National Library of Canada

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

The seducer-figure in Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* and *Clarissa.*

BY

Ndana Ndana

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Department of English

Edmonton, Alberta

Spring 1995

ISBN 0-612-01520-3

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Ndana Ndana

TITLE OF THESIS: The Seducer-figure in Richardson's *Pamela* and *Clarissa*.

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED: Master of Arts

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: Spring 1995

NDANA NDANA

University of Botswana
P/Bag 0022
Gaborone
Botswana.

DATED Jan. 9, 1995

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled The Seducer-figure in Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* and *Clarissa* submitted by Ndana Ndana in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Dr. E.W.B. Pitcher

Dr. M.G. Badir

Dr. B. Stovel

Dr. D. Gay

Date 16 Dec 1994

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to the following people:

My son **Rungwe** who endured two years of my absence

Muche and **Mulera** (my mother and grandmother) who have always sacrificed their meager resources for my education

My **sisters** and **brother** for their love and support

In memory of **Sinvula** (father), **Ntumbwa** (brother), **Ikume** (grandmother), **Nalishebo** (aunt), [illegible] **da** (cousin), who never lived to see this document. May the spirit of [illegible]ndulu Shamukunga, our God, rest their souls in peace.

Abstract

"Pamela, Clarissa and Sir Charles Grandison," argues Eagleton, "are not only fictional characters: they are also public mythologies, coordinates of a mighty moral debate, symbolic spaces within which dialogues may be conducted, pacts concluded and ideological battle waged" (5). We can add, and so are Mr. B. and Lovelace. This in estigates the mind, action, and motivation of two of Richardson's seducer Mr. B. and Robert Lovelace, to show why they seduce women. Richardson did not intend us to see his seducers as males with uncontrollable sexual drives, but as telling embodiments of the sexual double standards and early eighteenth-century power struggles between men and women.

In attempting to seduce women, the seducers manifest in action beliefs which were common in English society. First, they believed that women were easy for intelligent males to manipulate; secondly, that women were vessels of passion, interested in sexual gratification, but worried about the consequences, both at the level of the individual and of society. As intelligent males, the seducers' purpose was to disarm these women of their anxiety. Lastly, being members of the upper class, the seducers believed that their rank would intimidate their victims. Of course, as we discover in both works, the victim's resistance qualifies the seducers' assumptions. The victims prove that they are equally intelligent as (if not more intelligent than) their aggressors by effectively frustrating their attempts. The victims' continued resistance brings to an end the seducers' careers. We also discover that the seducers' behavior is a result of an internal conflict. They are characters torn between their rakish tendencies, which encourage them to pursue women only to gratify their rakish ego, and genuine feelings of love for their victims, feelings which contradict their rakish creed of behaviour.

In *Pamela*, the seducer, Mr. B., allows his genuine feelings for his victim to transcend his rakishness; hence he reforms to become her doting husband. In *Clarissa*, however, Lovelace suppresses his feelings of love for Clarissa; thus he pursues his rakish agenda to his destructive end. In these two works, therefore, Richardson explores two ways in which the seducer ends his career: happily for Mr. B., and destructively for Lovelace.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Pitcher for his assistance during the term of this project and members of my committee (Dr. Stovel, Dr. Badir, and Dr. Gay) for their insightful comments. I am also grateful to the University of Manitoba/Botswana Linkage Project for financing my studies , to the English department of the University of Botswana for introducing me to the joys of literature, to members of SACUDA (Southern Africa Cultural and Development Association) for providing that family atmosphere during my stay in Edmonton, and particularly to Patricia for typing and all the support.

Table of Contents

"To rape is to attempt to master, to assert one's will upon another"
C. H. Flynn, *Samuel Richardson: A Man of Letters*, p.108.

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to give (i) a general introduction to the area of study, (ii) a review of Richardsonian criticism from 1930 to the present day, (iii) an outline of the socio-political and economic conditions of the first half of the eighteenth century, and, (iv) remarks on contemporary literature which might have influenced Richardson in writing *Pamela* and *Clarissa*.

My interest in the themes of seduction and near-seduction is in the main to unde nd Richardson's views of why men seduce women. One observes in his novels that sex, which is the ultimate aim of the seducers or the means by which they conquer their victims, becomes a language through which power structures and struggles between males and females are communicated. I am convinced that, to a great extent, Richardson's seducers are motivated by the desire to dominate; thus by successfully seducing their victims, they effect that domination. Secondly, we can observe of the actions of the seducers that they cause conflicts which move the action forward. The victims as human beings who want to assert their freedom and independence resist the seducers. The seducers, on the one hand, as they are out to conquer women will not tolerate any resistance. Thwarting resistance proves that indeed males are superior in intelligence. So when the two sexes confront each other, the friction between them makes the novels lively and action-oriented. Of course conflict also exists within the individual. The seducer is not wholly evil. Constantly he equivocates between doing good and being a plotter to achieve his purpose. The victim too gets torn between her natural love for the seducer, because he is usually attractive, and her distrust of his motives. Growing up, the seducers and their victims are confronted by their sexuality and they are in constant debate whether to acknowledge it. Thus, the conflict presented in Richardson's novels is especially a conflict within characters, as they reflect life's conflicts on the issues of sex.

Sex's primary function is the continuation of the human race through procreation. Society encourages its members to institutionalize sex through marriage. In this case, marriage, besides being a shelter for procreation, has added advantages. It is a means to curb promiscuity, and by extension, guard against incestuous matches which are likely to arise in situations where men are fathering children without any restrictions. Secondly, related to the above, marriage ensures security and avoidance of diseases which are likely to result from extramarital sexual transactions. But where seduction and rape are a means for 'men' to oppress 'women', sex involves a series of power-plays, a struggle from which each person wants to emerge victorious. This struggle between characters we see in Richardson's novels. The male organ becomes the aggressor while the female one becomes the receptacle of the power-transaction. As Janet Todd in *Women's Friendship in Literature* (1980) observes:

> The eighteenth-century novel almost invariably tells
> of romantic attachment between a man and a woman,
> an attachment expressed in conflict. The two sides
> grapple and spar the length of the book and, whether
> marriage or death closes the contest, they remain
> strangers to the end, the captains of their sex. (2)

My focus of inquiry is the seducer figures in *Pamela* and *Clarissa*, two novels which present a plot or formula of growing up. Richardson's subtle exploration of young men and girls growing from the world of innocence into the mature world of experience is his essential genius. The formula demands that the initiates be confronted with testing circumstances before gaining acceptance into the world of experience; and Richardson's technique was to permit the seducers and the victims to provide such circumstances for each other. Secondly, in the attitudes of the characters, particularly the seducers, we understand the existing power relations and society's character, attitudes towards sex,

politics, and social institutions. As Ivan Bloch in *A History of English Sexual Morals* as early as 1936 appropriately reminds us:

> For the character of a people (or of an individual) is revealed nowhere more clearly than in the realm of sex. Here those noteworthy peculiarities in race and individual are seen in sharpest, clearest outline, because a human being is most completely himself in this sphere. (13)

Richardsonian criticism began in the eighteenth century, from the time he published his novels. The criticism includes remarks and tributes about his novels in diaries, magazines, and letters, and ranges from praises to satires and burlesques of his novels. *Pamela*, in particular, suffered spurious continuations and parodies, the best known being Henry Fielding's *Shamela*, in which he portrays Pamela (as Shamela Andrews) as hypocritical, not virtuous as Richardson depicts her in his novel. Richardson received requests from readers of *Clarissa* to end the novel happily (i.e., with a marriage, not death, for the heroine), but he totally refused to do so.

I intend to survey Richardsonian criticism from the 1930's to the present day, with the hope of showing the trends through which the criticism has evolved and how it (the available criticism) informs my study of the seducers in the two novels. This survey is by no means exhaustive.

The 30's witnessed a variety of studies, some of which are not directly on Richardson and his novels, but provide significant background to his novels and place them in the context of the period. Pelham Edgar's book *The Art of the Novel From 1700 to The Present Time* (1933), although not exclusively on Richardson, makes valuable allusions to him, particularly the chapter "Richardson and the Epistolary Novel." The book starts off with a consideration of the elements of fiction Edgar refers to as "The Essentials." These include dialogue and its characteristics, point of view in narrative, which includes first and third person, and plot. He proceeds with a description of these

elements and points out some of the problems associated with each. For example, he says the following about the third-person omniscient point of view,

> ... the dangers of "omniscience" are as obvious as the advantages. The author enjoys an almost unlimited freedom in the disposal of his material, yet there is always the risk of obtruding himself to the point of destroying his reader's illusion and deadening the vitality of his report. (19-20)

To avoid the above, Edgar suggests that the author should "set some barriers to his omniscience" (20). Edgar then goes on to examine the epistolary novel.

He argues, rightly so, that the epistolary novel or its antecedents existed long before *Pamela* was published. Richardson was no doubt a good letter writer, making himself in Edgar's words "the scribe in ordinary of all the illiterate females in distress who applied to him for aid" (46). Letter-fiction for 100 years before Pamela, according to Edgar, based itself on four stock conventions: (i) the rifled post-bag, (ii) letters of travel, (iii) letters between the friend in the country and the friend in town, and (iv) the correspondence of lovers (47). Of the four, Edgar cites Helen Sard Hughes as attaching most importance to the fourth for the genesis of the epistolary novel. Emphasis is placed on John Hughes's paper in *The Spectator* no. 375 of May 10, 1712. John Hughes's paper "The History of Amanda" uses the medium of the letter to describe the experiences of a young lady's resistance to her master's attempts to seduce her. This similarity between Hughes's 1712 story and Richardson's about thirty years later shows that Richardson's task "was a matter of amplification. He is an originator in so far as he was the first writer to employ letters for purposes of narration on so extended a scale, and, may we not add? because he was the first writer of genius in England to utilize the device" (47).

Edgar then considers the degree of adaptability of the letter form to the purposes of fiction, and proceeds to compare Richardson to writers such as Tobias Smollett and Fanny Burney. He argues that Smollett's and Burney's letters (i.e. those of their

characters) arise naturally or spontaneously from their situation. In Smollett's *Humphry Clinker* (1771), the author presents the Bramble family on its travels, and the family members spontaneously relate to their friends vivid accounts of the episodes of their travels. In *Evelina* (1778), Burney presents a young country girl whose first experience of town life naturally drives her to relate such experiences to her guardian.

Unlike characters in Smollett and Burney, Richardson's do not write as a natural response to their circumstances. Both Pamela and Clarrisa are "jealously guarded prisoners. Both devise ingenious postal arrangements, and both are capable of driving their pens with accelerated energy in the midthroes of an emotional crisis" (49).
Despite its brevity and Edgar's failure to explain what he means when he refers to Richardson as the "first writer of genius in England...", the chapter offers valuable insights.

Godfrey Frank Singer's book *The Epistolary Novel Its Origin, Development, Decline, and Residuary Influence* (1933) deserves consideration because of its detailed attempt to make a complete survey of epistolary fiction. The book can be divided into three important parts intended to show the status of epistolary fiction before, during and after Richardson's writings.

In the Pre-Richardson era, Singer traces the art of letter writing from the Classical period through the Middle Ages to the time Richardson began writing his novels. He cites Cicero's letters as important because: "they represent the best tradition of letter writing in Latin, they are the models upon which the English letter writers of the pre-Elizabethan days patterned their letters" (4). Singer also reminds us that the New Testament in most part is in letter form, including St. Paul's letters "which contain not only what is information, to be used for the purpose of delivering a message, but are exhortations and exegeses as well.... Many of them are like essays or theological dissertations" (3). Also in letter form is the Gospel of St. Luke, which is addressed to Governor Theophilus. Important to note from these examples is the fact that letter writing is as old as literacy itself.

In the second part, Singer devotes a thirty-eight paged chapter to Richardson. Singer identifies Richardson as "the man who developed the epistolary novel, the father largely of the modern English novel" (60). Earlier in the book, he is referred to as "the dean and apex of all letter writers" (23). In this chapter, before considering Richardson's fiction, Singer examines the status of fiction at the time Richardson began writing. Available at that time (among scores of lesser geniuses) were Defoe and Swift's narratives, which recorded everyday experiences but lacked the psychological realism which came to be associated with Richardson's novels and characters: "Defoe intensified pretended verisimilitude; Swift, like authors of the scandal romances, presented well-known figures and events under a thin disguise, and added thereto a stinging entirely conscious satire" (61).

Singer proceeds to examine Richardson's novels, giving an elaborate plot summary of each, and where applicable, the sources used by Richardson. Like Edgar, Singer traces the source of *Pamela* to John Hughes's paper in *The Spectator*. He also writes that *Pamela*, "although it begins with letter 1, it is, at the outset of the story not so much a series of letters as a series of recordings in the Journal of the Heroine, a combination of letter and journal which is later to be found in several novels of the epistolary group..." (65). This is true in that many of the letters in *Pamela* (even in *Clarissa*) are written with the full knowledge that they will not reach their intended destination. Letters fall in the hands of Mrs Jewkes and Mr. B., for whom they are not intended. This technique helps Richardson add to the dramatic suspense of the story. The heroine, despite this interruption of her correspondence continues to write. The result of this, Singer suggests "is the production of something more nearly a diary than a letter or group of letters" (65).

Pamela and *Clarissa* are compared. In the former, the letter writing is confined to one character (Pamela) and this makes the story one-sided. In *Clarissa* Richardson allows for a multiplicity of correspondents, including the villain, Lovelace. The increase in the number of correspondents not only allows for different view points, but also makes the

novel more lively and balanced. It also shows the author's reckoning of the extent to which he can make use of the epistolary style.

Being an accomplished letter-writer, Richardson's choice of writing novels in letter-form is thus not strange. As Singer writes:

> Perhaps the most important (*sic*) to remember of Samuel Richardson's epistolary novel is, that since he has been in the habit of writing love letters for young ladies of his acquaintance since his early youth, that since he was himself an inveterate letter writer, it was the most natural thing in the world for him to write letters, and thus we find his novels not so much novels put into the form of letters for the sake of convenience as letters expanded naturally to the length of novels. (85)

He continues to argue that: "Richardson's method came spontaneously to him. He started, then, from the plan of writing letters to illustrate a given point of morality, and in order to make the letters more attractive and more convincing, fell upon the device of attributing them to a fictitious character" (85-6).

In the post-Richardson section, Singer looks at Richardson's influence on subsequent fiction. He makes a very elaborate examination of the epistolary novel from Richardson through 1785 when its popularity lessened. He also looks at the form in England, France, Italy and America. Like Edgar, Singer cites Smollett and Burney as showing Richardsonian influence. Richardson, according to Singer, stands as the most important figure in the development of the epistolary novel.

> ...it was the tremendous power of the example of Richardson that made possible the epistolary outburst to be found in the eighteenth century, that outburst which took almost thirty years after the publication of the first novel by that author (*Pamela*) to reach its height. But, even beyond this, it is a fact that in Richardson was concentrated, along with his greatness as a writer, the passion of the century for letter

> writing that made the enormous popularity of the epistolary form possible; that it was not Richardson alone, but the greatness of Richardson in his employment of what was already a common desire of the vast majority of the reading public. (102)

Singer's book is still very useful for understanding the evolution of the epistolary novel and Richardson's place in the tradition.

Alan Dugald Mckillop's *Samuel Richardson: Printer and Novelist* (1936) is an important historical commentary on Richardson's three novels detailing the novels' sources, composition, reception, social and literary contexts, and the early criticisms. As he succinctly writes in the preface, "the present work is not a "life and times" or even a full-length life, but centers on the origins, publication, and reception of Richardson's three great novels, though of course his personality and associations must figure largely in the account" (vii).

In this broad scheme, Mckillop makes passing remarks on Richardson's characters, and ends the book with an examination of Richardson's reputation and influence. It is a valuable reference book to those interested in the publication, reception, and sources of Richardson's novels. Its importance to this study lies in its occasional remarks on the seducers (23-24, 119-20, 131-34) and the comments on contemporary literature [such as Colley Cibber's *Love's Last Shift* (1696) and Nicholas Rowe's *The Fair Penitent* (1703), to mention just a few] which might have influenced Richardson in writing his novels.

The 1940's saw a continued interest in Richardson's works, although not as great as the one we see after 1950. In 1942, Stanley P. Cardon produced a study of the villains in Richardson's novels, a study whose focus is similar to mine. Like most critics on Richardson, Cardon emphasizes already known facts about Richardson's fiction: that the villain-figure in literature is an archetypal figure and that Richardson influenced the portraits of villains in later English, French and German literature. In the first two chapters, he cites the texts which might have influenced Richardson's conception of his

villains and those texts which exhibit Richardsonian influence. The last chapter is devoted to a comparison of the villains in Richardson's novels. This comparison highlights similarities between the three rakes, their motivations, characters, and the ways through which they attempt to effect their goal, seduction of the heroines. By far, Lovelace is the most complex and interesting of the three, and to him a lengthy discussion is devoted.

Despite its usefulness, the study has the following limitations. Firstly, it tends to be simplistic. It scratches the surface without an in-depth analysis of character. Lovelace is an enigma, a character requiring analysis beyond the basics which Cardon offers. In fact, he seems, in the main to recount events in the text. Secondly, while his quotations from the novels are appropriate and show his familiarity with the texts, they are in some cases very long. Quotations amounting to two pages (single-spaced) seem to allow him (Cardon) little room for his critical analysis.

In 1944, H.T.Hopkinson's article "Robert Lovelace, the Romantic Cad" was published. The article is a critical analysis of Lovelace's character and attitudes towards women. The qualities which Lovelace exhibits characterize him as a cad. The essay begins with some general remarks on the novel as having not received its due admiration:

> Partly because of its subject, the sexual war, personified in the encounter between two champions, Lovelace and Clarissa; and partly because of its curious medley of prosy sentiment with acute psychological understanding, of comfortable religiosity with an absorbed and almost prurient pre-occupation in the details of sexual pursuit - Lovelace being professedly drawn as Lucifer, the all-powerful seducer, and Clarissa the embodiment of female chastity. (80)

At the time Hopkinson wrote, it is true that *Clarissa* had not received much attention, but over the past thirty years or so, Richardson's works have received renewed interest, and it is possible to count more than fifty books and articles exclusively on *Clarissa*.

Hopkinson's essay has a three part structure: (i) in the first he paints a picture of a cad and tries to remove common misapprehensions concerning his nature; (ii) attempts to prove the supremacy of Robert Lovelace and does this by taking evidence of Lovelace's career, and (iii) makes passing general criticisms on the novel and an evaluation of Lovelace's character.

In the first part of the essay, Hopkinson begins by posing the question "what is a Cad?" This question remains unanswered, at least in the sense of stating directly what a cad is. He tries to answer the question by looking at that quality which distinguishes a cad, "his attitude to women" (80). What, then, is the Cad's attitude towards women? First and foremost, the cad perceives women as man's natural prey; he "regards women as game, the only game worth his trouble of pursuit" (80). We may note Lovelace's confession to Belford that when boys, they start by hunting birds and they grow up to hunt women.

Excellence, the article suggests, is one of the ideals to which a cad strives. He is a real cad if he can hunt women excellently. Excellence, "consists in choosing the finest and the most unapproachable for quarry, scorning the obvious and easy" (81). Clarissa's fame, chastity, and integrity, make her an appropriate target for Lovelace's machinations. It is his initial success in making Clarissa flee home that makes Lovelace feel he is indeed a good hunter.

Another quality of the cad is his ability to enter the victim's mind and anticipate her actions. An experienced cad will know the victim's limitations. Lovelace's contrivance to make Leman fake an angry Harlowe-family member's voice pursuing him and Clarissa, enables him to anticipate with certainty that Clarissa would rather run away with him than stay to face the wrath of her family. Pursuing the victims is the greater part of the hunt: "pursuit becomes a long series of moves designed to exhaust the pursued, and finally drive her into one of the few well-defined situations from which there is no escape. Cut down her radius of action; exhaust her powers of resistance; pen her into a chosen corner" (81).

A cad is not a lover of women at all. His aim is to destroy them, Hopkinson suggests. In Lovelace's case, it is possible to argue that while he is a cad bent on destroying women, he nevertheless shows at times that he loves Clarissa. I think he profoundly feels guilty after raping her. Lovelace's show of both love and hate for women makes him a complex character, and also brings into play yet another quality of the cad which is worth mentioning. To quote Hopkinson:

> the cad can be perfectly correct, shows sometimes even an excess of strictness, in his behaviour in the other relationships of life. He can be an excellent master, an honourable employer, manager or servant; punctual in his engagements; loyal and even generous friend to men. It is quite likely that he does not drink or smoke. (83)

Lovelace is indeed such a person, a good landlord, friendly and truthful to most men but not to women.

In part two of the essay, Hopkinson tries "to prove the supremacy amongst cads of Robert Lovelace" (92). He gives a brief but elaborate outline of his background and career from his university days up to the time he is killed in a duel by Clarissa's guardian cousin Morden. Lovelace finally drugs and violates Clarissa. It is this act which opens to question Lovelace's accomplishments as seducer. While Lovelace does succeed in making her run away from home and luring her into brothels, raping her while she is under the influence of drugs makes his chase a cowardly one. I will explore this further in Chapter Three when I examine Lovelace's character in more detail.

In the last part of the essay, Hopkinson points out three criticisms leveled against the novel. I would like to quote him at length to emphasize his rebuttal of those criticisms. Of the first criticism he rightly points to the fact "that it is long-winded and boring. So, in many places, it is. But the effect on the reader who can attune his mind to the book's pace is of the frightful slowing-down of a river as it nears a waterfall..." (78).

On the second criticism he writes:

> there are criticisms to *Clarissa* founded upon an exaggerated common-sense. Those who find the beautiful creature's slow destruction more than they can bear, keep rising, like rustics at the play, and giving her good advice. They tell her to leave the wicked man, to run out into the street; to go back home on any terms; to seize one of Lovelace's calculated half-proposals, and insist upon his marrying her outright. (98-99)

And of the last criticism which he feels is less important, he remarks that there

> are those who pick on the ludicrous side of *Clarissa* to ignore, not only its power and depth, its almost frightening penetration, but its wit and humour. This they pass over to detect the humour that's unconscious. We can give them their point. There is much in *Clarissa* of that exaggerated sensibility which the passage of time has rendered funny. A single example will serve, the observation of Clarissa's old nurse, Mrs Norton, that to have her eyes closed in death for her by Clarissa was a `pleasure' she had `often promised herself'. (99)

Hopkinson concludes his essay by noting that Clarissa and Lovelace love each other and are attracted to each other, although Lovelace's attraction is more than genuine feelings of love. He argues that up to the time of the fire, Clarissa cannot leave Lovelace because she is in love with him, despite her misgivings. She comes to him because she is attracted to him, and had Lovelace abandoned his intrigues, he would have won her love. He discovers that only when he has driven her to a stage where she can only reject him. Lovelace is, however, a cad, used to destroying; hence he continues to destroy. He is a victim of his intrigues, which make him ignore his scruples. The danger in being obsessed with intrigues is that, as Hopkinson observes, "he destroys what he afterwards wants back,

and this is the danger cads run into" (104). I feel, however, that to argue that Clarissa cannot leave Lovelace because she loves him is rather limited. Clarissa is jealously guarded, so escape is impossible. Love inhibits her, but Lovelace prohibits her escape.

W.V.Moody and M.R.Lovett's *A History of English Literature* (1946) examines, although briefly, Richardson's method, character and purpose. They claim that in *Pamela*, Richardson was the first to write a story which is guided by a single motive - the love of one person for another. The method is explicitly the letter form, which the authors claim makes the reader hold communication directly with the characters, but they argue, too, that Richardson thought of the novel as an elaborate drama, that he claimed *Clarissa* to be a dramatic novel (241). Lovelace, in their view, poses as an actor, and a director of a play in which all the other characters are acting. In particular, Lovelace's perception of himself as a play-director is revealed in his letters to his friend Belford.

On Richardson's character, the authors argue that Richardson "knew women better than men" (242). His acquaintance with women has a long history. As a youth, he used to write love letters for girls. [Richardson's letters survive in the following editions: Anna Laetitia Barbauld's six volume *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson* (1966), reprinted from the 1804 edition; William C. Slattery, ed. *The Richardson-Stinstra Correspondence and Stinstra's Prefaces to Clarissa* (1969), John Carroll's *Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson* (1964), and some of the letters survive in the Forster Collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum]. His circle of women admirers began with his wife and extended to include ladies of fashion. His knowledge of women thus makes him better able to portray their real feelings in the various circumstances of the novels.

Of studies published in the fifties, I want to consider two texts: one by Dorothy Van Ghent and another by Ian P. Watt. Dorothy Van Ghent's book *The English Novel: Form and Function* (1953) is a study of eighteen novels. It is an eclectic book, "designed for the general reader"(vii), but Van Ghent points out, like Singer, Moody and Lovett, how drama and the novel differ, in that the former is limited by the conventions of space

and time, and how Richardson's *Clarissa* used the epistolary technique, imagery, symbolism and also what she calls "myths". She identifies how each works. As we know, Richardson uses more than one correspondent to allow for various points of view, but Van Ghent suggests that all these views "are subjective" (46)--that is, they express the individual's personal views. She points out that allowing for a variety of correspondents creates a problem of slowing down the pace of the story:

> The epistolary form of the book slows down the pace
> of the story almost intolerably, for we are dependent
> for information upon the mechanics of the postal system
> and the finger and elbow mechanics of the pen wielders.
> Certain significances attach to this slowness of pace.
> Before the reader can find out "what has happened" at
> any one point in the action, he must wait until a half dozen
> people have had time to write letters, receive answers, and
> reply; for no one in the story knows precisely and
> objectively "what has happened," inasmuch as "what happens"
> lies not in the objective event but in a multitude of subjective reactions. (46)

The imagery that she comments upon is that of white clothes, kneeling in prayer, and being seen through a keyhole. White clothes stand for purity and piety and are conventionally symbolic. Van Ghent sees Clarissa herself as a symbol of goodness and purity that is vulnerable to male violence.

The opposite of the pure Clarissa is the vile and evil Lovelace, who, for Van Ghent, is the archfiend. He belongs to what Anna Howe calls a "vile race of reptiles." Reference to reptiles evokes images of the serpent which tempted Eve in the garden of Eden. Lovelace is thus the serpent which tempts Clarissa, but she (Van Ghent) also notices that Clarissa is tempted by her own feelings. The pure Clarissa and vile Lovelace give Van Ghent a chance to do a Christian/theological reading of the text. Clarissa, she

maintains, bears some similarities with Job in the Bible. In the context of the eighteenth century, readers would believe that, like Job, her purity seems to cry out to be violated. This analogy is problematic in that it equates Lovelace to God, an equation which elevates him to a status he does not deserve.

She also identifies what she calls `myths' in the novel, the Clarissa myth, religious, sexual, and class myths. Aware that myth may be confused with allegory, Van Ghent explains the difference between the two:

> Allegory, too, is an organized symbolism; but the differentia of allegory is the fact that its elements are, in gross, to be read off in point-to-point equations into an abstract, discursive, intellectual system. Myth does not offer an intellectual system. What it offers is the dramatization of powers that are assumed to have universal authority over the actions of men. The dominion of allegory (as a total system) is the intellect; the dominion of myth is the irrational. (53)

Van Ghent identifies "the myth of *Clarissa Harlowe,*" in which is embedded a number of other myths: "the Puritan religious myth", "the class myth", the "sexual myth" and "the family life myth." All these myths overlap and contradict at the same time. Clarissa is the puritan, a paragon of human purity who attempts to resist violence and corruption, while Lovelace is the epitome of violence, and seeks to destroy Clarissa's purity. In the class myth, Van Ghent offers a discussion of the class-system in *Clarissa* and the extent to which it plays a part in Clarissa's destruction. The desire of her family to raise its economic status by wanting her to marry the despicable Solmes and Clarissa's resistance to such an engagement make the girl vulnerable to Lovelace's manipulations. In fact, as Lovelace himself later boasts, the Harlowe family is working for him. As already pointed out, the various myths overlap and contradict simultaneously:

> Noticeably, the religious myth and the myth of class overlap

> in a good many places, for, whether by historical accident or inevitability, Puritanism became the moral code and the religious faith of the commercially prosperous middle class. Noticeably also, however, there are places where these two mythological aspects of the book seem to contradict each other. Lovelace's part in the religious myth is to represent evil; he is to be hated; above all, he is to be feared. But in the class myth he has an ambivalent status; he exerts powerful attraction; nevertheless, as the drama evolves, he is seen to be too vicious after all. Fear of what the aristocracy stands for (or what it stands for in Richardson's fantasy) overcomes the attraction of what it stands for. (57)

Her book is still a valuable one on the symbolism and the myths she identifies in the novel.

Like Van Ghent's, Ian Watt's *The Rise of the Novel* (1957) attempts a study of a very broad area - that of the emergence of the novel form, and assesses how three outstanding writers (Defoe, Richardson and Fielding) contributed to the development of this literary genre. If the number of citations a book receives is a good indicator of its popularity (or lack of it), then Watt's book qualifies as most popular. The publication of Watt's book evoked at least five reviews in English speaking scholarly journals within a year of its publication. One reviewer, Mark Roberts in *Essays in Criticism,* (1958), opened his remarks with the following praise: "This is a very good book. It has nearly all the obvious virtues. It does not lose itself in a mass of undigested scholarly detail, but neither is it one of those superficial appraisements of the history of the novel to which professional writers occasionally treat us" (428). Charles Woods (1957) saw the book as " longer, more formal, and more ambitious" (623), [than Mckillop's *The Early Masters of English Fiction* (1956) which is "a brief critical and historical survey" of the major works

of Defoe, Richardson, Fielding, Smollett, and Sterne (622)], while Benjamin Boyce (1958) saw it as "... a wide-ranging, speculative, meaty volume" (304).

Professor Watt's purpose in the book is to spell out the economic and social conditions which favored the emergence of the novel. Before going to the social conditions favoring the emergence of the novel, Watt shows the characteristics that distinguish eighteenth-century novelists from previous ones. Like other authors I have considered, he believes that the eighteenth century was an important period for the emergence of the novel, and that "Realism" is the main distinguishing factor between eighteenth-century novelists and their predecessors.

After outlining the social and economic conditions which favoured the growth of the novel, Watt examines the contribution of Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding. For the purposes of this chapter, I would focus on Richardson, particularly the chapters on *Pamela* and *Clarissa*. He writes in his introduction to a chapter on *Pamela*, entitled "Love and the Novel: *Pamela*" that:

> The importance of Richardson's position in the tradition of the novel was largely due to his success in dealing with several of the major formal problems which Defoe had left unsolved. The most important of them was probably that of plot, and here Richardson's solution was remarkably simple: he avoided an episodic plot by basing his novels on a single action, a courtship. It is no doubt odd that so fateful a literary revolution should have been brought about with so ancient a literary weapon... (135)

Watt emphasizes that *Pamela* touches the most important subjects in eighteenth-century England, family life, sexual morality, social class, and gender differentiation. The family presented in Richardson and other authors of his time is a traditional one in which the father is the dominant authority figure. Part of the plot of novels on this subject is the

struggle of the daughter-heroine against forced betrothal, Clarissa to Solmes, for example. In *Clarissa*, Clarissa's attempts to assert her freedom constitute the bulk of the novel. Watt explains factors such as the legal position of women which work against the heroine's attempt to be free from family ties:

> ... the legal position of women in the eighteenth century was very largely governed by the patriarchal concepts of Roman law. The only person in the household who was *sui juris*, who was a legal entity, was its head, usually the father. A woman's property, for instance, became her husband's absolutely on marriage, although it was customary to arrange a jointure for her when the marriage articles were drawn up; the children were in law the husband's; only the husband would sue for divorce; and had the right to punish his wife by beating or imprisoning her. (141)

Watt also stresses that *Pamela* is an indictment of eighteenth-century double standards of sexual morality:

> One aspect of this moral transformation which is particularly important for *Pamela* is the eighteenth-century attack on the double standard. Many women writers protested against the injustice it did their sex: Mrs. Manley, for example, attacked it in *The New Atlantis* (1709); and in 1748 another erring matron, Laetitia Pilkington, asked, 'Is it not monstrous that our seducers should be our accusers?' (157)

The novel's attention to the interests of women readers, Watt contends, was the basis for its success. Women constituted the majority of the reading public. [Of course, the success of the novel is also due to traditional, conservative themes. Many readers of the time, Watt suggests, were devoted to religious literature and the novel's religious

overtones would thus be attractive: "it is very likely...that one of the reasons for the success of *Pamela* was the way it enabled readers to enjoy the attractions both of fiction and devotional literature at the same time and in the same work" (152)].

Watt notes that the correspondence in *Clarissa* is varied and is distributed between two sets of people: "between two young ladies of virtue (Clarissa and Anna)... and two gentlemen of free lives" (209), and argues that the purpose of this distribution of the narration "is both an expression of the dichotomisation of the sexual roles which is at the heart of Richardson's subject, and an essential condition of the candid self-revelation by the characters which would have been inhibited by a mixed correspondence" (209).

The organization of the narration of the story has advantages and weaknesses:

> The use of two parallel series of letters, then, has great advantages, but it also presents considerable difficulties; not only because many of the actions have to be recounted separately and therefore repetitively, but because there is a danger of dispersing the reader's attention between two different sets of letters and replies. (209)

Richardson, however, tried to avoid this problem:

> he handles the narrative sequence in such a way as to minimize these disadvantages. At times the attitudes of the protagonists to the same events are so different that we have no sense of repetition, while at others he intervenes editorially to explain that some letters have been suppressed or shortened - the distinction, incidentally, between such intervention, which is limited to clarifying the handling of the original documents, and that which occurs in *Pamela*, where the author becomes the narrator, is an important one. (209)

Watt discusses the characters, particularly Lovelace and Clarissa, and the relationship that obtains between the two. He writes that Lovelace "is himself a representative of the masculine stereotype against which the feminine code is defence. He believes for example, that the hypocritical bashfulness of the `passive sex' justifies his own in using forceful methods" (226). Clarissa is caught between her family's authoritarianism and Lovelace's menaces. Watt writes that she has no allies, that:

> ... there is therefore every reason why Lovelace should at first represent for Clarissa a very desirable escape from the constrictions of the Harlowe way of life, and the immediate threat of being forced to marry. Events soon demonstrate, however, that Lovelace actually menaces her freedom and self-respect even more dangerously... (221)

Clarissa is therefore betrayed by a number of people: her family, which naturally should protect her, and Lovelace, who exploits Clarissa's situation to effect his devilish designs of raping her. He, after failing to persuade and bribe her, drugs and rapes her. The rape of Clarissa while under the influence of drugs, Watt suggests, serves a number of important moral and literary purposes which I will return to in Chapter Three.

Watt is also an astute reader of the imagery through which the relation between the sexes is rendered. The imagery associated with men has overtones of power and intelligence, while that associated with women suggests passivity, vulnerability, and lack of intelligence:

> Lovelace fancies himself as an eagle, flying only at the highest game; Belford calls him `cruel as a panther'; while Anna sees him as a hyena. The metaphor of the hunt, indeed, informs the whole of Lovelace's conception of sex: he writes to Belford, for example: `we begin when boys, with birds, and when grown up, go on with women; and both, perhaps, in turn, experience our

sportive cruelty.' (231)

That Lovelace is a sadist is obvious, but Watt sees this as part of eighteenth-century masculinity.

> Sadism is, no doubt, the ultimate form which the eighteenth century view of the masculine role involved: and it makes the female role one in which the woman is, and can only be, the prey: to use another of Lovelace's metaphors, man is a spider, and woman is the predestined fly. (231)

Contrasting the sadistic male is the masochistic female whom Clarissa appropriately represents. Her association with the lily and most important her rape while under the influence of opiates imply "the idea of the feminine sexual role as one of passive suffering; it suggests that the animality of the male can only achieve its purpose when the woman's spirit is absent" (232).

Watt also sees the masochistic Clarissa holding herself partly responsible for what befalls her. In one of the most moving passages in the novel she says:

> A lady took a great fancy to a young lion, or a bear, I forget which - but of a bear, or a tiger, I believe it was. It was made her a present of when a whelp. She fed it with her own hand: she nursed up the wicked cub with great tenderness; and would play with it without fear or apprehension of danger... But mind what followed: at last, somehow, neglecting to satisfy its hungry maw, or having otherwise disobliged it on some occasion, it resumed its nature; and on a sudden fell upon her, and tore her in pieces, And who was most to blame, I pray? The brute, or the lady? The lady, surely! For what *she* did was out of nature, *out* of character, at least: what it did was *in* its own nature (Cited in Watt 233).

Clarissa acted out of her nature by running away with Lovelace, and he being a man, did what is in his nature.

Despite his apparent evil, Lovelace as read by Watt is a man torn between good and evil. He loves Clarissa, but is motivated by his desire to seduce her (hence he is blinded to his moral conscience). Watt suggests that the

> ...division in Lovelace between conscious villainy and stifled goodness provides yet another satisfying formal symmetry to the conduct of the narrative. For, just as Clarissa began by loving Lovelace unconsciously and then was forced to see that, in truth, he did not deserve it, so Lovelace begins with a feeling in which hate and love are mixed, but comes eventually to love her completely, although only after he himself has made it impossible for her to reciprocate. (237)

Watt's study of the socio-economic and political conditions from which the novel emerged is valuable in that it introduces a trend in criticism which requires that we see characters in literary works as reflecting the social conditions from which they emerged. His comments on the conflict in characters, Lovelace being an excellent example, were followed by later critics, such as Mark Kinkead-Weekes and James Grantham Turner in their studies, and remain essential to this study.

The period from 1960 to the present day saw an increased interest in Richardson's novels, an interest which seemed almost a revival of Richardsonian scholarship. Morris Golden's *Richardson's Characters* (1963) assumed that justice had been done to the issues of history and social context. Martin C. Battestin's review has this to say about Golden's book:

> what we have wanted, however, and what Golden's book in part supplies, is an extended critical analysis concentrating not on the historical relationships between Richardson's

> novels and their social milieu (these have already been fully delineated), but rather on the essential quality of these books and of the characters and situations they present. (797)

In attempting an extensive study of characters in Richardson's texts, Golden's book, I think, becomes an important supplement to several other texts in this area which tended to study the context and characters at the same time. The problem that such texts run into is that they end up doing a general reading of the texts due to limitations of time and space. This is not to suggest that Golden's book is totally without any background readings, nor could it succeed fully without background information about characters. Battestin continues:

> Given its limited focus, Golden's book is among the most perceptive and stimulating critical essays written on a major novelist of the period. Whatever one's misgivings about his premises may be, one senses that he is constantly in touch with the essential quality of both novels and their author. (798-9)

He further writes that:

> Golden's efforts to prefer his thesis to those of other critics who have directed their attention elsewhere result unfortunately in the occasional distortion and oversimplification of the complex worlds of Richardson's novels. It is clear, I believe, that there *are* psychic distinctions to be made between the men and women who act out the sado-masochistic relationships which are the center of Richardson's interest: for Pamela the masculine and the diabolic are equivalent and are summed up in the image of the surly bull that gored the cook-maid; for Clarissa the coffin is the only satisfactory marriage bed, and the broken lily is her symbol. [Golden asserts, against Miss Van Ghent,

that only Lovelace in his sadistic fantasies applies this symbol

to Clarissa, but Clarissa herself has had it inscribed on her coffin]. (799)

Golden's central thesis is that Richardson's characters (particularly the male ones) are preoccupied by the male fantasies for domination. Benjamin Boyce's review stated the case succinctly: "Mr. Golden's book is about the "dominance urge" in each of Richardson's characters and in Richardson himself" (380).

In the first four chapters, Professor Golden attempts a psychological reading of Richardson's characters to show their "dominance urge," which manifests itself in the relationships among the characters. The relationship is generally that of conflict. For example, Lovelace and Clarissa love one another, and so do Pamela and Mr. B., but the males want to prove one of their beliefs about women--"that once subdued, always subdued." Theirs is a mission to conquer and seduce as many women as possible. Sally Godfrey and Miss Betterton in *Pamela* and *Clarissa,* respectively, are living testimony for Mr. B. and Lovelace's seduction-spree.

The "dominance urge," Golden postulates, is not only found between lovers, as in the case of Mr. B. and Pamela, but also between father and daughter, sister and sister, brother and sister and, on a very large scale, between Lovelace and most of the characters in *Clarissa.* The wish of James Harlowe, Senior, that Clarissa marry Solmes and give up Lovelace is nothing short of domination. His domination is supported by his position as the father, the legal head. His domination is further supported and fueled by his son and daughter Arabella, who are against Clarissa, and Clarissa's mother, a timid woman who cannot oppose her husband. Lovelace, a self-proclaimed director of other people's actions, tries to control almost every one in the book. Joseph Leman, the Harlowes' servant, is manipulated by Lovelace to be an aid in his plot to run away with Clarissa. In fact the whole Harlowe family is working for him by persecuting Clarissa. Lovelace boasts to his friend Belford that:

I knew that the whole stupid family were in a combination

> to do my business for me. I told thee that they were all working for me, like so many underground moles; and still more blind than the moles are said to be, unknowing that they did so. I myself, the director of their principal motions; which falling in with the malice of their little hearts, they took to be all their own. (*Clarissa*: 387)

The Pamela -Mr. B. relation is also one where the male is a dominating figure. Although Mr. B. differs from Lovelace in that he at least hearkens to his moral scruples, he too makes several attempts to dominate not only Pamela, but also all his servants. Mrs. Jervis is threatened with eviction when she tries to be Pamela's protector. In the case of Pamela, Mr. B. tries to bring her under his power by several methods, among others bribing her with money and forcing her into sex.

Golden discusses Richardson's female characters as the antithesis of their male counterparts. He assesses the relations among the female characters. Just as Lovelace wants to dominate even his friend Belford, there is some element of domination too in the female characters' relationships, although Golden applies some Freudian psychology in such relations: "Mrs Jewkes's relationship to Pamela strongly suggest the element of homosexuality... which one perceives faintly underlying the Clarissa-Anna relationship" (73).

On the whole, I think Golden's book is an excellent study, despite the problems of generalization which Ian Watt and Martin Battestin note in their reviews. Problems of generalization are to be expected from a book like this one because of the broadness of its focus--the study of numerous characters in all the three novels of Richardson. The value of the book lies in its division of characters into categories such as bold and mild young men, girls, aristocrats and old people, enabling the reader to best understand how the category to which a character belongs influences their behaviour. Emphasis is of course on the major characters with occasional comments on the minor ones. There is no doubt

that the book offers a good introduction to a study, like this one, which is interested in specific characters.

In 1968, Ira Konigsberg published *Samuel Richardson and the Dramatic Novel*, in which he argues that "Richardson brought to the English novel subject matter and techniques developed in the drama, and that it was the resulting integration of these dramatic elements with fiction which caused the mutation in genre that is responsible for the subsequent course of the English novel" (4). Konigsberg proceeds to examine the literature that might have influenced Richardson. He observes the tremendous influence of drama on his (Richardson) fiction, and argues it is due in part to Richardson's vocation as printer (which enabled him to read some of the plays his firm printed), and secondly, his acquaintance with men of the theatre such as Colley Cibber, whose play *Love's Last Shift* (1696) bears some similarities to Richardson's *Clarissa*.

Earlier in the year (1968), Konigsberg published an essay entitled "The Dramatic Background of Richardson's Plots and Characters," which constitutes part of the second chapter of his book. I find this an interesting article not because of its originality, but because of its elaborate attempt to show similarities between Richardson's novels and contemporary literature. While a definitive case of influence is yet to be established, the similarities between his novels and contemporary literature establish some common ground. I believe these similarities point to a crucial point--that literature arises from literature. Konigsberg's study expands more closely on what Edgar, Singer, Mckillop, and Cardon hinted or discussed.

As a reflection of the growth in Richardsonian criticism, one can mention two books *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Pamela*, ed. Rosemary Cowler (1969), and *Samuel Richardson: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. John Carroll (1969). Both are collections of critical essays on Richardson by some of the known scholars on Richardsonian fiction. They include Ian Watt, David Daiches, M. Kinkead-Weekes, Morris Golden, Leslie Fiedler, A.D. Mckillop, Dorothy Van Ghent, William Sale Jr., A.M.

Kearney, Carey McIntosh and others. Carey McIntosh wrote an article entitled "Pamela's Clothes" which was initially published in the *Journal of English Literary History* and later reprinted in Rosemary Cowler's collection. This is an interesting article which seeks to highlight the importance of clothes, particularly in the first part of *Pamela*. McIntosh suggests that clothes serve a number of functions, especially as indicators of one's social standing and as tools of seduction. I reserve this for Chapter Two. The articles in these two books offer in a single volume readings from various critics. However, some of the essays are not complete, and hence one needs to refer to the original journal/book in which they first appeared.

The increase in the number of critical works on Richardson's fiction in the 1970's is tremendous, making the choice of which books and essays to review very problematic. At the very least, I want briefly to mention some of the major books and say what their concerns are. Eaves and Kimpel's *Samuel Richardson A Biography* (1971), referred to by Hannaford (1980) as the standard biography on Richardson, is worth reviewing because of its richness in information on Richardson's life, family, friends, career as printer and novelist, ideology, reputation, and influence on eighteenth-century fiction. Its richness in information on Richardson makes it, in Ronald Paulson's words: "an excellent biography, directed largely to the specialist, but a useful reference volume to be dipped into and enjoyed by anyone interested in Richardson" (110). The work puts in a single volume what other critics have done and continue to do in their respective studies. Eaves and Kimpel document with some degree of success all information about Richardson, beginning with his early life, which they observe is shadowy before 1721 due to lack of information. To reconstruct his early life, they rely on his correspondence with Stinstra; they proceed to outline the social and economic conditions from which he arose and lived, and trace his career as printer and finally as novelist.

Richardson's biographers further walk us through the compositions, reception, and possible sources for his novels. By so doing, they expand on what critics like Mckillop did

in his *Samuel Richardson: Printer and Novelist* as early as 1936. In their consideration of the composition and publication of the novels, the biographers also make perceptive critical comments on the themes and formal elements of the works. I find their commentaries on characters stimulating. For example, they suggest that we see Lovelace and Clarissa as representing the dominating and independent parts of the human soul respectively (616). Implied in this observation is that we see Richardson's characters as a unit and perhaps a warning that we do not rush into condemning his villains because they point to the fact that humanity is a mixture of virtue and vice.

Another book of the 70's is Mark Kinkead-Weekes's *Samuel Richardson: Dramatic Novelist* (1973), which also earned itself several favorable reviews. Kinkead-Weekes's book is a reaction to some of Richardson's critics who argue that he was not a conscious artist. Kinkead-Weekes maintains that Richardson knew what he set out to do. To illustrate his argument, he suggests that in order to appreciate Richardson's artistic consciousness, we have to understand his "writing to the moment," as that elicits "reading to the moment." [Writing to the moment refers to the act of writing in which the author re-enacts situations, places characters in such situations, and records their changing reactions to those situations, thus making, in Zanforlin's words, the "situations so vivid that the reader has a sense of actual participation" (79). Kinkead-Weekes observes that in this form of writing, the author "places his characters in a situation of conflict, and the fiction grows, not through his complicated plotting and design, but by imagining how those characters will react to that moment, and so create the next, and the next" (1)]. It is by reading to the moment that we can appreciate the variety and complexity of Richardson's art, which Kinkead-Weekes believes cannot be a result of chance. Having suggested this method of reading, Kinkead-Weekes uses it in his critical evaluations of Richardson's novels and shows how repeated readings of particular moments in the novels can result in diverse meanings. This situation-by-situation analysis is useful to this study because it underlines the different mental states which Richardson's characters go through

at different times. Kinkead-Weekes argues, for instance, that Mr. B. is no booby and that a careful re-reading of certain moments will reveal that he is as complex as Lovelace and that he can also manipulate situations to his advantage. He also considers the moments in which Mr. B. gives out clothes to Pamela and suggests some of the functions they serve in the novel. Kinkead-Weekes further argues that Richardson's seducers must be understood as characters in conflict with their pride and love. Some of his observations are contained in an earlier study on Mr. B. by Gwendolyn Needham (1970), but this is a valuable book and I will return to it (particularly the issue of internal conflict in characters) in the body of this study.

Another masterpiece of the 70's is Anne Doody's *A Natural Passion: A Study of the Novels of Samuel Richardson* (1974), originally a doctoral dissertation. Like other books I have briefly reviewed, Doody's book attempts a thorough reading of the three novels by Samuel Richardson, although emphasis is on *Clarissa* and *Sir Charles Grandison*. Its scope is sweeping, covering imagery, sources and analogues of the novels, and Richardson's artistic achievement. Doody, following Ira Konigsberg in his article of source-hunting ("The Dramatic Background of Richardson's Characters and Plots"), sees Lovelace as having some resemblance to heroes in Restoration drama. Unlike some studies of sources, Doody's book discusses similarities between Richardson and Restoration or early-eighteenth-century literature as analogues. Doody's primary interest is the abundant imagery in Richardson's novels:

> Richardson's imagery has always fascinated me, for he is a master of the cumulative and intricate effect made possible by imagery; yet it has received little attention. In *Clarissa*, particularly, the imagery sustains and explains the religious theme which is central to the whole novel - but which does not seem to be well understood by modern critics. (viii)

attempts a careful and insightful delineation of such imagery and its significance, particularly in *Clarissa* and she goes well beyond the reading of imagery as sustaining the religious theme in Dorothy Van Ghent's book.

In 1972, Cynthia Griffin Wolff published her book *Samuel Richardson and the Eighteenth-Century Puritan Character*. This book is an interpretation of Samuel Richardson's texts, although it also falls into the common trap for Richardson's critics--that of laying more emphasis on *Clarissa* than on other novels. Wolff's primary focus is "character" in the novels, how the author presents his characters: "I have tried to limit my consideration of Richardson's novels to his conception of `character', his literary devices for rendering character, and the possible sources of both"(ix).

Wolff suggests that one way in which Richardson succeeds in his character portrayal is his ability to capture the dynamics of character under stress. She suggests that Richardson makes it possible for us to see how characters react to stressful and non-stressful situations, difficult and easy, relaxed and tense moments. In her words:

> ... Richardson's particular genius lay in his ability to capture the dynamics of character under stress: he anatomizes identity by detailing its disintegration. Thus in *Clarissa*, he investigates the dilemma of a woman who is systematically deprived of the opportunity to engage in those roles which comprise and sustain her identity; and he chronicles in minute detail the crisis of identity which inevitably follows. (2)

This book further makes itself valuable by examining Richardson's sources and by offering an interpretation of *Pamela* and *Sir Charles Grandison*, and assessments of Clarissa's relationship with her family, Clarissa and her seducer Lovelace, and her triumph over him. The value of the book to this study is its focus on what goes on in each character's mind.

The list of excellent essays on Richardson in the 70's is extensive, but I want to examine in this period only two journal articles: "Richardson's Characterization of Mr. B

and the Double Purpose in *Pamela*" and "Tremble and Reform: The Inversion of Power in Richardson's *Clarissa*" by Gwendolyn B. Needham and Elizabeth R. Napier, respectively. The choice of these two articles is partly due to their specific discussion of characters with whom this study is concerned.

Needham's lengthy essay on Mr. B explores a number of essential issues valid to Richardson's seemingly dull (compared to Robert Lovelace in *Clarissa*) seducer. The article is, among other things, a revolt against traditional readings of Mr. B as evidence for Richardson's ignorance of his own sex compared to his knowledge of the "female heart." It argues that Richardson is as knowledgeable about the male as he is about the female psyche. Needham explores the character of Mr. B as one who has "been either ignored by critics or dismissed as in one damning epithet - "booby," "cipher," "wooden stick," "unbelievable monster," "satyr," and (unkindest cut of all), "vague father-figure" (436).

In her close reading, Needham identifies some of the reasons for Mr. B.'s lack of attention from critics:

> The subtitle also has focused debate on the "virtue" of Pamela rather than on her total characterization and solely on her reward rather than on the reward of others. More important, the epistolary form so rivets attention on the heroine-narrator that the hero's true characterization may escape the average reader. (436)

Entrusting the whole text to Pamela as the sole correspondent has the great disadvantage of lack of objectivity, particularly in the presentation of Mr. B's character. Needham reminds us that Mr. B. is rarely given a chance to express himself and his feelings and that Pamela's fears of him mar her presentation:

> While Richardson's narrative method made easier Pamela's complex characterization, it made much more difficult the presentation of Mr. B. The plot calls for a villain-hero who, to be plausible, must exhibit an

> involved motivation naturally produced by conflicting traits and impulses. The form requires the hero to be viewed through the eyes of Pamela, the character least able to see him objectively. Plot and form make sympathy for the heroine a paramount requisite; therefore, not only must the novel present the villain-hero indirectly, it must highlight in the first half his bad qualities, in the second half his better ...(439)

Designing such a narrative structure seems not to be accidental but deliberate, intended to serve a specific purpose. First and foremost, it serves to foreground the hero's importance in the story as tempter, one testing the heroine as she is ushered into a world of experience; secondly, it shows the heroine's ignorance of her would-be-seducer: "The fifteen-year-old innocent does not know Mr. B. or his nature very well, and from the first her judgment is conditioned by the awful dread her parents have immediately aroused, her defensive or delaying action is guided by their advice or that of Mrs Jervis" (443).

In fact Needham shows that a close assessment of Mr. B. reveals both positive and negative aspects of character:

> To appreciate Richardson's skill in characterizing Mr. B, we need to realize what he is *not* as well as understand what he *is*. Most significant is our gradual discovery that he is not the typical dissolute rake for which readers usually take him. He is no spendthrift, but a prudent man of affairs; he is not a selfish and cold-hearted but kind and benevolent master (Pamela frequently wonders why he is hard and cruel only to her); he drinks wine, plays cards, loves gaiety, but is no drunkard, no gambler, no rioter. (446)

He is generally a good young man; and his goodness culminates in his realization that forcing Pamela into sex is not the right thing; hence his reformation and subsequent marriage to her.

He does not force Pamela beyond her effective resistance, unlike Lovelace in *Clarissa*. Needham remarks specifically that "his single rakish tendency, in fact, is his attitude toward matrimony and women--the avoidance of the first and the pursuit of the latter" (446). Later she suggests that "he seeks victorious seduction. Her successful challenging the vaunted superiority of the masculine mind makes him long for her complete subjugation" (455). Needham draws our attention to the cultural mis-shaping of Mr. B., in which he gets spoiled because he is taught that no one can contradict his demands. He is also brought up to believe in male superiority and the double standard of sexual morality (445). All of this Richardson exposes to warn against its recurrence.

On the whole, he is a man capable of reform, despite his rakish belief that women are prey to be hunted. He attempts to seduce Pamela through bribery, threats, and force before he reforms into a loving husband. His quarrel with his sister Lady Davers over his marriage to Pamela shows his conversion and provides support for the appropriateness of the match. Needham's essay is, I think, an attempt to make Richardson's readers reassess their views of Mr. B. She makes us see him as an ordinary human being in a state of inner conflict--conflict between his pride and love, social class status and his individuality, between the self and filial duty. It is only with this reassessment that dismissals of Mr. B. as dull and boring can be eliminated. He is complex and interesting in his own right, and Needham advocates that we see him thus and accord him the attention he deserves.

Elizabeth Napier's 1975 study analyses what many critics on Richardson call his most complicated character--Robert Lovelace. Her interest lies not in general character traits, but in one aspect of Lovelace, his desire for power (which is his main concern). She is, however, careful to point out that power is not only Lovelace's preoccupation, but also

every character's desire in the novel. In fact, the question of power is central to the whole novel:

> From the beginning of the novel, the issue of power is of signal importance. As the Harlowes' misuse of power initiates the events which lead to Clarissa's fall, so Clarissa's lack of it perpetuates her oppression, and Lovelace's compulsive urge to dominate guarantees the tragedy. In its broadest outlines, the plot of *Clarissa* hinges on an exchange of power between two individuals; within these outlines, modulations and transferrals of power infuse the book with a vital energy. Every character, from James Harlowe to Anna Howe, is involved in the struggle to gain or to conserve power. (214)

Napier's central thesis is that there is a reversal of power in the Lovelace-Clarissa structure after the rape, although there are sufficient signs even before the rape that there will be a shift in the balance of power. With this thesis in mind, Napier proceeds to divide the book into two main sections to enable her to point out who is the victim and the victor in each part. In the first half of the novel, Lovelace is in power, and all the imagery associated with him shows that he is the victor:

> Recurring images of control (through imprisonment: keys, locks and bolts; by domination: emperors, crowns and royal decrees), of the hunt (Lovelace's savage, predatory nature; Clarissa's 'entanglement' in his snares), and of warfare (swords and knives, physical conquest and surrender), establish a formal substructure which intensifies the novel's thematic movement. (214)

His power in the first part of the novel is evidenced by his boasting:

> he repeatedly speaks of himself as the director of a vast vengeful drama. His letters to Belford often take on the form of plays. His account of the visit to Mrs Moore's is a salient instance: it is

> written in dramatic configuration, complete with acts, scenes, and players... Not only is he the hero and principal actor of the drama - he is its stage designer, director, and author as well Thus, Lovelace is able to look upon the other characters in the novel as his own self-selected cast of players, as the puppets of his malicious, director's will. (215)

Napier remarks that not only does he boast of being a director of other characters' activities, but also alludes to himself as Clarissa's "emperor" (Letter 99). Further, he sees himself as a predator (suggested by his hunt-metaphor) and as an expert in disguise who surpasses Ovid (412). All these posturings characterize the power which he successfully and proudly exercises in the novel up to the rape.

As Napier explains, after the rape a tremendous inversion of power takes place. Instead of Lovelace being the most powerful, director of a vengeful drama, he lapses into powerlessness and remorse. The rape takes place while Clarissa is under the influence of drugs. Whether this shows Lovelace as a master of strategy is doubtful. His failure to gain satisfaction from his actions plunges him into feelings of guilt. His letters to his friend Belford no longer have that pride we see in the first part of the novel, but instead exalt Clarissa as the victor.

Evident in Napier is that the reversal not only affects Lovelace, although he gets the better part of the blame, but also the rest of the characters in the novel. Sinclair dies from a terrible illness, Lovelace gets killed in a duel by Colonel Morden, James and Arabella find themselves in unsuccessful marriages after the novel has ended, and the whole Harlowe family is so immersed in guilt that they avoid passing Clarissa's room. Belford reforms and becomes Clarissa's spokesperson. There is a sense of poetic justice in the novel: the bad are punished and the good rewarded (Dorothy Van Ghent called the novel a "Divine Comedy"). Clarissa leaves behind a curse which affects almost everybody in the novel, and the imagery of power comes to be associated with her. Her death

becomes a public spectacle that other characters are compelled to witness in order to receive blessings, she seems to be imparting in her death. Napier suggests that the imagery of the serpent on her coffin is crucial here:

> The metamorphosis in the novel's concept of time finds ingenious resolution in the emblem Clarissa engraves on her coffin. In coercing the former image of Lovelace's snake-like power into a circle, Clarissa figuratively effects a complete reversal of her persecutor's influence over the novel's symbolism, time and structure. Not only does she change his evil (the destructive power of his serpentine enterprise) to her good (the renewing power of her virtue), crowning it; she also transcribes Lovelace's linear conception of time into a scheme distinctly cyclical and eternal in nature. The duel, which is finally the end result of her fatal power, accordingly returns the novel to its beginning, in circular limitation of her emblem. Thus, the final structure of the book is diverted from the fatal linear design of Lovelace's devising to a pattern reinforcing the concept of Supreme, Providential direction. (221)

This is a convincing essay, particularly in its methodology of dividing the book into two large parts. The essay is useful to the layman and the scholar alike.

From the seventies, Richardsonian criticism has increased steadily. An MLA - CD-ROM search from 1981-1993 reveals 316 studies of Richardson. For the decade after 1980, I have chosen four studies which seem representative of the direction of criticism. They represent new critical approaches to Richardson's works.

Janet Todd's *Women Friendship in Literature* (1980) represents the feminist approach to Richardson's *Clarissa*. It is important to note that this work is just one of more than ten other feminist writings by Todd. In this book, Todd examines ten eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century novels, among them *Clarissa*, with the aim of

establishing the types of female friendships in each. She identifies five types of friendships: social, sentimental, manipulative, erotic, and political. She notes that several types can occur in a single novel, so that the divisions are for argument's sake. For example, all the five types occur in *Clarissa*, although it is sentimental friendship which is predominant. [Of course sentimental friendship can also occur between males, as is the case between Lovelace and Belford towards the end of the novel (cf.p.41)]. While this study of female friendship does not directly assist in the study of the seducers, it nevertheless implies a comparison between women and the seducers. For example, there is an underlying suggestion that the sentimental friendship between women has to be contrasted to the predatory males, whose purpose is partly to destroy women's connections. Lovelace's comments illustrate the male's purpose:

> Verily Jack, these vehement friendships are nothing but chaff and stubble, liable to be blown away by the very wind that raises them. Apes! mere apes of *us*! they think the word *friendship* has a pretty sound with it; and it is much talked of; a fashionable word: and so, truly, a single woman who thinks she has a soul, and knows that she wants something, would be thought to have found a fellow-soul for it in her own sex. But I repeat that the word is a *mere* word, the thing a mere name with them; a cork-bottomed shuttlecock, which they are fond of striking to and fro, to make one another glow in the frosty weather of a single state; but which, when a *man* comes in between the pretended *inseparables*, is given up like their music and other maidenly amusements...(863)

Present in *Clarissa* is the sentimental friendship which Todd defines as: "a close, effusive tie, revelling in rapture and rhetoric. Unlike the sentimental romance which so often ruins,

it aids and saves, providing close emotional support in a patriarchal world" (3). This (the fact that sentimental friendship provides emotional support) is particularly true because Clarissa is going through an emotional and social ostracism at the hands of her family and only gains solace and support from her correspondence with Anna. On the first page of the novel, Anna calls Clarissa "my dearest friend," and Clarissa writes:

> How you oppress me, my dearest friend, with your politeness!
> I cannot doubt your sincerity...I take many admirable hints from
> you...For in all you do, in all you say, nay, in your very looks
> (so animated!) you give lessons, to one who loves you and observes
> you as I love and observe you...(41)

Indeed the friendship between these two is a strong one, and through this friendship, Clarissa finds an opportunity to relate her feelings to one who cares for her. Venting her problems to a dear friend relieves her. Moreover, Anna can be seen as a caring substitute for the Harlowe family. Todd further argues that the subordinated women in a patriarchal society, specifically Arabella and her mother, cannot effectively provide sentimental friendship to Clarissa because they choose to imitate their oppressors (males), and thus act to further her rejection. It is implied by Todd, therefore, that, sentimental friendship can be better provided and received by one who tries to break free from the male-dominated society and that it is the only genuine relationship women can have, a plausible assertion in the context of this novel. As Todd writes:

> Female friendship is the only social relationship we (*sic*)
> actually enter in the novel and the only one the heroine
> actively constructs. The family commonly selects the lover
> (or the man nominates himself), where the woman
> chooses the friend. Richardson's Clarissa is free to make a
> friend, but a husband is imposed. (2)

Todd's study shows that Richardson was intrigued by female relationships, and his earlier associations (writing for them and reading letters to them) is the basis of this interest.

Terry Eagleton's *The Rape of Clarissa* (1982) is valuable for its successful blending of modern critical theories (Marxist, psychoanalytical, feminist, and post-structuralist) in its assessment of class, power, sex and politics in *Clarissa*. A combination of these theoretical approaches in so short a book is a sign not only of brilliance, but also of organization on the part of Eagleton. He examines Richardson's life, vocation as printer, and career as a novelist, and offers a critical evaluation of *Clarissa* with some passing references to *Pamela*. He argues that Richardson was born into a period of class-revolution in which he played an important role. Eagleton's view is supported by Doody and Sabor (1989), who also argue that for Richardson "to be born in 1689 was to be born in a decade of revolutions and into a revolution in progress "(1). Eagleton goes on to illustrate how Richardson helped construct his society through his novels which Eagleton argues are "great allegories of class warfare, narratives of alliance and antagonism between a predatory nobility and a pious bourgeoisie"(4). He further argues that Richardson's characters are not just fictional, but "public mythologies, coordinates of a mighty moral debate, symbolic spaces within which dialogues may be conducted..."(5).

He also examines the act of writing in *Clarissa* to show that, among its other functions, the letter is a site of constant power-struggle (49), the object of desire, and "double-edged: it is private confidence and political weapon, intimacy and intrigue, a jealously protected space in which you never cease to be at stake" (51). We need to remember that Lovelace's desire to confiscate Clarissa's letters and the Harlowes' hiding of papers and pens away from her illustrate the role of the letter in the power-struggle we see in the novel.

Eagleton's comments on the position of Clarissa, and therefore of women at that time, reinforces some of the comments we see in other critics on the property-status of women in a patriarchal society. He argues that in such societies, the unit of exchange is

women and that they are used to reinforce the system of male dominance (56). In this novel, Clarissa is the unit of exchange with which the family will buy its economic advancement. It is not surprising therefore that her family wants her to marry Solmes. Eagleton suggests that Clarissa represents not only property, but also, through her death, resistance against society:

> her elaborate dying is a ritual of deliberate disengagement
> from patriarchal and class society...(73)

> what Clarissa's death signifies, in fact, is an absolute refusal
> of political society: sexual oppression, bourgeois patriarchy
> and libertine aristocracy together. (76)

He also comments on Lovelace's character and assesses how successful his rape of Clarissa is. Like other critics, he argues that raping the unconscious Clarissa is far from being successful. Eagleton comments, convincingly, that Lovelace's writing is a tool in ensnaring Clarissa. This is particularly so because "it is by persuading Clarissa to 'correspond privately' with him that Lovelace ensnares her in the first place" (47). I want to add that his writing not only seduces Clarissa, but also the reader, and this makes him a dangerously convincing character. He is no doubt an evil character and his evil is exacerbated by the fact that he is goodness corrupted, but his prose forces one to pause and admire its liveliness, metaphors, energy, and logic.

David Robinson's study in Doody and Sabor (1989) deserves consideration because it is a "reaction" to Todd's interest in the subject of female friendship and, secondly, because it is a reaction to previous studies on Richardson which are "almost devoid of discussions of male friendship" (167). Robinson's study analyzes male friendship in Richardson's novels and observes that in *Pamela*, male friendship is almost non-existent, except for two of Mr. B.'s rakish friends who disrupt his wedding day and prevent him from dining with his newly wedded wife. Robinson argues that the closest friendship in

the novel is that between Mr. B. and the dying Carlton, whom Mr. B. pays a visit, leaving his wife to be harassed by Lady Davers.

In *Clarissa*, Robinson looks at the strong bond between Lovelace and his friend Belford and examines the characteristics of the friendship. He suggests that to understand how the two men relate to each other, we have to first understand Lovelace's fundamental trait, the desire for power and control, because it greatly influences their relation. Robinson observes that Lovelace's desire for power is tied to issues of masculinity and femininity- that is, having power constitutes masculinity and lack of it, femininity. For Lovelace, to be feminine means to be yielding, weak, and empathizing. It is not surprising therefore that he believes that in any relationship, there ought to be two spirits, the male and female, the latter to be always yielding, so that the relationship can last. As we would expect, he is the male spirit and everyone else ought to be the female one. Robinson maintains that Lovelace's desire for power, his notions of masculinity and his inability to empathize explain why he wants to feel superior even to his male friends. His relation to Belford is at times described in military terms, with him as the general and Belford as his junior.

However, both men know that Belford is Lovelace's equal (903, 1147). Robinson further suggests that this equality is further realized as Clarissa successively triumphs over Lovelace. Once reduced to powerlessness, Lovelace no longer issues commands, but asks for favors (172). I want to suggest that driven into powerlessness, Lovelace constructs a relation to Belford which approximates the sentimental one between Anna and Clarissa, and serves as a source of emotional support for him as he faces the consequences of his manipulations.

James Grantham Turner's "Lovelace and the Paradoxes of Libertinism" (also in Doody and Sabor) is valuable not only because of its focus on Lovelace, but also because it is a fresh commentary on sexual standards and a further emphasis on the central conflict in Lovelace's character, a conflict which must be understood in the context of the

libertine's paradoxical attitude towards sex. Turner's study proceeds not only with the mention of paradoxes, but also makes critical comments on the similarities between Lovelace and his predecessors. By so doing, Turner goes beyond the mere references given to us by Konigsberg and Cardon. Unlike Cardon and Hopkinson, Turner provides a broader definition of the libertine: "Libertine referred to an aesthetic as well as a sexual or philosophical stance, a style of writing as well as a mode of behaviour" (75). This broad definition leads Turner to a complex treatment of libertinism, while implying that Richardson must have been aware of the paradoxes and presented them in order to make Lovelace's character more appealing, one that had to be understood in relation to its predecessors.

In 1991, Lynda Zwinger published *Daughters, Fathers and the Novel: The Sentimental Romance of Sexuality*, a book whose title evokes suggestions of incestuous relationships between fathers and daughters. In examining the daughter-father relationship in *Clarissa*, Zwinger provides interesting psychological readings of James Harlowe's relationship to his daughter. Lovelace's statement "Whose Daughter is she, And is she not a daughter," with which Zwinger prefixes her discussion on *Clarissa*, evokes a number of readings. Of paramount importance, the words seem to suggest that daughters ought to behave in particular ways, one of which is never to oppose or resist their fathers' demands or oppose the husband whom the family chooses for her. Zwinger argues that the family dynamics "mask an incestuous impulse toward endogamy" (13). This kind of argument is supported in John Allen Stevenson's essay "The Courtship of the Family"(1981):

> ...the Harlowes are only using what appears to be a property marriage to disguise their true aim, which is to escape society's powerful imperative that parents give up their daughters in marital exchange. At bottom, they want to keep Clarissa for themselves, and the match they propose with Solmes offers no transition out of the family, but rather

> a kind of marriage into the family, a particularly literal form
>
> of endogamy which has, at times, strongly incestuous overtones. (760)

In effect, the family's choice of Solmes as Clarissa's husband is a way of vicariously possessing her. It is clear, as Terry Eagleton in *The Rape of Clarissa* argues (56), that Clarissa's body is the medium of exchange between men, in this case between Solmes and James Harlowe, Senior. Mr. Harlowe exchanges her for wealth which will enhance his family's economic status. He does not want to lose total possession of his daughter; Solmes makes a proposal that at his death (which the Harlowes hope will be soon) Clarissa's property will revert to th· ła ıily and so will she. Clarissa's rejection of Solmes is thus nothing short of rejecting her father and brother, and it is her desire for independence that precipitates her destruction. The father's curse, almost like God's to sinners, is revenge against her for refusing his desires, and, Lovelace, the man who effects Clarissa's destruction is, one can argue, the Harlowe's instrument for punishing Clarissa for her disobedience.

Zwinger analyses (briefly) Lovelace's behaviour and importance. Like the Harlowes, he is interested in Clarissa, although his motivation is not economic advancement. When the whole Harlowe family has made Clarissa's life unbearable, Lovelace takes over, and, as Zwinger suggests, he can be seen as the Harlowes' successor (24), because he takes James Harlowe, Junior's position (25). She wı :es about his similarities to the Harlowes:

> At Mrs. Sorlings in St. Albans, Lovelace introduces himself
>
> as Clarissa's brother, explaining that he has carried his "sister" away
>
> from the danger of marrying a "confounded rake" against the wishes
>
> of her "father and mother, her elder sister, and all her loving uncles,
>
> aunts, and cousins. (25).

She also argues that "Lovelace thus inserts himself - more ironically than he knows - into the configurations of Clarissa's actual family at the point James occupies, prompting this Shakespearean boast to Belford: "I topped the brother's part on Monday night..."(25). The curse which is paramount in the novel, has two effects on Lovelace. Zwinger argues that, firstly, he sees himself as a father-figure to Clarissa and gives her the freedom which her natural father denies her, and secondly, his pride is wounded by his acknowledgment that she now "must be wholly in my protection... more indebted still, thy friend, as thou seest to her cruel relations, than to herself for her favour" (25).

Douglas Murray's essay, "Classical Myth in Richardson's *Clarissa*: Ovid Revised" (1991), provides fresh and interesting similarities between *Clarissa* and classical literature. It is a more subtle and more detailed examination than Gilbert Highet's three-page commentary in his book *The Classical Tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature* (1949). In this essay, Murray documents Richardson's familiarity with classical literature and judges that he did not merely copy: "we should see Richardson not as a transcriber but rather as an adapter - even a questioner - of myth" (115). Murray outlines places in which Lovelace perceives himself in a manner similar to what we find in classical myth, comparing himself to a formidable list of Olympian gods, such as Mercury, Hercules, Vulcan, and Jupiter the rapist (115). He also announces himself as the archetypal king and conqueror, similar to Hannibal, and also the archetypal tempter, a modern Satan (113). He compares his victim Clarissa to famous violated women, such as Semele, Lucretia, Dido, and Philomela.

Lovelace, Murray suggests, is the contemporary analogue of Zeus the rapist. His money, social status, and especially his position within the patriarchy provide him with almost godlike power (116). Murray also notes the presence of Ovidian metamorphoses in *Clarissa*. The victim is transformed into a saint, and the underlying motif of the criminal's desire for the victim's silence is predominant. In the story of Philomela, Tereus cuts off her tongue. In *Clarissa*, Lovelace intercepts and interrupts, rewrites and forges

Clarissa and Anna's correspondence until he drugs her (119). Like Zwinger, Murray argues that Lovelace continues the practice of the Harlowes, who never allowed Clarissa a voice: "they had refused to believe that a refusal of Solmes does not mean a desire for Lovelace; and they had at last attempted to silence her by forbidding correspondence and confiscating paper and pen" (120).

Quite recently (1993), Mona Scheuermann published *Her Bread to Earn: Women, Money, and Society From Defoe to Austen*, in which she "examines the representations of women in the work of some of the major novelists, both male and female, of the eighteenth century" (1). Examined texts include *Roxana* by Defoe, *Clarissa* by Richardson, *Amelia* by Fielding, and *Pride and Prejudice* by Austen. By examining the various representations of women, she tries to refute certain readings of those female characters, especially "the view of woman as victim,... the image of woman as a non functioning member of society, essentially excluded from any but the role of sufferer" (1). What her study reveals is a predominance of the concern for money in all the texts. Clarissa is, for example, presented as a good keeper of accounts. Maria in *The Wrongs of Woman* suffers because her husband denies her the responsibility of managing her property. The chapter on *Clarissa* is insightful.

Clarissa's problem is purely of an economic nature. Scheuermann makes a detailed study of what brings about Clarissa's predicament, outlining all the economic aspirations the family hopes to achieve from her marriage to Solmes and how her association with Lovelace, which initially pleases her uncles, only exacerbates the enmity between her and the whole family. Lovelace, Scheuermann argues, is a threat to James and Arabella Harlowe's financial pretensions (67). They support Solmes because of his unmistakably stupid terms, which a shrewd and economically minded person would not accept. He offers among other things, that if Clarissa dies without an heir, her property, together with the grandfather's and Solmes', will revert to the Harlowe family. This the family accepts with alacrity, and hence it is determined to force Clarissa into accepting Solmes.

Scheuermann also notes the difference in Richardson's women from other female characters in texts she studies. She notes that Richardson's women are confined to the domestic with very few external events impinging on their lives. Unlike Maria and Jemima in *The Wrongs of Woman* by Mary Wollstonecraft, who go out into the world, Pamela and Clarissa remain indoors (61). Confining his characters to the domestic is something Richardson was aware of. For example, the full title of *Clarissa* reads *Clarissa or, The History of A Lady: Comprehending The Most Important Concerns of Private Life*. The book is about private, not public, life.

Money or wealth in Richardson does not empower women as it does in other novelists like Defoe. Scheuermann argues that even with all her wealth, Clarissa is not independent of the administration of the family by her father. In fact her property makes her even more a victim of the family's demands. Her decision to give to her father the running of her estate does not solve her problem in that the uncles consider her as their heiress, and this worsens the already sour relationship between her and her sister and brother.

In the manner of Todd's *Women Friendship in Literature*, Scheuermann comments on women's relationships in *Clarissa*. The relationship between Clarissa and her mother is not very definite. The mother is passive and also compelled by duty to support her husband. At the same time, she has tender feelings for her daughter. She tries to reconcile the two by persuading the daughter to accept Solmes (79). The only relationship which succeeds in the novel is the one between Clarissa and Anna. She writes that: "While good male-female relationships and good parent-child relationships are shown to be difficult if not impossible in *Clarissa*, the female friendship of peers is held up as the most successful, and arguably the most intense, of human bonds" (86).

Other issues of importance raised by Scheuermann include the laws which governed women's property at the time and the importance of the poor's fund which

Clarissa provides for in her will. The laws governing women's property were, to say the least, unfavourable to woman. Scheuermann writes that:

> While an unmarried (not betrothed) or widowed woman had control of her property and of her money, the married woman had virtually no such rights; a betrothed woman, even before her marriage, could no longer make gifts from her own estate. Even over her own children, a woman had virtually no legal rights. (9)

On Clarissa's poor's fund, Scheuermann writes:

> The section of the will that deals with the Poor's Fund is Clarissa's philosophical and practical guide to the philanthropic duties of the rich to the poor. Richardson's young heroine has a clearly articulated system of benevolence and in her wisdom knows exactly who is worthy of aid and who is not. (75)

Overall, this book is good on images of women in some eighteenth-century novels. Although it is not particularly helpful in understanding the seducers, its references to issues of money and therefore class are important in understanding how Clarissa ultimately falls under Lovelace's powe

I wish now to outline eighteenth-century social background with the aim of demonstrating, "environmental or social determinism," but that human behaviour is to a large extent a product of the values and beliefs learnt from society. The eighteenth century is a period of major discoveries and changes in literature, politics, science, and economics. It witnessed not only intellectual discoveries, but also their practical application in the Agricultural and Industrial Revolutions. There are of course the American and French Revolutions, but they occur late in the century and are not relevant here. These major changes in agriculture and manufacturing changed the lives of people in significant ways. Ian Watt's *The Rise of the Novel* (1957) suggests that changes in the life-styles of people, particularly women of the middle class, led to significant increases in

the reading public. By 1727, women of the middle class had more time than they had previously because certain essentials such as bread, beer, candles, and soap which they had to produce manually, were produced quickly by factories and could be bought from the nearest shop (44).

Of critical importance to this study are the double standards of sexual morals in the middle class. J.A. and Olive Banks in *Feminism and Family Planning in Victorian England* (1964), define this double standard as involving:

> ... the imposition of a far stricter sexual morality upon middle-class women than upon the men of the same class. Chastity, both before and after marriage, was regarded as desirable for a man, but it was a necessity for any woman who wished to retain even the semblance of respectability. (107)

Other critics further note the position of disadvantage in which women were held. Watt, Scheuermann, Eagleton et al. point out that women were not considered as legal entities who had the same recourse to the legal system as men. I.B. O'Malley, in a book *Women in Subjection: A Study of the Lives of English Women Before 1832* (1933), anticipated the modern critics' emphasis on the position of women in relation to the law. In his introduction, he observes that: "English History as it was written till about forty years ago was the history of English men; the few women who appeared in it were spoken of only in their relation to men. There were of course exceptions to the rule... "(9). O'Malley demonstrates the long-standing position of inferiority which has been the fate of most women. He argues further that while in theory women have been the law's favorite (16), in reality the situation is that the law simply holds women in subjection and that many of the privileges of women stipulated under the law are but an emphasis of their subjection (17):

> she (woman) was the property of father or husband, and very careful rules had to be made so that the respective

> rights of those owners should be balanced and so that their property should not at any time be damaged by irresponsible persons. (17)

> Nor did her own pe son belong to herself. From the day of her marriage her body was bound to be at the service of her husband for his pleasure and for begetting children. Her life and liberty were in his hands. (24)

All these disadvantages against women are what Mary Wollstonecraft late in the century fictionalized and condemned in her radical novel *The Wrongs of Woman* (1798). We recognize why Clarissa's mother cannot oppose her husband, just as in Wollstonecraft's novel Maria is imprisoned because she wants to manage her property and that her husband Venables takes her daughter from her. The ending of *The Wrongs of Woman* in which the judge rules in favour of men merely enforces the discriminatory legal system.

Ivan Blcch, supporting O'Malley's observations, wrote in his book *A History of English Sexual Morals* (1936): "...upto the nineteenth century a very curious custom prevailed in England: a husband who was tired of his wife could sell her to the highest bidder in a crowd assembled in some public place." (14). He further writes, "... that a man could lead his wife to market with a rope round her neck (such was the practice), offer her to the gaping crowd and sell her, frequently at a mock price..." (14), as further evidence of the property nature of women.

That women were men's property and their inferiors is clear from all the works cited. However, Janelle Greenberg's essay "The Legal Status of the Woman in Early Eighteenth-Century Common Law and Equity" (1975), disagrees with the view of women as mere property in the eighteenth century. She dismisses as inaccurate most references to women as chattels, devoid of legal existence. Her comments are worth quoting extensively:

> It is frequently said of women in the eighteenth century and earlier that they were chattels, mere property, devoid of a legal existence. For example, a lawyer specializing in women's rights recently stated in her testimony before a United States Senate sub-committee that "under the old English common law, women were not regarded as persons under the law; women were regarded as chattels, as property." Similar statements abound. Such descriptions are, however, inaccurate. In no period of English History, at least not since the Norman Conquest, have women been given the legal status of chattels. To be sure, they have not been treated as the legal equals of men. But neither have they been regarded as mere things, either in common law or in equity. (171)

The controversy, I think, suggests the fact that the area of women and law in the eighteenth century is such a vast and complex one, that it cannot be fully exhausted in the limited space of one book or essay. Greenberg's statement that "in no period of English history... have women been given the legal status of chattels" may be true, but it is against the truth of women being treated as chattels, showing the gap between what the law demands and what is practiced. The attitude that women are men's property continues to affect us in the modern world. However, Greenberg goes on to make important distinctions between `types' of women and how each type relates to the common law and equity. She distinguishes between the rights of married and unmarried women and their relation to private and public law. Greenberg sums up the position of women (married and unmarried) under public law in the following manner: "in public law there was no place for them, except on the throne." (172) Private law, on the other hand, allowed single women to enjoy "for the most part, the same rights and responsibilities as did men." (172) For example, a single woman could own property, but once married, she lost all her rights in that property to her husband, and her property automatically became the husband's.

The crucial point from all these quotations about the law is that women, despite Greenberg's qualification, are to a large extent perceived as men's property; she indeed notes that "to be sure, they have not been treated as the legal equals of men" (172), although exceptions do exist, particularly if we consider the various social classes. The property-status of women made men believe that they possessed sexual rights over them and could demand and have them anytime they saw fit. This belief is in part responsible for acts of sexual violation committed against women. Feminist critics such as Susan Brownmiller, Susan Staves, Anna Clark, and Susan Edwards perceive acts of sexual violation as intended to suppress women, and not as the result of uncontrollable sexual desires, although some men are driven by the latter. Anna Clark, in her book *Women's Silence, Men's Violence: Sexual Assault in England 1770-1845* (1987), points out some attitudes found the early eighteenth century. Certainly, attitudes and emotions of a people persist over a long time. She argues, convincingly:

> And the physical act of rape enables individual men of all classes to dominate women and violently to degrade and humiliate their victims. Because men use rape as a means of direct control over women, not primarily for sexual satisfaction, feminists such as Brownmiller have often declared that rape is a crime of violence, not sex. For instance, in fifteenth-century Toulouse gangs of youths raped young women to force them into prostitution; in eighteenth-century France men raped their fiancees in a ritual of domination. (6)

Writing on eighteenth-century rakes, she points out that:

> While many eighteenth century rakes prided themselves on seducing women with every technique but force, they often seemed to regard sex as the conquest of women, 'taking' her as if she were a precious jewel

rather than a person desiring sexual pleasure" (6).

The same judgments can be found fifty years earlier in Ivan Bloch's *A History of English Sexual Morals* (1936):

> One of the main features of the British Don Juans... is the cool, brazen calmness with which they indulge in the sensual pleasures of life; love to them is much less an affair of passion than one of pride and of the gratification of their consciousness of power... The English Don Juan seduces on principle for the sake of experiment; he pursues love as a kind of sport. Sensuality plays but a secondary role and in the midst of his sensual enjoyment the coldness of his heart is still painfully apparent. This is the `rake' described by Richardson in his *Clarissa Harlowe*. Taine writes of this type of English Don Juan: `what a character! How very English! How different from Mozart's or Moliere's Don Juan! Unyielding pride, the desire to subjugate others, the provocative love of battle, the need for ascendancy, these are his predominant features... (275-76)

Susan Edwards in *Female Sexuality and the Law* (1981) argues that "Women were typically considered to be totally devoid of sexual feelings, desires or needs" (23); these assumptions came to influence legal statutes. Of course, Edwards's argument is qualified by works such as Cleland's novel *Fanny Hill*. [Of course Cleland's argument is not typical]. In this novel, Cleland presents a young girl who gets introduced to sex, gets to like it and performs, very vigorously, and actually introduces us to a dozen such female characters. Cleland implies that within every woman there lies dormant intense sexual emotion which needs only to be awakened/activated, and with whose awakening comes vigorous performance. We might recall conventional interpretations of the Biblical story

of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. Perhaps women were generally considered as sexually passive, but Eve's luring Adam into eating the forbidden fruit suggests she was man's first seducer into sex.

Eighteenth-century discourses on sexual violation distorted women's experience by not allowing them to openly discuss issues relating to sex. Women who openly talked about sex were considered unchaste and immoral according to middle class sexual morality. Susan Staves in her essay "British Seduced Maidens" (1980/81), points out that society imposed a kind of silencing:

> the eighteenth century was quite certain it did not want young girls to be knowing, suspicious, or hard-hearted. Learned women, women who attempt to gain knowledge of the world, even women who like to spend time outside their own houses are constantly the butts of ridicule, bitter satires, and oratory from pulpit and moralist alike. (118)

Unless they talk freely about their experiences, women remain subject to sexual assaults. In the eighteenth century, when describing their experiences about sexual assault, they were forced to use euphemisms such as "ill-used," "barbarously used," "used me freely," all of which do not describe their true experiences. The form of silencing of women is symbolically presented in Richardson's two novels when the seducers interrupt, forge, and copy the heroines' correspondence. In *Clarissa*, the silencing climaxes in the drugging and violation of the heroine, an act similar to the removal of the victim's tongue in the story of Philomela cited in Douglas Murray's essay (cf.p.40).

The prevalence of sexual offenses committed against women was to a large extent made to flourish by the legal system of the time. Citations of some ramifications of the legal system and women have already been made above. Anna Clark observes that the eighteenth-century justice system was predominantly property-oriented, such that people were severely punished for stealing. J.H. Plumb in his *England in the Eighteenth Century*

(1950) when he wrote about "... the savage intensification of the laws dealing with crimes against property, so that, by 1740, for stealing a handkerchief worth one shilling, so long as it was removed privily from the person, children could be hanged by the neck until dead" (17).

According to the legal system, sexual assault was only punishable if it infringed on somebody's property rights. For example, if somebody's wife or daughter was raped, then the punishment for the culprit would be severe because he would have trespassed on somebody's property. James Harlowe, Clarissa's father, would with ease take Lovelace to court because he is considered as the first victim of his (Lovelace's) trespassing, if Clarissa is indeed her father's property. This would however be complicated by the social class to which one belongs. With property, one's social class is enhanced, and so too is one's "immunity" or "exemption" from the law. In Richardson's novels, the seducers are men of property; in fact they are the law or are immune to it. John Richetti, in his essay "The Public Sphere and the Eighteenth Century Novel: Social Criticism and Narrative Enactment" (1992), succinctly writes of Richardson's heroes in *Pamela* and *Clarissa* that

> Part of Richardson's Pamela's problem is that her would-be-seducer is nothing less than one of the legal representatives of the law, the chief landowner and therefore the magistrate in his part of Lincolnshire where he besieges her virtue. In *Clarissa*, Lovelace is a sexual buccaneer precisely because of the unresolved combination of social licence and moral control that defines the personality of young man of his class and privilege. His manipulation of others involves a freewheeling improvisation of a *droit de seigneur* that Richardson dramatizes as archaic but powerful, achieved partly by money but also by the force of aristocratic privilege and traditional prerogatives. No wonder, then, that Clarissa is reluctant to press charges against her rapist; she fears not only a demeaning

exposure to the public gaze but the aura of lingering aristocratic privilege that protects people like Robert Lovelace. (118)

In the preceding part of this chapter, I have described the place of women, the legal system, and some stereotypes held against women; of course they are a partial picture of society and should not be taken as the absolute and complete portrayal of the period. All of them need further inquiry. Certain ideas propounded by Clark, Staves Brownmiller and Edwards are partial because they present only the woman's side of the matter, but their arguments that acts of sexual assaults against women are to a large extent due not to uncontrollable sexual drives but to the desire for domination are convincing. I maintain as one of the crucial points in this study that the actions of Lovelace and Mr. B are largely motivated by the desire to dominate, and Lovelace's boasts to Belford are valuable evidence. I maintain too that Richardson intended to reveal that society has a role to play in creating the desires for dominance, and I concur with critics who consider the social background to the novels as of paramount importance. In the following and last part of this chapter, I briefly want to show similarities between Richardson's novels and contemporary literature. Konigsberg's, and Ward's (to cite a few) source-hunting will be of great value.

That parallels between Richardson's novels and contemporary literature exist is obvious. Critics concerned with the sources of Richardson's novels have tried to illustrate the similarities, while arguing that similarities do not mean that Richardson was a mere copier of existing literature. Similarities suggest that authors draw their subjects from a common source, life. The texts which I will cite later do indeed bear some resemblance to Richardson's novels, but, as would be expected, differences are as obvious and numerous as similarities. The differences are proof that what is at issue is adapting, not copying.

The similarities include character roles, plot, and themes. Critics such as Edgar, Singer, Mckillop, Cardon, Doody, Turner, and Konigsberg cite a number of texts which are similar to Richardson's in terms of the above-mentioned elements of form. Following

Konigsberg's essay more closely because of its exclusive interest in showing the similarities between Richardson's novels and contemporary literature, I will only examine three of those works which have similarities to Richardson's two novels.

Pamela sprang up when Richardson at the request of two booksellers compiled a collection of letters intended to be a model for the semi-literate. In the process, he is said to have remembered a story told to him a long time before of a servant girl who successfully resisted her master's attempts to seduce her. He decided therefore to adapt that story into the novel. Konigsberg, following Singer and Edgar (cf.p.4, 6), suggests that a source for *Pamela* might have been John Hughes' story which appeared in *The Spectator* no. 375 of May 10, 1712. Hughes's short story (five pages) presents in letter-form an account of Amanda's successful resistance to the Lord of the Manor's attempts to seduce her. She writes, like Pamela, to her parents informing them of her experiences. Her parents, the mother in particular, being virtuous, advise the daughter to guard her virtue, and be prepared to lose her life rather than her virtue. The parents, like Pamela's, are poor but humble, pious and loving. The Lord of the Manor writes to them promising them wealth if their daughter Amanda agrees to his proposals. The letter written to Amanda by her mother falls into the hands of her would-be seducer who reads it and is moved by it. He writes to apologize for his actions and helps to restore Amanda's parents' economic condition. Similarities to *Pamela* are obvious: the presence of licentious rich masters, innocent girls resisting seduction, and successfully protecting their virtue and finally being rewarded for that, and the interruption of the heroines' correspondence. Virtue triumphs over vice, and the would-be seducers reform and come to learn to respect their victims.

According to Konigsberg, bearing more resemblance to Richardson's novels are some plays available to him. Richardson's friendship with prominent figures in the English theatre might, in part, be the reason for the theatre's influence on his novels. Such personalities include Aaron Hill, Colley Cibber, Edward Moore, and David Garrick.

Aaron Hill, for example, was one of Richardson's correspondents and critics. Closer to *Pamela* might be Thomas Brewer's *The Countri[illegible] Gir[illegible]* which appeared as early as 1647. A plagiarized version of the play by John Lea[illegible], *The Country Innocence, or The Chambermaid Turn'd Quaker*, was produced and published in 1677. It is the latter that I wish to consider briefly. The play has two plots. The first one deals with a reluctant and shy widow and her suitors. The second one, the relevant one to this study, deals with attempted seduction. A tenant's daughter, Margaret, is being pursued by Sir Robert Malory, the lord of the manor. Like Pamela and Amanda, Margaret too values her chastity. Sir Robert Malory tries (through his wife who acts as his bawd) to use his wealth to bribe Margaret into sex. He promises her happiness, which she refuses. Sir Malory is a married man but lustful and always pursuing his tenants' daughters. As in *Pamela* and Hughes's story, the seducer reforms. Sir Malory apologizes to his tenants and wife, and gives his tenants property as a sign of his reform. Similarities between Richardson's novel and this play are clear: the social positions of the seducers and their victims are persistent factors, virtue triumphing, the redeemability of the seducers, the happy endings and the lustful masters.

Clarissa too has similarities with plays that Richardson found when he started writing. Nicholas Rowe's *The Fair Penitent* (1703) is a tragedy of Calista the heroine. *Clarissa* can be taken as a tragedy in which Clarissa is the tragic heroine. While there are major differences between Calista and Clarissa, they are victims in a man's world. They suffer seduction, although it comes in different forms. The value of the play lies in it being thought of as the source for the character of Lovelace in *Clarissa*. Professor H.G. Ward's essay "Richardson's Character of Lovelace" (1912) argued Richardson's indebtedness to Rowe's play, and particularly to the characterization of Lothario. Konigsberg argues that the influence of Rowe's play is evidenced by Richardson's quotation of the play twice in his correspondence and twice in *Clarissa* (69). Lothario, like Lovelace, is a seducer, but, unlike Lovelace, he does not drug Calista and he seduces her before she marries Altamont,

(and the incident is only reported in the first act). Lothario is killed by Calista's husband. Perhaps the greatest similarity between Lothario and Lovelace is their desire for destruction and plotting. Lothario is not bothered by what he did to Calista, but is instead preoccupied with the desire to destroy his enemy. Lovelace and Lothario seek vengeance, although to varying degrees. Both want to confront the families of their victims because their suits to the heroines were interrupted by the heroines' families. In terms of friendship, the texts do have similarities. Lothario's friendship with Rossano is similar to Lovelace's with Belford in *Clarissa*. Calista has a confidante in Lucilla, and Clarissa has Anna Howe. Calista's father is the equivalent of Mr. Harlowe, Clarissa's father. Lucilla's observation that men gain mirth in destroying women and that they are betrayers of women is echoed in Anna Howe's observation that men are serpents. Undeniably, despite the great differences, similarities do exist, although, clearly, the seducers are, to use Cardon's words, "descendants of a long line of rakes" (19), and so are female confidante relationships a common feature in literature. Richardson is thus adapting what is already in existence for his purposes. What might be Richardson's contribution to the literature of the seducers is their portraiture. In the following two chapters, I will examine each seducer and bring out his character, qualities and motivation(s).

Works Cited

Banks, Olive and J.A. *Feminism and Family Planning in Victorian England.* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1964.

Barbauld, Anna Laetitia, ed. *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson.* 6 vols. [London: R. Phillips, 1804.] New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1966.

Battestin, Martin C. "Morris Golden. *Richardson's Characters.*" Book review in *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 63(1964):797-800.

Bloch, Ivan. *A History of English Sexual Morals.* Trans. William H. Forstern. London: Francis Aldor, 1936.

Boyce, Benjamin. "Morris Golden. *Richardson's Characters.*" Book review in *Philological Quarterly*, 43(1964): 380-81.

---"Ian Watt. *The Rise of the Novel.*" Book review in *Philological Quarterly*, 37(1958): 304-06.

Brownmiller, Susan. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1975.

Cardon, P. Stanley. *A Study of the Villains in Richardson's Novels.* M.A. Thesis, University of Arizona, 1942.

Carroll, John, ed. *Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

---ed. *Samuel Richardson: A Collection of Critical Essays.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Cibber, Colley. *Love's Last Shift; or The Fool in Fashion: A Comedy.* London: 1696.

Clark, Anna. *Women's Silence, Men's Violence: Sexual Assault in England 1770-1845.* London and New York: Pandora, 1987.

Cleland, John. *Fanny Hill: Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure.* Ed. Peter Quennell. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1963.

Cowler, Rosemary, ed. *Twentieth Century Interpretations of "Pamela"* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Doody, Margaret Anne. *A Natural Passion: A Study of the Novels of Samuel Richardson*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974.

Doody, M. A. & P. Sabor, eds. *Samuel Richardson: Tercentenary Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Dussinger, John A. "Ira Konigsberg. *Samuel Richardson and The Dramatic Novel.*" Book Review in *Philological Quarterly*, 48(1969): 385-86.

Eagleton, Terry. *The Rape of Clarissa: Writing, Sexuality and Class Struggle in Samuel Richardson*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

Eaves, T.C. Duncan, and Ben D. Kimpel. *Samuel Richardson: A Biography*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Edgar, Pelham. *The Art of the Novel from 1700 to the Present Time*. New York: Macmillan, 1933.

Edwards, Susan. *Female Sexuality and the Law*. Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1981.

Golden, Morris. *Richardson's Characters*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1963.

Greenberg, Janelle. "The Legal Status of the English Woman in Early Eighteenth-Century Common Law and Equity." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*. Ed. Harold E. Pagliaro. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1975. 172-83.

Hannaford, Richard Gordon. *Samuel Richardson: An Annotated Bibliography of Critical Studies*. New York: Garland, 1980.

Highet, Gilbert. *The Classical Tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.

Hopkinson, H.T. "Robert Lovelace, The Romantic Cad." *Horizon*, 10(1944): 80-104.

Kinkead-Weekes, Mark. *Samuel Richardson: Dramatic Novelist*. Ithaca & New York: Cornell University Press, 1973.

Konigsberg, Ira. *Samuel Richardson and the Dramatic Novel*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1968.

---"The Dramatic Background of Richardson's Plots and Characters." *PMLA*, 83(1968): 142-53.

Learnerd, John. *The Country Innocence or, The Chambermaid Turn'd Quaker*. London: Charles Harper, 1677.

McIntosh, Carey. "Pamela's Clothes. "*Twentieth Century Interpretations of Pamela": A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Rosemary Cowler. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1969. 89-96.

Mckillop, Alan Dugald. *Samuel Richardson: Printer and Novelist*. Chapel Hill: North Carolina University Press, 1936.

---"Ian Watt. *The Rise of the Novel*." Book review in *Modern Philology*, 55(1958): 208-10.

Moody, V.M. and Robert M. Lovett. *A History of English Literature*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946.

Murray, Douglas. "Classical Myth in Richardson's *Clarissa*: Ovid Revised." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 3(1991): 113-24.

Napier, Elizabeth R. "Tremble and Reform: The Inversion of Power in Richardson's *Clarissa*." *English Literary History*, 42(1975): 214-23.

Needham, Gwendolyn B. "Richardson's Characterization of Mr. B. and the Double Purpose in *Pamela*." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 3(1970): 433-74.

O'Malley, I.B. *Women in Subjection: A Study of the Lives of English Women before 1832*. London: Duckworth, 1933.

Paulson, Ronald. "Eaves and Kimpel. *Samuel Richardson: A Biography*." Book review in *Studies in the Novel* (North Texas State University),5(1973): 110-16.

Plumb, J.H. *England in the Eighteenth-Century*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1950.

Preston, John. "Mark Kinkead-Weekes. *Samuel Richardson: Dramatic Novelist*." Book review in *Review of English Studies*, 27(1976): 81-84.

Richardson, Samuel. *Clarissa*. Ed. Angus Ross. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.

Richetti, John. "The Public Sphere and the Eighteenth-Century Novel: Social Criticism and Narrative Enactment." *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 16(Nov. 1992): 114-29.

Roberts, Mark. "Ian Watt. *The Rise of the Novel*." Book review in *Essays in Criticism*, 8(1958): 428-38.

Robinson, David. "Unravelling the 'cord which ties good men to good men': Male Friendship in Richardson's Novels." Doody and Sabor, eds. *Samuel Richardson: Tercentenary Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989. 167-87.

Rowe, Nicholas. *The Fair Penitent*. Ed. Malcolm Goldstein. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1969.

Scheuermann, Mona. *Her Bread to Earn: Women, Money, and Society From Defoe to Austen*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1993.

Singer, Godfrey Frank. *The Epistolary Novel: Its Origin, Development, Decline, and Residuary Influence*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1933. Repr.1963.

Slattery, William C, ed. *The Richardson-Stinstra Correspondence and Stinstra's Prefaces to "Clarissa"*. London and Amsterdam: Feffer & Simons Inc., 1969.

Staves, Susan. "British Seduced Maidens." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 14(1980/81): 109-34.

Stevenson, John Allen. "The Courtship of the Family: Clarissa and the Harlowes Once More." *English Literary History*, 48(1981): 757-77.

Todd, Janet. *Women Friendship in Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

Turner, James Grantham. "Lovelace and the Paradoxes of Libertinism." Doody and Sabor, eds. *Samuel Richardson: Tercentenary Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989. 70-88.

Van Ghent, Dorothy. *The English Novel: Form and Function*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953.

Ward, H.G. "Richardson's Character of Lovelace." *Modern Language Review*, 7(1912): 494-98.

Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957.

---"Morris Golden. *Richardson's Characters*." Book review in *English Language Notes*, 2(1964): 136-38.

Wolff, Cynthia Griffin. *Samuel Richardson and the Eighteenth-Century Puritan Character*. Hamden: Archon, 1972.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *The Wrongs of Woman, or Maria*. Ed. G.D. Kelly. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Woods, Charles. "Ian Watt. *The Rise of the Novel*." Book review in *Modern Language Notes*, 72(1957): 622-24.

Zanforlin, Nicolette Whitteridge. *"Clarissa": A Critical Analysis of Samuel Richardson's Novel in Letters*. Padova, Italy: Liviana Editrice S.P.A., 1981.

Zwinger, Lynda. *Daughters, Fathers and the Novel of Sentimental Romance of Sexuality*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.

Mr. B.

Mr. B.: "Do you know whom you speak to?"(55)

Pamela: "I should be quite destitute again, and forced to return to you and my poor mother, who have enough to do to maintain yourselves..." (43)

Mr. B.: "I know better what belongs to myself; but I was bewitched by her..." (67)

Miss Towers: "O you little rogue, you seem born to undo, or to be undone!" (86)

Whether *Pamela* is a great novel remains a controversial question for the students of Samuel Richardson. The responses the novel evoked when it appeared in 1740 are mixed, and they may be evidence for its greatness or lack of it. Eaves and Kimpel, Richardson's biographers, document some of the responses the book evoked in their introduction to the Riverside edition of *Pamela*. Soon after publication, an anonymous commendatory letter was published in *The Weekly Miscellany* and was addressed "To My Worthy Friend, the Author of *Pamela*." A certain Reverend Slocock is said to have recommended the book from the pulpit of St. Saviour's, Southwark, in 1740. On the negative side, the book sparked parodies, the best known being Henry Fielding's *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews* (1741), in which Fielding mocks the virtuous Pamela in Richardson's novel. The novel also evoked spurious continuations which forced Richardson to produce the second volume of *Pamela,* in which the heroine's married life is depicted. The novel divided the eighteenth-century British reading public into "Pamelists" and "Anti-Pamelists," and modern critics have been similarly divided.

The novel can best be described as one of transformation, not only for the characters, but for places too. Pamela, the poor servant girl, moves from rags to riches by marrying in the squirearchy. Her parents, too, once well-off but fallen into misfortune, end up as wealthy people after receiving property from their son-in-law. The villain, Mr.

B., transforms from the seducing master into a doting husband, and Mrs. Jewkes, the once hostile and ruthless servant, becomes Pamela's respectful waiting lady. Bedfordshire, once Pamela's peaceful abode, changes into a place where her virtue is threatened, but by the end of the novel, it returns to its former homely status. Lincolnshire, once Pamela's prison, becomes her peaceful haven. As she remarks: "But my prison is become my palace; and no wonder every thing about it wears another face!" (378).

One can observe that this positive transformation is a progress to maturity, especially for characters. Mr. B. sheds his arrogance and bad intentions and respects Pamela as a human being despite her condition. By this maturation, Mr. B. also liberates all the servants who acted under his instructions to reform into amiable characters. His role is thus double-edged: in his devilishness, he acts as a corrupting agent of other characters by using his power of influence, while in his goodness, he imparts that virtue to others. Thus, this double-edged role corresponds to the novel's central division between good and bad. I want to emphasize that, in understanding Mr. B.'s character, we have to be aware of this division. In this chapter, I examine the character of Mr. B., outlining his methods of attempting to seduce Pamela, and how his behaviour is a result of an internal conflict between his inherent goodness and a penchant towards vice due to his rakish beliefs.

One major criticism leveled against Richardson's *Pamela* is the organization of the narration of the story, which accords the heroine the sole responsibility of telling the story. This organization of the narration overshadows the presence and character of Mr. B., who I believe is the central character who acts upon many of the characters we find in the novel and the one on whom Pamela's virtue depends for justification. The narration of the story arises partly from the fact that the novel begins in *medias res* (Richardson was of course not writing a history book and therefore one should not expect a sequential outline of events), making it appear as though the events of the novel begin only after the introduction of Pamela at B. Hall. This creates the problem of making it appear as though

other characters, particularly Mr. B., has no life independent of Pamela, a fallacy which is discernible in some of the criticism on Richardson.

In recognition of the above problem(s), I want to foreground Mr. B. by reconstructing his past prior to the introduction of Pamela, thus imposing a linear type of narration on the entire novel. *Pamela* is, thus, a story of the twenty-five year old Mr. B. as he attempts to seduce his mother's waiting maid, Pamela, detailing all the methods he uses to achieve his intentions; it ends in marriage between the two, when he reforms due to Pamela's reformative influence. Assessing Mr. B.'s character is not without its attendant problems. As I demonstrated above, the narration of the story creates problems. We depend on Pamela for the reporting of the events, and, as Needham suggested, Pamela is the last person we should expect to describe Mr. B. objectively. Needham nevertheless notices that circumstantial details seem reliable: "But she faithfully reports opinions of his family, neighbors, and servants; and from this record readers, if objective, can interpret more truly the nature and feelings of Mr. B. but must wait the positive confirmation given later by the man himself" (443).

Mr. B. was born into a wealthy upper-middle class family which has estates in Bedfordshire, Lincolnshire, and Kent and a retinue of servants. He is the only son of Mr. and Mrs. B., and when the book opens, his father is already dead, and the mother is in her dying bed, from which she recommends to her son the care of all her servants. Being the only son, Mr. B. inherits all the family's property.

His family, besides being materially wealthy, has strict behavioural codes to guide conduct. As his only sister Lady Davers reports, the family does not allow its members to demean themselves by marrying below their station, and this has been its practice over several hundred years (293-94). This strictness about whom to marry seems to suggest that the family is not only mindful of its class position, but also keen on maintaining its genetic composition from any dilution. His sister reminds his seemingly wayward brother that the blood in his veins is ancient and untainted (294), meaning that marrying Pamela,

as he finally does, demeans the family's strict observance of genetic composition. It is implied in Lady Davers' statement that their parents were not promiscuous, and therefore Mr. B.'s other sexual encounters coupled with his seduction-attempts on Pamela depart from their parents' code of behaviour and thus make him the black sheep of the family. Lady Davers' condemnation of her brother is, however, limited because it does not consider the role played by his upbringing in spoiling him. I will pursue this later in the chapter.

From such a family came the handsome and wealthy Mr. B.; as his sister describes him, "a handsome man ...so happy in the gifts of...mind; and possessed of such a noble and clear estate; and very rich in money...(293-94). Pamela also notices Mr. B.'s handsome appearance (235). Coming from such a wealthy background, Mr.B. enjoyed all the benefits of an upper-middle class child. His education began with private tutoring; he proceeded to college and then to Oxford, after which he went on the Grand Tour to Italy and France to perfect himself in languages and manners. From his family, he also learnt the virtues of generosity, kindness, and sympathy. The novel abounds with praise from his servants, friends, and neighbors about his noble qualities. In fact, the novel opens with Mr. B. extending his kindness to his dying mother's servants and ends with even more acts of kindness to them and particularly his newly-wed wife, Pamela. Besides being kind and sympathetic, he is a courageous man who wields his sword in a duel to defend a friend (438, 451). From his class, he also learns the sport of hunting. In general, he grows up to inherit all the manners of his class.

Mr. B. is, however, no mere praiseworthy character. He, as he tells us, "has not lived a blameless life"(452), and we can attribute his cultural mis-shaping to his upbringing. His upbringing spoils him by making him believe that no one can oppose his will. Pamela reports that:

> My good lady, his dear mother, spoiled him at first.
>
> Nobody must speak to him, or contradict him, as

I have heard, when he was a child; and so he has not been used to be controuled, and cannot bear the least thing that crosses his violent will. This is one of the blessings attending men of high condition! (278)

The spoiling background is also confirmed by Mr. B. in his speech on how people of high condition are educated. I would like to quote his statement at length not only to illustrate the type of education he received, but also his rejection of it as a prelude towards his reformation. He confesses that:

We people of fortune, or such as are born to large expectations, of both sexes, are generally educated wrong...We are usually headstrong in our wills, and being unaccustomed to controul from our parents, know not how to bear it.

Humoured by our nurses, through the faults of our parents, we practise first upon them; and shew the *gratitude* of our dispositions, in an insolence that ought at first to have been checked and restrained.

Next, we are to be favoured and indulged at school; and we take care to reward our *masters* for their required indulgences, with further *grateful* instances of our unruly dispositions.

After our wise parents have bribed our way through the usual forms, with very little improvement in our learning, we are brought home; and then our parents take their *deserved* turn. We torture their hearts by our dutiful behaviour; which, however ungrateful in us, is but the natural consequence of their culpable indulgence, from infancy upwards.

After we have, perhaps, half broken *their* hearts, a *wife*

> is looked for: birth, and fortune, are the first motives, affection the last (if it be at all consulted): and two people thus educated, thus trained up, in a course of unnatural ingratitude, and who have been headstrong torments to every one who had a share in their education, as well as to those to whom they owe their being, are brought together; and what can be expected, but that they should join most heartily in matrimony to plague one another? It is indeed just it should be so, because they by this means revenge the cause of all those who have been aggrieved and insulted by them, upon each other.
>
> Neither of them having been subject to controul, or even to a contradiction, the man cannot bear it from one, whose new relation to him, and whose vow of obedience, he thinks, should oblige her to yield her will entirely to his.
>
> The lady (well-read in nothing, perhaps, but Romances) thinks it very ungallant now, for the *first* time, to be controuled, and that by a man, from whom she expected nothing but tenderness. (463)

Several important points surface from Mr. B.'s lengthy comments on middle class education. First, he provides us with ample background which we have to consider in evaluating his character. This upbringing is fertile ground for the propagation of rakish behaviour. Brought up to believe that he cannot be opposed, Mr. B., as his sister reports, destroys many girls (405) and hopes to add Pamela to the list. [Lady Davers' statement that her brother has destroyed many girls is, although true, suspect. First it comes out as an emotional outburst from a sister disappointed by a brother who compromises their family's strict code of conduct. Secondly, she does not consider all the facts surrounding the brother's sexual encounters. In so doing, Lady Davers fails to realize a very important factor--the manipulative conduct of women in luring men to their side. Her brother's relation of the Sally Godfrey story reveals not only his behaviour at the time, but also

Sally's mother's manipulative role in setting up her daughter with Mr. B. and Lady Davers' involvement in the cover-up of the story (499)]. He mistakenly believes that, being a servant girl, Pamela will be threatened by his position and thus readily accept his demands. The threats to send her back to her parents, and the threats he metes out on his other servants should they assist Pamela, are to be understood in the context of a shocked Mr. B., who for the first time in his life faces opposition. The number of girls he ruined suggests that he sees women as prey to be hunted and considers that the more one conquers the more masculine he becomes. This is particularly true if we consider that Mr. B. initially ridiculed matrimony (493). His desire not to be spoken to when he is in bad temper persists even after his marriage to Pamela (454).

Secondly, emphasis on social class status produces arrogant characters like Mr. B. and his sister, Lady Davers, who embarrasses Pamela during Mr. B.'s visit to his dying friend, Carlton (399); it also denies people the chance to make meaningful relationships. It appears in this novel that free interaction with people of other classes proves to be a worthwhile learning experience for Mr. B. and his sister. Thirdly, the education is routine (implied in the first sentence of the quotation), meaning that it is repeated even when it is clear that its results are detrimental to everyone in that class. To this extent, Mr. B.'s comments are a sharp indictment of his class, which insists on superficialities such as wealth, while failing to change its education system to suit the changing times.

In general, prior to Pamela's appearance (before the novel's opening), Mr. B. is a mixed character. His positive aspects include bravery, kindness, sympathy, and physical attractiveness. The major constituent of his negative side is his attitude towards women and matrimony. He invites us in his condemnation of his upbringing not to blame him entirely for his conduct, but while his education played a part in spoiling him, I believe that should not entirely exonerate him.

When Pamela appears, she finds a relatively seasoned and attractive seducer who, immediately after his mother's death, shows his true motives towards Pamela. In the

following part of this chapter, I want to consider the introduction of Pamela into Mr. B.'s family and the consequences arising therefrom. A brief consideration of Pamela's personality is very important. Unlike her young master, Pamela is only fifteen (when the novel opens) and is beautiful. Her beauty is the subject of public discussion by ladies of fashion who visit Mrs. Jervis to view a "rarity." One of the ladies, Miss Towers, describes Pamela in the following words: "Can the pretty image *speak*, Mrs. Jervis? I vow she has *speaking* eyes! O you little rogue,' said she, and tapped me on the cheek, 'you seem born to undo, or to be undone!' (86). Besides being pretty, she is an obedient, pious, and diligent servant girl, who becomes her benefactress's favourite and is also loved by other servants, particularly Mrs. Jervis, who treats her as her own child, and by Mr. B. himself. She is thus an attractive character who makes Mr. B. salivate to seduce her. Mr. B. and Pamela thus possess similar personal traits, although they differ in terms of their social stations. Pamela is from a poor family background; her family was initially well off but fell into some misfortune. She is introduced into the B. household by Lady B., who teaches her among other things how to play the piano, read, and to keep men at a distance.

The novel opens with the heroine's first letter to her parents in which she reports her lady's dying moments. On her death-bed, she recommends to her son's care all her servants, particularly Pamela. Mr. B.'s interests in Pamela are clearly manifested in this letter. The dying Lady B. recommends to her son the care of all her servants, but when it came to Pamela, Lady B. hesitates: "My dear son!" and so broke off a little; and then recovering, "Remember my poor Pamela!" (43). The hesitation suggests a number of things. First and foremost, Pamela is a special servant, whose economic background is constantly emphasized in the novel. It implies therefore, that Lady B. is emotionally distressed that Pamela might have to return to her original condition. Her recommendation is thus an earnest and passionate plea to the son not to forsake so poor a creature. Secondly, Lady B. might be suspicious of the son's interest in Pamela;

Christopher Flint's article, "The Anxiety of Affluence: Family and Class (Dis)order in *Pamela: Or Virtue Rewarded*"(1989), makes this point:

> The breaking off and recovering are signs not only of her physically and emotionally troubled state. They also suggest that Lady B. anticipates her son's misbehaviour; her silence connotes both anxiety about leaving Pamela in the hands of a man she knows to be untrustworthy and about leaving her son unattended. Lady B. wants Pamela to represent a continuing maternal influence in the house, to be a reminder to B. of his biologic historical condition. (493)

Flint's suggestions are plausible, but it seems to me that Lady B.'s hesitation is a complicated one and not clear; hence it is open to a number of readings. Her hesitation can be read as a recommendation or suggestion to her son that Pamela will make a good wife. It is also possible that Mr. B. realizes this and thus works to manipulate the situation to his advantage, although he seems not to expect any resistance from Pamela. The lady's hesitation is thus understandable as showing her inner conflict between her social class and the suitability of Pamela as wife to her son. She is in a difficult position because to advise her son openly to marry Pamela will be seen as outrageous, but at the same time she seems to feel it is necessary that the son realize Pamela's worth. She is conveniently relieved from this conflict by her death.

Mr. B.'s response to his mother's recommendation serves to show his attraction to Pamela, an attraction that pre-dates the events of the novel. He responds, a response with several implications, in the following manner: "I will take care of you all, my good maidens; and for you, Pamela; (and took me by the hand; yes, he took my hand before them all), for my dear mother's sake, I will be a friend to you, and you shall take care of my linen" (43). I agree with Flint's observation that singling out Pamela from other

maidens indicates his "ulterior motives" (494). He suggests that Mr. B's intentions are sexual:

> singling out Pamela from other lasses, the retrieval of her hand and the euphemistic tone of the word "friend" and "linen", which imply a much different kind of intimacy from that Lady B. had intended, point to the dual motivations on Mr. B.'s part to accommodate his mother's wishes and indulge his amorous designs. (494)

Flint goes on to suggest that:

> What perhaps makes this surprising is the speed with which he turns his attention from the dead mother to the girl she has just recommended. Mr. B.'s immediate concern for Pamela reveals a predisposition for the girl, one that must derive from a long standing attraction, it signals an antecedent passion, a pretextual inclination that is suddenly liberated in the absence of authority. Indeed, the quickness of B.'s interest implies an obsession with the object of his mother's care and concern, an obsession that seems to have been nurtured in the past by the mother's equally unconventional treatment of a lowly servant girl as a substitute daughter. (494)

While I agree with Flint's comments, I think that Mr. B.'s singling out of Pamela may also be a result of his sympathy for her situation, and following his mother's recommendation, he wants to make her comfortable so that she does not feel that with her lady's death she is forsaken.

That Lady B. seems to have been a stumbling block on Mr. B.'s way to express his obsession for Pamela is clearly evident. (This thesis is also advanced by Castle). With her

death, Mr.B.'s interest in Pamela becomes clearer. This brings us to an important aspect of this chapter--Mr. B.'s methods of seducing Pamela. The methods include bribery (through the use of clothes, money, and promises of a better life), persuasion, and threats--until he reforms into a husband. It is crucial to point out at this early stage that the number of methods used is a result of Pamela's persistent frustration of each of Mr. B.'s tactics. Once he is frustrated, he is forced to re-think his strategy. He begins by giving her money, the four guineas in Lady B.'s pocket, and promises that if she "was a good girl, and faithful and diligent, he would be a friend to me, for his mother's sake" (43). With these initial gifts, Mr.B. wants to create an atmosphere in which Pamela will not resist when he makes his intentions known. Money, a sign of social class position and the currency with which we purchase almost every commodity, functions conventionally in Mr.B.'s attempts to purchase of Pamela's sexuality, but she is of course not aware that words such as "diligent," faithful," and "friend" merely hide Mr.B.'s sexual purposes.

Continuing his encroachment, Mr.B. offers Pamela some of his late mother's clothes, presents which constitute a leitmotif in the novel and come to serve a number of functions. Clothes in *Pamela* become crucial "weapons" in the seduction-attempts of Mr. B. Commenting on the function of clothes, Carey McIntosh's perceptive essay "Pamela's Clothes"(1969), argues, convincingly, that clothes in *Pamela* serve two major functions: as indicators of class-standing and as suggesting Mr. B.'s sexual innuendoes. He writes that:

> Clothes in *Pamela* function first of all as the visible emblem of social standing. The circumstantiality in Pamela's various lists of various pieces of apparel is entirely appropriate to her self-consciousness about her social position (as well as to her femininity). As formal notice of her resolution not to proceed along the particular avenue of social advancement Mr. B. initially intends for her, she sews for herself a homely rural outfit,

> a "Dress that will become my conditi .," of "good sad - colour'd stuff" homespun by the local farmer's wife, Calico, flannel, and "some pretty good Scots Cloth." (89)

On the second function of clothes, McIntosh writes that

> the second major symbolic role which clothes play in *Pamela* is of course sexual. Mr. B., having honored Pamela with some of his mother's belongings in Letter VI, supplements them in Letter VII with fine stockings and "rich stays," and his point comes across: "I was quite astonished, and unable to speak for a while, but yet I was inwardly ashamed to take the stockens; for Mrs. Jervis was not there: If she had, it would have been nothing. I believe I received them very awkwardly; for he smil'd at my Awkwardness, and said, Don't blush, Pamela: Dost think I don't know pretty Maids wear shoes and stockens?" For what Mr. B. wishes to say here, Clothes are language enough to raise a blush. (91-92)

Developing McIntosh's argument, Professor Eva Maria Stadler's essay "Defining the Female Body Within Social Space: The Function of Clothes in Some Early Eighteenth-century Novels"(1988), has this to say:

> Over the centuries clothing has been a mark of the social and historical transformation. In every period, as the social historian Daniel Roche[1] has noted, "clothing is a good indication of the material culture of a society, for it introduces us immediately to consumer patterns and enables us to consider the social hierarchy of appearances" (1987:160). The place of women, especially their social,

---

[1]Daniel Roche, *The People of Paris-An Essay in Popular Culture in the 18th Century*, trans. Marie Evans and Gwynne Lewis. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1987. [Stadler's note]

> economic and sexual roles at any historical moment, is also revealed to a large degree through clothing. During a time like the eighteenth century, when social hierarchies began to shift, clothing is a sensitive indicator of social position (Braudel[2] 1981: 321-325). It is not surprising, then, that in the work of a number of "realist" novelists, from the early eighteenth century on, references to costume, particularly the clothing of women, have had an important function. Telling details of dress are central to issues of characterization, description and historical reference. However, clothing as it is depicted in literature--"written clothing" (Barthes[3] 1967:23 *et seq*)--does not only function to inform. By being actualized, by being *worn* by a character as well as presented through the voice of a narrator, clothing becomes not only a social institution (language) but also, on several levels, a particular speech act. Worn by female protagonists, clothes can be seen as elements that define, mediate and at times even protect a woman's gendered space. (468)

Given the various functions of clothes, it is clear that Mr. B. uses them to achieve certain objectives. Robert A. Erickson's essay "Mother Jewkes, Pamela, and the Midwives"(1976) discusses Mrs. Jewkes as a figurative midwife acting on Mr. B.'s behalf "to deliver Pamela of the secret body of letters which the girl sews to her underclothes, and eventually to deliver Pamela herself to Mr. B. for the purpose of sexual consummation"(500). Using Erickson's model, I want to suggest that, like Mrs. Jewkes, Mr. B. acts as a "midwife" in delivering Pamela into a class that is above hers. In giving Pamela clothes which are "too rich and too good for me, to be sure" (50), Mr.B. is

---

[2]Fernand Braudel, *The Structures of Everyday Life*, trans. Sian Reynolds. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.[Stadler's note]

[3]Roland Barthes, *Systeme de la mode.* Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1967.[Stadler's note]

preparing Pamela for her new station in life as Mrs. B., a station which has specific codes of dress. But Pamela will not be ready for that until Mr.B. goes through a process of reformation in which he will denounce his initial intentions towards her.

Secondly, and perhaps more important, Mr.B. uses clothes as a currency to buy Pamela. Clothes are in this case, as Stadler and McIntosh observe, a language, a particular speech act intended to seduce Pamela into becoming Mr.B.'s mistress. Stadler suggests that clothes here are indeed tools of seduction. She writes:

> In the following letter, her father is sensitive to the dangers of clothing as tools of seduction and cautions Pamela..."about his free Expression... about stockens..." Evidently, these gifts, like the gifts of clothing and linen made by Climal to Marianne, represent an encroachment upon the innocent young girl's space and a danger to the preservation of her integrity. (471)

Inasmuch as Mr.B. uses clothes as a language, so does Pamela, in her case, to frustrate his attempts. This is portrayed in Letter xxix just before her abduction when she is counting on a reunion with her parents. She sorts her clothes into three bundles: the first bundle contains what her Lady gave her, the legitimate gifts for her service; the second bundle consists of her young master's presents, which "were to be the price of my shame, and if I could make use of them, I should think I should never prosper with them" (111) The last bundle is " Poor Pamela's bundle, and a little one it is, to the others, the companion of my poverty, and the witness of my honesty" (110-11). The last parcel she hugs while the second she refers to as "thou second, wicked bundle!" (111). The second bundle, one containing Mr.B.'s gifts, is rejected by the heroine after realizing his intentions. She uses, therefore, Mr.B.'s own language (clothes) to reject his intentions while defending and asserting her innocence and integrity. Her third bundle becomes symbolic of her virtue, which she strongly defends against Mr. B.'s "incursions." Clothes thus assume yet another function, as Stadler writes:

> However, as we have also seen, clothing functions in these works not only as a referential marker, but also as a link between the female body and the world. An encroachment by society upon her space, clothing can also be a protective shell that a woman devises to assert and assure her position. (472-73)

Her rejection of Mr. B.'s clothes is not necessarily a rejection of him, and here I would like to consider yet another aspect of clothing. Clothing is an externality, an artificial veil which disguises the true appearance of a person, as indeed Mr. B.'s use of the maid's petticoats (240) hides his physical appearance so that he can gain access to Pamela's bed. Pamela's rejection is thus a rejection of Mr. B.'s public personality, which is inextricably linked to his gifts of clothing. He is, therefore, being challenged to present his inner personality; when that is exposed, Pamela will accept his presents without any problem. I want to suggest that, with his reformation, he exposes his inner personality, and it is this that facilitates their marriage.

While McIntosh and Stadler's argument that clothing is a tool in attempting to seduce Pamela is convincing, I suggest that they should have been also sensitive to the fact that Mr. B.'s gifts to Pamela might have been prompted by his underlying noble traits of kindness, generosity, and sympathy. I want to pursue the issue of gifts in full at this point. The circumstances of the opening page of the book take us to the dying scene of Lady B. who leaves Pamela with an uncertain future. As a mark of her generosity (I am aware of my reading of her recommendation as suggesting to her son to get a wife in Pamela), she requests her son to take care of the poor girl. Under such circumstances, the anxiety in Pamela about her future is obvious. Understanding her situation and also fulfilling his mother's request, Mr. B. extends his sympathy to Pamela and promises to take good care of her. As a true gesture of his commitment, he proceeds immediately to give her the job of taking care of his clothes, gives her mourning (costumes appropriate for mourning) like other servants, and gives her money that was in her lady's pockets. All these acts emanate

from a sensitive man, who nevertheless has some negative aspects, and this should be expected because no mortal is perfect. We notice later in the text that his upbringing had spoiled him, in that he grew up unaccustomed to control. Given that upbringing, I want to argue that Mr. B. might have not taken care of his mother's servants, but instead obtained a fresh retinue of servants somewhere. The gifts are a means to dismiss in Pamela's mind the possibility of being forsaken. Flint's suggestion that there exists a longtime attraction between Pamela and Mr. B. remains valid, and this implies that the gifts are intended to help consummate that attraction. But even so, Mr. B. continues to be kind to Pamela after their marriage to a degree which implies that he is inherently a good man whose earlier generosity was coloured by his rakish tendencies.

The relationship between Mr. B. and Pamela and his desire to seduce her are not merely a result of their class differences, but also of complex psychological factors which are tied to the idea of clothing. We have seen that Pamela is a special servant, Lady B.'s favourite, and later Mr. B's "friend" and "manager of his linen." By being Lady B.'s favorite servant, Pamela creates difficulties for the young Mr. B. The treatment she receives, Flint argues, equals that of a daughter, and she is therefore a sister to him.

Following Flint, I want to suggest that after his mother's death, Mr. B. has difficulties in relating to Pamela, (whether as her master or suitor). This is compounded by his personal attraction to her. Christopher Flint's suggestion that Mr.B. "sees Pamela as both victim and threat" (492) helps to illustrate his (Mr. B.'s) dilemma. I want to quote him extensively on this matter:

> He sees Pamela as both victim and threat. There are subtle indications in the text that Mr. B. not only lusts after Pamela but feels jeopardized by her easy assimilation into a domestic sphere he considers his own. One of the things that characterize Pamela, and triggered the desire and fear of many eighteenth-century readers, is her ability to transcend categories. In the novel's complex

> syntax of gender and class she becomes a transcendental signifier. Indeed, much of Pamela's power over Mr. B. (and other members of his class) derives from the ease with which she adapts to various family roles; his fear of her is in part generated by his concern that she will supplant him in the esteem of his own domestic relations. At several points he complains that she has exposed him and his family, upset the smooth running of the house, and influenced the other members of his "family" against him. (492-93)

Flint's observations are convincing. Pamela's transcendence of categories has given her insights into how people of class ought to behave, and this is one tool she constantly uses against Mr. B.--that the relationship between master and servant is one of duty from both and should not by any means extend to sexual contact. She points out to him that Lady B. did not invite his attempting an intimacy such as he sought in the summer-house and closet-incidents (92).

When money and clothes prove ineffective in breaking Pamela's obstinacy, Mr. B. attempts to persuade her, with very little success, into becoming his mistress. Persuasion as a tactic in the attempt to seduce Pamela is a mixture of promises and threats. He promises, for instance, to make a gentlewoman of Pamela if she obliges and does not stand in her own way (55). This and other promises he makes are just part of his bribery-scheme to entice Pamela to exchange her virtue for wealth, but she sees beyond the promises and rejects them. One can observe of these promises that Mr. B. manipulates Pamela's poor economic background by offering an alternative economic status. By rejecting such promises, Pamela symbolically rejects worldly pleasures and strives for the essential goodness which can only be found in God; hence her insistence that God will come to her rescue.

Mr. B.'s persuasion also includes the ability to convince his sister Lady Davers that Pamela should not wait on her. The reason, as Pamela reports, is that "her nephew might

be taken with me, and I might draw him in, or be drawn in by him" (53). The irony of it is that it is Mr. B. who is taken with Pamela, and his refusal to let her into his sister's service shows his jealousy and the fear that he might lose her forever; thus he must employ all the means he can to keep her for himself.

Frustrated by his failure to win Pamela by persuasion, Mr. B. resorts to threats which do not achieve anything except to make her more vigilant, suspecting, and more resistant. One major indication of his threats is the question, "Do you know whom you speak to?" (55), which is a constant reminder to Pamela, and the reader, of the class difference between the two, and a reminder, too, of Mr. B.'s upbringing which, makes him assume that he can never be opposed when he demands his will be done, and also an attempt to silence or even suppress any form of opposition which Pamela might be harbouring. Some of the threats include dismissal from service and rape-attempts. I will return to the class issue later in the chapter.

It is important to point out that even with all these threats, Mr. B. does not push Pamela beyond her feeble resistance because of one or all of the following reasons. First, he is essentially a good man with a conscience to guide his actions. Any deviation from good conduct points to the fact that human beings are a mixture of virtues and vices competing to guide our behaviour. Secondly, as an outcome of the preceding, we must understand Mr. B. as a man torn between his pride (as a result of his class) and his feelings for Pamela, which his class does not sanction, as he indeed confesses (251). His genuine feelings of love and his conflict are clear in the following statement: "He then took me in his arms, and presently pushed me from him. `Mrs. Jervis,' said he, `take the little witch from me; I can neither bear, nor forbear her.' (strange words these!) `But stay; you shan't go!--Yet begone!--No, come back again!" (90). These are words from a man torn between two worlds, equally swallowed in each such that it is difficult to define clearly to which he is attached. His ambivalence in sending Pamela away is obvious: first, he loves Pamela and literally cannot live without her (hence he requests her to return). Secondly,

Pamela represents Lady B and authority over him which he seems to require and resist at the same time. Thirdly, there is some physical resemblance between Pamela and her lady. Thus, the late Lady's clothes fit Pamela well: "He called me up to my late lady's closet, and pulling out her drawers, he gave me two suits of fine Flanders laced head-clothes, three pair of fine silk shoes, two hardly the worse, and just fit for me (for my lady had a very little foot)..." (50).

Flint comments that:

> the luxurious enumeration and fortuitous matching of sizes (Pamela can literally stand in Lady B.'s shoes) accentuate the close ties between the two women. In a premonition of the later moment in which Pamela, married to Mr. B., assumes the belongings of the dead mother, these rituals of gift-giving preserve the chain between mother and daughter/servant. Having received presents of clothing from the mother, Pamela appears in the guise of a daughter or sibling rival to Mr. B.; when she receives the clothing that the mother herself had worn, Pamela contrastingly appears to Mr. B. as a maternal substitute and hence class equal. (495)

The connection between Pamela and Lady B. is also illustrated in the following description of their physical shape. Mr.B. describes his mother as "...finely shaped, though in years, and very slender (51)." Pamela describes herself in the manner identical to that of Lady B. She writes to her parents: "...for you know I am very slender..."(207). Similarities between the two women are not only physical, but also spiritual. They are both kind. Lady B. shows her kindness when she takes Pamela into her service, while Pamela shows hers by taking into her household Mr. B.'s daughter with Sally Godfrey; after her elevation into the upper class, Pamela distributes money to her former fellow-servants. Lady B. and

Pamela, therefore, are advocates for a situation in which the privileged should use their power to help the underdogs. This lesson, which Pamela learns from her lady, is probably what she wants her to pass onto her son, and this is consistent with Flint's earlier suggestion of Pamela maintaining maternal influence on Mr. B.

Banishing Pamela from his house, Mr.B. will metaphorically be banishing his mother and therefore severing the maternal influence which Lady B. wants continued by Pamela. At the same time, Pamela's continued presence simply reminds him of his sexual attraction towards her, an attraction which borders on incest, but Mr. B. is attracted to Pamela because of those good qualities he sees in her. Perhaps one should ask whether if Lady B. acted as a kind of hindrance to Mr.B.'s amorous desires: is Pamela acting as Lady B.'s substitute thwarting those desires? On the whole, the similarities between Pamela and her lady compound to make stronger Pamela's frustration of his attempts.

When Mr. B. fails in his designs on Pamela, because of the Lady B. legacy, the support of the likes of Mrs. Jervis and other servants, and Pamela's resistance, he abducts her to Lincolnshire, a place that is not only far away from posthumous maternal control, but also inhabited by the likes of Colbrand and Mrs. Jewkes, all of whom act in concert with Mr. B. to violate Pamela. The place, according to Pamela's description, has an aura of mischief and magnificence:

> About eight at night we entered the court-yard of this handsome,
> large, old, lonely mansion, that looked to me then, with all
> its brown nodding horrors of lofty elms and pines about it,
> as if built for solitude and mischief. And here, said I to myself,
> I fear, is to be the scene of my ruin, unless God protect me, who
> is all sufficient. (146)

Indeed Lincolnshire is a place of mischief, seen as Mr. B.'s final assaults through bribery, persuasion, and threats on Pamela's virtue. The struggle that ensues between her and Mr. B. has echoes of Christian symbolism, particularly Jesus' temptations in the wilderness, and

the number of the days she spends in confinement show close ties to that story in the Bible (Luke 4:1-13). Her persecution, a persecution for what she believes is right, is comparable to the story of Job. Like Job's, Pamela's persecution is intended to put her off her faith, but like Job, she sticks to what she thinks is right. If her persecution is a testing of her faith and virtue, then, by the same analogy, Mr. B. is the devil's agent, one whose purpose is to seduce people from the path of goodness. But even so, Mr. B. is not entirely to be condemned. Given his amiable qualities, and given Richardson's intention to instruct, the characters are not polarized as either extremely vicious or virtuous. Of course, even though Richardson does not want to polarize his characters, there is nevertheless a sharp indictment of vice. However, temptation is not only external, in the form of Mr.B., Mrs. Jewkes, and their henchmen, but is also internal, in the form of a conflict within the heroine whether to continue resisting or to submit to all the external forces around her. This internal conflict is appropriately dramatized in the scene when she attempts to escape from Lincolnshire. After debating within herself, she resolves not to drown herself in the pool.

Realizing Pamela's determined resistance, Mr.B. devises means which he hopes will break her obstinacy. Mrs. Jewkes reports that: "My instructions are, not to let you be familiar with the servants" (163). Should this be allowed, Pamela will gain favors and support from other servants, as indeed was the case at Bedfordshire. Secondly, Mr.B. continues to intercept Pamela's correspondence to ensure that she does not communicate with anyone beyond the walls of Lincolnshire estate. As Flint argues, Mr.B.'s interest in Pamela's letters has sexual connotations. His threats to undress Pamela in order to recover the letters she sews in her under-clothing suggests the close ties between the letters and the female body which is Mr.B.'s ultimate desire:

> He (B.) intercepts the letters to her family, partly to uncover
> secret affirmations of the attraction he hopes she feels for him;
> partly to ensure that she does not take liberties with the private

> affairs of his family, and partly because he suspects that her letter writing nurtures her belief in an inviolable self inextricably linked to premarital chastity. (498)

The threat to undress her to get the letters is no different from an attempt to undress and possess her body. All the reasons suggested by Flint are valid and are tied to the idea of silencing women. In *Clarissa*, Lovelace not only kidnaps Clarissa, and intercepts her correspondence, but also drugs her to effect his designs.

Like Bedfordshire, Lincolnshire marks Mr.B.'s failure to seduce Pamela partly because of her continued resistance, and partly because of Mr. B.'s moral qualms. In his frustration, he sends Pamela off to her parents, only to recall her because, as he says "I find I cannot live without you" (286). Pamela succeeds in maintaining and protecting her virtue, and by so doing aids the reform of other characters like Mr. B., his sister Lady Davers, Mrs. Jewkes and the Swiss, Colbrand. Lincolnshire, to this extent, becomes a place of deliverance and reform, representing an important stage in the maturing process which begins in Bedfordshire and goes on at Lincolnshire, until Mr.B. and Pamela return to Bedfordshire, the starting point, as mature, friendly, and loving characters. Mr. B.'s journey from Bedfordshire to Lincolnshire and back to Bedfordshire is thus a symbolic journey from immature to mature adulthood, from rake to husband.

The final part of the novel in which Mr.B. requests Pamela to return, and they finally get married, is a tedious and boring catalogue of public appearances, praises, acts of goodness, and giving and receiving presents. For the reader who is not interested in Richardson's didacticism, which he proclaims in the Preface, Pamela's voluntary return to a man who attempted to rape her and the rest of the final part of the novel is a disappointment, and I feel it is in part the reason why some critics (Fielding and other anti-Pamelists) think Pamela is a calculating opportunist who uses her virtue to win a man's hand in marriage. This argument is plausible, especially when one considers that she in the end accepts the gifts of clothing she had rejected in the scene where she divides her

clothes into three bundles. Also evidence for her opportunism is her delay in finishing his waistcoat. But such an argument will be rejected if one considers Mr.B.'s initial reason for giving Pamela those presents, to buy her virtue. However, to the reader who finds Richardson's didacticism a strength, [illegible]al part of the novel is not only appropriate, but a necessity. My reservation about it is that there are too many acts of goodness, so emphasized that they are fit to be in a children's story book. The value of that part is, however, in its revelation of even more facts about Mr. B., particularly his upbringing and his previous love/sexual encounters, all of which I have used to reconstruct his past that is overshadowed by the narration of the story and which are very crucial in the creation of a rake.

It is useful to return to the question of social class because it pervades the whole novel (as is also argued by Koretsky, who notices that Richardson explores the relationship between classes through a sexual relationship). In almost every letter words such as "distance," or "poor," or "master," or "servant," "riches," or "degree" occur so frequently that I feel a statistical analysis, particularly of the word "poor," would show the extent to which Richardson meant to emphasize socio-economic differentiation. As already mentioned, Pamela and Mr.B. are both conscious of class. For Pamela, her insistence on the word "poor" and "distance" is evidence of her self-consciousness. Mr.B.'s question "Do you know whom you speak to?" (55; repeated on pages 62, 127 and 247) serves to remind Pamela that he belongs to the upper class.

The functions of class are numerous. First, it empowers or makes vulnerable a character, depending on whether they are of upper or lower class. Even with this, it is important to point out that social class as an institution is not necessarily bad, but can be manipulated by bad characters for sinister ends. As we notice in the text, it is Mr. B. and his sister who exploit social class for sinister ends, while their mother remains a good and humble character even with her high class-status. In *Pamela*, Mr.B.'s status empowers him to inflict terror on all people around him. Through his position as a Justice of the

Peace in his area, he sends characters like Williams to jail as he sees fit; further, he "imprisons" Pamela, dismisses Mrs. Jervis from his service, and above all, thinks he can seduce Pamela without any effective resistance from her. In fact, he is shocked that Pamela resists his attempts, and thus threatens to send her from his house if she does not succumb to his desires. Pamela's lower-class status makes her vulnerable to Mr.B.'s harassment, but her successful resistance makes her a much stronger character, who, despite her vulnerable situation, sustains a struggle against the powerful. He literally abuses his power. As John Richetti's recent article "The Public Sphere and the Eighteenth Century Novel: Social Criticism and Narrative Enactment"(1992), in words I have quoted in my first chapter (cf.p.54): "Part of Richardson's Pamela's problem is that her would-be-seducer is nothing less than one of the legal representatives of the law, the chief landowner and therefore the magistrate in his part of Lincolnshire where he besieges her virtue" (118). Mr.B. therefore attempts to use his status to intimidate Pamela into losing her virtue. In the introduction to the Penguin edition of *Pamela*, Margaret Anne Doody writes:

> Pamela is threatened by Mr. B., who uses and abuses
> his power as man, as an employer, and as a member
> of the governing class. He is the local J.P., so
> Pamela cannot turn to the law because her oppressor
> *is* the law. He subjects her to a form of imprisonment,
> and threatens rape. (9)

Social class also functions to suppress genuine human emotions. This is true for Pamela and Mr. B. He cannot openly express his feelings towards Pamela because his class values demand that he not marry below his station. Mr.B confesses:

> But, what can I do? Consider the pride of my condition.
> I cannot endure the thought of marriage, even with a person
> of equal or superior degree to myself; and have declined several

> proposals of that kind: how, then, with the distance between
> us, in the world's judgment, can I think of making *you* my wife?
> Yet I must have you; I cannot bear the thoughts of any other
> man's supplanting me in your affections. And the very apprehension
> of that has made me hate the name of Williams, and use him in a manner
> unworthy of my nature. (251)

The class to which one belongs imposes several restrictions which suppress the individual's freedom and stifle feelings. Should individuals go against the dictates of class, then they risk being ostracized by other members of the same class. Lady Davers threatens to renounce her brother because he would be stooping low in marrying Pamela. The threats are full of the arrogance that attends her class, particularly as represented by characters like her:

> ... As to marriage, I dare say you don't think of it. Your pride,
> surely, will set you above that. If it do not, you will be utterly
> inexcusable... This, though I think it must be a groundless
> surmise, excessively alarms me. Consider, brother, that ours is
> no upstart family. It is as ancient as the best in the kingdom:
> and, for several hundreds of years, it has never been known,
> that the heirs of it have disgraced themselves by unequal matches:
> and you know you have been sought to by some of the first families
> in the nation, for your alliance... Let me tell you, that I, and all mine,
> will renounce you for ever, if you can descend so meanly...(293)

In Lady Davers' case, class status is a justification for renouncing her brother and harassing Pamela. Her harassment of the heroine is a re-enactment of what Pamela suffers at the hands of Mr.B. before he reforms.

Throughout this chapter I have presented Mr. B. as the aggressor, the character who acts upon most of the characters, particularly those under his charge. This assertion

is valid, especially when we consider the position of advantage from which he acts. We observe that characters like Mrs. Jewkes and Colbrand for example, are made to act under his instruction in his attempt to deflower Pamela. However, it is erroneous to assume that he is the aggressor throughout the novel. We notice that Pamela, to a significant degree, acts upon Mr. B. Her introduction into the B. family marks the start of her influence on the entire household, and she later becomes in charge of it herself. Several instances in the novel show that Pamela's coming is an intrusion on Mr. B.'s domesticity, and Flint's remarks cited earlier in the chapter are valid (cf.p.79). Mr. B.'s statements that he was bewitched by Pamela (67), that Pamela is a witch (90), and that Pamela has set his family into a ferment (258) demonstrate the amount of influence she has; this influence will culminate in his reform.

Let us consider further the implications of "witchcraft" and "ferment." To bewitch someone entails spell-binding, fascination as by magical powers. This implies therefore that Mr. B. has irresistibly been charmed by Pamela. The attraction is made more complicated by their social stations implying that any move to pursue the attraction will jeopardize the relationship he has with his class and therefore the entire society. We need only to recall his sister's statements cited in this chapter. Fermenting also carries similar connotations. To ferment is to agitate or disorder, thus causing a change in the status quo. Pamela's presence does exactly this. As pointed out, she charms Mr.B. with her beauty and virtue, but her influence begins with his mother, who treats her as her favorite and even as a daughter, and extends to all characters who come into contact with her. Being the most liked character by everyone else in the novel, Pamela threatens Mr.B.'s power and control over his domestic world, and his attempts to make her his mistress are in the hope of making her inferior and so enabling him to gain control over his realm. The struggle between them ends with Mr.B.'s reformation, which requires not only the admission of one's guilt, a realization of how his upbringing was wrong, but also a

rejection of it and a readiness to make changes. His lengthy statement on the upbringing of people of his class is a testimony to this.

Reference to Pamela as a witch points to an important aspect of this novel and others dealing with seduction: that it is not only the male characters who are manipulative. Of course they are to a larger extent. I have shown that it is Mr. B. who tries to manipulate Pamela most of the time, but she also acts manipulatively. Two incidents are worth mentioning. In Lady B.'s dying scene, Pamela is the only character sobbing. I believe that while her sobbing suggests her emotionally troubled state, a case could be made that the sobbing is language enough to attract young Mr. B.'s attention. The second evidence of her manipulative behaviour is her delay in finishing her master's waistcoat even after resolving to return to her parents. While one can argue that she wanted to do a good job of it, one should equally not dismiss the possibility of a deliberate or an unconscious desire to delay. It is plausible to assume that she does not want to go away from Mr. B. In fact she euphemistically confesses that she had always loved him (472).

Mr. B. is not the only rake in the novel. There are others, and they can be divided in two categories. The first category consists of Sir Charles Hargrave's camp. This is an unruly camp of "abominable drinkers" who "have nothing to do but travel round the country, and beat up the quarters of their friends all the way; and 'tis all one to them, whether they stay a night, or a month, at a place" (377). This group is beyond reform, and its purpose in the novel is to act as a foil to emphasize Mr. B.'s redeemability. The second category consists of Mr. Arthur, Mr. Martin, Mr. Brooks, and Mr. Chambers. Our knowledge of their rakishness is only through Mr. B.'s description, particularly of Mr. Martin as one of his "rakish brothers"(491). If ever they were rakes, this group, like Mr. B., has reformed. Their praises of their friend on his nuptials suggest reformation, and they are happy that their friend has finally changed his views about matrimony. It is Mr. Arthur's group to which Mr. B.'s reform gains him admittance.

Mr.B.'s reformation, like the Lord of the Manor's in Hughes' story about Amanda, comes as a result of his reading of his victim's letters. In both situations, the letters are not voluntarily given to the seducers, but intercepted. The act of reading becomes a process of discovering and understanding oneself in relation to one's social environment. Pamela's letters, being a record of her daily experiences, act as a mirror in which Mr. B. sees his past. It is after reflecting on what Pamela records that Mr.B. comes to understand his situation and to learn from his mistakes.

Prior to his reformation, Mr. B.'s name (which is an abbreviation) points to his duplicity. Throughout the novel to just before their wedding, Mr. B. remains in the words of Kerry Larson, "Naming the Writer: Exposure, Authority, and Desire in *Pamela*"(1981), a nameless figure of authority who enjoys editorial power over Pamela's writings (127). His "namelessness" is inextricably connected to his fear of being exposed. It is possible to see it as a "code-name," under whose cover he can perform certain acts he will not want known to other people. Intercepting Pamela's letters occurs partly because he does not want to be exposed. Larson writes that for B, to be named is in effect to be "exposed"(128).

After his reform, in a letter to Pamela, he signs for the first time, W.B. (401). According to Peter Sabor's note in the Penguin edition W. B. stands for William Brandon; in *Pamela II* Pamela names her firstborn son William after his father (534). It would appear that with his reformation, Mr.B. "exposes" his full names. After this exposure, the use of B. no longer evokes the memories of a would-be seducer. I think the disclosure of his full name is the highest mark of his reformation, although the disclosure takes place in *Pamela II*.

Mr. B.'s reformation raises interesting implications. First, it is a positive move because it restores his initial noble personality, which was interrupted by his rakish behaviour. Secondly, it bridges the gap between people of the upper class and their servants by allowing for "vertical" social mobility. This is two-sided; Mr.B. allows a

descent in class terms to occur, but enjoys an ascent by allowing an influx of virtue into his family. Richardson seems to recommend this class alliance (where virtue corrects vice) as the effective basis for meaningful and enduring human relationships. But looked at differently, his reformation is an act of submission to Pamela's intrusion on his domestic realm, forcing him to settle for a power-sharing management of the domestic realm, if not a total surrender of it to her control. By so doing, Mr. B. accepts Pamela's role (as bequeathed to her by Lady B.) of continuing a maternal influence on him.

By way of concluding, I want to emphasize that Mr. B. is never entirely condemnable. He is a character in conflict, torn between inherent goodness and a penchant towards evil. He is a character whose conflict between pride and genuine feelings is made more profound by the existing social structures of his society. His education, as we saw does not adequately prepare him for some of the realities of his society, but his interaction with Pamela makes him realize the emptiness of his upbringing. The ability to change makes him an amiable character, and as we see, his love for Pamela is that which educates him.

In this chapter, therefore, I examined the character of Mr. B. and tried to show how he tries, unsuccessfully, to seduce Pamela. To do so, it was necessary to reconstruct his personality from his childhood before the coming of Pamela into his family and to show how his upbringing is responsible for the rakish behaviour we see in the novel. This reconstruction is intended to show that he is a prominent character, but one whose prominence is shadowy because of the point of view from which the story is narrated. I also showed the tactics which he uses in trying to seduce Pamela. All the tactics are frustrated until he reforms into a doting husband. The failure is not exclusively due to Pamela's strong resistance, but also to Mr. B.'s conscience which constantly interferes with his schemes and his paying attention to it. Richardson invites us to see his seducer in a favourable light by showing us that his behaviour towards Pamela is partly due to the conflict within him and that this conflict has its source in the class to which he belongs. In

Mr. B., therefore, Richardson presents a seducer in his early stages of development. The mature, more eloquent, and more manipulative seducer is what we see in Robert Lovelace, who is the subject of the next chapter.

Works Cited

Castle, Terry J. "P/B: Pamela as Sexual Fiction." *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 22(1982): 469-89.

Cowler, Rosemary, ed. *Twentieth Century Interpretations of "Pamela": A Collection of Critical Essays*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Erickson, Robert A. "Mother Jewkes, Pamela, and the Midwives." *English Literary History*, 43(1976): 500-16.

Flint, Christopher. "The Anxiety of Affluence: Family and Class (Dis)order in *Pamela: or, Virtue Rewarded.*" *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 29(1989): 489-514.

Koretsky, Allen C. "Poverty, Wealth, and Virtue: Richardson's Social Outlook in *Pamela.*" *English Studies in Canada*, 9(1983): 36-56.

Larson, Kerry. "Naming the Writer:" Exposure, Authority, and Desire in *Pamela.*" *Criticism: A Quarterly for Literature and the Arts*, 23(1981): 126-40.

McIntosh, Carey. "Pamela's Clothes." *Twentieth Century Interpretations of "Pamela": A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Rosemary Cowler. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1969. 89-96.

Needham, Gwendolyn B. "Richardson's Characterization of Mr. B. and the Double Purpose in *Pamela.*" *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 3(1970): 433-74.

Richardson, Samuel. *Pamela*. Ed. Peter Sabor. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.(*Unless stated otherwise, all references are to this edition.*)

---*Pamela* Eds. T. C. Duncan Eaves & Ben D. Kimpel. Boston: Houghton, 1971.

Richetti, John. "The Public Sphere and the Eighteenth-Century Novel: Social Criticism and Narrative Enactment." *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 16(Nov. 1992): 114-29.

Stadler, Maria Eva. "Defining the Female Body Within Social Space: The Function of Clothes in Some Early Eighteenth-Century Novels." Roger Bauer, Douwe Fokkema & Michael de Graat, eds. *Space and Boundaries in Literature: Proceedings of the 12th Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association*, 3(1988): 468-73.

Mr. Robert Lovelace.

> Arabella Harlowe: So handsome a man! (42)
>
> Clarissa Harlowe: But Mr. Lovelace is not a man to be easily brought to give up his purpose, in a point especially wherein he pretends his heart is so much engaged. (51)
>
> Robert Lovelace: ... 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. (143)
>
> Robert Lovelace: By my soul, I am half ashamed of myself; I, who am perjured too, by priority of obligation, if I am faithful to any woman in the world. (146)
>
> Robert Lovelace: What must that virtue be which will not stand trial? (430)
>
> Robert Lovelace: Then there are so many stimulatives to such a spirit as mine in this affair, besides love: such a field for stratagem and contrivance, which thou knowest to be the delight of my heart. ... What a triumph! - what a triumph over the whole sex! (147)
>
> Robert Lovelace: ... I am afraid of the gang of my cursed contrivances... So, now Belford, as thou hast said, I am a machine at last, and no free agent. (848)

Similarities between *Pamela* and *Clarissa* are obvious in plot, character, themes, and technique (that is, the epistolary style). *Pamela*, as has been mentioned, is best described as a novel of transformation. It is a story in which the "villain" is converted from a would-be a seducer to a loving and respecting husband because Richardson did not polarize his characters. The novel has a comic ending, one in which Mrs. Jewkes, Mr. B., and Colbrand are all transformed into good human beings despite their initial inclinations towards evil and wrong doings. In *Clarissa*, we face a different situation. The novel, as critics like William Park have argued, is a tragedy, not a comedy. There is no marriage between the villain and the heroine, at the end to make it a comedy. It is possible to

argue, however, that it is a divine comedy as Carroll states, in that the good are rewarded and the bad punished (25).

Clarissa is a story about a struggle for possession, control, and ownership. Involved in this tug-of-war over control is the Harlowe family, with their selfish economic motives, and their arch-rival, Robert Lovelace, to whom this chapter is devoted. The subject or target of this struggle is the Harlowe's youngest daughter, Clarissa, who can best be described as a paragon of human beauty and virtue. Simply, the Harlowe family wants Clarissa to marry Roger Solmes so that the family's economic status can be raised. Clarissa rejects this match, and her rejection is interpreted by the family as a result of her prepossession in favour of Robert Lovelace, with whom she has held a long standing and secret correspondence. Mr. Lovelace's acquaintance with the Harlowe family has a long history, he having been introduced to the family by Clarissa's uncle, Antony Harlowe. With this introduction, the Harlowe family encouraged his suit to Arabella, Clarissa's sister, because they expected from it a peerage, but the suit did not last long. Lovelace switched his suit to Clarissa, and this brought back to life the college-begun animosity between Clarissa's brother, James, and Lovelace. James and Arabella thus joined forces against their sister to make her the family's "unfavourite" child. This persecution from her family, coupled with the proposed match with Solmes, became what Lovelace exploited to dislodge Clarissa from her father's house under the pretext of offering her the freedom which her family denies her. Lovelace succeeds in running away with Clarissa to London, where, instead of protecting her, he ultimately drugs and rapes her. Dispirited by her rape, Clarissa dies, and her cousin Colonel Morden avenges her life in a duel in which Lovelace is mortally wounded. Thus, the novel that began with a duel, involving James Harlowe, Jr., and Lovelace, ends in a duel in which Morden kills Lovelace. In this chapter, I examine Richardson's complex seducer, highlighting some of his character-traits, thoughts about women, and how he attempts to seduce Clarissa.

While it is possible to argue that, like Mr. B., Lovelace is a mixed character, it is equally essential to point out that there are great differences, and although similarities may be many, they are superficial. Both characters have been at some point in their lives involved in a duel, once for Mr. B. and twice for Lovelace. Lovelace's first duel earned him the enmity of James Harlowe, Jr., while at the same time it drew him closer to Clarissa. The secret correspondence between Clarissa and Lovelace serves as evidence. Like Lovelace, Mr. B.'s duel earned him enmity, not from the deceased's brother, but from his friends, and this forced him to leave Italy earlier than he had wanted. Unlike Mr. B., Lovelace's second duel ends his association with Clarissa, when he is mortally wounded and later dies. Unlike Lovelace, Mr. B. lives to win Pamela, the subject of his pursuit, into a happy marriage. Clarissa's cousin, Morden, avenges her suffering at the hands of Lovelace. Terry Castle, (1982) argues that "strictly speaking, Morden's revenge is not so much on behalf of Clarissa, but on behalf of the Harlowe males, whose property rights Lovelace has violated by stealing her" (183).

Like Mr. B, Lovelace is an educated man, at least by the standards of his time. He has been to university; his career there Clarissa summarizes to her friend Anna in the following manner:

> Mr. Lovelace was always noted for his vivacity and courage;
> and no less, it seems, for the swift and surprising progress
> he made in all parts of literature; for diligence in his studies,
> in the hours of study, he had hardly his equal. This, it seems,
> was his general character at the university, and it gained him
> many friends among the more learned youth; while those who
> did not love him feared him... (49)

His accomplishments in literature are demonstrated in the novel by his numerous quotations from literary works, and his knowledge of literature not only shows his

interests, but also their influences on his behaviour. For example, he perceives himself as some of the heroes he has read about.

His achievements earn him not only friends and admirers, but also enemies. Among those who do not like him is James, Clarissa's brother. Lovelace's achievements, together with the duel in which he wounded James, made James a nonentity whose manhood is diminished by comparison with Lovelace's. When Lovelace switches his suit from Arabella to Clarissa, the long-standing hatred between the two is simply revived.

Not only is Lovelace an educated man, but he is wealthy as well. With an annual income of £2000, estates, and more property still coming from his uncle and aunts, Lovelace is, to use a Shakespearean term, "sufficient." Like Mr. B., he is a good landlord. From Aunt Hervey's informant, Clarissa gathers the following about the type of landlord Lovelace is:

> That he was a generous landlord; that he spared nothing for solid and lasting improvement upon his estate; and that he looked into his own affairs and understood them; that he had, when abroad, been very expensive, and contracted a large debt (for he made no secret of his affairs); yet chose to limit himself to an annual sum and to decline equipage in order to avoid being obliged to his uncle and aunts, from whom he might have what money he pleased... However, that his estate was never mortgaged, as my brother had heard it was; his credit was always high; and, he believed, he was by this time near upon, if not quite, clear of the world. (50)

Above all, Lovelace is a young, handsome man who is full of life, is energetic, vibrant and eloquent. A day after Lovelace's introduction to the Harlowe family, Arabella Harlowe calls him "handsome" and "charming" (42). Clarissa, quoting her sister's observations, reports that: "He was but *too* handsome a man for *her*!--Were she but as amiable as

somebody, there would be a probability of holding his affections!... But he was young; a man of sense..." (42). On the surface, therefore, Lovelace presents an attractive personality whom no unattached woman can choose to ignore. His beauty, age, and success act as a powerful force in attracting Arabella and Clarissa.

His management-skills and generosity to his tenants are some of the qualities which Clarissa espouses. She is a good manager herself, an accomplished keeper of accounts whose time is well-proportioned for the whole day's work. Like Lovelace, she too likes independence in all its manifestations. Her rejection of Solmes is partly because he is imposed on her, but also because he threatens the independence she values. Lovelace's generosity to his tenants is in concert with Clarissa's feelings for charity. We need only to remember her fund for the poor, which she sets up in order to show her feelings for the under-privileged. Lovelace and Clarissa therefore possess certain common character traits which implicitly or explicitly facilitate their mutual attraction. I will return to this later in the chapter to corroborate John Carroll's observation that Clarissa and Lovelace are necessary complements (14).

With all these amiable qualities, why do Clarissa and everybody in her world detest Lovelace?, why does he not marry Clarissa if indeed they have much in common? To answer these and many more questions, we need to undertake an in-depth character assessment of Lovelace. To begin with, he is a complex character whose personality cannot be fully explained by the virtues I have catalogued above. First mention of his name is in the initial letter, Anna's letter to Clarissa, which recounts the duel between him and James, and the treatment he received at the hands of the Harlowe family, which will become the basis for Lovelace's desire to wreak vengeance on the Harlowe family.

Despite Lovelace's early introduction in the novel, we meet the man in his own voice only after thirty letters, a period spanning two months. There are good reasons for this. In the main, this method of narration is intended to create suspense. What happens between January 10 when the novel begins and March 13 when we first meet Lovelace in

his own voice is intended to raise the reader's anxiety about this much-talked about man. Between the two periods, we get snippets of his character from our two main female correspondents, Clarissa and Anna Howe. As readers, we await anxiously to approve or disapprove Anna and Clarissa's observations on Lovelace. On the secondary level, without ennobling Lovelace, this method of narration is intended, I think, to show the important place Lovelace will occupy in the novel. It is no doubt a position of prominence which I think conforms to his main purpose, to dominate. In his essay "Two Dramatists: Lovelace and Richardson in *Clarissa*" (1973), William J. Palmer poses the question "Who is the playwright?":

> A close reading of *Clarissa* provides a surprising answer to this question. For Richardson is not the dramatist in control here. Throughout most of the novel the central character, Lovelace, is the dominant dramatic presence: he controls the speech and actions of the characters and stages the scenes. But Lovelace does not merely collaborate with Richardson in *Clarissa*, he dominates him. Lovelace publicly acknowledges the desire for dramatic control over other people, the desire for self-dramatization, and the obsessive need to be acclaimed as an artist. (7)

Certainly Lovelace is the dominant character through most of the novel, but Clarissa seems to dominate after the rape. However, much as I agree with Palmer's argument, I differ with him on the point of Lovelace dominating Richardson. In the "reality" of the events of the novel, Lovelace is undoubtedly the controlling personality. When we move a step back out of the world created in the novel, Lovelace must be seen as Richardson's creation. The puppet moves as the puppet master wishes.

Palmer's and Lindley's theses of Lovelace's perception of himself as a playwright, an author of comedies and therefore a writer just like Shakespeare, Dryden, or Rowe

whom he quotes, suggest his dominance. He writes to Belford that he is writing a comedy whose title is *The Quarrelsome Lovers* (571). As a dramatist, Lovelace, takes his relationships with other rakes, the Harlowe family and Clarissa as subjects for the drama he is weaving. His literary acumen is multi-dimensional. At one point he is not only an author, but a director of the play he has written. One of the most prominent scenes in which we see his directing behaviour is during the Captain Tomlinson interview with Clarissa. He creates signals which Tomlinson has to follow. His signals, as is true of his authorship in general, are intended to deceive Clarissa. The scene is as follows:

> He took his chair over against her. I stood behind her, that I might give him *agreed-upon signals*, should there be occasion for them. As thus - A wink of the left eye was to signify, *Push that point, Captain.* A wink of the right, and nod, was to indicate approbation of what he had said. My forefinger held up, and biting my lip, *Get off of that as fast as possible*. A right forward nod, and a frown - *Swear to it, captain.* My whole spread hand, *To take care not to say too much on that particular subject.*
>
> (832)

As dramatist he is aware that meaning can be spoken or enacted. Language is both verbal and non-verbal, and in a situation like the one above, non-verbal language is essential in conveying meaning.

Lovelace's authorship, together with his knowledge of literature and elaborate quotation from literary works, raises some interesting issues in literary criticism. First, as an author he shows familiarity with other authors by acknowledging their existence and even inviting them into his own writings. Arising from the above, there is a suggestion that these (Dryden, Shakespeare, or Rowe) are well-known authors, making them the standards by which new literary writings are judged and evaluated. To quote these authors suggests the similarities between Lovelace's writings and what the already cited

authors have written. These similarities point to the fact that literature is derived from literature, and thus Lovelace has not wandered away from tradition. This analogy shows the close ties between Richardson and his creation (Lovelace). I pointed earlier to some of the works which might have influenced Richardson when he wrote his novels. Further, Lovelace's quotation of the works with which his society is familiar to support his actions raises questions of what use literature is. One senses that these works are held as sources of some of society's ideals, and quoting them implies that one is using standards sanctioned by society to justify one's actions, although in Lovelace's case there is also his wit to consider. By quoting some of these works, Lovelace is deliberately challenging some of his society's assumptions and also implying that to blame him for his actions will mean ignoring the social environment from which he is acting. For example, on the frailty of women, Lovelace quotes Ariosto's book with which his society was familiar, and I think this is a way of telling society that he is merely making use of a book that society has allowed in its midst, despite that book's derogatory depiction of women. In yet another interesting example, Lovelace uses the story of Dido and Aeneas to illustrate humanity's double standards. He argues, convincingly, that if after betraying Dido, Aeneas is referred to as "pius Aeneas," then he too must be called "pius Lovelace" after raping Clarissa. I think these examples are meant to force society to evaluate itself critically.

Lovelace's letters are full of drama/action, in which he and Clarissa or Belford are the main characters. One essential aspect of that drama is the presence of more than one character. There is a dialogue in the letters, question and answer in which Lovelace although writing the letter alone, anticipates Belford's questions, comments, reactions and responds to them. Let's consider the following situation:

> ... But why repeat I what I have said before? - Turn back, thou egregious arguer, turn back to my long letter of the 13th; and thou wilt there find every syllable of what thou hast written either answered or invalidated.

But I am not angry with thee, Jack. I love opposition. (519)

As dramatist too, Lovelace is conscious of the technicalities of the art. He uses language in a manner that is characteristic of literary authors. He is conscious of style - use of rhetoric, imagery, personification, dividing his letters into acts and scenes. He perceives his schemes and contrivances in animate terms, as in the following: "Wilt thou believe me, when I tell thee that I have so many contrivances rising up and crowding upon me for preference,... that I hardly know which to choose?" (672). In another incident he describes a scheme in the following words: "... and I have a scheme rumbling in my head that wants but half an hour's musing to bring into form..." (634)

Drama, and literature in general, requires that there be an audience, in which case it becomes a public thing. Lovelace, as the author, ought to have an audience which will judge his creation, and he has an audience in the form of readers, his friends, the Harlowes, and the Howes. Clarissa, as part of the drama, is subject to public talk, and this Anna reports on the first page of the novel. Not only that, Clarissa dies in public, a kind of ritual ceremony in which people receive curses or blessings. Lovelace's rape of Clarissa too is a public incident, [in fact Flynn observes in Richardson's novels that "all rapes would seem to be communal affairs" (107)], done in the presence of women at Sinclair's house who persuade and encourage him to rape her by challenging his manhood. Fearful of having his manhood questioned, Lovelace carries out the rape only to regret it later. The rape is intended to change Clarissa's public image as a virtuous girl while at the same time it elevating Lovelace's image as the most witty plotter, the only one to subdue what no other man would attempt.

When we meet him for the first time, Lovelace is no conventionally generous landlord, rich, educated and handsome: he, in John Carroll's words "emerges not only as a highly complex but an extraordinarily magnetic character"(14). His first letter reveals a number of crucial points which we do not find in *Pamela*. Firstly, unlike Mr. B., Lovelace is an accomplished letter writer. We depend not only on Anna, Clarissa, James, Arabella,

and Belford to understand Lovelace's character, but also on Lovelace himself. His letters are pregnant with meaning, direct revelations of his purposes and indirect disclosures of the inner workings of his psyche. I want to consider his first letter at length to illustrate the preceding claims.

In his first letter, he takes us back to what Anna reports on the first page of the novel, by confirming his hatred towards the Harlowe family, reporting his introduction to Harlowe Place and his suit to Arabella and then later to "my charmer" Clarissa. He confirms, too, the virtuous qualities of Clarissa, to whom the word "angel" is applied insistently, and his enmity with James Harlowe is revisited. Mention is also made of the proposed match between Clarissa and Roger Solmes and how Clarissa is persecuted by her family because she opposes the match. Mention of these issues by Lovelace is not only a result of the repetitions which might be expected to occur in a situation where there are more than one correspondent, but also because Lovelace, as the dominant character, playwright in Palmer's sense, sets his own stage for his performance. Indeed, Richardson makes the Lovelace letters repetitious to emphasize how his character demands dramatic control. The rest are passive participants or part of his audience.

Lovelace's letters take us into the recesses of his imagination in which we witness the development of his strategies. But before we are treated to a catalogue of contrivances, he explicitly outlines his motivation(s): "I have boasted that I was once in love before: and indeed I thought I was. 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" (143). No doubt that Lovelace is an organized man. He has a sense of purpose; and whether it is justified or not is another matter. His purpose or motivation reveals an even more crucial aspect of his character. He is a rake, libertine, cad, or villain.

This terminology will be used interchangeably in this chapter. Stanley Cardon (1942) describes a rake or libertine as:

a man of society whose aim in his life is the gratification

> of sensual pleasures. Being essentially selfish, he thinks only of himself... Haughty by nature, there is one thing on which the rake particularly prides himself--his method of obtaining a new mistress. Women to him are game to be stalked and hunted like wild animals. Like the proverbial fisherman, the rake loves to boast of his fine "catch" (46).

In an essay which delineates the qualities of a rake or cad, Hopkinson confirms Cardon's description. He argues that of all the traits of a rake, his distinguishing characteristic is his attitude towards women. To quote Hopkinson, "The Cad is a man who looks on women as man's natural prey... The Cad regards women as game, the only game, worth his trouble of pursuit" (81). Lovelace is thus a cad or libertine because the idea of the hunt and warfare informs his view of the relationship between men and women. To illustrate this, let us consider the following: "... we begin with birds as boys, and as men go on to ladies; and both perhaps, in turns, experience our sportive cruelty" (557).

Lovelace sees himself as a hunter whose main aim is not the kill, but the process of hunting. During the process, the hunter tries all his skills and it is from this that he derives pleasure and satisfaction. Lovelace gives Belford examples:

> Does not the keen foxhunter endanger his neck and his bones in pursuit of a vermin which, when killed, is neither fit food for men nor dogs?
>
> Do not the hunters of the nobler game value the venison less than the sport? (557-58)

> More truly delightful to me the seduction progress than the crowning act--for that's a vapour, a bubble! (616)

As hunter, he holds certain assumptions about his game. As rake, Lovelace believes that women are indeed vulnerable and will always succumb to the power of men.

Instead of merely stating his perception of women as frail, Lovelace, an accomplished student of literature, quotes from books, plays and poems by literary giants to substantiate his point. On the frailty of the sex, he has this to say:

> Rinaldo, indeed, in Ariosto, put the Mantuan Knight's cup of trial from him, which was to be the proof of his wife's chastity--This was his argument for forbearing the experiment: `Why should I seek a thing I should be loath to find? My wife is a woman: the sex is frail... (430)

He continues that

> For what woman can be said to be virtuous till she has been tried?
>
> Nor is one effort, one trial, to be sufficient. Why? Because a woman's heart may be at one time *adamant*, at another *wax*-- as I have often experienced. And so, no doubt, hast thou. (430)

Indeed Lovelace's beliefs are backed by experience with ladies such as Miss Betterton, his Rosebud, and the French lady. His knowledge of the sex enables him to anticipate their behaviour in varying situations. This anticipation is best illustrated in his contriving to dislodge Clarissa from her father's place. He explicitly spells out what is to be done in his letter to Joseph Leman, a servant at Harlowe place. He instructs Joseph to

> contrive to be in the garden in disguise, if possible, and unseen by your young lady. If you find the garden door unbolted, you'll know that she and I are together... If you hear voices parleying, keep at the door, till I cry Hem, hem twice: but be watchful for this signal, for I must not hem very loud, lest she should take it for a signal... (383)

After all this, he concludes: "But so frighted, there is no question but she will fly" (384).

To assume that Lovelace's motivation is revenge only because of the "quality-jilt" will mean ignoring another very important aspect of his character, the apparent contradictions in him. These contradictions, equivocations between good and evil, are partly due to the fact that he has a conscience. The problem is that he is so preoccupied with his plottings that he turns a deaf ear to his moral scruples. He states at one point that there are actually three passions which motivate him. In his words: "I have three passions that sway me by turns; all imperial ones. Love, revenge, ambition, or a desire of conquest" (719). That he is swayed by these passions is evidence of the internal conflict or struggle that is part of his personality. It is interesting to consider briefly each passion and how each has its genesis in his association with Clarissa. He loves Clarissa. This is evidenced by his use of terms of endearment when referring to her. He calls her his angel and charmer insistently in the novel. But he chides love because it is his master: "Thus, Jack, as thou desirest, have I written: written upon something; upon nothing; upon revenge, which I love; upon love, which I hate, heartily hate, because 'tis my master..."(148).

To allow himself the feeling of love is to go against his desire for revenge. Love is indeed his master because it will stop him from continuing with his plotting. In short, if he allows love to rule over him, he will be forced to abandon his attempts on Clarissa and therefore put an end to his views of man-woman relationship as war, hunt, and game. Revenge as another passion, is in contradiction to his genuine feelings of love for Clarissa. To pursue it will be to deny his love, which I think is as powerful as revenge itself. Ambition, or desire for conquest, is part of his schemes. Clarissa as a model of perfection has not been any man's, and if Lovelace succeeds in his designs on her, then he would have added to his list of subdued women. Not only that, winning the model of perfection means he is an accomplished seducer who will have proved his theories about women and succeeded in his revenge against the whole sex.

Lovelace's use of the term 'love' raises some problems. He claims that he loves Clarissa, and I have cited the terms of endearment he uses as part of the evidence. But the sincerity of such terms is doubtful because as a rake, according to Hopkinson, Lovelace does not love women but considers them as prey to be hunted for his pleasure. The love that Lovelace claims for Clarissa is merely the hunter's love for his prey, a love that cannot effectively sway the hunter from killing his prey. Compounding the problem is the "quality-jilt" which Lovelace suffered and has vowed to avenge. Clarissa, like the woman who jilted Lovelace, has name, making Lovelace's love for her (Clarissa) problematic. One can conclude that he loves her in so far as she is a means by which he will avenge for the "quality-jilt". But looked at differently, the "quality-jilt" is evidence that Lovelace was sincerely in love and is capable of loving, and one can conclude therefore that he sincerely loves Clarissa. He is, however, cautious not to blindly love as he did before, because women, particularly of quality, are not to be trusted. This is probably what interrupts his genuine feelings of love for Clarissa.

It is important at this time to consider in more detail why Clarissa is the "right" object for Lovelace's plottings. She is no ordinary person in the Harlowe family. In the first letter of the novel, Anna says this about Clarissa:

> I know how it must hurt you to become the subject of
> the public talk; and yet upon an occasion so generally
> known it is impossible but that whatever relates to a young
> lady, whose distinguished merits have made her the public
> care, should engage everybody's attention. (39)

Clarissa, like Lovelace, is a distinguished person of merit. She has property given to her by her late grandfather, and her two uncles, John and Antony Harlowe, have made her their heiress. She is virtuous, dutiful, and loved by everyone. In fact she is the Harlowes' favorite. Her late grandfather writes the following about her:

> ... For all these reasons; and because my dearest and beloved

> grand-daughter Clarissa Harlowe has been from infancy a matchless young creature in her duty to me, and admired by all who knew her as a very extraordinary child: I must therefore take the pleasure of considering her as my own peculiar child... (53)

Her brother James complains to Arabella that she has "out-grandfathered" them and wants to "out-uncle" them too. Belford's description of her culminates in her being all "mind" (555). Her seducer, too, acknowledges Clarissa's greatness of soul and character. He reports that "I love her more than ever... Oh Belford, she is all perfection..."(727). Why then does Lovelace attempt the paragon of human beauty, virtue, and duty? The answer is not simple. With all her virtues, Clarissa is different from all other women. He acknowledges that: "Thou knowest that I have more than once, twice or thrice been tempted to make this trial upon young ladies of name and character: but never yet found one of them to hold me out for a month..." (429).

As already pointed out, Clarissa is a woman of name, and with her accomplishments and attributes, Clarissa, in Lovelace's view, is the ideal woman. He at one point calls her a "divine lady" (429). Being a "divine lady", she is vulnerable to Lovelace's attempts, because it is through the trials that her divinity will be known. He says:

> What must that virtue be which will not stand a trial?...
> Well then, a trial seems necessary for the further establishment of the honour of so excellent a creature...
> For what woman can be said to be virtuous till she has been tried?. (430)

Clarissa being a representative of the whole sex, his triumph over her will thus be a success over the whole sex. He would have revenge for the "quality-jilt" and the Harlowe treatment: "Such triumph over the whole sex, if I can subdue this lady! -My maiden vow as I may call it! - For did not the sex begin with me? and does this lady spare me?" (413).

While he is an accomplished plotter, he is favoured by circumstances at the same time: the Harlowe's persecution of Clarissa. Lovelace is aware of the role played by chance in his activities and acknowledges it as his friend:

> ... But I will not anticipate - besides, it looks as if I
> were afraid of leaving anything to my old friend CHANCE;
> which has many a time been an excellent second to me; and
> ought not to be affronted or despised; especially by one who
> has the art of making unpromising incidents turn out in
> his favour. (473)

Two important points are clear from his statement: first, he is a friend to chance (in this case meaning destiny), and that they have a good working relation. It is implied, therefore, that his actions are supported by destiny and that he is fulfilling a predestined cause. Secondly, as is the case with all his relationships, Lovelace's treatment of chance as "an excellent second" to him emphasizes his desire of being superior. One can suggest that he places himself in a position of an immortal who is above fate.

Clarissa's elopement with Lovelace marks his first success, a culmination of all the encroachments into Harlowe Place. As we saw in his letter to Joseph Leman, the elopement is contrived. He turns Leman against his masters and plants him to facilitate Clarissa's elopement. As usual, Lovelace boasts on this initial success: "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 down upon everybody now!" (403).

Part of Lovelace's success lies in the fact that, unlike the Harlowes, he seems to allow Clarissa freedom, an opportunity to express her desires and aspirations. Terry Castle's view on this matter is worth quoting at length.

> In the beginning Clarissa is drawn to Lovelace because he lets
> her speak. He offers her a correspondence, and out of her great
> and desperate desire - for discourse itself - she falls into it with

him. For his part, the strategy is one of slow entrapment. He plays precisely, masterfully, on her desire for language, on her tremendous will toward signification... When Clarissa agrees to meet secretly with Lovelace in the garden, he chooses the most seductive and ingenious of tactics: he allows her to interrupt *him*. In their first encounter, when he jumps out from behind the woodhouse, he tries to pledge his love, and Clarissa replies with "And pray, sir, let me interrupt you in my turn." (1 259)[4]. He does. In the final garden meeting, which leads to abduction, the two talk wildly to each other - but Lovelace still allows her significant moments of expansion: she breaks in upon him ("interrupted I") at several important places in the conversation. At such moments, Lovelace becomes passive, attentive, sycophantic. Clarissa is taken by surprise - and powerfully attracted - by such apparent speechlessness. In the time between the first and last meeting, Lovelace makes himself even more attractive by contracting - or telling Clarissa he has contracted - the perfect symbolic illness: he becomes "hoarse" after sitting all night by the Harlowes' garden wall, and "has no voice" for several days after. (81-82)

As Castle argues, Clarissa gets duped by Lovelace's apparent "silence" because she believes that people and reality never change; that is, she fails to interpret critically the situation in which she finds herself. [Bruce Stovel's essay, "Clarissa's Ignorance" (1992), explores further Clarissa's failure to critically interpret situations]. For example, she fails to decipher who is really behind the angry voice (in the garden at the time of the elopement), and she never suspects that the voice could be falsely orchestrated. She only

[4]*Clarissa.* 8 vols. Shakespeare Head Press.(Oxford: 1943).[Castle's note]

discovers later (after the elopement) that reality can be re-arranged to suit certain goals. Once Lovelace has Clarissa under his power, he is no different from the Harlowes. Like them, he imprisons Clarissa, subjects her to torture and constant surveillance, and interrupts and transcribes her letters, acts which are literally and symbolically a way of silencing.

Lovelace is good at manipulating and mutilating reality. One major way of re-arranging reality is through disguise, by clothing and names. He boasts:

> Ovid was not a greater master of metamorphoses than thy friend. To the mistress of the house I instantly changed her into a sister, brought off by surprise from a near relation's (where she had wintered), to prevent her marrying a confounded rake (I love always to go as near the truth as I can), whom her father and mother, her elder sister and all her loving uncles, aunts, and cousins abhorred... (412)

Some interesting things surface from Lovelace's statement. Firstly, he does not fabricate extravagantly. He slightly twists what is the truth in order to lend himself credibility. Secondly, his perception of himself as `changing' Clarissa seems to suggest that he perceives himself as a super-being, a God, who can re-model human nature depending on circumstances. Thirdly, his ability to change human beings anticipates what happens towards the end of the novel. Clarissa, after the rape, symbolically metamorphoses into a martyr, one whose dying and changing have several Christian theological implications. Considering this dimension, Lovelace's change is a temporal one, one in which he is merely a devil's agent whose actions are a foil intended to emphasize the goodness and piety of Clarissa. Clothes in *Clarissa*, as in *Pamela*, play a significant role as tools of seduction. In *Pamela* they are mainly used to bribe the unsuspecting Pamela, in *Clarissa*, they are a veil which Lovelace uses to hide his identity so that he can have access into Clarissa's room. We see this when Lovelace disguises himself as a gouty old

man who is looking for an apartment for himself and his wife. With this trick, he convinces the landlady Mrs. Moore to allow him entry into Clarissa's room. She subsequently sees the transparency of his disguise by recognizing him.

Of his power to change names, he boasts in the manner of a person of authority, being humorous and witty. He says the following about "young Newcomb," also known as Captain Mennell, whom he introduces to make Clarissa feel at ease:

> It is. And I have changed his name by virtue of my own single authority. Knowest thou not that I am a great name-father? Preferments I bestow, both military and civil. I give estates, and take them away at my pleasure. Quality too I create. And by a still more valuable prerogative, I *degrade* by virtue of my own imperial will, without any other act of forfeiture than my own convenience. What a poor thing is a monarch to me! (369)

Indeed Lovelace is a great name-father with a whimsical sense of play with names: "Another thing remember; I have changed my name: Changed it without an Act of Parliament. `Robert Huntingford' it is now" (417).

When his tactics (imprisonment of Clarissa, disguises through clothes and names) fail to achieve his intentions, Lovelace uses opiates. With them, he manages to rape Clarissa. Whether the rape is evidence of his success or lack of it remains a crucial issue in Richardsonian criticism. Ian Watt in *The Rise of the Novel* (1957) writes on the rape as serving "a number of important moral and literary purposes:" "First, and most obviously for Richardson's didactic purpose, it puts Lovelace wholly beyond the pale of any conception of honour, and proclaims to all the barbarity which lies below the genteel veneer of rakery..." (227).

Another critic, William Palmer, writes that: "The rape is the lowest ebb of Lovelace's imaginative power. It is a squalid scene, lacking in dramatic tension, and, for

Lovelace, both physically and artistically unsatisfying" (12). Surely, no accomplished "hunter" will pride himself as a good one when the hunted is tranquilized, silenced and practically absent. The rules of the game are skewed towards the hunter and therefore cannot demonstrate his superiority. To this extent, Lovelace's violation, even before we consider its morality, is a failure.

The use of opiates requires further commentary. Lovelace's hunt, as indeed the bird-analogy suggests, proceeds in stages. Capturing the bird is the initial stage, while making the bird accept its fate is the second, and probably more important than the initial one. Once captured, the bird is left in its cage to tire itself by beating on the bars of the cage. As he boasts:

> Hast thou not observed the charming gradations by which the ensnared volatile has been brought to bear with its new condition? How at first, refusing all sustenance, it beats and bruises itself against its wires, till it makes its gay plumage fly about, and overspread its well-secured cage. Now it gets out its head; sticking only at its beautiful shoulders: then, with difficulty, drawing back its head, it gasps for breath, and erectedly perched, with meditating eyes, first surveys, and then attempts, its wired canopy. As it gets breath, with renewed rage it beats and bruises again its pretty head and sides, bites the wires, and pecks at the fingers of its delighted tamer. Till at last, finding its efforts ineffectual, quite tired and breathless, it lays itself down and pants at the bottom of the cage, seeming to bemoan its cruel fate and forfeited liberty. And after a few days, its struggles to escape still diminishing, as it finds it to no purpose to attempt it, its new habitation becomes familiar; and it hops about from perch to perch, resumes its wonted cheerfulness, and every day sings a

song to amuse itself, and reward its keeper. (557)

Lovelace's description applies well to Clarissa's situation. He had hoped that by imprisoning her, she would ultimately come to accept her fate and thus he could easily achieve his designs on her. But as we discover, Clarissa refuses to conform to Lovelace's model outlined above. In fact, the imprisonment makes her even more vigilant and suspicious of his intentions. Once his schemes are frustrated, Lovelace settles on opiates, which knock the victim unconscious and therefore forced to submit, and this contradicts his model of gradual submission he outlines above. The opiates only assist him in violating the body, not the soul. As he admits: "There is no triumph in *force*! No conquest over the will! -No prevailing, by gentle degrees, over the gentle passions! *Force* is the devil!" (657). Lovelace discovers that his rakish maxim of "once subdued... always subdued" is very wrong. Instead of Clarissa being subdued, there is a sharp reversal of the balance of power in favour of her. Elizabeth Napier's essay "Tremble and Reform"(1975) traces this reversal in power and points out that it is hinted earlier in the novel. Even before the rape, Lovelace is worried that "this sweet creature will at last undo me!" (651).

Lovelace's admission of defeat contradicts his perception that love is a game, a warfare in which what is essential is not the kill, but the progress towards the kill. That being the case, the sexual contact between him and Clarissa should not be a significant thing. He does not derive satisfaction from it because that is not his aim. It is merely to crown the long hunt in which he has been an ingenious contriver. If we disregard the implications of the rape, then Lovelace achieves his goals.

When we consider at length the hunt and duel analogies, Lovelace's use of drugs is a violation of the rules of fair play, and this makes him a cheap and an unaccomplished hunter or dueller. (The concept of fair play is of course questionable because its rules are set out by men and therefore tend to favour them more than they do women. The seducer in this case is judge over his own case). The hunt and the duel are governed by pre-arranged rules which the hunter and the hunted or each dueller has to follow. The

struggle between Clarissa and Lovelace can appropriately be seen as a duel, a fight in which each character wants to maintain honour and pride. As a capable seducer, Lovelace wants to seduce Clarissa by deception and entrapment in order to prove that he is superior in intellect. By so doing, he will be allowing Clarissa 'fair chances' to challenge and even frustrate his schemes. But when he uses drugs to render her unconscious, he not only denies her the opportunity to resist his manoeuvres, but also brings into question his intellectual superiority. The rape of Clarissa, when she is incapable of responding, should thus be seen as sign of Lovelace's lack of achievement.

I want to end this chapter with a consideration of the issue of power in *Clarissa.* While Richardson's critics agree that Lovelace's main concern is domination, I want to emphasize that his desire for power is influenced by his previous experiences in which, lacking power, he suffered embarrassment. When the novel opens, he is already a casualty of power. The "quality-jilt", as he calls her, made him a victim to woman's power (particularly that of women of quality), and the Harlowes' interruption of his suit to Clarissa makes him feel even more powerless; hence he seeks vengeance. The "quality-jilt" and the treatment he gets at the hands of the Harlowes combine to make Lovelace seek power to avoid being a victim. Of course, we know that Lovelace has seduced many women, and wants to use the "quality-jilt" to rationalize his desire to ruin more.

The "quality-jilt" Lovelace suffered points to an important aspect of his personality, which is his emotional fragility. For the effects of the "quality-jilt" to be so powerful on him implies that he was a sensitive young man who had invested a lot of emotions in this woman and was devastated when he was unexpectedly jilted. His emotional fragility suggests that he is a mixture of femininity and masculinity which are in constant conflict. As pointed out earlier (cf.p.41), according to him, masculinity is a sign of power, while femininity is associated with weakness. Feeling the effects of the "quality-jilt" is a sign that he is allowing his feminine side to take control over him, and the desire

to wreak vengeance on Clarissa, and therefore on all women, is a deliberate attempt to suppress his weaker side from taking the larger part of him.

The target for his power is woman, as "she" "started with him," but more importantly, Clarissa, who is not only a representative of the whole sex, but also of the Harlowe household. Conquering Clarissa is thus a double-edged success, over the female sex and the Harlowe family. But as we saw in Robinson's study (cf.p.41), Lovelace not only desires power over women (although they are his primary target), but also over men. His relation to Belford and other rakes is evidence for this. The instructions he gives them when they meet Clarissa and his frequent reference to himself as their general suggest that he is their superior, and he thus requires subordinates not equals. His notion of relationships is such that one should be aggressive and the other submissive, and we see this in his discussion of the friendship between Anna (the active) and Clarissa (the submissive):

> Thou hast a mind, perhaps to make an exception for these two ladies. With all my heart. My Clarissa has, if *woman* has, a soul capable of friendship. Her flame is bright and steady. But Miss Howe's, were it not kept up by her mother's opposition, is too vehement to endure...
>
> Thus much indeed as to these two ladies, I will grant thee; that the active spirit of the one, and the meek disposition of the other, may make their friendship more durable than it would otherwise be; for this is certain, that in every friendship, whether male or female, there must be a man and a woman spirit (that is to say, one of them a *forbearing* one) to make it permanent. (863)

His perception of any relationship is tied to traditional notions of women as passive and males as dominant. Even in his relationship with Belford and other rakes, he wants to be

the principal male and the others to be submissive. In a passage in which he explains how he got the reputation of a wit, he writes to Belford:

> ...This story [Dryden's *Alexander's Feast*] had such an effect upon *me*, who had ever a proud heart, and wanted to be thought a clever fellow, that in order to avoid the like disgrace I laid down two rules to myself. The first, whenever I went into company where there were strangers, to hear every one of them speak, before I gave myself liberty to prate: the other, if I found any of them above my match, to give up all title to new discoveries, contenting myself to praise what they praised, as beauties familiar to me though I had never heard of them before. And so, by degrees, I got the reputation of a wit myself: and when I threw off all restraint, and books, and learned conversation, and fell in with some of our brethren who are now wandering in Erebus, and with such others as Belton, Mowbray, Tourville, and thyself, I set up on my own stock; and ...valued myself on being the emperor of the company; for, having fathomed the depth of them all, and afraid of no rival but thee, whom also I had got a little under(by my gaiety and promptitude at least), I proudly, like Addison's Cato, delighted to give laws to my little senate. (1147)

Despite his desire to control everybody, he is aware that Belford is a threat to his power, as Robinson has shown (171). He is thus living under constant fear of being over-powered, and the threat comes not only from Belford, but from Clarissa as well.

In *Clarissa* as in *Pamela*, there is more than one seducer. Lovelace is merely the main actor, and his dominance tends to overshadow other rakes. The relationship between these rakes has been fully explored by Robinson (cf.p.40-41). The relationship, as we

have seen, is one where power over others is Lovelace's preoccupation. While Belford, Mowbray, Tourville, and Belton support their friend Lovelace, as the novel progresses their support diminishes, and they petition Lovelace to spare Clarissa (555-56). Belford in particular, becomes Clarissa's advocate. I want to suggest that Belford can be Mr. B.'s equivalent. He initially is a rake, but his goodness and that of Clarissa change him from his rakish tendencies. Through Belford's intervention for Clarissa we are made to see how evil a character Lovelace is, particularly in that he chooses to ignore his scruples. Following Lindley's argument, it is possible to argue that Belford becomes Lovelace's conscience.

Lovelace's desire for power makes the struggle between him and Clarissa more pronounced and intense. Part of the reason for this is that Lovelace and Clarissa are proud, and neither wants to be defeated. As already mentioned, Clarissa is no ordinary girl: she is an "angel," and "goddess", "a vigilant charmer" and a model of human perfection. She dominates the Harlowe household with her virtue, piety and duty, which make her sister Arabella and brother James inferior in her presence. Even to Lovelace, she repeatedly reminds him of her spiritual superiority (646, 734). Her pride, therefore, is a threat to Lovelace's masculinity. To be threatened by a woman is what drives Lovelace to extremes to triumph over her and thus humble her. Lovelace is also a proud character. He does not want to yield to woman's threats or to be caught in his own snares: "what a figure should I make in rakish annals, if at last I should be caught in my own gin" (671). For Lovelace to maintain his pride, he has to outwit the vigilant Clarissa, who is "lion-hearted in every case where her honour, her punctilio rather, calls for spirit" (647). She being a lion, it will be a proof of masculinity if he attacks her:

> And will ye not all join to say that it is more manly to
> attack a lion that a sheep? - Thou knowest that I always
> illustrated my eagleship by aiming at the noblest quarries;
> and by disdaining to make a stoop at wrens, *phil* tits, and

wagtails. (559)

Lovelace's description of Clarissa in masculine terms, his fear of being caught in his own snares, and the fear that Clarissa will undo him at last, all show the extent to which he is conscious of his own weakness (and therefore femininity). Clarissa's "lion-heartedness" questions his notions of femininity and masculinity as weakness and strength respectively; hence the struggle between the two (Lovelace and Clarissa) is so intense. Like him (at least he claims to be masculine at all times), Clarissa is masculine, not submitting to whatever pressure Lovelace exerts on her. His use of drugs is therefore intended to erase her masculinity, leaving only her physical femininity so that she can be forced to yield to his will. Clarissa's "virtue, her resistance, which are her merits," are his "*stimulatives*"(716). He demands opposition because it sharpens his skills, and he finds it in Clarissa: "I love opposition. As gold is tried by fire and virtue by temptation; so is sterling wit by opposition" (519).

The power-struggle between these equally strong characters culminates in their destruction. Lovelace is killed in a duel, and Clarissa wastes away and dies. Their destructions are similar on the physical level, but differ significantly at the symbolic one. Clarissa becomes a martyr, while Lovelace is damned. He becomes, in his own words: " a machine at last, and no free agent" (848). To be a machine means to be an unsuspecting and predestined object drifting towards its own destruction, that is, lacking or predestined to lack the ability to see in advance the consequences of one's actions. He has human feelings which are suppressed by his delight in plotting. By delighting in plotting, he "steels his heart" (694), an image which suggests a conscious and deliberate attempt to dry up the "milk of human kindness" from his heart, literally turning himself into an unfeeling human being.

Lovelace's reference to machines and lack of free will raises fundamental philosophical questions about human nature. Some of these questions include: Are human beings free agents who can effectively determine their course of action without any

external influence from the supernatural? or are they in Shakespearean terms "flies to wanton boys"?; If human life is not predetermined, to what extent are they free agents? These and many more questions tend to be Lovelace's concerns when he realizes (after the rape) the nakedness of life. He seems to be a guinea pig in the gods' moral experiment.

At the moral level, Lovelace's maxim of "once subdued.. always subdued" is proven wrong. Whether Lovelace succeeds in his designs is not clear and depends on one's notion of success, but his triumph is at best limited. He succeeds in his encroachments into Harlowe Place and in dislodging Clarissa from her father's house. The Harlowe family's persecution of Clarissa makes his plots easier. As he boasts:

> I knew that the whole stupid family were in a combination to do my business. I told thee that they were all working for me, like so many underground moles, and still more blind than the moles are said to be, unknowing that they did so. I myself the director of their principal motions; which falling in with malice of their little hearts, they took to be all their own. (387)

At the same time, he does not emerge victorious in the power struggle, but, instead, he entangles himself in his own plottings and damns himself.

Lovelace's tragic end is a culmination of all the intrigues in which he passionately delighted. He tells us after his wounding by Morden: "But be ye all witnesses, that I have provoked my destiny, and acknowledge, that I fall by a man of honour" (1487). This acceptance of responsibility for his fall amounts to reformation, because facing one's guilt is the first stage towards reforming. Like his rape of Clarissa and her death, Lovelace's death is a public affair, which other characters are to witness. One can sense Richardson's didacticism in this. Lovelace's death is made public probably for two reasons: because his persecution of Clarissa was a public one, and, secondly, as a vivid demonstration to others of how wrong doers end.

To conclude, while in Mr. B. we witness a conversion to goodness, in Lovelace we witness damnation. Lovelace progresses from great heights of his self-proclaimed power to the naked reality of his powerlessness. At the end of the novel, the vivacious and brilliant Lovelace is humbled to nothingness, a sorrowful figure who begs for mercy and encourages his friend Belford to continue on the path of goodness. His end was obvious, but even so, the Lovelace we see between the beginning and the end of the novel continues to baffle Richardson's scholars as an enigma who cannot be explained merely by the binaries of good and evil. He is certainly evil, but his statements are highly seductive. For example, his comments on war and how humanity has bestowed titles of lord, kings and heroes on murderers call into question some of the assumptions humanity holds. Certainly this does not exonerate him from blame. I think Lindley comes close to grasping his nature when he argues that: "Richardson's Lovelace is a continually self-generating character: one who reinvents his identity from moment to moment, casting himself into different roles according to his situation"(195). I want to add that it is perhaps Kinkead-Weekes's "reading to the moment" that can enable us to fully grasp Lovelace's nature. The fluidity of his character, his vast knowledge of the world and humanity, his knowledge of his social milieu, and his articulation of its stereotypes point to his complexity of character.

Works Cited

Cardon, P. Stanley. *A Study of the Villains in Richardson's Novels*. M.A. Thesis, University of Arizona, 1942.

Carroll, John. "Lovelace as Tragic Hero." *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 42(1972): 14-25.

Castle, Terry. *Clarissa's Ciphers: Meaning and Disruption in Richardson's Clarissa*". Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1982

Flynn, Carol Houlihan. *Samuel Richardson: A Man of Letters*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Golden, Morris. *Richardson's Characters*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1963.

Hopkinson, H.T. "Robert Lovelace, The Romantic Cad." *Horizon*, 10(1944): 80-104.

Kinkead-Weekes, Mark. *Samuel Richardson: Dramatic Novelist*. Ithaca & New York: Cornell University Press, 1973.

Levin, Gerald. "Lovelace's Dream." *Literature and Psychology*, 29(1970): 121-27.

Lindley, Arthur. "Richardson's Lovelace and the Self-Dramatizing Hero of the Restoration." Robert Folkenflik, ed. *The English Hero 1660-1800*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1982. p.195-204.

Maddox, James H.Jr. "Lovelace and the World of Ressentiment in *Clarissa*." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 24(1982): 771-92.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Doctor Faustus*. Ed. Keith Walker. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1973.

Napier, Elizabeth R. "Tremble and Reform: The Inversion of Power in Richardson's *Clarissa*." *English Literary History*, 42(1975): 214-23

Palmer, William J. "Two Dramatists: Lovelace and Richardson in *Clarissa*." *Studies in the Novel*(North Texas State University), 5(1973): 7-21.

Park, William. "Clarissa as Tragedy." *Studies in Literature 1500-1900*, 16(1976): 461-71.

Richardson, Samuel. *Clarissa*. Ed. Angus Ross. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.

Robinson, David. "Unravelling the 'cord which ties good men to good men': Male Friendship in Richardson's Novels." Doody and Sabor, eds. *Samuel Richardson: Tercentenary Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989. 167-87.

Stevenson, John Allen. "The Courtship of the Family: Clarissa and the Harlowes Once More." *English Literary History*, 48(1981): 757-77.

Stovel, Bruce. "Clarissa's Ignorance." *Man and Nature*, 11(1992): 99-110.

Ward, H.G. "Richardson's Character of Lovelace." *Modern Language Review*, 7(1912): 494-98.

Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957.

Zanforlin, Nicolette. *"Clarissa": A Critical Study of Samuel Richardson's Novel in Letters* Padova, Italy: Liviana Editrice S.P.A., 1981.

Conclusion

By way of concluding this study, let us return to the conception of the rake and illustrate how Richardson closely follows them. Cardon and Hopkinson tell us that a rake is usually an educated and handsome young man of high class who rarely drinks, smokes, and gambles, but spends most of his time chasing women because he believes they are the only prey worth man's pursuit. The number of women a rake destroys suggests a superiority in intellect which enables him to seduce them. A rake is also knowledgeable about women, so that he can anticipate their reaction in different situations. More intriguing to the rake is the process of the hunt than the kill, and to make the process more interesting, the rake aims at strong prey (avoiding the weak one, who gives in easily), because the resistance from strong prey motivates him to perfect his hunting skills. Lastly, the rake can be a successful and virtuous man in other aspects of life. In short, he is a mixed character, with either his goodness or his evil guiding his actions.

Richardson demonstrates them out closely with subtle differences which make his portraiture unique. Both his villains are superficially good men who are loved by their friends, respected by their servants and neighbours. They both are wealthy, born to wealthy parents, and they are good managers of their estates. Both villains want to dominate their victims through seduction; as Flynn argues "to rape is to attempt to master, to assert one's will upon another" (108). Despite their virtues, they are women-hunters who always want to expand their lists of destroyed women. Sally Godfrey and Miss Betterton in the two novels are evidence for Mr. B. and Lovelace's careers of seduction, and Pamela and Clarissa are the intended victims who will mark the heights of their (the seducers) careers. But, as we discover in the novels, these would-be victims successfully frustrate their assailants. In fact, they mark the end of these two gentlemen's careers, Mr. B.'s ending happily while Lovelace's ends tragically.

While Mr. B. and Lovelace are products of the same imagination, the differences between the two point to an important factor: that from his (Richardson) first seducer to the second, we witness signs of development from a mild to an ambivalent and complex villain. Mr. B. reforms while Lovelace is damned, and the reformation is partly due to Mr. B.'s goodness, which controls him more than his rakishness and sways him to do good. While we rarely get Mr. B. to reveal himself because of the way the story is narrated, in *Clarissa* Lovelace tells his own story, and it is from his self-revelatory statements that we penetrate the recesses of his mental processes to understand what he is made of. Unlike Mr. B., Lovelace uses his knowledge of literature to portray himself as a heroic figure like those he has read about. This perception of himself makes him, in Lindley's words, "a continually self-generating character: one who reinvents his identity from moment to moment, casting himself into different roles according to his situation" (195). This self portraiture is accompanied by a vocabulary that is self-praising, justifying his actions, and challenging some of the assumptions his society holds. Lovelace also strikes us as a character who always wants to be in control of all the situations he finds himself in, and for him to gain control, he has to study and understand every situation. His desire to seduce Clarissa is motivated by the urge to know her, understand what she is made of, fix her identity, prove that she is just a woman, and hence gain mastery not only over her body, but also her soul. By fixing Clarissa's identity, Lovelace also fixes his as a successful and intelligent male who seduces women with ease. Lovelace's seduction-tactics are a result of planning accompanied by a full knowledge of the victim's reaction. The tactics show not only his devotion to his plottings, but also his delight in spending more time perfecting them. Unlike Mr. B., Lovelace has a sense of purpose, and this he outlines before he treats us to some of his schemes.

The differences in the "rakery" of Richardson's seducers are aptly noticed by Flynn when she argues that:

Mr. B. begins his career unimpressively, grabbing,

> pinching, and popping out of closets. Energy without art. By comparison, Lovelace is the master artist, devising complex schemes to control Clarissa and, through her, to control life itself. For him, seduction yields self-expression, freeing Lovelace from mundane reality. (199)

> A master plotter on the grand scale, Lovelace is driven to exert his control over his world. But, returning to the rake figure in all of Richardson's novels, we can see that his first rake was not so well developed...his rakery is simple, uncomplicated, and ineptly lustful. For him, seduction is a case of tickle and rub, not a quixotic attempt to conquer the world. He is a clumsy advocate of surprise, lurching out of corners to grab, pinch, and fondle the ubiquitous and provocatively kerchiefed Pamelian bosom. (214-15)

The degree of sophistry and complexity is commensurate to what happens to each seducer at the end of each novel. The less complex Mr. B. is rewarded for his lack of complexity while the ever-plotting Lovelace is proportionately damned for his actions.

To conclude, Richardson's seducers are engaged in an epistemological quest to understand and therefore conquer the reality around them. Their would-be victims are the subjects of the quest. Of course the degree to which one pursues their quest is a fundamental difference between the two villains. Mr. B.'s is confined to the human realm, and his ability to realize that he cannot push his victim beyond certain limits enables him to change and be accepted back into the human community. Lovelace, on the other hand, is a Faustian character who wants to rise above the human realm into the unknown world of absolute knowledge, and it is this which makes his fall tragic. Like Marlowe's Faustus,

Lovelace is driven by a desire for knowing and conquering reality, so that even in the face of destruction, he tenaciously pursues his quest. His downfall, to the extent that it is a fall of a genius from whom society would have benefited and that he is a human being like us, is tragic, as Carroll tells us:

> At the earthly level, then, Lovelace is a man in whom intellect has run mad, a man who must create by his schemes a world better than that given him, a world of constant freshness and novelty. When he at last finds something that is adequate to his imagination, when he does find a goddess in Clarissa, it is the one thing in the world that he cannot have. He is enslaved to the deed--to rape. In pursuing her he has pursued the death of his rakish self.
>
> But beyond this is the Faustian theme--the story of a man who purchases power--and the power itself is ultimately, absurdly impotent--at the price of his soul. Since Lovelace never doubts that there is a future state in which he will be rewarded or punished, his course inspires us with awe for his daring and wonder at his stupidity...
> In Christian terms, Lovelace suffers the real tragedy, the loss of his own soul. (24-5)

Even with his vice, Lovelace remains a magnetic character to the end, evoking pity from the audience. When one looks back at his career, one cannot help mourning his fall in the manner the Chorus mourns the fall of Doctor Faustus:

> Cut is the branch that might have growne full straight,
> And burned is *Apollo's* Lawrell bough,
> That some time grew within this learned man:
> *Faustus* is gone, regard his hellish fall,

Whose fiendfull fortune may exhort the wise
Onely (*sic*) to wonder at unlawfull things,
Whose deepnesse doth intice such forward wits,
To practise more then (*sic*) heavenly power permits. (V.iii)

Although Lovelace physically dies, he continues to exist in the reader's mind by leaving us with a series of unanswered questions: Why did he not abandon his schemes in time to save himself?; Do human beings have any control over their destiny?; How much should a human being strive to know?; Why should human beings be denied to acquire limitless knowledge?; What exactly is beyond the human realm?; To what extent should a human being pursue his quest (without endangering his own existence)?; Does the brilliant rogue deserve to be pitied?; What do we gather from him about human nature?; What about the dull rogue? The answers to these and many more questions will continue to engage us, and perhaps be the subject of another thesis.