love was attempting to control the fate of his passion:

> Success in love and fulfillment of its joys can come only when he has compensated for this sinful aggression by running away from his desire, or, more accurately, by becoming perfectly passive and waiting for love to reward him.[7]

Faithful to his expansion of "the myth of persecuted innocence," Richetti concludes that the Count must become the "helpless innocent" himself before he is worthy of that reward. Although I would agree with this conclusion, it seems to me that D'Elmont's sin is not so much aggression as it is insensibility. He violates the best inclinations of his own passion because he does not yet understand that virtuous spiritual love is the only sort that provides any lasting pleasure, and because he is either ignorant or scorn-

[7] Richetti, pp. 203-4.

ful of the terrible torments he inflicts on women who love him. Moreover, the completion of the role reversal which began on his first introduction as "femme" fatale is necessary to establish the basic sexual equality which must exist within an honest and lasting relationship. Passivity is itself not the virtue Haywood would extol; she is much more concerned with making her hero experience the same overwhelmingly thoughtless and selfish lust which he himself has inflicted on others. When he said to Amena that he found himself in the same position as that into which he had put her, he meant that both of them had known honourable emotions which met with insurmountable obstacles. The parallel is not particularly close, nor even particularly significant, in terms of his ultimate growth. The obstacle to his happiness was his own marriage to Alovisa, while the obstacle to Amena's was his ambitious vanity and wanton gallantry. Both are the result of his folly. He was still not aware of what it is like to be seduced, to have each principle violated and every inclination forced. Until he experiences for himself the pain he has caused, becomes the victim of a woman as rapacious as he has been himself, he can never match Melliora's fidelity to the highest orders of love.

He finds the perfect persecutor in Ciamara, who at her most modest is more than a match for D'Elmont at his worst. As I have suggested, because she is a woman, the logistics of her attempts on his virtue must differ from his techniques, but throughout their relationship, he remains relatively at her mercy.[8] When she first

[8] For a discussion of Ciamara's role in this sexual turnabout, see above, pp. 123-28.

approaches him, outside the cathedral in Rome, she is far from subtle, and her temptations very nearly lead him to succumb. Considering his scarcely hardened resolutions, that submission would have been tantamount to losing that aspect of his "virtue" which is synonymous with physical chastity. Although he has no desire to take advantage of her availability--in contrast to his earlier opportunism, his one thought is to declare as soon as possible that his feelings are preengaged--he is helpless before the bombardment she immediately begins. When he politely returns her jewel, she blasts him with the first in a long series of taunts and challenges, comparable to D'Elmont's own use of physical "liberties":

> Oh Heavens! cried she, receiving it with an affected air of surprize, could a trifle like this which I knew not that I had let fall, nor perhaps should have thought more on, could this, and belonging to a woman too, meet the regard of him, who prides in his insensibility? Him! who has no eyes for beauty, nor nor heart for love! As she spoke these words she contrived to let her veil fall back as if by accident, and discovered a face, beautiful even to perfection! Eyes black and sparkling, a mouth formed to invite, a skin dazzlingly white, thro' which a most delightful bloom diffused a chearful warmth, and glowed in amorous blushes on her cheeks. (pp. 179-80)

Predictably he is dazzled, and the combination of her charm and his own weakness prevent him from immediately making his position clear. Fortunately, like one of his own victims, he is "saved" from surrendering to temptation, interrupted by "that malicious trifler, Violetta," who becomes the companion of his trials. After Ciamara leaves him, D'Elmont's sentiments seem admirably reformed; he muses on how unhappy he must inevitably make her and again curses his

fatal charm.

At their next meeting, when he overhears her confession of passion in the summerhouse, he renews his resolution to make her understand that he loves another, believing implicitly that she will subdue her longing when she discovers that he cannot marry her. He remains polite and thoughtful, however, and not wishing to startle the two women, decides to reveal himself gradually.

> But with his over-caution in sliding his feet along, to prevent being heard, one of them tangled in the corner of the carpet, which happened not to lie very smooth, and not being sensible presently what it was that embarrassed him, he fell with part of his body across the lady, and his head in Brione's lap, who was sitting on the ground by her. . . . (p. 189)

This scene seems more appropriate to slapstick than to erotic romance, but it serves a vital function in establishing the balance of power between D'Elmont and his persecutor. As a woman, Ciamara cannot easily manipulate the Count into a position at once subservient and humiliating, as D'Elmont was so easily able to do with Amena, who found herself locked out of her father's house clad only in her shift, or with Alovisa, who was forced to write to him a second time to attract his wayward attention. Instead, Haywood maneuvers him into position for her villainess; she has him announce his presence draped indecorously across Ciamara's lap, which implies that he is also at her mercy. Once again, the encounter ends before he can make his declaration, only this time the interruption, by the police, results in sexual blackmail: he must promise to meet her again or she will reveal him to them. He can do nothing to resist her; she has the force of a mob in her arsenal,

as in his attempts on women he has had his physical strength. His second rescue from the "fatal" consequences of being with Ciamara is again by something external to himself, in this case the appearance of Frankville with his own troublesome affair.

The arrival of Frankville ushers in a new phase of D'Elmont's trials. The Count quickly becomes intimate with his lover's brother and promises to assist him in his amour with Camilla. This friendship immediately suggests a comparison with that of D'Elmont and Baron D'Espernay. The Count assumes the role of counsellor and go-between to Frankville, a role which the Baron filled for D'Elmont. But D'Elmont proves to be all that the Baron was not. He conducts himself with the greatest possible rectitude, and his primary concern is for the welfare of his friend. He offers Frankville no incitements to dishonour, and although the lovers have already shared the ultimate joys of their love, D'Elmont aids them in their attempts to elope and marry. When, on a mission to effect that elopement, he is propositioned once more by his unknown admirer, whom he now believes to be Camilla, he finally confesses that he loves someone else. He remains unshaken in his continence, even when her hysterics awaken his pity. The Baron, a true libertine, had urged his friend to violate his mistress in order to make him a cuckold; in a similar position, D'Elmont thinks only of Frankville's honour and happiness. He is deeply shocked at "Camilla's" betrayal, and his major worry when he leaves her is how to tell Frankville that his beloved is a whore. But the most revealing incident in this stage of D'Elmont's growth is his reaction when Frankville proposes a plan to reconcile himself with Camilla. He proposes that D'Elmont arrange a meeting

with Ciamara, whose love for him will make her eager to grant his request; Frankville will disguise himself as D'Elmont's servant and, once in the house, will force Camilla to talk to him.

> But he found it not so easy a task as he had imagined to persuade the Count D'Elmont to come into this design, his generous heart, averse to all deceit, thought it base and unmanly to abuse with dissimulation the real tenderness this lady had for him, and though pressed by the brother of Melliora, and conjured to it, even by the love he professed for her, it was with all the reluctance in the world, that he, at last, consented. . . . (p. 250)

Even though he finally agrees, "he had a great deal of compassion for Ciamara, and thought himself inexcusable for deceiving her" (p. 252). His reluctance to take base advantage of Ciamara's supposed tenderness for him recalls his hesitation in the early scenes with Melliora and his eagerness to exploit both Amena and Alovisa. His refusal to act now seems to him the honourable and manly thing to do, and reveals how much he has grown since the days when he so willingly agreed with D'Espernay that not to act would be unmanly and weak. That he once again, though with far greater difficulty, overcomes this reluctance, thereby making himself vulnerable to Ciamara's last, most prolonged and most nearly successful attack, is only the result of his fellow feeling for two lovers in trouble, a predicament with which he can now be in total sympathy.

This devotion to Love, by way of aiding Frankville and Camilla, provides D'Elmont with, or reveals that he already possesses, sufficient inner strength to emerge triumphant from the supreme temptation. D'Elmont's own struggling fidelity is reinforced by the

steadfast example of Frankville, who remains constant even though he has already, and frequently, possessed "all." The seduction scene in which Ciamara nearly rapes the Count completes the reversal of roles; though he wishes only to keep himself pure for Melliora, Ciamara plays on his sexual volatility and curiosity in the same way that he so often took advantage of Melliora and Amena. And D'Elmont, again like one of his own victims, ends up on the verge of submitting to sheer physical passion. Despite his strong love and renewed sense of fidelity and honour,

> yet, he was still a <u>man</u>! and, 'tis not to be thought strange, if to the force of such united temptations, Nature and Modesty a little yielded; warmed with her fires, and perhaps, more moved by curiosity, her behaviour having extinguished all his respect, he gave his hands and eyes a full enjoyment of all those charms . . . while she . . . suffered all he did, and urged him with all the arts she was mistress of, to move, and it is not altogether improbable, that he might not entirely have forgot himself. . . . (p. 261)

What saves him is the predictable interruption. Although he is swept along by Ciamara's lust and is on the point of sinning bodily, what is important is that his feelings are thoroughly innocent. When Amena or Melliora are but a moment away from ruin, we do not blame them for falling before superior force. Nor do we censure them for impurity when they respond to caresses--or liberties--even while protesting against violation. It is the same with D'Elmont. His only passive involvement despite the overwhelming energy of Ciamara's temptations insures that the reader's sympathy does not waver. Nor is it only coincidence that the interruption which saves him is a call to assist Frankville to escape with Camilla;

if too great a zeal to serve Love, by way of the two lovers, has exposed him to severe assault, that devotion to "love's deity" can also save him. And at the moment when he finally escapes from the persecution of which he himself had so frequently been guilty, his purification is complete; he is a man worthy of his mistress's love. He has only to prove that his conversion is irrevocable.

Violetta, who hovers over Part III of the novel like a guardian angel, provides both D'Elmont and Haywood with a perfect opportunity to offer that proof. Though he meets Violetta only shortly after this last scene with Ciamara, he has heard quite a bit about her from Frankville, because she had been instrumental in bringing Frankville and Camilla together, and because she, too, is engaged in engineering the reconciliation and elopement of the estranged lovers. That she and the Count are here working together to further the course of true love is no coincidence; D'Elmont's identification with so pure and selfless a person as Violetta reveals a great deal about how he has changed. She has put aside her own happiness, a marriage to Frankville in obedience to her father's wishes, serving "love's deity" by helping her friend win the love of her own betrothed. Previously, D'Elmont has not been capable of any sort of sacrifice, even for the sake of the woman to whom he professes devotion. He has learned that his first obedience should be to Love rather than to his own pleasure, and he does everything in his power to help the lovers, at the expense of his own search for Melliora. This intimation of his growth is expanded by his relationship with the page Fidelio, who is Violetta in disguise. Fidelio offers D'Elmont companionship, witty conversation, comfort, dependability, and affection: all the "pla-

tonic" aspects of love. Despite his distraction and despair at the disappearance of his mistress, he is cheered by the page. Many hours of his pain are made easier by conversation differing from that of lovers only in its lack of explicit sexual overtones. At last D'Elmont is able to achieve a tenderness which is relatively selfless, and know love which is perfectly complete without impetuous physicality. When he meets Melliora again, D'Elmont's trials are over.

To confirm that her hero has earned his reward, Haywood has Melliora come to him. He has become so pure of heart that at first he refuses to see her, believing that she is just another admirer. However, she forces her way in, and they are blissfully reunited. They meet passionately, even as before, but with two significant differences: Melliora is now as eager to express her love and relief as D'Elmont himself, and now there is the promise of marriage for them in the immediate future. They experience sexual feelings which Haywood does not condemn, but for the purposes of creating what Richetti terms erotic pathos, sexual climax for them is postponed. Having come so far with her virtue intact, Melliora is allowed (or compelled) to proceed all the way to the altar without changing her condition. The point is that they meet here as equals; no force and no compulsion are necessary, and D'Elmont now would not consider using either. Whatever he does, whatever they might do together, they both know that very shortly they can and will be spiritually and eternally united. They declare their intentions to marry that same hour. Violetta reveals herself and her passion, and D'Elmont's growth is complete, for her love inspires in him not vain regret that he is so charis-

matic, or detached pity as he stands looking down from the summit of happiness. He feels real tenderness and compassion, honouring her love for him even though he cannot return it as she might wish. His tears revive her long enough to make her final speech,[9] and she dies in his arms, presumably to continue to watch over his happiness from the next world.

D'Elmont's adventures are far removed from the heroic exploits of his predecessors. His days as a warrior are over before the story begins; apart from a skirmish with Frankville and the ruffians who pursue him, the Count fights no battles and scarcely lifts his sword. No feats of bravery are called for, at least not the sort of physical valour manifested by Cyrus or Oroondates. But D'Elmont proves that he has the courage to resist social pressure and conventional expectations in his quest to be worthy of Melliora's love. And the battle he fights is perhaps the most difficult and dangerous of all, the war between his baser, hedonistic inclinations and his desire to act honourably and unselfishly. By taking the awe and respect, the humility and ambition of the French romantic heroes and translating them into the emotions of ordinary life, Haywood changed the emphasis of her fiction. We are interested not so much in what he does, but in why he does it and what he thinks about the consequences of his deeds. She also transformed the concept of the hero from a man who is superior to all around him and strives to attain perfection, to one who is faulty and confused, who grows through his mistakes and perceptions to a deeper and more human ideal.

[9] See above, p. 122.

VI

THE NOVEL AS ROMANCE

Even a thematic explication of Love in Excess offers numerous examples of how close it is to the traditions of the heroic romance. In Haywood's novel the same prominence is given to love, and the France in which it is set is no more "real" than the Greece of Cassandra. The configuration of characters is similar, as well as the long conversations, the letters, and the use of disguises. With the single exception of oracles, Haywood employs every convention of the romance, yet she does so in such a way that the work which results is radically different from any of its predecessors. In the French romances, the conventions themselves became, in many respects, the subject of the fiction; they were certainly its heart and soul. In Love in Excess they have dwindled into techniques. This distinction is one which many literary historians have failed to make. Recognizing the outward form of conventions, they have assumed that their function will be equally familiar. Using the foregoing explication as a basis, I intend to examine each convention in turn and investigate the ways in which Haywood actually uses them in her first literary work. By doing so, I will both offer proof of her creativity and lay a foundation for my discussion of her other fiction.

Of the thematic conventions which Haywood utilizes, the most easily isolated is the chivalry and ambition of the hero, which I have touched on in my discussion of D'Elmont. The French heroes

consistently felt themselves unworthy of their mistresses; their love made no demands other than permission to be of service, military or otherwise, until such a time as their worth has been proven. The merest vestige of this convention remains in Love in Excess. In her first letter to D'Elmont, Alovisa writes:

> Resistless as you are in war , you are much more so in Love: Here you conquer without making an attack, and we surrender before you summons; the law of arms obliges you to show mercy to an yielding enemy, and sure the Court cannot inspire less generous sentiments than the Field. (p. 4)

Within this passage, the transfer from Field to Court is complete, and chivalric ideals of military glory are forever abandoned in Haywood's works.[1] However, the restraint and undemanding decorousness of the French heroes is beautifully mirrored by the role-reversal in the third part of the novel. D'Elmont becomes not merely submissive, but actually passive, in relation to his mistress, and to everyone else as well. His trials are not simply a test of his patience and endurance, as they would be in a romance, but a test of his moral fiber and a measurement of his inner growth. While the French heroes merely have to wait for opportunities to display their worth, D'Elmont actually has to prove his, to demonstrate to the reader and to himself, as well as to a

[1] The single exception is in The Arragonian Queen (1724), in which a marriage of convenience is arranged as a result of the hero's military aid to his neighbour. This novel also includes an example of a lover who goes to war to better his financial position, a particularly modern interpretation of the convention. See also the story of Horatio in The Fortunate Foundlings (1744) and below, pp. 359-60.

punctilious mistress, that he is worthy of her love. In this instance, Haywood has taken a major convention of romance, and put it to an important thematic use.

The relationship between the heroine of Love in Excess and her literary ancestors is less close. The first, and most important point, is that Melliora is present; she is an active participant in the novel. The second, which is perhaps equally important in the light of subsequent developments in fiction, is that her trials consist not merely of resisting the assaults, rapes and seductions of various men and women who want to keep her from her lover, but also of resisting the impulses of her own desire when they conflict with what she knows is right. Richetti says of Amena's seduction that she is "a victim of circumstances and her own irresistible inner compulsions."[2] She is helpless, not only because of external conditions, such as her insufficient fortune and physical weakness, but also because of her love for her seducer. Melliora's dilemma is almost identical. We have already seen the depth of her feeling, but one particular scene defines her role as heroine most clearly. After she escapes from D'Elmont and Melantha in the garden and retires to her chamber, she fears that her persistent lover will renew his attack and desires to protect herself. Suspecting that he has a key to her room, she thinks how she can block the lock.

> She had no keys that were large enough. . . and if she had put one in, on the inside, it would have fallen out immediately on the least touch, but at last,

[2] Richetti, p. 188.

> after trying several ways, she tore her handkerchief into small pieces, and thrust it into the hole with her busk, so hard that it was impossible for any key to enter.
>
> Melliora thought she had done a very heroic action, and sat herself down on the bedside in a pleased contemplation of the conquest, she believed her virtue had gained over her passion: But alas! How little did she know the true state of her own heart? She no sooner heard a little noise at the door, as presently after she did, but she thought it was the Count, and began to tremble, not with fear, but desire. (p. 125)

Melliora's heroism cannot be complete until she acknowledges that her greatest enemy lies within herself. Passive resistance, or a feeble defensive action like stuffing her linen down the keyhole, or even, as in the case of the sorely tried Bellamira,[3] drawing a sword to protect her honour, is no longer enough. If true and ideal love is an equal partnership, as it is in Love in Excess, the heroine must be more than an inspiration; she must be a real woman, with real human feelings.

Love in the heroic romance was, as we have seen, a highly stylized, almost entirely cerebral appreciation of virtue and beauty. Above all, love was subject to the rules of reason and good manners. Haywood, in her authorial intrusions, seems to present a notion of love which is exactly opposite:

> Love is what we can neither resist, expel, nor even alleviate, if we should never so vigorously attempt it; and though some have boasted, thus far will I yield and no farther, they have been convinced of the vanity of forming such resolutions by the impossibility of keeping them. (p. 171)

[3] See above, p. 102.

> When once Love becomes in our power, it ceases to be worthy of that name; no man really possesst with it can be master of his actions; and whatever effects it may enforce, are no more to be condemned than poverty, sickness, deformity, or any other misfortune incident to human nature. (p. 202)

Such sentiments would ill suit a hero who could refrain from taking even the smallest liberty for the space of twenty volumes. However, in the actual body of the work,[4] the concept of love which emerges, as we have seen, is much closer to the ideal presented in the earlier fiction. Dieter Schulz notices this ambiguous relationship, but does not attempt to resolve it:

> Mrs. Haywood presents us with a curious mixture of neo-Platonic love rhetoric and an endless series of breathtaking erotic scenes. Love in Excess . . . retain/s/ key concepts of courtly and heroic romance, while at the same time depriving them of their idealistic content. The result is an ambiguous rhetoric, which seemingly adheres to ideological and stylistic patterns of romance, but actually undermines those patterns and supplants their idealism by lasciviousness.[5]

I would contend that the idealism is still present, but that the nature of the ideal has changed. If Haywood's comments regarding the irresistible force of love were to be interpreted as Schulz implies, D'Elmont would succeed in all his rapes and seductions, and Ciamara would be an object of sympathy rather than one of disgust. If idealism had been supplanted by lasciviousness, Love in

[4] See also another authorial comment, pp. 259-60, quoted in part on p. 145 above.

[5] Dieter Schulz, "'Novel,' 'Romance,' and Popular Fiction in the First Half of the 18th Century," Studies in Philology, 70 (1973), 87.

Excess would have ended in a marriage immediately after Alovisa's death. The long dialogue between D'Elmont and Melliora in the garden[6] contains the key to Haywood's ideal of passion. Love cannot be resisted; the lover must recognize not only the presence, but also the depth and force of his or her feelings, even when the object of that love is forbidden. Although Melliora is profoundly shocked by her own violation of a basic taboo--thou shalt not covet another woman's husband--she readily acknowledges her surrender: "I confess I feel for you, a passion far beyond all, that ever bore the name of love, that I no longer can withstand the too powerful magick of your eyes, nor deny any thing that charming tongue can ask" (p. 114). That is what Haywood means when she speaks of love's irresistibility. However, Melliora does not stop with her confession. "But now's the time to prove yourself the hero, subdue yourself, as you have conquered me. . . . " (p. 114). When D'Elmont himself invokes the excuse that what cannot be helped is not blameable, she replies with another admission of her own vulnerability and inner turmoil, carrying him by the sheer momentum of her powerful emotion into a state of Platonic communion. Sense has elevated itself to reason; the fusion of the two becomes stronger than the force of either on its own. This conjunction of physical love with the "tender friendship" descending from the "tendresse" of Scudéry, constitutes Haywood's ideal of love, and the whole novel preaches her message.

An important romance convention, and the primary technical

[6] Quoted in full on pp 143-44 above.

device employed by Haywood, is vital to the presentation of these ideas about love, and that is the use of long conversations, the "set pieces" of Madeleine de Scudéry. In her discussion of this particular device, Eareckson admits that Haywood "is far more occupied with her narration than with digressions";[7] however, she goes on to compare a long conversation from Love in Excess with one from The Grand Cyrus,[8] thus implying that Haywood's dialogue is similarly précieuse and irrelevant. There are actually several long, elaborate discussions in Haywood's work, but in each case the discussion is vital to both plot and characterization. Although Eareckson misconstrues it, the conversation which she quotes in part is a fine example of the way this works. The Count discovers Melliora reading Ovid's Epistles.

> How Madam (cried he . . .) dare you, who the other day so warmly inveighed against writings of this nature, trust yourself with so dangerous an amusement? How happens it, that you are so suddenly come over to our party? Indeed my lord (answered she, growing more disordered) it was chance rather than choice, that directed this book to my hands, I am far from approving subjects of this kind, and believe I shall ever be so: Not that I can perceive any danger in it, as to myself, the retirement I have always lived in, and the little propensity I find to entertain a thought of that uneasy passion, has hitherto secured me from any prepossession, without which, Ovid's art is vain.
> (pp. 91-92)

The sight of the innocent Melliora reading a book of love-letters fires D'Elmont's hopes, as he believes the book symbolizes her susceptibility to love. His question is not fatuous politeness;

[7] Eareckson, p. 50.

[8] Eareckson, p. 50.

he is in reality asking her if her ostensible change of heart is due to anything more significant than a passing fancy. Nor is her ready reply simply pedantic. Her words constitute a warning to him not to presume too much, and a reassertion of her desire to remain free from entanglements.

> Nay, Madam (replied the Count), now you contradict your former argument, which was, that these sort of books were, as it were, preparatives to love, and by their softening influence melted the soul, and made it fit for amorous impressions, and so far, you certainly were in the right, for when once the fancy is fixed on a real object, there will be no need of auxiliary forces; the dear idea will spread it self thro' every faculty of the soul, and in a moment inform us better, than all the writings of the most experienced poets could do in an age. Well, my lord, (said she endeavouring to compose herself) I am utterly unambitious of any learning this way, and shall endeavour to retain in memory, none of the misfortunes that attended the passion of Sappho, than the tender, tho' never so elegant expressions it produced: And if all readers of romances took this method, the votaries of Cupid would be fewer, and the dominion of reason more extensive. (p. 92)

In his speech, D'Elmont is at once telling her that he suspects her tenderness for him and that he refuses to give up hope. He also hints to her that he could speak equally fine things to her if she would let him. Her disorder at his words is proof that she understands the subterranean meanings of their exchange. Her disclaimer of interest in love and her desire that reason extend its dominion declares to him that she has managed to subject whatever she has felt to its rule and does not wish to renew the struggle.

> You speak (answered D'Elmont) as tho' love and reason were incompatible. There is no rule (said she) my

> lord without exception; they are indeed sometimes united, but how often they are at variance where may we not find proofs? History is full of them, and daily examples of the many hair-brained matches, and slips much less excusable, sufficiently evince how little reason has to do in the affairs of love. (p. 92)

D'Elmont's words show that he has understood her, but he cannot resist asking if there is any hope for him, however slight. Her reply assures him that rationally, at least, she is set against becoming involved in a sordid affair which would ruin her both in her own eyes and in the eyes of "the world."

That ends the preliminary stage of the conversation. They have worked delicately from a homely discussion of reading matter to a highly charged exchange of abstractions. The next step is for the generalities to take on specific personal meanings.

> I mean (continued she, with a very serious air) that sort of love, for there are two, which hurries people to an immediate gratification of their desires, tho' never so prejudicial to themselves, or the person they pretend to love. Pray Madam (said the Count, a little nettled at this discourse) what love is that which seems at least to merit the approbation of a lady so extremely nice? (pp. 92-93)

D'Elmont's reaction to Melliora's thinly veiled accusation of selfishness and hypocrisy indicates that he, too, is aware of the undercurrents of their conversation. He is, in effect, asking her what he has to do to win her approval, or, as we might say now, to reach her. Her reply simultaneously reveals Haywood's ideals to us and communicates to him Melliora's unwillingness to act against her own better judgment.

> It has many branches (replied she) in the first place that which we owe to Heaven, in the next to our King, our country, parents, kindred, friends, and lastly, that which fancy inclines, and reason guides us to, in a partner for life, but here every circumstance must agree, parity of age, of quality, of fortune, and of humour, consent of friends, and equal affection in each other, for if any one of these particulars fails, it renders all the rest of no effect. Ah, Madam (cried the Count not able to suffer her to proceed). What share of pity then can you afford to a man who loves where almost all these circumstances are wanting, and what advice would you give a wretch so curst? I would have him think, (said she more gravely than before). How Madam (resumed he), think did you say? Alas! 'Tis thought that has undone him. That's very possible (answered she) but yet 'tis want of thinking justly, for in a lover's mind illusions seem realities, and what at an other time would be looked on as impossible, appears easy then they indulge, and feed their new-born folly with prospect of a hope, tho' ne'er so distant a one, and in the vain pursuit of it, fly consideration, 'till despair starts up in the midway, and bars their promised view, whereas if they gave way to due reflection, the vanity of the attempt would presently be shown, and the same cause that bid 'em cease to hope, would bid 'em cease to wish. (p. 93)

This passage is perhaps the most interesting in relation to the "set conversation" convention, because it most closely resembles the word play and intellectual manipulations of the French works. Melliora's first speech, in which she deliberately misconstrues D'Elmont's question and equivocates about the meaning of "love," is a brilliant use of the French style. She is desperately trying to stall, to ward off the inevitable moment when D'Elmont will declare his love, for once that declaration is made, she knows that her real conflict will begin. When she finally does tell him what she believes love must be, she is actually calling on him to admit, as he does, that their own case is hopeless. He reacts by asking, in a suitably opaque way, what do they do next? However, by calling on her to offer advice, he moves perilously close to the

personal revelation she is trying to avoid, and she responds with a second passage of equivocation revolving around the word "think," once again both stalling and communicating her own perception of their situation. The pedantry of her reply is also an indication of how precarious she feels her hold to be on the mental strength required to follow her own maxims. She is very young, and very innocent; her belief, as expressed in this last speech, in the power of "due reflection" is a perfect detail of characterization.

That Melliora's sophistry is insufficient to protect her from the confrontation she hopes to avoid is demonstrated by the next stage of the conversation. D'Elmont immediately moves one step closer to talking about himself.

> Ah Madam (said he) how little do you know of that passion, and how easily could I disprove you by the example of my friend; despair and love are of an equal age in him, and from the first moment he beheld his adorable charmer, he has languished without the least mixture of a flattering hope. . . . Where love is kindled in a generous heart by a just admiration of the real merits of the object beloved, reason goes hand in hand with it, and makes it lasting as our life. In my mind (answered Melliora coldly) an esteem so grounded may more properly be ascribed to friendship. (pp. 93-94)

Both of them recognize that D'Elmont is speaking of his own feelings, and obliquely flattering Melliora as he does so. Her reply, however, tells him that if his love is as pure as he says, it is not really love, but more properly friendship, based on admiration and respect rather than on any sort of desire to possess. The stage direction indicates that she does not believe him, and that she is unwilling to listen to another emotional appeal. The stage direction to his reply, which is the speech on friendship and love

quoted earlier,[9] indicates again that he has understood her perfectly: "Then be it so Madam (rejoined the Count brashly)." He disregards her coldness and disapproval and begins the final movement towards a bald avowal of his love. After some further exchanges about the nature of friendship, D'Elmont throws caution to the winds:

> That, which has in reserve, no separate interest, or divided thoughts, that which fills all,--gives all the soul and esteems even life a trifle, to prove it self sincere--What can love do more than yield every thing to the object beloved? And friendship must do so too, or it is not friendship! Therefore take heed fair angel (continued he taking her hand, and kissing it) how you promise friendship, where you ne'er mean to love. And observing she was silent, Your hand (said he), your lip, your neck, your breast, your all--All this whole heaven of beauty must no longer be in your own disposal--All is the prize of friendship! As much confused as Melliora was, at these words which gave her sufficient reason to fear he would now declare himself more fully than she desired; she had spirit and resolution enough to withdraw her hand from his, and with a look, that spoke her meaning but too plainly for the repose of the enamoured D'Elmont: I shall take care, my lord (said she) how I commence a friendship with any person who shall make use of it to my prejudice. (p. 95)

Despite Melliora's temporary resurgence of self-protective pedantry, D'Elmont proceeds with his liberties, both verbal and physical, and finally openly declares his passion. In this passage, the ostensible subject is another favourite "set piece": "the difference between friendly . . . and passionate . . . intercourse."[10] However, unlike the lovers in the romances, neither of them really

[9] See above, p. 146.

[10] McDougall, p. 41.

cares about that difference. The discourse is merely a veneer, or more properly, a camouflage, allowing them to tread on dangerous ground with less fear of fatal consequences. Haywood makes perfectly clear, by her description of Melliora's confusion, that she is not interested in the conversation for its own sake any more than are her characters. From the beginning her intention is to allow both Melliora and the reader to be drawn in, by a seemingly innocuous intellectual conversation, to an explosive and dramatic emotional confrontation. I have analyzed this confrontation at length because I believe it demonstrates the technical skill with which Haywood is able to make a stultified convention function efficiently for her on several levels.

Another outstanding feature of the conversation I have been discussing relates to Haywood's use of words. As I suggested in my description of the romance style,[11] the language of fiction is particularly elusive, and of all the conventions of the novel is perhaps the one most open to variant interpretations. A brief survey of critical opinion on Haywood's early works illustrates this point. Baker calls her style "melodramatic, rhetorical and high-flown";[12] Erickson finds her "fustian and bombast . . . hilarious."[13] Schulz believes that "sensationalism and erotic sensualism /are/ thinly veiled by the rhetoric of romance,"[14] while Richetti finds that her style "disguises" an "underlying realism" similar to that of Defoe.[15] On the other hand, there are critics

[11] See above, p. 105-6.
[12] Baker, p. 115.
[13] Erickson, p. 86.
[14] Schulz, p. 90.
[15] Richetti, p. 167.

who refer to "her glib reportorial style"[16] as being "more or less colloquial."[17] To these scholars, "Haywood's English is fluent, intelligible and fairly correct."[18] Morgan even goes so far as to call it "vigorous, natural and colloquial to a fault."[20] What emerges from this survey is that no one, which the exception of Richetti, who closely analyzes several passages in his essay on Love in Excess, makes any attempt to examine the texts of the novels and actually discover how the language functions. The apparent paradox of a style which is simultaneously "rhetorical and high-flown" and "vigorous, natural and colloquial" is easily resolved if one makes reference to the texts. In the long conversation just analyzed, Melliora's speech adheres closely to the précieuse style of the heroic romance; she is intellectual, didactic, and rather stuffy. D'Elmont, in contrast, is more "romantic"--that is, impetuous, extravagant, energetic. His manner of speaking is as vigorous as Melliora's is rhetorical. This is not the result of an inability on Haywood's part to be consistent, but rather a conscious technique for characterization. In each instance, the style in which the character speaks is the natural, almost inevitable result of his or her temperament and condition. This particular dialogue is one of the first long exchanges between hero and heroine after they have recognized that they love each other, and one of its functions is to allow both them and the reader to know them better. Compare it with the dialogue between

16 Harrison R. Steeves, Before Jane Austen (London, 1966), p. 95.
17 R. M. Lovett and H. S. Hughes, The History of the Novel in England (London, 1933), pp. 48-49.
18 Reynolds, p. 215.
19 Morgan, p. 103.

Oroondates and Statira.[20] In the romance the speakers are hardly differentiated, and their speeches reveal little more about them than that they are highly skilled in turning a compliment. Moreover, the "artificial," "inflated" style of the French works, which Haywood seems to imitate in Melliora's speeches, actually drains the language of emotion, substituting rhetorical devices and abstractions. In Melliora's case, the undercurrents of the exchange supply her words with additional emotional depth, and the force of the passage consists of the juxtaposition of the two. In a different situation, her style of speaking is so "natural" that it seems almost modern.

> As she was going . . . hastily to her own apartment, the Count and Baron passed her . . . she stept to the Count, and in a faulting, scarce intelligible accent, whispered, For Heaven's sake let me speak to you before night, make some pretence to come to my chamber, where I'll wait for you. . . . He misunderstood part of what she said, and . . . imagined she said <u>at night</u>. (p. 164)

The suspense and tension of her predicament here demand plain speaking, and Haywood complies. If the occasion demands it, Melliora is similarly capable of the energy and extravagance more characteristic of her lover, as when she slips into blank verse reminiscent of the heroic tragedy.[21]

The "analysis of emotion," that other romance convention closely related to the set conversation, is much more highly developed in Haywood's other novels than in <u>Love in Excess</u>[22] In her later

[20] Quoted above, p. 96-97. [21] See above, p. 143. [22] See below, pp. 220-25.

fiction the set conversation virtually disappears, and the other convention takes its place as a means of revealing feeling. But the device which figures so largely and characteristically in those novels is used far less frequently in her first. However, when she does employ it, she again reveals how close her work is to the romance, yet how different. The description of Melliora's feelings after her father's death[23] are couched in almost exactly the same terms as Statira's monologue on the "crime" of loving Oroondates.[24] In contrast to the convoluted abstractions of La Calprenède's heroine, Haywood's language is simple and direct. Melliora's state of mind after the "set conversation" between her and D'Elmont provides Haywood with another opportunity to employ the analysis of emotion in a situation complex enough to satisfy the most demanding habitué of French fiction:

> 'Tis impossible to guess the conflict in Melliora's breast at this instant; she had heard a most passionate declaration of love from a married man, and by consequence, whatever his pretences was, could look on his designs no otherwise than aimed at the destruction of her honour, and was fired with a virtuous indignation. But then she saw in this married man, the only person in the world, who was capable of inspiring her with a tender thought, she saw him reduced to the last extremity of despair for her sake: she heard his sighs, she felt his tremblings as he held her, and could not refrain from shedding some tears, both for him, and for herself, who indeed suffered little less. (p. 97)

This is no discussion of abstract principles. Each facet of Melliora's reaction to D'Elmont's confession of love is isolated, de-

[23] See above, p. 139. [24] See above, pp. 105-6.

fined, and placed in perspective against every other aspect. She does not debate with herself about the merits and inconveniences of adulterous love, nor does Haywood debate for her. She is frightened, angry, compassionate and sad at once, and Haywood attempts to capture these feelings at a specific moment in time. They are presented not as absolute and abstract, but as intense and individual. The language, compared with the involuted and cerebral terminology of Statira's speech, is far more sensuous; D'Elmont's "sighs" and "tremblings" contribute vividness and an aura of authenticity. We are given much more of a sense that her predicament, and her suffering, are real.

Haywood's design of revealing the innermost thoughts of her characters leads her to adopt another major convention of the romance, which then became vital to her own fiction: the frequent insertion of letters. She includes letters in every work she wrote, in every genre;[25] they are practically a hallmark of her style.[26] However, unlike the "documents of state"[27] which are "ornaments to the plot"[28] of the French romances, Haywood's letters are always vital to characterization and usually essential to the plot as well. Compare, for example, excerpts from two letters D'Elmont receives from women desiring to bring themselves to his attention:

[25] Even a few of her Poems on Several Occasions are verse epistles.

[26] It is because of the elaborate and well-written letters interspersed throughout Memoirs of a Certain Irish Dean that Day ascribes the work to her in "An Anonymous Attack on Swift," Notes and Queries, 200 (1955), 530-32.

[27] Jusserand, p. 361.

[28] Eareckson, p. 26.

> The little God lays down his arrows at your feet, confesses your superior power, and begs a friendly treatment; he will appear to you . . . in the eyes of the most passionate of all his votaresses; search therefore for him in her, in whom (amongst that bright assembly) you would most desire to find him; I am confident you have too much penetration to miss of him, if not byassed by a former inclination, and in that hope, I shall (as patiently as my expectations will let me) support till then, the tedious hours. (p. 4)

> In your country, where women are allowed the privilege of being seen and addressed to, it would be a crime unpardonable to modesty, to make the first advances. But here, where rigid rules are bars, as well to reason, as to nature: it would be as great a one, to feign an insensibility of your merit. (p. 173)

The first letter is coy, "flowery," and periphrastic. Only in the final parenthesis does its author reveal that she is motivated by tumultuous emotions, and even then her reference to her impatience is oblique. By contrast, the second letter is bold, direct, frank and unashamed. It comes as no surprise to a careful reader that Ciamara is its author, while the other was written by Alovisa. As proud and egotistical as she is, Alovisa never does anything immodest without terrible pangs of guilt and shame. She is constantly aware that she is committing "a crime unpardonable" by chasing the Count. Ciamara suffers from no such compunctions. She is ruthless and completely without shame when it comes to her pleasures. She could never write a letter full of "little Gods" and "votaresses." Love in Excess also contains several letters which are fundamental to the structure of the plot. The first is Alovisa's letter inviting D'Elmont to look for an unknown admirer at the ball; without it, the novel would never begin. That same letter is the means of revealing Alovisa's identity to the Count, and the actual writing of the letter represents a serious conflict between

Alovisa's modesty and the force of her passion. Later, Amena's letter from the convent serves as a means by which Haywood can demonstrate D'Elmont's changed feelings. It also results in what becomes Alovisa's fatal interference in her husband's affairs. Camilla writes a letter in Violetta's name to gain a meeting with Frankville, and it is a letter from Amena's father about Melliora's disappearance which brings together Frankville and D'Elmont.

If Haywood's use of the epistolary convention is an important departure from that of the French romance writers, her handling of subplots and intercalated stories is even more significant. The romans à longue haleine" contained a multiplicity of characters, each with a history to relate, each story only peripherally connected to the main "plot," such as it was. There is a similar multiplicity of characters in Love in Excess, involving a similar profusion of relationships, etc. However, the connections among them move beyond the tangential. We have already seen how each of D'Elmont's relationships is dependent in some way on his feelings for and reactions to the other women. Alovisa is an active agent in Amena's ruin; Amena affects D'Elmont's attitudes towards Alovisa and Melliora; Melantha interferes between Melliora and the Count and ultimately saves her from ruin; Ciamara tries to prevent D'Elmont from remaining faithful to Melliora, while Violetta gives him the opportunity to reassert that fidelity. The main subplot, the affair between Frankville and Camilla, is equally important, not only by presenting Frankville as a foil to D'Elmont, but also by bringing together D'Elmont and Violetta, and by allowing Ciamara further opportunities to tempt him. The connections are more than superficial. When Ciamara pretends to be

Camilla, she gains a chance to reveal her feelings to him; she also precipitates the estrangement between Camilla and Frankville. That estrangement, in turn, causes Franville to force D'Elmont once again into Ciamara's power, and later provides the means by which he is rescued from it. That Franville is Melliora's brother is a further link between the two stories.

The two minor subplots are slightly less critical to the main action, yet not altogether irrelevant. The first, the relationship between D'Elmont's brother, Brillian, and Ansellina, Alovisa's sister, serves several functions, the most important of which is revealing Alovisa's desperation in her attempts to keep D'Elmont even after she knows he no longer loves her. She interferes between the two lovers, causing them unnecessary pain, using her position in the family to blackmail her sister into submission. Brillian also serves as a foil, marrying one sister for love while his brother marries the other for ambition. More concretely, he acts as Alovisa's protector in her fatal escapade with the Baron. The other subplot, Melliora's abduction by the Marquiss, is the least relevant in itself. In some respects it is the most romantic of the stories: the Marquiss is a "generous rival," and despite the impetuous passion which led to his kidnapping her, he treats her honourably throughout her captivity, and surrenders her immediately when he realizes that her chosen lover has appeared. As a consolation prize for his good behaviour, he marries Charlotta, Melliora's friend, whom he had earlier abandoned. On a more practical level, however, even this flight of fancy is not without significance, for if Melliora had not been abducted, the two lovers could not have been reunited in the dramatic and immediate way

which provides the satisfaction of the ending. Melliora has to leave the convent and appear on the spot, and the Marquiss simply serves as her means of transport. The abduction also allows time for the final stage of D'Elmont's purification, his relationship with Violetta. The net result of this carefully established network of relationships is a novel with an organic plot; the work ends when the development of D'Elmont's personality has been completed, and the various strands of the story are resolved by a more or less "natural"--albeit somewhat coincidental--conjunction of characters.

Other literary devices from the romance appear in Love in Excess. Poetry, which is a standard part of the French repertoire and is usually absent from Haywood's fiction, occurs twice in the novel. The first instance is an exchange of witty epigrams between Brillian and Ansellina, which is similar to the scene in which Moll and a prospective husband scratch couplets on a window pane.[29] The other is a long verse lament written by Camilla, which Frankville shows D'Elmont when he is trying to describe his mistress's charms. Gratuitous as it sounds, the poem is not merely a chance for Haywood to show off her ability to write verse. Camilla is a remarkable woman, one of Haywood's "unfeminine" heroines: she is independent, active and learned, and is not afraid to take steps to achieve what she wants. Frankville tells his friend that "her humour, wit, judgment, good nature and generosity are in her countenance, conspicuous as in her actions. . . ." (p. 209). We hear of her actions mostly at second-hand, and there is

[29] Daniel Defoe, Moll Flanders (London, 1930), pp. 67-68.

no way for us to observe her genius in her face; consequently, the poem illustrates for the reader the quality of Camilla's mind. The disguises which are assumed within the course of the novel perform a similar service. In the romances, men frequently assumed women's clothing, but very rarely did women disguise themselves as men.[30] The hero as hero was valiant, daring and bold, but as lover he was passive and submissive. Consequently, the feminine robes he put on symbolized his emotional role. In Love in Excess the reverse is the case. The men do not disguise themselves, but frequently the women assume identities not their own. In three of the four instances, they "disguise" themselves as other women: Camilla pretends to be Violetta; Melantha pretends to be Melliora; and Ciamara pretends to be Camilla. All three examples are indicative of a certain boldness in the women assuming the disguise. The most interesting use of the convention is Violetta's transforming herself into the page Fidelio. Her action is seemingly a bold one; in men's clothing she is free to accompany her lover. However, like the heroes who dressed as women, Violetta contents herself with using her disguise to serve D'Elmont in silent unselfishness. In male habit she becomes not bolder, but more submissive, revealing herself as a true refugee from the world of romance.

The avowed purpose of the heroic romances, apart from simple entertainment, was to instruct their readers in the theory and practices of love, illustrating, in the process, ideals of character and behaviour. In the "Verses Written in the Blank Leaf of

[30] See above, p. 108.

Mrs Haywood's Novel," prefixed to the fifth edition of Love in Excess, an anonymous reader makes the same claim for Haywood's work.

> Of all the passions given us from above,
> The noblest, truest, and the best, is love;
> 'Tis Love awakes the soul, informs the mind,
> And bends the stubborn temper to be kind,
> Abates the edge of ev'ry poi'nant care,
> Succeeds the wishes of the trembling fair,
> And ravishes the lover from despair.
> 'Tis Love, Eliza's soft affections fires,
> Eliza writes, but Love alone inspires;
> 'Tis Love, that gives D'Elmont his manly charm,
> And tears Amena from her father's arms;
> Relieves the fair-one from her maiden fear,
> And gives Melliora all her soul holds dear,
> A generous lover, and a bliss sincere.
>
> Receive, my fair, the story, and approve
> The cause of Honour, and the cause of Love;
> With kind concern, the tender page peruse,
> And aid the infant labours of the Muse.
> So never may these eyes forget to shine,
> And bright Melliora's fortune be as thine;
> On thy best looks, an happy D'Elmont feed,
> And all the wishes of thy soul succeed.

The author of these lines recognizes that the novel presents a picture of the perfect couple and the perfect relationship, and recommends that it be followed almost as a blue-print by the young women who will read it. Haywood, in the passages where as author, she discusses the nature of love, makes clear that such instruction was in fact her intention. Realizing the tremendous appeal idealistic representations had for the people most likely to read her works, the same audience that had devoured volume after volume of didacticism in the romances, she goes even a step further. In addition to presenting food for thought in discussions and monologues, she actively involves the reader in a dialogue with

the authorial voice. Consider the following passage:

> There is nothing more certain than that love, though it fills the mind with a thousand charming ideas, which those untouched by that passion, are not capable of conceiving, yet it entirely takes away the power of utterance, and the deeper the impression it has made on the soul, the less we are able to express it, when willing to indulge and give a loose to thought; what language can furnish us with words sufficient, all are too poor, all wanting both in sublimity, and softness, and only fancy! a lover's fancy! can reach the exalting soaring of a lover's meaning! But, if so impossible to be described, if of so vast, so wonderful a nature as nothing but it self can comprehend, how much more impossible must it be entirely to conceal it! What strength of boasted reason? What force of resolution? What modest fears, or cunning artifice can correct the fierceness of its fiery flashes in the eyes, keep down the struggling sighs, command the pulse, and bid the trembling cease? Honour, and virtue, may distance bodies, but there is no power in either of those names to stop the spring that with a rapid whirl transports us from ourselves, and darts our souls into the bosom of the darling object: this may seem strange to many, even of those who call, and perhaps believe that they are lovers, but the few who have delicacy enough to feel what I but imperfectly attempt to speak, will acknowledge it for truth, and pity the distress of Melliora. (pp. 111-2)

Haywood's first trick is to offer to the reader membership in an élite; she will describe a kind of love "which those untouched by that passion, are not capable of conceiving." In that phrase she is appealing to a basic desire most people have of feeling superior to the majority of their fellows. She soon cements this bond between herself and suitably sensitive readers by moving into the use of the first person plural. The series of rhetorical questions which follows involves the reader still further in the process of her argument, and she then proceeds with another appeal to "the few who have delicacy enough to feel." By disclaiming her own

ability to describe the "sublimity" of love and the power of passion to sweep aside all other considerations, Haywood is in a sense making the reader directly responsible for furnishing the message she wishes to impart. At this point, she returns to the plight of her heroine and can rest assured that the identification between Melliora and her audience is fairly complete. Obviously, this almost propogandistic handling of language and rhetorical devices allows Haywood to achieve a much more direct relationship with her readers. Consequently she can communicate her concepts of love and correct behaviour with a much greater force and immediacy than the highly sententious romance writers, who were more concerned with wit than with emotion. Haywood's skill in manipulating language in this way became a fundamental part of her style; she was to use it with best effect in The Female Spectator and her other periodical literature. In Love in Excess, however, it functions quite effectively to insure that her lessons will penetrate deeply the sensibilities of her readers.

One further point remains to be made about the nature of the lessons she desired to impart in her first novel. Her use of the conventions of heroic romance inevitably engenders certain expectations, both literary and non-literary, in her audience. Her deft manipulation of the literary devices taken from her French predecessors allowed her to shape a new sort of fiction, retaining the desire to instruct, the idealism, the interest in love and ideals of conduct which were vital to the romance, but adding much in the way of characterization and organic unity. However, it is the ideals themselves, and their departure from those of the romance which comprise her other important contribution to fiction.

Haywood's ideal heroine is a vigorous, sensuous woman, unafraid to admit her feelings, asking and demanding emotional equality in her relationship with her lover. She discusses ideas and feelings with him. In turn, he is both passionate and respectful, learning to honour the integrity of all women and to denounce the opportunism of the kind of person he was before he fell in love. He is no humble, self-effacing "romantick" hero, but neither is he an attractive, almost satanic rake who sweeps all before him. He, too, must learn to talk to his mistress and to appreciate that friendship is a more important criterion for lasting happiness than a violent passion. In order to be worthy of the heroine, he must learn the difference between love and a desire to possess.

> For the contemporary female reader at whom Mrs. Haywood's novel . . . /is/ aimed, to read such sentiments is to participate in an exhilarating manner in an eighteenth century feminism, . . . a set of apparently stirring moral and emotional affirmations.[31]

This strain of feminism is present in everything she wrote, not only in the implicit messages of her novels, but also in her unfaltering concern with women as both subject and audience of all her works.

What is truly remarkable about Love in Excess is that it sets Haywood at once both within and without a powerful system of conventions. Some, like the analysis of emotion and the use of letters, she would develop into a major technique of her own art.

[31] Richetti, p. 181. See below, p. 274.

Others, like the set conversation and the passive heroine, she discarded completely. This first novel offered her the opportunity to experiment with the form of fiction that was most readily available to her; never again, until she exploited it as anti-romance in Philidore and Placentia (1727),[32] would she come so close to that earlier genre. The tension between the exoticism that she inherits and the realism she injects herself, which is of fairly low intensity in Love in Excess because of that adherence to the original forms, becomes the major interest of her later fiction. It may seem paradoxical to discuss realism in the context of romantic convention, but Haywood went on to develop the first by means of the second. In doing so, she would establish herself as a formidable and controversial figure in the world of letters, which, through this first work of fiction, she had chosen to inhabit.

[32] See below, Chapter Ten.

PART THREE

The Haywood Formula

VII

REALISM AND THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE HEROINE

Since 1956, when Ian Watt published *The Rise of the Novel*, any serious historian of the eighteenth-century novel has inevitably had to deal with the question of realism, with what it is and how its demands shaped the development of the genre. Works of fiction have always been required to reflect some sort of truth, from the parables in the Bible to the bawdy *fabliaux* of the middle ages. Even the romances were prized for their portraits of famous people in society and their reflection of contemporary manners. During the Restoration and early eighteenth century, that intellectual or philosophical impulse which had always demanded "truth" in literature became even more dominant. Chapbooks, biographies of famous criminals, and "factual" accounts of notorious trials flooded the literary market, along with the type of travel literature which culminated in such works as *Oroonoko* and *Robinson Crusoe*. Authors disclaimed responsibility for what they wrote, calling themselves "editors" or biographers rather than novelists;[1] as I have suggested, "history" is the most common description employed on the title-pages, even of obvious fictions.[2]

[1] This desire to claim that novels were in reality factual accounts persists throughout the century. Not only popular writers like Behn, Defoe and Haywood employed this tactic; Richardson's pose as the mere editor of his works is notorious.

[2] See above, p. 83. Of the original works listed by McBurney's *Checklist*, only 28 are called novels. There are an equal number of "secret histories," and 36 called "histories." Of the remainder, most are either "Life and Adventures," "Memoirs," or supposed letters.

To state it quite simply, the novel was required to be "about" real life. Watt defines what he calls formal realism (to distinguish it from the philosophical system) as

> the narrative embodiment of . . . the premise, or primary convention, that the novel is a full and authentic report of human experience, and is therefore under an obligation to satisfy its reader with such details of the story as the individuality of the actors concerned, the particulars of the times and places of their actions, details which are presented through a more largely referential use of language than is common in other literary forms.[3]

Despite her strong affiliation with the traditions of heroic romance, Eliza Haywood's novels do not shirk this obligation. To use the word "realism" in relation to books set in indistinguishable exotic countries and concerning characters who sport names and faces from the annals of romance may perhaps be considered contentious. Critics tend to assume that such characters and settings were the only ones of which writers of Haywood's kind were capable. Certainly it is on the basis of her exotic settings, her Lysanders and Lasselias, and her courts and convents that Haywood is so often dismissed as a third-rate, albeit popular, writer of extravaganzas. However, a careful examination of her works will, I believe, reveal that many of these foreign and "unrealistic" elements seem to be chosen deliberately, not only because the actions of the French or of Italians with long names were inherently more interesting and exciting than those of English Nells and Toms,

[3] Watt, p. 32.

but because Haywood is actually after a different sort of reality. She is not a biographer, content to plod through every circumstance of her protagonists' lives. She leaves material realism to writers like Defoe and instead provides a "full and authentic account" of other aspects of their existence, particularly of their relationships with one another. A painstakingly delineated setting, for example, would demand more details of person and action than Haywood needs or desires to give. On the other hand, her stylized countrysides provide a general atmosphere and background for the workings of her dramas in the same way that a stylized stage set will suggest a complete environment for a play not directly concerned with that environment.[4]

To begin a study of Haywood's "realism," it is first necessary to challenge the critical notion that she did not write like Defoe, for example, because she was not able to do so. When she needs to use physical details, Haywood is quite capable of the accurrate and "referential use of language" Watt mentions. However, such precision always serves some larger design than a simple desire to be "realistic." Consider the following passage, which sets the scene for an attempted assassination:

> It was a forest, wild and desolate, the trackless paths discovered not that any human feet had ever trod them--No fields of corn, no vines, no olives here were planted, no limpid streams, no cool refreshing rivulets appeared to charm the eye with gay delightful prospects, and with their pleasing murmurs sooth the listning ear; but sapless trees, whose wind-bent, leaf-less twigs hung quivering to oppose

[4] Haywood's use of romantic settings is discussed more fully below, pp. 275-82.

> the travellers passage, and rank unwholesome weeds, unfit for use, hemmed in the borders of some stagnant brooks, which here and there, by length of time, the falling rains had made, composed a sad, unblessed, variety, and spread an area of nought but horror.[5]

Although Idalia is set in Spain, the only distinctly Spanish touch in the above description is the mention of vines and olives; this forest could as easily be situated in England or Russia. However, it is a particular forest. Haywood contrasts it with the typical romantic landscape, opposing stylized "limpid streams" with a sharp picture of natural desolation. In this way she creates a suitable atmosphere for the attempted murder of her heroine and her resulting mental turbulance. This scene is not atypical; Haywood's backgrounds quite frequently function in this way, used by her almost as a sort of shorthand. In exotic, romantic countries, in bleak forests, in country retreats, exciting things must inevitably occur. Whereas, in mundane surroundings, where every article of furniture and each detail of landscape are described, it is more likely that ordinary transactions will take the place of heightened passionate exchanges. Free of the demands of strict material realism, Haywood can be summary when her plot requires a quickening of pace, without her omissions appearing incongruous. Richetti says of the country scenes in Love in Excess that

> the country retreat quickly becomes a strictly delimited area where we will not be disturbed by domestic detail, where we will not be distracted from the progress of the amatory fable. Domestic realism is precluded by an erotic and pathetic "intensity." The

[5] Idalia, pp. 56-7.

> stylized country retreat is an unreal world where passion can assume without contradiction correspondingly unreal dimensions.[6]

Haywood is thus enabled to come directly to what interests her--and, presumably, her readers--most of all. Crisis follows crisis, and the rapid series of confrontations maintains both the momentum of the story and the interest of the audience.

Most commonly, Haywood's use of physical detail is a function of her eroticism. Sexuality and all its emotional and social implications are her true realm of concern. Consequently, in order to be formally realistic in her portrayal of that realm, she is "under an obligation to satisfy /her/ reader with such details of the story"[7] as would convince that reader of the authenticity of the situation in question, and of its resolution. She does this in the most direct way, by consciously (though not admittedly[8]) striving to recreate the feelings of her protagonists in her audience. In the same way that an imaginative reader will feel the temptation Moll Flanders feels before she steals her first "bundle" because of Defoe's meticulous scene-setting,[9] a careful reader of Haywood's works empathizes with her besieged heroines and comprehends their submission to love against the dictates of virtue or duty, because of the lush eroticism of her writing. The scenes she sets are meant to be both evocative and provocative:

[6] Richetti, pp. 192-93. [7] Watt, p. 32.
[8] See the preface to Lasselia for her views on the "warmth" of her style. Part of it is included in Williams, Novel and Romance, p. 79. [9] Moll Flanders, p. 164.

> All Nature seemed to favour his design, the pleasantness of the place, the silence of the night, the sweetness of the air; perfumed with a thousand various odours, wafted by gentle breezes from adjacent gardens, compleated the most delightful scene that ever was to offer up a sacrifice to Love; not a breath but flew winged with desire, and sent soft thrilling wishes to the soul; Cynthia herself, cold as she is reported, assisted in the inspiration, and sometimes shone with all her brightness, as it were to feast their ravished eyes with gazing on each other's beauty; then veiled her beams in clouds to give the lover boldness, and hide the virgin's blushes.[10]

The language of this passage is deliberately infused with highly charged words and phrases, such as: "perfumed," "wafted," "sacrifice," "thrilling," "ravished eyes," "veiled," and "virgin." As is often the case with Haywood's evocative writing, the very rhythms of her prose lapse into poetical measure, thus adding to its impact.[11] She carries this lyricism intact into her descriptions of her lovers, particularly when they are taken unaware:

> She was stretched at her length in a kind of slumber . . . by the side of a little stream which ran through a meadow in sight of the great road: her hat, when she lay down, had fallen off her head, and her delicate hair was blown by the wind to and fro, now shading, now disclosing all her lovely face to the sun's burning view. . . .[12]

> Her hair unbraided, hung down upon her shoulders . . . . Part of it fell upon her neck and breast, and with its lovely shadyness, being of a delicate dark brown, set off to vast advantage, the matchless whiteness of her skin: her gown and the rest of her garments were white, and all ungirt, and losely flowing, discovered a thousand beauties, which modish formalities conceal.[13]

[10] Love in Excess, p. 25.
[11] See above, p. 143.
[12] Idalia, p. 112.
[13] Love in Excess, p. 104

The details Haywood provides in a passage of this sort are not specific enough to be photographic in their effect; it could be the same woman in each of the passages quoted. But the descriptions are sufficiently vivid to project a picture into the mind of a receptive reader, to produce the impression of a bold figure against a delicately outlined landscape, and to create that impression in such a way that female readers will imagine themselves in the heroine's place while male readers become voyeurs.

In all of the passages I have just quoted, Haywood combines a gentle and evocative lyricism with just enough physical detail to make it convincing. In her "warmest" passages she can be highly graphic, abandoning her usual protective lushness:

> Seized with shiverings like the hand of death, I fell motionless and senseless at the villain's feet. Thus once more exposed to the hot lust of this accursed fiend, who . . . bore me again to the guilty scene of my undoing, and while I had no spirits or strength to enable me to resist, or indeed knowledge of the violence he offered, triumphed in his repeated crime. I recovered from my swoon . . . just as the horrid rapture was completed. . . . With one hand he did confine mine; and throwing with his legs the bedclothes on the floor, took a malicious pride in viewing my naked limbs, and adding to the horrid fact he had committed, ten thousand monstrous indecencies.[14]

In this passage, replete as it is with euphemisms in accordance with the author's gender and audience, the matter-of-fact mention of the villain's kicking off the blankets with his feet to reveal his victim's nakedness strikes a grim contrast. That small, en-

[14] The Fruitless Enquiry (London, 1767), pp. 125-26.

tirely realistic detail is at once thrilling and horrifying, provocative and frightening. There are similar details in Idalia, after the heroine has mistakenly begun to feel secure in the house of her would-be ravisher:

> She had not been an hour in bed, before she felt the clothes thrown off, and something catch fast hold of her. . . .
>
> Don Ferdinand starting from his musing, and catching up his clothes, and putting them on as hastily as he could. . . .
>
> The imminent danger they were in, made them dispense with ceremony, and she was taken out of bed by force, and her clothes, in what manner they could, huddled on.[15]

All these almost domestic touches heighten the horror of what is taking place because they are familiar to the reader from different contexts. Haywood also uses this technique in more pleasant settings, including familiar, innocuous features to capture the reader's imagination, yet moving almost instantly into an intensely sexual atmosphere. The following scene, from The British Recluse, is an excellent example of this erotic realism:

> The arching trees formed a canopy over our heads, while through the gently shaking boughs soft breezes played in lulling murmurings and fanned us with delicious gales! a thousand nightengales sung amorous ditties, and the billing doves cooed out their tender transports! . . . Methought, we sat with all the sweets of nature blooming around us, like the first happy pair while blessed with innocence. . . . But he . . . had other notions, and aiming only at my ruin

[15] Idalia, p. 16, p. 18, p. 19.

> . . . now began to mingle kisses and embraces with his vows: my hands were the first victims of his fiery pressures; then my lips, my neck, my breast; and perceiving that, quite lost in ecstasy, I but faintly resisted what he did, far greater boldness ensued!--My soul dissolved! Its faculties overpowered!--and Reason, Pride, and Shame, and Fear, and every foe to soft desire, charmed to forgetfulness! my trembling limbs refused to oppose the lovely Tyrant's will![16]

The language attempts to seduce the reader by its use of detail even as Courtal attempts to seduce Belinda: first the scene is set, revealing her state of mind as well as the state of the weather in the garden. Her innocent expectations are suddenly shattered, as is the lyricism of the language used, by Courtal's kisses and Haywood's graphic portrayal of them. A man kissing a woman's hand is hardly a terrifying figure, but a man progressing from that harmless gesture to kissing "my lips, my neck, my breast" is a dangerous ravisher, particularly when his victim--or his audience--begins to respond. The passage builds in rhythm as it reaches a sort of climax, and Haywood builds up a series of loaded words intended to enthrall the reader into greater empathy. Courtal himself is merely a shadow. The encounter is almost autoerotic, for Haywood's focus remains exclusively on Belinda and her reactions to what he is doing to her.

It is this focus which keeps such passages merely graphic rather than pornographic. "If the emphasis of the language were on the physical relationship only, she could be labelled 'pornographic,' but the stress is on the reaction of the heroine, and the inner

[16] The British Recluse, pp. 112-13.

turmoil to which love and sexual desire give rise."[17] Another passage from The British Recluse will illustrate this point. First the scene is set and all subsequent actions are made probable:

> I had undressed, and thrown myself on the bed, restless and uneasy that Lysander had not been to visit me that day. . . . I was so buried in thought that I heard not the tread of any body coming into my chamber, till I saw a man stand close by me. It was about ten o'clock, at that time of the year when there is scarce any darkness; and willing to indulge contemplation, I had not called for candles; and could not presently discern who was there. . . .

Cleomira's concern about her absent lover explains her extreme thoughtfulness; the hour explains her state of undress and posture; the season accounts for the absence of sufficient light to identify her visitor. Thinking it is her guardian, she does not bother to get up, and only asks him what he wants.

> He must be a very ill judge of happiness, (answered he) that could form a wish beyond the treasure which this bed contains. These words, and the accent of his voice . . . told me it was Lysander, and obliged me to endeavour to rise, but he had thrown himself down by me while he was speaking, and seizing both hands, and gently forcing them to circle his waist, joined his lips to mine with too strenuous a pressure to suffer me to reproach the liberties he took.

With the appearance of the lover come graphic details; his actions are drawn with sufficient particularity to compel the reader to enter the scene. In a pornographic writer--John Cleland, for ex-

[17] Doody, p. 42.

ample--this movement would lead to an unabashed rendering of the precise nature of those liberties and the physical sensations they produce. Haywood, while acknowledging that the heroine is considerably affected physically, is more concerned with her emotional response. First, Cleomira describes her surrender to powerful sexual feelings:

> What could I do! surprised in this unguarded moment --full of desires and tender languishments before, his glowing touch now dissolved my very soul, and melted every thought to soft compliance!--in short, I suffered,--or, rather let me say, I could not resist his proceeding from one freedom to another, till there was nothing left for him to ask, or me to grant.

In her confession she piles clause upon clause, building up to her moment of absolute submission to sensation, even as her feelings grow to the point where she begins actively to desire her own ruin. And instantaneously the focus of the passage shifts even further from the physical actions of her lover.

> The guilty transport passed, a thousand apprehensions all at once invaded me! Remorse and shame supplied the place of exstacy!--Tears filled my eyes,--cold tremblings seized my limbs--and my breast heaved no more with joy, but horror![18]

Again, it is almost as though Lysander does not exist; Cleomira's shame might result from something she did to herself. In a way, that is exactly what has happened, for she is as active a participant in the above incident as her shadowy lover.

[18] This scene is found in The British Recluse, pp. 46-47.

This scene between Cleomira and Lysander raises one of the most interesting questions about Haywood's treatment of sexual relationships and, in consequence, about her fiction as a whole. To highly "moral" critics from Haywood's own century to ours, the difference between pornography and the kind of writing I have just described is so subtle as to pass for the most part unnoticed. Pornography, many would argue, is pernicious in itself; how much worse must pornographic romances be? Certainly, by attempting to describe sex and passion, the two main components of life which are largely absent from Defoe's more conventionally realistic works, Haywood exposes herself to the accusation that she wrote sensational trash which appealed to the very worst tastes of her reading public. Her accusers ignore her claim that "the aim of every person, who pretends to write (though in the most insignificant and ludicrous way) ought to tend at least to a good moral use,"[19] saying instead that "Mrs. Haywood kept up a smug pretense of morality as justification for her erotic scenes."[20] However, morality is more than a simple adherence to social rules. It is a question of conscience, self-respect and self-knowledge as well, and Haywood's novels are therefore far from being simply immoral. It is extremely easy for a woman to be chaste when she is immune to sexual feelings; if she is never tempted to act, she never really faces a choice. By restoring the dimension of sexuality to her women, Haywood transforms otherwise straightforward conflicts of good(virginity) and evil(sensuality) into a complex tangle

[19] Lasselia, preface, p. vii. [20] Lionel Stevenson, The English Novel: A Panorama (London, 1961), p. 77. Whicher, Erickson, Baker, and numerous biographical dictionaries share this opinion.

of alternatives. If sex is enjoyable, if women feel at least as strongly as men about satisfaction, if emotional fulfilment is the one area of her life over which a woman has any control,[21] then the resolution of a heroine's dilemma is as difficult to decide as it is important. Conventional morality is a main combatant still on the battleground of her conscience, but no longer is it the only one. In The Mercenary Lover, for example, after a long subtle seduction by Clitander, Althea is at last persuaded to go to bed with him. Later, when she is alone, her conscience begins to reconsider the situation.

> She accused her early nature, wondered how she could be so lost, so abandoned by all the principles her youth was taught, and curst the tenderness which had betrayed her,--the wrong she had done her sister /Clitander's wife/, the dishonour she had brought on herself, the crime she had been guilty of to Heaven, all appeared to her distracted imagination in their blackest and most damning colours, and for some moments involved her in so terrible a despair, that she was almost ready to lay desperate hands on her own life. . . .[22]

A conventional writer, desirous of instilling an acceptable moral, would have stopped there, and found some means to grant Althea that desperate wish. However, Haywood continues, enumerating the other arguments natural to a woman in her heroine's position.

> The idea of Clitander, his charms, his fondness and imagined honour and sweetness of disposition, took their turn to triumph over the faint remains of modesty and virtue; and the felicity of being beloved by a man she considered as the wonder of his sex,

[21] See above, p.36.

[22] The Mercenary Lover (London, 1726), p.26.

> seemed to her sufficient reparation for that she had resigned in the rewarding it; and the gratitude she owed his passion, an excuse for the crime her own had influenced her to commit. In fine, the morning found her as calm and composed as she had the night before been the contrary, and if there was left in her soul any tincture of her former disquiet, the endearments of Clitander, and the arguments he made use of . . . entirely cleared her of it; and made her willingly resign herself to repetitions of that guilty joy, she had at first so much regretted.[23]

Althea's admiration and respect for the cunning Clitander, her innocent vanity at being chosen by such a paragon of manhood, and her very strong sexual attraction to him are formidable opponents, even for the strictest virtue. Consequently, it is not surprising that she finally allows herself to be reassured by his arguments and her own, for she wants and needs very much to believe them. Althea is no libertine, and she must feel an essential rightness in what she does. At the best of times, love and sex cannot be undertaken lightly, but in her own case, where adultery and a kind of incest are involved as well, she must be convinced that Clitander can provide her with some basic personal fulfilment before she enters into intimacy with him. After she comes to that conclusion, the reader must accept it as well, for Althea never loses our sympathy despite her obvious lapse from strict "virtue." Her error is believing that Clitander is a good and honourable man, not surrendering her virginity to her sister's husband.

Perhaps the most striking aspect of this last passage is not its depiction of an extremely complicated situation, but the realistic view Haywood takes of a young woman's reactions to a man

[23] The Mercenary Lover, pp. 26-27.

she trusts implicitly. Clitander is no carefree gallant or ridiculous fop; he is in all senses a brother to her, a guardian and teacher. They live together in familial intimacy even before he begins his seduction, and she finds it only natural that he should confide to her all kinds of personal affairs. In such circumstances, it would be highly "romantic"--that is, idealized and unrealistic--for her to see through his pretences, resist his mental encroachment, and evade his physical advances. Or, if Clitander were somehow allowed to proceed in his vile endeavour, Althea might, like Clarissa, resist "repetitions of that guilty joy" until one or both of them was dead. However, Althea is no Clarissa, and Clitander's seduction is complete, and successful, long before he actually attempts her virtue. Given their kinship, her grave and innocent nature, his position of authority over her, what can Althea do but become an active partner in their intercourse? Although Haywood's novels are frequently condemned as fantastic romantic extravagancies, heroic romance actually presented the same view of sexual relations as conventional morality demanded, a view which Mary Manley ridiculed in her preface to The Secret History of Queen Zarah (1705):

> The authors of romances give extraordinary virtues to their heroins, exempted from all the weakness of humane nature, and much above the infirmities of their sex. . . . It would in no wise be probable that a young woman fondly beloved by a man of great merit and for whom she had a reciprocal tenderness, finding herself at all times alone with him in places which favoured their loves, could always resist his addresses. . . . 'Tis necessary the miracle should be feisable, to make an impression on the brain of reasonable persons.[24]

[24] Quoted in Williams, Novel and Romance, p. 35.

Haywood's "miracles" are nearly always feasible, because she draws her characters not the way society would like them to be, but the way she sees them, investing them with a depth of emotion and subtle motivation unknown either to romancers or to novelists like Defoe.

The Mercenary Lover is a full and authentic report of one woman's experience, and it is typical of all Haywood's early works; her realism is neither material or economic, but psychological. In a situation where Roxana or Moll would think primarily of practical considerations, Haywood's characters experience a variety of intense feelings and reactions, as the following comparison will illustrate. In both instances, the heroine must chose between an honourable marriage with a worthy man or fidelity to a love, the fulfilment of which involves a breach of honour.

> I was now in a dreadful condition indeed, and now I repented heartily my easiness with the eldest brother; not from any reflection of conscience, but from a view of the happiness I might have enjoyed, and had now made impossible; for though I had no great scruples of conscience, as I have said, to struggle with, yet I could not think of being a whore to one brother and a wife to the other. But then it came into my thoughts that the first brother had promised to make me his wife when he came to his estate; but I presently remembered what I had often thought of, that he had never spoken a word of having me for a wife after he had conquered me for a mistress; and indeed, till now . . . it gave me no disturbance at all, for as he did not seem in the least to lessen his affection to me, so neither did he lessen his bounty, though he had the discretion himself to desire me not to lay out a penny of what he gave me in clothes, or to make the least show extraordinary, because it would necessarily give jealousy in the family. . . .[25]

[25] Moll Flanders, p. 27.

> If I should marry Worthly (said I to myself) how wretched must I be? condemned to loathed embraces, and the detested talk of forced civility;--by painful duty restrained from even the wish of better fortune, yet Inclination still at war with Virtue, guilty and innocent at once, and miserable in both:--or, should I indulge my passion in the too-charming Courtal's dear society, could I expect content? Even in his arms, my breach of promise, and ingratitude to Worthly, his despair, and the just censures of the reproaching world, would embitter all my pleasures, turn the dear purchased blessing to a curse, and make my fancied Heaven a real Hell. In this manner would the different agitations which tormented me, make me argue with myself. Honour, reputation, and gratitude were on Worthly's side; but what are these when once opposed by Love![26]

Moll cares for no one but herself; she is essentially a pragmatist worried about her own survival. She never even thinks about the family's chagrin, or Robin's disappointment if she refuses him. Nor does she consider any course of action which might endanger her position in the family, unless, like the marriage itself, it would better that position. Her fear of scandal is the result of concern for her livelihood rather than care for her reputation or her eternal soul. Belinda, on the other hand, is well aware of the repercussions of her actions for other people and in her own conscience. Moll never mentions here what she discloses as an afterthought to Robin's funeral,[27] that every time she lay with Robin, in her heart she committed adultery with his older brother. Belinda admits at the outset that her whole relationship with Worthly, both physical and social, would be painful hypocrisy. Thus, in very similar situations, the concerns of the two writers are totally different, and mutually exclusive.

[26] The British Recluse, pp. 105-6. [27] Moll Flanders, p. 51.

What is evident even from this preliminary glance at some of Haywood's early fiction is that she is above all concerned with character: with the ways in which people react to various situations rather than the situations themselves, and with the reactions of individuals rather than the mechanical posturing of prototypes. Although her characters do not have the individuality of Lovelace or Parson Adams, it is wrong to dismiss them as "inane,"[28] as "embodiments of popular concepts,"[29] or as "puppets through whose convulsive starts and unnatural tones Mrs. Haywood vainly endeavours to make genuine passion speak."[30] Her characters certainly are familiar types from both drama and romance, as are those of Richardson and Fielding; it is common authorial practice to create literature from other literature.[31] Obdurate and tyrannical fathers, for example, are particularly prevalent in literature from Shakespeare's time to the beginning of this century. The presence of standard character types is not significant; what matters is the use to which the author puts them. Although Erickson states "that concentration on romantic conventions precludes any achievement in characterization,"[32] it is in fact by using those conventions that Haywood is able to achieve psychological realism. Her attempts to individualize may perhaps be unsuccessful by standards of modern psychology and the more sophisticated methods of Joyce, James, or even Richardson. However, her

[28] Doody, p. 142. [29] Richetti, p. 125. [30] Reynolds, p. 215. Critics are virtually unanimous in this derogatory assesment of Haywood's characterization. See Baker, pp. 116-17, or Whicher, p. 43, for typical comments. [31] The most sophisticated presentation of this theory is Northrop Frye's discussion of archetypes in Anatomy of Criticism (Princeton, 1957).
[32] Erickson, p. 79.

adaptation of the three literary conventions which made the romances seem most artificial and formulaic--the letter, the analysis of emotions, and the intercalated story--represents a major advance in the art of fiction.

As we have already seen,[33] "the French romance used letters copiously,"[34] primarily to express a variety of delicate sentiments. My analysis of Love in Excess has already shown some of the structural differences between Haywood's use of the epistolary convention and its function in earlier works.[35] Letters are crucial to the plot of every single work of fiction Haywood wrote. In addition to the standard forgeries, dropped or intercepted correspondence, and messages smuggled out of confinement to a would-be rescuer, her books abound with a less mechanical use of this convention: the depiction "of the processes of the mind--emotions, changes of feeling, traits of character, complexities of motivation."[36] A single exchange of letters from The Arragonian Queen will illustrate how she does this. Zephalinda, the princess of Valencia, has just been given in marriage to the prince of Arragon as a reward for his military aid to her father. The marriage destroys her hopes of a union with Abdelhamar, and his, and provokes the following letter:

> To the Adorable Zephalinda Pardon the wretched presumption of a despairing wretch, who dares to interrupt the round of pleasures you enjoy, by the despair and wild complainings of a soul doomed to everduring woe--Oh Princess! oh divinest Zephalinda! are you not lost to me for ever, gone, given to another--

33 See above, p. 106.
34 Day, Told in Letters, p. 24.
35 See above, pp. 186-88.
36 Day, Told in Letters, p. 98.

> Think, oh think what racks, what torture I endure, when every moment brings you to my view clasped in another's arms; distracting fancy shows me in idea my happy rival feasting on your charms.--I see, I see methinks, the gay triumpher wanton in your smiles, and with licensed boldness, riot in joys which sense cannot sustain.--Wretch--Wretch that I am--oh that I could lose all thought--all memory, how often with tender condescensions the lovely Zephalinda has received my vows, approved my flame, and aided my desires!--What I then dared to say, is now a crime even but to think--Yet can a love like mine, forget the charms which made it first exist?--No, I must adore you still, torn as you are forever from my hopes,--'tis you are changed, not I, nor must you, ought you, to condemn that constancy which once you thought a merit--I have enough submitted to rigid duty, and severer honour, in being aiding to my own undoing. . . . Exact no more in pity from me, and since Death, as averse to my desires as Love, refuses to put an end to my despair, be not you even more cruel yet, in forbidding me to wish I had been less accurst.--To be forced to disobey you, would add to the present horror of my state, yet in this I must, it not being in the power of Heaven or you to make me any other than what I am, and must eternally be,
> Your faithful slave, Abdelhamar[37]

When this letter is placed beside the one from Agatherses which I have quoted,[38] the differences are striking and obvious. Although Abdelhamar is in many respects similar to the languishing hero of romance, particularly in his surrender of power over his life to his mistress, his style is far more emotional and his love much more demanding. Agatherses' epistle is measured, formal, carefully balanced; in it he nobly and generously resigns his pretensions to his lady, and never betrays an indecorous thought. Though he may be a slave to Love, Passion is firmly in the control of Reason. Abdelhamar, equally devoted, has not his predecessor's

[37] The Arragonian Queen (London, 1724), pp. 17-18.
[38] See above, p. 107.

strength of mind. Not only can he not forget the former scenes of their love; he also cannot face resigning her with the stoicism which characterizes the "generous rival." His letter is deeply revealing of his state of mind, not only in his highly charged language, but in the broken rhythms of his thought. His sentences are fragmented; the punctuation is even more erratic than usual; and, especially at the beginning, he indulges in tautology of which his creator would herself never be guilty. And, as is usual in moments of high emotional intensity, Haywood hovers here just on the edge of blank verse. This is the kind of passage to which Day is referring when he says that, in them,

> authors had considered the process of thinking as it actually occurs and were trying to imitate its chaotic and disorganized appearance. They were . . . deliberately breaking up organized, formal patterns of discourse to reflect the disordered processes of actual thought and speech.[39]

In a letter like this, "the rant of the stage, apostrophe, exclamation, and dashes in profusion, indicate . . . disorder and violence."[40]

In the French romances, when heroines receive letters like those of Agatherses and Abdelhamar, asking for commands either to live or die, they frequently reply with singular restraint:

> Live as long as it shall please the Gods to allow you. Hope as long as Araminta lives--she begs you: and even if you yourself wish to live, she orders you to do so.[41]

[39] Day, Told in Letters, p. 137. [40] Day, Told in Letters, p. 130.
[41] Grand Cyrus, quoted in Saintsbury, French Novel, p. 194.

In contrast to this, Zephalinda's answer "to the Unhappy Abdelhamar" reveals a depth of feeling typical of Haywood's heroines.

> Has the faithful Abdelhamar resolved to make me more wretched than I already am? He has, or else why, oh why, am I reminded of our past endearments, now when I no more must please my raptured soul with the soft remembrance of those happy hours, when Love and Abdelhamar were mine, when I without a crime might own my chaste desires; but now, alas, its horrid guilt even but to think on you, for love is still inseparable from the dear idea; why am I told it o'er and o'er of your despair, do I not share the dreadful shock? am I not still much more unhappy torn from what I once held dearer far than life, and forced to receive another's vows. Ah, Abdelhamar, if e'er I was loved, contribute your assistance to my peace of mind, let me if possible forget there is a man whom my heart prefers to my husband.--My honour and my virtue shudders at the bold confession; think not that I will still do so, no, I'll tear the passion from my guilty heart, tho' it weeps tears of blood--Once more I beg, never again to hear from you; may Heaven have in store some happier she, who shall with innocence reward your truth; leave distraction and despair to
>
> The most unhappy,
> Zephalinda[42]

The substance of this letter is very similar to Melliora's plea for D'Elmont to recognize that she suffers as much as he;[43] Zephalinda's emotions are just barely under control. Yet unlike her lover, she is able to be rational. Her words are calm and ordered, and there are fewer dashes and more complete sentences. Only at the end, when she confesses her lingering love, does she break her progression of thoughts. However, her words remain profoundly revealing. They are simple and direct, and it is that simplicity, so different from both the artificial rationality of the romances

[42] Arragonian Queen, p. 20. [43] See above, p. 144.

and Abdelhamar's broken raving, which produces the terrible power of her plea: "let me . . . forget there is a man whom my heart prefers to my husband." In those few, quiet words, Haywood reveals the naked emotions of her heroine in a way which, in context, is as effective as the papers which Clarissa writes in the height of her delirium.[44]

The use of letters is an extremely convenient means of revealing depths of character, but, although Day believes that it is far more effective than more direct attempts at analyzing emotions,[45] Haywood depends on it far less than he would imply. Although the "analysis of emotion" in the romances is antithetical to realism of any sort,[46] in Haywood's works it is a major means of conveying psychological truth. In the French works, contrary to what the name implies, the analysis of emotion is merely a function of didacticism; it examines not deep, spontaneous feelings, but "emotion applied to conventional characterization, to types instead of individuals."[47] This device can take the form of either a soliloquy, where the character performs the analysis, or a passage in which the author herself takes on that task. As we have seen, both soliloquies and third-person discussions of emotional states acted as instruments of moral instruction. The language is "précieuse," the sentiments precisely defined, and the tone philosophical rather than impassioned.[48] The characters are not only conventional types, such as the humble suitor or the wife who loves

[44] Clarissa, III, 205-9.
[45] Day, Told in Letters, pp. 122, 224.
[46] See above, p. 104.
[47] Eareckson, p. 12.
[48] Cf. the passages from Grand Cyrus and Cassandra, quoted above, pp. 96-98.

another man, but representative as well. Artamène voices the fears and determination of all aspiring lovers, while Statira speaks for all women who love one man and are married to another. In Haywood's works, while never achieving the intricate psychology which we commonly associate with the great nineteenth-century novelists or the practitioners of stream-of-consciousness, the analysis of emotion does manage to advance considerably beyond the stilted didacticism of its precedents. Perhaps the major difference between the two is that although Haywood's characters may be conventional, they are never representative in the way I have described. It is true that their individuality is temperamental and circumstantial rather than specifically personal. Yet they are not allegorical figures, like the heroes and heroines of romance. Haywood's portraits of her major characters are very much like case histories,[49] Like a case history, they provide both a dossier of typical symptoms and a vivid picture of one individual's disturbance and distress. In this way they are both psychologically accurate and "representative" of a particular state of mind in a specific set of circumstances. For example, when Serinda loses both her fortune and her impecunious lover, Hersilius, she marries the only man who loves her for herself, and Haywood describes her reactions to her husband in a passage which is typical of the third-person analysis of emotion:

> Gratitude was still at war with inclination, and her disposition being naturally generous and noble, she

[49] Josephine Grieder suggests this metaphor in her introduction to the Garland reprint of The Mercenary Lover (New York, 1973).

> almost hated herself, because she could not love him as she ought. The idea of Hersilius was ever before her eyes, all the tender and obliging things which had past between them in their hours of love, came now fresh into her mind, and the more she used efforts to banish them, revolved with stronger force on her divided soul. Never did a husband more deserve the affection of a wife, and never did a wife more strenuously endeavour to cultivate that respect and esteem, which she really felt for him, into that tenderness his goodness merited. But how little is it in our power to force inclination! The more we aim to do it, the further it is from us! All she could do served only to augment her grief, that she was able to do no better, and the distracting inquietudes she laboured under, made her almost the martyr of fortune and of virtue.[50]

This passage offers not a debate on the difficulty of reconciling Love and Duty, but a description of the dilemma of one particular heroine who finds herself unable to act as she feels she ought. In a very similar situation, Statira refers to "him to whom I am engaged with so much affection, by so many oaths, and by so fresh obligations";[51] Haywood's second sentence is much more immediate and evocative, bringing a vivid picture of her former love to the reader as well. This appeal to the reader's imagination is enhanced by what Erickson calls "interpretative comment,"[52] a short lecture on universal conditions: "how little is it in our power to force inclination! The more we aim to do it, the further it is from us!" Although Erickson states that "the generalizing effect of such passages . . . is to rob a character of all individuality and reduce it to a pattern of abstractions,"[53] it is more correct to apply his criticism to the heroic romance. In the French works,

[50] *Persecuted Virtue* (London, 1729), pp. 11-12.
[51] See above, p. 106.
[52] Erickson, p. 94.
[53] Erickson, p. 98.

the analysis is in fact reduced to "a pattern of abstractions," while in Haywood's novels the effect of the interpretative comment is to invite the reader to a lively sympathy, or empathy, with the character whose feelings are under discussion. The convention has thus been turned inside out; where it originally was a means of creating a philosophical distance between the reader and the story, in Haywood's hands it becomes a means of drawing that reader into active participation in the characters' emotions.

The soliloquy functions in a slightly different way, but to the same end. Haywood exchanges the "artificial," dispassionate language of the romances for speech that has the vigour of dramatic writing. Clementina's monologue when faced with a disagreeable marriage is composed in the rhythms of natural speech:

> Oh! what is interest, when compared to peace of mind? What is honour and reputation, when to preserve them, we must sacrifice all the quiet of our lives?--I cannot love the Cardinal--I cannot be his without offending Heaven, and prophaning those holy rites which claim the heart as well as hand--Oh, how can I give the one, when utter detestation fills the other?--It is not barely want of liking, 'tis hatred, 'tis loathing, 'tis abhorrence fixed and rooted in my soul, never to be removed by time, nor services.[54]

The words themselves are highly charged: "sacrifice," "prophaning," "detestation," "hatred," "loathing," and "abhorrence" all are meant to reverberate with particular force in the sensibility of a sympathetic reader. But the syntax is extremely simple and the phrases unaffected, for all their emotional weight. In this man-

[54] Agreeable Caledonian (London, 1727), p. 11.

ner the reader is again drawn in to the scene; the plight of the heroine is vividly portrayed, and the reader responds directly, without the elaborate intellectual effort required by the romances. Haywood is particularly good at combining these two types of the analysis of emotion, thus creating a scene which is doubly intense and effective. The stage is set, and stage directions are supplied by the author, along with interpretative comment, where necessary, and direct speech.

> As soon as she was alone, she shut herself into her chamber, and gave a loose to the long labouring pent-up passions of her soul,--her couch,--her bed,--were no longer able to sustain the force of her wild grief, --she grovelled on the floor, she beat her breast, she wrung her lovely hands . . . whoever had seen her in this condition would have believed it impossible she could, but some moments before, have worn such an expression of serenity. As it grew nearer the hour in which her rival was to enjoy the presence of her adored Beauclair, her agonies increased: Oh God! cried she, now is the happy Tortillée preparing to receive a Heaven I have lost forever,--now, now, she summons all her charm, adorns her face with smiles, and practices a thousand arts, a thousand graces to secure her conquest--and what . . . gives addition to her beauty, and makes her eyes sparkle with an unusual splendour, is the knowledge that she triumphs over the forsaken Montamour.
>
> Whenever this reflection came across her thoughts, all she had of woman in her soul exerted itself. No, would she say, starting up and wiping away her tears, with an air of decision,--I am not, will not be unhappy --I scorn the wretch who yields his heart, where neither virtue, wit, nor beauty claim the prize, where novelty is alone the charm. . . . But how long she continued in this mind, those who have ever felt the force of true affection need not be informed; to them it may seem superfluous to say, tenderness soon got the better of resentment; but the insensibles, or those who love only because they are beloved, will perhaps condemn her when they know these resolutions were no sooner made than broke; and sinking from that air of haughtiness she had assumed into one wholly composed of softness. And yet, said she, among the race of

> man, where is there one whose charms can vie with those this dear, this false protector boasts?[55]

After this, what reader will admit to being an "insensible"? What reader can deny the truth of Montamour's reactions? By combining the various techniques for charting the workings of the mind, Haywood has brought her character to life, both in the context of the novel and externally, in the sensibilities of her audience.

For Haywood's psychological realism to take on any significance in terms of her fiction, it must also function structurally. The novels must exhibit a "plot which . . . also had an intrinsic coherence," and focus "on character and personal relationships as essential elements in the total structure, and not merely as subordinate instruments for furthering the verisimilitude of the actions described. . . . "[56] In this context her use of that hated romance convention, the intercalated story, assumes new dignity. It can operate in several ways. Love in Excess illustrated one of the more sophisticated, presenting a series of similar encounters which reveal the growing maturity and self-awareness of the hero.[57] A second use of subplots, this time actually in the form of inset stories, is identical to the "stories . . . enclosed in one another like Chinese boxes"[58] which characterized the heroic romance. However, whereas in the romances these stories were the results of chance meetings between characters and bore very little relation to one another, Haywood's in-

[55] The Injured Husband, pp. 68-70. Eareckson uses this passage to illustrate a similar point, pp. 38-39. [56] Watt, p. 131.
[57] See above, pp. 148-69 [58] Jusserand, p. 362. Eareckson lists some examples from five of Haywood's novels, p. 25.

tercalated stories are frequently interdependent as well. To change metaphors, the "disgorging"[59] of each story in turn serves as a significant part of the action of the novel. An outstanding example of this occurs in Part I of The Agreeable Caledonian. When the novel begins, Clementina's father is urging her to marry a Cardinal, whom she detests. In order to save herself from a marriage which, she feels, would be "prophaning those holy rites which claim the heart as well as hand,"[60] she briefly considers enlisting the aid of Bellario, a slightly more agreeable suitor. When her maid urges her to accept him, assuring her that he would do anything to win her affection, Clementina's reply reveals the state of her sensibility:

> Affection! . . . Alas! I know not what it means, unless that sort which is natural among those near to us by blood or friendship. Bellario neither is, nor will be, ever regarded by me with any more than that complaisance which is due his quality. As for his love, it always gave me rather pain than pleasure. What can be more tiresome, than an eternal talk of what one is not capable of apprehending? . . . It only moves my mirth, when I see people fold their arms, cast down their eyes, and groan as if seized with some mental disease, and all for no more than mere whimsy, or fancied ill, which I dare swear has no existence but in the poet, or the madman's brain. (p. 13)

A letter which she eventually writes to Bellario, in which she reserves the option of his aid in the event of dire calamity, is equally forthright in declaring her ignorance of passion. She makes no promises, saying only "that all I know of love, is in

[59] See quote from Raleigh, p. 94 above.

[60] Agreeable Caledonian, p. 11. Further references, all from Part I, will be given in the text.

your favour" and that he should "hope everything" for the future (p. 16). When the Cardinal renews his efforts to win her with even greater energy, her indifference to love turns to hatred. "Would to God (cried she) I could this moment be transformed into something which might rather terrify than excite desire.--Beauty, to all others of my sex a blessing, is to me a curse"(p. 17). When she finally frees herself from the Cardinal, she is pleased that "she owed her deliverance to herself, and not to any endeavours of Bellario, which would have laid her under an obligation to him, which she had neither the power nor the inclination to requite" (p. 24). To punish her disobedience, her father sends her to a convent, where she meets a probationer, Miramene, whose influence transforms both their lives.

It is Miramene who relates the two inset histories. Her own story occupies pages 30-60, of which "The History of Signiora Jacinta del Tortosa" takes up pages 41-47. These are truly conventional tales, one within the other. Miramene tells Clementina how she fell violently in love with Baron Glencairn at the carnival in Rome. He falls in love with her as well, and for a time they correspond happily and passionately. Miramene, at this point, is as innocent as Clementina: "None of the perplexities of love had I yet experienced" (p. 39), she says, and the two lovers pass their time in perfect tranquility. It is then that Jacinta comes in with her history. She had been involved in a love affair, but her parents had found out and had sent her into the country to get over it. During this time, she was married to Tortosa, a rejected suitor of Miramene. After her marriage, when she had attempted to renew relations with her former lover, she had found him indiffer-

ent to her, and only after much time and trouble has she finally obtained the promise of an interview. The projected meeting requires Miramene's assistance. Jacinta counts on her husband's passion for Miramene making him welcome an opportunity to be alone with her, thus allowing her to slip away unnoticed. Miramene agrees. Unfortunately, Tortosa takes advantage of his opportunity and tries to rape her; when she screams, out rushes Jacinta's lover, who is none other than her own beloved Glencairn. After this, Jacinta and Tortosa are banished to "their mutual upbraidings, the plague of matrimony" (p. 54), and Glencairn reassures Miramene of his constancy and devotion. Shortly afterwards Miramene is sent to the convent because her father will not give her a proper dowry, and she now indulges contemplation and corresponds happily with her Baron.

The stories of the two women are obviously deeply intertwined: Miramene's lover is also Jacinta's; Jacinta's husband still loves Miramene; Glencairn's love for Miramene is the cause of his coldness to his former mistress. They are united by far more than the vagaries of circumstance, as in the romances, where strangers issue forth autobiographies immediately upon meeting. But even more significantly, Miramene's narrative, which reveals how her own growth has been influenced by Jacinta's story, in turn is crucial to Clementina's development. To understand how this works, it is first necessary to consider the personalities of the two women. Our first exposure to Miramene is in the form of a paper which she drops. When Clementina unfolds it, she discovers a poem of some forty-five lines, entitled "On the Extensiveness of Thought," and dedicated "To My Dear Glencairn" (pp. 28-30). This

ode, which extols the mental happiness of a lover with vast inner resources, reveals a great deal about its author's character. She is a throwback to the long-suffering heroine of the romances, whose passion is spiritual and whose patience is endless. The body of the poem describes how she imagines conversations between herself and Glencairn, as well as conjuring pictures from their past time together. "Extensive thought" allows her mind all the liberty denied her body. But most revealing of all is her confession that

> The World is mine within this lonely cell;
> Thought makes me all I ever wished to be,
> Gives wealth, fame, honour, and, what's dearer, thee.
> (p. 30)

Miramene is a Platonist. Her history confirms this first impression. After she met Glencairn, passion grew within her before she had even received confirmation from him, and she confesses to Clementina, "being always addicted to theorick happiness, /I/ formed to myself a thousand pleasing ideas. . . . " (p. 36). Her idea of perfect fulfilment is the time before Jacinta appears, when "not a day passed without my receiving and answering a letter from him. As for serenades . . . and all those ordinary gallantries . . . he failed not in paying them as frequently as he could. . . . " (p. 39). In the convent, being absolutely sure of Glencairn's sincerity and devotion, she is so completely happy in "exchanging souls from distant bodies" that she "would not exchange conditions with an empress" (p. 60).

From the outset, Miramene's Platonism is contrasted with the practical, anti-romantic attitude which Clementina first revealed in her reaction to Bellario's love. When she returns the poem to

Miramene, she again admits her failure to comprehend refined passion, confessing that "Tho' you have described Idea in a manner too charming not to make one extremely in love with it, yet I cannot forbear thinking Fortune very unjust, to allow you nothing more" (p. 32). At times, Haywood uses this contrast between the two women to comic effect, as when Miramene's description of Glencairn's physical beauty has faded into silence:

> Clementina easily perceived she was now got into one of those extasies of Thought which had inspired her Muse to write in the manner she had been witness of, and forbore to interrupt her, tho' she made a long pause. But the other coming out of her revery, seemed a little ashamed of having so forgot herself. . . . (p. 37)

Yet it is Miramene's very romanticism which kindles the first sparks of passion in her more realistic friend. Her story fires Clementina's imagination, "for tho' yet she had no notion what it was to love, she thought the talk of it delightful; she now even wished for Bellario, and grew angry that he did not attempt something to see her" (pp. 60-61). Miramene's continuing fits of rapture expose Clementina to many "tender things which . . . very much helped to soften her heart" (p. 61), and the extravagance of Glencairn's letters soon "made her ready to burst with inward spite and envy" (p. 61). Those two inset stories have thus created a rapid fermentation in Clementina's character, in which her matter-of-fact attitude towards love combines with her headstrong desire to have her own way. The result is her successful scheme to alienate Glencairn's affections from Miramene and tranfer them to herself. It is interesting to note that her strategy consists of playing upon the hopelessness of Platonic love, and that the res-

ponse she calls forth in the Baron is exactly its opposite. "His passion for her was of too warm a nature to permit him to be content with a Platonic return.--He longed for more substantial joys. . . . " (p. 86). In Part II he gets them.

"Clementina is not just another lovesick maiden; she actually develops, from a young, innocent girl into an ingenious, unscrupulous woman who takes away her best friend's lover."[61] This development would be impossible without the intercalated stories narrated by Miramene and the background of heroic romance against which the sentiments of the novel are set. There is another method which Haywood employs to produce an intrinsically coherent plot, a method which is perhaps more congenial to modern sensibilities. In several novels, she utilizes all these devices for conveying psychologically realistic details and fuses them with a plot which is totally dependent upon the character of her heroine.[62] The Life of Madam de Villesache, written in 1727, is the finest example of this type of work, which forms a substantial part of Haywood's contribution to the development of fictional forms. When the novel opens, Henrietta is living simply in the country, unaware that she is the illegitimate daughter of a duke. She falls innocently in love with young Clermont, the son of a mercenary farmer with a prejudice against women without fortunes. When the Duke appears and arranges for Henrietta to accompany him to Court, Clermont is afraid of losing her to predatory noblemen, and presses

[61] Josephine Grieder, Introduction to the Garland reprint of The Agreeable Caledonian (New York, 1973), p. 10.

[62] Or hero, as in The Double Marriage. See below, pp. 296-99. The Fatal Secret, The Capricious Lover, The Rash Resolve and The Masqueraders are also of this type.

her to marry him secretly. "The thoughts of being separated from her beloved Clermont, gave her pangs, which the knowledge that she was of a birth much superior to what she had imagined, was not a sufficient balm to heal" (pp. 5-6). But being virtuous and believing in the principle of filial obedience, she objects: "Should we then fly boldly in the faces of those, in whose power alone it is to make us happy, what could ensue but misery and beggary?" (p. 8). His reply is a shrewd, even prophetic, observation on her character:

> Can it be a pleasure to leave the man, you say, you love, in agonies unsupportable? Oh, no, your gentle soul delights not in cruelty; and 'tis want of courage, or irresolution, not unkindness, that makes you fearful to do what, perhaps, **hereafter** when sollicited by some greater, though less faithful lover, you might repent. (pp. 8-9)

And precisely because she is irresolute and cannot bear to displease, she agrees to marry him secretly. Thus her want of firmness causes her to take this first step, which precipitates all the other predicaments in which she later finds herself. Irresolute to the last, she is persuaded by her insistent lover to consummate the marriage before she leaves. Then she goes off to Court, where she becomes her father's pride and joy, and the darling of the nobility.

For a time Henrietta misses her husband, but unlike the heroines of romance, she finds herself unable to live on memory alone.

> She compared the conversations with which he had entertained her, with those which now amused her hours, and in spite of the tenderness she had formerly born him, could not forbear acknowledging there was a mighty

> difference. By degrees she began to look back on all that had past with a kind of contempt. . . . Not that she hated Clermont; on the contrary, she had yet very great remains of her former passion for him, whenever she reflected on the endearments which had past between them: but then she despised the meanness of his extraction, and the thoughts that she had put him in possession of a title, which gave him the power, whenever he pleased to exert it, of calling her from the present grandeur of her state, and obliging her to live with him in a mean retirement; made all desires instigated by her affection, immediately give way to that new idol of her wishes, greatness! (pp. 13-14)

While she is pondering these conflicting feelings, her father announces his intention of marrying her to a Marquiss. Obeying her first impulse, which arises from the basic goodness and simplicity of her soul, she refuses. Confronted with the Duke's rage at her disobedience, she again decides to follow a first, correct instinct, to confess her marriage to Clermont and rely on her father's pity and tenderness. Unfortunately, she is prevented by the arrival of two ladies from the Court, who just happen to be full of gossip about women who have been cast off by father, husband, or lover and have lost wealth, position and reputation because of filial disobedience. These stories naturally frighten Henrietta, reawakening her self-interest and ambition; she reconsiders her decision.

> Who knows, said she, whether the Duke, when he shall be told how rashly I have dared to dispose of myself, will not wholly throw me off without the least means of support; and if so, I am too well acquainted with the sordid avarice of old Clermont, to be received into his family; his son . . . will rather be turned out to share the miseries in which we shall be jointly involved.--No, 'tis mere madness to harbour such a design;--better is it for me to obey my noble father, and retain the grandeur to which he has raised me.--I knew not what I did when I gave my hand to Clermont. I am not the person I imagined myself to be, nor will he dare to murmur at my forsaking one so infinitely

> unworthy of me.--I can make him happy some other way; and 'tis more his duty to be content without me, than mine to make myself wretched with him. (p. 19)

Once again, Henrietta succumbs to the momentary ascendancy of apparent self-interest and social ambition, without considering that in a case like hers, real self-interest can only be served by honesty. Being irresolute, almost incapable of sustaining a decision, she allows herself to be swayed by an unfortunately timed conversation, and she is lost. She really believes that she is superior to Clermont, and she persuades herself that a place at court can compensate for the loss of her love. And finally, she becomes convinced that "there was an absolute necessity for what she did" (p. 20). She agrees to marry the Marquiss with scarcely a further pang of conscience.

Henrietta being what she is, it hardly comes as a surprise when almost immediately after her wedding, remorse, guilt, shame and fear invade her mind. "Peace was a stranger to her breast.--She was continually accusing herself.--Her life was one perpetual terror, lest the resentment, or the love of Clermont, should reveal the secret of their marriage. . . . " (p. 23). Consistent with that aspect of her character which involves her in these difficulties, her main concern is self-preservation. Yet Henrietta is weak-willed rather than vicious, and she is not without compunction for betraying Clermont and entering into a bigamous marriage. Although her desire to survive dominates her other feelings, she does not lack a certain self-awareness. When she and the narrator, a family friend, discuss her change in fortune and her present misery, Henrietta tells her:

> My ideas of things are now more refined; all my notions changed; and what then gave me pleasure, I could look on **now only** with pity and disdain: Yet . . . I then possessed that innate joy, and from my soul lament I ever was deprived of it, for wretched greatness, and a pomp of woe." (p. 25)

The narrator deduces from these discussions that Henrietta's problem is that in her personality, faults and virtues are so blended as to be almost exactly in balance. The reader, too, scarcely knows whether to pity her for being the helpless victim of unfortunate circumstances, or to blame her for being selfish and conniving. What is certain is that each of her predicaments results from a previous decision she has made, and the immediate consequence of Henrietta's marriage and her subsequent attempt to buy Clermont's silence is his arrival to find out why she has betrayed him.

The deftest stroke in Haywood's portrait of Henrietta is that her irresolution always leads to self-deception, rather than to deliberate falsehood. She lives from moment to moment, which is a large part of her weakness. Henrietta never sets out to deceive in cold blood, for her inner turmoil always results in a conviction, however temporary, that what she decides to do is not only the right thing to do, but the only reasonable course of action possible. She always manages to persuade herself of the truth of whatever she needs to believe, and she is no less successful when Clermont appears. After a scene in which he reproaches her rather violently while she feebly tries to defend herself, Clermont again grows tender. "Charmed with his relenting fondness" (p. 27), she tells him that although she was compelled to marry the Marquiss, she never stopped loving <u>him</u>. And although she makes that state-

ment out of a desire to placate him, she soon begins to wonder whether it might be true. When Clermont, encouraged by her last remark, suggests that it would not be immoral for them to resume conjugal relations, she is at first

> extremely startled. . . . She had made use of her utmost endeavours to reconcile him, but desired not to have gone so great a length; at least, she thought she did not; but all the transactions of this unhappy lady discovered an irresolution, which rendered it impossible for her to be sensible of all she wished herself, or to be certain how far those wishes might transport her. (p. 28)

As usual, her first reaction is to do what is virtuous, although by this time it is difficult for even an impartial observer to determine what might be morally correct:

> She represented to him how infamous it was to put two men at the same time in possession of the same favours. --That since obliged to acknowledge the Marquis for her husband, she ought to be just to him.--That besides an intrigue of this nature could not be carried on without danger of a discovery, which might be fatal to them all. . . . (p. 28)

However, by the end of her representation she has already begun to slip from her high moral position. "Clermont was young, vigorous, and doubly armed with law and inclination; the marchioness was weak, timorous of offending; and, perhaps not without some little emotions of the nature of those with which he was so violently agitated" (p. 29). She succumbs to these combined pressures, and he again becomes her husband/lover. However, immediately upon the conclusion of their lovemaking, she is stricken with a kind of re-

morse, and Haywood describes it in a way which reveals both the complexity of the situation and her own acute psychological perception.

> She blushed and wept, and would have reproached him . . . but durst not, lest he should think she had yielded not so much through love as fear, and by harbouring such an opinion, convert the present tenderness he had for her into a resentment which might tempt him to undo her. (p. 29)

Henrietta is trapped; she herself recognizes that her weak will has thrown her into a state of constant insecurity and terror. Because their sexual relations represent a double forfeit of vows, love becomes an empty pleasure, guilt-ridden physical satisfaction rather than the complete union they had originally enjoyed. Yet because she is easily shaken and lacks sufficient moral fibre even to remain afraid, she soon loses her sense of shame, and the lovers become careless. It is this carelessness, leading to a discovery by the Marquiss, which sets in motion the events leading to her death.

Faced with the collapse of all her ambitions, Henrietta's immediate reaction is to run on her husband's sword, but characteristically, she misses it and is unhurt. When allowed by the Marquiss to remain in his house while he investigates her alleged marriage to Clermont, she thinks again of suicide. However, when she tries to bring herself to act, "that timorousness, and want of resolution, which had swayed her former actions, prevented her from being guilty of this crime" (p. 38). Her father has continued to treat her with tenderness, but she now feels all the shame which she had not felt before, and she can hardly face him. "She blushed

at the sight of her own women, and when any of them came to attend her . . . she held her handkerchief to her eyes, concealing her face as much as possible from them" (p. 40). In this state of mind, she visits a convent, to find out whether she can there find a refuge,

> and as she was of a disposition the most easy in the world to receive an impression, the elegant and persuasive descriptions which the Abbess and nuns gave her of their manner of life, made her long to see herself in a condition to become a professed religieuse. (p. 43)

When she informs her father of this new resolution, he is horrified at the prospect of losing his so recently acquired daughter. He represents to her in glowing terms all the grandeur and excitement she would be giving up, telling her that he will arrange to bribe witnesses and fix the trial so that her husband can prove nothing against her, and promising her that she will lose no part of her former reputation and position. "He won so much on the actual instability of her temper, as to make her quit all those desires she had so lately entertained of forsaking the world. . . ." (p. 45). He answers every objection with great eloquence, and

> he that so often had gained the most difficult points in Council, where the interest of nations lay at stake, could not fail to influence to think as he did, a weak woman, his daughter, and who had the instigations of her own advantage, as well as those of her duty to him. (p. 46)

In short, Henrietta is yet again persuaded to forego a course which is probably the most feasible and morally correct for a plan

which is acceptable to her own ambition and to the plans of someone else. By allowing herself to be convinced that she is safe from the vengeful Marquiss, she puts herself back into his hands and ends up the victim of a horrible murder, the indirect cause of Clermont's poisoning, and the direct cause of the Marquiss's madness.[63]

The Life of Madam de Villesache is a detailed study of a complex character, neither good nor bad, neither virtuous nor yet completely selfish and vain. Henrietta and the situations in which she finds herself are completely probable, in their context; her reactions are realistically portrayed. Haywood's moral is clear--beware irresolution and vanity--but her own judgments of her characters are never simplistic or dogmatic. The reader sympathizes with Henrietta fairly consistently, and at various points in the novel also sympathizes with Clermont, the Duke, and the Marquiss. And although sex plays an important part in the story, Haywood is not directly concerned with the act or the art of love. Her interest settles on Henrietta, the way her mind works, and the consequences of her feelings and decisions. There are many details omitted from this book which would appear in a novel by Defoe, but whatever is lacking is also unnecessary. Haywood has written a psychological novel, and brought to it a good deal more coherence and internal order than Defoe ever managed in his more conventionally realistic fiction. However, her realism is not important only as a technical innovation. It is also essential to

[63] See plot synopsis, p. 491, for details of the ending.

her major thematic interest, the portrayal of women. It is in this aspect of her novels that Haywood departs most radically from the conventions of her predecessors and, in consequence, from those of society as well. Using the techniques I have described, Haywood established a whole, new set of conventions of her own.

VIII

THE HEROINE AS HERO

The main use to which Haywood puts the erotic and psychological realism I have been discussing is not, as most critics have thought, facile exploitation of the emotional and sexual responses of her audience,[1] but rather an important exploration of the ways men and women use each other. Such a study was virtually unique in its own time,[2] though it would shortly become the very heart of the novel. When her main character is predatory, caring only for position, wealth, or carnal possession,[3] Haywood combines a portrait of villainy with a detailed picture of its victims. The best example of this is The Mercenary Lover. Although the novel purports to be about Clitander[4] and does in fact offer the reader what amounts to a case history, the actual psychological focus is Althea and her reactions to her devious brother/lover. Grieder is

[1] Critics who hold this view include Dunlop (III, 369-70), Erickson (p. 76), Grieder ("Mercenary Lover," p. 5), McBurney ("Mrs. Penelope Aubin," p. 25), Reynolds (pp. 214-15), Schulz (p. 87) and Stevenson (p. 77). Morgan is representative when she refers to Haywood's early fiction as "an exhibition of unhealthy pathos" (p. 99).

[2] Its only rival was the whore biography, which concentrated on the financial aspects of the male-female relationship rather than on psychological aspects.

[3] As in, for example, The Perplexed Dutchess, The Mercenary Lover, or The Injured Husband.

[4] See above, pp. 210-12. Haywood says in the Preface, "The Character of the Mercenary Lover, black and detestable as it is, would yet have been more shocking, had I inserted some passages of his former life. . . . " She thus invokes the biographer's privilege of knowing more about her subject than she is willing to divulge.

incorrect when she says that Haywood is dealing "with the psychology of the aberrant";[5] rather, she is portraying a serious, intelligent but naive young woman's response to the aberrant. The Mercenary Lover also illustrates an even more significant point: whatever gender her villain may be, Haywood's "victim," and the center of interest and sympathy, is almost always a woman.[6] In The British Recluse, when Lysander/Courtal seduces Cleomira and Belinda, it is the two women who hold the stage; the seducer never even appears in person. However, in The Injured Husband, in which Madam Tortillée seduces Bellcour, the emphasis shifts between Tortillée and Bellcour's cast-off fiancée, who is the most innocent victim of all.[7] When the major characters are basically "good," whether male or female, Haywood's primary interest remains her heroines, who are outstanding among early eighteenth-century female characters for both their prominence in the story and the particular combination of qualities they bring to bear on their circumstances.

As we have seen, the heroine of the romances has several distinctive characteristics: "Beauty, . . . an aloofness, an indifference to her lover's sufferings. . . . " They are "exempt" from passion, "virtuous," "noble," and "excellent," and they all have "Mind."[8] Her function is to inspire grand deeds and passions, as real women in ordinary middle-class households were not themselves to act in the world, but only to assist and appreciate the actions

[5] Grieder, "Mercenary Lover," p. 11. [6] The exceptions I have found are The Double Marriage, Memoirs of the Baron de Brosse, Love in Excess--where the focus is twofold--and two of the novels in Love in Its Variety. See synopses for details. [7] See above, pp. 224-25.
[8] Horner, p. 110. See above, pp. 102-3.

of others. In much of the other fiction of the early eighteenth century, modelled as it was on the French works or on the works of Aphra Behn, women exhibit these same characteristics. If the novels are slightly more "realistic," the heroines may be permitted desires, but even these are faint and two-dimensional; the women themselves remain almost entirely without any depth to their personalities.[9] The female protagonists of Eliza Haywood's fictions differ from this literary model in almost every particular. It is interesting that Joyce Horner, who bemoans the lack of characterization in the romance heroines, completely overlooks Haywood's dozens of more substantial women. Horner states unequivocally "that for many years there are no heroines. From Parthenissa to Pamela there is a gap in their history."[10] She excepts only the women in Defoe's novels who, in two works at least, are central and interesting. But she ignores Haywood, who produced a long succession of heroines whose strengths were not merely taken on the author's word, and who were, moreover, a challenge to conventional expectations of what women in novels should be. Beauty, of course, continues something of a prerequisite, but it alone remains undemonstrated, possibly because it is virtually undemonstrable. This description of Lasselia is typical:

> But if the grave part of the world were charmed with her wit and discretion, the young and gay were infinitely more so with her beauty; which tho' it was not of that dazzling kind which strikes the eye at first

[9] For example, in The Female Deserters, written by Mary Hearne in the same year as Love in Excess (1719), Calista is entirely passive, even having to be drugged and raped before she settles down happily to live openly as her lover's mistress.

[10] Horner, p. 111.

> looking at it with desire and wonder, yet it was such as seldom failed of captivating hearts most averse to love. Her features were perfectly regular, her eyes had an uncommon vivacity in them, mixed with a sweetness, which spoke the temper of her soul; her mien was gracefully easy, and her shape the most exquisite that could be; in fine, her charms encreased by being often seen, every view discovered something new to be admired; and tho' they were of that sort which more properly may be said to persuade than to command adoration, yet they persuaded it in such a manner, that no mortal was able to resist their force.[11]

Often Haywood eliminates even this much physical description. Heroines, if they are to be heroines, must inspire love and admiration, and to provoke any such passions in the world of fiction, women must be "beautiful." Beauty might even be defined as the ability to inspire those feelings. Certainly, physical attractiveness is a given, and consequently all of Haywood's women possess an abundance of personal charms and graces. Haywood had more important points to make about what sort of woman was truly desirable than to waste time and space on appearances.

Apart from beauty, the heroic qualities listed by Horner are not so easy to find in Haywood's characters. Several of them are of aristocratic birth,[12] with a similar number the daughters of "eminent tradesmen" or merchants.[13] The majority, however, are of indeterminate station, obviously possessing sufficient wealth and gentility to participate in the diversions previously confined to the nobility, and to render them susceptible to the delicate pas-

[11] *Lasselia*, pp. 8-9. [12] Often nobility is accompanied by illegitimacy: for example, Henrietta in *Madam de Villesache* and Celemena in *The Tea Table*. In one case, a noble woman is rendered mediocre because the title reverts to the male line (in *The Unequal Conflict*). [13] For example, Cleomelia in *Cleomelia*, Annilia in *The Distressed Orphan*, and Glicera in *The City Jilt*.

sions, of which "people of such low capacities are /not/ able to entertain any just notions. . . . "[14] Money seems to be the only important social criterion, and "good family" can mean either a first class pedigree or a first class income. In most cases, the heroines are not assigned any specific parentage, and because a substantial fortune did not necessarily denote noble blood or an elevated station, their true position in society is open to various interpretations.[15] The aloofness so characteristic of heroic princesses has been transformed into a certain indifference towards men and marriage and a disbelief in romantic love, especially in women whose fathers or guardians attempt to dispose of them like so much movable property. When Annilia's uncle, anxious to marry his son to her fortune, asks her whether her unwillingness to marry is because she is "willing to wait till some violent passion instigates /her/ to it," she replies: "I look on myself to be of a humour, which will never suffer me to fall into those extravagancies I have been witness of in some of my acquaintance."[16] Cleomira tells Belinda that before she saw Lysander, "Love was a passion I had so little notion of, that I considered it no more than as a fiction";[17] while Lasselia believes "that it was all Chimera. . . . "[18] Invariably, this insensibility lasts only until they meet a man who inspires a grand passion in them, one whom they find worthy of their love. Disdain, for a Haywood heroine, exists only as long as they are confronted exclusively with the material

[14] The Injured Husband, p. 139. [15] For example, Dalinda and Philecta in The Masqueraders, or Philenia in The Unequal Conflict. [16] The Distressed Orphan (London, 1726), p. 7. [17] British Recluse, pp. 17-18. [18] Lasselia, p. 10. There are examples of this sentiment in most of Haywood's early novels.

aspects of marriage, the self-interest of parents and the jealous, avaricious lust of unwelcome suitors. When their hearts are moved to feeling, they do not demand years of service or fine deeds to test the mettle of their lovers. They may wait to bestow their persons, like Melliora, until the man has shown himself properly appreciative, but unlike the lofty ladies of "Le Pays de Tendre," they never wait to bestow their hearts.

The illustration of the heroine's "intellectual gifts," an important point to Horner, is rarely overlooked in Haywood's novels, and is sometimes even demonstrated in some way important to the story itself. Camilla, Miramene and Lasselia[19] all write poetry, and Melliora reads La Fontanelle and Ovid's Epistles.[20] Cleomelia and Althea both reveal a great love of reading as well.[21] These tastes reflect a grave and serious temperament, and in each case that aspect of the heroine is a significant factor in the development of her relationship with her lover.[22] Certainly all the women in Haywood's fiction are skilled in the epistolary art. Fantomina is disgusted at the theatre by all the high society people who would rather chatter and gawk than pay attention to what is taking place on stage. Even when intellectual abilities are not actually demonstrated, Haywood makes a point of listing the achievements of her heroines, to illustrate that they are not frivolous social butterflies. Anadea, for example, did not limit

19 Love in Excess, The Agreeable Caledonian, and Lasselia.
20 Love in Excess.
21 The British Recluse and The Mercenary Lover.
22 For discussions of this point in some of these novels, see pp. 176-79; 190-91; 210-12.

> her studies to that part of education common to her own sex: she had an extensive genius, and emulated the other in their search of knowledge; she went a great way in the mathematicks; understood several languages perfectly well; and had she presevered in application, might have been as eminent for her learning, as the celebrated Madam Dacier.[23]

Along with more ladylike accomplishments, Annilia was instructed "in the French, Latin and Italian tongues,"[24] and Miriam was such an avid pupil that "in some things /she/ was confessed, by those who were /her/ instructors, to excel the lessons given" her.[25] Along with these strictly intellectual gifts, Haywood's heroines, on the whole, are curiously androgynous, at least in her descriptions. In Anadea, "the tenderness and bashfulness incident to womankind . . . was mingled with something of a manly majesty of thought. . . . "[26] Emanuella adds to

> the most lively and penetrating wit that was known, a wisdom wonderful in youth, a depth of learning which scarce any of the fair sex could boast, an elevated genius, and sublimity of thought; a soul composed of honour, courage, gratitude, generosity, fortitude, and all those virtues which wear the name of manly, joined with tenderness, sweetness of disposition, and every grace with which the softer species attracts and charms. . . .[27]

In her ability to preserve her independence, though she suffers and eventually dies as the result of her resolution, she also manifests

[23] Fatal Secret, p. 208. [24] Distressed Orphan, p. 2.
[25] Fair Hebrew (London, 1729), p. 31. [26] Fatal Secret, p. 212. The passage from which this quotation is taken is an elaborate comparison between her and her lover, Blessure, in whom "the boldness of manhood was . . . sweetly tempered with a more than female softness." [27] Rash Resolve, pp. 1-2.

a pride and strength of will which are typical of almost all Haywood's women, though that kind of pride and strength was rightfully the province of the male. The Rash Resolve, The Fatal Secret, Persecuted Virtue, The Capricious Lover, Fantomina, The Distressed Orphan, and The City Jilt all hinge on the resolution and unwavering determination of the main character, and in The Araagonian Queen, Zephalinda taunts her lover with her own greatness of spirit:

> Did I not force my bleeding heart, and to be just to duty, sacrifice a passion, the softest, and the truest, that ever heaved within a virgin's breast?--And do you, a Man! possessed of stronger reason, judgment more refined, want fortitude to follow in the path of honour, when a weak woman has led the way before you?[28]

Even those less fortunate women whose mental capacities prove not "enough to defend /them/ from the assaults of almost every passion human nature is liable to fall into"[29] are nothing if not strong-minded. The only force which they cannot resist is, naturally, love. Philecta, in The Masqueraders, is a perfect example. Deciding that she has too much concern for her friend Dalinda, whose lover she has stolen, and for her own honour, she decides to sacrifice her own happiness for that of her friend.

> Tho' overwhelmed and lost in love and soft desire, tho' at each thought of Dorimenus, unusual warmth ran thrilling through her veins, her blood beat high, and she was all over pulse--tho' her whole sould dissolved in tender languishments, and for one dear, one blissful moment she would have given an age of life--Yet fixed

[28] Arragonian Queen, p. 47. [29] Idalia, p. 2.

> in her determination, she chose to die rather than yield to accept the proferred joy. (p. 30)

Manifesting "a friendship pretty uncommon (especially in women)" (p. 39), she protects this determination by confiding the whole affair to Dalinda herself. Unfortunately, her resolution is made in solitude; when he later attacks her physically, "Love triumphed over all, and revelled in the spoils of honour" (p. 41). The only exception to this prevailing type of character is Henrietta de Villesache, and her weak will is the sustaining feature of her Life.[30]

Virtue is by far the most problematic of the characteristics expected of a heroine. In heroic romance, as we have seen,[31] it is never even an issue, for both heroes and heroines are immune from the urgent demands of vulgar passion. Because the world of romance is idealized, it is also a world of stark, uncompromising contrasts. As far as virtue is concerned, one of Haywood's main strengths as a novelist is her ability to portray all the states between libertinism and pristine chastity, whore and virgin. In other words, she is able to portray the sexual side of life with a fair amount of realism. The British Recluse illustrates the freedom with which she could treat conventional morality. Cleomira and Belinda have both been seduced by the same man; Cleomira is "ruined," but in Belinda's case an interruption saves her maidenhead. Technically, the preservation of that maidenhead in one sets the two women worlds apart, morally; but realistically, they have more in common than would warrant such a distinction. They

[30] See above, pp. 231-39. [31] See above, pp. 101-3.

take a house together in the country,

> where they still live in a perfect tranquility, happy in the real friendship of each other, despising the uncertain pleasures, and free from all the hurries and disquiets which attend the gaieties of the town: and where the solitary life is the effect of choice, it certainly yields more solid comfort than all the publick diversions which those who are the greatest pursuers of them can find.[32]

Although the reader is elsewhere called upon to pity women like Lasselia, "immured in a convent to suffer a living death,"[33] the solitary life led by Belinda and Cleomira is presented as admirable, even enviable. They "defy the world"[34] and are happy. Another such defiance is the marriage of two lovers who have consummated their union prematurely. Camilla yields herself willingly to Frankville, even refusing to marry him secretly to set things right, yet she ends up as happy as Melliora, the more strictly virtuous of the two. A standard eighteenth-century belief, in literature if not in life, was that unsanctified sex quickly ran its course. However, several Haywood heroes are "unfashionably constant," and their mistresses lose no sympathy by their socially condemned surrender.[35] If the women are taken by force or deceived by men they have come to trust, they may remove to a convent, or die as a sop to convention and a pathos-loving audience, but under no circumstances does our sympathy for them waver. We blame the ravisher, not the victim. "Virtue," to Haywood, is not simply a question of chastity; rather, it is a conjunction between

[32] British Recluse, p. 138. [33] Whicher, p. 46. [34] Whicher, p. 46.
[35] See Lasselia, Love in Excess, Cleomelia and Idalia. The inherent inconstancy of the male is a subject which is particularly important in The Rash Resolve, Fatal Fondness, The Masqeraders, The Double Marriage, Fantomina, The Lucky Rape, The Agreeable Caledonian and The British Recluse.

the heroine's sexuality and the sympathy she elicits, and, as Whicher puts it, "Mrs. Haywood followed the guidance of her own experience when it ran counter to the traditions of romance."[36]

It is, in fact, in the area of sexuality that Haywood's heroines differ most radically from their counterparts in French romance. The heroines of romance are passive, inspiring love and noble deeds, offering in return an object immutable and pristine, and above all, worthy of admiration. Life acts upon them: they are abducted, loved, shipwrecked, attacked, given in marriage. That aloofness mandatory to the heroic mistress represents not only a conscious desire to exact adulation, but also freedom from the vicissitudes of passion, the "sexual immunity" I have mentioned before.[37] Such a one regarded herself not as a woman, but as a prize to be awarded for the highest bid, the greatest act of heroism, or the most extravagant proof of devotion. She is exempt from anything so vulgar as passion, and her essential passivity is proof enough against any active sexuality which might conceivably be awakened by the proper lover. In Haywood's view, this condition exempts such heroines from life itself. Part of the vitality of her own heroines is their unabashed sexual desire, and their frequently energetic pursuit of gratification. There are, of course, various degrees of susceptibility to passion which determine a variety of different responses, but in one way or another sexuality is an active component of all Haywood's female characters.

The basic premise common to all the novels is that love, des-

[36] Whicher, p. 46.

[37] See above, p. 10.

pite the Platonism abounding in romantic literature, is incomplete and frustrating without sexual fulfilment. Although now that idea seems naive to the point of irrelevance, in context it means much more than it says. To a society whose accepted notion of love in literature was gleaned from the salons and "La Carte de Tendre," Haywood's insistence on the sensual aspects of the relationship between hero and heroine was tantamount to heresy. She makes the point that gratification is necessary to a woman's happiness explicit in one of the stories in The Fruitless Enquiry. Miramillia, in search of a woman who is completely happy and content, goes to her friend Iseria, who had married for love several years before, only to be almost immediately separated from her husband. Hearing that Montrano, long feared dead, has recently returned, Miramillia assumes that Iseria will enjoy the required peace of mind. However, Iseria relates a tale of her husband's shipwreck and slavery in Turkey, which ended with his castration for refusing the overtures of his master's wife.

> We pass our days in mutual endeavour to oblige each other, and our nights in such endearments as a chaste brother might allow himself with a sister he tenderly loved. . . . I believe no woman could be more tranquil, in such a circumstance, than myself; yet, Miramillia, loving as I do, and beloved with the same ardor, judge, if I can bring my wishes to that pitch of resignation and content that is necessary to qualify me for that task you would have me undertake.[38]

Perfect friendship they might have, and many of the pleasures and

[38] Fruitless Enquiry, p. 85.

conveniences of a shared life, but they lack that total union which, for Haywood's women, is essential to happiness.

Those lovers who are chaste for reasons other than disability are rarely able to remain Platonic friends for long; if they do, like D'Elmont and Melliora, it is not through a lack of desire on either part. Lasselia, who falls in love with a married man, convinces herself that her passion is wrong, and for quite some time is happy to enjoy his friendship within the larger society of their mutual acquaintances. Because of the ease and frequency with which they are thus able to meet, she is lulled into a false sense of security and consequently lowers the guard on her virtue. Then, having once experienced actual sexual arousal, she can no longer delude herself into thinking that her love is purely spiritual. Another heroine who is unable to maintain that lovers can be perfectly happy without being unchaste appears in a novel, the title of which refers to that very impossibility: Philenia, in The Unequal Conflict, or, Nature Triumphant (1725). She loves Fillamour, and even elopes with him in order to escape a forced marriage. However, as both their fortunes are dependent on consenting relatives with other ambitions for them, Philenia advises her lover to chose celibacy until some change in their circumstances takes place. She assures him of her love and affection, and they live quite amicably for some time, indulging only in chaste embraces and impassioned speeches. "But a true passion cannot for any long time content itself with an ideal bliss."[39] One evening Fillamour experi-

[39] Injured Husband, p. 118.

ences the force of Nature.

> Spite even of himself, he must transgress. His roving hands, without design, took liberties treasonable to Platonick laws.--His words no more maintained their cool reserve.--His glowing cheeks, and sparkling eyes, avowed wild, and irresistible desire.--And every part declared triumphant Nature.[40]

They both work themselves into a sexual frenzy, and Philenia is saved from "ruin" only by the (un)fortunate arrival of her father, who takes her home. However, although Nature here seems to have lost the battle, it wins the war in the sequel, Fatal Fondness (1725). On page 28, the now married Fillamour protests to Philenia that "there is still a sort of love which without a crime we may indulge--sisters and brothers, fathers and daughters love, and friendship is a nearer tie than blood"; on page 30 he "boldly seized what virtue would not grant" and is forgiven. These three instances, all of which are in keeping with her other works,[41] illustrate that in Haywood's fictional universe, love without sex is either the temporary result of self-delusion or super-human self-restraint, or a necessary evil due to circumstances beyond the control of the lovers. It is, above all, unnatural.

There is a whole category of Haywood women, not necessarily heroines, who, like Ciamara, appropriate for themselves sexual knowledge and techniques which are normally the prerogative of the

[40] Unequal Conflict (London, 1725), p. 58. Cf. "The Witty Reclaimer" in Love in Its Variety (London, 1727), p. 222. [41] See The Mercenary Lover, "The Witty Reclaimer" and the stories of Anziana and Clara in The Fruitless Enquiry for other examples.

male. Ciamara and her more successful counterpart, the Baroness de Tortillée, are the most aggressive and extreme. The latter

> never knew what it was to love sincerely; and at a time, when, perhaps, there were twenty (tho' each believed himself the only blessed) who possessed all the favours she was capable of bestowing, she was overheard to say . . . that that woman was a fool that ever gave herself the least <u>real</u> uneasiness on the account of love.[42]

Their problem could perhaps be termed sex in excess; its opposite, which is more common among Haywood's women, is the cool-headed, pragmatic control of sexuality also usually associated with the male libertine. Keziah,[43] for example, one of the least sympathetically portrayed characters who exhibit this trait, realizes how intensely Dorante craves her sexually, and uses that knowledge to further her own escape from the strict confinement of the orthodox Jewish community by refusing to see him again unless he marries her. The equally ambitious Gigantilla uses similar tactics to marry the Duke of Malfy in <u>The Perplexed Dutchess</u>. Both these women are, to one degree or another, ruthless opportunists who forfeit the reader's sympathy. However, this same Lysistrata technique, arising from a sophisticated knowledge of male weakness, appears in several other works with heroines who are entirely engaging. Ismonda, in <u>The Court of Caramania</u>, offers the most extravagant example. She so ardently desires King Theodore that she withholds her favours at daggerpoint, until he promises to marry the princess to

[43] <u>The Fair Hebrew</u>.

whose court she belongs so that she has an excuse for following him. He is amazed at her "masculine temper," believing that women are naturally fanatically possessive of their lovers.[44] Her plan is successful, and although she betrays both a tolerable husband and a good mistress, the reader applauds her success and deplores Theodore's later infidelities. Fantomina, in one of Haywood's most straightforward and entertaining works, plays on another prevalent male weakness to serve a similar form of self-interest. Having observed that men are extremely fickle, she reattracts her chosen lover, who would pay no attention to her in propria persona, by assuming four successive disguises. During the course of this intrigue she pauses frequently to reflect "on the unaccountableness of men's fancies, who still prefer the last conquest, only because it is the last."[45] She is so matter-of-fact that she might be pronouncing judgment on a new gown. Instead of ranting and raging against the light-mindedness of men or bemoaning her hard fate, Fantomina turns her knowledge to her own use, and for a considerable period of time manages to defeat her wandering lover at his own game.

Although both conventional morality and a concern for social realism demanded that Fantomina come to an "unhappy" end in the last few pages of the novel,[46] Haywood was not always so cautious in challenging conventional roles. In one novel, The City Jilt (1726), the sexually knowledgeable heroine is betrayed and ruined,

[44] The Secret History of the Present Intrigues of the Court of Caramania (London, 1727), p. 24. [45] Fantomina, in Secret Histories (1725), III, p. 277. [46] See below, pp. 262-63.

recoups her fortunes using the Lysistrata technique, and ends up happy and prosperous. On the eve of her marriage to Melladore, Glicera's father dies; when Melladore discovers that the old man's wealth was more legendary than real, he gives up his honourable pretensions. Glicera is too honest herself to suspect her lover of base motives, and he takes advantage of that trust, and their supposed engagement, to make her his mistress. When he eventually deserts her, all her former tenderness hardens into an implacable resentment, not only against him, but against all men.

> Despising . . . the whole sex, she resolved to behave to them in a manner which might advance both her interest and revenge; and as nothing is capable of giving more vexation to a lover, than a disappointment when he thinks himself secure from the fears of it, she gave encouragement to the hopes of as many as sollicited her.--She received their treats and presents, smiled on all, tho' never so old or disagreeable; nor indeed was it a greater task, to feign a tenderness for the most ugly than the loveliest of Mankind--for all alike were hateful to her thoughts.[47]

Having learned from her own bitter experience that men are more interested in the chase than in the enjoyment of what they capture, she keeps them all dancing, taking as much from them as she can and giving nothing more than a few smiles and words of encouragement in return. In this way she ultimately achieves a perfect revenge on Melladore[48] and lives in comfort, having renounced all designs on men. Haywood's final comment reveals definitively whose side she was on:

[47] The City Jilt (London, 1726), p. 21. [48] See synopsis, p. 470.

> Few persons continue to live in a greater reputation, or more endeavour by good actions to obliterate the memory of their past mismanagement, than does this fair jilt; whose artifices cannot but admit of some excuse, when one considers the necessities she was under, and the provocations she received from that ungrateful sex.[49]

Thus Glicera lives in triumph, having survived eating of the tree of sexual knowledge.

Even the most innocent and unsophisticated of Haywood's heroines respond to the sexual side of love. Throughout the century, in novels by other authors, seduction almost always represents a conflict between the passion of the man and the "virtue" of the woman. Usually this conflict is resolved by physical force or the use of drugs.[50] In Haywood's fiction an analagous conflict occurs, but it is largely contained within the heroine's own mind. Her modesty and sense of propriety struggle with her own passion. Often, the battle begins before the lover has declared himself or even become aware of her feelings. Lasselia's inner torment is the most elementary. She falls in love with de L'Amye at first sight, learning simultaneously that he is married, and argues endlessly with herself about the morality of loving him until her reason momentarily gains the upper hand. De L'Amye has indicated nothing to her of reciprocal passion; consequently, she can be innocently contented with his friendship. However, after he declares his love for her, despite all the same arguments and reasoning, she is lost. The knowledge that her love is returned tips the balance

[49] City Jilt, p. 60. [50] See The Accomplished Rake (1727), by Mary Davys, or Mary Hearne's Female Deserters (1719).

irretrievably. Belinda's case is more complicated and, therefore, more revealing. She is betrothed to the squire of the adjoining estate, Worthly, whom she greatly esteems, but cannot love. They meet Courtal at the same time, and while she is stricken with passion, Worthly conceives an ardent friendship for the stranger. Worthly invites Courtal to stay with him, and Belinda's reaction is ambivalent. She is glad of the opportunity to be near her beloved, but is afraid of being exposed to temptation, for Worthly's sake as well as her own.

> It gave me a concern I cannot well express, to see this generous, this undesigning man thus lay a snare for his own hopes: yet how could I avoid it, without making a confession too shocking for my modesty, or his passion, to be able to sustain? . . . How did I struggle to repel my daily-encreasing wishes? and how strenuously did I endeavour to outbalance Courtal's enchanting graces, by the solid perfections of the other? But all in vain; the tow'ring flame grew higher by my attempts to quell it, and a little time convinced me, that Almighty Love despises all Controul.[51]

The elements at war here are three-fold. First of all there is her passion itself, primarily if not exclusively sexual; the opposition set up between Worthly and Courtal makes the nature of her love perfectly clear. Then there is propriety, which would be outraged by her immodest rejection of a formerly accepted suitor in favour of a man who had never even expressed an interest in her, and equally outraged by the duel which would inevitably follow. And finally, there is Belinda's own virtue: not in this case mere

[51] British Recluse, pp. 97-98.

physical chastity, as in so many instances, but her awareness that her feelings sin against social and moral laws. She has promised to marry Worthly, and her passion impels her to break that contract; she recognizes that he is by far the better man, yet she yearns after Courtal. She dreads temptation, not for fear of any moral recriminations, but because she knows that she will not have the strength to resist her own desires. When temptation comes, and Worthly sends Courtal to urge her to agree to an early wedding date, we learn conclusively which element is uppermost. At first she is afraid, from his languishing looks, sighs, etc., that he has come to plead his own cause rather than that of his friend. The Courtal launches quite circumspectly into praise of Worthly, and

> if before I was alarmed at the apprehension of Courtal's entertaining me in another manner, I was now ten times more so, that he did not.--It stung me to the soul to find that when he had so favourable an opportunity to discover his sentiments, he should employ it in a theme which (if he had those inclinations that I had flattered myself I had inspired) must be so disagreeable to his own desires. My fears now turned to indignation! I raged to think my wishes had deceived me, and half despised him for his insensibility![52]

Even though his declaration forces her again into the agonies of conflicting love and duty, she has revealed that love, physical love, is what she desires most. The reader is left with the impression that if it were not for her pre-engagement, she would have no scruples at all about going to bed with her lover as soon as he chose to ask her.

[52] British Recluse, p. 101.

Belinda does not wait for Courtal's confession of love before she lets loose her passion within herself, nor does Lasselia. In this they exhibit one of the characteristics predominant in a majority of Haywood's heroines: they are active in taking emotional and sexual initiatives, exactly the opposite of their noble, passive predecessors in fiction. It is surprising how many of them violate the fictional convention which was tobecome moral law,[53] and fall in love before the man has a chance to fall in love with them.[54] And falling in love is only the beginning. It is in this area that role reversal is the most pronounced. When Haywood's women are deserted or betrayed, for whatever the reasons, they do not suffer in meek and heroic silence. Celemena and Althea[55] seek redress at court; Clara[56] takes a bitter and bloody revenge; and almost all of them become angry with a cold and just resentment.[57] Montamour, Belinda and Cleomira, Alathia and Euphemia,[58] Basilia and Christiana[59] all set off in pursuit of their wandering lovers. Very few indeed die of broken hearts; even Emanuella, who does die of what might be called grief,[60] first has to undergo, in order to sustain the life of her baby, the unaccustomed rigours of working. She succumbs to pain and weariness only after she sees the child safe in his father's family. When heroines are ignored by men

[53] See Watt, pp. 164-70, and above, pp. 13-14. [54] Fantomina, Clementina, Miramene, Cleomira, Belinda, Ismonda, Annilia, Anadea, Lasselia, Idalia, Philecta, Emanuella, Euphemia and most of the women in Love in Excess are guilty of this. [55] The Tea Table and The Mercenary Lover. [56] [57] The Fruitless Enquiry. For details see synopsis, p. 481. Glicera, for example, or Montamour. [58] [59] Love in Its Variety. [60] The Double Marriage and The Surprise. The Rash Resolve.

who are occupied with other lovers, they often substitute themselves for the favoured lady, though not usually so efficiently as Melantha: Philecta uses the convenient circumstance of a masked ball,[61] while Camilla and Ciamara pretend to be someone their lovers have not yet seen. Fantomina is by far the most adept and skilful at this activity. One evening at the theater she notices a crowd of men flocking around a notorious prostitute, and spots among them a gentleman she knows who would never treat her with anything but awe and respect. Recognizing that she is sexually attracted to him, and wondering what would happen, the next night she dresses as a woman of the town and throws herself in his way. He is attentive, and although she originally had not intended to see the affair through to its logical conclusion, he prevails upon her to become his mistress. She manages the affair with dispatch, taking great care to protect her reputation. When his ardour cools, she disguises herself as the widow Bloomer, provoking a response in him suitable to her station as a tradesman's relict. Twice more, as his passion dwindles, she reattracts him in another form, first as Celia the country wench, and then as the wealthy Incognita. Although the simultaneous arrival of her mother and a baby girl put a rather ignominious stop to her intrigue, the end of the novel has the air of being tacked on to the rest, and it is hard to read the work as a whole without feeling that Haywood herself was far from displeased with Fantomina's ingenuity and perseverance. In fact, she is not condemned on moral grounds so much as on practical ones; her mother helps her to tighten her laces

[61] The Masqueraders. Antonia, in The Unequal Conflict, takes the place of her maid in similar circumstances.

and sends her to a monastery only after all attempts to unite Fantomina and Beauplaisir have failed. She obviously considers scandal a worse disgrace than promiscuity. And as for Beauplaisir himself, although he does have the last word in determining Fantomina's fate, his refusal to marry her is a somewhat hollow victory in the light of his humiliation. He is angry at the deception practiced on him, but he has been made a fool of in his tenderest parts. In the end it seems almost as though Fantomina has paid the price not only for knowing too much about "the world," but also for knowing too little about her place in that masculine domain.

The last and perhaps most interesting facet of the sexuality of Haywood's women might be termed erotic imagination, and it is a quality which they have in abundance. These young ladies, though for the most part sheltered, innocent, and usually still untouched both literally and figuratively, are able to feel, recognize, and even indulge their sexual longings within the precincts of their fancy. Cleomira's experience speaks for all her literary sisters: "Lysander's idea would suffer nothing but itself to have any prevalence in my soul. . . . "[62] It is, in fact, this very susceptibility to passion which renders them vulnerable to the difficulties which assault them. In some cases,[63] the women conjure for themselves ideal lovers who later appear with feet of clay. In others, they display an untoward sexual curiosity such as that which leads to Fantomina's initial disguise or to Idalia's transvestite flir-

[62] British Recluse, p. 26. [63] For example, The Agreeable Caledonian, The Rash Resolve and The Masqueraders.

tation with Antonia.[64] Every female character in Haywood's fiction, with the exception of those two opportunists Keziah and Gigantilla, are amazingly quick to respond to "liberties," and are perfectly aware of the meaning of the throbbings and burnings to which they are subject. But it is perhaps through the explicit erotic dreams which appear so frequently that Haywood best reveals this side of her heroines.[65] The following passage offers the best example of the erotic dream (or daydream), and illustrates as well the multiple ways in which the device functions:

> The images which possessed my waking moments engrossed also those of my repose; even my shut senses could not exclude Charmillo; my soul beheld him, discoursed with him, discovered charms in him exceeding all I had before observed; a thousand indistinct ideas, but all on him, ran in my giddy fancy, but at last formed themselves to one, which seemed a vision more than a dream. Methought, I had received a letter from that unknown admirer, of whom I spoke before; and that going to the oak to leave a billet in answer to it, the narrow concave which used to be the repository, on my approach, extended itself; and the whole cleaving trunk at length opening a mighty passage, Charmillo, dressed as a bridegroom, and adorned with all the graces of art and nature, came rushing forth, and caught me in his arms, crying Behold, sweet Violanthia, your unknown adorer! No longer could I keep the burning secret, nor feed on the unsubstantial bliss of distant conversation. Something more the lovely phantom seemed to say, but what I know not. . . . I started, and awoke. . . . The first object of my opening eyes, was him who had been the inspirer of my sleeping meditations. . . . Yet still I thought it all a dream, and would have rose and shook the slumber off but was too forcibly with-held; his arms close-circled round my waist, overpowered my vain

[64] Idalia, passing as a youth, attracts her fellow-traveller Antonia. Partly to secure her disguise, partly to reform Antonia, and partly to see what will happen, she encourages Antonia's advances.

[65] I have already mentioned this device with reference to Love in Excess. See above, p. 142.

> efforts, as did his enchanting tongue, and my own ungovernable emotions, in a few moments, even my very will.[66]

The first function of the dream itself is to set the scene for the encounter with the real lover which invariably follows. By its very nature, fantasy creates an atmosphere in which expectations are raised, senses are sharpened, and outlines are blurred between what is real and what is not. This preparation affects not only Violanthia, who is thus weakened for a decisive attack on her self-control, but the reader as well. Her volatile sensibility is obviously intended to arouse and engage the imagination of the reader, like all good pornography, and on this level Haywood seems to have been quite effective. According to the testimonials included in some of her novels, it is in particular her ability to appeal to her readers on the level of erotic imagination which made her so popular in her own day.[67] At the same time, Violanthia's dream and, presumably, the fevered sounds and movements which accompany

[66] The Fruitless Enquiry, pp. 200-202. See also pp. 123-24 of that work. The following contain comparable instances of erotic imagination: Agreeable Caledonian, British Recluse, Fatal Secret, Love in Excess, The Masqueraders, The Rash Resolve, Idalia, and The Surprise.

[67] The following examples are both from poems prefixed to part II of Love in Excess:

> . . . . . I feel that fire
> Your words alone can paint! Your looks inspire!
> Resistless now, Love's shafts new pointed fly,
> Winged with your flame, and blazing in your eyes,
> With sweet, but pow'rful force. . . . . .
>
> "By an Unknown Hand"

> What Beauty ne'er could melt, thy touches fire,
> And raise a musick that can love inspire;
> Soul-thrilling accents all our senses wound
> . . . . . .
> Ev'n Nature's self in sympathy appears,
> Yields sigh for sigh, and melts in equal tears;
> For such descriptions thus at once can prove
> The force of language, and the sweets of Love.
>
> Richard Savage

it, serve as an extremely efficient means of revealing her feelings, not only to us, but also to the watching Charmillo. His knowledge gives him an advantage over her which he is quick to press. A third function, purely literary, is that the dream dispenses with elaborate seductions and coy manipulations; Violanthia's feelings are exposed almost brutally, thus enabling Haywood to proceed directly to the next crisis. A similar pattern occurs in all the works which include this device. The susceptibility of the woman to erotic suggestion allows Haywood to cut out all extraneous matter and frees her to concentrate not on elements of plot, but on modulations of character.[68]

The most important and most interesting revelation made by Violanthia's dream, and which is true of all other instances of this device, is that the heroine is passionate, even energetically sexual, in ways which would have horrified a princess straying from "Le Pays de Tendre." Haywood's pre-Freudian understanding of the subconscious seems naive now, but it was remarkable in its context. Violanthia is an eighteenth-century version of the battered wife; her husband is fanatically jealous and has continually mistreated her in consequence. Being fundamentally virtuous, she takes her marriage vows seriously, and has had to stifle all ordinary interest in the company of other people in order to try to please him. When her husband takes a liking to Charmillo and practically throws the two of them together, she struggles for a long time to combat both her feelings of sexual attraction, and the o-

[68] See above, pp. 201-2.

verwhelming gratitude she feels at being treated once again with dignity and respect. The long struggle to submit herself to her husband's unjust brutality causes her emotions to break with particular violence when she can no longer contain them, and they break straight from her subconscious into reality. Thus, in addition to making her plight appear more poignant to the reader, the involuntary force of passion exempts Violanthia, in a sense, from responsibility for her actions. The world of dreams is one over which we have no control. Consequently, what happens there is also beyond control. A curious paradox is the result: the act of adultery in which this scene terminates is at once something which happens to Violanthia rather than an act she responsibly commits, and a union of equal passion on both sides. She is no passive receptacle for male lust. From this it seems clear that the dream provides Haywood with a means of allowing her heroines to break all the rules, yet still maintain the unequivocal sympathy of the reader. As she says of Philecta, "Imagination . . . had given her in sleep, a full idea of those joys, which, when awake, she durst now allow herself to think of."[69] She can feel and act with total freedom only when unconscious, but above all, she can feel and act. And she is never self-deceived.

Haywood's heroines defy not only the conventions of literature, but also those of society itself. The most obvious instance of this defiance is the sexuality I have been discussing. The heroines of the novels are neither virgins nor whores, and although there is an occasional Platonist among them, like Miramene, none

[69] The Masqueraders, p. 40.

of them suffers from the "sexual immunity" which characterized the heroines of romance. But Haywood's women also rebel against the economic position of women, and the conventional belief that a woman was the "property" of husband or father.[70] A constant figure in her fiction is the woman who refuses her lover, either temporarily or permanently, because she has no fortune of her own and is too proud to become a burden on him, or at best, some sort of bargain purchase. Emanuella, who has become Emilius's lover, refuses his many offers of marriage, preferring to wait until the ships carrying her fortune in goods should land.

> As she then was, she might have looked on a marriage with the Count as extreamly to her interest; but as she expected to be, the advantage was wholly on his side, and among the other niceties of her passion, this was one, never to endure to be obliged to the man she loved.[71]

It is this same resolution which leads to her eventual demise, but she maintains her integrity to the end. Emanuella is not atypical;[72] like her, Haywood's other proud heroines are more willing to indulge their passion illicitly than to sacrifice their self-respect. There is certainly no denying that passion. Consequently, their refusal to marry is not the effect merely of indifference.

The full impact of Haywood's unique brand of heroine can only be appreciated in the context of a whole novel. One particularly interesting study is Anadea, in The Fatal Secret, or, Constancy in Distress (1724). Although of indistinctly noble birth, Anadea

[70] See above, pp. 6-8. [71] Rash Resolve, pp. 55-56.
[72] Philenia, Camilla, Serinda, Cleomelia and Mlle. Douxmouries (in Lasselia) all refuse lovers for this same reason.

is without fortune and occupies no particular place on the social scale. Her moribund father, afraid that she will be left without sustenance and protection, is anxious to entrust her care to a man of substance. She herself has no inclination for marriage, like so many of her counterparts, and agrees only out of filial affection and a sense of duty. Then she meets Blessure, who recegnizes not only her beauty but also her intelligence, and she is awakened to love. Haywood describes their curious harmony of temper in terms of an androgynous ideal:

> /There was in his air/ something so very graceful, yet withal so sweet. . . . He had an uncommon delicacy in his nature; so had she:--a grave chearfulness, or, if you will, a gay solidity in his behaviour; so had she.--In fine, never were two persons of different sexes so alike, so framed to please each other.[73]

When they first meet, in company, neither has the opportunity to speak of love. Without considering whether he even noticed her, Anadea gives free rein to the passion which she had previously doubted her ability to experience. That very night she spends "in anxieties such as hopeless lovers feel" (p. 213); she is fully aware of the obligations in which she is entangled and those which her love moves her to desire. Haywood uses this opportunity to reveal the processes of her heroine's mind.

> She could not avoid wishing, though there was not the least room for her to imagine a possibility of what she wished:--She could not help praying, yet thought those prayers a sin.--Her once calm and peaceful bo-

[73] The Fatal Secret, p. 212. Further references will be given in the text. See also quotation on p. 247.

> som was now all hurry and confusion:--the esteem which she had been long labouring to feel for the Chevalier, was now turned to aversion and disdain; and the indifference she had for all Mankind, now converted into the most violent passion for one. . . . She thought she could be contented to live a single life, and knew so little of the encroaching nature of the passion she had entertained, that she believed she should never languish for any greater joy, than that she might, without a crime, indulge contemplation with the idea of his perfections; and to destroy that pleasing theory by marrying with another . . . was more terrible to her than the worst of deaths.--Confounded what to do, or rather wild that there was nothing she could do that might be of service to her in an exigence like this, her mind grew all a chaos, and the unintermitting inquietudes of her soul not permitting any repose. . . . /she kept to her chamber for several days./ (pp. 213-14)

During her days of confinement, Anadea has much time to indulge these thoughts and, being a true Haywood heroine, she soon confronts her own sensuality. In a beautifully ambiguous passage, perhaps her most powerful evocation of erotic imagination, Haywood describes Anadea's modulations of thought from the spiritual to the physical:

> Then would she form long discourses (such as 'tis probable he indeed would have made, had he been blest with an opportunity,) and answer them again.--Nay, sometimes Contemplation, ravished with the rapturous image, would carry her to a confession of her love; she yielded, fainted, almost died with pleasure in the theory of that joy, the practice of which she had ne'er experienced:--Then all at once, remembering it was but illusive, start from the fallacious transport, and wake to real woe and bitterness of heart. (p. 215)

When Blessure finally writes to her, Anadea experiences the standard conflict between her own inclinations and what a female correspondent in the Spectator called "the laws of custom and

modesty."[74] She replies with tremendous self-restraint, and then abandons herself to the whirlpool.

> Sometimes she wished a second sollicitation;--at others she trembled, for fear she should again be put to so severe a trial, which she could not promise herself to go through with the same fortitude and resolution as before.--However, I believe most women will imagine she would have thought it a greater misfortune had the Count here ceased his prosecution. (p. 220)

The appeal to the reader here is as effective as it is deliberate. No woman, having just read pages and pages of similar self-torture, could, when applied to directly, refuse Anadea her passion.

What all these passages illustrate is Anadea's tremendous self-awareness; she recognizes her feelings for what they are, and does not long delude herself regarding either their depth or their implications. Despite her innocence, she has been sexually and emotionally wakened, and made alert as well to the moral complexity into which those feelings plunge her. The effect of this awareness is that she participates fully in the events which ultimately lead to her suicide. The only heroism she inspires in Blessure is a decision to risk his father's displeasure and to marry her with neither fortune nor favourable prospects. It is Anadea, not he, who resolves to keep their marriage secret until his father dies. It is she rather than her husband who determines that she must continue in her secrecy at Blessure's trial, so that his family will not refuse to help him. It is she who is truly

[74] Spectator, Number 199 (Oct. 18, 1711), II, 279.

heroic, watching her father die of grief, believing her dishonoured, rather than becoming truly dishonoured in her own eyes by breaking her vow of silence, and content to see her reputation annihilated if her loss might gain her husband's life and fortune. At the last, she is drugged into the helpless female, a role she has refused throughout the rest of the novel. Yet even then, she is not the frail, passive flower of romance. In a passage which is more pathetic than erotic, Haywood describes Anadea's rape by Blessure's father, who, through her resolution, is ignorant of her identity:

> The lethargy she was in, was not . . . so strong, as to have the power o'er fancy:--Her dear Blessure was ever in her thoughts; and at this moment, watchful Imagination brought him to her panting breast; and the real warmth of those caresses she received, making her dream more lively, she returned his ardours with an extasy too potent for the dull god's restraint. --Unbounded rapture broke thro' the power of art:-- All her senses regained at once their liberty, and she awoke, to sleep no more. (p. 250)

This is no half-dead Clarissa. In fact, what takes place could hardly even be described as a rape, except in the sense that her assailant had to use drugs to gain access to her. Anadea may be helpless in the sense that she is no longer in control of her mind and body; she may be as much a victim as any of her literary ancestors. But the force of her sexuality and depth of her love for her husband combine to make her party to her own undoing. She is destroyed, both figuratively and literally, by her own strength, of resolution, imagination and love. When she realizes what has happened and is back in control of herself, she again takes action. Haywood's heroines rarely pause long enough to waste away. Anadea

runs on her husband's sword, and dies with her fatal secret still untold. Throughout the narrative, she maintains a close hold on the reader's sympathy, and she dies truly a heroine.

The nature of Haywood's heroines reflects her awareness of the lives led by many of her readers and their need for vicarious adventure. Rejecting both the commonly accepted notions of women and the long-standing tradition of passive, "feminine" heroines, she catered to that need and, in doing so, developed a new set of conventions tailored specifically to its demands. At first glance, all of her early novels and heroines may seem identical. Raleigh accuses her of writing "novels, as an oriental tailor makes garments, to a ready-made pattern, with dexterity and despatch."[75] It is true that she wrote to a formula, as the very fact that I have been able to extract a "typical" Haywood heroine proves. But as her renunciation of the romance conventions testifies, it was a pattern far from ready made.

[75] Raleigh, p. 139.

IX

THE NOVEL AS TRAGEDY

Eliza Haywood's extraordinary popularity cannot be explained by her sensationalism alone. As Q. D. Leavis justly comments, although "the appeal made by Mrs. Haywood's titles is not infrequently to a frank interest in the amorous, . . . she never exploits a sensual response, and is extremely practical and matter-of-fact."[1] Nor can her reputation as "champion of her sex"[2] be accounted for by a simple reference to a rapidly expanding female reading public. Her books appealed to something more fundamental than the common, superficial interests of drawing-room society.

> The heroines of all these novels are the victims of a world which sees them simply as opportunities for lust and avarice, which depersonalizes them. . . . The love by which they are possessed. . . . is really a way for these heroines to assert personality, a desperate alternative to the depersonalization which the masculine world imposes upon them.[3]

Anadea, that quintessential Haywood heroine, achieves a relatively rare distinction for women during the first half of the eighteenth century:[4] she asserts her personality both in her own life and on

[1] Leavis, p. 300 (note).
[2] See above, p. 31.
[3] Richetti, p. 208.
[4] Her only literary rivals are Roxana and Moll Flanders; it is significant that in an output comparable to Haywood's Defoe produced only two such heroines, both criminals.

the imagination of her readers. To women who otherwise read only the conventional wisdom of Lord Halifax[5] or Mr. Spectator, Haywood's novels provided a kind of vicarious experience which perhaps better enabled them to support the severe limitations of the drawing room. In her novels, women saw themselves as heroines, fighting for some degree of autonomy in a world not of their own design--sometimes winning, often losing, but always fighting. In this period, it is extremely difficult to distinguish conventional morality regarding women from the literary conventions devised to present that ideal to the reading public. The passive romantic heroine was not only a character type inherited from earlier literature; she was also a model, one from which a literary woman, either author or character, deviated at her peril. As we have seen, Eliza Haywood regularly thumbed her nose at such conventions, and offered in her works a constant challenge, the nature of which has never been fully examined.

Ironically, in the context of this defiance of convention, Haywood's use of romantic, exotic settings becomes crucial to her art. I have already discussed how it functions as a means of quickening the pace and intensifying the emotional impact of the novels.[6] Another, equally important reason for such settings arises from the same impulse which led authors throughout the century to insist that their books "contain the history of some real facts."[7] In both ways they were thus able to claim only a limited respon-

[5] His Advice to a Daughter (1700), went through 25 editions by 1774. See above, p. 14.

[6] See above, pp. 201-2.

[7] Fruitless Enquiry, preface, p. iv.

sibility for what they published. Writers who felt obliged to assure readers that they were not makers of fiction but only reporters or editors--and the list includes "respectable" men like Richardson and Hawthorne as well as hacks like Haywood and Defoe--were usually presenting scenes and conflicts which, to the eye of an average reader, would seem in some way immoral. However, if they were merely offering the public what they had discovered, or in the interests of truth reporting what they had been told, then they, as editors, could not themselves be accused of immorality. Similarly, if the stories were set in the past, or in countries sufficiently remote from the everyday England of the reading public, any immoral passages or ideas to which those readers might object could easily be rationalized by nationalistic prejudices[8] or by the derision which obvious fantasy would demand of a rational human being. Haywood was dealing with particularly inflammatory material; not only was it immoral, because of the "too great warmth, which may perhaps, appear in some particular pages,"[9] but it was often something of a threat to the established order, in the body of her books if not in their endings. Haywood was not so much the independent spirit that she could often afford the

[8] E.g., that all nuns and priests are corrupt, that the French have a "hotter" temperament than the English, or that the sins of a past age are impossible in an age of modern enlightenment. Haywood herself corroborates this point in the preface to the fifth edition of The Injured Husband. "A gentleman . . . imagines . . . that tho' I have laid the scene in Paris, I mean, that the adventure should be thought to have happened in London, and that in the character of a French Baroness, I have attempted to expose the reputation of an English woman of quality. I should be sorry to think the actions of any of our ladies could give room for a conjecture of the reality of what he would suggest."

[9] Lasselia, preface, p. vi.

luxury of open rebellion; after all, she was financially in need of the widest reading public she could attract, and could not stand to alienate anyone by too extreme an exposition of her views. "Since the ultimate disaster of adventurous heroines was regarded as a sop to moral readers,[10] Mrs. Haywood frequently failed to gratify her audience with a happy ending, but occasionally a departure from strict virtue might be condoned provided it took place in a country far removed from England."[11] In the event of a rare English "happy ending," such as The British Recluse, the landscape is so vague and the names are so romanticized that the environment is not sufficiently real to disturb her more sober-minded readers. In these ways Haywood effectively set up a smokescreen between her audience and herself, obscuring her intentions so that only a reader not encumbered with a conventionally moral mind would be able to understand the implications of what she wrote.

A frequent concomitant of the exotic setting, the much maligned convent, is particularly significant in conveying Haywood's underlying message. The use of convents is frequently ridiculed as being merely a necessary aspect of marketable fiction, as vital to boosting sales as gratuitous rapes and scenes of recrimination in high theatrical bombast. Although Erickson points out that "presumably this device must have originated in someone's awareness of the dramatic and symbolic possibilities of the conflict between flesh and spirit,"[11] he completely ignores the exploitation of these possibilities in Haywood's fiction. The common notion of

[10] Nowhere does it appear more sop-like than in Fantomina, where the severe ending is antithetical to the author's delighted and approving tone throughout the rest of the story. See above, pp. 262-63.

[11] Whicher, p. 57. [11] Erickson, p. 52.

the use to which this device is put is that women "resort to convents as a form of renunciation in time of despair . . ."[12] In other words, because they cannot have what they want, in most cases a chosen lover, they have to settle for the dull life behind monastery walls. A corollary of this view is that the single life, the life in retreat, is a fate worse than death. Certainly, most of Haywood's permanently cloistered ladies are never the grand prize winners that her happily married ones are, but neither are they the pathetic rejects of conventional belief. If the convent is sometimes used as a punishment or a form of guardianship to headstrong girls,[13] more frequently their retirement is a gesture of independence, and of defiance to a world that would have them either compromise their principles and become whores, or sell themselves in marriage. The cloister represents, in general, a refuge for women who are attacked on all sides by parental, financial, and social pressures as well as assaulted from within by conflicting emotions. A typical case is that of Emanuella, in The Rash Resolve, who retreats to a convent after she discovers she is pregnant by a lover who she thinks has deserted her. The reason for that ostensible desertion, the loss of her fortune in a shipwreck, further isolates her from possible sources of aid. Because of her fierce pride and her refusal to accept charity from a man who once offered her love, she resolves never to tell Emilius, the child's father, that she has had a baby. In consequence, her only recourse is to retreat to a convent, where she finds the employ-

[12] Erickson, p. 52.

[13] As in The Agreeable Caledonian, Fantomina, and Idalia.

ment which would be denied her in her own social sphere. She serves "the nuns in the manner of an out or lay-sister,"[14] taking messages, washing and sewing to support herself and her son. As is frequent in Haywood's fiction, Emanuella's independence is misinterpreted, and Emilius assumes she has fled to the convent in order to hide her shame.

The significance of this particular episode is that the convent was the only refuge to which such a woman, well-bred and untrained, could go in time of need; it is thus a symbol of independence in the way that a profession would be for women one hundred years later. Yet Emanuella's problem was a real one. In 1694, Mary Astell published A Serious Proposal to the Ladies for the Advancement of Their True and Greatest Interest, followed by a second part in 1697. In this work, she sets forth her plans for a woman's college to provide them with "a retreat from the world,"[15] an institution to serve just such a purpose as the convents in Haywood's novels. To this college, which she also referred to as a "monastery, or . . . religious retirement,"[16] would come women lacking dowries for suitable marriages, women who found themselves bullied into accepting unreasonable proposals, those wishing intellectual training, those with no other place in the world, and women simply needing some sort of breathing space. The heiress "will not here be inveigled and imposed on, will neither be bought nor sold;" "she who has more money than discretion, need not curse her stars for

[14] Rash Resolve, p. 107. [15] Part I, p. 61; quoted in Ada Wallas, Before the Bluestockings (London, 1929), p. 116.
[16] I, 61; quoted in Wallas, p. 116.

being exposed a prey to bold importunate and rapacious vultures."[17] Gentlewomen in less fortunate circumstances would either remain as teachers or wait until their training could procure them a genteel match. "She only claimed for the ladies in her seminary the right to remain single and to refuse unsuitable marriages."[18] Astell was actually promised £10,000 to establish the foundations of her institution.[19] Unfortunately, this gift was withdrawn after Bishop Burnet strenuously objected to the proposal. His reason is significant: "to his mind her scheme suggested a revival of the nunneries, and savoured of Rome."[20] Consequently, the women whom Astell would have helped, even saved, were abandoned to the kinds of predicament found again and again in Haywood's novels. The characters may have been imaginary, but their problems and society's attitudes towards them were all too common in the real world. And in order to give her heroines a way out of those difficulties, the breathing space Astell would have claimed for them, Haywood sets many of her works in Catholic countries where convents provided a ready-made retreat. To a reader who accepted conventional morality without question, the heroine's entombment in a monastery represented poetic justice; this same reader would later weep for Clarissa and demand the "happy ending" Richardson abhorred. But a more discerning reader would realize that Haywood's convents were, in fact, an attempt to establish female autonomy.

This tension between Haywood's invented contexts and the rea-

[17] I, 146; quoted in Wallas, p. 118 and p. 119. [18] Wallas, p. 120.
[19] Wallas believes that the anonymous donor was Queene Anne (p. 111), while Adburgham's more recent suggestion is Lady Elizabeth Hastings (p. 42). [20] Wallas, p. 111.

lism with which she portrayed social attitudes and emotional states, forms one of the most important and interesting aspects of her achievement as a novelist. The world of the romances was formed to accommodate idealism; all the various conventions I have been discussing, both literary and philosophical, contribute to the making of that world. The settings, modes of speech, types of character and means of characterization conspire, in a way, to keep out realistic elements which might destroy the delicate architecture. Into this fragile universe, Haywood imported psychological realism. Her characters storm on stage with their intense passions, their lust, their rebelliousness, resolution or frailty, and that carefully constructed universe threatens to tumble about their heads. The effect on the reader, I think, is rather like that of a film in which the audience is suddenly permitted a glimpse behind the façade of houses, shops, etc., and sees the actors changing costume and the technicians cursing. Readers of novels, especially modern readers, seem to have particular difficulty coming to terms with the ambivalence of this sort of fiction;[21] they are unable to discern the delicate balance between what is realistic and what is not. Most people, reading Haywood, would register first the fantastic elements: the extravagant speeches, the ridiculous names, the absence of domestic detail in descriptions,

[21] A case in point is science fiction, which frequently uses technology to establish a fantastic setting, and then populates that scene with ordinary people. A brilliant example of this is Ray Bradbury's Martian Chronicles (UK title, The Silver Locusts, 1951), in which the pioneers to Mars soon transform their brave new world into a replica of earth because they themselves cannot help bringing with them their own, old natures. It is not a coincidence that science fiction is a "popular" genre still engaged in the process of achieving respectability.

etc. In this way they miss the vital actions and transactions of the novels and fail to appreciate that she is using the overt stylizations of romance to set up a covert challenge to conventional thought.

Haywood's most interesting work, from this point of view, is The Distressed Orphan (1726), in which the particularly precarious balance between realism and romance results in a moving and powerful indictment of contemporary society. Annilia, whose father left her and her vast fortune in the hands of her uncle, Giraldo, has been raised and educated by him with uncommon care. While everyone has been praising his generosity, he has been plotting to take advantage of a rare opportunity to advance himself and his son, Horatio, whom he orders to court his cousin. When Horatio protests that he feels more like a brother to her than a lover, Giraldo replies that "the estate which Annilia is possessed of, joined to your own, will make you the greatest man that has ever been of our family" (p. 4). Self-interest persuades him, and Giraldo proceeds to attack Annilia. In a speech presented with superb dramatic irony, he warns her that she will soon be exposed to the vile designs of a great number of men "whom either the charms of your person or estate will induce to call themselves your lovers" (p. 5), and advises that a good marriage, approved by him, is her best protection against fortune hunters. She is at first shocked, feeling that the union he proposes is unsuitable. In her opinion, she and Horatio "are too near already by blood, to be made more near by marriage" (p. 8), but she is obedient and submissive to Giraldo's supposed greater wisdom and gives her consent. Shortly afterwards, this businesslike exposition of domestic af-

fairs is interrupted by a meeting straight out of romance. She sees Colonel Marathon at a ball, and "never did the God of Love send swifter or more piercing darts, than those he now fixed in the hearts of this equally charming, equally charmed pair" (p. 10). From then on, the love between Annilia and Marathon supplies the strain of romance in what would otherwise be as straightforward a narrative as those written by Defoe. Marathon will woo her, challenge his rival as far as he can, pledge undying devotion, and eventually save her from the barbarity of her uncle. He is, in fact, one of the only real "heroes" Haywood created, actually rescuing a damsel in distress after a period of "service" from afar. Yet even this relationship is a curious mixture of extravagance and matter-of-fact detail.

Because Horatio and Giraldo are immediately suspicious of the Colonel's intentions, Annilia's freedom is severely restricted. Consequently, as in the romances, they communicate almost entirely by writing. Marathon's letters, in particular, reveal a wealth of extravagant sentiment, such as we have come to expect from Haywood's lovers, combined with a more unusual pragmatism. His first, written at the ball, epitomizes all the rest:

> To the most adorable Annilia
>
> Tho' I doubt not but my eyes have given all who have observed their glances, sufficient intelligence of my heart; yet lest you should be ignorant of their language, vouchsafe to learn it from my pen.--'Tis too much to suffer the wound, yet be denied the privilege of complaining.--I love you, O divinest of your sex! . . . with a flame as honourable as it is sincere and ardent; for sure so heavenly an innocence as shines about you, can inspire no other wishes but such as bear some comformity to itself--Nor can my zeal be supposed to arise from any mercenary view, as yet I know no more of you than your name, and /that you are/ not yet disposed of in marriage, for which . . . I

> bless indulgent Fate.--Your birth and fortune are things indifferent, provided I may not hear they are above my hopes; yet might I have my wish, 'twould be, that you had no other dowry than the treasure of your charms, that I might prove 'twas you, and only you, I would possess. But be you whatever Heaven is pleased to make you, you are and must be sovereign mistress of my soul, and the only disposer of my future destiny. I . . . take this way of declaring, what it is impossible to conceal and live--I shall . . . inform myself what place you make happy by dwelling in it, and throw myself at your feet for a pardon for this presumption; in the mean time, conjure you to think with pity on
>
> Your eternally devoted slave,
> Marathon (pp. 12-13)

Beneath phrases like "divinest of your sex," "so heavenly an innocence," "sovereign mistress of my soul," and "your eternally devoted slave," and behind concepts like the language of eyes, death from the repression of love, and the lover as slave, Haywood manages to conceal a good deal of information about her hero. We learn that he is generous and disinterested, that he is honourable, and that he is frank and forthright in his desire to marry her. He tells her that he is burning and dying for love of her, but he also tells her that he means to find out who she is and ask for her hand. His mention of dowries and fortunes, even to discount them, is far too businesslike for a hero of romance; yet the whole tone of the letter is romantic. In a later epistle, he declares himself willing to undergo the traditional trials of his love: "With all humility would I attend, till time and my future services should testify me less unworthy than at present I must appear" (p. 23). He truly believes that love can conquer all, and he acts accordingly.

In contrast to this motif of "tendresse," the gradual unfol-

ding of Giraldo's plot[22] has a documentary quality which is almost incongruous. His arguments with her over her independence, his luring her out of her room in order to put up bars at the window, her midnight abduction to the madhouse, are all presented with particular attention to detail, and that particularity seems to retard our realization of what is happening. We have been attuned to the high rhetoric of romance; in the period before we readjust to the practical tone of these other scenes, we are not fully conscious of what is taking place. However, once Annilia is imprisoned in the madhouse, the horror of her predicament is finally conveyed in a passage well worthy of Defoe:

> The rattling of chains, the shrieks of those severely treated by their barbarous keepers, mingled with curses, oaths, and the most blasphemous imprecations, did from one quarter of the house shock her tormented ears; while from another, howlings like that of dogs, shoutings, roarings, prayers, preaching, curses, singing, crying, promiscuously joined to make a chaos of the most horrible confusion; but the violence of this uproar continued not long, it being only occasioned by the first entrance of the keepers into the cells of those wretches who were really lunatic and had, for the addition of their anguish, so much remaining of sense, as to know what they were to suffer at the approach of these inhuman creatures, who never came to bring them fresh straw, or that poor pittance of food allowed for the support of their miserable lives, but they saluted them with stripes in a manner so cruel, as if they delighted in afflicting pain, excusing themselves in this barbarity, by saying that there was a necessity to keep them in awe; as if chains, and nakedness, and the small portion of wretched sustenance they suffered them to take, was not sufficient to humble their fellow-creatures. Besides, what is there to be feared from those helpless objects of compassion, who being hand-cuffed, and the fetters on their legs fast bolted

[22] Full details are given in the synopsis, p. 473.

> into the floor, can stir no further than the length of their chain! Yet with barbarity do these pityless monsters exert the power they have over them, that whoever is a witness of it, would imagine they were rather placed there for the punishment of some capital crime, for which law has provided no sufficient torture, than for the cure of a disease, by their nearest and dearest relations. (pp. 41-43)

The writing in this passage is powerful and rhythmic, the sentiments intense with a reforming zeal, and, if contemporary accounts are to be believed,[23] the details are entirely accurate. Moreover, Annilia is in very real trouble. Marathon's repeated offer to serve her is suddenly no longer an empty courtesy. He searches everywhere for her, and when he discovers that she has been taken to a madhouse, he arranges for a friend to pay his entry into the same asylum, feigning "a melancholy madness" (p. 51) in order to be near her. Here, too, the age-old metaphor of a lover going mad with despair at losing his mistress is made shockingly literal. He and his servant Osephas arrange her escape, and when the lovers are reunited, Marathon the lover threatens to overthrow Marathon the pragmatic man of action.

> In spite of the danger they were in of discovery, the amorous colonel could not forbear wasting some moments in gazing on the adorable object of his affections, thus unseen by her; and perhaps had continued longer in that tender revery, had not Osephas reminded him, that in indulging a present delight, he might possibly incur eternal grief. . . . (p. 57)

[23] See Max Byrd, Visits to Bedlam (Columbia, S. Carolina, 1974), pp. 38-43, as well as the collection of documents for the 18th century in R. Hunter and I. MacAlpine, Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry (London, 1963), pp. 277-566.

He wakes her, they escape, and they are immediately married, presumably to live happily ever after.

On one level, The Distressed Orphan is a simple tale of parental cruelty, heroic love, and good triumphing over evil, with an incongruous dose of muckraking in the madhouse passages. However, even as Marathon's heroics are subject to literal interpretation, Annilia's real predicament takes on symbolic meaning. Despite her utter helplessness when made captive, she is never a passive victim, and much of the novel's interest lies in her struggle to preserve her integrity. In the beginning, while she still believes her uncle to be an honest, generous guardian, she does appear almost meek. When he proposes the match between her and Horatio she replies,

> To whatever you think for my good, I shall submit with readiness; having learnt this much from my studies, that I shall never be able to know so well what is best for me, as those do, from whom I received that knowledge which I have. (pp. 6-7)

Her behaviour is exemplary, and relations among the family are harmonious. However, at the first encroachment on her freedom, spurred by her new love for Marathon, she rebels openly. The day after the ball, the Colonel sends a letter to be delivered only into her own hands. The messenger arrives while the family is at dinner, and Giraldo, who suspects from whom it has come, informs the servant that "Annilia received no letters but what were first communicated to him" (pp. 20-21). She waits politely until the man has left the room, then retorts, "with a countenance which sufficiently denoted the highest discontent,"

> I think, Sir! . . . the message you have sent is a pretty odd one. I am now past my childhood, and people must imagine that I am either very deficient in understanding, or you in the care of improving it, when they shall be told I am incapable of judging what answer is fit for me to give to any letter which is sent to me. (p. 21)

When Giraldo replies that he did not think it seemly for her to receive private letters in front of the man who was going to be her husband, she loses her temper completely. "He is not yet so, answered she, and to whatever subjection I may be destined after marriage, I take it ill that my liberty should be restrained until then" (p. 22). This speech reveals that she is aware of some measure of "subjection" inherent in marriage, and that she despises the man who would make use of it, especially before he has the right to do so. Her defiance alarms Giraldo, and he soon dismisses Osephas, originally Annilia's servant, for carrying letters between her and the Colonel. When he also tries to rush her into marriage with his son, she again asserts her rights. She refuses to give him an answer about the marriage until he informs her why he has dismissed her servant.

> You will not? cried he in an angry tone. No, Sir! I will not, returned she, in one which demonstrated she was equally incensed. This behaviour, resumed he, makes me believe you never meant but to deceive me, and had no serious thoughts of marrying with Horatio. If I had, said she, such arbitrary proceedings would make me exchange them for others, which would afford at least a show of greater satisfaction:--The love of liberty is natural to all, and I should have more reason to regret, than be pleased with the large fortune left me by my father, if it must subject me to eternal slavery. (p. 32)

Annilia's reply states exactly the case Mary Astell put forth in

A Serious Proposal. She asserts that "liberty is natural to all," not only to all men, and she refuses to be sold into marriage. The submissive niece has become a confident rebel.

Annilia needs no further incident to convince her that she is in grave danger while she remains in Giraldo's house. She immediately sends her woman to procure lodgings for her in the town, but unfortunately, Giraldo and Horatio intercept the maid as she is opening the door. The position in which the woman finds herself provides the first indication of how tightly Giraldo is able to draw the net around his niece. "Having been hired by him, and looking on him as her master, she durst no other than obey, nor had the courage to conceal, when asked the question, on what errand she was going" (p. 34). The woman has no choice; her future livelihood is at stake. Giraldo holds the purse-strings and therefore has the power. Haywood implies that the woman, out of loyalty or perhaps affection, would have preferred to conceal her errand, but economic necessity makes loyalty a luxury she can ill afford. The two men are astounded by her answer. "They looked on each other with a kind of amazement, as not having been able to imagine she had resolution enough to have carried her so great a length" (p. 34). Considering Annilia's initial mildness, their astonishment is inevitable. Neither of them realizes that she is willing to risk anything to preserve her integrity, which, since she has fallen in love, has become far more important to her than modesty or decorum. At this point, Giraldo happens on the clever expedient of telling the woman Annilia is mad. In this way he impales his recalcitrant niece on the horns of a dilemma: his treatment will either compel her to comply with his desire for her

to marry Horatio, or will give them, as her next of kin, the possession of her estate, for as a lunatic she will no longer have legal control over it. In either case, Giraldo and son come into her fortune. Giraldo is a subtle man, and he uses his niece's new-found independence to secure her own doom. He lures her to his room, so that bars can be fitted to her windows, by offering her a look at the papers to her estate. She has never before had the opportunity to inspect them for herself and readily agrees. When she returns, she finds herself literally a prisoner, and by telling the servants she is insane, Giraldo has deftly insured that no one will take her complaints seriously. Periodically he asks her if she is ready to submit to marrying Horatio, adding that her agreement is the only way in which she can procure her liberty. Finally she replies

> that not only to procure her liberty, but to preserve her life, she would never yield to be the wife of a man, who had consented to use her with so unexampled a barbarity,[24] and bid him invent a means to increase her sufferings as far beyond what they were, as he either would or dare; the pleasure it gave her to let him see they were in vain, would more than compensate for the pain. (p. 38)

Seeing her thus resolute, Giraldo realizes that stronger measures are in order, and he thinks of private madhouses. "He had often been told, that for a good gratification, the doors would be open as well for those whom it was necessary, for the interest of their friends, to be made mad, as for those who were so in reality, and resolved now to make the experiment" (p. 39). Consequently, Anni-

[24] Cf. Clarissa, III, 222.

lia is hurriedly bundled off to the asylum, where Giraldo hopes either to break her spirit into final submission, or to certify her insane in order to make himself executor of her estate. When Marathon frees her and they expose his villainy, Giraldo dies of vexation and shame, and his son is hounded off to foreign wars. Annilia is married to a man who, presumably, would never abuse his legal power over her, but rather will live with her as an equal partner.

In the early eighteenth century, private madhouses were a public scandal, and contemporary journals and pamphlets document frequent cases of people who were falsely confined.

> Wives put their husbands in them that they may enjoy their gallants, and live without the observation and interruption of their husbands; and husbands put their wives in them, that they may enjoy their whores without disturbance from their wives; children put their parents in them, that they may enjoy their estates before their time; relations put their kindred in them for wicked purposes, guardians to cheat their pupils, managers those with whom they are entrusted either by law or choice, . . . and all this without redress.[25]

"The vast majority of such incidents, moreover, concern young women, especially young women at their disposal who refuse to cooperate with their families, generally on the matter of marriage."[26] This is certainly true of The Distressed Orphan, whose story is very similar to "Mrs. Clark's Case" in 1718,[27] and the histories of gentlewomen given by Defoe in his Review[28] and by the anonymous

[25] "Proposals for redressing some grievances which greatly affect the whole Nation," published anonymously in 1740; in Hunter and MacAlpine, p. 366. [26] Byrd, pp. 42-43. [27] Hunter and MacAlpine, p. 298. [28] Defoe's Review, ed. A. W. Secord (New York, 1965), III, Book 7, Number 7.

author of the pamphlet just quoted. Moreover,

> the girls who are put away in this manner are put away because they have refused to be good bourgeois daughters. . . . And when such a girl refuses to do her monetary duty she is locked in a madhouse. It is the association that should be emphasized here: hostility to ordinary . . . values is associated instantly, almost automatically, with insanity. . . .[29]

Applying this analysis to Haywood's novel, Giraldo becomes far more than a cruel, avaricious guardian who abuses his trust. He is also society's avenging angel, who punishes Annilia for daring to question her place in the social chain-of-being. Once she falls in love, she realizes that she can, in fact, object to being sold into marriage, and she finds within herself sufficient strength to remain true to the ideal that love has made possible. In this way, her love truly does become "a way . . . to assert personality, a desperate alternative to the depersonalization which the masculine world imposes upon" her.[30] Marathon's romantic subservience encourages Annilia in her efforts to achieve autonomy. It is as if he is saying, "You have entire power over me; surely that must mean that you also have power over your own fate." Thus an attitude which seems totally out of place operates on another level of mean-

[29] Byrd, p. 43. Phyllis Chesler makes the same point in a feminist context. She documents dozens of cases of American women who were institutionalized for refusing to remain conventionally submissive. One particularly horrifying example is the case of Ruth, whose husband got bored and began to spend all his evenings with male friends. When Ruth objected to this neglect of her and the children, he declared that she was "sick." She was consequently hospitalized, and for six years was treated with electric shock therapy. Women and Madness (London, 1974), p. 155.

[30] Richetti, p. 208. See also p. 274.

ing, where it is essential.

A similar sort of symbolism occurs in nearly all Haywood's early novels. Parents who change from loving friends to inhumane tyrants represent all those social and moral forces which combined to keep women in their proper place; conversely, the deep and overwhelming love her heroines feel symbolizes their growing awareness of their own strength and individuality. The sexually rapacious or avaricious hero/villain plays Scylla to the parents' Charybdis, and between them the heroine lies in mortal danger of being totally destroyed. Haywood refines this system of allegory into a formula which becomes the basis, both structurally and thematically, of her art. The fundamental principle underlying that formula is that women's lives are essentially tragic; that is, for a vast majority of women, the potential for tragedy in their lives is far stronger than the possibility of happiness. The conflict which determines which potential is fulfilled, is produced by a variety of forces and circumstances in endless combinations, but basically there are two necessary elements. The first consists of external social pressures on the heroine. This can take the form of conventional morality, the authority of a parent or guardian, or some sort of ideal held by the heroine herself; all three can be loosely classified as "duty." Examples of this aspect of the formula include Lasselia's initial refusal to love a married man, Anadea's obligations to the Chevalier and her father, and the pride which prevents Emanuella from telling Emilius of her pregnancy.[31]

[31] See also Belinda's predicament in The British Recluse, and above, pp. 259-60.

The second element is in many respects the more important: internal compulsion, or love. There is hardly a single work in which love is not a means of asserting personality. In some permutations of the formula, such as The Distressed Orphan or The Surprise, the heroine's love is a positive force, offering her a chance to overcome the latent tragedy of the conflict, at least temporarily. In others, it contributes to her downfall, either by joining her to an unworthy man, or by encouraging in her a heroism which amounts to an inability to adapt to the circumstances of her life.[32] Haywood applies to these two elements a catalyst consisting of physical force. This can take the form either of some sort of confinement or of male lust resulting in seduction or rape. Annilia's incarceration in the madhouse is a perfect example of actual incarceration. Clitander's power over Althea in The Mercenary Lover is representative of seduction, and the rapes in Haywood's works are too numerous to list.

It is in the light of this predicament, of a woman confined and restricted on all sides by those people and institutions she has valued most, that Haywood's preoccupation with love and with female psychology assumes its full stature. Doody suggests that novels based on this formula were the only vehicles for tragedy possible in the philosophical and moral climate of the eighteenth century. "The idea of tragedy involves suffering, and a character's conflict with uncontrollable circumstances, difficulties brought on by something within that character, and yet in consequence ex-

[32] Examples of the first sort include Althea, Clementina and Celemena; prime examples of the latter kind are Violetta and Anadea.

ceeding any notion of desert. . . . "[33] That very idealism and belief in human perfectibility which made the heroic romances so congenial to the Augustan temperament,[34] when combined with Puritanism's emphasis on the importance of individual experience,[35] made tragedy with a central male figure extremely unlikely. Men were considered to be masters of their own fate; they were expected to pursue their goals and to overcome obstacles and injustices with reason and determination.

> If Man is thus free, the idea of his being overthrown by uncontrollable circumstances becomes repellant. . . . This is weakness, and he becomes, at best, only pathetic. . . . To be a failure is not to be interesting, not to be totally a Man.[36]

In this instance, "Man" means not the human race, but men, individual males. While men were assuming increased control of their consciences, their goals, and their social environments, a woman remained bound on all sides.

> She is not free to . . . order the exterior world according to her wishes, nor even free to correct the effects of her own mistakes. It is no dishonouring sign of disqualifying weakness in a woman to be overcome by social pressure or the power of others. Since she is not free in the realm of action, even a slightly wrong attitude on her part could have immense consequences. Suffering is possible for /a/ woman without her losing the admiration and sympathy that go out to a tragic character.[37]

[33] Doody, p. 242. Although she is writing primarily of Richardson, her observations are applicable to authors throughout the century and are particularly relevant to Haywood.

[34] See above, pp. 111-16.

[35] See Watt, pp. 60-61. Christopher Hill in his article and J. C. Dales in "The Novel as Domestic Conduct Book" (Diss. Cambridge 1970), also discuss Puritan individualism.

[36] Doody, p. 244.

[37] Doody, p. 245.

A man caught in similar circumstances might inspire a certain amount of sympathy, but he would never command the admiration necessary to tragic stature.

One of Haywood's own works provides ample proof of this assertion. The Double Marriage (1726) is one of the two major exceptions to her heroine-oriented novels, and it has at its center a male version of Henrietta de Villesache. Bellcour, the eldest son of a wealthy nobleman, and Alathia grow up in an intimacy encouraged by their respective fathers. Just as Bellcour is about to ask her father formally for her hand, his own father, Maraphil, receives a more advantageous proposal from an old friend whose daughter, Mirtamene, stands to inherit an enormous fortune. When Bellcour is not immediately enthusiastic about this proposal, Maraphil flies into a rage and they quarrel.

> 'Tis difficult to say whether the father or the son thought themselves most unhappy after this conversation; the one thought it a hardship not to be sustained with patience, that a son of whose education he had taken so much care, and whom he had loved with a tenderness infinitely superior to what the greatest part of parents express, should not in all things be conformable to his will. The other looked on it as the utmost rigour of his fate, that there was a power on earth capable of controlling him in desires which appeared so reasonable; and tho' he had ever been accustomed to behave with the utmost duty, resolved now to be disobedient, and thought the breach of it a less crime than falsehood or ingratitude to a mistress, to whom he so often had vowed an everlasting faith, and by whom he knew himself to be most tenderly beloved. (pp. 9-10)

This begins a drawn-out conflict of wills between father and son. Here at its inception we are, I think, inclined to cheer the son in his resolve to be disobedient, especially since his love for Ala-

thia was the result of an initial obedience to Maraphil's desires. Bellcour's defiance is natural and expected; a hero could never desert his mistress simply to be obliging to his father. He visits Alathia in this frame of mind, and when she generously urges him to obey Maraphil and give her up, his reply is a model of heroic indignation:

> May just Heaven forsake me, load me with curses here, and at the hour of my death, when most I pray and cry for mercy, may it be deaf, and not one saint convey my penitential sighs, but plunge me down in endless woe and ever-during hell, a companion for fiends, whenever I . . . deviate even in thought from thee; thou soul of sweetness, thou lovely abstract of all that's good in woman! (p. 12)

They swear eternal constancy, and when eventually the connection between their families is officially severed, Bellcour again acts like a hero and urges her to marry him in defiance of them all. Alathia, with characteristic insight, warns him how severely "offended Heaven denounces against a breach of duty to those to whom we owe our being" (p. 17), foreseeing that poverty, shame and isolation will be the result of their defiance, and will eventually make them repent their disobedience and hate each other. For a third time, in the face of grim reality, Bellcour's reply is extravagantly heroic: "Oh never! never! . . . could I be guilty of such baseness, much less could thy angelic nature descend to mean reproach, or poor reviling" (p. 18). However, he is willing even then to compromise, and they agree to keep their marriage secret.

Unfortunately, the consummation of that marriage is Bellcour's last heroic act. When he returns from his hastily arranged wedding night, Maraphil begins to break his spirit by a process of

bullying which rivals that of the notorious Harlowes. Maraphil utters solemn curses if Bellcour be the husband of Alathia, and "the soul of Bellcour shrank back with horror" (p. 25). From his son's expression, Maraphil guesses the truth, "and transported with the most vehement indignation . . . he drew his sword, and taking him by the throat, uttered unheard of imprecations on himself if he did not, that moment, plunge it in his breast. . . ." (p. 25). No longer the hero, Bellcour cannot bear the force of his father's rage, and he equivocates feebly until further curses force him to confess. However, where a hero would own the truth and take responsibility for his actions, Bellcour's inherent cowardice allows him to reveal only part of that truth. He is trapped. "Again demanding of him if he were married or not, /Maraphil/ repeated those curses with redoubled fury . . . if he were" (p. 26). Finding himself damned no matter what he replies, he says only that he has made a solemn contract with Alathia that he will marry no other woman. He apologizes for this rash action, and obtains permission to visit Alathia once more in order to obtain from her a signed release from this contract. He explains to her that if she signs the release, his father will restore his freedom, thus enabling him to see her more frequently, as well as giving him more time to work out a solution to their dilemma. She agrees, and Bellcour returns to his father thinking that all might be well at last. However, Maraphil does not trust his son, and immediately takes him to Plymouth to await the landing of Mirtamene and her father. There Bellcour unknowingly rescues her from assault and is so dazzled by her beauty that he suddenly finds himself more than willing to fall in with his father's plans. While

the preparations for the wedding are taking place, he remains irresolute.

> His evil genius, and the guilty passion he had for Mirtamene, render/ed/ it impossible for him, either by flying to escape the crime he was so near to acting, or by declaring to anyone the truth, seek comfort from advice or precept. (pp. 54-55)

Maraphil renews his curses if his son does not instantly marry Mirtamene, and Bellcour submits.

> Yet he had not left the room two minutes, before the wrong he was about to do Alathia, awakened conscience with so severe a check, that he was then more resolute than ever, rather to die than be guilty of so detestable a crime. (pp. 55-56)

Unfortunately, the first person he sees as he sets off to tell his father the truth is Mirtamene, and "the sight of her in a moment chased from his soul all the ideas which honour, virtue, and the remembrance of Alathia had created there. . . . " (p. 56). Consequently, they are married the next day, and Maraphil is at last content. Bellcour convinces himself that the release, joined with the fact that there were no witnesses to his first marriage, will cow Alathia into leaving him to what he now regards as his happiness. However, when she arrives to confirm the rumours of his second marriage, he immediately confesses his guilt, and they both commit suicide.

As we have seen, the idea of circumstances beyond an individual's control is fundamental to Haywood's works, whether those circumstances constitute parental tyranny, the faithlessness of a

lover, or simply the onset of love itself. Anadea is trapped between being vilified as a whore and condemning her husband to exile from his family and fortune. Emanuella loses her fortune in a shipwreck; had she been a man, like Philidore or Malaventure,[38] she might have gone out and repaired her loss through trade. Numerous women are raped or seduced into secret marriages. Many of them are also threatened at some point with an unsuitable match. Annilia's case is only the most extreme example of a heroine who is surrounded by circumstances, all her exits blocked and no foreseeable means of escape left her. Compared to these women, Bellcour is an unforgivable weakling. Henrietta de Villesache, whom he most resembles, is saved from losing our sympathy by the addition of one important factor missing from Bellcour's situation: she stands to lose all means of support if she reveals her first marriage. At no time is Bellcour threatened with the loss of his estate; poverty does not seem to worry him. Even if he were to be disinherited, and even if he were unable to become a merchant, through a lack of opportunity or a fastidiuos regard for his position in society, he has the option, as a man, of joining an army and winning both glory and a living in foreign wars. He gives way to his father simply because he cannot bear his anger. Henrietta suffers from a similar lack of resolution and courage, but from a woman timidity is more or less expected. In a man, it is unforgivable. And compared to Bellcour, Haywood's other women reveal their true strength and dignity. While he cannot tolerate

[38] In Philidore and Placentia and Cleomelia. [39] Financial security is also the reason which persuades Anziana to forfeit her vows to Lorenzo in the first story of The Fruitless Enquiry.

even his father's verbal abuse, Anadea must bear responsibility for her father's death. Bellcour is unable to disobey commands which are unreasonable as well as inconsiderate: Lasselia refuses the summons of the King of France, along with all attendant glory and power. For the sake of love or self-esteem, nearly all Haywood's heroines are able to assert themselves against strictures which, though perhaps unreasonable to us, were accepted as inviolable in the eighteenth century. They write letters, run away from home, dress as men to pursue their lovers, and defy both fate and "the world" to condemn them. Because most of what then happens to them remains outside their range of control, the repercussions of their deeds and decisions almost always "exceed any notions of just desert." In The Double Marriage, it is Alathia and Mirtamene whom we truly pity; Bellcour's death we regard primarily as his own fault.

Haywood's feminism, which is inseparable from the idea that she perfected a sort of Georgian tragedy, does a great deal to explain why poetic justice is largely absent from her novels. That concept which was so dear to both the French romancers and the Augustans is irrelevant to women leading unconventional lives, for the "good" and "evil" which are rewarded are based on conventional standards of morality. Even if we were to adopt notions of good and evil closer to Haywood's own--that is, that independence, sexual self-awareness and courage are "good," while passivity, delicacy and lust are "bad"--strict poetic justice is rarely observed. Anadea's story[40] is an excellent example. She possesses all the

[40] See above, pp. 269-73.

qualities of which Haywood most approves, yet she ends up being violated by her father-in-law and committing suicide. Fantomina is another case in point.[41] The novel is narrated with a briskness and humour which indicate that the author approves of her inventive and strong-minded heroine. Yet Fantomina is summarily dispatched to a monastery. If Haywood approved, why did she not reward her with marriage? Why are Anadea and Emanuella, both of whom are truly admirable, punished with death when they obviously deserve happiness? These endings, which have been interpreted as "a sop to moral readers,"[42] can also be regarded as concessions to realism. Haywood's formula is only workable so long as women's lives are potentially tragic, as the weakness of The Double Marriage proves. Too many happy endings would make a mockery of the forces, both internal and external, against which women had to fight. If Haywood knew that women were not the passive, delicate princesses depicted in earlier fiction, she was also very much aware that they were not free, emotionally or economically, to break the rules by which they had lived for so long. In an era without effective means of birth control, women like Fantomina would have babies. And as long as women had babies out of wedlock, they could never really attain both sexual freedom and social acceptance. For Emanuella, exactly the same limitations apply. While middle-class women had no means of support but dependence on a man, whether husband, brother or father, they would not be able to stand alone out of pride, and would suffer, if not die, when forced to manual la-

[41] See above, p.262-63. [42] Whicher, p. 57. See above, p.277.

bour. In either novel, a happy ending would have been sheer fantasy. Haywood was more than willing to challenge conventions, as we have seen, but she was too skilled an author and too gifted a psychologist to falsify her pictures of the life she set out to portray.

X

ANTI-ROMANCE: Philidore and Placentia

With *Philidore and Placentia; or, L'Amour Trop Delicat* (1727), we come a full circle, back to the close identification with the heroic romances which we found in *Love in Excess*. To the average literary historian, for whom Haywood is remarkable only for her prolificacy, this novel is little more than a name on the long bibliography of her works. Those few critics who do mention it specifically, and there are very few indeed, regard it as one of the most derivative, poorly written and unpalatable of her works. Raleigh compares the heroine to Clelia and Parthenissa, "whom she exactly resembles in life, in love, and in epistolary style."[1] Whicher states the case more bluntly:

> *Philidore and Placentia* is more conventional and stilted than any other work from her pen. It imitates closely the heroic romances, both in the inflated style and elaborate regard for the tender passion, and in the structure of the plot. . . . In substance the tale is simply a mosaic of romantic adventures.[2]

Even McBurney, who enjoys the distinction of being the first person in this century to edit and reprint a Haywood novel,[3] considers it

[1] Raleigh, p. 139. See above, p. 93. [2] Whicher, p. 63.
[3] In 1962, John Elwood submitted a critical edition of *Betsy Thoughtless* as his Ph.D. dissertation at the Univ. of Illinois; this has never been published. The Garland Publishing series; *The Foundations of the Novel*, *The Flowering of the Novel*, *Popeiana* and *Richardsoniana*, all include facsimile reprints of some of Haywood's works. See bibliography, p. 531.

of value primarily as a literary curiosity rather than as a work of interest in its own right.[4] However, despite the unanimity of this critical opinion, it does not seem unreasonable to argue that Philidore and Placentia is the crowning achievement of Haywood's early career. It is a highly original work, combining most of the elements of sexual and psychological realism which I have mentioned with respect to the heroine, and presenting a fundamental challenge to convention in the continued reversal of roles. Yet Raleigh and Whicher are not entirely wrong in their identification of this novel with the heroic romance, although they misconstrue it. I have been suggesting throughout this thesis that Haywood sets her characters against a background of romance conventions, playing the reality of her portrayal against her readers' expectations. In Philidore and Placentia she moves one step further, into the realm of the anti-romance. Far from being "the most conventional and stilted," it is rather a deliberate mixture of pointed exaggeration and simple straightforwardness. As with the women who would die for love but who would not marry for money, there is that curious juxtaposition of the extravagant with the realistic, and in this novel, Haywood uses that opposition to the full.

[4] In his introduction to Four Before Richardson, in which Philidore and Placentia appears, McBurney remarks that of the four novels, he by far prefers The Accomplished Rake, by Mary Davys, as both entertainment and literary achievement, perhaps because it is similar in many respects to Restoration Comedy: straightforward in its satire of foppishness, vanity, aristocratic decadence, and other vices of the age. However, his analysis of Haywood's work occupies the largest part of that introduction and mentions in passing many of the ideas which I have expanded in this essay, such as the parallelism of the three main episodes and the humour and originality of her role-reversals.

From the very beginning, elements of Jane Austen-like wit mingle with the more familiar rhythms of Haywood's customary style:

> Philidore was descended from a very ancient and noble family, but the indolence or unfashionable honesty of his predecessors had left him little but their virtue to inherit. He had qualifications, however, which might have raised his fortune in some employment worthy of his birth and genius; nor did he want friends whose recommendation would have been of service to him had he been inclined to apply to them, but alas! he laboured under the pangs of an unhappy passion which was not only infinitely more grievous to him than all he had to fear from a narrow fortune, but also entirely took from him the power of attempting anything for himself or in the least answering the expectations the world had of him.[5]

This is obviously no typical heroic lover; like Troilus, he is completely incapacitated by his love. Rather than attempting to make his fortune, or, in romance terms, to make himself worthy of his beloved, he gives himself over to despair. Like Bellcour, Philidore fails to live up to the image he himself projects, only in his case the satirical aspects of his character and situation are made even more pointed by the extravagance of his habitual speech. Haywood is not averse to using such florid prose in all seriousness,[6] but in this particular work, the relative simplicity of style in the rest of the writing makes her intentions quite clear. His address to the men who attack his mistress in the field, after the straightforward descriptive passage which precedes it, is characteristic of the contrast she employs:

[5] In Four Before Richardson, p. 157. All page references in this chapter refer to this edition and will be given in the text.

[6] See above, pp. 183-84.

> Jacobin, who had retired to that field on purpose to ruminate on the adventure which had befallen him in the grot, heard the voice of his adorable, and by her speeches to the ruffians was sensible of her distress. He was unarmed, but had he been certain of being cut to pieces by these remorseless villains, he could not have refrained from attempting her relief. Being a man of very great strength, he tore a bough from a tree and with that leafy shield run to the place where they were just at the moment as she was giving up what treasure she had about her. "Turn, monsters," cried he, "nor sacrilegiously presume to approach the shrine of that divinity with unhallowed hands." (pp. 163-64)

It seems fair to assume that Haywood composed that speech with her tongue in cheek. She seems to enjoy making fun of her hero and the tradition from which he stems. For example, after describing the ignominious duties to which his love obliged him, she proceeds to list the rewards his submission receives:

> He had the blessing of beholding the lovely Placentia every day as he went into the rooms, bringing coals, lighting up candles, or some other office suitable to his post. He had the boundless happiness of stealing to the coach-house and embracing the cushions on which she sat, kissing the step on which she trod . . . . (pp. 159-60)

Even McBurney acknowledges that this picture of the romantic hero appears intentionally humorous.[7] Whenever Philidore plays the role of tragically enamoured hero, Haywood's writing does indeed become artificial and "conventional." However, even at her moments of most intense passion and transport, Placentia remains free from her lover's poetic extravagancies. Those critics, like Whicher, who

[7] In the introduction to Four Before Richardson, pp. xxviii-xxix.

fail to recognize the humour in this novel are perhaps guilty of thinking that a Grub Street hack, or a woman who made money by appealing to the romantic fantasies of other women, was incapable of mocking the origins of her own success.[8]

If stylistic arguments alone are not sufficient to prove a satiric intent, an examination of the two main characters will provide ample evidence. Haywood moves beyond even anti-romance; she is not satirizing only a literary tradition. Her ridicule is aimed closer to the lives of her readers, for she is mocking conventional notions of actual relations between the sexes. In a way, what she does in this novel is similar to what Charlotte Lennox achieves in The Female Quixote, or Austen in Northanger Abbey, yet it is a curious similarity. The hero, not his mistress, is deceived in his expectations of "romance," and the heroine, not her lover, is rational and practical. And Philidore's notions are not wholly the result of reading pernicious, idealistic French romances. His central conviction, that no woman can think honourably of attaching herself to a man so unworthy as to lack a suitable jointure, is as realistic a point of view as any of the advice given in the Spectator. Similarly, his belief that she will be happier if he makes no attempt to reveal his feelings and instead disappears from her life completely is founded

[8] Elsewhere, Haywood makes her tongue-in-cheek attitude explicit. See above, p. 226. In The Court of Caramania, when Theodore asks, "What proofs do you demand . . . will nothing less than a dagger, a bowl of poison, or a leap from some promontory suffice?" Ismonda replies: "I assure you . . . I am for no such romantick flights; testimonies of a more modest fashion will content me." Both characters are laughing (p. 13). And in Betsy Thoughtless and some of her other later novels, her heroines take a down-to-earth attitude towards passion as a matter of course. See below, pp. 388-89; 395-97.

on the widely held belief that sexual passion figures largely (and urgently) only in the lives of men. His naivety resembles that of D'Elmont when contronted by Ciamara.[9] However, in Philidore's case, the author's sympathy is clearly with the lady, and the hero is regarded not as virtuous, but as rather stupid. Because Placentia is a likable character, clever, virtuous without being repressed, and eminently sensible, the situation which proved disastrous in Love in Excess is a source of witty and ironic humour in Philidore and Placentia.

From the very outset of the story, the reversal of typical male and female roles has a satiric effect. In the French romances, "mistress" is considered the exact equivalent of "master"; the woman is queen and the lover her slave, at least in matters of love. Philidore takes that idea literally.

> Never did nature adorn a head with more lovely hair than was his, all which he cut off and in the room of it wore a little periwig of a dark colour. His fine and delicate complexion he disguised with the peel of walnuts. . . . His gay apparel was converted into homely russet, all the fine gentleman into a country boor; and thus transformed, he went to the house of his adored Placentia, having been informed she wanted a servant, and offered himself in quality of one. (p. 159)[10]

As a thrall in the service of love, he runs errands, sharpens knives, draws water, fetches coal and lights candles. Like so many Haywood heroines, Placentia is notoriously disdainful of marriage, and has previously refused several financially advantageous offers.

[9] See above, p.125. [10] Philidore's rustic disguise also recalls that of Behn's Wandering Beauty (1698) and the heroine of Blackamore's Luck at Last (1723). The latter is included in Four Before Richardson.

Philidore, a true man of his time, judges his own worth by the state of his fortune. It never occurs to him that the proposals she refused were from men she did not love, or that she could love someone independent of pecuniary considerations. Consequently, his love makes him recede into passivity; he is afraid that if he attempts to win her hand, "he should be looked on as ridiculous" (p. 158). Fearing failure, he does nothing, living an entire year as the most menial servant in her household. Such trepidation and servility[11] are hardly the attributes of a hero, or in common thought, even of a man. In Haywood's other works, it is usually the women who are overcome by love, made impractical and headlong by their passions, surrendering self-interest to the necessity of the moment. Even that weakling Bellcour had the excuse of parental pressure to mitigate his cowardice. Yet here is Philidore, assumed dead by all his friends, neglecting what estate he has, all for the opportunity to sharpen his mistress's carving knife and live, distantly, under the same roof. If Haywood thinks involuntary chastity a misfortune, she most certainly regards voluntary abstinence as a near impossibility.[12] When that Platonism emanates from the hero, a man deeply in love, the miracle is no longer "feisable"; the situation becomes absurd.

Nonetheless, Philidore remains content for a year. Then the crisis comes, and the heroine is finally introduced. She embodies all those characteristics outlined in chapter eight: she is inde-

[11] Throughout this section of the novel there are frequent references to Philidore as a slave: see pp. 159, 160, 162, 166, 167 and 174.

[12] See above, pp. 252-54.

pendent, reasonable, witty, refreshingly matter-of-fact, and far too proud to sell herself in marriage. While Philidore serves and reveres her from afar, she remains "all this while wholly ignorant of the conquest she had made, nor certainly had never suspected him for other than he seemed. . . ." (p. 160). The telling incident, her overhearing his song, reveals to the reader as much about her as it tells her about Philidore. Their first exchange, with its broad irony and contrasting styles of speech, is among the best writing in all Haywood's early works:

> "Jacobin," cried she, "how came you by that heavenly voice? How could a youth of your low breeding acquire such judgment in music?"--Never was confusion equal to his at this demand and the sudden presence of her who made it; but recollecting himself as well as he was able and rising from the posture he was in, "Excellent lady," replied he, "if there be anything like art in the accents you have heard, I profess myself a stranger to it and rather think it is owing to your own harmonious soul, which turns to concord everything it hears, than any real melody in the sound." (p. 161)

Her response to this effusion is in keeping with their relative positions. She is curious, and even amused.

> "A courtier, too!" resumed she. "I knew not that I had such gallantry in my family. Prithee, tell me who didst thou serve before me?"--"None, madam," said he. "You are my first, and will be my last mistress."

His reply sounds gallant to the reader, who is aware of Philidore's meaning, but to Placentia, who knows him only as Jacobin, his words sound exactly the reverse. She interprets his heart-felt, though equivocal, declaration of love as a statement of ambition, and her amusement increases.

> "That is more than you know," cried she, laughing. "I may discharge you immediately, perhaps, and I suppose you have not gained an estate in my service to support you for life."

In fact, he has, by serving her, lost what little estate he formerly possessed. However, his reply is a masterful piece of equivocation, which she again takes literally.

> "I have gained that, I am certain, madam," answered he, "will never let me want one thing, which is a pride too great to become an attendant on any other, having already been so to you."--"Well," said she, throwing him a small purse, "there is something, however, to make that pride more easy; and since you are so well pleased with your service, be assured I will never turn you away till you behave yourself worse than yet I have heard of you."

Were Philidore a proper hero, that money would outrage him; rather than making his pride "more easy," accepting gold from a woman he loved would inflame it, and emasculate him. But Philidore, like Clarissa after a harrowing interview with Lovelace, or Melliora just rid of D'Elmont, is pleased at any excuse to terminate their discussion:

> He took up the favour she bestowed on him and retired with a low bow, glad now to be released lest in the present hurry of his spirits he should say or do anything which might render him liable to suspicion or offend the goddess of his desires. (p. 161)

As for Placentia, she acts the reverse of Arabella in The Female Quixote. That lady saw a hero in every gardener; Placentia, with her sweet reasonableness, sees only the gardener in her hero.

In the following interlude, however, she reveals that same erotic imagination which is so quick to be awakened in most Haywood heroines. She begins to imagine that perhaps her gardener may be a hero after all, finally even guessing the truth, that he has disguised himself in order to be near her. Unlike Arabella, Placentia has facts upon which to base her speculation. In her time, the vast gulf between the educated and the ill-bred would have been evident in all the outward manifestations of character. Peasants did not sing "art" songs, nor did they speak in accents appropriate to the finest gentlemen on the Augustan stage. Bucolic swains usually eschewed "graceful bows" and elaborate addresses. Her premise is, therefore, rational in its origin, and it subsequently renders her vulnerable to encroaching love. Unaware at first of the nature of her feelings, she boasts to her company about her marvellous discovery, even as Mr. B would boast of his clever servant twelve years later. In this state of romantic susceptibility, she is attacked by the thieves and rescued by her servant-cum-lover. Although Philidore manfully comes to her aid, his heroic deed takes an unusual, and significant turn. He has just blinded and disarmed one of the attackers with the limb of a tree when

> the other villain, coming behind him in the meantime, had certainly run him through the back if Placentia, agitated with a more than ordinary concern for her valiant defender, . . . had not catched up that serviceable bough and with it run between Jacobin and the assassin and, beating down with her utmost force his murdering sword, prevented the blow from falling with what weight it was designed, and glanced only with a slight wound on the hip of Jacobin. . . . (p. 164)

It is quite ordinary for a hero to be inspired by love to save his mistress from assault, but for a heroine to be inspired by love to save her hero is an unorthodox bit of scene-stealing which only Haywood would employ. Although there is no further mention of Placentia's part in the struggle, the point is quietly made, and thereafter Placentia assumes the initiative with increasing boldness.

Jacobin's wounds, before they are pronounced harmless, provide Placentia with the necessary opportunity to examine her own feelings. When she does, she plunges into the requisite conflict between her passion and convention. Her first consideration is amazement that she should have been so extravagant in her praise of his bravery. After all, "he did no more . . . than was his duty. Nay, any man would have done as much for a woman to whom he had not the least obligation" if he found her in like distress (p. 166). Then she admits that had he been her equal, she would have supposed she was in love. "But, oh! far be it from me to debase myself so far" (p. 166). Wealthy noble ladies cannot seek gratification among their servants, at least not until the era of Lady Chatterley. Placentia does admit to herself that, despite the ostensible meanness of his birth and station, she finds in him every attractive quality she could possibly require in a man. This admission leads her back to her initial speculation, that he has disguised himself in order to gain access to her, a privilege she has always denied her declared lovers. At this point, erotic imagination takes over, calling up scenes of discovery and union, conjuring whole conversations. She is wholly the lover, given over to the possibilities of her passion. Then reason reasserts itself,

and she offers a judgment of Philidore which the reader is perhaps inclined to share, and temporarily reestablishes her proud independence.

> Were he . . . of any degree which could encourage his pretensions to my love, he could not for so long a time have endured the servile offices to which he has been put. Some way his ingenious passion would have found out to have revealed itself. No, no; he is neither a lover nor a gentleman, and I but raise chimeras to distract myself. . . . How could I descend so low as to think any perfection in a slave worthy of regard? (p. 167)

All during his convalescence she fluctuates between these two conflicting passions, love and pride.

Upon his recovery, she is forced to declare her feelings. Being a woman, she cannot declare herself outright, and her first indication to him of her more than usual regard is an offer of advancement within her household.

> I have observed . . . some qualifications in you which makes me think you deserving a better post than you have hitherto held in my family; and that you have not before now been preferred is owing only to your own modesty, which has made you sit down contented in the meanest offices while you saw others of less merit exalted above you. You shall from this day forwards be the groom of my chambers. . . . (p. 170)

Once again, Haywood has used dramatic irony with great effect. Philidore's rejection of advancement is a prefiguration of his later sexual rejection, even as Placentia's offer foreshadows the gift of herself she is willing to make him. On a literal level, naturally, his refusal puzzles her. She has offered him a larger salary, a more dignified and less taxing occupation, and an oppor-

tunity to be more intimate with her which, considering the zeal he has always expressed in her service, she assumes he will welcome. If he were a prince in disguise, so to speak, he would have appreciated the proximity to her person and the testimony of her regard. He might even have taken the chance to reveal his true identity. She is discreet, and says nothing of her perplexity until the second time she makes her offer. In this second exchange, they are again both carefully equivocal, and the dialogue is brilliant, operating on both a literal level and an emotional one. He tells her that he wishes to remain as he is: "I know myself unqualified, unfit for any higher post, nor have I ambition to desire it."

> "Want of ambition is sometimes a fault," interrupted she hastily, "and I know not if you could be guilty of any I should be less inclined to pardon. Nor are you a judge of your own worth while thus you suffer it to be buried beneath a modesty which, like other virtues, degenerates to a vice when it exceeds the bounds of reason and moderation. It is enough I think you fit for a more exalted station. . . . Nor am I without regard to my own interest. . . . (p. 172)

To anyone but Philidore, such a speech, with her additional desire to consult him and converse with him more freely, would have been as obvious as Ciamara's less bashful declarations. Placentia is no nymphomaniac. She is a strong, proud woman, and his continuing rejection, with its invocation of the opinion of "the world" infuriates her rather than breaks her spirit. She shrewdly senses that it is neither lack of breeding nor even fear of scandal which causes him to refuse her.

> Obstinate, ungrateful man! . . . Is it thus you requite favours the noblest of your sex would hazard

> life to purchase? Know I am not to be deceived. I am well assured your birth and education is not such as you have pretended. I see the gentleman through the disguise of rusticity and, sir, I take you at your word and this moment will order your discharge. I will have none among my family who think me unworthy of their confidence. (p. 173)

When she retires to her room, her reflections reveal how deeply her love and her pride have been hurt by his rejection.

> Suppose he is in reality what he pretends. His spirit is as mean and grovelling as his birth, else would he have had courage to have told me that he loved me? I even begged the question, threw off all modesty, forgot all pride to force him to a confession. For what unknown crime am I thus punished? To be rejected--rejected by my slave! (p. 174)

She does not know whether to banish him or to throw herself at his feet. "In this position of mind," as Haywood says, "let us leave her for a while and see in what state his was who had wrought so wonderful a transformation in her" (p. 168).

Philidore is difficult to characterize, because it would be so easy to disregard him completely. As in The Double Marriage, for a man, a hero, to assume the role ordinarily taken by a woman, can very easily lead to his discredit; "effeminate" is always a term of abuse. When Placentia announces that she will, in fact, dismiss him, he reacts like any eighteenth or nineteenth century heroine. He is left "in agonies which were very near depriving him of his senses. He . . . run to his own chamber where, shutting the door upon him, he gave a loose to tears and to complainings" (p. 173). For a man, such weakness is unforgivable. By rights he should have been storming the fortress, which had already given ample signs of

a willingness to surrender. Yet it is not weakness which prevents him from assaulting her virtue, or from revenging his disappointments in the approved fashion. From the very beginning, we are shown that Philidore, like his seventeenth-century ancestors,[13] is fundamentally an idealist, and his love takes on the aura of a religion.

> His fancy pictured her so divine a creature that not only himself, but all mankind beside were unworthy to be styled her servants. It was with the most enthusiastic adoration only he regarded her; and angel-like Placentia . . . was formed only for the wonder of the inferior world. But to think of aiming at her possession is sacrifice beyond that of robbing the altar, and the presuming wretch should be struck dead with the lightning of her eyes. Scarce could he think her mortal, so high an esteem had he conceived for her. (p. 153)

This is no mere bashfulness or uncharacteristic timidity. Haywood has created in him an incarnation of that in society which attempted to make women radically different from men, to enforce sexual immunity to the point where no other state was even acknowledged. Here is the worship of the virgin which has accompanied the invocation of Eve in romance literature from the songs of the earliest minstrels. Philidore's humility is, by Haywood's standards, not so much an exaltation of Placentia as a deprivation. After he has recovered from his wounds, he reflects that "some men . . . might perhaps be vain enough to interpret the care she expressed to me as the effect of love, but far from me be any such

[13] Compare his sentiments in this passage with those of Artaxerxes, quoted on p. 100.

gross ideas" (p. 168). She is too far above him for the world to wonder at such condescension; he attributes it to an angel-like pity and magnanimity. Haywood is more explicit. "The truth is, he saw not that she loved him because he wished not she should do so" (p. 169). He wants to remain always near his lady, his religious rapture undisturbed by any need to gratify her. Whenever he begins to believe that he might have virtues which compensate for his poverty, he rejects his thoughts as "too aspiring, as a sin to the divine excellence of Placentia, and a vain imagination of a fault she could not be guilty of" (p. 169). It would be a "fault" in her to feel passion for him, to descend from her pedestal and admit to appetite, or even to confess tenderness when the world might have reason to remark upon it. After the scene in which Placentia orders his dismissal, "he knew not well how to interpret her anger and was sometimes, in spite of the respect he had for her, tempted to believe it sprung from the cause it really did. . . . " (p. 173--italics mine). Having placed her on a pedestal out of his reach, Philidore suffers; but were she to step down from it, he would suffer even more. Haywood seems to commend the generosity and selflessness of such a passion, but immediately she returns to her distraught heroine, who has been forced into immodest self-exposure and then rejected. There seems little doubt where our sympathies are meant to lie.

The attitudes of these two strong-willed protagonists come into violent, revealing conflict in another of Haywood's famous female seductions.[14] Placentia, having decided that righteous indig-

[14] See above, pp. 125-28.

nation is not the way to her lover's heart, tries a gentler tactic.

> She pitched on a desperate remedy for a desperate disease; and, having summoned all her charms into her eyes /and/ passed the **best part of the** day in consulting what look and what habit would become her best, she put on one of the most languishing and tender that her instructive passion could direct her to assume and, clothing her delicate body in the richest undress, threw herself on a couch with a studied but most engaging carelessness. (pp. 174-75)

Trusting to human nature, she assumes that under such extreme provocation, Jacobin/Philidore must be compelled to admit his passion. Unfortunately, he is not like other men, and must be coaxed to do what would come naturally to them. Placentia, though hardly a brazen, indelicate vamp, is certainly equal to taking charge of the situation, as she does from his first entrance. Her initial command is to ask him to perform the impossible. She requests that he diminish "that displeasing distance which you have <u>too religiously</u> observed. . . . You must sit down . . . and forget you have been my servant or that there is any difference in our circumstances" (p. 175--italics mine). She might as well have asked him to forget to breathe, or to desecrate a shrine. When he remains standing at the door, she makes a further move, requesting that he sit near to her and abandon all his "unnecessary homage." He then establishes his position with equal clarity. "I shall obey you, madam, . . . in all things in which I can do so without forfeiting that respect which it is not even in your power to banish from my soul" (p. 175). It is difficult to imagine a more concise statement of his unwillingness to succumb to her charms. His actions suit his words, and he stands near her couch,

bowing his head as if to hear an oracle delivered. She is, perhaps justly, annoyed at this apparent obtuseness. "'Must I then make use of force to draw you to me?' said she, catching suddenly one of his hands and pulling him to a chair close to the couch" (p. 175). She is compelled by his reticence to become physically aggressive as well, a role which offends her modesty. After he has refused once more to admit to any origin other than that of a rustic, he swears to her that

> "My whole soul is devoted to you, nor does one wish rise in my breast but for your happiness and peace of mind."--"Yet you alone have robbed me of it," sighed she out; and at that instant the violence she did her modesty in acting in this manner deprived her of the power of proceeding, and she sank motionless and fainting. (p. 176)

Up to this point, Placentia has never seemed the sort of woman who would faint, or display such obvious signs of weakness. Her swoon is not so much a revelation of her character as it is a means of precipitating a reaction in Philidore: it forces him finally out of his excessive delicacy. He cannot call her maids, as they might spread scandal about such an unusual tête-à-tête; nor can he leave her alone and unconscious. Consequently, he must violate the first principle of his strange creed, and touch her.

> He took her head and laid it gently on his arm and, with the other hand, endeavoured to unfasten some ribbons which seemed to confine her breath too much. While thus employed, 'tis easy to judge with what wild emotions a heart so young and so enamoured as was his must swell; yet did his respect and the awe he had of her prevail above them. He offered not to touch her lips nor satisfy his longing passion with the smallest bliss. (p. 176)

This incident illustrates the heights of Philidore's religious zeal. Even D'Elmont, under the most rigorous self-restraint, could not have remained so long true to an abstraction. Like most of the men in Haywood's novels, D'Elmont governs his actions and feelings by the belief that women need and enjoy sexual satisfaction, not in a libertine sense,[15] possessing neither soul nor conscience, but rather as rational, loving human beings motivated by emotional impulses. In this respect, there is little difference between men and women. Philidore, however, acts on the opposite belief, that women are all soul and feel none of the intense longings and painful desires claimed by their brothers. Placentia's reaction to this final proof of his ignorance is understandable and consistent. She regains consciousness, which she originally lost out of frustration at his insensibility, only to find that he is unmoved even by her naked bosom. Quite naturally she is deeply shamed, not only for her immodest declaration and posture, but for making herself vulnerable to his apparent indifference.

That indifference, as the reader knows, is the result of Philidore's peculiarly extreme views of marriage and womanhood. Women have their place, their acceptable ways of behaving, and he is determined to keep them in it regardless of how they might feel. He wants not a lover, but a heroic mistress, someone to serve eternally from a distance. When Placentia has left him, he realizes that she loves him as passionately as he loves her, and Haywood's comment is wry: "Sure he was the first lover that ever re-

[15] As do Lovelace and Pope, who believe that "Every woman is a rake in her heart." Clarissa, II, 55. See also p. 12.

gretted such a discovery" (p. 177). His regret is based on his misery at putting her in such an awkward and compromising position. If she should marry him, which would be the otherwise obvious resolution of their predicament, their union would "give the world an opportunity to censure her conduct in marrying a man who had no other jointure than his love to endow her with" (p. 177). His attitude reveals not only how materialistic a project marriage was considered, but also how purely functional it was as far as the woman's personal fulfilment was concerned.[16] He concludes by considering that he must either commit suicide or leave the country in order to remove all reason for disquiet from her life. It never seems to occur to him that she might feel worse at his disappearance than she could ever feel at the prospect of exciting gossip. She writes, telling him simply and quite courageously, considering the circumstances, that she loves him and wants only to make him her husband, regardless of his birth and fortune. His reply is similarly as characteristic as his speech, combining rococco romantic flourishes with an unalterable devotion to his notion of truth, the way things are and ought to be.

> A discovery such as you have made in my favour would to any man but me afford a bliss too great to be endured; yet such is my unhappy fate that to me it brings only grief of heart and the most bitter anguish. . . . I can never consent that you should do an act the world might justly blame. How greatly would your reputation and your prudence suffer when it should be known that you had disposed of yourself merely to gratify a blind passion. . . . Long have I been an adorer of your perfections, but with so pure and disinterested a zeal

16 See above, pp. 6-13.

> that I take Heaven to witness, I never had a wish but such as your guardian angel might inspire. (p. 178)

He also discloses his true name and situation, and announces his intention to leave the country in the hopes that his absence will restore her peace of mind. He concludes: "Forget me, then, I beseech you. Drive from your breast all memory of a passion that is rendered fruitless by the demerits of its object" (p. 178). He departs before she has even read the letter, thus insuring that she cannot disturb his carefully constructed plans. Had he lingered, he would have seen that though she is distracted with grief and bewilderment, she has care enough for her reputation to satisfy even his punctilio. Sending her servants in pursuit of him, she tells them that the reason for her excessive anxiety is that he has robbed her, "stole from me what is dearer to me than my life" (p. 180), dearer than that reputation itself. In the conventional world, chastity is more prized than life, certainly more than even the most ethereal love; in Haywood's world, love, especially in its sexual aspect, is all that makes life valuable. This is what Philidore needs to learn, while Placentia must come to appreciate a man who is truly unselfish.

It would be very satisfying to be able to illustrate how the two protagonists arrive at new knowledge of each other and the ways of the world. They do undergo various adventures, and they are eventually reconciled. However, they do not seem to profit from these events so much as to survive them. Placentia's experience with the ship's captain and Philidore's vicarious knowledge of Bellamont and the Turkish court appear to have little bearing on how they behave. Philidore does not run back to Placentia, nor

does she accept him gratefully immediately upon being rescued. Haywood is perhaps less skilful, perhaps more subtle than that. Yet it is a mistake, I think, to assume that Philidore and Placentia "is one of the few novels . . . that do not pretend to a moral purpose."[17] It is true that the characters themselves make no comparisons and draw no conclusions. But the two inset stories, which Whicher regards as proof of Haywood's use of the conventionally romantic mode,[18] are neither diversionary nor irrelevant. Nor are they haphazardly constructed, to provide merely a few coincidences necessary to the plot.

Bellamont, the young man whom Philidore saves on his way to his uncle in Persia, is the perfect foil for the delicacy of that hero. They seem stamped from the same mould. Like Philidore, Bellamont is made a slave to a will outside his own, though in his case, the slavery is real. He is taken into the household of the Bashaw of Liperda, and the relationship he has with that dignitary is notable for its resemblance to a typical male-female relationship. His description of his life is not unlike that of a sumptuously kept mistress:

> When in his palace, I was treated with a kindness which left me nothing but the name of slave. All the others he was master of were ordered to serve and obey me. All the employment allotted me was to attend in his chamber, more for state than service, and sometimes entertain him. . . . Such a slavery had been a glorious fortune for some men, but the remembrance of my friends and country rendered vain all the bashaw's endeavours to make me happy. And though I appeared before him with as much serenity as possible in my countenance, yet did he see through my disguise and complained of my want of gratitude for the favours he bestowed on me. (pp. 197-98)

[18] Whicher, p. 63.

The very language he uses--his "want of gratitude," the bashaw's attempts "to make me happy"--is part of that vocabulary with which women in the eighteenth century traditionally speak of men. A fellow slave describes the bashaw's attitude towards his slaves in terms which would also describe the attitude of many men towards women: "He thinks on those whom ill fortune has reduced to be his slaves but as part of the furniture of his house, something he has bought for his use" (p. 198). The purpose of this comparison between the young, virile Englishman and an Oriental fancy-woman is to extend Philidore's self-imposed slavery to its logical extreme. He has chosen to effect a reversal of traditional roles, an exact exchange of passivity and initiative, in the same way that Bellamont is forced to undergo a similar reversal. In the more severe circumstances, Bellamont appears ridiculous, deprived of all dignity, all purpose and all control over his own destiny. The result is, I believe, to illuminate the degradation of that position, for man or woman. The implications for Philidore's own condition are made even clearer by the rest of his friend's story.

Like Philidore, Bellamont finds a woman to love who is beyond his ambition, only in his case, the distance between them is physical. She is one of the bashaw's wives, and "'tis death inevitable for any man who enters the seraglio walls" (p. 199). For a while, like his friend, he is content to adore her perfections from a distance, despite "the utter impossibility there appeared of ever possessing her . . . or declaring what I felt. . . . " (p. 199). Eventually, he desires "still to see her more and to be more her slave. . . . " (p. 199). The precision with which Haywood has replicated the circumstances of her hero and heroine is extraordi-

nary. The major difference is that in the case of Bellamont and Arithea, language which has hitherto been figurative is made literal. It is impossible to declare love to members of a harem, and Bellamont's slavery is certainly real. Moreover, his distant adoration, as with Philidore, leads him to an idealization which is taken equally literally. He risks his life and enters the seraglio not to go to Arithea directly, but only to contemplate her in solitude. From his hiding place he watches rapturously as she sits in what he describes as a second Bower of Bliss, in a state of undress which would inflame any other Haywood male. But Bellamont's inflammation spreads only as far as his imagination, and he paints her portrait.

> Pygmalion-like, I now doted on an image of my own formation, and could kisses have inspired breath into the inanimate plate, mine must certainly have warmed it into life. My time was now wholly taken up between the shadow and the substance. (p. 201)

He neglects the bashaw during this time, disregarding the fact that his negligence might arouse suspicion. He abandons all thoughts of his religion, which had previously been a major source of concern to him, and "placed all my heaven in gazing on" Arithea's charms. Just like Philidore, he neglects his future, renounces his past, and is too timid and ignorant to take advantage of the present. Even when he is caught and flogged to the point of death, he cares almost more for the loss of his portrait than he does for his own fate. Yet in retrospect, he recognizes the degradation of his position. He tells Philidore, as if in warning,

> Had I been the master of the least share of soul or spirit, or had been possessed of any part of that fortitude and resolution which every man ought to have, I should have . . . /tried to get away from/ a place where I was doubly a slave. (p. 203)

Unfortunately, he prefers to remain, indulging in romantic fantasy nearly identical to Philidore's own. Haywood says of her hero,

> that while he suffered all that a hopeless passion could inflict he had one reflection to console him, which was, that by dying a martyr to it, he proved a generosity which 'tis to be doubted if ever man before him could boast in so eminent a degree. (p. 174)

Bellamont is equally religious in his fervor:

> So much I prized my pains that, having not the least notion of a possibility of being eased of them, I desired nothing but to die a martyr to them, and had folly enough to think I could not make a more glorious exit from the world. (p. 203)

He imagines his dying words, his epitaph, the reactions of friends and of Arithea herself. The religious conceit is not out of place either in his own case or in that of Philidore. Both men indulge in goddess-making, at the expense of the feelings of the women they love.

Arithea has the same difficulties to overcome as Placentia, though her position and nationality enable her to be more frank. She sends her admirer a letter in which she verbalizes Haywood's implicit judgment of Bellamont and, by extension, of Philidore.

> I intend at a proper season to chide the coldness of you Europeans, who can content yourselves with so

> little when you so much merit all. It was only the want of a necessary boldness which brought you into any misfortune, since it had been more easy as well as more safe to have had the real substance than the shadow of Arithea. (p. 204)

When they finally arrange a meeting, despite Bellamont's certain knowledge of her passion for him, it is she who must make the first move. Characteristically, on entering her chamber, he kneels and begins to express his love "in the most humble terms." But Arithea can afford to be bold with him; she is an experienced woman. She tells him that she has had enough of humility and leads him to a bower where she "encourages /his/ submissive passion. . . ." (p. 205). When they are on the point of consummation, the bashaw rushes in and seizes them. Once again, Bellamont reacts in accordance with his obssession:

> Not all the respect I had for Arithea nor the favours she had bestowed on me could hinder me in the first emotions of my surprise from believing I had been betrayed by her and that she had laid this snare for me only to punish the presumption of loving her. (p. 205)

His suspicion seems only natural; it is quite likely that she might have been forced to betray him, or that she might even love the bashaw. However, his reasoning is natural only to him, or to Philidore. He tarried too long, and denied his woman the fulfilment he owed both her and himself, yet his immediate thought is that she was offended by his daring to love her at all. His punishment, castration, seems peculiarly fitting. We have at first seen him stripped of dignity and self-direction, incapable of loving a real woman, content with the image of her he has himself created; at the last, he is literally unmanned. That he is also forced to

serve Arithea as the lowest menial in her train is a superb detail of irony, making his resemblance to Philidore complete. Philidore, hearing this story, understands only that his friend is forever denied the utmost pleasure and pain of life, but the reader necessarily sees the parallels in their situations.

Placentia's inset narrative is equally pertinent to the basic themes of the novel. When her brother's unexpected return deprives her of her excessive wealth, she immediately takes off in search of her errant lover, delighted that they are now financial equals. In this, she resembles many other Haywood heroines as well as remaining true to her own character, going after what she wants the minute she has some hope of improving her condition.[19] She sets off by sea, where she meets a man who is the exact opposite of Philidore, the ship's captain. His first declaration of passion, in its aggressive, self-confident tone as well as its substance, reflects directly on her relationship with her more cautious lover.

> I confess, madam, . . . that you are an utter stranger to me. But whatever is your birth and fortune, my love will find the means to equal us. If above me, my courage and my industry shall raise me to the same; if inferior in the goods of chance, your charms make up for that deficiency, and 'twill be my pride as well as pleasure to exalt the woman I adore. (pp. 215-16)

At this point, the captain does not seem at all unattractive; his feelings even resemble Placentia's initial willingness to marry a

[19] See above, pp. 261-63.

man whose background was yet unknown to her. However, the captain pushes on unreasonably and forces her to recognize the nature of a love which is directly opposed to what she has known previously, though perhaps stemming from a similar motivation.

> He loved me not for my sake, but his own, and believing it in my power to gratify a brutal passion, had little regard by what means she obtained me or the miseries such an action might draw on me. (p. 216)

Though Philidore's love claims to be selfless, his stubborn refusal to acknowledge her passion calls that claim into question. He believes it in her power to gratify a passion as delicate as the captain's is brutal, a gratification which is even further beyond her capabilities than to satisfy arbitrary lust. Like Bellamont, the captain, or Pygmalion, Philidore is guilty of loving more for his own sake than for hers, guilty of loving an image of his own making without much regard for the object of his passion.

When Placentia refuses these relatively humble entreaties, the captain threatens to take her on his own terms. When he comes for his answer, his words are a mockery of courtship and compel a comparison with Philidore, to the credit of the latter.

> Well, madam, . . . are you yet prepared to be my wife? Have you considered on the deference I pay you, and how much you are obliged to my obsequious passion? who having you in my power, choose to make you mine only by such means as virtue will permit? (p. 217)

Placentia's reply indicates that she is making mental comparisons and perhaps is slipping into the romanticism she once had so much reason to curse.

> Humility is the truest mark of love, nor can I think your heart at all devoted to me when you make use of menaces to obtain your wishes. Were you indeed my lover, I should have greater power over your actions than my ill fate has given you over my person. (p. 218)

Her words are perhaps not so much romantic retreat into the fictitious world where women were heard and obeyed, as they are a gesture of defiance.[20] In an even more realistic sense, they are an appeal for recognition as a human being with preferences and aversions, and for treatment as an equal. The captain's only response is again to invoke the image of the absent Philidore.

> You must strangely differ from your sex, if I hear you not some time hence confess that the fury of my impatience is a more agreeable testimony of love than that cowardly submission and resignation you seem to praise at present. (p. 218)

Here is the true libertine, who believes that all women are libertines as well, who assumes that sexual gratification is an end in itself, and that because women enjoy sex in some situations, they must desire it under any and all circumstances. His attitude is as arrogant and hedonistic as Philidore's is ethereal and humble.

When the two lovers are at last reunited, it seems as though their various adventures have taught them to value love and the full enjoyment of the moment above all else. Unfortunately, their material circumstances at their meeting are exactly the sort which could never mean a happy consummation in Haywood's fiction. Philidore, having inherited his uncle's vast wealth, finally possesses a fortune consistent with his birth and breeding, and he is delighted that he can now offer his mistress a suitable husband.

[20] See above, p. 274.

Placentia, having restored her fortune to her long-lost brother, the rightful heir, can boast only a very modest portion and is ecstatic that she can share her lover's reduced circumstances. Their positions are exactly reversed, though now the configuration is quite conventional. For rich men to marry relatively poor women was tolerated, though perhaps censured as not economically sound, for it was assumed that some men would marry "merely to gratify a blind passion." However, Haywood's heroines refuse to be purchased, nor are they willing to accept any sort of double standard. Placentia's position is aggravated by the fact that Philidore has purchased her literally, buying her freedom from the merchant whose slave she had become. She grows withdrawn when she learns of their new circumstances, and her first action on their arrival in England is to send to her brother for money with which to repay her ransom. When Philidore reproaches her for behaviour which seems to him outrageous, she explains her motivation.

> The regard you had for my interest would not suffer you to accept of the offering I made you of my person and estate, because you were at that time incapable of making me a jointure suitable to the latter. Fortune has changed the die. The advantage is wholly on your side. You are master of very great riches; I am entirely portionless and I should ill return the obligations I have received from you to become your wife. (p. 226)

Like Emanuella, she is determined not to be obliged to the man she loves. Naturally, Philidore immediately and elaborately protests that no riches could make him worthy of her and, basically, that the situation is different because he is a man. True to herself, and with her usual directness, Placentia replies "that were they

on an equality she could have submitted to the meanest way of life with him, but never would be brought to be obliged by him who would not be obliged by her" (p. 226). Repeating the earlier pattern of the novel, she runs away from him then, and again when he appeals to her brother's authority to make her marry him. She has no less integrity than he has himself, though her reasons for refusing him are far more sound than his reasoning at the beginning of the novel. Fortunately, her brother is Philidore's devoted friend Bellamont; knowing that he will have no children of his own, he shares his wealth with his sister, thus endowing her with a fortune equal to Philidore's. "Thus," says Haywood, "was the mighty scruple over," leaving the newly married couple, now equals in all things, to a life of incomparable happiness.

Perhaps the most interesting and important aspect of Philidore and Placentia is its divergence from Haywood's standard formula. Although Placentia herself shares many of the personal characteristics of her sister heroines, such as intelligence, pride, erotic imagination, and strength of mind, her story differs radically from theirs in two ways: she has no family or guardian to keep her financially and morally dependent, and she is not, for the most part, the victim of male arrogance and lust. In Haywood's other works, these external conditions provide much of the realistic social detail behind the psychological drama. They represent the "real world," social forces which would be immediately recognized as "true," however exotic or vague other aspects of the narrative might be. Philidore and Placentia posits an exact reversal of the usual conditions: a timid, spiritual lover and a heroine who can please herself. It is not a characteristic story. It

violates the conventions which Haywood herself has established for psychological realism and even appears to retreat into pernicious "romance." However, as we have seen, an analysis of the text reveals a strong strain of anti-romance which is, in fact, the controlling theme of the book. This apparent paradox holds the key to Haywood's achievement in this stage of her career. At bottom, despite appearances to the contrary, Philidore and Placentia does not abandon the formula which kept Haywood prolific. The overdelicate hero who cares more for the opinion of "the world" and his mistress's reputation than for their mutual happiness is simply the ultimate variation of the lover, like D'Elmont, who wants to maintain his reputation among rakes and does so by imposing his will and sexual desire on the woman he pursues. Both men deny that woman any choice in the matter. Whether she is degraded or exalted, idealized or debased, her happiness remains outside her own control. As for Placentia, although she is free from parental tyranny and economic subjugation, she is as much a prisoner of "the world," of custom and convention, as Henrietta or Annilia. Because of Philidore's attitudes, she is denied sexual expression and free choice in marriage as they are denied money and liberty. She, too, attempts to defy the forces which confine her, by trying to seduce her Platonic swain, by following him to Persia, and finally by refusing to marry into a state of dependence. The presence within the novel itself of a foil to the main configuration which is a more conventional version of Haywood's formula--Placentia's relationship with the ship's captain--provides additional evidence that she did not abandon the foundation of her previous success.

That Eliza Haywood was able to write so many variations on her theme of sexual warfare that some seem to contradict the truth of others is proof that her works are not identical; "to know one" is not, as Reynolds says, "to know all."[21] By adhering to a formula, Haywood may have risked accusations of ineptitude, but she gained one important advantage. The use of a set pattern provides a structural unity sorely lacking in other fiction of the period. Haywood poses a conflict; she then explores all the factors leading up to it and all possible solutions. Finally, she presents a resolution to the conflict. To do so may take a mere twenty pages, as for The Padlock (1728), or it may take a whole standard volume, like Love in Excess, when a more complicated set of factors is involved. But in either case, the beginning of the novel contains the seeds of the ending. The unity of the work is organic, internal rather than external as it is in fiction using a biographical or autobiographical form. Her method also had an important effect on the development of the novel. The convents representing independence, the tyrannical fathers symbolizing the societal restrictions on a woman, and the love which above all stands for her individuality, are all combinations of what is exotic or larger than life with psychological truth. That intermingling of allegory and social commentary provides a useful transition between the idealized world of the romances and the material, topographic realism of writers like Defoe. Moreover, Haywood was so prolific and so inventive in creating variations on her theme, that

[21] Reynolds, p. 215.

she nearly singlehandedly created a strong fictional "tradition" on which Richardson and Fielding could draw. Her formula was easily perceived, as easily adapted, and sufficiently flexible to allow whoever used it to address profound emotional truths which were largely neglected by other writers. Haywood used it to great effect, but she left it to two greater authors to perfect its possibilities.

PART FOUR

Haywood and the Literary Dialectic

XI

RICHARDSON, FIELDING AND THE FORMULA

Literary historians have often remarked the change in style and tone of Haywood's works between 1730 and the mid-1740's, when she began writing again in earnest after her interlude in the theater.[1] This has generally been attributed to the chastening of her spirit by Pope's vicious attack in the Dunciad.[2] According to this view, the humbled Eliza Haywood did not dare to persist in her scandalous ways, but slavishly followed the example set her by Richardson and Fielding. Even those critics who give her credit for the finely tuned awareness of trends in taste which is absolutely necessary to a popular author,[3] are inclined to regard her later fiction as a remarkably adept response to the influence of the two male authors. This second explanation is closer to the truth, but it again is inhibited by the "evolutionary" view of literary development.[4] I do not believe that the novel is linear in its development, proceeding neatly from stage to stage, each one marked by a flurry of imitations. There is no real question of imitation, as such, in the middle decades of the eighteenth cen-

[1] There are no exceptions; in most general histories of the novel (e.g., Saintsbury, Lovett and Hughes, Raleigh, Ernle or Cross) and in biographical dictionaries, if Haywood is noted at all, it is this change which is marked. [2] See above, p. 64. for an alternative explanation. [3] For example, Leavis (pp. 126-27), Baker (IV, 14), or Raleigh (pp. 140-41). [4] See above, pp. 1-2.

tury. What takes place between Eliza Haywood and the two great men is a process of mutual influence, a true dialectic which results in the century's two finest novels. In this context, the absolute literary merits of the works themselves are irrelevant. For all its flaws, Pamela may be far greater than Haywood's less ambiguous Fortunate Foundlings, and Tom Jones is far superior to either. However, what is significant is not any sort of relative judgment among them, but their common relationship to a single preoccupation. Were absolute merit the only criterion, Haywood would obviously be dwarfed by the stature of her two colleagues. But in the context of ongoing literary development, her achievements and influences were at least as important as theirs.

As we have seen, Haywood recognized the untenable position of marriageable women from the outset of her career. She saw women as participants in modern tragedy, restricted on all sides by economic necessity and moral law.[5] Parental tyranny, invariably provoked by avarice or, at best, by an ardent desire to secure a daughter's future,[6] is as important an element of Haywood's formula as sexual power. Property marriages had frequently been contracted and as frequently been condemned throughout the early part of the century.

> The arguable issues connected with marriage at the time, as it affected women, were the inequalities involved in marriage; man's social freedom vs. woman's domestic confinement, surrender of control over property both real and personal, inability to extricate herself from an unhappy marriage or to bring an action for divorce

[5] See above, pp. 5-15.

[6] As in the case of Anadea, for example. See above, p. 269.

> on any grounds--all these in addition to the multitude of problems of accommodation to a husband's habits and temper.[7]

These problems are above all practical problems, and the sort of symbolic protest which characterized Haywood's early fiction was obviously inadequate to providing specific, practical answers. A woman burdened with a miserly and tyrannical husband, for example, might exult for a time in reading novels like The Distressed Orphan, and her identification with the rebellious heroine might, temporarily, be complete and comforting. But when she had put the book down, she still had to face a lifetime of niggardly tyranny. Into this void the conduct book entered triumphantly. Like the problems they attempted to solve, conduct books had existed throughout the century, but in the decade preceding Pamela, they seemed to gain a new popularity. It is this period which also saw a great proliferation of periodicals designed especially for the instruction of the fair sex.[8] What made such works popular was the very pragmatism which Haywood's novels, despite their feminism, so sorely lacked. "In English courtesy books, the whole question of sex is regarded from a practical rather than from a romantic point of view."[9] They might inform a suffering woman that there was no way she could be rid of a brutal and debauched husband, but at

[7] Edna L. Steeves, "Pre-Feminism in some Eighteenth Century Novels," Texas Qtly, 16 (1973), No. 3, 52-53. [8] See Adburgham, pp. 274-275 and Chapter V, pp. 79-94. [9] James Hodges, "The Female Spectator, A Courtesy Periodical," in Studies in the Early English Periodical, ed. Richmond P. Bond (Chapel Hill, 1957), p. 157.

least they would address themselves to the question rather than holding out some vision of timely deaths and happy endings. Pragmatism and prudence were their watchwords.[10]

The courtesy literature read in the first half of the eighteenth century has been acknowledged as an important contributor to the novel,[11] but the debt is usually defined in terms of content rather than form or style. From the conduct books the novel--meaning in this case works published after 1740--took both the intention to instruct and the means of instruction. Richardson's Preface to Pamela provides an account of the novel which could as easily refer to one of the moral handbooks:

> To Divert and Entertain, and at the same time to Instruct, and Improve the minds of the YOUTH of both Sexes: . . . To inculcate Religion and Morality in so easy and agreeable a manner, as shall render them . . . delightful and profitable. . . . To set forth in the most exemplary Lights, the Parental, the Filial, and the Social Duties, and that from low to high Life. . . . To paint Vice in its proper colours, to make it deservedly Odious; and to set Virtue in its own amiable Light to make it truly Lovely. . . . To teach the man of Fortune how to use it; the Man of Passion how to subdue it; and the Man of Intrigue, how, gracefully, and with honour to himself, to reclaim. . . . To give practical Examples, worthy to be followed in the most critical and affecting Cases, by the modest Virgin, the Chaste Bride, and the obliging Wife. . . .[12]

Although Richardson is closest to the conduct books, even the satiric comedy of Fielding was intended to inculcate ideas of virtue and proper conduct, by showing characters who, "to become truly

[10] See above, pp. 13-14. [11] See especially Dales and Hornbeak.
[12] Quoted in Williams, Novel and Romance, p. 93.

moral must begin with innate good nature, and then learn by experience the prudential values of their society."[13] Fielding is far less sententious than Richardson, but his ultimate purpose is the same. However, moral purpose, like the conduct books and the problems they hoped to solve, was not new to the 1740's. Haywood made a claim to it in many of the prefaces and dedications to her early works, and the novels themselves are repositories of instructive "sententiae."[14] Writing in 1723, she expresses the conventional view of the function of literature: "As I take it, the aim of every person, who pretends to write (tho' in the most insignificant and ludicrous way) ought to tend at least to a good moral use. . . . "[15] Consequently, it is necessary to look further for the real contribution of courtesy literature to the genre as it was developing in the 1730's and 1740's.

I believe that the answer lies not so much in the moral content of such works, but in their practicality and down-to-earth concern.

> The conduct-book approach to fiction in fact involved an extension of fiction in two apparently contradictory directions: towards the portrayal of real life and towards the portrayal of the exemplary or the ideal.[16]

The ideal is the end to which all the advice in a conduct book leads. In order to achieve that end, given the multiplicity and depth of

[13] Robert B. Pierce, "Moral Education in the Novel of the 1750's," Philological Qtly, 44 (1965), 76. [14] See Doody, pp. 139-40, for examples of "sententiae" about love. [15] Dedication to Lasselia, p. vii. Part of this dedication is included in Williams, Novel and Romance, p. 79. [16] H. A. Austin, "Richardson's Clarissa, and its Relation to Past and Contemporary Fiction and Drama," Diss. Liverpool, 1968, p. 16.

the pitfalls along the way, especially for women, that advice must consider all eventualities. No subject is too mundane, no problem too trivial. Moreover, for advice to be effective in literature, it has to be both universal and specific. It must apply to situations in which a majority of readers might at some time find themselves, yet it must also be convincing in individual instances. As a result, the author of such literature is obliged to be mundane in order to gain credibility. Betsey's mother in Richardson's Familiar Letters[17] is an effective mouthpiece precisely because she argues material, rather than spiritual, necessity for the course of action she advises. The heroic romance attempted, as I have shown,[18] to serve as aristocratic conduct literature of the highest order; one of the reasons why it failed to endure either as literature or as handbook, is its preoccupation with the Ideal to the exclusion of ordinary problems and feelings. Even the psychological realism Haywood provided in her early novels was not enough as women had to come to terms with the increasing pressures of "the World." What was needed was a sort of "domestic romance," combining the spiritual idealism of the heroic romance with the pragmatic idealism of the conduct books. And it was the domestic romance which was developed by the dialectic begun with the publication of Pamela.

Richardson's debt to his predecessors has frequently been acknowledged. The influence of heroic tragedy and drama in

17 See above, p. 13.
18 See above, pp. 103-4; 110-11.

general has gained widest acceptance.[19] The relationship between his fiction and the conventions of romance has also been documented, although not so often.[20] Even Haywood's contribution to his art has been analyzed.[21] However, all those analyses overlook the simple but vital fact that in both Pamela and Clarissa, Richardson adopted Haywood's recipe for success, and it is with regard to his skill in manipulating her formula that his novels are great. As we have seen,[22] the main ingredient is the germ of tragedy inherent in women's lives. This is produced by various combinations of forces and circumstances, but basically there are two necessary elements: external social pressure, or "duty"; and internal compulsion, or "love." The catalyst is some sort of physical force, often taking the form of lust. In Pamela, Richardson provided a permutation of this formula which was severely flawed, and it is this mismanagement on his part, I believe, which provoked the fury of the Anti-Pamelites, as well as Richardson's own second attempt seven years later.

It is fairly easy to isolate the "physical force" in Pamela.

[19] Critics discussing this influence include John A. Dussinger, "Richardson' Tragic Muse," Philological Qtly, 46 (1967), 18-33; T. C. D. Eaves and B. D. Kimpel, Samuel Richardson (Oxford, 1971); W. J. Farrell, "The Style and Action in Clarissa," Studies in English Literature, 3 (1963), 365-75; M. Kinkead-Weekes, Samuel Richardson: Dramatic Novelist (London, 1973); I. Konigsberg, Samuel Richardson and the Dramatic Novel (Lexington, Ky., 1968); W. Park, "Clarissa as Tragedy," Studies in English Literature, 16 (1976), 461-71; Edward Wagenknecht, Cavalcade of the English Novel (New York, 1943); and Doody.

[20] Sheridan Baker, "The Idea of Romance in the Eighteenth Century Novel," Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters, 49 (1964), 507-22; J. C. Beasley, "Romance and the 'New' Novels of Richardson, Fielding and Smollett," Studies in English Literature, 16 (1976), 437-50; Dales; Dalziel, "Richardson and Romance," Elton and Watt are the main historians of this relationship.

[21] Her contribution is discussed by Morgan, Richetti and Whicher. McBurney's selection of one of her works for Four Before Richardson implies a similar recognition of her importance. Doody specifically relates her novels to Clarissa; see especially pp. 129-50.

[22] See above, p. 293.

Whether or not one accepts Mr. B's awkward attempts to violate Pamela as a legitimate threat to her chastity,[23] there remains her abduction to Lincolnshire and her incarceration by Mrs. Jewkes. The "internal compulsion" is slightly more difficult, but only slightly; evidence includes Pamela's curious reluctance to leave her master's house, her care over the waistcoat she is working for him,[24] her own fears that his "kindness" might cause her to give in to him,[25] her disproportionate grief when she takes leave of him (p. 85), her inability to force herself to escape from her captivity (p. 132) her reverie by the pond in which she imagines the effect on him of her suicide (p. 150), and, finally, her strange concern for him when she hears of his near drowning.

> What is the matter, that, with all his ill usage of me, I cannot hate him? . . . . He has certainly done enough to make me hate him; but yet, when I heard his danger, which was very great, I could not in my heart forbear rejoicing for his safety, though his death would have ended my afflictions. . . . and oh what an angel would he be in my eyes yet, if he would cease his attempts and reform! (p. 156)

The significance of these feelings is underlined by their coming immediately after her crisis of despair. Mr. B is the cause of that despair, and has nearly compelled her to commit the worst of all sins. That she can express tenderness for him while recovering from her agony in the garden is indicative of a strong, unquench-

[23] For an alternative reading, which I myself am inclined to accept, see Kinkead-Weekes, pp. 15-33 and Doody, p. 47.

[24] See Kinkead-Weekes, p. 25.

[25] Pamela, Everyman's Library edition (London, 1963), I, 70. Further references to this edition, all from vol. I, will be given in the text.

able love. Even after she rejects his "proposals," surely the highest insult to a virtuous woman, she remarks his handsome appearance as he leaves for church and cries again, "Why can't I hate him?" (p. 172).

It is the element of "external force" which gives rise to almost all the censure that Pamela has earned.

> The dual role of master and of lover which Mr. B has to play clouds the main issue of the novel . . . . Were he not Pamela's master as well as the man she wants to marry, Pamela would seem far less the schemer than she too often shows herself to be.[26]

Because B is not only her master, but a wealthy and respected member of the landed gentry, Pamela's resistance has frequently given rise to the accusation that her virtue

> is no more than a realization of the fact that her virginity is by far the most valuable of her possessions and a wise determination not to lose what has a perfectly tangible value.[27]

Pamela herself is constantly reminding Mr. B of their social inequality. Early in the novel, when he asks her what harm he has done her, her reply typifies her attitude towards him:

> Yes, Sir, . . . the greatest in the world: you have

[26] William M. Sale, Jr., "From Pamela to Clarissa," in The Age of Johnson, ed. F. W. Hilles (New Haven, 1949), p. 133. I am indebted to this essay for inspiring the outline of this chapter.

[27] Joseph W. Krutch, Five Masters (New York, 1931), p. 129.

> taught me to forget myself, and what belongs to me, and have lessened the distance that fortune has made between us, by demeaning yourself, to be so free to a poor servant. (p. 12)

Much later, when his honourable love begins to subdue his pride in the world's opinion, she tells him again, "You cannot be my master; for no master demeans himself so to his poor servant" (p. 184). The cumulative effect of her insistence on the difference in their stations is that Pamela appears unwholesomely concerned with his rank and wealth; "her behaviour . . . forces upon one /the conviction/ that it is mainly prompted by a disproportionate respect for her lover's wealth and position."[28] This effect lasts throughout both parts of the novel, though after they finally decide to marry it manifests itself primarily in her inability to call him anything but "my master" and in the eulogies on his kindness and generosity which most readers find cloying and distasteful.

Another major difficulty arising from B's dual role is that Pamela's duty to him as her master obscures her growing awareness of him as her lover. This confusion can easily lead the reader to charge her with scheming and hypocrisy. Pamela is, after all, a servant in B's household, and one who has formerly received exceptional favour from his mother. She is, as we have seen, deeply conscious of the dignity and obligations of her rank. Consequently, when B asks her to stay on, or when she willingly postpones her departure in order to finish the waistcoat or put his linen in order, she is only fulfilling those obligations. The waistcoat in-

[28] Clara Thompson, Samuel Richardson, (London, 1900), p. 165.

cident would be much more effective if we could regard it unambiguously as an indication of Pamela's partiality for Mr. B. As it is, it appears to reveal an unseemly willingness on her part to remain in his household. From that view itis only a short jump to the conclusion that she is trying to maneuver him into a better matrimonial position. In terms of the actual relationship between them, the conjunction in him of duty and love acts to prevent self-awareness in her until the conflict between them is nearly at an end. Her sense of station makes her suspicious of his motives long after she has any cause. In answer to his very frank and trusting letter (p. 115) asking her if she will invite him to Lincolnshire, which at the same time invites her to trust to his honour and love, she replies:

> But what proposals can one in your high station have to make to one in my low degree! I know what belongs to your exalted station too well, to imagine that any thing can be expected but sad temptations, and utter distress, if you come down. . . . (p. 120)

Because of the element of condescension involved in any honourable intentions he might have, she is unable to believe in the sincerity of his feelings. And because of that same distance between them, she never has to deal directly, as Clarissa does, for example,[29] with the possibility that she loves him.

Richardson's most serious error in Pamela is using Haywood's

[29] Clarissa, I, 46-48, 189-91, 199-201 and 356-58. There are other examples throughout the novel.

tragic formula as the basis for a novel which is essentially comic in spirit. The awkwardness and hesitancy of B's attempts at seduction,[30] absolutely necessary if we are to believe in Pamela's love for him and their eventual marriage, serve also to mitigate our sense of danger in the various "rape" scenes; there is never any doubt that Pamela will end happily. And that happy ending reinforces the notion that Pamela was scheming all along, trying to manipulate her master into marriage. Moreover, Pamela never really struggles with herself, as do the heroines of Haywood's novels. Her conflict remains almost abstract.

> One does not praise someone for morality in not allowing themselves to be raped if they can help it. Had she been tried in a scene where B's gentleness and tenderness brought out her own secret feelings . . . her purity would have been tested as it, clearly is not, for example, in the closet episode.[31]

It is not her "virtue" which is rewarded; it is her patience and endurance. Taken as a whole, despite Richardson's well known "realism," the detail in which Pamela reports the progress of her days and the psychological acuteness of his characterization, almost any of Haywood's early novels is fundamentally more realistic. For Pamela presents "a triumph against all obstacles and contrary to every expectation, a triumph which was in the last analysis as improbable as any in romance."[32] The difference, of course, is that the romance never pretended to offer anything different.

[30] See Kinkead-Weekes, pp. 15-33. [31] Kinkead-Weekes, pp. 113-14.
[32] Watt, p. 205.

Not surprisingly, it is the defects I have just pointed out, defects resulting from Richardson's misapplication of Haywood's fictional formula, which exposed Pamela to the satire of the anti-Pamelites. In Shamela, Fielding voiced his objections to Richardson's first attempt by making his own heroine a consummate hypocrite as well as a whore. He notices every point I have mentioned, including B's hesitancy, which he converts into satire by renaming him "Booby" and relating Shamela's sexual frustration each time he takes her protestations seriously:

> Sir, say I, you had better not offer to be rude; well, says he, no more I won't then; and away he went out of the Room. I was so mad to be sure I could have cry'd.[33]

Shamela and her mother plot to get Booby to make a large settlement on her for her "vartue"; they are rewarded beyond expectation when he proposes marriage instead.

> Now, Mamma, what think you?--For my own Part, I am convinced he will marry me, and faith so he shall. O! Bless me! I shall be Mrs. Booby, and be Mistress of a great Estate, and have a dozen Coaches and Six, and a fine house at London, and another at Bath, and Servants, and Jewels, and Plate, and go to Plays, and Opera's, and Court; and do what I will, and spend what I will. But, poor Parson Williams! Well; and can't I see Parson Williams, as well after Marriage as before: For I shall never care a farthing for my Husband. No, I hate and despise him of all Things.[34]

Shamela's strong sexual preference for Williams and her detestation

[33] Henry Fielding, Shamela (London, 1970), p. 329.
[34] Shamela, p. 337.

of Booby are particularly significant, for they emphasize that her marriage will be a grand act of prostitution. It is this aspect of the argument which most interested Haywood in 1741, when she wrote

> Anti-Pamela: or, Feigned Innocence Detected; in a series of Syrena's Adventures. A Narrative which has really its foundations in Truth and Nature; and at the same time that it entertains, by a vast variety of surprizing incidents, arms against a partial credulity, by shewing the mischiefs that frequently arise from a too-sudden admiration. Published as a necessary caution to all young gentlemen.

Syrena Tricksy, the heroine of this novel, is motivated by selfish lust and avarice. Haywood had no objections to female sexuality, as we have seen, but in her early works, whenever it appears outside the sanction of love, it is vigorously condemned.[35] Lust for its own sake is wrong in either sex. A greater sin, in Haywood's books, is the enslavement of sex to interest; in all her early novels, property marriage is regarded as a fate worse than death. Seeing a glorified property marriage extolled in Pamela, whose story contains materials out of which she would have fashioned a less ambiguous tale, she protested vigorously by offering the history of a woman willing to be all things to all men, provided the price was right. Like Shamela, Syrena has her preferences among them, but on the whole she is willing to subordinate lust to her desire for financial security. It is significant that in her first adventure, she falls in love with the soldier Vardine, and they are

[35] As in Ciamara or Madam de Tortillée.

happy together until, on her mother's advice, she presses him for money. He immediately decamps, thus illustrating that her misfortunes are to be blamed on her mercenary schemes.

Joseph Andrews offers a far more serious criticism of Pamela, not by pointing out defects in Richardson's presentation, but by questioning the formula on which it is based. It is no coincidence that the protagonist of Fielding's novel is male rather than female. By that simple substitution he reveals a completely different outlook on life, offering real comedy rather than Richardson's unintentional burlesque.

> In Shamela the attack concentrated on Pamela and her morals, but here, by juxtaposing a male in the situation, Fielding makes us stop and examine the whole question of the relationship of the sexes. If we take our cue from the author's own attitude, or conclusion will be that the whole thing is just not as important as Pamela's histrionics would have us believe.[36]

Role reversal can be an effective technique for illuminating the inequalities in a relationship; when Haywood made a similar substitution in Philidore and Placentia,[37] she exposed the hopeless impotence of a woman who challenges her conventional role. It is Philidore's insensibility which is exasperating and somewhat riduculous, not his chastity or any pretension to "virtue." The result of their conflict is to broaden our understanding of "the relationship of the sexes." Joseph, in contrast, is a figure of

[36] Bernard Kreissman, Pamela-Shamela (Lincoln, Neb., 1960), p. 20.

[37] See above, pp. 321-21. McBurney has pointed out the similarity between Placentia's attempts to seduce Philidore and Joseph's interviews with Lady Booby. Introduction to Four Before Richardson, p. xxv.

fun; by making him the object not of love but of single-minded lust, Fielding renders both Joseph and Lady Booby ridiculous. Lady Booby expresses the conventional view when she cries, "Did ever mortal hear of Man's Virtue!"[38] His behaviour, and, to a lesser extent, hers, is the opposite of what is expected, and this incongruity provokes laughter. Moreover, by providing a protagonist "whose chastity will always be in his own power,"[39] Fielding reveals the fundamental difference between his scheme and that of Haywood and Richardson. Someone whose fate is in his own control can never be a tragic figure.[40]

Fanny is also the object of lust. At her first appearance Adams rescues her from ravishment, and during the rest of the novel she is abducted by the Roasting Squire, schemed for by Peter Pounce, propositioned by Didapper's servant, and "attacked" by the Beau himself. Each of these incidents could easily be represented as disturbing, but Fielding presents them in such a way that Fanny is never in actual danger. Peter Pounce's attempt results in a long argument about seating arrangements for the journey to Booby Hall. The Squire never even attacks Fanny himself; she is rescued not from him but from his friend the Captain. Di-

[38] Henry Fielding, Joseph Andrews (London, 1970), p. 36. Further references to this edition will be given in the text.

[39] Maynard Mack, "Introduction to Joseph Andrews," in Fielding: Twentieth Century Interpretations, ed. Ronald Paulson (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962), p. 53.

[40] See above, pp. 294-96. Morris Golden, in Fielding's Moral Psychology (Amherst, Mass., 1966), presents a different interpretation. Of the scene between Lady Booby and Joseph he says, "Though this is supposed to be and is hilarious, it nonetheless reaffirms Joseph's insistence on his individual humanity and forces Lady Booby . . . to think of him as a person. . . . " (p. 54). I am inclined to think that he overstates his case.

dapper's servant is quickly dispatched by Joseph's lightning fist. As for his master, "our spark was not of the Herculean race," (p. 272), standing less than four and a half feet high, and his attempts to ravish Fanny are diminished into farce. It is typical of Fielding's comic outlook that Didapper ends up in bed with Mrs. Slipslop; it is equally typical that Fanny spends the night naked in the same bed with Adams, in complete ignorance of his presence. Far from being "overheated," Fielding's world seems almost innocent.

The relationship between Joseph and Fanny provides further opportunity for contrast. A main element in Haywood's "tragedies" is internal conflict, which is entirely lacking in Fielding's comedy. Joseph is conspicuously absent from the list of men who attack Fanny's virtue. Fanny and Joseph are not sexually immune, but their love is "pure"--that is, they are content to wait for their union to be blessed in marriage. There is no power struggle involved in their relationship; when Joseph, after rescuing Fanny from Didapper's servant, is transfixed by the sight of her naked bosom, he takes no advantage of her vulnerability or of her love for him.

> Joseph saw the uneasiness she suffered, and immediately removed his Eyes from an Object, in surveying which he had felt the greatest Delight. . . . So great was his fear of offending her, and so truly did his Passion for her deserve the noble Name of Love. (p. 274)

Their horror at the discovery of their supposed kinship reveals that their feelings are healthily sexual, but they resolve

> that if they found themselves to be really Brother and Sister, they vowed a perpetual Celibacy, and to live together all their Days, and indulge in a Platonick Friendship for each other. (p. 303)

Above all else, Fanny and Joseph truly love and esteem each other. Their relationship is uncomplicated, honest, and fundamentally unselfish, and the simplicity of their happiness together provides one of Fielding's most pungent comments on the cynicism of his predecessors.

The only novel which Haywood published between the appearance of Joseph Andrews and that of Clarissa is an interesting footnote to the literary exchange between the two men. In The Fortunate Foundlings, which came out in 1744, she offers the adventures of a brother and sister, and it seems very much as though, by interweaving their histories, she is attempting to combine her formula with Fielding's. Horatio and Louisa are twins whom Dorilaus has found under a tree on his estate. He raises them as his own children. When they are sixteen, Horatio goes off to win fame and fortune in the army, while Louisa remains with her guardian. At this point their stories diverge, but they proceed along comparable lines. Louisa soon discovers that Dorilaus is in love with her, and when her refusal to marry him provokes him to attempt her in a drunken rage, she leaves home. To support herself she takes in sewing and is so skilful that she is soon engaged by a fashionable milliner. She is then taken on as companion to Melanthe, a lady of quality, and travels with her all over Europe. She falls in love with du Plessis, and is desired by Bellfleur, Melanthe's lover, who manages to alienate the two women. When Louisa leaves her service, he attempts to rape her, but she escapes. She is aided

by du Plessis, who proposes to her, but she refuses him on the grounds that she is of unknown birth and has no fortune. She goes to a convent in Italy to await the end of the war, as she cannot get a passage to England until then. At the convent, she is so popular that the abbess attempts to compel her to take the veil by keeping her virtually a prisoner and by intercepting her letters to and from du Plessis. She contrives an escape and makes her way back to Paris, where she is reunited to Dorilaus, who turns out to be her father.

Meanwhile, Horatio has been taken prisoner in France, and has obtained a place at the court of the Chevalier St. George. He falls in love with Charlotta de Palfoy, which curbs his desire to return to England, and is set free on parole. Charlotta's father suspects an intrigue between her and another man, and removes her from court, as he is ambitious of a great marriage for her. When he hears this, Horatio despairs, but then he saves M. de Palfoy in a duel and is permitted to visit frequently. When a friend returns with glorious stories about fighting with Charles XII of Sweden, Horatio resolves to try and raise his fortune and position by heroism and valour. An intrigue spreads rumors of his love for Charlotta, and M. de Palfoy is instrumental in giving him letters of recommendation to the Swedish court. In a short time he has amassed considerable wealth and earned promotion. However, he is still ambitious; even after receiving an encouraging letter from Charlotta and a request to return from Dorilaus, who hints at more good fortune if he does so, Horatio cannot decide whether or not to leave the army. When his regiment is suddenly ordered to Russia, his honour compels him to stay, and after a long march and a fierce

battle, he is imprisoned by the Russians. He is there befriended by the Prince's mistress, and desired by Mattahesa, who makes the Prince jealous of him. Mattahesa throws herself at Horatio, but he gets rid of her by summarily passing her on to a lustful fellow prisoner. When the Prince discovers his mistake, he sets Horatio free to return to Paris, where he is reunited with his family, and the appropriate marriages take place.

Even from this brief synopsis,[41] it is obvious that Louisa has a great deal in common with Haywood's earlier heroines. She has the same integrity, the same determination, the same ability to take action on her own behalf. At the inn where she is cornered by Bellfleur, she displays singular coolness and physical courage:

> Running to a table where he had laid his sword, she drew it out of the scabbard with so much speed, that he could not prevent her, and making a push at him with one hand, kept him from closing with, or disarming her, till with the other she had plucked back the bolt of the door.[42]

Her decision to earn her own living is very much like that of Emanuella in The Rash Resolve or Philenia in Fatal Fondness, and in her fierce desire to remain financially independent of her lover, she greatly resembles a dozen of her predecessors, from Camilla to Placentia. But Louisa's financial independence is even more significant. Her rejection of Dorilaus and du Plessis, both of whom are eminently "eligible" in worldly terms, is at once a re-

41 A more detailed summary is included below, pp. 479-80.
42 The Fortunate Foundlings (London, 1744), p. 200. All further references will be given in the text.

affirmation of Haywood's own formula and a criticism of the way in which Richardson used it. Louisa's reflections on Dorilaus's proposal echo Pamela's rhetoric in several places:

> He has all the accomplishments of his whole sex centered in him.--I could wish to be for ever near him.--All that I am is owing to his goodness.--How wretched must I have been but for his bounty. . . . What maid of birth and fortune equal to his own but would be proud of his addresses; and shall I, a poor foundling, the creature of his charity not receive the honour he does me with the utmost gratitude! . . . How madly stupid, how blind to my own interest, how thankless to him I must appear! (p. 20)

Dorilaus is similar to Mr. B in his dual literary function; he, too, is both benefactor and lover. Haywood seems to recognize, in Louisa's soliloquy, the difficulty of a heroine's position in relation to such a hero, but the further intricacies of the plot enable her to avoid Richardson's predicament. Louisa does not love Dorilaus; consequently, a "property marriage" to him, inspired primarily by gratitude, is not a real temptation. Her true test comes when du Plessis, whom she sincerely loves, asks her to marry him. Her reply in this instance seems to bear directly on Pamela:

> How would the world censure and ridicule the fondness of an affection so ill-placed!--What would they say when they should hear the nobly born, the rich, and the accomplished Monsieur du Plessis, had taken for his wife a maid obscurely descended, and with no other dowry than her virtue!--My very affection for you would, in the general opinion, lose all its merit, and pass for sordid interest:--I should be looked upon as the bane of your glory;--as one whose artifices had ensnared you into a forgetfulness of what you owed to yourself and family, and be despised and hated by all who have a regard for you. (p. 204)

In effect, this passage contains a summary of anti-Pamelite argument. The judgment which Louisa says would fall to her if she married du Plessis is exactly that which Pamela had earned as a literary character. Marrying Mr. B "with no other dowry than her virtue," whe was regarded with both "censure and ridicule"; her love passed "for sordid interest," as in Shamela and Anti-Pamela, in which she was also condemned as a skilled mistress of "artifices." Louisa refuses du Plessis firmly, though she remains in contact with him, and only consents to marry him when she is reinstated as Dorilaus's child.

If we compare Horatio's adventures with those of his sister, Haywood's deep understanding of the difference between the "tragic" female experience of life and the comic vision of the male becomes clear. Like Louisa, Horatio loves a person who, as he supposes, is far above him both socially and materially. Like Louisa, Horatio is kept prisoner, and is sexually accosted by someone who does not interest him. And finally, both brother and sister go out into the world and work to improve their lot in life. However, these similar experiences produce radically different reactions in the two protagonists. The most straightforward example relates to sex. Bellfleur, lusting after Louisa, entraps her at an inn by telling the innkeeper that she is his wife and that he is taking her home from an elopement with her lover. Once he has gained access to her, his physical strength and the nature of his anatomy enable him to attempt to force her compliance. She escapes only because she is an exceptionally brave and enterprising woman. In contrast to this, Horatio's encounter with Mattahesa is pure comedy. Like Joseph, Horatio always has his chastity in his

own power. He regards his aspiring mistress as vaguely ridiculous, and simply hands her over to a less particular fellow prisoner. Neither Mattahesa nor her new lover seems to mind. The affair does have more serious implications, in that Mattahesa's jealousy nearly contrives to have Horatio tortured, but in the event the misunderstanding is untangled and her plot becomes instead the instrument of his freedom. Nothing that happens to him ever seriously concerns him. When he learns that M. de Palfoy will not consider his proposal to Charlotta because of his low degree, he immediately sets out to make his fortune. "Make his fortune" is, in fact, the key; he is a man, and the world offers him several possibilities of changing his rank in society. It is true that he and Louisa both gain employment in which they are able to advance. Both do advance both materially and socially. However, at the height of their advancement, Horatio has actually changed his lot; the wealth and glory he has amassed make him a worthy husband for Charlotta. In contrast, though Louisa has progressed from poverty to being the beloved lady-companion to a wealthy woman of quality, she is still the impecunious foundling. She can only marry du Plessis when she acquires both a parent and a dowry. That she does so is, perhaps, a reward for all her labour and integrity more than equal to Horatio's greater wealth and glory. The moral which Haywood draws on the last page of her novel could again be a direct reference to the theme of Pamela;

> By these examples we may learn, that to sustain with fortitude and patience whatever ills we are preordained to suffer, entitles us to relief, while by impatient struggling we should but augment the score, and provoke fate to shew us the vanity of all attempts to frustrate its decrees. (p. 352)

This sentiment would seem to apply to Horatio's adventures far more than to Louisa's. It is true that she is swept along by circumstances, but if she had not struggled as she did, she would have ended up married to her own father, raped and abandoned, censured as a fortune hunter or imprisoned in a convent. Yet if we interpret "fortitude and patience" to include the determination to act on principle even when giving in to circumstances would be easier and more gratifying, then the moral is clear: "virtue" will be rewarded indeed.

By the middle of the 1740's, it must have been glaringly obvious to Richardson that he had erred badly in his first attempt at fiction. He was particularly fortunate in his critics, who showed him exactly what mistakes he had made. They also offered him what amounted to a challenge which he could not resist. His first endeavour to answer them, the continuation of Pamela,[43] was inevitably inadequate; he could not explain away the flaws in construction and conception that I have been discussing. His next step was a reworking of the theme--Haywood's formula"--in a simple, more powerful configuration which would allow him full scope. This he created in Clarissa, which came out in 1747-48. The fundamental story of Clarissa is that of a woman in conflict with her mercenary family on the one hand and with the sensual arrogance of her lover on the other, and it is a permutation of her formula which Haywood herself used on several occasions.[44] The main elements

[43] For a discussion of Pamela II as a direct reply to Shamela, see Owen Jenkins, "Richardson's Pamela and Fielding's 'Vile Forgeries,'" Philological Qtly, 45 (1965), 200-10. [44] The Unequal Conflict is closest to Clarissa, but The Agreeable Caledonian and The Fatal Secret use essentially the same configuration. The Double Marriage uses it with a male protagonist.

are easily recognizable in Richardson's novel: The Harlowes and Lovelace are all eager to use physical force, and it is their various machinations which, taken together, compel Clarissa to act. Duty to her parents and social convention exert pressure on Clarissa from the outside, and Richardson's subtle revelation of her attraction to Lovelace provides the internal compulsion which was so sorely lacking in Pamela. But in order to produce his tragedy, Richardson instituted several substantial modifications to the formula which had helped to make the novel popular, and it is in his manipulation of the narrative pattern he inherited that his genius is best displayed.

The most important difference between Pamela and Clarissa is that Mr. B's dual role has been divided between Lovelace, representing Love, and the Harlowes, representing Duty. This separation of function insures that Clarissa's attraction to Lovelace exists independent of "interest" of any sort. Moreover, it allows them to engage as equals. Although he is of higher rank in terms of birth, her family's wealth has entitled her to similar social status, and there is never any question, in their relationship, of either the condescension or the self-aggrandizement which confuse the issues in Pamela. The social and financial equality of Clarissa and Lovelace also lowers the level on which their conflict takes place. Clarissa is not trapped in the chaos of class struggle.[45] There is no reason, in terms of wealth or quality, for the Har-

[45] There are, of course, critics who would strongly disagree. These include Hill, Kettle and Watt. Lovelace does, at times, rationalize his plots by reminding himself that the Harlowes are "upstarts," but rank is not really a crucial element in his relationship with Clarissa herself.

lowes to prefer Solmes, and Lovelace lacks Mr. B's excuses for pride and prerogative in deciding whether or not to marry the woman he loves. Consequently, in both cases, the actions of Clarissa's adversaries are the effects of a desire to assert authority, a lust for power which seems to require no excuse.

Although the desire of the Harlowes to marry Clarissa to Solmes is prompted, at least in part, by the contiguity of their estates and by his willingness to entail that estate away from his own relations back into their family (I, 59-60), the issue of Clarissa's marriage soon becomes blurred with that of filial duty. Consider this reply from the elder James Harlowe to his daughter's entreaty that she "may not be sacrificed to projects and remote contingencies" (I, 120):

> I write, perverse girl; but with all the indignation that your disobedience deserves. To desire to be forgiven a fault you own, and yet resolve to persevere in, is a boldness, no more to be equalled, than passed over. It is my authority you defy. . . . I see how light all relationship sits upon you. The cause I can guess at, too. . . . Continue banished from my presence, undutiful as you are, till you know how to conform to my will. Ungrateful creature! . . . Write no more to me till you can distinguish better; and till you are convinced of your duty to
>
> A JUSTLY-INCENSED FATHER (I, 120-21)

This brief letter contains no less than eight references to duty and authority; the same note is sounded repeatedly in all the exchanges between Clarissa and the various members of her family. Brother James is particularly adept at taunting his tyrannic father with Clarissa's lack of respect for his prerogative as a parent. James fears that a marriage between Clarissa and Lovelace, who is heir presumptive to two titles, will result in the family concen-

trating their ambitions on her rather than placing their hopes, and their property, behind a bid to obtain him a peerage (I, 54-58). These apprehensions, joined with his hatred of Lovelace, lead him finally to usurp his father's authority entirely in his eagerness to dispose of Clarissa to his own advantage; she is "given up to the cruelty of /her/ brother" (I, 411). Throughout the first quarter of the novel, Clarissa is aware of her brother's manipulations and protests strongly against what she regards as an improper delegation of authority: "Transfer not, I beseech you, to a brother and sister your own authority over your child" (I, 261). She objects on the grounds that power not founded on mutual responsibility is corrupt and unjust. To her parents she owes her duty, but she assumes that that duty is reciprocal. She must obey them, but their commands will be tempered with a sincere desire to promote her happiness and welfare. James, in contrast, is supposedly her equal. Although, as son and heir, he is a more considerable member of the family in some respects, they are both children and thus equally subject to parental authority. Her first gesture of defiance makes her feelings perfectly clear:

> I would be glad, sir, said I, to understand that you are by brother--and that you would understand that you are only my brother. (I, 26)

To submit to petty tyranny is not dutiful; she would be sacrificing her integrity in a way which would destroy her soul. Her last conversation before she resolves to elope with Lovelace reiterates her belief that her rebellion is not undutiful. On Aunt Hervey's

informing her that she must submit to the inevitable and marry Solmes, she replies: "Indeed I never will! This, as I have said over and over, is not originally my father's will" (I, 428). By defying James's improper claim to authority, she is forced into the painful necessity of disobeying her father and earning his curse for her undutiful obstinacy.

Clarissa's relationship with Lovelace presents her with the same sort of dilemma. Lovelace, too, threatens her integrity, but he does so in a way which is at once more dangerous and more likely to succeed. Like Mr. Harlowe and James, Lovelace

> is committed with startling intensity to an obsession with desire and will which finds its only worthy object in Clarissa. He is incessantly eager for power. . . . Any exertion of his authority gives him an almost sensual pleasure.[46]

The truth of this assertion, and proof that Lovelace is no ordinary sensualist, is evident in nearly every letter he writes. Consider the following, written to Belford from St. Albans:

> How it swells my pride to have been able to outwit such a vigilant charmer! I am taller by half a yard in my imagination than I was. I look <u>down</u> upon everybody now. Last night I was still more extravagant. I took off my hat as I walked, to see if the lace were not scorched, supposing it had brushed down a star; and, before I put it on again, in mere wantonness, and heart's ease, I was for buffeting the moon.
>
> In short, my whole soul is joy. When I go to bed I laugh myself asleep: and I awake either laughing or singing. (I, 515)

[46] Doody, p. 100.

His high spirits, which form a large part of his attractiveness to the reader, are not the result of nearness to his beloved, of hope at a quick union between them, or of happiness in being trusted by her. They stem from his triumph over her own prudence on the one hand, and over the prohibitions of her family on the other. He constantly refers to himself as an emperor[47] and a general,[48] and he explains his own libertinism as arising from hurt pride and a desire for revenge, rather than from carnal lust:

> I have boasted that I was once in love before. . . . It was in my early manhood--with that quality-jilt, whose infidelity I have vowed to revenge upon as many of the sex as shall come into my power. (I, 145)

Elsewhere, he also admits that it is the intellectual exercise of pursuing a woman and seducing her that he enjoys, and his feeling of power at the moment of her surrender, rather than the physical pleasure of that surrender itself (II, 30). His initial experience with women, in which he was used and manipulated, left him feeling helpless, and "having felt the power of women to humiliate, he is out to use the power of masculinity to revenge, or simply assert, his own ego."[49] His principal maxim, as he frequently repeats, is "once subdued, always subdued";[50] there can be no higher pitch of egotism. In this context, it is essential to remember that throughout the novel, James Harlowe and Lovelace are linked in both

[47] See I, 151-2, 516; II, 270, 369, 495; III, 99.
[48] See II, 215-16, 218, 425, 491.
[49] See Kinkead-Weekes, p. 147.
[50] See, for example, II, 41 and II, 225.

temperament and experience.[51] Both are hot-tempered, imperious, and jealous of any authority but their own, and it is to this similarity in character that Clarissa herself ascribes their initial quarrel (I, 14-15). And both men, with no inherent authority over her,[52] presume to exert it with vengeance.

What makes Lovelace a far more dangerous adversary than James or the combined Harlowes could ever be is Clarissa's attraction to him, which draws her into his power. That she loves her abductor/protector is obvious. Although she protests for a long time that she "would not be in love with him, as it is called, for the world" (I, 47), her true feelings are those which she reveals to him in one of the letters written in the delirium after the rape:

> At first I saw something in your air and person that displeased me not. Your birth and fortunes were no small advantages to you. You acted not ignobly by my passionate brother. . . . Thus prepossessed, all the rest that my soul loved and wished for in your reformation, I hoped! (III, 208)

That the nature of her love is at least partly sexual is more difficult to prove. Kearney suggests that "Clarissa's violent reaction to /Solmes/ . . . owes something to her less well-defined feelings about Lovelace . . . and about her sexual awareness of him."[53] This suggestion is borne out by Clarissa's vivid descrip-

[51] I, 15-16, 403; IV, 283. [52] See, for example, III, 73, where Clarissa tells Lovelace, "You have no business with me! You have no right over me! You know you have not." [53] Anthony Kearney, Samuel Richardson: Clarissa (London, 1975), p. 25.

tions of Solmes's repugnant physicality[54] and her admission about Lovelace that

> I think, that, with all his preponderating faults, I like him better than I ever thought I should like him; and, those faults considered, better perhaps than I ought to like him. . . . In a word, I will frankly own . . . that were he now but a moral man, I would prefer him to all the men I ever saw. (I, 203)

Her choice of verb is significant; she prefers Lovelace not to all the men she has known, but to all the men she has seen. Like Haywood's heroines (but unlike Pamela), she is deeply aware of her own sexuality and realizes how vulnerable it would make her; consequently, Lovelace's assaults are not only an external threat. "Clarissa is tempted by her own desires each time Lovelace makes an advance; in rejecting him she must also repress the desires in herself that he awakens. . . . "[55] The reason she does so is that she recognizes, long before she knows anything of his machinations, that he would use her love as another weapon in his struggle to subjugate her. This is what she means when she tells Captain Tomlinson, "I had no other motive in not being forward to own it, than my too just apprehensions of his want of generosity" (III, 118).

> She is a woman capable of love who is placed in a situation which entails, whatever choice she makes, the denial of the kind of love she has to give.[56]

[54] For example, I, 68-69. [55] Cynthia G. Wolff, Samuel Richardson and the Puritan Character (Hamden, Conn., 1972), p. 146. For an additional discussion of Clarissa's sexuality, see Kinkead-Weekes, pp. 230-40. [56] Doody, p. 125.

Lovelace and her father, both of whom she loves and would oblige, are equally quick to turn her acts of "love" into acts of submission; therefore, she is forced to deny them both.

There is another element present in Richardson's tragic formula, one which is not generally found in Haywood, and that is the compulsion of social convention.

> Clarissa is not destroyed by the libertine Lovelace, she is destroyed by the forces of convention--forces which work almost as strongly within her own heart as they do in the society in which she moves.[57]

Her own belief in the laws of that society go a very long way towards isolating her and limiting her choices. It is Clarissa's belief in conventional wisdom which leads her to refuse Anna's repeated offer to elope with her.[58] It is also convention which, to a large extent prohibits her from making her feelings known to Lovelace with frankness and trust at the stages in their relationship when his plots had not yet become irrevocable. It is difficult to assess this particular aspect of her character because her "delicacy," as it is often called, is an ambivalent force. On the one hand, it prohibits her from forcing the issue of marriage with Lovelace; he knows this, and counts on it in his various schemes.[59] On the other hand, Clarissa's adherence to strictly conventional behaviour is her only protection against Lovelace's encroachments, and it prevents her from making concessions of which he would cer-

[57] R. F. Brissenden, Samuel Richardson (London, 1958), p. 26.
[58] I, 420-23, 457; II, 233.
[59] II, 33-34, 101, 142, 314-15, 475 and 517.

tainly take advantage. On the whole, convention is no more "good" or "evil" in itself than duty or love. Clarissa's tragedy results from a pernicious conjunction of all three in a world, very much like Haywood's, in which women are easily preyed upon and confined.

The fictional formula which Haywood developed to express her perception of women as prey culminates in Clarissa, in which Richardson perfects that formula as tragedy. Haywood never succeeded in writing pure tragedy, although in several instances she approached it,[60] not only because she lacked Richardson's scope and skill; but also because there is a fundamental difference between her heroines and Richardson's. They all struggle against manipulation, against the force of duty and morality, and against that of their own desires. But whereas Haywood's women remain active in their resistance, even to the point of committing suicide when death offers the only escape,[61] Clarissa subsides into passivity. Although she escapes from Lovelace, after the rape, as she has escaped from Harlowe Place, she then proceeds to waste away, like the caged bird to which Lovelace at one point compares her (III, 246). She refuses to prosecute him, and, by resigning her will to live, simply refuses all responsibility for her future. Her resignation, and her ability to suffer with quiet strength, are the elements which perfect the tragedy. Yet, like Haywood, Richardson is a feminist, and though his moral seems to support conventional, religious notions of feminine behaviour, there would be no tragedy if Clarissa did not struggle against those notions, and were her ob-

60
61 The Rash Resolve and The Fatal Secret come closest.
See above, pp. 272-73.

jections to them not perceived as fundamentally just.

> The way that Lovelace exploits every disadvantage of her situation means that Clarissa continues to be confronted with the issue which parental tyranny first raised--the power of all the forces which deny her sex their just equality with men.[62]

Lovelace's "convincing blend of overt sadism with conventionally accepted views brings out the hostility and contempt for women in the culture as a whole."[63] Clarissa recognizes this hostility and responds to it; throughout the novel, her repeated use of the word "man" as an epithet builds in intensity like a leitmotif. Her first reaction to Belford, when he visits her at the bailiff's house, stands as an indictment of his sex: "No--no--go, go, MAN!" (III, 446). In such a world, men and women must be continually at war with each other.[64] Haywood, with a similar perception of life, had proposed love as a means by which women could assert their personalities and live more or less as equals.[65] Clarissa's understanding of love is identical; her "idea of marriage is . . . that of a relationship between two people, whose compatibility is such that the woman finds no degradation in submitting to man's authority."[66] Melliora and D'Elmont, Frankville and Camilla, Annilia and Marathon, Philidore and Placentia all achieve such a marriage.

[62] Watt, p. 224. [63] Katharine Rogers, "Sensitive Feminism vs. Conventional Sympathy: Richardson and Fielding on Women," Novel, 9 (1976), 259. [64] See also Elizabeth R. Napier, "'Tremble and Reform': The Inversion of Power in Richardson's Clarissa," ELH, 42 (1975), 214-23. [65] See above, p. 274.
[66] Judith A. Simons, "The Treatment of Women in Select Novels From Richardson to Jane Austen," Diss. Manchester 1971, p. 89.

Richardson was not so optimistic for his characters. In his world, love is extremely rare and happiness, especially for women, virtually impossible.

It is to this vision of humanity that Fielding took exception. His criticism of Clarissa includes warm praise of Richardson's skills,[67] but it was written before the final installments had been published. Richardson told several of his correspondents "that Fielding was among those who wanted a happy ending to Clarissa."[68] Such an ending would have falsified Richardson's observations of reality, and he rightly kept to his original plan. Fielding refused to accept Richardson's version as truth, and once again he proposed an alternative in the form of a novel ostensibly based on the same theme, but differing radically in outlook and conclusion. The similarities in plot between Clarissa and Tom Jones have frequently been catalogued:[69] both novels concern a young woman who is the victim of parental tyranny and greed; both heroines are forced to receive the addresses of a wealthy, unpleasant hypocrite when they prefer an attractive man of dubious morals; both elope from the house where they are kept prisoner by their fathers. Yet the differences far outweigh the similarities. Fielding, in answer to Richardson's persistence, encorporated the happy ending into his own novel. The desired marriage takes place; the hypo-

[67] Jacobite's Journal, 2 January and 5 March, 1748. See also Fielding's letter to Richardson, 15 October 1748, quoted in Eaves and Kimpel, p. 295.

[68] Eaves and Kimpel, p. 295.

[69] See Watt, p. 298; Wagenknecht, p. 65, and Aurelian Digeon, The Novels of Fielding (London, 1925), pp. 148-51. See also the Wesleyan Tom Jones, ed. M. Battestin and F. Bowers, notes to pp. 793-94, p. 850 and p. 955.

crite is exposed, and the heroine is reconciled with her family. The hero earns, through his fortune, a respectable position in society, and "Whatever in the Nature of Jones had a Tendency to Vice, has been corrected by continual conversation with /Allworthy/, and by his Union with the lovely and virtuous Sophia."[70] While everyone who knew Clarissa mourns the date inscribed on her coffin, commemorating the day she put herself in Lovelace's power, "there is not a Neighbour, a Tenant, or a Servant, who doth not most gratefully bless the Day when Mr. Jones was married to his Sophia" (p. 982). In refusing to provide a happy ending, "Richardson protested against the rather too universal opinion that 'a reformed rake makes the best husband.' . . . The dénoument of Tom Jones conforms exactly to this idea."[71]

The reason that Fielding is able to write a comedy using much of the same material as Richardson's tragedy, the reason that his ending does not seem false and improbable, is that the world of Tom Jones is not one in which sex is an arena. Fielding's society is based primarily on good nature and chivalry; the main vices of his characters are greed and hypocrisy rather than the monomania for power found in Richardson. Sophia, like Fanny, is never really in any danger. Allworthy's insistence that he will not permit the marriage with Blifil unless Sophia consents willingly is an important safeguard, insurance against our taking her dilemma too much to heart. Blifil himself is a pallid villain. His hypocrisy always acts as a necessary curb to his malevolence with regard to Sophia. Knowing how much Allworthy values her happiness, he cannot

[70] Tom Jones, Wesleyan ed., p. 981. Further references will be given in the text.

[71] Digeon, p. 140.

be as brutal as he might wish in his haste to acquire her fortune. Nor is Sophia ever in any real danger of losing her "virtue." She is only seriously assaulted once, and Lord Fellamar is a true lover rather than a libertine. His reaction to the news that he has a rival is characteristic:

> "Upon my Word, Lady Bellaston . . . you have struck a damp to my Heart which hath almost deprived me of Being." "Fie! my Lord," said she, "I should rather hope I had struck Fire into you. A Lover, and talk of Damps in your Heart!" (p. 787)

It is Lady Bellaston who urges him to rape Sophia: "My dear Lord . . . you certainly want a cordial. . . . Fie upon it! have more Resolution. Are you frightened by the Word Rape?" (p. 794). He is too respectful and too humane to think of such a plan when left to himself, but Lady Bellaston, like Mrs. Sinclair and her "nieces," insults his pride and goads him into action. His actual attack consists more of words than of deeds (pp. 796-98), and it comes as no surprise when Sophia's father bursts in to save her. Jones's own vices are similarly ameliorated. He is far more a sensualist than Lovelace, and his sensuality is the result of good-nature rather than egotism. He delights in sex as an animal pleasure; his affair with Molly and his involvement with Mrs. Waters are entirely spontaneous. "Even the involvement with Lady Bellaston . . . come/s/ from Tom's compliant, affectionate disposition, a specific contrast to her mercenary wish to buy sex."[72] He never means to

[72] Golden, p. 56. John Middleton Murray advocates this same explanation in "In Defense of Fielding," Unprofessional Essays (London, 1956), p. 31.

offend, his hypocrisy is unintentional, and we never doubt the sincerity of his love for Sophia. "He never lays siege to a woman; it is always the women who beleaguer him."[73] But above all, Tom is never "manipulative."[74] Like Lovelace, sex for Tom is a manifestation of his will, but in his case it is "good will"[75] rather than a desire to assert authority.

In Clarissa and Tom Jones, whereas Richardson depicts the crucifixion of the individual by society, Fielding portrays the successful adaptation of the individual to society. . . . "[76] Carrying Haywood's conception of women's restriction inside that society to its logical extreme, Richardson created the ultimate eighteenth-century tragedy in a work which critically questions the values it portrays so well. Fielding denied the inevitability of those values, and in Tom Jones he presented Clarissa's exact counterpart, the ultimate social comedy. Yet both of these works are hyperbolic; the characters represent exaggerated virtues and vices, and the plots offer examples of extremes in luck and fortune. Consequently, they are no closer to addressing the problems of ordinary reality than Haywood's more succinctly symbolic novels. Literature had to become more responsive to those problems, and more representative of quotidian emotions and behaviour. Haywood, always attuned to the vicissitudes of popular taste, recognized that, great as they were, Tom Jones and Clarissa still failed to satisfy a basic need in the reading public. Learning from them both, she went on to take the first steps towards fulfilling it herself.

[73] Murry, p. 31. [74] Golden, p. 56. [75] Golden, p. 57. [76] Watt, p. 270.

XII

DOMESTIC ROMANCE: Betsy Thoughtless

Both Clarissa and Tom Jones were in many respects dead ends as far as the development of the novel was concerned. Each was the culmination of an already well-established trend in fiction. It took the experimenting genius of Eliza Haywood to chart a new direction, and this she did in her finest work, The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless (1751). It is customary among literary historians to regard Haywood's writing, particularly that which she published after 1740, as entirely derivative.[1] In the light of received opinion, my claim for her may seem rash, but on examination will not, I think, prove unfounded. I have already discussed the ways in which she contributed to the dialectic between Richardson and Fielding regarding the nature of "the new species of writing"; in that dialectic, particularly in The Fortunate Foundlings, Haywood took a middle ground between Richardson's tragic stance, and Fielding's comic one.[2] When, in their masterpieces, the two men produced classic examples of eighteenth-century tragedy

[1] See Adburgham, p. 104; A. S. Collins, "English Reading Public," p. 292; Dobrée, p. 409; Brian W. Downs, Richardson (London, 1928), p. 204; E. A. Baker, III, 114; Ernle, p. 186; Morgan, p. 102; Wagenknecht, p. 41; MacCarthy, p. 241; Clara Whitmore, Women's Work in English Fiction, p. 36; Lovett and Hughes, p. 50; Leavis, p. 131 and Dobson, "Polly Honeycombe," p. 92. Elton (p. 161) and Leavis (p. 137) do point out that to call it an imitation is to oversimplify.

[2] See above, pp. 355-61.

and comedy, Haywood saw that her territory would bear most fruit, and that her most effective method would be cross-breeding. To produce her hybrid, she first had to consider the defining qualities of the two parent genres, the most important of which were concerned with character and the relationship between an individual and society:

> While the tragic hero "changes" (that is, comes eventually to a new and revolutionary realization of what he is and what he has done), the characters of comedy are laid under no artistic obligation to "change," since the reason for their . . . existence is that they may be exposed, in their "true" natures, to the eyes of other men. . . .[3]

In other words, a tragic character grows through an awareness of being alienated from his or her world; a comic character, rather than growing, is caused to become incorporated into that world by public recognition of what he or she was all along. What Haywood wrote, in Betsy Thoughtless, was a novel in which her heroine uses her developing self-awareness to enable her to adapt to society, thus combining the most important aspects of each fictional type. In order to understand Haywood's achievement in her finest work, it is necessary first to analyse it in considerable detail. This close analysis will provide the basis of my later discussion of her developing themes and techniques. It will also, I believe, offer proof that Betsy Thoughtless is not only a useful artifact in the study of the novel's history, but an entertaining and percep-

[3] Dorothy Van Ghent, The English Novel: Form and Function (New York, 1953), p. 67.

tive work in its own right.

From the beginning of the novel, Betsy is presented as having "a great deal of good-nature, and somewhat engaging in her manner of behaviour. . . . "[4] She has been sheltered by her father in the country, and Haywood is careful to root her heroine's later conduct firmly in the soil of her childhood. When her good nature and innocence lead her into friendship with Miss Forward, she is eager to oblige her by helping her carry on a flirtation with a young neighbour. "This gave her an early light into the art and mystery of courtship, and consequently a relish for admiration" (I, 4). Miss Forward is a born coquette, and Betsy has ample opportunity to witness "all the airs the other gave herself on this occasion, and the artifices she made use of, in order to secure the continuance of his addresses" (I, 7). When the young lovers are discovered, the impressionable accomplice is handled in exactly the wrong way.

> Miss Betsy might, possibly, have sooner forgot the little artifices she had seen practiced by Miss Forward, if her governess, by too strenuously endeavouring to convince her how unbecoming they were, had not reminded her of them. (I, 9)

But above all, at this early age, Betsy lives up to her surname:

> She was not of a humour to give herself much pains in examining, or weighing in the balance of judgment, the merit of the arguments she heard urged, whether for or against any point whatsoever. She had a great

[4] The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless (London, 1751), I, 3. Further references will be given in the text.

> deal of wit, but was too volatile for reflection, and as a ship without sufficient ballast, is tossed about at the pleasure of every wind that blows, so was she hurried through the ocean of life, just as each predominant passion directed. (I, 10-11)

When her father dies, she is sent to live with Mr. Goodman and his wife, Lady Mellasin, in London. To a young woman who has known only "such diversions as the country afforded" (I, 2), London is a dream world formed for her own delight. She enters into "society" with zest and enthusiasm, and the long process of changing that surname from Thoughtless to Trueworth is begun.

Again Haywood explains Betsy's vulnerability to her environment: she "was now just entering into her fourteenth year,--a nice and delicate time, in persons of her sex; since it is then they are most apt to take the bent of impression" (I, 19). Unfortunately, she is amiable and attractive, well-off and genteel, and thus lacks "nothing to render her liable to the greatest temptations" (I, 19), and the greatest dangers, that London can offer. Almost immediately she attracts a crowd of admirers among which Saving, the son of an alderman, soon distinguishes himself as a true lover. Her reaction to him is characteristic:

> It was not till after Miss Betsy had reason to believe she had engaged the heart of her lover too far for him to recall it, that she began to take a pride in tormenting him. While she looked on his addresses as of a piece with those who called themselves her admirers, she had treated him in that manner which she thought would most conduce to make him really so; but no sooner did she perceive . . . that his passion was of the most serious nature, than she behaved to him in a fashion quite the reverse, especially before company; for as she had not the least affection, or even a liking towards him, his submissive deportment under the most cold, sometimes contemptuous carriage, could afford her no other satisfaction, than, as she fancied

> it shewed the power of her beauty, and piqued those ladies of her acquaintance, who could not boast of such an implicit resignation and patient suffering from their lovers. . . . (I, 23-24)

The correspondence between her own behaviour and that which she observed in Miss Forward is obvious; she, too, delights in giving pain, and in imposing her whims on the will of someone who professes to be devoted to her. Master Saving brings out "that vanity so natural to a youthful mind" (I, 22), but a careful reading of this passage reveals that it is not vanity alone, even at this stage, which motivates Betsy. Her treatment of Saving is described as mildly sadistic, and, like all sadists, she is attracted by the power she has to give or withhold both pleasure and pain, rather than by the pain itself. In other words, what she enjoys is not so much Saving's actual sufferings, but her knowledge that she is dangling him on wires like a puppet, that what she wills, he acts. In this she greatly resembles Lovelace, who himself uses puppet imagery about the Harlowes.[5]

At this point, it is easy to interpret Betsy's concern with her own will as the exuberant egotism of youth, especially since Haywood provides a persistent red herring in her heroine's appellation. Betsy remains Thoughtless in name throughout the first three volumes of the novel, but she is forced to think almost immediately, and at great length, about the consequences of her actions. Her eagerness to excite admiration, joined with a desire to make Sa-

[5] Clarissa, I, 147.

ving jealous, has led her to behave with particular friendliness to Gayland, a fashionable young spark who has "too great an admiration for his own person to be possessed of any great share of it for that of any other" (I, 28). He interprets her friendliness according to the London code of conduct, and Betsy is astonished to discover that a billet she receives from him is not the "sonnet or epistle in praise of her beauty" which she expects, but a letter of assignation which begins, "I must certainly be either the most ungrateful, or most consumedly dull fellow upon earth, not to have returned the advances you have been so kind to make me. . . . " (I, 29). She is outraged at his presumption, yet a "consciousness of having by a too free behaviour towards him, emboldened him to take this liberty, involved her in the utmost confusion. . . ." (I, 30), and she is forced to reflect.

> Never was a night passed in more cruel anxieties than what she sustained, both from the affront she received, and reflection that it was chiefly the folly of her own conduct which had brought it on her. . . . She was ashamed to relate the story to any of the discreet and serious part of her acquaintance;--she feared their reproofs for having counterfeited a tenderness for a man, which she was now sensible she ought, if it had been real, rather have concealed with the utmost care both from him and all the world. . . . (I, 31)

Here is the conduct book injunction actually in a context. Betsy's sudden appreciation of the value of prudence has less to do with innate femininity than with her realization that men seem only too willing to take advantage of what they perceive to be women's feelings. The implication of her reflections is that to encourage a lover or admit tenderness, even to a worthy man, is wrong not merely because it is not her place to do so, and not only because

it may involve her in an unsuitable engagement, but because men are fundamentally opportunists. Armed with this insight, she feels momentarily superior to her antagonist:

> The surest guardians of my fame and peace . . . is the little share of understanding I am mistress of, which, I hope, will always be sufficient to defend my honour in more dangerous attacks, than the rude impertinencies of an idle coxcomb. (I, 33)

However, she is soon compelled to reflect even more deeply, first by the behaviour of Flora, Lady Mellasin's daughter, in which "she saw, as in a mirror, her own late follies" (I, 36), and then by contrasting a respectful, delicate, almost obsequious letter from Saving with Gayland's businesslike arrogance.

Soon afterwards, Betsy acquires the advisor she wanted in Lady Trusty, the wife of her other guardian. When she hears of Betsy's difficulties and of her resolution to depend on her own honour, she condemns self-sufficiency:

> Nor can it be esteemed prudence to run oneself into dangers merely to show our strength in overcoming them; nor, perhaps, would even the victory turn always to our glory: the world is censorious, and seldom ready to put the best construction on things; so that reputation may suffer, though virtue triumphs. (I, 60)

Lady Trusty is society's mouthpiece, and her concern with appearances amounts to the conventional wisdom of courtesy literature. At this stage of her development, Betsy is inclined to ignore her; rejecting Lady Trusty's invitation to spend the summer in the country, she goes to Oxford with her brother Frank and there experiences the first serious threat to her honour or reputation. While taking

an outing with Flora, Betsy meets a "gentleman-commoner" whose facile use of "romantic" language at once gives his game away to the reader:

> "Heaven!" cried he, "how divinely do you now appear? The Goddess of the Spring, nor Venus's self, was ever painted half so beautiful. What eyes!--what a mouth! --and what a shape!" continued he, surveying her, as it were from head to foot, "how exquisitely turned!-- how taper!--how slender!" (I, 85-86)

Haywood's use of language in this passage is extremely skilful. The student's romantic rhetoric at the beginning of his speech reveals that he is out to manipulate her in some way, while the second half, with its gradual physical emphasis, tells us what that way might be. Betsy, who is sensible and intelligent, reacts spontaneously by ridiculing what she perceives as nonsense. She is far too innocent herself to catch the deeper meaning of his words.

> "O fie upon it," said Miss Betsy, laughing, "this poetry is stale; I should rather have expected from an Oxonian some fine thing of his own extempore, on this occasion, which, perhaps, I might have been vain enough to have got printed in the monthly Magazines!" (I, 86)

She seems to have forgotten her earlier insight about the nature of the opposite sex. Consequently, she is totally unprepared for the student's attack:

> As she was opening her mouth to utter some sarcasm or other, he catched her in his arms, and began to kiss her with so much warmth and eagerness that surprised her. (I, 87)

He attempts to rape her, but she is rescued by her brother. The result of this instance of her "thoughtlessness" is that Frank is injured in a duel, and she and Flora are frozen out of Oxford by women who "are more than ordinarily circumspect in their behaviour" (I, 107).

On her return to London, Betsy is again confronted with the possibility of marriage, and her attitude seems sensible and carefully considered rather than frivolous:

> She had too much good sense not to know it suited not with the condition of a wife to indulge herself in the gaieties she at present did, which though innocent, and, as she thought, becoming enough in the present state she now was, might not be altogether so pleasing to one, who, if so he thought proper, had the power of restraining them. In fine, she looked upon a serious behaviour as unsuitable to one of her years, and therefore resolved not to enter into a condition which demanded some share of it, at least for a long time. . . . (I, 128-29)

In other words, she is not yet ready to submit to anyone else's authority. Haywood uses terms like "vanity" to describe Betsy's desire to remain socially active, but at bottom it amounts to an unwillingness to be submissive. Before marriage, she is in a position to command admiration and to exact submission herself.

> As the barometer, said she to herself, is governed by the weather, so is the man in love governed by the woman he admires: He is a mere machine,--acts nothing of himself,--has no will or power of his own, but is lifted up, or depressed, just as the charmer of his heart is in the humour. (I, 143)

After marriage, the two positions are exactly reversed; it is the woman who has no will or power of her own. Betsy's idea of love

also reflects her insistence on maintaining the upper hand.

> "I verily believe I shall never be in love; but if I am, it must be a long length of time, and a series of persevering assiduities must make me so." Mr. Goodman told her, these were only romantic notions. . . . (I, 195)

They are indeed romantic, not only because they are unrealistic in conventional terms, but because they involve a fantasy in which Betsy, as heroine, remains the center of attention and has ultimate power over those whom the real world would place over her. Thus her vanity is really a delight in her independent spirit. Betsy's reaction to Miss Forward's story of seduction and betrayal adds strength to this interpretation.

> 'Tis strange . . . that a woman cannot indulge herself in the liberty of conversing with a man, without being persuaded by him to do every thing he would have her. (I, 180)

She further reflects on Flora's intrigue with Gayland, and cannot understand what could induce a woman to sacrifice her honour. She also pities both her friends, and tries to find excuses for their lapses.

> But, amidst sentiments as noble, and as generous, as ever heart was possessed of, vanity, that foible of her soul, crept in. . . . She had never been thoroughly attacked in a dishonourable way, but by Gayland, and the gentleman-commoner at Oxford; both of whom she rebuffed with a becoming disdain. In this she secretly exulted, and had that dependence on her power of repelling all the efforts, come they in what shape soever, that should be made against her virtue, that she thought it beneath her to behave so as not to be in danger of incurring them. (I, 182)

Clearly, vanity in this case is spiritual pride; Betsy feels superior to her fallen sisters, and cannot believe that she is equally vulnerable to attack. She believes that she is self-sufficient, needing neither advice nor protection, confident in her own strength and enjoying the freedom which, she believes, that strength gives her. Therefore it is her vanity, as we have defined it, that allows her, even encourages her, to ignore the guidance of Lady Trusty and Mr. Goodman, and to treat men with the same freedom she shows towards other women. As Flora says, "'Tis like Miss Betsy Thoughtless, . . . and only like herself, to go abroad with a man alone" (I, 272). Other women might stay securely at home, or like Flora herself, meet men privately. Betsy is honest and straightforward, and for that she is condemned.

Betsy is soon involved in other, more serious adventures. Mr. Staple and Mr. Trueworth are both proposed to her as husbands, one by Mr. Goodman and one by Frank. Her aversion to marriage causes her to treat them with equal affability, until they fight a duel over her and Staple resigns his claim. While wandering around Westminster Abbey with several sparks, she becomes involved in a quarrel between two of them which leads to another duel. She also discovers that Flora is base and treacherous, which puts her on her guard in one quarter, at least. However, the primary interest of this section of the novel is her relationship with Trueworth, whom all her friends urge her to marry. In this instance, Lady Trusty's advice, which again reflects conventional wisdom, is particularly revealing:

> There are so many daily instances of the strictest

> caution not being always a sufficient security against the snares laid for our destruction, that I look upon it as half a miracle, when a young woman, handsome, and exposed as you are, escapes unprejudiced, either in her virtue or reputation. . . . You have no tender mother, whose precepts and example might keep you steady in the paths of prudence;--no father, whose authority might awe the daring libertine from any injurious attack; and are but too much mistress of yourself.--In fine, thus environed with temptations, I see no real defence for you but in a good husband. (II, 53-54)

This is the prudential doctrine of the conduct books taken to an extreme. Lady Trusty, a practical woman presented with considerable sympathy, sees life as an eternal war between men and women. Whereas Betsy is idealistic, in the sense that she does not automatically assume that every male has dishonourable designs on her, her mentor is worldly-wise. Lady Trusty's notion of marriage is not one in which the woman's happiness or fulfilment is the chief end; rather, wives are given over into the protective custody of their husbands. It seems a strange sort of war in which males are both the enemy of woman and her only defense against that enemy, but that is the idea which is repeated throughout the novel.[6] Betsy replies to this advice that she is aware that she has inadvertently exposed herself to danger, and that some day she will probably be glad to marry Trueworth, "but I know not how it is, I cannot at once bring myself into a liking of the marriage state" (II, 65). She is too intelligent not to be aware that Lady Trusty's idea of marriage is little better than voluntary incarceration. Knowing herself, and fully aware of her duties

[6] See, for example, III, 9-10, 12, 28, 112 and 131.

once a wife, she wisely chooses to wait until she feels capable of undertaking marriage.

The relationship between Betsy and Trueworth is the most complex in the novel. When he is first introduced, he seems a model of elegant and respectful gallantry, giving her a tame squirrel because he noticed that she enjoyed watching one the first time he met her. She appreciates his thoughtfulness, but is shy of taking it seriously:

> "I love him excessively! You could not have made me a more obliging present."
> "How, Madam!" cried he, "I should be miserable indeed, if I had nothing in my power to offer more worthy your acceptance than that animal.--What think you, Madam, of an adoring and passionately devoted heart?"
> "A heart! . . . oh dear, a heart may be a pretty thing for ought I know to the contrary; but there is such an enclosure of flesh and bone about it, that it is utterly impossible for me to see into it, and consequently to know whether I like it or not." (I, 224-5)

Deflating the metaphorical language of love seems to be one of Betsy's favourite pastimes, and although Trueworth is not a ridiculous figure, as is Sir Frederick Fineer, his passion frequently leads him into similarly extravagant speech.[7]

> He began to represent, in the most pathetic terms he was able, the true felicity that two people, who loved each other, might enjoy when remote from the noise and interruptions of a throng of giddy visitors.--"The deity of soft desires . . . flies the confused glare of pomp and public shews;--'tis in the shady bowers, or on the banks of a sweet purling stream, he spreads

[7] See below, pp. 395-96.

> his downy wings, and wafts ten thousand nameless pleasures on the fond,--the innocent,--the happy pair."
>
> He was going on, but she interrupted him with a loud laugh;--"Hold,--hold . . . was there ever such a romantic description?--I wonder how such silly ideas came into your head?--Shady bowers! and purling streams!--Heavens, how insipid!--Well, . . . you may be the Strephon of the Woods, if you think fit, but I shall never envy the happiness of the Chloe that accompanies you in these fine recesses.--What! to be cooped up like a tame dove, only to coo,--and bill--and breed;--O, it would be a delicious life indeed!
>
> (II, 88-89)

There are two separate conflicts under discussion in this passage. The most important, from the point of view of Betsy's development, is that between her preference for life in the whirl of London, and her lover's delight in pastoral pursuits. Betsy's flippancy reveals yet again her unwillingness to exchange a way of life in which she is the center of attention for one in which she would be, she assumes, a mere satellite to her husband. Inherent in the peace of country life is a resolution to the problem of her independence and authority which she prefers not to contemplate. That she would no longer be the object of admiration and flattery, those delightful accompaniments to her "power" over men, is a further convincing argument against what Trueworth proposes. However, Betsy's sarcasm at that proposal is far from unsympathetic to the reader; we are inclined to laugh with her at his high-flown rhetoric and admire the wit with which she punctures it. The reason for this ambivalence, I believe, is that the language of romance places a barrier between men and women. Throughout Haywood's fiction, whenever men are most extravagant in their speech, they are least to be trusted. It seems that Trueworth "ventures to be romantic in

an attempt to win her over";[8] even to us his arguments sound strained and insincere. Betsy's response is not just another instance of her vain desire to contradict and cause pain to someone who loves her. It also expresses the skepticism of her down-to-earth intelligence when confronted with a language and an attitude which apparently bear no relation to the world she knows.

However, even when Trueworth is first introduced, Betsy is not always flippant about him.

> Enemy as she was by nature to serious reflection, on any account, much more on that of marriage, . . . she could not avoid seeing and confessing within herself, that if she ever became a wife, the title could not be attended with more felicity, than when conferred on her by a person of Mr. Trueworth's fortune, character and disposition. (II, 71)

This is an important admission, for she has never before acknowledged a preference. Staple is as suitable a candidate for her hand as his rival, but when they duel, she is tricked into revealing that although she feels esteem for him, it is Trueworth she loves. Unfortunately, Betsy's independence and Trueworth's almost condescending impulse to instruct are obviously incompatible. The quarrel which eventually leads to their marrying two other people begins when he presumes to advise her not to visit Miss Forward, who is by this time "a common prostitute," though Betsy herself has been deceived by her friend and believes her to be reformed. As one would expect, Trueworth's presumption angers her:

[8] Christina Bishay, "Aspects of the Domestic Novel (1693-1753)," Diss. Manchester 1961, p. 91.

> Mr. Trueworth, if you desire to continue on good terms with me, you must forbear to interfere with what company I keep, nor pretend to prescribe rules for my conduct, at least 'till you have more right to do so. (II, 105)

She believes that she has sole right to control her own life, and takes exception to what she regards as a usurpation of that authority. Indeed, it is primarily because she is unwilling to resign her autonomy that she refuses to marry him at once. On the other hand, Trueworth cannot perceive this about her, and understands only that she is ignoring his good counsel in order to persist in a foolish course of action. The scene between them is passionate and angry, and it ends with him walking out, slamming a door metaphorically behind him:

> "Farewell, Sir," said she, . . . "When I want a spy to inspect, or a governor to direct my actions, the choice, perhaps, may fall on you." . . . "The choice, Madam, perhaps, may not be in your hands to make." (II, 108)

His retort is particularly effective, in that it reminds Betsy that her "power" is only illusory; in all the important areas of life, she is more or less at the mercy of men.

Her illusions are finally shattered when, in the days following this quarrel, Trueworth receives Flora's anonymous letter and "confirms" the accusation it contains, that Betsy is the mother of an illegitimate child. His sudden absence, combined with her own greater appreciation of the advice which caused the rift, leads her again into unaccustomed reflections.

> I wonder . . . what is become of Trueworth. . . . Indeed I used him a little ill at our last conversation; --but what of that? If he loves me, as well as he professes, he will not sure pretend to be affronted at any thing I do.--My brother desires me to give his compliments, but if the man will not come to receive them, 'tis none of my fault;--yet after all, . . . what privilege has our sex to insult and tyrannize over the men?--it is certainly both ungenerous and ungrateful to use them the worse, for using us, perhaps, better than we deserve.--Mr. Trueworth is a man of sense, and, if I were in his place, I would not take such treatment from any woman in the world.--I could not much blame him if he never saw me more.--Well,--when next he comes, I will, however, behave to him with more respect. (II, 188-89)

There is an interesting progression in this soliloquy. She begins, as Haywood says, in "the idle humour of a vain coquette" (II, 189), confident of her power to attract and to abuse, delighting in the role of mistress over her poor slave. In this humour she is able to joke about his apparent desertion. Then, momentarily perceiving how her behaviour must appear to him, she is able to put herself in his place and is appalled at her own tyranny. What she objects to in his conduct towards her, is his untoward desire to control her life, yet she suddenly realizes that she is being equally unreasonable in her demands for homage and fealty. She would be the same proud and independent person whichever gender she was, and, consequently, she is able to see the injustice of her own double standard. She resolves to reform, though the way she phrases that resolution communicates her utter certainty that Trueworth <u>will</u> come again, a certainty which indicates that she still believes in the power of her own attractiveness and her dominion over his affections. She is never given the opportunity to test her resolution. Trueworth has been convinced, first by a "long succession of repeated inadvertencies" (II, 113) and

then by the damning appearance of her charity to the baby in the country, that "her manner of behaviour would ill suit with the character he wished should always be maintained by the woman he made choice of for a wife" (II, 196). He writes her a cryptic, almost rude letter which she, of course, cannot fully understand, breaking off their courtship. She is stunned, and unaware of what he considers her worst fault, she magnifies those of which she does know. She is still unwilling to be married, but she again admits to herself that if marriage were forced upon her, she would yield "with less reluctance in favour of Mr. Trueworth, than of any other she yet had seen" (II, 209). The irony is that she will have marriage forced upon her, and will be compelled to accept a man who is Trueworth's inferior in every respect.

Trueworth's concern for Betsy does begin to bear fruit, although only after he has renounced her entirely. She could not submit to him at the time, but

> the few remonstrances Miss Betsy would vouchsafe to listen to from Mr. Trueworth, had a much greater effect upon her mind, than her pride, and the excessive homage she expected from her lovers, would suffer to make shew of, or than he himself imagined. (II, 109)

Because she does love him, she values what he tells her, especially after her friendship with Miss Forward involves her in another serious attempt on her honour. One of her male companions at Miss Forward's, seeing that she is intimate with a notorious prostitute, takes her for another. While he is seeing her home, he kisses her and, when she protests, offers her a settlement of six guineas a

week if she will remain constant to him (II, 117). She manages to convince him of her honesty, but the shock of being treated in such a fashion serves amply to prove Trueworth's point. For the first time she is truly humbled, "and in this fit of humiliation and repentance, would even have asked Mr. Trueworth's pardon for the little regard she had paid to his advice" (II, 124). She has no opportunity to do so, but she does break off all contact with Miss Forward. Her fit of repentance is not the momentary change of mood her others have been; she is learning to trust neither her own capacity for self-preservation nor the good-will and honourable intentions of other people. She renews her friendship with Miss Mabel, a young woman of great integrity and decorum whom she has avoided whenever her vanity and independence have taken over her conduct. A visit to the theater to see The Careless Husband affects her deeply, as she sees herself and Trueworth in the main roles; "she came home full of the most serious reflections, on the folly of indulging an idle vanity, at the expense of a man of honour and sincerity" (II, 211). It is in this chastened frame of mind that she meets Sir Frederick Fineer, who provides her next major trial.

Sir Frederick and the incident in which he is involved are considered anomalous by some critics. The valet disguised as a baronet who lures Betsy into a sham marriage is regarded either as a throwback to Haywood's earlier works,[9] or as a development of the picaresque.[10] In either case, he is explained as a roman-

[9] Erickson, p. 121.

[10] MacCarthy, p. 244.

tic aberration in what is otherwise a realistic, domestic novel. This explanation seems to miss the point. It is true that Fineer is a throwback, but the anachronism is deliberate; Haywood provides her heroine with a suitor who, in his enthusiasm, adopts all the trappings of courtship in the heroic romance. Betsy has had strongly mixed feelings about the sort of lover she wants. She has demanded sycophancy in her admirers, yet at the same time, she is always slightly scornful of their servility. Fineer provides her with the opportunity finally to make up her mind, for he is the submissive, obliging lover par excellence:

> "Your house is become a temple, and this is the divinity that honours it with her presence;--this Graecian Venus."--Miss Betsy . . . answered briskly, "if you mean the compliment to me, Sir, the Graecian Venuses are all painted fat, and I have no resemblance of that perfection." "Only in your face, Madam," returned he; --"such sparkling eyes,--such a complexion,--such a mouth;--in your shape you are a Helen of Troy." "That Helen of Troy," said Miss Betsy, with an ironical smile, "I think was a Graecian princess, and must also be fat, or she would not have been reputed a beauty there."
>
> The Baronet . . . thought to salve up the matter by saying, "Sure you are Diana then." "Worse and worse," cried Miss Betsy;--"I beseech you, Sir, compare me to no such boisterous goddess, that runs up and down, bare footed and bare legged, hunting wild boars in the forest!" (II, 283-84)

Undaunted by her sarcasm, he persists, and in his next epistle "she found herself more deified than ever she had been, by all her lovers put together" (III, 5-6). He professes his adoration, he places his fate in her hands, and he requests her to tell him whether he must live or die, just like the heroes of the French

romances.[11] Each letter is more extravagant than the last, and once he even sends her "A true picture of my heart, in the different stages of its Worship, A Poem" (III, 43-44). When they actually meet,

> Never was such an Orlando Furioso in love; . . . whatever he said to her was on his knees:--he threw himself prostrate on the carpet before her, grasped her feet, and tenderly kissed each shoe, with the same vehemence, as he could have done her lips, and as much devotion as the pilgrims at Rome do the pantofle of his Holiness.--Darts!--Flames!--Immortal joys!--Death!--Despair!--Heaven!--Hell!--ever-during woe; and all the epithets in the whole vocabulary of Cupid's legend, began and ended every sentence of his discourse. (III, 36-37)

The ruse with which he lures her to his chamber is equally "romantic." He pretends to have stabbed himself in despair at her rejection and requests one last blessing before he dies.

Betsy's reaction to Sir Frederick tends, as we have seen, towards ridicule and sarcasm, but it is not as simple and straightforward as it might seem. Although he does take submission to an unpleasant extreme, it is still flattering on one level to the girl whose power over men has become to her the symbol of independence and spiritual integrity.

> She wondered, as indeed she had good reason, that a man of his birth, and who it must be supposed had an education suitable to it, should express himself in such odd terms; but then she was tempted to imagine, that it was only his over-care to please her, had made him stretch his wit beyond its natural extent,

[11] See above, p.101.

> and that if he had loved her less, he would have been able to have told her so in a much better style. (III, 7)

Moreover, although she realizes that Sir Frederick is "a vain, silly and affected coxcomb, . . . this coxcomb had a vast estate, and the enchanting ideas of the figure she should make, if in possession of it, in some measure outbalanced the contempt she had of the owner's person, and understanding. . . ." (III, 35). To have conquered a wealthy baronet is proof of her power which she almost cannot resist. However, she is protected by the same integrity which so often has plunged her into difficulty:

> The thoughts of being sacrificed to a man for whom it was impossible for her to have either love, or esteem; --to be obliged to yield that through duty, which inclination shuddered at, struck a sudden damp to all the rising fires of pride and ambition in her soul, and convinced her that greatness would be too dearly purchased at the expense of peace. (III, 35)

"In short, though she could not consent to sacrifice herself to his quality, she took a pride to sacrifice his quality to her vanity" (III, 2). She does take a certain pleasure in his effusions even though she despises him for them.

It would not seem as though Betsy has really changed very much; she still allows her pride in exacting admiration to dominate her better judgment. However, she has learned to be more skeptical about men. She is not entirely satisfied with Sir Frederick's deportment even when she is most impressed by his title. He seems "stiff and awkward, and looked, as if not made for his clothes," and we have already remarked the exaggerated romantic bombast which

passes as his conversation. Her suspicions are aroused when he proposes to elope with her and is further alarmed when he expresses surprise that she is not entirely at her own disposal. He requests her not to tell her brothers about his suit, and she is prevented from doing so by trouble over Mr. Goodman's will. But when Fineer renews his request in a letter, she is convinced he is a knave and informs him by way of the dressmaker who introduced them, that she is "above encouraging a secret correspondence with any man, on what pretence soever it may be requested. . . . " (III, 162). She adds that if he attempts to see her again, she will inform her brothers. In the self-righteous glow which surrounds her after this decision, she even turns down an invitation to go out with Miss Airish when she sees that their companions are to be two men of dubious morals. Then the dressmaker tells her that Fineer has stabbed himself in despair and refuses to see a parson until she has come and visited him once more. To die without receiving absolution is a terrible sin, and Betsy's goodness and charity compel her to agree without a moment's hesitation. It is particularly ironic that the action which provokes the crisis of her fate involves no vanity or pride of any kind. Although her action is extremely imprudent, she goes to Fineer out of simple kindness for a fellow creature. In the confusion in his bedchamber she is hurried into a mock marriage, and is rescued from Fineer in the nick of time by Trueworth, who reveals that the Baronet is really a valet, and a criminal.

It is this last incident which truly mortifies Betsy's spirit. For one who had thought herself strong enough and powerful enough to subdue any attack, she has suffered the ultimate ignominy; she

has been tricked into vulnerability. She has also discovered that she is not self-sufficient, and her chagrin is intensified by the fact that her rescuer is the man who has rejected her. Her pride is hurt because it is Trueworth, who had formerly cautioned her and tried to prevent her from exposing herself to danger, who snatches her from the unpleasant consequences of her refusal to heed him.

> All her pride,--her gaiety--her vanity of attracting admiration;--in fine, all that had composed her former character, seemed now to be lost and swallowed up in the sense of that bitter shame and contempt, in which she imagined herself involved, and she wished for nothing but to be unseen, unregarded, and utterly forgotten, by all that had ever known her. (III, 225)

Her brothers, alarmed at this latest instance of what they consider Betsy's folly, are even more anxious to see her safely married, and they begin to apply the pressure which eventually results in her marriage to Munden. She hopes against all odds that Trueworth will renew his suit, not knowing that he is already engaged to Harriot Loveit, and manages to buy the miniature which he had commissioned for his bride. When she discovers that he is married, she finally, and reluctantly, submits to the wishes of her family.

George Munden is the perfect adversary for Betsy Thoughtless. As his name suggests, "le monde" is his primary concern, and he is as particular about appearances as Betsy is careless. He is a shrewd, calculating man, and he reads her temperament perfectly.

> He knew very well, that persons in power seldom failed to exercise it over those, who had any dependence on them; and looking on the case of a lover with his mistress, as the same with one who is solliciting for a

> pension, or employment, had armed himself with patience, to submit to every thing his tyrant should inflict, in the hope, that it would one day be his turn to impose laws. . . . (II, 228)

Betsy's awareness of the power struggle implicit in courtship is identical:

> What extravagancies does it /love/ . . . sometimes make men guilty of!--yet one never sees this madness in them after they become husbands. (III, 7-8)

They also share an immunity to love's torments and uncertainties; he manipulates their relationship as vigorously as she does. Because he does not love her,

> he could act over all the delicacies of the most tender passion, without being truly sensible of any of them, and though he wished . . . nothing so much as attaining the affections of Miss Betsy, yet wishing it without those timid inquietudes,--those jealous doubts,--those perplexing anxieties, . . . he was more capable of behaving towards her the way she liked. (II, 229)

Like Betsy, the only thing he takes pride in is himself, and he is as jealous of his appearance in society as she is of her power over her lovers. Although she is frequently imperious towards him, the only time he protests is when she refuses to see him at the dressmaker's house; in that case her rebuff is public, and he feels that he has been made to look a fool. Throughout their long, uneven courtship he is only uneasy when he believes that he has lost dignity in the eyes of other people.

It is his worldliness which explains his perseverance after

so many slights and postponements.

> All his acquaintance knew he had courted her a long time;--some of them had been witness of her treatment of him, and he was unwilling it should be said of him, that he had made an offer of his heart in vain. (III, 266)

Even his reasons for courting her are worldly in their aim. He never loves her, but

> he had at first, indeed, a liking of her person;--he had considered her beauty, wit, and the many accomplishments she was possessed of, were such as would render his choice applauded by the world. The hopes of gaining her in a short time, by the encouragement she had given his addresses, had made him pursue her with vigour; but the delays,--the scruples, the capriciousness of her humour,--the pretences she made to avoid giving him a definite answer, had at length palled all the inclination he once had for her, and even desire was deadened in him, on so many disappointments. (III, 266)

Naturally, her escape from Fineer and the gossip it must inevitably engender would not endear Betsy to such a man.

> As soft and complaisant as he carried it off, . . . /he/ was very much disgusted . . . at her late behaviour;--he found she loved him not, and was far from having any violent inclination for her himself; but the motives, which had made him persevere in his courtship, after being convinced of the indifference she had for him, made him also impatient to bring the affair to as speedy a result as possible. (IV, 18)

When he is finally told that she has accepted his proposals and is committed beyond the possibility of withdrawing, sheer relief enables him to counterfeit the ardent transports expected of him,

and despite Betsy's misgivings, they are duly married.

Munden's character more or less guarantees that Betsy's marriage will be unhappy. She is shrewd enough to realize "that all the mighty passion he had pretended to have . . . for her, while in the days of courtship, was too weak to enable him to bear the least contradiction from her, now he became a husband" (IV, 44). The arena in which their marital battles are fought is the larder rather than the bedroom; money takes the place of sex as the means by which a man can tyrannize over his woman. After his marriage, he entertains lavishly for a month or two. Then when he realizes that his fortune is dwindling, he chooses to keep up appearances by maintaining his "amusements" abroad, but becoming "excessively parsimonious at home" (IV, 42-43). In the beginning he is content merely to skimp on Betsy's housekeeping allowance, and she has

> too much generosity, and indeed too much pride . . . to endure that there should be any want in so necessary an article of life, and as often as she found occasion, would have recourse for a supply to her own little purse. (IV, 43)

He soon begins "to encroach upon her right" (IV, 50), by demanding first that she pay for certain household expenses out of her "pin-money," and then that she take on the livery and board of her footman. Following Lady Trusty's advice, Betsy resolves to do her best with what he permits her. She provides a table within the limits of her budget, and when Munden one day brings home an unexpected guest who is a man of some importance, the scantiness of the provisions is highly embarrassing to them all. When the guest

leaves, Munden explodes:

> he no sooner was at liberty to say what he thought proper, without incurring the censure of being unmannerly or unkind, than he began to reproach her in the most cruel and unjust terms, for having . . . exposed him to the contempt and ridicule of a person, who had hitherto held him in the highest estimation. (IV, 56-57)

As usual, his sole concern is the opinion of "the world," while Betsy is disturbed at his threat to her integrity. They engage in a long argument in which she attempts to assert her rights, both as a wife and as a human being. Once again, he orders her to pay for various household expenses out of her pin-money.

> What usage was this for a young lady, scarce yet three months married,--endued with every qualification to create love and esteem,--accustomed to receive nothing but testimonies of admiration from as many as beheld her, and addressed with the extremest homage and tenderness, by the very man who now seemed to take pride in the power he had obtained of thwarting her humour, and dejecting that spirit and vivacity he had so lately pretended to adore. (IV, 59)

Munden is a particularly brutal man, whose pride in appearance forces him to contain himself in public. In this scene with his wife he is under no such restriction, and in answer to her defiance his violence erupts in a particularly distasteful way. Betsy has kept the pet squirrel Trueworth gave her,

> and always cherished it with an uncommon care;--the little creature was sitting on the ridge of its cell cracking nuts . . . the little fondness she had always shewn of him put a sudden thought into Mr. Munden's head, he started from his chair, saying to his wife, with a revengeful sneer,--"Here is one domestic,

> at least, that may be spared."--With these words he flew to the poor harmless animal, seized it by the neck, and throwing it with his whole force against the carved work of the marble chimney, its tender frame was dashed to pieces. (IV, 61)

The graphic detail of this passage heightens our horror and astonishment, reactions which we share with Betsy. She is appalled at his cruelty, and hurt even more at losing the one gift that Trueworth had given her. But, most important of all, the incident convinces her "that he took pleasure in giving pain to her, and also made her not doubt, but he would stop at nothing for that purpose, provided it were safe, and came within the letter of the law" (IV, 64). Forgetting all the advice she has been given about gentleness and submission, she vows never to eat or sleep with him again.

Lady Trusty, that oracle of worldly prudence, is also shocked by Munden's sadistic attempts to dominate Betsy, but above all she considers "how odd a figure a woman makes, who lives apart from her husband" (IV, 68). Consequently, she and Sir Ralph manage to effect a reconciliation. Munden, who always has a thought for what other people will think, is perfectly agreeable to restore peace between them, but the only way they can live together with any ease is by leading virtually independent lives. Then one day he instructs Betsy to prepare a particularly impressive entertainment for Lord [illegible], his prospective patron. She does so, and during the evening is troubled to discover that the peer attempts to flirt with her at her own table, in the intervals when her husband's back is turned. When she receives an anonymous letter expressing adoration and violent passion (IV, 126-27), she is fairly

certain from whom it has come, but she is reluctant to expose him to Munden for fear that jealousy and suspicion will destroy her husband's current good humour. She burns the letter and puts it out of her mind. Soon afterwards they are invited to dine with the peer and one of his lady relations. At first Betsy resolves not to go. Then her vanity, her curiosity, and the assurance she derives from being married, unite to change her mind. Once again, her pride takes the form of self-sufficiency: "I am sufficiently capable myself of being the guardian of my own honour without disturbing a husband's peace about it" (IV, 129-30). To be just to her, we must remember that Betsy's further reliance on her husband's protection, as she assumes that his presence will be a deterrent, is a logical extension of her brothers' and Lady Trusty's notion of marriage as a means of removing her from "danger." She concludes that refusing to go would only disoblige Munden and do him a disservice with his patron. Then,

> safe as she imagined herself from all the encroachments of presumptuous love, she pleased herself with the thoughts of being looked upon by the adoring peer, as Adam did upon the forbidden fruit;--longing, wishing, but not daring to approach. (IV, 134)

After the degrading disillusionment of her marriage, she finds the flattering fantasy of a great man in love with her and totally submissive to her will particularly soothing; she soon looks forward to the dinner with positive pleasure. Unfortunately, her original fears prove justified, for he sends Munden off on an errand and attempts to seduce her. She is only able to save herself by ringing for the servant, a possibility for which his va-

nity has not allowed him to prepare. Betsy suspects that her husband has chosen to sacrifice her to his ambition,[12] and her suspicion is partially confirmed by his reaction when she tells him what happened. At first he cannot believe her. Then he chides her for being so haughty that she has ruined his chances of advancement. Moreover, he feels that he has been duped by the peer and expresses all his rage and frustration to the only person who is available, his innocent wife. Betsy herself is deeply shocked to discover her husband's indifference to her honour, and troubled even more by the discovery that being married is no real protection against the designs of men, and the realization that "no man can now pretend to love /her/ but with the basest and most shameful views" (IV, 159). She is forced to recognize that prudence and all the self-restraint it implies are the only way to keep herself from harm. She rejects another admirer out of hand, renews her friendship with Mabel, now Lady Loveit, and resolves to be a model of good behaviour.

When her brother's mistress, Mademoiselle de Roquelair, comes to her for refuge after Thomas Thoughtless has turned her out, Betsy's good nature again gains ascendancy over her prudence. She agrees to take her in and try to get Thomas to provide for her to return to a monastery in France. "Mr. Munden treated her with the same politeness and complaisance he always used towards persons, over whom he had no power" (IV, 213), and consequently Betsy does

[12] This is a theme familiar to Haywood from her comedy, A Wife to Be Lett (1723), in which a husband attempts to sell his conjugal rights for £2000.

not suspect that the Frenchwoman's repeated postponements of her departure are the result of her affair with Betsy's husband. When she finally asks her to leave, she is insulted first by Roquelair and then by Munden himself, to whom she has appealed. This confirms her suspicion of their "criminal correspondence," and she determines to leave him once and for all. When both of them are away, she packs all her things and leaves him a letter:

> As you cannot but be sensible, that the mutual engagements between us have been strictly adhered to on my part, and almost in every particular falsified on yours, you ought not to be surprised, that I have at last resolved to put a final end to a way of life so unpleasing in the eyes of heaven, and so disagreeable to ourselves;--it never was in my power to make you truly happy, nor in your will to make me even tolerably easy. . . . (IV, 234)

She is absolutely decided never to live again as his wife, and when they hear what has happened, none of her friends or relations can urge otherwise. Munden, however, is astonished and outraged by her departure, and determined to have her back. Once again his motives are entirely worldly. It was

> not that he regretted the parting with her through any remains of affection, or that his hardened heart was touched with a just sensibility of her merit, or with any repentance of his ill treatment of her, but that he knew such an affair must necessarily be attended with some noise and confusion, and in many respects give him a good deal of embarrassment:--it was therefore these two last reasons, which alone determined him to make use of all his artifice to bring about a second reconciliation. (IV, 235)

Because he looks upon a wife "as a necessary appendix to his house" (IV, 247), he threatens to bully her into returning, first by re-

fusing her a separate maintenance, then by threatening to procure "a warrant from the lord chief justice to force her immediately home" (IV, 244). To avoid his persecutions, and also to prevent the possibility of seeing Trueworth, now widowed, Betsy moves to quiet lodgings in the suburbs, where she finds the way of life surprisingly congenial: "How delightful--how heavenly . . . is this solitude, how truly preferable to all the noisy giddy pleasures of the tumultuous town, yet how have I despised, and ridiculed the soft serenity of a country life" (IV, 259)

When Betsy decides to leave London before Trueworth arrives, she is not yet fully aware of her feelings for him. "She imagined she had only fled his presence because she could not bear a man who had courted her so long, should see her thus unhappy by the choice she had made of another" (IV, 250-51). A little contemplation soon makes her recognize her love, and at last she sees their relations in perspective.

> Nothing so much sharpens the edge of affliction as a consciousness of having brought it upon ourselves, to remember that all we could wish for,--all that could make us truly happy, was once in our power to be possessed of, and wantonly shunning the good that Heaven and Fortune offered, we headlong run into the ills we mourn, /which/ renders them doubly grievous. (IV, 252)

The miniature of him which she took before his marriage becomes the favoured companion of her retirement. Early one morning she is sitting in the garden addressing it with passion and regret when Trueworth, a guest at the neighbouring estate, himself overhears her.

> He heard her sighs, he saw her lovely hand frequently put up to wipe away the tears that fell from her eyes

> while looking at it;--he also saw her more than once, though doubtless . . . not knowing what she did, press the lifeless image to her bosom with the utmost tenderness. (IV, 263)

He has never believed that she cared for him and had never once suspected her of taking the portrait; consequently he is doubly charmed by her inadvertent admission that she loves him (IV, 267-8). As for him,

> the innocence of the charming Miss Betsy fully cleared, all the errors of her past conduct reformed, kindled in him an esteem;--the sight of her, after so many months absence, made the seemingly dead embers of desire begin to glow, and on the discovery of her sentiments in his favour, burst forth into a blaze. (IV, 283)

In the heat of this blaze, Trueworth embraces her and attempts to kiss her, but she has at last learned her lesson. Although "she was conscious, that while she most resisted the glowing pressure of his lips, she . . . felt a guilty pleasure in the touch" (IV, 271), she firmly repulses him and makes him promise not to visit her again. She is aware that she is still a married woman, and because of her separation from Munden, she must be even more circumspect than usual. This instance of her prudence, when he knows that her inclinations match his own, wins Trueworth completely; by "exerting the heroine" (IV, 271) Betsy at last earns the right to her hero.

Trueworth's love and admiration for her are intensified by what he hears of her behaviour towards her husband during his illness. Munden, worn out by a life of dissipation, and learning that

he is unlikely to recover, requests to see Betsy once more.

> Not all the indifference she had for the person of Mr. Munden,--not all the resentment his moroseness and ill nature had excited in her, could hinder her from feeling an extreme shock on hearing his life was in danger; --she sought for no excuses, either to evade, or delay what he desired of her; she went directly to him, equally inclined to do so by her compassion, as she thought herself obliged to do by her duty. (IV, 275)

In this instance her good-nature is rewarded, for he begs her forgiveness and they are reconciled before he dies. Then, against the urging of her relations and of Trueworth himself, she determines to be punctilious in her observation of custom regarding mourning. Lady Loveit has to persuade her that her duty does not require her to act melancholy and refuse all entertainment with her friends (IV, 281). Betsy makes Trueworth vow not to speak to her of his feelings until a complete year has passed, though during that year he occasionally writes to her and gradually draws her into an innocent correspondence. Their letters are formal, graceful and correct, and the circumspection of each is the delight of the other. However,

> innocent and pure as the inclinations of Mrs. Munden were, it is highly probable . . . that she was not sorry to see the time arrive, which was to put an end to that cruel constraint her charming lover had been so long under, and while it gave him leave to declare the whole fervency of the passion he was possessed of, allowed her also to confess her own without a blush. (IV, 295-96)

A year to the day after Munden's death, Trueworth writes to announce his intention of throwing himself at her feet, "to claim that re-

compense which /his/ submission has in some measure merited" (IV, 296). Her reply is simple and frank:

> An attempt to conceal my heart from you will be in vain;--you saw the inmost recesses of it at a time when you should most have been a stranger there;--but what was then my shame to have discovered, is now my glory to avow; and I scruple not to confess, that whatever makes your happiness will confirm mine. (IV, 298)

When he receives this reply, he sets off for L-------e at once, and arrives like a knight of old in his coach to sweep her off to a land of eternal delight. But romance, even at the happy ending, is not entirely appropriate to the mid-century sensibility. Although Betsy is now cast as the fair princess, she cannot resist alarming Lady Trusty's fears by not telling her who it is she suddenly proposes to marry (IV, 303-4) and laughing at everyone's astonishment when they find out. And although Prince Charming arrives in state and flies to her open arms, he also signs marriage settlements amounting to double what Munden had made. In a few days they are married, and Betsy Thoughtless appears in the world as a Trueworth at last.

XIII

THE NOVEL AS "NOVEL"

Betsy Thoughtless is obviously a very different type of novel from any of those which Haywood had written earlier in her career. The demands of a newly mature reading public had been growing increasingly more sophisticated in the 1740's. Realism assumed even greater importance as people recognized that the fiction they read could be related to their own lives. At the same time, both writers and their audience were becoming more aware of the novel's efficacy as a means of instruction. Its scope was sufficiently wide to carry both moral guidance and pictures of exemplary social behaviour. The conduct books and periodicals had always used fiction to illustrate their lessons; now the novel was given weight and substance by the addition of conduct book aims and standards. As a genre, it was also brought more into line with the probabilities of real life. Haywood realized what changes were taking place in public tastes, and they were not uncongenial to her own ends. *Betsy Thoughtless* represents her most successful attempt to respond to those demands. Yet, on closer consideration, her masterpiece reveals itself to be a logical extension of all that had gone before. *Betsy Thoughtless* is not so much a departure from, as a reinterpretation of the conventions and themes which had occupied Haywood in the first half of her career.

Haywood published two other novels between the appearance of *Tom Jones* and that of *Betsy Thoughtless*, both of which are obviously

"essays" at a new style of fiction. Life's Progress Through the Passions: or, the Adventures of Natura (1748) is, as the title suggests, a collection of moral essays on human nature, lavishly illustrated with examples from the life of Natura. As "Everyman," Natura is necessarily unidealized. Haywood shows him being foolish and generous, petulant, querulous, rash, amorous, sensible and senile. His problems are not restricted to those involving parental and sexual relations, as in most of her other fictions. His problems, passions and abilities are all suitably mediocre. But in a moral tale like this one, although there is much realistic detail in general terms, the hero's exemplary status demands that he remain in many ways an abstraction. This is certainly the case with Natura. The following year, Haywood published Dalinda, or, the Double Marriage, which also makes marginal advances in terms of realism. The preface to the reader offers the most elaborate theory of fiction found in any of Haywood's works, and it is clear that realism is a problem much on her mind. After a standard dissertation on the wisdom of combining instruction and delight, she emphasizes that to "convey precept,"[1] a fable must use "examples of facts drawn from real life."[2] This she claims to have done.

> The Reader must therefore expect no perfect character.--I have drawn my heroes and heroine, such as they really are, without any illustration, whether of their virtues, or their defects.--Here are no poetical descriptions, no flights of imagination. I have put no rhapsodies into their mouths, and . . . I have . . . made them speak as persons in their circumstances would naturally do.[3]

[1] Dalinda (London, 1749), p. iv. [2] Dalinda, p. v.
[3] Dalinda, pp. vi-vii.

After another statement of moral purpose, an assertion that her "sole design, in the following pages, is to shew both sexes, the danger of inadvertently giving way to the passions of what kind soever,"[4] she takes up the question of poetic justice:

> The Reader will, perhaps, be surprized to find the catastrophe less tragical than might be expected, where persons were worked up to that pitch of rage these were; but as they have contented themselves with only railing at each other, I would not, for the sake of embellishing my history, be guilty of injuring truth, which alone has been my guide, and to which I have strictly adhered, through every incident in the whole work.[5]

Her claims in this preface seem reasonably justified; there is a great deal more domestic detail than in any of her earlier works, and the characters are singularly "mixed," being at various times both praiseworthy and highly culpable. Sums of money and interest rates are specified; erotic scenes are more graphic than "romantic."[6] However, at bottom Dalinda is only an elaboration of Haywood's standard formula. If the ending is "less tragical" in the sense that none of the characters dies, it is more tragical in the hopelessness of the situation in which all three protagonists find themselves. Love is still a violent, overriding passion which motivates all the actions of the heroine, who remains primarily a victim, as before. The two years between Dalinda and Betsy Thoughtless represent a tremendous leap of imagination for Haywood. In the later work she finally produces the kind of book

[4] Dalinda, p. ix. [5] Dalinda, p. xi.
[6] See, for example, pp. 23-24 and pp. 172-173.

which a modern reader can immediately accept as a "novel."

The most glaring departure from her earlier fiction is the material realism of Betsy Thoughtless. Although the surnames are "humour" titles, every character has an ordinary Christian name as well, and the settings are solidly English. The London where Betsy lives is a real, bustling city, and there are dozens of references to specific places which would have been part of the social life of the times. Staple takes her on "an airing through Brumpton, Kensington, /and/ Chelsea" (I, 238); at Westminster Abbey she stops to look at "the fine tomb, erected to the memory of Mr. Secretary Craggs" (I, 248). When she leaves Mr. Goodman's, she takes lodgings in Jermyn Street (II, 241), and Flora arranges to meet Trueworth in St. James Park (II, 246), a reference to a notorious rendez-vous for eighteenth-century lovers.[7] After Betsy and Munden are reconciled, they go with Lady Trusty and Sir Ralph "to take the air in Kensington Gardens" (IV, 106). There are other examples too numerous to list.[8] The cumulative result of these references is to establish a setting for the fiction which is sufficiently vivid to demand that it be populated by "real" people. In creating a graphic picture of London, Haywood raises our expectations regarding her portrayal of Betsy and her circle. This end is also served by the naming of explicit sums of money throughout the novel. One of Betsy's first assertions of independence involves not love, but her annual income. Dissatisfied with some silks purchased for her by Lady Mellasin, she goes to Mr.

[7] Forsyth, p. 210. [8] For some further examples, see: I, 29-30, 40, 76-77, 140; II, 45, 102, 140; IV, 3, 33, 217.

Goodman. It had been agreed between him and Sir Ralph that

> out of the income of my fortune thirty pounds a year should be allowed for my board, twenty pounds for my pocket expences, and fifty pounds for my clothes, /and/ I think I ought to have the two latter entirely at my own disposal, and to lay it out as I think fit, and not be obliged, like a charity child, to wear whatever livery my benefactor shall be pleased to order. (I,66)

The difference in temperament between Betsy's husbands is made explicit by Haywood's specification of the settlements they offer. Her brother tells her that Munden "will settle 150 pounds per annum on you for pin-money, and jointure you in four hundred," and adds "your fortune does not entitle you to a better offer" (III, 230). In contrast, the generous Trueworth, when his turn comes, offers "a settlement of 800 pounds a year . . . in case of accidents" (IV, 311), or nearly twice as much, presumably in addition to pin-money and housekeeping. We are also told that Thomas Thoughtless is not willing to pay more than "an hundred, or an hundred and ten pounds per annum" for a house near St. James Park and Palace (II, 45), that the sum for which Mr. Goodman is arrested is "no less than £2575 8s" (II, 147), and that Mabel's father will settle £10,000 on her when he dies (III, 60). From these details it would be possible to deduce Betsy's fortune,[9]

[9] See Habbakuk, p. 21. The standard ratio of jointure to dowry was 1:10; thus Betsy's fortune would have been approximately £4000. Munden would do only exactly what was proper and no more, which makes this deduction particularly easy to make.

her annual income, average house rentals at the period, and numerous other facts about domestic life in mid-century London. We are even given contemporary rates for kept mistresses (II, 91, 117).[10] Although the average reader is probably not interested in making such deductions, the mere possibility of doing so is significant. It is the result of a documentary quality, missing from Haywood's other novels, which provides a convincing argument for the "reality" of the characters.

Haywood does not trust to background documentation alone to make her characters real. Her techniques, though considerably advanced compared with her earlier fiction, are recognizable as those which she adapted from the heroic romance. The use of letters and the analysis of emotion are both vital to the characterization in Betsy Thoughtless. Letters loom particularly large; there is not a single major character who does not at some point express his or her personality through an epistle. It is from a letter that Betsy learns of Gayland's lack of respect for her, of Saving's awe and devotion, and of Captain Hysom's eccentricity. Frederick Fineer's correspondence is used as a measure of his ridiculous lack of intelligence and social grace,[11] and the second courtship of Betsy and Trueworth is entirely epistolary. The most interesting use of the letter convention relates to Flora Mellasin; anonymous letters are the primary outlet for her malice and ingenuity. The following, written to Trueworth, is a typical specimen:

[10] Five to six guineas per week. [11] See above, pp. 395-97.

> Sir, the friendship I had for some of your family, now deceased, and the respect due to your own character in particular, obliges me to acquaint you with truths more disagreeable than perhaps you ever yet have heard:--but before I proceed to the shocking narrative, let me conjure you to believe, that in me your better angel speaks, and warns you to avoid that dreadful gulf of everlasting misery, into which you are just ready to be plunged.
>
> I am informed . . . that a treaty of marriage is on foot, and almost as good as concluded, between you and Miss Betsy Thoughtless.--A young lady, I must confess, well descended,--handsome, and endued with every accomplishment to attract the admiration of mankind; and if her soul had the least conformity with her exterior charms, you, doubtless, might have been one of the most happy, and most envied men on earth;--but, Sir, this seeming innocence is all a cheat,--another has been before-hand with you, in the joys you covet; --your intended bride has been a mother without the pleasure of owning herself as such. The product of a shameful passion is still living, and though she uses the greatest caution in this affair, I have by accident discovered is now nursed at Denham, a small village, within two miles of Uxbridge, by a gardener's wife, who is called . . . Goody Bushman. I give you this particular account, in order that you may make what enquiry you shall think proper. . . . I pity from my soul the unfortunate seduced young lady,--she must be doubly miserable, if by having lost her virtue, she loses a husband such as you;--but if after this you should think fit to prosecute your pretensions, I wish she may endeavour, by her future conduct, to atone for the errors of the past;--but, alas! her present manner of behaviour affords no such promising expectations; and if you should set your honour and fortune, and all that is dear to you, against so precarious a stake, as the hope of reclaiming a woman of her temper, it must certainly fill all your friends with astonishment and grief:--but you are yourself the best judge of what it will become you to do,--I only beg, that you will be assured this intelligence comes from one, who is, . . . Your . . . unknown servant. (II, 139-41)

The author of this letter is an astute psychologist. Well aware of Trueworth's passion for Betsy and of his distress at her social carelessness, Flora skilfully interweaves remarks which appeal to both. After stating her credentials, she soothes that passion with an acknowledgement of Betsy's good points; to criticize her immediately would only anger her lover and make him defensive. Then, like

Haywood, Flora shows her appreciation of the value of specific detail to credibility. She offers him verifiable facts, though only enough to arouse his curiosity and enable him to undertake an enquiry. She next taunts him with his own doubts about Betsy's present conduct, which is indeed her finest stroke. In all her correspondence Flora reveals this same perceptive intelligence, and the same care in organizing the details of her plots, while the existence of those plots fortifies her strength of mind in pursuing her desires.

What is most significant about Flora's letter, especially when compared with those in Haywood's earlier works, is that it is more expressive of personality than of specific emotions; it is not an outpouring of her feelings so much as it is an illustration of the kind of woman she is. Most of the letters in Betsy Thoughtless, as my initial list of examples suggests, conform to this type. The revelation of internal conflict is predominantly confined to passages of "analysis of emotion," of which Betsy's "reflections" are the prime example.[12] In these passages we recognize the same convention that was made familiar by the early novels, but with a significant difference. In a majority of instances, the analysis of emotion in Betsy Thoughtless is performed not by the character, in an internal monologue as before,[13] but by the author herself. The description of Betsy's feelings after Trueworth rescues her from Fineer is representative:

[12] See, for example, I, 180-83; II, 188-90; III, 7-8; IV, 22-24.
[13] See above, pp. 223-25.

> She fell into reflections that almost turned her brain;--she represented to herself all the sarcasms, --all the comments, that she imagined; and probably would have been made on her behaviour,--her danger, and her delivery;--all these thoughts were insupportable to her,--she resolved to hide herself forever from the town, and pass her future life in obscurity; so direful to her were the apprehensions of becoming the object of derision, that rather than endure it she would suffer any /exile/.[14] (III, 224)

It is difficult to know whether to regard this innovation in characterization as an advance or a regression. Her increased use of the narrative voice is perhaps an indication of Fielding's influence, perhaps a natural result of her greater didacticism. Significantly, the passages of internal monologue are far more successful, and even innovative. Betsy's "reflections" on Trueworth's absence[15] provide an excellent example of Haywood's capacity to develop new modes of expression from old materials. In that passage, she manages to encorporate the tone and spirit of the "letter" convention with the aim of "the analysis of emotion." Betsy speaks in a voice not quite her own, yet neither is it the formal, authorial voice of the third-person analysis I have just quoted. It is effective and informative at the same time that it sounds spontaneous and natural. However, on the whole, the analysis of emotion appears far less important in Betsy Thoughtless than in her earlier works. In its place, Haywood developed several new techniques with which to reveal personality and psychology.

One of the most noticeable of these new methods of character-

[14] This last word is missing from the first edition, through a printer's error.

[15] See above, p. 392.

ization is the use of dialogue. Haywood had used conversation before to demonstrate aspects of personality, notably in Love in Excess.[16] Distinctive modes of speech had also been important, as in Philidore and Placentia.[17] In Betsy Thoughtless, however, the two are combined on a scale hitherto unattempted by Haywood. Captain Hysom, Betsy's "tarpaulin enamorato," provides an interesting example. Both his letters and his conversation are forthright and full of sea-faring expressions, for which he is ridiculed even by Trueworth. Yet although what they mock is his manner of speaking, what is really condemned is "the amorous declaration of a person of the Captain's age, and fashion of bringing up, to one of Miss Betsy's" (I,236). Hysom's response to their ridicule is characteristic of his manner:

> I think it would have become you as well, to have given me a more civil answer. If you did not approve of my proposals, you might have told me so at first; but I shall trouble neither you nor myself any farther about the matter. I see how it is well enough, and when I next steer for the coast of matrimony shall take care to look out for a port not encumbered with rubbish. (I, 233)

His nautical terminology is certainly amusing and incongruous, given the sort of society in which Betsy moves, but this speech reveals the basic honesty and dignity of the man, of which even their mockery cannot deprive him. Lady Trusty, the voice of prudence and worldly wisdom, habitually writes and speaks in the style of The Female Spectator:[18]

16 See above, pp. 176-82. 17 See above, pp. 311-12.
18 Cf. The Female Spectator, III, 21.

> There are some women, who think they can never testify too much fondness for their husbands, and that the name of wife is a sufficient sanction for giving a loose to the utmost excesses of an extravagant passion;--but this is a weakness, which I am pretty sure you will stand no need of my advice to guard against, I am rather apprehensive of your running into a contrary extreme. . . . A constant and unmoved insensibility will in time chill the most warm affection. . . . (IV, 35-36)

Staple and Trueworth are consistently gallant, eloquent and reasonable in their speech, combining the solidity of the citizen with the sprightly flattery of the lover.[19] Munden, exactly the opposite, characteristically fawns in public and blusters in private. His usual tone to his wife is sarcastic, as in his reply to her offer to turn over the housekeeping to him:

> "No really, Madam," answered he, very churlishly, "I did not marry, in order to make myself acquainted with how the markets go, and become learned in the prices of beef and mutton." (IV, 45)

His indignant "Rot your accounts" (IV, 58), when she attempts to show him how she has spent his money, is equally revealing. However, it is in her treatment of her heroine that Haywood puts dialogue to its greatest use in the novel. Betsy's manner of speaking is uniformly witty and high-spirited; as I have shown, one of her favourite activities seems to be making witticisms at the expense of her lovers.[20] She never loses the humourous cast of her speech even after her "reformation," and her language is always

[19] For an example of Staple's particular charm, see his letter to Betsy, I, 108-9.

[20] See above, pp. 383, 388-89. Other examples include II, 90-91; III, 7, 31-2.

forthright. For example, after finally submitting to pressure from her brothers to marry Munden, she adds:

> Well, since both of you have so high an opinion of matrimony, and will needs have me, who am by some years younger than either of you, lead the way, I hope I shall soon see you follow my example. (IV, 17)

In this single sentence she expresses both her good-humoured resignation to the inevitable and her faintly sardonic perception of the inequalities of their respective positions. She is never afraid to speak her mind, and the scenes in which she stands up to Trueworth and Munden are among the finest in the book.[21] Here more than anywhere else in her writing, Haywood has succeeded in drawing characters who come to life through dramatically realized dialogue.

Careful attention to details of setting and speech is one of the major innovations in Haywood's characterization. Another is the extent to which she includes her concern with character in the very structure of the plot. In her earlier fiction, she modified the romance convention of intercalated stories into the more elaborately connected subplots of works such as Love in Excess, The Agreeable Caledonian and Philidore and Placentia. As we have seen, these subplots could take various forms. In some instances, as in Love in Excess, Haywood involved her protagonist in a number of parallel situations, forming a series of contrasting relationships

[21] For Betsy and Trueworth, see II, 88-91 and 105-9. Her scenes with Munden are found on IV, 46-47 and 57-59.

which served to illustrate the protagonist's growth.[22] In The Agreeable Caledonian, the intercalated stories demonstrate the effect of one character's experience on that of another,[23] while in Philidore and Placentia the relationship between the hero and heroine is replicated in several variations which influence our understanding of it, if not that of the characters themselves.[24] Haywood employs all three variants of the subplot convention in Betsy Thoughtless, although her greater artistry in the later book makes it more difficult to isolate the different types. The most obvious is the gallery of contrasting couples which the novel presents: Mabel and Flora, Trueworth and Munden, Lady Mellasin and Lady Trusty and Betsy and Harriot are the main ones; minor examples include Saving and Gayland, Thomas and Frank, and Fineer and Captain Hysom. In addition, Betsy herself enters into comparison with Miss Forward, Mademoiselle de Roquelair, Mabel and Flora as well as with her obvious foil, Harriot. The purpose of this elaborate pattern of contrasts is twofold: some of the pairings provide the reader with an absolute standard against which to measure a person or a relationship, while others perform a similar function for the characters themselves.

A comparison which falls into the former category is that of Lady Mellasin with Lady Trusty. Both women are married to Betsy's guardians; both at some point assume considerable responsibility for her care. There the similarities stop. Lady Mellasin actually has very little to do with Betsy. She offers no advice to

[22] See above, chapter five. [23] See above, pp. 226-31.
[24] See above, chapter ten.

and exercises no authority over her young charge. It is Mr. Goodman who is active in Betsy's care. The extent of Lady Mellasin's influence is exposing Betsy to the more frivolous pleasures of London life and conducting a series of "at homes" at which young men have the opportunity of turning her head with flattery. In contrast, Lady Trusty is extremely assiduous. Of Betsy's L------e guardians, it is Lady Trusty who is the active party; Sir Ralph steps in only when the weight of masculine authority is required as a last resort.[25] At each stage of Betsy's development, Lady Trusty offers her advice and stands also as an excellent example of wise and prudent womanhood, exactly the opposite of Goodman's immoral wife. When Lady Trusty advises Betsy and Flora to spend the summer with her in the country, Lady Mellasin encourages them to accompany Frank to Oxford, where she hopes Flora will make a more profitable match. It is, of course, in Oxford that Betsy first really experiences the consequences of her thoughtlessness.[26] Lady Mellasin and her daughter also injure Betsy by depriving her to a large extent of Miss Mabel's companionship, by representing her "as a prying, censorious, ill-natured creature" and giving her "all the epithets which compose the character of a prude" (II, 69). It is significant that Mabel, as Lady Loveit, becomes with Lady Trusty, Betsy's most important advisor. Lady Trusty herself recognizes her counterpart's pernicious influence: "she laid the blame of her ill-conduct chiefly on her having lived so long under the

[25] The only two occasions on which Sir Ralph takes an active part in Betsy's care are to bring about her marriage (IV, 9-13) and to effect her reconciliation with Munden (IV, 95-102). In both instances his intervention is instigated by his wife.

[26] See above, p. 383-84.

tuition and example of a woman, such as Lady Mellasin" (IV, 11). However, at no time does Betsy actually compare the two women. Although she for the most part heeds Lady Trusty and ignores Mellasin (whose very name suggests "malice"),[27] it is the reader who is left to judge between them.

An example of a set of contrasting characters which serves a primarily internal function can be found in Trueworth's two wives. Apart from an occasional flash of wit (III, 68), Harriot and Betsy could not be more different. Where Betsy's statement to Trueworth that she "would not for the world miss the first night of a new play" (II, 102) implies that being seen at the theater is her great delight, Harriot prefers to read them in the solitude of her country home. There, she tells him, "I have a very good collection of the old ones by me, and have all the new ones sent down to me as they come out" (II, 271). Looking "upon a good play as one of the most improving as well as agreeable entertainments, a thinking mind can take" (II, 270), she shuns the bustle and publicity that are the main attractions of the theater for Betsy. Harriot's views on living in the metropolis are also radically different from Betsy's, and much more congenial to Trueworth's own:

> London . . . is a very magnificent opulent city, and those who have their lot cast to live in it, may, doubtless, find sufficient to content them; but as for those amusements, which you gentlemen call the pleasures of the town, and which so many people take

[27] Michael Irwin has suggested to me that this name is derived from "sin" plus the Latin "mal," or honey. Lady Mellasin is both "sweet" in terms of her beauty, and sinful. She is also malicious.

> every winter such long journeys merely to enjoy, I can see nothing in them, which a reasonable person may not very well dispense with the want of. (II, 268)

When Trueworth hears her sentiments, he inevitably compares them with Betsy's scorn of his "shady bowers! and purling streams!" (II, 89).[28] Harriot's reaction to courtship also provides Trueworth with ample room for comparison. Her brother tells him, "all young women" are apt to express an aversion to marriage, "but when once the favourite man comes in view, away at once with resolution and virginity" (III, 61), and in Harriot's case this conventional wisdom is certainly correct. Her modesty, though extreme, is unfeigned; she genuinely "had not considered the difference of sexes, and could not hear any thing in her had reminded others of it, without blushing" (III, 83). Her views on vanity are particularly applicable to Trueworth's relationship with Betsy, as when she requests him not to pay her extravagant compliments, adding,

> it is an ill-judged policy, methinks, in you men, to idolize the women too much, you wish would think well of you;--if our sex are in reality so vain as you generally represent us, on whom but yourselves can the fault be laid? (III, 90)

She might be accusing him directly of helping to corrupt the woman he formerly adored. But the crowning touch, by which she secures to herself the esteem of a man of reason, is her pragmatic, rational conception of courtship and marriage:

> Love is a theme I have never made my study, . . . but according to my notions of the matter, those gentle-

[28] See above, p. 389.

> men, who pretend to be affected by it, give themselves more trouble than they need:--as that passion is generally allowed rather to be the child of fancy, than of real merit in the object loved, I should think it would be sufficient for any man in his addresses to a lady, to tell her, that she happens to hit his taste,--that she is what he likes, without dressing her up in qualities, which perhaps have no existence but in his own imagination. (III, 91-92)

Such words, unknown to Harriot, are calculated to hit her suitor below the belt. Having just terminated his relationship with a woman to whom he had offered "an adoring and passionately devoted heart" (I, 224) because he had discovered her to be morally despicable, Trueworth is particularly vulnerable to a charge of endowing his mistress with imaginary excellence. Harriot's words compel him to remember the

> long succession of repeated inadvertencies /which/ made him first begin to fear, and then to be convinced, that however innocent she might be in fact, her manner of behaviour would ill suit with the character he wished should always be maintained by the woman he made choice of for a wife. (II, 196)

In contrast, Harriot's "manner of behaviour" suits his expectations perfectly, and his mind is soon made up.

Betsy knows nothing of Harriot beyond her good fortune in becoming Trueworth's wife; therefore, she cannot herself learn anything from her rival's excellence. Her relationship with her two other foils is far more instructive. Harriot is presented as an exemplum; she is believable as a character, but she does not develop. Flora and Miss Forward are both Betsy's intimates, and both gradually degenerate as Betsy grows more prudent and more

wise.[29] Her school-friend's decline is most dramatic; she has begun her downward journey even before Betsy leaves for London. In this early stage of her degeneration, she exhibits "the airs . . . and the artifices" which Betsy later employs towards her own lovers (I, 7). Miss Forward's next appearance in Betsy's life occurs after Saving's abrupt departure, Gayland's presumption and her Oxford adventure have already begun to affect her, and after Staple has been introduced as a serious suitor. Miss Forward tells her how she met Mr. Wildly on a walk with the French governess and some other girls, and how he "so plied me with kisses and embraces, that I scarce knew where I was.--Oh! the difference between his caresses and the boyish insipid salutes of Master Sparkish!" (I, 149). Her lust is awakened as well as her vanity, and she arranges to become his mistress. It is significant that her description of the scene in which she submits to him might have come from one of Haywood's earlier works:

> Never was there a finer night: The moon, and her attendant stars, shone with uncommon brightness, the air was all serene, the boisterous winds were all locked in their caverns, and only gentle zephyrs, with their fanning wings, wafted a thousand odours from the neighbouring plants, perfuming all around.--'Twas an enchanting scene: Nature herself seemed to conspire my ruin, and contributed all in her power to lull my mind into a soft forgetfulness of what I owed myself, my fame, my fortune, and my family. (I, 158)[30]

Miss Forward is obviously "romantic" at heart. However, she is soon brought to her senses when she becomes pregnant and is unsuc-

[29] See Rudolf, p. 241. Her analysis of the novel is the best I have seen.

[30] Cf. Love in Excess, p. 28; quoted above on p. 137.

cessful at inducing an abortion (I, 170). Wildly deserts her and the baby dies, so she is free to repent and mend her ways. Always charitable, Betsy lends her some money, but Miss Forward's story has touched her more deeply than she admits to her. Unfortunately, at this point, she ends up feeling superior to her former schoolmate, and certain that she could never fall into the same errors herself (I, 183).

When Miss Forward next reappears, she informs Betsy that she is being supprted by a distant relation who took pity on her distress. Betsy's good-natured affection for her old friend prompts her to renew their intimacy, now that she sees Miss Forward, as she believes, so well established in a virtuous prosperity. This time the consequences of her charity are far more serious than before. Ignorant that "Miss Forward . . . finding herself utterly discarded by her father, and abandoned to the utmost distresses, accepted of the offer, made her by a rich Jew-merchant, of five guineas a week to be his mistress" (II, 91). Betsy is seen in her company and is mistaken for a common prostitute. Trueworth's warning initiates the quarrel between them, and Betsy narrowly escapes losing her honour as well as her lover (II, 117-18). This time, she is not able to feel much superior to her fallen friend, and she is indignant both with Miss Forward for taking advantage of her affection, and with herself for not heeding Trueworth's advice. However, the main burden of her indignation again rests on the other woman:

> If you had retained the least spark of generosity, or good-will towards me, you would rather have avoided than coveted my company, as you must be sensible, that to be seen with you must render me in some measure

> partaker of your infamy, though wholly innocent of your crimes.--How base, how cruel is such behaviour, especially to one, who had a real regard for you, even after you had confessed yourself unworthy of it. . . . Your conduct is too bare-faced, to give me even the shadow of an excuse for ever seeing you again. (II, 125-26)

Nor does she see her again. Miss Forward's final appearance in the novel takes the form of a letter from "Marshalsea Prison," where she has been "languishing" for unpaid debts. Abandoned by all her companions in sin, she requests a loan of three guineas from Betsy, to buy her freedom, after which she "will think no labour, though ever so hard or abject, too much, if it can enable me to drag on my remains of life in true penitance" (IV, 4). This time Betsy's reflections are more just:

> How unhappy is our sex, . . . either in a too much, or a too little sensibility of the tender passion;--she was, alas! too early influenced by the flatteries of the base part of mankind, and I too little grateful to the merits of the best. (IV, 6)

At last she recognizes that she is equally culpable with her friend, saved from "ruin" only by the difference in their temperaments. Consequently, Miss Forward is no longer necessary to Betsy's development, and she is left to a merciful obscurity, to be heard from no more.

Miss Forward's material and social circumstances change during the course of the novel, but basically, her character remains unaltered. Her amorousness is as well-developed in the opening pages as it is in the days of her mature immorality; she is always willing, and always eager to oblige. Betsy's relationship with Flora

Mellasin, and Flora's own fall from grace, are far more complex, largely because her degeneration is internal as well as external. Although Flora is always selfish and malicious, she is not consummately wanton. Her involvement with Gayland, the first of her escapades, is the result of vanity and a susceptibility to flattery equal to Betsy's own. After Betsy has rejected him, Gayland, "to pique her, as he imagined, directed all the fine things his common-place book was well stored with, to Miss Flora. . . ." (I, 35-36). Flora has been piqued herself by the defection of Saving and other lovers, on Betsy's arrival, and the rake's attentions soothe her battered ego; she succumbs to him, in a way which Betsy never really has contemplated. Flora's behaviour provides Betsy with her first opportunity to perceive "the errors of such a way of thinking and acting in so clear a light" (I, 36) that she resolves to modify her own conduct in future. At Oxford, Flora again encounters the same temptations as Betsy and again succumbs, and her retreat with the scholar to another room clears the way for the gentleman-commoner to make his attack. Although in both cases, Flora is "seduced"--that is, gives in to passion only after being importuned by someone else--her moral decline is already apparent in her ability to carry off the deception vital to her reputation. Her lies about Gayland (I, 71) are unconvincing, especially since both Betsy and the reader know the truth. In the case of the scholar, she insists calmly and persuasively that she called to Betsy that they were leaving the room (I, 87, 93-94), thus exonerating her own behaviour and helping to incriminate her companion. Although we suspect her of lying, we do not know for sure.

As in Betsy's case, it is Trueworth who has the most lasting

effect on Flora's character, only his influence is corruptive rather than ennobling. "It is her passion for Trueworth that first leads her to make advances herself,"[31] and in the world of Betsy Thoughtless, such aggression on the part of a woman is highly questionable behaviour. It is not so much the act of taking the initiative to which Haywood objects; Mrs. Blanchfield also offers herself to Trueworth, albeit fruitlessly, and she is praised rather than criticized (III, 100-1, 214-17). Rather, it is the singlemindedness of Flora's pursuit and her inability to accept that he does not love her which are condemned.[32]

> Whenever she had an opportunity of speaking to him alone, she made him many advances, which he either did not, or would not interpret in the sense she meant them.--This coldness, instead of abating but the more enflamed her wishes. (II, 78)

In the light of his indifference, his obvious devotion to Betsy proves too much for Flora's weakened moral fiber; out of love for him, she hatches the plots which eventually alienate Betsy and Trueworth completely. When their separation is made official, Flora again attempts to win his love, though her desperation now makes her offer herself without shame, under the scanty protection of an incognita. When they meet, she tries to keep up appearances, telling him that

> she hoped he would not abuse the confidence she reposed in him . . . that though she loved him with the most tender passion, . . . yet her inclinations were

[31] Rudolf, p. 242.

[32] Flora's similarity to Alovisa in this respect is marked. See above, p. 134.

> innocent, and pure as those of a vestal virgin, and a great deal more stuff of the like sort, which . . . Mr. Trueworth could scarce refrain from smiling at. (II, 253)

Similarly, he ignores her objections to revealing her face, and is only mildly surprised to discover her identity. At last Flora has achieved her great desire, and she is happy until his engagement with Harriot makes it necessary for him to break off his relationship with her. When she perceives that his ardour has cooled, her first reaction is only to write a reproachful letter. When this fails to move him, she follows him around London, visiting the coffee-houses he frequents in an attempt to force herself on him (III, 102-3). When he eventually writes to inform her of his marriage (III, 135-36), she is driven nearly mad, and attempts to ruin his relationship with Harriot by means of another of her anonymous letters. They have one final scene, in which all her threats and hysterics are to no avail. When Trueworth walks out of the public house, abandoning her to her fate, Flora abandons herself as well. A young man comes to her aid, and she carefully calculates her response.

> She examined his person,--his behaviour, and found nothing in either that was not perfectly agreeable; and though she had really loved Mr. Trueworth to the greatest excess that woman could do, yet, as she knew he was irrecoverably lost, she looked upon a new attachment as the only sure means of putting the past out of her head. (IV, 75)

Without love as an excuse, she becomes nothing but a common whore, like Miss Forward, and ends her days exiled to Jamaica with her mother. Flora's progress is exactly the opposite of Betsy's.

"The reader is not merely shown a bad example, but is instructed in how a fairly normal girl can become a social outcast."[33]

There are two other important patterns of relationship: one between Betsy and her advisers, the other between her and her suitors. At any given point in the novel, the state of Betsy's development can be measured by her attitude towards the advice of her friends and relations. One of the first things we learn about her is that she is unwilling "to consider the justice of the /governess's/ reasoning" about Miss Forward's misconduct (I, 10). She is equally disdainful of Mr. Goodman's attempts to moderate her conduct, and when Lady Trusty suggests that she might be better off back in the country, "Miss Betsy . . . plainly told her ladyship, that what she called a happy tranquil manner of spending one's days, seemed to her little better than being buried alive" (I, 59). After some of her experiences have frightened her, she is somewhat more willing to listen, and when Lady Trusty writes to counsel prudence, she admits her errors and assures her that "I shall regulate my conduct, so as to ease you of all those apprehensions you are so good to entertain on my account" (II, 65-66). She goes one step further:

> The letter of Lady Trusty, . . . joined to the late accidents which had happened, having now given her a turn of mind vastly different from what it had been a very little time before, made her now prefer the conversation of Miss Mabel, to most others of her acquaintance. (II, 70)

[33] Rudolf, p. 242. I am indebted to this work for my analysis of Flora and Miss Forward.

This is the first time Betsy has actually put herself in the way of sound advice and a worthy example. Unfortunately, her need to wrestle for predominance with Trueworth again blinds her to the value of his guidance:

> Mr. Trueworth . . . reminded her that Solomon, . . . the wisest of men, pronounced, that all the gaieties and magnificence of the earth were vanity and vexation of spirit.--"He did so," replied she, with a scornful smile; "but it was not till he had enjoyed them all, and was grown past the power of enjoying yet further:--when I am so, 'tis possible I may say the same." (II, 90-91)

After Trueworth withdraws, Betsy renews her intimacy with Mabel. When Fineer presents himself, Betsy is willing to take the advice of her brothers; she is prevented from confiding in them completely only by Lady Mellasin's affairs. After her escape from him, and in her subsequent marriage to Munden, she is most open to those who would advise her. Lady Trusty offers a letter of advice on how to conduct her "family affairs" (IV, 35-37), and later Betsy appeals to her in person regarding Munden's niggardly refusal to allow her sufficient housekeeping (IV, 52, 67-68). She also welcomes the opportunity to renew her friendship with Mabel, who has just returned from her wedding trip with Sir Basil Loveit, because she is confident that Mabel would be "what she so much wanted, a faithful adviser and an agreeable companion. . . ." (IV, 171-72). The period of her marriage is Betsy's most difficult time; she has matured a great deal, but she is still trying to find a safe way through the intricacies of her condition. Because of her uncertainty, she is unwilling to act without the approval of those who had formerly criticized her. "It was not sufficient that she should

be justified to herself; she was willing also to be justified in the opinion of her friends" (IV, 226). Her need for support is greatest just after she leaves her husband. Her brother expresses his approval of her decision to leave Munden, yet Betsy "could not be quite easy till she should hear what judgment her dear Lady Loveit would pass on the step she had taken. . . . " (IV, 236). Having gained their backing, and believing that she has handled a difficult affair with considerable dignity, Betsy no longer needs to feel dependent on advice and guidance. When she decides to spend her widowhood in the country, she writes to Lady Trusty, not to ask her opinion, but "to acquaint her with her intentions" (IV, 286). And her engagement to Trueworth is a complete surprise to everyone. "Unlike her early wilful decisions, this one is faultless."[34] No longer does she need to worry about appearances, for she is no longer in any danger of violating the social code.

x x x x x x x x x

The pattern of Betsy's relationships with her various suitors is nearly identical to that found in Love in Excess; in both novels, that pattern marks the growing emotional maturity of the protagonist. Like D'Elmont, Betsy treats her first lover with nonchalance, learns from her subsequent encounters the meaninglessness of amorous conquest, and comes in the end to value a true partnership in love. In both cases, the progress of the main char-

[34] Rudolf, p. 105.

acter's response to the opposite sex acts not only on the reader, but directly on that character as well. D'Elmont reflects on his treatment of Amena after he meets Melliora;[35] Betsy's marriage to Munden makes her realize that she has been "too little grateful to the merits" of Trueworth (IV, 6). D'Elmont must undergo being seduced and treated as a sex-object by Ciamara before he can live happily with Melliora; Betsy endures the misery of being married to a man who regards her as "an upper servant bound to study and obey . . . him" (IV, 60) before she is reunited to Trueworth. The significant difference between the two novels is that D'Elmont's reformation comes about through the purifying force of "true love," while Betsy is taught to value the friendship and respect of a good man through an arranged marriage to a domestic tyrant. This change in the representation of love from a mysterious spiritual force with almost allegorical overtones to a balanced affection combining the best elements of friendship and passion, embodies perfectly the alteration in sensibility which took place between the 1720's and 1750. Haywood's actual conception of love, as an equal partnership encompassing both sensuality and mental compatibility, has not changed. To the psychological realism of her earlier fiction she has added concrete surroundings, and her characters now have believable lives apart from their passions. Haywood has merely extended her scope. For all the innovations in technique which I have enumerated, the motifs of Betsy Thoughtless are identical to those of the more "romantic" novels which

[35] See above, p. 153.

first made Haywood popular. Thematically, the impact of those early works is predominantly what I have called "feminist." They portray a world in which women are continually struggling to assert their personalities, and men are equally assiduous in their efforts to maintain their power over women's lives. Nearly all the permutations of Haywood's highly successful formula involve men who are rapacious and single-minded in their pursuit, either of feminine favours or of wealth somehow connected to the possession of a female body. That her formula so frequently hovers on the brink of tragedy indicates how hopeless it is for a woman to attempt to keep her integrity intact in such a world. Betsy Thoughtless is, in this sense, the final reworking of that formula, in which Haywood deals directly and specifically with one woman's attempts. Gone is the elaborate allegory of the romances; instead we are offered day to day life in the pragmatic style of the conduct books. But beneath the mechanics of the story lies the same conflict, between men and women, between the individual and her society, which had provided the interest and impetus of many of her earlier works.

In Betsy Thoughtless all the elements of external pressure which the heroine must resist are united in what we can call the prudential code. Both Richardson and Fielding advocate prudence;[36] Fielding is particularly concerned, adopting the need for prudence as "the basic moral of Tom Jones":[37]

[36] See, for example, Clarissa I, 74, 103; II, 9, 277, 309, 313-14 (note); IV, 493, 505.

[37] Michael Irwin, Henry Fielding: the Tentative Realist (Oxford, 1967), p. 142. I am indebted to this analysis and Digeon's for first suggesting the basis for this parallel with Betsy Thoughtless.

> If Tom Jones errs . . . it is usually through sheer imprudence. He is no one's enemy but his own. Optimist as he is, he is ready to believe that all other men are as good as he. . . . He trusts simply to the dictates of his conscience, without the slightest regard for appearances. This makes it all too easy for his enemies to put him in a bad light.[38]

Substitute feminine pronouns for masculine, and this statement about Tom Jones is equally applicable to Betsy Thoughtless. For a woman, in the eighteenth century, prudence was even more crucial than for a man. It was the cardinal virtue, encompassing chastity, modesty and obedience. As I have suggested,[39] conventional morality during this period was something of a jungle, and it was necessary for a woman to tread very carefully in order to emerge with her reputation intact, particularly regarding relations between the sexes. Moralists were realistic in their awareness of these pitfalls, and advised women

> to find a mean between the poles of coquettry and prudery. The coquet is not only a merry candidate for sexual indiscretion, very fond of male admiration, but also a trifler with male affections, holding out hope where there is none. She is warned that beauty will not last, and is served with the ultimate threat in the moralist's bag, loss of reputation and so of marital prospects.[40]

This description is a fairly accurate picture of Betsy in the early sections of the novel. The other extreme, prudery, is condemned as flagrant hypocrisy and "play-acting"; writers on the subject "suggest that under the reserve /of the prude/ seethes a lawless-

[38] Digeon, p. 144.
[40] Rudolf, p. 142.

[39] See above, pp. 12-14.

conduct herself; she defies it.[46] She considers it irrational and degrading. To her mind, "as she meant no ill, those who censured her were most in fault" (I, 281). When Mr. Goodman warns her that "reputation is also of some value;--that the honour of a young maid . . . is a flower of so tender and delicate a nature, that the least breath of scandal withers and destroys it" (I, 281), she does not believe that anything matters apart from her own innocence and self-respect. In this context a conversation between her and her brother is particularly revealing:

> "What avails you being virtuous?" said Mr. Francis. "I hope,--and I believe you are so;--but your reputation is of more consequence to your family:--the loss of the one might be concealed, but a blemish on the other brings certain infamy and disgrace on yourself and all belonging to you."
>
> On this she assumed the courage to tell him, his way of reasoning was neither just nor delicate. "Would you," said she, "be guilty of a base action, rather than have it suspected that you were so?"--"No," answered he, "but virtue is a different thing in our sex. . . . The forfeiture of what is called virtue in a woman is more a folly than a baseness; but the virtue of a man is his courage, his constancy, his probity, which if he loses, he becomes contemptible to himself, as well as to the world."
>
> "And certainly," rejoined Miss Betsy, with some warmth, "the loss of innocence must render a woman contemptible to herself, though she should happen to hide her trangression from the world."--"That may be," said Mr. Francis; "but then her kindred suffer not through her fault:--the remorse, and the vexation for what she has done, is all her own.--Indeed, sister, . . . a woman brings less dishonour upon a family, by twenty private sins, than by one public indiscretion."
>
> (III, 108-9)

It is difficult to imagine a more blatant statement of the pruden-

[46] James Erickson, "Evelina and Betsy Thoughtless," Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 6 (1964-65), 98.

tial code than Frank's views on female chastity. According to him, the principle of "the greatest good for the greatest number" would join with that code to force a woman to choose to act immorally rather than be thought to act immorally. For all our awareness of Betsy's faults, we cannot help sympathizing with her amazement and applauding her scorn of Frank's advice. Haywood is clearly critical here; a system of values which prefers reputation to actual virtue is far from admirable.

The prudential code would not be necessary if men and women were not continually at war with each other. Men are "enemies because open and trusting relationships with them could lead to a ruined reputation and because men were the possessors of power."[47] This is amply demonstrated in the novel. Gayland, the gentleman-commoner, Fineer, Lord xxxx and the man of quality who takes Betsy home from Miss Forward's, all illustrate the maxim that men are not really interested in women apart from sex. Even Trueworth, who is capable of genuine love, proves to be only human. Of his affair with Flora, Haywood says: "he had indeed done no more than any man, of his age and constitution, would have done. . . . " (III, 77). It is not that men are incapable of honour and restraint. When the man of quality realizes that Betsy is not a prostitute playing hard to get, he is genuinely sorry for her and takes her home (II, 117-19), and Trueworth "reproached himself severely" for his amorousness when he is about to marry Harriot (III, 77). The attitude of one of Betsy's admirers is more typical:

[47] Rudolf, p. 195.

> The indifferent opinion which . . . most genteel rakes of the town have of women in general . . . made him imagine there required little more for the gaining her than the making his addresses to her. (IV, 163)

In either case, the burden of whatever restraint is exercised is placed on the woman. Again, her dilemma is how to avoid condemnation either as a prude or as a coquette. The illogic of a social code which places the entire responsibility for morality on those it regards as the weaker sex is obvious. What is less apparent is the cynicism underlying this view of human relations. As Betsy says, "'Tis strange . . . that a woman cannot indulge herself in the liberty of conversing freely with a man without being persuaded by him to do every thing he would have her" (I, 180). Yet if a woman wishes to keep both her honour and her reputation, she must avoid indulging in that liberty or she will be irreparably damaged in the eyes of the world, who know better than to believe in innocent social intercourse between the sexes. In this respect the basis of the prudential code is merely a practical restatement of the idea fundamental to Haywood's novels, that "a true passion cannot for any long time content itself with an ideal bliss";[48] sex is an inevitable factor in any relationships between men and women. Betsy wishes for nothing beyond what she enjoyed, the pleasure of being told she was very handsome, and gallanted about by a great number of those who go by the name of very pretty fellows" (I, 56). She cannot understand that the nature of men guarantees that that pleasure can never be innocent,

[48] The Injured Husband, p. 118. See above, pp. 252-54.

and that because of "the baseness of the world" (III, 230), even "compassionate acts like visiting a sick-bed and caring for an orphaned infant may be dangerous to reputation."[49]

There is a frightening irony inherent in the prudential code, and Haywood is well aware of its significance. If men are enemies, they are also "a necessity to every woman not suicidally inclined--for material maintenance, physical protection, and social identity."[50] It is this aspect of male-female relationships which is uppermost in the minds of Betsy's brothers and Lady Trusty, who agree "that marriage was the only sure refuge from temptation, for a young woman of Miss Betsy's disposition and humour" (III, 18). Betsy knows their views and recognizes the possible consequences to herself:

> they are in such haste to get me out of the way of what they call temptation, that I believe they would marry me to any man, that was of good family and had an estate. (III, 173)

Her speculations prove correct. After her misadventure with Fineer, Lady Trusty, we are told, "heartily wished to see her settled in the world, even though it were to less advantage, than her beauty, and the many good qualities she was possessed of might entitle her to expect" (IV, 13). They are so anxious to make sure that she goes through with her engagement that they conspire never to leave her alone in the days before the wedding.

[49] Rudolf, p. 262.

[50] Rudolf, p. 195.

> Mr. Munden had taken a very handsome house;--the upholsterer received all his orders for the furnishing it from her.--There were besides many other things necessary for the rendering it complete, that were not in his province to supply:--the going, therefore, to shops and warehouses for that purpose, took a very great part of her time.--What could be spared from these, and some other preparations for her wedding, either Lady Trusty, or her brothers, had the address to engage:--one or the other of them were always with her, 'till the night was far advanced, and sleep became more welcome than any meditations she could indulge. (IV, 32-33)

After the wedding, "the two Mr. Thoughtlesses were extremely overjoyed, on thinking a period was put to all their cares in relation to their sister" (IV, 34). What makes the irony even sharper is that Betsy seems to accept their belief. She relies on the protection of her husband at Lord xxxx's dinner; "a wife may certainly go anywhere with her husband" (IV, 133), and she imagines herself "safe . . . from all the encroachments of presumptuous love" (IV, 134). If Lady Trusty and her brothers were correct in their assumptions about marriage, Betsy would be perfectly safe. But Lord xxxx hints to her, and her husband later acts in accordance with the possibility, that "he might have been tempted by the hopes of interest to become yielding to the dishonourable intentions of his patron. . . . " (IV, 142). In the end she realizes that "real protection only comes from virtue within and concordant manners without."[51] She has been bludgeoned into marriage for nothing.

Marriage, as it is presented in Betsy Thoughtless, is for the most part a pretty dismal affair. Of the six marriages in the no-

[51] Rudolf, p. 249.

vel, the three which can be described as happy are not represented in any detail. Harriot and Trueworth live their entire wedded life off stage; Lady Trusty and Sir Ralph seem to have little to do with each other, and are considerably past the time of working out their relationship; Mabel and Sir Basil are assumed to be an ideal couple, but Haywood does not show us much of their actual life together. On the other hand, the domestic affairs of the Munden's and Mr. Goodman are essential to both plot and theme. Even the union of Mr. and Mrs. Marplus, though only of minor importance, is given a solidity which the good marriages lack. When Mrs. Marplus is explaining to Mr. Goodman her husband's relationship with Lady Mellasin, she makes her dissatisfaction very clear:

> Would you believe it, Sir?--Not withstanding all he got from her Ladyship, he kept me poor and mean, as you see--would not let me have a servant, but made me wash his linen, and do all the drudgery while he strutted about the town, like a fine fellow, with his toupée wig and laced waistcoat; and if I made the least complaint, would tell me, in derision, that as I had no children I had nothing else to do but to wait upon him. (II, 163)

Her financial subjugation foreshadows Betsy's own. Lady Mellasin and Mr. Goodman also differ about money, but there is not the same power struggle between them as there is in the other two relationships. Thomas and Frank, as we have seen, regard marriage, for their sister, as a sort of institutional chastity belt. Even Lady Trusty, perhaps speaking from experience, is far from idealistic about the nature of married life:

> I would have you always confine yourself to such things, as properly appertain to your own province,

> never interfering with such as belong to your husband;--be careful to give to him all the rights of his place, and at the same time maintain your own, though without seeming too tenacious of them.--If any dispute happen to arise between you, concerning superiority, though in matters of the slightest moment, rather recede a little from your due, than contend too far; but let him see you yield more to oblige him, than because you think yourself bound to do so. (IV, 36-37)

Betsy herself has no illusions about what being a wife entails, and no great expectations of romance:

> What a ridiculous thing this love is! . . . What extravagancies does it sometimes make men guilty of! --yet one never sees this madness in them after they become husbands;--if I were to marry . . . I do not doubt but he would soon recover his senses. (III, 7-8)

After she weds Munden, she realizes how important her marriage is to her whole identity.

> She began seriously to consider on the duties of her place;--she was ignorant of no part of them, and soon became convinced, that on a strict observance of them depended her honour,--her reputation,--her peace of mind, and, in fine, all that was dear to a woman of virtue and understanding. (IV, 39)

Realizing that only love can make these duties, which include the submission counselled by Lady Trusty, at all bearable to a woman of her spirit, she dreads being united to Munden. Consequently, her later assessment of that union as "an Egyptian bondage" (IV, 47) comes as no surprise.

Haywood's portrayal of Betsy's apprehensions taps a new well of psychological realism. They begin almost immediately after she

consents to the match.

> Miss Betsy had not as yet had time to meditate on what she had given her promise to perform:--the joy she found her compliance had given all her friends, --the endearing things they said to her upon the occasion, and the transport Mr. Munden had expressed . . . had kept up her spirits, and she imagined, while in their presence, that her inclination had dictated the consent she had uttered. But when she was alone, . . . when she no longer received the kind caresses of her smiling friends, nor the flattering raptures of her future husband, all the lively ideas, which their conversation and manner of behaviour towards her had just inspired, vanished at once, and gave place to fancies, which might justly bear the name of splenetic. (IV, 22-23)

It would, perhaps, have been more instructive or more interesting to have Betsy submit to the marriage only grudgingly, to be truly forced, as the Harlowes attempt to force Clarissa. But Betsy takes no heroic stance. Happy to make her friends happy, needing their reassurance and approval, she nearly convinces herself that she really wants to be married--until she has time to inspect her true feelings. These are not quite so agreeable.

> I wonder what can make the generality of women so fond of marrying?--It looks to me like an infatuation. --Just as if it were not a greater pleasure to be courted, complimented, admired, and addressed by a number, than confined to one, who from a slave becomes a master; and perhaps uses his authority in a manner disagreeable enough.
>
> And yet it is expected from us.--One has no sooner left off one's bib and apron, than people cry,--"Miss will soon be married,"--and this man, and that man, is presently picked out for a husband.--Mighty ridiculous! --they want to deprive us of all the pleasures of life, just when we are beginning to have a relish for them. (IV, 23-24)

Her awareness of her position in society as a woman is well-articulated here, and in her own case proves to be prophetic. Her re-

bellion is understandable and natural, given her temperament and her short experience of life in London. But it is her subconscious thoughts which are most fascinating, and frighteningly real:

> In this humour she went to bed, nor did sleep present her with images more pleasing,--sometimes she imagined herself standing on the brink of muddy, troubled waters;--at others, that she was wandering through deserts, overgrown with thorns and briars, or seeking to find a passage through some ruined building, whose tottering roof seemed ready to fall upon her head, and crush her to pieces. (IV, 24)

The images conjured in these dreams are not sexual, as dreams in early novels so often are. If they reveal anything about Betsy, it is a deep-seated fear that she will lose her sense of identity. All three images place her poised on the edge of unknown and dangerous territory; she is both lost and threatened. As there are no human or anthropomorphic figures in her dream landscape, it is obviously not Munden as a man that she fears,[52] but the state of wedlock itself. Given Lady Trusty's doctrine of submission, which is representative of conventional wisdom, Betsy's terror of losing herself and being subsumed in her husband's public persona is natural and inevitable.

But the true psychological significance of this passage is not revealed until Betsy's subconscious dread merges with her conscious feelings of rebellion:

[52] Cf. Clarissa, I, 433.

> These gloomy representations, amidst her broken slumbers, when vanished, left behind them an uncommon heaviness upon her waking mind:--she rose;--but it was only to throw herself into a chair, where she sat for a considerable time, like one quite stupid and dead to all sensation, of every kind.
>
> At last, remembering, that they were all to dine at her brother's that day, by appointment, she roused herself as well as she was able, and started from the posture she had been in.--"I see I am at the end of all my happiness," said she, "and that my whole future life is condemned to be a scene of disquiet;--but there is no resisting destiny;--they will have it so:--I have promised, and must submit." (IV, 24-25)

Her position is not materially different from that of Haywood's earlier heroines. Munden and her family supply the element of external force necessary to the formula, while Betsy's pride and natural independence supply the place of love as the internal impetus. However, this description is not the stuff of tragedy. Betsy is neither heroic nor suicidal; she is merely depressed in a very ordinary way. Her dilemma has the same tragic implications as those in which the earlier heroines found themselves, but the resolution is not of epic proportions. She simply gives in, wearily, and perhaps with some relief that the suspense is finally at an end. Clarissa could never have given in to Solmes, nor Anadea to the Chevalier, without falsifying the terms of the conflict and, by implication, its essential truth. Betsy and her society engage on different terms. The consequences of her mistakes in judgment are great,

> but they do not consist of thrilling scenes of rape and murder, nor of dramatic renunciations of life via death or convent or exile--they consist of a dreary succession of days and weeks worn away in

> futile efforts to patch up a bad marriage to the wrong man. . . .[53]

Suicides, broken hearts and murders would be as out of place in Betsy Thoughtless as London topography would be in The Fair Hebrew or The British Recluse. Like thousands of other young women faced with arranged marriages, Betsy carries on regardless. Her lot is not to be deliriously happy, but she expects that it will eventually be tolerable. And, at least for the first few months, those expectations are fulfilled. Even at its worst, her marriage is too ordinary, too real to be tragic. Munden's tyranny is truly domestic; he could never, as a character, support Satanic overtones, like Lovelace, or bear the weight of myth. He is a small-minded man, and he makes Betsy miserable, but only in a very "mundane" way. Moreover, her feelings for him are not the epic emotions one might expect from the situation, using the earlier novels as a guide. When he repents his ill treatment of her, she is deeply moved and reaffirms her marriage vows, but she does not suddenly forget their past life and fall in love with him. Nor does she rejoice at his death, welcoming it as the removal of the final obstacle to her marriage with Trueworth.

> She had been deeply troubled at finding her husband in so deplorable a situation; the tenderness he had now expressed for her, and his contrition for his past faults, made a great impression on her mind, and the shock of seeing him depart was truly dreadful to her;--the grief she appeared in was undissembled--the tears she shed unforced:--she withdrew into another room, where shutting herself up for some hours, life, death, and futurity were the subjects of her mediations. (IV, 278-79)

[53] Erickson, "The Novels of Eliza Haywood," p. 122.

Again, Betsy's reactions to an intensely dramatic situation are prosaic, ordinary and perfectly natural. The depression mingled with her grief and shock is an emotion which anyone who has experienced bereavement can acknowledge as fundamental, and in the circumstances, far truer than elation or even relief would be. Haywood's understanding of her heroine is sophisticated, and she never falsifies Betsy's feelings for effect.

If Clarissa's resistance to Solmes is heroic, and Sophia's energetic refusal to marry Blifil is admirable, how are we to regard Betsy's apparent weakness in giving in to her family and marrying Munden? This is the critical question, and I believe that in the answer lies the importance of Haywood's contribution to later fiction. Both comedy and tragedy deal with extremes; the characters are idealized, and the situations allow for no minor adjustments to be made. Writing about Anna Howe, Kinkead-Weekes pinpoints the difference between Betsy and the heroines of the epic forms:

> She is more likable than Clarissa, not only because she is given vivacity and wit, spirit, sturdy independence; but mostly because she is less absolute, far more willing (like ourselves) to compromise absolute standards if she must.[54]

Willingness to compromise is the key. Like Anna, Betsy is able to bow before the inevitable, and she gains strength from that submission; she bends so that she does not break. And by doing

[54] Kinkead-Weekes, p. 163.

the same thing, by bending to the realities of every day life, Haywood's novel revealed a new path along which fiction could develop. The tragedy of Richardson and the comedy of Fielding were overstrained by their own greatness; distended, they became rigid. Haywood infused the one with the other. The flexibility of her characters, the domestic detail which gives Betsy Thoughtless a sound basis in reality, the humour of rebellion combined with serious moral purpose, and the growth of the heroine through a potentially tragic situation to a happy ending that we can believe in, all join to create a new kind of novel which would soon become the mainstream of English fiction. It is significant that Fielding, later in 1751, and Richardson in 1753-54, wrote domestic tragi-comedies similar to Haywood's. Both Amelia and Sir Charles Grandison contain a gallery of marriages, and a central dilemma with tragic implications. Both novels also end happily. The importance of money in Fielding's novel and the gradual adaptation of Richardson's Lady G. to "the state of wedlock" are other important elements found first in Haywood's work.

The object of this essay is not to claim that Betsy Thoughtless is as great a book as Grandison or Amelia. Nor is it to determine direct influences, although the chronology of the three novels offers a tremendous temptation. However, the popularity of Betsy Thoughtless and the radical change in the novels of the period's two major writers would seem to support a claim for Haywood's novel as a truly pioneering work of fiction. The existence of an ordinary reader was not maintained at a high pitch of intensity. Most people were neither cynics nor idealists, and compromising was as fundamental a component of every day living as refined

feelings and impetuous passion were to the romances. Having discovered, through the illustrative fiction of courtesy literature and the "realism" of Richardson, Fielding and Smollett, that novels were capable of reflecting their own lives, readers were demanding that fiction be brought in line with the probabilities of those lives. Tragedy had nothing to teach them; Clarissa was admirable, but how many women would find themselves in a position where they required the model of behaviour she provided? Comedy offered little more. For most people, the vicissitudes of fortune were less violent than for Tom Jones or Joseph Andrews. But Betsy Thoughtless is different. There were hundreds of young women coping for the first time with the terrors and delights of London society. Many women had to tolerate marriages made for everyone's "convenience" but their own. Husbands were niggards; men were thoughtlessly brutal in their sexual egotism; society slandered and speculated on the basis of the smallest inadvertency. Women were headstrong yet kind, spirited yet sensible, depressed, yet able to carry on going to dinner, conversing, worrying about mortality and household economy. As a writer whose ability to satisfy the public's literary longings had for many years been all that stood between her and poverty, Haywood was peculiarly attuned to the changes in taste which evolved during the 1730's and 1740's. Richardson and Fielding both came to recognize the need for compromise in fiction. In addition to the taming of Lady G., which is similar to the process which takes place during Betsy's marriage, Grandison's "divided heart" was a major departure from the more "romantic" literature which had preceded it. The heroes of tragedy, like those of romance, are only capable of loving one person

in a lifetime. In this respect, Grandison is a realistic character, who can be attracted to two completely different women, and honestly not know which one he prefers. The central conflict in Amelia, the "virtuous" heroine's toleration of her husband's profligacy and infidelity, is similarly true to life. Whether Fielding and Richardson had learned something from her success, or whether they merely followed their own, independent perceptions of the same trends, the fact remains that Haywood wrote and published first. Betsy Thoughtless is both a culmination of Haywood's long career, and a beacon marking fiction's way forward in the future. It deserves to be read and appreciated in its own right, as a well-executed and entertaining work, and as an important contribution to the development of the novel form.

PART FIVE

Conclusion

The five years between the publication of Betsy Thoughtless and Haywood's death saw only one new novel from the pen of "the female veteran."[1] Some critics have even preferred The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy (1753) to Betsy Thoughtless,[2] usually on the basis of its blatant didacticism and unimpeachable morality. All the other works she wrote in these last years of her life[3] are conduct books of a kind; Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy is no exception. As a novel, it is far inferior, lacking the organic structure, the unity and the depth of characterization found in its predecessor. Haywood had been struggling against conventions, blazing new trails in fiction, and leading her contemporaries in production for over thirty years. Perhaps she was growing weary; possibly she was standing down, having pointed out a new direction, to let the next generation have its turn. The problem of tracing literary influences, which I first mentioned in my discussion of Haywood, Richardson and Fielding, is perhaps even more troublesome in the years after her death. In 1778, Fanny Burney published Evelina, and though no record exists of her having read Betsy Thoughtless, the striking similarities between the two works

[1] Haviland, p. 157. [2] See Elton, pp. 161-62; Saintsbury, The English Novel, pp. 137-38; and Bishay, p. 93. [3] These works are: The Wife and The Husband, which actually are conduct books; The Young Lady, a periodical much more serious in tone than The Female Spectator; and The Invisible Spy, a work in which she adapted the format of the secret history to make it serve an obviously didactic intent.

have frequently been noted and catalogued.[4] It has been suggested that Burney was, in turn, an influence on Jane Austen,[5] who has herself frequently been imitated. The feminist strain in Haywood's works similarly seems to reappear in a series of later works. The Distressed Orphan is remarkably like Mary Wollstonecraft's The Wrongs of Woman (1798), which is similar in many ways to Sylvia Plath's The Bell Jar (1963). I have also noted a striking resemblance between The Rash Resolve and Margaret Drabble's The Millstone (1965). Rudolf, putting Betsy Thoughtless at the head of a long line of "tea-table novels," attempts to establish a tradition which is both literary and feminist.[6]

Again, it is impossible to determine whether the similarities I have listed are the result of direct influence, or simply of parallel perceptions. In the case of the feminist strain, it is probably a question of "plus ça change. . . . " However, whether or not individual authors read and imitated Haywood is neither important nor useful from the point of view of the kind of development I have been discussing. After all, the actual number of books directly influenced by Defoe's fiction--that is, imitated in whole or in part in his own period--is relatively small, and Haywood can probably boast an equal number of imitators from among their contemporaries.[7] Neither Richardson nor Fielding, both of whom had

[4] Dunlop was the first to point out the close correspondence between the two works; III, 369-72. See also Dobrée, p. 409; Dobson, "Polly Honeycombe," p. 98; Erickson, "Evelina and Betsy Thoughtless"; Forsyth, pp. 203-4; Lovett and Hughes, p. 50; Whicher pp. 26 and 175; Whitmore, pp. 39 and 48. It is dismissed as coincidence by the Jerrolds, p. 269. [5] See Frank Bradbrook, Jane Austen and her Predecessors (Cambridge, 1967); R. B. Johnson, The Women Novelists (London, 1918); or Harrison Steeves. [6] Rudolf, pp. 272-73. This idea is one of the central themes of her dissertation. [7] See above, p. 31.

an immediate effect on the course of fiction, owed anything to Defoe. Of the century's major literary figures, Smollett is the only one to whom Defoe's works made any difference, directly. Yet Defoe is regarded by some as "the father of the modern novel."[8] Although Haywood obviously had some effect on Richardson, if only by supplying him with a fictional tradition on which to draw,[9] and although even her earliest novels have a coherence and formal unity which Defoe's conspicuously lack, she is either discounted or ignored.

Literary development is not as straightforward and easily demonstrable as genetic evolution. There is a delicate relationship between the critical assessment of a work, which is necessarily subjective and sometimes prejudiced, and that work's popularity: if a book like Betsy Thoughtless or Love in Excess is condemned by the few who have access to it, it will never be published and widely circulated. If it is never available, it can never be read. To a critic who uses survival as his chief criterion, Haywood is easily dismissed. Her works are no longer read; therefore, most would agree, they are not worth reading. Criticism did not, however, begin to achieve its current potency or its sophistication until the early nineteenth century. It seems more than just a coincidence that Haywood, and particularly Betsy Thoughtless, remained popular until that time.[10] I believe that the development of the

[8] See Watt, pp. 93-94. [9] See above, pp. 344-49.

[10] It was reprinted as late as 1783, as part of Harrison's Novelist's Magazine. The Invisible Spy and Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy were also published in this series. Haywood was included in Mary Hays' Female Biography: or, Memoirs of Illustrated and Celebrated Women of All Ages and Countries (London, 1803), along with people like Sappho and Queen Elizabeth I; Hays calls Betsy Thoughtless "an excellent novel, abounding in nature and good sense" (IV, 402). See also D.R.'s note in Notes & Queries, 8th series, 9 (1896), 366, for evidence of the novel's popularity in the early 19th century.

novel was a far more intricate process, and one in which a more diffuse type of influence operates, than is commonly accepted. Imitations and literary "borrowings" are easily perceived, and extremely satisfying to the critic who first identifies them. The parallels between Betsy Thoughtless and the more respectable Evelina have been pounced on with relish by both students[11] and professional scholars. Doody takes similar delight in listing parallels between Haywood's early novels and Clarissa.[12] To claim a more subtle relationship among authors is far more difficult, and probably far more interesting.

It has been my purpose in this thesis to adjust what I regard as a major imbalance in the history of the English novel. Because Haywood based her fiction on the tradition of heroic romance, because she adopted a battery of conventions and devices which critics have consistently misinterpreted for the past 250 years, her impact on the development of the genre has been for the most part dismissed. Yet by adapting those conventions and devices, she was able to write books which reflected the lives of her readers and raised issues which soon became the very heart of fiction. From her own experience, and from observing the lives of other women, Haywood derived a deep understanding of the peculiar pressures, both emotional and physical, to which a woman was subject. Using the romance conventions as a basis, she developed what I have called her fictional formula, which combined elements of external stress,

[11] Erickson's "Evelina and Betsy Thoughtless" was originally the final chapter of his dissertation, "The Novels of Eliza Haywood."

[12] Doody, pp. 15-33; 122-50.

such as property marriage, parental tyranny, and masculine aggression with such internal sources of tension as erotic imagination, duty, and conventional morality. The "problem" which this formula expresses is fundamental: the potential tragedy of women's lives, and their perpetual struggle to preserve their integrity in a world which refuses to recognize that that integrity even exists. But the formula itself allowed for endless permutations, and enabled Haywood both to illustrate the fulfilment of the tragic potential, as in The Fatal Secret and The Rash Resolve, and, as in Love in Excess or The Distressed Orphan, to inculcate a more realistic and more equitable ideal of sexual love. In The Distressed Orphan and Philidore and Placentia she also exploits to the full the tension which was generated when, to make clear the allegorical implications of her formula, she set her psychologically realistic heroines in exotic backgrounds, populated with characters whose passions were frequently exaggerated. In this way she successfully filled a gulf left between on the one hand, the material realism of rogue literature and the works of Defoe, and on the other, the idealism of the heroic romance itself.

Haywood's formula was so flexible and so useful to a genre which took human relations as its subject, that it became the basis of the dialectic between Richardson and Fielding which began with the publication of Pamela. Haywood was an important third party in the process of development which took place during the 1740's. The outcome of that dialectic was, in Clarissa and Tom Jones, the apparent exhaustion of the possibilities of her formula; it seemed that the novel could take it no further, in either the tragic, or the comic mode. Richardson and Fielding both offered

extreme resolutions of the tensions in women's lives. By making Clarissa a saint in a savagely imperfect world, Richardson exaggerated into tragedy the kind of conflict which Haywood had portrayed in her earlier works. In Tom Jones, Fielding simply denied that those particular sources of tension existed; his men are neither imperious nor lustful, his lovers are self-restrained, and good-nature prevails over cynicism. Haywood's early novels were to a certain extent similarly hyperbolic, insofar as her characters are representative and their dilemmas subject to symbolic interpretation. By putting the emotions of her heroines under a magnifying lense, Haywood succeeded in displaying a sharply focused picture of female psychology. However, in doing so, she necessarily blurred the background of that picture. As tastes changed, in the 1730's and 1740's, Haywood recognized that there was another type of fiction she could write, one which would harmonize foreground and background, as it were, and bring each clearly into focus. Perceiving that the reading public was ready, even eager, to read literature which reflected not extremes, but the probabilities of ordinary life, Haywood attempted a more uniformly realistic fiction, and produced works which more closely accord with our modern conception of "the novel."

Haywood was quick to appreciate that the pattern on which she had based her earlier narratives could prove even more serviceable to her new novels. In Betsy Thoughtless, her most "modern" work, she once again presented a vision of woman's life, this time not in terms of its potential tragedy, but as an endless series of compromises. Betsy is very similar to the heroines of the earlier works. Unlike Clarissa, Haywood's heroines are not paragons of

virtue: they all make mistakes, and behave defiantly and foolishly as well as courageously. Where Betsy and her predecessors part company is in their ultimate fates. Although strict poetic justice does not pertain in many of the early novels, and heroines like Camilla, Cleomira and Glicera enjoy a happiness which conventional morality would have denied them, the conflicts which these books portray are still exaggerated. The works are short, and death is often the easiest and most dramatic resolution to a woman's unhappiness. Betsy Thoughtless depicts intermediate stages of growth and development. The hopelessness of a situation, symbolized in the earlier works by a dramatic demise, is translated in the later novel as a long series of humiliations and a loveless, soul-destroying marriage. Technically, Betsy Thoughtless represents a similar modification of Haywood's earlier fiction. Many of the romance conventions are still recognizable; others have been refined or replaced, and the symbolism of the early works has given way completely to concrete realism. Richardson and Fielding both soon realized that they had exhausted certain of the novel's possibilities, in the hyperbolic mode, and when they found a new direction for their fiction, it was the same one taken by Haywood in Betsy Thoughtless.

I believe that Haywood's contribution to the rise of the novel was at least as great as Defoe's. Watt suggests that "Defoe, Richardson and Fielding all earned themselves a . . . secure literary immortality . . . by expressing their own sense of life with a completeness and conviction which is very rare. . . . "[13] Eliza

[13] Watt, p. 301.

Haywood, as a courageous, unconventional and perceptive woman, possessed a strong "sense of life" which they, as men, could never express, and offered her own view of reality with "a completeness and conviction" more than equal to theirs. Throughout her long career she championed the interests of her sex with a dedication that lasted until her death. It is time that her "monument"[14] be renovated and her reputation reconsidered.

[14] See above, p. 72.

APPENDIX

Plot Synopses of Haywood's Novels

THE AGREEABLE CALEDONIAN

Clementina is the only child of Jaquez de Morella, a wealthy nobleman in Rome. He is ambitious for her and refuses many offers of marriage in hopes that she can make a spectacular match. Then a Cardinal offers to give up the church for her. Clementina dislikes the Cardinal, and Morella agrees not to force her. For fear of humiliation if rejected, the Cardinal has kept his honourable proposals secret, and it is rumoured that Morella has sold him his daughter's honour. When Morella hears these reports, he orders her to marry the Cardinal at once. When she tells the Cardinal that he is hateful to her and accuses him of taking advantage of her father's power over her, he gives up his suit, and Morella sends her to a monastery to punish her disobedience.

At the convent she meets Miramene, an idealist in love with Glencairn. They had fallen in love at the Carnival, and enjoyed a romantic courtship. Then Jacinta, married to Tortosa, a former suitor of Miramene's requested her help in arranging an assignation with her own lover, who has recently grown cold towards her. Miramene agreed to distract Tortosa, still in love with her, while the lovers met in an adjoining room, but Tortosa takes advantage and attempted to force her. She was rescued by Jacinta's lover, who is her own Glencairn. He swore that he had been faithful since he met her, and they were reconciled before her father sent her to the convent because of an insufficient fortune to support her in a marriage. Now they correspond daily, and she is content simply to think about him.

Miramene's story inflames Clementina's imagination, as do the letters from Glencairn which she shares. Believing that she herself is worthy of equal constancy, Clementina determines to make him transfer his affections to her. Although she begins her conspiracy out of vanity, she soon falls seriously in love, and separates the lovers by dwelling on the hopelessness of their plight. Glencairn suspects her feelings, and his amorous temperament is soon cooperating fully. He arranges her escape.

Part II

Glencairn and Miramene are forced to postpone their marriage because it is Lent, but on the strength of their engagement, he persuades her to consummate their union. Ismenia becomes her companion, having been betrayed by her aunt's young husband. Morella discovers Glencairn and his daughter, and they are held in separate monasteries to await trial. Ismenia acts as messenger, and Glencairn falls in love with her. She tells Morella that Clementina and Glencairn are not married, in order to obtain Glencairn's freedom, and then they elope. After they have become lovers, she reveals that she is Miramene's sister, and that she has stolen him for revenge.

When Clementina learns what has happened, she learns to shoot and pursues him in men's clothing. She attacks him, but is arrested, and when he learns of her passion he obtains her release and offers to marry her out of gratitude. He is soon unfaithful, and she grows jealous and shrewish, eventually dying of a violent fever.

THE ARRAGONIAN QUEEN

Albaraizor, prince of Arragon, is offered the hand of Zephalinda in return for military services to her father. Zephalinda is in love with Abdelhamar, but she consents out of obedience to her father. She forbids Abdelhamar to see her again, but he comes to her the night before her wedding. He offers to elope with her, but she is too honourable and prudent to break her vow to her father. At the tournament celebrating the marriage, she recognizes him as the mysterious black knight who wins all the prizes. She pretends to love her husband, and although he is not fooled, he hopes that her fidelity will grow into love. After a time, however, he complains of her coldness, and she resolves to think of no one but him in future.

Abdelhamar is sent to Arragon as an ambassador from her father, and Zephalinda's steadfast constancy to her husband only inflames him more. She finally orders him away, and in his despair he faints. Her woman, Selyma, is in love with him and runs to his aid. Albaraizor sees them together, and becomes convinced that Abdelhamar is in love with Selyma. The story of their supposed romance circulates, and when Zephalinda hears it, all her tenderness for her husband is lost in her jealous rage. She is afraid of Selyma, who knows the truth of their passion, and insists that Abdelhamar silence her by marrying her. He is extremely reluctant, and when Selyma overhears his coldness, she vows revenge. She tells Albaraizor everything she knows, proving her story with a letter she had intercepted. He has the lovers arrested, and the whole kingdom is plunged in gloom and despair.

THE BRITISH RECLUSE

Cleomira, who has been educated at court, suffers a change in fortune and is secluded in the country with her mother. She meets Lysander at a ball and falls in love. She follows him to London, where she puts herself under the protection of Marvir, the husband of an old school friend. Marvir arranges for Lysander to go to her in her room, and he takes advantage of her passion to ruin her. She loves him to excess, and he soon sickens of her and her reproaches. When she hears that he is marrying someone else, she goes mad, determining to kill herself, but a suspicious apothecary dilutes the poison she asks for into a sleeping potion. When she thinks herself dying, she sends to Lysander, who responds with such indifference that her passion is cured. She retreats to a boarding house in London, pretending to her family that she is dead.

At the boarding house she lives like a hermit, where the strangeness of her life attracts Belinda's attention. After hearing Cleomira's story, she relates her own. She has been betrothed by her father to Worthly, for whom she feels great esteem, but no love. One day as they are riding in their coach, it overturns and they are assisted by Courtal, a dashing young man, who then comes to stay with Worthly. Worthly sends his new friend to urge Belinda to name an early day for their wedding, but Courtal takes the opportunity to declare his own passion. She is torn between love and duty, but at last agrees to meet him in the woods. He takes advantage of her intense love to seduce her, but they are interrupted at the critical moment by Worthly. Courtal injures him in a duel and escapes, and Belinda has come to London to search for him. She finally sees him at the theatre with his wife and a third mistress and is soon convinced of his baseness by his reputation as a great rake.

The two women discover that Lysander and Courtal are the same person. This common misfortune and their great affinity for each other determine them to take a house togetherin the country, where they lead a solitary and peaceful life.

THE CAPRICIOUS LOVER

Calista is in love with Montano, but fearing the immoderate force of her passion, she behaves with a self-restraint which he interprets as indifference. Unsure of her love, he is equally cautious in his proposals, and she comes to believe that his intentions are not honourable. To protect her reputation, she pretends that she is utterly unconcerned about him, and he reacts by breaking their engagement. She agrees to marry Gaspora, whom she has previously rejected, to prove to the world that Montano has not hurt her. On the morning after her marriage, Montano comes to see if the rumours he had heard were true. He kills himself, but befor he dies they explain themselves and are reconciled. Calista is cast off by Gaspora, who resents being used, and soon dies of grief.

THE CITY JILT

Glicera is the only child of an eminent tradesman who is believed to be enormously wealthy. This reputation attracts Melladore, and a marriage is arranged to their mutual satisfaction. However, the marriage is postponed because of her father's illness, and when he dies, Melladore discovers that the old man had been virtually impoverished. His tenderness and respect quickly change to lust, and he takes advantage of her trusting love to make her his mistress. When she becomes pregnant she asks him to marry her, but he refuses and terminates their relationship. The shock causes a miscarriage, and she nearly commits suicide, but she is so afraid of dying that she wills herself slowly back to life. She soon becomes indifferent to Melladore himself, but comes to hate men in general with a terrible bitterness. To gain revenge she encourages everyone who courts her, only to frustrate them when they least expect rejection. Among her beaus is a rich old alderman named Grubguard, and she singles him out as the chief object of her revenge. With the help of her friend, Laphelia, she plots to make her fortune at his expense. Laphelia encourages him and convinces him to adopt the ways of a dandy. He predictably makes a fool of himself. They also encourage him to gamble, and he loses vast sums of money to Glicera. She has been amassing wealth from her other suitors as well, and in a short time is extremely well off.

Meanwhile, Melladore has married Helena for her fortune, but soon discovers that her estate is tied up in a lawsuit hinging on the legitimacy of her birth. On her assurance that she is the rightful heir, he goes into debt to fight the case, but she has lied and he loses everything. She is vain and extravagant, and when he foils one of her love affairs, she runs him even more into debt out of spite. He is forced to morgage his estate to Grubguard. When Glicera learns what has happened, she resolves to complete her revenge by obtaining control of the mortgage. She promises Grubguard her final favours if he wagers the deeds at play, but when she wins them, she denounces him as a decrepit old fool. Melladore does all he can to pay off the mortgage, but quickly goes bankrupt. His misfortune at last causes him to repent, and he begs Glicera's forgiveness. At his request, she releases enough of his estate for him to buy a commission, and he is killed in battle. She and Laphelia live happily together for a while, and when Laphelia leaves to get married, Glicera showers her with gifts. She then lives the rest of her life as a model of goodness and probity.

CLEOMELIA

Cleomelia is the only daughter of an English merchant in Bengal. She is in love with Gasper, whose mercenary father, Flavonius, prohibits their marriage. Her father makes her promise to receive the addresses of Heartlove, an equally worthy suitor. She decides that obeying her father will cause the least unhappiness, but Gasper is so miserable when she tells him that she agrees to marry him instead. Not trusting her, he makes her sign a formal contract, on the basis of which they consummate their union. Cleomelia dreads hurting Heartlove and her father, and appeals to Heartlove's generosity to avoid the loss of her reputation. When he learns that she loves another, he replies that he values her happiness above his own, and withdraws his proposals.

When Cleomelia becomes pregnant, Gasper wants to make their marriage public, but she refuses for fear of his father's displeasure. When her own father finds out, he appeals to Flavonius, who secretly conveys Gasper away. When her father dies of grief, she is left in poverty and the generous Heartlove renews his proposals. His generosity compels her to love him, and after she gives up the contract with Gasper to purchase her son's security from Flavonius, she and Heartlove are married. They are happy until she learns that Gasper is returning. Her love for Heartlove turns to resentment, and she sets sail at once for England. In her absence, Gasper and Heartlove duel, and Gasper flees to Spain. When Heartlove recovers, Flavonius sends for his son, but he is told that Gasper has run off with a Spanish woman.

The Captain of Cleomelia's ship, Conrade, falls in love with her. They are forced to take shelter from a storm on an island where they hear that Heartlove has died, and that Gasper has married a Spanish woman. She agrees that if the reports are true, she will marry Conrade. They return to Bengal, and she finds herself a rich widow. She and Conrade are married and live happy until he leaves on another voyage. One day, she meets Gasper and his friend, who have been attacked by robbers. Gasper tells her that he had been duped by Flora, the Spanish woman, into offering her a refuge from her brutal husband. He had sent her to Flavonius to be rid of her, and on the way back had been attacked and left for dead. She promises to write to him, refusing to speak to him further. Gasper learns of her marriage from his father, and he soon receives her letter, which renounces him. Flora is married off to a rich merchant, and Gasper takes his son to settle in England. When Cleomelia hears, several months later, that Conrade has been lost at sea, she sails to England as well, and she and Gasper are at last happily married.

DALINDA: OR, THE DOUBLE MARRIAGE

Dalinda and her cousin Malvolio are raised by their grandmother. When the grandmother perceives that Dalinda has fallen in love with him, she orders him to treat her with indifference. When he obeys, Dalinda languishes, and only his kindness can restore her. Leander is in love with her, and Malvolio advises her to encourage him. She confesses that she would rather marry him, and he grows lustful. After much debate, he threatens to leave the county if she does not yield. She refuses unless he promises to marry her. When he does, she insists on their reading part of the marriage service, and then they retire happily to bed. After a few months she thinks she is pregnant, but he cannot bear to lose his grandmother's favour by marrying Dalinda. When she threatens to expose him if he breaks his promise, he storms off to London. She discovers that the pregnancy was a false alarm, and he returns. However, when his father dies, his estate is much encumbered, and he is forced to look for a wealthy wife. She again falls ill, and he is forced to marry her at the Fleet. He arranges not to have it recorded anywhere. In preparation for the marriage, she compels her brother to give her more than the ordinary 4% on her fortune, which later causes hard feelings.

Malvolio negotiates a marriage with Flavilla. Knowing that she cannot prove her marriage, Dalinda despairs and threatens to expose him to their grandmother. He offers her an annuity of £100 if she remains silent. Leander renews his suit, though he knows about the relationship between her and Malvolio. She rejects him, unwilling to marry under false pretenses. Flavilla, who does not love her husband, turns out to be haughty, capricious and nasty-tempered. Malvolio soon realizes what he has lost in Dalinda. He goes to her with his change of heart and they are reconciled. They also become lovers again. He plans to get her to London as his mistress, and when she discovers his intentions, all tenderness for him is killed. She confesses the truth to Leander and asks his advice. He advises her to tell her brothers; they go to London to try to find the priest who married her. Instead they discover that Malvolio had married someone else several months earlier than his supposed marriage to Dalinda. She quarrels with her brother over her fortune, with her grandmother over Malvolio's innocence, and with Malvolio himself over a settlement. She refuses to marry Leander out of delicacy, and everyone is miserable.

THE DISTRESSED ORPHAN

Annilia, the orphaned daughter of a rich merchant, is lovingly raised by her uncle, Giraldo. She and her cousin Horatio are educated as equals and are constant companions. Giraldo proposes a match between them, for the sake of her vast fortune, and though neither is enthusiastic, they are both obedient. Then at a ball, Annilia falls in love with Colonel Marathon. When he learns she is unmarried, he attempts to speak with her, but Horatio is too vigilant. He sends her a letter instead, declaring his love and offering to marry her no matter what her material circumstances. This letter confuses her, and she goes home. From the talk occasioned by her departure, he learns her name and family, and also hears of Giraldo's self-interest, which is universally condemned. The next day he calls on them, with the express purpose of leaving his address, so that she can write to him. When he leaves, Giraldo and Horatio are both extremely abusive, but Annilia remains silent. The next day, when a messenger arrives with a letter for her, Giraldo guesses from whom it has come, and sends it back. This angers her, and she storms off to her room. She then decides that as Marathon's intentions are honourable, there would be no harm in corresponding. After a time they are betrayed. When Marathon attempts to bring about a confrontation, Giraldo decides to force Annilia to marry Horatio at once. Annilia resents his high-handed manner and swears that she will never marry him.

Giraldo intercepts the woman she sends to procure her lodgings, and he hits on the expedient of telling her that her mistress is mad, and that he has to confine her closely in order to prevent violence. He then lures Annilia out of her room by offering to show her the papers to her estate. While she is reading them, he has her room fitted with iron bars. He confines her, threatening to hold her captive until she consents to the marriage. She refuses consistently, and after a time he is afraid that someone will expose him. He remembers that private madhouses would take in anyone for a price, and arranges to have her committed as a lunatic, which would give him control of her estate anyway. They take her away in the dead of night. She remains there for fourteen weeks, until Marathon, by pretending to be mad himself, gains admittance and arranges her escape. They are immediately married and live happily ever after. Giraldo and Horatio both die in disgrace.

THE DOUBLE MARRIAGE

Bellcour and Alathia grow up in an intimacy encouraged by their fathers. When he declares his love, she gives him formal permission to ask for her hand. As he is about to ask Maraphil, his father, he is told that an old family friend is about to arrive with a great fortune and a beautiful daughter, Mirtamene. When Bellcour is not overjoyed, Maraphil forces him to confess that he loves Alathia, who has no fortune to speak of. They part in a rage. Alathia, hearing of the quarrel, tries to make him give her up, for his own good, but he indignantly refuses. When their fathers fall out and both forbid their meetings, they arrange to marry secretly. When Bellcour returns, Maraphil bullies him into admitting a contract between him and Alathia, though he is too cowardly to tell him that they are actually married. Bellcour is so afraid of his father's rage that he agrees to get a release from her. He persuades her to sign it by telling her that it will allay his father's suspicions and free him to see her more frequently. However, two days later, Maraphil whisks him off to Plymouth to wait for Mirtamene and her father.

Bellcour resolves to confess his predicament to Mirtamene and fling himself on her mercy. Then, during a hunt, he comes upon a beautiful woman being ravished in the woods and rescues her. They fall in love at first sight, and he is delighted to discover that she is his intended bride. He is torn between honour and gratitude, and his new passion joined with his fear of Maraphil's periodically renewed curses. Just as he decides to do the honourable thing, he meets Mirtamene alone, and all thoughts of Alathia are lost. They are finally wed, and Bellcour counts on Alathia's release to save him. However, when she appears, in men's attire, to check the truth of the rumours she has heard regarding his marriage, he immediately confesses his guilt and kills himself, after she has fallen on his sword. Both fathers die of grief, and Mirtamene renounces men forever.

THE FAIR HEBREW

Dorante, on a visit to the Jewish synagogue with some friends for a lark, finds himself the recipient of a hanky dropped from the women's gallery. He glimpses its owner, Keziah, and diligently pursues her. She refuses her favours until he promises to marry her, and his passion is so great that he is forced to submit. His marriage causes a rupture with his father. Keziah converts, satisfying a long-standing secret desire. Having once attained the escape she wished from the orthodox Jewish community, she becomes shrewish and extravagant.

Miriam arrives with Keziah's brother. She has been ruined by a soldier at Tunbridge, who had left her pregnant and at the mercy of her strict, religious uncle. He had kept her a prisoner, talking constantly of the wrath of god. When at last she delivers, in the presence of him and Keziah's brother, who has been brought to witness an object lesson, he rips the baby from her and throws it directly onto the fire. Keziah's brother rescues her and later marries her. Keziah eventually elopes from Dorante, taking all his money.

FANTOMINA

A young gentlewoman, fresh from the country, ponders contemptuously the fickleness of men. She is young and inexperienced, and she decides to dress as a woman of the town, just to see what happens. In this disguise, she attracts Beauplaisir, an acquaintance who had never paid her the slightest attention in her ordinary life. She has not intended to take the masquerade to its logical conclusion, but he insists. Because she is attracted to him, she agrees to become his mistress, managing the affair with great discretion, and using the alias Fantomina. When he predictably grows distant, she dresses as Celia, a country wench, and attracts him all over again. She maintains both affairs at once, remarking on the difference in his behaviour. She reattracts him twice more, first as the Widow Bloomer, then as the wealthy Incognita. Her mother comes up to town and finds her pregnant. She attempts to arrange a match with Beauplaisir, but he refuses, and after helping her daughter conceal her pregnancy, she consigns Fantomina to a monastery.

FATAL FONDNESS

(Sequel to The Unequal Conflict)

Fillamour finally submits to great pressure from his uncle to give up Philenia and marry Elaria, but even after the wedding he cannot forget her. When he writes to her, Philenia is indignant at the insult, but her resistance only makes him more determined. He takes to drink and ignores his wife, who is equally indifferent to him. Just as he is about to try to see Philenia in the country, he receives a letter and gift from an anonymous admirer. When he eventually surprises Philenia alone, he swears that he will love her rationally and spiritually; then he finds himself overcome with passion and rapes her. She is soon brought to forgive him, and they are happy as lovers until he has to return to town. When he arrives home, he finds Misimene keeping Elaria company. She has long been in love with him, and sent him the letter and gift. He thinks that she is Elaria's spy, and avoids her. When he returns to Philenia, she follows him, dressed as a man, and they meet up on the road. At the inn where they stop it is so crowded that they are forced to share a bed. Fillamour learns that Philenia has been kidnapped by mistake; he is upset, but not so much as he would have been if he had not already enjoyed her. In bed that night,he rolls against Misimene, and she takes him in her arms. She gets carried away, and her strenuous embraces wake him. When he discovers who she is, they retire back to bed, where they cavort riotously for several days. When Fillamour comes home, he discovers that Elaria has been caught with a lover by Antonia, Philenia's friend, and he begins divorce proceedings.

Antonia tells him that she had been thought that Coeurdemont, the man she has been pursuing, had made an appointment with Elaria, but it had turned out to be another man, his near double. She had called Fillamour's uncle and some witnesses, and burst in to discover Elaria and her swain in bed. Fillamour obtains his divorce, and resolves that he has had enough of marriage. Misimene believes that he will marry her, but is too proud to bring up the subject herself. He thinks that she is too jealous and possessive, and says nothing; she grows nasty and peevish.

Meanwhile, Philenia has been shipwrecked and taken home by a fisherman and his wife. They agree to let her stay until she receives money from her father, but when several letters bring no reply, they ask her to leave. She takes to making nets to earn her keep. She proves so skilful that she attracts people of quality; one day she is discovered by Antonia and Coeurdemont, now married. They take her away with them. Antonia tells of Fillamour's divorce, then how she had hidden Coeurdemont from the effects of a duel by dressing him in her own clothes and passing him off as her sister. He is so moved at her devotion, that he marries her, and they decide to settle abroad. Philenia sets off for London to see Fillamour.

When Misimene finally tells Fillamour that she expects him to marry her, he refuses, and in the furious argument which follows, she stabs him. As she is bending over him, repentant, Philenia comes in and, seeing them embracing, she finds out from the servants what has happened. When she forgives him, he swoons; thinking him dead, she kills herself with the same sword. Fillamour recovers and nearly goes mad. Misimene does go mad, and Antonia and Coeurdemont live happily ever after.

THE FATAL SECRET

Anadea is noble and well-educated, but she has no fortune, and her father is anxious to provide for her before his death. Although she prefers the single life, she agrees to marry the Chevalier de Semar out of filial duty and affection. He is a worthy man, and she esteems him, but she cannot love him. Then she falls in love with the Count de Blessure at a ball, and she passes the night in agonies of hope and despair. All the next day she fantasizes about their possible happiness together. The Count, equally in love, writes to ask her if she is marrying through love or duty. She replies discreetly, hinting that she does not love the Chevalier, and Blessure resolves to risk his father's displeasure to marry her. They correspond, and after much debate, he at last persuades her to suspend her wedding.

All the emotional strain causes Anadea to fall ill. Blessure bribes a doctor to recommend a change of air, and she goes to Versailles, where they are secretly married. She promises him not to reveal their marriage until the death of his father. Despite her misgivings, he insists on consummation, and after a short period of happiness they are betrayed. The Chevalier's relatives, anxious to break off such a poor match, tell him rumours of her intrigue with Blessure. He refuses to believe them, but when a neighbour at Versailles also tells him, he goes in disguise to discover the truth. He bursts in on the lovers, and the two men fight. The Chavelier is killed, and Blessure is arrested. He goes on trial and the whole story of his passion, except his marriage, is made known. Anadea maintains her silence so that his family will not desert him before the trial, and Blessure's father is promised a pardon if Blessure will marry the daughter of the King's favourite mistress. When Blessure is cold to the lady, and asks for time to consider, the old Marquiss is furious. Blessure confers with Anadea, who has endured hell from her father and watched him die of grief at her supposed dishonour rather than tell her secret, and they reaffirm their promise not to reveal their marriage. She retreats to St. Clou to await the Marquiss's death. Blessure tells his father that he has an aversion both to marriage and to the particular lady proposed to him. The Marquiss, in a rage, curses both his son and Anadea, and banishes him until he comes to his senses.

Anadea hears of Blessure's flight and suspects that he has been false. Then the Marquiss appears at the inn and falls in love with her. He tries to take liberties, but she awes him, and he proposes marriage. When he refuses, she almost reveals her identity and her secret, but remembers her promise. The Marquiss, in a rage at being denied, drugs and rapes her. When she learns what has happened, she faints. Blessure arrives and reveals the truth to his father. She kills herself on Blessure's sword. The Marquiss shoots himself, explaining in a note what has occurred, and Blessure becomes a monk, eventually dying of grief.

THE FORCE OF NATURE

Felisinda, Don Alvario's daughter, is in love with his ward, Fernando. Fernando is given the management of the estate, and while he is away on business, Alvario discovers their affair. Although Felisinda insists that it has been entirely innocent, Alvario is furious and orders her to marry Carlos immediately. She becomes hysterical and attempts to deface herself, and when Carlos hears of her aversion, he generously withdraws. Alvario dies, entrusting his affairs to Berinthia, an abbess, who tells the two lovers that Alvario's fortune is to be divided between them on condition that they do not marry each other, with an eternal curse on them if they disobey him. Felisinda is confined in the convent with Berinthia until the abbess can find an appropriate husband.

At the convent, Felisinda confides in Alantha, who agrees to act as a messenger to Fernando. Fernando feels a curious respect and tenderness towards Berinthia which he cannot explain. Alantha falls in love with Fernando and arranges to substitute herself for Felisinda when an escape is arranged. However, Cleomas, the friend whom Fernando has entrusted to arrange that escape, proves false and attempts to ravish his charge. She is rescued by Carlos, and when she feels shame at what she has done and resolves to find Fernando to confess and help him, Carlos goes with her. They are delayed by storms and illness, and Fernando is seized for stealing a nun. He believes that Felisinda eloped with Cleomas, or that they were both lost at sea. In prison, he receives letters from Berinthia and Felisinda, deploring his behaviour, and advising him to marry Alantha to repair her honour. Because no one knows where Alantha is, he is put on trial for her murder.

As Fernando is about to be sentenced to death, Berinthia reveals that he is her son, and tells the story of her affair with Alvario. They had wanted to marry, but she had been blackmailed by her lawyer, who was also her guardian, to marry his son if he won a lawsuit for her. She had retired to the convent after having Fernando, and Alvario had married Felisinda's mother. Carlos and Alantha walk in at a suitable moment, and the appropriate marriages are made.

THE FORTUNATE FOUNDLINGS

One evening, Dorilaus discovers two babies in a basket under a tree on his country estate. A note informs him that they are twins named Horatio and Louisa, and that they have been entrusted to his care. He raises them as his own children. After Horatio leaves to join the army, Dorilaus finds himself suddenly in love with Louisa. He struggles with his unaccountable passion for a long time, then asks her to marry him. She refuses in confusion, and because she can think of no good reason for that refusal, she feels she is being ungrateful. Then, when he comes in drunk one night and tries to force her, she runs away and takes lodgings in town. She supports herself by doing needlework, and proves so skilful that she soon enters the service of a fashionable milliner. One day she sees an advertisement for herself, in which Dorilaus says he will leave her alone if she returns. She is afraid to trust him, and worrying about discovery makes her ill. The milliner sends her to the country to recover, and she there enters the service of Melanthe, a lady of quality who makes Louisa her companion. Melanthe tells her that after an indifferent marriage, she had been discovered in a love affair, and proposes to travel abroad to live down the scandal. Louisa accompanies her to Vienna, where she becomes socially adept. She also writes for an explanation to Dorilaus.

Meanwhile, Horatio has been taken prisoner in France, and is freed in the service of the Chevalier St. George. He falls in love with Charlotta de Palfoy, the daughter of a French Baron. Palfoy is extremely ambitious for his daughter, and Horatio, of unknown background and little fortune, despairs. Then he saves Palfoy's life and becomes intimate in the family. When Horatio hears of the glorious army of Charles XII of Sweden, he resolves to make himself worthy Charlotta by military fame. Horatio's passion is betrayed to Palfoy, who sends Charlotta to a monastery. Horatio joins the Swedish army.

Louisa accompanies Melanthe to Venice, but soon finds herself tired of constant diversions. Count de Bellfleur, one of Melanthe's lovers, falls in love with Louisa, who is beginning to fall in love with Du Plessis. When Melanthe makes a tryst with Bellfleur, De Plessis is sent to keep Louisa occuppied. He reveals Bellfleur's passion for her, and her indignation kindles his respect for her. Bellfleur, enraged at being rejected, attempts to get at Louisa by playing on Melanthe's jealousy, telling her that Louisa has propositioned him. Melanthe is furious, and in her rage humiliates and even hits her companion. Louisa leaves, but she is followed by Bellfleur, who tells the innkeeper that she is his wife, and that she has eloped from him with a lover. She manages to hold him at bay with his own sword, and escapes from her chamber. He chases her, but Du Plessis intervenes. Hearing what has happened, Melanthe falls ill. Bellfleur is exiled. Unable to leave for England because of the war, Louisa resolves to go to a convent. She refuses to marry Du Plessis because of her lack of fortune and position, but accepts his protection as far as the monastery.

At the court of Charles XII Horatio quickly earns promotion to colonel, and makes a substantial fortune. When he receives a letter from Dorilaus requesting him to come home, he is torn, being still ambitious, but before he can decide, his regiment is ordered to Russia. There he is taken prisoner. He is befriended by Edella, mistress of Prince Menzikoff, and she becomes a public benefactor of the Swedish prisoners. Mattahesa falls in love with Horatio, and although his friendship with Edella is entirely innocent, she represents to the Prince that they are lovers. The Prince forbids Edella to visit the prison, and the lot of the prisoners again becomes hard. Mattahesa throws herself at Horatio, but he passes her on to Mullern, a lustful fellow captive. The Prince intimidates several prisoners, including Horatio, but when Mattahesa reveals that she has lied, the prisoners are set free.

Louisa is so beloved by everyone in the monastery that the abbess urges her to become a nun. When Louisa declines, the abbess tries to break up her relationship with Du Plessis by intercepting all their letters. After a time, Louisa begins first to doubt his constancy, then to fear his death, and she nearly agrees to take the veil. Then she discovers the abbess's plot. She decides to leave, but is kept prisoner by the nuns. She escapes by pretending devotion to the Virgin, and telling them that she has been called to a pilgrimage by a vision. Once out of the monastery, she travels alone to France, where she is discovered by Dorilaus. He tells her that she is his daughter, and that he has moved permanently to France. Louisa and Charlotta become friends, and Horatio returns in time to take part in a double wedding.

THE FRUITLESS ENQUIRY

1) Anziana takes an oath never to wed any but Lorenzo. Under threat of disinheritance, she agrees to marry a friend of her father: her motives are self-interest joined with a distrust of men. She is about to change her mind and remain constant to Lorenzo despite her fear of his fickleness, when a French novel falls open to a story in which the faithlessness and inconstancy of men is the main theme. This decides her, and she marries. Her husband ambushes Lorenzo, who has arranged to meet her, and keeps her in a closet with his bare bones. She preserves the skeleton as a sort of shrine, at which she weeps every day.

2) Iseria is forever discontent because her husband Montrano, who had left her on business shortly after their marriage, refused the offer of an Italian lady married to the Turk whose slave he was. His punishment was castration.

3) Stenoclea has just discovered that her husband, in ignorance, had murdered her brother.

4) After four barren years, Tellisinda was afraid of losing her husband's affections, and arranged to feign pregnancy and substitute someone else's child. Then she has a son of her own, and she is tormented that her natural child, for whom she has much more affection, will be deprived of its inheritance.

5) Just as she has married a second time, Celesino's daughter arrives to tell her that she had been seduced by her stepfather one day as she pretended to be a country wench. The daughter becomes a nun, and Celesina half loves, half hates her husband.

6) Bellazara, happily married to Antonius, one night makes love with a man she believes to be her husband, come in late after she has already been asleep. It turns out to be Mercino, Antonius's valet. Mercino blackmails her into repeating her crime at his pleasure.

7) Violantha, after months of ill-use by her jealous husband, finally turns her affections to Charmillo, an admirer of long standing. When she asks for a divorce, having committed adultery on the assurance of a future marriage, her husband repents his abuse of her. She gives up Charmillo and is reconciled to her husband, but is soon reseduced, as love is stronger than duty.

8) Clara, a spinster in retreat, reveals that she was very intimate with her cousin Ferdinand, who one day tricks her into helplessness and rapes her. He vows tenderness, which she comes to return. Then she discovers that he has boasted of his conquest of her. Pretending to be playful, she uses the same trick to tie him down, and castrates him with a penknife. They are reconciled before he dies.

These stories are all told to Miramillia, who believes that her long lost son will return if she can find someone who is completely happy. Her quest is unsuccessful, but her son returns anyway.

THE HISTORY OF MISS BETSY THOUGHTLESS

Volume I

Betsy Thoughtless is the only daughter of a gentleman in L----e who dislikes London and lives always in the country. She attends a nearby boarding school, where she becomes intimate with Miss Forward, who is conducting an innocent intrigue with Sparkish. Miss Forward is haughty and proud, and initiates Betsy, her accomplice, into the various arts of courtship. When the governess of the school discovers what is going on, she keeps Betsy's mind on love by constantly speaking against it.

When Betsy's father dies, Betsy and her fortune are left to the care of Sir Ralph and Lady Trusty, neighbours in the country, and Mr. Goodman in London. She goes to live with the latter, his wife, Lady Mellasin, and Lady Mellasin's daughter Flora. Goodman has married only recently and is totally besotted with his wife, who is arrogant and extravagant. Betsy enters with delight into the active social life of her guardians, and is soon an accomplished coquette. Young Saving, son of an alderman and an admirer of Flora before Betsy's arrival, soon distinguishes himself as a genuine lover, and when Betsy realizes that he is sincere, she begins to torment him. She attempts to arouse his jealousy by paying attention to Gayland, a conceited fop who interprets her behaviour as a proposition. He writes to her making an assignation, and she is shocked. She tells him indignantly that he is a foolish coxcomb and storms off. He attempts to pique her by paying attention to Flora. Soon after, Saving writes in reverential tones requesting a meeting. She agrees, but is astonished when he never arrives. Goodman speaks with Alderman Saving, a miserly old man, who tells him he sent his son away to keep him from making an improper match.

Betsy soon forgets her discomfort over Gayland's behaviour and throws herself again into the whirl of London society. Lady Trusty, suspecting that her counterpart is not the best example for Betsy, writes cautioning prudence, and suggesting that she might be happier back in the country. Betsy replies that a rural life would now be a living death to her. One day she is dissatisfied with a pattern of silk Lady Mellasin buys for her, and goes to Mr. Goodman demanding that she have the management of her clothing allowance and her pocket money. He agrees, and she goes to exchange the material. When she returns, she hears Flora and Gayland together behind their locked bedroom door. Betsy is shocked, but Flora pretends that nothing has happened.

Lady Trusty invites Betsy to spend the summer with her. Betsy is willing to go, but she is prevented by the arrival of her brother Frank, who then insists that she return with him to Oxford. Betsy and Flora are the toasts of the town, until on an outing they meet two students who entertain them in a grotto. One tries to make love to Betsy, but she is sarcastic. Flora and the other student slip away, and Betsy's swain assaults her in earnest. Frank arrives at the crucial moment, and challenges her assailant. Both men are wounded, and the resulting scandal drives the two girls back to London.

Betsy receives a letter from Frank proposing Charles Trueworth, one of his friends, as a suitable husband. She is averse to marriage. Lady Mellasin is involved in some peculiar goings-on which include the disappearance of her best necklace and her going out in her oldest, plainest clothes. Betsy visits Miss Forward and is shocked to hear that her old friend had been ruined. She had gone for a walk with the French mistress and some other girls, and had stumbled upon a fashionable party of pleasure at a neighbouring estate. The gentlemen had invited the girls to join them, and Miss Forward had been particularly seduced by the flattery of Wildly. She arranges to meet him privately, with the assistance of the equally sensual French mistress. They became lovers, and after a time Wildly deserted her. When she discovered she was pregnant, she tried to induce an abortion, then followed him to London. He was indifferent to her fate, but the baby was born dead, so that she is now free to repent. She asks Betsy to lend her some money. Betsy complies, but is deeply disturbed by what she has heard.

Thomas Staple is introduced by Mr. Goodman as a contender for her hand. He and Trueworth are always hindering each other's progress. Then they are joined by Captain Hysom, a middle-aged sailor whose nautical language is a great source of amusement. Betsy discovers that Lady Mellasin pawned her necklace to repay some sort of debt. Staple invites Betsy and Flora to a concert; Trueworth sends her a pet squireel. Captain Hysom is ridiculed by everyone, but responds with dignity and almost succeeds in putting Betsy in her place. Trueworth and Staple both declare themselves formally, and the competition intensifies. Then she is involved in an incident in Westminster Abbey, which results in a duel. Trueworth and Staple also duel on her account, and Trueworth twice gives Staple his life. Staple resigns his pretension to her. By pretending that each one in turn is seriously wounded, Mr. Chatfree tricks Betsy into revealing a preference for Trueworth.

Volume II

Staple reaffirms his intention to give Betsy up and takes his leave. Flora becomes peevish and moody, and refuses the proposals of a linen draper because he offers too small a settlement. Then she encourages Betsy to let her visit Staple in Betsy's name and persuade him not to give up hope. Fortunately, before she can agree, Saving returns and tells Betsy that Flora had sent an anonymous letter to his father about his courtship, which had led to his being sent away. Her elder brother, Thomas, comes to London from Paris, where he has been living for some years. She receives a letter and repayment of her loan from Miss Forward, informing her that she is now being kept by a distant relation. She also has a letter from Frank urging her to accept Trueworth, and one from Lady Trusty pleading the same cause. Betsy decides that she prefers Trueworth to her other suitors, but that she does not yet feel ready to marry. She encourages him, and they take in all the diversions of the town. She also grows intimate with Mabel, a young woman of great probity and good sense.

Because of Saving's warning, Betsy grows suspicious of Flora

and coldly refuses her offer to visit Staple. She then receives an anonymous letter telling her that Trueworth is simply trifling with her affections, and guesses that it is from Flora, although she cannot think of her motive. Betsy reads the letter aloud at the dinner table and swears to encourage Trueworth further, watching Flora's reaction. She is mortified and enraged, and the author explains that Flora is in love with Trueworth, and trying to separate them. Trueworth's aunt warns him against Betsy because of her frivolity, and thus plants the first doubts in his mind. She advises him to test Betsy by asking her to live in the country. When he does so, she treats the idea with scorn and disdain. Soon afterwards, he and his friend Sir Basil Loveit see Betsy in the company of Miss Forward. Sir Basil recognizes Forward as a prostitute, and Trueworth is alarmed for Betsy's reputation. He attempts to warn her against her friend, but Betsy resents his interference. She goes to Miss Forward, and tries to establish the truth of Trueworth's accusations, but ends up being swept along to the theater. Trueworth follows in disguise and finds her in a box with the prostitute and several notorious rakes. One in particular makes advances, and while taking her home attempts her virtue. He interprets her protests as an attempt on her part to raise her price, but is at last brought to realize her sincerity. She writes reproachfully to Miss Forward, breaking off their relationship. Trueworth vows to give her up if she still refuses to listen to one last plea, but before he can see her, Flora plants the seeds of suspicion.

The narrator interrupts with the story of the laundry-woman's child, which Betsy and Mabel undertake to keep in the country, while the parents emigrate in the hopes of starting a new life. Because of Mabel's father's niggardliness, the entire transaction is carried out in Betsy's name. Flora sends Trueworth an anonymous letter telling him that Betsy has an illegitimate child. He goes to check what she has told him, and believes that the charity story is only a pretence. Meanwhile, Betsy has resolved to beg his pardon, and is puzzled by his absence. She is also puzzled by Thomas's coldness and refusal to let her visit his house, until she learns that he has a Frenchwoman living with him as his mistress. Goodman is arrested for a bond Lady Mellasin had given, several days before their marriage, to Oliver Marplus. He resolves never to trust her again, as she has injured his standing in the world. Then Mrs. Marplus tells him of Lady Mellasin's passion for her husband, and how he has used it to extort money from her. She offers to be his witness, and he sues for divorce. Goodman also orders Lady Mellasin and Flora to leave his house. Left alone and unable to consult her brother, Betsy almost decides to accept Trueworth when she receives a cryptic letter breaking off his courtship. Not knowing what Flora has told him, she thinks that the provocation she had given him was too slight to merit his upbraidings, but soon comes to believe that he had reason to reproach her.

George Munden is introduced, and she seems to encourage him. However, she is hoping all the time that Trueworth will change his mind. When Goodman falls ill, she takes lodgings. Trueworth is propositioned by Incognita, who turns out to be Flora, and they have an affair which helps him get over his passion for Betsy. Then he meets Sir Basil's sister Harriot, who is delicate and modest, and prefers the country life. Mrs. Modely, a dressmaker, introduces Betsy to Sir Frederick Fineer, whose rank and title appeal to her vanity, but she finds him a foolish and extravagant fop.

Volume III

Although Betsy finds Fineer tiresome and unattractive in himself, she is flattered by his assiduity. Going to take tea with him at Modely's, she snubs Munden, who takes exception in a letter. Goodman dies, and his parting words to Thomas are directed to the welfare of the Thoughtless family. Thomas ignores the advice addressed to himself, but joins with Frank in an effort to see Betsy married as soon as possible. Betsy herself is depressed by Goodman's death and reflects on the vanities of worldly pleasures. In this mood, she admits that she could never marry a coxcomb, even a titled coxcomb. She still hopes for Trueworth's return. Then her carriage collides with a chariot driven by Trueworth and Loveit, who are both very cold and distant with her.

Trueworth, meanwhile, has grown intimate with Sir Basil's family, but he proceeds cautiously with Harriet herself. Mrs. Blanchfield, an acquaintance of Harriot, offers herself to him in marriage, but he replies that he is otherwise engaged. Sir Basil reveals that he is in love with Mabel, but cannot marry her because her father refuses to give her a settlement while he is still alive, and Loveit has to have his own money ready to pay out Harriot's fortune when she marries. Trueworth replies that he wants to marry Harriot, and will not ask for her fortune until it is convenient for his friend. Sir Basil promises to encourage Harriot in his favour.

When Flora writes to Trueworth to find out why he has been neglecting her, he is shocked at the memory of his own conduct, and resolves to terminate their relationship immediately. He meets Frank, and his aloofness almost leads to a duel. Then Trueworth receives another anonymous proposal, which he also declines. Frank, discovering from Trueworth that the rift between them was due to some misconduct on Betsy's part, returns home furious with her, and advises her that her reputation is more important than virtue itself. He also warns her against Fineer, whom he suspects of being an imposter. When Sir Frederick presses for an immediate elopement, she directs him to her brothers, and he is astonished that she is not at her own disposal, as he had thought. He asks her not to tell them of his suit, which arouses her suspicions even further. Before she can tell Frank, she is called to take part in a court case involving Lady Mellasin's attempt to counterfeit a will in her own favour, to challenge the one leaving the estate to Goddman's nephew Ned Goodman. Betsy is required as a witness, which puts Fineer out of her mind.

Flora is doubly distraught, afraid of her mother's disgrace, and hysterical at the thought of being abandoned by Trueworth. He writes to her, breaking off their affair, and she falls into fits, vowing revenge. To forstall his suspicions, she writes back complaisantly, then plans to send an anonymous letter to Harriot. The wedding preparations are in full swing for both Trueworth's marriage and Sir Basil's. One afternoon when both couples are at Mabel's, the laundry-woman's husband appears and demands the child, which convinces Trueworth that he has wronged Betsy. Betsy breaks off her relations with Fineer, whom she now regards more as a knave than a fool, and Frank is delighted with her decision. She also refuses an outing with Miss Airish when she learns their companions are to

be two rakes of quality. Modely comes to tell her that Fineer has stabbed himself in despair and is refusing to see a parson until he has spoken to Betsy once more. Modely is afraid that her house will be haunted if he dies there without absolution, and Betsy consents to accompany her out of common kindness. He tells her that he has settled his fortune on her, but insists for propriety's sake that she marry him and have it as his widow. In the confusion of the sickroom, Betsy participates almost unknowingly in a sham marriage ceremony. When she realizes what is happening, she starts to fling out, but the door is locked and Sir Frederick is suddenly in perfect health. Trueworth bursts in at the crucial moment and tells her that Fineer is a criminal who used to be the valet of a friend of his in France. Her brothers meet them as he is taking Betsy home, and seeing her all dishevelled, jump to the wrong conclusion. Another duel is nearly fought, but when they learn the truth, the brothers apologize. Mrs. Blanchfield dies, grieving for Trueworth, and leaves him her fortune.

When Thomas tells her that he has seen Trueworth's miniature at the artist's studio, Betsy decides to obtain it, which she does by pretending to call for it on Trueworth's behalf. Trueworth believes that Flora has taken it and is touched at her devotion. Flora, meanwhile, has written her damning letter, and is on her way to post it when she meets Trueworth himself. They go into a tavern to converse, and he finds himself more moved by her emotion than he thinks proper. But then he discovers the letter and storms out in a rage, recognizing that it is in the same handwriting as the one he received about Betsy.

The same lawyer who is dealing with Ned Goodman's legacy is handling Mrs. Blanchfield's affairs, and he tells Betsy of the legacy to Trueworth. This leads her to believe that Mrs. Blanchfield had been his fiancee, and that her death leaves Trueworth free. When her brothers urge her to accept Munden, she stalls in the hopes that Trueworth will come back to her. Then she accompanies Thomas to a sale and sees the wedding processions emerge from the church adjacent to the warehouses.

Volume IV

Lady Trusty and Sir Ralph arrive and at last apply sufficient pressure on Betsy to make her agree, unwillingly, to marry Munden. After one final attempt to put him off, she submits gracefully, and the marriage takes place. They begin their life together happily enough, but after a few months of constant diversion, Munden decides to retrench some of his expenses. Unwilling to make less of an appearance in public, he becomes extremely parsimonious at home. At first Betsy resorts to using her own money rather than doing whith out things the inadequate housekeeping will not cover. Then Munden accuses her of mismanagement, and she explodes in turn. Discovering that he does not love her destroys all her good-will and most of her motivation to make the marriage a success. Lady Trusty, to whom she appeals, advises her to obey his instructions exactly, and not impinge on her own rights. They manage reasonably well until Munden brings home an unexpected guest who is a figure of some importance. When the guest leaves, Munden explodes. In a passion, he kills the squirrel Trueworth had given her, and she resolves never to share

his table or his bed again. However, Lady Trusty and Sir Ralph manage to effect a reconciliation, and the Mundens continue as before.

Lady Mellasin, deserted by her false witnesses, flees arrest. Flora, having been abandoned by Trueworth in the tavern, allows herself to be comforted by another man, and is again cast off just as her mother is in the depths of her troubles. Lady Mellasin sends Flora to appeal to Ned, who is impervious to her charms and offers instead to pension them off to Jamaica.

An interval of relative contentment in the Munden household is interrupted by the visit of Lord XXXX, Munden's would-be patron. The peer flirts shamelessly with Betsy, and when she later receives an anonymous letter, she guesses that it is from him. She is shocked, but refrains from showing it to Munden for fear of destroying his current good humour and of arousing his restrictive jealousy. She burns it, and when they are invited to the peer's house for dinner, she resolves not to go. Then her vanity, and her reliance on her husband's protection get the upper hand, and she consents. After dinner Munden is sent off on a mock challenge, and Lord XXXX attempts her virtue. She suspects Munden of sacrificing her to his own advancement, but manages to escape by ringing the bell for the servant. When Munden returns, the peer is contemptuous towards him, and he accuses Betsy of ruining his chances with her excessive pride. He also feels that he has been publicly humiliated by his false errand, and vents his rage and frustration on his wife.

This misadventure, which she would have avoided had she not been vain of the peer's attentions, makes a lasting impression on Betsy. She renews her intimacy with Mabel, now married to Sir Basil. From them she finds out that Harriot has died. Out of pity she takes in Mlle. de Roquelair, Thomas's mistress, whom he has turned out for supposedly betraying him with a mercer. Betsy arranges for Thomas to pay her entry to a convent, but the Frenchwoman repays her by having an affair with Munden. When Betsy discovers this, she leaves home for good. At first Munden refuses to pay her a separate maintenance, and threatens to obtain a warrant to bring her home. Then he is brought to agree.

Betsy avoids Trueworth by going to stay in the country, where she will also be safe from Munden's threats. There, she is discovered by Trueworth embracing his miniature. He tries to take liberties, but her virtue repels him and kindles new respect. She confesses that she loves him, but makes him promise to stay away from her. Then Munden falls ill and asks to see her. He apologizes, and they are reconciled before he dies. She mourns him punctiliously, corresponding chastely with Trueworth, who comes to fetch her at Lady Trusty's the day her mourning is over. They live happily ever after.

IDALIA

Idalia's father forbids the suit of Florez, a vain fortune-hunter. Out of rebelliousness and pride, she pursues Florez, although he is no longer interested in her. He boasts of her passion to his patron, Don Ferdinand, who has Florez arrange to deliver Idalia to him. He tries to rape her, and although he pretends to reform his intentions when she threatens to kill herself, he tricks her to stay in his house and succeeds in possessing her that night. When her father threatens him, he consigns Idalia to Henriquez, who also falls in love with her. Ferdinand discovers his friend's treachery, and they kill each other in a duel. When Henriques's brother, Myrtano, brings her the news, they fall immediately in love. She debates with herself whether he can really love her, knowing she is not a virgin, and wonders why he never speaks of marriage. One night he tries to take advantage of her, but she gets the better of his passion and her own, and forces him to admit that there are reasons he cannot marry her. He leaves, and she soon hears that he is engaged to another. She resolves to retire to a monastery to await his explanation.

Part II

On the way to the monastery, she is led through the woods by a guide who tells her he has been paid to kill her. She pleads for her life, and he gives in. She suspects Myrtano, but the guide assures her of her lover's innocence. He takes her to a cottage, but when he inadvertently reveals that he, too, loves her, she escapes and sets sail for Naples. Captain Rickamboll falls in love with her. He is brutal, and intent on gratification, but the ship is suddenly taken by pirates, and he is killed. Abdomar, the leader of the pirates, assures Idalia that he is civilized, and introduces her to his mistress, Bellraizia, who tells her their history.

Part III

After a storm wrecks the ship, Idalia is saved and, dressed as a man, sets off for Rome. She meets some bandits on the road who rob her and kill her horse. Antonia discovers her by the roadside, and falls in love with the supposed youth. Idalia is curious and plays along, just to see what happens. After recovering from a long attack of fever, Idalia begins to long earnestly for a life of seclusion, and resolves to reform Antonia's adulterous impulses. However, when she discovers that Antonia's husband is Myrtano, her good intentions are brought to an untimely end. Myrtano tells the youth how Antonia killed the only woman he loved, whereupon Idalia reveals herself. After he tells her how he had been betrothed to Antonia from childhood, they become lovers. Antonia again tries to kill her rival, and after some further outrages, the Pope orders the lovers to separate. Idalia lodges next to a monastery where Bellraizia has converted and become a nun. Her total loss of reputation make her vow revenge on Florez. Myrtano comes to the place where she has arranged to meet Florez, and she kills the wrong man. Then she kills herself, and Florez is executed for other crimes.

THE INJURED HUSBAND

Madam la Motte marries the elderly Baron de Tortillée for his money. She and Du Lache, her pimp and henchman, spend their time breaking up otherwise happy marriages for her pleasure. She falls in love with Beauclair, and in order to get him she has Du Lache spread rumours about Montamour, Beauclair's fiancee. He believes the rumours and abandons her; she retires in disgust to a convent. He succumbs to Tortillée in order to forget Montamour. When they are discovered by the Baron, Tortillée decides to do away with her husband to avoid future trouble. Du Lache gives him a potion which reduces him to a state of idiocy, and they board him out in the country.

Beauclair discovers the duplicity of his lover and his friend. Tortillée is also discovered in an affair and loses her reputation. Beauclair visits Montamour in the convent, but she is adamant in her refusal to see him. Then he meets a young chevalier, Vrayment, who reminds him of Montamour. He also meets Du Lache, and the Baron, now recovered finds them together. The Baron, having heard of his wife's affairs, attacks Beauclair, and Du Lache kills him as they fight. He frames Beauclair and escapes. The judge is Montamour's brother. Vrayment defends Beauclair, and gives the judge a ring, whereupon he pronounces the prisoner innocent. When Vrayment has gone, the judge reveals that he was really his sister in disguise. She has gone back to the convent, but when they both go after her, is eventually persuaded to marry him. The Baroness kills herself in prison.

IRISH ARTIFICE

Aglaura, grasping and ingratiating, is housekeeper to Clarina. She is young, innocent, and trusting. Aglaura feeds her all sorts of romantic extravagancies to persuade her to marry a young man who turns out to be her son. As her mother-in-law, Aglaura dominates Clarina even more, and she and her son are recklesslyextravagant until Clarina's money runs out. Then they abandon her, and she becomes a woman of the streets.

LASSELIA

Lasselia, the niece of Louis XIV's favourite mistress, is brought up at court. Despite many offers, she remains averse to marriage. When the king falls in love with her, she rejects his offers and runs away to a friend in the country. There she is happy until she meets de l'Amye, the gentleman on the neighbouring estate. She falls in love immediately, but her good sense and severe self-discipline allow her to subdue her passion. For a while they are good friends, meeting innocently in the country society they both frequent. She falls into a false sense of security, despite her erotic daydreams and fantasies about him. Then he confesses that he loves her, and she succumbs at last, giving him all but the final favour. She even writes him verses, and is totally absorbed in her love.

When the king discovers her, she runs away again to avoid becoming his mistress. She sleeps out in the fields, and de l'Amye discovers her there during a hunt. He takes her to a nearby inn, and she becomes his mistress. At the inn she meets Mlles. Doux-mouries, who tell her that the eldest had been betrothed to de l'Amye, who through ignorance had fallen in love with the wrong sister. Their father had died, disinheriting the younger sister if she marries de l'Amye, but she rebels and becomes his mistress. When she becomes pregnant, her family urge her to marry him, but she refuses to do so without a fortune. She retreats to a convent. The older sister, for revenge, tried to stab him, but when that fails, revenges herself by telling his wife about Lasselia. They are all involved in a huge scene, in which Lasselia tries to run on her lover's sword. Husband and wife are at length reconciled, and Lasselia also retires to a convent, where she becomes a model of piety.

THE LIFE OF MADAM DE VILLESACHE

Henrietta is the illegitimate daughter of a Duke who cannot own her. He places her with a family in the country and sees that she has all the advantages suitable to her birth. She falls in love with Clermont, the son of a mercenary farmer who disapproves of her lack of fortune. They meet secretly, and when the Duke appears with plans to take her to Court, Clermont persuades her to marry him before she goes. She eventually submits, then accompanies her father to town. Caught up in the whirl of the court, she comes to regard Clermont with contempt, and although she still feels affection for him, she is afraid of the power she has given him over her. When the Duke encourages the proposals of a Marquiss, she plans to confess her marriage, but is put off by the conversation of two society women who tell her about daughters who have been disowned, etc. She is afraid that both her father and Clermont will give her up, and agrees to receive the Marquiss as a lover. She has no moral regrets, and offers Clermont a post at court or a commission in the army as compensation. She fears his resentment and possible exposure, and marries the Marquiss as soon as possible.

Clermont duly arrives, full of reproaches, and his anger frightens her. When he suggests that she still owes him conjugal rights, her fear defeats her sense that she should remain faithful to the Marquiss, and she submits. They become lovers, but because they have no sense of shame, they are careless and are quickly betrayed. When she is caught, she tries to run on her husband's sword, but misses and is unhurt. Clermont confesses their marriage, and as Henrietta is pregnant, the Marquiss allows her to stay in his house while he investigates what Clermont has told him. She wants to kill herself, but has not sufficient strength of mind. The Duke dissuades her from becoming a nun by promising that he will arrange the trial so that her reputation is completely cleared. However, the witnesses he has bribed desert him, and the trial is completely mismanaged. The Marquiss has Clermont poisoned in prison, and when Henrietta has her child, he kills them both. The Duke dies of grief, and the Marquiss eventually goes mad with remorse.

LOVE IN EXCESS

Count D'Elmont, returning to Paris from the wars, is greeted with admiration by both sexes. Alovisa, coheiress of a substantial estate, falls in love with particular violence, but D'Elmont is insensible. The night before a ball, she sends him an anonymous letter, telling him that she adores him and asking him to try to find her out among those who attend. At the ball, she sees him with Amena, whom he has taken to be his unknown admirer. Alovisa faints. Back home, she decides that he had been awed by her considerable social position and dares not presume to love her without encouragement. She writes him a second letter, informing him of his mistake and urging him to set his sights higher. Although D'Elmont is intrigued by this hint, he feels that he has invested too much gallantry in seducing Amena to give up his pursuit. He has even almost convinced himself that he loves her. Amena's father discovers their affair and confines Amena to her room until he discovers whether the Count's intentions are honourable.

D'Elmont is too ambitious to marry someone of such insignificance, and his intentions are far from honourable. When Amena's father discovers this, he convinces her of his baseness, and she renounces him. He talks her out of that resolve, and persuades her to walk with him in the park at midnight, but they are interrupted by the maid who has been their go-between. Amena's household had been disturbed by Alovisa's spying servant, and her father has locked her out. D'Elmont delivers her to Alovisa, who is her friend. He is relieved at being rid of her after such a fiasco, and his coldness angers her. She demands the return of a letter she had written, but he mistakenly hands her one from his anonymous lover, which she recognizes as Alovisa's. She is convinced that she has been trifled with, and reproaches both of them for duplicity. Alovisa persuades Amena's father to send her to a convent to avoid scandal. D'Elmont is called away to meet his brother, Brillian, who is in love with Ansellina, Alovisa's sister and coheiress. He had been introduced to her by his friend Belpine, but when she prefers her new lover to her old, the two men duel, and Brillian is forced to flee. D'Elmont decides that if he does not believe in love, he might as well marry for ambition; Brillian resolves to marry Ansellina as soon as it is safe for him to return to her. Belpine recovers, and Brillian begins arrangements for their wedding. D'Elmont marries Alovisa, and for a time everyone is happy.

Part II

Frankville, D'Elmont's former guardian, on his deathbed gives his daughter into D'Elmont's care until young Frankville returns to France. They fall immediately in love, and he regards his despair as divine retribution for what he has done to Amena. When he receives a letter from Amena, telling him that she is about to take final vows and requesting his blessing, he confides his own unhappiness, begs her pardon, and urges her to leave the convent. This letter is intercepted by Alovisa, who grows jealous at the hint it contains that he is fruitlessly in love, and she resolves at once to spy on him and try to win him back. When Amena receives no re-

ply, she writes to reproach him and immediately takes the veil. From this the Count discovers Alovisa's interference, and they quarrel furiously. In his passion, he confesses his love obliquely, but is interrupted by a servant informing him that Brillian is ill and has had to postpone his wedding. Alovisa is extremely submissive in an attempt to regain his affection.

D'Elmont moves his household out to the country, where they are welcomed by Baron D'Espernay and his sister, Melantha. The Count confides in his friend, who urges him to seduce Melliora. When D'Elmont then finds her in a tempting state of undress, he declares his love openly, which angers her, but they are soon reconciled. Hearing of D'Elmont's hesitation, D'Espernay ridicules him and persuades him to seduce Melliora at the next opportunity. He is particularly encouraging in order to distract the Count from his own designs on Alovisa. D'Elmont sneaks into Melliora's room with a second key. He finds her asleep, and is overcome with protective tenderness. When she flings her arms around him in a dream, that tenderness turns to desire, and he wakes her with his energetic embraces. They are interrupted at the crucial moment by Melanthe, looking for diversion. The three play hide and seek in the garden, where D'Elmont surprises Melliora alone. She confesses her love and throws herself on his protection. After a moment of spiritual communion, he attempts her again, and is again interrupted by Melantha. Melantha is vexed by his coldness; Alovisa complains to Melliora that she is jealous of Melantha. When she also complains to her husband, he swears never to sleep with her again. In her rage, Alovisa is accosted by the Baron, who promises to arrange for her to catch D'Elmont in the act of adultery. To do this, he arranges a ball and plans to deliver Melliora to D'Elmont in the course of the Evening. Melantha discovers the plot and, out of spite, substitutes herself for Melliora. The Baron and Alovisa discover them together just after Melantha has lost her honour. Alovisa makes a violent scene during which D'Elmont, seeing Melliora fully clothed in the doorway, realizes his mistake. The Baron, furious at his sister's ruined virtue, attempts to blackmail Alovisa into sleeping with him by refusing to tell her who was in her husband's bed.

Back in Paris, Ansellina arrives, but Brillian accuses his brother of ruining his romance. Alovisa has ordered her sister not to marry him until D'Elmont has confessed the partner of his adultery. In her desperation she has also consented to D'Espernay's proposals, a decision which she instantly regrets. She apologizes to Brillian and asks his help to prevent mischief. Melliora overhears their conversation and attempts to warn D'Elmont, but he misunderstands her and believes she is making an assignation. Consequently Brillian kills the Baron, and Alovisa runs on her husband's sword in the resulting confusion. Because of the extenuating circumstances, both brothers are pardoned, but Melliora retires to the convent where she had been educated, feeling guilty. Brillian and Ansellina are married; Melantha marries beneath her; and D'Elmont goes off to lose his sorrows in travelling.

Part III

D'Elmont is tormented by feelings of guilt, and bemoans his fatal charm. Melliora is determined to see him no more, but they correspond. In Italy, he returns all letters and favours from his admirers. Outside the cathedral in Rome, a lady drops a jewel at his feet, and leads him into a retired walk, where he nearly succumbs to her charms. At a commotion, she leaves him before he can tell her that he is not able to return her love. He comes to the aid of a young gentleman fighting with some ruffians, and when one of the mob is killed, he escapes into a walled garden. There he finds his unknown admirer in a summer-house, and overhears her relating what has just happened. When she mentions his name, he reveals himself, but he trips on the carpet and falls on top of the woman and her companion. Before he can complete his confession, a servant comes in announcing that the police want to search the garden for him, and she blackmails him into another meeting.

The next day, young Frankville calls, demanding reparation for the honour of his sister, who has been stolen from the convent. Then he discovers that D'Elmont was the man who helped him against the ruffians, and the two become firm friends. He tells D'Elmont that Amena's father, hearing of Melliora's disappearance, had accused D'Elmont of being responsible. Frankville tells of his love for Camilla, betrothed to his old friend Cittoline, who wants him to marry his daughter, Violetta. Violetta writes to ask Frankville to come to her privately first, so that if he refuses, she will be able to save face. The lady that he meets is really Camilla, who confesses that she has loved him from first seeing him, and they secretly become lovers. He presses her to marry him, but she has scruples about marrying without a fortune, and before they can elope they are betrayed, and he is set upon by the thugs from which D'Elmont saved him.

Camilla's poems and letters call up D'Elmont's sympathy, and he offers to help them elope. He visits Camilla to make arrangements, but the lady he sees is Ciamara, his admirer from the summerhouse. She again offers herself, and this time he does confess his pre-engagement. She falls into fits, and he returns to Frankville, who refuses to believe that his mistress is a whore. He writes, releasing her from her vows. She renounces him in turn, and when Ciamara reveals the truth, Frankville is distraught. He persuades his unwilling friend to take advantage of Ciamara's passion to gain them an entry to the house. Ciamara attempts to seduce him in earnest. Because her lust has fired his, and because her shamelessness has destroyed his respect and pity, he nearly succumbs, but they are interrupted by a quarrel between Camilla and Frankville. The two men escape. Violetta offers to help reconcile the lovers, as does D'Elmont; eventually, they are successful.

D'Elmont sets off to search for Melliora. When she learns of his departure, Violetta appears melancholy, but she sends him a page, Fidelio, to attend him on his journey. Fidelio proves a great comfort to him. They hear that Ciamara has poisoned herself in despair, that Violetta has disappeared, and that Cittoline has died of grief for his lost daughter. At this news, Fidelio falls into a severe fever. When they are caught in a storm, they take refuge with the Marquiss de Seguillier, who is so charmed by their com-

pany that he invites them to stay. Fidelio grows worse. D'Elmont receives a request from a woman to visit him privately, and he refuses, but she bursts in anyway. It is Melliora, whom the Marquiss had abducted from the convent. He had sworn to treat her honourably, but he has kept her in captivity. She had been informed by Charlotta, the Marquiss's former fiancee and Melliora's friend from the convent, of D'Elmont's arrival, and she has come to claim his protection. Their reunion is passionate, but they are interrupted by Charlotta, who brings word that the Marquiss is insisting on marrying Melliora at once, before all his guests. When the Marquiss learns the identity of his guests, he generously resigns Melliora. Fidelio turns out to be Violetta. She dies of love for D'Elmont, inspiring the whole company with tender pity. After her burial D'Elmont and Frankville are married to Melliora and Camilla, and the Marquiss marries Charlotta. They live happily ever after.

LOVE IN ITS VARIETY

1) The Distressed Beauty; or, Love at a Venture

One evening during a walk, Basilio finds a young woman nursing a baby. He takes her in as a servant, as she has told him that she had come looking for her husband. She had been secretly married to Eldomar, and had run away after refusing to marry the family steward. He soon falls in love with her, but he is steadfastly refused. His son returns from abroad and turns out to be Eldomar; Letitia turns out to be a lady of quality, and they live happily ever after.

2) Good out of Evil; or, the Double Deceit

Alphonso has two daughters, Laura and Marcella; Fabritio has two sons, Antonio and Julian. Antonio, the serious one, is in love with Laura, and is so extravagant in her praise that Julian, who is naturally amorous, cannot believe him. Antonio introduces them, to prove his point, and Julian also falls in love. He intercepts a letter from Laura, arranging for Antonio to come to her chamber, and substitutes himself. After a time, Alphonso sends for Fabritio and Antonio, having found Marcella pregnant. It turns out that she had substituted herself for Laura out of love of Antonio. The appropriate marriages are made and they all live happily ever after.

3) Female Revenge; or, the Happy Exchange

Bellcourt falls in love with Climene, a poor neighbour, and marries her secretly. When his uncle eventually proposes a marriage with the wealthy Julia, Bellcourt stalls, and is saved by his uncle's death. He duly makes his marriage public and for a time lives very happily. Then a friend asks his assistance for an intrigue, and Bellcourt agrees to help him abduct a lady of quality. He falls in love with her, and discovers that she is Julia. He rescues her from his friend's designs, and the friend, for revenge, tells Climene that Bellcourt has been unfaithful. She has an affair with the friend, Bellcourt is divorced, and Bellcourt marries Julia.

4) Love Posed, or the Triple Conquest

Count Valerno and his wife live with her sisters Isabella and Althea, a widow. Cardenio visits, and systematically seduces each of the three women. Valerno discovers the intrigue with his wife, and substitutes himself, thus preserving her honour and cementing her love for him. When they discover Cardenio's activities they throw him out.

5) The Hasty Marriage; or, Love Not to be Controuled

Angelina loves Alphonso, but he is too poor to suit her father, Pedro, who insists that she marry Francisco. After some angry scenes she pretends to give in, but she and Alphonso vow never to marry anyone else. They are forced to refrain from corresponding for a time, and Alphonso, hearing of preparations for her marriage, is deeply disturbed. One day he sees her at the window, and while they are gazing at each other, he is insulted by her brash cousin Antonio. They exchange angry letters, and Alphonso is provoked into naming Angelina in a most ungentlemanly fashion. In a huff she denounces him and marries Francisco. Alphonso attempts to interrupt the wedding, but when he is ignored, he kills Francisco in despair. Antonio kills him, and Angelina dies of shock. Pedro blames his own greed, and Antonio is imprisoned.

6) The Witty Reclaimer

Fabritio loves Christiana, who is not as wealthy as he. They are shortly to be married, and spend all their time together. One day Fabritio is suddenly overcome by lust and ravishes her, promising to marry her in a few days. He avoids her after that, and constantly humiliates her if she dares to reproach him. He arranges to marry Villaretta, and is universally condemned. Villaretta turns out not to suit him, and he apologizes to Christiana, promising her that if he were free he would marry her in an instant. They agree to wait patiently to see what the future brings. He tries to make love to her again, but she repulses him, adding that as penance he must never see her again until he is in a position to fulfill his promise. She then goes off, telling no one where she has gone.

Villaretta and her husband come to dislike each other intensely. She has also fallen in love with a shy youth, Diego, and agrees to meet him secretly. Fabritio receives an anonymous letter advising him to bring justices and relatives to the appointment, so that he can take his wife in adultery. They catch the two lovers in a highly suggestive position, and Fabritio is able to obtain his divorce. Diego then reveals to Fabritio that he is actuall Christiana in disguised. He is totally delighted, and they marry, living happily ever after.

THE LUCKY RAPE

Andalusia is the scene of a great annual carnival, and Emilia arrives just before it starts. The relation with whom she is staying grants her total freedom during the duration of the festival, provided she uses the alias Florella. At her first masque, she falls in love with Berinthius, and they arrange to meet the next night. She arrives too early, and is assaulted by a drunken cavalier. She is rescued by an obliging stranger who offers to take her home; he takes her instead to his chamber and rapes her while she is unconscious. When she recovers, she hears the ravisher talking with Berinthius, whom she calls on to revenge her. She reveals her true identity, and Berinthius discovers that he is her long-exiled brother. Alonzo, her assailant and her brother's friend, offers to marry her, and after much discussion she agrees. They live happily ever after.

THE MASQUERADERS

Dalinda, a widow of independent means, is having an affair with Dorimenus. She is so fond of him that she confides the entire affair, in all its lurid detail, to Philecta. Philecta, who mistrusts men because of several earlier betrayals, at first feels only compassion for her friend's gullibility. Then, as she hears more and more amorous details, she begins to envy Dalinda his constancy. Finally, she comes to think that Dalinda, her inferior in all but beauty, is grossly unworthy such a prize. She asks to meet him. When she finds Dalinda unwilling, Philecta arranges to switch costunes with her at a masquerade they are all attending. She falls in love when she sees Dorimenus, and he is intrigued by her ingenuity. They agree to meet, but she is torn between love and honour. Before the time to meet him arrives, she resolves to protect her honour by telling Dalinda, but Dalinda reveals everything to Dorimenus. Now knowing Philecta's true feelings, he enters her chamber just as she is dreaming about him, and they make love. Dalinda discovers them and tells the whole town, causing great scandal. It ends with Philecta pregnant, Dorimenus entreated to marry another, and the promise of a sequel.

MEMOIRS OF THE BARON DE BROSSE

De Brosse, visiting Marshall Turenne in the country, rescues Larissa from an overturned chariot. He falls in love with her, but as the only daughter of the wealthy Count de Chevreux, she is far above him. Turenne tells him that her father is arrogant and proud, and that they had quarreled over the pretentions of Turenne's ward, D'Amois, to Larissa's hand. D'Amois had saved her from a rape, but Chevreux had accused him of staging the assault to get at her fortune. As Larissa does not love him, this final insult caused him to leave for Italy, and he has not been heard from since.

Turenne's recently widowed sister, Madam de Monbray, has long been in love with De Brosse, who does not wish to offend the brother by spurning the sister. He manages to equivocate, which also allows him to see Larissa. He declares himself in a letter, and they correspond chastely. She refuses to forfeit her duty by marrying without her father's consent. Desolate, he then discovers that Turenne wants to marry him to Henrietta, his own mistress, to patch up her reputation. The Baron resents this insult and leaves, followed by Monbray.

Part II

Monbray follows De Brosse to a nearby village, where she finally induces him, in his despair, to become her lover. Then he receives word of an appointment at court, and writes to Larissa of his hopeful prospects. She replies that her mother, who had been ruined by her father's attendance at court, had made her promise never to marry a courtier. When De Brosse hears that she is engaged to Visnay, he sets off to see her at once. Chevreux congratulates him on his engagement to Monbray, which Turenne had made public for revenge, and Larissa accuses him of inconstancy. When he explains, she forgives him, and she feigns madness in order to postpone the wedding. They arrange to elope, but are betrayed. Monbray reveals the full extent of the Baron's infidelity, and Larissa makes him take her to a monastery. They are overtaken by Chevreux and Visnay, and he is rescued by a hostile stranger. After fruitless weeks trying to see Larissa, he overhears her confess that she loves Visnay, and he faints. When he comes around, he sees the stranger and Visnay duelling and intervenes. The stranger is D'Amois, whose involvement with a woman resembling Larissa had led him back to her. He had been told by Turenne that the Baron had tried to force Larissa, which accounted for his hostility. The two unsuccessful rivals become friends, and discover that their love has caused them to lose their court positions. De Brosse is involved in Monbray's plot to have him murdered, but at the last minute the plot is discovered and he is restored to favour. A sequel, telling of further misfortunes, is promised but has not survived.

THE MERCENARY LOVER

Miranda and Althea are coheiresses of a vast estate. Miranda, the younger, is gay and social, while Althea is grave and reserved. Clitander marries Miranda, solely for her money. He is then anxious to possess the other half of the fortune as well, and ingratiates himself with Althea in order to gain influence over her. Under this influence, she is kept from marrying anyone else, and conceives a desire to leave her estate to him and his heirs. He is satisfied for a time, then decides to corrupt her in order to be sure of her cooperation. First he gives her loose, immoral books, and then he discusses all aspects of love with her. When he argues against virtue, she is unable to refute his reasoning and consequently thinks that he must be right. Then he begins to take physical liberties, talking about unhappy marriages, and hinting that his own is less than ideal. Finally, he confesses that he loves her and cannot live without her. As she suspects nothing of his plots, she is totally taken in, and he is able to possess her before she has time to think. When he leaves her, she suffers great mental torment, but eventually rationalizes what has happened and is able to carry on happily. Eventually she becomes pregnant, and he plays on her superstitions and fears of childbirth to convince her to make a will leaving him the trustee for her child. She agrees, and he comes back not with the document he has suggested, but with a deed of gift, resolving to murder her after she has signed. She becomes suspicious when he refuses to let her read it. He attempts to read it to her, but when he stumbles, being unprepared, she discovers his baseness. She retreats to the country. He pretends to a reconciliation, inviting her to a birthday party he is giving for Miranda, and when she attends, he poisons her. On the point of death, she accuses him before her sister and other witnesses, and Miranda renounces him.

THE PADLOCK

Violante is married to Lepidio, who is old and fears that he cannot satisfy her. Despite her virtue and submission, this fear leads him to keep her a virtual prisoner in order to prevent her from being unfaithful. He even resorts to using a chastity belt. His distrust turns her first indifferent, then contemptuous, and he is soon forced to rape her each time he desires his conjugal rights. One day she receives an anonymous letter offering to rescue her. It turns out to be Honourious, who has loved her from his youth. Her parents had promised to arrange the match, but his mercenary father had objected. To be near her, he had disguised himself as a deformed old imbecile and entered Lepidio's service. She loves him, but reasserts her virtue, and he conducts her to the home of his kinswoman. Honirius's father dies, she obtains a divorce, and they are married. Lepidio is universally condemned, and Honorius universally applauded.

THE PERPLEXED DUTCHESS

Gigantilla, companion to a great lady at the court of Malfy, is a skilful opportunist who refuses many good matches in the hopes of achieving a great one. She is not at all amorous, and the Duke of Malfy regards her insensibility as a challenge. He is engaged to Artemia, her patron, and Gigantilla needs all her subtlety to alienate them, using scandal, double-meanings, innuendo and forgery, and her plots result in her own marriage to the Duke, in Artemia's taking a vow of celibacy, and in the death of Philamont, the innocent instrument of her ambition. Because she has gained her position dishonestly, Gigantilla is suspicious of everyone, and particularly hates the Duke's virtuous brother, Theanor. She has him exiled and attempts to break up his engagement to Amarantha; she also attempts to convince the Duke that Theanor is conspiring to kill him in order to gain the throne. The Dutchess falls in love with Niarchus, and between them they plot even more destruction, wreaking havoc in the kingdom and causing the people to turn against the Duke. However, they also detest her, and when the Duke dies, she is universally denounced. She is prevented from committing suicide by her fears of eternal damnation, and remains, with a remorseful conscience, in the village where her husband died. Theanor marries Amarantha and becomes Duke, and they live happily ever after.

PERSECUTED VIRTUE

Serinda becomes heiress of a large fortune when her brother is presumed dead in a shipwreck. She is in love with Hersilius, noble but poor, and they keep their passion secret, waiting for her father's death. After two years her brother turns up, and Serinda is universally abandoned. When Clodio, the wealthiest and noblest of her former suitors, renews his proposals, she marries him in gratitude and triumphs over the world. She appreciates his merit and hates herself for not being able to love him. When she hears that Hersilius is in prison for debts contracted during his courtship of her, she feels obliged to purchase his release, but she refuses to see him. During this time she is also solicited by Theander, a relative and close friend of Clodio. When she threatens to tell her husband, he treats her with more respect. After she has a baby, she goes to the country to recuperate, and there Hersilius attempts again to see her. She sends him away, but a maid misinterprets the scene and sells this information to Theanor. He again attempts her virtue, but she jumps out the window to avoid him. He imposes on Clodio and gets him to change his will, leaving him the estate, and giving Serinda a small pension dependent on her remaining a widow. When Clodio dies, Theanor evicts her. When Hersilius gets a court appointment, Theanor gets it rescinded. Hersilius goes off to the wars, and Serinda lives hopelessly abroad.

PHILIDORE AND PLACENTIA

Philidore, noble but impoverished, has fallen love with the wealthy, noble Placentia, who is haughty and independent. He has no hope of winning her due to the disparity in their fortunes, but disguises himself as a servant in order to be near her. After a year, she overhears him singing, and immediately intuits his superior breeding. Later, when she is attacked by thieves, he saves her, and her distress when he is wounded leads her to realize that she loves him. She guesses that he is really a man of quality, but then she bemoans his lack of spirit. When he recovers, she offers to promote him to groom of her chamber, but he refuses, fearing discovery. She threatens to dismiss him, enraged at his insensibility. Then she attempts to seduce him and so offends her modesty that she faints. When she revives and finds that he is even then respectful, with her lying naked in his arms, she sends him away with a letter offering to marry him. He replies, revealing his name and condition, and explaining the reasons for his excessive delicacy. She sends for him, but he has disappeared. Emanthe, her woman, finds out that he has left to visit his uncle, who is a merchant in Persia. Fourteen months later, she receives word that her long lost brother, true heir to her fortune, is still alive and is coming home.

Hoping that his absence will help to restore Placentia's peace of mind, Philidore sets sail for Persia. His ship is taken by pirates and subsequently cast ashore. The twelve survivors die off gradually, finally leaving only Philidore, who always survives because he has least will to live. Then he rescues a handsome stranger from a gang of assailants. The stranger claims to be Christian and an Englishmen, and Philidore feels strangely drawn to him. He is seriously wounded, and Philidore takes him to the home of a rich dignitary who cares for him until he recovers. Philidore is intensely concerned for the stranger's health, and personally supervises his care. In the course of this, he discovers that the young man has been castrated. Philidore tells his friend his own story, concealing only the lady's name.

Part II

The eunuch relates his history, concealing only his name and rank. When very young, he left for the Grand Tour. On his way home he was shipwrecked and picked up by Persian privateer who sell him to the Bashaw of Liperda. The Bashaw treats him with extraordinary kindness, more like a guest than a slave, but he only longs to escape. Then he sees Arithea, the Bashaw's favourite wife, and he falls desperately in love. He indulges his passion with wild extravagance, even daring to enter the seraglio in order to paint her portrait, unobserved by her. He totally neglects the Bashaw, which arouses suspicion, especially when he is offered his freedom and refuses. Several days later he is seized, his picture confiscated, and a severe beating inflicted on him. After a long period of convalescence he returns to court, but he is no longer in such

high favour. He despairs of satisfying his passion, but has not the will to try to leave for England. Then he receives a letter from Arithea, reproaching him for his timidity and arranging a meeting. He goes to her, but is too timid to presume to touch her. Tired of his humility, she initiates the action, but on the point of consummation the Bashaw bursts in on them. He is castrated by the guard, then forced to serve as a menial in the seraglio. After six years Arithea finds the means of sending him some money for his escape. He is successful, but negligent in forgetting to change his costume, and so was easy to follow. It was from the Bashaw's men that Philidore rescued him . He offers to share his fortune with Philidore if he will come home with him, but Philidore refuses, and they go their separate ways.

Philidore is welcomed by his uncle, who dies soon after, leaving him his entire fortune. At last feeling worthy of Placentia, he immediately sets sail for England. Ill winds force the ship to harbour, and some of the passengers go on shore to explore. One of them returns with the story of a woman, seemingly of superior birth and being sold into slavery, who tried to kill herself in the marketplace. Philidore decides to redeem her for her courage, and sends the man to buy her. It turns out to be Placentia. They have a suitably passionate reunion; then Placentia tells him her own adventures.

In her illness and madness after his departure, Placentia had been kept from suicide only by the ministrations of Emanthe. Then her brother had come home, and she had refused his offer of half her estate in order to put herself on a financial basis equal to Philidore's. Eluding her brother, she set off with Emanthe for Persia. The captain of her vessel, an arrogant, confident man, offered to marry her, but when she refused, attempted to take her by force. His attempt is interrupted when the ship is taken by an Algerian corsair. At the slave market, she discovered that the captain had been purchased by the same merchant and still had lascivious designs on her. To escape him, she had attempted suicide.

At her request, Philidore sends to purchase Emanthe. When he tells her of his change in fortune, she grows pensive and withdrawn, promising to tell him why when they get to England. The messenger returns with Emanthe and with Tradewell, who has loved her ever since he saw her in Oxford, and was about to give up his own ransom money to redeem her. After some weeks they arrive in England, and Placentia writes to her brother. His steward arrives and repays Philidore for her ransom. She then tells Philidore that since their fortunes are again unequal, she cannot marry him. She runs away, and Philidore tries to use her brother's influence to compel her to marry him. Her brother turns out to be Bellamont, the Christian Eunuch, who is delighted to oblige his friend. After a further chase, and after Bellamont, on the assurance that he will have no children of his own, shares his estate with her, she at last agrees to marry Philidore. Emanthe weds Tradewell, and they live happily ever after.

THE PUNISHMENT OF MUTABILITY

See The Tea Table

THE RASH RESOLVE

Emanuella's guardian, Pedro, attempts to cheat her out of her fortune, but his ugly, virtuous son, Marco rescues her from his father's plots and restores part of her estate. When he fails to restore the rest he kills himself, which causes Pedro to confess, and arrangements are made for the money to be returned. Emanuella, with a large gift of money, saves her cousin, Berillia, from a nunnery, but turns the girl against her by chiding her for an unworthy passion. Emanuella falls in love with Emilius. For revenge, Berillia spreads scandal and leads her cousin on towards ruin, then uses Emanuella's assignations as a cover for her own. Emilius presses for marriage, but Emanuella refuses to marry without her fortune. However, on assurance of their eventual union they become lovers. Then they hear that the ships bringing her goods have been lost at sea. She is too proud to be financially indebted to her husband, and tells Berillia to relay the news to Emilius. Berillia takes the opportunity to tell each lover that the other has been false and mercenary, and they are completely alienated, and Emanuella decides to take refuge in a convent.

Part II

Emilius cannot believe that Emanuella would be false, but he is presented with a challenge before he can take measures to find out the truth. This challenge reveals to him the feelings of Julia, who has loved him since first seeing him. They have a passionate affair. Berillia tells Emanuella, confirming her original story, and Emanuella removes to a monastery. There she discovers that she is pregnant, but she is too proud to appeal to Emilius's charity. She resolves never to tell him. She leaves the convent. The nuns spread the truth of her condition, and when Emilius hears of her pregnancy, he cannot believe that she would keep the news from the baby's father; therefore, he believes that she must have been false. He marries Julia.

Emanuella has a son, and to support him, she becomes a menial at another convent. She takes Berillia in, but Berillia runs off with all her money. She becomes governess to Jacinta, a friend of Julia, and one day is seen by Julia and Emilius. Emilius announces Berillia's death; she had been stabbed by her lover for the money, and had confessed to Emilius her betrayal of Emanuella. When all the explanations are made, Julia adopts the child as her own and invites Emanuella to live with them. Emanuella, having seen her child safe and prosperous, loses her will to live and dies. The rest live happily ever after.

THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE PRESENT INTRIGUES OF THE COURT OF CARAMANIA

Theodore, the prince of Caramania, falls in love with Ismonda, wife of Adrastus and chief lady-in-waiting to Hyanthe, princess of Anatolia. Ismonda returns his love, and persuades him to marry Hyanthe so that she can legitimately leave her husband and accompany the Caramanian court. The marriage is celebrated, and Theodore returns to Caramania. For a time he and Ismonda are happy, but although he truly loves her, he also loves variety and soon gets Lutetia pregnant. Fearing the jealousy of both his wife and his mistress, he asks his closest friend, Marmillio, to take Lutetia away to the country and placate her until after the birth. However, Marmillio's assiduous attendance on Luteti gets him into trouble with both Irene, to whom he has contracted marriage and of whom he has tired, and with Arilla, a modest young virgin whom he had raped and then persuaded to forgive him. When Irene's powerful brother, Doraspe, complains to Theodore of Marmillio's conduct, Theodore chides his friend, apparently forgetting that Marmillio actually would not have been in trouble if not for his loyalty to Theodore. The two men part in a huff.

Part II

When Artabanes attempts to insinuate his niece, Euridice, into Theodore's bed, Ismonda confers with Marmillio, who advises patience. Because Theodore needs help to get rid of Euridice, he and Marmillio are reconciled, and Theodore promises to help extricate him from his engagement with Irene. To do so, they pretend still to be estranged. Thus, with the promise of favour, Theodore is able to persuade Doraspe to persuade Irene to marry elsewhere; Doraspe marries Euridice; Theodore remembers Ismonda, and both he and Marmillio are free from their troublesome entanglements.

Parts III-VI

The rest of the novel is very similar, with a closely knit fabric of relationships surrounding the central intrigue of Theodore and Ismonda. The piquancy of their relationship is maintained by the constant threat of Adrastus' arrival to fetch home his wife. When he eventually does come for her, and she openly refuses to leave Caramania, the lovers are perfectly free to meet, and Theodore loses much of his interest. He begins to stray more and more, and he also grows increasingly fond of Hyanthe, who has known of his affairs, but has behaved with gracious generosity. The novel ends with Marmillio again counselling patience to Ismonda, and the promise of more to come.

THE SURPRISE

Alinda's affections are divided nearly equally between Ellmour and Bellamont. Euphemia, her friend, faints at the sight of Bellamont. When she recovers, she tells Alinda her story and enlists her aid. Although several profitable offers of marriage had been made to her, she had no inclination to wed until she met Bellamont. He had loved her as well, and they had made preparations for the wedding. On the point of signing the settlements, he had disappeared, writing that he had to give her up. She had fallen into a fever, which she gave to the aunt with whom she lived. Although Euphemia had recovered, the aunt had died, leaving her a vast fortune. Euphemia had resolved to find Bellamont at all costs, and at least find out what had caused his sudden desertion.

Alinda writes to Bellamont, declining his proposals, and then she finds out that his estate is heavily mortgaged. Then they learn that he has been imprisoned for his debts, having avoided jail only on the expectation of marriage with the wealthy Alinda. Euphemia, now understanding why he left her, buys his freedom, and tests his love for her by meeting him as his unknown benefactress, in disguise. She asks if he would marry her out of gratitude. He confesses his former love, and she reveals herself, to his great joy. Alinda marries Ellmour, whom she has always marginally prefered , and they all live happily ever after.

THE TEA TABLE

"Beraldus and Celemena: or, the Punishment of Mutability"

Celemena is the bastard of a prince who sends her to serve the Princess of Parma, as he cannot provide properly for her himself. She falls in love with Beraldus, who is a cruel man of small fortune and great ambition. She succumbs to his outward tenderness, though he soon comes to despise her for her lack of resistance. The Princess reproaches her gently for her loss of reputation, and sends for Beraldus, who swears that his affections are engaged elsewhere. He is quite nasty about Celemena, then tricks her into discretion by telling her that the Princess wants to forbid their marriage because of her own designs on him. Then she catches him making love to Lamira and immediately confesses their whole affair to the Princess. The Prince decrees that Beraldus must wed Lamira and leave the country immediately. Celemena, still innocent, resents this solution as far from just to her, and attempts to stab Lamira. General chaos ensues. Celemena dies of a decline in a convent. Lamira is poisoned by Beraldus, who is duly executed.

THE UNEQUAL CONFLICT

Philenia loves Fillamour, but her father wants her to marry Coeurdemont. As her fortune is dependent on her father's consent, her lover, similarly dependent on a mercenary uncle, is forbidden to see her. On Fillamour's assurance of eternal love, Philenia defies her father and is confined to her chamber. Her friend Antonia ingratiates herself with the father and is admitted freely. She offers to act as a messenger for the lovers, and then forms a plan for him to abduct Philenia. This plan is successful, and he takes her to a bagnio, but she refuses to allow him to stay with her there because she does not trust his male nature.

Antonia is pleased to help the lovers because she herself loves Coeurdemont. Her estate had been entailed away from her because she was a woman, and she had married a title to satisfy her love of grandeur. Her husband soon tired of her, and they lived in mutual indifference. He had invited Coeurdemont to stay with them in the country, and she had fallen in love with him. She overheard him intriguing with her maid, and had substituted herself, sending the maid off to America so that he never knew of the deceit. However, even after her husband died, she was unable to get Coeurdemont because of his suit to Philenia.

Philenia moves to lodgings. Fillamour is torn between his love and his need of a fortune. His uncle proposes a ward of his own as a possible bride, and Philenia advises him to live singly until one of their guardians dies. They maintain a mutually satisfactory Platonic relationship until one day Fillamour gets carried away. He is on the point of ravishing her when her father bursts in, having discovered her hiding place. He takes her home, and shortly afterwards she hears that Fillamour has married the ward. She falls ill and nearly dies. It ends with the promise of a sequel.

(For the sequel, see Fatal Fondness)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts

Anonymous. Ms. notes to Clio: or, a Secret History of the Life and Amours of the Late Celebrated Mrs. S-N-M. By Martha Fowke Sansom. London: 1752. Brit. Mus. 1418.c.51.

Haslewood, J. Ms. notes to A List of the English Dramatic Poets. Brit. Mus. C.45.d.12.

Haywood, Eliza. In Original Assignments of Mss. Between Authors and Publishers 1703-1810. Brit. Mus. Add. Mss. 38728, fols. 112-113.

----------. Undated letter in Original Letters to Sir Hans Sloane. Brit. Mus. Sloane Mss. 4059.h.9, vol. 24, fols. 144-145.

----------. Letter dated 20 August 1720. State Papers, Dom. George I, Bundle 22, No. 97.

Works by Eliza Haywood

(Place of publication is London unless otherwise specified)

The Adventures of Eovaii, Princess of Ijaveo. A Pre-Adamitical History. 1736.

The Agreeable Caledonian: or, Memoirs of Signiora di Morella, a Roman Lady, who made her Escape at a Monastery at Vitebo, for the Love of a Scots Nobleman. 2 pts. 1727.

Anti-Pamela, or Feigned Innocence Detected; in a Series of Syrena's Adventures. 2nd ed. 1742.

The Arragonian Queen: A Secret History. 2nd ed. 1725.

Bath Intrigues: In Four Letters to a Friend in London. 1725.

The British Recluse: or, the Secret History of Cleomira, Supposed Dead. A Novel. 2nd ed. 1722.

The Capricious Lover; or, No Trifling with a Woman. In Cleomelia, 2nd ed. 1727.

The City Jilt; or, the Alderman turned Beau: A Secret History. 2nd ed. 1726.

Cleomelia: or, the Generous Mistress. Being the Secret History of a Lady Lately arrived from Bengall, a Kingdom in the East Indies. 2nd ed. 1727.

Dalinda: or, the Double Marriage. Being the Genuine History of a very Recent, and Interesting Adventure. 1749.

The Disguised Prince: or, The Beautiful Parisian. A True History. 2 pts. 1728, 1729.

The Distressed Orphan, or, Love in a Madhouse. 3rd ed. 1726.

The Double Marriage: or, the Fatal Release. A True Secret History. 3rd ed. 1726.

The Dramatic Historiographer: or, the British Theatre Delineated. 1735.

The Fair Captive: A Tragedy. 1721. 2nd ed. in Works, Vol 2, 1724.

The Fair Hebrew: or, a Secret History of Two Jewish Ladies, who lately resided in London. 1729.

Fantomina: or, Love in a Maze. Being a Secret History of an Amour Between Two Persons of Distinction. 2nd ed. in Secret Histories, Vol. 3, 1725.

Fatal Fondness: or, Love its own Opposer. (Being the sequel of The Unequal Conflict.) A Novel. 1725.

The Fatal Secret. 3rd ed. in Secret Histories, Vol 3, 1725.

The Female Spectator. 7th ed. 4 vols. 1771.

The Force of Nature: or, the Lucky Disappointment: a Novel. In Secret Histories, 4th ed., vol. 4, 1742.

The Fortunate Foundlings: Being the Genuine History of Colonel M--rs, and his Sister, Madam du P--y, the Issue of the Hon. Ch--es M--rs, Son of the late Duke of R-L-D. 2nd ed. 1744.

Frederick, Duke of Brunswick-Lunenburgh. A Tragedy. 1729.

The Fruitless Enquiry. Being a Collection of Several Entertaining Histories and Occurrences, which Fell under the Observation of a Lady in her Search after Happiness. 2nd ed. 1767.

The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy. 3 vols. 1753.

The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless. 4 vols. 1751.

The Husband, in Answer to the Wife. 1756.

Idalia: or, the Unfortunate Mistress. A Novel. 3rd ed. in Works, vol. 3, 1725.

The Injured Husband: or, the Mistaken Resentment. A Novel. 1723.

Innocence Preserved. In The Perplexed Dutchess. Dublin, 1727.

Irish Artifice; or, the History of Clarina. A Novel. In The Female Dunciad. 1728.

Lasselia: or, the Self-Abandoned. A Novel. In Secret Histories, vol. 4, 1725.

Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier. 2nd. ed in Works, vol. 3, 1724.

The Life of Madam de Villesache. 1727.

Life's Progress through the Passions: or, the Adventures of Natura. 1748.

Love in Excess; or, the Fatal Enquiry. 3 pts. 5th ed. in Works, Vol. 3, 1724.

Love in Its Variety: Being a Collection of Select Novels; Written in Spanish by Signior Michael Ban Dello. 1727.

Love Letters on All Occasions Lately Passed Between Persons of Distinction. 1730.

The Lucky Rape; or, Fate the Best Disposer. In Cleomelia, 2nd ed. 1727.

Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots: Being the Secret History of her Life, and the Real Causes of all her Misfortunes. 1725.

The Masqueraders, or, Fatal Curiosity: Being the Secret History of a Late Amour. Part 1. In Works, vol. 4, 1724.

Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia. 2 vols. 1725,1726.

Memoirs of the Baron de Brosse. 2 pts. 1725.

The Mercenary Lover: or, the Unfortunate Heiresses. Being a True, Secret History of a City Amour, in a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia. 1726.

The Padlock: or, No Guard Without Virtue. A Novel. In The Mercenary Lover, 3rd ed. 1728.

The Perplexed Dutchess: or, Treachery Rewarded. Being Some Memoirs of the Court of Malfy. Dublin, 1727.

Persecuted Virtue: or, the Cruel Lover. A True Secret History. 1729.

Philidore and Placentia: or, L'Amour Trop Delicat. In Four Before Richardson, ed. W. H. McBurney. Lincoln, Neb.: Univ. of Nebbraska Press, 1964.

Poems on Several Occasions. 2nd ed. in Secret Histories, 4th ed. Vol. 2, 1742.

The Rash Resolve: or, the Untimely Discovery. A Novel. 1724.

Reflections on the Various Effects of Love, According to the Contrary Dispositions of the Persons on Whom it Operates. 2nd ed. 1726.

Secret Histories, Novels and Poems. 4 vols. 1725.

The Secret History of the Present Intrigues of the Court of Caramania. 1727.

Some Memoirs of the Amours and Intrigues of a Certain Irish Dean. 2 pts. 1728.

The Surprise: or, Constancy Rewarded. In Secret Histories, vol. 3, 1725.

The Tea-Table /periodical/. 1724.

The Tea-Table: or, A Conversation between some Polite Persons of Both Sexes, at a Lady's Visiting Day. 2 pts. 1725.

The Unequal Conflict; or, Nature Triumpahant. A Novel. 1725.

A Wife to Be Lett: A Comedy. 1723. Also in Works, vol. 2, 1724.

The Wife. 1756.

The Works of Mrs. Eliza Haywood; Consisting of Novels, Letters, Poems, and Plays. 4 vols. 1724.

The Young Lady, 1756.

Works of Fiction by Authors other than Haywood
(Where unspecified, place of publication is London)

A, Ma. The Prude; A Novel: Compleat in Three Parts. 1726.

The Adventures of Lindamira, A Lady of Quality. Ed. Benjamin Boyce. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1949.

Aubin, Penelope. The Life and Adventures of the Lady Lucy. . . . 1726.

----------. The Life of Madam de Beaumont, A French Lady. . . . 1721.

----------. The Strange Adventures of the Count de Vinevil and His Family. 1721.

Bandello, Matteo. Novelle. Trans. John Payne. 6 vols. London: Villon Society, 1890.

Barker, Jane. A Patchwork Screen for the Ladies. 1723.

Behn, Aphra. Novels. Ed. E. A. Baker. London: Routledge, 1905.

Blackamore, A. Luck at Last: or, the Happy Unfortunate. In Four Before Richardson, ed. W. H. McBurney. Lincoln, Neb.: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1964.

Boursault, Edme. Treize Lettres de Suite d'une Dame a un Cavalier, in Lettres Nouvelles, vol. 2. Paris, 1738.

Boyd, Elizabeth. The Happy Unfortunate; or, the Female Page: A Novel. 1732.

The Brothers: or, Treachery Punished. 1730.

Burney, Fanny. Camilla, or a Picture of Youth. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972.

----------. Cecilia, or Memoirs of an Heiress. 2 vols. London: George Bell, 1904.

----------. Evelina; or, the History of a Young Lady's Introduction to the World. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1968.

Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. "The History of the Captive" (pp. 217-241) and "The Novel of the Curious Impertinent" (pp. 173-207), in Don Quixote. Trans. Charles Jarvis. London: Sands, 1899.

----------. Exemplary Novels. Trans. C. A. Jones. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.

Croxall, Samuel. A Select Collection of Novels. 4th ed. Dublin, 1769.

Davys, Mary. The Accomplished Rake, or, Modern Fine Gentleman. In Four Before Richardson, ed. W. H. McBurney. Lincoln, Neb.: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1964.

----------. Familiar Letters Betwixt a Gentleman and a Lady. 1725.

----------. The Reformed Coquet; or, the Memoirs of Amoranda. 1724.

----------. The Works of Mrs. Mary Davys. 2 vols. 1725.

Defoe, Daniel. The Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Famous Moll Flanders. London: Dent, 1930.

----------. The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe of York, Mariner. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972.

----------. Roxana, the Fortunate Mistress. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969.

Fielding, Henry. An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1970.

----------. The History of Amelia. London: Hutchinson, 1905.

----------. The History of the Life of the Late Mr. Jonathan Wild the Great. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1947.

----------. The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling. Ed. Martin C. Battestin and Fredson Bowers. Oxford: Clarendon, 1974.

----------. Joseph Andrews. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1970.

Fielding, Sarah. The Adventures of David Simple. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1973.

----------. The Lives of Cleopatra and Octavia. Ed. R. Brimley Johnson. London: Scholartis Press, 1928.

Guillebert, de Bois, le Sieur. Marie Stuart, Reyne d'Escosse. Nouvelle Historique. Paris, 1675. /Original of Haywood's Mary Stuart/.

Hearne, Mary. The Female Deserters. 1719.

----------. The Lover's Week. 2nd ed. 1718.

The History of Tom Jones the Foundling, in His Married State. 1750.

The Jamaican Lady: or, the Life of Bavia. In Four Before Richardson, ed. W. H. McBurney. Lincoln, Neb.: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1964.

The Ladies Advocate: or, Wit and Beauty a Match for Treachery and Inconstancy. 1749.

Lennox, Charlotte. The Female Quixote. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1970.

Love in All Shapes: or, the Campaigns of Cupid. 1732.

Love Upon Tick: or, Implicit Gallantry Exemplified.... 1725.

Lover's Tales: in Several New, Surprising and Diverting Stories. 1727.

Manley, Mary de la Riviere. The Adventures of Rivella. 1714.

----------. Letters Written by Mrs. Manley. 1696.

----------. The Power of Love. In Seven Novels. 1720; rpt. 1741.

----------. The Secret History of Queen Zarah and the Zarazians. 2 pts. 1705.

The Perfidious Brethren, or, the Religious Triumvirate. 1720.

The Perjured Citizen: or, Female Revenge. 1732.

Plantin, Arabella. The Ingrateful: or, The Just Revenge. In Letters to the Lady Wharton, vol. 2. 1727.

----------. Love Led Astray: or, The Mutual Inconstancy. In Letters to the Lady Wharton, vol. 2. 1727.

Prechac, Le Sieur de. L'Illustre Parisienne. Paris, 1679. /Original of Haywood's Disguised Prince/.

Richardson, Samuel. Clarissa. Or, the History of a Young Lady. 4 vols. London: Dent, 1967.

----------. The History of Sir Charles Grandison. London: Shakespeare Head ed., 1930.

----------. Pamela: or, Virtue Rewarded. 2 vols. 1918; rpt. London: Dent, 1963.

Smollet, Tobias. The Adventures of Roderick Random. London: Hutchinson, 1905.

----------. The Expedition of Humphry Clinker. London: Dent, 1943.

The Treacherous Confident: or, Fortune's Change, a Novel. Dublin, 1728.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. Mary, A Fiction and The Wrongs of Woman. Ed. Gary Kelly. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1976.

Other Primary Sources

Addison, Joseph. See The Spectator.

Astell, Mary. Some Reflections Upon Marriage. 4th ed. 1730; rpt. New York: Source Book Press, 1970.

----------. An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex. 1696; rpt. New York: Source Book Press, 1970.

Curll, Edmund. A Compleat Key to the Dunciad. 3rd ed. London: 1728.

Defoe, Daniel. Defoe's Review, ed. A. W. Secord. Vol. 3. New York: AMS Press, 1965.

Fielding, Henry. The Covent Garden Journal, ed. G. E. Jensen. 2 vols. 1915; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1964.

----------. The Jacobite's Journal, ed. W. B. Coley. Oxford: Clarendon, 1974.

Halifax, George Savile, Marquess of. Advice to a Daughter, in Miscellanies. London: 1700.

Hill, Aaron. The Works of Aaron Hill. 4 vols. London: 1753.

Montagu, Lady Mary Wortley. The Complete Letters, ed. Robert Halsband. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965-67.

Pope, Alexander. A Collection of Letters Never Before Printed: Written by A. P. Esq. . . . To the Late Aaron Hill, Esq. London: 1751.

----------. The Correspondence of Alexander Pope, ed. George Sherburn. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1956.

----------. The Dunciad, ed. James Sutherland. London: Twickenham ed., 1963.

----------. The Works of Alexander Pope, ed. W. Elwin and W. J. Courthope. Vol. 4. London: 1881-82.

Sansom, Martha Fowke. Clio: or, a Secret History of the Life and Amours of the Late Celebrated Mrs. S-N-M. London: 1752.

Savage, Richard. An Author to Be Lett. London: 1729.

----------. Poetical Works, ed. Clarence Tracy. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1962.

Savage, Richard, et al. A Collection of Pieces in Verse and Prose, Which Have Been Published on Occasion of the Dunciad. London: 1732.

----------, et al. Miscellaneous Poems and Translations by Several Hands. London: 1726.

Spectator, The. Ed. D. F. Bond. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.

Steele, Richard. The Tatler, ed. J. Nichols. 6 vols. London: 1786.

----------. The Tatler, ed. A Chalmers. 4 vols. London: 1806.

----------. The Tatler, in British Essayists, ed. R. Lynam. Vols. 1-3. London: 1827.

----------. See also The Spectator.

Termagant, Roxana. See Thornton, Bonnell.

Thornton, Bonnell. Have at You All: or, the Drury Lane Journal. By Madam Roxana Termagant. London: 1752.

Whincop, Thomas. Scanderbeg, with a List of the English Dramatick Poets. London: 1747.

Secondary Sources

Adburgham, Alison. Women in Print. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1972.

Austin, Hugh Andrew. "Richardson's Clarissa, and Its Relation to Past and Contemporary Fiction and Drama." Diss. Liverpool 1968.

Avery, Emmett L. "Fielding's Last Season with the Haymarket Theatre." Modern Philology, 37 (1939), 283-92.

----------, et al., eds. The London Stage, 1600-1800. 5 pts in 11 vols. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1960-61.

Babb, Moira C. F. "Declarations of Independence: The Rebel Heroine, 1684-1800." Diss. Washington 1973.

Baker, David Erskine. A Companion to the Playhouse. 2vols London, 1764.

----------, et.al. Biographia Dramatica; or, a Companion to the Playhouse. 3 vols. London: 1812.

Baker, E. A. The History of the English Novel. 11 vols. 1924-39; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1960, 1967.

Baker, J. H. An Introduction to English Legal History. London: Butterworth's, 1971.

Baker, Sheridan. "The Idea of Romance in the Eighteenth Century Novel." Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters, 49 (1964), 507-22.

Beasley, Jerry C. "English Fiction in the 1740's: Some Glances at the Major and Minor Novels." Studies in the Novel, 5 (1973), 155-75.

----------. "Romance and the 'New' Novels of Richardson, Fielding and Smollett." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900, 16 (1976), 437-50.

Beljame, Alexandre. Men of Letters and the English Public in the Eighteenth Century. Trans. E. O. Lorimer. London: 1948.

Bishay, Christina. "Aspects of the Domestic Novel (1693-1753)." Diss. Manchester 1961.

Black, Sidney J. "Eighteenth Century 'Histories' as a Fictional Mode." Boston Univ. Studies in English, 1 (1955), 38-44.

Blomefield, Francis. An Essay Towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk. Vols. 6 and 9. London: 1807.

Boas, F. S. From Richardson to Pinero. London: Murray, 1936.

Boswell, James. The Life of Samuel Johnson LLD. London: Bodley Head, 1931.

Boyce, Benjamin. "English Short Fiction in the Eighteenth Century: A Preliminary View." Studies in Short Fiction, 5 (1967-68), 95-112.

Bradbrook, Frank. Jane Austen and Her Predecessors. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967.

Bradley, Rose M. The English Housewife in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. London: Edwin Arnold, 1912.

Brewster, Dorothy. Aaron Hill, Poet, Dramatist, Projector. New Columbia Univ. Press, 1913.

Brissenden, R. F. Samuel Richardson. Writers and Their Work, No. 101. London: Longman's, 1958.

Byrd, Max. Visits to Bedlam: Madness and Literature in the Eighteenth Century. Columbia: Univ. of S. Carolina Press, 1974.

Canby, Henry S. The Short Story in English. New York: Henry Holt, 1909.

Chalmers, Alexander. The General Biographical Dictionary. Vol. 17. London: 1814.

Chesler, Phyllis. Women and Madness. London: Allen Lane, 1974.

Chetwood, William Rufus. A General History of the Stage. Dublin; 1749.

----------. The British Theatre, Containing the Lives of the English Dramatic Poets. Dublin: 1750.

Clark, William S. The Early Irish Stage. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.

Cokayne, George Edward. The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom. Ed. V. Gibbs and H. A. Doubleday. Vol. 5. London: 1926.

Collins, A. S. Authorship in the Days of Johnson. 1927; rpt. Clifton, N. Jersey: Kelley, 1973.

----------. "The Growth of the Reading Public During the Eighteenth Century." Review of English Studies, 2 (1926), 284-93, 428-38.

Cooke, Arthur L. "Henry Fielding and the Writers of Heroic Romance." PMLA, 62 (1947), 984-94.

Cross, Wilbur L. The Development of the English Novel. New York: MacMillan, 1899.

----------. The History of Henry Fielding. 3 vols. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1918.

Cruickshank, John, ed. French Literature and Its Background. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969.

Daiches, David. "Samuel Richardson," in Literary Essays. 1956; rpt. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1966, 26-49.

Dales, J. C. "The Novel as Domestic Conduct Book--Richardson to Jane Austen." Diss. Cambridge 1970.

Dalziel, Margaret. Introd. and Notes. The Female Quixote. By Charlotte Lennox. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1970.

----------. "Richardson and Romance." AUMLA, No. 33 (May, 1970), 5-24.

Day, Robert A. "An Anonymous Attack on Swift." Notes and Queries, 200 (1955), 530-32.

----------. Told in Letters: Epistolary Fiction Before Richardson. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1966.

Dibdin, Charles. A Complete History of the English Stage. 5 vols. London: 1797-1800.

Dictionary of National Biography, ed. Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. 22 vols. 1908-9; rpt. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1960.

Digeon, Aurelien. The Novels of Fielding. London: Routledge, 1925.

Disraeli, Isaac. Curiosities of Literature. 3 vols. London: Frederick Warne, 1881.

Dobree, Bonamy. English Literature in the Early Eighteenth Century, 1700-1740. Oxford: Clarendon, 1959.

Dobson, Austin. "Polly Honeycombe," in Eighteenth Century Vignettes, 3rd Series. Oxford: Clarendon, 1923.

----------. Samuel Richardson. London: MacMillan, 1902.

Doody, Margaret A. A Natural Passion: A Study in the Novels of Samuel Richardson. Oxford: Clarendon, 1974.

Doran, J. Annals of the English Stage, ed. R. W. Lowe. 3 vols. London: Nimmo, 1888.

Downs, Brian W. Richardson. 1928; rpt. London: Frank Cass, 1969.

Drake, Nathan. Essays, Biographical, Critical, and Historical, Illustrative of the Rambler, Adventurer, and Idler. . . . 2 vols. London: 1809.

Dunlop, John. The History of Fiction. 3 vols. London: 1814.

Dussinger, John A. "Richardson's Tragic Muse." Philological Quarterly, 46 (1967), 18-23.

Eareckson, Irma. "Mrs. Eliza Haywood's Fiction in Relation to the Heroic Romance." Diss. Chicago 1929.

Eaves, T. C. Duncan and Ben D. Kimpel. Samuel Richardson: A Biography. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

Ehrenpreis, Irvin. "Letters of Advice to Young Spinsters." Stuart and Georgian Moments, ed. Earl Miner. Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1972, 245-69.

Elton, Oliver. A Survey of English Literature 1730-1780. Vol. 1. 1928; rpt. London: Edwin Arnold, 1959.

Elwood, John R. "A Critical Edition of Eliza Haywood's The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless /with/ Text of the First Edition in Four Volumes." Dissertation Abstracts, 24 (1962), 2462 (Univ. of Illinois).

----------. "The Stage Career of Eliza Haywood." Theatre Survey, 5 (1964), 107-16.

----------. "Swift's 'Corinna.'" Notes and Queries, 200 (1955), 529-30.

Erickson, James P. "Evelina and Betsy Thoughtless." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 6 (1964-65), 96-103.

----------. "The Novels of Eliza Haywood." Diss. Minnesota 1961.

Ernle, Rowland Edmund Prothero, 1st Baron. The Light Reading of Our Ancestors. London: Hutchinson, 1927.

Esdaile, Arundel. A List of English Tales and Prose Romances Printed Before 1740. Part 2. London: Bibliographical Society, 1912.

Evans, Ifor. A Short History of English Literature. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1940.

Farrell, William J. "The Style and Action in Clarissa." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900, 3 (1963), 365-75.

Fiedler, Leslie A. Love and Death in the American Novel. 2nd ed. London: Jonathan Cape, 1967.

Fletcher, Edward G. "The Date of Eliza Haywood's Death." Notes and Queries, 166 (1934), 385.

Forsyth, William. The Novels and Novelists of the Eighteenth Century, in Illustration of the Manners and Morals of the Age. London: Murray, 1871.

Foster, James R. History of the Pre-Romantic Novel in England. New York: MLA, 1949.

Foster, Joseph. Alumni Oxonienses 1500-1714. Vol. 2. Oxford and London: 1892.

Foxon, D. F., ed. English Verse 1701-1750. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1975.

Fry, J. F. "Betty Careless." Notes and Queries, 8th Series, 9 (1896), 453.

Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1957.

G., F. S. "Betty Careless." Notes and Queries, 8th Series, 9 (1896), 453.

Gallaway, Francis. Reason, Rule, and Revolt in English Classicism. 1940; rpt. New York: Octagon Books, 1965.

Genest, John. Some Account of the English Stage, From the Restoration in 1660 to 1830. 10 vols. Bath: 1832.

Golden, Morris. Fielding's Moral Psychology. Amherst, Mass.: Massachusetts Univ. Press, 1966.

----------. Richardson's Characters. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1963.

Golden, Morris. "Richardson's Repetitions." PMLA, 82 (1967), 64-67.

Graham, Walter. English Literary Periodicals. 1930; rpt. New York: Octagon Books, 1966.

Gray, Charles H. Theatrical Criticism in London to 1795. 1931; rpt. New York: Blom, 1964.

Greiner, Walter F., ed. English Theories of the Novel. Vol. 2. Tubingen: Max Niemeyer, 1970.

Grieder, Josephine, introd. The Adventures of Eovaii. By Eliza Haywood. New York: Garland, 1972.

----------, introd. The Agreeable Caledonian. By Eliza Haywood. New York: Garland, 1973.

----------, introd. Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia. By Eliza Haywood. New York: Garland, 1972.

----------, introd. The Rash Resolve and The Life and Adventures of the Lady Lucy. By Eliza Haywood and Penelope Aubin. New York: Garland, 1973.

----------, introd. The Reformed Coquet and The Mercenary Lover. By Mary Davys and Eliza Haywood. New York: Garland, 1973.

----------, introd. The Secret History of the Present Intrigues of the Court of Caramania. By Eliza Haywood. New York: Garland, 1972.

H., F. "Betty Careless." Notes and Queries, 8th Series, 9 (1896), 453.

Habakkuk, H. J. "Marriage Settlements in the Eighteenth Century." Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 32 (1950), 15-30.

Halsband, Robert. "The Female Pen." History Today, 24 (1974), 702-9.

----------. "Ladies of Letters in the Eighteenth Century." Stuart and Georgian Moments, ed. Earl Miner. Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1972, 271-91.

----------. "Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and Eighteenth Century Fiction." Philological Quarterly, 45 91966), 145-56.

Haviland, Thomas P. The Roman de Longue Haleine on English Soil. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylaania , 1931.

Hays, Mary. Female Biography: or, Memoirs of Illustrated and Celebrated Women, of All Ages and Countries. 6 vols. London: 1803.

Heidler, Joseph Bunn. The History, from 1700 to 1800, of English Criticism of Prose Fiction. Univ. of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. 13, No. 2. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1928.

Heinemann, Marcia. "Eliza Haywood's Career in the Theatre." Notes and Queries, 218 (1973), 9-13.

Hill, Christopher. "Clarissa Harlowe and Her Times." Essays in Criticism, 5 (1955), 315-40.

Hill, Georgiana. Women in English Life from Medieval to Modern Times. 2 vols. London: Bentley, 1896.

Hodges, James. "The Female Spectator, A Courtesy Periodical." Studies in the Early English Periodical, ed. Richmond P. Bond. Chapel Hill: Univ. of N. Carolina Press, 1957, 153-182.

Holdsworth, W. S. A History of English Law. Vol 11. 1938; rpt. London: Methuen, 1966.

Hole, Christina. English Home Life 1500 to 1800. London: Batsford, 1947.

Hornbeak, Katherine M. Richardson's Familiar Letters and the Domestic Conduct Books. Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, Vol. 19, no. 2. Northampton, Mass.: 1938.

Horner, Joyce M. The English Women Novelists and Their Connection With the Feminist Movement (1688-1797). Smith College Studies in Modern Languages. Vol. 11, nos. 1-3. Northampton, Mass.: 1930.

Humphreys, A. R. The Augustan World. London: Methuen, 1954.

----------. "The 'Rights of Woman' in the Age of Reason." Modern Language Review, 41 (1946), 256-69.

Hunter, Richard and Ida MacAlpine, eds. Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry 1535-1860. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1963.

Irwin, Michael. Henry Fielding; the Tentative Realist. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.

----------. Rev. of Fielding and the Nature of the Novel by Robert Alter and The Art of Joseph Andrews by Homer Goldberg. Review of English Studies, 22 (1971), 89-93.

Jackson, Joseph. The Formation and Annulment of Marriage. 2nd ed. London: Butterworth's, 1969.

Jeaffreson, J. Cordy. Novels and Novelists, from Elizabeth to Victoria. Vol. 1. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1858.

Jenkins, Owen. "Richardson's Pamela and Fielding's 'Vile Forgeries.'" Philological Quarterly, 44 (1965), 200-10.

Jerrold, Walter and Clare. Five Queer Women. London: Brentano's, 1929.

Johnson, R. B. The Women Novelists. London: W. Collins Sons, 1918.

Jusserand, J. J. The English Novel in the Time of Shakespeare. Trans. Elizabeth Lee. London: 1890.

Kaufman, Paul. "In Defense of Fair Readers." Review of English Literature, 8 (1967), 68-76.

Kavanagh, Julia. English Women of Letters. London: 1863.

Kearney, Anthony. Samuel Richardson: Clarissa. London: Arnold, 1975.

Kettle, Arnold. An Introduction to the English Novel. Vol. 1. London: Hutchinson's Univ. Library, 1951.

Kinkead-Weekes, Mark, introd. Pamela. By Samuel Richardson. London: Dent, 1963.

----------. Samuel Richardson: Dramatic Novelist. London: Methuen, 1973.

Knight, Charles. Shadows of the Old Booksellers. London: 1865.

Konigsberg, Ira. Samuel Richardson and the Dramatic Novel. Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1968.

Kreissman, Bernard. Pamela-Shamela. Lincoln, Neb.: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1960.

Krutch, Joseph Wood. Five Masters: A Study in the Mutations of the Novel New York: Jonathan Cape, 1931.

Kunitz, Stanley and Howard Haycraft, eds. British Authors Before 1800: A Biographical Dictionary. New York: Wilson, 1952.

Lang, Andrew. History of English Literature from 'Beowulf' to Swinburne. London:Longman's, 1912.

Leavis, Q. D. Fiction and the Reading Public. 1932; rpt. London: Chatto and Windus, 1965.

Loftis, J. The Politics of Drama in Augustan England. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.

Lounsbury, T. R. The Text of Shakespeare. New York: Scribner's, 1906.

Lovett, Robert M. and Helen S. Hughes. The History of the Novel in England. London: Harrap, 1933.

McBurney, William H., ed. Checklist of Prose Fiction 1700-1739. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1960.

----------, ed. Four Before Richardson. Lincoln, Neb.: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1964.

McBurney, William H. "Edmund Curll, Mrs. Jane Barker, and the English Novel." Philological Quarterly, 37 (1958), 385-99.

----------. "Mrs. Mary Davys: Forerunner of Fielding." PMLA, 74 (1959), 348-52.

----------. "Mrs. Penelope Aubin and the Early Eighteenth-Century English Novel." Huntington Library Quarterly, 20 (1957), 245-67.

MacCarthy, B. G. Women Writers, Their Contribution to the English Novel 1621-1744. Cork: Cork Univ. Press, 1946.

----------. The Later Women Novelists 1744-1818. Cork: Cork Univ. Press, 1947.

McDougall, Dorothy. Madeleine de Scudery: Her Romantic Life and Death. London: Methuen, 1938.

McKillop, Alan D. The Early Masters of English Fiction. Lawrence: Univ. of Kansas Press, 1956.

----------. "English Circulating Libraries, 1725-50." Library, 2nd Series, 14 (1934), 477-85.

----------. Samuel Richardson, Printer and Novelist. 1936; rpt. New York: Shoe String Press, 1960.

Mack, Maynard, introd. Joseph Andrews. By Henry Fielding. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1948. Rpt. in Fielding: Twentieth Century Interpretations, ed. Ronald Paulson. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1962, 52-58.

Manheim, Leonard. "The Absurd Miss Pamela and the Tragic Miss Clarissa." Nassau Review, 2 (1964), 1-10.

Mason, John E. Gentlefolk in the Making. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1935.

Mayo, Robert D. The English Novel in the Magazines 1740-1815. Evanston: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1962.

Mews, Hazel. Frail Vessels: Woman's Role in Women's Novels From Fanny Burney to George Eliot. London: Athlone Press, 1969.

Miner, Earl, ed. Stuart and Georgian Moments, Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1972.

Mingay, G. E. English Landed Society in the Eighteenth Century. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.

Mish, Chatles C. "Mme, de Gomez and La Belle Assemblee." Revue de Litterature Comparee, 34 (1960), 212-25.

Moore, C. A. "A Note of the Biography of Mrs. Eliza Haywood." Modern Language Notes, 30 (1918), 248-50.

Morgan, Charlotte. The Rise of the Novel of Manners (1600-1740). New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1911.

Moynihan, Robert D. "Clarissa and the Enlightened Woman as Literary Heroine." Journal of the History of Ideas, 36 (1975), 159-66.

Murry, John Middleton. "In Defence of Fielding," in Unprofessional Essays. London: Jonathan Cape, 1956, 9-52.

Napier, Elizabeth R. "'Tremble and Reform': The Inversion of Power in Richardson's Clarissa." ELH, 42 (1975), 214-23.

A New and General Biographical Dictionary, ed. William Tooke. 15 vols. London: 1798.

Nicoll, Allardyce. A History of English Drama 1660-1900. Vol. 2, 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1961.

Novak, Maximillian E. "Defoe's Theory of Fiction." Studies in Philology, 61 (1964), 650-68.

----------. "Defoe's Use of Irony." Stuart and Georgian Moments, ed. Earl Miner. Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1972, 189-220.

----------. "Fiction and Society in the Early Eighteenth Century." England in the Restoration and Early Eighteenth Century, ed. H. T. Swedenberg, Jr. Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1972, 51-70.

----------. "Some Notes Toward a History of Fictional Forms: From Aphra Behn to Daniel Defoe." Novel, 6 (1973), 120-33.

Oakman, Robert L. "The Character of the Hero: A Key to Fielding's Amelia." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900, 16 (1976), 473-89.

Park, William. "Clarissa as Tragedy." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900, 16 (1976), 461-71.

Paulson, Ronald. Satire and the Novel in Eighteenth Century England. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1967.

----------, ed. Fielding: Twentieth Century Interpretations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1962.

Pierce, Robert B. "Moral Education in the Novel of the 1750's." Philological Quarterly, 44 (1965), 73-87.

Plomer, H. R., et al. A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers Who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1726 to 1775. London: Bibliographical Society, 1932.

Poole, E. P. "The Lesser Novels 1740-1770." Diss. London 1930.

Pope, W. J. MacQuean. Theatre Royal Drury Lane. London: Allen, 1945.

Price, Martin. To the Palace of Wisdom. Carbondale: S. Illinois Univ. Press, 1964.

Priestley, J. B., introd. to selections from Eliza Haywood's Female Spectator, ed. Mary Priestley. London: Bodley Head, 1929.

Pritchett, V. S. "Clarissa," in The Living Novel. London: Chatto and Windus, 1946, 9-17.

Quinlan, Maurice J. Victorian Prelude, A History of English Manners 1700-1830. 1941; rpt. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1965.

R., D. "Betty Careless." Notes and Queries, 8th Series, 9 (1896), 366.

Rabkin, Norma. "Clarissa: A Study in the Nature of Convention." ELH, 23 (1956), 204-17.

Raleigh, Walter. The English Novel. London: Murray, 1903.

Ratner, M. Theory and Criticism of the Novel in France From "L'Astree" to 1750. 1938; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1971.

Reid, B. L. "Justice to Pamela." Hudson Review, 9 (1956-57), 516-33.

Reeve, Clara. The Progress of Romance. 1785; rpt. New York: Facsimile Text Society, 1930.

Reynolds, Myra. The Learned Lady in England 1650-1760. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1920.

Richetti, John J. Popular Fiction Before Richardson: Narrative Patterns 1700-1739. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.

Rogers, Katharine M. "Sensitive Feminism vs. Conventional Sympathy: Richardson and Fielding." Novel, 9 (1976), 256-70.

Rogers, Pat. Grub Street: Studies in a Subculture. London: Methuen, 1972.

Rudolf, Jo-Ellen S. "The Novels That Taught the Ladies: A Study of Popular Fiction Written by Women, 1702-1834." Diss. California (San Diego) 1972.

Russell, Ann Z. "The Image of Women in Eighteenth Century English Novels." Diss. Brandeis 1974.

Sacks, Sheldon. "Clarissa and the Tragic Traditions." Irrationalism in the Eighteenth Century, ed. Harold E. Pagliano. Cleveland: Case Western Reserve Univ. Press, 1972, 195-221.

Saintsbury, George. The English Novel. London: Dent, 1924.

----------. A History of the French Novel. Vol. 1. London: MacMillan, 1917.

Saintsbury, George. A Short History of French Literature. 7th ed. Oxford: Clarendon 1917.

Sale, William M., Jr. "From Pamela to Clarissa." The Age of Johnson, ed. F. W. Hilles. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1949, 127-38.

----------. Samuel Richardson: Master Printer. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1950.

Schulz, Dieter. "'Novel,' 'Romance,' and Popular Fiction in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century." Studies in Philology, 70 (1973), 77-91.

Scott, J. W. "Prose Fiction." French Literature and Its Background, ed. John Cruickshank. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969, 152-67.

Sherbo, Arthur. "Eighteenth-Century British Fiction in Print: An Uncritical Census." College English, 21 (1959), 105-11.

Sherborn, G. T. "Betty Careless." Notes and Queries, 8th Series, 9 (1896), 453.

Sherburn, George. The Early Career of Alexander Pope. 1934; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1963.

Shugrue, Michael F. "The Sincerest Form of Flattery: Imitation in the Early Eighteenth Century Novel." South Atlantic Quarterly, 70 (1971), 248-55.

Simons, Judith A. "The Treatment of Women in Selected Novels From Richardson to Jane Austen." Diss. Manchester 1971.

Singer, G. F. The Epistolary Novel. 1933; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1963.

Smith, Elsie. "Some Pioneer Women Novelists and Their Contribution to the Eighteenth Century Novel 1688-1740." Diss. London 1926.

Spacks, Patricia Meyer. "Early Fiction and the Frightened Male." Novel, 8 (1974), 5-15.

----------. "'Ev'ry Woman is at Heart a Rake.'" Eighteenth Century Studies, 8 (1974), 27-46.

Stauffer, Donald A. The Art of Biography in Eighteenth Century England. 3 vols. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1941.

Stearns, B. M. "Early English Periodicals for Ladies." PMLA, 48, (1933), 38-60.

Steeves, Edna L. "Pre-Feminism in Some Eighteenth Century Novels." Texas Quarterly, 16 (1973), Pt. 3, 48-57.

Steeves, Harrison R. Before Jane Austen: The Shaping of the English Novel in the Eighteenth Century. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1966.

Stenton, Doris M. The English Woman in History. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1957

Stephen, Leslie. English Literature and Society in the Eighteenth Century. 1904; rpt. London: Duckworth, 1965.

Stevenson, Lionel. The English Novel: A Panorama. London: Constable, 1961.

Stockwell, La Tourette. Dublin Theatres and Theatre Customs (1637-1820). 1938; rpt. New York: Blom, 1968.

Taylor, John Tinnon. Early Opposition to the English Novel: The Popular Reaction From 1760 to 1830. New York: King's Crown Press, 1943.

Thompson, C. J. S. Love, Marriage and Romance in Old London. London: Heath Cranton, 1936.

Thompson, Roger. Women in Stuart England and America. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.

Thoms, William J. "The Dunciad," correspondence in Notes and Queries, Series 1, 10 (1854) 109-10

Thomson, Clara Linklater. Samuel Richardson. London: Marshall, 1900.

Tietje, Arthur J. The Theory of Characterization in Prose Fiction Prior to 1740. Univ. of Minnesota Studies in Language and Literature, No. 5. Minneapolis; Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1916.

Timperley, C. H. Dictionary of Printers and Printing. With the Progress of Literature. London: 1839.

Todd-Naylor, Ursula. "Richardson's Influence on the Women Novelists of the Eighteenth Century." Diss. London 1934.

Tompkins, J. M. S. The Popular Novel in England 1770-1800. London: Constable, 1932.

Towers, A. R. "Amelia and the State of Matrimony." Review of English Studies, N.S. 5 (1954), 144-57.

Tracy, Clarence. The Artificial Bastard. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1953.

Turberville, A. S. English Men and Manners in the Eighteenth Century. 1926; rpt. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1961.

Van Ghent, Dorothy. The English Novel: Form and Function. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953.

Wagenknecht, Edward. Cavalcade of the English Novel. New York: Henry Holt, 1943.

Wallas, Ada. Before the Bluestockings. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1929.

Walmsley, D. M. "Eliza Haywood: A Bicentenary." Times Literary Supplement, 24 February 1956, p. 117.

Watson, A. F. "British Women Writers and the Origins of the 'Feminist' Movement in England in the Latter Part of the Eighteenth Century." Diss. Manchester 1963.

Watt, Ian, introd. Shamela. By Henry Fielding. Los Angeles: Augustan Reprint Society, 1956.

----------. "The Ironic Tradition in Augustan Prose From Swift to Johnson." Stuart and Georgian Moments, ed. Earl Miner. Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1972, 161-188.

----------. The Rise of the Novel. London: Chatto and Windus, 1957.

----------. "Serious Reflections on The Rise of the Novel." Novel, 1 (1968), 205-18.

Wendt, Allan. "Clarissa's Coffin." Philological Quarterly, 39 (1960), 481-95.

Wheatley, Henry B. The Dedication of Books to Patron and Friend. London: 1887.

Whicher, George F. The Life and Romances of Eliza Haywood. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1915.

White, T. H. The Age of Scandal. London: Jonathan Cape, 1950.

Whitmore, Clara H. Woman's Work in English Fiction, From the Restoration to the Mid-Victorian Period. New York: Putnam's, 1910.

Williams, Aubrey. Pope's Dunciad. London: Methuen, 1955.

Williams, E. N. Life in Georgian England. London: Batsford, 1963.

Williams, Ioan, ed. Novel and Romance 1700-1800: A Documentary Record. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.

Williams, Jane. The Literary Women of England. London: 1861.

Winch, R. F. "References in Macaulay and Dryden." Notes and Queries, 8th Series, 8 (1895), 507.

Winner, Anthony. "Richardson's Lovelace: Character and Prediction." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 14 (1972-73), 53-75.

Wolff, Cynthia Griffin. Samuel Richardson and the Eighteenth Century Puritan Character. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1972.

Woolf, Virginia. A Room of One's Own. London: Hogarth Press, 1935.

Wurzbach, Natascha, ed. The Novel in Letters, Epistolary Fiction in the Early English Novel 1678-1740. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

Modern Reprints of Haywood's Works

McBurney, W. H., ed. Philidore and Placentia, in Four Before Richardson. Lincoln, Neb.: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1964.

Priestley, Mary, ed. The Female Spectator. Being Selections Chosen and Edited by Mary Priestley. London: Bodley Head, 1929.

The following all appear in the series, Foundations of the Novel, by Garland Publishers, In all cases, the place of publication is New York:

The Adventures of Eovaii, 1972.

The Agreeable Caledonian, 1973.

Memoirs of a Certain Island, 1972.

The Mercenary Lover, 1973.

The Rash Resolve, 1973.

The Secret History of the Present Intrigues of the Court of Caramania, 1972.

The following appear in the Garland Series, The Flowering of the Novel:

The Fortunate Foundlings, 1974.

The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy, 1974.

Life's Progress Through the Passions, 1974.

The Virtuous Villager, 1974.

The following appears in the Garland Series, Popeiana:

Irish Artifice, in The Female Dunciad, 1974.

The following appears in the Garland series, Richardsoniana:

Anti-Pamela, or Feigned Innocence Detected, 1975.

KENT LIBRARY UNIVERSITY