



A COMPANION TO

THE ENGLISH *NOVEL*

EDITED BY
STEPHEN ARATA, MADIGAN HALEY,
J. PAUL HUNTER AND JENNIFER WICKE

WILEY Blackwell

A Companion to the
English Novel

Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture

This series offers comprehensive, newly written surveys of key periods and movements and certain major authors, in English literary culture and history. Extensive volumes provide new perspectives and positions on contexts and on canonical and post-canonical texts, orientating the beginning student in new fields of study and providing the experienced undergraduate and new graduate with current and new directions, as pioneered and developed by leading scholars in the field.

Published Recently

- | | |
|---|---|
| 71. <i>A Companion to African American Literature</i> | Edited by Gene Jarrett |
| 72. <i>A Companion to Irish Literature</i> | Edited by Julia M. Wright |
| 73. <i>A Companion to Romantic Poetry</i> | Edited by Charles Mahoney |
| 74. <i>A Companion to the Literature and Culture of the American West</i> | Edited by Nicolas S. Witschi |
| 75. <i>A Companion to Sensation Fiction</i> | Edited by Pamela K. Gilbert |
| 76. <i>A Companion to Comparative Literature</i> | Edited by Ali Behdad and
Dominic Thomas |
| 77. <i>A Companion to Poetic Genre</i> | Edited by Erik Martiny |
| 78. <i>A Companion to American Literary Studies</i> | Edited by Caroline F. Levander and
Robert S. Levine |
| 79. <i>A New Companion to the Gothic</i> | Edited by David Punter |
| 80. <i>A Companion to the American Novel</i> | Edited by Alfred Bendixen |
| 81. <i>A Companion to Literature, Film, and Adaptation</i> | Edited by Deborah Cartmell |
| 82. <i>A Companion to George Eliot</i> | Edited by Amanda Anderson and
Harry E. Shaw |
| 83. <i>A Companion to Creative Writing</i> | Edited by Graeme Harper |
| 84. <i>A Companion to British Literature, 4 volumes</i> | Edited by Robert DeMaria, Jr.,
Heesok Chang, and Samantha Zacher |
| 85. <i>A Companion to American Gothic</i> | Edited by Charles L. Crow |
| 86. <i>A Companion to Translation Studies</i> | Edited by Sandra Bermann and
Catherine Porter |
| 87. <i>A New Companion to Victorian Literature and Culture</i> | Edited by Herbert F. Tucker |
| 88. <i>A Companion to Modernist Poetry</i> | Edited by David E. Chinitz and
Gail McDonald |
| 89. <i>A Companion to J. R. R. Tolkien</i> | Edited by Stuart D. Lee |
| 90. <i>A Companion to the English Novel</i> | Edited by Stephen Arata, Madigan Haley,
J. Paul Hunter, and Jennifer Wicke |

A COMPANION TO THE

ENGLISH
NOVEL

EDITED BY

STEPHEN ARATA, MADIGAN HALEY,
J. PAUL HUNTER, AND JENNIFER WICKE

WILEY Blackwell

This edition first published 2015
© 2015 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Registered Office

John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

Editorial Offices

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA

9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK

The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell.

The right of Stephen Arata, Madigan Haley, J. Paul Hunter, and Jennifer Wicke to be identified as the authors of the editorial material in this work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services and neither the publisher nor the author shall be liable for damages arising herefrom. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A companion to the English novel / edited by Stephen Arata, Madigan Haley, J. Paul Hunter, and Jennifer Wicke

pages cm. – (Blackwell companions to literature and culture ; 155)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4051-9445-7 (hardback)

1. English fiction—History and criticism. 2. Literary form—History. 3. Fiction—Technique—History. 4. Narration (Rhetoric)—History. 5. Authors and readers—Great Britain—History. I. Arata, Stephen, author editor. II. Haley, Madigan, author editor. III. Hunter, J. Paul, 1934— editor. IV. Wicke, Jennifer, author editor.

PR823.C66 2015

823.009—dc23

2015001069

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Cover image: Detail from *Faces of Flower Avenue* by George Fishman, original mosaic artwork in Silver Spring, MD, USA. Source: George Fishman / photo courtesy of Jim Kuhn, Creative Commons Attribution

Set in 11/12.5pt Garamond 3 by SPi Global, Pondicherry, India

Contents

<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	viii
<i>Preface</i>	xiii
Part I The Novel and Its Histories	1
1 The 1740s <i>Patricia Meyer Spacks</i>	3
2 The 1790s <i>Lynn Festa</i>	18
3 The 1850s <i>Ivan Kreilkamp</i>	34
4 The Long 1920s <i>Jennifer Wicke</i>	49
5 The 2000s <i>Ashley Dawson</i>	71
Part II The Novel and Its Genres	87
6 Realism and the Eighteenth-Century Novel <i>John Richetti</i>	89
7 Romance <i>Laurie Langbauer</i>	103
8 Gothic <i>John Paul Riquelme</i>	117
9 Popular and Mass-Market Fiction <i>Janice Carlisle</i>	132

10	Experimental Fictions <i>Mark Blackwell</i>	144
11	The Novel into Film <i>Jonathan Freedman</i>	159
Part III The Novel in Pieces		175
12	Some Versions of Narration <i>Alison Booth</i>	177
13	Some Versions of Form <i>Stephen Arata</i>	192
14	A Character of Character, in Five Metaphors <i>Deidre Lynch</i>	209
15	Affect in the English Novel <i>Nicholas Daly</i>	225
Part IV The Novel in Theory		239
16	The Novel in Theory before 1900 <i>James Eli Adams</i>	241
17	The Novel in Theory, 1900–1965 <i>Chris Baldick</i>	256
18	The Novel in Theory after 1965 <i>Madigan Haley</i>	271
Part V The Novel in Circulation		289
19	Making a Living as an Author <i>Deirdre David</i>	291
20	The Network Novel and How It Unsettled Domestic Fiction <i>Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse</i>	306
21	Reading Novels, Alone and in Groups <i>Andrew Elfenbein</i>	321
Part VI Geographies of the Novel		339
22	London <i>Cynthia Wall</i>	341
23	The Provincial Novel <i>John Plotz</i>	360
24	Intranationalisms <i>James Buzard</i>	373

25	Internationalisms and the Geopolitical Aesthetic <i>Lauren M. E. Goodlad</i>	387
Part VII The Novel, Public and Private		407
26	The Novel and the Everyday <i>Kate Flint</i>	409
27	The Public Sphere <i>John Marx</i>	426
28	The Novel and the Nation <i>Christopher GoGwilt</i>	441
29	World English/World Literature <i>Jonathan Arac</i>	456
	<i>Index</i>	471

Notes on Contributors

James Eli Adams, Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University, is the author of *Dandies and Desert Saints: Styles of Victorian Masculinity* (Cornell, 1995) and *A History of Victorian Literature* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), as well as the co-editor, with Andrew Miller, of *Sexualities in Victorian Britain* (Indiana, 1996).

Jonathan Arac is Mellon Professor of English and founding Director of the Humanities Center at the University of Pittsburgh. A longtime member of the *boundary 2* Editorial Collective, he also chaired from 2002 until 2012 the Advisory Committee of the Successful Societies Program of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research. His most recent book is *Impure Worlds: The Institution of Literature in the Age of the Novel* (Fordham, 2010).

Stephen Arata is Professor of English at the University of Virginia. He is a General Editor of *The New Edinburgh Edition of the Works of Robert Louis Stevenson* (Edinburgh) and the author of *Fictions of Loss in the Victorian Fin de Siècle* (Cambridge, 1996, 2008) and the forthcoming *A History of the English Novel* (Wiley-Blackwell). He has edited William Morris's *News from Nowhere* and George Gissing's *New Grub Street* for Broadview and H. G. Wells's *The Time Machine* for Norton Critical Editions.

Nancy Armstrong is Gilbert, Louis, and Edward Lehrman Professor of English at Duke University. Her books include *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel* (Oxford, 1987), (with Leonard Tennenhouse) *The Imaginary Puritan: Literature, Intellectual Labor, and the Origins of Personal Life* (California, 1992), *Fiction in the Age of Photography: The Legacy of British Realism* (Harvard, 1999), and *How Novels Think: The Limits of Individualism, 1719–1900* (Columbia, 2005). A book titled *The Conversion Effect: Early American Aspects of the Novel*, co-authored with Leonard Tennenhouse, is forthcoming from the University of Pennsylvania Press in 2015. She also edits the journal *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*.

Chris Baldick is Professor of English at Goldsmiths, University of London. His publications include *Literature of the 1920s* (Edinburgh, 2012), *The Modern Movement* (Oxford, 2004), *Criticism and Literary Theory, 1890 to the Present* (Longman, 1996), and *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (4th edition, Oxford, 2015).

Mark Blackwell is Professor of English and Associate Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences at the University of Hartford. His most recent scholarly project is an edition of object and animal tales entitled *British It-Narratives, 1750–1830* (Pickering & Chatto, 2012).

Alison Booth is Professor of English at the University of Virginia, specializing in narrative, feminist studies in nineteenth-century literature, and digital humanities. Her books include *Greatness Engendered: George Eliot and Virginia Woolf* (Cornell, 1992) and *How to Make It as a Woman: Collective Biographical History from Victoria to the Present* (Chicago, 2004), and she has completed a book on transatlantic literary tourism, house museums, and reception of authors. A Fellow of ACLS (Digital Innovation) and the Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities, she directs the Collective Biographies of Women project, <http://womensbios.lib.virginia.edu> and <http://cbw.iath.virginia.edu/public/women.php>.

James Buzard is Professor of Literature at MIT. He is the author of *The Beaten Track: European Tourism, Literature, and the Ways to "Culture," 1800–1918* (Oxford, 1993) and *Disorienting Fiction: The Autoethnographic Work of Nineteenth-Century British Novels* (Princeton, 2005), as well as of numerous articles in journals and books. He is also a contributing editor of *Victorian Prism: Refractions of the Crystal Palace* (Virginia 2007).

Janice Carlisle is Professor of English at Yale University. In addition to many essays in journals and books, her publications include *The Sense of an Audience: Dickens, Thackeray, and George Eliot at Mid-Century* (Georgia, 1981), *John Stuart Mill and the Writing of Character* (Georgia, 1991), *Common Scents: Comparative Encounters in High Victorian Fiction* (Oxford, 2004), and *Picturing Reform in Victorian Britain* (Cambridge, 2012).

Nicholas Daly is Professor of Modern English and American Literature at University College Dublin. His publications include *Modernism, Romance, and the Fin de Siècle* (Cambridge, 1999), *Literature, Technology, and Modernity* (Cambridge, 2004), *Sensation and Modernity in the 1860s* (Cambridge, 2009), and *The Demographic Imagination and the Nineteenth-Century City: Paris, London, New York* (forthcoming). He is currently working on a collaborative study of Ruritanian narratives, from *The Prisoner of Zenda* to *The Princess Diaries*.

Deirdre David has published several books dealing with the nineteenth-century novel, women writers, and British imperialism. She is the editor of *The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel* (2nd edition, 2013) and the co-editor (with Eileen Gillooly) of *Contemporary Dickens* (Ohio State, 2009). Her most recent publications, as a biographer, are *Fanny Kemble: A Performed Life* (Pennsylvania, 2007) and *Olivia Manning: A Woman at War* (Oxford, 2013). She is now at work on a biography of Pamela Hansford Johnson (under contract to Oxford).

Ashley Dawson is Professor of English at the City University of New York's Graduate Center and at the College of Staten Island/CUNY. He is the author of the *Routledge Concise History of Twentieth-Century British Literature* (2013) and *Mongrel Nation: Diasporic Culture and the Making of Postcolonial Britain* (Michigan, 2007), and co-editor of three essay collections: *Democracy, the State, and the Struggle for Global Justice* (Routledge, 2009), *Dangerous Professors: Academic Freedom and the National Security Campus* (Michigan, 2009), and *Exceptional State: Contemporary U.S. Culture and the New Imperialism* (Duke, 2007).

Andrew Elfenbein is Professor of English at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. He has published *Byron and the Victorians* (Cambridge, 1995, winner of the *Choice* Outstanding Academic Books award), *Romantic Genius: The Prehistory of a Homosexual Role* (Columbia, 1999), and *Romanticism and the Rise of English* (Stanford 2009, winner of the *Choice* Outstanding Academic Book award). For Longman Cultural Editions, he has edited Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* and Bram Stoker's *Dracula*. His forthcoming book is *The Gist of Reading*.

Lynn Festa is Associate Professor of English at Rutgers University. She is the author of *Sentimental Figures of Empire in Eighteenth-Century Britain and France* (Johns Hopkins, 2006) and co-editor, with Daniel Carey, of *The Postcolonial Enlightenment: Eighteenth-Century Colonialism and Postcolonial Theory* (Oxford, 2009).

Kate Flint is Provost Professor of English and Art History at the University of Southern California. She has published *The Woman Reader, 1837–1914* (Oxford, 1993), *The Victorians and The Visual Imagination* (Cambridge, 2000), and *The Transatlantic Indian 1776–1930* (Princeton, 2008), and edited the *Cambridge History of Victorian Literature* (2012). She is completing a book entitled *Flash! Photography, Writing, and Surprising Illumination*, and has a new project on cultural manifestations of the ordinary and the overlooked.

Jonathan Freedman is the Marvin Felheim Collegiate Professor of English at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. He has also taught (in various capacities) at Yale, Caltech, Oxford, Williams College, and the Bread Loaf School of English. He has published books on Henry James and aestheticism, Jews and the making of high culture in Anglo-America, and the relation between Jewish and other ethnic American cultural formations.

Christopher GoGwilt is Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Fordham University. His book *The Passage of Literature: Genealogies of Modernism in Conrad, Rhys, and Pramoedya* (Oxford, 2011) won the Modernist Studies Association book prize for 2012. He is also the author of *The Invention of the West: Joseph Conrad and the Double-Mapping of Europe and Empire* (Stanford, 1995) and *The Fiction of Geopolitics: Afterimages of Culture from Wilkie Collins to Alfred Hitchcock* (Stanford, 2000).

Lauren M. E. Goodlad is the Kathryn Paul Professorial Scholar of English and Criticism & Interpretive Theory at the University of Illinois, Urbana. Her publications

include *The Victorian Geopolitical Aesthetic: Realism, Sovereignty, and Transnational Experience* (2015), *Victorian Literature and the Victorian State: Character and Governance in a Liberal Society* (2003) as well as essay collections including *Victorian Internationalisms* (a 2007 special issue of *RaVoN* co-edited with Julia Wright) and *The Ends of History* (a 2013 special issue of *Victorian Studies* co-edited with Andrew Sartori).

Madigan Haley is Postdoctoral Preceptor in the Department of English at the University of Virginia. He has published on the novel genre, geoculture, and world-scale analysis in *the minnesota review* and on the ethics of global fiction in *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*.

J. Paul Hunter is Emeritus Professor of English at the University of Virginia and the University of Chicago. His many publications include *The Reluctant Pilgrim: Defoe's Emblematic Method and Quest for Form in Robinson Crusoe* (Johns Hopkins, 1966), *Occasional Form: Henry Fielding and the Chains of Circumstance* (Johns Hopkins, 1975), and *Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction* (Norton, 1990).

Ivan Kreilkamp is Associate Professor in the Department of English at Indiana University, where he is also co-editor of the journal *Victorian Studies*. The author of *Voice and the Victorian Storyteller* (Cambridge, 2005), he has published widely on both Victorian and contemporary literature and culture.

Laurie Langbauer is Professor of English at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. She is the author of *Women and Romance: The Consolations of Gender in the English Novel* (Cornell, 1990) and *Novels of Everyday Life: The Series in English Fiction, 1850–1930* (Cornell, 1999). In 2015, Oxford University Press will publish her book *The Juvenile Tradition: Young Writers and Prolepsis, 1750–1835*.

Deidre Lynch is Professor of English at Harvard University. Her books include *The Economy of Character: Novels, Market Culture, and the Business of Inner Meaning* (Chicago, 1998), which won the Modern Language Association Prize for a First Book, and *Loving Literature: A Cultural History* (Chicago, 2015).

John Marx is Professor of English and a member of the Humanities Innovation Lab at the University of California, Davis. He is also an Editor of the journal *Contemporary Literature*. He is at work on a solo book entitled *Mega: How Mass Media Make Contemporary Cities* and is collaborating with University of South Carolina film scholar and archivist Mark Garrett Cooper on a project called “Mass Media U” (instances of this work in progress can be found at <http://humanitiesafterhollywood.org/>). To date, his publications largely have been devoted to twentieth-century anglophone fiction, including his most recent book *Geopolitics and the Anglophone Novel, 1890–2011* (Cambridge, 2012).

John Plotz, Professor and Chair of English at Brandeis University, is the author of *The Crowd* (California, 2000) and *Portable Property* (Princeton, 2008), as well as a young-adult novel, *Time and the Tapestry: A William Morris Adventure* (Bunker Hill, 2014). His current project is “Semi-Detached: The Aesthetics of Partial Absorption.”

John Richetti is A. M. Rosenthal Professor (emeritus) of English at the University of Pennsylvania. His most recent book is *The Life of Daniel Defoe: A Critical Biography* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2005). He has also edited *The Cambridge History of English Literature: 1660–1780* (2005) and *The Cambridge Companion to Daniel Defoe* (2008), and with Toni Bowers he co-edited and abridged *Samuel Richardson's Clarissa* (Broadview, 2011). He is currently completing for Wiley-Blackwell *The History of Eighteenth-Century English Literature*. In 2010–2011 he received a Mellon Emeritus Fellowship.

John Paul Riquelme, Professor of English at Boston University and Co-chair of the Modernism Seminar at the Mahindra Humanities Center (Harvard), has published, in addition to his work on modernist writers from Joyce to Beckett, essays on *Frankenstein* and science fiction, *Dorian Gray* and aestheticism, and *Dracula's* stylistic excesses from a post-structural perspective. He has edited *Gothic & Modernism: Essaying Dark Literary Modernity* (Johns Hopkins, 2008) and *Dracula* (2nd edition, Bedford, 2015). He is currently at work on a study of the discursive modernity of Gothic narratives and a study of Oscar Wilde and literary modernism.

Patricia Meyer Spacks is Edgar F. Shannon Professor of English Emerita at the University of Virginia. Her most recent books are *On Rereading* (Harvard, 2011) and an annotated edition of Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* (Harvard, 2013).

Leonard Tennenhouse is Professor of English at Duke University. In addition to a number of articles on the early American novel, he is the author of *The Importance of Feeling English: American Literature and the British Diaspora, 1750–1850* (Princeton, 2007) and, with Nancy Armstrong, of *The Imaginary Puritan: Literature, Intellectual Labor, and the Origins of Personal Life* (California, 1992).

Cynthia Wall is Professor of English at the University of Virginia. She is the author of *The Prose of Things: Transformations of Description in the Eighteenth Century* (Chicago, 2006; Honorable Mention, James Russell Lowell Prize 2007) and *The Literary and Cultural Spaces of Restoration London* (Cambridge, 1998), the editor of the *Concise Companion to the Restoration and Eighteenth Century* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2005), and has edited works by Bunyan, Defoe, and Pope.

Jennifer Wicke, Professor of English at the University of Virginia, is the author of *Advertising Fictions: Literature, Advertisement, and Social Reading* (Columbia, 1988) and the co-editor of *Feminism and Postmodernism* (Duke, 1994). The twentieth century editor for the first editions of the Longman Anthology of British Literature, she is a founding executive board member for the Society for Novel Studies; her book *Born to Shop: Modernism, Modernity, and The Global Work of Consumption* is forthcoming. She has published widely on nineteenth- and twentieth-century literature from a global anglophone perspective, as well as on film and other media.

Preface

This *Companion* is addressed to readers interested in the English novel and the many ways there are to think and write about it. Each of the twenty-nine essays presumes a basic familiarity with the tradition of the English novel and an appetite for learning more, but none presumes the possession of any specialized knowledge. Collectively, the essays are informed by a vast body of scholarly and critical work while remaining accessible, lively, and intellectually engaging. Readers will acquire a sharp sense of some of the main lines of inquiry that have shaped criticism of the novel over the course of its still relatively brief history, but the essays also vibrantly testify to the innovation and diversity that marks the field at the present moment – as is only fitting for the study of a genre that itself has always been marked by innovation and diversity.

As a glance at the table of contents reveals, the essays in this *Companion* are not arranged by chronology. Rather than thread essays along a time line, we have organized the volume topically in the belief that our contributors could cover more ground, pursue more original approaches, and cumulatively achieve a greater overall coherence if they were set loose from the requirements of a chronological survey. Without exception, the individual essays are informed by an awareness of history and chronology: arranging discrete events in meaningful sequences is one way novelists make sense of experience, and it is one way scholars make sense of the development of literary forms. But the volume's alternative structure makes it possible for our contributors to be rigorously historical yet not constrained by the demands of "coverage" or by the need to canvass particular periods or centuries. Individually and in aggregate, then, the chapters seek to address the pivotal dimensions of the English novel both in time and across time, including its aesthetic and formal properties and its embedding in a variety of social and cultural contexts.

Calling this a *Companion to the English Novel* raises the question of what is covered by the designation *English*. Until recently, "the English novel" was generally used by critics to refer to works written in English by British authors, thereby taking in Scottish, Irish, and Welsh writers while putting to one side the ever-expanding corpus of anglophone fiction originating elsewhere in the world – including North America.

Limitations of space prevent the present volume from doing full justice to the richness and variety of world anglophone literature, but readers will find throughout the following pages perspectives that are anything but parochial. From its beginnings, the “English” novel has been an international form, open to continental, transatlantic, and now global influences and energies. Our contributors are everywhere alive to those energies and to the many ways they have shaped, and continue to shape, the novel in English.

Part I

The Novel and Its Histories

1

The 1740s

Patricia Meyer Spacks

Exuberance marked British literary production in the 1740s. In prose and in poetry, the decade saw a vivid explosion of energy. Poetry ranged from Samuel Johnson's passionate *Vanity of Human Wishes* (1749), composed in heroic couplets and imitating a classical model, to William Collins's *Odes* (1747), innovative in form and content; from Alexander Pope's *Dunciad* (1743), a satiric anti-epic in couplets, to the final version of James Thomson's *The Seasons* (1744), a long blank verse poem with a rhapsodic view of the natural world. Prose fiction included moralized fable, social satire, imitation biography and autobiography, sentimental investigation, action narrative, erotic exploration, and various combinations. The many important published novels did not necessarily have much in common. *Clarissa* (1747–1748) bears little obvious resemblance to *Roderick Random* (1748). Eliza Haywood's *Anti-Pamela* (1741) and Henry Fielding's *Joseph Andrews* (1742) share almost nothing beyond their common satirical target of *Pamela* (1740). The efflorescence of fiction implied only a few widely held assumptions about what the novel is, does, or should do. Most of its manifestations, however, suggested a conviction that fiction, providing vicarious experience for its readers, should dramatize for them human experience in its common forms.

That rather obvious project carried significant weight in the 1740s. The notion that experience provides the only secure basis for knowledge was at the heart of philosophic empiricism, strongly articulated by the philosopher David Hume, whose *Treatise of Human Nature* (1739–1740) insisted that we must content ourselves with experience as the stuff of knowledge and that experience provides sufficient basis for the conduct

of life. Hume elaborated the point in *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (1748) in terms suggesting the central principle of many novelistic plots:

There is no man so young and unexperienced, as not to have formed, from observation, many general and just maxims concerning human affairs and the conduct of life; but it must be confessed, that, when a man comes to put these in practice, he will be extremely liable to error, till time and farther experience both enlarge these maxims, and teach him their proper use and application ... Not to mention, that, to a young beginner, the general observations and maxims occur not always on the proper occasions, nor can be immediately applied with due calmness and distinction. (Hume 1998, 88)

The investigation of how a young man – or, often, a young woman – acquired and used experience provided a vibrant topos for the decade's novels.

History, Hume believed, because factual, exerted great power over the human mind; but fiction, imitation history, could concern itself with ordinary individuals, whose version of experience might bear a closer relation to a reader's than could happenings befalling princes or generals. Although novels throughout the decade explored many possibilities – as they would continue to do for the rest of the century – the pattern of following an imaginary young person's acquisition of life experience persisted. Such narratives could provide vicarious experience, safer and less costly in emotional terms (particularly for women and young people) than direct experience of the world.

At the decade's opening, terminology about fiction remained unstable, with *novel* and *romance* interchangeable labels for extended pieces of prose fiction. What we now call "romances," fictions of a certain length that represent fanciful events, with no concern for probability, had long existed and were thought to have wide readership. Not many new ones, however, were being published. The Eighteenth-Century Short-Title Catalogue indicates that between 1700 and 1740, on average, ten or fewer new works of prose fiction in English emerged annually. "A brief but limited upsurge" developed between 1719, the year of *Robinson Crusoe* and Eliza Haywood's *Love in Excess*, both hugely popular, and 1726. After *Pamela* appeared in 1740, however, to wide acclaim, the average enlarged to about 20 novels a year, doubling again by the century's end (Downie 2000). As the 1740s concluded, multiple possibilities remained in play. The novel had begun to solidify its authority as a form, but no one had won the struggle over its ongoing direction.

When Richardson and Fielding began writing, in the early 1740s, the novel could hardly claim a form at all. Fiction, of course, had flourished since ancient times, but the notion of an extended prose work focused on nonaristocrats was recent. The moral and aesthetic status of such a composition remained uncertain; novelists of the 1740s had to justify their enterprise. They did so most often by invoking a classical rationale: literature instructs and pleases. The first of these purposes carried more weight than the second. The familiar claim to offer moral instruction persisted in the eighteenth century – especially in the works of such writers as Haywood, where it might seem dubious. Fielding, though, a great innovator of the 1740s, offered a new kind of teaching. In *Tom Jones* (1749), he purported to instruct his readers about that large, vague concept, human nature: to teach them, along with his hero, how human beings operate in the world and on what principles. The claim aligned him with Hume, whose *Treatise of Human Nature*, his first major work, had similar aspirations if different methods.

Although not every novelist articulated the same justification, the emphasis of prose fiction in the 1740s, despite the novel's diversity in other respects, steadily moved in this direction. Instead of knights and ladies of high birth, novels now concerned themselves with men and women who might work for a living, whose origins might be indeterminate, whose fate depended not on heroic combat but on Providence as well as their own effort – effort that could prove, as often as not, misguided. Like the popular romances on our newsstands today, these fictions customarily had happy endings, but their protagonists typically faced arduous struggles, against internal as often as external obstacles. They thus educated their readers in the nature of moral endeavor, as well as in its proper goals, and they suggested the kinds of problem one might face in the world.

As for the other traditional justification, the pleasure literature provided, that too remained important to novelistic offerings, but now in new forms. The exuberance of Fielding's play with language and with plot, the abandon with which Smollett sends his protagonists on wild travels, the inventiveness of detail, of happening, and of characterization in many of the decade's novels: all promised and provided forms of lively delight.

While the British novel developed in new directions, attracting enthusiastic readers and listeners (reading aloud remained a common practice, and illiteracy, though decreasing, was still widespread), difficulties beset the country in which it pursued its course. During most of the 1740s, Great Britain was at war. The War of Jenkins' Ear, against Spain, began in 1739, provoked by a merchant captain, Robert Jenkins, who displayed to the House of Commons his ear, allegedly cut off by a Spanish official. It merged into the War of the Austrian Succession, which ended only in 1748. In 1743 and 1744, the nation experienced constant threats of invasion from France, in support of claims to the British throne by James III, son of the deposed King James II. In 1745, a small force led by James's son, Charles Edward ("Bonnie Prince Charlie") invaded Scotland and, joined by considerable numbers of Scotsmen, managed to get within 150 miles of London. War and rumors of war, in short, formed a constant background to English life.

And not a background only. The threat of French invasion and the actuality of Bonnie Prince Charlie's arrival stimulated divisions among the British. In 1689, after the so-called Glorious Revolution, Parliament had summoned the Protestant William of Orange and his wife Mary, daughter of James II, to the throne, replacing Mary's father, unacceptable mainly because of his Catholicism. By 1740, George II ruled, as he had since 1727, the second of the Hanoverian kings. His father, George I, had succeeded Mary's sister, Queen Anne, as her closest Protestant relative. German by birth and by residence, George I did not even speak English. His successor, without sharing this linguistic disability, likewise remained oriented toward Germany. Less unpopular among the English than his father had been, he was yet widely thought too bellicose, cause for anxiety in an era of widespread European wars.

Although relatively few British citizens had Catholic sympathies, many felt troubled at the breaking of the Stuart line when George I succeeded Anne, and many deplored the incursion of German rulers. Jacobites, as sympathizers with James's cause were called, wanted an invasion and a new king who would restore the old lineage. Most of their countrymen did not. Such political divisions within the nation, less

widespread than they had been 50 years before, yet contributed to national unease both before the 1745 invasion and after, when those who had provided military or financial support to Prince Charles were ferociously punished.

The custom of “impressing” soldiers and sailors – taking men by force from their usual pursuits – generated uncertainty and fear in the working classes. The wars might come all too close to home – as, indeed, they literally did in 1745 after Prince Charles landed from France and won a series of military victories that carried him from Scotland to within striking distance of London before his army was defeated by the English.

More than war troubled the nation. Corruption was thought to abound in the government. Money, as opposed to landed property, took an increasingly important place in individual lives. Both public and private corruption derived from desire for wealth and from easy possibilities for achieving it. The vast gap between the rich and the poor began to attract attention, as members of the growing mercantile class flaunted their money and its appurtenances. Possibilities for dealing with money had amplified: paper credit now existed, and stock trading was increasing – developments fraught with uncertainty. Anyone who looked around could find much to criticize – a situation familiar in every era. In the 1740s, however, the novel provided not only an imaginative escape from troubling actualities but also a fresh medium for conveying criticism. Tied to some version of ordinary life, the novel could attend both to the ways that human beings proceed through their careers and to matters that trouble them along their paths. Among these matters, in the 1740s as always, were national and international political issues.

To suggest that novels engaged the period’s large concerns is not to say that they focused as much attention on public as on private matters. But this fiction manifested not only intensifying interest in individuals, not only heightened concern for realism,¹ but also fresh possibilities for pondering authority, succession, legitimacy, negotiation – issues alive in national and international politics. Moreover, many novelists used fiction to criticize corruption, public and private, and to convey anxiety about, or condemnation of, the place of money in national life. Such actualities figure mostly as objects of overt or implicit criticism, and their incorporation suggests the novel’s ambition.

In *Clarissa*, a work conspicuously concerned with its characters’ intimate lives, social and political allusions occur mainly by analogy. Early in the novel, while Clarissa still believes that she can negotiate successfully for her own freedom, she comments that the “world is but one great family” (Richardson 1985, 62). Her comment acquires increasing ironic force as her own immediate family ever more clearly epitomizes the viciousness of the larger world. Helpless against her siblings’ machinations, her mother’s weakness, her father’s obsessions, and her uncles’ venality, she grasps with increasing clarity the degree to which, both before and after her defection from her father’s home, those around her, like most in society at large, operate on the basis of narrowly conceived self-interest.

A series of apparently casual analogies strengthens the connection between intimate groupings and larger ones. The early part of the narrative, before Clarissa’s elopement, offers frequent comparisons between happenings in the Harlowe family and what Clarissa at one point calls “intrigues and plots carried on by undermining courtiers against one another” (82). Anna Howe, imagining herself married to her meek and compliant wooer, Hickman, fancies “how he *ascends*, and how I *descend*, in the

matrimonial wheel, never to take my turn again, but by fits and starts, like the feeble struggles of a sinking state for its dying liberty" (277). Only two short paragraphs intervene before she begins generalizing about marriage. Two people who come together, she says, should have suitable tempers, yet need boundaries between them. Unless each holds the other to these boundaries, encroachment threatens. She illustrates her assertion:

If the boundaries of the three estates that constitute our political union were not known, and occasionally asserted, what would become of the prerogatives and privileges of each? The two branches of the legislature would encroach upon each other; and the executive power would swallow up both. (277)

The novel's vocabulary reinforces the implications of Anna's comparison. *Authority*, *liberty*, *independence* are key words in the early part of *Clarissa*, abstract but potent nouns familiar from public politics. Clarissa, having inherited a house and money from her grandfather, already potentially possesses independence (meaning, primarily, financial freedom). Fear lest she assert that independence torments her family. Although she has turned the management of her estate over to her father, she could assert her legal right to reassume it. She professes no desire to do so, yet her family's fear remains: fear of an overturning of established order, a miniature revolution.

In this narrative the language of national politics, belonging to women as well as men, calls attention to the novel's concern with sexual and familial politics, both in their operations reminiscent of national and international possibilities. Young women's awareness of political issues informs their responses to personal dilemmas. Politics generates wars – in families and in erotic pairings as on a larger scale. Analogical references to politics interpret personal experience, reflecting characters' and shaping readers' understanding.

Roderick Random provides more direct reference to social and political actualities. The novel concerns a young man encountering unexpected situations that reveal at every social level the destructiveness of corrosive and apparently universal self-interest, focused mainly on financial gain. Roderick's predicaments seem more or less arbitrary, exacerbated by his conflicted desire for wealth and importance, often resolvable only by providential happening. Whether comic or uncomfortable or desperate (and all these emotional registers occur), the protagonist's perplexities demonstrate operations of a social world that rewards malevolence and encourages disregard for individual need. Roderick must endure a painful education – experience *is*, or should be, education – about his chaotic and perverse social environment. *Roderick Random*, suggesting that education in the world's dangers facilitates maturity, finally rewards its central character both financially and erotically.

Late in the novel, Roderick sums up his moral experience and his conclusions from it. He speaks of "scoundrels, ... habituated to falsehood and equivocation," of "the knavery and selfishness of mankind," and of the "perfidious world" (Smollett 1995, 394). He would seclude himself permanently from this world, were not his beloved Narcissa part of it. Thus he in effect accepts while acknowledging the imperfect state of being. The scoundrels who persecute one good man have persecuted others and will continue to do so. They epitomize human knavery and selfishness, about which nothing can be done.

The novel depicts war directly. At the moral center of *Roderick Random* lies Roderick's account of the Battle of Cartagena. The 1741 battle in the War of Jenkins' Ear produced an unexpected defeat for the British, who had sent a large fleet against a Spanish fort in present-day Colombia. Dissension among the expedition's leaders, as well as the willingness of the vastly outnumbered Spanish, contributed to the British downfall.

Smollett interests himself in the battle primarily as an image of British society. Harsh, rather clumsy, but passionate satire creates a new narrative tone. As Roderick reports it, squabbles within the upper class effectually sacrifice thousands. Sheer stupidity appears to dictate British tactics; Roderick can only surmise that the tacticians, motivated by British sportsmanship, don't wish to take advantage of their opponents when they might easily do so. Dreadful conditions on board ship contribute to numberless deaths.

Wounds and stumps being neglected, contracted filth and putrefaction, and millions of maggots were hatched amidst the corruption of the sores. This inhuman disregard was imputed to the scarcity of surgeons; though it is well known that every great ship in the fleet could have spared one at least for this duty; an expedient which would have been more than sufficient to remove this shocking inconvenience: But, perhaps the general was too much of a gentleman to ask a favour of this kind from his fellow-chief, who, on the other hand, would not derogate so much from his own dignity, as to offer such assistance, unasked ... (190)

The narrative implicitly indicts "gentlemen," concerned with forms rather than substance, and the idea of "dignity" as a substantive value. The inhumanity that destroys human lives emanates from "chief[s]" of the expedition. The fierce understatement of calling enormous loss of life a "shocking inconvenience" ("shocking" an intensifier used casually and frequently by members of the upper class) emphasizes the narrator's perception that "gentlemen" ignore their social inferiors.

The character Roderick, like the novel he inhabits, throbs with energy, which informs frequent exposés of human costs generated by universal preoccupation with rank and wealth. Roderick's comprehensive view of the human condition discerns significant innocence or virtue only occasionally, as in an imprisoned playwright, helpless victim of injustice, and in Narcissa, barely sketched as a character, who exists quite outside the novel's dominant scheme and has imaginative power, if at all, only as a fantasy. All characters of fiction derive from fantasy, but Narcissa, a fantasy within a fantasy, seems Roderick's creation, and even he hardly believes in her. The novel's unconvincing resolution of happy marriage signals that Roderick responds to harsh experience by evasion, escaping into his own fantasy.

Novels can claim the significance of the stories they tell by hinting, as *Clarissa* and *Roderick Random* do, that the problems of private persons adumbrate those of public groups. Jerry C. Beasley speaks of the "elevation of private experience to the status of public history" in novels of the 1740s (Beasley 1982, 43). He means that novels take ordinary individuals as seriously as histories take the extraordinary. One way to do so, I would add, is to indicate connections between stories told by novelists and those that make the stuff of history. History can illuminate novels, these fictions suggest, and novels can shape public opinion.

Novelistic allusions to public events call attention to one aspect of fiction's ambitions. One of Fielding's half-playful claims for his own accomplishment suggests another aspiration: a formal one with large implications. *Joseph Andrews* originated in satiric impulse, as a comment on Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* and Colley Cibber's *Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber* (1740). Predicated on the comic notion of a young man who, like Pamela, must defend his chastity, the novel soon goes far beyond its origins. It causes Fielding to hold forth on his invention of a new form of writing, albeit one with roots in classic tradition. *Joseph Andrews* is, he avers, a comic romance, by which he means "a comic Epic-Poem in Prose" (Fielding 1999, 3). The claim insists on the kinship between a mainly light-hearted narrative and the genre universally considered the highest literary form. Poetry provided the traditional medium for epic. Fielding argues by his practice for prose as appropriate to grand literary endeavor, and for the possibility of affirming positive values both by attacking the corrupt and by celebrating virtue. As revolutionary as his claim of a new form of epic is his use of an apparently low-born protagonist to embody goodness. Joseph's sidekick and mentor, Parson Adams, moreover, is inept, clumsy, and naïve, the butt of derisory jokes, yet also embodies the good man in action. Although the rich and powerful mock him, the poor parson with his tattered cassock emerges as heroic by virtue of his moral force.

In asserting the kinship to epic of a prose comic fiction while translating epic conventions into a modern key, Fielding in effect boldly intervenes in literary history, delineating his own place in it. As the word *novel* suggests, he is doing something new. He says so again, explicitly, in *Tom Jones*, where the narrator declares himself "the founder of a new province of writing" and therefore "at liberty to make what laws I please therein" (Fielding 1996, 68). Richardson, with none of Fielding's playfulness, makes comparable claims. First he tentatively suggests, in relation to *Pamela*, that he "might possibly introduce a new species of writing";² then he retrospectively proclaims his resolution, in writing *Clarissa*, "to attempt something that never yet had been done" (Richardson 1751, 8: 279). The sense of newness many novelists shared encourages inventiveness.

Cumulatively, the novels of the 1740s indeed did much that was new, innovating in characterization, in tone, and in substance, engaging moral, political, and psychological dilemmas, investigating society and individuals. Fielding may have been alone in his grandiose assertion of epic intent and achievement, but his contemporaries likewise demonstrate large purposes. Their heroes hardly resemble the epic variety, and the novels frequently articulate values by negation, through sharp criticism of perceived failures in fulfilling public obligations. Yet social values remain a central concern. Experience properly used, many novels suggest, teaches how to defend the good.

Their protagonists assume many shapes. *Clarissa* inhabits the most commanding position. She needs no education beyond her early religious indoctrination to combat evil, embodied in her family, in her would-be lover, and in many less intimate associates. Experience teaches her the intractability of omnipresent evil, although it also affirms the rare possibility of fidelity and virtue. She comes to think death a welcome escape from a corrupt world. An imperfect mortal, she yet approaches perfection.

Such a summary may raise questions about the degree of “realism” involved in Richardson’s construction and, by extension, about realism’s desirability. Samuel Johnson, agreed in his own time and ours to be the period’s greatest literary critic, pondered the matter in a 1750 essay, beginning with a salient definition of the previous decade’s novels:

The works of fiction, with which the present generation seems more particularly delighted, are such as exhibit life in its true state, diversified only by accidents that daily happen in the world, and influenced by passions and qualities which are really to be found in conversing with mankind. (Johnson 1969, 19)

The essay meditates about verisimilitude: it’s all very well to imitate life, but not promiscuously; some things, Johnson insists, should not be imitated. “It is therefore not a sufficient vindication of a character, that it is drawn as it appears, for many characters ought never to be drawn” (22). Concerned with literature’s moral function, Johnson worries about the representation of imaginary persons who combine good and evil qualities. Such “mixed characters,” Johnson believes, endanger readers, who might choose to imitate bad behavior exemplified in attractive fictional figures. He recommends that novelists instead depict unmistakably evil and almost perfect human beings rather than ambiguous characters. Realism does not much matter.

Although Johnson does not name names, he seems to be denigrating books like *Tom Jones* and *Roderick Random*, preferring to them such works as *Clarissa*, in which readers can know clearly whom to admire and whom to despise. Tom Jones has a good heart, but he also has a tendency to go to bed with every available woman. He is therefore “mixed,” a dangerous model. Roderick Random exploits women in order to solve his financial problems. Conversely, Clarissa, although (as Richardson himself pointed out) not devoid of human flaws, behaves for the most part admirably. She is thus essentially “unmixed,” or so Johnson believes.

But Johnson is wrong. Even Clarissa, examined closely, has traits a moralist would not wish imitated. Richardson’s epistolary technique encouraged, almost required, emphasis on his letter writers’ inner lives, enlarging the notion of experience and stressing intricacies and paradoxes of character. Readers have long found Clarissa compelling because of her complexity, ambivalence, and failures of self-knowledge: her divided nature. Despite Johnson’s objections, many of the decade’s novelists eagerly pursued the possibilities of such “mixed” characters, possibilities that potentially increased readers’ interest in imagined persons’ behaviors and their motivations. Richardson’s representations of Pamela and Clarissa and Lovelace, as even the earliest readers perceived, had more dimensions than their creator acknowledged. He repeatedly revised and enlarged *Clarissa*, in a vain attempt to make Lovelace, the novel’s villain, so villainous that readers would see nothing attractive in him. He never succeeded.

Other novelists deliberately employed unmixed characters, despite their implausibility, to chart contemporary experience. Henry Fielding’s sister Sarah, for instance, delineates a protagonist not only unmixed but “simple,” in name and in nature. In *Adventures of David Simple* (1744), Sarah Fielding imagines her central character as a good Christian man in a bad society. In a series of episodes that sometimes approach

Bunyanesque allegory, the eponymous figure, “simple” in the sense of “pure,” travels England in search of a friend. He witnesses hypocrisy, greed, and malice. He engages himself to a woman who turns out to care only for money, but he quite easily disengages. Eventually he acquires three friends, two female and one male, all victims of society. The novel ends with two marriages, involving all four friends, and with the promise of an idyllic future. More specifically, it ends with an emphatic statement of the characters’ relevance to the good of society at large, suggesting that every man of intelligence “make use of his Talents for the Advantage and Pleasure of the Society to which he happens more particularly to belong,” and that members of that society use their abilities on his behalf. Then, “what Happiness would Mankind enjoy, and who could complain of being miserable?” (Fielding 1987, 305).

Sarah Fielding’s imaginings evoke a utopian world apparently devoid of politics, in which the small society to which each person “happens more particularly to belong” determines well-being. Realistically implausible, this solution to the problems of a larger society apparently became in the long run unpersuasive even allegorically to Fielding herself, who in her sequel to *David Simple, Volume the Last* (1753), would represent the little community as bombarded by malice and avarice until three of the four die. Death rescues them from hardship. The narrator invites her readers, if they wish, to imagine David still bustling about on earth, but her final sentence suggests that only death can protect him from “falling into any future Afflictions” and ensure that no future suffering will “rend and torment his honest Heart” (1987, 432). As in *Clarissa*, death, given the Christian vision of an afterlife, provides the only solution to the problem of earthly corruption.

As *David Simple* illustrates, the “unmixed” character, relatively rare in fiction with realistic settings and circumstances, provides a ready instrument for social criticism. David Simple’s innocence, producing his astonishment at what he sees around him, facilitates satire; so does *Clarissa*’s initial idealistic vision. Such employment of the characters tacitly acknowledges the mixed nature of actual experience, which the pure figures that Dr. Johnson preferred have difficulty grasping. The reader – even the young or female reader – perhaps understands more than David does, particularly at early stages of his progress through the world.

Readers’ roles in relation to this early fiction of experience involve more than vicarious participation in the protagonist’s career. Readers enlarge their own experience by in effect watching and judging characters in action, as well as by imaginatively sharing their predicaments and solutions. They function simultaneously as spectators and as imaginative participants. That fact becomes especially apparent in works involving unmixed characters who do evil rather than good, as in as in Haywood’s *Anti-Pamela* and Henry Fielding’s *Shamela*. Both works convey skepticism about Richardson’s *Pamela*, who guards her chastity against seduction and force and claims her primary commitment to Christian virtue yet, in the view of Haywood and Fielding, demonstrates an eye for the main chance that discredits her goodness. Richardson’s novel has long interested readers through the letters that convey *Pamela*’s lack of self-awareness despite her constant self-examination, and the degree of self-interest that sometimes motivates her without her conscious knowledge. Thus, for a minor instance, *Pamela* decides (in the course of elaborate delays about leaving her master’s house, despite her proclaimed desire to depart) that she must dress as a country girl in order to return to

her rural parents. She gradually acquires the necessary materials, attires herself in her new garb, and appears before her master. "To say Truth, I never lik'd myself so well in my Life," she writes, after looking at herself in the mirror (Richardson 2001, 55). That night, Mr. B for the first time attempts to rape her (rather halfheartedly, to be sure). Before he appears, Mrs. Jervis, the housekeeper, remarks that she has never seen Pamela look so lovely as she did in her country dress, and that of course she struck Mr. B as attractive. Pamela declares that she "expected no Effect from [the clothes]; but if any, a quite contrary one" (62).

The remark seems disingenuous at best, in relation to her acknowledgment of how much she liked her image in the mirror. When Mr. B sees through what he calls her disguise, he accuses her of hypocrisy – the accusation that would be made by numerous critics in Richardson's time and later. In order to make that point, both *Anti-Pamela* and *Shamela* represent unmixed figures, motivated and acting entirely in terms of self-interest, hypocrisy their consistent resource. Syrena Tricky, the anti-Pamela, trained from girlhood by her mother to find and get a profitable man, learns her lessons well and thinks herself cleverer than her mother. She consequently loses her virginity early and inadvertently but goes on to effect one rewarding liaison after another, until she is disgraced and banished to Wales, with no men in the vicinity. Shamela, like Pamela a servant, has, like Syrena, a mother of dubious morals. Although she has already had a baby by Parson Williams (who figures in *Pamela* as an honorable although unrewarded suitor), Shamela successfully presents herself as a frightened and chaste young woman, concerned mainly about her "Vartue." Fielding has fun with his characters, making Mr. B into a man of dubious virility but extreme lewdness and having Shamela use talk about her Vartue as a resource in every extremity. Shamela gets her man, such as he is, and ends up pleased with herself. Experience teaches such characters nothing about virtue, and their machinations hardly invite imaginative participation. As spectators, readers witness their activities and perhaps internalize their implicit criticism of Pamela.

Shamela and Syrena differ from Pamela in their full awareness of what they are doing. Hypocrisy implies awareness, and Pamela's revealing letters to her virtuous parents suggest that she doesn't understand her own motives. But Haywood and Fielding implicitly mock Richardson for having it both ways: for representing Pamela as an innocent and demonstrating as well that more than innocence occupies her mind. They in effect criticize the character for being "mixed" while pretending otherwise, and they purport to demonstrate what Pamela might look like if truly "unmixed." Incidentally, though, they raise a question about the valorizing of experience in more realistic novels. Shamela and Syrena learn nothing that can change their direction in life. Experience in itself has no necessary effect. To be useful, it must intersect with specific human qualities.

Reflecting on Shamela and Syrena calls attention to the limitations of Pamela's education through experience. A good student, the girl has learned domestic skills and decorum from her late mistress. She takes advantage likewise of her experiences with Mr. B – but only, the perspective of *Shamela* suggests, to effect her advantageous marriage. Each encounter with her master sharpens her skills for dealing with him the next time. Experience demonstrates Pamela's courage, ingenuity, and determination. It teaches her how to get and keep a husband: precisely the skill she needs. It does not greatly enlarge her human capacities.

Joseph Andrews, Fielding's second satire of *Pamela*, surpasses his first not only by developing a novel that goes far beyond satire, but also by complicating the satiric point, adding Cibber's *Apology* as a target and pondering diversities of human response. Published, like *Pamela*, in 1740, the *Apology* constituted a new form of memoir. Its first paragraph proclaims that the author will publicize his follies because they have made him happy. At the beginning of Chapter 2, he announces with satisfaction "that nothing gives a Coxcomb more Delight, than when you suffer him to talk of himself; which sweet Liberty I here enjoy for a whole Volume together!" (Cibber 2000, 21). He also boasts of his own vanity, a note that he will strike often.

Pamela and Cibber alike manifest conspicuous self-absorption. Cibber acknowledges his delight in talking of himself; *Pamela* talks of little beyond herself, though she acknowledges nothing of the sort. Cibber cheerfully proclaims his follies, his vanity, and his egotism; *Pamela*, in Fielding's perception, possesses the same qualities without knowing it. Both use their experience to polish their self-representation. They share, most importantly, their marked theatricality.

Cibber deliberately forms himself on the page into something resembling a fictional character. He is his own creation, self-manufactured, a performer on his own stage. The metaphor of performer suits *Pamela* equally well, as she attires herself in country costume and appears before her master, or constructs her self-presentation in the letters to her parents, or dexterously carves a fowl for upper-class visitors.

Such staginess speaks to one of the period's central concerns: how to distinguish performance from straightforward action, fictional character from true character, role from substance.³ Experience presumably helps, but a masterful hypocrite can deceive even a person of much experience. (Squire Allworthy, the wise patriarch of *Tom Jones*, does not see through his evil nephew Blifil until the novel's conclusion.) Haywood and Fielding attack *Pamela* as a hypocrite partly because they can hardly imagine a more serious indictment. In their view, she not only claims her primary concern with virtue to disguise her seeking of personal advantage; she also conceals her sense of her own importance behind an appearance of humility.

During the 1740s, the idea of individual significance was taken seriously, pondered by philosophers and largely accepted by imaginative writers. Nonetheless, both *Pamela* and Cibber could be challenged as self-important: the significance of every individual does not warrant a claim of superiority over others. Cibber proclaims his own weaknesses, but, like *Pamela* enacting her humility, he glories in them. Both he and *Pamela* reveal – so Haywood and Fielding claim – a dangerous delight in their poses.

Fanny Hill, a heroine of pornography who happily violates professed social norms, feels no apparent need to pose for her readers, although she frequently deceives her clients. John Cleland's *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1748–1749), widely known by the name of its protagonist, provides unexpectedly useful perspective on other novels of the 1740s. Relying heavily on such models as *Pamela*, it conforms to and parodies the new pattern of romance in the lower social ranks, exposing some of its implications: with particular clarity: ambiguities of hypocrisy, and ambivalent attitudes toward sex and money.

Like *Pamela*, Fanny comes from poor-but-honest rural parents. When she arrives in the city seeking work, however, she quickly finds herself in a brothel. Her extensive sexual education yields to more intellectual pursuits in time to prepare her for the

return from enforced travel of the man to whom she had long before lost her virginity. Married to him, mother of a son, she announces herself a champion of morality. In the novel's final paragraph, she reports how her husband takes their son to a brothel in order to familiarize him "with all those scenes of debauchery, so fit to nauseate a good taste" (Cleland 1999, 188). Her memoir implicitly serves a comparable function.

The notion of hypocrisy as usually defined hardly applies. Fanny believes what she says; she has changed her mind as a result of her happy marriage. The narrative has previously emphasized her continued pleasure in the maneuvers and deceptions of her role as prostitute, as well as her pleasure in experience for its own sake. Now her delight in sexual relations with the man she loves provides new perspective. Yet her new morality rings false because she has neither repented nor essentially changed. Just as she comfortably assumed various roles in her life as prostitute, she now comfortably assumes the role of domestic partner. Like Colley Cibber, she postures happily on any stage. Like Cibber, too, she feels no need to conceal anything from the public – except the vast amount she can be thought to conceal from herself.

Fanny's role as what we might now call a sex worker makes transparent the connection between erotic attraction and monetary reward, a connection present although unemphasized in much fiction of the 1740s. Men and women alike, in this fiction, tend to marry prosperously, although money never consciously motivates their marriages. Every stage of Fanny Hill's career stresses the importance of money: testimony to her attractiveness, means of subsistence, temptation to deceit, source of luxuries, and, increasingly, index of respectability. It serves all these functions in other novels as well.

Before Fanny's reunion with Charles, she acquires, by inheritance from one of her lovers, a large fortune. Meeting Charles unexpectedly, she is thrilled to discover that he, in contrast, has lost all his money: now she can act as benefactor. She begs him to accept her fortune as a gift, but he insists on marrying her, although she worries about his possible social disgrace as a result.

But money, it turns out, makes everything all right: makes black into white. Fanny subsides into maternity and moral smugness. Nothing in the tone of *Fanny Hill* – a first-person narrative by its complacent protagonist – suggests any criticism of this development.

Criticism of misguided and misdirected acquisitiveness abounds in other 1740s novels. The Harlowe family's desire to increase their already significant wealth largely motivates their persecution of Clarissa. Roderick Random's desire (and, often, need) for money motivates his most morally dubious behavior, and he witnesses much similarly motivated reprehensible behavior in others. David Simple sees the corruptions of wealth everywhere. Corruption stems, many novels suggest, from caring too much about money, from wanting too much of it, and from being unscrupulous about acquiring it. Definitions of "too much" and "unscrupulous," however, remain vague; and the desirability of money continues to be assumed even as fiction castigates the evils it brings.

Fanny's large inheritance rewards fornication, which has been her career. The novel's romantic resolution asserts but hardly substantiates her new moral insight. This is, after all, pornography; one can hardly demand rigorous moral logic. The novel's crude construction exposes the comparable illogic implicit in more well-crafted novels of experience, which betray a love–hate relationship to money and discomfort at thinking too much about it.