

REWRITING AND RICHARDSON'S PAMELA

IN THE INTEREST OF PRIVACY,
SOME NAMES HAVE BEEN CHANGED:
REWRITING AND RICHARDSON'S PAMELA

By

ANNE MILNE, 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

(c) Copyright by Anne Milne, September 1994

MASTER OF ARTS (1994)
(English)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: In the Interest of Privacy, Some Names Have Been
Changed: Rewriting and Richardson's Pamela

AUTHOR: Anne Milne, B.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Peter Walmsley

NUMBER OF PAGES: v, 101

Abstract

This study examines the issue of rewriting, its impact on Samuel Richardson's editorial and writing practice and the implications this practice has had for women. Using Richardson's 1741 novel, Pamela, as the example, the study focuses in its first chapter on the circumstances surrounding Richardson's creation of a sequel (Pamela II) to the enormously successful two-volume Pamela I.

In Chapter two, three rape scenes are closely read for the ways in which they are rewritten or retold by various characters and across the gap between "original" version and sequel. The pattern which emerges is one of increasing editorial control of Pamela's writing by her husband. Pamela is also shown to be complicit in this rewriting process.

In Chapter three, the author of this study enters into the rewriting process herself in order to explore the relationship between circumscribed women's roles in the Eighteenth Century and the situation for women today. This issue is explored through the use of feminist and psychoanalytic theory as well as contemporary media imagery.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my thesis supervisor, Peter Walmsley, for his generous support.



Table of Contents

Rewriting and Richardson's Editorial Frame.....	1-24
Rape and Rewriting within <u>Pamela</u> : Three Examples.....	25-64
The Seduction of Rewriting: My Version.....	65-95
Conclusion.....	96-98
Works Cited.....	99-101

Rewriting and Richardson's Editorial Frame

I have as a rule not reproduced the process of interpretation to which the patient's associations and communications had to be subjected, but only the results of that process.
Freud "Fragment of An Analysis of a Case of Hysteria"
(Penguin Freud Library, Vol. 8, 41).

Mass production and literary elite production share in important features of production, which have bearings on the question of representation. They share the principle of meritocracy and the irresponsibility of authorship, of production itself....The responsibility for production has been shoved off, apparently onto the shoulders of consumers, while the authority, the authorship of production has been made to disappear from view.
Susanne Kappeler, The Pornography of Representation, 129-30

An enormous amount of critical energy has been spent on tracing Pamela back to her source in order to "prove" that Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* is based on a "true story". This obsession, with its emphasis on social mobility and inheritance (was it possible that a story of such social mobility *actually* took place?), works to distract critical attention from other social issues, especially those that work to inscribe essential womanhood in the novel. Because both Richardson and *Pamela* are text producers we should not fail to consider how their production processes work in fashioning particular representations. Neither Richardson or *Pamela* was shy about stating their moral positions. Are their texts produced (together or separately) in particular ways to bolster these positions?

Richardson's editorial frame serves to mask his authority without diminishing it. Within the frame of the epistolary novel, *Pamela* rewrites Richardson's public opinions into her private thoughts and suspends them in the private form of the letter. Richardson never wholly passes the story over to *Pamela*. The truths in the novel remain those of a middle-aged merchant class man and not those of a fifteen-year-old waiting maid. Richardson's editorial frame informs us that the editor has selected and organized *Pamela's* letters.¹ In the business vocabulary of the period, Richardson is not only *Pamela's* editor, he is *Pamela's* publisher. We are never given any indication of how the

¹An interesting social question to ask is if *Pamela* could not have published her letters herself?

editor came to possess these letters, what his relationship is to Pamela who is presumably the owner of the letters, and what her cut of the profits will be.

Obviously Richardson's editorial frame of an anonymous editor for Pamela I² and the necessity of identifying himself as author in order to maintain control of the text are central to any understanding of Pamela's process. Pamela II's position as a text written solely, it seems, in order to rewrite (and re-right) the damage done by Pamela I's imitators and pirates makes it a particularly interesting text to look at from this point of view. If Pamela I is a product of Richardson's anxiety, it is also a document of Pamela's release from anxiety, from the no-state of virginity into marriage. Pamela II then, is a strange mix. Richardson's printer's face is exposed more clearly in Pamela II -- much of his discussion on polygamy for example comes from a book he printed for Patrick Delaney in 1737 called Reflections upon polygamy, and the encouragement given to that practice in the scriptures of the Old Testament (Sale, Master Printer, 165).³ In Pamela II Pamela moves

²I will refer throughout this paper to Volumes I and II as Pamela I and to Volumes III and IV as Pamela II. I have used the 1971 Riverside edition of Pamela I edited by Eaves and Kimpel and all references to Volumes I and II are taken from this edition. Because a combined edition of Pamela II was not available to me, I am using the 1929 Shakespeare Head edition of Volumes III and IV. Quotations from Pamela II will refer to the specific volume used.

³Alan McKillop identifies Pamela's "account of the masquerade...as inspired directly by the letters on masquerades in *Spectator* No.14 and *Guardian* No. 154". As well, McKillop asserts that some of Richardson's material for Pamela II "was supplied by friends; Alexander Gordon the antiquary sent him a short paper headed 'Some

not only into marriage but into authority as more and more of her writing becomes organized away from private letters and into publication.

Diagnosis: Agoraphobia?

But Richardson's anxiety does not just develop after Pamela I. Richardson was always anxious. The writing and publication of Pamela I involves Richardson in writing a kind of social mobility for himself with a movement from private letter writer to "editor" to public (not to mention famous) epistolary novelist. Richardson's particular anxiety is formally inscribed through the printing history of Pamela and his subsequent novels. As Alan McKillop describes it, "[s]erious and important works were usually published in a relatively expensive form, and then, if successful, in cheaper editions. In the publication of Pamela Richardson had reversed this order, testing his success at first with a duodecimo edition and then following it up with a sumptuous octavo" (McKillop, 155). Richardson was similarly cautious with the copyright of Pamela: "When I had written the two first Vols. of Pamela, and was urged by a particular Friend to put it to the Press, I accepted of 20 Guineas for two Thirds of the Copy-Right, reserving to myself only one Third." As McKillop points out, "[t]he continuation of Pamela, and the whole of Clarissa and Grandison, were Richardson's sole property" (McKillop, 153-4).

Thoughts about Operas' which duly appears w... as Mr. B.'s opinion" (McKillop, 58).

Richardson's caution is rooted in his moral commitment to text production as instruction. In initially urging him to "write a little volume of letters, in a common style" (Rivington, 33), the booksellers Osborn and Rivington, who saw Richardson's personal letters as formally exemplary, sought to capitalize on the market for an instruction manual on writing letters. Richardson pushed the issue farther by inquiring if it would "be any harm...if one should instruct them how they should think and act in common cases as well as *indite*?" (Rivington, 33). Richardson's commitment to instruction is emphasized later, in response to criticism of *Pamela*, when he writes to Stephen Duck: "I am contented to give my Profit if I can but instruct" (McKillop, 63).

It was with the publication of John Kelly's *Pamela's Conduct in High Life* (1741) that Richardson began to fear so much that he would "lose control" of *Pamela* (and I'm sure this fear was economic as well as psychological) that he publicly dropped the device of editorial anonymity in order to claim and maintain ownership and authorship of the content of the commodity, *Pamela*. According to a letter Richardson sent to James Leake in August 1741, Chandler, the bookseller, who had employed John Kelly to write this continuation of *Pamela*, defended his actions saying that he "understood that [Richardson] had neither the Leisure nor Inclination to pursue the Story". Richardson continued:

I told him it was true...but that I said it [was] upon a Supposition that no one would offer to meddle with it at least without consulting me: But that if such an attempt were made, I was resolved...to do it myself, rather than my Plan should be [basely] ravished⁴ out of my Hands, and, probably, my Characters depreciated and debased.... I told him that still I would decline continuing it, if he and other did not force me to it in my own Defence; but if they proceeded I must and would; and Advertise against them, as soon as they Published. He had the Assurance [Impudence] to propose to me, to join my Materials to their Author[s] and to [so] let it come out under my Name: A Proposal I rejected with the Contempt it deserved. Next he offered to cancel 4 Sheets he had printed...and to lose 9 Guineas...if I would continue it, for him and his Partners. (McKillop, 57)

McKillop goes on to describe Richardson as "writing [the continuation] under compulsion and with an oppressive sense of responsibility"

(McKillop, 57). As well, Richardson's health interfered with the enterprise, and in his letter to Leake there are references to "Tremors" along with a description of himself as "one whose old Complaints in the Nervous way require that he should sometimes run away from Business, and from himself, if he could" (McKillop, 53-4). Much of his energy during the last six months of 1741 was taken up writing statements, notices and announcements attacking the High Life Men who were intentionally associating their work with his original. To complicate

⁴Pamela I apparently represented more than mere text to Richardson. His use of verbs like "ravish'd" in reference to imitators' relationship to his text forms strong associations to Pamela's own experiences of attempted rape even as she proclaims her virtue in the novel.

matters and increase Richardson's anxiety, the Dublin booksellers "George Faulkner and George Ewing got out an unauthorized edition of Pamela early in 1741....[and] with magnificent impartiality...also printed Kelly's High Life, and either copied or concocted an advertisement calculated to delude unwary purchasers" (McKillop, 37).

Pamela's Books

Considering the distasteful and time-consuming drama Richardson becomes involved in as a result of Kelly's book and the works of the other Pamela imitators, Pamela II can be viewed as an extremely optimistic text product. Richardson articulates his own most positive production desires in Pamela's apparently smooth growth from letter writer to author. As an editorial effect of her social mobility Richardson creates an expectation that Pamela's writing (because it emanates from such an exemplary source) must be commodified and rendered formally marketable. She loses her modesty about publication. Increasingly, Pamela's writing becomes an echo of what the quality of Richardson's business life must have been. In Pamela II we are in contact with a wide variety of texts and kinds of text products. Pamela's letters are not only sidelined in Pamela II in order to make way for productions like her formal reviews of the plays she has seen in London, her thoughts on Locke's theories of education, her book of religious devotions and her nursery tales and stories, they begin to serve less than their original function of entertaining her

parents,⁵ or providing her with a future opportunity for self-reflection.⁶ Indeed, according to Alan McKillop, Richardson "entertained the idea that the success of his story would be to float miscellaneous discussions of these subjects" (McKillop, 58). An advertisement printed at the end of Pamela II not only points to this certainty but indicates just how unnerved Richardson had been by his experience with imitators after Pamela I was published.

There being Reason to apprehend,
 from the former Attempts of some Imitators,
 who, supposing the Story of PAMELA a
 Fiction, have murder'd that excellent Lady,
 and mistaken and misrepresented other
 (suppos'd imaginary) CHARACTERS, that
 Persons may not be wantonly who will impose
 new Continuations upon the Publick:

⁵She writes to her Father and Mother that she "shall write on, as long as I live, tho' I should have nothing but Sillinesses to write; for I know how to amuse yourselves at nights with what I write, because it is mine" (Pamela, 10).

⁶In Letter XLII, Pamela begins a journal of her imprisonment. Her purpose in writing the journal, according to a note from the "editor" is "In hopes some Opportunity might once be send it to her Friends, and, as was her constant View, that she might afterwards thankfully look back upon the Dangers she had escaped, when she should be happily over-blown, as in time she hoped they would be, and that then she might examine, and either approve of, or repent for, her own Conduct in them" (Pamela I, 94).

It is with a view to some Designs of this Nature, that the Editor, gives this publick Assurance, by way of Prevention, That all the Copies of Mrs. B.'s Observations and Writings, upon every Subject hinted at in the preceding Four Volumes, and in particular those relating to *Devotion, Education, Plays, &c.* are now in *One Hand Only*. And that, whenever they shall be published, (which at present is a Point undetermined)...[it will be] solely, at the Assignment of SAMUEL RICHARDSON, of *Salisbury-Court, Fleetstreet*, the Editor of these Four Volumes of *PAMELA*; or *VIRTUE REWARDED*. (McKillop, 58-9)

The production of Pamela's books preclude an alteration in the composition of her audience. Though Richardson begins, in *Pamela I*, to demonstrate the elasticity of the notion of audience, the act of letters read surreptitiously (especially by Mr. B.) ties into the movement of the plot and Richardson's moral web where Mr. B. is tangled by Pamela's language. In *Pamela II*, new audiences spring up like benevolently conquered colonies. Letters written to one person are suddenly being read by a whole family (the Davers) or a circle of women (Lady Davers and her friends). Copies of letters are made and inserted in other letters. Stories are rewritten and repeated. Richardson does not want to completely clean these readers' slates,⁷ but he cares very much about influencing and changing both this upper-class audience and the broader *Pamela* readership. Like a queen, Pamela demurely declines intentionality even as her audience, like her body and her family,

⁷Despite his merchant-class values, Richardson reveres much about the aristocracy.

expands.⁸ That expansion is wrapped with a naturalness that elides its own central assumption: that expansion itself is natural. Pamela's writing props up those assumptions. Her writing expands. Her body expands. Her family expands. Her wealth expands. Her benevolence expands. The last image of Pamela Richardson gives us is of her disbursing (with her charity book in hand, no doubt) Mr. Longman's wealth after his death. He had in his service to the "worthy family" died rich and left most of his money to Mr. B. (Vol. IV, 455-6).

Richardson may not have immediately recognized it but Pamela has grown up with the potential to become a very dangerous woman. Before marriage her "scribbling" is often described by aristocratic characters as threatening the social order and unnatural in a girl of her class.⁹ Therefore, just as her body (and the bodies of most adult women in the period) is controlled through continuous pregnancy, after marriage, Pamela's writing is controlled both through its increased commodification and the strict editorial direction of her husband.

⁸She does not seem at all surprised to learn, for example, that her character is "admired" in Jamaica (Vol. IV, 270).

⁹Mr. B. even makes this criticism of Pamela in the conversations with his mother which he describes in Pamela II.

Pamela's Conger

During the two decades from which examples have been drawn of Richardson's printing for groups of booksellers, there flourished two congers whose organization was permanent enough for them to be known by names -- the so-called "Old Conger" [formed in 1719] and the "New Conger" [formed in 1738 --this is the conger Richardson would have printed for since it included the Rivingtons]. They were joint stock associations in which membership changed only infrequently, though shares were sometimes bought and sold. Copyrights held by members represented a considerable sum....These congers gained a certain amount of ill-repute because they were thought to be powerful combines that could bring an author to terms....I have found little evidence to suggest that the congers dealt unfairly with authors. It is true, however, that they were generally unwilling to publish books that were financial risks even though genuine contributions to knowledge.

William M. Sale Jr., Samuel Richardson: Master Printer, p. 96.

Though bibliographical evidence supports the idea that by the time Richardson published *Pamela II*, she determined to remain personally in control of his printing text product and his authorship of those texts, Pamela is very ambivalently portrayed as an author. She is both servant to and mistress of her text. Though Richardson's editorial frame is still in place in the sense that he continues to write a fiction for her and the action of the main plot, and though she is instructed by her husband to privilege scribbling over other activities, Pamela appears to exercise an editorial practice which includes moving from letter to journal to letter forms as it suits her and making various kinds of editorial decisions. Because of her new social position there is a

delicacy in the balance which she is sometimes able to control that is unlike the rough desperation of the texts she creates in Pamela I. She also engages in two-way correspondence to a degree not seen in Pamela I. On the other hand, the mere demand for her letters by her constantly growing audience makes her a prisoner of her own writing practice.¹⁰

Richardson's design for Pamela II appears to be that once married, Mr. B. has editorial control over Pamela's writing. When, at the end of Pamela I, Mr. B. presents her with the rules for marriage, many of them specifically deal with Pamela's presentation of Mr. B. in public. None of them, though, specifically refer to her writing. Mr. B. is able to both recognize the value of her writing and understand its potential for abuse. Pamela's memorandum book becomes much more than just a household record, it serves as an aid to memory. As she writes to Mr. B: "for every time I am pleased with a conversation, and have leisure before I get out of my room, I enter it down as near the very words I can" (Vol. II, 100). Mr. B. uses Pamela's memory-book to his advantage particularly when she records his public speeches and actions. Mr. B.'s assignment for Pamela -- to "review" Locke's Some

never really learn whether Pamela likes being an author. Indeed, her existence as a writer is often associated with her states of anxiety. In Pamela I, afraid that she will be unable to write and denied an audience she becomes consumed with hiding paper, pens, ink and most importantly, letters, during her imprisonment. In Pamela II, she speaks not of how she enjoys writing but how she "cannot write without a pen in her hand" (Vol. IV, 238), and she chooses to write even at the risk of her own health, during crises -- in this case, Billy's serious illness. Richardson forces her to write. To be exemplary is to suffer, is to be too good to be true.

Thoughts on Education in writing works as a means to monopolize Pamela's writing time. What their personal relationship suffers in this artificial portrayal of a husband and wife who write to each other about the education of their children (as it is read through Locke's text), Mr. B. benefits at least by knowing who Pamela's prime correspondent is.¹¹ Mr. B.'s knowledge of Pamela's correspondents becomes crucial for him during the masquerade affair, and it is not insignificant that Pamela's letters to him on education follow the conclusion of that episode.

Indeed the issue of how private Pamela's letters are permitted to be once she is married is an interesting demonstration of the B.'s power relations. Though she still hides letters in her bosom, the scenes in which this occurs in Pamela II play themselves out differently from that in the first bosom snatching (where Mr. B., caught, apparently, in a jealous fantasy that Pamela is writing to a rival admirer, snatches and reads her letter to her parents). For one thing, the act of Mr. B. snatching a letter from Pamela's bosom becomes less an overtly sexual act in Pamela II. After all, as his wife, Pamela's body already belongs to him. There are other aspects of Pamela's body which can only be negotiated after marriage. The primary negotiation takes place around Pamela's pregnant body and her desire to breastfeed. By the end of Volume III, she has begun to discuss the issue in her correspondence with Polly Darnford.

¹¹Pamela's duty to her husband is further emphasized formally by her decision to "leave one side of the leaf to your corrections and alterations" (Vol. IV, 361).

Richardson uses the success or failure of the bosom snatch as a formal reiteration of his moral position on the topics being discussed; Mr. B. sees Pamela put the letter to Polly Darnford into her bosom but does not remove it because she negotiates with him based on Polly's request for privacy and successfully wins this right (Vol. III, 416). Though she is permitted to discuss the issue privately (and she later writes to her parents for their opinion on the subject), she does not, ultimately, win the right to breastfeed. It is her bosom but obviously not her choice. During the masquerade affair, in Volume IV, Pamela and Mr. B. have become sufficiently alienated from each other¹² that Pamela is able to anticipate Mr. B.'s entrance and hide her letter to Lady Davers in her bosom without being detected. This is not to imply though that Pamela behaves coldly or with calculation. She is, in fact, desperate to appear calm, to be composed. Composure, after all, is one of her wifely duties. Composition is more and more the kind of writing practice she engages in as her writing becomes more managed and project-oriented. The correspondence she wants to hide from Mr. B. -- to which she talks as she hears him -- is comprised of writing which reveals just how unstable she is becoming in her knowledge of his relationship with the Countess.

¹²She has presumably also become a more adequate and efficient wife and household manager, having already fully secretly managed the affair between Jackey and Polly Barrow.

But here I must break off.
 He is returned, and coming up. Go into my
 Bosom for the present, O letter dedicated to
 dear Lady Davers! -- Come to my Hand, the
 Play Employment,¹³ so unsuited to my present
 afflicted Mind! -- Here he comes!
 (Vol. IV, 157)

Her behaviour, as these letters reveal is, in Mr. B.'s terms, less than exemplary, though it is interesting with what sympathy and solidarity she is treated by Lady Davers. This female support marks a pale women's sphere subsumed and co-opted for the most part by loyalty to wifely duty but still able to operate, especially when traditional roles or family are threatened as is the case here.

While Richardson is forced to "go public" after Kelly's book is published, he is also permitted to expose his anxiety both publicly and privately. Pamela's public acts and private acts are carefully circumscribed by her husband's rules (which instruct her primarily to cover-up) and her own fear of appearing anything less than exemplary. Jealousy, as a vice, is an emotion that Pamela must gain control of. Richardson rewards Mr. B.'s virtue when the affair with the Countess is abandoned by allowing him to demand, possess and read the correspondence on the affair between Pamela and Lady Davers and as a result learns of Pamela's true lack of composure.¹⁴ To create the

¹³If we can assume that this "play employment" is needlework, it has an ironic resonance since earlier in *Pamela II*, Mr. B. has told Pamela to leave needlework to her maids and pursue writing. In an alert frame of mind, Mr. B. would have been able to enter the room and "read" Pamela's "play employment" as a false step.

¹⁴When he is assured that only Lady D. has been party to Pamela's anxiety around the affair he sets a strict deadline of three days

illusion of equality and undermine the proper realignment of their marriage, Mr. B. insists that Pamela read any correspondence that passes between him and the Countess (Vol. III, 246). Both he and the Countess subsequently tell Pamela "their stories". These retellings, in their "openness" and "frank" revelations do nothing to reveal the real private discomposure of Mr. B. but are designed to recompose the marriage and allow Pamela to function within it in her proper capacity. Pamela is totally complicit in this rewriting. One of her exemplary characteristics is that though she allows herself the occasional ironic aside (her italicized comments on Mr. B.'s rules at the end of Pamela I, for example) she is fundamentally in agreement with the regulation of women within "proper" married life. As the marriage "re-rights" itself, Pamela's letters become longer and concentrate on supporting Mr. B.'s version of the affair.

There are other ways in which the movement in these passages distinguishes public from private space. As well, we begin to see that public and private space can be subdivided creating, for example, layers of "publics" to whom Pamela must be, in different ways, accountable. Pamela the waiting maid is very much a public figure in the sense that her social position relative to Mr. B.'s does not allow her the privilege of privacy. Anything she might appear to hide from Mr. B. threatens his right of control over her. Though this situation still exists greatly for the married Pamela -- Mr. B. has ultimate sanction over her acts -- it is by which all of Pamela and Lady Davers correspondence must be delivered to him (Vol. IV, 201).

class ascendancy, at least, seems to include a private space in which she can operate. This space, indeed, is part of her growing sphere as mistress of the house. In Pamela II, we see her filling up (just as her body is filled up during pregnancy) into her new role. Pamela can legitimately request or entertain requests that explicitly include naming crises (like the Jackey and Polly affair) and withholding letters from Mr. B. But Pamela's private acts as a wife are always held accountable within the mini-public sphere of the family.¹⁵

This multiplicity of publics can be observed through others who are involved with Pamela's texts. Both Lady Davers and Polly Darnford play important roles in influencing and overtly directing what Pamela writes in Pamela II. Pamela also engages in complex rewriting in order to provide, achieve and maintain the expectations Lady Davers and Polly Darnford have in their relationship with her. Indeed, Lady Davers appears to recognize the values of Pamela's writing sight unseen when she hinges her approval of her son's marriage on what she hopes to read in Pamela's journal of imprisonment (Pamela I, 374). In inviting a tutelary relationship, Lady Davers has obviously read and approved of the earlier journal. In Pamela's first letter to Lady Davers she spends some of time honouring Lady Davers' mother as Pamela, then, part of Lady Davers' inheritance in Pamela II, just as she was seen

¹⁵It is no accident that Lady Davers is her correspondent during the masquerade affair, just as the waiting-maid Pamela wrote to her parents.

as Mr. B.'s inheritance in Pamela I?) and apologizing for her inability to write.

In her correspondence with Lady Davers there is a tension articulated between what Lady Davers commands Pamela to write and what she actually decides to write (or send). One of the most common ways that Pamela exercises her editorial will on Lady Davers is to send her more than she "requires," though not always more of Pamela's own writing. Transcription plays its role here, for Pamela can send a letter to Lady Davers which is constructed from pieces of other correspondent's letters.¹⁶ At the very beginning of their correspondence Pamela manages both to point out to the fact that now that she is mistress of a household she has less time to devote to writing and to enclose "not only the copy of the Letter your Ladyship desired me to send you, but my Father's answer to it" (Vol. III, 58). She also, through the use of self-deprecating flattery, hints to Lady Davers that the character of her writing will be different from that of her undirected "virginal" letters. "I will proceed to obey your ladyship, and write with as much freedom as I possibly can: for you must not expect that I can entirely divest myself of that awe which will necessarily lay me under a greater restraint, than if I was writing to my father and

¹⁶Transcription, in this context, does comprise a subtle form of publication. The issue of copy right (does Pamela have the right to copy the writing of others and distribute it?) is not explored by Richardson. Though it preoccupied him a great deal in his own practice, what McKillop points out about his own indiscriminate borrowing of other people's writing for his book contradicts this one. Please see note on page 3 or McKillop, 58.

mother" (58). Though Lady Davers continually "requires," (58) "desires," (58) "commands," (62) "insists," (101), Pamela often manages to control the content and quantity of their correspondence. But there are ways in which her correspondents manage and control her. As her children, too, become text products, especially through Pamela's analysis of Locke,¹⁷ her instruction to the young ladies¹⁸ and her nursery tales and stories, it is important to remember the letter near the beginning of Volume IV in which Lady Davers names Pamela's children. Pamela's ability to produce appropriate heirs for Mr. B. and properly extend their family is really what is central in Lady Davers' correspondence with Pamela.

Just as Lady Davers directs Pamela to produce writing on certain topics, and, indeed, to produce books of play reviews and devotions for her personal use, Polly directs Pamela to write for her. Though Lady Davers recognizes Pamela as exemplary, she does not seek Pamela's correspondence as a guide to life in the way that Polly does. Polly Darnford is motivated not only by Pamela's exemplary status to maintain a correspondence with her but by her own need for entertainment and her desire to winter with the B's in London. She allows her parents access to Pamela's letters, hoping to gain their consent. She appears to

¹⁷She talks to Mr. B. about reading the child in order to respond properly to Locke's book.

¹⁸Pamela's discussion with Miss Stapylton is particularly revealing here (Vol. IV, 425-32).

express concern for Pamela's terror of childbirth by attempting to distract her with a direction to write:

First, Where he has borne with any Infirmity of your own; and I know of none where you can give him such an Opportunity, except you get into a vapourist Habit by giving way to a Temper too thoughtful and apprehensive: Next, That, in Complaisance to your Will, he recedes from *his own*, in any one Instance: Next, Whether he breaks not into your Retirements unceremoniously, and without Apology or Concern; as I have hinted above (Vol. III, 410).

This concern, though, masks Polly Darnford's own need to impress her parents with examples of Pamela's exemplary family life and her own preoccupation with her unmarried state.

Richardson uses Polly Darnford's unresolved sexual status as an opportunity to discuss upper-class attitudes towards virginity from the point of view of both the virgin and her father. Pamela's class background and the relative powerlessness of her father did not allow Richardson to explore this relationship in Pamela I. Polly presents her relationship with her father, Simon Darnford, as difficult in order to enlist Pamela's support. Indeed, there is some mirroring of the Pamela-Mr. B. relationship in Polly's feelings of imprisonment as well as in Simon Darnford's unreasonableness, his violence and his desire to control Polly. But when Pamela presumes to give Simon Darnford advice, he reacts by writing to Mr. B. He is very much affronted by his daughter's attempt to have Pamela, exemplary as she is, interfere in his regulation of her. The sexual regulation of daughters is a topic for

discussion only by men. Darnford's view is given some weight by the fact that he is not Polly's seducer, but her father. His concern, as he expresses it to Mr. B., is to regulate Polly's sexuality and he considers it his fatherly duty to do so. Though Simon Darnford was a Pamela supporter by the end of Pamela I, in Pamela II he appears now to fear his daughter's too close relationship with her. The fact that Pamela is pregnant seems particularly to bother him. His worry, as he expresses it in a letter to Mr. B., is that the B's will show Polly "all the Game of a Lying-in; and, at least, set the Girl a longing to make one in the Dance before I have found out the proper Man for her Partner" (Vol III, 139). He also fears that Mr. B.'s passions (and only from an old rake) will be awakened by the presence of a young virgin in his household. But Richardson undermines any authority Simon Darnford has by portraying him humourously, especially in Mr. B.'s letter. In doing so he is able to assert that part of Pamela's example is to demonstrate a progression of attitudes, a movement from aristocratic values regarding inheritance to middle-class ones.

Through Polly's long letters to Pamela we learn a great deal about other, perhaps more typical marriage arrangements made for young girls of the upper classes.¹⁹ Richardson's inclusion in Mr. B.'s rules of Rule 21 -- "that Love before Marriage is absolutely Necessary" (Pamela I, 370) -- is actually played out in the story that Polly Darnford writes of her movement from virgin to married woman. Polly rebels. Though

¹⁹Richardson explores this in more detail in Clarissa.

she is the eldest daughter, Polly passes one suitor whom she does not like on to an unhappy marriage with her disagreeable sister Nancy (whom she also does not like). She also rejects a potential match proposed by Lady Devers, who hopes to marry her to Jackey, because she has found someone she can and does marry for love and, of course, is very happy.²⁰ Richardson cannot rewrite Pamela's past since that would erase the valuable lesson in it for servant girls. He does, though, by expanding Polly Darnford's role in Pamela II, create a space in which courtship of a different sort can be discussed.

Given the freedom to imagine shopping a spouse (just like shopping!) both Pamela and Polly initially fall victim to a romanticization of courtship. Because Pamela cannot erase her own past and Polly cannot emulate it, Pamela laughs away the terror of her own experience, firmly associates its occurrence with her social status, and fantasizes an ideal courtship which Polly will supply her with and more importantly write to her about.

Pray, then, let me know how Gentlemen court
 their Equals in Degree; how they look when
 they address you, with their Knees bent,
 sighing, supplicating, and *all that*, as Sir
 Simon says, with the words Slave, Servant,
 Admirer, continually at their tongues' ends.
 (Vol. III, 160)

²⁰Richardson does temper this other absurdly happy love story in the conclusion with the news that "Lady G --, Miss DARNFORD that was...died in Childbed of her Fourth Child" (Vol. IV, 454). This may connect directly to the loss of Richardson's own first wife but also underlines the fact that for him the ultimate authority is God.

Polly requires this kind of support from Pamela. Polly's questions to Pamela about her marriage help Pamela engage in this form of daydream rewriting. She is able to reiterate Polly's own hopes and fears and lead her through this socially prescribed, anxious and uncertain time. When Polly becomes Pamela's spokesperson during her first confinement, Richardson emphasizes Polly's role as Pamela's apprentice, though she seems to reject Pamela's fears in favour of Mr. B.'s sensible authority and willingly deludes Pamela into believing that the midwife is merely her visiting relative. Her unwitting dual role as Pamela's apprentice and Mr. B.'s accomplice is demonstrated in another way during this episode. Mr. Stanford is unable to keep letters hidden. In "her joy" following Billy's birth, she gives the letter to Mr. B. which was intended to be read only if Pamela dies. In the letter are directions, for example, for finding Pamela's text on the Jackey and Polly affair which she has kept a secret from Mr. B. Polly's virginity and her inexperience apparently do not allow her to control herself yet she has successfully controlled many other situations.

There is a sense in which Pamela can be seen as much more in control of the relationship and Polly as awkward and naive. Yet it is not enough for Pamela, as a character, to simply and continually strike exemplary poses. Richardson pushes Pamela's writing toward publication, toward the market, precisely because behaving in an exemplary manner means that Pamela's behaviour must reach a wider audience and serve as an example. In order to be morally beneficial,

Pamela's example, like a contagion, must rewrite itself in others. Polly Darnford controls Pamela in that Pamela needs her and needs the kind of issues Polly's reality presents. Polly Darnford enables Pamela to be useful and productive. Polly, herself, is also useful. Not quite as inately virtuous as Pamela, Polly Darnford demonstrates that one can, with the proper example, grow into her role.

Rape and Rewriting within Pamela: Three Examples

Richardson's decision to present Pamela as a non-fiction collection of letters written by Pamela herself commits him to accounts (at least in Vols. I & II) written primarily from Pamela's point-of-

37. That a Wife should therefore draw a kind Veil over her Husband's Faults.
38. That such as she could not conceal, she should extenuate.
39. That his Virtues she should place in an Advantageous Light.
40. And shew the World, that he had HER good Opinion at least.

from Mr. B's rules for a good wife
as transcribed by Mrs. B.
Pamela I, 371.

view. The voices and thoughts of other characters are carried through the epistolary form (sometimes through letters written by others contained within Pamela's letters) and mediated by Pamela. Though verbal exchanges and conversations are often reproduced within Pamela's letters, it is not until Vol. III (Pamela II) that long passages marked with inverted commas appear. Here, the speaking voice of Mr. B. is no longer truly mediated by Pamela's account of the events although it is she who records and transcribes his words "verbatim". This shift in balance may indicate a reassessment of the delicate power relations between Mr. B. and Pamela. The assumption may be that through their marriage Pamela's voice has been subsumed by his or that their voices have been united. This difference in point-of-view or speaking voice is particularly important when we look at the writing and rewriting of an early attempted rape scene.

Marriage necessarily requires the two to speak in one voice, a voice determined primarily by Mr. B.

“I found his Hand in my Bosom” (but, of course, there was a perfectly reasonable explanation for it)

The first **writing** of this scene (Pamela I Letter XXV) is “to the moment”. Mr. B. conceals himself in Mrs. Jervis’s closet just before she and Pamela retire. The scene is constructed by Richardson to reflect Pamela’s artlessness against Mr. B.’s calculated infamy. She is not consciously engaged in **publication** (as she is later in Pamela I and throughout Pamela II). She is childishly confident in writing to her father and mother that she “shall write on, as long as I stay, tho’ I should have nothing but Sillinesses to write; for I know you divert yourselves at Nights with what I write, because it is mine” (Pamela I, 60). She is unaware that she will soon be writing to them of another attempt on her Virtue. She is also certainly unaware that her letters are being redirected (in a kind of publishing piracy²¹) by John Arnold to Mr. B. before they are read by her parents. In Pamela II the attempted rape is **retold publicly** by Mr. B. to a select (and selected) after-dinner audience. Mr. B’s telling is later transcribed (the retelling is twice rewritten) by Pamela into her Memorandum Book²² and from there into a letter to Polly Darnford (Vol. III, Letter XXIX). While it can be argued that both tellings are realistic — in keeping with what each of the characters would have said or done or felt — Mr. B’s story is calcu-

lated to retell and reframe Pamela's writing of the story in order to ensure that her version ultimately serves and becomes subservient to his.

When it comes time for Mr. B. to actually retell the tale, he manufactures a false start. This not only creates a degree of anticipation among the characters present (as well as Polly Darnford and the larger readership), but it allows Mr. B., by giving him the opportunity to schedule a storytelling performance, to forewarn Pamela that her transcription skills will be needed, and to permit him to rehearse and select the content of his confession. For Lady Davers, initially, catches Mr. B. off-guard. During a scene in which Mr. B. and Lord Davers²³ are teasing and coaxing Lady Davers to call Pamela "sister", she retaliates or, perhaps, seeks to divert attention from the subject by questioning her brother about the rape attempts on Pamela. Richardson cleverly complicates the scene by weaving Mr. B.'s retelling with Lady Davers's disapproval of Lord Davers's frequently calling Pamela sister. Although often portrayed elsewhere in the text as rash and emotional, Lady Davers is controlled enough, aware enough of the public consequence of her actions, to ask Jackey and Polly Barlow to leave the room before she speaks (inadvertently giving them the opportunity to act in their own affair). Mr. B. is "disconcerted" (Vol. III, 183) by the fact that Lady Davers offers him along with her public, verbal accusation a textual version of the rape attempt (a copy of Pamela's letter accounting the rape attempt). This transcribed letter read not only by Lady Davers but by the other readers of her correspondence with Pamela (and this would

include Lady Betty who had been the Lady Davers' choice for Mr. B's wife) constitutes the **publication** of an act it has been in his best interests to keep private. He begs to continue the discussion later in the day.

If Mr. B. was seduced and possessed by Pamela's text in *Pamela I*, by the time this retelling occurs in *Pamela II* it is apparent that Mr. B. has regained his composure, so to speak, and has taken on the metaphoric role of Pamela's publisher. Socially (and this is achieved, in part, by the **public** nature of Mr. B's telling), the retelling dictates Pamela's story back to her in a more acceptable form. This is also a literal dictation since it is Pamela who records and reports the retelling verbatim. The retelling also serves to reinforce dominant social values around rape and quickly quell rebellious, alternative views on the subject.

Lady Davers' role in the publication of Mr. B's infamy is also effectively diffused by his retelling. Pamela refers to herself as Lady Davers's "happy correspondent" in an early letter (Vol. III, 56). Their relationship, we are to assume, in the gap between *Pamela I* and *Pamela II*, has become one of devoted sisters-in-law. Lady Davers and her circle become established, in the early letters of *Pamela II*, as a community of women (a sisterhood?) who read Pamela's texts. Her letters to Pamela are a response to readings of both Pamela's previous letters and her current ones particularly in the light of her new position of relative social power. Lady Davers and her circle question, for example, Pamela's decision to forgive Mrs. Jewkes. A discussion through epistolary exchange ensues in which Pamela

presents the logic behind her decision and ultimately convinces the ladies that she is not only wise beyond her class and correct in her decision, but that she is the exemplary individual whom Mr. B. vigorously promotes.

Lady Davers' live introduction of Pamela's pre-marital letters into an extended social context that includes men represents an attempt to distribute and publicize these epistolary discussions. She has, in effect, tried to take over guardianship of Pamela's text. As Mr. B.'s older sister, Lady Davers often attempts to control Mr. B by appealing to his sense of family, while Mr. B. asserts his social superiority. She can ultimately and with social sanction, though, be controlled by him. Her physical gesture of waving Pamela's letters (what might be considered the true, solid evidence) at Mr. B. is disempowered by his speech. Within the context of the narrative (the progress of Mr. B.), this women's publishing venture is allowed to go no further. The only thing Lady Davers can do following Mr. B's version of the story is to fold and return the letters to her pocket. Just as Pamela's earlier attempt to "publish" her story and win support among the Lincolnshire gentry failed, Lady Davers' attempt to publish Pamela's story and have it read as the official story is thwarted by Mr. B's apparent ready willingness to **confess**. His **confession** neatly rewrites the story.

Much of this entire retelling sequence is staged by Mr. B. At the end of Pamela I, it is clear that he has taken control of Pamela's letters. Though Lady Davers informs Pamela in their bedside chat at the end of Volume II that she intends to read her letters, it is to Mr. B. that Lady Davers applies

when, having been moved by her servant's **telling** of Pamela's story, she wants to read the letters. There is a sense, then, that Mr. B. (taking into account his sister's volatile personality and his awareness that she has been reading Pamela's papers) must have anticipated this drawing room scene in Pamela II. It is curious, for example, that Lady Davers uses the first attempted rape scene rather than the more calculated and violent attempt at the Lincolnshire house to castigate Mr. B. Lady Davers's access to Pamela's papers is incomplete. This is due not only to Mr. B.'s position as publisher/bookseller but to the increasing complexity of Pamela's audience and the number of readers she now needs to serve.²⁴ In her artless manner, Pamela still primarily perceives her letters as a distraction for her aging parents. Often other readers cannot get access to particular letters because they are still with her parents.

Part of the staging of Mr. B.'s retelling is contained in the very production of Pamela's letters. In Letter XXIX, Pamela writes to Polly Darnford that she has less time to transcribe and that "my dear friend **permits** (my emphasis) me to rise an hour sooner than usual, that I may have time to scribble" (Vol. III, 165). Mr. B., as her Master, privileges Pamela's writing over her needlework which "your Maids can do" (Vol. III, 165) in order to ensure that by the time he tells his history, Pamela will faithfully and accurately record his words.²⁵ He is aware of the powerful influence Pamela's letters have. Lady Davers, in fact, begins one letter to Pamela not with her own words but with a quotation by Mr. B. taken from "the early

part of your papers" (Vol. III, 97). Mr. B. may recognize and wish to promote the pedagogical potential of the letter form.²⁶ As he has made clear in his rules for a good wife outlined and duly recorded by Pamela at the end of Volume II, part of a wife's duty lies in her ability to create complimentary representations of her husband in public. Mrs. B. now has a private life to protect and a sense of duty not to her father and her virgin state but to her husband. What Pamela wrote about Mr. B. in her unmarried state must be rewritten in the light of her new status.

The story Mr. B. offers his audience differs quite substantially from Pamela's version. Writing to the moment tends to narrow the immediate scope of events and emphasize minutia. Here, though, the scale of events is expanded. In his own defense, Mr. B. emphasizes his motivation. Writing to the moment disallows this defense by insisting upon access to a limited point of view and the slow accumulation of actions as the only means by which the reader can assess character. In this epistolary novel, though Mr. B. understands the power and effectiveness of letter writing, he writes very few letters. Mr. B.'s retelling is an important moment in *Pamela II* for, by retelling this story in a different way (not just with different details), Mr. B. is able to take charge of his story and ultimately take charge of the story. By pushing the story beyond Pamela's perception into a past she has passed no comment on, Mr. B. produces a marginally cleaner slate on which he can begin writing himself.

Because Lord and Lady Davers have a part in this extended past, Mr. B.

must manage them and their reactions gently. Mr. B. shows particular care in his manipulation of Lady Davers. It is her anger, after all, which has brought about the retelling. In order to ultimately win her favour and have the family speak in one voice, Mr. B. must skillfully harness and direct her anger. Pamela dutifully records in an aside to Polly Darnford the "*Out-upon-you's* of the attentive ladies, and *Fie Brother's* of Lord Davers" (Vol. III, 188). Lady Davers' interruptions of Mr. B.'s narrative are also recorded by Pamela. Lord and Lady Davers are seen to respond emotionally to Mr. B.'s worst revelations especially since they have never before been allowed to have access to his "real" thoughts. Mr. B. answers these reactions with an ever reasonable tone and an expression of honest intentions: "Yet I ought to tell you all the truth, or nothing" (Vol. III, 191). Mr. B. openly invites comment from Lady Davers by acknowledging her presence in his past. He uses asides such as "as you know, Sister" (Vol. III, 191) to place Lady Davers as an actor in and especially as a witness to this past. Because part of Mr. B.'s tactic is to chart his own progress from rake to husband, Lady Davers' nod to his profligate past serves to signpost the eventual change in his character and behaviours.

Mr. B. winds the narrative back about two years prior to where Richardson begins Volume I and Pamela's letters begin. The attempts on Pamela's virtue, which are the focus of Volume I, are not entirely replaced by Mr. B's long preamble to the retelling of the attempted rape; they are simply reframed or, as Mr. B. himself might put it, placed in their proper

context. Mr. B. sets up a tension, for example, between his desire for Pamela even at thirteen and his ability to wait a considerable length of time before love “unmans” him (Vol. III, 185) and he makes an attempt on her virtue. This serves to subtly yet quite thoroughly to rewrite him. From the sober rake whom his mother cries over (Vol. III, 190), he progresses to the state of patient (and somehow subdued) rake. Though he is careful to emphasize Pamela’s complete indifference to him he writes her as

both the source of his discomfort and the cause of his new-found stability. On his return from a trip to France, for example, he says that “I found her so much improved, as well in Person as Behaviour, that I had the less inducement either to renew my intriguing Life, or to think of a married State” (Vol. III, 192).

Pushing the story back also allows the audience(s) and readers to view the relationship between mother and son, a relationship which Richardson, because of the editorial framework he imposed, was unable to develop in *Pamela I*.²⁷ The introduction of his mother as character in Mr. B.’s retelling works not only to aid in establishing Mr. B.’s moti-



I am glad to hear this from my son,
replied the good lady (Vol. III, 110
[Crosscup]).

vation and map his psychological state by giving him a “good woman” to play opposite, but again serves as a means of controlling Lady Davers. Though Lady Davers appears more harsh and worldly than their mother, Mr. B., by capitalizing on her own memories of their mother and sense of family loss, “blinds” Lady Davers in a manner parallel to the way that he had blinded his mother to his true intentions regarding Pamela “by dropping hints against her” (Vol. III, 188). What Mr. B. hopes to hide from Lady Davers is precisely that she has been manipulated by him. By ordering him to account for his past behaviour, Lady Davers, in an apparent paradox, both unwittingly and willingly enables Mr. B. to rewrite Pamela’s letter. The sense of complicity in all this exists, of course, because Lady Davers ultimately wants her outrage answered reasonably in the interest of “family”. At the same time she has truly been won over to Pamela’s cause. Her struggle to voice the word “sister” is part of the essential spirit of reform in the novel. Pamela’s virtue (and in Pamela II she achieves a state of purity beyond virginity) catalyzes reform in the entire family. Pamela II seems designed primarily to catalogue this reform as it pervades not only the immediate family but the family circle and their class. With his retelling, Mr. B. intervenes to ensure that Lady Davers and Pamela’s sisterhood are encompassed by the larger paternal familial frame.

Much of the need for retelling and rewriting turns on the fact that Mr. B. eventually marries Pamela. Pamela’s initial writing of the scene, even as she is terrorized by Mr. B., strives to present him sympathetically.

Virtue, after all, in order to be rewarded, cannot burn its bridges. Part of this portrayal is in deference to his social position as her master. Pamela is aware of her parents as her intended audience²⁸ and tailors her tale to emphasize her expression of the attitudes and behaviours of which they would approve. Within the larger editorial frame, if Richardson's concern is to show Pamela as virtuous, then her ability to view Mr. B. sympathetically works also to convince the unintended readers of Pamela's letters (including Mr. B. himself) that her thoughts, even under grave trial, remain pure. In addition, Richardson needs to make the story work convincingly. Without the ability to enact a reform in Pamela's character Richardson must show that she is throughout the letters, capable of *real feeling* for Mr. B. As she put it in answer to Lady Davers's inquiry at the end of Volume II.

But tell me truly, said she, Did you not love him
all the time? I had always, Madam, answer'd I, a
great Reverence for my Master, and thought all
his good Actions doubly good; and for his
naughty ones, tho' I abhorred his Attempts upon
me, yet I could not hate him; and always wish'd
him well; but I did not know that it was Love.
(Pamela I, 373)

Pamela excuses Mr. B.'s behaviour as a kind of madness. In the letter preceding the attempted rape scene, Pamela confides to her parents that

I really am concern'd that my poor Master should cast such a Thought upon such a Creature as me; for besides the Disgrace it has quite turn'd his temper; and I begin to think he likes me and can't help it; and yet strives to conquer it, and so finds no way but to be cross to me. (Pamela I, 60)

Later in the same letter and quite poignantly she describes how he grasps, her, pushes her away, orders her taken away, then calls her back. When she, confused, does not come, he follows her and brings her back with such a firm grip that he bruises her arm.²⁹ In his retelling, Mr. B. acknowledges this madness (he, in fact, begins his story with a preamble about the power of love) but concentrates on how much control he is able to exercise over his emotions. At the crucial moment in the retelling, the moment of the actual rape attempt, Mr. B. does not become “caught up” in his telling. Rather, he first interrupts the narrative flow to give a bow to the judges “at your dread Tribunal” (Vol. III, 208) and then proceeds to describe quite a different scene from the one Pamela depicted.

Though Pamela, in Volume I, puts a great deal of emphasis on her moment by moment feelings during the scene, she also devotes a great deal of time to recording the conversation that passes between her and Mrs. Jervis. Mr. B. who claims that his purpose in hiding in Mrs. Jervis's room was “in order to hear their private Conversation” (Vol. III, 209) devotes none of his retelling to details of that conversation. Mr. B. develops a seamless logic in his narration through the use of several techniques. A kind of back and forth argumentation effectively plays with the illusion of

**“...and had very few sallies”³⁰:
Sally Godfrey stories**

The placement of the first hint of the Sally Godfrey story at the end of Volume II sets the story within the context of the reformed and married Mr. B. Pamela, as well, views both the telling and the retelling of the Sally Godfrey story from her new position as a married woman. Richardson does not provide us with an account of Sally's experience written to the moment. Mr. B. tells Pamela two versions of the Sally Godfrey story, both contained in the journal entries written to Pamela's mother and father. Pamela reports to Lady Davers in a letter in Volume III on her response to Mr. B.'s second retelling. In Volume IV, Sally Godfrey writes a carefully planned letter (using her new name, Mrs. Sarah Wrightson). As Mrs. Wrightson, she has rewritten her own story. Echoing the writing of the attempted rape scene in Volume I and Mr. B.'s rewriting in Volume III, the Sally Godfrey rewriting also favours the reformed Mr. B.

There is a certain implausibility to the whole fiction of Mrs. Wrightson which can be explained by the manner in which families control public access to their private sins when they close ranks around a scandal.³¹ News of Pamela's character (and no doubt her class background) has reached the enclave of polite English society in Jamaica “where you have as many admirers as have heard of you” (Vol. IV, 270), yet Mrs. Wrightson (apparently for some years since she now has two children

with Mr. Wrightson) has been able to keep the truth of her past from her husband and pass herself off as a widow whose child “was the Care of her Papa’s Friends, particularly of good Lady *Davers*, and her Brother” (Vol. IV, 272-3). In the dairy house telling of his relationship with Sally Godfrey, Mr. B. emphasizes the cooperation between and within the two families around hiding the story (although, it seems, there had been little cooperation during the affair). Mr. B.’s father and mother never, apparently, learn of the scandal³² because Mr. B is able to confide in and rely upon Lord and Lady *Davers* who take the child “until it came to be fit to be put to the Boarding-school” (*Pamela I*, 395). That Sally Godfrey is forced to cover up her story, of course, reflects the sexual double standard that allows Mr. B. to speak. Indeed, he is **invited** to speak openly of his past misdemeanors and be publicly admired for his reform.³³ Only Pamela and Lady *Davers* can observe and admire the movement from Sally Godfrey to Sarah Wrightson but they must do so privately through their own correspondence. This is in contrast to the public admiration of Pamela. Sally Godfrey seems to be of little interest to Mr. B. and Lord *Davers*,³⁴ though Pamela does tell Lady *Davers* that Mr. B. “will take care to have [the letter] convey’d to [Mrs. Wrightson]” (Vol. IV, 274). It seems that Mr. B. has been able to contact Mrs. Wrightson all along and that he controls Pamela’s correspondence with her. The presumption is there, of course, that he will read Pamela’s letter to Mrs. Wrightson before he “conveys” it.³⁵

The reader does not view Sarah Wrightson’s letter directly as it is

received by Pamela. It is presented as a copy within a letter to Lady Davers. This helps to establish the movement from Lady Davers as Pamela's tormentor to her confidante. In Pamela I, Lady Davers raises the Sally Godfrey story in order to prevent or annul the marriage between Mr. B. and Pamela. Included along with Mrs. Wrightson's letter are copies of Pamela's response to Mrs. Wrightson and a letter from Sally Goodwin to her mother. Pamela becomes Mrs. Wrightson's co-conspirator to the extent that she supports Mrs. Wrightson's fiction in her response. Pamela knows that the letter will certainly be read by Mr. Wrightson, but also, as has been the case with most of Pamela's correspondence, may be read by or to a larger audience (especially if Pamela's virtue is already well known as Mrs. Wrightson has suggested). Pamela plays to both these audiences not only by supporting the details of Mrs. Wrightson's fiction — referring to "the Loss of your dear Spouse" (Vol. IV, 276), for example — but by writing the letter in a heightened, pious tone that supports the reading this audience has of her as a virtuous woman deserving of the social advancement she has gained. Pamela's use of religious language and imagery is also in response to the same tone in Mrs. Wrightson's letter to Pamela. Richardson connects reform to piety in order to underline Pamela's ultimate hope for Mr. B. Pamela begins her letter to Lady Davers by returning a present of "choice Products of that Climate" (Vol. IV, 269) which Lady Davers has received from Sarah Wrightson. Pamela does not need the gift because "I have a valuable Present made by the same excellent Lady" (Vol. IV, 270).

Though there is a present from Mr. Wrightson alluded to in the postscript of Sarah Wrightson's letter, it is the gift of Sally Godfrey's penitence, and, indeed, her transformation into a new person with a new name, that Pamela values so highly.

As Pamela tells Lady Davers, she feels limited by Sarah Wrightson's own fictionalizing of her story, for she is unable to praise her as much as she would like to.

...I was circumscribed and limited; otherwise I would have told the good Lady how I admire and honour her for her Penitence, and for that noble Resolution which enabled her to...abandon her Country, her Relations, Friends, Baby...as well as the Seducer, whom she too well loved, and hazard the Sea, the Dangers of Pirates, and possibly of other wicked Attempters of the mischievous Sex, in a World she knew nothing of...and all to avoid repeating a Sin she had been unhappily drawn into; and for which she still abhors herself!

Must not such a Lady as this...have as much Merit as many even of those who, having not had her Temptations, have not fallen? (Vol. IV, 277-8).

During Mr. B.'s second retelling Pamela interjects using similar language. Without any direct insight into Sally Godfrey's thoughts at this stage in the narrative, Pamela reads her "Penitence and Reformation" (Pamela I, 396) as directly tied to her decision to leave the country. All of the problems facing Sally Godfrey are tied to "preserving herself further Guiltiness" (Pamela I, 396). Leaving England and risking Country, Relations, Baby, Fortune, World, Strangers, Seas (all nouns Pamela uses in her speech) "shew'd she was much in Earnest to be good" (Pamela I, 396). Against this

reading of Sally Godfrey's resolve, Mr. B. places his own "to the moment" reading in which he "did not believe her so much in Earnest" (Pamela I, 396). This allows his retelling to expand for over two pages into a romance tale of love and adventure in which Mr. B., after an extended chase, full of details and place names which help to draw a breathless map, boards Sally Godfrey's Jamaica-bound ship and takes her in his arms in order to convince her to stay.

This romanticization of the Sally Godfrey story fits neatly with the assertion that Sally Godfrey's defilement was, again, not due to rakishness on the part of Mr. B., but consensual, albeit misguided, love. There seems to be some effort made to promote the view that Sally Godfrey and Mr. B. were engaged in a "true" love affair. Neither Mr. B., Sarah Wrightson, nor Pamela ultimately describes the Sally Godfrey story as a rape. Mr. B. comes close in his first telling when he says that "the young Lady...yielded to my Addresses" (Pamela I, 357). He has chosen, though, to pair the first telling with the story of his duel in Italy and this may account for the more heightened, dramatic tone. When it is less in his interest to present himself as a rake — once the telling includes (as it does in the second telling which is a private telling between him and Pamela but does not in the first which is more public) the illegitimate child — Mr. B. emphasizes a tone of artless love. In the second telling Mr. B. clearly describes the affair as consensual. "[T]hey met at *Godstow* often, at *Woodstock*, and at every neighbouring Place to *Oxford*; where he was then studying, as it prov'd,

guilty Lessons, instead of improving ones" (Pamela I, 395).

Near the beginning of Volume III, Pamela writes at Lady Davers' command to give "[a]n Account of the Manner in which your dear Brother acquainted me with the affective Story of Miss Godfrey" (Vol. III, 48). In addition to enclosing a transcript of the letter she wrote to her parents describing this scene (in Vol. II), Pamela reflects on the "unfortunate lady". Though her own experience with Mr. B. makes it very easy for her to take the side of Sally Godfrey, the worst label she can assign Mr. B. is "dear deceiver". Pamela also plays up the idea of romantic love though from another angle. Romantic love is not intriguing and adventurous for Pamela. Rather, it blinds its victims. Pamela paints Sally Godfrey as sincere in her love for Mr. B. but duped by her own frailty. Mr. B. also becomes love's victim. Pamela's description of love personified is actually a description of Mr. B as he behaved towards her. But Pamela intends no irony or allegory. As the good wife, she refuses to make Mr. B. responsible for his own actions:

And then this Love, to be sure, is a sad Thing, when once it is suffered to reign: —A perfect Tyrant! — requiring an unconditional Obedience to its arbitrary Dictates, and deeming every Instance of Discretion and Prudence, and Virtue itself, too often, but as so many Acts of Rebellion to its Usurped Authority. (Vol. III, 63).

Later in the Volume, Mr. B. borrows from this same philosophy of love's passion in his retelling of attempted rape attempt in Volume I. Love, according to Mr. B. "unmans and levels with the dust, the proudest spirit" (Vol. III, 185).

Sally Godfrey's greatest sins according to Pamela seem to be a lack of self-esteem which make her "think highly of the beloved Object, and lowly of [herself]" (Vol. III, 64) and a naive trust in Mr. B.'s good intentions towards her. Though Pamela cannot excuse Sally Godfrey's fall, "because Virtue is, and ought to be, preferable to all Considerations" (Vol. III, 64), she is prepared to forgive her. To do so, though, requires Pamela to rewrite the Sally Godfrey story as one of first love. Ultimately it is Mr. B. who is excused by this story. "[I]n all Probability, it was a *first* Love on *both* Sides; and so he could not appear to her as a *practised* Deceiver" (Vol. III, 64). Putting the Sally Godfrey story to rest is central to Pamela's rewriting. Though the existence of Miss Goodwin makes it more difficult to do so, Pamela, by gaining guardianship of Miss Goodwin, is able to intercede in the production of this child's life story. Indeed, the last letter in the book is a scene in which Pamela instructs Miss Goodwin (and her other children) using an allegorical children's tale. She also must ignore the hint that Mr. B. gives, when Lady Davers first says the name, Sally Godfrey, of "other Liberties" (Pamela I, 357). She pauses, during her anxiety before the second telling of the Sally Godfrey story, to consider that "he had had other Faults, (of this Sort, I suppose) that had not come to [Lady Davers'] Knowledge!" (Pamela I, 372), but she extenuates them by praying that "he has seen his Error, and will be very good for the future" (Pamela I, 372).

Pamela ends the letter to Lady Davers with a short report on her assessment, so far, of Miss Goodwin's character.³⁶ There is a tacit acknowl-

edgment here of Lady Davers as Sally Goodwin's first guardian. Whereas Mrs. Wrightson never faults Mr. B. but only herself, Pamela is careful, in her judgment of Miss Goodwin, not to fault Sarah Wrightson (likely because Mrs. Wrightson has put her own "reform" in religious terms) but to blame the failings of Miss Goodwin's character on Mr. B. (who has not yet claimed piety) from whom, Pamela observes in her letter to Lady Davers, she has inherited her hastiness, haughtiness and pride (Vol. IV, 278). Some blame is reserved for her social circumstances. Her governess is unable to control her because she "has *many young Ladies* to take care; I but *one*" (Vol. IV, 280). The underlying assumption that a particular family structure is necessary for a child's "proper" development is promoted by Pamela and can be connected as well to Mr. B.'s desire for Pamela to write a response to Locke's essay Some Thoughts Concerning Education. Pamela, in her campaign to adopt Miss Goodwin, argues with Mr. B. that in order to understand Locke's essay she needs a real child (not her newborn baby, Billy) to "experiment" with. As well, Pamela, as the new mother of baby Billy and well along in her second pregnancy, begins to perceive of herself as the designate family mother figure and, as a result, Sally Goodwin's "natural" guardian.

Richardson's places the Sarah Wrightson and Sally Goodwin section directly following the happy resolution of the masquerade affair. This placement is important in understanding the growing intimacy between Pamela and Lady Davers. Especially evident is the frankness with which

Mr. B.'s character is discussed in this letter sequence. Pamela is not, at this point, adhering to the Rules for a Good Wife laid out by Mr. B. at the end of Volume II. The masquerade affair often mirrors the Sally Godfrey affair in foregrounding for both intrigues the need for the family to protect itself from scandal.

Both the masquerade affair and the Sally Godfrey story make Pamela very nervous. Richardson allows Pamela's language to carry this anxiety. Sally Godfrey's name (and the accompanying adjective "poor") becomes a destructive rhythm in Pamela's head during the early weeks of her marriage. It becomes necessary (for the reader as much as for Pamela) for Mr. B. to reassure Pamela by telling her the story. There is, underlying this, a greater concern: that Pamela's virtue may not be strong enough to overcome jealousy.³⁷ This is emphasized by her inability to allow Mr. B. (and Mr. B. knows this) to finish his second telling of the story without asking what has happened to "poor Sally Godfrey". During the masquerade affair, Richardson develops a series of short letters between Lady Davers and Pamela at the height of her fears which stand in sharp contrast to the lengthy letters and journals provided earlier by her even at her most terrorized. Within this series, Pamela's sense of isolation becomes so acute that she stops subscribing "sister" in her letters to Lady Davers. It is only when she is chastised by Lady Davers for this action that she is able to admit to the depth of her fears for her marriage (and perception of her tenuous connection as sister to Lady Davers) in a substantially longer letter.

The View through the Keyhole (Again)

But tell me, how often have you been in
private together?
In private, Me'm!—I don't know what your
Ladyship calls *private*!
Why that is *private*, Polly, when, as just
now, you neither imagined nor intended any-
body should see you.

(Vol. III, 366)

It is no exaggeration or class presumption on Pamela's part to suggest that she is able to see herself reflected in the Sally Godfrey stories. Mr. B. recognizes the parallel too when he quite readily admits to Pamela at the end of his second retelling that though moved by Sally Godfrey's suffering, he "was full of Spirits and Inconsiderations...[and] five or six Years afterwards... I doubted not to make my Pamela... be *Sally Godfrey* the second" (*Pamela* I, 399). In the illicit romance between Pamela's waiting maid, Polly Barlow, and Lord Davers' nephew, Jackey, this mirroring is also present. Not only is Polly Barlow a young woman in danger of seduction, she is a waiting maid under sexual pressure from a member of the aristocracy.³⁸ Pamela can only "see" the Sally Godfrey story and her connection with it through the tellings and retellings of the story and, of course, through the existence of Miss Goodwin. Indeed, her own writing of the Sally Godfrey story is based on tellings and retellings. Polly and Jackey's scene has a much more visceral connection to Pamela's past. The geo-

graphical setting of the Sally Godfrey affair is elaborately mapped out by Mr. B. as having occurred in Godstow, Woodstock and Oxford. Sally Godfrey herself now resides under another name, far away. Polly and Jackey's scene takes place in the house and in the rooms where Pamela was sexually harassed by Mr. B. A series of connections accumulate in the Polly and Jackey scene, including Pamela's illness³⁹ (likely related to her pregnancy and thus to her impending matronly status), which unexpectedly allows her to be in her closet when the rendezvous between Polly and Jackey takes place in her bedroom. This contrasts nicely with Mr. B.'s intentionally placing himself in the closet in order to watch Pamela and Mrs. Jervis just before the attempted rape scene. The close architectural mirroring of the attempted rape scene in Volume I helps to underline the shocking contrast: Polly encourages rather than resists Jackey.

By "forc[ing] a faint Cough" (Vol. III, 363) Pamela, even while altering the course of events, is the character who makes the story into a story. Both Polly and Jackey appear to have difficulty articulating their stories when called upon to do so. At first this appears to contrast with Pamela's experience. Articulating her story was her constant obsessive activity. Yet in Volume I she was often silent under Mr. B.'s questioning and learned that when she spoke (even privately to Mrs. Jervis) things often became worse rather than better. Clearly there is a Polly and Jackey story exclusive of Pamela's involvement. A number of meetings have taken place, as have an exchange of proposals, a fifty pound bank note, and a promissory

note (signed by Polly) giving Jackey ownership of her upon his father's death. In Mr. B.'s retelling of the attempted rape scene his concerns became legitimized and central. Similarly, Pamela's insinuation into the Polly and Jackey story shifts the focus onto her. Consideration for Pamela's position and her ability to manage a house becomes one of the prime concerns in the Polly Barlow scandal.

Pamela is the first to elucidate her position in the potential scandal of Polly and Jackey.

But it behov'd me, ...to examine this Matter narrowly; because, if Mr. H. should marry her, it would have been laid on Mr. B.'s Example. —And if *Polly* should be ruin'd...People would have said, Ay, she could take Care enough of herself; but none at all of her Servant. (Vol. III, 367)

Her intimacy with Polly Darnford allows her to be frank and open in her thoughts on the story (which becomes part of her telling of the story). As is the case with her advice to Polly Darnford on courtship, Pamela may feel that a thorough description of the complexities of her household is necessary for Polly Darnford who, presumably, will be mistress of her own household soon enough. If, indeed, this does describe Pamela's relationship to Polly Darnford, then Simon Darnford's fears that Polly may be influenced to "grow up" if she is present (serving a kind of apprenticeship) during Pamela's confinement and lying-in are justified.

Richardson sets up an interesting difficulty by placing the affair in

Volume III, after Pamela's marriage. Pamela is forced to observe the affair from the point of view of a former waiting maid who has married "up". Her compassionate response to Polly indicates that she acts on the affair partly as one servant girl helping another,⁴⁰ but her primary point of view is as Polly Barlow's mistress. As mistress, she attempts to control Polly's sexuality and eventually control who and how she can marry. Pamela dictates and transcribes the specialized rules for a clergyman's wife to Polly before she consents to her marriage to Mr. Adams. This dictation is set up to echo the dictation at the end of Volume II when Mr. B. outlines his rules for a good wife to Pamela. It is Pamela's position as lady of the house that gives her the authority to speak, censure and offer alternatives to both Polly and Jackey.

At the point where Pamela becomes aware of the intimacies between Jackey and Polly Barlow, Jackey is well-established in the novel as a fop. Jackey, in fact, is portrayed as being so silly that both Pamela and the reader are surprised



Polly attended as usual; for I can't say I love men attendants in these womanly offices (Vol. IV, 182 [Croscup]).

that he has been able to manage the details of such an affair.⁴¹ The attempted seduction of Polly is Jackey's skewed interpretation of Pamela's success. Pamela and Mr. B. have made themselves so conspicuously public by their unconventional marriage and Pamela's unbelievable virtue that an aspiring imitator like Jackey and a naive girl with "such a turn to Dress and Appearance" (Vol. IV, 254) like Polly may have been able to convince themselves that they were merely mimicking a newly acceptable (because of the B's shining example) form of courtship. Richardson, though, does more than hint at the darker side of this foolishness. Jackey is not merely allowed to reside within a Restoration stereotype. Jackey's real threat to Polly is made clear through Pamela's angry reaction to his belittling of his interest in the affair.

Pamela has no real illusions of changing Jackey. She behaves as a wiser and more virtuous member of his own family towards him. She asserts her power by offering to publicize⁴² his dalliance and show the note he extorted from Polly "when we are set down to Supper" (Vol. III, 374) if he does not behave as she expects him to.⁴³ Though he infuriates her by flippantly pushing blame for the affair on Polly's "willingness," she articulates her anger against the typical rakish sexual double standard: "[F]or he that sticks not at *one* bad Action, will not scruple *another*, to vindicate himself: and so, Devil-like become the Tempter, and the Accuser too!" (Vol. III, 375). Pamela is willing to actively interfere and intercede in Polly's

rehabilitation, possibly because of the similarities to her own past but more importantly because, as she rightly perceives, “What Virtue requires of a Woman...Custom has made shameless in a man” (Vol. III, 370). Since women are ultimately either virtuous or ruined, their rehabilitation can take place on an individual, case by case basis. In order to change Jackey, Pamela would be forced to change her world. Though she finds her own power over Jackey quite disturbing, she prefers to leave him to God.

What a sad thing it is for a Person to be guilty of such Actions, as shall put it into the Power of another, even by a Look, to mortify him! And if poor Souls can be thus abjectly struck at such a Discovery as this, by a Fellow Creature, how must they appear before an unerring and omniscient Judge, with a Conscience standing in the Place of a Thousand Witnesses! and calling in vain upon the *Mountains to fall upon them*, and the *Hills to cover them!*

(Vol. III, 378)

Because the Polly and Jackey episode is a contained subplot involving very few characters — Jackey, Polly, B., Pamela, Mrs. Jervis,⁴⁴ Polly Darnford (as recipient of the letter) — Richardson allows Pamela to play the central role which is normally reserved for Mr. B. Pamela not only commands this central role, she makes the decision to keep the Polly and Jackey story from Mr. B. (as well as Lord and Lady Davers). Though some argument can be made for Pamela’s act of concealment reflecting her desire to protect the private interests of the family, surely informing Mr. B. and Lord and Lady Davers would not have interfered with this desire. There is a sense that Pamela intends to tell Mr. B., but only after she sees if

her handling of the affair is successful or not. Jackey denies that his attempt on Polly “was a Breach of Hospitality” (Vol. III, 373), but Pamela, in her desire to “become” mistress of the house, may want to test her own abilities. In the letter she writes to Mr. B. before her first confinement (which he is not to receive unless she dies) she directs him towards “a little parcel, indorsed, ‘Mr. H. and P. Barlow’ “in which she has “thought it best to give a brief History of it in Writing” (Vol. IV, 109). The request she has of Mr. B. is that “the whole may be kept within your own breast”. She hopes that she has been able to ultimately control and manage the situation. Though this rewriting of the story which (except for Jackey’s letter to her which she tells Mr. B. she has also sealed in the packet) the reader never is given the opportunity to read, Mr. B. will be given a fresh opportunity after her death to admire her not just for her household management skills but for her compassion. Part of Pamela’s desire is to shield Polly and Jackey from damaging public knowledge of their foolishness. Pamela decides, perhaps based on her own past and particularly her experience of Lady Davers’ temper, that since Polly has not yet been “ruined” by Jackey, it is unnecessary to expose them⁴⁵.

Language seems to be the medium through which Pamela judges the sincerity of any character’s reputation and reformation. This is why Mr. B.’s rewritings particularly of the attempted rape scene and the masquerade affair are of such importance to Pamela. As someone who is constantly forwarding through writing these rewritings to other readers, she must be

convinced of the sincerity of the writers. Confident in her own virtue, which had been written for her by her father and her religious faith, she rewrites or reiterates these lessons through her fixed and immobile position of virtue and virginity. She closely examines the language of other characters like Sally Godfrey and Polly Barlow for evidence of their reformation. Sarah Wrightson's pious expression readily convinces Pamela that she is a woman to be admired and this affects the whole rewriting of her story. As was clear in Mr. B.'s rewriting, whether or not Sarah Wrightson's piety extends beyond her language is not essential.

Polly Barlow's initial reluctance to speak puts Pamela on alert. Short, terse sentences describing Polly's silence — "She never said a Word" (Vol. III, 363), "Still the poor Girl never said a Word" (363), for example — are contrasted with Pamela's purposeful questioning and lecturing. "She was silent" is used three times on one page to create space (and visible white space as well because the sentence is so short) between Pamela's speeches. Pamela seems oblivious to her effect (in terms of her social position) on

...
 chiefly to be upon your Guardian
 inner by your Mistress, (as I have
 , to gratify their Curiosity,
 parity, and seem willing to
 Servant.) In such a Case it
 ly with all Humility, and ex
 ering to the Point with Mode
 : utterly incapable of giving
 or against the Affair in Questi
 your speaking, let it be as evasiv
 is an innocent Artifice, and
 can take; for if guessing at
 you answer contrary to your o
 Dissimulation; and if ignoran
 ontradi& her Sentiments, she
 better for not being of the f
 lf. Numberless Reproaches
 ir by complying, but can ha
 ; and those, who attempt to

Polly's ability or desire to speak openly. As is evident both in her relationship with Jackey and in later in her dealings with Mr. Adams, Polly is perfectly capable of "telling a story" and indeed of using language to achieve her goals. She is even sophisticated enough to use the epistolary product to her advantage. She carefully drops a letter she "received from a young man in Bedford" near Mr. Adams' desk to "let him know...that she has another Humble Servant" (Vol. IV, 257) as a ploy to speed up Adams' intended suit. Mimicking romantic conventions, Polly writes a subplot for her own story as a means of injecting it with an urgency it would not have left to its natural course. In retrospect too, the plot with its twist will make a better story for Polly and Mr. Adams to tell to their children.

The urgency with which Pamela lectures Polly on the importance of "language and conduct" (Vol. III, 364) is directly connected to her recollections of her own experience at the hands of Mr. B. In instructing Polly Darnford, on the joys of courtship Pamela denies that her own experience is atypical.⁴⁶ With Polly Barlow, Pamela uses her worst experience to harshly remind Polly "I was once in as dangerous a Situation as you can be in. And I did not escape it, Child, by the Language and Conduct I heard from you" (Vol. III, 364). Pamela, rewriting in order to write a conduct book for both Pollys, reframes both her own story and Polly Barlow's story to this end.

Though ultimately reassured after this episode, Pamela has the chance to reexamine Polly Barlow and rearticulate her fears when Mr. Adams

comes forward with a proposal for Polly. The notion of a marriage between Polly and Adams is calculated to mirror Mr. B.'s plan during the Lincolnshire imprisonment to ruin Pamela and then marry her off to Williams. The proposed match between Adams and Polly also echoes Mr. B.'s mother's design that Pamela marry a "Man of a genteel Calling" (Vol. III, 203). Here, the implication is, however, that Polly may not only ruin herself but ruin Mr. Adams, who, as a clergyman has, like a virgin, a reputation to uphold.

Jackey does not know, as Polly does, how to remain advantageously silent. His elevated social position has deluded him into believing that his language is necessary. It is, of course, often through the things he says in company that his stupidity is exposed. In his scene with Pamela, he transparently tries to control the action by first avoiding her, then attempting to talk to Polly first, and finally by "start[ing] half a dozen silly Subjects, in hopes to hinder me from speaking" (Vol. III, 373). He also tries to discount Pamela's accusations by casting doubt through feigned incredulity — "Has she told you that, Madam?" (Vol. III, 374) — on Polly's version of things. He even resorts to piteous whining and begging (which Mr. B., for example, never does): "But to make it known will only expose me, and it can do no Good...and I shall be sent to travel again — And...I was once in a Storm, and the crossing the Sea again would be Death to me" (Vol. III, 376).

Richardson uses Jackey's letter to Pamela as a way to underline other characters' attitudes towards him and to contrast him particularly with Mr. B. The letter, which Jackey gives to Pamela "with an Air of Respect and

even Reverence" (Vol. III, 391) as he, the Davers and the Countess of C. are leaving the B.'s, is ostensibly an apology for his behavior, but is seen primarily by Jackey "to cleare myselfe" (Vol. III, 392). Pamela's decision to transcribe the letter rather than paraphrase the argument is essential. Not only are Pamela and her reader, Polly Darnford, able to view the letter comically, but Pamela can observe to Polly that poor spelling and general illiteracy may be typical of "this Class of People" (Vol. III, 395). Like his earlier, verbal argument, Jackey's letter is taken up by bluster and digressions. About halfway through the letter, he interrupts his request for forgiveness to tell Pamela that he has to start another sheet of paper "—I did nott think too write so much — for I don't love itt: Butt on this Occasion, know nott how too leave off" (Vol. III, 393) as he launches into another long digression. Jackey also tries to mitigate his guilt and blame Polly wondering "whatt hadd one of oure Sexe to do...when they finde *littel* Resistance" (Vol. III, 392). His praise of Pamela throughout the letter is excessive and calculated to undermine her determination to be stern with him.

Richardson also plays with the word "ruin". By associating both Polly Barlow and Jackey with the word, it is easier to see how both characters' futures rely upon fulfilling their circumscribed roles. For different reasons both must be protected and preserved from ruin. Pamela uses "ruin" to oppose "virtue" in order to emphasize to Polly her only available sexual options. When Jackey worries in his letter that Polly's ruin may come

about not from him but if Pamela “turn[s] her away” (Vol. III, 393), he is distancing himself from any personal responsibility for Polly’s virtue, demonstrating his obsessive concern for himself and reiterating Pamela’s fears that she will be judged a poor mistress if Polly does not remain virtuous. Jackey seems much more preoccupied with his own ruin. He uses the word in the context of a long, fantastic paragraph about the terrible things that might happen to him if his affair with Polly continues. These include fighting a duel with Mr. B. which he predicts he would lose and end up “dy[ing] *like a Dogge in a Ditch*; and there would have been an Ende of a noble Family, that have been Peeres of the Realme Time out of Minde...What a sadd thing would this have been! A *publicke* as well as *private* Losse.” (Vol. III, 393).

Richardson’s apparent lack of respect for Jackey’s type is close to the surface here, but Pamela mediates by listing Jackey’s good qualities. Lady Davers later defends Jackey on similar grounds when she asks Pamela to inquire if Polly Darnford would accept an offer of marriage from Jackey. Jackey, as Lord Davers’ heir, must be redeemable. Jackey is ultimately only partially so and then only through the protection of Mr. B. Richardson’s conclusion makes no mention of Jackey’s having any children, though, apparently his first wife, “her gaming Brother...[and] his bullying Friends [made] great Devastations in his Estate” (Vol IV, 455). He does, with Mr. B.’s “protection” manage to extricate himself from the marriage and with the recommendation of Lady Davers “married a second [wife]...who by her

Prudence and Virtue, made him happy for the remainder of his days" (Vol. IV, 455). Jackey's lack of progeny can be paired with Lady Davers' and set against the amazing bounty of the B's seven offspring. If Pamela and Lady Davers have been vying for position throughout the novel, perhaps, then, Richardson has set Mr. B. against Jackey. Much is said, for example, of Mr. B.'s ultimate reformation as a pious man. Though the conclusion acknowledges that Jackey has become "wiser by his past sufferings" (Vol. IV, 455), there is no hint that he has turned to god.

The Lord of her Wishes!

The retelling of the attempted rape scene serves as an opportunity for Mr. B. to appropriate Pamela's story and make it his own. Pamela colludes with Mr. B. in this rewriting. It is not only her wifely duty to do so but in the general interests of the family. The Sally Godfrey story tests Pamela's virtue in a new way, by trying her capacity for jealousy. The Polly and Jackey affair is designed to test Pamela's capabilities as the mistress of a household. As well, Richardson has a project to promote. A compliant Pamela works in his interest to outline the path that a virtuous woman must follow when she inevitably becomes a virtuous wife.

The way that all of these stories are written through Pamela yet are not rooted in her own “real” experience requires a self-denial and an amnesia that is ultimately disturbing: disturbing to a reader such as me who worries about how much this process silences speakers, and psychologically disturbing to Pamela. It goes without saying that compliance to Mr. B.’s 48 Rules for a Wife is inordinately onerous. The rules also **demand** rewriting. Rewriting is a rule of the virtuous marriage. The rewritings in Pamela may serve their expedient and immediate purpose of shifting the emphasis from the exemplary woman in Pamela I to the making of the exemplary marriage and the exemplary family in Pamela II, but they never adequately address the question of what rewriting does to Pamela’s memory. Pamela Andrews, the unruined waiting-maid from a decent though humble family, slips silently away. Maybe she was never really there. What is lost along with her? Or, to put the question more pointedly — who is lost?

²¹ Richardson was constantly concerned about piracy in his business life and wrote a pamphlet in 1753 arguing for more legislative protection for legitimate copyright holders.

²² Late in Vol IV, Pamela describes her book of memorandums: "for every time I am pleased with a conversation, and have leisure before it goes out of my memory, I enter it down as near the very words I can" (Vol. IV, 324).

²³ It's interesting that Lord Davers never "needs" to read Pamela's writing. His "reading" of her exists completely in his "real" experience of her. He never fails to take the opportunity to kiss her. His calling her "sister" is so excessive, it is noted in the text of Pamela II.

²⁴ Richardson's creation of a clamour for letters and copies of letters within Pamela II reflects the market demand for the sequel.

²⁵ She explicitly discusses her practice of keeping a Memorandum Book in Pamela II (Vol. IV, 324).

²⁶ This perhaps, mirrors Richardson's own purpose in producing both Familiar Letters and Pamela as epistolary conveyers of morality.

²⁷ Mr. B. spends twenty-five pages on narrative preamble before he retells or describes the actual rape attempt. His description of the attempt fills fewer than four pages.

²⁸ In Volume III, Lady Davers requests that Pamela give her "all you can recollect in relation to the honoured Lady [her mother], and of her Behaviour and Kindness to you, and with a Retrospect to your own early Beginnings, the Dawning of this your bright Day of Excellence" (Vol III, 98). Here Richardson seems to be designing the opportunity for writing the past. Whether it is significant or not that Mr. B. does so and Pamela does not may again have to do with the way in which Mr. B. takes charge of telling the stories and, indeed, of Pamela's writing practice.

²⁹ It is in Mr. B.'s interest to push a sisterly relationship on Pamela and Lady Davers. Mr. B.'s intervention between Pamela and Lady Davers occurs even more strongly in Volume IV. After the "satisfactory conclusion" of the masquerade affair, Mr. B., in a letter to Pamela, tells her that "if you have written to your Mother, to Miss Darnford, or to Lady Davers, anything of this Affair, you must show me the copies of your Letters and let me into every Tittle how you came by your Information" (Vol. IV, 198-9). When he learns that Pamela has only confided in Lady Davers about the affair and she offers (in a letter to him) to "dispatch a Messenger to her Ladyship for [the letters]...in the Morning before tis Light" (Vol IV, 200), Mr. B., again in a letter, lets her know that she has "Three Days time to procure them" (Vol IV, 201).

³⁰ In Pamela II, she makes it clear that she changes her approach to writing depending on who she is writing to. She takes on, for example, a more intimate tone with Polly Darnford than she does with Lady Davers.

³¹ During his retelling, this is the only part of Pamela's letter that Mr. B. quotes from directly.

³² She also does this prior to the Lincolnshire rape attempt when she is in bed with Mrs. Jewkes.

³³ This quotation is part of Mr. B.'s retelling of the attempted rape (Vol. III, 191).

³⁴ Richardson demonstrates through his characterization of Goodman Andrews that this need is not limited to the upper classes. Andrews' ability to manage information regarding his daughter's reputation is limited by his relative powerlessness and lack of resources, yet he still attempts to discover what has happened to Pamela. It is also interesting to observe the change in the Andrews' status once Pamela is married. Their inclusion in the private space of the Sally Godfrey scandal through Pamela's letters speaks to the process of their becoming members of the B. family. Within their own household, it is possible to see a class ascendancy and a hierarchical structure establishing itself especially when they are relocated to the Kentish farm. This allocation is contrasted with Mr. B.'s earlier offer to Pamela that she live there as his mistress.

³⁵ Pamela also wonders why she has never heard of this scandal "for, is it not strange, that I, who lived Years in the Family, should have heard nothing of this? But I was so constantly with my Lady, that I might the less hear of it; for she, I dare say, never knew it or she would have told me" (Pamela I, 361).

³⁶ He is not, though, able to openly acknowledge Sally Goodwin as his daughter. This reflects the family's concern with heirs.

³⁷ They all, though, in their way, enjoy the product of the scandal, Miss Goodwin. Lord and Lady Davers raise the young Miss Goodwin in their own home as a "relative" of Lord Davers. Mr. B. plays her benevolent uncle and uses Miss Goodwin's disarming qualities at the dairy house to ease Pamela into the truth of his illegitimate progeny. Albert J. Rivero shows how Sally Godfrey's defilement is contrasted with the cleanliness and goodness of the dairy where Pamela first encounters Miss Goodwin. It is also worth considering the way that this story is echoed in the story of Jackey's first wife: "and the poor wretch is a father already; for he has had a girl of three years old (her husband has been dead seven) brought him home, which he knew nothing of, nor ever inquired whether his widow had a child!" (Vol. IV, 393). The generous attitude we saw displayed by Lady Davers and Pamela towards "poor Sally Godfrey" is nowhere to be seen in this story.

³⁸ It is worth contrasting Pamela's blind trust of Mr. B. with her correspondence after their marriage with his treachery in Pamela I and the extent to which she endeavours to hide her letters from him.

³⁹ With Mr. B.'s blessing, Pamela has taken over guardianship of Miss Goodwin about a week before she receives the letter from Mrs. Sarah Wrightson.

⁴⁰ Would Pamela have been as eager for this "adoption" if Miss Goodwin had been a boy? Would "he" have posed any threat, in terms of inheritance, to baby Billy, Mr. B.'s legitimate heir?

⁴¹ Later in Volume IV, with the masquerade affair over, Pamela, in a letter to Lady Davers, writes that the good which has come from the affair

is that "I don't believe I shall ever be jealous again; indeed I don't think I shall. And won't that be an ugly Foible overcome? I see what may be done, in Cases not favourable to our Wishes, by the Aid of proper Reflection; and that the Bee is not the only Creature that may make Honey out of the bitter Flowers, as well as the sweet" (Vol. IV, 247-8).

⁴² Though Pamela can clearly "see herself" in Polly Barlow's scenario, it becomes increasingly important for Pamela to limit this identification with Polly in order to achieve "true" class ascendancy. As Susanne Kappeler (and others like Jane Gallop) make clear through their feminist readings of Freud, "such identification must not take place...a juxtaposition of the...'servant-girl' and the 'noble lady' reveals the true structural relations of the women in the family and in the aristocracy to their illustrious male hosts" (Kappeler, 204). As a "good wife" Pamela is required to rewrite (or re-right) her initial identification with Polly Barlow.

⁴³ Pamela later reads her "sudden indisposition" as "a providential Thing, which may save one poor Soul, and be a seasonable Warning to her as long as she lives" (Vol. III, 377).

⁴⁴ This situation changes somewhat with the second rape attempt. As Mr. B. tells Pamela afterwards, "Your pretty Chit-chat to Mrs. Jewkes, the last *Sunday* Night, so innocent, and so full of beautiful Simplicity, half disarmed my Resolutions before I approach'd your Bed" (*Pamela* I, 184).

⁴⁵ If she recognizes herself at all in the role of Polly surely it is odd that she does not remember her own desperate attempts to publicize her case. "[A]s if she were my Sister" is what she writes to Polly Darnford (Vol. III, 389).

⁴⁶ In fact, Pamela decides that Polly "is more to blame because, of the two, she has more Wit than the Man" (Vol. III, 370). Jackey's behaviour here can also be read against scenes in Volume II in which he attempts to tease and behave suggestively towards Pamela. The incongruity becomes even more pronounced when Jackey is proposed as a possible husband for Polly Darnford.

⁴⁷ I would emphasize the connection between **publicize** and **publish**. Since we know that Pamela does "write down" the Polly and Jackey story part of her threat in publicizing the story lies in literally publishing it (which she does to some extent in letter form by writing the story to Polly Darnford). Richardson has taken a similar tact in choosing his editorial frame for *Pamela*. Pamela's letters by their very existence as non-fiction make Mr. B.'s outrageous behavior public.

⁴⁸ Richardson allows Jackey to mouth her words and be embarrassed by her yet not follow Pamela's example, in part, because, generally speaking, Richardson does not so tightly circumscribe male roles. Richardson's tactic with male characters is slightly different. While he tends to make them appear as fools (particularly the aristocratic characters), their foolishness aids in exempting them from ultimate responsibility for their actions except, of course, before God.

⁴⁹ Mrs. Jervis is only given a "hint" of the matter. (Vol. III, 377) It is worth contrasting the manner in which Mrs. Jervis helped Pamela, even at

risk of losing her position, to Pamela's motivation for helping Polly Barlow.

⁵⁰ In her journal to Polly Darnford and her parents, she describes the sealing up of her account of the Polly and Jackey story as a kind of insurance, "[a] method, I believe, very proper to be taken by every married lady" (Vol. III, 396). She places this action in a broader context too by mentioning "a little sealed-up parcel of letters my lady made me burn in her presence about a month before she died" as a "good example" for her own actions and attitude toward household management (Vol. III, 396).

⁵¹ Pamela is aware of the risk she runs in making this decision. "And yet, should my good intentions be frustrated, and they should conclude their vile bargain, and it appeared that I knew of it, but would not acquaint [Lady Davers], then should I have been more blamed than any mistress of a family circumstanced as I am" (Vol. III, 371). These thoughts also reflect the ongoing competition between Pamela and Lady Davers for the position of family matriarch. In the conclusion to Volume IV, Richardson tells us that after the death of Lord Davers, Lady Davers moves with the B's to the Hall in Lincolnshire where "in the strictest friendship with the happy pair [she lived as] an honourable relict" (Vol. IV, 454).

⁵² This is, in part, a class distinction, but, considering the case of Sally Godfrey, it is interesting that Pamela presents Polly Darnford with such a positive portrait, in such romantic language too.

⁵³ Male characters like Jackey, Mr. B., Jacob Swynford etc. have a tendency to use this strategy to control Pamela. As an anomaly in the social fabric, Pamela must continually be seen as one in a million. Simon Darnford serves as an example of a male character who refuses to praise Pamela and must ultimately answer to Mr. B.

The Seduction of Rewriting: My Version

If I had based my theories on the statements of servant girls, they would all be negative.... Fortunately for our therapy, we have previously learned so much from other cases that we can tell these persons their story without having to wait for their contribution. They are willing to confirm what we tell them, but we can learn nothing from them.

Freud, letter to Jung (14 June 1907)

Why do I let this bother me so much?

It seems to me that what I've done in the preceding section is to outline Mr. B.'s pattern of reclaiming, reframing and rewriting stories which do not, strictly speaking, belong to him. I have also shown how, as Pamela moves from virgin/victim to wife/mother/mistress, it is increasingly in her interest to support Mr. B.'s version of things both through her own rewritings and by her endorsement of his rewritings. Mimicking Mr. B., Pamela also begins to take control of the stories of other characters and rewrites those stories. She does not presume to write Jackey's story (though his clearly needs rewriting). She does try with both Polly Barlow and Polly Darnford. Perhaps the root of her struggle with Simon Darnford lies in who will control Polly's story. After all, their disagreement does focus around a book thrown by Simon Darnford at Polly's head! It also seems quite clear that up to a certain point she will be able to write Miss Goodwin's story and the stories of

her seven children. The intertextual weaving of a big chunk of Volume IV with Locke's Some Thoughts Concerning Education and the suggestion by Mr. B. to Pamela that she write a response to Locke's essay emphasize how seriously they both take the task of writing their children.

This is an interesting process to map and I have been both impressed with and overwhelmed by the complexity of both Pamelas as texts. Ultimately I connect the rewritings and the necessity for them to a general anxiety (on the part of both the author and the characters) around virginity. Virginity exists in the text as a problem to be solved. A woman of unresolved sexual status (and widows, as we see in the masquerade affair, cause special problems) is a source of anxiety. This problem involves larger concerns of progeny and inheritance. I have even found it possible to connect this anxiety to the private and public concerns of Samuel Richardson, Master Printer. There are aspects of all of these explanations, though, that strike me as utterly **unreasonable** and obsessively anxious.

Let's Be Unreasonable

Social readings of a text which are overly sensitive to the period of its production and publication can work to protect the text (and its author) from **unreasonable** readings: "You can't read Samuel Richardson across the end of the twentieth century", some say. "Your mind can't understand what his world was all about. Besides, the poor guy can't even be here to defend himself. A feminist reading? Don't be unreasonable! He was a man of his time!" Yet it is precisely this so-called **unreasonable** approach which helps us to understand why and in whose interests these texts need protection.

How to Hold a Man by Giving Him His Freedom

When I took leave of absence from marriage six years ago, a long-divorced friend began phoning solicitously every other Sunday to find out if my "ex" was fair game yet. Another old acquaintance, who had mystifyingly dropped me from her annual party list of two thousand, suddenly invited me to lunch. Whatever I'd done, I thought all was forgiven or, more likely, that she wanted to show off her new puffed cheekbones. But as we carefully air-kissed good-bye, she whipped out a jumbo red Filofax and purred, "Now, when are you two going to get it over with?"

It was no good trying to explain that I was just cutting him—and myself—loose. Letting go without, er, letting *go*. Even I didn't know what I meant. "It ain't over with," I sobbed, "till the fat lady sings." And as it happens, she hasn't sung yet.

During those first agonizing months, when I was still calling him twice a day and taking taxis from my new flat to sleep "at home" every night, there was keen nosy-neighborly interest in how we were doing, marked by unannounced midnight drop-ins—both my place and his (aka ours). One lifelong chum's ancient husband came around to shake his finger at me, intoning coldly that as an absentee wife, I was no longer a fit playmate. "We're not your friends," he actually said. "We're *his* friends." Never mind that they and he had disliked each other for years. Never mind that this life sentence was being pronounced by a fellow who had once left a perfectly good pregnant wife and four children to run off with my pal—a girl thirty years his junior. That kind of letting loose was okay. Mine, however...

Discovering radium must have been simpler than what I was doing: finding a way to hold on to a man by giving him his freedom. When I left him, I had no idea how free I had in mind or how (if) it would all end. There were a few things I did know: that I loved and needed him, that being together had been bad for too long, and that freedom was scarier than jail. Ask any two-time loser.

I remembered my mother letting go of my father, who had fallen in love with a redhead. I was about three, and he was whistling "Over the Rainbow" as he packed to leave us forever. But during the sixteen years Mother and Dad were separated, he came home for dinner every Friday; she consulted him about everything, including her other gentlemen callers; and Dad never married the redhead he had left us for. If my mother had *meant* to hold him, she couldn't have done better. Eventually, it was she who got bored, divorced, and remarried. My father danced at the wedding and then rebounded off on a five-day cruise to Bermuda, where he proposed to the first young redhead who could follow his two-step.

Years later, at my father's funeral, there were quite a few redheads (including the original), but my mother, still a brunette with streaks, held court like the rightful widow she was. He had never really belonged to anyone else.

Most people, including me, would hardly settle for that. But most people who "get it over with"—via flying plates or custody fights over the gerbil and the CDs—don't seem to settle much either.

In Ireland, where I've lived on and off for nearly three years, there is no divorce. In the name of freedom, people simply disconnect, reconnect, yet stay connected in astonishing ways. I know some who have children with partners past, present, and even in-between. Old spouses and new lovers are, and remain, family; even the strict, tradition-bound older generation accepts the looseness of ties that won't stop binding. I recently attended a

If there is a
universal rule of
love, it is this:
To be possessive,
clinging,
desperately needy,
will gain
you nothing and
possibly lose
you all. But say so
long and
really mean it, and
you may find
him forever there!
By Lois Gould

Unreason is a tricky concept. You could begin to believe you're crazy for thinking the way you do. Lots of people out there can help you continue to believe this. You could find yourself making lists and seeing connections between literary texts firmly situated in the past and a hamburger wrapper you find discarded on your front lawn just after the police have come and told you that the neighbour who you always felt resembled Samuel Beckett is a once-successful counterfeiter and that the twelve hundred dollars he paid you for your old car is funny money. You could begin to believe you're crazy for thinking the way you do. But then there it is on the hamburger wrapper: "Yabba Dabba Doo!" Isn't there some kind of connection to a reading of the past there -- both the past of early television history and the past of something you were raised to call **Prehistoric Times** (or is it ModHistoric)? And just who is making up these labels anyway?

He was a Man of His Time: Rape Stories -- Not!

Over and over again as I was examining the writings and rewritings in Pamela, I kept writing down a question to myself. "Don't forget to ask this question", I reminded myself. The question has to do with the relationship between the rewriting and rape (or not-rape). **Is it or why is it important that this is not a rape?**

The question stops me short. The attempted rape scene in Pamela is an attempt that is denied as attempt. The denial is accepted even by the intended victim who never read it that way while she was almost being raped. She was unconscious for half of it, so how did she know what was

COLLEGE

going on anyway? "I was only teasing", he said later. The reader understands how frustrated the poor man is in his love for her. Even the victim understands. Indeed, part of her virtue lies in her ability to understand his violent behavior towards her. In the Sally Godfrey story there is "True Love" to contend with. "OK, so, what they did was wrong. But they were in love! He pressured her for sex and she said yes. If only she hadn't gotten pregnant! He even loved her after the baby was born. Look how he chased her all over the place and boarded her ship and tried to pull her off and even stop the ship from sailing! That's passion. You don't do stuff like that unless you're really in love." The Jackey and Polly story falls somewhere between the two. He's a rake. She's a climber. She knows it can be done. She's seen other servants climb. She and Jackey mark their moves as if they are in love. He uses his social position to lure her into an agreement that will always and ultimately favour him. He knows that money is her weakness and that she doesn't really understand enslavement. (Hadn't she read those conduct books out on the market?) He forgets, though, that waiting-maids have feelings too (not to mention friends in high places). And maybe she did take a look at those conduct books.

But back to this rape thing.

What would Dr. Freud say?

Well, Freud would say that no means yes.

What did Dr. B., oops, I mean Dr. Freud, say?

It is of course not to be expected that the patient will come to meet the physician half-way with material which has become pathogenic for the very reason of its efforts to lie concealed; nor must the inquirer rest content with the first 'No' that crosses his path.

(P.F.L., Vol. 8 54-55)

What else?

It's pretty easy to construct some kind of pseudo-legal argument against the reading of any of these scenes as rape. For example, the "I was only teasing" argument doesn't wash, but, to readers, I think Mr. B.'s confused passions and his attempts to control himself read convincingly. It's "natural" to feel sorry for the guy. It is, in fact, so easy to deny rape in these scenes that I begin to wonder if the scenes are not designed intentionally to be read as not-rape or not-seduction and ultimately as not a big deal.¹ It makes some sense if you think of the task that Richardson takes on in moving Pamela from Mr. B.'s unwilling and unwitting victim to his willing wife. And in Pamela II, where so much rewriting occurs, the willing wife must settle in, expand and conquer her new role (just like the colonizer). Losing your memory has to be part of that process.

This "after the event-ness" of the rewritten not-rape stories in Pamela reads strongly in relation to feminist writings about rape. In the

¹*Eaves and Kimple, for example, read the rape attempt at Lincolnshire as comedy and certainly, in the period, dramatic adaptations like Giffard's Pamela and Edge's Pamela, an Opera staged this rape scene as bawdy (Giffard, 46-51); (Edge, 56-60).*

unmarried man. "You always hear about single women trying to get their married lovers to leave their wives. This behavior isn't limited to the female of the species.

"With single men, you've got to remain extremely vigilant, as I learned almost too late, when, after an initial period of being very careful not to leave any clues, I got careless. We'd meet at my apartment when my husband, Jay, was out of town. You never think about neighbors going to your husband behind your back to tell him you're having a regular male visitor, so I was complacent. Then one day my lover left a condom wrapper on the bathroom counter, tucked behind Jay's aftershave. Jay and I didn't use condoms because I was on the Pill. If I hadn't decided to clean up the apartment to surprise my husband when he got home, I wouldn't have seen the wrapper. Disaster was averted, and I dumped the man. I promised myself that in the future I'd only get involved with men who have as much to lose as I do."

As Jocelyn's experience proves, little things mean a lot when you're balancing a secret sexual life against your marriage. A parking-garage receipt in a pocket discovered by a husband doing laundry, an ATM withdrawal from a neighborhood in which you had no reason to be, a sudden interest in a new kind of music or food—all can trigger suspicion in the mind of a loving, faithful spouse.

Few of the wives I interviewed said they'd tell their husbands about their affairs. "But I will if I know in my gut he knows anyway," Jocelyn says. "Then I'll clean up my act for a long time. My feeling is nobody wants to know his spouse is cheating, and my husband is no exception."

The Peril Is in the Details

The details are "the hard part" for Suellyn, a California media consultant who's been having an affair with Dean, a coworker, for almost a year. "I catch myself sometimes forgetting that it's Dean who likes his coffee with cream or Dean who hates takeout Chinese when I'm with my husband. William. The saving grace for me is that Dean and I have worked closely on several projects; we spend half our time in meetings with clients, often in cafés, so I have an excuse for handing my husband the cream pitcher in a restaurant when he drinks his coffee black. There's no good excuse, however, for calling out the wrong name in the heat of passion—which I've almost done."

Leading a double life requires you to concentrate, often just at those moments your ability to do so is compromised. "You really have to remember the freshness factor," says Kim, a lusty twenty-eight-year-old who sometimes makes love to her lover and her husband within hours of each other. "The smell of sex is distinctive and can linger even after a quick shower. If I've been with my lover earlier in the day, I don't go near my husband until I've had a leisurely bubble bath. He thinks I'm a sensual woman because I love the bath so much. I am a sensual woman, and a careful one."

Kim says that sex with her lover, rather than sating her, can leave her feeling aroused, even after orgasm. She and her husband have more sex now that she's involved in this liaison. Often, that's true of others who stray as well. Indeed, those frequently published lists of ways women can tell if their husbands are having an affair invariably include: "He is suddenly more interested in sex." Which may be why women who say two men are better than one swear...

"The Affair Is Good for My Marriage!"

It is sometimes the case that women who report improved sexual relations with their husbands after taking lovers learn about their own sexuality from other men. These women may discover some new technique or a different position that they can adapt to the marital bed. And sometimes the sex at home improves largely because they are now so highly erotically charged.

"I'd stopped feeling sexy," says Nancy Lee, a New Orleans

advertising executive who believes her recent affair, now ended, put the sizzle back into her marriage. "After ten years together, my husband, George, and I were too used to each other's body. The sex was lackluster. Then I had a torrid six-month affair with a younger, black man I met when I joined a gym to get back into shape. Being desired by such a gorgeous, sexy man was an energizing experience in itself. Of course breaking the ultimate Southern white girl's taboo by having sex with a black man turned the thermostat up a few notches for me too. And I took all that back to George. He thought he owed his sudden good sexual fortune to my workout program."

Some women who don't find sex with their husbands much, or any, improved, still believe the affairs help their marriages. They don't expect a husband to fulfill their every need, so they are more relaxed and giving wives. As an older wife who's "always" had lovers says, "You're so forgiving of your husband's little flaws, and his big ones, when you have this delicious secret life."


Good sex makes many women unanimous, if not monogamous. "One man is not enough for me," Jenny says. A beautiful twenty-eight-year-old, she married a man twenty years her senior, admittedly for money, status, and all the trappings. "I love my married life. I also need more sexual excitement than I can get in this marriage."

"My husband is an average lover with an average penis who wants to make love once or twice a week, which is average. I want a lot more than that. If I didn't allow myself a lover, I'd be a spoiled-bitch princess wife, like a lot of the women in our social circle. But because I'm getting the sex I want elsewhere, I can be as emotionally generous with my husband as he is financially generous with me. I'd hate to be one of those women who spends all her time cutting up other women over glasses of wine. Sexual frustration is so ugly."

Is There No Downside?

These women seem so pleased with themselves and their affairs, past and present. Do they have no regrets? Most of them, particularly those who are happily married, say their affairs have a bittersweet quality, like a summer day at the beach—all romantic glory, not meant to last forever.

Yet on that rainy day, which eventually almost surely comes, does a woman pine for what might have been? Perhaps. And perhaps knowing the end will sooner rather than later occur gives the lovers' time together a special edge. Women who play around live with the understanding that they or their lovers or their husbands could suddenly and dramatically change the status quo.

The negative aspects of affairs include matters of logistics and timing and the need for vigilance in leaving no clues or traces for a husband to find—like the scent of another man's cologne on your clothing, which is the equivalent of the other woman's lipstick on a husband's collar. But the uncertainty about tomorrow that surrounds lovemaking with the aura of fond regret gives the extramarital affair its special status. "Sometimes when I'm with my lover, I feel like I'm starring in an old movie," says one incurable, if pragmatic, romantic. "He's going off to war. Of course he'll be killed. And I'll be sad, but my life will go on." 

*Sex with
a lover,
rather than
sating her,
can leave
a woman
feeling
aroused
for her
husband.*

*In the interest of privacy, some names have been changed.

introduction to their anthology Rape and Representation, for example, Lynn A. Higgins and Brenda R. Silver connect art and criticism with "the well-documented bias of rape law, where representations of rape after the event are almost always framed by a masculine perspective premised on men's fantasies about female sexuality...as well as their codified access to and possession of women's bodies" (Higgins and Silver, 2). It's as if Richardson trips himself up early in Pamela, in his initial conception of the fiction and then realizes it (or doesn't realize it) and changes it for Pamela. The editorial frame for Pamela insists that the story be told from Pamela's point of view. Writing to the moment proved to be a very exciting way to write as well as a very engaging way to receive the thoughts of a character. But that character was a woman. When Fielding objected to Richardson's technique and narrative premise (a servant girl remains virtuous and marries her master) by parodying it in Shamela, perhaps what was particularly objected to was hearing Pamela's voice.

But do we ever hear Pamela's voice? Or, like Freud's Dora, does Pamela suffer from a kind of aphonia with "writing operat[ing] vicariously in the place of speech" (P.F.L. Vol. 8, 71). Freud never presumes to present us with any of Dora's writings. Isn't there something suspicious about just how much of Pamela's writing we are given to read? Do we hear Pamela's voice in the writing? Don't lose sight of what Higgins and Silver say: "**framed by a masculine perspective premised on men's possession of women's bodies.**" Just because Richardson and his fictional editor say these are the letters of "A Beautiful Young Damsel To her Parents" doesn't make the voice

of a woman speak. They've already lied to us. The whole production is a lie. And could it have really happened this way? Even Richardson argues that she's one in a million. He doesn't really want her to be anymore than one in a million, otherwise he's got a major social upheaval on his hands.² As Susanne Kappeler emphasizes in her book The Pornography of Representation, one of the ways in which social and especially representational practices like literature avoid real social change is to embrace a "narrow literalism" which works to frustrate any "attempt to establish the connection between the individual victim and a class of potential victims" (Kappeler 14). The novel with its emphasis on the individual is the perfect vehicle. Though a small amount of outrage can be generated around the powerlessness of and treatment of servant girls by their masters, Pamela's "special status" continually encourages the reader to separate her from others of her class.³ This allows both her exceptional suffering and her

²When European writers like Voltaire and Goldoni picked up on Pamela for their own productions they raised Pamela's social status -- Goldoni managed it by revealing Goodman Andrews as a Scottish nobleman who has been forced for political reasons to live for years as a peasant. They did not believe that their audiences (or, maybe more to the point, their patrons) would accept the marriage of a servant girl (regardless of how virtuous or how one in a million she was) to a member of the aristocracy.

³Michael McKeon's discussion of power relations in Pamela also informs this argument: "Pamela's essential power is the passive and negative one of being virtuous, of resisting the sexual and social power of others. That she is rewarded for it as a result of her discipline in exemplary self-representation. She writes a "spiritual autobiography" of such persuasive force that she gains the full moral accreditation of the community...B. is reformed and converted as a result of reading her journal, but it is crucial that he then be accorded that "godlike" authority which, some readers have felt, is belied by the very need for reformation. Similarly, if

exemplary virtue to be highlighted and for a relationship to be established between them: Pamela suffers precisely because she is virtuous.

It may also be the case that in his gusto to create a virtuous woman, an exemplary woman, Richardson severs Pamela's connection with women. A community of women who read her letters springs up around Pamela, but she is the subject of that community not a member of it. Not that Pamela is a man. But Pamela isn't really a woman either. She's Pamela. Except Pamela is too good to be true. Pamela is an idea. Pamela is a fiction. Pamela is and is not a woman. Literature allows us to believe she is though and this is the trick. An entire ideology of "womaness" can be contained in Pamela. It comes from what's happened before Pamela in literature, and what has filtered through Pamela colours even our most contemporary beliefs about women. In this way Richardson's editorial frame has worked better than he could have ever imagined. I guess at some point, though, it gets hard to believe in Pamela the way that Richardson wrote her down. The gaps get too big.⁴ The issues get too big and the stakes get too high. For all of us Pamelas, at least.

Pamela's reward for virtue is to have meaning, the moral authority of the social order by which it is conferred must remain intact despite the evidence of social injustice manifest in the very need for her reward" (McKeon, 364).

Kappeler and other feminists writing through Freud would also read the need for this separation between Pamela and other 'servant-girls' as springing from the way that the servant-girl's sexuality threatens the fragile middle-class 'family economy'. See Kappeler, pp. 202-6 and my comments on the attempted seduction of Polly Barlow in the previous section.

⁴Wayne C. Booth's guidelines for "proper" suspension of disbelief in The Rhetoric of Fiction are as follows: "[A]ny story will be unintelligible unless it includes, however subtly, the amount of telling necessary not only to make

and baby made four

without a marriage license in sight

I tried to explain to my father that being an unwed, pregnant thirty-two-year-old didn't carry quite the stigma of being an unwed, pregnant high-school cheerleader. By Joan Caraganis Jakobson



Things change, but they really don't. My daughter once said, referring to her school uniform. "It's hard to be cool in a kilt." And it's still not easy to be cool about having a baby without being married—no matter what anyone may tell you.

My daughter and I had lived happily for a number of years with a man who was legally separated but not divorced. When we decided to get married, his wife stubbornly dug in her heels and the negotiations proceeded at a very slow pace. While we waited, we thought perhaps I should begin trying to get pregnant. After all, how long could a divorce take?

Since there was never any question of our commitment to each other or doubt of our desire to have a child together, I didn't hesitate. On the other hand, I didn't expect I'd conceive in less time than it takes me to empty the dishwasher.

We were ecstatic. At worst, I thought, I would have to let out the waistband of my tasteful second-wedding-color suit. No one would know. In reality, when our wedding day finally did arrive, our son was four months old and I wore a red dress that buttoned down the front so that after kissing the groom I could dash upstairs and breast-feed his baby.

Listen, I know that some women—Jessica Lange, Susan Sarandon, Glenn Close—give birth without husbands as casually as others al-

phabetize their spice racks; but I'm not some hip movie star insulated against disapproval by an adoring public and good hair. I was simply an ordinary woman desperate to have a baby with the man I loved while I was still young enough to walk without a cane to my natural-childbirth classes.

My first task, once my obstetrician had confirmed the pregnancy, was to inform the family. My eight-year-old daughter, who'd been told in advance of our plan, was thrilled, and my mother doesn't care how she gets her grandchildren as long as they appear. My father, though, was nearly comatose with the shock and horror of it all. Concealing my own discomfort, I tried to explain that being an unwed, pregnant thirty-two-year-old didn't carry quite the same stigma as did being an unwed, pregnant high-school cheerleader—a prospect that had given him sleepless nights for years during my teens. He was too distraught to respond.

Unbelievably, the divorce stalled on a tiny financial detail and, as the months passed, my pregnancy naturally became more noticeable. It was time to tell the headmistress of my daughter's very small, traditional school, where everyone knew everyone else's business, that I had taken my job as class mother for the third grade rather more seriously than she might have expected. The headmistress was kind and understanding, and except for fiddling nervously with her kilt pin, she took the news better than some other people I encountered.

In the seventh month of my pregnancy, I was chatting in a hotel lobby with a friend from out of town when an acquaintance and her sister came by and stopped to talk.

"You're pregnant," the acquaintance offered helpfully. "I didn't know you'd gotten married."

"I haven't," I said. "Not yet."

Her sister looked at me as though I'd just opened fire with an assault weapon in a shopping mall. "Well, do you know who the father is?" she demanded.

It's different in the period, though. In the period, after a while, no one really believed in the editorial frame. These were not the real letters of a real woman. It didn't matter. People tried to take control of the "editorship" of the letters by pretending to be the editor of Pamela⁵ as a way to make money, a kind of piracy. People made fun of her. She was too good to be true. Or, people used her as a model. Yet, oddly enough, or maybe not oddly enough at all since Pamela is, essentially, a conduct book, and because it is written convincingly, Pamela became a real woman. Pamela spoke to a whole class of people who wanted her story to be true because it would promote their particular ideal -- essentially a Protestant ideal. For these readers Pamela exists simultaneously as fiction, documentary and guide book and reiterates their self-promoted Christian stance. *Virtue Rewarded*.⁶

You Are Here: Don't Move!

Examined more closely and carefully, what exactly is "womanly" about Pamela's point of view? In Letter XXV, where Pamela's version of the rape attempt appears, writing to the moment is actually writing to the moment

us aware of the value system which gives it its meaning, but, more important, to make us willing to accept that value system, at least temporarily....[T]he work itself must fill with its rhetoric the gap made by the suspension of my own beliefs" (Booth, 112).

⁵It's almost as if the very theatricality of Pamela infected these readers and they too had to "put on an act".

⁶In the Prefatory material accompanying the Second Edition of Pamela (published Feb. 14, 1741, three months after the First Edition), Aaron Hill gushes: "who could have dreamt, he should find, under the modest Disguise of a Novel, all the Soul of Religion, Good-breeding, Discretion, Good-nature, Wit, Fancy, Fine Thought, and Morality?-- I have done nothing but read it to others, and hear others again read it to me...if I lay the book down, it comes after me" (Pamela, 10).

about something that occurred at an earlier moment. What Richardson emphasizes through this organization is Pamela's grief, anger and powerlessness, as well as a reassurance and a reiteration to her parents that she has remained "Honest" (Pamela J, 64). The particular details of Mr. B's attack on Pamela are less compelling than is the fact that she has been attempted and remains virtuous. The frame of Letter XXV provides a sense of Richardson's other primary preoccupation: keeping the uncertainty of Pamela's fate high. This is a concern that speaks both to the tradition of romance writing and to the marketability of the book. It's the same strategy used in educational television: if you can't wrest your audience away from an inappropriate medium or genre like TV, or romance novels, fill the form with "appropriate" content. Pamela begins her letter unhappy and heart broken. A few lines later she is angry with no patience. "Is there no Constable or Headborough...to take me out of his House?...But, alas! he is greater than any Constable, and is a Justice himself" (Pamela J, 64). At the end of the letter she expresses her gratitude for being spared but wonders if Mr. B. had been able to convince Mrs. Jervis to leave the room "what would have become of your poor Pamela!" (Pamela J, 68). In the interests of sustaining suspense, Pamela is continually suspended between moments of uncertainty. The real suffering of a woman in Pamela's position is sacrificed to these "greater" goals. Perhaps it's not so much that we don't hear her voice it's that she's always saying the same thing. And that "same thing" more neatly serves Richardson's moral purpose.

What happens to Pamela's body?

It sounds kind of obvious saying this, but rape is an act of physical violence. You can't just talk about it. And you can't just look at the violated body. It's a distraction. While you're busy looking at her body, the rapist is getting away. And you're thinking all kinds of irrelevant thoughts about her. And all kinds of "blame the victim" thoughts like "what was she wearing?" Pamela's body and her clothes are very visible through the letters. This is where the details in the letters work very effectively to dissolve the opacity of text production and render a visual image. Some characters, in fact, learn to know Pamela only visually by looking at her body. In *Pamela* II, when she contracts smallpox,⁷ Mr. B's letter to Lady Davers reassuring her that Pamela has recovered and suffered no facial scars, is not enough. Lady Davers must send Jackey down to Kent to look at Pamela's face and report on its being spared.

Jackey, like Lord Davers and Sir Jacob Swynford, never needs to read Pamela's letters; he reads her body as a text. Jackey, Lord Davers and Swynford have no interest in the accuracy or appropriateness of their "reading". Reading Pamela exists completely in their "real" experience of her through their projected fantasies about her. In Volume II, Jackey and Lady Davers arrive unannounced at Lincolnshire to discover what is going on between Pamela and Mr. B. (they have just been secretly married). Though Lady Davers has set a serious tone for their meeting Jackey cannot control

⁷Pamela contracts smallpox from her son, Billy. Her pathology of weakness necessitates this connection both physically and psychologically and reinforces the relationship between mother and son.

himself when Pamela makes her first entrance: "A charming girl tho', said her rakish Nephew, and swore a great Oath; dear Aunt, forgive me, but I must kiss her" (*Pamela* I, 318). Once Mr. B.'s immediate family accepts Pamela's presence, Lord Davers never fails to take the opportunity to call Pamela "sister" and then kiss her. This gesture is so excessive, it is noted in the text of *Pamela* II (in the same letter to Polly Darnford that contains Mr. B.'s retelling of the attempted rape scene). Sir Jacob Swynford's experience is so predicated upon her physical presence, he can be successfully tricked into believing her to be Lady Jenny. Swynford cannot obviously read the "text" of class in the body or he would have immediately recognized Pamela as Other.⁸

Just before the rape attempt in Volume I, Pamela, dressed in the peasant garb she has assembled for her return to her parents, fools both Rachel, the maid, and Mrs. Jervis, who are unable to recognize her. They have no means of reading her outside of what they believe is her prescribed role. Mrs. Jervis convinces Pamela to appear in her disguise before Mr. B. in order to carry the prank one step further. Mr. B. pretends not to know her. Rather, he communicates very physically with her as if she **is** the unknown peasant girl who she appears to be; first, taking her by the hand, then taking

⁸In another intertextual twist, Pamela also engages in reading the bodies of other women. She is critical of Sir Jacob's sister, Judy, a woman of sixty who tries to pass herself off, with the help of powder, paint and clothing as considerably younger. Pamela worries, in her letter to Lady Davers, about Mrs. Judy in the first place because her behaviour "exposes her to the Remarks and Ridicule of the Gentlemen" (Volume IV, 285) but, more importantly, because she does not behave with the wisdom and dignity that is the duty of an older person.



The Politics of Men, Women, and Food

She favors the fat-free life; he'd sooner starve than ingest that oxymoron of a

dessert known as Skimpy Treat.

What to do?

By Jim Gerard

Recently, near a lavish buffet table at a work-related event, I overheard a conversation between two of my female colleagues.

"I'm being so *bad!*" squealed one of them with that unmistakable mixture of guilt and glee in her voice. "I just gorged on a huge plate of pesto pasta with Portobello mushrooms, but I'm sorry, I cannot *resist* this chocolate-peanut-butter mousse cake."

"Tell me about it," replied the other. "I've been a total piglet. I swear, tomorrow is definitely a grapefruit-and-springwater day."

Now, try imagining two men engaging in such a conversation. Impossible, right? Because men simply *eat* food, they don't obsess about it. Women's relationship with food, on the other hand, is far more complex, a stormy love-hate affair. Why? I contend the difference is rooted in prehistory. While the man assumed responsibility for hunting the mastodon, his wife was left with the task of tidying up the cave and deciding how to prepare the imminent bounty: filets or stew? With brushberry sauce or lightly blackened? Much of this culinary anguish was wasted, however, since most caveboys didn't care if their meal was still covered with fur, as long as it was *there*.

Today, women's food-related troubles focus on the fattening effects of overindulgence. Females monitor their bodies for signs of cellulite with

the compulsion of astronomers searching for Planet X. Conversely, men remain completely oblivious, even as they metamorphose into human life preservers. Women's conflicted desire for both tasty food and slim hips drives them to seek out odd, synthetic mutations on normal delicacies—something a man would never do. Even the highly body conscious among us would sooner starve than ingest the oxymoronic dessert known as Skimpy Treat.

How We Eat

The way women consume food varies a lot, depending on who's watching them: other women, no one at all, or men. With the latter—especially if romance is a possibility—they tend toward minimalism. They order salads and nouvelle cuisine-y dishes, such as "finger of radicchio," that look so bereft on the plate, you'd think the waiter had spilled the rest of the entrée en route. When forced to eat a heartier meal in front of the opposite sex, they first make a horrified face and say, "I'll *never* be able to finish this!" then nibble with a great display of timidity. When was the last time you heard a man say, "Oh, I'll have just one rib" or "No french fries for me. I'll take a bite of yours"?

"If I'm going to dinner with a man, I'll eat *beforehand* or just have a salad in the restaurant," my friend Roberta confesses. "God forbid he should think I'm a pig. By the time I get home, of course, I'm so starved, I could suck on frozen TV dinners." (I wonder if Roberta applies this same logic in other areas of her life. Before club hopping, does she tire herself out by dancing around her living room? Is it her habit to end sex after foreplay because she doesn't want her lover to think she's demanding?)

Alone at the table, most women do a complete turnaround. "When I'm by myself, I tend to eat anything that isn't glued to the plate," my coworker Dianne admits. Sarah, another friend of mine, is so reluctant to let her boyfriend, Dan, witness her solo bingeing, that soon after they started cohabiting, she encouraged Dan to take various night classes, so she could, as she puts it, "wrap my arms around a pizza" in private.

Women eating together are a totally different matter. If woman A is dieting successfully and consumes nothing but celery and seltzer, you can be sure women B, C, and D aren't chomping on cheese steaks. But if just one of them flirts with the idea of sharing a bag of peanut M & M's, the rest will follow, and the deca-

CARLOS MARRERO

her about the neck, and then speaking. "You are very pretty, Child; I would not be so free with your Sister, you may believe but I must kiss you" (*Pamela* 5, 61).⁹ Ignoring Pamela's immediate revelation of her "true" identity -- "O Sir, said I, I am Pamela, indeed I am: Indeed I am Pamela, her own self!" -- he kisses her anyway. Are women, then, in Richardson's version, never who (or what) they appear to be? In the masquerade scene, the widow countess who praises polygamy and comes close to having an affair with Mr. B. appears as a nun. Pamela, visibly pregnant, is dressed as a Quaker. Janet E. Aikins reminds us that though Pamela may have thought the disguise "prim," "Quakers were steadily ridiculed... for their reputed sexual license" (Aikins, 170). Richardson, Aikins is certain, would have been aware of this. In her estimation "Mr. B. has turned his wife into a visual joke" (Aikins, 170). But for what purpose? Has he in his supposed reformation lost his memory, his ability to think rakishly? Or does he want to draw attention to Pamela's body at the masquerade and away from his flirtation?

Richardson shows us Pamela's body undergoing a number of changes. Through Mr. B's retelling of the attempted rape scene we not only

⁹Why does he say this? Why does he say this like this? Does he possess a code of decorum or a code of familiarity for women based on their rank. Would he be more "free" with a peasant girl he has apparently never met before than with his mother's waiting maid who he so obviously lusts after? Or, is the whole statement designed for the consumption of Pamela in order to make her believe that if it were **she** standing there that he would not behave this way? It's also important to remember that at this point in the story, Mr. B. is involved in deciding Pamela's fate --whether she should be allowed to return to her parents, go to work for Lady Davers, or stay with him. His position, inside this process, would certainly influence his behaviour towards her.

see his motivation and desires for Pamela while she is still a child (and his abilities to control those desires) we see a sketch drawn by Mr. B. of Pamela from the age of thirteen as "her charms increased everyday... Besides the Beauty of her Figure, and the genteel Air of her Person, the dear Girl had a surprising Memory, a Solidity of Judgment above her Years, and a Docility so unequal'd, that she took all Parts of Learning... crouded upon her" (Vol. 999, 185-6). As her virgin status becomes an issue to be resolved, Pamela's body is used to highlight somatic symptoms which are directly connected to her psychic state -- her determination to remain virtuous which Restoration characters (whom Richardson is always interested in discrediting) read as "sick" and the rising Protestant middle class reads as "healthy".¹⁰ They are also symptoms which make her body more accessible to Mr. B. In what is almost a classic Freudian **scene of the kiss**, Pamela struggles, trembles and sinks down "not in a fit" in the Summer-house only to find herself in Mr. B's arms. He is able then to kiss her "two or three times, as if he would have eaten me" (*Pamela* 9, 35). When she actually faints during the two attempted rape scenes she is able, through her physical

¹⁰Freud discusses this relationship between body and mind in "Fragment of An Analysis of a Case of Hysteria": "We must recall the question which has so often been raised, whether the symptoms of hysteria are of psychical or of somatic origin, or whether, if the former is granted, they are necessarily all of the psychically determined.... As far as I can see, every hysterical symptom involves the participation of both sides. It cannot occur without the presence of a certain somatic compliance offered by some normal or pathological process in or connected with one of the bodily organs. And it cannot occur more than once -- and the capacity for repeating itself is one of the characteristics of a hysterical symptom -- unless it has a psychical significance, a meaning" (*P.F.L.*, Vol. 8, 73).



an intimate look at the life of a call girl

Michele*, whom I've arranged to meet in the opulent lobby of a Manhattan hotel, is thirty-five and asparagus-thin. She wears pearls and leather pumps, carries a no-nonsense briefcase, and looks more like a sedate stockbroker than a part-time call girl. When I introduce myself as the reporter to whom she's agreed to bare her life, she timidly smiles, then lowers her pretty hazel eyes. We find a quiet table in the elegant adjoining dining room, and our friendship begins...

"This is the image my customers want me to have," Michele confides over dinner, referring to the wealthy businessmen whom she services—for \$175 an hour. (Although Michele's personal preference is for men who are arty and colorful, the typical respondent to her weekly personal ad in sex tabloids is, surprisingly, of a more conservative stripe.) "They like me to look like a woman who works on Wall Street... but a little sexier. So I dress the part. I have nice legs, yet I don't wear very short skirts. My blouse is tasteful, but underneath I have no bra. And I never use perfume. Customers don't want to leave my apartment smelling like they've been in a boudoir."

Although terrified of discovery by a boyfriend, parents, cops, this sweet Midwesterner-turned-big-city-pro insists her work is rewarding. By Mary Reinholz

The business of meeting a client's libidinal needs takes place exclusively at Michele's studio apartment, located on the ritzy Upper East Side. There, she claims to feel totally in control. "When I apply for a job in the outside world [she freelances as a graphic artist], I have no power," she explains. "But when men walk through my door, they're on my turf. I create the atmosphere—flowers, lighting, music. One time, though, in the middle of a session, my usual classical-music station suddenly played the *Rawhide* theme song, which absolutely killed the mood." Michele orders filet mignon, medium rare, and a glass of white wine, then describes her modus operandi. First-time customers are generally nervous, so she tries to be a gracious hostess. "When a client walks in, I take his coat or jacket and

offer something to drink," she says. "Mostly I'm asked for a soft drink, which ends up sitting in the glass. We talk, but not about sex, and get to know each other a little. I never strip at the door or jump right into bed. After a while, I say something like, 'Do you feel comfortable?' and he might reply, 'Do you?' as if he is looking for approval and needs to feel attractive.

"At this point, I get him to take off his clothes, and I remove mine. If we start undressing each other, things get too romantic, and I try to keep a friendly distance. Then it's time to open the sofa bed. And I take the lead, constantly changing positions. Men hate it when women want to do only a couple of things. I'm great at giving oral sex, which they love, although not many want me to bring them to orgasm that way. Without intercourse, they'd feel unfulfilled."

Michele says she's encountered "few real creeps" during her fifteen-year stint in white-collar prostitution, but she has come into contact with her share of annoying customers: "Good-looking men are the worst. They're used to women falling all over them, so they're demanding. The nerdy ones, on the other hand, tend to be grateful." Nerdy or not, however, many clients, Michele reports, do believe the stereotype that all call girls are bimbos. "They feel anyone with brains wouldn't be doing this," she says with a sigh, "and they're surprised when I can keep up with them in conversation." (continued on 114)

PHOTOGRAPH BY TED HUBBARD. THE MODEL IN THIS PHOTO IS IN NO WAY ASSOCIATED WITH THE EVENTS OF THE STORY.

reaction, to control Mr. B.'s violence. There may be no intent, on Pamela's part to control Mr. B. in this way but a pathology of weakness is written as a consequence.¹¹

In the scenes immediately after her marriage when her virginity ceases to be an issue and her virtuousness is centered in other kinds of behaviour, she appears strengthened. In the dining room scene at the end of Volume 5, when she begins to fear physical violence from Lady Davers and Jackey, Pamela alludes to her "poor Heart" (Pamela 5, 324). When Lady Davers slaps her and Jackey draws his Sword to prevent Mrs. Jewkes (who warns them that Pamela will "fall into Fits") from leading Pamela out of the room, "Mrs. Jewkes held her Salts to my Nose and I did not faint" (Pamela 5, 329). Indeed, she is so strengthened by the justice of her married state that to escape she jumps out the window and runs "as hard as I could drive" (Pamela 5, 330).¹² Even her running becomes celebrated and retold, not only at Simon Darnford's dinner party which she escapes to attend (and tell her story) but in her own home: "Mr. Colbrand...told Mrs. Jewkes, when he got home, that he never saw such a Runner as me, in his Life" (Pamela 5, 331).

Things change drastically, though, once Pamela is fully incorporated within marriage. Marriage, once established and especially as it is read through Pamela's first pregnancy becomes a destabilizing force. Though

¹¹ Fainting can also be read as a sign of Pamela's sensibility and, hence, nobility.

¹² Her escape seems miraculously easy considering this is the house in which she had been imprisoned for so long. I guess this is because she is escaping **to** her husband, not from her jailer.

Pamela gives birth to five children (and has two more as the Conclusion tells us) in *Pamela* [1], pregnancy is hardly mentioned by Pamela herself. In several scenes, other characters remark upon changes in her body shape. Contrary to popular belief, pregnancy is not an illness but the changes in her body signal a further change in her status. Maternity requires Pamela to submit fully to the laws of marriage. This is demonstrated most clearly during her first pregnancy when she becomes preoccupied by her desire to breastfeed. The ensuing debate with Mr. B. on the subject takes up a sizable chunk of the text at the end of Volume [1]. Its result undoubtedly effects Pamela's relationship to her own body as well as her relationship with her children, husband and nurse. The debate between Pamela and Mr. B. is a power struggle not unlike the one they enacted prior to their marriage. Central to it is Mr. B.'s demand that "Husbands have a Dispensing Power over their Wives" (Vol. [1], 390). Pamela is aware that her answer on this will not only effect her relationship with Mr. B. but her relationship with God. She expresses confusion in a letter to her parents around the fact that "both Mr. B. and I build our Arguments on Scripture, tho' we are so different in our Opinions" (Vol. [1], 390-1). Ultimately her parents advise her to obey her husband. Her married state necessitates this shift in loyalties from God as master (her piety maintained her virginity in *Pamela* [1]) to husband as master.


The breastfeeding debate takes the form of an abstract exercise since it comes prior to Pamela's actual experience of lactation. It is not until Pamela is about to give birth to her first child that we are able to read

weakness in her body and mind again. Richardson sandwiches Pamela's first childbirth within the masquerade affair (between the actual masquerade and the playing out of the affair) and heightens Pamela's instability.¹³ Pamela's jealousy -- a flaw in her perfection -- frames the childbirth through Polly Darnford's comments both before Billy's birth and after it. Pamela is seen again (for the first time since her Lincolnshire imprisonment) at her most vulnerable. She writes a letter to Mr. B. to be given to him "if she dies" (Vol. IV, 117). Her anticipatory terrors of childbirth appear so excessive that those around her (including her mother) find it necessary to trick her into believing that the midwife is a distant relation of Polly Darnford. When the assistant of this midwife comes to check on Pamela, in Polly Darnford's words, "never did I see so much shyness and apprehension as Mrs. B. showed...holding sometimes her mother, sometimes Mrs. Harris, by the hand, and being ready to sweat with terror" (Vol. IV, 70). Still, even with this terror possessing her, Pamela is able to moralize to Polly Barlow from her bed by comparing her secure position of a woman about to give birth within marriage to

a poor Creature destitute of all spiritual Consolation (as well as of the Assistance and Comfortings of the nearest Friends and of a kind Husband), when she has sacrific'd her Honour, and cannot think of anything so probable, as the Moment approaches, but that GOD will publish her in kind...by the very Sufferings which are the natural Consequences of the Sin she has so wickedly committed (Vol. IV, 118).

¹³The titles of the plays Pamela sees and "reviews" for Lady Davers just prior to the masquerade -- *The Distressed Mother* and *The Tender Husband, or Accomplished Fools* -- match Pamela's preoccupations.

Though Mr. B. has argued that "freeing" Pamela from the "burden" of breastfeeding is a social advance -- both in terms of her class ascendancy and as a general level of advancement in the culture -- the reality is that Pamela is physically separated from her baby. Mr. B., who uses his argument against breastfeeding to also push for his endorsement of polygamy, neglects Pamela in order to pursue the Countess. Pamela may even be estranged from God (though she says in her letter to Lady Davers that "my Nursery, and my Reliance of God...are all my consolation" (Vol. IV, 142). She begins to alienate herself from her family-by-marriage when she fails to subscribe sister on her letters to Lady Davers. She is physically weakened by this aloneness fearing even to show her discomfort openly. "I am all patience in appearance, all uneasiness in reality" (Vol. IV, 144) This is partly due to the fact that Mr. B. has noted an "alteration" in her and orders her to improve her behaviour: "Don't receive me in this manner, I charge you." (Vol. IV, 145). After Billy's birth, Pamela replaces her fear of childbirth with the fear that she will lose Mr. B. to another woman. Her letters to Lady Davers become very short and anxious during this period to mirror her state of mind. In Letter LXXIX, she describes her "Eyes as swell'd with crying, and look red, although I am always breathing on my Hand, and patting them with that, and my warm Breath, to hide the Distress that will, from my overcharged Heart, appear in them" (Vol. IV, 144). Later in the same letter Pamela becomes almost irrationally fearful that Mr. B. and the Countess will try to take Billy from her and implies that she will attempt suicide if this comes to pass. She is still self aware enough, though, to see her behaviour as



What You
Should
Know
About His
Mother
Before
Committing
to Him

Jacqueline's* photography career is thriving. So is her six-year-old daughter. Her marriage, however, is not. Her husband, Robert, has been involved with another woman throughout the ten years of their marriage—as well as before. Even in their wedding pictures, this Other Woman is clutching Robert's hand, as if *she* were the bride. Her name is Sarah. She is Robert's mother.

The signs were there early on, but Jacqueline never put all the pieces together until recently. She should have recognized years ago that Robert invariably placed Sarah's wishes and needs above his wife's. One memorable incident occurred shortly after Jacqueline and Robert were married, when Jacqueline came home from work to find a brand-new fire-engine red carpet on the living-room floor. The beautiful tapestry rug in subtle tones of wheat and peach, Jacqueline's most prized possession, was nowhere in sight. Speechless, she stared at the red monstrosity. "It's a gift from my mother," Robert said, smiling. Jacqueline felt betrayed and angry that neither he nor her mother-in-law had asked her opinion—it was *her* home, after all, not Sarah's—but she said nothing. She didn't want to start a fight with Robert so soon into the life they'd started to build together. *It's only a rug*, she told herself. *What matters is that he values his mother's opinion, because that means he thinks well of women.* Only in hindsight did Jacqueline understand that Sarah's gift was nothing of the kind. It was a message: *My son belongs to me.*

You know how it is when you're newly in love. You share stories about your siblings, your parents, your ex-lovers, your shrinks. Your perceptions about life seem to converge. You feel like kindred spirits. You may have fallen in love a hundred times, but the beginning is always the same, full of hope and infinite possibility. You don't notice any snags

Not that she's the enemy—but do think of her as a potential ghost from his past who may haunt your life and love!

By Susan Squire

"unhealthy": "Your ladyship will think I rave. Indeed I am almost crazed at times" (Vol. IV, 154). But, what, in *Pamela*, must be read as the ultimate sign of health, she maintains the ability to control her own writing. She hides a letter in her bosom which he does not snatch out and in her postscript to Letter LXXIX, she requests that Lady Davers "let no Soul see any Part of this our present Correspondence, for your Brother's sake, and your sake, and my sake" (Vol. IV, 155).

Pamela's progress is charted only slightly through the geographical dimension. Where we would see a boy's coming-of-age or search-for-identity quest mapped through a series of adventures which take him outside of domestic space, a woman's development is constructed primarily through the changes which take place in her body. She may move (or be moved) from space to space but containment is always emphasized. Though expressions of sexuality are common to both quests, women's relationship to their sexuality and their own bodies seems to be consistently presented as a problem in need of a solution.¹⁴

¹⁴This brings to mind Freud's much quoted assertion from his essay "Femininity" (1933): "Throughout history people have knocked their heads against the riddle of the nature of femininity....Nor will you have escaped worrying over this problem -- those of you who are men; to those of you who are women this will not apply -- you are yourselves the problem" (P.F.L., Vol. 2, 146).

He was a Man of his Time: Freud in 1741

There are strong connections between Freud's reading of Dora's "hysteria" and Pamela. Why is it of any interest to read Pamela, a book published more than 150 years before Freud did his major work, in this way? I guess it's because male circumscribed behaviours for women which had become socially institutionalized before and through the writing of Pamela became with Freud institutionalized within the unconscious.¹⁵

The Scene of the Kiss

Freud presents **the scene of the kiss** as a defloration scene and connects it to Dora's troubled relationships with not only Herr K. and her father but with Frau K. The **scene of the kiss** is the central site for Freud's interpretation of Dora's "case". He reads Dora's past, present and future through the **scene of the kiss**, asserting particularly that "these symptoms...had been produced by the patient years before the time of the trauma, and that their earliest appearances belong to her childhood..." (P.F.L., Vol. 7, 27) In this way he prepares the ground for his inevitable elision of Herr K. and Dora's father (and later, Frau K.) as objects of Dora's desire. Freud reads **the scene of the kiss** -- at Herr K's "place of business" when Dora is about fourteen -- within a male construct of female sexuality. Clearly it is also these male-authored subtexts, these misguided notions of female desire, that drive the writing of Pamela.

¹⁵Elizabeth W. Harries article "Fragments and Mastery: Dora and Clarissa" is helpful too in understanding a relationship between Richardson and Freud.

As Freud writes Dora's description of the events, Herr K. conspires to get Dora alone and that accomplished "clasp[s] Dora to him and pressed a kiss upon her lips" (P.F.L., Vol. 7, 28) Dora's immediate response (which strikes me as quite "natural") is to break free and flee the building. Freud sees this response, though, as wholly unnatural and connects all of Dora's somatic symptoms to her hysterical behavior. In Freud's interpretation of **the scene of the kiss**, the kiss must have "called up a distinct feeling of sexual excitement". (P.F.L., Vol. 7, 28) Dora, by not responding positively to the kiss, displays, therefore, an hysterical reaction.

I should without question consider a person hysterical in whom an occasion for sexual excitement elicited feelings that were predominantly or exclusively unpleasurable; and I should do so whether or not the person were capable of producing somatic symptoms. (P.F.L., Vol. 7, 28)

Not only does he read Dora without a social context -- what were the social restrictions on a fourteen year-old girl's sexuality, for example, he denies Dora the right to her own reaction (disgust, as she apparently describes it) to the kiss. He labels her instead as unnatural and hysterical. Presumably a "natural" woman or a "healthy" woman would have allowed Herr K. to "make love to her" because this is what she "really wants". Freud's sense of Dora as commodity is also highlighted. As he reads her she is handed over by her father to Herr K. in order to appease him for Frau K.'s affair with Dora's father. Dora's hysteria lies in her inability to "complete the circuit" and properly pass through **the scene of the kiss**.

How does she blow dry it, curl it, perm it,
tease it, and still keep her hair so well adjusted?



She's into Therapy.

Alberto VO5. Hot Oil Hair Therapy.

A complete line of shampoos & conditioners that replenishes hair and helps restore its natural beauty. Only VO5 Hot Oil Hair Therapy has Hydratein™, a micro-fine moisturizing breakthrough. It penetrates deep to moisturize from the inside out and gives you more naturally beautiful hair.



VO5. Hot Oil Hair Therapy.
There's no end to the benefits of therapy.

© 1994 Alberto-Culver USA, Inc.

USA

There is a sense in which you can say that Pamela never becomes wholly hysterical because, unlike Dora, she does not fully reject Mr. B.'s advances. She merely postpones them until they become properly framed. Pamela is commodified too, but like a shrewd, risk-taking, businesswoman, she holds out in order to get the best possible deal. But this is not exactly what happens. In fact, Pamela never becomes wholly hysterical because no one intervenes in Mr. B.'s "courtship" of her and describes her actions/ reactions as inexplicable or unhealthy to a person in authority. In the summerhouse scene, Pamela's reaction mirrors Dora's: "she burst from him and was getting out of the Summer-house: **but he held me back, and shut the Door**" (Pamela J, 35, my emphasis). It is both Herr K.'s lack of coercion in his relationship with Dora and Freud and Dora's father's inability or disinclination to read him as Dora's seducer that results in an analysis which is ultimately hostile towards Dora. In Freud's retelling of Dora's story, Herr K. never warns Dora to keep either their **scene of the kiss** or, four years later, the **scene by the lake**, a secret. In the summerhouse scene, Mr. B. warns Pamela twice not to tell anyone. He even offers her gold "to make you Amends for the Fright I put you to" (which she refuses) and orders her to "take a Walk in the Garden, and don't go in till your blubbering is over" (Pamela J, 35). Pamela writes to her parents of the incident. She has already been keeping them up on Mr. B.'s inappropriate attention to her but she is unaware that her letters are being diverted and read by Mr. B. She also, after some thought to Mr. B.'s order, tells Mrs. Jervis who, though alarmed, advises Pamela to "not think of leaving my Service: for, says she, in

all Likelihood, you behav'd so virtuously that he will be asham'd of what he has done, and never offer the like to you again" (*Pamela* 9, 37). Clearly all of the people Pamela tells her story to up until her marriage are either unsympathetic or powerless to help her.

Dora's father does not share this position of powerlessness. It is merely in his interest to maintain his affair with Frau K. despite Dora's objections to it however they manifest themselves. He, and later Freud, frame Dora's story. Like Pamela, Dora keeps the stories of the **scene of the kiss** (which took place when she was fourteen) and **the scene by the lake** (when she was eighteen) to herself at first, attempting to control the situation by cutting herself off from the K.'s for a little while at least. She claims, indeed, that Freud is the first to hear of **the scene of the kiss**. The events of **the scene by the lake** on the other hand were communicated to Dora's mother "intending that what she said should be passed on to her father" (*F.P.L.*, Vol. 8, 56). Once Herr K. is confronted by Dora's father and denies any ill intent, Dora is blamed for the scene. Herr K. even suggest that Dora's imagination was "over-excited" by her reading of books on sexual matters and that she made the whole thing up. Dora's governess had also been similarly accused for such reading.

Richardson's devotion to social contextualization also apparently helps Pamela to maintain her stability. Freud's remarks show no insight into either Dora's age or social position although he mentions that at age eighteen she employs herself by "attending lectures for women". (*F.P.L.*, Vol. 8, 53). Surely, part of the reason why she is able to communicate her outrage

regarding Herr K.'s "proposal" to her with a slap to his face and a story to her mother, is because she is eighteen, not fourteen. Indeed, she may have developed opinions about her unjust status as a woman, which make it possible and necessary for her to express her disapproval. She may also have reached an age at which she is interested in choosing a mate and rejects her father's choice.

Why is virginity a problem anyway?

- a) Because female sexuality must be controlled.
- b) Defloration is a crucial moment in a woman's sexual history.
- c) It has to be enacted by the "right" man.
- d) Because of inheritance.
- e) Because female sexuality must be controlled.

Pamela writes her wedding day in nervous snatches 'to the moment' spread over ten pages. She begins with a journal entry at six o'clock in the morning and ends with an entry at "Eleven o'Clock Thursday Night." As we have seen elsewhere, during the masquerade affair in Pamela II, Pamela's "idle Fears and Apprehensions" (Pamela I, 294) manifest themselves through very short letters or journal entries. Because Mr. B. has decided to keep their marriage secret even from the servants, Pamela's actual moment of defloration is postponed until later due to the unexpected arrival of "three mad rakes" to dine with him. They not only disrupt the wedding night but



Just How Realistic Are You About Marriage?

By Theda Dritchell

You accept his foibles—his getting to the airport two hours early, calling “Mommy” to rehash her previous night’s bridge game. But what if you *married* him? Never mind his by-now familiar faults; holy wedlock presents a whole new slew of pitfalls for which even the most ardently enamored girl may not be prepared. So *before* committing, why not test your marital IQ by choosing the most appropriate response to each of the questions below, and brace yourself for *eye-opening* revelations!

1. Your beloved is a football nut; you, on the other hand, detest any kind of spectator sport. Ever resourceful, you:

- a. Pursue interests of your own while he sits in his La-Z-Boy recliner, cheering on the home team.
- b. Develop a nodding acquaintance with the Cowboys, Troy Aikman, and the draw play, then get set to pass the popcorn.
- c. Introduce him to some *active* joys—say, tennis and tromping through the woods—and see if he doesn’t get *unhooked* from watching “the game.”

2. After a year of blissful matrimony, your dear one isn’t as attentive as he once was. Your plan would be to:

- a. Let him *know*—in rational, non-combative terms—how neglected you feel.
- b. Simply *stifle* complaints.
- c. Schedule more time together—and while you’re at it, ask yourself what you’ve done for *him* of late!

3. Bedtime has become distressingly routine. What to do?

- a. Not a thing for now; after all, sometimes loving’s hot, and sometimes it’s not.
- b. Get him to open up about what he wants and expects from sex.
- c. Try new positions.

4. Your mate has always played the role of strong protector. If he should suddenly lose his job, you would:

- a. Treat him the way you always have—i.e., as your shining knight.
- b. Encourage him to share his fears, making it clear you love him even *more* for showing his vulnerable side.
- c. Follow his lead—either showering him with TLC *or* simply letting him be (depending on what he seems to want).

5. Now imagine that your spouse is in a major career slump while you’re soaring. How to deal?

- a. Crow a little—anything less would be dishonest.
- b. Downplay your achievements—a *small* price, you believe, to save his pride.
- c. Acknowledge the problem and talk about how other couples have coped (or *failed* to cope).

6. The best way to handle *most* conflicts, you feel, is to:

- a. Avoid *dwelling*.
- b. Listen, really listen, while your partner airs his point of view.
- c. Go straight to the mat—backing down from a zesty argument was never your style.

7. For a while now, Mr. Adorable has been oddly irritable. You take this to mean he’s:

- a. Bored.
- b. Having troubles away from home.
- c. Leaving something important unsaid.

remind us of where Mr. B.'s roots lie.¹⁶ With what mimics rake-like smoothness, Mr. B. prepares Pamela for her defloration with soothing words -- "And yet I will indulge my dear Girl's bashful Weakness so far, as to own that so pure a Mind may suffer from Apprehension, on **so important a Change as this**" (*Pamela* 5, 294 --my emphasis) and by "kindly forcing [her to] drink two Glasses of Champaign, and afterwards a Glass of Sack" (*Pamela* 5, 295). The morning after, Pamela writes to her parents that "[a]t Breakfast...I knew not how to see him" (*Pamela* 5, 296). She describes how Mr. B. "emboldens" her with his 'indulgence,' 'pity,' 'purity,' 'decency,' and 'chastity,' wondering happily "that a Gentleman, who had allow'd himself in Attempts, that now I will endeavour to forget for ever, should have behav'd with so very delicate and unexceptionable a Demeanour" (*Pamela* 5, 296). Richardson asserts here that the transition from virgin to wife, even in a woman as delicate and full of sensibilities as Pamela, is almost seamlessly achieved when enacted within a loving marriage. What defloration unleashes in a woman in Pamela's circumstances is not hostility but gratitude and the desire to serve.¹⁷

¹⁶They bring a concrete challenge to Mr. B. on his relationship with Pamela: "I find, said [Mr. B.] Lady Davers is full of our Affairs. She has taken great Freedoms with me before Sir Charles; and they have all been at me without Mercy; and I was forced to be very serious with them, or else they would have come up to have seen you, as I would not call you down" (*Pamela* 5, 292).

¹⁷The taboo of virginity which Freud refers to in his essay is a blood taboo with "defloration...unleashing an archaic reaction of hostility towards [the man]" (*P.F.L.*, Vol. 7, 282)

The rake's greatest sin is, perhaps, his failure to take seriously the business of inheritance. Freud begins his essay "The Taboo of Virginity" (1918 [1917]) by talking about just how "firmly rooted" the notion of virginity is, "indeed, [it is] nothing other than a logical continuation of the right to exclusive possession of a woman, which forms the essence of monogamy" (P.F.L., Vol. 7, 265). The assumption of marriage is always there. During Mr. B's retelling of the attempted rape, he introduces his mother as a character who constantly urges him to marry:

She used, in vain, therefore, to plead family reasons to me. Like most young fellows, I was too much a self-lover to pay so great a regard to posterity; and, to say truth, had very little solicitude at that time, whether my name were continued, or not, in my own desendants. (Vol., 999, 192).

The rake moves from virgin to virgin, performing a defloration ritual quite different from those that Freud refers to in his essay. Citing various anthropological texts, Freud tells us that "In the Philippines there were certain men whose profession it was to deflower brides" (P.F.L., Vol. 7, 268). This is clearly an important part of a larger marriage ritual. The community is drawn together by the act of defloration "outside marriage and before the first act of marital intercourse" (P.F.L., Vol. 7, 266). The rake's function within his community seems not to emphasize the coherence of that community but to disrupt it. The rake's method, without reservation, utilizes deceit and subterfuge in order to gain sexual access to virgins (and other women). Part of the challenge, for example, for Mr. B. at the beginning of his pursuit of

Pamela (at least as he retells and *Pamela* rewrites it in *Pamela JSJ*) is to fool others as to his intentions towards *Pamela* by appearing aloof and disdainful. Richardson, with his interest in conduct and dictating conduct, writes against Mr. B. and all rakes to help *Pamela* preserve her virginity. This is done in order that she be able to engage in the "proper" ritual of defloration -- by the husband within marriage.

Though, from some perspectives, Mr. B. is the one circumscribed by his own need to reform (and later by his need to reform further and accept piety), he is the one who literally dictates the rules of marriage to *Pamela*. As Freud describes it, typically, the loss of virginity "creates a state of bondage in the woman which guarantees that possession of her shall continue undisturbed and makes her able to resist new impressions and enticements from outside" (P.F.L., Vol. 7, 265). Freud and others use the term **sexual bondage** to describe the relationship between the husband and his once virgin wife. The implication is clear that what is at stake here is the husband's ability to control his wife's sexuality. The concern that ultimately dominates Freud's reading of virginity, though, is not that of inheritance-- of knowing who the father of her children is. It is the uncontrollable desire in women that the loss of virginity supposedly releases.¹⁸ This, as Susanne

¹⁸The rake is only too happy to find this sexual insatiability in a woman. He merely rejects the institutionalization of it within marriage. In *Pamela JSJ* who can blame Mr. B., a former rake, for wanting to get a little on the side with an experienced woman (a widow, therefore, no messy duels to fight) who publicly endorses polygamy?

When I Lost My Virginity

Don Johnson

*was the youngest—
at twelve (and single)
—Phil Donahue the
oldest, a married man
of twenty-three. And
in between range a
host of celebs whose
first-time tales of
sex-at-last are firmly
rooted in their teens!*

By David Ragan

MADONNA: "I went through puberty before most of the girls I knew. My lover when I was fifteen was named Russell, and the first time I had sex with him. After we'd been going together for several months, I was really curious to find out what making love was all about. I wasn't disappointed. But the idea that the first guy I ever slept with is now married and has kids really breaks me up."

▼ BRUCE WILLIS:

"My first sexual experience was a lucky break that happened when I was a fourteen-year-old bellboy at a Holiday Inn in New Jersey. The weekend night clerk there,

a buddy of mine in his twenties, would often invite friends over to the motel for some pretty wild parties. When I looked in on one of them, I spotted this really gorgeous chick who was older than me by a few years. I couldn't believe my luck when she started coming on to me. So we went down to the laundry room together, and she kind of guided me through it. Things got kinda hot down there among all the motel's clean sheets. It was honestly the most incredible experience of my life."



TED DANSON: "Attending a boys' prep school meant I stayed ignorant for too long of the traditional initiation rites of boy-girl relationships. But in my freshman year at Stanford University, which was coed, I made some great discoveries about the real world, about the opposite sex, and yes, about sex too."

DUSTIN HOFFMAN: "I was fifteen and a half. She was what was known in those days as a nymphomaniac—at least, that was the term we used. But she was a very nice person. Her name was Barbara, and she was about nineteen. It happened when my brother Ronnie was home from Korea on leave, and he threw a New Year's Eve party, and the parents were gone. Anyway, there was a line of guys standing



outside this bedroom door. I said, 'What's going on?' and they said, 'This woman's in there, and she's taking us on one at a time.' And they put me in front. I was very excited when I walked in. It was very dark. 'Hello, Barbara,' I said, and she said, 'Is that you, Ronnie?' In a split second, my brain told me, *You'd better be Ronnie or she's going to kick you out.* So I said, 'Yeah,' in my brother's voice. Like the first time for so many of my colleagues in the world, it was over before it began. But I couldn't believe that was it, so I just kept going, partly out of fear, because she thought she was making love to my brother. When a shaft of light came in, she saw my face and screamed. And I jumped off and just ran out, naked. If I ever had to look back at the first moment I knew I was an actor or realized it was a good idea to be one, I'd have to say that was it."

BARBRA STREISAND: "I couldn't even think about having sex until I got past certain inhibitions. Sex was taboo in my family. It was drilled into me that you don't hold hands, you don't kiss—because you could get a disease—and you absolutely don't make love until you get married. With that background, I didn't have my first sexual experience until I was eighteen. In one way, it was what I expected it to be, but not completely. It got better later."

BOY GEORGE: "I've attracted straight men since I was very young. One man who was rather important in my life was a famous Italian pop singer. We met on the tube in London. I was a punk with spiky hair and wearing bondage gear. He came up to me and, smiling, asked if I



PHOTOS: GERRARD SOMAZA/OUTLINE; RUSS FIMHORN/VSAGES (top to bottom)

Kappeler points out, is what has come to be perceived as women's 'natural' state, one to be feared.

When [the woman-object] is new, unused, intact, it bears the seal of its 'unwillingness' in its virginity....Once the seal is broken, however, the woman-machine gets going, responding to its use. The presumed unwillingness was only a state of inexperience. The underlying presupposition is that the body is insatiable....The unwillingness of the woman-victim is thus the cultural state of woman, coded by the patriarchal economy of the exchange of women, in its laws and its religions. The willingness of the woman-object is the natural state to which she has been returned through the offices of men. Willingness and unwillingness are thus expressions of her body not determinations of her mind (Kappeler, 157-158).

Richardson represses all knowledge of this aspect of the willing/unwilling dichotomy in *Pamela* by writing her willingness as a "determination of the mind". From a feminist perspective this shift might be perceived positively except that it is not **her** mind which does the determining. Along with this rewriting of willingness comes the erasure of *Pamela* as a sexual presence. Defloration within marriage works to desex her. In Richardson's construction of woman, self-discipline and piety are emphasized even after marriage. *Pamela* cannot abandon her virginal appearance for this is the representation that all have come to admire.¹⁹ When forced to, Mr. B. can

¹⁹Look at how affronted the married *Pamela* is when an 'admirer' leaves verses under her seat at church. As she says to Lady Davers in her discussion of the incident: "it would extremely shock me but to know that any wicked Heart had conceived a Design upon me: Upon me...whose only Glory and Merit is, that I have had the Grace to withstand the greatest of Trials and Temptations from a Gentleman more worthy to be beloved, both for Person and Mind, than any man in England" (Vol. 999, 231-2).

admire Pamela's appearance and even consider her exceptional or beautiful, but his desire for her (which 'unmanned' him in *Pamela*) is and must be replaced by his desire for her to serve and reproduce.²⁰ There is a class aspect to this change in Mr. B. Just as Pamela must efface the 'wanton' sexuality associated with her class of servant girls, Mr. B. must learn to forget he is a rake and meet with Pamela on this new middle-class plane.

There they meet Freud and Dora. Jane Gallop reads this same sense of class-biased virtual virginity in Freud and Dora's dismissive posture towards Dora's governess. In Gallop's reading, Freud and Dora "cannot bear to identify with the governess because they think there is still some place where one can escape the structural exchange of women. They still believe that there is still some mother who is not a governess" (Gallop, 147). In the process of social ascendancy, Pamela's defloration is a marker. It is also illusory. Richardson tries to convince us that she must not only leave her individual past behind,²¹ she must leave her past as a servant-girl behind.

²⁰The best example of this is during Mr. B.'s telling (or retelling) of the masquerade affair when he describes a conversation (sexually charged, no doubt) between himself and the countess: "Tell me now of a Truth [she said], with all the Charms your too agreeable Flattery gives me, Which is the most lovely, your Pamela or myself?" (Vol. IV, 223) Mr. B. proceeds to compare the hair, foreheads, complexions, eyes, cheeks, noses, smiles, teeth, chins, ears, and necks of the two women.

²¹Her parents are conveniently ascended along with her though her other relatives are disassociated from her and left behind. This process of abandonment is the first issue Pamela asks for Lady Davers' advice on in *Pamela*. Interestingly, where Pamela's initial interest in heredity comes up is before her first childbirth where she expresses the anxiety that if she dies in childbirth, her parents will lose their possession of the Kent farm. Lady Davers writes to Mr. B. asking him to reassure Pamela that her parents will inherit the farm (Vol. IV, 104).

Freud's comment to Jung that "well-informed persons assure me that these [servant] girls are much less diffident about engaging in coitus than about being seen naked" (Freud-Jung Letters, 64) underlines the pervasiveness of such stereotypes (as well as embarrassingly betraying Freud's upper-class bias and his social irresponsibility toward the many clear cases of rape which he encountered in his practice, but preferred to label **infantile fantasy**). But it is only this way because Richardson (and Freud) says so. And has the authority to say so. In order to speak for Richardson and maybe, more importantly, in order to be listened to, and therefore serve as an exemplary figure, Richardson knows that Pamela must renounce her group's sexual history. This is partly achieved by the consistent alienation of Pamela and Mr. B. after their marriage and is best demonstrated by their practice of communicating by letter even while in the same house. In Pamela, while their sexual relations were being negotiated, interchanges between the two were mostly recorded as live (and lively) conversation within Pamela's letters.

Inheritance **is** the issue for Richardson. Pamela's project and purpose in Pamela clearly becomes procreation. This is to further Richardson's purpose of Pamela as an exemplary wife and mother.²² Yet it is a procreation process that denies the sex act in its aversion to the pregnant body, its emphasis on the terrors Pamela experiences prior to childbirth (but

²²She is even able to have the "correct" gender distribution among her seven children, as prescribed by (interestingly) the childless Lady Davers (Vol. IV, 30-1). This can also be read across Richardson's own personal anxieties about heredity. All of his sons died young. His daughters survived.

only the first one) and on the education of children where this whole process of writing women's sexuality can be neatly reproduced. We see this clearly in the nursery tale Pamela tells Miss Goodwin and the other children and transcribes for Polly Darnford (now a mother herself) as part of the final letter in Pamela. Pamela through her regenerated history never really loses her virginity. Perhaps it is this lack of change in Pamela that most marks her defloration.

Looking at what might have been: A Kind of Conclusion (though clearly not a solution)

I had this impulse to figure out what other marriages Pamela might have had if things hadn't worked out with Mr. B. I thought I could go back to the texts and look at what Mr. B.'s mother had said about this and what Mrs. Jervis had said and the evil stuff Mr. B. had planned with marrying her off to Colbrand or Williams or whatever that was. I actually started to do it but then the most depressing thought hit me: it wouldn't have made any difference. I kept thinking that any kind of marriage would have been bad. Or maybe it's because marriage is a commodity and where we're catching Richardson is when marriage is changing from one kind of product to another kind of product. And none of these products are really any good for women. They're not even for women. They treat women like a problem that needs a box wrapped around it. Or a frame. Or 48 Rules. Or a book. Maybe Simon Darnford throws the book at Polly because he can't put her in it. And when he can't adequately answer Pamela's letter, he tries to get her husband on his side. Well I guess it would have made a difference. It would have been worse for Pamela to have been married to Simon Darnford. I didn't really look at how Mrs. Darnford feels about her marriage. After they're married Mr. B. does try for the most part to be nice to

Pamela and he's proud of her and likes to show her off even to his almost lover. That was a weird scene. Have I talked myself out the depression already?

I started typing in this font because it's called **New Century Schoolbook**. I guess it has its roots somewhere, maybe in a font called Schoolbook. Maybe I wanted to see if my ideas looked more academic or maybe more childishly academic if I used this font. Just like in the last section where I used a font -- kind of romantic, kind of ethereal, kind of like handwriting -- called **Nadianne**, no, wait a minute: **Nadianne** to talk about women's issues in an odd, tentative way. Maybe I just should have handwritten it. Or would that have blown the credibility of the project completely?

Form concerns me a lot. Richardson and I are connected in this way at least. By making a **production** out of this project I've tried to underline how form and production work to control expression. I guess it bothers me too that all these words take a long time to read and a lot of people can't even read them and maybe there are other visual means of explaining these ideas. Or maybe (my favourite expression?) it's just complicated and my unwillingness to accept the prescribed form will simply work to complicate things formally. Or maybe, I wouldn't be able to write about what I'm writing about if I didn't play with the form.

Honestly, it's not a game with me. If you look back at all of the things I've been talking about: publishing, editorial frame, rape, marriage, virginity -- they are all institutions which even at the slightest probing break open and offer possibilities for new readings and, indeed, new ways of experiencing those realities. It's actually, in my opinion, a disservice to Pamela (and probably to Richardson too) to just let her lie there in that book for all these years without thinking about how the container within which she lies (the book object) holds us in there too. I feel this particularly from my female perspective but I think it holds all of us who share this inherited middle-class, Western culture. On one hand it seems so normal, so *natural*...but it has its weird and scary side too. How have we come to think this way? To whose advantage? What happened to everyone else? **What has been lost?** **Who** has been lost?

Works Cited and Consulted

- Aikins, Janet E. "Re-presenting the Body in Pamela II." in New Historical Literary History. eds. Jeffrey N. Cox and Larry J. Reynolds. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Armstrong, Nancy. Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Barbault, Anna Laetitia. The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson, Vol. VI. London: Richard Phillips, 1804.
- Berg, Temma, "From Pamela to Jane Gray: or, How Not to Become the Heroine of Your Own Text" *Studies in the Novel*, 17.2 (Summer 1985), 115-137.
- Booth, Wayne C. The Rhetoric of Fiction. Second Ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- Brown, Murray L. "Learning to Read Richardson: Pamela, 'Speaking Pictures,' and the Visual Hermeneutic" *Studies in the Novel*, 25.2 (Summer 1993), pp.129-151.
- Carroll, John. Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- Castle, Terry. Masquerade and Civilization. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1986.
- Cohen, Philip. Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory. Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia, 1991.
- Dance, James, Henry Giffard, Mr. Edge and Carlo Goldoni. Pamela : Four Versions. New York: Garland, 1975.
- Doody, Margaret Anne. A Natural Passion. A Study of the Novels of Samuel Richardson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Doody, Margaret Anne and Peter Sabor, eds., Samuel Richardson: Tercentenary Essays. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Eaves, T.C. Duncan and Ben D. Kimple. Samuel Richardson: A Biography. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- "Richardson's Revisions of Pamela," in *Studies in Bibliography*. Charlottesville, Virginia: The University Press of Virginia, 1967.
- Freud, Sigmund. New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis. Pelican Freud Library, Vol. 2, ed. Angela Richards, Penguin Books, 1973.
- On Sexuality. Pelican Freud Library, Vol. 7, ed. Angela Richards, Penguin Books, 1977.

- Case Histories I. Penguin Freud Library, Vol. 8, ed. Angela Richards, Penguin Books, 1990.
- Gallop, Jane. The Daughter's Seduction. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982.
- Gaskell, Philip. From Writer to Reader: Studies in Editorial Method. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- A New Introduction to Bibliography. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Gwilliam, Tassie. Samuel Richardson's Fictions of Gender. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Harries, Elizabeth W. "Fragments and Mastery: Dora and Clarissa" *Eighteenth Century Fiction*, Vol. 5, No. 3, (April 1993), 217-38.
- Haywood, Eliza. A Present for a Servant-Maid (1743). New York: Garland Publishing, 1985.
- Heath, Stephen. The Sexual Fix. London: Macmillan, 1982.
- Higgins, Lynn A. and Brenda R. Silver, eds., Rape and Representation. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Kappeler, Susanne. The Pornography of Representation. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
- Kelly, John. Pamela's Conduct in High Life. (1741), New York: Garland, 1975.
- Locke, John. "Some Thoughts Concerning Education" in The Works of John Locke, Vol. IX, London: Thomas Tegg, et. al., 1823.
- McGuire, William, ed. The Freud/Jung Letters. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.
- McKeon, Michael. The Origins of the English Novel 1600-1740. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.
- McKillop, Alan. Samuel Richardson: Printer and Novelist. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1936.
- Richardson, Samuel. Pamela; or, Virtue Rewarded. Vols. I & II, Eaves and Kimple, eds. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971.
- Familiar Letters on Important Occasions. London: Geo. Routledge and Sons, 1928.
- Pamela; or Virtue Rewarded. Vol 3. Oxford: Basil Blackwell for the Shakespeare Head Press, 1929.

- Pamela; or Virtue Rewarded. Vol 4. Oxford: Basil Blackwell for the Shakespeare Head Press, 1929.
- "The Case of Samuel Richardson of London, Printer; with regard to the INVASION of his PROPERTY in The History of Sir Charles Grandison before Publication by certain BOOKSELLERS in Dublin" (1753) in English Publishing, the Struggle for Copyright and the Freedom of the Press: Thirteen Tracts 1666-1774. New York: Garland, 1975.
- Rivero, Albert J. "The Place of Sally Godfrey in Richardson's Pamela" *Eighteenth Century Fiction* , Vol.6, No. 1 (October 1993), pp. 29-46.
- Rivington, Septimus. The Publishing Family of Rivington. London: Rivingtons, 1919.
- Sale Jr., William M. Samuel Richardson: Master Printer. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1950.
- Samuel Richardson: A Bibliographical Record of His Literary Career with Historical Notes. Archon Books, 1969.
- Sussman, Charlotte. "I Wonder Whether Poor Miss Sally Godfrey be Living or Dead: The Married Woman and the Rise of the Novel" *Diacritics* 20.1 (1990) 88-102.
- Watt, Ian. The Rise of the Novel. London: Hogarth, 1987.
- Wolf, Naomi. The Beauty Myth. Toronto: Vintage Books, 1990.