

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Papers from the University Studies series (The University of Nebraska)

University Studies of the University of Nebraska

5-1960

Pamela-Shamela: A Study of the Criticisms, Burlesques, Parodies, and Adaptations of Richardson's "Pamela"

Bernard Kreissman

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/univstudiespapers>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

Kreissman, Bernard, "Pamela-Shamela: A Study of the Criticisms, Burlesques, Parodies, and Adaptations of Richardson's "Pamela"" (1960). *Papers from the University Studies series (The University of Nebraska)*. 58.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/univstudiespapers/58>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Studies of the University of Nebraska at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Papers from the University Studies series (The University of Nebraska) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

BERNARD KREISSMAN

PAMELA-
SHAMELA

new series no. 22

University of Nebraska Studies

may 1960

PAMELA-SHAMELA

Bernard Kreissman

PAMELA-SHAMELA

*A study of the criticisms, burlesques, parodies,
and adaptations of Richardson's "Pamela"*

University of Nebraska Studies : New Series No. 22

*Published by the University
at Lincoln : May 1960*



The University of Nebraska

The Board of Regents

RICHARD E. ADKINS

FRANK FOOTE

B. N. GREENBERG, M.D.

CLARENCE E. SWANSON

J. LEROY WELSH

J. G. ELLIOTT, *president*

JOHN KENT SELLECK, *corporation secretary*

*Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 60-62514
Copyright © 1960 by the University of Nebraska Press
Manufactured in the United States of America*

To Shirley

Acknowledgment

At the outset I must acknowledge my debt to my former teachers, to the librarians of the country, and to the Richardson scholars who have given us the history of his life and works. Several critical biographies have provided insight and information which I list elsewhere, but I must note here my major indebtedness to William Merritt Sale's bibliographical record, and Alan Dugald McKillop's biography. I have used the resources of too many libraries to list, but their uniform generosity and courtesy must also be recorded.

I am personally obliged to Professors Bernice Slote and Robert Koehl for their judicious criticism of the manuscript, and to Mr. Richard Farley of the Nebraska University Library for his technical assistance. It should be noted also that my wife typed the manuscript more times than I can bear to remember.

Contents

Introduction	1
1 / From Pamela Andrews to Joseph Andrews	3
2 / Anti-Pamela	23
3 / Pro-Pamela	54
4 / Reincarnation	75
Notes and Bibliography	81
Index	96

Introduction

The English novel traces its roots beyond the medieval romance, but it first began to assume recognizable form early in the eighteenth century with such books as Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, *Roxanna*, and *Moll Flanders*; Mrs. Behn's *Oroonoko* and Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*. It was not until mid-century, however, that it took on its full lineaments in the works of Richardson, Fielding, Smollett, Sterne, and their followers. The first of these "true" novels, published on November 6, 1740, was Richardson's *Pamela: or, Virtue Rewarded*. *Pamela* caught on, enjoyed a great popular vogue, started several schools of fiction, and was directly responsible for a vast array of imitation, adaptation, burlesque, parody, translation, commendation, and vilification—in short, a veritable literary warfare.

Much of this story has been told elsewhere, notably in the scholarly biography by Alan Dugald McKillop and the bibliographical record by William Merritt Sale, Jr. But one aspect of this literary broadside has received scant attention—the criticism of Richardson's ethical outlook and artistic ability which is at the base of all the burlesque, parody, criticism, objection, and condemnation his novel evoked. It is true that a great deal has been written about Henry Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*, and his *Shamela* also has received a share of critical attention; but here the examination usually ends. And while these two admittedly are the big guns of the anti-Pamela artillery, they represent only a small front of the attack.

In this study the anti-Pamela literature is examined, not as literature, but rather as it serves to illustrate a particular facet of the character of Richardson or of Pamela. Some consideration has been given to the various works as individual entities because their value as critiques of *Pamela* is in direct ratio to their degree of artistry, and because the validity of the argument—that is, the content—can hardly be dissociated *in toto* from the manner in which it is presented. Their exposition of social patterns also is examined, both to help understand the period in which Pamela arose and to provide the context necessary for a proper evaluation of the novel and its detractors.

Part of this context is the language of eighteenth-century burlesque and parody. Even the “polite” literature of this period occasionally shocks a modern reader, and those familiar with Swift’s *Directions to Servants* or Defoe’s *Law to Enact the Castration of Popish Ecclesiasticks* know that the language of eighteenth-century satire and burlesque is meat too strong for the modern stomach. Most of the objectionable passages are not quoted, but to expurgate completely would be to lose a good measure of the truth—and an even larger measure of the flavor—of these criticisms.

Although *Pamela* spread in translation from Portugal to Russia, the scene here is confined to England, where the major portion of the anti-Pamela literature was published. France provided some secondary material, but as the French arguments all are considered in the English works only the Gallic accent has been lost. There are a few minor deviations from this geographical rule, and two exceptions. The first is the French novel, *Antipamela ou Memoires de M.D.****. While this work carries “à Londres” as the place of publication, William Sale believes that French publishers faked the imprint, probably to add topical interest. On the chance that Mr. Sale might be wrong, and because it is the one French objection of considerable interest not to be found in an English piece, *Antipamela* is covered in this study. (*Lettre Sur Pamela*, a pamphlet which also bears a London imprint, has been bypassed, since the same arguments appear in English works.) The second exception is a twentieth-century American reincarnation of the Richardson heroine, Upton Sinclair’s *Another Pamela; or, Virtue Still Rewarded*.

1 / From Pamela Andrews to Joseph Andrews

On Saturday, February 14, 1741, the London *Daily Advertiser* carried the announcement:

This Day is published (Price bound 6s) In two neat Pocket Volumes The Second Edition (to which are prefix'd Extracts from several curious Letters written to the Editor on the Subject) of Pamela: or, Virtue rewarded. In a Series of Familiar Letters From A Beautiful Young Damsel, To Her Parents. Now first Published In order to cultivate the Principles of Virtue and Religion in the Minds of the Youth of Both Sexes. A Narrative which has its Foundation in Truth and Nature; and at the same time that it agreeably entertains, by a Variety of curious and affecting Incidents, is intirely divested of all those Images, which, in too many Pieces calculated for Amusement only, tend to inflame the Minds they should instruct.¹

Since this second edition was called for only three months after the appearance of a large first edition on November 6, 1740, it looked as though booksellers Rivington and Osborn had a best seller on their hands. The anonymous author of this piece, which scrupulously avoided the title of novel, was a certain Mr. Samuel Richardson, a printer of about fifty years of age, who already had performed some small editing, indexing, and writing stints, but of whom very little had been heard until the appearance of *Pamela*.² As one result of the book's crashing success, Richardson emerged from his anonymity to become a major figure on the London scene.

The plot of this novel which captivated all of Britain is a disarmingly simple one. The story is narrated in the form of long, explicit letters from Pamela Andrews, a poor country girl in service with a rich family. After the death of the mistress of the household, Pamela is continually put to the necessity of resisting the advances

of the young master. When his seduction schemes fail, he attempts rape on several occasions but always is thwarted at the last instant. Finally, in desperation, he proposes marriage and the offer is joyfully accepted, Pamela thus receiving the reward of her virtue.

Whatever the reasons for the book's appeal, the fact is that by September of 1741 five editions had been published, not to mention a pirated Irish edition.³ Undoubtedly sales were helped along by such friendly notices as that which appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (January 1741):

Several Encomiums on a Series of Familiar Letters, publish'd but last Month, entitled Pamela or Virtue rewarded, came too late for this Magazine, and we believe there will be little Occasion for inserting them in our next; because a Second Edition will then come out to supply the Demands in the Country, it being judged in Town as great a Sign of Want of Curiosity not to have read Pamela, as not to have seen the French and Italian Dancers.

In a similar vein was Horace Walpole's remark, made that same winter of 1740-1741: "*Pamela est comme la neige, elle couvre tout de sa blancheur.*"⁴

The arrival of spring saw no abatement of the *Pamela* rage. In April, with warmer weather ahead, a "tie-in product" was offered for sale:

For the entertainment of the Ladies, more especially for those who have the Book, Pamela, a new Fan, representing the principal adventures of her Life, in Servitude; Love, and Marriage. Design'd and engraven by the best Masters.

Virtues Reward you in this fan may view,
To Honours Tie, Pamela strictly true:
But when by conjugal Affection mov'd
A Pattern to her Sex, and Age she prov'd
In ev'ry amiable scene of Life
Beneficent, fond Parent, loving Wife.⁵

Pamela souvenirs continued to be offered to the public for a good many years. In 1744 Joseph Highmore completed a series of twelve illustrations of *Pamela*, which, engraved by Truchy and Benoist, were delivered to subscribers.⁶ In 1745 some clever showman advertised a three-dimensional *Pamela*:

This is to acquaint all Gentlemen and Ladies, That there is to be seen, without Loss of Time, at the corner of Shoe Lane, facing Salisbury Court Fleet-Street, Pamela; or Virtue Rewarded.

Being a curious Piece of Wax-work, representing the Life of that fortunate Maid, from the Lady's first taking her to her Marriage; also Mr. B. her Lady's Son, and several Passages after; with the Hardships she suffered in Lincolnshire, where her Master sent her, and the grand Appearance they made when they came back to Bedfordshire.⁷

Even more indicative of Pamela's popularity was the tribute paid to her early in her career by the Grub Street hacks. These gentlemen were quick to make capital of Richardson's success, and on May 28, 1741, there appeared *Pamela's Conduct in High Life*, a spurious continuation now attributed to one John Kelly. Aware of this Grub Street activity and considerably vexed by Kelly's illegitimate offspring, Richardson set to work and produced his own "true" sequel, which came out on December 7, 1741. By this time there had been published a second fraudulent continuation, whose title was an obvious attempt to draw on both Kelly and Richardson: *Pamela in High Life; or, Virtue Rewarded*. And as if this were not enough, hard on the heels of Richardson's own continuation followed a third fake, *Life of Pamela*, which retold Pamela's epistolary first-person narrative in straight third-person style.⁸

Apparently it was felt that one couldn't have too much of a good thing; at any rate, the proliferation of Pamelas had only begun. By the end of 1742 there were three dramatic versions in England alone: *Pamela, A Comedy*, by Henry Giffard; *Pamela; or, Virtue Triumphant*, possibly by James Dance,⁹ and *Pamela: An Opera*, by Mr. Edge. Before long there were also *Pamela The Second; Pamela Censured; Anti-Pamela, or Feign'd Innocence Detected; The True Anti-Pamela; Pamela Versified; Pamela: ou La Vertu recompensée*, a French translation; *The Virgin in Eden . . . To which are added Pamela's Letters; Memoirs of the Life of Lady H—, the celebrated Pamela; Lettre Sur Pamela; and Pamela: or The Fair Impostor*.

Across the channel in France an almost identical *Pamela* vogue was in full swing. Dottin records the observation that to be in style one must own a *Pamela*; and that without *Pamela* there was nothing to talk about.¹⁰ As well as the translation of Richardson's original work, the current *Pamela* literature included Boissy's *Pamela en France; Mémoires de Pamela*; La Chaussée's stage version, *Pamela; Antipamela ou Memoires de M.D.****; *La Déroute des Pamela* by Godard d'Aucour; and in the contemporary periodicals several letters about *Pamela* besides the usual analyses.

The history repeated itself in Germany and Italy, with one im-

portant difference. On the continent, Goldoni's Italian play, *Pamela nubile*, became even more popular than the parent work, and over the next few years was translated into more European languages than Richardson's novel.¹¹ Indeed, the "Adventures of 'Pamela' on the Continental Stage" is a story in itself,¹² and her influence on European literature in general is attested in many studies.¹³

The books and plays cited above by no means comprise a complete catalogue of the works directly inspired by *Pamela*, for the list has been limited to those which openly acknowledge their debt by carrying the name "Pamela" in their titles. A complete roster would include all such others as Voltaire's *Nanine*, Bickerstaffe's *Maid of the Mill*, and Moore's *The Foundling*. It also would take into account another category excluded here—the works written more than ten years after *Pamela* was first published, among them Cerlone's *Pamela nubile* and *Pamela maritate*, Rossi's *Pamela*, and *Pamela* by François de Neufchateau.

As for the duration of the Pamela vogue, perhaps some idea of it may be gathered from the following two instances:

In 1741 a bookseller trying to trade on *Pamela*'s "sex interest" advertised: "The pleasures of conjugal love revealed. . . . of the same Letter and Size with Pamela, and very proper to be bound with it."¹⁴ Twenty years later, in 1760, a similar trick was used to push a book by John Piper, Esq., *The Life of Miss Fanny Brown; or, Pamela the Second (A Clergyman's Daughter)*. The title relies for its effect on a vulgar play on words.*

In 1742 Joseph Warton describing Curio, a fop, "all prate and smiles," wrote:

Such weak-wing'd May-flies Britain's troops disgrace
That Flandria, wondring mourns our altered race:
With him the fair, enraptured with a rattle,
Of Vauxhall, Garrick, or Pamela, prattle.¹⁵

And ten years after, a critic writing in the *Monthly Review* (December 1752) still cites *Pamela* when discussing

* The first name is self-explanatory, and there is no doubt that the second is a play upon the slang of the period, as both "Fanny" and "Miss Brown" meant "the female pudend"; cf. Eric Partridge, *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* (2nd ed.; London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1938), pp. 265 and 523. These titles together are an excellent indication of the salacious aura surrounding *Pamela*.

The history of Betty Barnes (so called from her having been born in a Barn) contains the adventures of a maid-servant, beloved by a young gentleman, who, after the usual course of obstruction from his relations, marries her (and she becomes a fine lady: of which the world has probably had enough in Pamela . . .).

It would hardly be proper to present an account of Pamela's popularity without reference to the two most famous incidents of all, mentioned by every Richardson biographer, one of which concerns the villagers of Slough and the other a Reverend Benjamin Slocock. The people of Slough, it seems, used to gather at the local smithy to hear *Pamela* read aloud by the blacksmith. No story had ever absorbed them as did this one, and when finally little Pamela was married to Squire B., there was no containing their enthusiasm: out they rushed to the parish church and celebrated the happy nuptial with a joyous pealing of bells.¹⁶ (Mrs. Piozzi, relying on an aunt's memory, placed this story in "Preston in Lancashire" and even added flying flags and a holiday gaiety.¹⁷) As for the Reverend Benjamin Slocock, soon after the first appearance of *Pamela* this worthy divine recommended the book from the pulpit of St. Saviour's Church, Southwark.¹⁸ That a novel should be recommended from the pulpit in 1740 is in itself so dazzling a wonder that even the possibility of bribery, raised by Downs,¹⁹ can not entirely dim its effulgence.

If this introduction partakes of the character of a panegyric, it does so by design: from this point on *Pamela* is in for few kind words. Hereafter the discussion is limited to the anti-Pamelas, the myriad objections to *Pamela*, and even the sins which her own imitators disclosed in her. Surely it would be decidedly unfair to detail the many faults which Pamela's critics discover, and fail to preface it with some account of the great popularity she enjoyed in her early years and which, in a slighter measure, she continued to enjoy for two hundred years. For Pamela's critics have been many, they have been vociferous, and some of them have even been just.

II

The legitimate objections to *Pamela* all began on April 4, 1741, with the appearance of *Shamela*, or to give the full title:

An Apology For The Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews In which the many notorious Falsehoods and Misrepresentations of a Book called Pamela are exposed and refuted; and all the

matchless Arts of that young Politician set in a true and just light. Together with a full Account of all that passed between her and Parson Arthur Williams; whose Character is represented in a manner something different from that which he bears in Pamela. The whole being exact Copies of authentick Papers delivered to the editor. Necessary to be had in all families.

To mark how closely *Shamela* burlesques *Pamela*, it is necessary to recount more fully the events of Richardson's novel: The story opens with Pamela's letter to her parents relating the death of Lady B., the mistress who had trained Pamela far above the station of common servant. Mr. B., the son, assures Pamela that for the sake of his dear mother she will continue to be well treated. He gives her some small gifts, and in the process takes her by the hand—a gesture which so alarms her parents that they write back to warn her to guard her virtue.

As the days go by, Squire B. makes further presents, insists on reading her letters to her parents, and makes an oblique remark about her legs. When he refuses to permit Pamela to leave his house as his sister's maid, his designs become apparent. He makes his first real sortie in a small summerhouse, but his fumbings result in nothing more than his kissing her "two or three times, with frightful eagerness," after which he tries to bribe Pamela to silence. She refuses the money, informs Mrs. Jervis, the housekeeper, of the attempt, and for mutual protection they agree to sleep together thereafter.

B. soon tries again. This attempt occurs when he has learned of Pamela's revelation of the summerhouse "secret" and punctuates the subsequent angry interview with undercover caresses. Pamela refuses his generous offer to let the proposed seduction pass as a rape for which he will take full blame, but weakened by prayers and weeping she is forced into an ardent embrace. B. once again makes the worst of opportunity and, pressing his advantage too far too soon, insinuates his hand into Pamela's bosom. Indignation gives her "double strength," she escapes, flees to the next room, and faints.

Pamela is now resolved to leave, but nonetheless she stays to embroider a waistcoat for the master. With the idea of reaccustoming herself to the simple life of the home to which she is to return, she puts on her homespun dress and ordinary cap, and is led to Squire B.'s study, where this disguise inspires B. to kiss her as some "other" girl. Then, thoroughly vexed with Pamela's continued offishness, B. decides on action, and that night conceals himself in

her bedroom closet. She hears a rustle, but has undressed down to an "underpetticoat" before a second rustle leads to an inspection. At B.'s onrush Pamela flees to Jervis and the double bed. B. orders Jervis out; instead she throws herself on Pamela. With both women screaming and Jervis and B. fighting over her supine form, Pamela once again faints at the touch of B.'s hand upon her bosom. She awakes to find the worst has been averted.

Jervis and Pamela are discharged, Pamela agreeing to wait one week to accompany Jervis from the house. However Jervis is re-hired, and though it seems that perhaps Pamela may stay too, she finally determines to leave. There is a to-do about her dividing her clothes into three bundles: her lady's presents, Mr. B.'s gifts, and her own things, the latter being the only bundle she will take with her. After resisting further temptations to stay, among them a promise of an arranged marriage with B.'s handsome chaplain, Parson Williams, Pamela leaves the Bedfordshire estates, memorializing her departure with fourteen stanzas of "Verses On My Going Away."

Supposedly as a last gesture of good will, Mr. B. supplies her with his coach driven by his own coachman, but Pamela soon discovers that B. has compounded his crimes by adding kidnap to attempted rape. She is taken to his Lincolnshire estates presided over by Mrs. Jewkes, at present a Gorgon though formerly an "inn-keeper's housekeeper"—and whatever else that implies in Pamelian circumlocution. Here, carefully guarded, Pamela is told with Jewkesian straightforwardness that she is being held for B.'s pleasure. She therefore plots an escape with Parson Williams, Pamela doing all the plotting while Williams merely nods assent. Subsequently the bungling Parson is temporarily crippled by hired ruffians, and the plot is discovered and thwarted. In the interim Pamela fails in her own escape attempt solely from her apprehensive maidenly fancies, and weeps self-pitying tears over a contemplated suicide which never goes beyond the stage of contemplation.

B. arrives at Lincolnshire and offers Pamela a legal settlement as the price for her acquiescence, adding that refusal will only produce the identical consummation minus the cash. When she refuses—naturally!—B. leaves orders for two women to guard Pamela in her bedroom, and pretends to leave. He returns privily disguised as Nan, Pamela's second guard, and watches while Pamela undresses and discourses with Jewkes, warder number one. Finally in bed, Jewkes holds Pamela's right arm as B. takes her left, clasps her, and

announces her fate. Pamela makes screaming protestations of his action, Jewkes of his inaction; B. yells for both of them to stop so *he* can talk. Then the forgetful bungler once again slips his hand into her bosom, and Pamela "fainted away quite."

Upon regaining consciousness Pamela demands to know if—? But B. swears "that he had not offered the least indecency." Upon which Jewkes spurs him on again and Pamela swoons once more, reawakening in time to forgive the Squire all as he takes his crest-fallen departure.

Of course after this there is nothing to do but marry the girl, but even here the suspense is sustained by a letter declaring that a sham marriage is to be perpetrated upon Pamela. However, with her father in attendance, the marriage is truly performed by Parson Williams, and thereafter interest subsides rapidly as a graceful and charming Mrs. B. wins over various members of the B. family. This takes the story to the end of the second volume. Volumes III and IV—Richardson's continuation of *Pamela in Her Exalted Condition*—are outside the scope of this study, and a good thing it is, for two duller volumes have rarely graced the English language.

To conclude this obviously biased recital on a more impartial note, it should be stressed that a summary of the plot of *Pamela* without Richardson's development of detail, psychology, and sentiment can only display *Pamela's* naked faults without the clothing of Richardson's artistry. Or as Dr. Johnson put it:

Why Sir, if you were to read Richardson for the story,
your impatience would be so much fretted that you would
hang yourself. But you must read him for the sentiment.²⁰

Both the sentiment and the story are the objects of Henry Fielding's satire in *Shamela*;²¹ indeed, Fielding began before the beginning and satirized the "Extracts from several curious Letters . . .," the commendatory letters which Richardson had had inserted into the second edition of *Pamela*.²² For the sake of scholarly exactitude, perhaps it should be noted that the burlesque actually started even before the commendations with the title and the name of the "author," Conny Keyber. When he wrote his satire, Fielding was still unaware of the true identity of the "editor" of *Pamela* although the secret must have been fairly widely known by then. The *Daily Advertiser* on April 7, 1741 ran the ditty:

Advice to Booksellers (after reading Pamela),
Since Printers with such pleasing Nature write,
And since so awkwardly your Scribes indite,

Be wise in Time, and take a friendly Hint:
Let Printers write, and let your Writers print.

However, Fielding mistakenly attributed *Pamela* to Colley Cibber, who had recently published *An Apology for the Life of Mr. Colley Cibber*. Thus Colley Cibber became Conny Keyber.

Fielding's bawdy dedication to Miss Fanny contains a foretaste of what is to come; and his burlesque of the dedicatory letters attacks not only Cibber and two other minor writers of the day, but also the Reverend Slocock for his pulpit commendation, and Pope's remark that *Pamela* "will do more good than many volumes of sermons."²³ After some extravagant flattery, the first dedicatory letter ends with the note that *Shamela* "will do more good than the C[lerg]y have done harm in the World."²⁴

The *Shamela* narrative begins with Parson Tickletext sending Parson Oliver a copy of *Pamela*, which has been praised in "pulpit" and "Coffee-house." He declares that when *Pamela* casts "off the Pride of Ornament, and displays itself without any Covering; which it frequently doth . . . the coldest zealot cannot read without Emotion. . . ." After several "emotions," he admonishes Oliver to be sure to read the book to his girls and servants. Parson Oliver, however, wishes to be excused from reading it to them because he knows the true story of *Pamela*, whose real name is *Shamela* and whose "authentick" letters he is sending on to Tickletext so that he may judge for himself.

There follows a series of letters in which the surface action of *Pamela* is so closely duplicated that were only the action dramatized, an onlooker would believe he was viewing identical stories—one in a condensed version. The difference lies beneath the surface. Where Richardson has *Pamela* pass her time in prayer, in softly entuned hymns, and in reading *The Whole Duty of Man*, Fielding takes the position that between drinks she is reciting the latest barroom ditty and Rochester's poems, and reading *Venus in the Cloyster: or, the Nun in her Smock*. Fielding has also filled out Richardson's Mr. B. to his full proportions with a name that is almost as famous as *Pamela* itself—it is "Booby."

In *Shamela*, Booby's first presents are accompanied with more material evidence of his regard. Led on by *Shamela*'s skilled pretenses of innocence, he is halted in his first attempt on her virtue only by Mrs. Jervis' entrance. "How troublesome is such Interruption," *Shamela* writes to her mother, and is irritated to receive a reply reminding her of the consequences of her past error, the

illegitimate birth of Parson Williams' bantling. Shamela heatedly tells the pot not to call the kettle black; and Mama replies that she is not upbraiding her for "being thy Mother's own Daughter," but this time "take care to be well paid before-hand. . . ."

The next attempt on her "virtue" is introduced with a direct parody of Pamela's sweet, demure, modest reply to Mr. B. Booby, cursing Shamela for pertness, says, "You are a d—d impudent, stinking, cursed, confounded Jade, and I have a great Mind to kick your A—. You, kiss —, says I." Shamela then retreats, but just so far:

if you don't come to me, I'll come to you, says he; I shant come to you I assure you, says I. Upon which he run up, caught me in his Arms, and flung me upon a Chair, and began to offer to touch my Under-Petticoat. Sir, says I you had better not offer to be rude; well, says he, no more I wont then; and away he went out of the Room. I was so mad to be sure I could have cry'd.

Oh what a prodigious Vexation it is to a Woman to be made a Fool of.

Mrs. Jervis, who has been eavesdropping, is highly amused by the whole incident. She tells Shamela that it was different with the "Jolly Blades" of her day; and conspires to draw Booby on by giving him a view of Shammy naked in bed. Booby of course takes the bait and Shamela helps matters along by feigning sleep, but when she "awakes," her screaming and scratching end only as she "swoons." Booby, scared witless, begs forgiveness after Shamela "recovers": "By Heaven, I know not whether you are a Man or a Woman, unless by your swelling Breasts. Will you . . . forgive me: I forgive you! D—n you (says I)." After all he is not dealing with Pamela here, as witness Shamela's remarks to Mrs. Jervis on the subject of his hands going no further than her bosom: "Hang him, . . . he is not quite so cold as that I assure you; our Hands on neither side, were idle in the Scuffle, nor have left us any doubt of each other as to that matter."

The two women are sacked, and Jervis plans to open a "house" in London. This proves unnecessary, thanks to the success of Shamela's scheme to appear before Booby dressed as a demure farmer's daughter. Jervis is rehired, and Shamela is sent off to Lincolnshire, supposedly kidnaped by the coachman, who is really a member of the counterplot against the master (they "hang together . . . as well as any Family of Servants in the Nation").

There is an interesting note on techniques here. Since Pamela is in the act of being abducted, she cannot send any letters. Richard-

son resorts to an editor's account of the action, but Fielding stays with the characters. Robin, the coachman, gives full details to Jervis, who immediately writes them to Shamela's mama, Henrietta Maria Honoria Andrews, adding that Booby is now sure to come through with a settlement. Mama's pleased return letter is short because "I have sprained my right Hand with boxing three new-made Officers."

Shamela, in Lincolnshire, immediately resumes her old relations with Williams. Jewkes comments slightly upon this affair, which provokes Shamela to call her a "Mynx," whereupon she slaps Sham. This is a mistake. Shamela's counterattack with unsheathed talons is so effective that Jewkes is forced to flee. (In Richardson's novel, Pamela, when slapped for calling Jewkes a "Jezebel," throws herself upon the grass and bemoans her lot.) An ardent letter from Booby, implying a settlement, convinces Shamela that she need not settle merely for cash. With a little artful parrying she can be mistress "of a great Estate . . . a dozen Coaches and Six, . . . a fine House at London, and another at Bath, and Servants, and Jewels, and Plate, and go to Plays, and Operas, and Court, and do what I will, and spend what I will" as the wife of Booby. Thus, when Jewkes mentions the coming settlement, our heroine declares that she would not receive such an offer if it came from the "greatest King, no nor Lord in the Universe. I value my Vartue more than I do anything my Master can give me; and so we talked a full Hour and a half, about my Vartue." As for Williams, "Well! and can't I see Parson Williams, as well after Marriage as before."

Shamela duplicates the false-suicide gambit as an excuse for having stayed out too long with Williams, and prepares for her new role with Booby by exposing as much of her bosom as possible, practicing her "Airs before the Glass" and reading "a Chapter in the Whole Duty of Man." Upon Booby's arrival, she announces that she is aware he contemplates "the Destruction of my Vartue. . . . O what a charming Word that is, rest his Soul who first invented it" and asks to be sent home. Booby angrily dismisses her, and she and Jewkes retire to discuss her "Vartue till Dinner-time." At the dinner's conclusion, Booby sets the stage for the ultimate attempt with a bumper of champagne and some off-color toasts.

In bed, Shamela once again feigns sleep, which allows Booby to get in the usual preliminaries. Yet despite Jewkes' coaching he is thoroughly foiled for Shamela follows Mama's expert instructions

to avoid being ravished, . . . which soon brought him to Terms, and he promised me, in quitting my hold, that he would leave the Bed.

O Parson Williams, how little are all the Men in the World compared to thee.

The next morning Booby offers a settlement, but Shamela now is certain her "Vartue" is worth far more than 250 pounds per year. Mama is delighted to receive these tidings and repeats lesson number one: "that a married Woman injures only her husband, but a single Woman herself." Therefore she urges less of Williams and more of Booby. Before this advice can be accepted or rejected Shamela learns for herself "What a Foolish Thing it is for a Woman to dally too long with her Lover's Desires; how many have owed their being Old Maids to their holding out too long." An effusion of excessive coyness has been too much even for Booby; he sends her off to pack up and get out.

Shamela's nondescript linen and bawdy books are a fine parody of Pamela's three bundles, and, as in the Richardson novel, our heroine leaves Lincolnshire only to return the next day with a promise of marriage. After the wedding she has some trouble mustering up the blushes and other maidenly manifestations suitable to the role of a pure young bride, but sustains her part well to the accompaniment of reflective comparisons between Booby and Williams.

Legally entrenched as Mrs. Booby, she starts spending the estate, cows Booby utterly, and even manages to see a great deal of Williams. On his advice she disavows Mama Andrews, since it would never do "for a Lady of my Quality and Fashion to own such a Woman as you for my Mother." Paying Shamela back in kind, her enraged parent turns over the original letters to Parson Oliver—an apt revenge, because she has learned from Shamela that Booby is having a book made about himself and his bride by a man "who does that Sort of Business for Folks, one, who can make my Husband, and me, and Parson Williams, to be all great People; for he can make black white it seems. Well, but they say my Name is to be altered, Mr. Williams, says the first Syllabub hath too comical a Sound, so it is to be changed into Pamela."

Shamela concludes with Parson Tickletext's note that he will have these "authentick" letters printed to counteract the other book; and "P. S. Since I writ, I have a certain Account, that Mr. Booby hath caught his Wife in bed with Williams; hath turned her off, and is prosecuting him in the spiritual court."

Pamela has now been presented in two sets of dress—or, if you will, undress—and within the bounds of identical actions there seem to be two totally different characters displayed. But are they really so different? If we look carefully at Richardson's heroine, some of these apparent contradictions disappear. For one thing, modest little Pamela is quite well aware of the beauties of her person.²⁵ What's more, this artless miss has her Machiavellian side: Richardson has painted a full picture of her crafty ability to plot and conspire (I, 161 ff.). Most important of all, he has depicted her with a morality which has gold as its standard, for Pamela's "virtue" rests, not on principle, but on good business sense. How stupid it would be to sell "the whole sixteen years innocence . . . for a pair of diamond earrings, a necklace, and a diamond ring for my finger" (I, 274) when with clever bargaining "innocence" can fetch a much higher price! Pamela knows full well she carries a jewel on her person; and the best that can be said for her is that once she has established a price for her jewel no one can talk her into lowering it.

The proof of Pamela's businesslike attitude is too clear-cut to be open to doubt. When B. intimates that he is willing to meet Pamela's terms and marry her, she not only agrees to return, but is in such a hurry to do so that her impatience taxes the endurance of the coachmen and even the horses. This unseemly haste stems from more than her eagerness to "close the deal." Her presence in the flesh is part and parcel of her strategy: it is "good for business" to keep B. constantly aware of the prize within his reach. (Viewed in this light, it is not hard to understand why Pamela stayed to embroider the waistcoat, stayed to accompany Jervis, and failed to take advantage of her numerous opportunities to escape.) When marriage finally is offered to her, not for one moment does she consider refusing this villain whose courtship has consisted of revilement, incarceration, kidnaping, and attempted rape; indeed, so far is she from being indignant that she falls on her knees to thank him for his generosity. Moreover, in accepting him she unwittingly discloses the hypocrisy of her earlier repeated denials of the possibility of marriage between one so great and one so low. For when B. inquires how she will pass the time after her marriage, Pamela promptly presents a list of projected household duties whose extent and organization indicate hours of serious planning.

Pamela's actions show clearly that it is B.'s position as landowner which makes him such a desirable husband. As Clara Thomson put it:

. . . what makes her behaviour particularly repulsive is the conviction it forces upon one that it is mainly prompted by a disproportionate respect for her lover's wealth and position. No one can doubt that if equal insults had been offered her by a man of her own class she would have rejected him with scorn. But because Mr. B. is a gentleman, and has a large income, and two or three country seats, he is to be forgiven what would be unpardonable in a hero of low degree. Richardson's vulgar exaggeration of class distinctions permeates the book, and Pamela blissfully crawls to the feet of her master.²⁶

Regardless of Richardson's intention, an attentive reading of the novel reveals behind the Pamela who minces across its pages the Shamela whom Fielding exposed.

While the cumulative effect of *Shamela*, and its main achievement, is an indictment of Pamela's total ethical view, Fielding, through his character Parson Oliver, also condemns the book on several specific points. Though the parson is careful to say that there are "many more objections" that may be made, his arraignment lists only five (p. 58).

First, there are many lascivious Images in it, very improper to be laid before the Youth of either Sex.

2dly, Young Gentlemen are here taught, that to marry their mother's chambermaids, and to indulge the Passion of Lust, at the Expence of Reason and Common Sense, is an Act of Religion, Virtue and Honour; and, indeed, the surest Road to Happiness.

Despite the harsh little note of class awareness that intrudes itself, this is a valid objection to B. He is apparently a satyr whose frustration by one girl blinds him to everything but the necessity to enjoy her. Such a basis for marriage is hardly reasonable or sensible; it is not even romantic. But the complaint about the effect of his example on "young gentlemen" can be discounted as an effort to capitalize on the eighteenth-century view that literature influences action by inducing emulation in an impressionable reader. It seems highly improbable that many young men were tempted to emulate B., although it is true that in 1754 Lady Mary Wortley Montague did write her daughter of a noble-commoner wedding which was stirring the Italian countryside, and which was "copied from, Pamela."²⁷

3dly, All Chambermaids are strictly enjoined to look after their Masters; they are taught to use little Arts to that purpose; and lastly, are countenanced in Impertinence to their Superiors, and in betraying the secrets of Families.

This third objection, which is a commentary on a favorite theme of the eighteenth century, the prevailing notion of chambermaids as sluttish, avaricious, and scheming,²⁸ must also be regarded with suspicion. For anything Pamela could teach the chambermaids, it would seem more than likely they already knew. Swift took backstairs depravity for granted in his *Directions to Servants*. Addressing the "waiting maid," he wrote, "I must caution you particularly against My Lord's eldest Son: If you are dextrous enough, it is odds that you may draw him in to marry you and make you a Lady . . . [but] probably you will get nothing from him, but a big Belly or a Clap, and probably both together."²⁹ Swift's satire leaves one wondering how far the exaggeration extends: that there is some factual basis for his view may be seen in Eliza Haywood's straightforward *Present for a Serving Maid*, a manual for girls going into service, which is an obvious attempt at a distaff duplication of John Barnard's famous *Present For An Apprentice*, and copies its title page and format closely. Haywood admits to the girls that a master's "importunities" will probably win out, but "resistance . . . is a Duty however owing to yourself to endeavour it."³⁰ She provides precepts on how to act if the man is single or married—never tell the wife—and advises the maids that the master's son will not keep a promise of marriage: "This last Bait has seduced some who have been Proof against all the others . . . [do] not flatter yourselves, that because such Matches have sometimes happened, it will be your Fortune: Examples of this kind are very rare . . ." (p. 43). So objection number three is not all rhetoric.

4thly, In the Character of Mrs. Jewkes Vice is rewarded; whence every Housekeeper may learn the Usefulness of pimping and bawding for her Master.

This objection and the one to follow are both invalid, because they apply only to *Shamela* and do not carry over to *Pamela*. In *Shamela*, Booby is a dupe; the villain on his side of the struggle is Jewkes. But in Richardson's novel, regardless of his bungling, the archvillain is B. and Jewkes is merely his tool—one must not be misled by her greater coarseness. Thus in the character of B. we have vice rewarded.

Pamela's contradictory reactions to B. and to Jewkes are very important because they picture so clearly her class attitude toward morals. The master villain is thanked by Pamela on her knees, but Jewkes, who has merely been carrying out B.'s orders (with perhaps unnecessary relish), must do penance with "humility and appre-

hension" before Pamela forgives her. Pamela, we see, has one set of standards for the master, another for the servants.

5thly, in Parson Williams, who is represented as a faultless Character, we see a busy Fellow, intermeddling with the Private Affairs of his Patron, whom he is very ungratefully forward to expose and condemn on every occasion.

This has even less validity in *Pamela* than number four. We can only object that whatever Williams did was not done forcefully enough. Pamela had good reason to stay away from the police,³¹ but Williams had none. Far from being a busy meddler, he is an ineffectual do-nothing.

However invalid these final objections may be, Shamela soon gathered her converts, of whom one, at least, was moved to pen a testimonial:

To the Author of Shamela

Admir'd Pamela, till Shamela shown,
Appear'd in ev'ry colour—but her own:
Uncensur'd she remain'd in borrow'd light,
No nun more chaste, few angels shone so bright.
But now, the idol we no more adore.
Jervice a bawd, and our chaste nymph a w———
Each buxom lass may read our Booby's case
And charm a Williams to supply his place;
Our thoughtless sons for round ear'd caps may burn
And curse Pamela, when they've serv'd a turn.³²

III

Fielding had not yet finished with Pamela. In a satire on women in general, written in 1743, there is a slurring allusion to her:

But say you, if each private family
Doth not produce a perfect Pamela;
Must every female bear the blame
Of one low, private, strumpet's shame?³³

But this potshot in passing is scarcely worthy of mention in the same breath with the work Fielding had completed the previous year—*Joseph Andrews*, the most famous of all the anti-Pamelas and one of the great novels of the language.

In *Joseph Andrews*, which appeared on February 22, 1742, a year after *Shamela*, Fielding renews the attack on *Pamela* in Chapter One. However, although the parody figures prominently in the opening chapters, it is not sustained. By Chapter Ten the *Pamela* element is negligible, and it remains out of sight for the greater

part of the novel. The Boobys and Pamela do return in the final pages, enabling Fielding to bring down the curtain with a fine burlesque of *Virtue Rewarded* in particular and of the super-happy ending of the sentimental novel in general.

No doubt the explanation for this rather faulty organization from so skilled a craftsman as Fielding must be sought in the mysterious workings of the creative process. It may be supposed that as the author developed his work, his own creations came too strongly to life to be contained within the narrow confines of his original intention. At any rate, what had begun as just another burlesque of *Pamela*, albeit on a larger scale than *Shamela*, soon left Richardson behind and took off on its own course. Having recognized the greater potentialities of Joseph Andrews and Parson Adams, Fielding dropped *Pamela-Shamela* in favor of the eccentric parson and of Joseph and Fanny's love story, and only brought back the Boobys to round out the parody and provide an artistic finale.

Yet it would be wrong to assume that the anti-Pamela sections are merely the vestigial remains of what had seemed a good idea in the beginning. Though it is not overtly expressed, certain elements of the satire are implicit through all of *Joseph Andrews*, and the explicit anti-Pamela sections contain very cogent objections to Richardson's heroine.

In the preface Fielding declares his intention of doing a work on "The Ridiculous."³⁴ He tells us that the "source of the true Ridiculous . . . is affectation," and presses this point for three and one-half pages. Chapter One is titled "Of Writing Lives in General, And Particularly of Pamela; With A Word By The By of Colley Cibber And Others." Just as in *Shamela*, Cibber and Pamela are joined for a single attack. After Cibber has been quickly polished off, we learn that Pamela Andrews' precepts are to be the touchstone for the novel's hero, her brother Joseph Andrews.

Joseph, like Pamela, is a servant in the household of Squire Booby's aunt, Lady Booby. Like his sister, he has risen in the household: because of his fine voice, great strength, and handsome body, he has attained to the post of footboy to the lady. While her husband is alive, Lady Booby's attentions to Joey only serve to cause some town talk, but after the death of Sir Thomas Booby his widow ends her six days of mourning—passed at the card table—with a summons to Joseph. His virtue—not to prolong the suspense—is preserved: he pleads innocence, and Lady Booby in a rage dismisses him—which gives her maid Slipslop the opportunity to launch a

similar unsuccessful assault. Events now follow a familiar pattern. Sorely tried, Joseph writes to his sister asking for her guidance; he continues to withstand attempts on his virtue, and finally, when Lady Booby discharges him, he takes the road for home.

In these chapters the burlesque has a social character which was only an undertone in Fielding's first book. In *Shamela* the attack concentrated on Pamela and her morals, but here, by juxtaposing a male in the situation, Fielding makes us stop and examine the whole question of the relationship of the sexes. If we take our cue from the author's own attitude, our conclusion will be that the whole thing is just not as important as Pamela's histrionics would have us believe.

Joseph as seen in the opening episodes is a prig. He is far more chaste than his contemporaries would believe necessary or even possible. His virtue is not that of his fellows, but an extreme exaggeration of his own vanity. This exaggeration is an ugliness which clothes itself in the beauty of virtue, and "when ugliness aims at the applause of beauty, or lameness endeavours to display agility, it is then that these unfortunate circumstances, which at first moved our compassion, tend only to raise our mirth" (p. xv), and deserve our mirth instead of our compassion. As the Joseph-Pamela exaggeration is of course an extreme affectation, it is thus "The Ridiculous." Joseph is less contemptible than his sister because his affectation arises merely from a "vanity"; Pamela's "vanity" is multiplied by her "hypocrisy" which "endeavour[s] to avoid censure, by concealing . . . vices under an appearance of their opposite virtues" (p. xiv).

When Joseph sets out on the road from London, the "Ridiculous" with which Fielding invested him as a tool of parody is dropped and he becomes, inwardly, the man he is to outward appearances. Such an arbitrary metamorphosis is not great art, despite Fielding's apologists.³⁵ The reader is not prepared for the adjustment he must make from a Joseph he has snickered at to the hero of the novel. However, matters are helped by the appearance of Parson Abraham Adams, Joseph's former teacher, whose amiable eccentricities immediately evoke a sympathetic response, and by Fanny Goodwill, Joseph's sweetheart. If Adams is Joseph's friend, then Joseph cannot be too silly, and if the lovely Fanny is his intended bride, his reluctance to bed with a Lady Booby is understandable.

Fanny may be seen as another answer to Pamela. She is aware of her desire for Joseph, which is chaste by Fielding's standards; and where Pamela carries on an uninterrupted stream of correspondence, "poor Fanny could neither read nor write." The sharp contrast between Fanny's straightforward avowal of her love for Joseph and their open-and-aboveboard courtship, and Pamela's deviousness and her concealed preoccupation with B.'s lechery, must stand as the highest point of the parody—yet here, in the body of the work, *Pamela* is never mentioned. The burlesque is carried on at this high level throughout the central portion of the novel—which nonetheless is not as well organized as some Fieldingophiles would have us believe. Fielding's biographer, Wilbur Cross, for example, suggests that even faults of construction in *Joseph Andrews* are deliberately contrived in imitation of Richardson. "At times," he says, "perhaps Fielding lets his narrative stand perfectly still as a burlesque of the suspense characteristics of Richardson."³⁶ This would be something on the order of boring the reader with a quantity of boring dialogue in order to convey the fact that a character is a bore. The satire exists in the general mood pervading the two love affairs; and the effect of this tacit contrast on the reader has been wonderfully epitomized by Coleridge—"to take him [Fielding] up after Richardson is like emerging from a sick-room heated by stoves, into an open lawn on a breezy day in May."³⁷

The satire returns to the manifest level during a visit by Pamela and her husband to Lady Booby. With her nephew's example before her, Lady Booby is determined to marry Joseph, which of course means preventing the marriage of Joseph and Fanny. She is seconded in her endeavor by Pamela, who has blossomed into the full-blown snob presaged by her earlier class-consciousness. Joseph's marriage to Fanny, she tells her brother, will throw their family down from the heights to which she has elevated it by her exalted marriage: Fanny "*was* my equal, . . . but I am no longer Pamela Andrews, I am now this gentleman's lady, and, as such, am above her." And she adds in her finest Pamelian manner, "I hope I shall never behave with an unbecoming pride" (p. 302).

The discovery that Joseph and Fanny are brother and sister makes their marriage impossible; it also occasions a sanctimonious comment from Pamela which is as devastating a condemnation of herself as any that went before: "She said, if he loved Fanny as he ought, with a pure affection, he had no reason to lament being related to her" (p. 331). In these few words are synthesized all the

sham and hypocritical pretense of Pamela's "pure affection" as opposed to Fanny's brand, which never for an instant denies the hope of marriage. She is right to keep on hoping.

Further revelations cancel out the calamitous relationship supposedly established by the earlier disclosure: Joseph is not the brother of Pamela and Fanny, after all; he is the son of Mr. Wilson, a gentleman of a neighboring parish.

Thus the novel ends with a close parallel to *Pamela*: Fanny, now Fanny Andrews, sister to Pamela, marries Joseph Wilson, a gentleman of birth and fortune. In the concluding pages there is a skilful braiding of the many strands of satire, and a resounding slap at the glorious denouement of *Virtue Rewarded*.³⁸ Fittingly enough, the author's final words are an allusion to the lady who started all the shooting in the first place: Joseph and Fanny are "a perpetual fountain of pleasure to their fond parents; and what is particularly remarkable, he declares he will imitate them in their retirement; nor will be prevailed on by any booksellers, or their authors, to make his appearance in high life" (p. 348).

Fielding's two satires of *Pamela* were both popular,³⁹ but they did not achieve the enormous success enjoyed by Richardson's novel in its early years. *Shamela* went through two issues (plus an Irish edition), and *Joseph Andrews* through five editions in the author's lifetime. In these two works, Fielding sounded most of the notes which were to be amplified by later critics of *Pamela*. *Shamela* by its open bawdiness was a condemnation of the concealed eroticism of *Pamela*, though in the main it was an attack on Pamela's business view of morality. *Joseph Andrews* on a far higher level continued the assault by a dissection of the personality of such views. It centered its charge on the hypocrisy, the vanity, the affectation, and the snobbery of Pamela's ethical outlook, though it too criticized the hints of lechery lurking between the lines of Pamela's letters. There were to be no more critiques as acute as Fielding's, but the anti-Pamelas had only just begun.

2 / *Anti-Pamela*

THOUGH Henry Fielding is undoubtedly the greatest of the anti-Pamela authors, he is first in time only by a very narrow margin. Less than one month after the publication of *Shamela*, a very pertinent observation was made in the *London Magazine* (May 1741):

Remarks on Pamela. By a Prude

So moving is Pamela's tale
And innocently told
That I believe it cannot fail
To please both young and old

Yet, I must own, it stirs my gall
To think of Master B———;
And to be sure good women all
Will censure him like me

In naked bed to hold her fast!
While she did roar and brawl!
And then to leave her at the last!
When she had ceas'd to squawl!

He might be sure that she would cry,
And seem t'oppose his will,
Whilst odious Mrs. Jewkes was by;
And yet the girl laid still.

The man it seems, was frightened fore
At her pretended faint;
So, when he might have had a w——e
He took her for a saint.

Pray, Sir, said she, before you go,
What mischief have you done?
His spirits were so very low,
That he said—truly none.

The question, sure, was meant a joke,
 Her scorn of him to show;
 Else, who desire to hear that spoke
 Which she could not but know?

However, pardon did he crave,
 For making such a fuss;
 Her hand unto him then she gave
 Which he vouchsaf'd to buss.

Tho' odd the question may be thought,
 For one so very modest;
 Yet that she would forgive the fault
 To me seemed much the oddest.

The author has spotted that willingness which Fielding first imputed to Shamela. More important, he draws attention to the hypocrisy of Pamela's query to B., and finally, he questions the morals of a girl who could marry such a man.

In July, after *Shamela* had achieved some circulation, these verses were reprinted by the *Scots Magazine*.¹ By this time the "anti-Pamelas" were in full voice, although only three used the word "anti" in their titles. They were *Antipamela ou Memoires de M.D.****; *Anti-Pamela: or, Feign'd Innocence Detected*; and *The True Anti-Pamela: or Memoirs of Mr. James Parry*. The only one of these to follow the *Shamela* theme was *Anti-Pamela: or, Feign'd Innocence Detected: In a Series of Syrena's Adventures. A Narrative which has really its Foundation in Truth and Nature; and at the same time that it entertains, by a vast variety of surprizing Incidents, arms against a partial Credulity by shewing the Mischiefs that frequently arise from a too sudden Admiration. Publish'd as a necessary Caution to all Young Gentlemen*.

The title as set forth above, with its painstaking correlations to the title of the work it assails and the sting in its closing sentence, would seem a more than adequate index to the author's intentions. However, lest the reader be left in any doubt, it is buttressed with a subhead, *Anti-Pamela or, Mock-Modesty Display'd and Punished*.² An anonymous work thought to have come from the versatile pen of Eliza Haywood, it is enjoyable in its own right; but as with all anti-Pamela literature, the reader's pleasure is multiplied when he is familiar with its prototype.

In scenic structure and dialogue as well as in the "case history" of its protagonist, *Anti-Pamela* has countless and patent correspondences to the Richardson novel. It purports to be the story of Syrena Tricky, a beautiful young thing whose look of freshness and in-

nocence “never forsook her Countenance, but continued to dwell in every little Turn and Gesture long after she came to Maturity, and had been guilty of Things, which one would think should have given her the Boldest and most audacious Air.” Her mother—unmarried like Mama Andrews—has schooled Syrena so well that at the age of thirteen she is an accomplished actress who can cry and faint at will.

Soon after she goes into service at a milliner’s, Syrena becomes involved with Vardine, a soldier. In a correspondence that is a counterpart of Pamela’s, her mother warns her against this sort of unprofitable dalliance, whereupon the perverse youngster promptly carries the affair to its conclusion. There are frequent rendezvous, but the first time Syrena presses Vardine for money he decamps. Mama Tricksy, from the richness of her worldly wisdom, finds it in her heart both to forgive her errant daughter and to perform the abortion which allows Syrena to present to the world a sweet, round, innocent face unbelied by a full, round, peccant belly.

Syrena next takes service in the household of Sir Thomas, a baronet, and his son, Mr. L. In this section there occur most of the scenes and dialogue which openly parallel *Pamela*. For instance, when Sir Thomas tries to bribe Syrena following a duplication of Richardson’s summerhouse scene, she replies, “Sir . . . you would not harbour any thoughts of ruining a poor Girl who has nothing but her good Character to depend upon.” And her response to his offer of a settlement is sheer Pamelian rhetoric: “I preferr’d my Honesty in Rags, to all the Splendor in the World, when it must be the purchase of Vice and Infamy.”

When the old man leaves, his son pops out of the closet (parodying the closet scene in *Pamela*). Interrupted only by the tears she is “squeezing out,” he tells her, à la Mr. B., “I loved you.———But your Wit, your Prudence, your unaffected Modesty, has made me now almost adore you.” A little later, spurred on by Syrena, Mr. L. makes *his* request. With “Breasts aheaving—and in a Faultering Voice” she protests her virtue for several pages. Having decoyed him to a settee where his insistence becomes active, she “counterfeited Faintings, fell dying on the Floor, and between every pretended Agony lifting up my Eyes, cry’d O! Sir you have kill’d me—but I forgive you.” Unable to decide between old married Moneybags and young unmarried Penniless, Syrena and her Mama contrive a scheme to get her married and monied at the same time. While the family is at church, she “receives” Mr. L. and pretends

rape. Since the family takes her “to be the most artless and innocent of her Sex,” she knows that they will insist on a marriage and will finance it to help cover up the scandal. The ruse nearly succeeds, but the last-minute discovery of an incriminating letter leads to an arrest instead of a marriage ceremony.

Syrena is spared a prison sentence, and embarks on a succession of amours. During this part of the narrative her exploits have no parallel in *Pamela*. The Pamelian motif reappears when Syrena becomes the housekeeper of a Mr. W., who, of course, falls for the lure she immediately puts out. He wrestles her to a couch, whereupon Syrena “fell a weeping, and cry’d, O, Sir do not . . . make me fearful of the Lot I so lately blest—I am unhappy, it is true; but I am virtuous.” What really bothers her in this situation is not knowing whether he wants a wife or a mistress. She is willing either way, but a *faux pas* might cost her the victory, so she must fight a delaying action. Finally she runs through men and money, is reduced to walking the streets, and is kept out of jail only by the intervention of her kinsmen, who send her to an estate in Wales, “where what befel her must be the Subject of future Entertainment.”

Syrena, then, is the twin sister of Shamela-Pamela, and her special virtue for us is that she emphasizes the points of similarity between the Pamelian and the anti-Pamelian characterizations. She serves to fill out the picture of a “mock modesty,” of a “feign’d innocence,” of a girl who can be a schemer and a politician to her fingertips and yet be regarded as the “most artless and innocent of her Sex.”

In two details of the narrative, this *Anti-Pamela* also scores solid blows against the Richardson novel. In connection with the first of these—Syrena’s “forgiveness” of her would-be rapist—it is only necessary to recall Pamela’s virtuous and persistent forgiving of Mr. B. to appreciate that here again Richardson is guilty of the “Ridiculous.” To forgive ceases to be a virtue when it is done to please one’s own “affectation.” With Pamela, we suspect that, at best, to be forgiving is another aspect of her exaggerated conception of her own purity and her ideas on how to act to sustain her chosen role. At worst, this “vanity” is alloyed with the vice of drawing Mr. B. on for her own ends. In either event, the truly great virtue of forgiving must be followed by action of a high and serious nature if the story is to proceed artistically on as elevated a level as *Virtue Rewarded* presumes to operate. If, instead, it immediately descends to the buffoonery of B.’s curses and plans for another attempt, the

result is the "Ridiculous." Because the artistic development is poor and we see through the sham of the action, instead of sighing with this hard-pressed maid, we laugh, when she forgives B. We might recognize this failure as an artistic flaw in Richardson and absolve Pamela as a character if we could believe that her actions were prompted by naïveté or stupidity; but we know these are characteristics which may never be assigned to her.

The second point concerns the fact that Mama Tricky's excellent counsel backfired and impelled Syrena into bed with Vardine. To understand this point, it is necessary to know that Syrena had not consummated the affair with Vardine and indeed was about to drop him when her mother wrote her to do just that. Irritated that her mother should presume to coach her, Syrena allowed Vardine to take her to a tavern bedroom. In the case of Pamela, her first letter to her parents tells them simply that B. has been kind to her, has read her letters, and has taken her by the hand. The Andrews' lengthy reply is a five-alarm siren, bell, whistle, and red flag alerting her to guard her "jewel." That her parents should dispatch this frantically worded warning on the meager evidence they had before them is an indication of the type of household in which Pamela's character was molded. We may with justice wonder at the sort of morality that exhibits this constant and extravagant preoccupation with vice. Ideally, a pure person would judge others' actions by his own thoughts and deeds, and would not so unhesitatingly infer guilty intentions. Even if we accept the Andrewses as a worldly family, a truly virtuous couple would not see lechery in B.'s first advances. The answer is that regardless of the hymn-singing with which they seek to conceal what lies in their minds, the Andrewses no less than Mama Tricky live with lust as the constant companion of their thoughts. The end result of the cautionary letter to Pamela is not so direct as in Syrena's case, but then Pamela is so much wiser.

The kinship of Syrena and Pamela is also displayed in their identical reaction to another parental behest. Pamela's parents admonish her, "If you find the least attempt made upon your virtue, be sure you leave every thing behind you, and come away to us."⁸ But like Syrena, Pamela disobeys, and stays, and stays, and stays.

II

The authors of the two anti-Pamelas next discussed adopted the name of "Pamela," as Eliza Haywood did for *Syrena*, chiefly to cash in on the popularity of Richardson's novel. Nonetheless, in an

oblique fashion, each contributes one valid point to the indictment of *Pamela*.

The True Anti-Pamela: or Memoirs of Mr. James Parry is an autobiographical account of Parry's amour with a Miss Powell, alias Parthenissa, and is known to be a true story. A clue as to the book's nature is given in the full title: *The True Anti-Pamela: or Memoirs of Mr. James Parry Late Organist of Ross in Herefordshire In which are inserted His Amours with the Celebrated Miss ——— of Monmouthshire: Written by Himself Interspersed with many Curious and Entertaining Love-Letters which passed between them.*⁴ The connection with *Pamela* is explained in the preface: Parry declares that if *Pamela* is virtuous and poor, anti-*Pamela*-Parthenissa is rich and sinful. This is the only explicit reference except for one short interpolation in which a Mr. B. tells Parry the sad story of his marriage. Mr. B., a man of fortune, marries a girl of inferior rank. Some time later a servant informs him of his wife's infidelity; B. pretends to go on a trip and returns to catch his wife with her "gallant." She runs off, but not before she makes away with his movable property (pp. 304-306).

This story, however, is a trifle beside the revelation of the author's character which emerges from the narrative. Parry's grievance against Parthenissa derives from her refusal to marry him after she has kept him "for her pleasure" for several years. He has no qualms about publishing their "curious . . . love letters," nor does he hesitate to expose her passionate, erotic poetry to public inspection (pp. 193-195). He maintains that the affair was initiated by Parthenissa and prolonged by her carnal desires and reluctance to marry; he compares her to Pasiphae, whose yearnings could only be assuaged by a bull; and, as a crowning insult, he discloses her right age.

Even though the work was animated by the spirit of revenge, the author has succeeded in drawing not so much a scarlet picture of Miss Powell as a black picture of himself. The portrait of Parthenissa depends wholly upon the degree of Parry's truthfulness; we may or may not choose to accept what he says about his mistress. But we do not question the rightness of the self-portrait; Parry exists for us in all his meanness and petty frustration.⁵

Similarly, Richardson in telling the story of *Pamela* unwittingly has given us a self-portrait. He is a Pygmalion whose Galatea is modeled on what he perceives in the mirror of his own vanity; he invests her with his complete repertoire of virtues, she is his own

reflection, his alter ego. The result is not only the portrait of Pamela but also of the man. As Digeon points out:

If the author's attitude had only been more critical he might have made of *Pamela* an admirable and profound psychological study, pitilessly true, the penetrating portrait of a little eighteenth-century waiting-maid, rather mincing, cautiously romantic, and very skilled in making her virtue pay. No, the thing which irritates and sometimes exasperates is not the heroine herself, but the author's devout admiration for her. One feels that his view of the world is the same as hers, narrow and conventional. In painting her he has laid bare the secret of his own soul.⁶

While I do not concur with Digeon's estimate of the novel, I do agree that Richardson's "soul," in all its priggishness and prudery, and Richardson's general ethical outlook can be mapped by means of a critical examination of Pamela's morals.

In the French novel *Antipamela ou Memoires de M.D.**** by Claude Villaret, we receive not only permission to examine Pamela's morals, but a directive to do so. The story opens as M.D.***, an innocent young girl, is given by her mother to Mr. Kiel, a rich cashier of a Bristol company, who desires her for his mistress. Apparently she is too innocent to be fully aware of the sinfulness of the life she is about to enter; at any rate, it is Kiel's ugliness and deformities, not the moral issue, which cause her to flee. She is accompanied in her flight by a young nobleman, Milord, who soon seduces her,⁷ and the life for which she had been destined with Kiel, she finds enjoyable with Milord—or so it would appear from their first bedroom scene, described in rich, pornographic detail (pp. 40-41).

Loving attention to detail is also noticeable in a scene of passion with another lover—a chevalier—for whom she has deserted Milord and from whom she is later abducted by Kiel. Held prisoner by Kiel, she receives word that her chevalier has found her; he cannot procure her escape but she is to make preparations to receive him. That night, in complete darkness, her lover steals to her bedside, and our heroine passes the most exquisite hours of her already full career: "*Je n'avais jamais ressenti une volupté si piquante . . .*" (p. 98). But next morning her fury and chagrin know no bounds when she wakes to find it is Kiel in bed beside her. However, as this seems to be a case where ugliness is only skin deep, she makes the best of things and marries him. After several well-documented infidelities, Kiel conveniently dies, leaving her rich and free to

marry Milord. But soon thereafter Milord breaks his neck in a fall from a horse, leaving her with only her memories for company.

Now comes the moral—she decides to publish her memoirs to demonstrate how improper training may corrupt an innocent maid! And why not? If Pamela can do it, why can't M.D.***?

Such a question assumes duplicity in both authors, which is of course incorrect. Villaret was using the moral only as an excuse for writing a pornographic story; Richardson sincerely thought he was telling a tale of virtue rewarded. But if *Antipamela* points up the fact that we must be free to question the sincerity of an ostensible moral purpose in a story, *Pamela* just as surely highlights the fact that we must be free to question the nature of the morals which the author expounds. We cannot seriously doubt Richardson's moral intentions, for his species of virtue is on display in every page of *Pamela*. But as Fielding first stated, Haywood repeated, and Villaret accidentally brought to our attention, Richardson's virtue is really vice in disguise.

III

In 1744 *Pamela* was placed on the Index by Pope Benedict XIV.⁸ Unfortunately, the reasons for this action are unknown, but in all probability they are concerned with the surface lewdness of the novel—the lubricious scenes which, though strong, hardly deserved this extreme condemnation. *Shamela*, as we know, had parodied the “warm” descriptions, and they were the subject of Parson Oliver's first specific charge. However, Fielding undoubtedly felt that this was a minor point, important only as it bore on the possible hypocrisy of an author who could inveigh against such scenes and at the same time write them. Moreover, Fielding knew that laughter can set to naught the effect of even the sultriest passages, and he could see the humor in *Pamela* much as we see it today. A modern introduction to an excerpt from *Pamela* even in its title—“A Close Shave”—is representative of the attitude of most twentieth-century readers:

Pamela, the heroine, was the female precursor of Hairbreadth Harry. Throughout the first volume this fair maiden is in constant danger from day to day, almost from hour to hour, of losing her virtue. As our scene opens she is being relentlessly pursued in every paragraph . . .⁹

But, as our own book-censors demonstrate, such a point of view would not be universal, and in Richardson's day only a few could discern the ludicrous elements in Pamela's story.

The Church was not alone in finding the so-called "luscious" passages a matter for censure. Among the others, the first to note his displeasure was the unknown author of the interesting pamphlet *Pamela Censured: In A Letter To The Editor*.¹⁰ The author's strongest point is made in the title, which continues in the usual eighteenth-century manner:

Shewing That under the Specious Pretence of Cultivating the Principles of Virtue in the Minds of the Youth of both Sexes, the Most Artful and Alluring Amorous Ideas are convey'd.

And that, instead of being divested of all Images that tend to inflame; Her letters abound with Incidents, which must necessarily raise in the unwary Youth that read them, Emotions far distant from the Principles of Virtue.

For full effect this rebuttal should be set in parallel columns with Richardson's original title. It would then be seen that the pamphleteer has made use of Richardson's own phrases to fling the "moral" back at him. Here is the same questioning of "moral" purpose which has been discussed in connection with *Memoires de M.D.****. Although Richardson has claimed that his work "is intirely divested of all those Images, which . . . tend to inflame," the pamphleteer has decided that this statement and Richardson's announced purpose to cultivate the principles of virtue and religion are "Specious Pretence." That this attitude is not mere eighteenth-century overzealousness is attested by Digeon's comments:

Again, what irritates the reader is to find that under the pretence of giving us an edifying and moral novel, the author has presented a salacious tale, the sole interest of which lies in discovering whether a ruffian will finally succeed in seducing a young woman: "Will Pamela be violated or not?" Such, in a word, is the question which soon becomes the point at issue, such the agonizing problem which has caused so many panting readers feverishly to turn the pages of this book and read without disgust scenes as painful as that in which the author, having cast Pamela and B. . . . into the same bed, complacently describes with unmentionable details an attempt at rape (p. 51).

Now, I am forced to disagree with both Digeon and the pamphleteer because both imply that *Pamela* is all pretense and that this is proved by the attempted rape scenes. In fact, the truth lies in Digeon's very next sentence: "One feels quite clearly in

reading Fielding that he is in revolt against the author's [Richardson's] state of mind. . . ."

Here we have it—*Richardson's mind*. Obviously if this was Richardson's "state of mind" it was not pretense. And the attack should not be against his sincerity, but against his "mind," his morals, his ethics. There is good reason to attack these scenes, but if we try to exploit them as proof of pretense, we will lose out against the preponderant evidence of the rest of the novel. What they do show is the prurience lying at the back of every prude's attempt to teach us virtue. Their minds see obscenities which escape everyone else, and in voicing their thoughts, they proclaim their prurience as the virtue by whose authority they have set themselves up to judge others.

Pamela Censured starts out bravely, for the author is concerned with "Artful and Alluring Amorous Ideas";¹¹ and if he attacks the ideas, then he will be going to the heart of the matter. His heavy artillery, however, is concentrated on out-Richardsoning Richardson and he merely lists the many passages such as "Naked breasts being run over with the Hand, and Kisses given with such eagerness that they cling to the Lips," without any attempt to relate these imaginings to the mind that produced them. As a matter of fact, like Richardson, the pamphleteer discloses the direction of his own thoughts when he declares that these scenes will impel a girl still too young to find a bed-partner to "seek Remedies [for aroused passion] which may drive her to the most unnatural Excesses" (p. 24).

His small shot does bring down some of Richardson's petticoat army. As Fielding did in *Shamela*, he accuses Richardson of the authorship of the prefatory letters as well as the novel: "The many Eulogia in your Preface . . . are but an abstract of what fulsome Praises an Author would privately entertain himself with . . ." (p. 10). With greater critical discernment the author, in a sly reversal of the class double standard (which would be particularly irksome to a man of Richardson's ilk), states that if it is good for Pamela to marry B., then it should be equally good for young genteel girls to marry their footmen. He also makes the interesting point "that Pamela instead of being artless and innocent sets out . . . with as much Knowledge . . . of the Town, as if she had been born and bred in Covent Garden." This bears on the question of Pamela's home training which has already been touched on; and it corroborates an earlier assumption about her—that she is never

innocent. She always avoids the pitfalls from which the less knowledgeable Fanny Goodwill has to be rescued.

The pamphleteer makes a further accusation, frequently repeated by eighteenth-century critics, that other "young men will be tempted to rehearse the scenes with some other Pamelas. . . ." This is the sort of bootless comment typical of book-censors, but he attempts to bolster it by adding that these scenes "must fill the Youth" with "lewd ideas" more effectively than "Rochester can." Here we have a seeming contradiction. After an assault on the surface manifestations of Pamela's sinfulness, the author declares that Rochester's work, which is glaringly pornographic on the surface, is less evil than *Pamela*. He argues that Rochester openly labels his verses as pornography and thus warns off those who would not read such poetry, and that Rochester's grossness of expression would repel those who did read him. On the other hand, Richardson's lofty moral tone and the refinement of his language would only lull the adolescent into a more receptive state, and he is therefore the more dangerous.

This argument may dispel the contradiction, but it does not convict Richardson of pretense. The author confuses the results with the intent, and Richardson's intention must be viewed in the context of the total work. The rape scenes may be highly erotic, but the eroticism is not an end in itself as it is for Rochester. These scenes are necessary episodes in the development of the novel and they must be examined within its framework, not as separate entities. Within the total picture they are never really as objectionable as Rochester's pornography. Further they are important for the full exposition of Pamela's virtue and of Richardson's ethical outlook. Thus it is not "Specious Pretence" on Richardson's part that has produced these scenes; it is his prurience acting on his imagination. And Pamela is not pretending to a certain kind of virtue: this is her virtue—a good businesswoman's appreciation of the value of rejecting B.'s demands.

The real point at issue is not pretense, but Richardson's species of morality, and the pamphleteer seems to show some awareness of this when he writes that Pamela's "Virtue is only founded on Shame, and she seems to imply that could she be secure from the Censure of the World she would not hesitate to commit the Sin" (p. 33). In this statement the pamphleteer has abandoned the argument for pretense, and has Richardson's code squarely under examination. Now if Richardson were pretending, there would be no "shame"

involved (he could tell a much warmer story with a second shameless M.D.***), but it is exactly "the censure of the world" that Pamela seeks to avoid, not the loss of virtue. Pamela herself gives the same answer when she tells Mrs. Jervis of the probable results of acceding to B.'s propositions:

So, if I was wicked enough, he would keep me till I was undone, and till his Mind changed; for even wicked Men, I have read, soon grow weary of Wickedness, and love Variety. Well then, poor Pamela must be turn'd off, and look'd upon as a vile abandon'd Creature, and every body would despise her; ay, and *justly* too, Mrs. Jervis; for she that can't keep her virtue, ought to live in Disgrace (pp. 44-45).

This is quite bald, and even its sermonizing conclusion helps to point up the virtueless nature of Pamela's refusal.

IV

Pamela Censured is interesting for its failure. Several times the author shows some insight into the essential fault of Pamela-Richardson, and each time he loses the trail to wander aimlessly in the maze of bedroom scenes. Charles Povey, the author of the pamphlet which soon followed, never did find his way out of the maze. His work—distinguished by a coat of arms, religious zeal, and poor English—was titled *The Virgin in Eden. . . . To which are added, Pamela's Letters proved to be immodest Romances painted in Images of Virtue: Masquerades in Disguise, that receiv'd Birth now Vice reigns in Triumph, and swells in Streams even to a Deluge.*¹²

Povey should have been beloved by a century that adored *Don Quixote*, but it is one thing to enjoy an eccentric literary character and another to live with one, and unfortunately the eighteenth century had to live with Povey. His projects were not all quixotic; one, an insurance scheme, made him a fortune. His attack on Pamela's petticoats, however, resembles nothing so much as the Don's attack on the windmill.

My thoughts on Solitude and Silence, that should at this Time receive their Birth, must remain in Manuscript uncorrected: There now lies before me two Volumes, under the Title of Virtue Rewarded, that I cannot omit taking Notice of: The Work hath obtained a glorious Character in the Eye of some; they recommend it to Families equal to The whole Duty of Man, to instill Religion into the Minds of both Sexes.

Good God! what can Youths and Virgins learn from Pamela's Letters, more than lessons to tempt their chastity;

Those Epistles are only Scenes of Immodesty, painted in Images of Virtue; Disguises in Masquerade as I shall prove both from Truth and Reason . . . (p. i).

Having flung down the gauntlet he prepares for the assault with an account of a virgin's journey from Sodom to Canaan. (Of course he does not fashion his work on the old romances à la Cervantes, but rather on "the Pilgrim's Progress wrote by John Bunyan a poor Mechanick.") After the virgin has been conducted to her destination, he tells us that his reading of *Pamela* soon conveyed him into "Circles of Lewdness; nay even in Bed-chambers frequented by Women as charming as Nuns in Company with wild Rakes." As for Pamela herself, she would raise "Desires even in Men as chaste as Joseph when tempted by his Mistress." Although he cannot as "a Christian" repeat some of Pamela's "expressions," he is not too coy to provide a catalogue of the scenes of Pamela and B. "both in the naked Bed together."

Then, at long last, he makes a point which pertains to more than the bedroom descriptions. "Pure Virgins," he writes, "At the first Assault upon their Virtue . . . retreat. . . . That Maid who holds a Parley with a vicious Man a second time . . . I censure her Chastity." In Povey's view, chastity connotes more than technical virginity. He implies that there must be a corresponding spiritual virginity, a quality which Pamela notably does not possess.

This is good criticism, and it seems that perhaps Povey will work his way out of the maze, after all. But reading on we discover that his virtue, like Pamela's, is characterized by caution and suspicion: "Virgins pure in Mind and Thought, when they retire to Rest at Night [when suspicious] . . . never undress till every Avenue in the Room is searched and the Doors safely secur'd." Instead of answering Richardson, Povey merely outdoes him. He even surpasses him in the matter of commendatory letters. Richardson used only two, but Povey, to demonstrate the universal appeal of his "Virgin," includes letters from a "Divine of the Church of England"; a "Dissenting Minister" who assures him he will meet his just "Reward" for his anti-Pamela services (somehow, they all seem to be concerned with the reward their virtue will bring); a "Speaker amongst the People call'd Quakers"; a "young Nobleman" formerly a disciple of Pamela's, now converted to Povey's heroine; and a "young Lady." In short, just about every precinct is heard from.

Povey concludes his pamphlet by listing some forty subjects he has yet to air his views on, such as:

Heavenly Bodies not made for the Use of Man only . . . which Sex is most guilty of Incontinency . . . The Composition of Licentious Authors justly Censured . . . whether the custom of saluting Women upon Visits be conformable to the Laws of Chastity and Advice to Virgins on this Point . . . and whether any modern Authors can be compar'd with Homer and Virgil (pp. 117-118).

Ending his life on the note on which he'd lived it, Povey, in a posthumous gesture, bequeathed to each of two hundred poor widows a copy of his *Virgin in Eden*.¹³

V

A sizeable portion of the anti-Pamela literature is concerned with the descriptive scenes rather than character analysis. As criticism, much of it is meaningless, and "random sampling" should suffice to give us a notion of its kind and content.

In her *Memoirs* (1824) Laetitia Matilda Hawkins traces the "fashion of light reading,"¹⁴ interspersing her remarks with snide asides at "chambermaids and washerwomen," presumably to establish her own superior position. Lest some vulgarian doubt her scholarship, she is at pains to let it be known that she is aware of the Latin origins of the English novel. Apropos of *Pamela*, she remarks that "persons of any discrimination, I had almost said of common decency, (and I know not why I should not say it,) began to loathe Pamela . . ." (p. 195). She continues in this vein, concluding her criticism—if such it may be called—with a reference to a lawyer who had read and enjoyed Richardson's novels. Evidently she had favored this young man, "yet the consciousness of the dirt through which he had waded, tacitly destroyed all idea of delicacy or his disgust at want of it. We parted never to meet again" (p. 199)!

In *The Feelings of the Heart* (1772), an earlier writer creates a young girl even more innocent than Pamela is supposed to be, who fancies herself in love. Her knowledgeable mother has just the remedy at hand:

My mother made no answer; but opening a book-case, took down a volume of Pamela.

"This," said she, "is perhaps a dangerous instructor, but dangerous distempers require dangerous remedies. Read this Sophia," continued she, "and learn from it to guard against . . . men."¹⁵

To be sure, not all the objections to the rape scenes or B.'s surface villainy are as insipid as these. The anti-Pamela writings display a regular hierarchy of intelligence, at one extreme producing

the kind of criticism we have just seen, at the other something very like good sense. A brief survey, arranged without regard to chronology, provides a representative selection of the objections to *Pamela's* morals, and shows that the passage of time did not in itself unify opinion on the book.

One of the most persistent and consistent criticisms of *Pamela* was also aimed at novels as a class. A considerable body of opinion held that reading for pleasure was a waste of the time which could be more profitably spent in preparation for departure from this vale of tears. Critics of this persuasion were, of course, anti-novel as well as anti-Pamela.

In 1745, A.W., a poor male, inveighing against women's fashions and pastimes, confided that it was not that he didn't like women, he just wished that "Reading of the Bible and other Books of Religion took up at least half as much of their Time as the Reading of Plays, Pamelas, Novels, Romances. . . ." ¹⁶ In the same year, James Miller, a playwright well-versed in Richardson, adapts the *Clarissa* marriage theme to his drama *The Picture*, and makes an almost identical comment. Celia's father, berating her for not accepting a husband of his choice, says: "These confounded Romances have been the Ruin of Thee; I warrant thou canst say more of Pamela . . . than thy Catechism." ¹⁷ A. W. and Miller could not have read all the way through the title of *Virtue Rewarded* or they too would have realized that it was slyly inculcating principles of virtue and religion in novelistic guise.

Another objection came from those who regarded the brain as a muscle which was exercised by reading. The duller and heavier the book, the better the exercise; but the light workout provided by novels would only tend to weaken the muscle and make it unfit for more rugged work. Thus Laura Guilford, writing to Sophia Manchester (1798), complains that after reading Richardson she cannot go back to her history studies: "This is one disadvantage of novel reading. It dissipates the ideas, relaxes the mind, and renders it inattentive to the more solid and useful branches of literature." ¹⁸

These objectors disclose less of *Pamela's* defects than of their own deficiencies, but in *The Sylph* of 1783 we can detect a glimmering of real criticism. A father, describing the attack on his daughter Nancy's virtue by a Colonel Montague, reports that the Colonel employed a trusted neighbor as his bawd. This neighbor advised Nancy to throw over her farm-boy sweetheart, and attach herself to the upper-class Colonel. She pictured for Nancy

What a fine opportunity it would be to raise her family like Pamela Andrews and accordingly placed in the hands of my child those pernicious volumes. . . . what wonder such artifices should prevail over the ignorant mind of a young rustic. . . . Nancy first learnt to disrelish the honest, artless effusions of her first lover's heart. His language was insipid after the luscious speeches of Mr. B.¹⁹

While this is an unlikely estimate of B.'s language, at least there has been some effort to trace an effect back to a specific source, and were this done logically it would result in a true exposure of Pamela.

We finally approach character evaluation in Henry Brooke's *Juliet Grenville* (1774). Juliet had been reading "Pamela, or virtue rewarded which already had made some noise in the world," to the Countess of Cranfield. When the Countess asks her opinion, Juliet responds that she likes the author's touches:

but then I blush at the manner in which he undresses our sex. Indeed his ideas are much too frequently and unnecessarily wanton. Neither can I wholly approve the title of the book: can virtue be rewarded by being united to vice? Her master was a ravisher, a tyrant, a dissolute, a barbarian in manners and principle. I admit it, the author may say; but then he was superior in riches and station. Indeed Mr. Richardson never fails in due respect to such matters; he always gives the full value to title and fortune.²⁰

Juliet's comments are sane and perceptive. Being a proper young lady she blushes at the "luscious" scenes, but being a sensible one as well she does not regard them as grounds for book-banning. She has looked beneath the surface to see what makes Pamela-Richardson tick and has recognized that the "luscious" scenes are the visible symptoms of wanton ideas. Thus it is not so much the descriptions that should be objected to as the context in which they appear, for it is from the context that these scenes take their coloration. In a sense, Juliet's remarks on the "reward" of virtue marrying vice are contextual criticism. And, as her concluding sentences show, she has seen the sniveling class-consciousness which has helped to shape Richardson's concept of virtue.

The question of virtue marrying vice is one which Richardson himself was to answer differently in his second novel, *Clarissa* (not that he had abandoned his class standards; *Clarissa* was the social equal of *Lovelace*). This key question is also answered differently by two minor *Pamelas*: *Innocence in Distress: or, Virtue Triumphant* (1760) and *Pamela Howard* (1773). *Innocence in*

*Distress*²¹ is a direct steal from Richardson, but the author cannot accept the marriage of the virtuous Sophia (Pamela) to the villainous Ballarin (B.). Instead, Sophia leaves Ballarin and is rescued from poverty when she too receives the reward of her virtue—marriage to a rich merchant. The *Pamela Howard* plot²² is an amazing amalgam of all three of Richardson's novels: *Pamela*, *Clarissa*, and *Grandison*. The author drags in the whole Grandison family by name; Bouvery the lover is compared to Lovelace of *Clarissa*, and the heroine is called Pamela. Pamela flees to Bouvery after she has been drugged by her family to marry Appleby. When Bouvery decides to make a test of her virtue, Pamela spurns him and returns to Appleby. Tragedy, black tragedy, thereafter stalks them all.

Baculard d'Arnaud, in an even more unconvincing novel, *Fanni ou la Nouvelle Pamela* (1767), has the young nobleman stage a mock marriage in order to seduce Fanni. When she learns how she has been put upon, by Pamela's standards Fanni should live—or die—in shame. However, according to her American translator, she cries: "My honour is still the property of my heart—It is he—it is the execrable traitor who has forfeited his own. . . . Can I be criminal in your eyes, in the eyes of God?"²³ This is the central point even in a sketch for puppets, Samuel Foote's *Handsome Housemaid, or Piety in Pattens* (1773),²⁴ and when a theme can be parodied in a form which is itself a parody of serious drama, then indeed it must be of wide popular appeal. In Foote's sketch the pious housemaid refuses the scheming master in favor of the butler, so Richardson's class standards also get their comeuppance.²⁵

Richardson's followers, too, recognized this major moral flaw. Frances Brooke, in her incredibly popular opera, *Rosina* (1793), appropriates the entire *Pamela* plot but divides B. into two characters: Mr. Belville, the master, who loves Rosina, and Captain Belville, the brother, who attempts the kidnaping and rape. When Captain Belville is foiled by his virtuous brother, he offers to marry Rosina as atonement:

Bel. [the virtuous brother] If Rosina accepts it, I am satisfied.

Ros. (to Belville) Will you, sir, suffer?—This, sir, is a second insult. . . .²⁶

That Pamela, maiden of full and acute sensibilities, did not feel the insult, is the key to her character.

For a full picture of this business of marriage as it was probably viewed by the majority in Richardson's England, we must turn to Sophia Lee's *Life of a Lover* (1804). Here a young girl accepts a rake's proposition, assuming it to have been a proposal. Astonished, the rake replies:

Matrimony? absolute, serious matrimony? Lord help thee child! . . . I see you have been reading *Pamela*, and mean to figure away in the same character; but faith, my dear! You will not find Mr. B's more plenty, than such damsels of fifteen.²⁷

The question of the hasty marriage is also a part of Dr. Peter Shaw's essay in *The Reflector*. This criticism is especially interesting because McKillop shows it to have been stolen *in toto* from the *Moral Thoughts* of the Scandinavian dramatist Ludwig Holberg.²⁸ *Moral Thoughts* was translated into German and French, and we thus have additional confirmation of Pamela's European vogue. Even in England Shaw's essay was popular enough to call for a reprint in 1762 in *The Tablet, or Picture of Real Life*:

There are Swarms of Moral Romances. One, of late Date, divided the World into such opposite Judgments, that some extolled it to the Stars, whilst others treated it with Contempt. Whence arose, particularly among the Ladies, two different Parties, Pamelists and Anti-pamelists. . . . Some look upon this young Virgin as an Example for Ladies to follow; nay there have been those who did not scruple to recommend this Romance from the Pulpit. Others, on the contrary, discover in it, the Behaviour of an hypocritical, crafty Girl in her Courtship; who understands the Art of bringing a Man to her Lure. . . . Her History, indeed, would have been more exemplary, and her Conduct less exceptionable, if this Heroine, after suffering so many Persecutions, had continued in her low Condition; for, thus she would have avoided the Censure now passed upon her. At least she might have made her Admirer wait a few Years, before she concluded the Match. Nevertheless I approve of this Romance, so far as it contains just Sentiments and holds out an example of Virtue and Honour. At the same time, I cannot allow it to be a Master-piece; and by no means think it deserves to be recommended from the Pulpit. For tho' there are some instructive Parts in this Work, yet there are others too licentious. And certainly the Images it draws of a beautiful Woman, her Shape, Air, Neck, Breasts, &c which are fully display'd cannot furnish a proper Text for a sermon.²⁹

Essentially, Shaw was pro-Pamela (a section of praise has been deleted from the above quotation), and his criticism of the

descriptive scenes is merely that they are unsuitable for a sermon; but even one who "approves" of Pamela cannot dismiss without comment her speedy acceptance of B.'s marriage offer. As for the criticism that she should continue "in her low Condition" or at least "wait a few years," it is sheer nonsense because it takes no account of the character of the person under consideration. Pamela does exactly what a girl of her sort should do, and by this action she must be examined. It is the capstone of the story just as her former acts are the blocks which support it; and they are held together by her final move. This is an excellent, unified development, for it is only when we get the final act of the marriage acceptance that the consistency of all her former deeds becomes clear. To try to "improve" *Pamela* by removing this unifying element would bring down the whole structure.

After all the foregoing censures of Pamela for having been lacking in virtue, it is decidedly refreshing to come upon a criticism which finds her too strict or at the least appearing to have an overly rigid code. In "The Delicate Distress" (1769), by Elizabeth Griffith, Lady Straffon writes to Lady Woodville concerning a mutual friend whose husband is involved in a public scandal with the chambermaid. She voices criticism which may be applied to *Pamela*; and in fact a direct reference shows that the novel was actually in her mind. Lady Straffon writes:

A young man, who is capable of seducing a young creature, that is immediately under his protection, can never be worth regretting . . . a truly delicate woman cannot preserve her affection for such a one long.—Contempt must follow vice; and where we once despise, we must soon cease to love. . . .

Had she been led astray, by an agreeable young man, I could have pitied, nay, perhaps, have loved, and even esteemed her; for I am not such an Amazon, in ethics, as to consider a breach of chastity, as the highest crime, that a woman can be guilty of; though it is, certainly, the most unpardonable folly; and I believe there are many women, who have erred, in that point, who may have more real virtue, aye, and delicacy too, than half the fainted dames, who value themselves on the preservation of their chastity. . . . a simple girl, however mean her condition, may flatter herself, that her lover's intentions are honourable. . . . and your Pamelas . . . encourage hope, in young, untutored minds. . . .

I will endeavour to make my girl distinguish between vice, and weakness; and I hope, while she detests the one, she will be always ready to pity, and, if in her power, to protect, the other.—There is no character, I so heartily abominate, as that of the outrageously virtuous.³⁰

While Lady Straffon condemns Mr. B. and any girl who could love so vicious a character, in the main her criticism is directed at Pamela's philosophy: "She that can't keep her virtue, ought to live in Disgrace" (p. 48). Pamela cannot distinguish between vice and weakness, and for her chastity is all of virtue, whereas for Lady Straffon it is merely a part and not even a necessary part. To Lady Straffon a breach of chastity is folly, and in this respect Pamela is never, never foolish. Perhaps herein lies her "virtue." Finally, Pamela is to be "heartily abominated" according to Lady Straffon's code, for she is certainly "outrageously virtuous"—by her own account. This is sensible criticism, and any comparison of Lady Straffon's ethics with Pamela's is certain to show up the meanness and narrowness of Pamela's conception of virtue.

Pamela's pretended modesty is also exposed in a letter written by Eliza Lucas in 1742. Miss Lucas, later to become the wife of Chief Justice Charles Pinckney, wrote to an acquaintance:

Dear Miss Bartlett: I send by the bearer my compliments to Mrs. Pinckney, and the last volume of "Pamela." She is a good girl and as such I love her dearly; but I must think her very defective, and even blush for her while she allows herself that disgusting liberty of praising herself, or what is very like it, repeating all the fine speeches made to her by others. . . .³¹

"Disgusting" is a strong word, but Miss Lucas is letting Pamela off mildly. The book abounds in such quotations as: "for he said I was very pretty" (p. 12); "[her shoes] just fit me (for my Lady had a very little Foot)" (p. 12); "Pamela is very pretty indeed" (p. 63); "See that shape! I never saw such a face and shape in my life" (p. 65); "I took my Straw Hat in my Hand . . . look'd about me in the Glass, as proud as anything—to say Truth, I never lik'd myself so well in my Life" (p. 67). Self-praise is strewn throughout the novel and is particularly annoying because Pamela almost always puts the compliments in someone else's mouth. Oh, she transmits them all right, and never does she let a single one go by, but always with an accompanying show of modesty which makes her constant refrain: What can Mr. B. see in poor little lower-class me! pure hypocrisy, for by the testimony of the last quotation above, she has often "looked about in the glass" and has just as often "lik'd" what she has seen.

VI

As their dates show, these objections persisted throughout the eighteenth century, and seem unmodified by the publication of

Clarissa in 1747 and of *Grandison* seven years later. It is true that the "divine *Clarissa*" won many critics over to Richardson's side, and that some few more were converted when Sir Charles made his bow. But, not surprisingly, other critics seized upon each new book as an excuse to reopen the controversy and included in their arguments Richardson's previous work as well as the current title. Illustrative of this are two letters published in 1754, shortly after *Grandison's* appearance.³²

Although as in the previous criticism both letters castigate the boudoir scenes of "the blooming Pamela," they introduce many other considerations. The questions raised do not always stay close to the matter at hand, but the letters are interesting for their simplified—oversimplified, really—exposition of social trends which bear on our view of *Pamela*. What is most important, however, is their excellent critical method. In each of these pamphlets Richardson is appraised as an artist; his morals, language, and politics are criticized as units, but only as they pertain to his literary craftsmanship. Here, in short, the novel is examined as an art form.

The second and apparently the more successful of the pamphlets—it went through three editions from April to July—was titled *A Candid Examination of the History of Sir Charles Grandison. In a Letter to a Lady of Distinction*, and is supposedly the work of Francis Plumer. After writing a sort of review for the *Lady*, the author observes that "it seems as if Mr. R——n begun to consider himself as a Bookseller as well as an author; . . . or he could not in writing for Reputation only, have surfeited us so much with tedious repetitions and very trifling uninteresting circumstances."³³

This question of Richardson's prolixity occupies a major portion of all the criticism of his work as art. Of the scores of such references to Richardson's longiloquence perhaps two other brief examples will serve. The *Imperial Magazine* in 1760 declares that "the very idea of eight or nine volumes of [Richardson's] romance is enough to surfeit one without beginning to read."³⁴ And a satirical poem of 1758 asserts that in reading Richardson

. . . Hearts of righteous folk are hurt
When young, in sev'n-fold works of Salisbury court.³⁵

(Salisbury Court was Richardson's home.)

Returning to the Plumer critique, in his view Richardson's failure to condense destroyed his moral purpose.

His good Intention is frustrated; and it is Pity some of his
Friends don't shew him how much he fails in his Labours.

by incumbering his Writing with unnecessary Repetitions, tedious Narratives of very immaterial Circumstances, and some Absurdities which cannot be relished even in this Age (pp. 35-36) .

The absurdities which help to wreck Richardson's novel are mainly faulty characterization, dialogue, and action. "It grieves me," Plumer writes, "to observe that he has introduced such whining and crying and kneeling, as is very absurd, and no where in practice, except amongst the Pamelas and Clarissas etc of his own making. Then so many sweet blessed Words—Language that would better become an old Nurse than any of the Parties that use them" (pp. 11-12) .

So far as *Pamela* is concerned, this criticism is justifiable if we see the Pamela that Richardson would have us see—then the heroine's speech is indeed unreal. But if we accept the thesis that she is play-acting, consciously or unconsciously, then those excessive tears, the constant entreaties to Heaven, the overly "sweet blessed words" take on a very genuine character. Of course to accept this view is to argue that Richardson had written the opposite of what he had intended. A strange idea; but there is no other way of explaining Pamela completely and consistently.

Another kind of writer might have composed *Pamela* tongue in cheek. As Professor Elton puts it, "It is singular to think how a master of irony might have written it much as it stands, with an exactly opposite intention."³⁶ But Richardson was not a master of irony. He was a petty bourgeois, and his intention was to set down a straightforward recital exalting good mercantile virtues. That the novel leaves a critical reader with the opposite view is purely a reflection on the nature of these virtues, not at all on the sincerity of the author's intention.

Since this is a point upon which much depends, perhaps it should be underlined by reference to other modern critics. In general, all are in agreement that Richardson undoubtedly is sincere, but that the novel ends by being a satire of his intention. Sidney Lanier, writing late in the nineteenth century, observes that Richardson

starts out with a perfectly clear and conscious moral mission . . . [but we later discover] the silly and hideous realization of it which meets us when we come to read this wonderful first English novel—*Pamela*. . . . I need only read you an occasional line . . . to show . . . the purely commercial view of virtue and of religion which make up this intolerable

book. . . . The virtue of Pamela, it is true, is duly rewarded: but Mr. B., with all his villainy, certainly fares better than Pamela . . . so that considering the enormous surplus of Mr. B.'s rewards . . . instead of the title Pamela; or The Reward of Virtue ought not the book to have been called Mr. B., or, The Reward of Villainy.³⁷

Walter Raleigh puts it more succinctly: "In Pamela or Virtue Rewarded the prudential doctrine appears in its earliest and most disgusting form."³⁸ Henry Duff Traill and Walter Lewin make the same point:

Mrs. Pamela's virtue, though no doubt quite sincere and genuine, is (as of course it should be) of a very soubrettish type, exceedingly, not to say pharisaically, self-conscious, not refined or elevated by the slightest admixture of delicacy and obviously associated with a very shrewd eye to the main chance.³⁹

Richardson, too, is genuine—more genuine than he knew. His Pamela survives, not as the virtuous serving-maid he tried to portray, but as a perfectly true picture of an atrocious prude, who well knew how to play her cards to advantage.⁴⁰

Since Plumer evidently did not take this view, he was, by his lights, quite correct in asserting that Pamela's emoting—her "whining and crying and kneeling"—was absurd.

An even more damaging criticism, and one which provoked almost as much discussion as Richardson's prolixity, was that such conduct was "no where in practice, except amongst the Pamelas . . . of his own making." To call an author's work unreal and un-lifelike was to damn it in the eyes of the greatest number of eighteenth-century critics, for one of the most generally accepted critical theories of Richardson's day was that an artist must learn from nature and portray it as exactly as possible. Equally strong at this time was the conviction that literature should inspire virtuous action on the reader's part. This could be achieved, the critics felt, if virtue (in literature), after a course of vicissitude, received its due reward and vice its just deserts.

There is a contradiction between these two theories which few critics of the eighteenth century recognized. They wanted life to be mirrored in art, yet they must have been aware that in real life virtue may go unrewarded. If reality is desired in literature, then one must accept the natural consequences even though they lead to a material reward for vice.

What such critics, and Richardson too, failed to perceive, is that virtue is a quality within the individual. It may or may not

receive material recognition, but either way it is unimportant because virtue is its own reward. Richardson never could see that a truly virtuous character does not require the conventional trappings symbolic of virtue. To him, Tom Jones was a low person because Tom made no effort to elevate himself (or his readers) by affecting the pseudo-graces and the hyper-morality of a Grandison. It is just this meretricious attitude that Fielding is blasting in *Shamela* and *Joseph Andrews*. (But Fielding could recognize true morality even when it came from Richardson, and his letter to the editor of the *Jacobite's Journal*, published in the issue of January 2, 1748, was one of the first to applaud *Clarissa*.) Being blind to the "inwardness" of virtue, Richardson could not conceive a virtuous character like Parson Adams, who was outwardly hot-tempered, eccentric, and loud. He could only project paragons—the "perfect" man, Grandison, and the psalm-singing Pamela, who if we accept them at face value are too good to be true and inwardly are lacking in the virtue Richardson claimed for them.

One of the few reviewers to recognize the moral and artistic consequences of falsifying reality for "encouragement to Virtue" was Samuel Jackson Pratt. His *Miscellanies* contains an essay which had first appeared in the *Westminster Magazine* (October 1776) under the title, "A Criticism upon Modern Novels and Novel Writers." Pratt observes that the novelistic rule which makes it mandatory to reward the virtuous hero and heroine not only "disgusts" readers because they thus know in advance the final outcome, but is also contrary to the "law of Nature." For

the sun shineth upon the just and the unjust; and it is by no means certain that success shall reward the best intended or the most amiable efforts; it often happens on the contrary that Virtue meets a thousand shocks and obstructions, while Vice carries her point without either cost or care. . . .

Truth is sacrificed to poetical licence, and what they may safely call literary equity, for the sake of holding out encouragement to Virtue; not considering that the reader should never be gratified in his love of Romance, at the expence of Nature, Reason and Common-Sense. [Even the encouragement of virtue must be sacrificed to Nature, Reason and Common Sense. Here he has put his finger on the very crux of the contradiction which his fellow critics missed.] . . . The fault of Richardson is in drawing his principal characters without a fault. Sir Charles is laboriously uniform in his conduct . . . Clarissa Harlowe, too, is liable to the same charge, and Pamela is worse than either. [At the risk of monotony I should like to point out again that Pamela is

only unreal on the level on which Richardson wanted her to be examined.] The apology is, that by a proper distribution of rewards and punishments, by encouraging Virtue and reproaching Vice, examples become the more forcible and imitation the more ardent. This cannot be allowed, for it is not altogether true. That Vice should be discountenanced, and Virtue rewarded is highly proper . . . provided it be brought about with any face of human probability. . . . The human mind calls for resemblance, and constantly shrinks from incongruity whether moral or intellectual.⁴¹

Reality was the sole standard for Mr. Pratt; to achieve it he would sacrifice all teachings, artistry of organization, and all extravagantly painted characters. But his was one lone voice among many, and the dual demands for "reality" and good precepts were strong enough to infiltrate the novels of the day. In *The Brothers* (1758), the young heroine, a reader of romances, is warned not to "expect to meet a Sir Charles Grandison at every turn of the streets, or a Miss Byron in every company."⁴² And in *The Excursion*, another young girl, Maria, begs her uncle to be allowed to make a holiday tour. Her uncle objects, but Maria finally wins his unwilling consent:

He cautioned her, not against the giants of modern novel, who carry off young ladies by force in post-chaises and six with the blinds up, and confine free-born English women in their country houses, under the guardianship of monsters in the shape of fat housekeepers, from which durance they are happily released by the compassion of Robert the butler; but against worthless acquaintance, unmerited calumny and ruinous expence.

The first dangers he knew were generally imaginary, the latter alas! too real.⁴³

To return to Plumer's *Candid Examination*, in his letter to the Lady he also records his distaste for the "liberty Mr. R———n takes of coining Words," and for his new fashions in spelling. However, the new spellings and words will soon be set to right—"there is a learned Gentleman now composing a Dictionary, which will rescue the English Language from this licentious treatment." The reference was to Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary*, which followed within a year.

Finally, Plumer performs a real service in examining the moral effect of Richardson's novels as an aspect of his art. He prefaces his observations by saying that Richardson is obviously sincere in his desire to write a story to inculcate religion and virtue.

Yet so rich is his Imagination; that he cannot help being perhaps too lively and particular in some Scenes: For he in pleasing Rapture carries us to bed to the blooming Pamela; we clasp her in our Arms; and are almost as happy in Thought as Mr. B——himself. . . . Besides the Spirit, with which it is natural for Mr. R———n to draw every scene, he might have a Reason for being so particular here. Because it should not be said that Matters were not carried far enough for a Trial of Pamela's . . . Virtue (pp. 23-24).

Even from Plumer's point of view this criticism is weak. To picture Richardson's imagination as a sort of wild lush growth completely out of control of reason or temperance is too much to accept unless we agree that it was a deliberate artistic plan to show that the trial of Pamela's virtue was carried to the ultimate degree, hence her virtue was far beyond the ordinary. But Plumer could not have believed this, for he says in the next sentence, "But still I am of Opinion that neither of the two Gentlemen [B. in *Pamela* and Lovelace in *Clarissa*] conducted themselves so as to overcome an ordinary Share of virtue." Exasperatingly enough, instead of developing this very interesting statement, he drops the subject.

The loss is not so serious as it might be, for the other letter—the first chronologically—raised the identical question and answered it fully; and since the two authors seem to have similar points of view, we may assume that the one answer will do for both. This second letter, though reviewing many of the points raised by the first, is broader both in content and title. It is: *Critical Remarks on Sir Charles Grandison, Clarissa and Pamela. Enquiring, whether they have a Tendency to corrupt or improve the Public Taste and Morals. In A Letter to the Author. By a Lover of Virtue.*

The anonymous author prefaces his remarks with an observation that Plumer was to make and which also has been stressed in this study: in order to evaluate *Pamela* correctly one must agree that Richardson was completely sincere in his stated purpose. In his *Letter to the Author*, the pamphleteer writes:

I firmly believe that your motive in writing . . . [the novels] was a laudable intention to promote and revive the declining causes of religion and virtue . . . [but] that your writings have in a great measure corrupted our language and taste, is a truth that cannot be denied.⁴⁴

We find in this "Letter" the same concern with language that we noted in Plumer, expressed in almost identical terms: here too is mention of the fashion of "new-coined" words. One cogent point

which escaped the two pamphleteers was made by an earlier critic (in *Remarks on Clarissa* [1749]) who noted that the use of new and common words, especially in the letter-form novel, was desirable for the sake of reality.⁴⁵ A preoccupation with words and language was not peculiar to our pamphleteers; it characterized many of the literate people of the day. Johnson's *Dictionary*, Swift's "*Proposal*" for an *English Academy*, Joseph Priestley's *Grammar*, and George Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric* are symptomatic of the awareness of their language stirring among the people of England, and the pamphlets reflect in a small way a great movement of English thought.⁴⁶

The anonymous pamphleteer has other ideas in common with Plumer, some of which bear on the question Plumer left unanswered.

Your three Heroines [he writes, addressing Richardson] are Pamela, Harriet, and Clarrissa, ladies all renowned for chastity and Bible-scholarship. The chastity of the first was from beginning to end never well attackt and the defence she made is so far from being extraordinary, that had she surrendered at discretion, it ought to have been reckoned miraculous (pp. 23-24).

The reason, already given by Fielding, is Booby's extreme clumsiness:

The fine, or rather the naughty gentleman in your Pamela, to whom Mr. Fielding very properly gives the surname of Booby is indeed one of the greatest bubbles and blunderers that one can meet withal. You have informed us that he had been a great rake, and had debauched several women; tis well you have done so, but he certainly had made little proficiency in that laudable science, for, from his whole behaviour towards his Pamela, one should be apt to think him the meekest novice in the world (pp. 21-22).

After detailing the blunders, the author goes so far as to instruct Richardson in the course of action Booby should have taken to accomplish his desires. He concludes that Booby shows "the utmost ignorance of human nature," and that

Mr. Booby by the whole of his conduct, appears to be nothing but a downright Covent-garden rake. He was resolved to have Pamela and marriage was indeed the only way left for him. . . . But had I undertaken the task [of writing the continuation of *Pamela*] without violating the probability or the consistency of the characters, I should have introduced Parson Williams very fairly making a cuckold of Booby and

providing him with an heir to his estate, which is the way all such Boobies ought to be treated, and a proper catastrophe for all such preposterous matches (p. 23).

This is perhaps a little strong, but it is just. For Booby, once he has bestowed his first few presents, never again takes a sensible approach. Thereafter it is muddle, blunder, and frontal attack. Of course this was not an original observation with the "Lover of Virtue": as we have noted, *Shamela* had made the point originally; it was repeated in *Remarks on Pamela—By a Prude*, which had appeared in at least two periodicals; and *To the Author of Shamela* had voiced similar sentiments. In all likelihood, Booby's ineptness was one of the stock criticisms of *Pamela* in Richardson's own day. Its full exposition fourteen years after the publication of *Pamela* shows that it is not to be classed with the quibbles and carpings evoked by the early popularity and "newsworthiness" of Richardson's first novel, but was a criticism that withstood repeated examination.

The pamphleteer next turns to a consideration of Pamela as an artistic creation, concentrating particularly on her display of "female chastity and delicacy." He feels it necessary to explain to her creator that virtue is not something innate in the individual; it is a product of the culture in which the individual is raised. Thus in ancient Greece

women were remarkable both for continence before marriage and fidelity after it. . . . [yet] It was customary among them, for the women to perform the offices of rubbers, sweaters, and cuppers to the men, when bathing; nor was this the employment of the servants, or female slaves, but of young ladies of the highest rank and quality. Thus in the third *Odyssey*, when Telemachus is entertained at Nesboe's palace his youngest daughter,

Sweet Polycaste, takes the pleasing toil
To bathe the prince, and pour the fragrant oil (p. 27).

So, too, Ulysses stands naked as he talks to Nausicaä and neither of them feels the least sense of shame. Having evoked these images, the author compares them to Richardson's delicate heroines who can hardly sign the marriage articles without assistance.

There follows a discourse on "political chastity" and "religious chastity" in which the author educes further examples to demonstrate that virtue is merely a question of "custom, habit, and education," and which is introductory to an examination of Pamela's virtue. "It is possible Sir," says the author, "that a great deal of

this philosophy may be too deep for your conception. . . ." In applying his theories to Pamela he finds that political chastity could have played no part in the retention of her virtue because "she was not of that rank or situation in life which could entitle her to those notions of honour and virtue . . ." (p. 35). In other words, being of humble birth she would not have received the training which would have inculcated these "notions." As for religious chastity,

the principles which she imbibed from her religious education under Booby's lady mother never could have been sufficient to preserve her virtue, as it is called, had it been properly besieged . . . (pp. 35-36).

Therefore, on both counts the character of Pamela is unreal—untrue to her time and her station in life.

This is an interesting rationalization even if we can by no means swallow whole what seems to be a class standard of morality. But it does not really have class at the base, for the writer specifies that birth is not the reason for individual codes of ethics, but rather "custom, habit, and education," and that modes of virtuous conduct change with time and place. The fault is in the pamphleteer's terminology. Had he said that Pamela's education makes her unyielding virtue improbable, rather than impossible, one would find it easier to agree. From this view such a character as Pamela is improbable, highly improbable, but we may not say impossible—as the story of Hannah Sturges will later demonstrate. However, Pamela remains improbable only if we make the mistake of criticizing her as the virtuous albeit unreal creature the author here objects to. If she is seen as the shrewd, scheming Shamela, then all her actions fall into a pattern consistent with her personality, her background, her education, and her age. Indeed, a later author shows us that the view of a scheming Pamela was a highly probable one, and that the lesson to be learned from *Virtue Rewarded* was a hard, practical one. In "Jenny: or The Female Fortune-Hunter" (1760),⁴⁷ Jenny is described as a fair simple girl who reads all the books in the house, including "The Fortunate Maid . . .⁴⁸ [and] Pamela," and discovers from them that "Virtue will bring servant-girls, and folks of low degree, to ride in . . . coaches and six, and marry their masters." She plans to imitate Pamela's "Vartuous" life for the sole and express purpose of fortune-hunting.

To return to the *Critical Remarks*, the pamphleteer continues his attack on Richardson's supposedly moral purpose, which he

believes will not only be lost in the writing, but will result in immorality.

The plot and fable of your Pamela may indeed be easily discovered. They consist in Mr. B.'s attempts to debauch his beautiful waiting-maid; in her resistance, and their happy nuptials. If we look for a moral, we shall find the only one that can be extracted out of it to be very ridiculous, useless and impertinent; it appears to be this, that when a young gentleman of fortune cannot obtain his ends of a handsome servant girl, he ought to marry her; and that the said girl ought to resist him, in expectation of that event (pp. 13-14).

This, we have noted before, is valid criticism, for Pamela's is exactly that sort of a marriage; and for once the critic has seen her as she is. He goes on to discuss the possible effects:

In short, your whole achievement, in your first performance amounts to no more than this; by giving so circumstantial an account of Booby's fruitless operations, you have pointed out to young gentlemen, who may have the same designs, the quite contrary method, by which they may assuredly promise themselves better success (p. 36).

Coming from a man who knew enough about the technique of seduction to write several pages of instructions for Richardson, this remark is not without irony. But the author may not be regarded as speaking cynically or derisively, for in the next sentence he states flatly that "Romances" lead to improper sexual activities, and therefore all such writings "are of a bad and pernicious tendency and do more evil than they can possibly do good." Here, surely, is a queer contradictory personality—a chap who can discuss so lightly and at such length the "laudable science" of seduction, and in the next breath serve up such a strong indictment of the novel.

Even more sweeping is his denunciation of Richardson's characters. He shares with Plumer the feeling that they are "contrary to truth." If he means by this that they do not correspond to fictional stereotypes, he is of course correct. Lovelace in *Clarissa* is not the rake as he is usually portrayed—the characterization goes far beyond that; and Pamela is not the ordinary sly schemer, she is much more. But this does not negate their real, living stature and quality. The greatness of Richardson's art consists in developing these unusual characters in a setting of detailed psychological insight which makes them wholly acceptable. This is undoubtedly what Dr. Johnson meant when he spoke of reading Richardson "for the sentiment," and it is this magnificent character delineation

which draws readers on through eight volumes of *Clarissa*. As for Pamela, we can only say again that as a simple little serving maid she is unbelievable, but as the sly-puss drawing B. on to marriage, she is only too real.

Letter to the Author ends with a neat category of objections which may stand equally well as the summation of the criticism of the anti-Pamelas:

To conclude, I think your writings have corrupted our language and our taste; that the composition of them all, except *Clarissa* is bad; and that they all . . . have a manifest tendency to corrupt our morals. I have likewise shewn that your principal characters are all, except *Clarissa's*, faulty, ridiculous or unmeaning. Grandison is an inconsistent angel, Lovelace is an absolute devil, and Booby is a perfect ass; Pamela is a pert little minx whom any man of common sense or address might have had on his own terms in a week or a fortnight. . . .

At any rate this conduct of yours must proceed either from a weakness of the head, or a badness of the heart. A weakness in the head, that your understanding still continues blinded with all those prejudices in their full strength, which you imbibed in the years of your childhood, from the old women in the nursery. A badness of the heart, that makes you imagine any difference in opinions merely speculative, ever can give just occasion to an unfavourable distinction among members of the same society, partakers of the same human nature, and children of one common indulgent Parent, the Almighty and beneficent Creator of all Things (pp. 57-59).

3 / *Pro-Pamela*

WE have seen that Pamela's morals were the major objection of the anti-Pamela literature, but was this also the case with the *Pamelas* which plagiarized or were adapted from or inspired by the novel? What aspect of the book attracted those various writers who, since they took their inspiration directly from *Pamela*, may be said to comprise the pro-Pamela contingent? What was it in the novel that struck them? What particular component, or components, did they pick out to emphasize? When we have the answers to these questions, we can then look back to the anti-Pamelas and evaluate them more justly in the context of the whole of the *Pamela* literature.* It will be especially interesting to see if there is unified opinion on each side of the argument.

Three dramatic *Pamelas* were in print shortly after the novel's publication, but it is unknown whether the first of these—*Pamela: or Virtue Triumphant* (1741), by James Dance—was ever performed. The second was *Pamela, a Comedy* (1741), by Henry Giffard¹ from which a Mr. Edge fashioned the third, *Pamela, An Opera* (1742).

In Dance's play, *Virtue Triumphant*,² the story-line and action follow closely that of the original novel, but the playwright, faced with the difficulties of compressing a 700-page novel into three hours' playing time, excluded the sentiment. The result is *Pamela*

* The reader is reminded that the pro-Pamela pieces to be examined are limited to those English works which came out shortly after the novel, and which drew attention to their derivative nature by using the name "Pamela" in their titles.

in undress, with few of the novel's better qualities and all of its faults. The dramatic high spot is the attempted rape, and once this situation has been resolved the suspense is over, interest flags, and the play dies a lingering death. In a very stupid piece of showmanship, Dance stages this climactic scene in the first act, after which three acts of unrelieved monotony are required to get Pamela to the altar. The playwright's ineptness is such that instead of dramatizing the final rape attempt, which might have enlivened the proceedings, he makes it the subject of an oral report by Jewkes.

Even allowing for the cruder treatment of plot in the play, the adaptation does make it clear that the story interest depends a great deal on the salacious element of the rape situations. But the playwright has none of Richardson's skill in building the action. The drama erupts almost as the curtain rises, and in no time at all Squire Beaulove (B.) is grappling with Pamela:

[*Beaulove*] . . . No! no! these snowy Globes are capable of tenderer Passions than mine—dissolving Softness (putting his Hand on her Bosom). See where the Couch invitingly is spread and all things wait to crown my Joy (pp. 21-22).

When she escapes, faints, and lies "trembling on the Floor," Beaulove desists and divulges to the audience information which apparently B. never possessed: he declares that Pamela is playing a cunning game to ensnare him.

They know their Int'rest, and like Hawks of Game
Strike a sure stroke e'er we're aware of them;
They are Mens Fowlers, and all Snares they set,
To lure us Woodcocks to the Noose we hate (pp. 23-24).

By ascribing improper motives to Pamela, Dance may be telling the truth, but he is losing sympathy for his heroine when he should be arousing it.

There are other interesting comparisons between the play and the novel. For instance, the Pamela of the play also speaks of the poor material reward of harlotry, implying the greater material reward of virtue. Although it sounds even crasser and more mercenary in Dance's version, it will serve for us as an indication that Richardson was not alone in his businesslike view of morality. And Pamela's decision to stay at B.'s estate despite the likelihood of further rape attempts is highlighted in dialogue taken bodily from the novel. After two attempts by Beaulove, Jervis tells Pamela that he was terribly "vex'd" with his failures:

Pam—Yes and so he will be vex'd the third and fourth
Time too . . . (p. 30) .

Pamela's grovelling obsequiousness to her betters and her cold acceptance of villainy are openly on display:

Sq. B—Well my Pamela, I sent for you tis true but I did
not think after what passed last Night that you would come
(p. 72).

What could be blunter than that?

The heroine's role could only have been undertaken by an actress with a sturdy pair of knees, for Pamela is constantly flinging herself on them. She cannot rid herself of the habit, even after she is married:

Pam—Forgive me, Sir if I thus (kneeling) return you
Thanks for the unbounded Goodness you have shewn me
(p. 92).

She is still wallowing in these sentiments even after Beaulove has prescribed, for half a page, how they will live, dress, eat, and sleep.

Pam—Oh Dearest Sir! have you no more of these sweet in-
junctions to honor me with, they oblige and improve me at
the same time (p. 92) .

This is far balder than the novel, and while it does serve to throw in relief Pamela's defects of character, it also testifies to the considerable talents which Richardson brought to bear and which are so conspicuously lacking here.

Giffard's *Pamela, a Comedy* may also speak for *Pamela: or Virtue Rewarded: An Opera* "alter'd from the Comedy, call'd Pamela." The alteration consists only of the addition of fifteen songs, some stage directions, and some insignificant changes in dialogue made necessary because Belvile (B.) does not speak as a "Gentleman or a Lover."

Garrick made one of his first stage appearances in the comedy and he is even supposed to have written in the new part of Jack Smatter, which he played. The addition of Smatter, who did not appear in the novel, was a very wise move, and for a reason which reflects unfavorably upon Richardson's book. In the novel B. is a completely unsympathetic character until the marriage proposal; after he has made his offer, Richardson would have us at once forget all about his past villainy. In the Giffard play, B. benefits by the presence of Jack Smatter, a dandified, mincing, effeminate fop who also tries to seduce Pamela. In comparison with this

noxious fellow, B. is a hero; and rather than have Smatter's plans succeed, the audience would welcome B.'s conquest. Even if the role was not consciously written in for this purpose, the unappetizing character of the hero is still one of the strongest and most valid objections to *Pamela*. Giffard must have felt that this was a serious defect, for as early as the prologue he attempts to display B. in a kinder light. B. is not one of those rakes

... who glory to betray a Maid,
Who welcome Guilt, and make Deceit a Trade.

but rather among those

Who bend unthinking to the Syren's Voice
The Reprobates of Custom not of Choice.³

Giffard wisely decided to condense the action, and the play opens as Pamela is about to leave Bedfordshire. What has happened before is revealed in the dialogue. Being conscious of the shortcomings of Richardson's B., in several scenes Giffard tries to make Belville a more rounded character and to justify his future actions. Looking ahead to the marriage proposal, he writes lines designed to make it seem the logical outcome of love rather than the last hope of a satyr:

Bel—Have her I must—yet I see but slender Hopes of Compliance—and Force is base and brutal—nor would I give Sixpence for her Person without her Inclination—Ah! I am far gone, that's plain—Heretofore Minds had no share in my Amours (p. 12).

And again:

Bel—... the poor Creature will be shock'd at finding that Innocence betray'd she has so long and worthily defended—Ha!—worthily! And am I endeavouring to destroy that Worth, I cannot help admiring? (p. 31).

There are several other utterances of this kind, but all to no avail, for in the denouement Belville turns an even hastier flip-flop than B. During the final rape scene in Lincolnshire, Pamela cries:

Pam—... O! Heaven! assist and help me now!
Belv—You call in vain for Help there's no Protector near.
Enter Williams from behind and interposes (p. 55).

In a wild rage Belville accuses the two of carrying on in his own house behind his back, and swears revenge; upon which out steps Arnold, another servant, who has overheard the rape plot and

summoned Parson Williams. Arnold explains Williams' presence, and Belvile, immediately contrite, proposes the marriage.

Belvile remains as improbable as B., but the Parson Williams of the play does show up, in speech and action, the do-nothingness of his counterpart in the novel.

Will— . . . I will use my utmost Power . . . nor shall the fear of incurring Mr. Belvile's Displeasure stop me in so commendable a Pursuit, as the Defence of injured Truth and Innocence (p. 39).

Another attitude the play underlines is Pamela's "double standard" of morality: even after she has married Belvile, Jewkes is still an "evil woman" to her. It is left to Jewkes to evaluate correctly her own villainy in comparison with Belvile's. She says to the coachman who is bemoaning his own part in kidnaping Pamela:

Ah! the Squire, Robert, loves a young Tit Bit; but I vow he's a sinful Man to undo such a young innocent Body—let him look to that, tho'—we are but Servants (p. 32).

This is clear enough and true enough to need no amplification.

Giffard's adaptation, like Dance's, depends on the rape attempts for story interest; after the climax of the last rape scene, the play just peters out. In the novel too, so far as narrative interest is concerned the sexual episodes are an important feature. The person reading for plot is carried from rape scene to rape scene, and loses interest after the final attempt. (Of course a less superficial reading will discover a magnificent character in Pamela, whose development is in itself engrossing.) That the narrative is also a basic element of the novel, despite Dr. Johnson's dictum, is obvious from the decided loss of interest after Pamela's marriage, and doubly plain in the deadly dull continuation of *Pamela in Her Exalted Condition*.

Apparently Giffard was unsure about the reception of the moral drama which he had announced in the prologue. Except where it is necessary for the *Pamela* plot, he ignores Richardson's constant preoccupation with morals; and in the epilogue he tries only half-heartedly to please the bourgeois moralists for whom Richardson had written:

Hold, Critics, whats your Sentence ere you go?
Say is our Bard pronounc'd an Ass or no?
Or do you wisely nod your Heads, and cry So, so!
Well, entre nous, I think him strangely dull,
A senseless, stupid, antiquated Fool!

Was ever such another Blockhead seen!
 To chuse a Servant for his Heroine!
 God, on our Sex, a gen'ral Satire's thrown,
 Who love more cheap to part with—whats their own,
 If this should pass, all Womankind must fear,
 For none will purchase, if the Sales so dear.
 Unhappy Belvile! What a Wife!—Protect her!
 No doubt he'd often have a Curtain-lecture:
 Besides, a Girl, so over-fond of Grace
 Might be devout in an improper Place;
 And pour forth Sermons from her fervent Mind,
 When the poor Man's quite otherwise inclin'd (p. 75).

But after these double-entendres which, because of the vulgarity, do fit Pamela's case, he spoils the effect by prophesying for the moralists' benefit that these sparks of virtue will collect in British minds and mount into a blaze.

As for the *Opera* by Mr. Edge, the few points at which it diverges from the play indicate that Edge would have done better to adhere to the Giffard version in every respect. The songs are poor and the lines at times humorlessly coarse, as shown, for example, in the following dialogue between Robin and Mr. Andrews. Andrews is seeking Pamela after her marriage:

And. My business is with Pamela—where is she?
Rob. To tell you the Truth, Father, she is doing that she never did in her Life before.
And. Pray, Friend, dont trifle with me, but conduct me to Pamela, or let me see her Master———.
Rob. Nay, if you see one, you may see both—they are doing a Job together, that will be over presently, but must not be disturb'd at present.⁴

Andrews faints, revives, finds his daughter in her married finery, and berates her for her loss of virtue. Pamela then explains the situation in phraseology even more commercial than Shamela would have employed:

Pam. Oh! my lov'd Father, banish your Fears, nor think your Daughter's Innocence the hateful Barter for this costly Habit!—Tis made the purchase, not the Exchange—For know, this worthy Gentleman, won by my constant Firmness to the virtuous Principles your Goodness early taught me, has rais'd me justly to the Honour of his Bed—I am his Wife (p. 63).

Surely nothing more need be said as to the mercenary nature of this Pamela's virtue.

One other dramatic *Pamela* must be mentioned—Carlo Goldoni's *Pamela*, which was published in England in 1756, but was not performed. The English translation is given on alternate pages with the original text,⁵ perhaps as a device to aid in reading the Italian. Apparently it was not intended as an acting script. The Goldoni adaptation corrupts the original theme by giving Pamela a nobleman for a father—a secret unknown to Pamela though her master is aware of it. Presumably Goldoni introduced this twist to circumvent the Italian laws of the period, which did not permit a noble to retain his rank if he married a commoner. Although it may have satisfied the law, the device robs the play of many of its social and psychological implications, and the result is poor melodrama. In comparison Richardson's novel stands out as a master work.

We see from these dramatic *Pamelas* that the salacious element is an essential part of the novel. It is presented in terms which may amuse us today, but it is understandable that in Richardson's time it gave offense to many. That a swarm of unwarranted, captious, and misdirected criticisms obscured the objections on moral grounds does not negate the fact that these objections had a legitimate basis. The salacious element did indeed exist, even though one may feel that some critics' overweening dismay at its presence (their overreaction, we might say now) was quite as much a comment on the nature of their own inner thoughts as it was a condemnation of Richardson's fictionalized improprieties.

The other major moral defects in *Pamela* which the various dramas make more apparent—the class standards of virtue and the virtue-on-a-paying-basis type of morality—would go unnoticed by many who objected to the salacity simply because they, like Richardson, were infected with these very same faults. The dramas also disclosed defects in characterization—the weakness of B. and Williams—and the improbability of the denouement. But overriding all the negative considerations, what emerges from a reading of the plays is our mounting respect for Richardson's handling of a story which adapters and imitators were able only to weaken or corrupt.

II

A conception of *Pamela* which would have been applauded by the extreme fringe of the moral objectors is found in *Memoirs of the Life of Lady H*———*The Celebrated Pamela. From her Birth*

to the Present Time.⁶ This work, though the story of an actual person, Hannah Sturges, is less biography than hagiography. The pseudonym of Pamela for Hannah, and the designations of Sir A. and Lady H. for Sir Arthur and Lady Hesilrige, are not intended to fool anyone; the author clearly intends for the reader to discover the true names.

Hannah-Pamela, we are told early in the story, was never seen out in the fields romping with other children. "Nature having implanted in her such an abhorrence of Vice," she refused to participate in such sinful activities. Later, "Pamela being arrived at the Age of fifteen Years, her Parents thought it time to enquire after a Service for her." She goes into the household of Lady H., whose son Sir A. attempts seduction. Completely frustrated, he insists upon an immediate marriage. Lady H. forces a separation upon the newlyweds, but all is forgiven after Pamela gives birth to a son; and she becomes Lady H., a model of sober virtue and refined manners.

Compared to the original novel, this recital is as bloodless as a potato. In one, the story is charged with interest and plausibility—if we discover the scheming behind the "virtue"; in the other, the same basic plot yields matter which is flat, uninteresting, and devoid of reality. The difference, of course, is—Richardson.*

III

Three poems, in addition to the poetic commentaries already noted, were modelled on *Pamela*. The first of these, by George Bennet, must have been begun shortly after the novel's publication, for in October 1741, the *Scots Magazine* ran an excerpt of the first hundred lines or so under this notice:

Pamela, or Virtue rewarded, a heroick poem, began to be published lately at London, in numbers, but the work now

* There are two other notes of interest here. One is the fact that Lady H. is only one contender for the title of the "original" model for Pamela. Others were also in the running, and the question of whether there was a model, living or fictional, on which Richardson drew is one that has intrigued many readers. The *Universal Magazine* (February 1786, p. 73) declares the story is based on "The Earl of Gainsborough and Elizabeth Chapman, his game keeper's daughter." Richardson himself lists another possible model in a story of a virtuous girl which he had heard many years before, and this story is repeated by Mrs. Barbauld in the *Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, Vol. I, pp. xix-xxiii.

The other note is one on the duration of Pamela's popularity. In 1822 Lady Hesilrige's daughter died, and her obituary in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, part II, p. 572, still saw fit to mention her mother; "the character of Pamela was drawn from that of Lady Hesilrige."

seems dropt. We believe the following extract from it, as it is the attempt of no mean genius will be acceptable to our readers.

From the advertisement for this poem, which appeared in the London *Daily Advertiser*, July 24 and August 12, 1741, Sale believes that the poet intended to make capital out of the salacious element:

Though the title of the poem suggests an attempt to reproduce Richardson's story in heroic verse, the lines from Ovid lead one to suspect a more questionable motive. Ovid is suggesting that a woman may be seduced without much difficulty when she is in a good humor and has not much to do.⁷

This view is buttressed by the short extract in the *Scots Magazine*, which, after an introductory invocation to the "British nymphs" to aid the work, includes such questionable lines as:

When eager wishes sparkle from the eyes,
And teach the tender virgins breast to rise,
Love in bewitching smiles assumes his throne
Ruling with power despotic and alone
Soft converse melts the yielding soul away,
And sighs and languid eyes the lovesick nymph
betray.

Where pair'd in bliss the sexes both resort,
And innocent as young fleg'd halcyon's sport.

Or paint the struggles of a chaste desire

He sees fair Pamela, with blooming grace,
And everyday doth rip'ning beauties trace (p. 453).

The extract continues in this vein, and there is reason enough to agree with Sale's estimate.

The second poem, *Pamela: Or The Fair Impostor* by J. W. Esq., which appeared in 1744, does not call for speculation as to its nature. Pro-Pamela only by the grace of its name, it is a fine adaptation of the *Shamela* theme skilfully worked into a bawdy parody of both *Pamela* and Pope's *Rape of the Lock*. Pope's Sylphs, Gnomes, and epic machinery all come into play, but with quite a difference, for the stake in *The Fair Impostor* is not a lock of hair.

In this piece, Pamela is the protégée of Venus, who is determined to have her married to her master, Sir Blunder. Juno, Venus' enemy, is out to thwart the scheme by allowing Pamela's true nature to decide her conduct—knowing that this will surely result in the

union minus the wedding ceremony. Venus sends her Sylphs to guard Pamela's "virtue":

Banish the intruding Fop, and cos'ning Beau,
And watch the wide Extremity below,
There most I fear———but, much I fear will fail
A guardian Spirit, if the Flesh prevail.⁸

Thanks to the assistance from Venus, Pamela manages to provide an occasion for a brief encounter, just long enough to draw Blunder on, while she pretends coyness and modesty.

With practis'd Wiles and with bewitching Charms,
She wins, O Shamel Sir Blunder to her Arms.

Ariel, chief of Venus' Sylphs, briefs his army for the coming foray as Blunder plots ravishment:

... if a Lover, by appointment, meets
To gain a kiss, or slip between the sheets;
Or if to steal, some precious private thing———
———A secret Lock to beautify a Ring———
Her Top-knot, Snuff-box, Girdle or her Shoes,
Or some more trifling Toy a Maid may lose:
Of these be diligent, be these your Care,
I'll be myself, the Guardian of the Hair
That on her Head, and that which grows elsewhere!
Pamela now in Sleep, forgets her Cares
Her Parents, Lovers; nay, indeed———her Pray'rs (p. 13).

The Nymphs warn Pamela that resistance will meet with a fit reward, so she repulses Blunder, but allows him sufficient liberties to keep his interest fired. Ariel advises Pamela to leave Blunder, knowing she could not resist a second attempt. She agrees, and ponders what to wear:

What Habit best will do?———A Quaker's Stuff
Will shew my Shape, and is genteel enough——— (p. 20) .

Pamela presently is delighted to find herself abducted by Blunder to Lincolnshire, but Juno sends her Gnomes to combat Venus' Sylphs. The Gnomes beat off the guardian Sylphs, and Pamela, now lacking heavenly protection, succumbs to her earthly desires and invites Parson Williams into her bed. Venus is not concerned with Williams, but she realizes that only desperate measures will prevail against Pamela's animal nature. Prior to Blunder's arrival, the Goddess brews a potion which will insure the girl's indifference to men. But even Venus' skill can not cool Pamela's desires and there is no abatement in her licentious behavior.

The Sylphs, having lost with Pamela, are dejected but not defeated. They decide to vary their strategy by concentrating on Blunder, and finally manage to convince him of his perfidy. He relents and marries Pamela. Now that she is married Venus removes her charges, leaving the bride on her own.

In Bed dissatisfy'd, In Love grown cold,
 Nothing he has can please her-----but his Gold.
 Soon a large Diff'rence 'twixt the rival Lovers
 (Sir Blunder and the Chaplain) she discovers:
 While he's perplex'd a wide Extreme to meet,
 And she so alter'd, who was once discreet (pp. 44-45) .

At the end, Blunder catches Pamela with Williams, but discovers he can not even divorce her.

The poem is virtually a retelling of the *Shamela* story and, coming three years later, is evidence of the persistence with which bawdry continued to batten on the original novel. If we add *The Fair Impostor* and the Bennet poem to *Miss Fanny Brown, Remarks by a Prude, To the Author of Shamela*, and *Shamela* itself, we see that Pamela had mothered a string of raucous, illegitimate offspring—which may well have served to inflame the moral objectors even more. Quite possibly their attacks on *Pamela* reflect their reaction to the total picture.

The following year brought another Pamela poem, this one devoid of rowdy description. In subtle phrases and Popean rhythms, it ticks off Richardson for the “reward” of virtue.

To The Author of Pamela

Dux faemina facti

To thee, kind author, what unusual praise
 Shall we instructed country damsels raise?
 Who fir'd by thy Pamela's merit, scorn
 The servile deeds to which our rank is born;
 With virtuous dignity our minds improve,
 And teach e'en lawless lords connubial love.
 'Tis thus pure nature foils the boast of art,
 And wings the arrow surer to the heart;
 The vain coquet, in radiant vesture dress'd
 May shine a meteor while she moves a jest!
 Not so delights the artless country maid,
 With charms of blushing innocence array'd;
 All other guardians absent, that supports
 An honour far above the pride of courts.
 Protecting angels aid the tempted girl,
 And bid her if she's chaste,—command—an earl.⁹

These poems, unlike the dramas, do little to highlight the virtues and defects of Richardson's original treatment because they do not attempt to adapt the story. (Bennet's *Pamela Versified* might have provided this sort of comparison had we a complete version; but the few opening lines in the *Scots Magazine* are an insufficient basis by which to judge.) The poems do, however, emphasize once again the lubricious element inherent in *Pamela*.

Strangely enough, this aura of lubricity is also present in some of the advertisements for two illustrations of *Pamela*. The first advertisement appeared in the *London Daily Post and General Advertiser* for February 22, 1744: "Twelve Prints . . . representing the most remarkable Adventures of Pamela."¹⁰ These are conventional pictures with a tall, thinnish Pamela posturing through twelve scenes. Some time later there appeared the notice:

This Day is Publish'd (Price 2s) A Beautiful Print, seventeen inches by fifteen, of Pamela rising from her Bed. . . .¹¹

Unfortunately I must leave this merely as a suggestion, as I have not been able to locate a copy of this print.

IV

The three spurious continuations of *Pamela* have one thing in common besides their titles and their inspiration: each is an affirmation of Richardson's superiority as a writer. This is most clearly shown in the *Life of Pamela* (1741) which is not really a continuation, but is a retelling of the Pamela story in third-person narrative and 495 pages of dull prose. For us the only interest the book holds, other than its elevation of Richardson, lies in the author's asides about Richardson's novel and Richardson himself. Alluding to Richardson's pose as the "editor" of Pamela's correspondence, and to the prefatory letters, he writes:

The Author of some Letters which Pamela never saw, is pleased to compliment himself with calling the Manner of writing those Letters beautiful, and indeed he has been pleased to pay himself some other Compliments which discover more Vanity than ever yet appeared in any one of the Meanest of the Scribbling Tribe, and the Meanest are always the most conceited.¹²

He declares he is writing the

genuine Account of her Life, to rescue her Character from the ridiculous Absurdities that have hitherto attended it; and hope she will now appear with a little more consistency

than to be talking like a Philosopher on one Page and like a Changling [*sic*] the next: * As we hope her Master will be found to talk a little more like a Gentleman. Nor shall we load our Readers, with a Heap of trivial Circumstances, which, tho' they may be true, it is very idle to trouble the Public with, and which occasioned a Gentleman to say, in a Coffee house, where mention was made of some Things wrote about this celebrated Pamela, that he wondered the author had not told the exact Number of Pins Pamela had about her when she set out for Lincolnshire, and how many Rows of those Pins she bought for a Penny (pp. 185-186).

This sounds like excellent criticism, but when the author puts his precepts into practice the result is dullness and boredom,¹³ and as for the changeling-philosopher contradiction, it is apparent that this author too failed to see that the wise little Pamela only *acted* the changeling. Perhaps his lack of insight into the true character of Pamela is partly responsible for the failure of his novel. He also remarks that Pamela is "too indiscreet" (p. 340), again demonstrating his lack of understanding, for she is a marvel of discretion when she so chooses. When she doesn't so choose, she is indiscreet consciously and for excellent material reasons.

The author does make a good point in comparing Richardson's *Pamela* and John Kelly's *Pamela's Conduct In High Life* (1741). He writes that of the letters "the last [Richardson's] seem to be wrote by a Girl, but the other [Kelly's] by a Man of Sense and Learning" (p. 416). While Kelly's book does not impress one as the work of a man of learning, at least Richardson's has enough artistry to seem to come from the pen of a girl, and in saying this the author, whether he intended to or not, has applauded Richardson.

Kelly's novel, which takes Pamela from her marriage to her death, is readable, even though it is by no means on a par with Richardson's. To sustain interest the author interpolates short sketches, often of a sexual nature, writes long passages of supposedly "High Life" dialogue, and even tries injecting little melodramatic touches, such as Mr. Andrews' discovery of his relationship to Sir Simon.

* This was one of the major objections of the French critics. For instance, the French translation of *Syrena, L'Anti-Pamela ou la Fausse Innocence Découverte dans les Aventures de Syrène*, Traduit de l'Anglois par Mr. D. M ****. [Mauvillon?] (Amsterdam and Leipzig: Arkstel & Merkus, 1743), adds a preface just to criticize "a naive girl reasoning like a philosopher, even more, a theologian" (p. 2), which leads the translator to a criticism of her virtue versus her materialism. He decides Syrène is a better character than Pamela.

Of great interest here, as in the *Life of Pamela*, are the statements Kelly makes regarding Richardson's *Pamela*: "There have appeared so many sensual Censurers of that work [Richardson's novel]; so many have made it their Business. . . . so many, I say, have risen up to depreciate them;"¹⁴ that he doubts whether his volume will be able to sell in the teeth of these denunciations. Only lechers are attacking the book, he adds, and calls *Shamela* "low Humour" and *Pamela Censured* a "Piece of Curlism" (I, xiii).¹⁵ (Richardson's associate, Aaron Hill, also held this idea, and wrote to Richardson of a friend's opinion that *Pamela Censured* was "a Booksellers Contrivance for recommending ye Purchase of Pamela." Richardson of course could not accept such a statement and marked the passage "Quite Mistaken."¹⁶) Kelly carries on his attack on the author of *Pamela Censured* in exactly the same spirit as the moral objectors had criticized Richardson. He declares that "the Shrieks of a Woman in Labour would excite his Passions, and the Agonies of a dying Woman inflame his Blood, and stimulate him to commit a Rape" (I, xiii). The author of *Pamela Censured*, he concludes, must surely be an exceptionally lewd fellow. Kelly is paying back the carping critics of Richardson in their own coin. He is returning the same epithets they had employed as they diligently searched out all the bedroom scenes for denunciation. One is reminded of Dr. Johnson's retort to two ladies who complimented him for omitting "all *naughty words*" from his *Dictionary*: "What my dears! then you have been looking for them?"¹⁷

Within the novel itself a further reference to the anti-Pamelas occurs when Pamela writes

We have among us here some Satyrist who . . . has done me the Honour to mention me in his Poems, which speak me crooked, and obliged to the Art of my Stay-maker for a padded Shape. . . . That I am extremely vain, a false Devotee, mean-spirited, which is the Consequence of my former servile Condition; a Prude, and know not how to bear my good Fortune, and a great Wine-Drinker (II, 191).

But in seeming contradiction to Kelly's distaste for the anti-Pamelas, one of the interpolated stories concerns Beatrix, a poor girl who has been "sold" to Varino, a noble, by Mona Bencoglio. Beatrix refuses Varino, and Mona Bencoglio replies, "You could not make a more prudent Answer; if he is really desperately in Love with you, and the more Difficulty he finds the better Bargain you may make." When Beatrix still demurs, Mona does not know what to make of

the situation: "Go, . . . you are a Fool, you will by this obstinacy (if it is not rather Cunning) over stand your Market" (I, 89-90, 91).

Since Kelly obviously was conversant with the anti-Pamelas, it is incredible that he should not recognize the parody of *Pamela* he is here developing. It goes on in the same vein; there is an attempted rape, escape, recapture, and finally a court trial wherein Varino is fined a thousand crowns, which are awarded to Beatrix. And now at last, when Kelly points to this as the moral of the story, the contradiction is dissolved, for we then see that—at least for the purpose of this novel—he has accepted completely the surface Pamela of Richardson's creation. The story is therefore not a burlesque or a parody, but a simple retelling of *Virtue Rewarded*. Here we have another instance in which virtue receives an immediate and material reward, and in greater measure than would have been offered by vice:

Had this vertuous Girl been allured by strong Temptations . . . or had she been overcome by Want of the glorious Resistance she made, her Lot would have been Infamy and Poverty; for she would have been turn'd to the publick Stews when those lewd young Gentlemen had been tired of her, as they probably would soon have been. But her fear of God (which is indeed the Beginning of Wisdom) has not only provided her a Portion, but has gain'd her the Applause of all who now know her Story (I, 104-105).

In the midst of all the anti-Richardson arguments, our sense of proportion is restored by a story such as this, which reminds us that a great many, probably most of the people of his day agreed with Richardson's ethical outlook. And in this light we think again of *Pamela's* great popularity, and remember that these "continuations" were actually one result of that popularity.

The third continuation was *Pamela In High Life; or, Virtue Rewarded* (1741),¹⁸ and it is the worst of the lot. Plotless, characterless, senseless, it drags its humdrum length through 452 pages of inert prose and saccharine sentiment. Pamela, who lives to be seventy-six, remains a cipher to the end even though she is by this time the mother of ten, a grandmother, a great-grandmother, and surely one of the wealthiest widows in England. Her husband, Sir Thomas B., bears no resemblance whatever to the B. of Richardson's novel; he occupies his life wholly in charitable deeds and in managing the affairs of England. The inscription on his tombstone reads:

Here lieth the Body of Thomas B. Duke of G. late Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and Lord Commissioner of the Kingdom of Scotland; Envoy Extraordinary to the French King; late Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the County of Lincoln; late Member of Parliament for the City of Lincoln, one of the Lords of his Majesty's Privy Council; Knight of the Garter, and Baron of B, in the aforesaid County; Lord of the Manors of B. and K. in the said County, and of the Manor of A. in the County of Bedford, who departed this Life in the 78th Year of his Age (p. 447).

He had several more titles, but no doubt he was modest.

The book, which was planned to log Pamela's life from her marriage to her death, starts out as a daily journal, but with sixty years to cover the author soon settles for a monthly, then an annual entry. Even reporting only once a year he has nothing to say; he pads out the volume to a size which will justify its purchase price with insipid frame-tales, told by the family group for their own amusement, and with lengthy and boring accounts of the church in England and social conditions in Russia. There are some tentative starts at a plot—for instance, a suspected liaison between B. and a Mrs. Ray—but they dissipate into nothingness within a page or two. The book is far more an inventory of money and material possessions than it is a journal, and if it has any value it is as an index to Pamela's audience. The book obviously addressed itself to those who saw life as a series of transactions which could be adequately measured in the profit and loss columns of their ledger sheets. Throughout the volume there are lists (somewhat reminiscent of Defoe) of moneys spent, materials used, incomes accumulated, and inheritances bequeathed.

To assert the superiority of the parent work over this wretched bundle of ink and paper would be tantamount to claiming nothing. At any rate, it adds—at least in physical bulk—to the array of dramas, novels, and poems which document the verdict that *Pamela* is a better work of its kind than are any of its progeny (excepting Fielding's) in their respective categories.

V

That Richardson's style as well as his content was the subject of several lampoons is not surprising, for his extreme prolixity and his characters' habit of writing personal letters in the midst of hot and heavy action left the door wide open for parody. The first of many to accept the invitation was Fielding, and we find his *Shamela*

writing: "Ods-bobs! I hear him just coming in at the Door. You see I write in the present Tense as Parson Williams says."

One of the finest parodies came from the pen of William Shenstone, a poet who admired Richardson but took frequent exception to his wordiness and his overindulgence in the first person present indicative.¹⁹ Writing "in the manner of Pamela," Shenstone sent the following letter (incorrectly dated 1739)²⁰ to the Reverend Richard Jago:

Well! and so I sate me down in my room, and was reading Pamela—one might furnish this book with several pretty decorations, thought I to myself; and then I began to design cuts for it, in proper places. For instance, one, where Pamela is forced to fall upon her knees in the arbor: a second, where she is in bed, and Mrs. Jewkes holds one hand, and Mr. B the other: a third, where Pamela sits sewing in the summer-house, &c. So I just sketched them out, and sent my little hints such as they were, to Mr. R———n. As soon as I had sealed my letter in comes Mrs. Arnold—"Well, Mrs. Arnold, says I, this Mr. Jago never comes—what can one do? I'm as dull as a beetle for want of company" "Sir say she, the hen—" "What makes you out of breath says I, Mrs. Arnold, whats the matter?" "Why Sir, says she, the hen that I set last-sabbath-day-was-three weeks has just hatched, and has brought all her eggs to good." "Thats brave indeed, says I" "Ay that it is says she so be and't Please God an how that they liven, there'll be a glorious parcel of em". . . [here follows a heap of trivial circumstance about the chicks and deep philosophy of life]. "Well, says I, Mrs. Arnold, you and your chicken may go down; I am going to write a letter" So I sat down and wrote thus far: scattle, scattle, goes the pen—why how now? says I—whats the matter with the pen? So I thought I would make an end of my letter, because my pen went scattle, scattle. Well, I warrant I shall have little pleasure when Mr. Jago comes; for I never fixed my heart much upon anything in my life, but some misfortune happened. . . . it must be some very ill accident that outweighs the pleasure I shall take in seeing him.²¹

This letter deftly catalogues many of the criticisms made of Richardson's style. The warm scenes are ticked off, but without the rancor that usually attends the objections to them. The heavy philosophy, the homespun dialogue, the concern with trivia, the self-pity, the foreboding for the future, the prolixity, and, most notably, the first person present tense, are slyly and finely parodied. However, the amiable tone of the whole letter indicates Shenstone's admiration for the material he was twitting.

John Kidgell was not nearly so enamoured of Richardson as Shenstone, but his raillery too has an affable tone. In the preface to *The Card* (1775), he gives us a lady's "letter to a Female Friend," which lampoons lightly but sharply Richardson's material, characterization, and style.

———Every the minutest Circumstance, my Dear is to a friendly correspondent material—I write to you as to another Self—I am but half Myself when not disclosing every Thought to my ever dear and ever kind Monimia, and seem a defect in Nature, a Blot in the Creation. How charming is it to have a Bosom Friend in the most elegant Sense of the Expression!²²

Next, in a nonstop sentence the lady describes her awakening, the people who were up before her, their characters, her trip to a lace store, the present fashions, and the beggars along the way. Two pages of the beggars, their prayers, and her tears lead to philosophizing on poverty and life, and a conclusion in Richardson's favorite tense:

But here comes my unsisterly Sister and un-cousinly Cousin; so adieu my ever dear Monimia, and remember your ever-affectionate Nerissa (I, xiv).

The Card itself is a broad parody of Richardson's style with particular reference to *Grandison*. The heroine, Sukey Paget, who is a character midway between Pamela and Shamela, writes to a friend describing her schoolmistress:

She'll expect me I suppose to . . . muse over Night-thoughts, and Milton's Paradise Lost, and Clarissa. I know their favourite authors, Charlotte, from their manner and their Conversation. Nay, I believe there is scarcely a Day passes in which one of them does not read the Bible . . . (II, 68).

Because Kidgell is more interested in parodying Richardson's style in general, as exhibited in all three novels, than in lampooning the plot of a specific work, *The Card* does not stay as close to *Grandison* as *Shamela* to *Pamela*. A lighthearted humorous account of the stock characters of sensibility, it is an early thrust at the school of sensibility which sprang from Richardson. Kidgell's handling of the slim narrative is expert, and altogether this excellent burlesque is delightful reading in its own right.

Unlike the earlier burlesques which concentrated on content rather than style, the criticism in the Shenstone and Kidgell pieces

is tempered with admiration, even though—as we have noted—in Kidgell’s case it is grudging. Affirming the greatness of the work as a whole, they yet find distasteful its constituent trivialities. Apparently they did not perceive that it is the circumstantial treatment which gives life to the characters; it is by the linking of trivia, petty detail, and sentiment that they take shape for us as human beings; and it is by these minutiae that we recognize them, rather than from Richardson’s formal descriptions. As Hazlitt put it, “The links in this wonderful chain of interest are not more finely wrought, than their whole weight is overwhelming and irresistible.”²³ Possibly Richardson might have been more selective; possibly the book would have been improved by cutting; but that is beside the point—which is precisely that his method did achieve the desired effect, his characters did come to life. Thus, Shenstone and Kidgell are in the parlous critical position of relishing the result yet despising the means.

The highborn Fulke Greville defined this dilemma in an article which appeared in the *Critical Review* (April 1756), and which was included in Greville’s book, *Maxims, Characters and Reflections*:

There is a certain author who produces perpetual paradoxes in my mind; I am at a loss to decide whether he charms or offends me most, whether to call him the first of writers or the last: and this one would think a difficulty likewise with other people; for he has written what has had merit enough to get into all hands, and defect enough to be flung out of all. . . . He is in many particulars the most minute, fine, delicate, observer of human nature I ever met with, the most refined and just in his sentiments; but he often carries that refinement into puerility, and that justness into tastelessness. . . . This writer possesses infinite powers both of delicacy and reason, but he possesses not the judicious faculty of directing those powers: he is deficient in TASTE; hence . . . you grieve that he does not please you more—or less.²⁴

This aristocrat’s review of the bourgeois moralist is decidedly *de haut en bas*; and the comments of other titled critics also smack strongly of condescension. Perhaps unconsciously they recognized this book as a portent of social change, as an epitome of the middle-class morality and bourgeois standards which were to supersede their own codes. At any rate, for whatever reason, there seems to be an element of personal hostility to Richardson in their criticism.

Horace Walpole alludes to Richardson’s work slightly several times. In a letter to George Montague in 1765, he writes: “Many English books I conclude are to be bought at Paris—I am sure

Richardson's works are, for they have stupefied the whole French nation."²⁵ Writing to the same correspondent one month later, he expands this criticism by condemning French literary taste in general: "Their taste in it [literature] is worst of all: could one believe that when they read our authors, Richardson and Mr. Hume should be their favourites" (p. 176).

The most delicate sneers emanated from Lady Mary Wortley Montague. In her voluminous correspondence with her daughter, the Countess of Bute, she mentions Richardson often. For instance, on the receipt of a parcel of books:

All the other books would be new to me excepting Pamela, which has met with very extraordinary (and I think undeserved) success. It has been translated into French and Italian; it was all the fashion at Paris and Versailles, and is still the joy of the chambermaids of all nations. . . . I look upon . . . [Clarissa] and Pamela to be two books that will do more general mischief than the works of Lord Rochester.

In regard to *Pamela*: "I know not under what constellation that foolish stuff was wrote, but it has been translated into more languages than any modern performance I ever heard of." And of Richardson: "This letter is as long and as dull as any of Richardson's. . . . This Richardson is a strange fellow. I heartily despise him, and eagerly read him, nay, sob over his works in a most scandalous manner." She also declares that she is exposing his ignorance because he "is a favourite author in the nurseries in England; and has done much harm in the boarding schools. . . . Richardson is as ignorant in morality as he is in anatomy. . . ." ²⁶ But her most crushing comment is yet to come:

I believe this author was never admitted into higher company, and should confine his pen to the amours of housemaids, and the conversation of the stewards' table, where I imagine he has sometimes intruded, though oftener in the servants' hall . . . I do not forgive him his disrespect of old china . . . (p. 299).

Now after all, what can one do with a man who has no respect for old china!

These pinpricks may be just right to deflate Richardson's ego, and to show up the social climber, but they are hardly valid aesthetic criticism. Lady Mary does make several salient observations in this October 20, 1755 letter to her daughter, but they are invariably lost in supercilious sneering.

We have seen that the objections to Richardson run the gamut from keen penetration and fruitful analysis to spite, useless denunciation, and personal pique. In the face of this array of criticism it is sometimes difficult to keep in mind that many regarded him as the first novelist of England, or at the very least second only to Fielding.

Since his own day Richardson's rank among the English novelists has changed,²⁷ but *Pamela* has remained a fixture on the literary scene; has been frequently republished for the general reader, and has come in for a full share of critical attention from the scholars. Certainly there has been no slackening of interest in our time: *Pamela* has recently appeared in hard cover (1955) and paperback (1958), and the last four decades alone have witnessed more than a score of major works on Richardson or in which he figured significantly.²⁸

4 / *Reincarnation*

SOME twelve years ago—to be precise, on December 12, 1948—J. Donald Adams, writing in the *New York Times Book Review*, remarked that Richardson's works were dead for the general reader. In view of the headline news of the day—the election of Truman, the impending war in Korea, the indictment of Alger Hiss—one would suppose that an obituary notice, even a premature one, might easily be overlooked. But the outcry of dissent evoked by this “rash statement” forced a hurried retraction from Adams.¹

Unbeknownst to Adams and his readers, at this very time Pamela Andrews was alive and walking the soil of California. By a most remarkable stroke of fortune it came to the knowledge of one of the twentieth century's more prolific popular novelists, Mr. Upton Sinclair, that Pamela “had experienced a reincarnation.” He promptly “sought her out and obtained permission to edit and publish the letters which she had written to her family over a period of several years.”² The letters, published as *Another Pamela; or, Virtue Still Rewarded* (1950), are an account of her life from her sixteenth year up to her marriage two years later.

While there are differences in the two stories, in its essential elements Sinclair's redaction is *Pamela* in modern dress, with some superstructure added to the basic plot for the sake of twentieth-century plausibility. The story opens about 1920; the place is a valley in Southern California; the setting a decrepit tar-paper shack where Pamela lives with her widowed mother and grandfather. There is also an older sister, Rachel, who is away studying at an Adventist medical school—the Andrewses, be it noted, are devout Seventh-Day Adventists. The only gainfully employed member of the family is Mrs. Andrews, who takes in washing in order to pur-

chase the few necessities which their scruffy little hand-watered truck garden will not provide.

A limousine breaks down near their shack, bringing the wealthy Mrs. Harries into their lives. Mrs. Harries soon has Pamela appraised as an aggressively virtuous, hard-working girl and one whose religion permits her to work on Sundays, on which day Mrs. Harries frequently entertains. Knowing a good thing when she sees it, she hires Pamela as parlormaid for the princely sum of forty dollars a month and found. (We will learn, not altogether to our surprise, that Pamela divides her earnings to the last penny between her mother and her elder sister.)

Having always lived in the virtual isolation of her family and faith, Pamela's entrance into the Harries' household is attended with wide-eyed, open-mouthed amazement and an equally open-minded willingness to learn. Besides Mrs. Harries, the members of the household—who bear a mass-produced resemblance to other groups comprising the literary-stereotyped wealthy family—include Mr. Harries, an ultra-conservative, irascible business tycoon whose temper is kept at the boil by his even wealthier wife's support of left-wing activities; Yvette, Mrs. Harries' younger sister, a social butterfly who is also possibly a lesbian; and, inevitably, the young master, Mrs. Harries' adopted nephew Charles, a moody, discontented young rake—Byronic *cum* Hollywood. There are also a social secretary, a housekeeper, and a full complement of servants.

When Master Charles returns from Europe and first sees Pamela, he is delighted to find such a lovely young thing so conveniently at hand for his pleasure. He is less pleased that her religious scruples are proof against his usual financial blandishments. When he tries philosophy, she counters with dogma; and though he occasionally leaves her wondering, she always leaves him—virtuous. (Apparently under Charles' well-dressed exterior there beats a faint heart, for only once—and then in a somewhat drunken state—does he attempt to rape her.) After each repulse he retires to sulk in iniquitous surroundings, such as Hollywood, where his money has real buying power and he can reaffirm that the world has not really gone to pot. On one occasion he returns with a young actress in tow, one of his "Hollywood ladies," but this obvious device of provocation moves Pamela to pity, not acquiescence. Several times he is fetched home on the brink of delirium tremens, and is tenderly nursed back to health by Pamela.

Recognizing in Pamela the probable cause of her nephew's malaise, Mrs. Harries none too subtly attempts to bribe her to do all that is necessary to keep Charles at home and content. As it happens, Pamela has loved him almost at first sight, but even so she is not to be bought. She consolidates her position in the household by making herself so indispensable to Mrs. Harries that she is elevated to the post of social secretary. The impossibly close resemblance to her eighteenth-century namesake is pointed out by one of the more literate guests, who brings her a copy of Richardson's novel. Pamela's religion proscribes the reading of novels, but she rationalizes that a series of letters may perhaps be permissible, and soon is weeping over the oppressed heroine. From this point on, Pamela's letters to her sister are larded with passages from *Virtue Rewarded*, although her mother is kept in strict ignorance of this defection.

Mrs. Harries involves Pamela in some Wobbly activities, as she pursues her hobby of aiding ineffectual radical causes—a pastime which eventually drives her husband to an apoplectic death. Also, in the course of recreational philanthropy, Mrs. Harries has established on the estate a young protégé, Piers, a poet (Sinclair's version of Parson Williams). Charles, whose most recent flight from frustration has taken him to Paris, learns about Piers and fears a possible attachment between the poet and Pamela. After his return his jealousy mounts and finally, in desperation, he proposes marriage, but Pamela withholds her acceptance until she has extracted the last full measure of devotion. "No more cocktail parties! No more night clubs! No more gambling! No more Hollywood ladies! No more ladies of any sort!" cries Charles on his knees (p. 302). Mrs. Harries raises Pamela's salary to five hundred dollars a month.

Later, from a letter describing their honeymoon, we learn that Pamela too can make concessions: in defiance of the tenets of her church she accompanies Charles to the movies. She has had to balance the evil of breaking a church rule against the evil of managing Charles "too strictly and so losing my hold on him." Appropriately enough, the correspondence ends with a paragraph on the glory of God—words spoken two hundred years before by the lady who Pamela has decided is her great-great-great-grandmother.

The most interesting thing for us about *Another Pamela* is that it might almost have been written as an answer to the critics of *Virtue Rewarded*. Sinclair has seemingly accepted the moral and stylistic criticisms of the anti-Pamelas and has produced a *Pamela*

devoid of the erotic description, of the commercial view of virtue, and of the prolixity which marked Richardson's novel. It is of course possible that the author, before he "edited" his modern *Pamela*, steeped himself in eighteenth-century Pameliana and cut his figures to fit the pattern desired by Povey, Plumer, Haywood, *et al.* But a far more probable explanation is that Sinclair, the old Socialist, nonconformist, crackpot, pure-minded idealist, simply sat himself down and wrote a story that grew out of his own social and ethical outlook—a philosophical view of life which stands in sharp contrast to Richardson's ethical views.

The styles of both men are also elements within the larger framework of their social views; and what they say is, for the most part, indistinguishable from how they say it. But for simplicity's sake, the objections to *Pamela* are here arbitrarily divided under two general heads: Richardson's presentation (style) and Pamela's-Richardson's morals (content). Under the first head are the objections to the graphic "luscious" scenes, the overindulgence in the first person present indicative tense, B.'s and Williams' lack of credibility, and Pamela's prolix correspondence. Under the second head come the objections pertaining to Pamela's hypocritical modesty, her snatching at marriage, her prudery, and her shop-keeper's concept of virtue. Most of these morally objectionable points are developments of Pamela's extreme consciousness of money and class.

Sinclair answers the moral objections by presenting *his* view of our class society. In *Another Pamela*, he turns Richardson's whole social structure topsy-turvy. Pamela Two is not only virtuous; her station in life is the good and happy one. The upper classes are not only immoral, they are also corrupt and unhappy: the "Hollywood lady" who achieves a measure of wealth as an actress commits suicide; the magnate, Mr. Harries, is not once shown as having a happy moment; Yvette is rootless and perverted; Charles is constantly seeking a share of Pamela's enjoyment of life; and—a particularly telling point—Mrs. Harries remains unhappy because while she wishes to identify herself with the poor, she never realizes that to find their satisfactions in life she must also share that life. Since Pamela is the means by which the Harries family may achieve happiness, it is she, not her "betters," who occupies the superior social position.

Pamela is aware of her real superiority even though she does not see it in these terms; she recognizes in herself a person with a

goal in life as opposed to those whose earthly sojourn is frittered away aimlessly because their lives have neither purpose nor meaning. Because she is conscious of her superiority and secure in it, Pamela Two has no need for the pretenses and wiles of Pamela One. And for Pamela Two there will be no pouncing on the offer of marriage, no hasty wedding. Although she is ready to marry Charles from the moment she realizes that she loves him, she will accept him only on *her* terms, which stipulate that she will continue to work and that Charles will step out of the leisure class and engage in productive activities. Her superior position obviates the need for personal cunning just as it also gives her the social whiphand. The sham, hypocrisy, and business calculation of Pamela One are thus superfluous and they too disappear. Pamela Two drives as sharp a bargain as Pamela One, and has the forthrightness to say straight out that she *is* bargaining (p. 294); but she does not do so to gain material advantages and higher social status—instead, reversing the original Pamela, she is bargaining *away* from them. It is highly unlikely that *Another Shamela* could be written to expose *Another Pamela*, for there are simply no hidden motives to uncover.

When all this has been said, it ought to follow that Sinclair's heroine holds our affection more than does Richardson's, yet nothing could be farther from the truth. Richardson's Pamela is alive within her scheming narrow world; she engages our attention, our delight, even our awe. Beside her, Sinclair's Pamela is a shadow, a wooden understudy essaying a star's role. We come now to a full realization of the effect of Richardson's style. Sinclair paid deference to Richardson's artistry even as he made wholesale changes in the ideological content of Pamela. While he seems to agree with the previous criticisms of B. and Williams as characters and the criticism of Richardson's prolixity, in his Pamela we find most of Richardson's stylistic mannerisms—the first person present indicative, the entreaties to Heaven, the little sentimental touches, the moralizing, and the flood of trivia. But without the prima donna to carry them off the speeches fall flat. The mannerisms can be imitated, but it takes the spark of life to animate them. Even the scenes between Pamela and Charles are flat without Richardson's descriptive power to give them vitality and verisimilitude.

Charles, though still a stock characterization, is more plausible than B., and this is also true of Piers vis-à-vis Parson Williams. But then Richardson sacrifices the other characters to devote himself

almost exclusively to Pamela. In the original novel, Pamela occupies stage center throughout and is Richardson's voice for his ideas on all of eighteenth-century English life. Sinclair, by limiting the nature and extent of his Pamela's correspondence, limits her development as a character and is forced to introduce a number of extraneous social and political events to portray the twentieth-century world. Not only is the spotlight frequently off his leading lady, but at times she is lost from sight altogether behind a host of maudlin but distracting bit players.

What Sinclair's novel demonstrates above all is that a sounder philosophical point of view does not by any means insure a sounder work of art. Even with all the revisions suggested by the significant criticisms of Pamela incorporated into the new version, even with all her personal defects replaced by virtues, the result is not a better novel. *Pamela* is great because it is precisely what it is. Today no less than two hundred years ago it stands as a magnificent "picture of an atrocious prude," of "mock-modesty display'd," of "all the matchless arts of that young politician"—so great indeed that for another two hundred years we can expect Pamela to interest readers in her virtue, and critics in her virtuosity. The array of parody, burlesque, criticism, imitation, plagiarism, objection, and condemnation, from *Shamela* to *Another Pamela*, is a striking affirmation of the unquenchable vitality of the one and only, the incomparable, the original Pamela.

Notes and Bibliography

NOTES

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

¹ No attempt has been made to reproduce the typography of this title or of any subsequent titles, and occasional italicization is omitted.

² Cf. Alan Dugald McKillop, *Samuel Richardson, Printer and Novelist* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1936), pp. 4-7 and 284-291.

³ William M. Sale, Jr., *Samuel Richardson, A Bibliographical Record of His Literary Career with Historical Notes* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1936), p. xv.

⁴ Paul Dottin, *Samuel Richardson, Imprimeur de Londres* (Paris: Perrin et Cie., 1931), p. 111.

⁵ *Daily Advertiser*, April 28, 1741.

⁶ McKillop, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

⁷ *Daily Advertiser*, August 8, 1745.

⁸ Cf. Frank G. Black, "The Continuations of Pamela," *Revue Anglo-Américaine*, XIII (1936), 499-507.

⁹ Cf. Sale, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

¹⁰ Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

¹¹ McKillop, *op. cit.*, pp. 100-103.

¹² E. Purdie, "Some Adventures of 'Pamela' on the Continental Stage," in *German Studies Presented to H. G. Fiedler* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), pp. 352-384.

¹³ For a partial listing see: Francesco Cordasco, *Samuel Richardson, A List of Critical Studies Published from 1896 to 1946* (Brooklyn: Long Island Univ. Press, 1948), Section VII, p. 10.

¹⁴ *Daily Advertiser*, April 9, 1741.

¹⁵ Joseph Warton, "Fashion," in Vol. 18 of *Works of the English Poets*, ed. Alexander Chalmers (21 vols.; London: J. Johnson, 1810), p. 162.

¹⁶ Cf. Archibald Bolling Shepperson, *The Novel in Motley* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1936), pp. 9-10.

Austin Dobson, *Samuel Richardson* ("English Men of Letters" [New York: The Macmillan Co., 1942]), p. 31.

McKillop, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

¹⁷ Hester Lynch Thrale Piozzi, *Thraliana*, ed. Katherine C. Balderston (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942), I, 145.

¹⁸ Cf. Clara Thomson, *Samuel Richardson* (London: Horace Marshall & Son, 1900), p. 31.

Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

McKillop, *op. cit.*, pp. 47, 102.

¹⁹ Brian W. Downs, *Samuel Richardson* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1928), p. 48.

²⁰ James Boswell, *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, ed. George Birkbeck Hill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1887), II, 175.

²¹ While no primary material has been discovered to link Fielding to *Shamela*, the circumstantial evidence is so strong we shall refer to him as the author without the modification of "supposed."

See Wilbur L. Cross, *The History of Henry Fielding* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1918), I, 23, 303-309.

Notes and Queries, 12th Series, II (1916), 24-26.

R. Brimley Johnson, ed., *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews* (Berkshire: The Golden Cockerel Press, 1926), pp. iii-vi.

Brian W. Downs, ed., *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews* (Cambridge: The Minority Press, 1930), pp. ix-xi.

Dobson, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-45.

And especially, Charles B. Woods, "Fielding and the Authorship of *Shamela*," *Philological Quarterly*, XXV (July 1946), pp. 248-272.

²² For a full account of these introductory letters, see Sheridan W. Baker, Jr., ed., *Samuel Richardson's Introduction to Pamela* ("Augustan Reprint Society Publication Number 48" [Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1954]), pp. 1-12. An equally fine account of the introductory pages of Fielding's *Shamela* may be found in Ian Watt's introduction to *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews* ("Augustan Reprint Society Publication Number 57" [Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1956]), pp. 1-11.

²³ Thomson, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

²⁴ Fielding, *Shamela* (Cambridge: Minority Press, 1930), p. 7.

²⁵ Samuel Richardson, *Pamela; or, Virtue Rewarded*, "Shakespeare Head Edition" (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1929), I, 67. All references to *Pamela* will be to this edition.

²⁶ Thomson, *op. cit.*, pp. 165-166.

²⁷ Lady Mary Wortley Montague, *The Letters & Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montague*, ed. Lord Wharnccliffe (London: George Bell & Sons, 1887), II, 272.

²⁸ For contemporary views of this attitude, see Sir John Barnard, *Present for an Apprentice* (London: T. Cooper, 1740), pp. 30-31; Daniel Defoe, *Everybody's Business Is Nobody's Business* by Andrew Moreton Esq. [pseud.], (5th ed.; London: W. Meadows, 1725), p. 5; and Ralph Strauss, ed., *Tricks of the Town* (New York: Robert M. McBride & Co., 1927), p. 29.

²⁹ Jonathan Swift, *Directions to Servants* (London: R. Dodsley & M. Cooper, 1745), p. 83.

³⁰ Eliza Haywood, *Present for a Serving Maid* (Dublin: George Faulkner, 1743), p. 45.

³¹ See Downs, *Richardson*, pp. 100-101.

³² *London Magazine*, X (June 1741), 304.

³³ Henry Fielding, *Miscellanies and Poems*, ed. James P. Browne (London: Bickers and Son, 1872), I, 177.

⁵⁴ Henry Fielding, *The History of the Adventures of Joseph Andrews and His Friend Abraham Adams*, Vol. IV of *The Works of Henry Fielding, Esq.*, ed. Leslie Stephen (10 vols.; London: Smith Elder & Co., 1882), p. xiii. All references to *Joseph Andrews* will be to this edition.

⁵⁵ Cf. Aurelien Digeon, *The Novels of Fielding* (London: George Routledge & Sons Ltd., 1925), p. 53.

⁵⁶ Wilbur L. Cross, *op. cit.*, p. 319.

⁵⁷ Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*, ed. Thomas M. Raysor (London: Constable & Co., Ltd., 1936), p. 437.

⁵⁸ McKillop denies this. See *op. cit.*, p. 76.

⁵⁹ Hiran Kumar Banerji, *Henry Fielding; Playwright, Journalist and Master of the Art of Fiction* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1929), pp. 130-133.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

¹ *Scots Magazine*, III (July 1, 1741), 303.

² [Eliza Haywood], *Anti-Pamela: or Feign'd Innocence Detected: In a Series of Syrena's Adventures* (London: J. Huggonson, 1741), p. 1.

³ Richardson, *Pamela*, p. 6.

⁴ James Parry, *The True Anti-Pamela* (2nd ed.; London: 1742). Sale notes that many copies of this book have the name of "Powell" filled in, in the blanks, and this is the case with the Yale University Library copy.

⁵ See W. J. T. Collins, "A Scandal of Old Monmouthshire," *Monmouthshire Review*, I (1933), 8-27.

⁶ Aurelien Digeon, *op. cit.*, pp. 50-51.

⁷ Claude Villaret, *Antipamela ou Memoires de M.D.**** (Londres, 1742), pp. 18-19. See Sale, *op. cit.*, p. 118, for his doubts concerning the place of imprint.

⁸ *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* (Vatican, 1940), p. 407. Actually the French translation was put on the *Index*, but in 1900 the French title was changed to that of the English one. See Florian J. Schleck, "Richardson on the Index," *Times Literary Supplement*, April 25, 1935, p. 272; and Richard H. Thornton, "English Authors Placed on the Roman Index (1600-1750)," *Notes and Queries*, 11th Series, XII (1915), 333.

⁹ *Encore*, IV (August 1943), 174.

¹⁰ *Pamela Censured* (London: J. Roberts, 1741). This pamphlet is second, in time, to *Shamela*. It was published April 29, 1741; *Shamela*, April 4, 1741.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, title page.

¹² Charles Povey, *The Virgin in Eden* (London: J. Roberts, 1741).

¹³ McKillop, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

¹⁴ Laetitia Matilda Hawkins, *Memoirs, Anecdotes, Facts & Opinions* (London: Longman, 1824), p. 195.

¹⁵ *The Feelings of the Heart or The History of a Country Girl* (London: F. & J. Noble, 1772), I, 36.

¹⁶ A. W., *The Enormous Abomination of the Hoop-Petticoat* (London: William Russel, 1745), p. 4.

¹⁷ James Miller, *The Picture: or The Cuckold in Conceit* (London: J. Watts, 1745), pp. 9-10.

¹⁸ Hannah [Webster] Foster, *The Boarding School* (Boston: I. Thomas and E. T. Andrews, 1798), p. 162.

¹⁹ [Lady Harriet (Georgiana Cavendish) Devonshire], *The Sylph* (3rd ed.; London: T. & W. Lowndes, 1783), II, 23.

²⁰ Henry Brooke, *Juliet Grenville: or, The History of the Human Heart* (Philadelphia: John Sparhawk & John Dunlop, 1774), II, 184.

²¹ "Innocence in Distress: or Virtue Triumphant" in *The Theatre of Love, A Collection of Novels* (Dublin: W. Smith and J. Potts, 1760).

²² *The History of Miss Pamela Howard* (London: T. Lowndes, 1773).

²³ François Thomas Baculard d'Arnaud, *Fanny, or The Happy Repentance* (Worcester, Mass.: Isaiah Thomas, 1785), p. 94.

²⁴ See *Town & Country Magazine*, V (February 1773), 99-100.

²⁵ This work is unpublished but is described in *Town & Country*, as noted in note 24 to this chapter; and Mary Megie Belden, in *The Dramatic Work of Samuel Foote* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1929), reports, on page vi, that a manuscript copy of the sketch is available in the Henry E. Huntington Library. She also notes on page 154 that the names "Polly (short, perhaps, for Pamela); her wicked pursuer, Squire Boothby (long perhaps, for Mr. B.—already developed by Fielding into Booby)" are changed in the Huntington copy.

²⁶ Frances [Moore] Brooke, *Rosina* (London: W. Simpkin & R. Marshall, 1820), p. 22.

²⁷ Sophia Lee, *The Life of a Lover* (London: G. & J. Robinson, 1804), I, 51.

²⁸ McKillop, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

²⁹ [Peter Shaw], *The Tablet or Picture of Real Life* (London: T. Longman, 1762), pp. 14-15.

³⁰ [Elizabeth Griffith], "The Delicate Distress," in *Two Novels in Letters* (London: T. Becket and P. A. de Hondt, 1769), II, 111-114.

³¹ Eliza Lucas, "To Miss Bartlett, May 2, 1742," in *A Library of American Literature*, ed. E. C. Stedman and E. M. Hutchins (New York: Charles L. Webster & Co., 1889-1890), II, 446.

³² *Grandison* published Nov. 13, 1753; *Critical Remarks* published Feb. 21, 1754; *A Candid Examination* published April 16, 1754.

Incidentally, the "lettre" was a favorite form of French criticism also. See *Lettres à des Fontaines sur Pamela; Lettre à Madame de*** sur l'Anti-Pamela; Lettre sur Pamela*, possibly by Abbe Marquet; *Lettres Amusantes et Critiques sur les Romans*, by Aubert de la Chesnaye-Desbois; and *Lettres d'un François*, by Jean Bernard Le Blanc.

³³ [Francis Plumer], *A Candid Examination, of the History of Sir Charles Grandison. In a Letter to a Lady of Distinction* (London: Dodsley, 1754), pp. 3-4.

³⁴ *Imperial Magazine*, I (1760 Supplement), pp. 686-687.

³⁵ *Woman, A Fragment* (London: R. Withy, 1758), p. 5.

³⁶ Oliver Elton, *A Survey of English Literature 1730-1780* (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1928), I, 167.

³⁷ Sidney Lanier, *The English Novel* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885), pp. 171-174.

³⁸ Walter Raleigh, *The English Novel* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895), p. 153.

³⁹ Henry Duff Traill, *The New Fiction* (London: Hurst and Blackett, Ltd., 1897), p. 116.

⁴⁰ Walter Lewin, "The Abuse of Fiction," *The Forum*, New York, VII (August 1889), 668.

⁴¹ Samuel Jackson Pratt, *Miscellanies* (London: T. Becket, 1785), III, 116-124.

⁴² [Smythies], *The Brothers* (London: R. & J. Dodsley, 1758), I, 87.

⁴³ Frances [Moore] Brooke, *The Excursion* (London: T. Cadell, 1777), I, 22-23.

⁴⁴ *Critical Remarks on Sir Charles Grandison, Clarissa and Pamela* (London: J. Dowse, 1754), p. A2 [3].

⁴⁵ *Remarks on Clarissa, Addressed to the Author, Occasioned by some Critical Conversations on the Characters and Conduct of That Work* (London: J. Robinson, 1749), p. 12. This work is probably by Sarah Fielding.

⁴⁶ Cf. Albert C. Baugh, *A History of the English Language* (2nd ed.; New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts Inc., 1957), pp. 306-355.

⁴⁷ "Jenny: or The Female Fortune-Hunter" in *The Theatre of Love. A Collection of Novels* (Dublin: W. Smith and J. Potts, 1760).

⁴⁸ *The Fortunate Country Maid* is an English translation of Charles de Fieux, Chevalier de Mouhy's *Paysanne Parvenue*, which the author of *Pamela Censured* declared was similar, superior, and the predecessor to *Pamela*. William Whitehead linked *Pamela* with this book as well as with Marivaux's *Marianne* in a poem, *On Nobility*. Marivaux's *Marianne* is thought by some to be the model for *Pamela*.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

¹ The presence of two distinct dramatic works, both anonymous, has caused some confusion as to authorship. Thus the Library of Congress copy of *Virtue Triumphant* notes that this play is falsely attributed to "Dance alias Love," but does not supply the name of Giffard. (Sale believes Dance is the author.) The British Museum catalogue lists James Love as the author of *Pamela, a Comedy*. Sale's arguments outweigh these brief notes; we will therefore follow his ascriptions as to authorship.

For a more complete account, see Sale's "The First Dramatic Version of *Pamela*" in *The Yale University Library Gazette*, IX (April 1935), 83-88.

² *Virtue Triumphant*, Dublin ? 1783 ? (These are the written inscriptions on the Library of Congress copy, which lacks a title page.) Sale on page 122 shows it as "James Dance (?), *Pamela; or Virtue Triumphant*, London: Samuel Lyne, 1741."

³ Henry Giffard, *Pamela, a Comedy* (London: J. Robinson, 1742), p. 5.

⁴ Edge, *Pamela, An Opera* (Newcastle: J. White, 1742), p. 61.

⁵ Carlo Goldoni, *Pamela Commedia . . . Pamela A Comedy* (London: J. Nourse, 1756).

⁶ *Memoirs of the Life of Lady H—The Celebrated Pamela* (London: T. Cooper, 1741). Sale lists this item #77, p. 126, as available only in the British Museum, but Harvard University Library now owns a copy.

⁷ Sale, *Samuel Richardson*, p. 130, #82.

⁸ J——— W———, Esq., *Pamela, or The Fair Impostor. A Poem in Five Cantos* (London: E. Bevens, 1744), p. 8.

⁹ *Gentleman's Magazine*, XV (February 1745), 104.

¹⁰ McKillop, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

¹¹ *London Daily Advertiser*, September 21, 1750.

¹² *Life of Pamela* (London: C. Whitefield, 1741), p. 185.

¹³ Other narrative retellings of *Pamela*, among them *The Paths of Virtue Delineated: or the History in Miniature of the Celebrated Pamela, Clarissa Harlowe and Sir Charles Grandison* (London, 1764); and *The History of Pamela: or Virtue Rewarded. A Narrative* (New York, 1852), are also failures.

¹⁴ [John Kelly], *Pamela's Conduct in High Life* (London: Ward and Chandler, 1741), I, xii.

¹⁵ The "Unspeakable Curll" was a contemporary publisher of notorious repute, who employed this sort of sensationalism to publicize his books.

¹⁶ McKillop, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

¹⁷ George Birkbeck Hill, ed., *Johnsonian Miscellanies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897), II, 390.

¹⁸ *Pamela in High Life: or, Virtue Rewarded* (London: Mary Kingman, 1741). The Harvard University Library copy of this novel contains two identical prefaces, and two dissimilar title pages. Sale, on pages 120-121, item #69, accounts for the two prefaces and title pages by ascribing one set to the edition as it appeared in parts, and another set to the collected edition. The presence of both sets in one volume is probably the result of rebinding.

Sale goes on to say that this book appearing in parts is probably responsible "for the frequently reappearing rumours that *Pamela* itself was so published." However, just as likely a possibility for such rumors was the very early serialization of the novel (which may have become confused with publication in parts) which has been discovered with the May 20, 1741 copy of *Robinson Crusoe's London Evening Post*, now in the Yale University Library, which contains a short excerpt of two paragraphs beginning "And so I am to be exposed, said he in my House and out of my House..." from letter XV of the novel. Even allowing for larger excerpts in foregoing issues of the paper, this would indicate an extremely early start of serialization and one which many people probably saw before they noticed a copy of the book itself. Sale lists *Pamela in High Life: or, Virtue Rewarded*, as available only at Harvard, but the University of Michigan Library now owns a copy also.

¹⁹ William Shenstone, *The Letters of William Shenstone*, ed. Marjorie Williams (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939), pp. 82, 262, 267, 363.

²⁰ See J. E. Wells, "'Pamela' and Shenstone's Letters," *Nation* (N. Y.), XCIII (August 10, 1911), 120; and "The Dating of Shenstone's Letters," *Anglia*, XXXV (1912), 430.

²¹ Shenstone, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-29.

²² John Kidgell, *The Card* (London, 1755), I, xi-xiii.

²³ William Hazlitt, *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1930), VI, 118.

²⁴ Fulke Greville, *Maxims, Characters and Reflections* (2nd ed., London: J. & R. Tonson, 1757), pp. 51-52.

²⁵ Horace Walpole, *Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, ed. W. S. Lewis (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1937), X, 172.

²⁶ Lady Mary Wortley Montague, *op. cit.*, pp. 209, 232-233, 272, 294, 298-299.

²⁷ However, for a dissenting opinion, see A. E. Carter, "The Greatest English Novelist," *Univ. of Toronto Quarterly*, XVII (July 1948), 390-397.

²⁸ See Bibliography section, bibliography numbers 2, 4, 6, 10.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

¹ J. Donald Adams, "Speaking of Books," *The New York Times Book Review*, December 12, 1948, p. 2; December 26, 1948, p. 2; and January 9, 1949, p. 2.

² Upton Sinclair, *Another Pamela; or, Virtue Still Rewarded* (New York: Viking Press, 1950), p. vii.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

A single complete bibliography of Richardson has not been published, but a good working list may be obtained by combining the various texts in the field, though this will by no means be a definitive catalogue. For this purpose, the section "Bibliographies" on this page should be consulted.

For an excellent listing of Richardson's works and the editions during his lifetime, see number 8 in the section "Bibliographies."

For further editions and translations see numbers 3, 7, and 9.

For critical works on Richardson see numbers 1, 2, 4, 7, and 9.

For a listing of the parodies, burlesques, and other works inspired in part or in whole by Richardson's work see numbers 7 and 8.

Sale's bibliography, it should be remembered, is already twenty-four years old and thus some of his notations may be out of date. For instance, *The Memoirs of the Life of Lady H-----The Celebrated Pamela* (number 77 in Sale) is now in the Harvard University Library, though he lists it as available only in the British Museum. Similarly item number 66, *Pamela in High Life*, is now available at the University of Michigan Library as well as at Harvard.

The presentation copy of *Clarissa*, from Richardson to Garrick's wife, containing Garrick's holograph poem, which McKillop notes on page 161, is now located in the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library.

Pamela: or The Fair Impostor is included by Richmond P. Bond in *English Burlesque Poetry 1700-1750* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932), pp. 425-426; but under the incorrect title of *Pamela: or the Female Imposter*.

Yale University Library owns the recent discovery of the May 20, 1741 issue of *Robinson Crusoe's London Evening Post*, with a serialized extract from *Pamela*.

Samuel Foote's parody of *Pamela, The Handsome Housemaid, or Piety in Pattens* is listed as unpublished, but the Henry E. Huntington Library holds a manuscript copy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

1. Bartholomew, A. T. "Samuel Richardson," *Cambridge History of English Literature*. Cambridge, 1921. X, 411-413.
2. Cordasco, Francesco. *Samuel Richardson. A List of Critical Studies Published from 1896 to 1946*. Brooklyn: Long Island University Press, 1948.
3. Downs, Brian W. *Richardson*. London: George Routledge & Sons Ltd., 1928. Pp. 235-241.
4. ———. "Samuel Richardson," *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1941. II, 514-517.
5. *Essay and General Literature Index*, "Samuel Richardson." New York: H. W. Wilson Co.
6. Gettmann, Royal A. "Samuel Richardson," *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957. V, 450-451.
7. McKillop, Alan Dugald. *Samuel Richardson, Printer and Novelist*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1936. Pp. 321-333.

8. Sale, William Merritt, Jr. *Samuel Richardson, A Bibliographical Record of His Literary Career with Historical Notes*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.
9. Thomson, Clara Linklater. *Samuel Richardson. A Biographical and Critical Study*. London: Horace Marshall & Son, 1900. Pp. 292-301.
10. Tobin, James E. "Samuel Richardson," *Eighteenth Century Literature and Its Cultural Background: A Bibliography*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1939. Pp. 149-150.

II

PERIODICALS¹

- Adams, J. Donald. "Speaking of Books," *The New York Times Book Review*, December 12, 1948; December 26, 1948; and January 9, 1949.
- Beckwith, F. "The Anti-Pamelas," *Times Literary Supplement*, February 19, 1931, p. 135.
- Belinda. "To the Author of Pamela," *Gentleman's Magazine*, XV (February 1745), 104.
- Bennet, George. "Pamela Versified: or, Virtue Rewarded," *Scots Magazine*, III (October 1741), 453-454.
- Black, Frank G. "The Continuations of Pamela," *Révue Anglo-Américaine*, XIII (1936), 498-507.
- [Bridgen, Edward]. "Samuel Richardson," *Universal Magazine*, LXXVIII (January and February 1786), 17-21, 73-77.
- Carter, A. E. "The Greatest English Novelist," *University of Toronto Quarterly*, XVII (July 1948), 390-397.
- Collins, W. J. T. "A Scandal of Old Monmouthshire," *Monmouthshire Review*, I (1933), 8-27.
- Gentleman's Magazine*. "Several Encomiums," XI (January 1741), 56. "Obituary of Mrs. Hannah Hesilrige," XCII (December 1822), ii, 571-572.
- [Greville, Fulke]. "Maxims, Characters & Reflections," *Critical Review*, I (April 1756), 224-225.
- Historical, Biographical, Literary and Scientific Magazine*. "History of Literature for the Year 1799, Works of Fiction," I (March 1799), 55-59.
- Imperial Magazine*. "On the Present State of Literature in England," I (1760 Supplement), 686-687.
- Lewin, Walter. "The Abuse of Fiction," *The Forum* (New York), VII (August 1889), 659-672.
- London Magazine*. "To the Author of Shamela," X (June 1741), 304. "Remarks on Pamela. By a Prude," X (May 1741), 250-251. "Umbra's Dialogues," LI (May 1782), 210-213.
- Monthly Review*. "Betty Barnes," VII (December 1752), 470. "Sir Charles Grandison," X (January 1754), 70-71. "The Card," XII (February 1755), 117-121.
- [Pratt, Samuel Jackson]. "A Criticism upon Modern Novels and Novel Writers," *Westminster Magazine*, IV (October 1776), 518-522.
- Richardson, Samuel. "A Close Shave," *The Magazine Encore*, IV (August 1943), 174-180.
- Sale, William Merritt, Jr. "The First Dramatic Version of Pamela," *Yale University Library Gazette*, IX (April 1935), 83-88.

¹ Anonymous articles are listed under the periodical in which they appear.

- Schleck, Florian J. "Richardson on the Index," *Times Literary Supplement*, April 25, 1935.
- Scots Magazine*. "Remarks on Pamela. By a Prude," III (July 1741), 303.
- Thornton, Richard H. "English Authors Placed on the Roman 'Index' (1600-1750)," *Notes and Queries*, 11th Series, XII (1915), 333.
- Town & Country Magazine*. "The Theatre," V (February 1773), 96-100.
- Utter, Robert Palfrey. "On the Alleged Tediousness of Defoe and Richardson," *University of California Chronicle*, XXV (1923), 175-193.
- Wells, J. E. "The Dating of Shenstone's Letters," *Anglia*, XXXV (1912), 430.
- . "'Pamela' and Shenstone's Letters," *Nation*, XCIII (August 10, 1911), 120.
- Woods, Charles B. "Fielding and the Authorship of *Shamela*," *Philological Quarterly*, XXV (July 1946), 248-272.

III

GENERAL

- Anon. *Critical Remarks on Sir Charles Grandison, Clarissa and Pamela*. London: J. Dowse, 1754.
- . *Critical Remarks on Sir Charles Grandison, Clarissa and Pamela*. Edited by Alan Dugald McKillop. "Augustan Reprint Society Publication Number 21." Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1950.
- . *The Feelings of the Heart, or The History of a Country Girl*. 2 vols. London: F. and J. Noble, 1772.
- . *The Female Mentor: or, Select Conversations*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: John Hoff, 1802.
- . *The History of Miss Pamela Howard*. 2 vols. London: T. Lowndes, 1773.
- . "Innocence in Distress: or, Virtue Triumphant," *The Theatre of Love. A Collection of Novels*. Dublin: W. Smith and J. Potts, 1760.
- . "Jenny; Or the Female Fortune-Hunter," *The Theatre of Love. A Collection of Novels*. Dublin: W. Smith and J. Potts, 1760.
- . *Life of Pamela*. London: C. Whitefield, 1741.
- . *Memoirs of Sir Thomas Hughson and Mr. Joseph Williams*. Vol. II. London, 1757.
- . *Memoirs of the Life of Lady H———The Celebrated Pamela*. London: T. Cooper, 1741.
- . *Pamela Bespiegeld*. Amsterdam: Dirk Swart, 1741.
- . *Pamela Censured: In a Letter to the Editor*. London: J. Roberts, 1741.
- . *Pamela in High Life: or, Virtue Rewarded*. London: Mary Kingman, 1741.
- . *Remarks on Clarissa*. London: J. Robinson, 1749.
- . *Woman, A Fragment*. London: R. Witherby, 1758.
- Arnaud, F. T. Baculard d'. *Fanni ou la Nouvelle Pamela*. Translated as: *Fanny, or The Happy Repentance*. Worcester, Mass.: Isaiah Thomas, 1785.
- Baker, Ernest A. *The History of the English Novel*. Vol. IV. London: H. F. & G. Witherby, 1930.
- Banerji, Hiran Kumar. *Henry Fielding: Playwright, Journalist and Master of the Art of Fiction. His Life and Works*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1929.
- Barbauld, Anna Laetitia (ed.). *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*. 6 vols. London: Richard Phillips, 1804.

- Barnard, Sir John. *Present for an Apprentice*. London: T. Cooper, 1740.
- Baugh, Albert C. *A History of the English Language* (2nd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957. Pp. 313-365.
- Beattie, James. *Dissertations Moral & Critical*. 2 vols. Dublin: Exshaw *et al.*, 1783.
- [Beckford, William]. "Harriet Marlowe, or The Elegant Enthusiast," *Modern Novel Writing*, by the Right Hon. Lady Harriet Marlow [pseud.]. Vol. I. London: G. G. and J. Robinson, 1796.
- Belden, Mary Megie. *The Dramatic Work of Samuel Foote*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929.
- Bickerstaffe, Isaac. *Maid of the Mill*. London: J. Whitworth [1765].
- Birrell, Augustine. *Res Judicatae*. London: Elliot Stock, 1892.
- Boas, Frederick. *From Richardson to Pinero*. London: John Murray, 1936.
- Boissy, Louis de. "Pamela en France, ou La Vertue Mieux Eprouvée," *Oeuvres du Théâtre*. Vol. IX. Paris: Veuve Duchesne, 1766.
- Bond, Richmond P. *English Burlesque Poetry 1700-1750*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.
- Boswell, James. *Boswell's Life of Johnson*. Edited by George Birkbeck Hill. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1887.
- Brewster, Dorothy. *Aaron Hill, Poet, Dramatist, Projector*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1913.
- Brooke, Frances (Moore). *Rosina, A Comic Opera*. London: W. Simpkin and R. Marshall, 1820.
- . *The Excursion*. London: T. Cadell, 1777.
- Brooke, Henry. *Juliet Grenville: or, The History of the Human Heart*. 3 vols. in 2. Philadelphia: John Sparhawk & John Dunlop, 1774.
- Brown, Herbert Ross. *The Sentimental Novel in America 1786-1860*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1940.
- Burns, Robert. *The Letters of Robert Burns*. Edited by J. De Lancey Ferguson. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931.
- Byron, George Gordon, Lord. *The Works of Lord Byron*. Edited by Rowland E. Prothero. 13 vols. London: John Murray, 1898-1904.
- Carlyle, Thomas. *The Works of Thomas Carlyle*. 30 vols. London: Chapman & Hall, 1898-1901.
- Chesterfield, Philip Dormer Stanhope, Fourth Earl of. *The Letters of . . . Chesterfield*. Edited by Bonamy Dobree. King's Printer's Edition, 6 vols. London: Eyre & Spottiswode Ltd., 1932.
- [Christie, Thomas]. *Miscellanies: Philosophical, Medical and Moral*. 2 vols. London: J. Nichols, 1789.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*. Edited by Thomas M. Raysor. London: Constable & Co., Ltd., 1936.
- Cross, Wilbur L. *The History of Henry Fielding*. 3 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918.
- Cumberland, Richard. *The Observer—Being a Collection of Moral Literary & Familiar Essays*. Vol. II. London: C. Dilly, 1786.
- [Dance, James]. *Virtue Triumphant*. Dublin?, 1783?. (These are the written inscriptions on the Library of Congress copy which lacks a title page.) Sale lists this as James Dance (?) *Pamela: Or Virtue Triumphant*. London: Samuel Lyne, 1741.
- Darwin, Erasmus. *A Plan for the Conduct of Female Education in Boarding Schools*. Derby: J. Drewry, 1797.

- [Defoe, Daniel]. *Everybody's Business Is Nobody's Business*, by Andrew Moreton, Esq. [pseud.]. 5th ed. London: W. Meadows, 1725.
- [Devonshire, Georgiana Cavendish, Lady Harriet]. *The Sylph*. 3rd ed. 2 vols. London: T. and W. Lowndes, 1783.
- Digeon, Aurelien. *The Novels of Fielding*. London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1925.
- Dobson, Austin. *Samuel Richardson*. ("English Men of Letters Series.") New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902.
- Dottin, Paul. *Samuel Richardson, Imprimeur de Londres*. Paris: Perrin et Cie., 1931.
- Downs, Brian W. *Richardson*. ("The Republic of Letters.") London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1928.
- Edge. *Pamela: or, Virtue Rewarded. An Opera*. Newcastle: J. White, 1742.
- Elton, Oliver. *A Survey of English Literature 1730-1780*. 2 vols. London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1928.
- Fielding, Henry. *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews* by Conny Keyber [pseud.]. Edited by R. Brimley Johnson. Berkshire: The Golden Cockerel Press, 1926.
- *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews*, by Conny Keyber [pseud.]. Edited by Brian W. Downs. Cambridge: The Minority Press, 1930.
- *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews*. Edited by Sheridan W. Baker, Jr. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953.
- *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews*. Edited by Ian Watt. ("Augustan Reprint Society Publication," Number 57.) Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1956.
- *The History of the Adventures of Joseph Andrews, and of His Friend Mr. Abraham Adams, Written in Imitation of the Manner of Cervantes, Author of Don Quixote*. 2 vols. London: A. Millar, 1742.
- *The History of the Adventures of Joseph Andrews and His Friend Abraham Adams*, Vol. IV of *The Works of Henry Fielding, Esq.* Edited by Leslie Stephen. 10 vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1882.
- *Miscellanies and Poems*. Edited by James P. Browne. London: Bickers and Son, 1872.
- [Foster, Hannah (Webster)]. *The Boarding School or Lessons of a Preceptress to Her Pupils*. Boston: I. Thomas and E. T. Andrews, 1798.
- [Giffard, Henry]. *Pamela, a Comedy*. London: J. Robinson, 1742.
- Goldoni, Carlo. *Pamela Commedia . . . Pamela a Comedy*. London: J. Nourse, 1756.
- Graham, Catherine Macauley. *Letters on Education*. London: C. Dilly, 1790.
- [Greville, Fulke]. *Maxims, Characters & Reflections*. 2nd ed. London: J. and R. Tonson, 1757.
- [Griffith, Elizabeth]. "The Delicate Distress," *Two Novels in Letters*. 2 vols. London: Becket and P. A. de Hondt, 1769.
- Hawkins, Laetitia Matilda. *Memoirs, Anecdotes, Facts & Opinions*. Vol. I. London: Longman et al., 1824.
- [Haywood, Eliza]. *Anti-Pamela: or, Feign'd Innocence Detected*. London: J. Huggonson, 1741.
- *L'Anti-Pamela, ou la Fausse Innocence Découverte dans les Aventures de Syréne*. Traduit de l'Anglois par D. M****. Amsterdam & Leipzig: Arkstel & Merkus, 1743.

- . *Present for a Serving Maid*. Dublin: George Faulkner, 1743.
- Hazlitt, William. *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt*. Edited by P. P. Howe. 21 vols. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1930.
- Highmore, Joseph. *Plates illustrating the "Pamela" of Samuel Richardson*. Engraved by L. Truchy and A. Benoist. London, 1745 [?].
- Hill, George Birkbeck (ed.). *Johnsonian Miscellanies*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897.
- Hunt, Leigh. *The Town*. 2 vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1848.
- Index Librorum Prohibitorum*. Vatican, 1940.
- Keats, John. *The Letters of John Keats*. Edited by Maurice Buxton Forman. 2nd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1935.
- [Kelly, John]. *Pamela's Conduct in High Life*. 2 vols. London: Ward et al., 1741.
- Kidgell, John. *The Card*. 2 vols. London, 1755.
- Kitchin, George. *A Survey of Burlesque and Parody in English*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1931.
- Krutch, Joseph Wood. *Five Masters: A Study in the Mutations of the Novel*. New York: J. Cape & H. Smith, 1930.
- La Chaussée, Pierre C. Nivelles de. "Pamela," *Oeuvres de Monsieur Nivelles de la Chaussée. Tome Quatrième*. Paris: Prault, 1762.
- Lamb, Charles. *Detached Thoughts on Books and Reading*. Norwood: Plimpton Press, 1910.
- Lamb, Charles and Mary. *The Letters of Charles and Mary Lamb*. Edited by E. V. Lucas. 3 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935.
- Lanier, Sidney. *The English Novel*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885.
- Le Blanc, Abbe [Jean Bernard]. *Lettres d'un François*. 2 vols. La Haye: Jean Neaulme, 1745.
- Lee, Sophia. *The Life of a Lover*. Vol. I. London: G. & J. Robinson, 1804.
- Lubbock, Sir John. *The Pleasures of Life*. New York: The F. M. Lipton Publishing Co. (n.d.).
- Lucas, Eliza. "To Miss Bartlett, May 2, 1742," *A Library of American Literature*. Edited by Edmund C. Stedman and Ellen M. Hutchinson. Vol. II. New York: Charles L. Webster & Co., 1889. Pp. 446-447.
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington, Lord. *The Works of Lord Macaulay*. Vol. 10. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1916.
- Marivaux, Pierre Carlet de Chamblain. *The Life of Marianne: or The Adventures of the Countess of ****. 2nd ed., 2 vols. London: Charles Davis and Paul Vaillant, 1742.
- . *La Vie de Marianne, ou Les Aventures de Madame la Comtesse de ****. 4 vols. Amsterdam, 1745.
- [Marquet, Abbe]. *Lettre sur Pamela*. Londres, 1742.
- McKillop, Alan Dugald. *Samuel Richardson, Printer and Novelist*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1936.
- . *Samuel Richardson: Master Printer*. ("Cornell Studies in English," Vol. XXXVII.) Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950.
- Miller, James. *The Picture: or, The Cuckold in Conceit*. London: J. Watts, 1745.
- Montague, Lady Mary Wortley. *The Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montague*. Edited by Lord Wharnccliffe. 2 vols. Covent Garden: George Bell & Sons, 1887.
- Moore, Edward. "The Foundling." *The Dramatic Works of Edward Moore*. London: W. Lowndes et al., 1788.

- Mouhy, Chevalier de. *La Paysanne Genereuse*, translated as *The Virtuous Villager: or Fortunate Country Lass*. London: J. Hodges, 1743.
- A New and General Biographical Dictionary*. Vol. X. London: T. Osborne et al., 1762.
- Nichols, John. *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*. Vol. II. London, 1812.
- Parry, James. *The True Anti-Pamela: or Memoirs of Mr. James Parry*. 2nd ed. London, 1742.
- Partridge, Eric. *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*. 2nd ed. London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1938.
- Piozzi, Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale. *Thraliana*. Edited by Katherine C. Balderston. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942.
- Piper, John, Esq. *The Life of Miss Fanny Brown: or, Pamela the Second (A Clergyman's Daughter)*. Birmingham, 1760.
- [Plumer, Francis]. *A Candid Examination of the History of Sir Charles Grandison*. London: Dodsley et al., 1754.
- Povey, Charles. *The Virgin in Eden*. London: J. Roberts, 1741.
- Pratt, Samuel Jackson. *Miscellanies*. Vol. III. London: T. Becket, 1785.
- . *Pupil of Pleasure*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Robert Bell, 1778.
- Praz, Mario. *The Romantic Agony*. Translated by Angus Davidson. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Priestley, Joseph. *A Course of Lecture on Oratory & Criticism*. London: J. Johnson, 1777.
- Purdie, Edna. "Some Adventures of 'Pamela' on the Continental Stage," *German Studies Presented to Professor H. G. Fiedler*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Pp. 352-384.
- Raleigh, Walter. *The English Novel*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895.
- Reeve, Clara. *The Progress of Romance*. New York: The Facsimile Text Society, 1930.
- Richardson, Samuel. *Writings of Samuel Richardson*. Introduction by Ethel M. McKenna. 20 vols. London: Chapman & Hall Ltd., 1902.
- . *The Case of Mr. Samuel Richardson of London, Printer, in Reference to a Piracy Committed on Him by Certain Booksellers in Dublin*. London, 1753.
- . *The Case of Samuel Richardson, of London, Printer: On the Invasion of His Property in the History of Sir Charles Grandison, before Publication, by Certain Booksellers in Dublin*. London, Sept. 14, 1753.
- . *Clarissa or, The History of a Young Lady*. "Shakespeare Head Edition," 8 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1930.
- . *Clarissa, or The History of a Young Lady*. Condensation by Charles H. Jones. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1922.
- . *A Collection of the Moral and Instructive Sentiments, Maxims, Cautions, and Reflections, Contained in the Histories of Pamela, Clarissa, and Sir Charles Grandison*. London: S. Richardson, 1754.
- . *Familiar Letters on Important Occasions*. Edited by Brian W. Downs. London: George Routledge and Sons Ltd., 1928.
- . *The History of Pamela: or Virtue Rewarded. A Narrative*. New York: Richard Marsh, 1852.
- . *The History of Sir Charles Grandison*. "Shakespeare Head Edition," 6 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1931.

- . *Pamela: or, Virtue Rewarded*. 2 vols. London: C. Rivington, J. Osborn, 1741.
- . *Pamela: or, Virtue Rewarded*. "Shakespeare Head Edition," 4 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1929.
- . *The Paths of Virtue Delineated: or, the History in Miniature of the Celebrated Pamela, Clarissa Harlowe and Sir Charles Grandison*. London: R. Baldwin and R. Collins, 1764.
- . *Samuel Richardson's Introduction to Pamela*. Edited by Sheridan W. Baker, Jr. ("Augustan Reprint Society Publication," Number 48.) Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1954.
- Ruskin, John. *The Works of John Ruskin*. 39 vols. Edited by F. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn. London: George Allen, 1903-1912.
- Sale, William Merritt, Jr. *Samuel Richardson: A Bibliographical Record of His Literary Career with Historical Notes*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.
- Scott, Sir Walter. "Samuel Richardson," *Lives of Eminent Novelists and Dramatists*. London: Frederick Warne and Co., 1887. Pp. 384-418.
- [Shaw, Peter]. *The Tablet or Picture of Real Life*. London: T. Longman, 1762.
- Shenstone, William. *The Letters of William Shenstone*. Edited by Marjorie Williams. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939.
- Shepperson, Archibald Bolling. *The Novel in Motley—A History of the Burlesque Novel in English*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936.
- Simonds, William Edward. *An Introduction to the Study of English Fiction*. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1894.
- Sinclair, Upton. *Another Pamela; or, Virtue Still Rewarded*. New York: Viking Press, 1950.
- Smith, Charlotte. *Desmond*. 3 vols., 2nd ed. London: G. G. J. and J. Robinson, 1792.
- [Smythies]. *The Brothers*. 2 vols. London: R. and J. Dodsley, 1758.
- [Spence, Joseph]. *Moralities: or, Essays, Letters, Fables: and Translations by Sir Harry Beaumont [pseud.]*. London: R. Dodsley, 1753.
- Stockdale, Percival. *Lectures on the Truly Eminent English Poets*. Vol. I. London: D. N. Shury, 1807.
- Strauss, Ralph (ed.). *Tricks of the Town*. New York: Robert M. McBride & Co., 1927.
- Swann, George Rogers. *Philosophical Parallelisms in Six English Novelists*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1929.
- Swift, Jonathan. *Directions to Servants*. London: R. Dodsley & M. Cooper, 1745.
- Thomas, Clara Linklater. *Samuel Richardson. A Biographical and Critical Study*. London: Horace Marshall & Son, 1900.
- Traill, Henry Duff. *The New Fiction*. London: Hurst & Blackett Ltd., 1897.
- Tuckerman, Bayard. *A History of English Prose Fiction*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1882.
- Uhrstrom, Wilhelm. *Studies on the Language of Samuel Richardson*. Upsala, 1907.
- Utter, Robert Palfrey, and Needham, Gwendolyn Bridges. *Pamela's Daughters*. 2nd ed. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1937.
- Verschöyle, Derek (ed.). *The English Novelists*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1936.
- [Villaret, Claude]. *Antipamela ou Memoires de M.D.****. Londres, 1742.

- W., A. *The Enormous Abomination of the Hoop-Petticoat*. London: William Russel, 1745.
- W——, J——. *Pamela: Or the Fair Impostor*. London: E. Bevens, 1744.
- Wagenknecht, Edward. *Cavalcade of the English Novel*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1943.
- Walpole, Horace. *Horace Walpole's Correspondence*. Edited by W. S. Lewis. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937—.
- Warton, Joseph. "Fashion," *Works of the English Poets*. 21 vols. Edited by Alexander Chalmers. London: J. Johnson *et al.*, 1810. XVIII, 161-162.
- Watt, Ian, *The Rise of the Novel*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957.
- West, Jane. *Letters to a Young Lady*. 2 vols. Troy: O. Pennison and Co., 1806.
- Whitehead, William. "On Nobility," *Works of the English Poets*. 21 vols. Edited by Alexander Chalmers. London: J. Johnson *et al.*, 1810. XVII, 209.
- Wodhull, Michael, Esq. *Poems*. London: W. Bowyer and J. Nichols, 1772.

Index

- Adams, James Donald, 75
Another Pamela; or, Virtue Still Rewarded, 2, 75; morality, 78-79; plot, 75-77
Anti-Pamela; or, Feign'd Innocence Detected, 5, 24-27
Anti-Pamela, ou la Fausse Innocence Découverte dans les Aventures de Syréne, 66n.
*Antipamela ou Memoires de M.D.****, by Claude Villaret, 2, 24, 29-30
Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews, *See Shamela*
 Arnaud, François Thomas Marie de Baculard d', *Fanni ou la Nouvelle Pamela*, 39
- Barnard, John, *Present for an Apprentice*, 17
 Behn, Aphra, 1
 Bennet, George, *Pamela Versified; or, Virtue Rewarded. A Heroic Poem*, 61-62, 64
 Betty Barnes, 7
 Bickerstaffe, Isaac, *Maid of the Mill*, 5
 Boissy, Louis de, *Pamela en France*, 5
 Brooke, Frances Moore, *Excursion*, 47; *Rosina*, 39
 Brooke, Henry, *Juliet Grenville*, 38
Brothers, by Smythies, 47
- Candid Examination of the History of Sir Charles Grandison*, by Francis Plumer, 43-44, 47-48
Celebrated Pamela, *See Memoirs of the Life of Lady H-----The Celebrated Pamela*
 Cerlone, Francesco, *Pamela Nubile and Pamela Maritata*, 6
 Cibber, Colley, 11, 19
 Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 21
- Critical Remarks on Sir Charles Grandison, Clarissa and Pamela*, 48-53
 Cross, Wilbur, 21
 Curl, Edmund, 67, 86 n.15
- Daily Advertiser*, 10
 Dance, James, *Pamela: or Virtue Triumphant*, 54-56
 Defoe, Daniel, 1, 2
 "Delicate Distress," 41
 Devonshire, Lady Harriet (Georgiana Cavendish), *Sylph*, 37-38
 Digeon, Aurelien, 31, 32
 Dottin, Paul, *Samuel Richardson, Imprimeur de Londres*, 5
- Edge, Mr., *Pamela: or Virtue Rewarded. An Opera*, 5, 54, 59
 Elton, Oliver, 44
Enormous Abomination of the Hoop-Petticoat, by A.W., 37
Excursion, by Frances Moore Brooke, 47
- Fanni, ou la Nouvelle Pamela*, by François Thomas Marie de Baculard d'Arnaud, 39
Fanny, or the Happy Repentance, translation of *Fanni...*, 39
Feelings of the Heart, 36
 Fielding, Henry, 1, 10, 30, 46; authorship of *Shamela*, 82 n.21; on *Clarissa*, 46; *Joseph Andrews*, *See Joseph Andrews; Miscellanies and Poems*, 18; *Shamela*, *See Shamela; Tom Jones*, 46
- Fieux, Charles de, Chevalier de Mouhy, *Paysanne Parvenue*, 51, 85 n.48
 Foote, Samuel, *Handsome Housemaid*, 39, 84 n.25
Fortunate Country Maid, 51, 85 n.48
 Foster, Hannah Webster, *Boarding School*, 37
Foundling, by Edward Moore, 6

- Garrick, David, 56
Gentleman's Magazine, 4
 Giffard, Henry, *Pamela, a Comedy*, 5, 54, 56-59
 Godard d'Aucour, Claude, *La Deroute des Pamela*, 5
 Goldoni, Carlo, 6, 60
 Greville, Fulke, *Maxims, Characters and Reflections*, 72
 Griffith, Elizabeth, "Delicate Distress," 41
- Hawkins, Laetitia Matilda, *Memoirs*, 36
 Haywood, Eliza, 17, 24, 30; *Anti-Pamela; or Feign'd Innocence Detected*, 5, 24-27
 Hazlitt, William, 72
 Highmore, Joseph, 4
 Hill, Aaron, 67
History of Miss Pamela Howard, 38, 39
 Holberg, Ludwig, *Moral Thoughts*, 40
- Imperial Magazine*, 43
 "Innocence in Distress," 38-39
- "Jenny: or the Female Fortune-Hunter," 51
Joseph Andrews, 1, 18-22, 46; burlesque of sentimental novel, 22; as a parody of *Pamela*, 18-19, 21; plot, 19-22
 Johnson, Samuel, 10, 47, 52, 67
Juliet Grenville, by Henry Brooke, 38
- Kelly, John, *Pamela's Conduct in High Life*, 5, 66-68
 Kidgell, John, *Card*, 71
- La Chaussée, Pierre Claude Nivelles de, "Pamela," 5
 Lanier, Sidney, 44-45
 Lee, Sophia, *Life of a Lover*, 40
Lettre Sur Pamela, by Abbé Marquet, 5
Life of a Lover, by Sophia Lee, 40
Life of Pamela, 5, 65-66
 Lucas, Eliza, 42
- McKillop, Alan Dugald, 1, 40
Marianne, by Pierre Carlet de Chamblain Marivaux, 85 n.48
 Marivaux, Pierre Carlet de Chamblain, *La Vie de Marianne*, 85 n.48
 Marquet, Abbé, *Lettre Sur Pamela*, 5
Mémoires de Pamela, 5
Memoirs of the Life of Lady H-----, *The Celebrated Pamela*, 5, 51, 60-61
- Miller, James, *Picture: or, The Cuckold in Conceit*, 37
 Montague, Lady Mary Wortley, 16, 73
Monthly Review, 6
 Moore, Edward, *Foundling*, 6
 Mouhy, Charles de Fieux, Chevalier de, *Paysanne Parvenue*, 51, 85 n.48
- Nanine*, by François Marie Arouet de Voltaire, 6
 Neufchateau, François de, *Pamela*, 6
 Novels, their influence on readers, 16, 33, 37, 52
- Pamela*, 1; criticism of, 16-18, 22, 26-27, 30 ff., 67, 84 n.32; dramatic versions, 5, 6, 54-60; erotic interest, 6, 6n., 22, 30, 31, 33, 60; illustrated, 4; immodesty, 15, 42; influence on literature, 6; introduction, 82 n.22; morality, 15, 17-18, 22, 38, 42, 55, 59; narrative adaptations, 65-66, 85 n.13; narrative interest, 10, 58; originals of, 61n; plot, 3-4, 8-10; popularity, 1-7, 61n., 73; publication in parts, 86 n.18; spurious continuations, 5, 65-69; translations, 2; in verse form, 5, 61-65. *See also* Richardson, Samuel
- Pamela*, by Carlo Goldoni, 6, 60
Pamela, A Comedy, by Henry Giffard, 5, 54, 56-59
Pamela Censured: In a Letter to the Editor, 5, 31-34, 67
Pamela Howard, 38, 39
Pamela in Her Exalted Condition, 5, 10
Pamela in High Life: or, Virtue Rewarded, 5, 68-69
Pamela: Or the Fair Imposter, by J-----W-----, 5, 62-64
Pamela: or, Virtue Rewarded, *See Pamela*
Pamela: or Virtue Rewarded. An Opera, by Mr. Edge, 5, 54, 59
Pamela: or Virtue Triumphant, by James Dance, 5, 54-56
Pamela the Second, *See* Piper, John
Pamela Versified: or Virtue Rewarded. *A Heroic Poem*, by George Bennet, 5, 61-62, 64
Pamela's Conduct in High Life, by John Kelly, 5, 66-68
 Parry, James, *True Anti-Pamela*, 5, 24, 28
 Partridge, Eric, *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*, 6n.

- Paysanne Parvenue*, by Charles de Feuix, Chevalier de Mouhy, 51, 85 n.48
- Picture: or, The Cuckold in Conceit*, by James Miller, 37
- Piozzi, Hester Lynch Thrale, 7
- Piper, John, *Life of Miss Fanny Brown: or Pamela the Second*, 6
- Plumer, Francis, *Candid Examination of the History of Sir Charles Grandison*, 43-44, 47-48
- Pope, Alexander, 11, 62
- Povey, Charles, *Virgin in Eden*, 5, 34-36
- Pratt, Samuel Jackson, *Miscellanies*, 46-47
- Raleigh, Walter, 45
- Remarks on Clarissa*, 49
- "Remarks on Pamela," 23, 50
- Richard, Samuel, 1, 3; artistry, 43ff., 52, 60, 61, 79-80; *Clarissa*, 37, 38, 53; class standards, 32, 38, 39, 58; *Grandison*, 46, 71; morality, 28-29, 30, 33, 46; prolixity, 43-44, 70; style criticized, 1, 66n, 69-72. *See also Pamela*
- Rochester, John Wilmot, 33
- Rosina*, by Frances Moore Brooke, 39
- Rossi, Giovanni Gherardo de, 6
- Sale, William Merritt, Jr., 1, 2
- Shamela*, 1, 7, 10-18, 22, 30, 46, 50, 69-70; introduction, 82 n.22; plot, 11-14
- Shaw, Peter, "Tablet," 40
- Shenstone, William, 70
- Sinclair, Upton, *Another Pamela; or, Virtue Still Rewarded*, 2, 75-79
- Sloccock, Rev. Benjamin, 7, 11
- Slough, village, 7
- Smollett, Tobias, 1
- Smythies, *Brothers*, 47
- Sterne, Laurence, 1
- Sturges, Hannah, *See Memoirs of the Life of Lady H———*
- Swift, Jonathan, 1, 2, 17
- Sylph*, by Lady Harriet (Georgiana Cavendish) Devonshire, 37-38
- Thomson, Clara, 15-16
- "To the Author of Pamela," 64
- "To the Author of Shamela," 18, 50
- Traill, Henry Duff, 45
- True Anti-Pamela*, by James Parry, 5, 24, 28
- Villaret, Claude, *Antipamela ou Memoires de M.D.****, 2, 24, 29-30
- Virgin in Eden*, by Charles Povey, 5, 34-36
- Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de, *Nanine*, 6
- W., A., *Enormous Abomination of the Hoop-Petticoat*, 37
- W———, J———, *Pamela: Or the Fair Imposter*, 5, 62, 64
- Walpole, Horace, 4, 72-73
- Warton, Joseph, 6