

EQUAL ARDOUR

EQUAL ARDOUR:
GENDER AND THE IDEAL RELATIONSHIP
IN
ELIZA HAYWOOD'S AMATORY FICTION

By
CAMERON MCFARLANE, B.A.

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Master of Arts

McMaster University

MASTER OF ARTS (1991)
(English)

MCMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Equal Ardour: Gender and the Ideal Relationship
 in Eliza Haywood's Amatory Fiction

AUTHOR: Cameron McFarlane, B.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Peter Walmsley

NUMBER OF PAGES: v, 87

Abstract

This thesis examines a selection of Eliza Haywood's early fiction. The central action in all of these works is the development of a passionate love relationship between a man and a woman. (Haywood's ideal vision of this relationship is the union of man and woman as equals with a relationship based on mutual affection and esteem. The vast majority of her novels, however, demonstrate that there is only a slim possibility that this ideal can be realized. I argue that the greatest obstacle to the ideal relationship in Haywood's novels is the concept of absolute gender difference. Only when conventional gender roles have been cast aside is Haywood's ideal of an equal union possible.)

Chapter One focuses on the tragic effects that conventional ideas about gender difference have on the love relationship. Chapter Two looks at two of Haywood's novels in which her ideal is achieved. The last chapter examines how Haywood shows men and women using language to establish a relationship with each other and, then, expands on these ideas to consider the "conversation" which takes place between Haywood and her reader. The thesis concludes with a brief look at the last two works which Eliza Haywood wrote: The Wife and The Husband. In Answer to the Wife (1756).

Acknowledgements

This thesis was written under the supervision of Dr. Peter Walmsley. His guidance, encouragement, and patience have been greatly appreciated. Thank-you very much.

I wish to express my thanks to the staff of the William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections at McMaster University Library for their cheerful assistance.

I am indebted to Kathy Behrendt and Maureen Dwyer who listened to more talk about Eliza Haywood than I had any right to expect them to; and to my mother and father who have always supported me in what I do.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter One:	
<u>Love and "Difference"</u>	12
Chapter Two:	
<u>The Equal Pair</u>	32
Chapter Three:	
<u>"The Force of Language and the Sweets of Love"</u>	55
Conclusion.....	75
Appendix.....	81
Works Cited.....	84

INTRODUCTION

Eliza Haywood (1693?-1756) was one of the most widely read and prolific writers of her day. Her first novel, Love in Excess; or the Fatal Enquiry (1719), was, along with Gulliver's Travels and Robinson Crusoe, one of the three most popular works of fiction before Pamela, running to seven editions (McBurney, in Richetti, Popular 179). After this initial success, Haywood went on to write scores of novels, as well as scandal chronicles, translations, plays, and conduct books. At the height of her success, between 1723 and 1728, she published over thirty novels, writing nine in 1726 alone. Not only prolific, Haywood was extraordinarily adaptable. Earning her living from her writing, Haywood was quick to follow public taste, and the short amatory fiction which characterizes her early career gives way, later, to longer "domestic" novels with an emphasis on how to live a virtuous life. As Dale Spender has written, "in Haywood's own work we witness the 'rise of the novel'" (83).

It was, however, with her early amatory fiction that Haywood gained her fame (or notoriety), and it is her early fiction which is the subject of this study. As the "Great Arbitress of Passion", Haywood entertained her readers with

such novels of highly-wrought emotion, seduction, and titillation as Lasselia; or the Self-Abandon'd, The Unequal Conflict; or Nature Triumphant, and Philidore and Placentia; or L'Amour trop Delicat. A contemporary of Haywood, James Sterling, wrote of her, "You sit like Heav'n's bright Minister on High/ Command[ing] the throbbing Breast and watry Eye" ("To Mrs. Eliza Haywood, on her Writings"). Thwarted love, persecuted virtue, and steamy boudoir scenes were devices used to move the reader from "refin'd Delight" to "exquisite Disquiet", to use Haywood's own terms.

The central organizing action in all of Haywood's early fiction is the development of a passionate love relationship between a man and a woman. In this respect, her novels have much in common with what we call "romantic fiction" or "romance novels". In most romance novels, the basic plot is that a man and a woman meet and fall in love, but there are obstacles to their love. Together, they are able to overcome these difficulties which function as a means of first challenging and, in the end, reinforcing the love relationship. The novel usually concludes with the marriage of the hero and the heroine which we are meant to believe will be permanently happy. The fantasy of the romance, then, is that of love triumphant, capable of overcoming any and all difficulties.

The appeal of the romance lies in its ability to involve the reader emotionally, to evoke in him or her those

feelings of "refin'd Delight" and "exquisite Disquiet". The reader vicariously experiences the trials and tribulations of the hero and heroine's love, but always within the comforting fantasy that everything will work out in the end. Romantic fiction indulges our desire for the perfect love relationship by assuring us, at least for the time while we are reading, that such a relationship is possible.

Haywood's vision of the ideal relationship is the union of the Equal Pair.¹ The Equal Pair is a man and a woman whose relationship is built upon mutual love and respect. It is a non-hierarchical relationship in which each recognizes and values the worth of the other. While this vision of the love relationship may be unremarkable, what is remarkable is the frequency with which Haywood refuses to assure us that it is attainable. (Of the sixteen early Eliza Haywood novels that I have read, only five end with the happy union of the central male and female characters.) It is for this reason that I prefer the term "amatory fiction" to "romantic fiction" in describing Haywood's novels. Although her novels focus on the love relationship between a man and a woman, and although they provide the reader with abundant emotional thrills, Haywood refuses to participate fully in the fantasy of the romance.

¹The term "Equal Pair" is my own. It is inspired by Haywood's descriptions of her characters who have successful relationships. For example, one of the stories in Reflections on the Various Effects of Love deals with an "equally loving, equally meritorious Pair" (58).

In both Haywood's fiction and the more conventional, happier romantic fiction, the obstacles to the ideal relationship are of great importance. Obviously, without some kind of difficulty for the lovers to overcome, there would be no narrative at all, nothing to prevent the hero and heroine from uniting on page one. Most often, these obstacles are external--the schemes of a rival or the whims of autocratic parents. Sometimes, they have the appearance of being internal and psychological: the hero or heroine believes the other to have a seriously flawed character. Usually, this turns out merely to be a temporary misunderstanding and, by the last chapter, the mistake is discovered. In Haywood's fiction, the obstacle to love takes on an added importance because of the fact that the vast majority of her lovers are unable to overcome it and achieve the ideal of the Equal Pair. Haywood's characters also invariably face, albeit in different manifestations, the same difficulty. In these novels, the greatest obstacle to the ideal of the Equal Pair is the concept of absolute and fixed gender difference.

Within this ideology, masculinity and femininity are considered to be mutually exclusive and opposing entities. Because the qualities traditionally associated with masculinity are those of power, and the qualities associated with femininity are those of weakness, the only relationship possible between men and women is a hierarchical one.

Clearly, then, this way of thinking is incompatible with Haywood's ideal. For Haywood, maintaining the concept of absolute and fixed gender difference can only lead to disaster, pitting man and woman against one another in an antagonistic relationship of opposites.

In this, Haywood differs greatly from the vast majority of writers, before and since, for whom the success of the ideal love relationship requires the maintaining of rigid gender boundaries. In Sex and Sensibility, Jean Hagstrum writes that most writers and readers in the eighteenth century looked to Milton's Adam and Eve and "to the bower in Eden as a sanction and source of their dreams of marital bliss" (Hagstrum 27). He also writes, though, that Adam and Eve's perfect relationship was based upon their each remaining in their own gender-specific sphere, and that the relationship is obviously hierarchical ("God is thy Law, thou mine: to know no more/ Is woman's happiest knowledge and her praise" [Paradise Lost 4. 637-38].) For Milton, the subversion of gender difference is an upsetting of the "natural" order which can only end in chaos. Hagstrum argues, correctly I think, that the disaster of the Fall occurs in Paradise Lost because gender boundaries are transgressed:

Man does not take the lead; woman does, for she "inspires" him to take and eat. He falls because...he is "fondly overcome with Female charms" (Paradise Lost 9. 999). The doctrine that governs the poetry is inescapable--the Great Chain has been broken because man has become a

sentimental slave, an effeminate man, a haec-vir, a moral transvestite. Where he should have led, he followed. (38)

Not all prophecies of the disaster and chaos that will result if absolute gender difference is blurred have been as eloquent as Milton's. Several popular pamphlets published in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had as their subject the necessity of maintaining distinct gender difference. These pamphlets all attack fads and fashions which they fear will have the effect of masculinizing women and feminizing men. This, the authors warn, would be to subvert "nature".

Haec Vir: or, the Womanish Man and Hic Mulier: or, the Man-Woman were both published in 1620.² Hic Mulier was written in reaction to a fashion in which women adopted a masculine style of dress. Seeing this as an attempt by women to appropriate masculine authority, the author of Hic Mulier attacks these "Masculine-Feminines" as being "exorbitant from Nature and an Antithesis to kind" (268). They are guilty of "high Treason to God and nature" (269). The author counsels men to assert their rightful dominance and to "cure this Impostume" (275). Let "every Female-Masculine...cast off her deformities," concludes the pamphlet, "and clothe herself in the rich garments which the

²Haec vir is deliberately incorrect Latin for "this man" using the feminine form of the adjective with the masculine noun. Hic mulier, Latin for "this woman", uses the masculine form of the adjective with the feminine noun.

Poet bestows upon her in these Verses following:

Those Virtues that in women merit praise
Are sober shows without, chaste thoughts within,
True Faith and due obedience to their mate,
And of their children honest care to take." (276)

Haec Vir, being a dialogue between the Womanish Man and the Man-Woman, gives Hic Mulier a chance to respond, but like Hic Mulier, the pamphlet ends by strongly advocating absolute gender difference. Haec Vir opens with a scene of confusion in which each of the participants mistakes the sex of the other. In the ensuing discussion, Hic Mulier makes a spirited defence against the necessity of being slaves to custom, but she eventually capitulates and states that women have only adopted masculine attire because men have become feminine:

Now since according to your own Inference, even by the Laws of Nature, by the rules of Religion, and the Customs of all civil Nations, it is necessary there be a distinct and special difference between Man and Woman, both in their habit and behaviors, what could we poor weak women do less...than to gather up those garments you have proudly cast away and therewith to clothe both our bodies and our minds? (287-288)

Hic Mulier tells Haec Vir to cast off his womanish ornaments and counsels men to be "men in shape, men in show, men in words, men in actions, men in counsel, men in example. Then will we love and serve you; then will we hear and obey you" (288). The two agree to exchange their clothes, "and with our attires, our names. I will no more be Haec Vir, but Hic Vir; nor you Hic Mulier, but Haec Mulier" (288). The "natural" order is, thus, restored,

enabling men and women to once more have a "proper" (and hierarchical) relationship.

Closer to Haywood's own time are two pamphlets which also express concern about the blurring of rigid gender distinctions: Mundus Foppensis: or, the Fop Display'd (1691) and The Levellers (1703). Both of these pamphlets worry about Restoration fashions which they fear have had the effect of feminizing men. The author of Mundus Foppensis writes:

Bless us! what's there? 'tis something walks,
A piece of Painting, and yet speaks:
Hard Case to blame the Ladies Washes,
When Men are come to mend their Faces.
Yet some there are such Women grown,
They can't be by their Faces known:
.....
Far much more time Men trifling wast,
E'er their soft Bodies can be drest;
The Looking-Glass hangs just before,
And each o'th' Legs requires an hour. (10-11)

The fear in this poem, explicitly stated, is that the feminization of men will upset the "natural" relationship between men and woman--in this case, render it non-existent. Men can only be becoming feminine because they are becoming homosexual:

The World is chang'd I know not how,
For Men kiss Men, not Women now;
And your neglected Lips in vain,
Of smugling Jack, and Tom complain:
A most unmanly nasty Trick,
One Man to lick the other's Cheek;
.....
For who that loves as Nature teaches,
That had not rather kiss the Breeches
Of Twenty Women, than to lick
The Bristles of one Male dear Dick? (12-13)

The Levellers also laments the fact that men are "grown full as effeminate as the Women" (419). A dialogue between "two young Ladies", The Levellers is a discussion about the scarcity of suitable men for marriage: "Learning and Wit seem to have forsaken the Masculine Dominions, and to have taken up their Abode in the Feminine Territories" (420). This is not, however, seen as a boon for women, for they are unable to find themselves husbands. The two young ladies, Politica and Sophia, eventually propose a tax on all unmarried men, twenty-four years old or older.

All of these pamphlets lament the disastrous effects which the masculinizing of women and the feminizing of men will have on male-female relationships, and they advocate a strict adherence to absolute gender difference. They clearly demonstrate the power of the ideology of distinct gender difference, for in these pamphlets the most superficial deviations from that ideology come under violent attack. Eliza Haywood is a significant departure from this way of thinking. For Haywood, a successful male-female relationship is only possible if there is a blurring of gender distinctions, a relaxation of the boundaries between masculinity and femininity. Her novels show again and again the grim results of defining the sexes as opposites. Though not concerned with our outward attire, but rather with what Sandra M. Gilbert would call the "costumes of the mind", Haywood wished all men and women to become, in a way, types

of Haec Vir and Hic Mulier. Only if the qualities traditionally associated with masculinity and femininity were shared equally between both men and women, could Haywood's ideal of the Equal Pair be realized.

Unfortunately, not all of Haywood's thirty-odd novels from the 1720's are available to me, nor would the scope of this thesis permit discussion of all of them even if they were available. From the texts that I have read, I have limited my discussion primarily to five novels, although I do occasionally refer to other works. The texts on which I have chosen to focus provide a coherent picture of what I see as being Haywood's major concerns.

Although Eliza Haywood's fiction is not widely known or available, I have chosen not to give extensive plot summaries because of space limitations. Plot summaries of almost all of Haywood's works can be found in both George Whicher's The Life and Romances of Mrs. Eliza Haywood (New York: Columbia University Press, 1915) and Mary Anne Schofield's Eliza Haywood (Boston: Twayne, 1985). Inevitably, of course, each of these authors tends to highlight different aspects of the plots; summary is always coloured by interpretation. Although I have tried to eschew summary, I do quote at length in order to give the reader an idea of Haywood's narrative voice and style.

Except with Philidore and Placentia, which is available in a modern edition, I have used the earliest editions available to me. I have, in some cases, silently adjusted what seem to be printers' errors, such as upside-down or transposed letters.

It is unfortunate, I think, that Eliza Haywood is not better known. With her works only available in a few research libraries, or in expensive and hard-to-come-by reprints, she has been consigned to literary oblivion. I cannot agree with critics, like John J. Richetti, who say that there is little to admire in her works, that they are, in fact, "unreadable". Haywood's own particular brand of amorous and sensual fiction deserves to be better known, better appreciated. As the most popular woman novelist of her day, Eliza Haywood's contribution to the development of this genre should not be ignored.

CHAPTER ONE: LOVE AND "DIFFERENCE"

...one need, methinks, only consider with how much greater Force that Passion influences the minds of Women, than it can boast on those of a contrary Sex.

Eliza Haywood
Reflections on the Various Effects
of Love

You must first lay it down for a foundation in general, that there is inequality in the sexes, and that for the better economy of the world, the men, who were to be the law-givers, had the larger share of reason bestowed upon them, by which means your sex is the better prepared for the compliance that is necessary for the better performance of those duties which seem to be most properly assigned to it.

Lord Halifax
Advice to a Daughter

The "distinct and special difference" which Hic Mulier maintained must exist between the sexes has most frequently resulted in what Mary Jacobus calls the "ultimately conservative and doom-ridden concept of [sexual] difference as opposition" (in Boone 9). According to this way of thinking, as Joseph Boone comments, "'man' is what 'woman' is not; attributes of 'masculinity', therefore, categorically oppose and exclude those associated with

`femininity`" (Boone 9). Or, to use Eliza Haywood's term, man is "contrary" to woman. As is obvious from the passage by Lord Halifax, the idea of gender difference as opposition is easily translated into the idea of gender difference as gender hierarchy. The supposed polarities of male/female, masculine/feminine are expanded to include the very real polarities of rational/irrational, strong/weak, dominant/submissive. "Different", thus, becomes synonymous with "opposite", which, in turn, becomes synonymous with "unequal".

Nowhere is the concept of gender difference as opposition more clearly expressed than in ideas concerning the love relationship, that "union" of the sexes. Even in the developing social ideal of what Lawrence Stone calls the "companionate marriage" (see Stone Chp. 8)--a vision of marriage as the balanced union of friends which was coming into being in the late seventeenth century and the early eighteenth century--the concept of gender difference as opposition is maintained. Addison, a great advocate of the harmony of marriage, writes in Spectator 128:

As Vivacity is the Gift of Women, Gravity is that of Men. They should each of them keep a Watch upon the particular Biass which Nature has fixed in their Minds, that they may not draw too much, and lead them out of the Paths of Reason....Men should beware of being captivated by a kind of Savage Philosophy, Women by a thoughtless Gallantry....By what I have said we may conclude, Men and Women were made as Counterparts to one another, that the Pains and Anxieties of the Husband might be relieved by the Sprightliness and good Humour of the Wife. When these are rightly tempered, Care

and Chearfulness go Hand in Hand; and the Family,
like a Ship that is duly trimmed, wants neither
Sail nor Ballast. (Bond 2: 8-9)

This ideal, balanced relationship between the sexes depends upon men and women both remaining in their own distinct and opposing spheres, each supplying what the other "lacks". However, it is obvious that the polarization of the sexes, even under the guise of complementing opposites, serves to uphold the concept of gender hierarchy and invests the sphere of masculinity with an importance which is not attributed to the sphere of femininity. The dominant quality which "Nature has fixed" in men is seriousness--in women, frivolousness. The importance of men is recognized by Nature which has made women as "Counterparts" so that the "Pains and Anxieties" felt by the man in his serious business of life, might be relieved by the woman who apparently felt none of her own.

The women in Eliza Haywood's fiction, however, feel a great deal of pain and anxiety, and, indeed, are almost characterized by it. Given the inequality of the sexes which underlies even the growing notion of the companionate relationship, it is no wonder that Haywood despaired of frequently seeing the realization of her ideal: the Equal Pair. As she writes in Reflections on the Various Effects of Love, "for one Example of two Persons, who with equal Ardour and equal Tenderness regard each other, we shall find ten thousand of the contrary--even among those whose Choice

seem'd wholly guided by Inclination" (56).

In this chapter, I shall look at two novels and one essay by Eliza Haywood: The Unequal Conflict: or, Nature Triumphant (1725), The Mercenary Lover: or, the Unfortunate Heiresses (1726), and Reflections on the Various Effects of Love (1726). All three of these works are populated with men and women who are characterized conventionally as being absolute opposites. Far from leading to a happy relationship in which the sexes complement and balance one another, for Haywood, the concept of gender difference as opposition transforms men and women into sexual antagonists and the love relationship becomes a battleground for the conflict of the sexes. Absolute and fixed gender difference, then, precludes the possibility of achieving the ideal of the Equal Pair; it can only lead to disaster.

"Tho' there is no Passion more universally spoken of than Love," writes Haywood, "yet none appears so little understood: Those who have pretended to give us any Definition of it, seem, methinks, as widely different from the Truth, as they are from one another in their Ideas" (Reflections 3). With her growing reputation as the "Great Arbitress of Passion", Haywood, in 1726, attempted to set the record straight about love in Reflections on the Various Effects of Love, an essay illustrated with short stories, letters, and poems. As George F. Whicher has noted, observing the words emphasized with capital letters on the

title-page, Reflections on the Various Effects of Love offers the reader a veritable feast of LOVE, PASSION, HISTORIES, AMOURS, and INTRIGUES (Whicher 56). The reader, though, sufficiently captivated by this title-page to purchase a copy of the essay might well be disappointed, for what follows is a bleak picture of the disastrous effects of love. Haywood realized in 1726, as clearly as did Mary Jacobus in 1979, that the opposition of the sexes is "doom-ridden".

Although the transformative powers of love have long been a subject of literature, Haywood treats love as a force which, when it acts upon a person, has only the power to reveal, rather than to transform, his or her nature. "Let us take away a little of that almighty Power which we ascribe to Love," she writes, "and allow something more to Nature and those Inclinations born with us....Love, like the Grape's potent Juice, but heightens Nature" (Reflections 10-11).

To prove the truth of this assertion, Haywood states that we need only examine how differently love affects men than it does women. Haywood speaks of women as the "softer Specie" (11), and it is because of this "biological" softness that women are so frequently undone by love. Love becomes almost a physiological function rather than an emotional experience as Haywood continually describes women with words like "tender", "melting", and "dissolving", and

argues that it is the soft nature of women which allows them to receive love's "deep Impressions" (11). The woman who loves "has no reserve; she profusely gives her all, has no regard to any Thing, but obliging the Person she affects" (12). In this distracted state, the woman dispenses with all concerns for her own well-being, and "not all the Dictates of Religion, Reason, Virtue, Interest or Fame [are]...of sufficient Force to combat with that more prevailing Tenderness which seems inherent to the very Nature of her Sex" (18-19). Consumed by her passion to the point of madness, the woman unwittingly becomes a "Partner in her own Ruin" (19).

Love cannot but lead to ruin because men, the "worthless Objects" that women love (8), are of such a very different nature. Unlike women, men are hard. Their "natures...[are] more rough and obdurate" (11), and, therefore, incapable of receiving the impressions of love as deeply. A woman may "lavish her whole Soul", but a man, "more wisely, keeps a Part of his for other Views, he has still an Eye to Interest and Ambition" (12). Men are unable to set aside material concerns and give themselves wholly to love as women do. Because of this, passion in men seldom carries them "any farther than a Self-gratification", and the interest of the women they "pretend to admire" is what "they very rarely consult" (12).

A man may love with vehemence, but it is not "so tender

nor so lasting a Flame" (11). There are not many whom "either an unrestrain'd Enjoyment does not satiate, or some darling Foible from which not the most perfect are exempt, does not disgust" (56). The "Winter of Indifference and Neglect" rarely, if ever, fails to succeed the "sultry Summer of too fierce Desire in Man's unconstant Heart" (53). While in men, that "Flame" of passion burns hot, but burns fast, women, on the other hand, "generally love for ever" (55). They are, says Haywood, more prone to indulging imagination, reliving past pleasures and filling "deluded Fancy" (19) with ideas of future happiness: "Thus do they, self-deceiv'd, supply Fuel to the unceasing fire which consumes their Peace, and rarely is extinguish'd but by Death" (55-56).

Haywood's explication of the natures of the sexes seems conventional enough. The sexes are categorized into the polarities of masculine/feminine, hard/soft, unfeeling/feeling, self-interested/self-sacrificing. The conception of the oppositional natures of the sexes is so conventional that it would be uninteresting were not for the fact that at the time when Haywood was writing this, there was occurring a growing idealization of romantic love, a trend to which Eliza Haywood is frequently credited with contributing.

Lawrence Stone writes that according "to contemporaries, the growth of marriage for love in the

eighteenth century was caused by the growing consumption of novels. Always a stock-in-trade of theatre, romantic love was the principal theme of the novel, whose astonishing rise to popularity was so marked a feature of the age" (Stone 283). As one of the most popular and prolific novelists of her day, Haywood cannot be ignored, yet in Reflections on the Various Effects of Love, she denies the possibility of romantic love's existence: "That Heaven which Lovers talk so much of, is indeed, too much a real Heaven to be frequently found on Earth" (56).

The elements which composed the "romantic love complex", as Stone calls it, were

the notion that there is only one person in the world with whom one can fully unite at all levels; the personality of that person is so idealized that the normal faults and follies of human nature disappear from view; love is often like a thunderbolt and strikes at first sight; love is the most important thing in the world, to which all other considerations, particularly material ones, should be sacrificed; and lastly, the giving of full rein to personal emotions is admirable, no matter how exaggerated and absurd the resulting conduct may appear to others. (Stone 282)

All of these ideas are raised in Reflections on the Various Effects of Love, but they are seen as being gender-specific. It is only "soft-natured" woman who will succumb and who will give "full rein to personal emotions". [Far from being admirable, Haywood sees this as dangerous and destructive, and the illustrative letters, poems, and stories which are scattered throughout the essay are not shining examples of the wonders of love, but horrible warnings of love's dire

consequences. In becoming the "Slave of Love" (51), the woman really becomes the slave of the man, whose "natural" inconstancy will cause him to tire of her and abandon her.

The ideal of romantic love is not, in itself, incompatible with Haywood's ideal of the Equal Pair, which stresses mutual dependence and mutual commitment. Given the prevailing assumptions about gender, though, the inequality of the sexes can only render romantic love a one-sided and disastrous affair. Haywood concludes her essay with a warning to her female readers and an observation that the majority of those who love are miserable:

Love is, therefore, for many Reasons, dangerous to the softer Sex; they cannot arm themselves too much against it, and for whatever Delights it affords to the Successful few, it pays a double Portion of Wretchedness to the numerous Unfortunate. (56)

Underlying this warning, and, indeed, the entire essay, is a fear of the growing idealization of romantic love within a society which simultaneously believes that gender difference is synonymous with gender opposition and gender hierarchy. [The more widespread the notion becomes that giving way to consuming passion is admirable, the more likely it is that women will do so, increasing the risk of sexual exploitation by becoming "Slaves to Love". In order to take advantage of this situation, men might only assume the role of the romantic lover in order to mask "that unruly Passion which goes by the mistaken name of love" (*Idalia* 54).] This fear is played out in dramatic form in the two

novels The Unequal Conflict and The Mercenary Lover.

In The Unequal Conflict; or Nature Triumphant, the hero, Fillamour, tries to give himself totally to love, and the heroine, Philenia, tries to resist doing so. In the end, Philenia "dissolves" and becomes a "sacrifice to love" (58), while Fillamour, who could not "forget he was a man" (58), opts for a marriage of convenience leaving Philenia in ruin. This is "nature" triumphant.

Although Philenia and Fillamour are in love with each other, Philenia's father and Fillamour's uncle have already picked out other spouses for each of them. At the beginning of the story, Fillamour is described in great detail: a "dissolving tenderness diffus'd itself thro' all his air, languish'd in his eyes, and play'd in dimpled sweetnesss about his mouth" (7). In his voice, "[s]uch a bewitching softness dwelt on his accents, as would have made even nonsense pleasing" (8). Fillamour seems to be the opposite of what Haywood characterized men as being in Reflections. He is soft, tender, languishing, the perfect romantic hero.

Philenia, too, is presented as being more resisting than the women described in Reflections. To be sure, the "melting maid yielded" at the first sight of Fillamour, but only "in mind" (8). She prudently conceals her desire because of "virgin modesty". But yielding "in mind" is as doom-ridden, if not more so, than yielding in body, for what the novel shows Fillamour and Philenia caught up in is not

so much the primitive and "natural" urgings of the body, but the concept, the "thought", of romantic love. This concept, as we have seen, can only lead to disaster given the polarization of the genders.

When Philenia has been confined to her chamber by her father so that he can force her to marry Coeurdemont, her friend Antonia offers her services as a messenger and begins to instruct Philenia in the glories of romantic love. Philenia writes a very modest letter to Fillamour to tell him of her condition. Displeased with the mild nature of this letter, Antonia describes for Fillamour the tenderness which Philenia feels for him with the "most moving expressions" (17). Although to marry without a fortune is "in no way agreeable" to Fillamour (9), the "soft description" which Antonia gives of passion inspires him to continue in his role as a romantic lover, and he responds with a letter of burning, raging passion, the style of which "Antonia was infinitely better pleas'd with" (19).

Upon reading Fillamour's letter, Philenia relents and allows herself to succumb to the thought of romantic love:

There needed but few of those many arguments the diligent Antonia had furnish'd herself with, to persuade her loving friend to reject all other considerations than such as were obliging to her passion.---That tender maid cou'd not think Fillamour must be wretched in the loss of her without resolving to hazard everything for his sake. (20)

She becomes possessed with a passion in which the "mind is wholly taken up, and cannot endure an interruption.---Our

passion seems the only business of our lives, our only hope, our only fear, our only pleasure, and our only pain" (26). Encouraged by Antonia, Philenia comes to believe that "it was rather a merit in her, than the contrary, to be susceptible to the unequall'd perfections of the charming Fillamour" (26). Significantly, Fillamour's and Philenia's passion is at its height at this point when they are separated from one another and it can only exist in the form of "moving expressions". As the rest of the novel shows, when the attempt is made to put that exalted passion into action, it is doomed to destruction because of the oppositional characteristics of the sexes.

Antonia and Fillamour enable Philenia to escape from her father's house, and Fillamour takes her to a "Bagnio". Haywood implies that in giving way to her passion and becoming a "Slave of Love", Philenia prostitutes herself. Indeed, though Fillamour protests that there is not an affection in the world "more pure and refined" than his, at the end of the story, she will be left "abandon'd and undone" (61).

Delivered from the "terror" of a forced marriage, Philenia thinks herself perfectly happy. Fillamour, though, has begun to have second thoughts. His male "nature" begins to think of the material misfortune that he has brought upon himself. Although the "part" of his soul devoted to love is satisfied, "men generally have minds more extensive than to

be wholly taken up with that passion" (49). The definition of the sexes as opposites requires that, while Philenia will become "engrossed" with her passion, Fillamour will "still keep an Eye to Interest and Ambition". He begins to realize that Philenia's father could never be brought to bestow "the material part of his blessing on him" (49), and without that, he would be "ruined" with his uncle also:

The thoughts of living a mean and obscure life, tho' with the woman he ador'd, presented to him an idea, which not all her charms, nor his admiration of 'em, cou'd make agreeable. (49)

Discovering Fillamour's concerns, Philenia suggests that if they cannot marry without financial ruin, that they remain single until such a time as their circumstances change--either "by the death of this arbitrary uncle.. or [her] father restoring her to his favour" (57). In the mean time, they should content themselves with this mutual testimony of their love, "and banish from [their] minds all such desires as will not agree with a Platonick passion" (57).

Fillamour readily agrees to this plan, but "few of my readers," says Haywood, "will believe that Fillamour, such as I have describ'd him, young, gay, and in the height of vigour, few, I say, will believe that he cou'd so far throw off the nature of his sex, [and] forget he was a man" (57-58). The seduction scene which follows this statement is interesting because, again, it is the language of romantic love which leads to Philenia's ruin. The scene echoes the

fears which were implied in Reflections on the Various Effects of Love, that the concepts of romantic love and irresistible passion can provide a convenient mask and venue for male lust:

...happening to be there one evening, later than usual, having past all the afternoon in conversation on the tender theme, he [Fillamour] became so influenc'd by it, that he no longer had the mastery of his actions---Spite even of himself, he must transgress---His roving hands without design, took liberties treasonable to Platonick laws---His words no more maintain'd their cool reserve---His glowing cheeks and sparkling eyes avow'd wild, and irresistible desire---And every part declar'd triumphant nature---Philenia, frightened and asham'd, yet all dissolv'd and melting too, felt the destructive softness spread from the overflowing heart thro' every little vein, and thrilling fibre---Faintly she chid, but but much more faintly struggled---Soon she lost all the breath to form denials; nor was the will, amidst that sweet confusion, capable of inspiring any---While he more actuated by his passion, and growing still more bold, took in his arms her, now, but half reluctant body, and threw her with himself upon the bed...(58; emphasis added)

Haywood uses the dashes instead of full stops to capture the breathless and uncontrollable passion of the scene. Like the seduction, the passage, once it is begun, must run its course to its inevitable end. It also shows the breakdown of romantic love as a concept existing only in "moving expressions" where it is safe and can be controlled. Here it has become lust, beyond the power of the participants to control it, or of language to contain it. Moved into the "real" world of gender opposition, the former expressions of mutual love change as Fillamour's words lose

their "cool reserve" and Philenia cannot form denials, mirroring the physical opposition of Fillamour's activeness and Philenia's yielding. Pitted against one another as opposites, Fillamour must become "actuated" as Philenia "melts", and that melting is "destructive". Almost as if he is motivated by a force outside of himself, Fillamour becomes both subject and object and throws Philenia "with himself" on the bed.

The seduction is not, however, completed. Philenia would have inevitably "fallen a sacrifice to love" (58), but they are interrupted by her father who has discovered the place where she is hiding. As Fillamour escapes out of a back window, Philenia is taken home and, once again, confined to her chamber. She does, nevertheless, in a less sensual way, become a "sacrifice to love". Waiting patiently, Philenia only receives one or two indifferent letters from Fillamour, and, then, she hears nothing from him at all. As she gives herself up to despair, she hears the "shocking and surprising account that Fillamour had comply'd with his uncle's desires, and was married to that young lady he had recommended" (61).

Once again, Fillamour could not "forget he was a man" and he proves it by his inconstancy. Philenia, too, proves her "soft" nature, capable of receiving, but not of erasing, the deep impressions of love:

...the charms of Fillamour had made an impression on her tender nature, too deep to be eras'd by any

thing but death, that universal finisher of woe, and neither time, absence, the persuasions of her friends, the reproaches of her enemies, nor the fix'd belief she had of his falshood and ingratitude, had the power to make his idea less dear to her remembrance. (62)

It is the romantic "idea" of Fillamour, rather than the actual proof of his baseness, to which Philenia clings. Fillamour, though, in "masculine" fashion has, like another of Haywood's male characters, "Resolution enough to withstand the Emotions of his Tenderness whenever he found them contrary to his Interest" (*Idalia* 10).

Fillamour discards the role of romantic hero in order to pursue his avaricious aims; in The Mercenary Lover; or, the Unfortunate Heiresses, Clitander dons the disguise of the romantic hero in order to pursue his. The sexual antagonists in The Mercenary Lover, Clitander and Althea, are described as opposites from the beginning. He is "artful"; she is "artless". This opposition, of course, can only end in doom, and in this novel the combat of the sexes becomes a literal fight to the death.

The story opens with the marriage of Clitander to Miranda, Althea's sister. The marriage seems to be a perfect "companionate" match: he "appear'd the most indulging Husband, as she did the most obliging Wife, and they were look'd on by all who knew them, as the most exemplary Patterns of Conjugal Affection" (11). This is, though, all a facade on the part of Clitander who is "practis'd in wiles, experienc'd in Deceit" (12). Aware of

the behavior expected of a lover and a husband, Clitander is able to impose upon Miranda.

Clitander, like the Restoration rake, is motivated by self-interest, aggression, and love of conquest. Unlike the Restoration rake, though, Clitander longs for financial, not sexual, conquest: "his was not a Soul capable of being touch'd with the Charms either of the body or the Mind; ...Money was the only Darling of his mercenary Wishes" (12). Clitander's material interests are reflected in the language with which Haywood speaks of him. He is characterized as a "Trader", and in wooing Miranda, he works to ensure that he becomes the "solid Business" of her affections (10). Later, he will seduce Althea by advocating a "free Commerce" between the sexes (18).

Clitander no sooner has Miranda than he begins to long for another conquest. His aim, though, is still money: "as the Estate of which Miranda was co-heiress was the sole Inducement to his addressing and marrying her, so by that Means beings possess by that Moiety of it which was her proportion, he now began to grow anxious for the other also" (12). His longing for Althea's share of wealth turns into a lusting for her body as well. He burns to "enjoy" Althea, and "when in Miranda's Arms, languished to rifle the untasted Loveliness of her beauteous Sister" (16). As Josephine Grieder comments in the introduction to the Garland reprint of Haywood's novel, Clitander is "impelled

by the desire to possess" (Grieder 10). He decides to possess Althea sexually as he assumes it will be the most effectual means of gaining possession of her money.

Althea's tenderness and her belief in Clitander's virtue blind her to his deceit and place her "absolutely in his power" (13). It is her stereotypical "feminine" qualities of tenderness and innocence which spell her doom. Clitander ruthlessly uses the language of romantic love to gain his point. Alone with Althea, he "artfully, and as tho' it were by accident, introduc'd a Discourse on the Force of Love,...under-taking to prove, that whatever were the consequences of that Passion they ought not to be condemn'd, because they were unavoidable" (18). Manipulating this language until Althea "dissolves", Clitander becomes the "barbarous Author" of her ruin.

When Althea announces that she is pregnant, Clitander is initially shocked, thinking it will inevitably bring on the discovery of his crime. Soon after this, Althea catches Clitander in an act of deception which he was carrying out in order to gain possession of her money and she flees to the country. Again, Clitander plays the role of the romantic lover, writing "artful" letters to Althea asking for forgiveness. Like Philenia, Althea "dissolves" before the language of love: "she cou'd not read those tender Expressions he had made use of in his Letter, without a Flood of forgiving Softness pouring in upon her Soul" (42-

43). Clitander's mastery of language and Althea's powerlessness before it reflect the "doom-ridden concept" of gender difference as opposition.¹

Althea is lured back to London by Clitander's "too fatal Charms" (48). Here she is poisoned by him so that she may never reveal what he has done. The long description of Althea's death focuses on her mad ravings and her bodily torment:

...in a few Moments [she] swell'd to that prodigious Degree, that her Laceings burst, her Eyes seem'd to start out of her Head, and every Feature was distorted....[she] immediately fell into Ravings so horrible and shocking, that they imprinted a Terror on the Minds of those present...; never came Death accompany'd with Torments such as hers...leaving that once lovely and Desire-creating Form, the most terrible and ghastly Spectacle, that ever made the View of Death a Horror. (53-56)

Joseph Boone reads Althea's death, with its concentration on the body, as a "perverted figure of the female orgasm" (104). If this is so, it is the tragic "climax" of romantic love in the world of sexual opposition, and Clitander's "triumph" (62) in not being punished for his crimes, grimly mirrors the double standard which such opposition creates and allows.

[Haywood clearly demonstrates that the rising ideals of the "companionate marriage" and romantic love cannot be realized in a society which defines gender difference as

¹For more on language and seduction in The Mercenary Lover, see Chapter Three.

opposition. Both ideals advocate a turning to the softer, more tender emotions--the emotions traditionally associated with the "feminine"--but the idealization of "feminine" characteristics and simultaneous acceptance of the concept of gender opposition only serves to intensify stereotypical female roles and foster sexual inequality. Thus women are told that it is "admirable" to succumb to passion and to submit to a man even though he will "naturally" tire of her and continue to roam, and the "weak" wife is asked to rest assured that she "balances" her "strong" husband in a harmonious union.

Haywood's ideal of the Equal Pair requires that there be none of this inequality or opposition. Mutual dependence, affection, and esteem must replace the sexual antagonism of domination and submission. The Equal Pair necessitates not only the "feminizing" of men, but the "masculinizing" of women. If the sexes, though, are "naturally" opposite, then Haywood's ideal is unrealizable. To bring about the success of the Equal Pair, then, Haywood is forced to destabilize what was thought of as being naturally evident and evidently natural: absolute and fixed gender difference.

CHAPTER TWO: THE EQUAL PAIR

Man might consider that women were not created to be their slaves or vassals; for as they had not their Original out of his head (thereby to command him), so it was not out of his foot to be trod upon, but in a medium out of his side to be his fellow feeler, his equal, and companion.

The women's sharp revenge

Thus did these [sic] equally enamoured, equally deserving pair bring inquietudes to themselves by an excess of that which is too much wanting in the generality of other lovers. Yet did their happy meeting in marriage at last fully recompense their former cares.

Eliza Haywood
Philidore and Placentia

In Raising Their Voices, Marilyn Williamson writes that in Haywood's fiction "we are treated to a catalogue of rapes by rakes and libertines; no man remains with the woman he has violated or with his child by her. Yet the fiction does not call for another way of perceiving the sexual relationship....Instead, women are described as fixed in detestable patterns, and the only tolerable male-female relationship--a love marriage--is available to but a few" (Williamson 231). In this chapter I look at two novels by Haywood in which the love marriage is achieved. In these

two novels, Haywood does call for another way of perceiving the sexual relationship, but it is only possible if we change our way of perceiving the sexes themselves.

As we saw in the preceding chapter, Eliza Haywood does not reject the concepts of romantic love and the companionate marriage, both of which inform her own ideal of the Equal Pair. What Haywood does reject is the viability of such concepts within the prevailing ideology of gender difference as opposition. The polarization of the sexes into soft, irrational, selfless women and hard, unfeeling, self-interested men can only lead to the disaster of domination and submission, seduction and betrayal. The conflicting concepts of romantic love, which advocates succumbing to traditionally "feminine" emotions, and of gender opposition and hierarchy, which states that only women are capable of doing this, result in a situation in which the "feminine" is admired and valued, but females, individually, are not. The definition of the sexes as opposites demands undying, yet fruitless, devotion from women and emotionless promiscuity from men. A meaningful, lasting relationship is denied to both sexes.

The success of the Equal Pair, then, is dependent on a definition of the sexes in which "difference" does not imply "opposition" and "inequality". Only then can the sexual relationship become an arena for mutual affection, esteem, and worth. For Haywood, such fellowship between men and

women demands the depolarization of the sexes, and the equality of man and woman in marriage at the end of the novel involves the realization of the equality of masculine and feminine within the individual. Each of the partners in the Equal Pair must accept and value qualities traditionally attributed to the other sex within himself or herself in order to accept and value the other person in a "companionate" relationship.

"To talk about the concepts of femininity and masculinity," writes Juliet Dusinberre, "is to change them, because in no other field are the constants, the perceptible natures of men and women, so variable" (Dusinberre, 199). Thus, in undertaking to describe the natures of men and women in the Reflections, Haywood notes that it is not so easy to divide masculine and feminine nature from human nature. There have been men, she observes, who have "run the greatest Hazards in Fortune, Life, and Reputation" to secure the women they love, and have rewarded those women with tenderness (Reflections 12). There have been women, too, who have been influenced by their passion into "Actions the very Reverse of Disinterestedness (12). Haywood concludes: "when any Instances of this kind happen, the Sexes seem to have exchange'd Natures, and both to be the Contradiction of themselves" (12).

With this comment of Haywood's, we can, at last, separate sex from gender, words which I have used almost

interchangeably until now. Within the conventional view which would hold that sex and gender are the same, it is assumed, as Elaine Showalter points out, that "a biological male, for example, 'naturally' acquires the masculine behavioral norms of his society" (Showalter, Rise of Gender 2). A biological female, it follows, would "naturally" acquire feminine behavior. What Haywood's observation points out, though, is that nature does not always distribute masculinity and femininity so precisely; the body does not necessarily give rise to "appropriately" gendered behavior. Haywood, in this statement, destabilizes the idea that nature ordains both sexual and gender identity.

Haywood's comment also undermines the concept of "natural" opposition. If sexual identity is not identical with gender identity, then masculine and feminine need not be mutually exclusive and opposing entities. Sexual difference (biological) need not imply gender difference (social and cultural) at all. Men and women, then, can be both themselves and the "Contradiction of themselves". The supposed polarities of masculine and feminine can meet and exist in the same person. It is this which is necessary for the realization of the Equal Pair. Haywood is, in effect, forced to undermine the ideological fixity of gender opposition as "natural" in order to establish the happy ending of the companionate relationship. Love can only conquer all when one lover is not trying to conquer the

other.

The two texts which I discuss in this chapter, The Injur'd Husband; or, the Mistaken Resentment (1723) and Philidore and Placentia; or, L'amour trop Delicat (1727), end with the happy marriage of the Equal Pair. Both novels are, at once, conservative and radical. They are conservative in that they both validate the social ideal of wedlock as the ideal outcome of the love-plot; the wedding provides an absolute closure to the text. As Joseph Boone writes, "The author thus envisions the event of marriage as the happy ending beyond which no comment is necessary because nothing more happens: all is serene" (Boone 79). They are radical, though, in their insistence that this ideal outcome can only be attained by subverting the idea of "natural" gender opposition and the antagonistic behaviour which results from it.¹

The central character of The Injur'd Husband, the Baroness De Tortillee, is not involved in the romantic conclusion of the novel, but it is she who paves the way for the destruction of the notion that certain behaviour is naturally gender-specific. The actions of the Baroness are constantly described in terms of performance and acting.

¹Mary Anne Schofield would disagree with my choice of texts. She reads both novels as ending by forcing Placentia and Montamour back into the acceptable patterns of romance. (See Masking and Unmasking the Female Mind. Toronto: Associated University Press, 1990. 44-66.) My own argument does not deny the romantic conclusion, but focuses on the conditions which enable it to occur.

She has "Sighs, Tears, Swooning, Languishments, at command" which enable her to act "a thousand various Passions in Gestures and Grimaces, suited to them all" (Husband 129, 193). In short, "no Woman that ever liv'd was Mistress of more Artifice, nor had less the Appearance of being so" (129). As the Mistress of Artifice, the Baroness is able to disguise her entire personality, "knowing how to form her Behaviour to all Humours" (131).

Annette Kuhn writes that performance involves pretence and dissimulation,

an intent to seem to be something or someone one is, in reality, not. An actor's role is assumed like a mask, the mask concealing the performer's 'true self'....In effecting a distance between assumed persona and real self, the practice of performance constructs a subject which is both fixed in the distinction between role and self and at the same time, paradoxically, called into question in the very act of performance. For over against the 'real self', performance poses the possibility of a mutable self. (Kuhn 170-171)

Within the ideology which holds that sexual identity is identical to gender identity, certain behavioral norms are gender specific, the manifestation of difference between the sexes. When behaviour becomes performance, however, as it does in the case of the Baroness, far from being the fixed signifier of a fixed gender identity, it has the potential to disguise and to alter the self, to make that self mutable.

If behaviour can be disguise, capable of being modified at will, it follows that the gender identity conventionally signified by behaviour can be just as easily changeable.

Behaviour as performance highlights the means by which a supposedly fixed gender identity is culturally constructed. It subverts the construct by calling attention to its status as convention and artifice, by pointing out that it is not at all a reflection of a natural order. The potential threat posed by "inappropriate" behaviour to fixed gender identity (and the power relations which follow from it) goes a long way toward explaining the proliferation of conduct books aimed at women in the eighteenth century.

As a consummate performer, the Baroness is an ironic comment on the cultural construction of gender identity, for we watch her continually construct and reconstruct herself. Having squandered the fortune she inherited, Mlle. La Motte, with nothing but "a few rich Clothes...and a tolerable Face and Air" (126), presents herself as still being a Woman of Fashion. She becomes acquainted with the Baron, and, attracted to his great wealth, she charms him into proposing. Although Mlle. La Motte thinks that "that Woman was a fool that ever gave herself the least real Uneasiness on the account of Love", she realizes that "to engage the Assiduity of a fellow one likes, 'tis necessary to counterfeit a Passion" (132). When the rich Baron proposes she readily agrees, and, knowing "the World too well", pretends "her speedy Compliance with his Desires was the Effect of a Passion which Desert, like his, cou'd not but create" (127).

The Baroness is able to reproduce the conventions of feminine behaviour, but her awareness that they are, indeed, only conventions allows her to act out the traditionally passive female role in such a way that it becomes the centre of power. Behind the act of the "weak" female, the Baroness assumes the power usually attributed to the male. When she first meets with Beauclair, the Baroness,

having throughly [sic] inform'd herself by Du Lache what would best suit his [Beauclair's] Humour, she threw the vain Coquette entirely off, and wore the Appearance of the Woman of Honour.--- Her Carriage, tho' affable and complaisant, was all on the Reserve; nor did she (so exact was she in Dissimulation) in the least Word or Action, all the time he stay'd with her, swerve from the most nice Punctilio of Modesty. They parted extremely satisfy'd with each other: He consider'd her as an agreeable Acquaintance, and she him, as a Man, whom in time she might be able to subdue. (153-154)

The Baroness subdues Beauclair by pretending to be a woman who is a slave to passion. She maintains the illusion of the "natural" opposition of the sexes, letting Beauclair think that he is in control of the situation while she seduces him.

Alone with Beauclair, the Baroness, as Clitander did with Althea, turns the conversation, so that it "more wore the Face of Chance than Design, into an argument on the Force of Love: She pretended to prove that whatever Indecorums were the Consequences of that Passion, they were wholly unavoidable, and therefore cou'd not but be pardonable" (156). When Beauclair declares himself, the

Baroness, "seeming to weep", exclaims that she is undone by her own "Inadvertency" and falls back in a "counterfeited Swoon" (158). While acting the part of a woman undone by the charms of Beauclair, the Baroness assumes the male role of conqueror:

...not all the countless Wonders of [Beauclair's] Wit and Beauty could work that Miracle, and triumph over the Inconstancy of this universal Dispenser of her Favours. She who, engag'd with a Multiplicity of Lovers, cou'd find no Satisfaction while wanting Beauclair, languish'd for others, when possess'd of him; and this accomplish'd Gentleman, in a little time, serv'd but to swell the Number of her Admirers. (158-159)

The Baroness continually acts out the conventional female role, and her greatest triumph occurs when she plays the part of the weakest and most powerless of women. Caught by her husband while she is in bed with Beauclair, the Baroness proves how much she is the Mistress of Artifice in this, "the greatest Tryal she cou'd meet" (192). She cries out that she is being raped and breaks loose of Beauclair's embrace. Haywood's description of the scene focuses on the Baroness's abilities of performing:

The Scene must certainly have been pleasant enough to observe, if any disinterested Person had been witness to it: To behold a couple of Men stand gazing on each other, without power of Speech or Motion, while a Woman was acting over a thousand various Passions in Gestures and Grimaces, suited to them all; sometimes rejoicing at the Deliverance she pretended to have had; sometimes feigning to look back with Horror on her past Danger; now weeping, as it were, thro' Tenderness; then exclaiming against the baseness of Mankind....The Surprise which both the Husband and Lover were in, gave her sufficient Opportunity to exercise her Talent. (193-194)

The Baroness acts out the role of the passive woman who is determined by the powerful male world--the victim of one man who can only be saved by another. Her control over the conventions of masculine and feminine behaviour, however, allows her to determine the meaning of the incident while the men become the passive audience to her performance.

The Baroness, though, is incapable of real love. While "half the Town" have enjoyed her favours, it was "to them all... but feigned" (132). Her manipulation of the conventions of masculinity and femininity inverts, but maintains, the opposition of the sexes. However, the character of the Baroness shows that men and women are not locked by nature into specific patterns of behaviour. It is important for Haywood to establish this point, for the union of Beauclair and Montamour as an Equal Pair at the end of the novel is dependent on their breaking out of traditional gender roles and the antagonism which results from defining the sexes as opposites.

Significantly, when the novel opens, Beauclair and Montamour are engaged to be married and appear to be the embodiment of the Equal Pair. Beauclair's heart has "long been devoted" to Montamour, and he has a mind of "Honour, Constancy, [and] Good-Nature....He plac'd not his Affections on Montamour...without a perfect Knowledge of how worthy she was of them" (136). Montamour is the "Mistress of every Excellence" (135), and though she loves Beauclair

to a great degree, her "natural Reservedness of...Temper had kept her from making such violent Declarations of her Passion, as many of her Sex are too apt to do" (149-150). Neither Beauclair nor Montamour conform to the conventional patterns of gender-specific behaviour. Beauclair does not wish to make Montamour a conquest, and Montamour does not subordinate her reason to her passion. Freed from the antagonistic behaviour which follows from the conventional definition of the sexes, they have a relationship based on mutual affection and esteem.

When the Baroness becomes attracted to Beauclair, she calls upon her accomplice and pimp, Du Lache, whose business it is, "wherever he found a noble Friendship between Persons of different Sexes, to endeavour to disunite, or make it appear scandalous" (130). With Du Lache, the Baroness, as the most accomplished performer in the novel, engineers a script in which Beauclair and Montamour will be forced to act out the conventional roles of men and women, thereby ending their relationship. Du Lache, too, as Mary Anne Schofield points out, is also a creation of the Baroness, "for she controls him; he does not act at all without her directions" (Schofield, Masking 56).

The Baroness and Du Lache concoct a plot in which two other villains, Toncarr and Le Songe, are required to act as well. Together, these four convince Beauclair that Montamour has been having an affair with a man named

Galliard for a long time. Du Lache persuades Beauclair to break off with Montamour, advising him to rid himself of all feminine emotion and to "behold her with Indifference" (147). Beauclair resolves to write a letter to Montamour telling her that he hates her:

Alas! reply'd [Du Lache], how little is a Soul, in the Condition yours is, capable of judging of its own Conceptions?---To say you hate, is to confess you love;---for Heaven's sake do not thus unman yourself; ...I wish...you'd give me leave to dictate. (emphasis added; 148)

The letter which Du Lache dictates places Beauclair and Montamour in the convention roles of hard, unfeeling man and abandoned woman:

She [Montamour] could not presently believe her Eyes: She read the fatal Scroll again and again; and being perfectly assur'd it was his Hand, had not the least Hold for Hope his Heart was untainted with the Vices common to his Sex---She found herself utterly abandon'd; the Letter told her so, in Words too plain to suffer her to make a doubt of it. (150)

Thinking that she has been abandoned by Beauclair, Montamour gives way to grief, choosing "to die away in fruitless Wishes" (170) and to be "entirely passive" (177). Led to believe that Montamour is no better than a "common Fille de Joye" (167), Beauclair becomes ashamed of the affection he had for her, and an "honourable Passion was what, for the future, he resolved to avoid" (190). They both adopt the conventional behaviour of their sexes, but it is in no way "naturally" masculine and feminine behaviour; their actions are solely the effect of the charade created

by the Baroness. They are actors in the Baroness's play, but they act their parts without the awareness that they are fictional.

Beauclair and Montamour can only be reconciled once the Baroness has been exposed and Beauclair realizes that his adoption of the traditional masculine role has been based on artifice and invention. Their reconciliation and subsequent marriage as an Equal Pair involves Beauclair's recuperation of the feminine aspects of his personality and Montamour's assertion of her masculine attributes.

Beauclair sees that his enacting of the male role has made him "a Villain", "a Monster" (213), and fearing that he has rendered himself forever unworthy of Montamour's love, he begins to experience the feminine anguish of fruitless passion: "all that Despair, and Rage, and Grief, heighten'd by a consciousness of Guilt, and justly meriting every thing he suffer'd, cou'd inflict, was his...; he gave himself up wholly to Distraction, and Life or Death were become Things indifferent to him" (236).

Beauclair's acknowledgment that he deserves his sufferings signifies his rejection of the male prerogative of inconstancy. He loses the "boldness" which characterizes conventional male domination in the sexual relationship: "All that vivacity of Thought--that energy of soul, which despises Opposition, and triumphs over the most strict reservedness of the denying Charmer, was now utterly

extinguished in him" (236). He becomes progressively more feminine as the novel draws to a close. Filled with an "Excess of Passion" (247), Beauclair is consumed by his despair and appears like "one totally depriv'd of Reason" (247). His love for Montamour begins to manifest itself in physical weakness: "His trembling Limbs, his wild distracted Looks, his faltering Speech, his unconnected Expressions, display'd the Deity [love] in his full genuine Force" (232). Convinced that Montamour will never be brought to a reconciliation, Beauclair actually swoons:

Who that has been present when Death's Icy Hand has on the sudden seiz'd on the Faculties of some one in Company, may figure to themselves what Beauclair was at reading this! Just so the Blood flew from his Lips and Cheeks, his Eyes grew dim, the Life and Vigour of his Air chang'd to cold Trembling, all his Limbs enervate, and down at once he sunk into the Chair. (261)

Montamour's actions become more masculine. Although she still loves Beauclair, she resolves to view him with a "fix'd Coldness" (232). To renew her relationship with Beauclair, she thinks, would be to display a "Meanness of...Spirit" and an "easy Fondness" (246). While Beauclair becomes more passive, Montamour becomes more assertive. She assumes the disguise of a man, and, under the name of Vrayment, Montamour reveals, as the name Vrayment implies, her true strength of character. Vrayment's justification of Montamour's behaviour juxtaposes that behaviour with the conventional definition of feminine frailty. Vrayment points out the unreasonable limitations and the unnecessary

devaluation of character which convention imposes on women:

...we poor Mortals, whose Actions are censured by each other, and scarce the best can 'scape Reflection, must be cautious, ever watchful how we tread that slippery Road, the World's Opinion; for Reputation is so nice a thing, so finely wrought, so liable to break, the least false Step disjoins the beauteous Frame, and down we sink in endless Infamy.---Consider...the Reasons why Women are...excluded from publick Management? Us'd but as Toys? Little immaterial Amusements, to trifle away an hour of idle Time with? Is it not because their Levity of Nature, their weak Irresolution...make them unfit for Counsel, for Secrecy, or Action? If one among them can tow'r above the Follies of her Sex, and awe her encroaching Passions with superior Reason, we should admire a Virtue so uncommon.---...had Montamour granted your Inconstancy the kind Reward its contrary had merited, she had proved the Lover, but not the Woman of Discretion.(246-247)

It is Montamour who has shown herself fit for counsel and action while Beauclair has been imposed upon because of his weak irresolution. Unlike the Baroness who uses performance to conceal her true personality, Montamour, in acting the part of Vrayment, uses performance to reveal her inner strength. The "mask" which Montamour assumes allows her to transcend the traditional boundaries of gender difference, and it becomes the outward manifestation of her inner masculine qualities.

In the end, Montamour resumes her "own Shape" (259) and is gradually brought to relent; Beauclair, "little by little, ...became again the Man he was" (262). While this seems, at first, a restoration of traditional gender roles, the fact that Beauclair has accepted and proven the feminine side of his personality, and Montamour, the masculine side

of hers, allows them to come together as equals. The sentence with which Haywood concludes the novel points to the reciprocity which marks the relationship of the Equal Pair: "The Manner of their living together since their Marriage is such, as might be expected from that unalterable Affection which each felt for the other before, and full of that sincere Tenderness which might furnish many more Examples were Love and Virtue the chief Inducements to Hymen" (263).

Philidore and Placentia; or, L'amour trop Delicat is also concerned with role-playing. Philidore and Placentia first act out the conventional gender roles and an inversion of those roles before they are, in the end, brought together as an "equally enamoured, equally deserving pair" (Philidore 230). As in The Injur'd Husband, Haywood shows in Philidore and Placentia that behaviour is not ordained by nature. Philidore and Placentia, until the end of the novel, act according to fictions which they have created themselves, and, in this case, the fictions are the result of economic concerns.

We have already seen in The Mercenary Lover how a preoccupation with money distorts the love relationship. There, Clitander's desire to possess ever more wealth transformed Miranda and Althea into little more than economic resources for his exploitation. Philidore's

concern for money is less sinister, but not less destructive. Paradoxically, although money drives Philidore and Placentia apart, it is also money which will allow them to unite.

The very first sentence of the novel informs us about Philidore's financial condition: although he is descended from a very noble family, his predecessors "left him little but their virtue to inherit" (157). Philidore is very much aware of his "little estate", and his lack of money has a demasculinizing, even castrating, effect upon him. He falls in love with Placentia at first sight and takes up the conventionally feminine position of "slave to love". He gives his psychological slavery an outward manifestation by disguising himself as a "country boor" (159) and becoming the lowliest servant in Placentia's household.

Convinced of his own unworthiness, Philidore begins to transform Placentia into a goddess, imagining her to be "so divine a creature that not only himself, but all mankind beside were unworthy to be styled her servants" (158).

It was with the most enthusiastic adoration only he regarded her; and angel-like Placentia, would he say to himself, was formed only for the wonder of the inferior world....Scarce could he think her mortal, so high an esteem had he conceived of her.
(158)

Philidore gives Placentia this exalted status because she is "so very much superior in point of fortune" (158). Unable to get over the disparity in their financial status, Philidore never reflects that there is "a possibility for

Placentia to think he had merits which might overbalance his other deficiencies" (169). Even when he becomes aware that Placentia also loves him, Philidore resolves to die a martyr to his passion rather than "by becoming her husband give the world an opportunity to censure her conduct in marrying a man who had no other jointure than his love to endow her with" (177).

Philidore, in fact, becomes too feminine, "trop Delicat"; "if most men are agitated by too gross a passion, Philidore was certainly by one as much too nice" (169). The realization of the Equal Pair involves the equality of the masculine and feminine within the individual, not the total renunciation of one for the other. Philidore neglects all other interests but his slavish passion, and at one point he sings:

All regards of Fame and fortune leave me,
Ambition no more charms me,
'Tis Love alone now warms me,
And in sweet slavery true joys can give me. (160)

Placentia will later tell him that "[w]ant of ambition is sometimes a fault" (172).

Because Philidore adopts the passive, feminine role, Placentia is forced to take the assertive, masculine role and attempt to get Philidore to yield. She throws off "all modesty" and forgets "all pride to force him to a confession" (174). She decides upon "a desperate remedy for a desperate disease" and attempts to take control of the relationship (174):

[H]aving summoned all her charms into her eyes and passed the best part of the day in consulting what look and habit would become her best, she put on one of her most languishing and tender that her instructive passion could direct her to assume and, clothing her delicate body in the richest undress, threw herself on a couch with a studied but most engaging carelessness. Then ordering Jacobin [Philidore] should attend her, [she] received him in that manner....[H]e drew near the couch and stooped down his head in the posture of a bow...."Must I then make use of force to draw you near me?" said she, catching suddenly one of his hands and pulling him to a chair close to the couch. (174-175)

Even this has no effect on Philidore. He tells her, "I shall obey you...in all things in which I can do without forfeiting that respect which it is not even in your power to banish from my soul" (175).

After this episode, Philidore and Placentia resume the conventional roles of their sexes. Placentia faints at the "violence she did her modesty in acting in this manner" and she becomes "deprived...of the power of proceeding" (176). Because she cannot overcome the image Philidore has created of her, she is, paradoxically, rendered powerless in the face of his passivity. She experiences "a numbness of soul", a "cessation of thought" (214). Philidore, on the other hand, becomes active and departs for Persia to make his fortune. He imagines that he is making a great sacrifice to restore Placentia's "peace of mind", when what he is really doing is abandoning her and leaving her in a state of abject misery.

Placentia becomes no more than the fictional image

which Philidore had created of her: "Every faculty of my mind was deprived of its force, and I was in effect no more than a piece of imagery wrought by some skilful hand which walks and seems to look, yet knows not its own motions" (214). She retires to the country and experiences a "melancholy which knew no intervals of pleasure. All day she sought some lonely, unfrequented shade where, undisturbed, she might enjoy her griefs; and all her nights were passed in burning sighs and unavailing languishments" (183).

On his journey to Persia, Philidore undergoes all the adventures of a hero and eventually rescues the Christian Eunuch whose "History" makes up most of the second part of the novel. "The History of the Christian Eunuch" (whom we eventually discover is Pacentia's brother, Bellamont) is an ironic commentary on Philidore's own history. Sold into slavery to the Bashaw of Liperda, Bellamont falls hopelessly in love with Arithea, "the most loved and beautiful of all the numerous train which crowded" the bashaw's seraglio (199). Unable to have the real Arithea, Bellamont, as Philidore did with Placentia, adores an image that he has created of her: "Pygmalion-like, I now doted on an image of my own formation, and could kisses have inspired breath into the inanimate plate, mine must certainly have warmed it into life" (201).

Bellamont, though, is able to act upon his passion when

the opportunity arises and a meeting is arranged between himself and Arithea. When they are discovered together, though, Bellamont is taken away and castrated. The fate that is imposed upon Bellamont is the fate which Philidore had brought upon himself. While Bellamont is sold into slavery, separated by force from the woman he loves, and rendered incapable of having a sexual relationship, Philidore offers himself as a servant, banishes himself voluntarily, and will not allow himself to have a sexual relationship with the woman he loves because of the false ideal to which he clings. He has been "industrious" to "destroy his own happiness" (182).

When Bellamont returns to England and reclaims the family inheritance, Placentia feels a "sudden spring" within herself, "like the first start of life" (214).

The vast possessions I was mistress of in the right of my brother being the greatest motive that had made me wretched in love, never woman rejoiced more at acquiring an estate than did I in the loss of mine. 'I shall now,' cried I to myself, 'be equal with my dear Philidore.' (214)

She sets sail for Persia, but her ship is captured by pirates.

If Philidore's lack of money at the start of the novel caused him to undertake a castrating and slavish role, when he inherits his uncle's "immense treasures", his phallic power returns with a vengeance. Philidore quickly discards the fiction he has created of Placentia as being lofty and above him, and immediately forms another which leaves her

just as powerless. Now, with plenty of ready cash, Philidore rescues Placentia from slavery and assumes that he will be rewarded with her hand in marriage. Placentia, however, is not content to be a reward; she wants a marriage of equality, and refuses Philidore's proposal:

'I perceive your surprise, Philidore,' said she, 'but as my love is not inferior to yours, [I] will prove that my generosity is also as great. The regard you had for my interest would not suffer you to accept of the offering I made you of my person and estate, because you were at that time incapable of making me a jointure suitable to the latter. Fortune has changed the die. The advantage is wholly on your side. You are the master of very great riches; I am entirely portionless and I should ill return the obligations I have received from you to become your wife.' ...she remained fixed in her determination, telling him that were they on an equality she could have submitted to the meanest way of life with him but never would be brought to be obliged by him who would not be obliged by her. (226)

Only when her brother gives back a portion of the inheritance he had claimed on returning to England, giving her the same economic status as Philidore, does Placentia agree to a marriage in which neither of them is "obliged" to the other. Haywood stresses their equality at the end of the novel: Placentia embraces Philidore with "equal rapture"; they are an "equally enamoured, equally deserving pair" (230).

The ideal of the Equal Pair is realized in only a very few of Haywood's early novels. For all their high-flown passion, Haywood's novels are realistic in their depiction of the outcome of gender relations within the ideology of

difference as opposition. Though Haywood despaired of frequently seeing the Equal Pair, it nevertheless remained her ideal of the sexual relationship. As she would later write in The Female Spectator, the marriage of the Equal Pair is

indeed the Fountain-Head of all the Comforts we can enjoy ourselves, and of those we transmit to our Posterity.--It is the Bond which unites not only two Persons, but whole Families in one common inseparable Interest.--...but then not to pervert the Intention of so necessary and glorious an Institution, and rob it of every Blessing it is full of, lies only in ourselves. (in Williamson 237)

CHAPTER THREE: "The Force of Language and
the Sweets of Love"

Ev'n Nature's self in Sympathy appears,
Yields Sigh for Sigh, and melts in equal Tears;
For such Description thus at once can prove
The Force of Language, and the Sweets of Love.

Richard Savage,
"To Mrs. Eliza Haywood, on
her Novel call'd Love in
Excess, &c."

"Inescapably but also elusively," writes John J. Richetti, "gender must affect speech. Given their distinct positions in the hierarchy of social power, men and women must have different relationships to language and use it in different ways" (Richetti, Voice 263). Most discussions of language and gender, like Richetti's, focus on the assumption that all language is marked by gender "inescapably". Their aim is to discern those features which identify spoken and written language as either male or female. My own aim in this chapter, however, is not to look at Haywood's writing as a gender-specific discourse. Instead, I want to look at the ways in which Haywood shows men and women using language to establish a relationship with one another, how, in the novels, the conversation of

the sexes becomes a mirror of their physical relationship, and the possibility of escaping the conventional gender relationships to language. My reason for looking at language and gender in this way is that Haywood's ideal, as I hope is clear by now, involves bringing together, not separating, the concepts of masculinity and femininity.

In those of Haywood's novels which maintain the conventional opposition of the sexes, men and women's relationships to language are marked by those qualities and experiences traditionally assigned to males and females: masculine control and feminine submissiveness, respectively. While men, with unemotional and unscrupulous masculine cunning, skilfully manipulate language in order to exercise their power, women become incoherent, or, more frequently, silent. The "feminine" anguish (or joy) of love is an experience which cannot be expressed; it is intense emotion beyond the power of words. In the novels which end in the union of the Equal Pair, masculine articulateness and feminine silence still exist, but they are no longer qualities assigned exclusively to men or women. Both sexes can, and, for Haywood, must, possess a measure of each so that the conversation of the sexes does not degenerate into monologue.

The fiction itself possesses both masculine articulateness and feminine silence. Haywood's narrative control takes the reader into the feminine world of love,

attempting to give expression to those emotions and passions which "cannot be expressed". The last part of this chapter will look at the "conversation" between Haywood and her reader to show how Haywood's novels bring together the conventionally masculine "Force of Language" with the conventionally feminine "Sweets of Love".

"Then for his Wit and Conversation," writes Haywood of de L'Amye in Lasselia; or the Self-Abandon'd (1723), "it was not to be equall'd---he was so perfect a Master in the Art of Persuasion, that whoever would resolve on any thing, must be sure not to hear him plead against it; so impossible was it to dissent from him in Argument" (Lasselia 27). This mastery of language which characterizes de L'Amye characterizes all of the men in Haywood's novels of seduction. These men speak a language of persuasion against which even the most virtuous heroine cannot defend herself. When Fillamour, in The Unequal Conflict, speaks his "tender messages", where, asks Haywood, "is the heart so fenc'd by duty or by virtue, that cou'd resist the sweet inchantment?" (Conflict 8) The heroine's story of tragic love is like that of Cleomira in The British Recluse: "a sad Example of what Miseries may attend a Woman, who has no other Foundation for Belief in what her Lover says to her, than the good Opinion her Passion made her conceive of him" (Recluse 6).

In spite of the fact that the women in these stories find that words are "too poor, too mean Acknowledgments of the unbounded Bliss" of love (Lasselia 39), they nevertheless unfailingly trust the language in which men express their supposed feelings. Frequently, the woman's attraction to a man is figured as the pleasure she has in simply hearing him speak. She either thrills to his declarations of love, or else melts at the "bewitching softness" of his voice which would make "even nonsense pleasing" (Conflict 8). Both reactions leave her equally speechless. In these stories of seduction, women become passive objects, manipulated by the masculine mastery of language, and what often begins as a dialogue between the sexes, ends as a monologue of male power.

The Mercenary Lover, which I considered in Chapter One, provides a characteristic example of a relationship which is totally directed by the male's control of language. As the "Author of her Ruin", Clitander writes the script which eventually ends in the silencing of Althea. Because the conventional opposition of the sexes is maintained in this story, Clitander's articulateness easily gains the upper hand over Althea's inarticulateness. The following scene shows how Clitander's seduction of Althea is primarily an effect of speech:

[He] introduc'd a Discourse on the Force of Love, always undertaking to prove, That whatever were the Consequences of that Passion...they were unavoidable....Had the modest Soul of Althea been

in the least apprized of the Aim of these Conversations, ...the Shock of such a discovery had at once stop'd her Ear's from listening to Doctrine so pernicious, but as she was far from suspecting any Thing of his Inclinations, and took an infinit Pleasure in hearing him talk, by little and little the Poison of his Infectious Precepts gain'd Ground on her Belief; and finding herself wholly incapable of defending the Cause of Virtue against those Arguments which his superior Wit and Genius brought, began to think, indeed, that what he said was just. (18)

As Clitander's power with language grows, Althea becomes more and more speechless. Before she "yields" to Clitander in body, Althea first "yields" to him in conversation. When Clitander finally does declare himself a lover and takes Althea in his arms, the conflicting emotions in her mind stop her thoughts "e're she cou'd form them into Speech":

in broken Sentences she sometimes seem'd to favour, then to discourage his Attempts,...and when she most strove to say something which might dash his Hopes, cou'd bring forth no harsher sounds than, Forbear, forbear my dangerous, and too lovely Brother...(23)

As soon as Clitander has perpetrated his "cruel Purpose" (24), he immediately begins to "exert his utmost Wit and Eloquence" in order to reconcile Althea to what he has done to her, and he uses the same "Arguments she had before too fatally given Ear to" (24).

Althea's literally fatal second "yielding" is brought about entirely through letters. Significantly, it is Clitander's plan to "silence" Althea permanently, to make sure that she does not speak and expose him. As Althea has

left the city, Clitander writes a letter to her about the "Torments" he is supposedly experiencing because of their separation, and he encourages her to re-enter their "conversation": "let the Balsom of returning Love restore once more Clitander to himself....Write to me some Lines of Comfort" (42). Again, Althea melts before his language; "she cou'd not read those tender Expressions he had made use of in his Letter without a Flood of forgiving Softness pouring in upon her Soul" (42-43).

Clitander sees by Althea's reply that there needed "but a few Oaths to compleat what his Letter has begun" (45). He pretends that their situation is reversed, that Althea is the more powerful of the two in their conversation, and he closes one of his letters saying "on what you write depends the fate of, Your Impatient Slave, Clitander" (47). Althea, here, is made to feel that her language has power, but it is only because Clitander says that it does; it is still his language which defines and, therefore controls, the relationship. In this way, he is able to convince Althea to return to London where he poisons her. We see, at the end of the novel, Althea's language deteriorate from speech, to mad ravings, to the final silence of death.

The antagonistic relationship resulting from the definition of the sexes as opposites is reflected in their conversation which always takes the form of an argument, a type of conversation which defines the speakers by their

difference, and their relationship, as the attempt by one to master the other, to impose interpretation and definition. Althea finds herself unable to refute Clitander's arguments, and her silence is interpreted as consent. In Haywood's novels of seduction, the stereotypical opposition of the sexes which grants men a mastery of language, but denies it to women, allows masculine speech to assert its power by imposing meaning on feminine silence. Obviously, this form of conversation can never be the basis for the equal union of the sexes.

In Chapter Two, we saw that, for Haywood, the success of the Equal Pair depended on the realization and acceptance of the equality of the masculine and feminine in each individual. The equal union of man and woman in the romantic conclusion of the text required that they each discard traditional gender roles. This is also true for men and women to be able to converse as equals. The conventional masculine relationship to language--the ability to master, control, and define--and the conventional feminine relationship to language--silence, and the submission to emotion which cannot be expressed--must become, in some way, characteristic of both sexes. The conversation of the sexes can only move from confrontation to understanding when the man can experience the inexpressible and the woman can speak herself into existence so that she is independent of male definition.

Both Montamour, in The Injur'd Husband, and Placentia, in Philidore and Placentia, differ from the women in the novels of seduction in their ability to articulate themselves clearly and forcefully. Although both of these women allow themselves to be temporarily defined by male language--Montamour sees herself as an abandoned and powerless woman after she reads the letter dictated by Du Lache, and Placentia becomes a mere "piece of imagery" because of Philidore's definition of her as a goddess-- in the end, Haywood allows them to break out of this pattern, and both novels have a scene near the conclusion where the heroines make long speeches to the heroes telling them that they cannot dictate female behavior. That Montamour gives her speech in masculine dress only underscores the fact that she has been able to adopt the masculine ability to articulate herself.

Placentia makes it clear to Philidore that she is assuming the male prerogative of articulation. When she declares that she will not marry Philidore because he is now so much richer than she is, Philidore is reduced to an amazement which "may more easily be imagined than expressed" (226). She asks him, "What cause have you to complain? I but imitate the pattern you set me" (230; emphasis added). Placentia refuses to be defined, either as a goddess or a reward; she will, instead, speak and define herself.

Although Placentia and Montamour still experience

moments of emotion which are beyond the power of language to represent, they never lapse into total silence. Their male partners, too, come to learn that language does have its limits. When the traditional gender roles are left behind, Philidore and Beauclair are able to experience emotions more powerful than words, emotions which, in fact, deprive them of words.

When Beauclair discovers the deceit of the Baroness and attempts a reconciliation with Montamour, the overwhelming love he feels for her deprives him of speech. Disguised as a friar, Beauclair gains admittance to the convent to which Montamour has retired. She greets him but

he neither heard nor had power to make any Answer to this Compliment; every Sense was absent, and Thought dissolv'd in the vast Hurry of his various Emotions; ...a thousand fond endearing Things crouded at once into his Soul, and press'd for Utterance--He wou'd have spoke 'em all, but the tumultuous Meanings were too great, too many, and overthrew each other in the Throng, and all he cou'd bring forth was Montamour! Angelick Montamour! (222-223)

Similarly, when Philidore is reunited with Placentia after he has rescued her from slavery, he experiences with her a moment of feminine inarticulateness, of emotion beyond the limits of language:

Kisses, embraces, and all the fond endearments of rewarded passion made up for want of speech. In their expressive looks and eager graspings, the violence of their mutual flame was more plainly demonstrated than it could have been by the greatest elegance of language. (213)

Philidore and Placentia establish a form of

communication beyond the realm of conventional language. This does not mean, however, that they dispense with language altogether; it is after this scene that Placentia will speak to free herself from the definition imposed upon her by Philidore. They can both speak when it is necessary, and remain silent when that is necessary. The Equal Pair is able to turn the argument of the sexes into a conversation between equals, and it is a conversation which the reader is expected to understand. Haywood concludes Philidore and Placentia by writing, "And of their future bliss the reader may better judge by their almost unexampled love, their constancy, their generosity and nobleness of soul, than by any description I am able to give of it" (231).

As a writer of popular fiction, Haywood is eminently aware of her reader. Frequently addressing the reader directly, she seems to anticipate his or her responses: "But I forget that by these Digressions I shall become tiresome to my Reader," Haywood interrupts herself at one point in Lasselia (44). In the last part of this chapter, I would like to turn to the "conversation" which takes place between Haywood and her reader, and particularly to the relationship between Haywood and her male reader. I choose a male reader for two reasons: I can obviously speak with more authority about this position, but most importantly, by using this model we can continue our examination of the

conversation of the sexes and the ways in which they can establish a relationship through language.

I should make it clear, here, that this is not a distortion of Haywood's vision of her reading public. Although her novels are frequently categorized as "women's fiction", Haywood herself does not see her audience as being specifically female. In the Dedication at the start of The Injur'd Husband, for example, she writes to Lady How: "...and while I treat of the Inadvertancies, and indeed Vices, which there is a Possibility that our Sex may be guilty of, I wou'd put those of the other in Mind, that there is One among us, whose Virtues may atone for the Mismanagement of the rest." In Philidore and Placentia, Haywood, on several occasions, addresses both male readers and female readers (See pp. 179, 220, 229). Most of the time, though, she simply addresses herself to the "Reader".

In reading a Haywood novel, one is taken into a world full of overwhelming emotion and palpitating passion. Something like setting, for example, usually receives no more attention than the mention of the name of the city in which the story takes place. Haywood subordinates the external and material to the internal and emotional; "Love! transported, raptur'd Love!" is always her main topic (Lasselia 26). Writing about Haywood's effectiveness as a author of amatory fiction, Richetti says that her "technique...is to evoke a female ethos to which her

readers' response is moral-emotional sympathetic vibration rather than a self-conscious and deliberate assent to moral ideas" (Richetti, Popular 182). While I agree that Haywood's readers' responses are undoubtedly more emotional than intellectual, I would change the word "female" to "feminine", for succumbing to emotion becomes, in these novels, a conception not of a female experience, but of a feminine experience available to men and women.

It is impossible, of course, to talk, as I have done, about Clitander as the "Author" of Althea's destiny, capable of manipulating her responses and experiences solely through language, without recognizing that this parallels the writer's control over the reader's participation in the narrative. The reader becomes, like Althea, the victim of a powerful manipulator of language. Haywood's novels are, in a way, like the books given to Althea by Clitander: "gay Treatises which insensibly melt down the Soul, and make it fit for amorous Impressions" (Mercenary Lover 17).

It is possibly this parallel between the reader's position and that of the female victim that has earned novels like Haywood's the label "women's fiction". Identifying with the feminine can call into question the male reader's masculinity. If this is the case, the male reader can reassert his masculine mastery and power by deciding that this fictional language has nothing to do with him, by simply refusing to enter into this particular

conversation.¹ Within her novels, Haywood frequently shows men dismissing women's words. For example, when Placentia encounters an over-amorous sea captain, she attempts to persuade him to relinquish his masculine power. He refuses to take the conversation seriously:

"Humility is the truest mark of love, nor can I think your heart at all devoted to me when you make use of menaces to obtain your wishes. Were you indeed my lover, I should have greater power over your actions than my ill fate has given you over my person."

"We will hereafter," resumed he, smiling, "dispute on the niceties of that passion. My present business is the gratification of it."
(218)

Like the sea captain, the male reader may keep his masculine power intact by choosing to see the words of a woman as being beneath serious consideration.

The male reader, though, who does let himself be manipulated by Haywood's language must identify with the feminine, not only because he is being manipulated like the seduced heroine, but because of what he is being manipulated into doing: giving way to emotion. In Haywood's seduction novels which maintain stereotypical gender opposition, the men merely inspire passion; it is the women who yield to it.

¹See Norman Holland and Leona Sherman's "Gothic Possibilities" in Gender and Reading. Eds. Elizabeth Flynn and Patrocínio Schweickhart. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1986.) 215-233. Holland writes: "For me, both identifying with a female and imagining being penetrated call into question my male identity. Both raise the threat posed by the castle and the gothic machinery to a pitch where I no longer wish them relevant to me, the male me, and I sense myself relegating gothic to an alienating category, 'women's fiction'" (220).

Consider the following seduction scene from Love in Excess. D'Elmont, though the aggressor, all but disappears from view; it is Amena's response which is Haywood's focus and which is described in detail:

What now could poor Amena do, surrounded with so many Powers, attack'd by such a charming Force without, betray'd by Tenderness within: ...only a modest bashfulness remain'd, which for a time made some Defence, but with such Weakness as a Lover less impatient than D'Elmont would have little regarded. The Heat of the Weather, and her Confinement having hindered her from dressing that Day, she had only a thin Silk Night-Gown on, which flying open as he caught her in his Arms, he found her panting Heart beat Measures of Consent, her heaving Breast swell to be press'd by his, and every Pulse confess a Wish to yield; her Spirits all dissolv'd, sunk in a Lethargy of Love, her snowy Arms unknowing grasp'd his Neck, her Lips met his half way, and trembled at the Touch; in fine, there was but a Moment betwixt her and Ruin. (25-26)

It is Amena's conventionally feminine "Wish to yield" which Haywood's novels inspire in the male reader.

It would be helpful, here, to turn to some contemporary responses to Haywood by male readers. These are three verse "tributes" to Haywood which appear at the front of Volume One of Haywood's collected works.² All three of the poets

²I am using the third edition, printed in 1732. The verses are James Sterling's "To Mrs. Eliza Haywood, on her Writings", Richard Savage's "To Mrs. Eliza Haywood, on her Novel call'd Love in Excess, &c.", and "By a unknown Hand. To the most Ingenious Mrs. Haywood, on her Novel intitl'd, Love in Excess." Because of the erotic nature of the praise by the "unknown Hand", and because the poet speaks of once being "an Unbeliever.../ That Women's Souls such strength of Vigour knew", it seems reasonable to assume that the poet is male. The complete texts of these poems can be found in the Appendix on page 81.

praise Haywood for her ability to inspire feminine desire within them. Particularly explicit is the anonymous poet, who, though once "an Atheist to Love's Power", now waits, resistless, to be penetrated by the fire of Haywood's language:

...I feel that Fire
 Your Words alone can paint! Your Looks inspire!
 Resistless now, Love's Shafts new-pointed fly,
 Wing'd with Your Flame, and blazing in Your Eye;
 With sweet, but powerful Force, the Charm-shot
 Heart
 Receives th' Impression of the Conqu'ring Dart,
 And ev'ry Art'ry hugs the Joy-tipt Smart!

Like Amena, the poet is attacked by a charming force without, and betrayed by tenderness within; he has no choice but to yield. The fire which Haywood's "Words alone can paint" make him "glow with more than Eastern Heat". The poem's thinly veiled erotic nature puts Haywood in the masculine aggressive and controlling role, while the male poet becomes passive and receptive.

James Sterling's "To Mrs. Eliza Haywood, on her Writings" is, perhaps, the best known of these three poems. Sterling, like the anonymous poet, praises Haywood for her power to persuade the reader to surrender to his emotions:

Great Arbitress of Passion! wond'rous Art!
 As the despotick Will the Limbs thou mov'st the
 Heart;
 Persuasion waits on all your bright Designs,
 And where you point the varying Soul inclines:
 See! Love and Friendship, the fair Theme inspires,
 We glow with Zeal, we melt in soft Desires!

 You sit like Heav'n's bright Minister on High,
 Command the throbbing Breast, and watry Eye,
 And, as our captive Spirits ebb and flow,

Smile at the Tempests you have rais'd below.

Sterling accords to Haywood's language, her "wond'rous Art", the seducer's power of persuasion. She commands the throbbing breast; the reader's spirits are captive. Her language involves the reader totally in the narrative and forces him to succumb to traditionally feminine emotions ("...we melt in soft Desires!/ ...we share/ The kindred Sorrows of the gen'rous Pair;/...And sudden burst the involuntary Tears"). Richard Savage, too, speaks of Haywood's prose as "a Musick that can Love inspire". For him, like the anonymous poet, Haywood's language has the power of penetration, the power to force the male reader to yield: "Soul-thrilling Accents all our Senses wound,/ And strike with Softness, whilst they charm with Sound!"

If these poets do not mention explicitly that, in allowing themselves to be manipulated into a passive position, they have taken on a conventionally feminine role, they all do mention that Haywood, as an active manipulator of persuasive language, has taken on a conventionally masculine role. "A Stranger Muse, an Unbeliever too," begins the poem by an "unknown Hand",

That Women's Souls such Strength of Vigour knew,
Nor less an Atheist to Love's Power declar'd,
Till You a Champion for the Sex appear'd.

"Let Tyrant Man, with salic Laws submit," writes Sterling, "Nor boast the vain Prerogative of Wit". Sterling even goes on to say that Haywood, along with Aphra Behn and

Delariviere Manley, transcends her sex when she writes:

Sure 'twas by brutal Force of envious Man,
First Learning's base Monopoly began;
He knew your genius, and refus'd his Books,
Nor thought your Wit less fatal than your Looks.
Read, proud Usurper, read with conscious Shame,
Pathetic Behn, or Manley's greater Name;
Forget their Sex, and own when Haywood writ,
She clos'd the fair Triumvirate of Wit.

If we are to "forget" Haywood's sex while we read her novels, it is because she writes with a masculine mastery of language.

It would seem, then, that Haywood has merely inverted the traditional gender relations to language. This, however, is not the case. Haywood, unlike the seducers in her novels, never totally deprives the reader of "speech". The reader of a Haywood novel may be seduced by the language, but he is also called upon to be an active participant in the telling of the story. One of the most frequently recurring phrases in these novels is, "The reader's Imagination here must help me out." It is in this way that Haywood's novels manage to combine "masculine" articulateness with "feminine" silence. As a narrator, Haywood is only too willing to admit the limits of her language, and, indeed, of language in general. When Philidore decides to sail for Persia, Haywood writes: "But with what words shall I represent the wild distraction of Placentia's soul when she received his letter! Here the reader's imagination must help me out; nor can any imagination but that of a woman who loves as she did and has

been, like her, deprived of all her soul holds dear, do justice to the agonies with which she was possessed" (Philidore 179). Similarly, in The Mercenary Lover, when Miranda is informed of Clitander's behaviour, Haywood states that "the reader's Imagination must here assist my Pen, or it will be impossible for him to form any just Notion of what she endur'd in the killing repetition of so dreadful an Account" (56).

Haywood continually leads the reader to the brink of overwhelming emotion and then asks the reader to take over. As Richetti has written, "[o]ver and over again, Haywood's narrators dramatize the inadequacy of their writing in the face of female experience at its most intense, extreme, and therefore inarticulate" (Richetti, Voice 266). Again, though, I would argue that these intense experiences are not exclusively female, for when Beauclair believes he has lost Montamour forever, Haywood says that "It must be a Pen infinitely more capable of Description than mine, which could represent the true state of his Condition" (Injur'd Husband 236).

Haywood's readers are flattered by inclusion in a group of emotionally elite people who understand the inexpressible mysteries of love and passion. One of the more striking examples of this occurs in The Injur'd Husband. Having fainted away with despairing love, Beauclair is found by a group of workmen who immediately begin to conjecture as to

why a man would be lying face down in the garden of a convent:

One thing in this passage I cannot let slip without observing; which is, That among the many different Conjectures which had been form'd on the Discovery that a Man had dared to conceal himself all Night in that forbidden Ground, there was not one who imputed it to the true Cause; which proves how little People of such low Capacities are able to entertain any just Notions of that tender Passion; and how impossible it is for any but a Lover to conceive the force of Love, and to what lengths it will transport the Votary inspir'd with an unfeign'd Ardour. But setting aside Reflections, which the sensible Reader need not to be put in mind of... (237-238)

One cannot help but notice that the emotional elite are not so very far removed from the social elite. But this is not simply flattery which makes it all the easier for Haywood to seduce the reader. Inclusion in this special group allows the reader to fill in the details which Haywood claims she is unable to represent. Only a reader with the same knowledge of "Love, soft Love" as Haywood can pick up where the text leaves off. When Haywood writes, "But with what words shall I represent the wild distraction of Placentia's soul," she does so with the knowledge that the "sensible Reader" does not need any words. In these silences, Haywood and her reader have a moment complete understanding. Like Philidore and Placentia's reunion, it is a moment of communication beyond the realm of conventional language. By limiting her own power as an author, Haywood empowers the reader and enables him or her to enter into conversation with the text. The reader is, thus, given a "voice".

Within the dynamic of this "conversation", Haywood never becomes totally dominant, nor the reader totally submissive. If we posit a male reader and look at this as a conversation between the sexes, we see that the conventional gender relations to language are not merely inverted, but equalized. Haywood's masculine mastery and control of language is balanced by her frequent "silences", her admissions that she has reached the limits of her language. The reader's conventionally feminine, emotional response is balanced by the opportunities to take over from the narrator in describing the characters' emotions. Because the reader is accorded a special understanding of the "tender passions", the topic of discussion, when Haywood's text falls silent, the reader can momentarily take control of the narrative. As the reader's refined sensibility is the same as Haywood's (and her characters'), the communication between Haywood and her reader is, in effect, like that of the Equal Pair, a conversation of equals.

CONCLUSION

Who then can, unconcern'd, behold this glorious benefit [marriage] perverted--the blissful union of hearts dissolv'd, and the hands, perhaps but lately join'd struggling with the chains that bind them to each other; --discord and confusion, in the place of love and harmony.

Eliza Haywood
The Wife

If Eliza Haywood despaired of frequently seeing the happy union of the Equal Pair realized, she seems also to have been skeptical of the chances for those fortunate few to remain forever in a state of unadulterated bliss. To conclude this paper, I would like to look at the last two works Haywood wrote: The Wife and The Husband. In Answer to the Wife, both published in 1756, the year of Haywood's death. These two conduct books advise their readers on how to deal with all of the difficulties which will inevitably arise after marriage, how to ameliorate those problems, and how to achieve and maintain happiness in the married state. Haywood's ideal is still a relationship based upon equality and mutuality, and she advises her readers, both male and female, to settle for nothing less.

The Wife contains advice to married women on how to behave toward their husbands in every conceivable situation from "On being over-fond of Animals" to "Sleeping in

different Beds". Haywood warns her readers that maintaining a happy relationship requires work, but it is work which wives should expect to be reciprocated by their husbands. Although fine in theory, this does not always work in practice. "I am sorry to say," Haywood concedes, "that tho' a woman should be able to fullfil, with the utmost exactness, all the duties of a wife...yet she may not always meet with a due return from her ungrateful husband" (275). If the relationship is not one of mutual affection and esteem, Haywood advises that it be dissolved.

When a wife has tried "all possible methods" of improving her marriage but finds that her husband "is never happy but in a gaming-house, a tavern, or a brothel; if he squanders the fortune she has a right to share; if he despises her kindness, repulses her caresses, maltreats her person", then she must remove herself from such a "maze of perplexity" (276-277). This can only be done by a complete separation:

The parting of a husband and wife has indeed a horrible sound, when we consider the anathema pronounced against all attempts to put assunder persons joined by God; yet when the devil has taken such full possession of the one that the other is in danger of being contaminated with his crimes, I cannot [but] think that the innocent will easily find absolution for breaking so unnatural a conjunction. (277)

The Husband. In Answer to the Wife is addressed to men who either are husbands or intend to become husbands. Like The Wife, it offers advice on conduct in a vast variety of

situations. Haywood begins, though, by reminding her male readers that a marriage is a mutual contract. If a man would only consider seriously the "true intent" of marriage, he would find that he "ought not to depend entirely on the virtue and good conduct of his wife, for the security of his honour, his interest, and his peace of mind; but that he himself is also bound by obligations no less essential to their mutual happiness" (2).

Haywood goes on to advise husbands on how to deal with troublesome wives--wives prone to lavish spending, gossiping, and flirting. In the end, as in The Wife, Haywood maintains that if the sanctity of the relationship is broken, the husband and wife should separate: "...when a woman has once broke through the conjugal covenant, and wantonly given herself to the embraces of another, her husband, in my opinion, has but a short course to take": separation (276).

As much a friend as I am to the wives, I cannot persuade any husband ever to forgive a transgression of this nature; --on the contrary, I should think a man who could suffer himself to be prevail'd upon to live with her after a detection of her falshood, would justly deserve all the contempt he would undoubtedly be treated with.
(277)

One cannot help but notice that in both of these books, the progress of marriage is from initial union to seemingly inevitable separation and divorce. One must also reflect, though, that this is not advice which Haywood would give lightly. Having left her own husband, the Rev. Valentine

Haywood, in 1720, Haywood undoubtedly suffered not only financially, but also in terms of her reputation.¹

These two late works echo many of the concerns we saw raised in Haywood's early novels--particularly, the danger of role-playing:

It is almost next to an impossibility either for the husband or the wife to be perfectly acquainted with the disposition and humour of each other before they come to live together; --in the days of courtship both but act a part, and in many things seem what they are not; --love favours the deception, and holds close the mask. (The Husband 3)

Of course, it is the acting out of conventional gender-roles which Haywood sees as being most dangerous, most likely to render marriage a miserable affair. She warns her female readers in The Wife against being too fondly believing and indulging in romantic fantasies about marriage: "the conduct, even in the best of husbands, proves that all the fine things they said beforehand were but words of course;--the tables, after marriage, are revers'd, the goddess is now stripp'd of all her divinity" (203). Haywood continues:

In a word, if she [a wife] has no reason to believe he likes any other woman so well as herself, and gives her all the marks in his power of a sincere and tender friendship, it is all she

¹On 7 January, 1721, the following notice appeared in the Post Boy: "Whereas Elizabeth Haywood, Wife of the Reverend Mr. Valentine Haywood, eloped from him her Husband on Saturday the 26th of November last past, and went away without his Knowledge and Consent: This is to give Notice to all Persons in general, That if any one shall trust her either with Money or Goods, or if she shall contract Debts of any kind whatsoever, the said Mr. Haywood will not pay the same" (in Whicher 3).

ought to expect from him. (205)

Similarly, The Husband warns men against thinking that their sex absolves them from the mutual responsibilities of marriage:

There are some men, too many I am afraid, who value themselves more upon their sex than they do upon their virtues or endowments; and, merely because they are men, imagine they have a right...to exact a blind, implicit, and indeed a slavish obedience from their wives. (5)

Although the word "obey" is in the marriage ceremony, Haywood states that "women of sense and spirit" are apt to think themselves not bound to observe it "because the form was composed by men, who they judge have been too partial to themselves in that article" (5-6).

Haywood's emphasis is, as always, on the equality of the partners. "Though I can ill endure to see a man treat his wife in an imperious and domineering manner," she writes in The Husband, "yet I am as far remov'd from wishing to see him too subservient" (15). After marriage, all the "submissions and adulations of a lover should be thrown aside, but all the tenderness remain";

he should not, by any word, look, or gesture, give [his wife] the least reason either to hope he would be her slave, or to fear he intended to become her master. (19)

For Haywood, the love relationship was something which could not be compromised. She held on to her ideal of the Equal Pair and did not ignore the consequences of maintaining such an ideal. In a society which too

frequently equated masculinity with unfeeling domination and femininity with slavish submission, it is no wonder that so many of Haywood's lovers are unhappy at the end of their stories, no wonder that The Wife and The Husband end in separation. Unable to overcome the obstacle of "human nature", their attempts at achieving that ideal relationship of mutual affection and esteem are doomed from the start. The dominant/submissive opposition which characterizes the conventional dynamics of the male-female relationship destroys any possibility of mutual esteem, and as Haywood writes in The Injur'd Husband, when esteem is destroyed, "all that remains of Love is scarce worth calling so" (130-131).

APPENDIX

These verses appear in the opening (unnumbered) pages of the first volume of Secret Histories, Novels, and Poems. In Four Volumes. Written by Mrs. Haywood. The Third Edition. (London: A. Bettesworth, C. Hitch, D. Brown, T. Astley, and T. Green, 1732).

To Mrs. Eliza Haywood, on her Writings

If but thro' fine Organs, Souls shine forth,
And polish'd Matter marks the mental Worth;
Sure Spirit free, by no dull Mass controul'd,
Exerts full Vigour in Fair Female Mold--

Let Tyrant Man, with salic Laws submit,
Nor boast the vain Prerogative of Wit:
See! from ELIZA in a Flood of Day
With vast Effulgence streams the pow'rful Ray!
But Nature, in an Elegance of Care,
At once creates our Wonder and our Fear;
So delicate's the Texture of our Brain,
We wish it less refin'd and nearer Man;
For weak's the Clock with over-curious Springs,
And frail the Voice that too divinely sings--
See! Handmaid-Nature guides her godlike Fires,
Each Grace adorns what ev'ry Muse inspires;
The charming Page pale Envy's Gloom beguiles,
She low'rs, she reads, forgets herself and smiles:
Proportion'd to the Image, Language swells,
Both leave the Mind suspended, which excels--

Great Arbitress of Passion! wond'rous Art!
As the despotick Will the Limbs, thou mov'st the
Heart;
Persuasion waits on all your bright Designs,
And where you point the varying Soul inclines:
See! Love and Friendship, the fair Theme inspires,
We glow with Zeal, we melt in soft Desires!
Thro' the dire Labyrinth of Ills we share
The kindred Sorrows of the gen'rous Pair;
Till, pleas'd, rewarded Vertue we behold,

Shine from the Furnace pure as tortur'd Gold:
 You sit like Heav'n's bright Minister on High,
 Command the throbbing Breast, and watry Eye,
 And, as our captive Spirits ebb and flow,
 Smile at the Tempests you have rais'd below:
 The Face of Guilt a Flush of Vertue wears,
 And sudden burst the involuntary Tears:
 Honour's sworn Foe, the Libertine with Shame,
 Descends to curse the sordid lawless Flame;
 The tender Maid her learns Man's various Wiles,
 Rash Youth, hence dread the Wanton's venal Smiles—
 Sure 'twas by brutal Force of envious Man,
 First Learning's base Monopoly began;
 He knew your Genius, and refus'd his Books,
 Nor thought your Wit less fatal than your Looks.
 Read, proud Usurper, read with conscious Shame,
 Pathetic Behn, or Manley's greater Name;
 Forget their Sex, and own when Haywood writ,
 She clos'd the fair Triumvirate of Wit;
 Born to delight as to reform the Age,
 She paints Example thro' the shining Page;
 Satiric Precept warms the moral Tale,
 And Causticks burn where the mild Balsam fails;
 A Task reserv'd for her, to whom 'tis given,
 To stand the Proxy of vincictive Heav'n!

James Sterling

To Mrs. Eliza Haywood, on her Novel call'd
 Love in Excess, &c.

Fain wou'd I here my vast Ideas raise,
 To point the Wonders of Eliza's Praise;
 But like young Artists, where their Strokes decay,
 I shade those Glories, which I can't display.
 Thy Prose in sweeter Harmony refines,
 Than Numbers flowing thro' the Muse's Lines;
 What Beauty ne'er cou'd melt, thy Touches fire,
 And raise a Musick that can Love inspire;
 Soul-thrilling Accents all our Senses wound,
 And strike with Softness, whilst they charm with
 Sound!
 When thy Count pleads, what Fair his Suit can fly?
 Or when thy Nymph laments, what Eyes are dry?
 Ev'n Nature's self in Sympathy appears,
 Yields Sigh for Sigh, and melts in equal Tears;
 For such Description thus at once can prove
 The Force of Language and the Sweets of Love.

The Myrtle's Leaves with those of Fame entwine,
 And all the Glories of the Wreath are thine;
 As Eagles can undazzl'd view the Force
 Of scorching Phoebus in his Noon-day Course;
 Thy Genius to the God its Lustre plays,
 Meets his fierce Beams, and darts him Rays for
 Rays!
 Oh glorious Strength! Let each succeeding Page
 Still boast those Charms, and luminate the Age;
 So shall thy beamful Fires with Light divine
 Rise to the Sphere, and there triumphant shine.

Richard Savage

By an unknown Hand. To the most Ingenious Mrs.
 Haywood, on her Novel, intituled, Love in Excess.

A Stranger Muse, an Unbeliever too,
 That Women's Souls such Strength of Vigour knew,
 Nor less an Atheist to Love's Power declar'd,
 Till You a Champion for the Sex appear'd:
 A convert now, to both, I feel that Fire
 Your Words alone can paint! Your Looks inspire!
 Resistless now, Love's Shafts new-pointed fly,
 Wing'd with Your Flame, and blazing in Your Eye;
 With sweet, but powerful force, the Charm-shot
 Heart
 Receives th'Impression of the Conqu'ring Dart,
 And ev'ry Art'ry hugs the Joy-tipt Smart!

No more Phoebus' rising vainly boast,
 Ye tawny Sons of a luxurious Coast!
 While our blest Isle is with such Rays replets,
 Britain shall glow with more than Eastern Heat!

Works Cited

- Boone, Joseph Allen. Tradition Counter Tradition: Love and the Form of Fiction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Bond, Donald F., ed. The Spectator. Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965. 5 vols.
- Dusinberre, Juliet. Shakespeare and the Nature of Women. London: MacMillan, 1975.
- Flynn, Elizabeth A., and Patrocínio P. Schweickart. Introduction. Reading and Gender. Eds. Elizabeth A. Flynn and Patrocínio P. Schweickart. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1986. ix-xxx.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. "Costumes of the Mind: Transvestism as Metaphor in Modern Literature." In Writing and Sexual Difference. Ed. Elizabeth Abel. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. 193-220.
- Griener, Josephine. Introduction. The Mercenary Lover. By Eliza Haywood. New York: Garland, 1973. 1-12.
- Haec Vir: or, The Womanish Man. In Half Humankind: Contexts and Texts of the Controversy about Women in England, 1540-1640. Eds. Katherine Usher Henderson and Barbara F. McManus. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1985. 277-289.

Hagstrum, Jean H. Sex and Sensibility: Ideal and Erotic Love from Milton to Mozart. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Haywood, Eliza. The British Recluse; or the Secret History of Cleomira, Suppos'd Dead. In Secret Histories, Novels, and Poems. In Four Volumes. Written by Mrs. Haywood. The Third Edition. Vol. 2. London: For A. Bettesworth and C. Hitch, D. Browne, T. Astley, and T. Green. 1732.

---. The Husband. In Answer to The Wife. London: T. Gardner, 1756.

---. Idalia; or, the Unfortunate Mistress. In Secret Histories, Novels and Poems. 3rd ed., Vol. 3.

---. The Injur'd Husband; or the Mistaken Resentment. 1723; reprint, New York: Scholars' Facsimiles, 1983.

---. Love in Excess; or the Fatal Enquiry. In Secret Histories, Novels and Poems. 3rd ed., Vol. 1.

---. The Mercenary Lover, or the Unfortunate Heiresses. 1726; reprint, New York: Garland, 1973.

---. Philidore and Placentia; or L'Amour trop Delicat. In Four Before Richardson. Selected English Novels, 1720-1727. Ed. William H. McBurney. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963. 153-231.

---. Reflections on the Various Effects of Love. London: N. Dobb, 1726.

---. The Unequal Conflict; or Nature Triumphant. London:

- J. Walthoe and J. Crockatt, 1725.
- . The Wife. London: T. Gardner, 1756.
- Hic Mulier; or, The Man-Woman. In Half Humankind: Contexts and Texts of the Controversy about Women in England, 1540-1640. Eds. Katherine Usher Henderson and Barbara F. McManus. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1985. 264-276.
- Kuhn, Annette. "Sexual Disguise and Cinema." Popular Fiction. Ed. Tony Bennett. London: Routledge, 1990. 169-188.
- The Levellers. 1703; reprint, Pasadena: The Castle Press, 1988.
- Milton, John. Paradise Lost. Ed. Christopher Ricks. New York: New American Library, 1968.
- Mundus Foppensis; or The Fop Display'd. 1691; reprint, Pasadena: The Castle Press, 1988.
- Richetti, John J. Popular Fiction Before Richardson: Narrative Patterns, 1700-1739. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.
- . "Voice and Gender in Eighteenth-Century Fiction: Haywood to Burney." Studies in the Novel, 19(3), 1987. 311-322.
- Schofield, Mary Anne. Eliza Haywood. Boston: Twayne, 1985.
- . Masking and Unmasking the Female Mind. Toronto: Associated University Press, 1990.
- Showalter, Elaine. "Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness." Writing and Sexual Difference. Ed. Elizabeth Abel.

- Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. 9-36.
- . "The Rise of Gender." Speaking of Gender. London: Routledge, 1989. 1-16.
- Sponder, Dale. Mothers of the Novel. London: Pandora, 1986.
- Stone, Lawrence. The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977.
- Whicher, George F. The Life and Romances of Mrs. Eliza Haywood. New York: Columbia University Press, 1915.
- Williamson, Marilyn L. Raising Their Voices: British Women Writers, 1650-1750. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1990.