

Loughborough University
Institutional Repository

*Theorizing voice and
perspective in the narratives
of Eliza Haywood and her
contemporaries*

This item was submitted to Loughborough University's Institutional Repository by the/an author.

Additional Information:

- A Doctoral Thesis. Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy of Loughborough University.

Metadata Record: <https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/2134/6353>

Publisher: © Joanna Elizabeth Fowler

Please cite the published version.

This item was submitted to Loughborough's Institutional Repository (<https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/>) by the author and is made available under the following Creative Commons Licence conditions.



CC creative commons
COMMONS DEED

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5

You are free:

- to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work

Under the following conditions:

BY: **Attribution.** You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor.

Noncommercial. You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

No Derivative Works. You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

- For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.
- Any of these conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.

Your fair use and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

This is a human-readable summary of the [Legal Code \(the full license\)](#).

[Disclaimer](#) 

For the full text of this licence, please go to:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/>

Theorizing Voice and Perspective in the Narratives of Eliza Haywood and her
Contemporaries

by

Joanna Elizabeth Fowler

Doctoral Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements

for the award of

PhD of Loughborough University

January 2010

© by Joanna Fowler 2010

Certificate of Originality

This is to certify that I am responsible for the work submitted in this thesis, that the original work is my own except as specified in acknowledgments or in footnotes, and that neither the thesis nor the original work contained within it has been submitted to this or any other institution for a degree.

..... (Signed)

..... (Date)

Abstract

This thesis traces the career of the prolific eighteenth-century author Eliza Haywood through narratological analysis of some of her key works. It contributes to the new wave of Haywood criticism that is moving away from the thematic, gender based focus that has dominated discussion of her oeuvre since her critical rediscovery in the 1980s.

My narratological method demonstrates how understanding at a formal and thematic level is enhanced by the employment of theoretical narrative paradigms. Narratology is interested in the relationship between the events of a narrative (story) and how these events are presented (text). I utilize the narratological terminology of Gérard Genette because it is narrative discourse, rather than the mere events of a story, that provides the basis for a meaningful discussion concerning matters of presentation. Making the topic of narrative discourse central to the study requires analysis of voice, point of view, speech, and temporality, as it covers the ways in which the story is told. Throughout her career, Haywood manipulates these narrative features so as to create inventive texts that adapt to the changing trends of the literary marketplace. Key topics of discussion include Haywood's continuous but developing use both of the embedded narrative and anachronies; the differing levels of intrusion created by her narrators' employment of metanarrative commentary; and her progressive use of metalepsis: from her inclusion of simple scene changes in her earlier work, to her emphatic use of explicit diegetic interruptions in her later work that mirror those utilised by Henry Fielding.

The thesis follows a chronological structure and is historically and bibliographically informed. This approach enables the thesis to provide extended comparison of Haywood's narrative choices with those of her main forebears and contemporaries, especially Aphra Behn, Delarivier Manley, Samuel Richardson, Tobias Smollett, and Henry Fielding.

Contents

	<u>Page Number</u>
Acknowledgments	vi
Glossary	vii
Introduction	1
The Development of Haywood Criticism	1
The Study of Narratology	8
Chapter 1: Haywood's Developing Narrative Strategies, 1719-23	16
Aphra Behn, <i>The History of the Nun</i>	20
William Congreve, <i>Incognita</i>	24
<i>Love in Excess</i>	29
<i>The Danger of Giving Way to Passion</i>	41
Chapter 2: Satisfying 'Curiosity': The Novellas of 1724-28	51
<i>Fantomina</i>	51
Scandal Chronicles	60
Delarivier Manley, <i>The New Atalantis</i>	61
Haywood's Scandal Fictions	65
<i>The Secret History of the Court of Caramania</i>	68
Secret Histories	77
Chapter 3: Narrative Experimentation in the Post- <i>Dunciad</i> Years, 1729-43	85
<i>The Adventures of Eovaai</i>	85
<i>Anti-Pamela</i>	100
<i>Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman</i>	105
Chapter 4: 'Moral Conversion' or Literary Progression? The Fiction of 1744-56	119
<i>Dalinda</i>	121
<i>The Fortunate Foundlings</i>	136
<i>The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy</i>	145
Conclusion	157
Objectives and Outcomes	157
Haywood's Narrative Techniques	160
Review of Methodology	166
Further Research	168
Bibliography	170
Primary Sources	170
Secondary Sources	173

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Loughborough University for funding the first year of my research, and the *AHRC* for funding the final two years.

Many thanks to my Supervisor, Professor Bill Overton, for his advice and support. I would also like to thank the staff and postgraduate community in the Department of English and Drama at Loughborough University, and the Subject Librarians in the Pilkington Library.

Glossary

Definitions are taken from Gérard Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, trans. by Jane E. Lewin (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980), except for those in the ‘Narrative Voice: Level’ and ‘Focalization’ sections, which are taken from Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 2002), and Mieke Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, trans. by Christine van Boheemen, 2nd edn (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 1997) respectively, because of the further clarity that they provide.

Narrative Voice: Level

extradiegetic narrator: ‘A narrator who is, as it were, “above” or superior to the story he narrates is “extradiegetic”, like the level of which he is a part’ (Rimmon-Kenan, p. 95).

intradiegetic narrator: ‘if the narrator is also a diegetic character in the first narrative told by the extradiegetic narrator, then he is a second-degree, or intradiegetic narrator’ (Rimmon-Kenan, p. 95).

hypodiegetic narrator: ‘a third-degree narrator’ (Rimmon-Kenan, p. 95).

Narrative Voice: Person

heterodiegetic narrator: ‘the narrator [is] absent from the story he tells’ (Genette, p. 244).

homodiegetic narrator: ‘the narrator [is] present as a character in the story he tells’ (Genette, p. 245).

autodiegetic narrator: ‘[a] homodiegetic [narrator] [...] [who] is the hero of his narrative’ (Genette, p. 245).

Focalization

focalization: ‘is the relationship between the “vision”, the agent that sees, and that which is seen [...]: A says that B sees what C is doing’ (Bal, p. 146).

focalizer: ‘The subject of the focalization [...] [who] is the point from which the elements are viewed’ (Bal, p. 146).

character focalization: ‘The reader watches with the character’s eyes’ (Bal, p. 146).

external focalization: ‘an anonymous agent, situated outside the fabula, is functioning as a focalizer’ (Bal, p. 148).

Narrative Speech

direct or reported speech: ‘The most “mimetic” form [of speech]’ (Genette, p. 172).

indirect speech: ‘this form never gives the reader any guarantee – or above all any feeling – of literal fidelity to the words “really” uttered: the narrator’s presence is [...] too perceptible in the very syntax of the sentence for the speech to impose itself with the documentary autonomy of a quotation’ (Genette, p. 171).

free indirect speech: ‘economizing or subordination allows a greater extension of the speech, and thus a beginning of emancipation, despite the temporal transpositions [...]. [Also known by] the absence of a declarative verb’ (Genette, p. 172).

Narrative Temporality

anachrony: ‘all forms of discordance between the two temporal orders of story and narrative’ (Genette, p. 40).

analepsis: ‘any evocation after the fact of an event that took place earlier than the point in the story where we are at any given moment’ (Genette, p. 40).

prolepsis: ‘any narrative manoeuvre that consists of narrating or evoking in advance an event that will take place later’ (Genette, p. 40).

metalepsis: ‘any intrusion by the extradiegetic narrator or narratee into the diegetic universe (or by diegetic characters into a metadiegetic universe, etc.)’ (Genette, pp. 234-35).

ellipsis: ‘where a nonexistent section of narrative corresponds to some duration of story’ (Genette, p.93).

descriptive pause: ‘where some section of narrative discourse corresponds to a nonexistent diegetic duration’ (Genette, p. 94).

paralipsis: ‘[a] kind of lateral ellipsis [...] [or] retrospective filling-in’ (p. 52).

‘the omission of some important action or thought of the focal hero, which neither the hero nor the narrator can be ignorant of but which the narrator chooses to conceal from the reader’ (Genette, p. 196).

paralepsis: ‘[the] giving [of] information that should be left aside’ (Genette, p. 195).

Introduction

A metamorphosis is occurring in Haywood studies. A critical shift is in evidence as analysis moves away from the thematic, gender based focus that has dominated Haywood discussion since her critical rediscovery in the 1980s, towards a broader survey of her work approached from a variety of interpretive perspectives, including political, comparative and historicist viewpoints. Key in this critical progression has been the recognition that the pigeon-holing of Eliza Haywood's works into homogeneous 'amatory' and 'moralistic' stages is limiting and pejorative. Patrick Spedding, in his *Bibliography of Eliza Haywood*, has also proven this labelling to be inaccurate through his attribution of the translation of the notoriously erotic *Le Sopha* by Claude-Prosper Jolyot de Crébillon to Haywood. He states that

The presence of *The Sopha* late in the Haywood canon ought to undermine the division, made by some, of Haywood's writings into early immoral works and late moral works. It also ought to be enough to end any attempt to link this putative division to Alexander Pope's attack on Haywood in *The Dunciad* in 1728.¹

The research field has been invigorated by this acknowledgement, because, as Al Coppola points out, it no longer 'seem[s] sufficient to view any of her [Haywood's] texts as uni-dimensional'.²

The Development of Haywood Criticism

Haywood, as a woman writer at a period when print culture was greatly expanding, and an author of 72 individual works that cover numerous generic categories,³ such as prose fiction, drama, poetry, translation, and periodical writing, demands critical acknowledgement. Her emergence from literary anonymity can primarily be attributed to her inclusion in the critical debate over the 'rise of the novel'. Unacknowledged in the seminal twentieth-century study by Ian Watt that argues that the development of the novel is intrinsically linked with the rise of Protestantism and economic individualism, and gives overwhelming precedence to the 'formal realism' of novels by Daniel Defoe, Samuel Richardson, and Henry Fielding,⁴ Haywood's position in the formation of this prose fiction genre has been debated ever since by literary theorists, cultural historicists, and feminist critics alike. For scholars who disagree

¹ *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), p. 20.

² 'The Secret History of Eliza Haywood's Works: The Early Novel and the Book Trade', *1650-1850: Ideas, Aesthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era* (New York: AMS Press, forthcoming; I am grateful to Coppola for allowing me prior access to this article).

³ Spedding, p. 20.

⁴ *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding* (Berkeley: University of Los Angeles Press, 2001), p. 10.

with the ‘teleological’ nature of Watt’s study,⁵ Haywood is a recognised figure in respect of the ‘prehistory’ of the novel. Michael McKeon sees the novel as a dialogic form that addresses the ‘instability’ both of ‘generic categories’ and of ‘social categories’.⁶ He states that ‘novelistic narrative becomes recognised as such in the way its form (or epistemological concerns) can be seen to correspond with its content (or socio-ethical concerns)’.⁷

Haywood’s works do not achieve this convergence for McKeon, though, and are discussed as ‘romance models’ that address only the socio-ethical side of the binary.⁸ J. Paul Hunter similarly sees Haywood as a precursor to the canonical novelists of the eighteenth century as she ‘constructed significant works of fiction of the emerging kind’.⁹ However, he does view Haywood as being in a ‘vexed’ position as her works demonstrate affinities with romance, but have “‘novelistic” features too’.¹⁰ Similarly to McKeon and Hunter, John Richetti, in *Popular Fiction Before Richardson*, asserts that studies of the ‘rise of the novel’ need to take into account the contemporaries of canonical novelists, because

we cannot [...] understand Defoe and Richardson properly until we take into account their participation in this milieu, unless we understand that their contemporary popularity was the result of their being able to use or exploit much more capably the same raw materials (i.e. ideas, attitudes, ‘myths’) as their fellows.¹¹

Richetti presents a lengthy analysis of Haywood in his study, addressing her work in two separate chapters. However, as indicated in the aforementioned quotation, his aim in doing so is to highlight what he perceives to be the superiority of the novels of Defoe and Richardson in comparison to the ‘mass art’ produced by writers like Haywood and Delarivier Manley.¹²

It was not until feminist critics entered the ‘novel’ debate that Haywood was discussed as a novelist rather than a novelistic precursor. Jane Spencer opens her significantly titled text *The Rise of the Woman Novelist* with the assertion: ‘Eighteenth-century England witnessed two remarkable and interconnected literary events: the emergence of the novel and the establishment of the professional women writer.’¹³ She gives the debate a biographical turn and goes on to discuss the works of several women novelists, Haywood included, as part

⁵ This description of Watt’s study is used in John Richetti, *Popular Fiction Before Richardson: Narrative Patterns, 1700-1739* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 2.

⁶ Michael McKeon, *The Origins of the English Novel 1600-1740* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), p. 20. McKeon states that one of his aims in his text is to provide a prehistory of the novel, p. xviii.

⁷ McKeon, p. xvii.

⁸ McKeon, p. 213.

⁹ *Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction* (New York and London: Norton, 1990), p. 22.

¹⁰ Hunter, p. 360.

¹¹ *Popular Fiction*, p. 5.

¹² *Popular Fiction*, p. 5.

¹³ *The Rise of the Woman Novelist: From Aphra Behn to Jane Austen* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), p. viii.

of ‘the feminist project of uncovering women’s history’.¹⁴ Spencer places analytical emphasis on studying Haywood as a woman writer and the difficulties that this sociological label evokes. As William Warner notes,

the feminist study of early writing by women has had the important role of bringing the novels of Behn, Manley, and Haywood back into print, critical discourse, and literary histories. But the project of feminist reappropriation has sometimes been guided by political values and conceptual terms that have obscured the actual significance of Behn, Manley, and Haywood in early modern culture.¹⁵

Warner reimagines the position of women writers in the novel debate by, he claims, ‘rewriting the literary history of the novel’.¹⁶ He states: ‘I do not assume the novel to be a type of literature, so I understand them [Behn, Manley, and Haywood] as early and formative players in another story -- that of the beginning of early modern print entertainment’.¹⁷

Unlike in previous cultural historicist accounts of the novel, Warner attempts to view so-called ‘predecessors’ as active participants in mass market formation, by foregrounding the influential nature of ‘novels of amorous intrigue’ on canonical ‘elevated novels’.¹⁸ From his critical viewpoint, ‘These new novels overwrite -- by disavowing but appropriating, tossing out but recycling -- the novels they spurn.’¹⁹ His study goes some way in presenting a comparative rather than a two-tier evaluation of non-canonical and canonical novels.

However, the pejorative connotations of the phrase ‘formula fiction’ that he assigns to the work of Manley and Haywood undermine his attempt at critical levelling.²⁰ Haywood’s position in this formative period seems to have concretized, and is addressed in modern studies of the debate, such as Brean Hammond and Shaun Regan’s *Making the Novel*, and Rachel Carnell’s *Partisan Politics, Narrative Realism, and the Rise of the British Novel*.²¹

The significance of such contributions as those by Richetti, Spencer, and Warner in the re-appropriation of Haywood cannot be denied, but they do also demonstrate some of the limitations of formative Haywood studies. Her identification as a woman writer who produced formulaic fiction, was associated with Aphra Behn and Manley as part of the ‘Fair

¹⁴ Spencer, p. viii.

¹⁵ *Licensing Entertainment: The Elevation of Novel Reading in Britain, 1684-1750* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), p. 89.

¹⁶ Warner, p. xi.

¹⁷ Warner, p. xiii.

¹⁸ Warner, p. 42.

¹⁹ Warner, p. 42.

²⁰ Warner, p. xv.

²¹ Brean S. Hammond and Shaun Regan, *Making the Novel: Fiction and Society in Britain, 1660-1789* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005); Rachel Carnell, *Partisan Politics, Narrative Realism, and the Rise of the British Novel* (New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

Triumvirate of Wit',²² and who evolved from 'the Great Arbitress of Passion' to a moralistic writer,²³ is difficult to surmount (especially as some of these labels can be traced back to the eighteenth century). Gradually these myths have been disproved through close textual, biographical, and bibliographical work, and the field of Haywood studies is evolving. In 1992, Ros Ballaster's *Seductive Forms* represented a progressive text in respect of eighteenth-century women's writing as, unlike previous feminist critics, she recognised that 'generic conventions are at least as important as ideological concepts in the making of women's fiction and the shaping of representations of femininity in this transitional period'.²⁴ In this book, she traces the formation of amatory fiction from its early European influences to its adoption by Behn, Manley, and Haywood. In her history of the form, Ballaster, similarly to Warner,²⁵ identifies a shift in terms of the genre when it is employed by Haywood by suggesting that

From 1720 onwards women's amatory fiction turned away from employing sexual desire as a substituting metaphor for political interest. Sexual desire, in these 'new' novels of the 1720s, is too protean and absolute a quality to be the vehicle for any other form of 'interest'.²⁶

By the time Ballaster included an essay in Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio's collected edition of Haywood articles in 2000 her convictions had changed. Noting the use of non-gendered and male narrators in Haywood's texts, a move she previously saw as 'a retreat from the attempt to figure (female) party political agency through sexual political narrative',²⁷ Ballaster suggests that 'Haywood chooses an aesthetics consciously and satirically signposted as "masculine" for political effect'.²⁸ As Margaret Case Croskery points out, the progression of Ballaster's work can be seen to characterise the progression of Haywood studies, as many accounts of her career have 'been reversed or redirected (either by rival critics or by theorists dissatisfied with their original assessments)'.²⁹ Consequently, new critical horizons are opening up and approaches are broadening.

²² This phrase was coined by James Sterling in his poem 'To Mrs. Eliza Haywood on Her Writings' that was part of the prefatory material in Haywood's *Secret Histories, Novels, and Poems*, 2nd edn, 4 vols (London: for Dan Browne, Jun. and S. Chapman, 1725), I, ii-v (p. iv).

²³ Similarly, this phrase was coined by Sterling.

²⁴ *Seductive Forms: Women's Amatory Fiction from 1684-1740* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 22.

²⁵ Warner, p. 111.

²⁶ *Seductive Forms*, p. 154.

²⁷ 'A Gender of Opposition: Eliza Haywood's Scandal Fiction', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 143-67 (p. 143).

²⁸ 'A Gender of Opposition', p. 144.

²⁹ 'Who's Afraid of Eliza Haywood?', *Literature Compass*, 4 (2007), 967-80 (pp. 969-70).

For example, the politicized nature of Haywood's work has been evaluated in two essays in the edited Haywood collection, *Fair Philosopher: Eliza Haywood and The Female Spectator*, by Carnell in her discussion of what she calls 'narrative realism' in Haywood texts, and by Elizabeth Kubek in her 'Patriot Whig reading' of *The Adventures of Eovaai*.³⁰ The seeds of comparative analysis, as produced by Warner, have been developed by scholars such as Hammond who discusses the different 'reading experiences' evoked by Haywood's work in comparison to that of Defoe, by Richetti in his article on the 'intersection' of both the lives and works of Haywood and Henry Fielding, and by J. David Macey, Jr, in his analysis of the 'garden scene' in Madame de Lafayette, Haywood, and Frances Burney.³¹ More still needs to be done in this area, though, because of Haywood's penchant for rewriting. Haywood admits to this propensity in the preface to her 1720 translation, *Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier*. In defending the presence of a preface, she declares that

*I should not have troubled my Reader, with offering any thing in my own Defence, if the liberty I have taken in many Places of adding, and in others of diminishing (where I thought so doing would render the whole more entertaining) had not made it highly necessary. I am very sensible that, to those who consult the French, what I have done will appear to be more properly call'd a Paraphrase than a Translation.*³²

In 1733, alongside William Hatchett, Haywood produced *The Opera of Operas*, which Spedding describes as 'a ballad-opera adaptation of Henry Fielding's very successful play *The Tragedy of Tragedies*',³³ and she added to the body of *Pamela* imitations with *Anti-Pamela* in 1741. Her work can also be linked to the canonical novelists of the day by comparing her fictional accounts of real-life events with male-authored accounts of the same ones. For example, she depicts the court case involving James Annesley in her 1743 text *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman* and is followed in doing so by Tobias Smollett in 1751 in *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle*.

³⁰ Kathryn R. King, 'Patriot or Opportunist? Eliza Haywood and the Politics of *The Female Spectator*', and Earla A. Wilputte, "'Too ticklish to meddle with': The Silencing of *The Female Spectator*'s Political Correspondents', in *Fair Philosopher: Eliza Haywood and The Female Spectator*, ed. by Donald J. Newman and Lynn Marie Wright (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2006), pp. 104-21, pp. 122-40; Carnell, *Partisan Politics, Narrative Realism, and the Rise of the British Novel*; Elizabeth Kubek, 'The Key to Stowe: Toward a Patriot Whig Reading of Eliza Haywood's *Eovaai*', in *Presenting Gender: Changing Sex in Early-Modern Culture*, ed. by Chris Mounsey (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 2001), pp. 225-54.

³¹ Brean S. Hammond, *Professional Imaginative Writing in England, 1670-1740: 'Hackney for Bread'* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 216-32 (p. 227); John Richetti, 'Histories by Eliza Haywood and Henry Fielding: Imitation and Adaptation', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood*, pp. 14-47; J. David Macey, Jr, "'Where the World May Ne'er Invade'?: Green Retreats and Garden Theatre in *La Princesse de Clèves*, *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless*, and *Cecilia*", *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 12 (1999), 75-100 (p. 87).

³² *Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier* (London: for William Chetwood, 1721), p. iv.

³³ Spedding, p. 318.

Critical expansion is also evident because relatively unexplored Haywood texts are being critically illuminated. Earla Wilputte has produced articles on *Frederick, Duke of Brunswick-Lunenburgh* and *A Letter from H- G-g, Esq.*, whilst 2006 saw the publication of an essay collection dedicated to examining Haywood's long running periodical, *The Female Spectator*.³⁴ However, there is still much to address in respect of Haywood's immense oeuvre as set out and documented by Spedding in his 2003 *Bibliography*. Historicist studies concerned with the biography, bibliography, and book history of Haywood have increased in recent years, building on, and, in some cases, correcting the work of Haywood's early biographers David Erskine Baker, George Frisbie Whicher, and Christine Blouch.³⁵ A clear picture of Haywood's life is difficult to establish accurately as little biographical evidence exists. According to Baker, 'she [Haywood] laid a solemn injunction on a person, who was well acquainted with all the particulars of it [her life], not to communicate to any one the least circumstance relating to her';³⁶ and, as Spedding notes, 'few records [on Haywood] survive of a public or private nature. Likewise, no single public or private library has approached completeness in gathering together the works of Haywood.'³⁷ Consequently, early biographies, particularly that of Whicher, contain inaccuracies that have been carried into Haywood criticism. Recent historicist studies try to work with hard evidence rather than supposition. For example, Coppola considers Haywood's publication history in respect of marketing strategies of the book trade, whilst Kathryn King looks to work on and by Martha Fowke, Richard Savage, and Aaron Hill in order to discuss Haywood's fictional representations of these real-life figures in her scandal fiction.³⁸ It is this new wave of historicist and bibliographical work that has particularly fed into my approach to Haywood. I aim to further broaden the field of Haywood studies, because, whilst the recent interest in book history has contributed to widening the critical viewpoint, there is still a need for properly systematic textual study.

³⁴ Earla A. Wilputte, 'Eliza Haywood's *Frederick, Duke of Brunswick-Lunenburgh*', *SEL*, 41 (2001), 499-514; 'Parody in Eliza Haywood's *A Letter from H- G-g, Esq.*', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 17 (2005), 207-30; *Fair Philosopher: Eliza Haywood and The Female Spectator*, ed. by Don Newman and Lynn Wright (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2006).

³⁵ See David Erskine Baker, 'Eliza Heywood', in *Biographia Dramatica, or, A Companion to the Playhouse* (London: for Mess. Rivingtons; T. Payne and Son; L. Davis; T. Longman; and G. Robinson [and 4 others], 1782), Vol 1, pp. 215-16; George Frisbie Whicher, *The Life and Romances of Eliza Haywood* (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing LLC, 2004); and Christine Blouch, 'Eliza Haywood and the Romance of Obscurity', *SEL*, 31 (1991), 535-52.

³⁶ Baker, p. 216.

³⁷ Spedding, p. 16.

³⁸ Coppola, 'The Secret History of Eliza Haywood's *Works*'; King, 'Eliza Haywood, Savage Love, and Biographical Uncertainty', *Review of English Studies*, 59 (2007), 722-39.

The focus of this thesis is an area of Haywood studies that still remains underdeveloped: formal analysis. Haywood's 'innovative' approach to narrative form has been alluded to by several critics, including Donald J. Newman and Lynn Marie Wright, and Croskery,³⁹ whilst her narratorial choices have been discussed by critics such as Paula Backscheider who referred in 2000 to Haywood's 'long line of slippery, teasing narrators [...] [that] are often disguised observers, purported neutral observers, and shocked but uninvolved citizens';⁴⁰ and also by Marta Kvande who had an article published in 2003 entitled 'The Outsider Narrator in Eliza Haywood's Political Novels'.⁴¹ However, the classifications utilised by both of these critics refer as much to the civic position of these narratorial figures as to their formal one; for example, Kvande concentrates on the societal status of the 'outsider narrators' rather than the narratological level that they inhabit. In 2003 Eileen Wilson completed her thesis on 'Narrative Structure in the Novels of Eliza Haywood', and this study comes closest to the approach taken by this current thesis.⁴² However, whilst the aim of Wilson's work is similar to that of this thesis, with both studies highlighting Haywood's 'continuous narrative experimentation' and demonstrating how close textual analysis of Haywood's formal techniques can add to our understanding of her oeuvre,⁴³ they differ greatly in approach. Firstly, Wilson, other than devoting a chapter to *Love in Excess*, focuses on Haywood's work from the last twenty years of her career, whereas this thesis discusses key texts from all periods of her publication history. Secondly, narrative voice and temporality take precedence in Wilson's study, whilst this thesis has a sharp focus on examining narrative perspective and discourse alongside the other topics. Thirdly, Wilson's analysis of form is based on a more empirical type of narratology as it focuses in greater detail on plot events and thematic mirroring and repetition within the story-level. In comparison, I utilise structuralist narratological terminology to explore the patterning at play in Haywood's work. Use of this kind of technical terminology is more evident in discussion of Haywood's use of speech representation by Deborah Nestor in her account of perspective

³⁹ Newman and Wright refer to Haywood's 'innovative experiments in voice, narrative structure, and point of view' in their 'Introduction' to *Fair Philosopher*, pp. 13-41 (p. 20), whilst Croskery states that 'it seems worth taking another look at Haywood's narrative techniques and her tricky blend of romance and novelistic narrative' in her article, 'Who's Afraid of Eliza Haywood?', p. 973.

⁴⁰ 'The Story of Eliza Haywood's Novels: Caveats and Questions', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood*, pp. 19-47 (p. 27).

⁴¹ 'The Outsider Narrator in Eliza Haywood's Political Novels', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 43 (2003), 625-43.

⁴² 'Narrative Structure in the Novels of Eliza Haywood' (unpublished thesis, University of Ulster, 2003).

⁴³ Wilson, p. 226.

and ideology in *The History of Betsy Thoughtless*,⁴⁴ but a sustained narratological study of narrative person, focalization, speech representation, and temporality that employs formal taxonomic labelling has not been undertaken. In concluding her findings in the aforementioned article, Kvande recognises that this represents a gap in Haywood studies. She suggests that

By examining the kinds of narrators Haywood constructs, we can identify continuities and show the connections between her amatory, political, and domestic fictions: the outsider narrators can thus be a means of seeing Haywood's career as a whole, rather than fragmented into phases.⁴⁵

My intention is to present a narratological analysis of Haywood's prose-fiction works that follows a chronological approach and is historically and bibliographically informed. I do not aim to dismiss ideas of thematic and formal development in her corpus, but, in line with critics such as Spedding and Coppola, hypothesize that stylistic progression is motivated by a changing literary marketplace rather than some kind of personal conversion.

The Study of Narratology

Monika Fludernik provides a concise and accurate definition of narratology when she states that

[it] is the study of narrative as a genre. Its objective is to describe the constants, variables and combinations typical of narrative and to clarify how these characteristics of narrative connect within the framework of theoretical models (typologies).⁴⁶

Narratology is interested in the relationship between the events of a narrative (story) and how these events are presented (text). Russian formalists make the distinction between these two levels of narrative by employing the terms 'fabula' and 'sjuzhet', whilst French structuralists utilise 'histoire' and 'discours'.⁴⁷ The employment of narratology can be traced back to Plato's *Republic*, but many of the seminal studies in the field are born out of formalism and structuralism.⁴⁸ It is a practice that has spawned schools in several countries (Russia, France, Germany, and the USA), and it can be approached from a variety of theoretical

⁴⁴ 'Virtue Rarely Rewarded: Ideological Subversion and Narrative Form in Haywood's Later Fiction', *SEL*, 34 (1994), 579-98 (p. 584).

⁴⁵ Kvande, p. 640.

⁴⁶ *An Introduction to Narratology* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), p. 8.

⁴⁷ For an explanation of these terms see Fludernik, *An Introduction to Narratology*, pp. 2-4.

⁴⁸ Regarding the beginning of narratology and Plato's place in it see Susana Onega and José Angel Garcia Landa, 'Introduction', in *Narratology: An Introduction*, ed. by Onega and Landa (London: Longman, 1996), pp. 1-41 (p. 13).

perspectives.⁴⁹ Narrative can be analysed regarding content and structure (as taken up by Vladimir Propp, and Roland Barthes),⁵⁰ discourse (as epitomised in the work of Gérard Genette, Mieke Bal, Wayne Booth, and Mikhail Bakhtin),⁵¹ and also phenomenology (see the work of Dorrit Cohn).⁵² Modern narratologists have diversified the field even more by adopting cultural and historical perspectives. Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan defines these studies as taking a ‘postclassical’ approach, as opposed to the ‘classical’ approach of founding narratologists.⁵³

In presenting this formal analysis I employ the narratological terminology of the French structuralist Genette because it is narrative discourse, rather than the mere events of a story, that enables an investigation of the intricacies of Haywood’s formal techniques. Making the topic of narrative discourse central to the study requires analysis of voice, perspective, speech, and temporality as it covers the manner in which the story is told. Temporality is an important topic in Haywood’s texts because she often utilises intercalated narratives that disrupt narrative organisation. The order in which a story is told can be disrupted from its chronological course by ‘anachronies’. These can take the form of an analepsis, described by Genette as ‘any evocation after the fact of an event that took place earlier than the point in the story where we are at any given moment’, or a prolepsis: that is, ‘any narrative maneuver that consists of narrating or evoking in advance an event that will take place later’.⁵⁴

Use of voice and perspective is also illuminating in Haywood’s texts. As Rimmon-Kenan notes, Genette views a text as a ‘stratification of levels’ and differentiates between different kinds of narrators and focalizers (figures through whose perspective the narrative is seen) according to which narrative level they inhabit.⁵⁵ The events of a narrative represent the diegetic level, and Genette ‘defines [...] difference[s] in level by saying that *any event a*

⁴⁹ For a concise introduction to the different conceptions of narratology see Fludernik, *An Introduction to Narratology*.

⁵⁰ V. Propp, *Morphology of the Folktale*, trans. by Laurence Scott, 2nd edn (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968); Roland Barthes, ‘Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives’, in *Image, Music, Text*, trans. by Stephen Heath (London: Fontana, 1977); and *S/Z* (London: Blackwell, 1990).

⁵¹ Gérard Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, trans. by Jane E. Lewin (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980); Mieke Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, trans. by Christine van Boheemen (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985); Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (London: Penguin, 1991); M. M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981).

⁵² Dorrit Cohn, *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983).

⁵³ *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 2002), pp. 143-49.

⁵⁴ *Narrative Discourse*, p. 40.

⁵⁵ *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, p. 92.

narrative recounts is at a diegetic level immediately higher than the level at which the narrating act producing this narrative is placed.⁵⁶ Therefore, as Rimmon-Kenan puts it,

A narrator [or focalizer] who is, as it were, ‘above’ or superior to the story that he narrates is ‘extradiegetic’, like the level of which he is a part [...]. On the other hand, if the narrator is also a diegetic character in the first narrative told by the extradiegetic narrator, then he is a second-degree or intradiegetic narrator.⁵⁷

Genette also makes a distinction between, to use Rimmon-Kenan’s words, a narrator ‘absent from the story he tells’ (a heterodiegetic narrator) and a narrator ‘present as a character in the story he tells’ (a homodiegetic narrator).⁵⁸ His distinctions between different narrative levels are particularly useful for analysing the works of Haywood, again, because of her propensity to use intercalated narratives, and her tendency to subvert the division between the story (‘the narrated events, abstracted from their disposition in the text and reconstructed in their chronological order, together with the participants in these events’) and text (the ‘spoken or written discourse which undertakes their [the events] telling’) levels of the narrative.⁵⁹ This is evident in her utilization of extra-heterodiegetic narrators who provide both metanarrative ‘commentary on the text and commentary on the diegesis’.⁶⁰

Using Genette’s narratological distinctions creates an analytical framework for discussion. However, there is a divergence from his terminology and/or allusion to other narratologists in two cases. Firstly, this occurs when Genette’s classifications have been significantly developed, while remaining in line with his original intentions. For example, Fludernik’s work on metalepsis is utilised, as it looks at a feature of narrative voice that Genette describes as ‘any intrusion by the extradiegetic narrator or narratee into the diegetic universe (or by diegetic characters into a metadiegetic universe, etc)’.⁶¹ Fludernik extends Genette’s work on the feature by defining different types of metalepsis and looks at Henry Fielding’s usage of it in the same period.⁶² Similarly, William Nelles is referred to regarding embedded narratives as he develops Genette’s work by identifying different levels and features of intercalation.⁶³ Secondly, alternative nomenclature is employed when it is believed that more useful terms have been derived. For example, a third-degree narrative is

⁵⁶ *Narrative Discourse*, p. 228.

⁵⁷ Rimmon-Kenan, p. 95.

⁵⁸ Rimmon-Kenan, pp. 244-45.

⁵⁹ Rimmon-Kenan, p. 3.

⁶⁰ Mieke Bal, ‘Notes on Narrative Embedding’, *Poetics Today*, 2 (1981), 41-59 (p. 56). Bal does not refer to Haywood’s works, but is setting out the difference between these types of commentary.

⁶¹ *Narrative Discourse*, pp. 234-5.

⁶² ‘Scene Shift, Metalepsis, and the Metaleptic Mode’, *Style*, 37 (2003), 382-400.

⁶³ *Frameworks: Narrative Levels and Embedded Narrative* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997).

denominated the hypodiegetic level, in line with Bal and Rimmon-Kenan, rather than metadiegetic as termed by Genette, because the prefix used by the former is more accurate.⁶⁴

However, arguing the point for specific narratological terminology does not come within the scope of this thesis. Neither does an in-depth sociological analysis of Haywood's readership. This is why there has been an omission of Bakhtin's form of narratology that explores the competing discourses at work in narratives and, hence, their dialogism, in favour of Genette's more syntagmatic approach. Some might question the usefulness of this classificatory method, but Genette himself addresses these concerns when he states that

the analysis of foundations discloses, beneath the smooth horizontality of successive syntagms, the uneven system of paradigmatic selections and relationships. If the object of analysis is indeed to illuminate the conditions of existence -- of production -- of the text, it is not done, as people often say, by reducing the complex to the simple, but on the contrary by revealing the hidden complexities that are the *secret* of the simplicity.⁶⁵

I would argue, similarly to Genette, that examination of form can be illuminating regarding exploration of content. Genette's taxonomical labels may seem complex, but an explanation of their use, and confirmation of their meanings, is sought throughout the thesis. They are necessary to this study, because of the accuracy that they enable when explaining multi-level narratives, such as the scandal fictions of Haywood and Manley. Hunter states that 'Even the best narratology seems to derive from an assumption that texts have no essential cultural grounding, in either place or time.'⁶⁶ However, the aim is not to lose the reader in endless formal language, but to keep that within its proper bounds and make necessary reference to non-formal elements of Haywood's texts. When discussing texts, Haywood's formal choices are also considered in relation to material and economic facts about book production, marketing, and selling, and the literary-historical context of texts.

Through close narratological analysis, I follow in the footsteps of academics who have successfully applied Genettian terminology in recent studies both to early-modern texts (see Wilhelm Fuger's 2004 paper on Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*) and modern texts (a good example being Amy Lai's analysis of 'Narrativity in Xinran's *The Good Women of China* and *Sky Burial*').⁶⁷ The purpose of this approach is to demonstrate the complexities at work in Haywood's prose fiction and question the 'formulaic' tag previously attached to her work by

⁶⁴ See Rimmon-Kenan, p. 95, and Bal, p. 43.

⁶⁵ Genette, p. 138.

⁶⁶ Hunter, p. 9.

⁶⁷ Wilhelm Fuger, 'Limits of the Narrator's Knowledge in Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*: A Contribution to a Theory of Negated Knowledge in Fiction', *Style*, 38 (2004), 278-89; Amy Lai, 'Self and Other: Narrativity in Xinran's *The Good Women of China* and *Sky Burial*', *Connotations*, 16 (2006-7), 194-218.

critics such as Richetti and Warner.⁶⁸ For example, discussion of Haywood's use of kaleidoscopic focalization questions the former's assertion that one of the traits of amatory 'formula' fiction is that 'action, incident, and plotting take precedence over ideas or characters',⁶⁹ as the numerous character perspectives often presented by Haywood in her texts means that narration of action is accompanied by character reaction. Similarly, by highlighting the use of prolepses throughout Haywood's body of work, the aim is to rebut Richetti's proposition that, in comparison to Manley's texts, Haywood's narratives 'take on a ludic chanciness, [and] feelings appear more spontaneous, and the action less predestined'.⁷⁰ Also, through work on Haywood's use of extradiegetic narrators, it is hoped that the idea that Haywood steps into her work as a narrator -- an idea that still appears in criticism, even Richetti's -- can finally be eradicated.⁷¹

As previously noted, the chapters of the thesis are organised around a chronological study of Haywood's work. This structure carries risks as it may be seen as conforming to the conventional splitting of the Haywood canon into distinct thematic categories -- categories that I have already rejected. However, the rationale behind this decision lies in the fact that this structure allows for analysis of how Haywood adapts her work both thematically and narratologically, in order to comply with changing literary trends, and, in doing so, for questioning and redefining some of the inaccurate labels that have previously been attached to her career. Key topics of discussion include Haywood's continuous but developing use both of the embedded narrative and anachronies; the differing levels of intrusion created by her narrators' employment of metanarrative commentary; and her progressive use of metalepsis: from her employment of simple scene changes in her earlier work, to her emphatic use of explicit diegetic interruptions in her later work that mirror those utilised by Henry Fielding. Another intention in adopting this structure is to allow extended comparative discussion in respect of Haywood's narratological choices and those of her literary contemporaries, especially Behn, Manley, Smollett, Richardson, and Henry Fielding. As a result, it is the intention to add to the number of studies of Haywood that recognise that she

⁶⁸ John Richetti, *The English Novel in History, 1700-1780* (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 42; William Warner, *Licensing Entertainment*, p. 294.

⁶⁹ Warner, p. 113.

⁷⁰ Warner, p. 114.

⁷¹ Richetti refers to Haywood as narrator in *The English Novel in History, 1700-1780* (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 47.

was not only a *woman* writer but a woman *writer*, one who grappled not only with questions of identity but also with issues of form, and who belongs in our histories of the novel because her texts are self-conscious explorations of narrative.⁷²

Because Haywood's publication output was much greater earlier in her career, the different periods of her career covered in each chapter cannot be identical. It is impossible to explore each of Haywood's prose narratives fully because of the amplitude of her body of work, so each chapter provides detailed case studies of key texts that are supplemented by reference to further works from the same period. The thesis begins chronologically by looking at *Love in Excess* (1719-20) in the chapter that covers the period 1719-23. It considers Haywood's position within the 'rise of the novel' debate and how her work can be seen to incorporate narratological features of both the European romance and its shorter predecessor the *nouvelle*. Before focussing on Haywood's narratological technique, those of her French predecessor, Lafayette, and her English predecessors, Behn and William Congreve, are analysed so as to indicate the literary milieu that Haywood was entering into. Her first work, *Love in Excess*, is a text that has received much critical attention, but has also been the subject of some misguided judgements, because, for a long time, it was believed to be Haywood's most popular text. Analysis of the narratological properties of *Love in Excess* is crucial to my discussion, because if I am to highlight the progression of Haywood's formal techniques then I must start by looking at her inaugural text. Like many of her early works, it utilises an extra-heterodiegetic narrator who implies that she has had contact with the diegetic characters. It also contains five intercalated narratives that are autodiegetically presented by intradiegetic characters. These embedded tales have been discussed in respect of their amatory themes, but the focus here is on their narratological status -- for example, how they relate to the primary narrative and how they manipulate narrative temporality to great effect.

The next chapter, covering the period 1724-28, demonstrates how narratological analysis can support previous critical theories about the representation of 'curiosity' in Haywood's work. This topic has been discussed by scholars including Barbara Benedict and King, but with a focus on theme and characterisation, rather than narratology. However, analysis of focalization, temporal disruption, and narratorial presentation can be enlightening as regards how 'curious' characters are portrayed and 'curious' readers satisfied. The chapter starts with an analysis of *Fantomina: Or, Love in a Maze* (1725), as it is a text that follows the adventures of one of Haywood's most 'curious' characters. It then continues by looking at

⁷² Scott Black, 'Trading Sex for Secrets in Haywood's *Love in Excess*', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 15 (2003), 207-26 (p. 207).

how Haywood and her publishers adapted to literary trends of the day in order to address popular culture of the eighteenth century, by presenting entertaining, yet narratologically complex, gossip-filled novellas and scandal narratives. These works depict present-day social situations that readers can associate with and satisfy the current trend by presenting ‘insider gossip’. A case study of one of the most famous examples of the scandal genre, Manley’s *The New Atalantis*, is included so as to indicate how Haywood’s work in this field both adapted and expanded on the narrative techniques used by her predecessors. These techniques allow authors to present controversial and entertaining texts whilst remaining far enough detached from the opinions articulated. Therefore, they remain relatively free from attack from the parties injured by the satirical portraits presented.

The fact that the following chapter that covers 1729-43 requires a different approach is itself evidence of Haywood’s development as a writer. Three case studies form this section of the thesis as Haywood’s ability to innovate and constantly adapt her subject matter and narrative style, at a time when it was assumed that she was retreating from the world of publication because of Pope’s attack on her in *The Dunciad*, becomes the subject of discussion. The first featured work is *The Adventures of Eovaai* (1736), which is a text that fits numerous generic categories: it is a scandal narrative that satirises the Prime Minister Robert Walpole through the guise of an oriental tale. Its polygeneric nature is reflected through its polyvocality that is created through the use of a Chinese-box structure that incorporates numerous voices at several diegetic levels. Next to be considered is *Anti-Pamela* (1741), in which Haywood becomes one of many authors to respond to Richardson’s *Pamela*. Finally, *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Nobleman* (1743) is discussed alongside Smollett’s *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle*, as these are two texts that both consider the real-life court case of James Annesley.

Much later in her career, Haywood was further adapting not just her themes but her narrative methods. As Catherine Ingrassia notes, with her final two novels, she was ‘ostensibly conforming to the desire for increasingly didactic fiction’.⁷³ Whilst this change in focus is apparent, in line with recent studies by critics including Backscheider and Juliette Merritt,⁷⁴ it is argued that the ‘transformation’ made is not as dramatic as some earlier Haywood scholars have suggested. Often the difference in tone being evidenced by these critics is assumed because of the presence of a more audible extradiegetic narrator, who

⁷³ Catherine Ingrassia, *Authorship, Commerce, and Gender in Early Eighteenth-Century England: A Culture of Paper Credit* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 128.

⁷⁴ Backscheider, ‘The Story of Eliza Haywood’s Novels’, p. 25; Merritt, *Beyond Spectacle: Eliza Haywood’s Female Spectators* (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 2004), p. 5.

comments on the actions of the diegetic characters. This kind of narratorial figure is also found in the works of Henry Fielding, and so his narrative techniques are compared to those of Haywood through an analysis of *Tom Jones*. The first text to be considered in the chapter on 1744-56 actually defies ideas of a transformation at all, as *Dalinda* (1749) contains scenes and characters that look back to Haywood's earlier work, and it is not split into chapters, unlike the rest of the prose fiction that she published in this period. Next case studies of *The Fortunate Foundlings* (1744) and *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy* (1753) demonstrate the use of the kind of narratorial figure identified above. This element of the narrative is discussed alongside that of temporal distortion, such as analepsis and prolepsis, so as not only to highlight the similarities between Haywood's narrative style and that of Fielding, but also to document the narratological progression made over Haywood's career.

Tracing Haywood's career in both narratological and comparative terms allows for several analytical avenues to be followed. Some of these avenues allow for confirmation and development of pre-existing claims about Haywood. For example, through formal analysis, Haywood's progression as a writer can be demonstrated and claims of a conversion within her career can be disputed. Also, it is possible to explore to what extent Haywood influenced or was influenced by other writers and therefore her role within the 'rise of the novel' can continue to be re-examined and evaluated. Whilst my narratological study supports current thematic and historicist Haywood criticism, it also contributes a new interpretative approach with the aim being to indicate the complexity and experimentation at work in her texts regarding the use of narrative voice, perspective, discourse, and temporality.

Chapter 1: Haywood's Developing Narrative Strategies, 1719-23

Haywood's publication of prose fiction seems to have been motivated by her inability to find success in writing for the stage. According to Haywood's bibliographer, Spedding,

Haywood refers to *Love in Excess* in a letter of 1720 thus: 'The Stage not answering my Expectation, and the averseness of my Relations to it; has made me Turn my Genius another Way; I have Printed some Little things Which have mett with a Better Reception than they Deserved, or I Expected.'¹

Her entry into the world of publication coincided with a period seen as pivotal in the development of the novel, because it coincided with 'an epistemological crisis [and] a major cultural transition in attitudes toward how to tell the truth in narrative'.² In Europe, the lengthy *roman*, concerned with, to use McKeon's terminology, 'questions of virtue', developed into the *histoire romaine*, and then started to be usurped by the shorter *nouvelle*, concerned with 'questions of truth'.³ As McKeon points out, 'the reigning narrative epistemology involve[d] a dependence on received authorities and a priori traditions, [...] [but it was] challenged and refuted by an empirical epistemology that derives from many sources'.⁴ Haywood's awareness of this shift in trend towards a new affinity for truth and socio-historical association is highlighted through her choice of nomenclature, with twenty of her texts containing a reference to 'history' within their titles, with a further two being presented as 'Written by' homodiegetic characters, whilst six of her works are offered as 'memoirs', with the connotation of their being 'Records of events or history [as] written from the personal knowledge or experience of the writer' (*OED*, sense 2a). She also refers to the epistemological shift within some of her texts so as to highlight the intended purpose and status of her work. For example, the novella *Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots* (1725) that is presented as 'Being the Secret History of her Life, and the Real Causes of all her Misfortunes', starts with the assertion that 'So great a number of Books being daily published, more for Delight than Instruction or Improvement; we think it proper to acquaint the Reader, that this is not a *Romance*, but a *True History*'.⁵ This claim to verisimilitude,

¹ *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), p. 88.

² Michael McKeon, *Origins of the English Novel, 1600-1740* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, 2002), p. 20.

³ McKeon, p. 20.

For more on the development of these types of prose fiction in France see Joan DeJean, *Tender Geographies: Women and the Origins of the Novel in France* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 5.

⁴ McKeon, p. 21.

⁵ *Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots: Being the Secret History of her Life and the Real Causes of All her Misfortunes* (London: for D. Browne Junior, S. Chapman, and J. Woodman and D. Lyon, 1725), p. iii. The title page of this work sets it up as a 'translation', but Spedding questions this identification, stating that it 'is not apparent from

which is made in the ‘Introduction’ to the text, is soon supported by the opening comment of the extradiegetic narrator that declares that ‘The Life of this celebrated Princess has something so extraordinary in the Whole Course of it, and so very mournful in the Catastrophe, that, without adding any thing to the Truth, it will appear in the recital as surprising as any Romance whatsoever’.⁶ This statement points to the fact that narratives led by truth can also be entertaining.

According to Edith Kern, the ‘preoccupation with morality and its concern for truth and *vraisemblance*’ that occurred during this transitional period ‘prompted writers to distance themselves from romance’.⁷ However, Haywood’s reaction to the generic associations of this form is not so clear cut, as she acknowledges the distinction between the romance and the *nouvelle*, whilst also implying recognition of the positive qualities of the earlier form. This is indicated when the narrator of *Memoirs of Baron de Brosse* (1725-26) appropriates the discourse of romance in order to express the strength of emotion that the Baron feels when he sees his lover, Larissa, but then apologises for this digression in tone, declaring:

I am sensible, that to go about to make any Description of the Ecstasy with which he saw her thus alone, and without the cruel Necessity of laying that Restraint he had been obliged to observe in all his Words and Actions, would have more the Air of a *Romance* than of a *true History*, in the opinion of the Generality of my Readers: -- Those few, - Those very few who love, or have loved like him, can only guess what ’twas he felt, and to them it will be needless to say, that the Joy which on such an Occasion rises in the transported Soul, is far beyond what any Representation can give an Idea of.⁸

Narratologically, Haywood can be seen to be recalling the romance traditions of writers like Madame de Scudéry with her utilisation of the intercalated tale in several of her texts. Regarding the structure of the romance, Paul Salzman writes, ‘the narrative of the heroic romance is principally composed of “anachronies” [...] [and] the multifarious yet connected histories achieve a unity-in-variety [...], and a satisfying baroque structure’.⁹ Haywood’s employment of embedded stories involving various kinds of temporal shift often creates a similarly inter diegetic unity as evident in the romance form. Her use of them is highlighted throughout the thesis, as it demonstrates the continuing development of this

Haywood’s ‘Introduction’ (which says nothing of [...] [its] being a translation) [...] [and] it seems more likely that Haywood wrote an original work that relied heavily on French materials’ (p. 233).

⁶ *Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots*, p. 1.

⁷ ‘The Romance of Novel / Novella’, in *The Disciplines of Criticism: Essays in Literary Theory, Interpretation, and History*, ed. by Peter Demetz, Thomas Greene, and Lowry Nelson (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1968), pp. 511-30 (p. 524).

⁸ *Memoirs of Baron de Brosse, Who was Broke on the Wheel in the Reign of Lewis XIV* (London: for D. Browne, Junior, and S. Chapman, 1725-26), p. 55.

⁹ *English Prose Fiction 1558-1700: A Critical History* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), p. 187.

narratological device in the period. Another recognised narrative feature of the romance that is adapted by Haywood is the ‘conversation’. Joan DeJean explains that

Scudéry’s introduction of the conversation in 1651 can be [...] interpreted as a gesture of homage to the power women had exercised before the outbreak of heroinism and to the art of conversation in which they had excelled in salons. The interpolation of conversations marked the first step in Scudéry’s rejection of the action-oriented model for romance that she had inherited from her precursors and exploited in her first novel *Ibrahim* and earlier in *Artamène*.¹⁰

Whilst Haywood often uses this kind of direct dialogue within her narratives, her experimentation with discourse representation is more analogous to that seen in the *nouvelles* of Lafayette. Like Scudéry, Lafayette uses speech to indicate power within the world of her narrative, but she often intersperses direct speech with indirect speech in order to explore the power relations at play. The employment of indirect speech is suitable for the shorter novella format, as it does not necessitate discourse to be presented verbatim, but its status as a device that can blur the distinctions between narrator and character means that it can also be used in interesting ways to indicate the level of mediation present in a text.

Indirect speech dominates the first half of Lafayette’s first publication, *La Princesse de Montpensier* (1662), that tells the story of a secret love affair between the Princesse of Montpensier and the Duc de Guise. Both characters represent real-life figures from the French court of Charles IX, but the ‘Publisher’s Note’ emphasizes the fact that their names are used solely for the purposes of ‘familiarity’, an effect that could not have been achieved if names like ‘those one finds in romances’ had been used, and that the story consists of ‘entirely imaginary adventures’.¹¹ The novella is set in a world where many of the conversations that take place are only suitable for certain interlocutors. Therefore, it seems suitable that these surreptitious exchanges are presented in an indirect manner -- it would not be appropriate for them to be directly uttered. The first direct speech representation of the novella occurs when De Guise feels it is necessary to openly express his feelings for the Princess. He passionately declares: ‘I shall surprise and displease you, Madame, when I tell you that my passion for you, which was known to you in the past has never ceased’ (p. 169), but then he realises that his direct approach does not fit in with normal custom, stating: ‘It would have been more respectful to let my deeds inform you of it rather than my words; but, Madame, my deeds would have disclosed it to others as well as yourself’ (p. 169). This first

¹⁰ *Tender Geographies*, p. 46.

¹¹ *The Princesse de Montpensier*, in *The Princesse de Clèves*, trans. by Terence Cave (Oxford: Oxford World Classics, 1999), pp. 157-88 (p. 158). All subsequent references to the text will be placed in parenthesis following the quotation.

instance of direct speech is, consequently, portrayed as significant, because incongruous, at both the story and text-level. It is De Guise's admission of his feelings that brings his relationship with the Princess from the private to the public sphere, and it initiates more direct dialogue between characters from this moment on. Lafayette uses speech representation in a way that allows story-level events to be reflected in text-level events, and this is a technique that Haywood goes on to manipulate for expressive means.

A striking usage of focalization that creates a similar diegetic effect is another feature of Lafayette's novella. In *La Princesse de Montpensier*, because of the restriction on communication caused by the numerous clandestine relationships occurring, focalization is used so that the differing perspectives of the characters involved are presented, giving readers an insight into their non-vocalised emotions. For example, when the Duc de Guise sees the Princess on the river after a long period of separation, he is forced to hide his emotions because of the presence of the Duc d'Anjou. However, readers know of his emotions through his character focalization. We are told that 'he felt everything that the princess had once awakened in his heart being kindled there anew' (p. 165). The inclusion of 'psycho-narration', in which De Guise's thoughts are presented in an indirect manner,¹² further emphasizes his strength of emotion: a feeling of propinquity to the 'salmon' that the Princess was 'curious to watch [...] being caught [...] [having] swum into a net' (p. 165) is implied, because he is again enraptured by his love for her. Readers learn that 'he told himself that he would find it hard to emerge from this adventure without having once more become her captive' (p. 165). Meanwhile, the Princess herself is similarly troubled by their re-acquaintance. She hides this disorder and charms her audience, but readers know her true emotions thanks to her character focalization that reveals: 'she wished to maintain an aloofness [towards De Guise] which would prevent him from founding any hopes on the inclination she had for him' (p. 165). This use of multiple-focalization is suitable for exploring the differing reactions of participants in scenes, and can be identified as another narrative tool that can achieve the kind of 'truth' now expected in fiction of the period. It is also another narrative technique that is taken up by Haywood in her prose fiction.

Haywood's early texts are now often discussed as novelistic precursors on account of their affinity to these short, action-led European novellas of the seventeenth century. She was not alone in looking back to this popular prose form for earlier English writers such as Behn and Congreve had also produced novellas of this kind. It is important to consider what other

¹² 'Psycho-narration' is a term coined by Dorrit Cohn. See *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983, p. 11, pp. 21-57).

writers of the novella genre had done in respect of formal narrative choices in order to determine the fictional and narratological milieu that Haywood entered into. This is especially important because, as has already been discussed and as is demonstrated further in later chapters, Haywood had a tendency to adapt to literary trends and reintegrate the narratological features utilised by other writers into her work. The novellas of Behn and Congreve are particularly relevant as they present narrators that become almost like diegetic characters because of their performance of narration. Their narrators are involved in the narratives that they relate through the use of metanarrative comments and direct addresses to readers. This is the type of narrator that is employed and developed by Haywood throughout her career.

Aphra Behn, *The History of the Nun*

In 1991, Jacqueline Pearson highlighted the significance of Behn's narrative choices in her novellas through an in-depth look at the narratorial figures that she employs. The main part of her analysis focuses on the gendering of these narrators. She writes:

In Behn's fourteen fictions, the narrator is never definitely male: six give no clue to gender, though she sometimes seems to be female by implication, and in eight, 'The Unfortunate Happy Lady', *Oroonoko*, *The History of the Nun*, 'The Nun', 'The Lucky Mistake', 'The Unfortunate Bride', 'The Wandering Beauty', and 'The Unhappy Mistake', she is definitely female.¹³

According to Pearson, Behn's narrators perform a complex female role that is characterised by 'contradictions',¹⁴ because they display authority but also 'self-deprecation' in relating 'simple narratives [...] [that] turn out to encode quite different meanings, [that are] more sinister, revealing, and subversive' than first thought.¹⁵ Pearson 'suspects irony' is at play in the use of these conflicting traits.¹⁶ She suggests that Behn seeks to indicate the 'paradoxes' at work in her fiction concerning 'female power and powerlessness',¹⁷ and that whilst these female narrators are using their authority to relate stories, they are also acknowledging their unstable position in a patriarchal society. Pearson's analysis of Behn's narrators is sociologically rather than narratologically grounded as it focuses most prominently on the societal 'role', rather than the diegetic involvement, of these figures. However, further narratological analysis of other formal techniques, such as discourse representation, can

¹³ 'Gender and Narrative in the Fiction of Aphra Behn', *Review of English Studies*, 42 (1991), 40-56 (p. 41).

¹⁴ Pearson, p. 41.

¹⁵ Pearson, p. 42.

¹⁶ Pearson, p. 42.

¹⁷ Pearson, p. 48.

additionally support Pearson's assertion that in Behn's novellas 'the narrator, who is not coterminous with "Aphra Behn", is a complex and subtle part of Behn's treatment, both open and implied, of issues of gender and power'.¹⁸

Power relations are particularly highlighted through narratological choices in *The History of the Nun* (1689), which is a novella that follows the story of Isabella, a young woman who leaves her nunnery in order to marry the love of her life, Henault. After his death is reported, she remarries, but it turns out that Henault was never dead. In order to avoid the shame of being a bigamist, Isabella kills both of her husbands. Readers are made to feel confused about how to react to Isabella as they have witnessed her fluctuating power status, with Behn moulding her narratological choices on her plot events, and reflecting Isabella's struggles in her choice of focalization and speech representation. Isabella begins the text as an innocent woman who is content to live in a nunnery for the rest of her life. Her lack of independence is reflected by the fact that her actions are mainly externally focalized and so are viewed from the perspective of the narrator rather than from her point of view. This means that readers have little sense of Isabella's actual feelings and only know what they are told by the narrator. For example, regarding the developing relationship between Isabella and Henault, the reader is made aware of Henault's passionate feelings because we are presented with his character focalization, which reveals: 'he found, he could not get himself from the Grate, without Pain; nor part from the sight of that all-charming Object, without Sighs',¹⁹ but we are not party to Isabella's immediate emotions or perspective. Instead, we are placed in a similar position to Isabella's companions and have to guess at her feelings as we view her differing demeanour through external focalization, with the narrator telling us that 'Isabella was not so Gay as she us'd to be, but, on the sudden, retir'd her self more from the Grate than she us'd to do' (p. 221). However, as Isabella starts to understand and respond to her feelings for Henault, we are told that 'she was now another Woman than what she had hitherto been' (p. 224), and this change is represented in Behn's increasing inclusion of her character focalization, through which we learn that 'she [Isabella] now repented, she had promis'd not to see Henault [...] [and] was not able to bear that thought, it made her rage within, like one possess' (p. 224). As Behn's use of focalization changes so does her choice of speech representation. At the beginning of the narrative, Isabella's speech is controlled by the narrator, because it is presented indirectly. The first direct presentation of her words occurs

¹⁸ Pearson, p. 41.

¹⁹ *The History of the Nun*, in *The Works of Aphra Behn*, ed. by Janet Todd, 7 vols (London: William Pickering, 2005), III, 205-58 (p. 221). All subsequent references will be in parenthesis following the quotation.

when she is compelled to express her love for Henault to his sister and her best friend, Katteriena. We are told, ‘At last, after a considering pause, she cried, “My dearest Sister, I do confess, I was surpriz’d at the sight of Monsieur Henault, and much more than ever you have observ’d me to be at the sight of his Person”’ (p. 222). This direct representation signals the start of Isabella’s metamorphosis and her growth in power.

Speech is of importance at both the story-level and text-level of the narrative, because when Isabella does not speak she represents the young, naïve nun. In comparison, when she does partake in conversation, she becomes the passionate lover, with her secret conversations with Henault leading to her flight from the monastery. Once this dramatic event has occurred, Isabella again becomes more passive at both the story and text-level. Behn does not represent her speech at all during the relation of her marriage to Henault, his departure, and reported death. Her response to Villenoy’s proposal is indirectly presented and we are informed that ‘she told him, She had made a Vow to remain three Years, at least, before she would marry again’ (p. 245). Direct speech returns, though, at the return of Henault, after Isabella has married and lived for several years with Villenoy, but significantly not comprehensively in the mouth of Isabella. We do directly hear her initial reaction to Henault’s return, as she exclaims, ‘I am ruin’d’ (p. 248), but whilst much of Henault’s relation of his imprisonment is presented directly, Isabella’s responses are not, as is demonstrated in this quotation: ‘she told him, No dress, no Disguise could render him more Dear and Acceptable to her’ (p. 250). Indirect speech representation previously indicated Isabella’s innocent state, but now it emphasizes her guilt, as she plans her husband’s death.

After killing Henault, Isabella is portrayed as genuinely distraught and consumed by regret. We are told that ‘when she had done this dreadful Deed, and saw the dead Corps of her once-lov’d Lord, lye Smiling (as it were) upon her, she fell into a Swound with the Horror of the Deed’ (p. 251). The guilt slowly subsides and is replaced by cunning as she plans her next murder. At this point, again, her indirect speech is succeeded by direct speech as she literally tells her second husband, Villenoy, how to complete his murder, explaining: ‘and when you come to the Bridge [...], that you are throwing him over the Rail [...], be sure to give him a good swing, lest the Sack should hang on any thing at the side of the Bridge, and not fall into the Stream’ (p. 254). Direct representation remains at the fore as we hear Isabella’s reaction to her behaviour and she tells herself, ‘it is but just, I should for ever wake, who have, in one fatal Night, destroy’d two such Innocents’ (p. 254). It continues, despite Isabella’s grief and guilt at her deeds, to reflect her ability to maintain the guise of an uninvolved and distraught wife, who concocts a story regarding the deaths of Henault and

Villenoys that she directly relates to her servant, Maria, declaring: ‘I will tell thee what my Heart imagines’ (p. 255). Again, though, following the discovery of her lies and murderous actions, her altering power, it can be suggested, is reflected in Behn’s altering choice of discourse representation, and the final presentation of her speech in the narrative, in which Isabella responds to her punishment, is indirectly offered. We are told that ‘she was Try’d, and Condemn’d to lose her Head; which Sentence, she joyfully receiv’d, and said, Heaven, and her Judges, were too Merciful to her, and that her Sins had deserv’d much more’ (p. 257).

The narrator of *The History of the Nun* also helps to signpost Isabella’s transformation from dedicated nun to murderer to repentant. This female presence is not over-bearing but clearly steps into the text at certain points. She indicates her credentials for relating the story of Isabella at the start of the narrative by revealing:

I once was design’d an humble Votary in the House of Devotion, but fancying my self not endu’d with an obstinacy of Mind, great enough to secure me from the Efforts and Vanities of the World, I rather chose to deny my self that Content I could not certainly promise my self. (p. 212)

As pointed out by Pearson, the narrator’s identification with Isabella, who metamorphoses from a nun to a two-time husband killer, leads to a contradictory narrative presentation, because whilst ‘One register of narratorial voice is overtly moralizing [...] the irony and overstatement elsewhere challenge[s] and mock[s] this tendency to moralize.’²⁰ This is evident in her addresses to readers and narrative comments. For example, after Henault returns, the narrator inserts a metanarrative digression on the nature of love that could be seen to justify Isabella’s confused response to her reappearing husband. She states that,

Love, like Reputation, once fled, never returns more. ’Tis impossible to love, and cease to love, (and love another) and yet return again to the first Passion, tho’ the Person have all the Charms, or a thousand times more than it had, when it first conquer’d. This Mystery in Love, it may be, is not generally known, but nothing is more certain. (p. 249)

Later in the narrative, whilst on the one hand appearing to condemn Isabella’s killing of Villenoys, the narrator implicitly confirms that she can see some justification in Isabella’s actions towards Henault by saying that

embolden’d by one Wickedness, she was the readier for another, and another of such a Nature; as has, in my Opinion, far less Excuse, than the first; but when Fate begins to afflict, she goes through-stitch with her Black Work. (p. 253)

The inconsistent nature of the narrator’s insertions, along with the differing degrees of speech representation utilised by Behn, mean that readers are invited to have contradictory feelings

²⁰ Pearson, pp. 51-52.

regarding Isabella. This novella demonstrates how Behn uses narrative technique to great effect for purposes of plot development. This technique is later utilised by Haywood as is demonstrated in discussion of *Love in Excess*. It cannot be definitively asserted that Haywood was influenced by Behn. However, as Spencer points out, it is known through references to the 'Fair Astrea' (Behn's literary identity) by several women writers of the period that Behn was widely read and admired as a literary predecessor by her female contemporaries.²¹ The similarities, both thematic and narratological, evident in the novellas of Behn and Haywood have led to them being considered together by literary commentators since James Sterling and Clara Reeve in the eighteenth century,²² and analysis of their narrative techniques further helps substantiate the link.

William Congreve, *Incognita*

Regarding *Incognita* (1692), Pearson states that Congreve was 'clearly influenced by' Behn in his use of narratorial voice.²³ The novella presents a narrator that performs a particular kind of masculinity in a similar way that Behn's narratorial figures perform a kind of feminine gender role. It represents an interesting antecedent to Haywood's novellas, not only because of its narratological choices regarding voice, but also because of its manipulation of narrative temporality, which is a technique commonly implemented by Haywood. Mainly the text has been discussed, in particular by McKeon and Richetti, regarding its generic status as a modern novella. Like Haywood, but in a more explicit manner, Congreve himself comments on the form of his fiction and how it fits into what he sees as the developing romance / novella binary in the preface to the text.²⁴ Salzman writes that

William Congreve offers a much-quoted account of the differences between the romance and the novel. By 'novel', Congreve has in mind the French *nouvelle* form, which had become extremely popular in England during the 1680s, both through large numbers of translations from the French, and through some English imitations.²⁵

²¹ *The Rise of the Woman Novelist: From Aphra Behn to Jane Austen* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), pp. 28-30.

²² See Sterling's poem, 'To Mrs. Eliza Haywood on Her Writings', in *Secret Histories, Novels, and Poems*, Eliza Haywood, 2nd edn, 4 vols (London: Printed for Dan Browne, Jun. and S. Chapman, 1725), I, and Reeve, *The Progress of Romance*, 2 vols (Dublin: for Price, Exshaw, White, Cash Colbert, Marchbank, and Porter, 1785), I, pp. 120-22.

²³ 'Gender and Narrative in the Fiction of Aphra Behn (*Concluded*)', *Review of English Studies*, 42 (1991), 179-90 (p. 190).

²⁴ See McKeon, pp. 61-3, and Richetti, *Popular Fiction Before Richardson: Narrative Patterns, 1700-1739* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), pp. 174-77.

²⁵ 'Introduction', in *An Anthology of Seventeenth-Century Fiction*, ed. by Paul Salzman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. ix-xxvi (p. xxii).

According to Congreve, the main difference between the two genres is that ‘Romances give more of wonder, novels more delight’.²⁶ The former ‘are generally composed of [...] miraculous contingencies and impossible performances [that] elevate and surprise the reader into a giddy delight, which leaves him flat upon the ground [...] when he is forced to be very well convinced that ’tis all a lie’, whilst the latter ‘are of a more familiar nature; [they] come near us, and represent to us intrigues in practice; [and] delight us with accidents and odd events, but not such as are wholly unusual or unprecedented’ (p. 474). Therefore, in Congreve’s opinion, the key difference between romances and novels lies in how readers can relate to them. In McKeon’s terms, Congreve is noting the ‘reversal of romance idealism by naïve empiricism’ in the production of fiction.²⁷ Novels afford more ‘delight’ than romances because they present more recognisable, if not wholly realistic, situations that readers can relate to and become involved in, because ‘not being so distant from our belief [they] bring also the pleasure nearer us’ (p. 474).

Incognita follows the trials and tribulations of the relationships between two best friends, Aurelian and Hippolito, and their respective lovers, Incognita and Leonora. As Congreve points out in the preface, ‘The design of the novel is obvious after the first meeting’ of the characters, but interest is maintained by the presentation of ‘obstacles’ that ‘act as subservient to the purpose which at first [...] [they seem] to oppose’ (p. 475). Congreve presents *Incognita*, his earliest work, as a novel that ‘imitate[s] dramatic writing, namely in the design, contexture and result of the plot’ (p. 474). His intention is to merge prosaic and dramatic elements to create an entertaining novella. He does so by employing a conversational narrator that often blurs the boundaries between spoken and written text through the use of discourse markers, such as ‘well’ and ‘by the way’, and who transcends the levels of story and text by speaking directly to readers. These addresses often occur when the narrator feels compelled to explain the appearance of digressions in the novella that delay the wished-for action. For example, after providing an elaborate description of ‘Madam night’ (p. 479), at a time when readers are expecting a relation of the events of the party to be attended by Aurelian and Hippolito, the narrator declares:

Now, the reader I suppose to be upon thorns at this and the like impertinent digressions, but let him alone and he’ll come to himself, at which time I think fit to acquaint him that when I digress, I am at that time writing to please myself; when I

²⁶ William Congreve, *Incognita: Or, Love and Duty Reconciled*, in Salzman, *An Anthology of Seventeenth-Century Fiction*, pp. 473-525 (p. 474). All subsequent references will be placed in parenthesis following the quotation.

²⁷ McKeon, p. 63.

continue the thread of the story, I write to please him. Supposing him a reasonable man, I conclude him satisfied to allow me this liberty and so I proceed. (pp. 479-80)

The narrator is comically highlighting his power in the text -- he is there to entertain his readers, but in a manner that he sees fit; therefore, he halts the progress of the action to meta-textually articulate his points. Narratologically, Congreve is manipulating the duration of the narrative -- this interruption represents a 'descriptive pause' that Genette describes as 'some section of narrative discourse [that] corresponds to a nonexistent diegetic duration'.²⁸ The plot obstacles that hinder the relationships of the protagonists in the story are mirrored by these textual obstacles that, as Maximillian Novak points out, 'have the effect of impeding the progress of the story [as] narrative time is utilized to frustrate the actual duration of the action'.²⁹ Like Behn in *The History of the Nun*, Congreve creates links between narratological and plot choices, and the result is a more interactive text that, Salzman notes, 'balances [...] the appeal of a pattern with the knowledge of its artificiality'.³⁰

In the preface, Congreve highlights the importance of the construction of the text and its 'unity of contrivance' (p. 475). In turn, his narrator acknowledges the importance of narrative structure in respect of plot development. After depicting Hippolito (who has been mistaken by Leonora for Lorenzo, her cousin) in Leonora's garden, the narrator writes:

In which interim let me take the liberty to digress a little, and tell the reader something which I do not doubt he has apprehended himself long ago, if he be not the dullest reader in the world. Yet only for order's sake, let me tell him. (p. 489)

The narrator then proceeds to present an analeptic digression that explains the story of Lorenzo. He feels that this discovery of plot information is necessary for a reader's understanding but not for their entertainment, as is evident when he declares,

So reader, having now discharged my conscience of a small discovery which I thought myself obliged to make to thee, I proceed to tell thee that Aurelian had, by this time, danced himself into a net which he neither could nor, which is worse, desired to untangle. (p. 489)

Any information that can afford to be omitted without affecting the development of the plot is comically neglected by the narrator. For example, descriptions of dress are elided twice within the course of the text, as when, regarding the habits of the cavaliers at the pageant, the narrator states: 'let him [the reader] dress them in what is most agreeable to his own fancy' (p. 502). Also, Hippolito's romantic declarations to Leonora during his proposal are excluded, because "'Twere tedious to tell the many ingenious arguments he used, with all her

²⁸ Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, trans. by Jane E. Lewin (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980), pp. 93-94.

²⁹ *William Congreve* (New York: Twayne, 1971), p. 74.

³⁰ *English Prose Fiction 1558-1700*, p. 337.

nice distinctions and objections. In short, he convinced her of his passion' (p. 520). These elisions, with their disregard for what were conventionally thought of as feminine interests, are part of the way in which the novella constructs its reader as masculine.

Congreve encodes the novella as masculine with the use of a male narrator, who presents himself as genteel and polite, and addresses to a male readership, with the focus of the text being drama and action, rather than romance and emotion. This focus is highlighted by choices of speech representation throughout the novella. Witty and entertaining banter between the male and female protagonists is presented in direct speech representation, whilst, in comparison, Aurelian's passionate discourse with Incognita, following the preservation of her safety, is pared down into 'transposed' or indirect speech. Genette notes that sometimes, when this style of speech is utilised,

It is, so to speak, acknowledged in advance that the narrator is not satisfied with transposing the words into subordinate clauses, but that he condenses them, integrates them into his own speech, and thus *expresses* them in his own style.³¹

Congreve's narrator explicitly recognises that this is the case with his choice of discourse representation, stating that 'He [Aurelian] made her a very passionate and eloquent speech in behalf of himself (much better than I intend to insert here) and expressed a mighty concern that she should look upon his ardent affection to be only raillery or gallantry' (p. 515). The narrator's style of presentation leads McKeon to assert that *Incognita* is a work of 'antiromance' created by 'parodic impersonation',³² whilst Salzman in contrast states that 'Congreve is not writing an anti-romance; he is not consistently parodying the conventions of love. On the other hand, he recognizes how conventional they are.'³³ The evidence suggests that Salzman's view is more accurate. There is no doubt that Congreve is presenting a male-centred novella, but he does not consequently ridicule the romances of the two couples. Congreve and his narrator are more concerned with the text as elegant performance than with ridiculing the romance genre. This is indicated by the narrator when recording Leonora's feelings for Hippolito at the receipt of his letter. He recognises that readers might question the immediacy of her love and pre-empts a possible accusation of romantic fabrication by asserting:

I would not have the reader now be impertinent, and look upon this to be force, or a whim of the author's that a woman should proceed so far in her approbation of a man whom she never saw; that it is impossible, therefore ridiculous to suppose it. Let me tell such a critic that he knows nothing of the sex if he does not know that a woman

³¹ Genette, pp. 171-72.

³² McKeon, p. 62.

³³ *English Prose Fiction*, p. 332.

may be taken with the character and description of a man, when general and extraordinary. (p. 501)

He is employing his worldly, masculine witticism to make a comment on the subject of women, and highlighting that, whilst he may manipulate the narrative at the text-level, he does not do so at the story-level. His aim may be to present an entertaining story but not to the detriment of realistic depiction.

As Irène Simon states, Congreve ‘observed probability in the conduct of the plot and adhered to truth in presenting the scene, but his prime concern was for the formal arrangement of his *intrigue amoureuse*’.³⁴ He mimics drama by employing explicit scene changes, but often incorporates them into the prosaic novella by having them take the form of metalepses. Genette defines a metalepsis as ‘any intrusion by the extradiegetic narrator or narratee into the diegetic universe (or by diegetic characters into a metadiegetic universe, etc)’,³⁵ so it occurs when the narrator transcends the story / text levels and seemingly steps into the world of the characters. For example, at a time when the two male protagonists are separated in the story, the narrator textually links them by metaleptically moving from the fortunes of Aurelian to those of Hippolito, stating that Aurelian ‘forebore his search [for Hippolito] till the mirth of that night should be over, and the company ready to break up, where we will leave him for a while, to see what became of his adventurous friend’ (p. 484). This type of scene shift that, as Fludernik points out, ‘combines an analeptic aspect with a foregrounded reference to the art of narration’, complements Congreve’s choice of narratorial voice, because it breaks boundaries between the story and text level and so ‘fit[s] nicely into a style of narrating in which the narrator persona (*qua* bard) [...] is an active participant in the act of narration’.³⁶ It is a technique that is utilised and adapted by Haywood throughout her career as later chapters go on to demonstrate.

Congreve’s narrator is a construct that is used to maintain the forward progression of the narrative and highlight key plot intricacies, such as the similar fortunes of the male lovers. As Salzman notes, the novella produces a ‘balance between involvement and detachment’ through the use of the witty narrator.³⁷ The latter positions himself as authoritative and highlights his extradiegetic status (he stands above the diegetic level of the story) through his disruption of narrative order and metanarrative comments. However, it is quickly revealed

³⁴ ‘Early Theories of Prose Fiction: Congreve and Fielding’, in *Imagined Worlds: Essays on Some English Novels and Novelists in Honour of John Butt*, ed. by Maynard Mack and Ian Gregor (London: Methuen, 1968), pp. 19-35 (p. 23).

³⁵ Genette, pp. 234-35.

³⁶ ‘The Diachronization of Narratology’, *Narrative*, 11 (2003), 331-48 (p. 339, p. 338).

³⁷ *English Prose Fiction*, p. 336.

that his status is that of a recorder of narrative events rather than an observer. This is indicated through asides, such as ‘(as Aurelian tells the story)’ (p. 513), when he notes that his knowledge of the plot has been gained retrospectively from the male protagonist. By including these revelations Congreve seeks to confirm the veracity of the novella, but also wishes to further emphasize the masculine focus of the prose.

Love in Excess

By presenting Congreve’s witty use of narrative person and time, and Behn’s manipulation of speech representation, and, overall, indicating how narrative techniques are used creatively by Haywood’s contemporaries, I have sought to pave the way for a detailed examination of her narratological choices, starting with those in her first publication. *Love in Excess* is a text that has received much critical attention, but has also been the subject of some misguided judgements, because, for a long time, it was believed to be Haywood’s most popular work with sales comparable to those of *Robinson Crusoe* and *Gulliver’s Travels*. Spedding, in his *Bibliography*, reveals this inaccuracy and how it came about, highlighting that it originates from a comment made by William H. McBurney in 1957.³⁸ He explains that, prior to his extensive bibliographical study,

there has been no way of distinguishing a work that was printed many times from one that was printed only once but issued many times. The result is that almost all discussion of the popularity of Haywood’s works has been wildly inaccurate. *Love in Excess*, for instance, has been described as ‘sensationally’ and ‘phenomenally’ popular, as ‘one of the great best-sellers of the eighteenth century’. It was no such thing; nor was it close to being Haywood’s most popular work.³⁹

However, he goes on to recognise that although sales figures have been overestimated, the effect of the book’s popularity on Haywood’s career was significant as ‘it is likely that Haywood was commissioned to write a series of novels on the basis of the success of this work’.⁴⁰ This series is discussed within the course of this chapter.

Much discussion of *Love in Excess*, which is seen as an archetypal example of an amatory tale, has focussed on its depiction of desire, because, as Sarah Prescott states, ‘The representation of seduction raises crucial questions [...] concerning power relations between the sexes, the problem of representing female desire and the unequal gender balance of

³⁸ Comment made in ‘Mrs. Penelope Aubin and the Early Eighteenth Century Novel’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 20 (1957), 245-67 (p. 250). For discussion on how the comment has affected subsequent criticism, see Spedding, pp. 88-89.

³⁹ Spedding, p. 19.

⁴⁰ Spedding, p. 88.

eighteenth-century society in general.’⁴¹ Critics such as Toni Bowers, Merritt, and Tiffany Potter see Haywood as dissolving common cultural binaries regarding female sexuality through the appropriation of the looks and language of desire by female characters.⁴² Merritt’s analysis of the ‘spectator / spectacle’ binary is approached from the psychology of the gaze but touches on ideas of focalization, especially when she comments on the ‘visual focus’ of the scene in which Alovisa catches D’Elmont in bed with Melantha.⁴³ As has previously been demonstrated with examination of Lafayette’s *La Princesse de Montpensier* and Behn’s *The History of the Nun*, the process of closer narratological analysis of who sees (focalization), who tells (narration), and who speaks (discourse representation) in key scenes can further indicate the manipulation of power relations within the narrative and advances the claims made by feminist critics regarding this matter.⁴⁴ By presenting the intricacies of Haywood’s formal techniques, her skill and sophistication as a story-teller is also demonstrated, which is something that has been overlooked by many critics, especially those who subscribe to the view that Haywood’s work is ‘formulaic’.

Merritt’s study on ‘Female Curiosity in *Love in Excess*’ looks in depth at the character of Alovisa, because it is her ‘Fatal Inquiry’ that is referred to in the subtitle of the book and ‘The trajectory of her story can be characterized as an effort to make a transition from object to subject’.⁴⁵ Other than that of the narrator, the voice of Alovisa dominates the beginning of the text as she raves and complains about D’Elmont’s ignorance concerning her passion for him, declaring at the height of her fervour: ‘Wherefore has the agreeing world joyned with my deceitful glass to flatter me into a vain belief I had invincible distractions. D’Elmont sees ’em not, D’Elmont is insensible.’⁴⁶ Her words, whether vocalised or committed to paper, are mainly presented in direct discourse, described by Genette as ‘the most “mimetic” form’ of narrative discourse.⁴⁷ This emphasizes to readers her strength of feeling, but, in the fictional world of the narrative, has little effect on her intended reader or auditor. Her first written

⁴¹ ‘The Debt to Pleasure: Eliza Haywood’s *Love in Excess* and Women’s Fiction of the 1720s’, *Women’s Writing*, 7 (2000), 427-45 (p. 429).

⁴² Toni Bowers, ‘Collusive Resistance: Sexual Agency and Partisan Politics in *Love in Excess*’, in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on Her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 48-68; Juliette Merritt, *Beyond Spectacle: Eliza Haywood’s Female Spectators* (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 2004); Tiffany Potter, ‘The Language of Feminised Sexuality: Gendered Voice in Eliza Haywood’s *Love in Excess* and *Fantomina*’, *Women’s Writing*, 10 (2003), 169-86.

⁴³ Merritt, p. 39.

⁴⁴ Genette, p. 186.

⁴⁵ Merritt, p. 30.

⁴⁶ *Love in Excess; Or, The Fatal Inquiry*, ed. by David Oakleaf, 2nd edn (Peterborough, ONT: Broadview Press, 2000), p. 38. All subsequent references to the text will be placed in parenthesis following the quotation.

⁴⁷ Genette, p. 172.

declaration of passion, sent anonymously to her wished-for conquest, has an adverse outcome when D'Elmont mistakenly identifies Amena as his admirer and approaches her at the event that Alovisa has planned for her unveiling. After an initial involuntary silence (caused by swooning), this misadventure provokes further extended outbursts of direct speech from Alovisa that fill almost three pages of text (pp. 43-45) as she plans her next move. However, Alovisa does not gain the power that she desires until Haywood stops representing her speech and she stops talking in the text. Her textual silence coincides with her conspiratorial talking within the world of the characters when she plants the seeds of filial disobedience in the mind of Amena's father, Monsieur Sanseverin.

At this point in the narrative, Haywood employs what Genette describes as a 'paralipsis' which is a 'kind of lateral ellipsis' as it is 'the omission of some important action or thought of the focal hero, which neither the hero nor the narrator can be ignorant of but which the narrator chooses to conceal from the reader'.⁴⁸ Alovisa's plotting is key to the story-level of the narrative, but is omitted from the text-level. Her silence does not appear untoward at first because narrative emphasis has moved from her passion for D'Elmont to his intrigue with Amena. However, when the Count receives a letter from Amena stating that 'Some malicious persons have endeavoured to make the little conversation I have had with you, appear as criminal' (p. 47), the curiosity of the readers is piqued and Alovisa's silence becomes questionable. Any suspicions are confirmed when Alovisa, in discourse with Monsieur Sanseverin after Amena's flight to her house, refers to her previous 'advice' (p. 64) to him, and her machinations are eventually fully exposed as she guiltily confesses to Amena 'that by her means, the amour [of Amena and D'Elmont] was first discovered to Monsieur Sanseverin' (p. 76). Haywood employs the paralipsis in order to create narrative tension and also to highlight how Alovisa's altering choice of addressee improves her position. Rather than pursuing D'Elmont in public and through open declarations, she seemingly takes a step back, but continues plotting privately. It is evident to readers that Alovisa is aware of the power of discourse as she chooses her forms of address tactically. She destroys a letter that exposes too much of her passion for D'Elmont because

when she had finished this so full a discovery of her heart, and was about to sign her name to it, not all that passion which had inspired her with a resolution to scruple nothing that might advance the compassing her wishes, nor the vanity which assured her of success, were forcible enough to withstand the shock it gave her pride. (p. 44)

⁴⁸ Genette, p. 52; p. 196.

It is this adroit use of discourse that provides Alovisa with the success that she craves in Part 1. However, it is her inability to maintain this adherence to discourse rules that eventually ruins her later in the text.

During this narrative period in which Alovisa's speech is foregrounded, D'Elmont is silent in the text. Instead, while we are hearing her vocalized pretensions, it is his perspective that is exhibited. Bal notes that in narrative 'a distinction [must be made] between, on the one hand, the vision through which the elements are presented and, on the other, the identity of the voice that is verbalizing that vision'.⁴⁹ D'Elmont may not speak during the opening of the narrative, but he is not absent from it, because his perspective on events is often presented by the narrator. When this occurs the words of the text are those of the narrator, but the vision is that of the character. It is through focalization, described by Bal as 'the relation between the vision and that which is "seen", perceived',⁵⁰ that readers learn about the character of the mysterious D'Elmont. At receipt of Alovisa's first letter, we are privy to D'Elmont's response through a mixture of external and internal focalization and so learn that 'tho' he was not very vain [external], yet he found it no difficulty to persuade himself to an opinion that it was possible for a lady to distinguish him from other men [internal]' (p. 40). The external focalization comes from the narrator -- 'an anonymous agent, situated outside the fabula [who] is functioning as focalizer',⁵¹ whilst the internal view comes from D'Elmont as the character focalizer.

As Bal points out, 'If the focalizer coincides with the character, that character will have an advantage over the other characters. The reader watches with the character's eyes and will, in principle, be inclined to accept the vision presented by the character.'⁵² However, Haywood often produces multi-perspectival scenes that allow readers to have a kaleidoscopic rather than singular view of events and they have the effect of avoiding this kind of bias. In using the term 'kaleidoscopic focalization', I am not trying to attribute ideological associations to the theory of narrative point of view. A kaleidoscope is defined as an 'optical instrument' that 'on looking through [...], numerous reflections [...] [can] be seen, producing [...] symmetrical figures, which may be constantly altered by rotation of the instrument' (*OED*). Therefore, I am suggesting that analogies to this instrument seem appropriate when used to express how the mantle of focalizer is almost 'passed around' by

⁴⁹ Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, trans. by Christine Van Boheemen, 2nd edn (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 1997), p. 143.

⁵⁰ Bal, p. 142.

⁵¹ Bal, p. 148.

⁵² Bal, p. 146.

Haywood to different characters in key scenes, which, consequently, gives the sense of shifting focus. Previous novella writers like Behn and Congreve also provide multiple character perspectives in key scenes, but it is the intricate interlocking of Haywood's focalization technique that sets her apart. For example, the scene which ignites the main action of Part 1, Alovisa's witnessing of D'Elmont and Amena's acquaintance, is seen from both external and numerous internal positions. At the couple's entrance, the narrator indicates Alovisa's shock through external focalization, exclaiming: 'how impossible is it to represent her confusion, when he appeared leading the young Amena' (p. 41). We are then presented with Alovisa's view as she tortures herself by thinking that 'she saw, or fancied she saw an unusual joy in her eyes, and dying love in his' (p. 41). External focalization then comes to the fore again as Alovisa is left paralysed by her distress and falls into a swoon. The perspective of the oblivious Amena is briefly presented as she responds to Alovisa's disposition and considers leaving the party to look after her, and next we see events from D'Elmont's point of view and learn that he wants Amena to stay at the party, but 'not [...] [because] he was in love in with her, or at that time believed he could be touched with a passion which he esteemed a trifle in it self, and below the dignity of a man of sense' (p. 42). Subsequently, readers are acquainted with the previously undisclosed story of D'Elmont and Amena's meeting through an analepsis or flashback in which it is revealed, through D'Elmont's character focalization, that he believes her to be his suitor because of the way that she reacts to his presence: when 'offering her his hand, he perceived hers trembled, which engaging him to look upon her more earnestly than he was wont, he immediately fancied he saw something of that languishment in her eyes, which the obliging mandate had described' (p. 42). By presenting multiple perspectives, Haywood places readers in a privileged position, as they are able to see how the same event affects all of the main protagonists -- they know that Alovisa's fears are only partly justified, the Count is mistaken concerning his admirer, and Amena is heading for a fall as her love for D'Elmont is not reciprocated.

D'Elmont is not in love with Amena, but he does desire her. When his amorous wishes are impeded by her obedience to her father he pursues her with even more vigour. At this point in the novella, the force of Haywood's characterisation of D'Elmont, the passion-driven libertine in pursuit of his lover, invites certain narratological choices, and it is this pursuit that brings about the first direct speech representation from her male protagonist. Previously, his discourse has been presented indirectly to readers, but they finally hear his own words when he is shocked into action by Anaret's (Amena's servant) assertion that 'for a time she [Amena] considered your lordship in no other view than that of her undoer' (p. 49).

The prophetic irony of his reply, “‘How [...] could my Amena, who I thought all sweetness judge so harshly of me’” (p. 49), will eventually be realised as he does go on to become, along with Alovisa, Amena’s undoer. However, at this stage of the narrative, it is this comment that, literally, starts the Count talking as his discourse is regularly presented directly by Haywood from this point onward and he uses it greatly in his pursuit of Amena.

Haywood’s narrative choices create the impression that, like Alovisa, D’Elmont is driven to discourse by his desires. When love is the overriding emotion, however, he is silenced as becomes evident when he meets his true love, Melliora. Her entrance is viewed from the narrator’s external perspective and, although we are told that D’Elmont spoke ‘some words of consolation to her’ (p. 86), we do not directly hear his discourse again until after Monsieur Frankville’s death (p. 87). The instant attraction between the pair is witnessed by readers because of the use of character focalization. However, even before this, Melliora’s allure is indicated by the narrator’s employment of modifiers such as ‘matchless’ (p. 86) and ‘charming’ (p. 87), so readers know that D’Elmont’s fall is inevitable.

It is actually Melliora’s passion and perspective that is revealed first, though, as we are told that

in spite of the grief she was in, she found something in his form which dissipated it; a kind of painful pleasure, a mixture of surprise and joy, and doubt ran thro’ her in an instant. (p. 86)

Again by looking at Haywood’s narratological choices, claims made by feminist critics, regarding her affirmative depiction of female desire, can be further supported. Employing Melliora’s character focalization here, and consequently revealing her passion before that of her male lover, has the effect, as Bowers points out, of indicating that ‘Melliora is not simply the *object* of D’Elmont’s desire: she is also an actively desiring sexual *subject*’.⁵³ However, whilst the lovers may be equal in their desires, Melliora realises that she is in a disadvantageous position as an orphaned girl who is falling in love with her guardian, a person whom ‘it was a crime to love’ (p. 88). Consequently, she tries to smother her feelings, but D’Elmont cannot control his and this causes several moments of tension between the pair in which readers perceive their similar struggles as both characters act as focalizers. This is evident when the narrator discusses Melliora’s first few days living with Alovisa and D’Elmont, stating that

All made it their whole study to deceive each other, yet none but Alovysa was intirely in the dark; for the Count and Melliora had but too true a guess at one anothers meaning [external], every look of his, for he had eyes that need no interpreter, gave

⁵³ Bowers, p. 55.

her intelligence of his heart [internal -- Melliora], and the confusion which the understanding those looks gave her, sufficiently told him how sensible she was of 'em [internal -- D'Elmont]. (p. 97)

Eventually D'Elmont is overcome by his desires and hatches a plan to make Melliora 'a sacrifice to love' (p. 114). Sneaking in to Melliora's bedroom at night, the Count approaches her whilst she is asleep and considers whether he can go through with what he intends. At that moment, Melliora acts out her dream and grasps D'Elmont to her. The scene is dominated by external focalization with the narrator setting the scene, erotically describing the focalized sleeping Melliora who is displaying 'all the beauties of her neck and breast' (p. 116), and depicting the focalized D'Elmont's extremity of passion who we are told 'took an inexpressible pleasure in gazing on her as lay' (p. 116). D'Elmont's character focalization is then briefly depicted as, torn between his desires as a lover and his responsibilities as a guardian, he debates what action to take: 'he thought it pity even to wake her, but more to wrong such innocence, and he was sometimes prompted to return and leave her as he found her' (p. 116). After this brief change of perspective, though, the narrator again takes hold, positioning readers almost as if they are voyeurs -- whilst D'Elmont is watching Melliora, we are watching the pair of them, and so are made to feel, perhaps uncomfortably, involved in the action.

Readers are positioned similarly in the seduction scenes in Parts 1 and 3 between D'Elmont and Amena, and Ciamara and D'Elmont, as both are externally focalized. It is the reactions of the women in these scenes that set them apart from each other. Amena is the more damaged by her encounter with D'Elmont. She realises that their meeting will likely lead to her ruin but she is powerless to fight back, because 'Vertue and pride, the guardians of her honour fled from her breast, and left her to her foe, only a modest bashfulness remained, which for a time made some defence, but with such a weakness as a lover less impatient than D'Elmont would have little regarded' (p. 58). After the amorous liaison is cut short by Anaret's arrival, we are told that Amena 'accused the influence of her amorous stars, upbraided Anaret, and blamed the Count in terms little differing from distraction' (p. 59), but we are not presented with her direct speech again until she requests D'Elmont to leave her at Alovera's house. She is, temporarily, textually silenced by her remorse as we learn through her character focalization that she 'vowed she would rather die than ever come into her father's presence, if it were true that she was missed' (p. 59). It is left to D'Elmont to plot their escape from the house and their predicament, because all of the speech that he can coax from Amena takes the form of 'upbraidings' (p. 60). In the scene following the failed

seduction, his character focalization becomes pre-eminent even though ‘he was strangely at a loss what to do with her’ (p. 59). In comparison, following their failed seduction scenes, Melliora and Ciamara take equal control of the situation and start talking immediately in direct discourse. Both have more power than Amena -- Melliora because she is managing to control her desires and therefore protect her virtue and Ciamara because she plays the aggressive dominatrix in her scene. The latter’s response to D’Elmont’s perfidy is delayed by a text-level analeptic scene change that explains the cause of their interruption by Brione, but at the story-level her wrath is immediate with her crying “‘Monster! [...] have you then betrayed me?’” (p. 227).

Out of D’Elmont’s four lovers, it is Melliora who uses discourse most successfully, in terms of keeping her honour and virtue intact. She is initially silent regarding her passion for D’Elmont, but, when forced to speak following his amorous actions, she defends herself in their dialogue and, after his attempted seduction, even interrupts his vocal outpourings: “‘Yet think,” said she interrupting him, and struggling in his arms, “think what ’tis that you would do, nor for a moments joy, hazard your peace for ever”” (p. 117). Most importantly, though, she is the only principal character not to have her letters directly presented to readers. Melliora does send letters to D’Elmont regularly in Part 3 of the action, but they are not given in the text. Throughout the narrative, letters are used as plot devices to demonstrate the dangers of epistolary exchange between the sexes. Haywood discusses the danger of correspondence for women in an essay, entitled *A Discourse Concerning Writings of this Nature, by Way of Essay*, that she appends to her second published work, an epistolary translation, entitled *Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier*. As Spedding notes, ‘Little has been said of *A Discourse* [...] although this may be largely because Whicher [Haywood’s first twentieth century biographer] damns it’.⁵⁴ I find this to be an interesting document, though, as it is difficult to know its intended function. It is written as a conduct essay so perhaps we are to take it as a straightforward piece of didactic writing. If so, it represents an interesting source when considering Haywood’s motivation for her frequent use of letters in her fiction. In *Love in Excess*, perhaps she makes her virtuous heroine a non-writer to make a comment on how a woman should handle her desire and communication of it. On the other hand, the text could legitimately be viewed as a marketing tool to publicise Haywood’s first work -- it was published ‘ten months after the publication of the third and last part of her

⁵⁴ Spedding, p. 102.

previous work, [...] *Love in Excess*'⁵⁵ -- and her upcoming collection *The Danger of Giving Way to Passion* which is advertised on the final page of *Letters from a Lady of Quality*.⁵⁶ After all, the subject matter of the essay links to the themes of these other publications and specific comments, for example, on the effect of jealousy in women, can be seen to link to character stories in *Love in Excess*, Alovisa's in this case. There is even a reference to an 'unfortunate Lady, divided between Excess of *Love*, and Nicety of *Honour*'.⁵⁷

Whatever Haywood's true intentions for this essay, it cannot be denied that it contains relevant comments on the danger of letter writing and, as previously noted, links well with some of the action in *Love in Excess*. Haywood presents two main arguments against the use of amorous letters by women. Firstly, she states that

Letters from a Woman, distinguished for her Beauty, Wit, Virtue, or any other Excellence, are so great and valuable a Token of her Regard for the Person to whom they are written, that it is not to be wonder'd at, that *Men* should, by all possible Assiduity, endeavour to obtain so undeniable a Proof of Favour; it is a kind of Food for their Ambition, their Love, and, too often, their Vanity: but what a *Woman* gains by her Condescension (besides the Reputation of a Talent, which had better be eternally concealed, than made use of this way) I cannot find out.⁵⁸

Secondly, she writes:

Letters often live longer than the Person who wrote them -- they may by some Accident be lost -- may miscarry -- somebody must be trusted to convey 'em, and the Fidelity of such sort of People is not much to be depended on.⁵⁹

Both of these potential dangers are realised in *Love in Excess* by the character of Alovisa. As Barbara Benedict suggests, 'Letters provide the repeated stimulus for Alovisa's curiosity and jealousy, virtually becoming synonymous with sexual desire'.⁶⁰ Her letters to D'Elmont fire his ambition rather than his love and they set the tone of their relationship throughout their marriage, and it is her misplaced letter that reveals her betrayal to Amena and desire to D'Elmont. Also, it is an unfinished letter that is the catalyst that sets Alovisa on her 'fatal enquiry' to determine the identity of D'Elmont's other lover. From the beginning of Part 2, readers are aware of the imminent breakdown of Alovisa and D'Elmont's relationship because of the appearance of proleptic comments from the narrator, such as that which opens the narrative's second part: 'twas time for Fortune, who long enough had smiled, now to turn her wheel, and punish the presumption that defied her power' (p. 84). Alovisa is also aware

⁵⁵ Spedding, p. 99.

⁵⁶ Spedding, p. 103.

⁵⁷ *A Discourse Concerning Writings of this Nature. By Way of Essay*, appended to *Letters From a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier* (London: for William Chetwood, 1721), p. 14.

⁵⁸ *A Discourse Concerning Writings of this Nature*, pp. 1-2.

⁵⁹ *A Discourse Concerning Writings of this Nature*, p. 5.

⁶⁰ 'The Curious Genre: Female Inquiry in Amatory Fiction', *Studies in the Novel*, 30 (1998), 194-210 (p. 205).

of D'Elmont's change towards her; however, she manages to control her discourse and 'put on a countenance of serenity [...] [and act] the part of the unsuspecting wife' (p. 97). Her resolution is broken at viewing her husband's amorous letter to another, though, and her discourse strategies break down. We are told that during her confrontation with D'Elmont,

she upbraided him in such a fashion as might be called reviling, and had [...] little regard to good manners, or even decency in what she said [...]. She endeavoured (tho' she took a wrong method) to bring him to a confession, he had done amiss. (p. 133)

As Alovisa is deprived of D'Elmont's dialogue, and starts to become unsure of her allies, she is reduced to talking to herself. Prior to her discovery of her husband in bed with the hidden Melantha, readers are confronted with her interior monologue in which she bemoans: 'scarce a month [...] was I blessed with those looks of joy, a pensive sullenness has dwelt upon his brow e'er since, 'till now, 'tis from my ruin that his pleasure flows' (p. 141). Before this mimetic representation of Alovisa's thoughts, those of the cunning Melantha are also presented as she plans: 'I will receive his [D'Elmont's] vows in Melliora's room, and when I find him raised to the highest pitch of expectation, declare who I am, and awe him into tameness' (p. 140). Melantha, like Alovisa, is a cunning woman who has no allies and so has to resort to inner plotting, hence her inner monologue.

The other characters to have their inner thoughts directly recorded are D'Elmont and Frankville, who, similarly, start talking to themselves when they have no confidant to tell of their feelings. D'Elmont is the first person that Frankville truly confides in concerning his love for Camilla and he presents his story in an extended embedded narrative. *Love in Excess* contains five intercalated narratives, each of which is autodiegetically narrated (the character tells his/her own story): Brillian tells of his love for Ansellina in Part 1 and then continues the tale in Part 2, Frankville tells his love story in Part 3, whilst, also in the final part of the book, Melliora explains her capture to D'Elmont, and, within her story, Charlotta informs Melliora of how she gained entry to Monsieur D'Sanguillier's house. Each narrative represents, to use William Nelles's terminology, 'epistemic bedding' in which 'a shift in narrator is characterized by emphasis on the process of communicating knowledge',⁶¹ but the stories of Brillian and Frankville also have an analogous quality, as the love affairs of the two men follow similar paths. These men, along with D'Elmont, are consumed by passion and are trying to negotiate the obstacles that prohibit them from developing relationships with their chosen partners. Whilst D'Elmont's main impediment is Melliora herself and her female competitor, his wife Alovisa, Brillian and Frankville have to overcome older male

⁶¹ Nelles, *Frameworks: Narrative Levels & Embedded Narrative* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), p. 134.

competitors. Both characters relate their stories analeptically, so their narrating self dominates (they deliver the story from their current perspective), but, at times of great frustration or passion, the experiencing self breaks through (they deliver their past perspectives). This is another example of Haywood utilising her narratological choices to aid characterisation. For example, when Frankville describes the moment that he first saw Camilla, he remembers his strength of feeling at that point and exclaims ‘good God! [...] I saw thro’ a window [...] a woman, or rather angel, coming down a walk directly opposite to where I was’ (p. 190), and his experiencing self reveals to readers the depth of his love.

Frankville is so distressed when he tells of Camilla’s letter, informing him of the discovery of their affair, that he stops talking and the main narrator takes over, explaining that ‘Monsieur Frankville could not come to this part of his story, without some sighs’ (p. 198). The narrator of *Love in Excess* holds an extradiegetic position and so occupies the narrative level ‘immediately superior to the first narrative and concerned with its narration’.⁶² Haywood appropriates the kind of narrator used by Behn and Congreve with the effect that she presents an interactive figure who exhibits a specifically gendered narratorial viewpoint, in this case a feminine perspective. Like the extradiegetic narrators of *The History of the Nun* and *Incognita*, this narrator’s presence is felt through narrative comments on the action, but, unlike these previous narrators, her level of interaction alters throughout the novella and she becomes more prominent as the story goes on.⁶³ The narrator’s influence is particularly evident in the key seduction scenes, because, as previously discussed, they are externally focalized. Also, during D’Elmont’s attempted seduction of Melliora, the narrator intrudes into the action in order to address readers with the purpose of rationalising the action of the protagonists. Regarding Melliora’s sexual dream of D’Elmont, the narrator writes:

But whatever dominion, honour and virtue may have over our waking thoughts, ’tis certain that they fly from the closed eyes; our passions then exert their forceful power, and that which is more predominant in the soul, agitates the fancy, and brings even things impossible to pass. Desire, with watchful diligence repelled, returns with greater violence in unguarded sleep, and overthrows the vain efforts of day. (p. 116)

The narrator is implicitly appealing to readers through the repeated employment of the plural pronoun ‘our’ that suggests reader consensus, and justifying Melliora’s behaviour that could be viewed as non-virtuous. She goes one step further when discussing D’Elmont’s actions at witnessing Melliora’s passionate dreamlike state by appearing in the first person (for the first time in the book) to give a direct opinion, stating:

⁶² Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 92.

⁶³ Potter, ‘The Language of Feminized Sexuality: Gendered Voice in Eliza Haywood’s *Love in Excess* and *Fantomina*’, *Women’s Writing*, 10 (2003), 169-86 (p. 171).

If he had now left her, some might have applauded an honour so uncommon; but more would have condemned his stupidity, for I believe there are very few men, how stoical soever they pretend to be, that in such a tempting circumstance would not have lost all thoughts, but those, which the present opportunity inspired. (pp. 116-17)

A similar first person insertion occurs when D'Elmont's resolve starts to dwindle when faced with the amorous Ciamara and the narrator declares that,

Tho' it was impossible for any soul to be capable of a greater, or more constant passion than he felt for Melliora, tho' no man that ever lived, was less addicted to loose desires, -- in fine, tho' he really was, as Frankville had told him, the most excellent of his kind, yet, he was still a *man!* and, 'tis not to be thought strange, if to the force of such united temptations, nature and modesty a little yielded. (p. 225)

By this point in the story, readers are invested in the love story of D'Elmont and Melliora, so it is as if the narrator wants to keep the hope of this relationship alive and so tries to defend the male protagonist. After all, the narrator recognises that her job is to entertain the readers, as is indicated by the explanation of the ellipsis of details concerning D'Elmont's journey to Rome, in which the narrator states 'I shall not trouble my readers with a recital of particulars which could be no way entertaining' (p. 164).

The narrator's explanation of D'Elmont's temporarily roving eye could also be seen as an attempt to present a true depiction of male desire. Throughout the third part of the book, the narrator includes several extended metanarrative digressions on the nature of love and its difference from desire. Again in these narrative asides, readers are directly appealed to through the use of inclusive diction, for example, in the assertion that, 'When once entered, he [love] becomes the whole business of our lives, we think -- we dream of nothing else, nor have a wish not inspired by him' (p. 165). The narrator is at her most vocal during the third part of the narrative, and this produces a greater sense of diegesis that contrasts with the more mimetic Parts 1 and 2. The difference in style could simply be attributed to Haywood's development of narrative skills (Part 1 was published in January 1719, 2 in June of the same year, and 3 in February of the following).⁶⁴ However, it could also be a conscious decision by her to establish the third part as encompassing a different approach to the theme of love and desire -- after all, it is the part that contains D'Elmont's transformation from a rake to a moral man. The narrative could easily be concluded at the end of Part 2 as resolutions are achieved to Alovisa's, Melantha's, and Brillian's stories, and potentially to Melliora's too, and the proleptic comments that indicated a sequel at the end of Part 1 are omitted. Therefore, a change needs to be made in theme to justify the continuance of the characters' adventures, and a change in narrative style along with it. Like Behn, Haywood can be seen to be adapting

⁶⁴ Spedding, p. 819.

her narrative choices at the text-level so as to enhance her plot events at the story-level. She uses narrative elements, such as voice, focalization, and speech, dynamically to great effect in her first publication and she continues to adapt and evolve her narratological choices throughout her career in order to enhance her story-telling and appeal to her readership.

The Danger of Giving Way to Passion, in Five Exemplary Novels

Within recent years, thanks to bibliographical and historicist studies of her publication output, it has been established that Haywood attempted much greater variety in her choice of forms and genres following *Love in Excess* than previous purveyors of the ‘formula fiction’ tag have acknowledged. As Coppola points out,

in the first years after *Love in Excess*, as Haywood produced text after text, and as her booksellers experimented with novel ways of commodifying her texts’ novel pleasure, it was not immediately clear exactly what the formula was for replicating her fiction’s first success.⁶⁵

After *Love in Excess* came the epistolary translation, *Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier* (1720), which Haywood describes as a ‘Paraphrase [rather] than a Translation’,⁶⁶ and *The Fair Captive* (1721), a play that represents a rewriting of a production by Captain Robert Hurst,⁶⁷ but in which, according to Haywood, ‘there remains not twenty Lines of the Original’.⁶⁸ Her next novella publication was *The British Recluse* that appeared over two years after *Love in Excess*.⁶⁹ This title represents the first of five novellas that were due to be published in a collection entitled *The Danger of Giving Way to Passion, in Five Exemplary Novels* that was first advertised ‘on 26 December 1720 on the final page of *Letters from a Lady of Quality*’.⁷⁰ The collection never materialised, but the titles to be included, *The British Recluse* (1722), *The Injur’d Husband* (1722), *Idalia* (1723), *Lasselia* (1723), and *The Rash Resolve* (1723), were all published separately. Spedding writes:

That the [...] collection was intended as a cohesive group and was considered as such by the publishers is clear from the fact that the novels were gathered together into a single copyright, fractions of which were traded between publishers at trade auctions of copyrights.⁷¹

⁶⁵ ‘The Secret History of Eliza Haywood’s Works: The Early Novel and the Book Trade’, *1650-1850: Ideas, Aesthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era* (New York: AMS Press, forthcoming), p. 3.

⁶⁶ *Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier* (London: for William Chetwood, 1721), p. iv.

⁶⁷ Spedding, p. 107.

⁶⁸ *The Fair Captive: A Tragedy* (London: for T. Jauncy, 1721), p. xii.

⁶⁹ The third part of *Love in Excess* was published on 26 February 1720 and *The British Recluse* on 16 April 1722. For publication dates of Haywood’s works, see Spedding, pp. 764-66.

⁷⁰ Spedding, p. 53.

⁷¹ Spedding, p. 53.

Therefore, it is not surprising that each text can be seen to thematically adhere to the title of the intended collection, with each novella demonstrating the dangers of passion. This is a feature of many of Haywood's works, though, so it seems that, by assembling these titles, Haywood's publishers were tapping into a trend for collected editions rather than simply thematically collating her works. Spedding puts forward the suggestion that,

The idea for such a collection may have been suggested by Delarivier Manley's *The Power of Love: in Seven Novels* which was advertised from mid-December 1719. This was the period in which Haywood was writing the final part of *Love in Excess* and, possibly, wondering what to do next.⁷²

As highlighted at the beginning of the chapter, Haywood also seems to be following another trend with these texts, by acknowledging the public's evident inclination at this period for historical verisimilitude within fiction. She echoes the technique of Behn in having her narrators suggest that readers are being presented with 'the history' of a person's life rather than a simple fictional tale. For example, the narrator of *Idalia* refers to the historical nature of the text, in an attempt to excuse the accuracy of the narration, stating that 'Had the lover of *Idalia* been [...] poetically inclined, 'tis possible we might have had a better Description of her transmitted to Posterity, than I am able to gather from the imperfect Accounts I received from those who gave me the History of her Life';⁷³ whilst the extradiegetic narrator of *The British Recluse*, who frames the accounts of the intradiegetic narrators Cleomira and Belinda, legitimizes the story being told, by declaring that 'I can affirm [it] for Truth, having it from the Mouths of those chiefly concern'd in it'.⁷⁴ In order to imply the veracity of these stories, the narrators position themselves somewhere in between the states of heterodiegesis and homodiegesis. Concerning narrative person, Genette writes that

We will [...] distinguish [...] two types of narrative: one with the narrator absent from the story that he tells [...], the other with the narrator present as a character in the story he tells [...] I call the first type, for obvious reasons, heterodiegetic and the second type homodiegetic.⁷⁵

Haywood's narratorial figures blur the boundaries between the two states by claiming intelligence of, and contact in, the world of the characters, but they do not actually interact as characters at the story-level, despite the presence of statements such as this made by the narrator of *Lasselia* regarding the nature of Monsieur de l'Ameye: 'I have heard several of his

⁷² Spedding, p. 54.

⁷³ *Idalia: Or, The Unfortunate Mistress* (London: for D. Browne, 1723), p. 62.

⁷⁴ *The British Recluse: Or, The Secret History of Cleomira, Suppos'd Dead* (London: for D. Browne, 1722), p.

2.

⁷⁵ Genette, pp. 244-5.

own Sex who know him, aver they never saw any thing so lovely'.⁷⁶ Haywood, like Behn, with her involved narrators, is trying to appeal to a contemporary readership by providing what it craved -- stories about potentially real people. Coppola has recently highlighted this point about Haywood and literary trends, writing:

it would seem that the appetite for 1720s amatory fiction was more closely bound up with an appetite for secret histories than we have fully recognized -- that is, early novel readers read not just for the stimulation of auto-erotic pleasure and the enjoyment of highly-charged affective states, but just as surely for the consumption of scandal, whether real or merely imagined.⁷⁷

In particular, the novellas of this unpublished Haywood collection represent precursors to the successive scandal narratives that she produced in the following years. Representative Haywood texts in this genre, as well as those of her contemporary Manley, are examined in the following chapter.

The Injur'd Husband and *The Rash Resolve* come nearer to this scandal genre than the *The British Recluse* and *Idalia*, because Haywood makes further claims to verisimilitude in their prefatory matter and implies that the characters depicted represent real-life figures. In the preface to *The Injur'd Husband*, on denying the 'Accusation' that the character of De Tortillée is meant to 'expose the Reputation of an English Woman of Quality', Haywood implies that the figure of the French Baroness is not wholly a fictional one, by stating that 'I hope there is not a second De Tortillée in the World';⁷⁸ whilst in the dedication to *The Rash Resolve*, she flatters her addressee Lady Rumney, by saying that 'were the Fair Unfortunate [of this story] still living, she would as readily submit her Fate to the Determination of so sweet a Judge, as I do my weak Endeavours to represent it',⁷⁹ and so points to the actuality of her protagonist, Emanuella. The fictional status of Lasselia, the protagonist of the novella of the same name, is not referred to by Haywood, but her identification within the text as the niece of Madam de Montespan, the famous mistress of Louis XIV, seems to suggest her real-life status. As Jerry Beasley emphasizes,

Haywood was by no means the first to conduct [...] the blending of fact and fiction [...]. It] was a hallmark of seventeenth-century French romances like [those of] Madeleine de Scudéry [...] [Haywood] made the intersections between the actual and the imagined a principal distinguishing feature of her fiction.⁸⁰

⁷⁶ *Lasselia: Or, The Self-Abandon'd*, in *The Injur'd Husband and Lasselia*, ed. by Jerry C. Beasley (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1999), pp. 103-49 (p. 119). All subsequent references to the text will be placed in parenthesis following the quotation.

⁷⁷ Coppola, p. 7.

⁷⁸ *The Injur'd Husband; Or, The Mistaken Resentment*, in *The Injur'd Husband and Lasselia*, pp. 1-101 (p. 4). All subsequent references to the text will be placed in parenthesis following the quotation.

⁷⁹ *The Rash Resolve: Or, The Untimely Discovery* (London: D. Browne, 1724), p. ix.

⁸⁰ 'Introduction', in *The Injur'd Husband and Lasselia*, pp. ix-xxxvii (p. xx).

Beasley sees this ‘blending’ at work in *Lasselia*, but, narratologically, he views it as ‘clumsy’ in its composition.⁸¹ This is partially true, particularly in respect of, as he points out, ‘the interpolated history of the hero de l’Amye’s entanglement with the Douxmourie daughters [that] is awkwardly managed [to the extent that] the reader may even have minor difficulty -- at least initially -- in grasping the relation between the history and the main story line’.⁸² However, Haywood’s extensive use of *Lasselia*’s character focalization makes the novella narratologically and thematically interesting as it demonstrates ‘*The Danger of Giving Way to Passion*’ mainly from the perspective of the female protagonist. This has previously been achieved, to a certain extent, in the other novellas of the collection, particularly in *The British Recluse* through the autodiegetic narration of Cleomira and Belinda. But the power of the depiction of the passion of these women is lessened, because of their narratorial status, which means that their narrating selves take precedence over their experiencing selves, whilst *Lasselia*’s passion appears with immediacy. Kathleen Lubey and Helen Thompson have both discussed *Lasselia* because of its depiction of the inner workings of a desiring female’s mind, but their focus has been psychologically rather than narratologically focussed.⁸³ Therefore, they do not wholly acknowledge the significance of Haywood’s choices of focalization and speech representation within the narrative, and, consequently, refer little to the coherence of her narrative strategies.

From the beginning of the text, *Lasselia*’s reactions to the problems that she faces are presented through her character focalization. For example, when she realises that the King is enamoured with her, we learn through presentation of her perspective that she ‘was so far from being proud of her Power, that it gave her a very great Uneasiness; she foresaw a world of Difficulties would attend the Conquest of this Royal Slave’ (p. 109). Her focalization comes dramatically to the fore, though, after her first meeting with her eventual lover, de l’Amye, during which ‘three Drops of Blood fell from his Nose, which stain’d a white Handkerchief she happen’d to have in her Hand’ (p. 113). As Lubey notes, ‘While there is a tumult of action in the pages that intervene between this initial meeting and the consummation of their love, almost all of that action occurs in *Lasselia*’s imagination.’⁸⁴ Initially *Lasselia*’s response to this event is paralytically omitted. This is because the narrator focuses on the violent reaction of de l’Amye’s wife to both the nose bleeding incident and the

⁸¹ Beasley, p. xxx.

⁸² Beasley, p. xxix.

⁸³ Kathleen Lubey, ‘Eliza Haywood’s Amatory Aesthetic’, *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 39 (2006), 309-22; Helen Thompson, “‘In *Idea*, a thousand nameless Joys’”: Secondary Qualities in Arnould, Locke, and Haywood’s *Lasselia*’, *Eighteenth Century*, 48 (2007), 225-43.

⁸⁴ Lubey, p. 317.

proceeding jests made about its possible foretelling of a ‘future Union’ (p. 114) between Lasselia and de l’Amye. We learn, through her character focalization, that she is threatened by Lasselia, because ‘she knew her husband to be of a Disposition amorous enough, and [she thought] the Charms of Lasselia were too prevailing, not to make her think there was a Probability, that what had been spoke in Raillery, might one Day prove too true in Earnest’ (p. 114). When Lasselia’s response is presented, it is unbounded as Haywood interweaves presentation of her character focalization with extended passages of interior monologue that demonstrate her inexperienced protagonist’s confused machinations, as is evident in this quotation:

loth she was to think she was falling into a Passion she had so long ridicul’d -- and lother to imagine it was for a Man for whom it was neither consistent with Virtue, nor Discretion, to indulge it [focalization] -- Is it impossible, said she to herself, that the seeing a Person so every way agreeable as de l’Amye cou’d give me Shocks such as, one wou’d think, cou’d only be inflicted by the Appearance of some horrid Spectre, some frightful Enemy to Nature! [interior monologue] (p. 114)

Lasselia’s fight against her passion continues to be conveyed through her revealing focalization, as is its failure, and her eventual embracement of her feelings for de l’Amye:

She thought it enough that she restrain’d her Wishes within the Bounds of Modesty; and perceiving not the least reason to imagine, by his Behaviour, that he would ever tempt her to transgress them, believ’d she might, without a Crime, indulge herself in those Felicities which at present appear’d so innocent. (p. 116)

As the previous quotation indicates, at this point in Lasselia’s story, Haywood has her narrator regain the narrative foreground, and it is this figure’s perspective that now dominates, because it is time for the implications of Lasselia’s actions to be highlighted to readers. This is carried out through proleptic comments that emphasize the danger of love. For example, immediately prior to the scene in which Lasselia inadvertently reveals her passion to her lover, the narrator laments:

how little do they know the Hazard they run, who depend on their own Strength alone for Protection. Love is a subtle, and a watchful Deceiver, and directs the Votary he designs to bless, to make the Attack when the *Fair* is least capable of Resistance. (p. 117)

As in *Love in Excess*, Haywood employs a narratorial voice that comes from a feminine perspective. The gender of the narrator is never specifically revealed, but comments like ‘as his Sex ordinarily do’ (p. 129), imply a gendered viewpoint. Despite questioning the actions of Lasselia, this narrator can often be seen to sympathize with the female protagonist of the text, whose unfortunate fate is highlighted through proleptic paralepses. A paralepsis

represents the opposite of a paralipsis and Genette refers to it as ‘the excess of information’.⁸⁵ When employing the earliest paralepsis in the text, the narrator of *Lasselia* can be seen to reach past the duration of the story in order to justify Lasselia’s deep passion for de l’Amye, writing:

One of the many Letters which pass’d between him [de l’Amye] and Lasselia, being found among some other Papers since both their Deaths, may give some little Idea of what he was; which, tho it was writ by a Woman in Love to Madness, and one who had abandon’d all things for her Passion, has been acknowledged by those of cooler Sentiments, and consequently better capable of judging, to be no more than what Perfections, such as his, might justify. (p. 120)

This paralepsis, along with the next that proleptically occurs just before Lasselia and de l’Amye consummate their relationship, and relates her justifications of her polygamous relationship, is recognised, by the narrator, as a digression from the main thread of the story, but is utilised to explain the motives and actions of Lasselia. Readers are invited to sympathize with Lasselia whilst also learning from her mistakes.

In the dedication to *Lasselia*, Haywood refers to the intended purpose of the novella, explaining that ‘My Design in writing this little Novel (as well as those I have formerly publish’d) [is] [...] to remind the unthinking Part of the World, how dangerous it is to give way to Passion’ (p. 105). As Spedding points out, this comment also serves as ‘a reminder’ that this novella is to be read as belonging to the collection, *The Danger of Giving Way to Passion*.⁸⁶ He goes on to note that ‘Similar phrases appear in *The Injur’d Husband*, *Idalia*, and [again in] *Lasselia*’.⁸⁷ The collection is meant to be read as a cohesive group, with a cohesive message, but the representations of dangerous passion are quite varied. Whilst in *The British Recluse*, *Idalia*, *Lasselia*, and *The Rash Resolve*, the main focus of the text is the danger faced by women if they give in to passion, it can be argued that in *The Injur’d Husband* narrative emphasis is equally placed on the danger faced by Beauclair in succumbing to his passion for the Baroness de Tortillée. This novella, like *Lasselia*, is narratologically sophisticated because of Haywood’s dynamic use of focalization and speech representation. However, it aligns more with the narrative style of *Love in Excess*, as these narrative techniques reveal the power relations at play in the novella, rather than the depth of passion involved for the characters, as in *Lasselia*.

The Injur’d Husband records the treachery of the Baroness de Tortillée, who, aided by her lackey, Du Lache, plots and schemes to steal Beauclair from the virtuous Montamour.

⁸⁵ Genette, p. 197.

⁸⁶ Spedding, p. 53.

⁸⁷ Spedding, p. 53.

The importance of speech, regarding the indication of power relationships at play within the novella, has previously been discussed by Beasley. He highlights that ‘Montamour, the very emblem of female propriety, is nearly voiceless except when she speaks in the assumed character of Vrayment [...]. But the baroness is aggressively vocal and full of the language of passion.’⁸⁸ Extended analysis of the gradations of speech used by Haywood can push Beasley’s discussion of the novella’s power hierarchy even further, though. It is key to point out that, at the beginning of the text, Montamour is not only silent, as Beasley notes, but also not physically present in any scenes. She does not appear in the narrative until a fifth of the way through the book, having previously been the subject of discussion rather than a participant in it. However, when she does appear, and her voice is presented by Haywood, she still lacks an interlocutor. The first real sense that readers gain of her character is given through her internal focalization, in which she reacts to Beauclair’s cold leave-taking letter. This is followed by her interior monologue. Lacking a confidante with whom to discuss her emotions, she tells herself: ‘I should deserve the base Contempt he treats me with, shou’d I persist to love’ (p. 22). We do not hear her take a role in direct dialogue until another fifth of the narrative has elapsed. She is finally driven to discourse by the interfering Sansfoy, who relishes disclosing information to Montamour about the affair between Beauclair and Tortillée. Haywood presents her direct words at this point in the action so as to signify the commencement of her gradual metamorphosis from discussed object to acting subject. From this moment on, Montamour can be seen to take control of her life -- firstly, by following her former lover to witness his deceit, secondly, by removing herself to a monastery so as to avoid further heartbreak, and thirdly, by dressing up as a man to witness Beauclair’s repentance. Her new found power is accompanied by further direct speech representation, as, again, Haywood can be seen to be moulding her narratological choices to plot developments.

Beauclair fares little better than Montamour against the dominant speaker of Tortillée, whose machinations with Du Lache take up several pages of narrative space. The first representation in the text of his words is indirect. Haywood’s choice of discourse-level reflects Beauclair’s power at this point, because whilst the narrator is controlling his speech, Du Lache is controlling his thoughts. Tortillée’s accomplice manages to wheedle his way into Beauclair’s society and then plants seeds of doubt concerning Montamour’s fidelity in his mind. The early success of his plan is indicated by the appearance of Beauclair’s first speech representation, in which he tells Du Lache that

⁸⁸ Beasley, p. xxix.

he had been the Night before at Montamour's, that Sansfoy was with her, and staying till it was late, he had waited on her Home; [and] that as they went, she had given him some Hints [that] he was not so happy in the Affections of his Mistress as she had made him hope. (pp. 15-16)

Beauclair is fooled by the speeches and words that Du Lache feeds him, both directly from his own mouth, and indirectly through the mouths of his hired associates, Toncarr and Le Songe. Consequently, Du Lache's discourse often has the ascendancy in the text, with the height of his power coming when Beauclair allows him to write a letter to Montamour posing as himself. The only person that Du Lache cannot compete with is the Baroness.

Tortillée represents the dominant force in the narrative for the opening half of the book. Whereas in the other novellas that make up the collection, *The Danger of Giving Way to Passion*, the 'history' presented by the narrator is that of the passionate heroine of the tale, at certain points in *The Injur'd Husband*, readers are reminded that the history being told is that of the Baroness. For example, when the narrator digresses and discusses the actions of the Baron instead of the Baroness, readers are explicitly returned to the main thread of the story through a scene change that evokes the assertion: 'But to return to her History, which alone can give the Reader any just Notion of her character' (p. 8). Tortillée's power is demonstrated not only through her speech representation, as previously highlighted, but also through Haywood's use of her character focalization. This is evident during the seduction scene between Beauclair and the Baroness. At first, the male lover seems to be in control of the situation as his direct discourse is presented to readers and he declares:

I own my self a Lover, an Adorer of your Perfections -- I am no longer Master of my Passion -- I must indulge the burning Wishes of my Soul -- and you must pardon 'em -- you have said you will, -- and sure, you are too Heavenly to retract your Promise.
(p. 27)

External focalization is then employed so as to imply that the Baroness has forgotten her plan, and has, therefore, lost control of her passion because of Beauclair's power. We are told that 'A thousand melting Kisses, on her Lips, her Eyes, her Breasts, made a delightful Parenthesis between almost every Word he spoke, and took from her the Power of answering, if she had attempted it' (p. 27). Readers are mistaken, though, if they believe that this heralds the end of her reign, because she comes back stronger. The revival of her senses and her constant plotting during this scene is then depicted through her character focalization, and we learn that 'Presence of Mind [...] resuming its former Place, and reminding her, how cheap, in his Esteem, a too easie yielding wou'd make her appear, oblig'd her to make some faint Efforts to get loose from his Embrace' (p. 27). Narratological analysis of this scene demonstrates that at the height of her power, Tortillée is the key focalizer and speaker.

Therefore, it makes sense that when she loses her power, she also loses her place at the top of the narratological hierarchy.

As Beasley notes, ‘it is the baroness’s language that undoes her at the gathering in her home during which the Marquis de Sonville reads aloud from her letters to her latest company’.⁸⁹ This failure in her discourse control is mirrored in Haywood’s omission of her customary powerful speech and focalization. After her initial, directly represented, complaints are ignored by Sonville, the narrator stops giving any space to the content of her repetitive verbal attacks, and instead presents their general substance through indirect speech, declaring that ‘she rav’d like one distracted, call’d him ten thousand Villains [...], and seeing none offer to assist her in wresting this fatal Paper from the Hand that held it, she flew out of the Room, wishing Eternal Damnation on ’em all’ (p. 58). As is evident in the previous quotation, her ravings are narrated and focalized from an external perspective controlled by the narrator, and so her power is fully taken from her. The result of her downfall, as Beasley states, is that ‘In the end, Montamour’s story supersedes and displaces the baroness’s, just as Montamour herself has the joy of superseding and displacing her rival in Beauclair’s affections’ (p. xxviii).

This chapter has achieved two key objectives. Firstly, it has placed Haywood’s early work in respect of her predecessors as links have been formed between Lafayette, Behn, Congreve, and Haywood regarding their awareness of the changing trends in prose fiction, as well as their narratological techniques. Lafayette’s and Behn’s use of speech representation to indicate power relations within their texts is a technique similarly used by Haywood, whilst the figure of an extra-heterodiegetic narrator who has diegetic involvement in the text is traced from Behn and Congreve to Haywood. By approaching some of Haywood’s earliest work from a narratological perspective, it has been demonstrated how an awareness of formal techniques can support, develop, and complicate pre-existing criticism, as well as how revealing analysis of narrative technique can be regarding both plot development and characterisation.

The chapter ends appropriately with analysis of *The Injur’d Husband*, which, according to several critics, including Beasley and Phyllis Guskin,⁹⁰ represents an example of a scandal narrative, as the characters of the Baroness, Beauclair, and Montamour are fictional representations of Martha Fowke Sansom, Aaron Hill, and Haywood respectively. Scandal

⁸⁹ Beasley, p. xxix.

⁹⁰ See Beasley, ‘Notes to the Novel’, pp. 151-58 (pp. 151-52), and Phyllis Guskin, ‘Introduction’, in *Clio: The Autobiography of Martha Fowke Sansom (1689-1736)*, ed. by Phyllis Guskin (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1997), pp. 15-50 (p. 30).

fiction is a genre of writing that is discussed at length in the next chapter of this thesis as Haywood produced six titles that can be classified in this way within the next three years of her career. While discussing the appeal of this genre to both Haywood and her readership, the narratological evolution required, and fulfilled, by her at this time is examined in detail. The next chapter continues where the current one leaves off, by demonstrating Haywood's skill as a literary chameleon, who links narrative and theme in interesting and dynamic ways.

Chapter 2: Satisfying ‘Curiosity’: The Novellas of 1724-28

As seen in the previous chapter’s analysis of *Love in Excess*, one of the clearest links between theme and form found in Haywood’s work is evident in the way that ‘curiosity’ is represented, with the actions of ‘curious’ characters being depicted using narratological techniques, such as temporal disruption and intriguing focalization, that tease and excite a ‘curious’ readership. Several scholars have discussed the fact that in evoking the state of ‘curiosity’ in her texts, Haywood is drawing on a trend found in literature of the late seventeenth to the earlier eighteenth century. King writes that ‘few novels of the period fail to refer in some fashion to the “Devil of Curiosity”. At its simplest, curiosity moves the plot forward, which in the novel often means bringing within its purview the whole new areas of experience to be observed.’¹ Merritt and Benedict similarly make the connection between ‘curiosity’ and new experience, with the latter noting that this literary investigation into the spirit of inquiry reflects how ‘the culture was working out whether and how to order the inquiring impulse’.² These two critics focus more on the sexual nature of epistemology portrayed by Haywood, though, with Merritt discussing how ‘the conventional gender configuration of male subject / female object is frequently overturned’ in her fiction.³ Both support their assertions by highlighting choices in characterisation and discourse with Merritt, for example, indicating how the ‘gaze’ of a lover is used to imply power, or lack of it, in Haywood’s work. The aim of this chapter is to demonstrate how narratological analysis can further support the points that these critics are making regarding the representation of ‘curiosity’, as narrative voice, point of view and temporality are used in interesting ways to reflect the action occurring at the story-level. The texts considered are examined in respect of the curiosity of the characters, the curiosity of the readers, and the curiosity of the narrators. First to be discussed is the novella that contains perhaps Haywood’s most actively ‘curious’ heroine.

Fantomina

Fantomina: Or, Love in a Maze (1725) traces the metamorphosis of an unidentified ‘young Lady of distinguished Birth, Beauty, Wit, and Spirit’, who decides to disguise herself as a

¹ ‘Spying upon the Conjurer: Haywood, Curiosity, and “the Novel” in the 1720s’, *Studies in the Novel*, 30 (1998), 178-93 (p. 181).

² ‘The Curious Genre: Female Inquiry in Amatory Fiction’, *Studies in the Novel*, 30 (1998), 194-210 (p. 201).

³ Juliette Merritt, *Beyond Spectacle: Eliza Haywood’s Female Spectators* (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 2004), p. 12.

prostitute in order to satisfy ‘a Curiosity in her to know in what Manner these Creatures [prostitutes] were address’d’.⁴ In representing how the title character keeps reinventing herself so as to ensnare her lover Beauplaisir and satisfy her sexual curiosity, Haywood manipulates several narrative techniques so as to depict the ‘curiosity’ at work in the world of the characters, whilst also increasing that provoked in the world of the readers. As King notes, with ‘curiosity driven plots [...] [often the] tendency is to test socially sanctioned categories [whilst] at the same time [...] they press outward against received literary boundaries’,⁵ and this kind of experimentation is at work in *Fantomina*. It represents an important text in Haywood’s oeuvre as it has received extensive attention, with Ballaster, Croskery, Potter, and Mary Anne Schofield all recognizing its thematic complexities, as Haywood defies convention by representing active female desire and inverts gender roles. These critics, especially Croskery, allude to the formal techniques employed, but omit a detailed narratological analysis of the novella. Regarding Haywood’s amatory output, Richetti writes: ‘Such prose is designed to be scanned hastily, not to be pondered closely or logically as language and thought but to evoke by its conventional formulas familiar and thrilling scenes.’⁶ I disagree with this statement and demonstrate that in *Fantomina* Haywood skilfully utilises narrative person, perspective, and voice in order to reflect the unconventional nature of her characterisation and her deconstruction of recognized binaries.

As the novella progresses, the Lady moves from the realm of naïve virgin to that of a powerful, sexual force, who fools her lover, the rake, Beauplaisir, into unrealised constancy by employing four different personas, each of which temporarily captures his fleeting interest and passion. The Lady’s changing status, from a curious yet powerless figure to powerful sexual being, is evident from her differing reactions to her sexual encounters with Beauplaisir, which are portrayed to the reader through her character focalization. The Lady’s first encounter with Beauplaisir as *Fantomina* has evoked diverse interpretations from critics. Both Croskery and Ballaster believe that Beauplaisir rapes *Fantomina*, whereas Jonathan Kramnick thinks the issue of consent is more complicated. He writes: ‘Croskery and Ros Ballaster [...] both shore up this reading [of the scene] by cutting the final clause, the “extreme Liking” from their citations, a revealing nervousness, I think, around the novel’s

⁴ Eliza Haywood, *Fantomina: Or, Love in a Maze in Fantomina and Other Works*, ed. by Alexander Pettit, Margaret Case Croskery, and Anna C. Patchias (Peterborough, ONT; Plymouth: Broadview Press, 2004), pp. 41-71 (p. 41). All subsequent references will be given in parenthesis following the quotation.

⁵ ‘Spying upon the Conjurer’, p. 181.

⁶ Richetti, p. 41.

ambiguous treatment of consent and desire.’⁷ The ambiguity that Kramnick is referring to is created because of the differing stances that the Lady can be seen to take regarding her feelings about meeting Beauplaisir. These are evident through her character focalization. Before Beauplaisir’s arrival in the action, the Lady seems convinced that she will not consent to have sex and is set to disappoint her lover. She also seems to take pleasure in the idea of deflating his male ego:

She depended on the Strength of her Virtue, to bear her safe thro’ Tryals more dangerous than she apprehended this to be, and never having been address’d by him as Lady, -- was resolv’d to receive his Devoirs as a Town-Mistress, imagining a world of Satisfaction to herself in engaging him in the Character of such a one, and in observing the Surprise he would be in to find himself refused by a Woman, who he supposed granted her Favours without Exception. (p. 44)

However, then the Lady appears to change her perspective, as we are told:

Strange and unaccountable were the Whimsies she was possess’d of, -- wild and incoherent her Desires, -- unfix’d and undetermin’d her Resolutions, but in that of seeing Beauplaisir in the Manner she had lately done. As for her Proceedings with him [Beauplaisir], or how a second Time to escape him without discovering who she was, she cou’d neither assure herself, whether or not in the last Extremity she wou’d do so -- Bent, however, on meeting him, whatever shou’d be the Consequence, she went out some Hours before the Time of going to the Playhouse. (pp. 44-45)

Now, the Lady seems unable to form a resolution as to what to do regarding Beauplaisir. As Kramnick suggests,⁸ she is torn between her socially instilled ideas about the importance of virtue and her strong desire for her suitor. By the time readers reach the disputed scene, the Lady’s confusion is still evident, and Kramnick is correct that the phrase ‘the extreme Liking she had to him’ (p. 46) demonstrates this uncertainty. However, I suggest that, through analysis of the character focalization that occurs immediately before and after we are told that ‘In fine, she was undone’ (p. 46), it can be ascertained that the Lady, in fact, did not want the sexual act to occur by the time the moment arrived. For example, straight after the phrase Kramnick sees as critical occurs in the Lady’s character focalization, we are told that ‘Shock’d, however, at the Apprehension of really losing her Honour, she struggled all she could’ (p. 46), which implies non-consent. Even Beauplaisir acknowledges the change in the Lady’s attitude towards the event. We learn this fact through his character focalization, as is demonstrated in this quotation: ‘He could not imagine for what Reason [...] [she] should lament a Consequence which she could not but expect, and till the last Test, seem’d inclinable to grant’ (p. 47). Kramnick acknowledges that this quotation ‘would seem to suggest a final statement of non-consent’; however, he then points to the phrase ‘the ruinous

⁷ Jonathan Brody Kramnick, ‘Locke, Haywood, and Consent’, *ELH*, 72 (2005), 453-70 (p. 463).

⁸ Kramnick, p. 463.

Extasy' (p. 46) to further question the issue of consent, writing that '[it is] an experience of cleverly ambiguous provenance, one neither his nor hers but rather the subject of an indeterminate definite article'.⁹ Despite the presence of the indeterminate article, though, the phrase can be attached to Beauplaisir's character because it occurs in a period of his focalization, at which time readers are seeing events from his perspective -- he is aware of the Lady's status as a virgin, because she informs him of this point prior to their sexual encounter, and so can acknowledge that whilst the moment created 'Extasy' it also was 'ruinous'.

The alternating perspectives allow the reader to see the scene from each party's angle of understanding. Both of the protagonists are highly confused by the situation -- the Lady, as to how she let the situation get so far, and Beauplaisir, because of the Lady's unexpected reaction -- and this confusion is likely to be repeated in the readers. The perplexity that readers will probably feel stems from the fact that, after the rape, the narrative does not take the path that contemporary conventions would seem to indicate. As Croskery points out, the novella seems to be evoking the 'tale of the persecuted maiden' with the rape scene, but then 'rewrites' it.¹⁰ As both Croskery and Kramnick note, readers do not expect to encounter Beauplaisir's perspective, but the Lady's, after the rape (even though Kramnick incorrectly describes the section of Beauplaisir's character focalization as 'an usually prolonged bout of thinking').¹¹ Also, the Lady's response to the event defies our expectations. At first, she appears to be devastated, declaring: 'Oh! no, I am undone beyond the Power of Heaven itself to help me!' (p. 47). Ballaster notes that 'Haywood employs her characteristic rhetoric of victim and victor to describe the scene, and it appears that Fantomina will go the way of her sisters, seduced, abandoned, and falling into hysteria.'¹² However, the Lady soon seems to recover from her hysteria and arranges another meeting with Beauplaisir. As Croskery and Ballaster acknowledge, the Lady does not transform into the stereotype of the 'persecuted maiden' or the 'victim' as expected. Instead, as Croskery writes, 'it now seems that she will use disguise to her sexual advantage, much like the heroine of a Restoration comedy'.¹³ The Lady goes on to pursue the man of her desires and becomes increasingly powerful.

⁹ Kramnick, p. 464.

¹⁰ Margaret Case Croskery, 'Masquing Desire: The Politics of Passion in Eliza Haywood's *Fantomina*', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 69-94 (p. 72).

¹¹ Croskery, p. 74.

Kramnick, p. 464.

¹² Ros Ballaster, *Seductive Forms: Women's Amatory Fiction from 1684 to 1740* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 188.

¹³ Croskery, p. 81.

When the character of Fantomina can no longer hold the attention and sexual curiosity of Beauplaisir, the Lady employs the character of Celia, the country wench. There is no ambiguity about the seduction scene between Celia and Beauplaisir. The Lady seeks out her target and pursues him. Regarding her position as a maid in the house where Beauplaisir is lodging, the reader hears through her character focalization that 'she was in no Apprehension of any Amorous Violence, but where she wish'd to find it' (p. 52). This statement highlights two important points regarding this character's metamorphosis. Firstly, it seems to confirm the earlier point made that the Lady did consider that Beauplaisir forced her into a sexual act as Fantomina; however, now a repetition of that act does not scare her, in fact she is seeking it, because whilst the first encounter signified the end of her 'virtue', the next will mean the continuing gratification of her 'curiosity'. This change in character situation is reflected in the narratological depiction of the scene. The consummation of the couple's desires is presented, this time, mostly through the narrator's external focalization: '[he] devour'd her Lips, [and] her Breasts with greedy Kisses, held to his Burning Bosom her half-yielding, half-reluctant Body, nor suffer'd her to get loose, till he had ravaged all' (p. 53). The characters' perspectives are not necessary for the reader to understand the scene, as we are aware that the Lady is no longer confused. She is 'half-yielding' because she is artfully trying to play her part, not because she is, in fact, reluctant to fulfil her lover's desires. Similarly, when playing the part of her third persona, the Widow Bloomer, the Lady is very aware of her disguise and the part she is acting. Before giving in to her lover's desires, she 'counterfeit[s] a fainting' (p. 57) because she thinks it not 'Decent, for the Character she had assum'd, to yield so suddenly' (p. 57). This scene is delivered to the reader through the alternating points of view of the two protagonists. Both Beauplaisir and the Lady believe that they have perfectly orchestrated this moment to their advantage, and, therefore, both characters feel that they hold the power in the relationship. It is the reader, though, who holds the most power in this scene, as we are placed in a privileged, yet voyeuristic position.

By the time of the amorous encounter between Beauplaisir and the Lady's fourth persona, Incognita (a mysterious woman who continually hides her face from her lover), the Lady's metamorphosis is complete, as we are told that 'She yielded without even a Shew of Reluctance' (p. 65). Her concern is now focussed on avoiding a 'Ruin of her Passion' (p. 67) rather than the ruin of her virtue and her 'Loss of Honour' (p. 47). She is no longer the 'curious' party in her relationship. Instead it is Beauplaisir who is portrayed as crippled by his curiosity regarding the identity of his new admirer. He tries everything to bring the Lady to a revelation, 'But not in the Height of all their mutual Raptures, could he prevail on her to

satisfy his Curiosity with the Sight of her Face' (pp. 65-66). This lack of knowledge frustrates Beauplaisir greatly as it affects his power status within the relationship. At realising that the Lady has evaded his latest attempt to see her face, we learn that 'He was so much out of Humour [...] at the Disappointment of his Curiosity, that he resolv'd never to make a second Visit' (p. 67). Again, Haywood is defying conventional gender roles at this point, because it is the male lover who is curious, whereas, as Benedict points out, 'Curiosity, particularly sexual curiosity, is an impulse traditionally attributed to women'.¹⁴

This final relationship is very different from the previous three, because the lovers are driven equally by a wish for power, as much as for a fulfilment of desire. The seduction scene is quickly over and our attention is turned to the power struggle between Beauplaisir and Incognita over whether the latter will reveal her face to the former. The confidence of both protagonists is revealed through their character focalization. Also, lexical repetition of the phrase 'doubted not' emphasizes how similarly self-assured the two have become over the course of the narrative. Regarding his desire to uncover the Lady's appearance, we learn that Beauplaisir 'doubted not but the Morning's Dawn would bring the wish'd Discovery' (p. 66). He is wrong, though, and is so frustrated by his failure that he vows 'never to make a second Visit' (p. 67) to Incognita. The Lady is confident of her sexual power, though, and 'doubted not but he would recede from' his declaration. The phrase 'doubted not' appears twice before in the novella, in relation to Beauplaisir's confidence that he will triumph in his conquests both of Fantomina ('he doubted not but on very easy Terms he might enjoy [her]' [p. 43]) and the Widow Bloomer ('[he] doubted not, but, that before they parted, he should find a Way to dry the Tears of this lovely Mourner to the Satisfaction of them both' [p. 56]). Therefore, it is significant that Haywood utilises the phrase in the Lady's focalization when she is at her most sexually powerful. The phrase has an ironic function in the text, however, because, even though both Beauplaisir and the Lady gain a victory where they 'doubted not' that it was possible, their victory is not as comprehensive as they imagine. Beauplaisir might win over his targets of seduction, but he is unaware that he is, in fact, wooing the same woman each time; and the Lady may secure a dominant victory over her libertine lover as Incognita, but it is after this encounter that her recklessness catches up with her and she becomes pregnant. The irony of the phrase's usage by Haywood is further highlighted when it is used for a final time in the character focalization of the Lady's mother, who 'doubted not' that her daughter

¹⁴ 'The Curious Genre', p. 194.

‘was struck with the Hand of Death’ (p. 69) when, actually, she has collapsed with labour pains.

Linguistic wordplay is employed in many ways to great effect by Haywood. For example, early on in the text, linguistic repetition creates a symbolic link between the Lady and the figure of the Prostitute: she is described by suitors as ‘my fine Lady Such-a-one’ (p. 42); she disguises herself as a prostitute after she has decided that her plan is to ‘set herself in the Way of being accosted as such a one’ (p. 42); and after gaining Beauplaisir’s attention she imagines ‘a world of Satisfaction to herself in engaging him in the Character of such a one’ (p. 44). This linguistic linking indicates the Lady’s imminent move into the world of sexual freedom and curiosity. Even the title of the novella is linguistically significant. The idea of disguise is intrinsic to the narrative and its presence in the text is indicated immediately by the title *Fantomina*. As Croskery notes: ‘As the title implies, the heroine of *Fantomina* pantomimes a self, “masquing” her own desires without masking them.’¹⁵ Also, because of the phonetic similarity of ‘Fantomina’ and ‘phantom’ (spelt ‘fantome’ in medieval English) the title connotes ideas of ‘illusion, unreality; emptiness, vanity; delusion, deception, [and] falsity’ (*OED*) -- all of which link to the character and situation of the Lady. Haywood has employed *Fantomina* as the name for one of her female protagonist’s personas and also for the title of her novella, because the text is shedding light on the position of females in society and is breaking down assumptions about women, female desire, and love. This is further highlighted by the novella’s subtitle ‘Love in a Maze’. Sense 3a (*OED*) of the noun ‘maze’ describes it as ‘A state of bewilderment; a feeling of amazement or perplexity; [and] (in pl.) confused and puzzled thoughts [...] (In early examples it is uncertain whether **a maze** or **amaze** (AMAZE n.) is intended)’. Haywood is portraying the complexity of love and its results -- love, like the novella, is not clear cut and simple, but confusing and complicated.

Croskery and Potter also point to the importance of the epigraph of the novella,¹⁶ which consists of the final two lines of Edmund Waller’s poem ‘To a Friend, of the Different Successes of Their Loves’ (1645), which read: ‘In Love the Victors from the Vanquish’d fly. / They fly that wound, and they pursue that dye’.¹⁷ It is likely that these lines would have been familiar to Haywood’s readers, even if they did not have knowledge of Waller’s poem, as they are also quoted by Dorimant in George Etherege’s *The Man of Mode* (1676, III, iii),

¹⁵ Croskery, p. 86.

¹⁶ Croskery, pp. 75-76.

Tiffany Potter, ‘The Language of Feminized Sexuality: Gendered Voice in Eliza Haywood’s *Love in Excess* and *Fantomina*’, *Women’s Writing*, 10 (2003), 169-86 (177).

¹⁷ Edmund Waller, ‘To a Friend of the Different Successes of Their Loves’, in *The Poems of Edmund Waller*, ed. by G. Thorn Drury (New York, Greenwood Press, 1968), pp. 102-103.

and by Donna Cornelia in Francis Manning's *The Generous Choice* (1700, I, iv). These lines are significant to the novella, because Haywood plays with the stock positions of the 'victor' and the 'vanquished'. Beauplaisir sees himself as the victor, the perfect rake, in his love affairs, because he believes that he fulfils his fleeting desires and then moves on to the next conquest. He is unaware that he is actually going back to the same woman every time, albeit in different disguises. He is being fooled by a lady who is adept at playing different parts according to her situation. She is playing a libertine game.

As previously demonstrated, the Lady's increasing power throughout the novella is evident if we study her character focalization, but it is also highlighted by the dominant role in speaking given to her through Haywood's use of direct discourse. All of Beauplaisir's discourse is presented in indirect speech until his final words of the text are directly presented to the readers for dramatic effect. After the Lady names him as her baby's father, he asks, 'What mean you Madam? I your Undoing, who never harbour'd the least Design on you in my Life' (p. 70). In contrast, the Lady is attributed with direct speech on numerous occasions -- she is given a voice to assert her new-found power. Significantly, the first time the reader is presented with the Lady's direct speech is straight after her rape by Beauplaisir, when she disdainfully replies to Beauplaisir giving her money: 'Is this a Reward (*said she*) for Condescensions, such as I have yielded to?' (p. 47). The reader is surprised that at a time of powerlessness for the Lady we are presented with her speech verbatim. However, the odd usage of 'condescensions' which is a word that evokes connotations of 'voluntary abnegation' (*OED*, Sense 1) and 'submissive deference' (*OED*, Sense 3) and so therefore does not usually collocate with the verb 'to yield', sets the tone of how this character is going to progress in an unexpected manner. Haywood is defying expectations -- the Lady is not going to take the route of a stereotypical female victim, but is going to break with convention.

As the Lady's 'frolic' (p. 42) becomes an 'Intreague' (p. 50), her attitudes towards her lover and her motivations for her actions alter. These changes are documented through direct representation of the Lady's thoughts. In the first interior monologue presented to the reader, the Lady is still in the early throes of passion and is naïve regarding Beauplaisir's loyalty towards her, remarking: 'If he is really (*said she, to herself*) the faithful, the constant Lover he has sworn to be, how charming will be our Amour?' (p. 49). However, by the next time we hear her inner thoughts, she is wise to Beauplaisir's rakish ways and, instead, delivers an almost didactic speech to herself: 'Had he been faithful to me (*said she, to herself*), either as *Fantomina*, or *Celia*, or the *Widow Bloomer*, the most violent Passion, if it does not change its Object, in Time will wither: Possession naturally abates the Vigour of Desire' (p. 65).

Again, Haywood employs thought representation to present the Lady's metamorphosis from a potential 'persecuted maiden' to a curious, worldly-wise, powerful woman.

The Lady does not represent a stock female character, but Beauplaisir does epitomize the stereotypical male rake, or, to use the Lady's phrase, one of 'the deceiving kind' (p. 59). As noted, his discourse is presented indirectly, and often it is indicated that we do not even get to hear all of his locutions. His questions to Fantomina, at their first meeting, are post-modified by the phrase 'And such like Questions' (p. 43). Similarly, on meeting Celia, he asks her 'How many Sweethearts she had? If she had ever been in Love? and many other such Questions' (p. 53), and quizzes Incognita's servants regarding 'if she were a Wife, or Widow, and several other Questions' (p. 63). In employing this type of speech representation, Haywood is demonstrating that Beauplaisir is simply going through the stages that he feels are necessary for seduction. She is also inverting expectations by providing the female protagonist with a more expressive voice than the male protagonist. She is challenging readings likely to be produced in a society like her own that grants the power of controlling to men, not women. Haywood also disregards reader expectations at the end of the novella. After the delivery of her baby, the reader is told that the young Lady's mother 'sent her to a Monastery in France' (p. 71). As Croskery points out, 'in Haywood's works, banishment to convent or monastery was no guarantee of moral transformation, nor was it an effective stopgap to erotic pleasure. The story's ending suggests not a conclusion, but a sequel.'¹⁸ The expected closure and moral of the novella is withheld. However, the Lady's actions are not completely unquestioned, as they are scrutinized by the extra-heterodiegetic narrator.

From the beginning of the novella, the narrator plays a key role in the reader's understanding of the characters. Through a proleptic comment, the narrator indicates that the Lady's motivations will have changed by the end of the text. We are told that she 'thought it not in the least a Fault to put in practice a little Whim [...] having at that Time no other Aim, than the Gratification of an innocent Curiosity' (p. 42). This implies that the narrator is dubious about the Lady's actions. This concern is confirmed in an inserted narrative comment which appears in the text. After the reader hears of how the Lady covers up her meeting with Beauplaisir, as Fantomina, from her Aunt, they are presented with the narrator's opinion, who says:

Thus did this Lady's Wit and Vivacity assist her in all, but where it was most needful. -- She had Discernment to foresee, and avoid all those Ills which might attend the Loss of her *Reputation*, but was wholly blind to those of the Ruin of her *Virtue*; and

¹⁸ Croskery, p. 92.

having managed her Affairs so as to secure the *one*, grew perfectly easy with the Remembrance, she had forfeited the *other*. (p. 49)

The heterodiegetic narrator becomes involved in the narrative when compelled to articulate concerns for the female protagonist. This compulsion to speak happens again during the seduction scene between Beauplaisir and the Widow Bloomer. However, this time the interruption is even more explicit, as the narrator employs the personal pronoun 'I', in order to address the audience:

It may, perhaps, seem strange that *Beauplaisir* should in such near Intimacies continue still deceiv'd: I know there are Men who will swear it is an Impossibility [...]. In answer to these Scruples, I can only say, that [...] she was so admirably skill'd in the Art of feigning, that she had the Power of putting on almost what Face she pleas'd, and knew so exactly how to form her Behaviour to the Character she represented. (p. 57)

This extended narrative comment conveys a different emotion from that communicated in the first -- we, as readers, sense admiration for the Lady rather than concern. The narrator occupies a similar position to the reader -- that of concerned, yet fascinated voyeur -- and almost speaks for the reader. Haywood is asking her reader to act like the narrator. Throughout the text, she is presenting social and cultural norms and asking them to question these norms and form their own opinions on their validity. The stereotypical assumption would be that the Lady's initial 'Curiosity' and her consequential pursuit of her desires would lead to her downfall, but, as already noted, this is not the whole story for this female protagonist. The narrator of one of Haywood's later texts, *Life's Progress Through the Passions* (1748), states that 'curiosity is one of the greatest advantages we receive from nature; it is that indeed from which all our knowledge is derived'.¹⁹ Throughout *Fantomina*, the adage 'Knowledge is Power' is brought strongly to mind and so this could be the point that Haywood is making -- by presenting 'curious' characters', she is evoking 'curiosity' in a readership and asking them to question their preconceived knowledge.

Scandal Chronicles

Haywood continued to evoke and satisfy the curiosity of her readers during this period by tapping into the trend for secret histories and scandal chronicles. In publishing these genres of prose fiction, Haywood was not only giving readers what they craved, but also opening them up to the epistemological concerns of the period. As King points out, texts that deal with 'curiosity' 'tend to take on larger cultural and generic meanings as the curiosity-driven plots

¹⁹ *Life's Progress Through the Passions; Or, The Adventures of Natura* (London: by T. Gardner, and Sold at his Printing House, 1748), pp. 14-15.

of early novels transport characters and readers to unmapped territories and across socially constituted boundaries and meanings'.²⁰ Scandal chronicles, in particular, are texts that bridge social and cultural boundaries as they depict fictional representations of real-life figures, whose identities are implicitly hidden behind shortened names or pseudonyms. As Richetti points out, this gossip-driven, often slanderous, genre 'began in France, [...] [and] translations of French *chronique scandaleuses* were frequent and popular [in England] in the early eighteenth century'.²¹ English-authored versions of the form also proved to be successful. Between 1683 and 1687, Behn released her three-part contribution to the genre, *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and his Sister*, but perhaps the most recognized proponent of the form, and the person most often viewed as Haywood's predecessor in it, is Manley. Her scandal fiction has been widely discussed in respect of its political intentions. However, the episodic nature of her texts, particularly *The New Atalantis* (1709), and also that of Haywood's *Memoirs of a Certain Island* (1724-25) that is similarly constructed, leads Richetti to dismiss their structural properties and to state that 'they are formally nothing more than a series of anecdotes, some swollen to novella length and complexity, [that are] unified only by a narrative occasion similar to that which unifies [...] framework collections of stories'.²² Such an analysis of form is rejected here and highlighted instead is the complex narrative structures in use that are created through polyvocality and embedding and that satisfy the curiosity of readers regarding the lives of the real-life figures portrayed. Also considered is the appeal for Manley, and then Haywood, of this multi-stranded and multi-voiced narratological approach, as it is highly revealing in terms of the intentions and techniques of these authors.

Delarivier Manley, *The New Atalantis*

Manley's most famous work, *The New Atalantis*, is a 'Tory-motivated exposé of the supposed "secret lives" of rich and powerful Whig peers and politicians of the reigns of the Stuart kings and queens from Charles II to Anne I'.²³ It follows Astrea, who returns to earth 'to see if humankind were still as defective, as when she in a disgust forsook it',²⁴ and Virtue as they journey around the Mediterranean island of Atalantis (a satirical representation of

²⁰ 'Spying Upon the Conjuror', p. 181.

²¹ *Popular Fiction Before Richardson: Narrative Patterns, 1700-1739* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), p. 120.

²² *Popular Fiction Before Richardson*, p. 121.

²³ Ros Ballaster, 'Introduction', in *The New Atalantis*, ed. by Ros Ballaster (London: Penguin, 1992), pp. v-xxi (p. v).

²⁴ Delarivier Manley, *The New Atalantis*, ed. by Ros Ballaster (London: Penguin, 1992), p. 4. All subsequent references to the text are given in parenthesis following the quotation.

England) guided by Intelligence, who helps them in order to ‘oblige [...] [their] curiosity’ (p. 13) about the ways and manners of the land. On the way the three goddesses interact with and comment on its inhabitants. The narrative is populated by corrupt politicians and debauched lovers, in a world where ‘women’s sexuality is appropriated by men for their own use and pleasure, [...] [and] contemporary politicians appropriate the rights and privileges of the public for their own use and pleasure.’²⁵ These depraved characters portray what Manley sees as the degeneracy of the nation and evoke judgement from the Goddesses, who are positioned as assumed mouthpieces for readers. Their voices are three of the numerous ones that occupy different diegetic levels of the text. Sometimes these voices, presented both directly and indirectly, transgress their diegetic limits and so the text becomes even more polyvocal. In utilising a stratification of voices -- speakers, focalizers, and narrators -- Manley introduces her readers to the different kinds of people that live in Atalantis / her society -- a society that she satirises in order to depict what the text represents as widespread sexual and political corruption at work in it.

The narrative has a Chinese box structure that is constructed in this way: the characters, such as Charlot and the Duke, occupy the inner container and have little power as all of their words and actions are mediated through other characters. The next container is filled by Lady Harriat and the Prince, who are not given the privilege of narrating their own stories, but whose dialogue is presented alongside that of Intelligence, Astrea, and Virtue. They have little more power than the other characters but are advantaged by the fact that the readers hear some of their words directly from their own mouths. The third-degree hypodiegetic narrators fill the next container. These are narrators who are also diegetic characters in the narrative thread being told by Intelligence and whose stories are judged and commented on by Astrea and Virtue. The narrators who occupy this level can then be split into two subgroups depending on their status in the story that they narrate. For example, on the one hand, there are the Country Woman and Mrs Nightwork, who tell other people’s stories but are present within these stories, and so they are homodiegetic narrators. On the other hand, there are the Baroness, Elonora, and Delia who tell their own stories and so are autodiegetic narrators. Despite their narratorial status, these characters do not have as much power as Intelligence, Astrea, and Virtue, because this triad have the choice to interrupt or even stop listening to their narratives; therefore, they fill the next container. Intelligence is the text’s intradiegetic narrator, but it also has an extradiegetic narrator whose words frame the

²⁵ Ballaster, ‘Introduction’, p. ix.

dialogue of the three goddesses and this figure fills the penultimate container. The final, outermost container is filled by the text's translator. In reality, this fictional, two-dimensional figure, employed as a satirical device by Manley, has no bearing on the narrative and only appears in the dedication to the story, but, in the fictional world of the text, the Englishman who has translated the text from the French, which in turn was translated from the Italian original, holds the most power as readers rely on the accuracy of his translation when reading.

The extradiegetic narrator may hold the most power in principle, but he/she (I can find no textual evidence to help establish the narrator's gender) actually appears the least in the text. This figure employs external focalization to set the scene for readers and introduces us to the characters of Astrea and Virtue, but then disappears as the dialogue of the characters dominates the text. We briefly hear twice more from this figure, but his/her intermissions are simply functional and bridge the gap between different narrative events. There is little room for the extradiegetic narrator because of the fact that the narrative is structured as if it were a play-text with the dialogue being labelled according to the identity of the speaker. The three goddesses, whose dialogue dominates, prevail because their curiosity is meant to reflect that of the readers of the text -- their concerns mirror that of the readership. They focalize the action for the readers and because of the lack of external narration have to provide us with stage directions that describe the scene that is in front of them. For example, we are introduced to the characters of the Baroness and the Count by Astrea who explains: 'I see a lady [...]. There is a cavalier with her, who seems earnest in persuading. They take the next seat to us. We can at ease hear all that they discourse' (p. 74). The focalization of the goddesses is limited at times, though, as some of the action, such as the chariot race, is elided and instead is described retrospectively. Consequently, readers feel as if they are under the control of the goddesses -- we see what they want us to see. It is as if Manley feels as if her society has been turned on its head through the domination of the Whig party and so she expresses this to readers by presenting them with a text that on the surface appears highly structured, but that has actually been turned upside-down. It is a work of prose fiction set out like a play, with narrators who defy and transgress the bounds of the diegetic levels, as the goddesses usurp the usually powerful extradiegetic narrator.

The narration of Intelligence fills the majority of the text as she floats between different diegetic levels. She is a diegetic character within the first narrative told by the extradiegetic narrator and therefore represents an intradiegetic narrator, but, at the same time, because of her invisibility she also, at times, stands above the action that she narrates.

Similarly, she can be seen to inhabit both a homodiegetic and heterodiegetic position within the narratives she articulates. Consequently, sometimes she recruits help from other sources, such as Mrs Nightwork, in order to fulfil her narratorial role, whilst at others she demonstrates her omnipresence by providing her audience with insider information. This is evident after the three goddesses have witnessed the dialogue that occurs between the Baroness and the Count, and Astrea expresses a positive opinion of the latter. Intelligence informs her of his duplicity and describes his true character, stating that ‘He has indeed the appearance of [...] [worth], no more. All this fine advice tends only to his own interest’ (p. 81). Intelligence relishes her role as narrator because she loves her ‘beloved diversion, scandal’ (p. 99), and she expresses her unhappiness at Elonora’s temporary dominance as narrator, complaining: ‘Elonora’s relation has took up so much of the time that I believe [...] [Count Biron] has left off play and is retired to his bedchamber’ (p. 188). She uses her power as narrator to express her own opinions, often digressing for long periods of time. She becomes so involved in talking about the degeneracy of the poet and the critic that Virtue is forced to interrupt her, saying: ‘My Lady Intelligence is wandered from her subject. She has forgot the dead lady and her history’ (p. 60).

Intelligence narrates the majority of the story threads that occur in the text, but the Baroness, Elonora, and Delia each tell their own stories, alternating between the narrating self and the experiencing self as they are overcome by the emotion of their situations. After describing her brother’s death at the hands of her former lover, Elonora steps out of her narrating self and asks the goddesses to ‘Permit [...] [her] a few tears at the remembrance of so amazing, so great a loss!’ (p. 172). It could be questioned why these characters, these women in particular, are allowed to tell their own stories and several possible suggestions are put forward here. Firstly, they are being rewarded for their virtue, as each of them vehemently tries to uphold it and maintain her reputation despite the attempts of their corrupting lovers. In this way, Manley is giving them power by omitting mediation and letting them assert their own voices. Secondly, by providing supposed ‘first-hand’ accounts, Manley is further satisfying the curiosity of her readers by supplying them with alternatively narrated evidence about the lives of these characters. Finally, it could be suggested that Manley is using these women as alternative mouthpieces through which to express her own feelings. If we look at the stories that these three women tell, we can see the similarities between their lives and that of Manley.²⁶ Of course, Delia, who tells of her distress at being

²⁶ For more on Manley’s life see Ballaster’s ‘Introduction’. Regarding the character of Delia, see p. ix.

tricked into a bigamous marriage, is a fictional representation of Manley herself; the Baroness is also faced with the fact that she is in a bigamous marriage; whilst Elonora faces ruin by a family member, an uncle, in the same way as Manley had. By giving direct voices to these characters, Manley is providing herself with numerous channels through which to vent her frustrations and could be seen to be reasserting control of her life through her writing.

This structure is not only narratologically effective as it satisfies the curiosity of readers by presenting a widespread attack on numerous contemporary figures, but also, along with publishing tricks such as the use of type names and keys, the episodic and stratified nature of *The New Atlantis*, viewed by Richetti as formally unsophisticated, provides Manley with an astute way to cover her tracks against accusations that could arise from her scandalous writing. By utilizing numerous voices at a more distant diegetic level she is displacing narrative authority in the text and so cleverly distancing herself from the provocative nature of its narrative content. Political satire is a dangerous pursuit and, as Ballaster points out, *The New Atalantis* ‘reverberated at the highest levels’.²⁷ In fact, ‘Manley was arrested with her publisher and printer on 29 October, 1709, nine days after the publication of the second volume of the *New Atalantis* which had promptly been suppressed.’²⁸ However, she was eventually cleared of the charges, because as Ballaster explains:

the *New Atalantis*, like a number of contemporary pieces of party propaganda, evaded charges of *scandalum magnatum* by virtue of the fact that it employed feigned names and published separate keys, so that council for the defence could argue over the ‘innuendo’ implied. After the first edition of a text, publishers were no longer liable so that keys were bound with the text in subsequent editions.²⁹

Through using different voices and several diegetic levels, Manley is narratologically disassociating herself from her own points and obscures her satire to a great enough degree so that legally it is downgraded to ‘innuendo’. Haywood can be seen to narratologically follow in Manley’s tracks with the same motivation in mind as is now to be shown.

Haywood’s Scandal Fictions

Between 1724 and 1726 Haywood published six texts that could be classified as scandal chronicles. The status of *Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia* (1724-25) and *The Secret History of the Present Intrigues of the Court of Caramania* (1726) is conclusive as these texts have keys appended to them that refer to the identities of the

²⁷ Ballaster, ‘Introduction’, p. v.

²⁸ Ballaster, ‘Introduction’, p. xv.

²⁹ Ballaster, ‘Introduction’, p. xv.

characters presented. That of *The Mercenary Lover* (1726) and *Reflections on the Various Effects of Love* (1726) is uncertain, because, although they are both set on ‘a certain Island adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia’, their characters have not been collocated with real-life figures. The claim for the latter-text being a scandal chronicle is strengthened, though, as Spedding points out, by ‘The fact that a second part of *Reflections* was published “With a Key to the whole” [...]. Without this key, however, it would be difficult for modern readers to uncover the identity of any of Haywood’s victims.’³⁰ *Bath-Intrigues* (1724) has no key either, but Simon Varey has recognised three of the figures that are represented in the narrative and so has confirmed its generic standing,³¹ whilst *Letters from the Palace of Fame* (1726), ‘in which the non-fictional characters and the events described are concealed by being placed in an oriental framework’, has been widely acknowledged as a scandal memoir, even though ‘no Key is available and so it is not possible to establish the identities of the people thus concealed’.³²

It is Haywood’s most well-known scandal fiction that follows the Chinese box structure as utilised by Manley in *New Atalantis. Memoirs of a Certain Island* follows Cupid as he reveals to a travelling youth the corruption at work on the Island (a satirical representation of England) whose inhabitants are obsessed with the Enchanted Well (the South Sea Company). Similarly to Astrea and Virtue in Manley’s text, Cupid has been forsaken by the people of the Island, but because he sees the ‘Curiosity and Expectation’ in the eyes of the traveller he agrees to ‘once more revisit that ungrateful City, and [...] shew [...] the Destruction these Ideots are fond of, and by what means they are provoking the Vengeance of long-suffering Heaven’.³³ The text has a six-level structure with a similarly pasteboard translator, devalued extradiegetic narrator (these narrators technically occupy a powerful position, but both Manley and Haywood use them as marginal, purely functional figures), dominating intradiegetic narrator (Cupid), and hypodiegetic narrators (Windusius and the Chevalier le Brune). As demonstrated, Haywood’s levels of voice are comparable to Manley’s, but the gender of the voices differs, because whereas Manley employs female narrators throughout her text, Haywood employs male ones (except for the extradiegetic narrator who is non-gendered in both texts). Ballaster states that Haywood uses these male

³⁰ *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), p. 244.

³¹ ‘Introduction’, in *Bath-Intrigues: In Four Letters to a Friend in London* (Los Angeles: Augustan Reprint Society, 1986), p. 17.

³² Spedding, p. 267.

³³ *Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia*, Part I (London: sold by the Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1725), p. 5. All subsequent references will be given in parenthesis following the quotation.

narrators ‘satirically’,³⁴ but in a scandal chronicle that satirises the majority of the characters that it presents, it is difficult to see that the male figures are attacked any more virulently than the female ones. Like Manley’s hypodiegetic narrators, Haywood’s represent relatively ‘good’ characters. After a questionable past, Windusius is described by Cupid to be ‘since [that time] the truest, most faithful, and zealous of my Devotees’ (p. 71), whilst the Chevalier le Brune enters the story duelling with the Marquis de Bon Coeur over the reputation of his sister, but soon realises his error and goes on to tell his story of misplaced love with Euphelia to his former duelling partner. Windusius tells his story directly to Cupid and the Traveller, but le Brune is unaware of his widened audience as, in fact, he and his interlocutor are being spied on by Cupid and the Traveller. We are told that

the new-made Friends sat down together at the foot of that Hill, on which the attentive Stranger and his heavenly Guide had listen’d to the former part of their (le Brune and Bon Coeur’s) Conversation, and with an equal Curiosity waited for the Remainder. (p. 246)

Through the introduction of another voice and diegetic level, and because of the concealed positioning of the text’s intradiegetic narrator, readers are made to feel as if they are listening in covertly to le Brune’s story. They are placed in a similar situation when Cupid and the Traveller eavesdrop on the conversation of some women who are planning to play a trick on their friend from a place where ‘unseen [they could] hear all was said’ (p. 199).

Consequently, the multi-voiced structure of the narrative also helps add to the spice of intrigue and secrecy being created by Haywood and plays a key part in appealing to readers, as it is assumed that the ‘curiosity’ of the text’s intradiegetic narrator is also shared by them.

Curiosity is narratologically satisfied by the use of multiple voices in *Memoirs of a Certain Island*, but Haywood experiments with other ways to indulge it in her subsequent scandal works. While Manley replicated a multi-narratorial structure in *Memoirs of Europe*, Haywood uses just a single letter writer (as in *Bath-Intrigues* [1724] and *Letters from the Palace of Fame* [1726]) or extradiegetic narrator in her other scandal texts (utilised in *The Mercenary Lover* [1726], *Reflections on the Various Effects of Love* [1726], and *The Secret History of the Present Intrigues of the Court of Caramania* [1726]). Rather than through multiple diegetic levels, the wished-for gossip and scandal is instead produced by multivocality through her use of speech representation and focalization as is demonstrated in the next featured text.

³⁴ ‘A Gender of Opposition: Eliza Haywood’s Scandal Fiction’, in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 143-67 (p. 144).

The Secret History of the Present Intrigues of the Court of Caramania

The Secret History of the Present Intrigues of the Court of Caramania (1726) is a scandal narrative that depicts the marriage of George II (Theodore) and Queen Caroline (Hyanthe), and the King's affair with Henrietta Howard (Ismonda).³⁵ Josephine Grieder states that *Memoirs of a Certain Island* is 'nothing but a choppy series of anecdotes connected only by their participants' devotion to the Enchanted Well, [whilst] *Caramania* has an integrated plot (albeit with no end), a degree of characterization, and a consistent moral point of view'.³⁶ Unlike Grieder, I acknowledge the narratological sophistication of *Memoirs of a Certain Island*, as previously discussed, and also the suitability of the structure employed in expressing the widespread corruption at work in the society of the text. It cannot be denied that *The Secret History of Caramania* has, at a story-level, a more unified narrative thread with the novella charting the affair between Theodore and Ismonda and the other love plots that are entangled with this main relationship. At the text-level, though, the narrative is similarly complex to that of *Memoirs of a Certain Island*, because of the number of temporal displacements incorporated. However, the kind of 'deep embedding' seen in the former text, a device defined by Nelles as utilising 'both vertical and horizontal "movement"', when the shift in narrator is accompanied by a shift in narrative level',³⁷ is not in use in *The Secret History of Caramania*. The anachronies in this later text are not signposted in such an explicit manner and also there is no stratification of voices at work, as the extradiegetic narrator is in control throughout; consequently, a more 'integrated plot' is evident.

Haywood could have utilised graphologically distinguished intercalated tales in *The Secret History of Caramania* that are given their own titles and that are set apart from the main narrative in order to present the love intrigues of the secondary characters, such as that between Aridanor, Elaria, and Zelinda, as they represent lengthy digressions away from the story of Theodore and Ismonda. However, this narratological option is not used as, instead, the different narrative threads are connected through relatively implicit scene changes and some examples of metalepsis. At times, a change in narrative focus occurs so unexpectedly and with such immediacy that readers could become bewildered by the number of intrigues that are simultaneously taking place. This is evident when, after hearing a long piece of dialogue between Ismonda and Marmillio (Theodore's confidant and favourite) in which

³⁵ For more on the identities of the real-life figures represented in the text, see Josephine Grieder's 'Introduction', in *The Secret History of the Present Intrigues of the Court of Caramania*, ed. by Josephine Grieder (New York: Garland Publishing, 1972), pp. 5-12.

³⁶ Grieder, 'Introduction', p. 6.

³⁷ *Frameworks: Narrative Levels and Embedded Narrative* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), p. 139.

Ismonda voices her concern about Theodore's possible infidelity and Marmillio tries to placate her, readers are then presented with Marmillio's focalization that reveals his satisfaction at his conduct in this conversation, with the narrator telling us that 'he doubted not but the next Visit that the Prince should make, would entirely perfect what he had made so good a progress in'.³⁸ This then leads into his satisfaction at his changing fortunes regarding his need to rid himself of his unwanted mistress, Irene, who has been forced to depart the court. We are told that

By this removal of Irene's, he had time for Contrivance; the Journey she had to take, was long, and he was not without hope, that before her return, the Prince being now more than ever oblig'd to befriend his Interest, join'd with the Power Ismonda, of whose Favour he was also certain, had with Hyanthe, would render ineffectual all Complaints the Brother of that wrong'd Lady should make of his Behaviour. (p. 93)

At this point in the text, it may seem strange for Haywood to deviate away from the main narrative thread so as to focus on the relationship of a subsidiary character, at a time when a crisis point in the relationship between Theodore and Ismonda has been reached. For readers, to use Roland Barthes's terminology regarding the structural analysis of narrative events, it seems as if a 'cardinal function', or 'hinge-point of the narrative', has been interrupted in order to insert a 'catalyser', which is an event used to "'fill in" the narrative space separating the hinge functions'.³⁹ However, the interconnected nature of Marmillio and Theodore's affairs means that the actions of the former have a causal effect on those of the latter, with Marmillio's presumed attachment to Lutetia (that temporarily ruins his relationship with his actual mistress Arilla) meaning that Theodore's actual relationship with Lutetia is not uncovered. Therefore, this digression actually represents an intradiegetic insertion that adds to the telling and meaning of the previous cardinal function, as readers are reminded of Theodore's previous indiscretions at a time when his current one is troubling his mistress. All of the events in the narrative, regardless of the agents that take part in them, are interrelated in some way, because of the numerous links, both amorous and political, between the characters. This cause-and-effect phenomenon is demonstrated by Haywood through implicit narrative movement rather than a Chinese box structure so that the entanglement of character relationships that is occurring at the story-level is reflected through the narratological entanglement at the text-level.

³⁸ *The Secret History of the Present Intrigues of the Court of Caramania* (London: Printed and Sold by the Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1727), p. 93. All further references to the text will be placed in parenthesis following the quotation.

³⁹ 'Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives', in *Image, Music, Text*, trans. by Stephen Heath (London: Fontana, 1977), pp. 79-124 (p. 93).

As Kvande points out in her analysis of *The Secret History of Caramania*, the ‘outsider narrator’ of the text does not feature in any of these entanglements, because she is a ‘disinterested observer’ who ‘guides the reader into seeing connections between public and private actions’.⁴⁰ This extradiegetic narrator has the ability to reveal the secrets at work in a society that is built on deceit and intrigue. The gender of the narratorial figure is a point of disagreement in current criticism, with Ballaster stating that the narrator is ‘ungendered’,⁴¹ whilst Kvande clearly marks out a female presence with the use of the gender-specific pronouns ‘she’ and ‘her’.⁴² Neither critic justifies their assertions and so this adds to the confusion that the issue has created. Here the narrator is identified as female, because of textual clues that occur in some of the figure’s referential comments. For example, when the narrator is discussing the nature of Marmillio’s changeable passion, it is explained that

he languish’d in unspeakable Desires for that, which had it appear’d attainable, he would perhaps have slighted and avoided; so contradictory is the Temper of Mankind, and so much is Ingratitude ingrafted in their very Natures, that it seems inherent to the Sex to shun what comes with ease, and to court Dangers and Inquietudes. (p. 94)

The nature of the inserted meta-textual comment implies that the male Sex is viewed as ‘other’ by the narrator and the force of the critique supports this idea. The same can be said of the observation made regarding Aridanor’s fickleness when he switches his amorous attentions from Ismonda to Elaria and her cousin Zelinda, with the narrator exclaiming: ‘With how much ease do Men, when once they go about it, banish an Idea they have been most violently charm’d with!’ (p. 180). According to Kvande, the voice of the female narrator stands out in the text as she represents ‘a political outsider commenting on the corruption of those in power’.⁴³ However, she does not acknowledge the fact that the narrator’s gender also sets her apart as a powerful ‘outsider’ in a text in which the actions of the female characters are controlled by those of the male characters: women are told whom to marry by their male guardians, who in turn have had their instructions from the Prince who represents the father of the country. The veracity of this statement may be questioned, because of the presence of dominant women in text. It is true that Ismonda and Zelinda hold power within the narrative and have significant amounts of their speech representation directly presented, but they are women who actively pursue their desires in a manner that is portrayed as ‘masculine’. Meanwhile, the other female characters are narratologically devalued so as to reflect their

⁴⁰ ‘The Outsider Narrator in Eliza Haywood’s Political Novels’, *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 43 (2003), 625-43 (p. 633).

⁴¹ ‘A Gender of Opposition: Eliza Haywood’s Scandal Fiction’, p. 144.

⁴² Kvande, p. 632.

⁴³ Kvande, p. 632.

situations within the story. For example, the direct speech of Euridice, the Prince's second mistress, is related when she is in conversation with him regarding his plan that she marry Dorapse, but otherwise she is relatively mute, whilst Irene's refusal of her proposed marriage to Ernestus is heard through a letter that she sends to her brother, because, at this point in the narrative, she has left the court to have her illegitimate baby by Marmillio. This lady, who appears to represent a strong woman at the beginning of the text as she argues with Marmillio about his reported infidelity, gradually loses any sway that she had. Her death is reported as if a footnote in the affairs of the Prince, with readers being told that 'the Prince was beginning to think by what means he should recall [Marmillio] [...], when Cleomenes acquainted him, that his Brother [...] [had] receiv'd News that Irene had died in Childbirth' (p. 273). The weakened status of the majority of the female characters is counteracted by Haywood's female narrator, whose presence is felt throughout the different levels of the diegesis. By gendering the narrator in this way Haywood is not simply empowering women, though. Instead she is empowering people who are not part of the political clique at work in the text.

The presence of the narrator is felt from the beginning of the narrative, which starts *in medias res* with readers being told that Prince Theodore of Caramania has married Hyanthe, daughter of the King of Anatolia, and through this union he has gained the love and reverence of his people, because it has released the kingdom from the control of their neighbouring state. We are informed that

Nothing could more endear a Ruler to his People than did this Action of Theodore's; it seemed so magnanimous a proof of Love to his Country, that a young Prince, in the full Vigour of those Desires which Loveliness creates, and every way accomplish'd to please the Fair, should neglecting all Beauties of the last, and the present Advantages he might have enjoy'd in the Choice of another Bride, sacrifice himself to a Princess much older than himself. (p. 2)

Unlike the populace of Caramania, the text's narrator is not fooled by the actions of the Prince and addresses her 'like-minded' readers in order to satisfy their assumed curiosity regarding the real reasons for the Prince's sacrifice. In a matter-of-fact manner the narrator metaphorically turns to her readers and declares,

But not to detain on the rack the Curiosity of my Reader, who by what I have said, cannot but imagine there was some other and more powerful motive for this Prince's Behaviour, than that which I have related, or than was publicly known; I shall, in as brief a manner as the Subject will admit, give an account how very different from their seeming, were the real Inducements of Theodore to act in the manner he had done. (p. 3)

In actuality, the opening pages of the novella, in which the narrator sets the scene, do not present explicit reasons why readers would question the motives of Theodore (although his

actions, to some, might seem too selfless), but by addressing readers in this way, the narrator is highlighting the need to suspect the motives of the characters that, as the text goes on to demonstrate, inhabit a world based on lies and deception. As Kvande notes, in ‘making this assumption -- and announcing it -- [the narrator] naturally nudges the reader to fulfil it; after all, no one would want to be less astute than the narrator expects here’.⁴⁴

The Prince’s true motives for marriage are subsequently revealed through an extended external analepsis, which is a flashback, as defined by Genette, ‘whose entire extent remains external to the extent of the first narrative’.⁴⁵ Through this analepsis, readers learn that on his visit to Anatolia Theodore fell in love with Ismonda, the wife of an Anatolian Lord. It is the machinations of his lover that lead to Theodore’s marriage to Hyanthe, as Ismonda acknowledges that their affair will never survive the contempt that it inspires and so reasons that ‘there is but one way left which can secure our Love: you must marry with Hyanthe, and under the pretence of friendship and fidelity to her, I unsuspected may exchange the court of Anatolia for that of Caramania’ (p. 22). At first, this suggestion shocks the Prince and we learn through his character focalization that

Nothing [...] could appear less consonant to Reason than did this Proposal seem to him: He thought it so foreign from the Principles, not only of the Passion she had profess’d, but also from Nature itself, that a Woman could of her own accord desire to share the Possession of the Man she lov’d with another, that for a great while he was able to bring out no more than, Are you in earnest, Madam? (p. 23)

However, he is soon persuaded of the necessity of seeing it through by Ismonda, who is portrayed as the most powerful force in the text at this point. Her power is evident not only through her dialogue to Theodore, but also through her character focalization. For example, when Theodore and Ismonda first interact, it is clear that the youthful and inexperienced Prince is unaware of the meaning of the feelings that he is experiencing. Through Haywood’s characteristic kaleidoscopic focalization that takes in the external focalization of the narrator, then the character focalization of Theodore, and then external focalization again, we hear that

Unskill’d in Love, and all unstudied in the God’s approach, and by what means he steals himself into the unguarded Soul, he [Theodore] knew not to what Guest he had given room; and innocently, at first, indulg’d the growing Anguish, nor thought what future Pains might be the consequence of the present Joy he found in gazing on so dangerous an Object. (pp. 4-5)

In contrast, Ismonda is immediately aware of the effect that she has had on Theodore and is conscious of his feelings before he is. Again, we are made aware of this fact because of revealing focalization that moves from the external to the internal. We are told that

⁴⁴ Kvande, p. 633.

⁴⁵ *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, trans. by Jane E. Lewin (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980), p. 49.

the fair Occasion was too sensible of the Force of her Charms [...] she both knew and triumph'd in the Conquest she had made [...] [and] the thoughts of being belov'd by so great and so lovely a Prince as Theodore, rousing all that was vain or ambitious in her Soul, made her in very great danger of swerving from [...] [her] Duty [...]. She saw herself admired by him, was pleas'd with the discovery [...], and endeavour'd all she could to enhance the Esteem she had inspired. (pp. 5-6)

It is the female lover who is depicted as being in the stereotypically male role of the pursuer who is trying to capture 'her Conquest', with her virago like dominance actually being attributed to her 'masculine Temper' (p. 24).

Many critics have made a connection between *The Secret History of Caramania* and Haywood's unflattering appearance in Pope's *Dunciad*, in which she appears as the prize in a pissing contest, and the text appears, along with *Memoirs of a Certain Island*, as one of the 'Two babes of love close clinging to her waste'.⁴⁶ Ballaster writes that 'The specific instance of Pope's antagonism to Haywood lay in her scandalous portrayal of his neighbour and friend, Lady Henrietta Howard (mistress to the Prince of Wales and patron to Pope's Scriblerian ally John Gay) as the designing and power-hungry Ismonda'.⁴⁷ David Brewer similarly makes the connection between Howard and Pope, and his satirical attack on Haywood. However, he questions the vitriol with which it is delivered as he sees Haywood's portrayal of Howard (Ismonda) as 'fairly flattering, even admiring'.⁴⁸ It is true that the motives and actions of Ismonda are not questioned by the female extradiegetic narrator in the same manner as those of the male characters. For example, the analepsis that reveals the motive behind Theodore's marriage concludes with a critique of the Prince's actions, whilst those of Ismonda are not commented on, with the narrator declaring:

Thus did the Prince purchase the Goodwill of his Subjects, and the Admiration of the whole World, by the same means which secured to himself the Enjoyment of his Wishes, and at his return receiv'd the Thanks of an adoring People for an imaginary Obligation; being look'd on as the Father of his Country, for an Action only influenced by Self-satisfaction, and in which he had no other View than such as were very distant from deserving the Trophies erected to it. (p. 31)

This negative appraisal of the Prince's actions is further emphasised by the fact that readers rejoin the main temporal realm of the story at a point when the Prince is having an affair with a young maid called Lutetia. Therefore, sympathy rather than condemnation is possible regarding the reaction of readers towards Ismonda. However, at the same time, Ismonda is

⁴⁶ Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad: An Heroic Poem. In Three Books*, in *The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope*, ed. by James Sutherland, 3rd edn, 11 vols (London: Methuen; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1963), V, II, lines 136-65 (137).

⁴⁷ 'A Gender of Opposition: Eliza Haywood's Scandal Fiction', p. 150.

⁴⁸ "'Haywood", Secret History, and the Politics of Attribution', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood*, pp. 215-39 (p. 238, note 19).

portrayed as manipulative and ruthless, and so Pope's anger could have been piqued for this reason. Her duplicitous nature is highlighted by Haywood through the use of speech representation. Her decisive conversations with Theodore are presented in direct speech, whilst her appeals to Hyanthe in which she asks to stay in her company, are indirectly related. The narrator informs us that she 'entreated [that] she [Hyanthe] would permit her to attend her to her new Sovereignty, [...] [by] telling her, she should be the most unhappy Woman on earth, to be left behind her' (pp. 29-30). This use of a more mediated form of discourse representation gives the impression that Ismonda is concealing her true identity from Hyanthe and is playing the part of the loyal servant when in fact she is, at this point, her most powerful foe.

It might appear that Ismonda's level of power is sustained throughout the course of the narrative. She always has the upper-hand over her husband, Adrastus, who never gains enough authority to demand her return to their matrimonial home. Also, whilst she cannot secure Theodore's fidelity, she does have more influence over him than his wife, as it is her that Theodore feels he is betraying, rather than Hyanthe, when he has secret affairs. This is evident when he chastises himself after gaining success in his pursuit of Lutetia. Through his character focalization we learn that 'he regretted his Inconstancy [and] could not forgive himself for having once been false to her [Ismonda], who of all her Sex alone had the power of inspiring him with a serious Passion, and for whose Love he thought himself so much obliged' (p. 32). However, despite being able to hold Theodore's amorous inclinations, Ismonda's status as a powerful female can be seen to wane after she consummates her relationship with the Prince. Until this point, she has been the unobtainable 'object' that the Prince has 'gazed on': she is in control and has the upper hand. Regarding the representation of the 'gaze' in Haywood's works, Merritt writes that

Female oppression is related to a system of looking whereby relations of power are conducted within a subject / object dichotomy. In this 'ocular regime', power is traditionally believed to accrue to the subject side of this opposition, a position most frequently held by men who make women the objects of their gaze. I will argue that Haywood consistently, throughout her long career, challenged the way power is distributed within this structure. A presiding issue is whether women can, from their position as objects, as spectacles rather than spectators, exert some control over their destiny. Or, conversely, can they successfully become spectators and acquire the authority conferred by that role?⁴⁹

⁴⁹ Merritt, p. 16.

This view of the subject / object dichotomy is interesting regarding the character of Ismonda, as she represents a powerful 'spectacle', but a weak 'spectator', and this is a position that she has to gradually accept.

After Ismonda's initial advantage over her lover, the balance of power between them starts to neutralise when she rewards Theodore's 'obedient Love' (p. 27) and sleeps with him, with both partners being portrayed as if they have been conquered by their feelings. The language of battle is used to describe their union, in this manner: 'Never had the God of tender Wishes a Sacrifice more ardent, or attended with a greater Zeal, than that now offered him by this enamour'd Pair: each strove to outvie the other in the soft Devotion; both yielded, and both conquer'd in their turn' (p. 27). Despite the appearance of equality in this scene, though, it is the Prince's passion that is then focalized as readers are told that 'The Gratification of his Passion made the transported Theodore in [...] [a] good [...] humour' (p. 27), and from this moment on it is Ismonda who has to compromise in their relationship, as she has to share Theodore with Hyanthe. The narrator stresses that she accepts this fact, writing: 'exulting in the Triumph that she alone was mistress of his Soul [she] easily absolv'd her Fate, for the necessity there was, for their common Interest, that his Body must, at some times, be elsewhere devoted' (p. 29). However, at this point, Ismonda is not aware that she will have to contend with other rivals for Theodore's affection, and that the height of her power is now at an end. As a curious 'spectator' rather than a curiosity invoking 'spectacle', Ismonda's main interlocutor now becomes Marmillio as she feels unable to confront her lover over his conduct. Whilst her status as Theodore's main mistress continues until the end of the text, it is not guaranteed after the narrative time of the story has completed. The narrator suggests a possible sequel at the end of the text, declaring that 'what must become of unhappy Ismonda, hereafter must reveal: but 'tis highly probable, that in a Passion liable to such Vicissitudes, as have been observ'd in the course of these Memoirs, there will happen Occurrences worthy of Observation; which shall then, as they fall out, be communicated to the Publick' (p. 348).

Conversely, by the end of the text, Hyanthe's position has never been so strong. This may seem like an ironic statement seeing that she is a woman who is unaware of her husband's infidelity and her favourite's perfidy for the majority of the narrative. At her first real appearance in the text, some thirty pages in, she is openly pitied by the narrator who declares, 'Poor Hyanthe, who had also the most tender affection for the happy Theodore, contented herself with the Complaisance he paid her, imagining the little warmth of his Caresses were only owing to the fault of Nature, and that he knew of Love, he felt for her' (p.

29). Despite her importance to the story, she appears rarely in the text in comparison to the other primary characters and when she does it is mainly in conversation with the deceitful Ismonda. In fact, when she is finally depicted in a scene with her husband, it occurs, ironically, because Theodore is pleading Ismonda's cause regarding her potential return to her husband. He appeals to his wife, asking: 'Shall you, then, you, for whose sake she has incurred his [her husband's] Displeasure, abandon her to the Effects of it -- O! let it never be said a Sovereign has so ill requited the Faith and Zeal of a Subject' (p. 302). When Hyanthe does recognise the deceit that has been carrying on behind her back she reacts in a politic manner. In a rare moment of insight into her demeanour, through her character focalization, we learn that

She consider'd, that to fly into Passion, would but render her Condition worse by exposing to the World her Husband's Weakness, and her want of that Power she ought to have over him; that Pity was but a poor Relief for a Misfortune such as her's, yet that was all she could expect by revealing it; and that to accuse the Prince with any terms of Wrath, would but provoke him to avow his Crime to her face, and by that means lay her under the necessity either of coming to an open Rupture with him, or, by brooking such a Contempt tamely, testify a meanness of Spirit, which was not in her nature. She chose therefore not to seem to know what, acknowledging to know, she must resent, but had not the power of redressing. (p. 304)

From this moment on Hyanthe chooses not to react to the information that before she was not party to. Her conduct impresses her husband when he realises that she has gained knowledge of his affair. We are told that 'if this Conduct did not make him love, it caused in him the extremest Veneration and Esteem for her' (p. 305). Hyanthe's power over her husband might not equal Ismonda's in respect of his amorous inclinations, but it does match that of her rival in terms of the respect he holds for the two women in his life. There is no big scene between the three protagonists in this relationship, and Hyanthe once again fades into the background of the text. However, whereas her textual silence was previously caused by her naivety, it is now occasioned by, in her mind, necessity. In contrast to Ismonda, she represents a successful 'spectator' as she does not let her curiosity control her.

The tripartite relationship in *The Secret History of Caramania* is similar to that depicted in *Love in Excess*. However, the power relations between the three characters has been inverted with Hyanthe representing a good 'spectator', unlike Alovisa, whilst Ismonda does not follow in Melliora's footsteps in adapting to the 'spectator' role after being a successful 'spectacle'. The narrative structure of *The Secret History of Caramania* also has more similarities to that of Haywood's first published work, rather than to her most famous scandal fiction, *Memoirs of a Certain Island*. Whilst the Chinese box structure is effective in

presenting the wide-spread corruption at work in the macrocosm of the Island, it would not have been as successful in depicting the microcosm of society narrated in *Caramania*. The kind of distinct intercalated tales utilised in the earlier scandal work would not have allowed Haywood to intimate the interconnectedness between all of the characters lives and affairs in the later text. With *Memoirs of a Certain Island* she is presenting numerous surface-level gossip-filled stories, whereas in *The Secret History of Caramania* she is providing an in-depth ‘secret history’.

Secret Histories

The nomenclature ‘secret history’ was a popular one of the period. Eve Tavor Bannet writes that ‘Well over eighty different works including “Secret History” in their titles appeared between 1690 and 1750 alone [...] and even more works used the descriptor in their subtitles.’⁵⁰ Haywood published eleven works that identified themselves as secret histories somewhere within their full titles. Her propensity for portraying scandal and gossip is evident, not just in her scandal chronicles, but in much of her work of this period, and it has been discussed in recent scholarship by King and Coppola. In his recent essay on the evolving marketing of Haywood, Coppola notes the significance of the changing focus of Haywood’s published collections which seem designed to accommodate the burgeoning appetite for gossip-filled fiction. The unpublished *The Danger of Giving Way to Passion* (1720-23) is superseded by *The Works of Mrs Eliza Haywood; Consisting of Novels, Letters, Poems, and Plays* (1724) that Spedding describes as ‘an expanded version’ of the former collection.⁵¹ Then in 1725 seven of the texts found in *The Works* are printed with five other works to form the collection *Secret Histories, Novels, and Poems*.⁵² The title of the collection indicates the marketing strategy of Haywood’s publishers, because, as Coppola notes, this

collection, in conjunction with the other texts that Haywood was producing at the time under varying degrees of anonymity, seems to have been calculated to deploy a ‘Haywood’ that would be synonymous with ‘secret history’, a form of fiction-making that is intimately but ultimately unknowably bound up with the unspeakable truths of libel, scandal, and obscenity.⁵³

Haywood was obviously aware of the appeal of the genre, but also the fears that it evoked in traditionally-minded readers. As King points out, in publishing *A Spy Upon the Conjurer* in

⁵⁰ “‘Secret History’: Or, Talebearing Inside and Outside the Secretorie’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68 (2005), 375-96 (p. 376).

⁵¹ Spedding, p. 57.

⁵² For more on the contents of these collections see Spedding pp. 53-84.

⁵³ ‘The Secret History of Eliza Haywood’s *Works*: The Early Novel and the Book Trade, 1650-1850: *Ideas, Aesthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era* (New York: AMS Press, forthcoming), p. 29.

1724, Haywood presents a woman who visits Duncan Campbell (a real-life futurist) in order to satisfy her ‘curiosity’ and ‘compulsion to read “secret histories”’,⁵⁴ and in her depiction of this woman she introduces ‘the new novel-reader in the shape of the culture’s worst fears -- restless, obsessive, self-indulgent, overly excitable, and female’.⁵⁵ The book and its narrator recognize the dual purpose of this type of fiction. On the title page, it is declared that the work is meant to be ‘Moral and Instructive’, but when addressing her interlocutor for the first time in the ‘Introduction’ the narrator declares that ‘there are many diverting, as well as surprizing Occurrences; which, if they cannot convince your Judgement, will certainly entertain your Fancy’.⁵⁶ This is a book that it meant to educate whilst entertaining and it points to its ‘self-reflexivity’.⁵⁷

As King argues, this text helps to dispel the idea that Haywood only produced ‘formulaic fiction’. She writes that

this odd fiction is interesting precisely because it is so unlike anything else she [Haywood] wrote during her amatory phase, and because its sense of play and parodic self-consciousness, as well as its close attention to the actualities of everyday contemporary life, goes a long way toward complicating the received image of Haywood in the twenties.⁵⁸

It is made up of three parts, with the latter two consisting of various, supposedly real letters from Campbell’s customers, whilst the initial part presents ‘A Collection of Surprising and Diverting Stories’ that are ‘Written to my Lord ----- by a Lady, who, for Twenty Years past, has made it her Business to observe all Transactions in the Life and Conversation of Mr. Campbell’ (title page). The Lady’s address to her interlocutor is presented as a letter as it ends with a valediction. However, the text is also split into chapters and so the letter-writer takes on a more narratological function than might be expected in epistolary fiction. The female narrator represents one of the few homodiegetic narratorial figures that Haywood employs throughout her career. Many of her narrators blur the distinctions between heterodiegesis and homodiegesis by implying interaction with characters, but this narrator actually interacts fully in the world, and with the characters, that she is describing. There are several possible reasons why Haywood chose to use this type of narratorial figure. Firstly, the anecdotal nature of the text demands a controlling narrator to frame the numerous incidents

⁵⁴ King, ‘A Spy Upon a Conjuror’, p. 186.

⁵⁵ King, ‘A Spy Upon a Conjuror’, p. 186.

⁵⁶ *A Spy Upon the Conjuror: Or, A Collection of Surprising and Diverting Stories, With Merry and Ingenious Letters* (London: for J. Peele, 1724), p. 1. All subsequent references to the text will be given in parenthesis following the quotation marks.

⁵⁷ King, ‘A Spy Upon a Conjuror’, p. 184.

⁵⁸ King, ‘A Spy Upon a Conjuror’, p. 184.

being related. Similarly to in *Memoirs of a Certain Island* in which Cupid takes on this role, *A Spy Upon the Conjuror* utilises a story-level insider to control the text-level so as to authenticate the information being conveyed. Whilst Cupid wants to emphasize the depraved nature of the Island's society, Justicia (the name of the narrator of *A Spy Upon the Conjuror* is revealed in the valediction) is trying to convince non-believers of Campbell's ability that he has genuine powers. Her position is strengthened by the fact that she herself is a converted non-believer. She opens the first chapter by declaring that 'I confess that when I first heard the Name of Duncan Campbell mention'd, I consider'd him as no other than one of those idle Fellows, who being neither born nor bred to any other Hopes than an implicit Dependance on Fortune, make a Shift to rub through a precarious Life, by imposing on the ignorant Sort of People' (p. 2). However, after she has been convinced of his 'skill', she recalls that 'I could not resist the Temptation of becoming a constant Visitor; and by that means had the Opportunity of being let into the Histories of many secret Amours and Adventures unknown to the Generality of the World' (p. 14).

Secondly, by choosing to have the text narrated by a character who is also a friend of the subject of readers' curiosity, Haywood is utilising a figure who has access to all of the different characters at both the time of the story and the time of the text. Consequently, after relating the tales of Campbell's customers, often this narrator delivers prolepses that reveal the long-term futures of the characters. For example, on the narrator's first visit to Campbell, she interacts with a woman who wants the futurist to tell her which of her suitors she should marry. He tells her that one of them is only courting her to be close to her daughter. His final piece of advice is to 'let the young People be happy, -- or it will be worse for both' (p. 10). However, the furious mother does not heed Campbell's advice and the narrator informs us that she berated her daughter to the extent that she eloped with her lover, whilst the woman was left as the 'Jest of the whole Town; and by that means made out Mr. Campbell's Prediction, *that it wou'd be worse for both*' (p. 11; original emphasis). The power of hindsight gives this narrator a key tool for promoting Campbell's 'skill'. She is able to control the narrative that she presents in order to present her subject matter in the best light. As King highlights, the text was published with promotion in mind. She writes that

A Spy Upon the Conjuror began as a piece of hack work, a kind of infomercial, if you will, intended to plug Duncan Campbell, a deaf-mute fortune-teller, quack doctor, and, by the 1720s, member of Eliza Haywood's literary set [...]. During the 1720s he was the subject of no fewer than six books or pamphlets written as part of an

advertising campaign orchestrated evidently by Campbell himself in an attempt to drum up custom for his dwindling fortune-telling practice.⁵⁹

Haywood promotes her associate in a suitable manner by employing a knowing narrator, who has access to the man's genius, whilst being easy for readers to identify with. Not only was she a non-believer, but also she failed to heed Campbell's advice and was forsaken by her lover. This fact is referred to in several lengthy digressions in which the narrator bemoans the fact that 'tho' I was far enough from disbelieving what he said, yet Youth, Passion, and Inadvertancy render'd his Cautions ineffectual' (p. 13). She is a representative of the 'curious' reader and she satisfies their curiosities about this real-life figure.

As Coppola states, the characters represented in a 'secret history' need not coincide with actual real-life people to cause interest in the reading public. He writes, 'The fact that these secret histories *may or may not have been true* would seem to have been the very source of their particular pleasures.'⁶⁰ As with the novellas described in the previous chapter, Haywood continues to suggest in varying ways that the characters she is presenting in many of her fictions are real people. For example, the title page of *Memoirs of Baron de Brosse* (1724) sets the novella in a recognisable historical period, stating that Brosse 'was Broke on the Wheel in the Reign of Lewis XIV' and that the narrative has been 'Collected from Authentick Authors, and an Original Manuscript';⁶¹ whilst in her dedication to Lady Frances Lumley in *The Arragonian Queen*, Haywood refers to the title character of the text as if she is a real person, writing: 'Madam, with the greatest Humility, I presume to lay at Your Feet the Misfortunes of a Queen, who resembles You in Beauty, and whose Virtue, tho put to the severest trial, preserv'd itself so pure and uncorrupted, that it gives her some sort of Title to Your Ladyship's Protection.'⁶² As Coppola points out,

After encountering enough 'secret histories', the reader of Haywood is encouraged to wonder if there might not be some real-world referent lurking within even the most outlandish amatory fiction, in spite of (or perhaps because of) the fact that such a truth claim might only appear (if it does at all) on the first page only to be dropped once the story takes off from there.⁶³

In terms of the narrative structure of these secret histories, Haywood emphasises their gossip-led, at times secretive, nature, by employing different tactics, some of which manipulate voice and others time. The withholding of secrets is a key feature in many of

⁵⁹ King, 'A Spy Upon a Conjuror', p. 183.

⁶⁰ Coppola, p. 30 (original emphasis).

⁶¹ *Memoirs of Baron de Brosse* (London: for D. Browne and S. Chapman, 1725).

⁶² *The Arragonian Queen: A Secret History*, 2nd edn (London: for J. Roberts, 1724), p. v. All subsequent references to the text will be given in parenthesis following the quotation.

⁶³ Coppola, p. 31.

Haywood's texts, but it is particularly prominent in those that utilise paralipses. The presence of this temporal narrative technique means that important information is withheld from curious readers for dramatic effect. For example, in *The Arragonian Queen: A Secret History*, readers question Princess Zephalinda's acceptance of Albaraizor's hand in marriage because of her telling silence at his declaration. We are told that his 'words were answer'd by the Princess no otherwise than by a gentle declining of her Head' (p. 4). However, the reasons for her underwhelming response are held back until her lover's despair at losing his mistress is represented. This is done emphatically and powerfully through free indirect thought, or to use Cohn's terminology, narrated monologue, which is a type of thought representation that 'maintains the third-person reference and tense of narration, but [...] reproduces verbatim the character's own mental language'.⁶⁴ Through his thought representation, we learn that Abdelhamar is

just on the point of being robb'd of what he thought alone worth living for, his Hopes at once all crush'd; the beauteous Object of his Passion, who with equal Ardor return'd his Love, snatch'd from his longing and expecting Arms, and in a moment bestow'd on a Stranger; yet on one whose Merits, Reputation, and Friendship for him, disarm'd his Revenge; neither could he so much as blame him, for it was entirely unsought by him. (p. 7)

After this outpouring of emotion, readers are taken back to the reality of Zephalinda's situation through the use of a metalepsis, in which the narrator states: 'But I must now return to the Princess, who I believe the Reader by this time with reason imagines to be the Object of unhappy Abdelhamar's Love and Despair' (p. 7). A paralipsis is employed by Haywood regarding Zephalinda's emotions so as to heighten the tension that readers feel when they learn that her true love, Abdelhamar, is having to fight side-by-side with her appointed husband, Albaraizor. Although the paralipsis does not cover a long temporal span, the tension between love and friendship is a feature throughout the novella.

The paralipsis used in *The Unequal Conflict* (1725) keeps readers in suspense for a much longer period. This novella tells the story of two young lovers, Philenia and Fillamour, who are kept apart by her family, because she is betrothed to another man, Coeurdemont. They are helped in their quest to reunite by Philenia's friend, Antonia. However, from her entrance into the story, her motivations for helping the couple are likely to be questioned by readers because of references to 'the reasons she had for wishing well to this amour'.⁶⁵ The

⁶⁴ *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984), p. 14.

⁶⁵ *The Unequal Conflict; Or, Nature Triumphant* (London: for J. Walthoe and J. Crockatt, 1725), p. 17. All subsequent references to the text will be placed in parenthesis following the quotation.

narrator of this novella is aware of the tantalising nature of Antonia's character and plays with readers until announcing that

But because the reader is yet in the dark, and probably may wonder for what reason this lady was so assiduous; I think it will not be improper to give a brief account who she was, and by what motives, excited to act in the manner she did. (p. 33)

The paralipsis is then finally broken and Antonia's story is presented in an intercalated tale, in which it is revealed that she is in love with Coeurdemont; hence her wish to help the young couple. Temporal disruption is used in this novella to mirror the secrecy of the plot and to enhance the impact of the scandal of the piece. In the opening narrative comments, the narrator recognises the appeal to readers of gossip, exclaiming: 'so darling a theme is scandal' (p. 6). However, the narrator hopes that 'in relating [...] [this] history impartially, I shall be able to rescue their characters from those imputations that they have labour'd under from the general' (p. 6). This promise to defend the characters does not have much bearing in the novella, though, as the quest for entertaining gossip takes over. For example, when the narrator arrives at the most scandalous part of Antonia's story, when she has sex with Coeurdemont whilst he mistakes her for her servant who is his lover, readers are told by the narrator:

but I am now arrived at a circumstance which will, I fear, lose her, at once, all the tenderness I would wish to inspire my fair readers with in her behalf, but as I think my self, since I have begun, obliged to go on with an impartial account of her adventures, this is too much material to her story to be omitted. (p. 39)

The narrator hides behind his/her 'impartiality', but the lure of gossip is too great.

The discontinuities that occur in *The Unequal Conflict* add to the entertaining nature of the novella. The same is true of those at work in *The Tea-Table* (1725). Prefacing this narrative is an 'Advertisement' that states:

The World is so apt to pick Meanings out of every thing, especially if there be the least Room for Censure or Ridicule, that I think my self obliged to acquaint my Reader, that I have no View to any particular Persons, or Families in the Characters contained in the following Sheets.⁶⁶

Whilst no characters have been identified by critics as real people in this narrative, the message in the advertisement has to be seen as ironic as real people are referred to in the text. For example, Amiana (the Tea-Table hostess) reads out a poem entitled 'A Pastoral Dialogue,

⁶⁶ *The Tea-Table: Or, A Conversation Between Some Polite Persons of both Sexes, at a Lady's Visiting Day*, Part I (London: for J. Roberts, 1725). All subsequent references to the text will be placed in parenthesis following the quotation.

between Alexis and Clorinda; Occasioned by Hillarius's Intending a Voyage to America',⁶⁷ which obviously refers to Aaron Hill (Hillarius is used as a pseudonym for Aaron Hill in Haywood's *Poems on Several Occasions*), whilst Philetus talks pejoratively about 'the author of a late Pamphlet, entitled *The Authors of the Town*' (II, 19) which refers to Richard Savage. *The Tea-Table* is narratologically interesting when considered alongside the rest of Haywood's fictional works, because it consists mainly of dialogue between a tea-table party of five people, of which one member is the narrator. Whilst many of Haywood's narrators float between the boundaries of heterodiegesis and homodiegesis, this narrator stands firmly in homodiegesis, declaring: 'I was sometime ago introduced by a particular Friend, to the Acquaintance of this admirable Lady [Amiana]' (p. 3). However, as Alexander Pettit points out, only 'Four of the characters talk; the narrator participates only as a scribe',⁶⁸ and this weakens his/her character status.

With this narrative fiction, Haywood finds new narrative methods for representing gossip. There is little reliance on focalization or time. In this instance, she incorporates intercalated narratives into the dialogue of four characters to create a polyvocal effect. Whilst being narratologically different in many ways to her other fictions, *The Tea-Table* is still recognisably Haywood's because, as Benedict notes, 'Presented as a philosophical debate, [...] [the] frame licenses pleasurable narratives of chaotic feeling, although Haywood here eschews the erotic details of her longer novels of the 1720s.'⁶⁹ The story of Beraldus and Celemena, as told by Brilliante, perfectly represents how Haywood mixes this new narrative style with some of her more tried and tested techniques. Celemena is a naïve girl who quickly falls in love and sleeps with Beraldus. After their sexual encounter, Beraldus is no longer interested, but he convinces her that he is so that she agrees to fool her concerned guardian. As in previously discussed narratives, speech representation is cleverly used by Haywood to demonstrate the power relations at play when Beraldus tells Celemena his plan to dupe her guardian. All of his utterances are directly represented, whilst Celemena's are indirectly depicted, as is demonstrated in this section of dialogue:

To feign a Hatred for each other, is, my Angel, (continued he) the sole Expedient that is left us to preserve our Love from being made the Victim of her cruel Resolution. It is natural to believe Celemena could not hear so surprizing a Piece of News without

⁶⁷ *The Tea-Table: Or, A Conversation Between Some Polite Persons of both Sexes, at a Lady's Visiting Day*, Part II (London: for J. Roberts, 1725), p. 2. All subsequent references to the text will be placed in parenthesis following the quotation.

⁶⁸ 'Adventures in Pornographic Places: Eliza Haywood's Tea-Table and the Decentering of a Moral Argument', *Papers on Language and Literature*, 38 (2002), 244-69 (p. 249).

⁶⁹ 'Wants and Goods: Advertisement and Desire in Haywood and Defoe', *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, 33 (2004), 221-53 (p. 237).

an Impatience to know the Meaning of it; and hastily asking him for what Cause the Princess refus'd her Consent to their mutual Passion -- I have already told you, answer'd he that it springs from what I dare not name. (p. 29)

With *The Tea-Table*, Haywood seeks to provide insider gossip through a homodiegetic narrator, whilst also entertaining her readers with amorous tales. The mix works well, but this type of narrative structure is not seen again in Haywood's works until the publication of her periodicals.

Despite talk of a moral conversion in her latter publishing years, Haywood actually continued to present texts that referred to real-life, or supposed real-life, figures throughout her career. As indicated in this chapter, though, she continued to adapt her narrative strategies in order to find new and interesting ways in which to portray these characters. This is evident in the case studies that make up the next chapter, which tries to dispel the myth, using narratological analysis, that Haywood's output was affected by Pope's attack on her in *The Dunciad*.

Chapter 3: Narrative Experimentation in the Post- *Dunciad* Years, 1729-43

As Spedding explains, a much repeated analysis of Haywood's publication history for many years affected the way in which her literary output was appreciated. He summarises it in this way:

Haywood begins as a writer of immoral fiction (such as *Love in Excess*), and as a scandal-monger (in her *Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia*). She is chastised by Alexander Pope in his *Dunciad* of 1728, for her errors, and so her reputation is destroyed. Haywood is silenced for a decade; but eventually, seeing the error of her ways, takes up her pen again as a moral crusader, and so makes up for all her wrong-doing.¹

The consequence of this view was that, in early criticism, the mid-point of Eliza Haywood's career received attention in respect of its biographical significance as the period of her perceived literary 'conversion', whilst the literary progression that she achieved at this time was greatly underestimated. Thanks, in the main, to the bibliographical work of first Blouch and then Spedding, this 'dichotomous' survey of her career has been rejected,² and more recent discussion of this time in her career acknowledges its consequence in highlighting 'her awareness and employment of contemporary literary trends'.³ The texts that particularly demonstrate this are the satirical novella *The Adventures of Eovaai* (1736) that represents the final text to appear from Haywood before her period of non-publication, as it taps into the vogue for anti-Walpole literature; *Anti-Pamela* (1741), which heralds her return to active publishing, and is one of many responses to Richardson's seminal novel, *Pamela* (1740), and *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman* (1743) that depicts the turbulent life of a contemporary figure, James Annesley. Thematically, the texts indicate Haywood's ability to adapt to current trends, whilst, narratologically, they further confirm that Haywood underwent a progression rather than a conversion in her writing style.

The Adventures of Eovaai

The Adventures of Eovaai is a novella attacking Sir Robert Walpole that combines multiple voices and perspectives in a way that is both satirical and playful. It represents one of

¹ 'Shameless Scribbler or Votary of Virtue? Eliza Haywood, Writing (and) Pornography in 1742', in *Women Writing, 1550-1750*, ed. by Jo Wallwork and Paul Salzman (Bundoora, VIC: La Trobe University, 2001), pp. 237-51 (p. 238).

² See Blouch, 'Eliza Haywood and the Romance of Obscurity', *SEL*, 31 (1991), 535-52 (p. 544), and Spedding, *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), in particular p. 20 and pp. 353-81.

³ Earla Wilputte, 'Introduction', in *The Adventures of Eovaai*, ed. by Earla Wilputte (Peterborough, ONT: Broadview Press, 1999), pp. 9-34 (p. 9). It is important to note that although Wilputte acknowledges this point, she also conforms to the dichotomous view of Haywood's career.

Haywood's most narratologically sophisticated works.⁴ Many previous texts demonstrate polyvocality through the use of intercalated tales, whilst a framing voice is utilised for this purpose in *The British Recluse* (1722) and *Memoirs of a Certain Island* (1724-25), but *The Adventures of Eovaai* stands ahead of these in respect of narrative complexity because of the use of competing extradiegetic voices. The novella not only has a Narrator but also a Translator who plays a quasi-narratorial role, and the importance of these and other figures is marked by initial capitals for their titles, just as with the names of the characters. While critics have commented on the novella's polyvocality and multivalency,⁵ the integral role of the Narrator, in comparison with that of the Translator, has been little explored.⁶ It is suggested that this is because of the special attention that critics have given to the political ideologies of the novella's different voices and the Translator as the mediator of these voices. Although this may seem anomalous, the Narrator of the novella is often overshadowed by the Translator, because the latter seems to be the key figure in mediating the text. If we think about the basic story / text distinction regarding the narrative,⁷ the Translator occupies the text level, as the job of a Translator is to present a previously constructed story to a new audience. However, this Translator also interferes in the text and includes meditations on the actions of the characters and the story's commentators. Both figures stand outside and comment on the story of Princess Eovaai, but occupy different tiers of the hierarchy of voices at the text-level.

The first voice is that of the Translator who provides the preface. The Translator, who is 'the Son of a Mandarin, residing in London' (p. 41), relates the history of how Eovaai's story came to be presented to the modern reader. He tells us that the story is one of 'twenty one Histories' (p. 51) dating from a pre-Adamitical time and that it was translated on the orders of a Chinese Prince by a group of seventy 'Eminent Philosophers of all Nations' (p.

⁴ *The Adventures of Eovaai*, ed. by Earla Wilputte (Peterborough, ONT: Broadview Press, 1999). All subsequent references to the text will be given in parenthesis following the quotation.

⁵ In particular, Earla Wilputte and Elizabeth Kubek have commented on these features of the text. See Wilputte, 'Introduction' in *The Adventures of Eovaai*, and Kubek, 'The Key to Stowe: Toward a Patriot Whig Reading of Eliza Haywood's *Eovaai*', in *Presenting Gender: Changing Sex in Early-Modern Culture*, ed. by Chris Mounsey (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press; London: Associated Presses, 2001), pp. 225-54.

⁶ Marta Kvande refers to the presence of two narratorial figures in the text but looks at them in little detail and mainly applies a political reading to their relationship, viewing the Narrator as a 'Whiggish Republican' and the Translator as a 'Tory outsider', in 'The Outsider Narrator in Eliza Haywood's Political Novels', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 43 (2003), 625-43 (639).

⁷ This distinction originates from the work of the Russian Formalists who utilised the terms 'fabula / sjuzhet', whilst French Structuralists employed 'histoire / discours'. In describing this distinction, Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan writes that "'Story" designates the narrated events, abstracted from their disposition in the text and reconstructed in their chronological order, together with the participants in these events. Whereas "story" is a succession of events, "text" is a spoken or written discourse which undertakes their telling. Put more simply, the text is what we read', *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 3.

50), entitled the Cabal, from ‘the Language of Nature’ (p. 50) into Chinese. This story, which is delivered by the Narrator (often referred to as the Historian), is punctuated by footnotes from several commentators on the Chinese translation. These figures contribute in varying degrees with the most frequently heard voices being those of the Cabal, the Commentator, and Hahehihotu, but there are many others. Then, of course, there are the voices of the characters. The main narrative thread of the novella follows the manipulation of Princess Eovaai of Ijaveo by the evil Prime Minister of Hypotofa, Ochihatou (the satirical representation of Walpole). During the course of this story, in which Eovaai almost falls for the minister’s charms but eventually is enlightened regarding his perfidiousness, we are presented with the stories of Yximilla (Queen of Ginksy, who loses her country and her independence in battle), Atamadoul (a woman infatuated with Ochihatou despite the fact that he has turned her into a monkey in an act of revenge), and Adelhu (the Prince of Hypotofa and eventual husband of Eovaai), and we hear the speeches of Alhazuza, a Hypotofan Patriot, and of a citizen from the Republic of Oozoff.

As Kvande points out, Haywood’s novella ‘is a mediated text [...] [that] has reached its present audience through several layers of transmission’.⁸ The text has a Chinese-box structure with the characters occupying the innermost container. Next is the Narrator, who has control over the telling of the characters’ stories. The external figures of the commentators have more power than the Narrator as they can interrupt the tale at any time in order to express their opinions. It is the Translator who rules supreme and occupies the outermost container, however, because, in the process through which the story is mediated to the reader, the Translator is at a later stage than the Narrator and so has more control. He has the prerogative to contradict any other voice and has authority as an editor. His agency is evident when we note that Hahehihotu’s contributions are limited to several footnotes in the present version of the narrative but that his original commentary filled more than one volume, as one of his assertions is said by the Translator to have been taken from ‘Volume the first, pag. 32d of his Remarks on this History’ (p. 64).

The Translator’s authority is highlighted immediately in the text, as it is he who delivers the preface to the reader and whose signature appears in the valediction of the dedicatee’s letter. The preface emphasizes the Translator’s quasi-narratorial role as he provides a narratological frame for the extradiegetic Narrator’s telling of Eovaai’s story. The word ‘Translator’ actually only appears twice in the novella -- the first being, as already

⁸ ‘The Outsider Narrator’, p. 637.

noted, in the dedicatee's letter and, secondly, when the Translator himself comments on the act of translation. He bemoans the fact that he cannot omit a part of the text, and this seems to support an earlier misogynistic remark by the Commentator. He states: 'This Supposition so much justifies the foregoing Reflection on the Fair Sex, that I wou'd fain have omitted it, cou'd I have done so without incurring the Censure of an unfair Translator' (p. 73). He is distancing himself from his official position and is referring to his more active role in the narrative. He is not simply a translator and this helps explain why the word is used so little in the text.

After the preface, the Translator's voice appears solely in the footnotes that punctuate the text. According to Wilputte the male Translator becomes a 'marginalized' figure from this moment on. She suggests:

In fact, the Translator is a feminized figure, observing but not truly participating in the events which draw his attention. He has much in common with an eighteenth-century woman: as she is a liminal figure in society and politics, the Translator is similarly marginalized -- to the bottom of the page in the book. (p. 28)

Kubek has rightly argued that this is a misreading of the Translator's position, but her corrective also needs modification. According to Kubek, 'Haywood's Translator is not simply "feminized," as Wilputte states, but rather marked as male Other by his status as "Oriental" exile, and by his deference to the "cabal"'.⁹ However, as already demonstrated, the Translator is highly powerful in the text and holds more influence over the Cabal than they do over him because of his position in the chain of transmission. His identity of 'Other' does not lessen his influence -- in fact he often uses it to his advantage. The function of the Translator is similar to that of the oriental frame employed by Haywood. Regarding the role of Orientalism, Edward Said writes that 'it is based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between "the Orient" and (most of the time) "the Occident"'.¹⁰ However, Haywood plays with this distinction by indicating both the 'otherness' of the characters and the settings (for example, the presence of magical characters, and 'celestial being[s]' [p. 93]), whilst also noting the similarities that they share with her society (for example, the presence of corrupt Ministers, and different political parties). She adopts the oriental tale as, to use Srinivas Aravamudan's words, 'a socioliterary "shifter"'.¹¹ In doing so, again, she is emphasizing the multivalent nature of her text -- through its presentation as both 'other' and 'related', it is both entertaining and allegorical.

⁹ 'The Key to Stowe', p. 226.

¹⁰ *Orientalism* (London: Penguin, 2003), p. 2.

¹¹ 'In the Wake of the Novel: The Oriental Tale as National Allegory', *Novel*, 33 (1999), 5-31 (27).

The Translator can also be seen as a 'shifter'. He employs the personal pronouns 'we' and 'our' in acts of implied consensus, but sometimes he identifies himself with the 'we' of his Chinese countrymen and at others with the 'we' of the English reading community. He highlights his multivalent position in order to appear authoritative as both a worldly-wise, foreign Translator and as the only figure in the novella who occupies the same temporal space as the readers. This figure's comments may appear at the bottom of a page, but they dictate the progression of the narrative. The footnotes interrupt the story, often in significant places, but sometimes to bathetic effect. Also, in a narrative dominated by direct speech representation, it seems possible that the Translator is filtering the words of the commentators in his role as mediator. Their contributions are presented as if directly taken from them (the pronouns, tense, and deixis are of these characters), but the Translator also clearly paraphrases some parts of the narrative -- as when, for example, he edits the Commentator's 'long Dissertation' that seeks to 'prove Vanity is so much a Part of Woman' (p. 73). Significant, too, is the fact that the Translator only once emphasizes that he is citing the exact words spoken by a character. This occurs when, commenting on Cafferero's speech on the power of Princes, he remarks: 'These are his words' (p. 115). The fact that he makes no such comment elsewhere suggests that his text often, perhaps even routinely, reformulates the discourse of others.

The dominance of the Translator is again underestimated by Wilputte when she declares that the Translator is 'aloof, non-judgemental, unbiased, and separate from the action' (p. 28). Instead, as Kvande points out, 'the Translator is the only voice permitted to pronounce final judgement on all the other voices in the text -- including the Historian as well as the various commentators',¹² and he even positions himself at odds with the Historian / Narrator. After the meeting of Eovaai and Adelhu, the Narrator writes that Eovaai 'determined to offer him her Crown and Person, *as she said*, to recompense him for what he had done for herself and her People, but *in reality* to gratify the Passion she was enflamed with for him' (p. 158; emphasis original). Regarding this comment, the Translator declares that

The Historian, methinks, might have spared giving his Opinion in this Matter; but, if it were as he suggests, that Passion cou'd not be blameable in *Eovaai*, which had Gratitude for its Source, and was encouraged by an appearance of the greatest Virtue and Bravery in the Object. (p. 158)

¹² 'The Outsider Narrator', p. 640.

The Translator defends Eovaai by suggesting that her behaviour is motivated by justifiable ‘gratitude’ rather than emotional ‘gratification’ as the narrator suggests. By including two powerful, narratorial males, who have contrasting views when it comes to the female protagonist of the text, Haywood is allowing her readers to listen to different opinions and to make up their own minds regarding the narrative and its characters.

Hahehihotu also comments on the significance of the Narrator’s presentation regarding his description of Ochihatou’s actions when he becomes ‘Vicegerent of the Kingdom’ (p. 64). He asserts that

our Author might have saved himself the Trouble of particularizing in what manner *Ochihatou* apply’d the Nation’s Money; since he had said enough in saying, he was a *Prime Minister*, to make the Reader acquainted with his Conduct in that Point. (p. 64; emphasis original)

However, Hahehihotu’s comments are driven by his opinion of Ochihatou rather than of the Narrator, whereas the Translator twice makes pointed negative comments on the narration of the Historian. As is evident from the aforementioned quotation, it is Hahehihotu who reveals the gender of the Narrator to readers as this figure is referred to as ‘he’. The Narrator tries extremely hard to appear neutral at the beginning of the text by employing lots of general description and allowing the majority of scenes to proceed through direct speech representation with little narrative comment. However, his choice of focalization is often very revealing and alters the amount of control that he has over a scene. The Narrator can be seen to apply the different levels of focalization (external and internal) within a single scene in order to allow readers to grasp an overview of what is happening from various differing perspectives. However, at times, such as in the scene of Eovaai’s seduction by Ochihatou, internal character focalization is withheld and readers are simply presented with the Narrator’s perspective and, consequently, this allows the Narrator to control and colour interpretation. Through direct speech, readers hear the persuasive arguments of Ochihatou and then are told:

The former Part of these Insinuations seemed so probable to the deluded Princess, and her Vanity so ensnared her into a Belief of the latter, that she listened to all he said with a kind of Rapture; and so much had his Artifices debilitated her Reason, and lull’d asleep all Principles of Virtue in her Mind, that she neither felt, nor affected any Reluctance to be led by him into a Place, the Gloom and Privacy of which might have been sufficient to let her know for what Ends it was designed. (p. 76)

This section of narration is externally focalized and the effect is that the Princess is painted in a negative light -- we are to believe that vanity has led to her knowingly behaving in a lascivious manner. Her perspective is omitted and so readers cannot know her view of this

situation and whether this is really the case -- our reading is influenced by the opinions and perspective of the Narrator.

The Narrator's opinions often burst forth, and many have misogynistic implications, especially in his use of pre-modifiers when discussing the behaviour of Eovaai. He refers, for example, to 'her own shallow Comprehension' (p. 68) and her 'affected Difficulty' (p. 74). It is evident throughout the text that the Narrator thinks little of many of Eovaai's actions. He is incredulous at what he sees as her blatant inconsistency when she dramatically changes her opinion on how to govern people after speaking to the Republican. He exclaims:

How little able to withstand the Force of Persuasion and Example! She who, by the Insinuations of Ochihatou, had imagin'd Princes might exalt themselves to Gods, and had a right to tread on the Necks of Millions, ruin'd to support that Arrogance; was now, by this Republican, brought into as great an Extreme of Humiliation, and ready to resign even that decent Homage and respectful Awe which were the Requisites of her Place. (p. 119)

He also often blames Eovaai for the predicaments she faces and has little sympathy for her. He does sympathize with Yximilla, but this is because she represents a virtuous and good woman in his mind. He makes little comment on Atamadoul and leaves her to articulate her own story.

While the extradiegetic Narrator stands outside the world of the characters, he interrupts the narrative with comments and digressions such as those quoted. Kvande observes that this is the kind of role played by 'a typical Haywood narrator', but she attributes it to the Translator rather than the Narrator,¹³ whereas it should really be accredited to both. For example, as Eovaai is beginning to show signs of forgetting her father's teachings, it is the Narrator who asserts that it is 'so easy [...] for the best Natures to be perverted, when Example rouses up the Sparks of some darling Inclination' (pp. 74-75). In the same way, he becomes so involved in the story when Eovaai makes the transition to the land of Oozoff that he momentarily appears in the first person as he digresses: 'I think it may be established as a certain Maxim, that the Love of Glory is more or less prevalent, according to the Liberty of the People; for true Bravery can never be the Companion of Servitude' (p. 109). The Narrator then is trying to control the story of the Princess. He may occupy a less powerful position in the chain of transition, but he has the most influence regarding the telling of the main narrative of the novella.

Furthermore, there is evidence that the Narrator tries to exploit his position in the text in order to increase his control over the representation of the Princess Eovaai. At some points

¹³ 'The Outsider Narrator', p. 637.

he acts as an editor employing ellipsis in order to cut out unnecessary parts of the narrative, as when he remarks, following the recapture of Eovaai by Ochihatou:

'Twould be more the Business of a Paraphrase than a History, to go about to relate the various Emotions which rose in the Mind of Eovaai at this sudden Turn of Fate; nor is it at all necessary for the better understanding her Adventures. (p. 121)

At other points, he includes extra proleptic information indicating how the story will progress. For example, after Eovaai has lost the precious jewel and just before Ochihatou is introduced, the reader is told that

A thousand times she [Eovaai] wish'd to throw the Burthen off, and had doubtless eased herself of it, by means no way agreeable to the divine Will, if the natural Timidity of her Sex had not restrain'd her; but her Melancholy, by degrees, grew into a Despair, which wou'd have been no less effectual for that purpose, had not a sudden Change happen'd in her Affairs, which gave her another, and very different Turn of mind. (p. 60)

The Narrator is asserting his authority by playing with the narrative order and the reader. Similarly to the Translator, in respect of his audience, the narrator sometimes employs the pronouns 'we' and 'our', lexical choices that imply reader consensus. Consequently, readers are placed in a similar position to Eovaai who throughout the novella is confronted with, and included in, different constructions of 'we'. Through the polyvocality of her novella, as critics such as Wilputte, Kubek, and Kvande note, Haywood is implying to readers that they do not have to accept a single interpretation and representation of events in the text, and allows them to decide whether they are part of the quasi-narratorial Translator's assumed consensus or that of the Narrator's, or of neither's.

The narrative presents the reader with multivalent perspectives as well as voices. Focalization is often employed in order to demonstrate how events affect different people, and, particularly, how Eovaai and Ochihatou view the same temporal moment. For example, when Eovaai is in Oozoff, feeling relatively safe and unconcerned about her situation, the reader is made aware of her impending danger through different types of focalization. We move from Eovaai's character focalization ('While she was thus forming Projects for the Happiness of a People, over whom, tho' by means she cou'd not foresee, she hoped once more to be established'), to the Narrator's external focalization ('Designs were laid to render her entirely and eternally incapable of any thing but the lowest, most abject, and withal, the most unpitied Wretchedness'), and then to Ochihatou's character focalization ('Ochihatou was not of a Disposition to give up any Point he had once fix'd his Heart upon, and that of enjoying Eovaai, was of so much Consequence to his Peace, that he cou'd not abandon it') (p. 119). The variable focalization is highly revealing and places readers in a privileged position,

as they are aware of Eovaai's danger before she is. Eovaai may be given a magical telescope within the text, but, as Wilputte states, 'it is the reader, the final voyeur, who possesses the real power being in the position to view and judge all of the action' (p. 32) and who is given the more revealing kaleidoscope with which to see all of the characters' perspectives.

The employment of differing perspectives is also highly revealing in the intercalated narrative of Atamadoul. Wilputte points out that,

In comparison with Yximilla's history, Atamadoul's story is relatively unhampered by textual commentary; however, the reader still finds discrepancies. In fact, the reader comes to doubt Atamadoul's own narration and must examine carefully her language to decipher her character. (p. 31)

The 'discrepancies' that Wilputte mentions result from the employment of both the experiencing self and the narrating self in Atamadoul's story. As an autodiegetic narrator, Atamadoul can present her narration from her current position as a narrator (the narrating self) or from her past position as a character in the story that she is telling (the experiencing self).¹⁴ The two selves through which focalization is presented in her analeptic tale are often indistinguishable. A case in point is when Atamadoul, discussing her emotions at hearing of the failure of Syllalippe and Ochihatou's relationship, exclaims: 'But alas! the burning Passion, for I can call it no other, with which I was inflamed, soon reminded me, that Revenge afforded but an imperfect Bliss' (p. 126). Here Atamadoul is speaking as the narrating self, but the passion belongs to the experiencing self. The confusion of the two can be attributed to the fact that Atamadoul's past passionate feelings for Ochihatou still exist and are as powerful as ever -- her experiencing self does not have the benefit of hindsight -- because with his spell Ochihatou has condemned her to 'be still possess of those Desires thou ne'er canst gratify' (p. 131).

The character of Atamadoul is crucial in the narrative, because she saves Eovaai from Ochihatou's sexual threat. However, there is another reason why her story is incorporated into the narrative, because it provides Eovaai with an example of how desire can be destructive. Atamadoul's words are employed for a didactic purpose, as Kubek notes: 'Atamadoul is Eovaai's final lesson in self-control and caution'.¹⁵ Indeed, all of the intercalated narratives and speeches have a function within the text. 'The History of Ochihatou', as related by the extradiegetic Narrator of the text, places readers in a privileged position, as they are made aware of the evil character of the man before the Princess is. In the

¹⁴ The distinction between the narrating self and the experiencing self originated from the work of F.K. Stanzel. See *A Theory of Narrative*, trans. by Charlotte Goedsche (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

¹⁵ 'The Key to Stowe', p. 249.

same way, the two speeches of Alhazuza and the Republican argue for the legitimacy of two different political states and therefore provide readers with more ideas to consider, whilst the autodiegetically narrated stories of Adelhu and Atamadoul provide Eovaai with important information and drive her narrative forward.

The intercalated narrative of 'The History of Yximilla' stands out in the novella, because it represents a heterodiegetic metalepsis. It has several functions within this text, the first of which is bathetic as it interrupts the progress of Eovaai's narrative, appearing just as Eovaai and Ochihatou are about to have sex. The effect is that of a narrative tease as the Narrator invokes an explicit scene change, explaining that 'we must quit her [Eovaai] and Hypotofa for a while, and see what Mischiefs were occasioned in Countries far distant from it, by the Wickedness of ambitious and unsatiable Man' (p. 79). The second function of this metalepsis is to introduce new voices and perspectives and so emphasize the narrative's multivalency: political and sexual corruption is not simply a problem in Eovaai's story, but is in fact widespread.

A third function of the metalepsis is rooted in the novella's political satire. The character Yximilla represents, in Kubek's words, 'the electoral monarchy of Poland' and her story 'invokes the War of the Polish Succession'.¹⁶ Yximilla's textual doppelganger is Eovaai -- both women are in a sexually and politically vulnerable position having lost control of their people, and, consequently, are now at risk from, respectively, the sexual and political predators Broscomin and Ochihatou. Similarly to Eovaai, also, Yximilla is not the narrator of her story. Her tragic tale is delivered by the extradiegetic Narrator as an extended mixed analepsis. However, as with the main narrative, this interpolated story is allowed to unfold mostly through dialogue and so the Narrator does provide Yximilla with a voice. Her locutions are included to emphasize her morality, however, whereas the opposite is often the case with the Princess. Wilputte propounds that 'Haywood's use of the textual apparatus [...] mirrors Yximilla's disempowerment: even her story is taken from her and controlled by the self-serving commentators in the footnotes who literally undercut her' (p. 30). It is suggested that Wilputte is stretching her feminist reading of the text a little far here, though. As a metadiegetic character, it is understandable that Yximilla does not narrate her own story. The advantage of having her story told by the same extradiegetic character who tells Eovaai's story is to highlight and bring home the parallels between the two. Yximilla's story may be subject to 'banal' (p. 30) interruptions, but the same can be said of the other tales present in

¹⁶ 'The Key to Stowe', p. 236.

the text and at least she, unlike Eovaai and Atamadoul, is not critiqued by the outside voices. As Wilputte declares, on the only occasion she refers explicitly to what she calls ‘the controlling Narrator’ (p. 30), Yximilla’s story is strategically placed at a key moment in Eovaai’s tale seemingly to demonstrate how a woman should react to such a situation. Unlike Eovaai, Yximilla deals with her problems with great virtue throughout her tale. She never gives in to ambition or sexual pressure. However, Yximilla’s praiseworthy actions do not save her: it is she who is raped and who does not achieve a happy ending. Yximilla represents a better example of womanly virtue than Eovaai, but is proof that even virtue cannot save some women.

Yximilla’s interpolated history demonstrates how sexual and political decisions affect not only the individual, but a whole group of people. Within the story, there are two internal homodiegetic analepses which demonstrate how Yximilla’s fate has an impact on her lover, Yamatalallabec, and one of her enemies, Oudescar. The story of Oudescar brings the narrative back to its main thread as it is the impending departure of his Ambassador that leads to Ochihatou’s seduction of Eovaai being interrupted. While the impact of Yximilla’s misery may recede after the narrative returns to the present and the text moves on, her tale has struck so many chords with other parts of the narrative that much of its multivalency is likely to remain.

Yximilla’s story is highly distressing and in no way humorous. However, it creates humour in the story of Eovaai, as its inclusion interrupts Eovaai and Ochihatou’s liaison, and leaves Eovaai awaiting the ‘Gratification’ of ‘Those warm Inclinations which the Behaviour of Ochihatou had raised’ (p. 92). As noted previously, it also evokes comic interruptions from the editorial footnotes. For example, whilst Yximilla is being forced into an unwanted marriage, the various commentators are debating the identity of the Tree whose bough is being used in her wedding ceremony. We are told: ‘Some believe it to have been Myrtle; others Palm [...] Hahehihotu imagines it rather a Plant, unknown in the Present State of Nature’ (p. 85). This narrative interruption is frustrating and may appear inappropriate to readers but at the same time it can be viewed as comic as it deflates the tension of the moment. As Ballaster points out,

Eovaai’s conservative politics of sexual and social economy is frequently undercut by anarchic and perverse comic energies. Haywood invites us to take seriously the pluralizing interpretative tendencies of the text’s machinery, not least in recognizing

that the name of the much-reviled commentator (Ha-he-hi-ho-tu) points to the text's comic purpose.¹⁷

It is suggested here that Haywood incorporates humour into this tragic and serious tale in order to appeal to different readerships. From before the very start of the novella, when, in the preface, the Translator addresses readers 'who wou'd be either instructed or diverted' (p. 48), Haywood makes clear that she realises different readers are approaching the text with different interests. Therefore, she employs multiple genres and multiple voices to appeal to a variety of people.

In general, the humorous nature of the novella has been overlooked in comparison with its political content and perhaps because of its seeming inappropriateness, but it is an intrinsically ludic text. Much of the humour is derived from the argumentative footnotes that punctuate it. Aravamudan writes that 'Ridicule of pedantry in prefaces and footnotes of satires was a standard feature, made popular in parodic texts such as Swift's *A Tale of a Tub*, Pope's *Dunciad Variorum*, and Fielding's *The Tragedy of Tragedies*'.¹⁸ Haywood's footnotes are made even more farcical by the seemingly useless nature of the Cabal, who, when faced with indecision regarding translations or semantics, often simply leave the matter unresolved, and who omit the words which make up Ochihatou's spell on Atamadoul, 'fearing that, by design or accident, they might be repeated, and cause other Transformations of this kind' (p. 131). Many of the jokes employed by Haywood are not biting satirical, but playfully mocking, highlighting the polygeneric nature of the text. One of the most humorous moments occurs when elements of the amatory tale and also the fairy tale are evident. Atamadoul, describing her passion-driven flight with Ochihatou from her kingdom to his in 'a Chariot, which seem'd made of one entire Emerald, and drawn by six wing'd Horses' (p. 129), comments that her lover was so enveloped in 'his furious desires' (p. 129) that he would have consummated their relationship then and there, during their chariot flight, 'had he not been deterr'd by the knowledge that the Vehicle which contain'd us, unable to sustain the Rapture, woul'd have burst in pieces, and thrown us headlong down' (p. 129). This assertion evokes a footnote from the Translator that states: 'This seems to prove what several Naturalists of later Ages have endeavour'd to maintain, that the Emerald is a stone of such Purity, as to endure no unchaste Endearments' (p. 129). This bathetic comment comically emphasizes the bawdiness of the moment whilst also deflating the passionate tension built up by Atamadoul.

¹⁷ 'A Gender of Opposition: Eliza Haywood's Scandal Fiction', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 143-67 (p. 164).

¹⁸ 'In the Wake of the Novel', p. 20.

Haywood is having fun with the conventions of romance that she has employed in many of her previous works. She is parodying the idea that every amatory encounter lives up to romantic expectations, and, as Ballaster comments, ‘also undercuts and makes comic the seriousness of romance as a mode of representation’,¹⁹ but, at the same time, she is trying to satisfy two kinds of reader-interest: in both satire and romance.

The sophistication of the novella is also demonstrated through the use of repeated images. They are utilised by Haywood so that readers make connections between various scenes and events, with the effect, again, of making the text even more multivalent. Wilputte has discussed the potential political interpretation of the repeated images of the oak tree as a ‘Tory emblem’ (p. 96), and Ballaster that of the images of stars as referring to the ‘star and garter’ of Walpole’s Order of the Garter.²⁰ However, other interpretations, including mythological readings, are possible. Similarly, the repetition of the number seven throughout the text can be seen as important because of the number’s mystical and cabalistic connotations. On the other hand, because of the negative nature of many of the events which evoke the number, its use can also be seen as a political reference to the unpopular Septennial Act that Walpole had succeeded in keeping in force in 1734 just two years before the novella’s publication. The majority of the images have polysemic meanings and, therefore, will be interpreted in a variety of different ways by different readers. One of the most evocative repeated images in the novella is that of the ‘garden’. Eovaai loses her precious jewel, which is a metaphor for her virginity, in the garden of her palace and then almost surrenders her actual, physical virginity to Ochihatou in the garden of the King’s palace in Hypotofa. The scene in which Eovaai’s jewel is, rather comically, carried away by ‘a little bird’ (p. 57) forms a parallel with the scene in which the falcon Ochihatou carries away the pigeon or young dove -- traditionally associated with gentleness, innocence, and love (*OED*) -- of Eovaai.

It is not just reiterated images that stand out in the text. The phrase ‘neither Force nor Fraud’ is repeated three times. When the phrase is first used by Eojaeu to Eovaai, Wilputte points out that ‘Haywood suggests a sexual subtext for the jewel by employing this phrase which is often used to describe the means by which men take advantage of a woman’s virtue -- rape or seduction’ (p. 56). She notes too that the phrase is used in Pope’s *The Rape of the Lock*, which is one of the many intertexts that Haywood evokes in her novella with the effect

¹⁹ ‘A Gender of Opposition’, p. 164.

²⁰ ‘A Gender of Opposition’, p. 153.

that the story appears even more multivocal.²¹ Yximilla also uses the phrase in a sexual context when she addresses her tormentor, Broscomin: ‘Nor Force, nor Fraud [...] has [the] power to move a Mind disdainful of your pretended Passion’ (p. 86). However, the phrase is repeated in a political context by the Republican in his tirade against kingship, when he declares: ‘We coveted what we wanted not; grew arrogant and assuming, and at length rapacious; seizing by *force* what *Fraud* cou’d not obtain’ (p. 111; emphasis original). This use of the phrase forms a link between sexual and political corruption. The repetition of this phrase creates multivalency and appeals to different readerships in different ways.

Various hypotheses have been articulated about the aim of the multivalent structure of this novella, with critics often seeking to establish a definitive answer regarding Haywood’s personal political views and her target audience.²² It has sometimes been forgotten that the key point of a multivalent text is that it is subject to a variety of applications and interpretations; therefore, a single meaning is not necessarily to be sought. The text is described as ‘a wild blend of genres’ by Wilputte (p. 9) and it is possible to enjoy its various modalities simultaneously, but it is mainly the political aspects of the text that have been explored, and therefore the novella’s playfulness has been overlooked. Analysing the various complex aspects of its narrative technique is one way of redressing this imbalance. While previous critics have contributed significantly to understanding how the text works by referring to its narrative form, I hope to have shown that detailed attention to such questions as narrative temporality, voice, perspective, and speech is necessary in order to bring out its full richness.

It is argued that a single readership for this text cannot be identified as it employs so many binaries -- a misogynistic male narrator and a sympathetic male narrator; satirical jokes and gently mocking jokes; monarchical ideologies and republican ideologies; and the list could go on. Therefore, similarly to Wilputte and Aravamudan, I suggest that, in writing this text, Haywood was actively responding to the condition of the literary market in the 1730s and created a multivalent text in order to appeal to an ideologically divided society containing

²¹ As well as *The Rape of the Lock*, Wilputte lists John Locke’s *Second Treatise on Civil Government* (p. 53), Halifax’s *Advice to a Daughter* (p. 58), Pope’s ‘Epistle to a Lady’ (p. 74), Machiavelli’s *The Prince* (p. 78), and Bernard Mandeville’s *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits* (p. 109), whilst Kubek makes a case for Pope’s ‘Epistle to Burlington’ (p. 240).

²² Kubek asserts that Haywood is motivated by her ‘political allegiance’ and that the novella can be seen as a ‘contribution to patriot Whig political theory’, pp. 225-26. Kvande also sees the text as ‘a specific party political attack’ but identifies Haywood as having ‘strong Tory and Jacobite sympathies’, pp. 625-26.

many different readerships.²³ In order to achieve this aim, Haywood draws on and incorporates into her works many popular trends of the period. As previously noted, she joins a growing number of writers creating anti-Walpole texts, many of whom employ satirical elements in their work, and her use of the oriental tale element can also be seen as a conscious decision to tap into another literary vogue. As Aravamudan points out, a possible source of inspiration is Crébillon's popular oriental tale *L'écumoire*, as 'In Crébillon's text, just as in *Eovaai*, the tried and tested tropes of the ancient manuscript and the incompetent translator resurface, and also deliberately bizarre names such as "the Genius Hic-nec-sic-la-ki-ha-tipohetaf"'.²⁴ Haywood recognises the multifarious possibilities of the oriental framework (Ballaster describes the oriental fable as 'both ancient and contemporary, both then and now, both there and here, both fantastical and a faithful representation'),²⁵ and so utilises it to complement her multivocal text in her attempt to appeal to a variety of readers. Unfortunately, Haywood's strategy did not seem to work, because, as Spedding demonstrates in his bibliography of Haywood, *The Adventures of Eovaai* actually represents her fifth least popular work.²⁶ The novella is clever and interesting enough to have fared much better.

After the publication of *The Adventures of Eovaai*, came 'a break of almost five years' in Haywood's production output.²⁷ As Spedding points out, 'A number of critics have commented on the length and significance of this gap and various explanations have been offered to account for it.'²⁸ These explanations vary from the supposedly devastating impact of Pope's attack on her in his *Dunciad*, to her being involved in the stage during this time. It is Spedding's explanation that is most convincing, though, as it is founded on bibliographic evidence rather than speculative biographical notions -- Haywood was ill during this time and so indisposed.²⁹ It is also Spedding, with his attribution to Haywood of the translation of *The Sopha*,³⁰ who has provided one of the most convincing objections to the idea that this period

²³ Wilputte highlights Haywood's 'awareness and employment of contemporary literary trends' and states that she 'Always [...] [has] an eye to the literary marketplace', p. 9. Aravamudan also writes that 'Haywood's tale addresses itself to multiple consumers of early-eighteenth century print culture', p. 17.

²⁴ 'In the Wake of the Novel', p. 20.

²⁵ 'Introduction', in *Fables of the East: Selected Tales 1662-1785*, ed. by Ros Ballaster (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 1-12 (p. 2).

²⁶ *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood*, p. 775.

²⁷ *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood*, p. 355.

²⁸ *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood*, p. 355.

²⁹ For more information on Haywood's publication gap and the various hypotheses surrounding it, see *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood*, pp. 355-56.

³⁰ *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood*, p. 374.

saw the birth of her allegedly ‘dichotomous’ career. He describes this text as ‘one of the most famous erotic books of her time’, and highlights that it was published in 1743 ‘during her [Haywood’s] “moral” period’.³¹ Prior to this attribution, the two-part description of Haywood’s career was already unacceptable, as Spedding notes, because of the presence of *Anti-Pamela* and *Dalinda* in her body of work. These are two texts that do not conform to the idea of a ‘moral’ Haywood.³² Ingrassia also recognizes the importance of the position of *Anti-Pamela* in Haywood’s publication history, writing that it ‘best captures the essence of her commercial and literary activity at this time. She attempted to increase her own marketability [...] while subverting the larger morality and didacticism that increasingly characterized the novel.’³³ It is also a key text, because it demonstrates how Haywood reacted both thematically and narratologically to the work of her contemporaries in a way that allowed for both narrative imitation and originality.

Anti-Pamela

Haywood published her answer to Richardson’s *Pamela* in 1741. Spedding states that, ‘it was composed in the seven months following the publication of *Pamela* on 6 November 1740’, and so ‘it was a few months after the publication of *Pamela* before Haywood decided to write her response’.³⁴ The year of publication was one that saw, in total, ‘five fictional responses’ to the novel, including Fielding’s *Shamela*.³⁵ Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor suggest that, ‘Perhaps dazzled by the brilliance of *Shamela*, critics have been too ready to dismiss *Anti-Pamela* as a mere parasite: a *Pamela* without moral depth and a *Shamela* without wit’.³⁶ In Fielding’s all-encompassing parody, the tales of *Shamela* and *Pamela* (a young servant maid who is pursued by, and eventually married to, her Master) are explicitly linked through the utilisation, but also distortion, of key characters, scenes, and discourse taken from Richardson’s original. For example, Richardson’s tendency to employ the technique of ‘writing to the moment’,³⁷ is mocked several times by Fielding, as when *Shamela* is in bed

³¹ *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood*, p. 374. Spedding first discusses this attribution in his article, ‘Shameless Scribbler or Votary of Virtue? Eliza Haywood, Writing (and) Pornography in 1742’, in *Women Writing, 1550-1750*, ed. by Jo Wallwork and Paul Salzman (Bundoora, VIC: La Trobe University, 2001), pp. 237-51.

³² *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood*, p. 374.

³³ *Authorship, Commerce, and Gender in Early Eighteenth-Century England: A Culture of Paper Credit* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 111.

³⁴ Spedding, p. 353, p. 354.

³⁵ ‘*Pamela*’ in *the Marketplace: Literary Controversy and Print Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 83.

³⁶ ‘*Pamela*’ in *the Marketplace*, p. 86.

³⁷ For more on this epistolary technique, see Altman, *Epistolarity: Approaches to Form* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1982), p. 123.

with Mrs. Jervis and, hearing her master arrive outside her door, declares: 'I hear him just coming in at the Door. You see I write in the present Tense'.³⁸ In Haywood's novella, however, the imitation is more implicit. As Keymer and Sabor note, 'the plot of *Anti-Pamela* differs markedly from that of *Pamela*, [but] it contains numerous telling allusions to scenes and incidents from the earlier work'.³⁹ This does not mean that Haywood's contribution to the field should be dismissed, though. It is argued here that Haywood's response to Richardson is sophisticated in its narratological choices and so deserves recognition.

Haywood's adaptation appeared at a time that critics have asserted saw the birth of her 'moral' conversion. However, it is not possible to identify *Anti-Pamela* with this simplistic classification. It is true that the text employs an overtly moralising narrator, who often presents metanarrative comments on the characters. For example, regarding the relationship between Syrena and her mother, the narrator asserts in a descriptive pause:

Here one cannot forbear reflecting, how shocking it is, when those who should point out the Paths of Virtue, give a wrong Bent to the young and unform'd Mind, and turn the pliant Disposition to Desires unworthy of it; but more especially so in Parents, who seem ordain'd by Heaven and Nature, to instil the first Principles for the future Happiness of those to whom they have given Being; and tho' cannot suppose there are many, who like the Mother of Syrena, breed their Children up with no other Intent than to make them the Slaves of Vice.⁴⁰

This narrator also addresses readers in an act of implied consensus that highlights the moral standing taken. Following the digression made above, the narrator declares, 'But as this is an Observation, that must occur to every thinking Person, I ought to beg my Reader's Pardon for the Digression, and return' (p. 57). However, the narrator's moral musings are undercut by the lack of editorial control that he/she takes regarding the presentation of Syrena's actions. As the frame editor that introduces the epistolary communication of the narrative's protagonists, this extra-heterodiegetic narrator has the power to omit or elide some of the letters that contain Syrena's most questionable actions. This option is not often taken, though. When letters are elided, it is because the 'Conversation' they contain 'is of no moment to the Reader' (p. 176). Therefore, whilst the narrator is condemning the actions of Syrena, he/she is also demonstrating to readers how effective they can be. The kind of deceitful technique employed by Syrena is, at least for a time, successful in each of her relationships and so she repeats it again and again, and the narrator continues to narrate her use of it. This gives the

³⁸ *Shamela*, in 'Anti-Pamela' and 'Shamela', ed. by Catherine Ingrassia (Peterborough, ONT: Broadview Press, 2004), pp. 228-76 (p. 247).

³⁹ 'Pamela' in *the Marketplace*, p. 89.

⁴⁰ *Anti-Pamela*, in 'Anti-Pamela' and 'Shamela', ed. by Catherine Ingrassia (Peterborough, ONT: Broadview Press, 2004), pp. 51-227 (p. 56). All subsequent references to the text will be placed in parenthesis following the quotation.

text an iterative quality. Regarding iterative narrative, Genette writes that it occurs when ‘a single narrative utterance takes upon itself several occurrences together of the same event’.⁴¹ If the actions of Syrena were meant to be fully viewed from a moralistic point of view, then this use of the iterative would not be employed. The moralising of the narrative is further questionable, because Syrena is not wholly punished for her behaviour by the end of the book. She is sent to the house of ‘one of her Kinsmen [...] [in] Wales’ (p. 227), where, we are told, ‘Probability [will] deprive [her] entirely from all Conversation with Mankind’ (p. 227). However, it is not thought that this restriction will end her exploits. In fact, the idea of a sequel containing her further adventures is implied, when the narrator declares: ‘what befell her [in this place], must be the Subject of future Entertainment’ (p. 227). Consequently, Haywood produces a text that defies easy categorisation. Whilst Richardson’s novel is ‘moral’, and Fielding’s response is ‘satire’, Haywood’s contribution has a dialogic quality, as is often the case with her work. *Anti-Pamela* is both moralizing and entertaining. It can be used by female readers to guide their conduct, and, as the title page points out, can be used as ‘a necessary Caution to all Young Gentlemen’ about the potential, troublesome female suitors that they might meet.

Perhaps the most striking difference between Haywood’s adaptation and Richardson’s original (and also Fielding’s parody) is her partial, not complete, adoption of the epistolary form. This structure was not foreign to Haywood, as she employed it in, for example, *Letters from a Lady of Quality* (1720) and *Letters from the Palace of Fame* (1726). Therefore, her non-adoption of it, in this imitation of one of the most successful epistolary novels of the period, must be seen as significant. An outside narrator is used cursorily in Richardson’s novel to bridge the gaps between Pamela’s letters and journal entries, and to conclude her tale, but, on the whole, Richardson ‘allowed his characters to speak without heterodiegetic intervention’,⁴² whereas in Haywood’s novella, letters account for about fifty percent of the narrative make-up, but are accompanied by long periods of extradiegetic narration. Textually, the interchanging between Syrena’s epistolary, autodiegetic narration and the narrator’s extradiegetic narration is justified, because it allows for when Syrena is residing or in physical contact with her mother, who is her main addressee. However, practicality does not seem to be the sole reason for this altering narrative presentation.

By utilising an outside narrator, Haywood can explore the feelings and emotions of all of her characters as it allows for multiple focalization points. This was not possible in

⁴¹ *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, trans. by Jane E. Lewin (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980), p. 116.

⁴² Keymer and Sabor, ‘*Pamela*’ in *the Marketplace*, p. 88.

Richardson's novel, because of the dominance of Pamela's perspective, which has the result that the views of other characters are only presented through her representation of their discourse and behaviour. Consequently, in Haywood's text, readers are put in a privileged position as they are allowed to see at work the machinations of all the figures in the novel. This is particularly useful in the relation of Syrena's intrigues with Mr. P, which represents one of the most fascinating unions portrayed. The two lovers pretend to each other that they have more money than in actuality they do, and so Syrena wants to entrap Mr. P, because she thinks he will provide her with subsistence, whilst he wants to court her for similar economic motives. Both characters are scheming against the other, but are not aware of this fact, whilst readers are party to this information through Haywood's characteristic layering of narrative discourse and focalization. For example, when finances are being discussed between Syrena and her mother and her lover, the reader is provided, firstly, with the direct speech of Mrs. Tricksy: 'I do assure you, Syrena has at present no Fortune; but lives dependant on me who have a tolerable good jointure' (p. 204). Mr. P's actual response to this distressing news is then presented through his character focalization, whilst his feigned answer is presented in indirect speech:

Mr. P -- found a shivering at his Heart from the time Mrs. Tricksy had said her Daughter was no more than a Dependent on her; but he conceal'd the Shock it gave him as much as possible, and told her, he was only concerned, that he had not more to lay at Syrena's Feet. (p. 204)

A metaphorical narrative stand-off then takes place with neither party directly articulating their emotions, but their perspectives are presented, in turn, through their focalization so that readers are aware of the situation. Firstly, we learn that Syrena and her mother 'were both of the Opinion he would not marry without a Portion, which was not a little Disappointment to them both, as they doubted not the Truth of his being possess of some Estate, if not altogether so much as he pretended' (p. 204); and then that Mr. P

doubted not the Truth of what Mrs. Tricksy had told him concerning the six thousand Pounds, and other Legacies, [and] he thought [that] if he could have any way supported her till that time, he might very well venture to marry her -- but as things stood now with him, that was entirely out of the Question, and how to proceed he could not determine. (p. 205)

This narratological play with perspective representation mirrors the play at work in the story - neither character will show their card and this leads to their downfalls: Mr. P is duped out of his money, whilst Syrena loses another potential long-term lover.

Whilst in *Pamela* the moral world of Richardson's protagonist is portrayed through her mediated view only, in *Anti-Pamela* Haywood's readers are allowed to see the dubious

morality of Syrena's society through numerous perspectives. Haywood is presenting a different narratological means to discover the truth and moral core of the narrative. Unlike in Richardson's novel, Haywood's readers are not left to wonder how the life of the protagonist will unfold. The unsuccessful nature of each one of Syrena's intrigues is indicated to readers through proleptic comments. For example, the profitless end to Syrena's relationship with Mr. P is foretold before we are even introduced to his character. Shortly after hearing of the end of her union with Mr. W, we are told: 'Syrena was not idle in spreading her Nets; but none as yet had the ill fortune to fall into them, and the first that did, proved little to her Advantage, as well as to his own. -- Their acquaintance began in this manner' (p. 198). These temporary shifts in temporality indicate to readers the circularity of Syrena's story -- unlike Pamela, she will never find a settled place in her life, but will continue to act as she has in the narrative after the depiction of her life has ended. As readers, we are not asked to feel sorry for the protagonist, though. In fact, the inserted comments from the narrator hint that condemnation is a more appropriate response. This is evident after the narrator has related how Syrena's ill treatment of Mr. L was discovered, as he/she then goes on to declare:

Now had the wicked Mrs. Tricky and her Daughter time to reflect on the ill success of their Strategem; but instead of acknowledging the Justice of Divine Providence in unravelling this Affair, they only cursed Fortune [...]. Dreadful Proof that their Hearts were totally void of all Distinction between Vice and Virtue! The best may have fallen into Errors which they have afterwards so truly repented of, that even those Faults have contributed to rendering them more perfect. -- Others again may have been guilty of repeated Crimes, and yet have felt Remorse, even in the Moment of perpetrating them; but the Wretch incapable either of Penitence or Remorse, one may, without Breach of Charity, pronounce irreclaimable but by a Miracle, and fit for engaging in any Mischief where Temptation calls. (pp. 121-22)

The behaviour of both the male and female characters is targeted by this 'obtrusive' narrator,⁴³ but repenting characters are presented in more forgiving terms. This is the case with Mr. D who cheats on his intended wife, Maria, with Syrena. The narrator assumes that his sympathetic portrayal will be questioned and so answers potential criticism in this manner:

methinks, I hear many of my Fair Readers cry out, that no Punishment could be too severe for the Inconstancy of Mr. D – [...]. It cannot, indeed, be deny'd that he had acted an ungenerous Part [...], but he had at sometimes his repenting Moments. (p. 135)

In this way, Haywood's and Richardson's moral view is not worlds apart, as repentance is also praised by Pamela. However, it is made to seem so because it is presented in such a

⁴³ Keymer and Sabor, *'Pamela' in the Marketplace*, p. 89.

narratologically distinct way from how it is in Richardson. Haywood is demonstrating both imitation and originality -- she is adapting to literary trends, but is not altering from her usual literary style. Rather than being timid after Pope's attack, she, in fact, seems to have become fearless in respect of her use of different narrative techniques. This is particularly evident in the next case study that analyses her use of an extremely outspoken narrator to depict the events of a real-life court case.

Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman

This title was not recognised as Haywood's until Spedding attributed it to her in his 2004 *Bibliography*; ⁴⁴ therefore, it has received limited critical attention. It represents an important entity in Haywood's mid-career body of work, though, because of its popularity and its depiction of a real-life story that charts the lives of figures from her society. Its title page sets out its qualities, declaring that it is the 'Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman, Return'd from a Thirteen Years Slavery in America, Where he had been sent by the Wicked Contrivances of his Cruel Uncle. [It is] A Story founded on Truth, and address'd equally to the Head and Heart'. ⁴⁵ As Spedding points out, 'The story is given in great detail, and, although the names were altered, it seems that few contemporary readers would have needed a key.'⁴⁶ The subject of this story is James Annesley (1715-1760) a famous peerage claimant of the period who

was born at Dunmain, County Wexford, the son of Arthur Annesley, fourth Baron Altham (1688/9-1727), [but] the identity of his mother is disputed. According to Annesley's account, his mother was Lord Altham's second wife, Mary Sheffield (d. 1729), whom his father had married in 1707 [...]. It was later alleged that his mother was Joan (Juggy) Landy, a maidservant, who was established as Lady Altham by his father following his parents' separation in 1717.

[After the separation of his parents] Annesley remained with his father and was recognized as his legitimate heir. [However] it would appear that his father became alienated from him, the timing of and the reasons for which are uncertain [...]. Following the death of Lord Altham [...], the title (an Irish barony) and estates passed to Arthur's younger brother Richard Annesley, in spite of reports that James was his legitimate heir. In the hope of extinguishing these rumours, which could have jeopardized Richard's inheritance, he arranged for Annesley to be kidnapped and sold as an indentured labourer [...]. Annesley eventually escaped to Jamaica [after thirteen years of slavery] [...] and returned to England, which happened in October 1741 [...] [and then] instigated an action of ejectment against his uncle for the recovery of the

⁴⁴ Spedding, p. 382.

⁴⁵ *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman, Part I* (London: printed for J. Freeman, 1743). All subsequent references to the text will be given in parenthesis following the quotation.

⁴⁶ Spedding, p. 383.

estates and titles, which now included the English earldom of Anglesey, to which his uncle had succeeded in 1737.⁴⁷

The first part of Haywood's narrative starts at a point prior to Annesley's birth and depicts his childhood, his slavery, his return to his homeland, his marriage, and his accidental shooting of a poacher. It ends with him awaiting the trial through which he hopes to reclaim the titles that his uncle took from him. As the title page of the second part of the text asserts, it continues 'the History of Count Richard, Concluding with a Summary View of the Tryal'.⁴⁸

Spedding lists *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman* as Haywood's ninth most popular title if translations and adaptations are excluded from calculations, and the fourth most popular if these types of text are taken into account.⁴⁹ The first volume of the book also represents the most frequently published of Haywood's works.⁵⁰ Spedding explains that

at least 9000 copies of the first volume of *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman* and its various abridgements were printed in less than a year. Only *La Belle Assemblée* and *The Female Spectator* went through more editions. Even if abridgements are ignored, *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman* was Haywood's fastest selling work by far, with only *A Present for a Servant Maid* approaching its record (seven editions in six years).⁵¹

The first part of the text 'appeared nine months *before* the trial (on 10 February 1743)',⁵² and obviously arrived in the public sphere at an opportune time for Haywood to take advantage of the curiosity evoked by the case. As John Martin notes, 'The case aroused considerable public interest, with a number of unofficial accounts being printed and reprinted under various titles, some of which were semi-historical, or otherwise unreliable.'⁵³ It seems as if sales of the second part of the text were adversely affected by this flooding of the market place, because Spedding writes that 'sales of this volume were significantly less than those of the first volume [...]. [This] can easily be accounted for by the strong competition it faced from the actual trial reports'.⁵⁴

In publishing a text that dealt with current events and took a clear stance on the actions of the participants in these events, Haywood can be seen to be engaging with societal affairs. These are hardly the actions of an author trying to shun the limelight following the

⁴⁷ John Martin, 'James Annesley', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2008) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/564.com>>

⁴⁸ *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman, Part 2* (London: printed for J. Freeman, 1743). All subsequent references to the text will be given in parenthesis following the quotation.

⁴⁹ Spedding, pp. 775-76.

⁵⁰ Spedding, p. 775.

⁵¹ Spedding, p. 389.

⁵² Spedding, p. 383.

⁵³ 'James Annesley' <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/564.com>>

⁵⁴ Spedding, p. 389.

publication of Pope's attack on her. As Spedding points out, 'That Haywood was strongly drawn to [...] [James Annesley's] story is evidenced by *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman*, which she started writing soon [...] [after she] first heard of Annesley in 1742'.⁵⁵ He suggests several reasons why Haywood's interest might have been piqued by Annesley's story. He notes that she 'was distantly related to the Annesleys and there is an intriguing possibility that she first heard of Annesley's story through these connections', but also points to the fact that 'Annesley's life story is every bit as romantic as any that Haywood invented'.⁵⁶ The extra-heterodiegetic narrator of the *Memoirs* refers to the amazing nature of the real-life events presented, and concedes that future readers might mistake the text as a romance. He/She declares that

For my part, I am apt to believe, that as the Heroes and Heroines of Romances are always described too near Perfection to be imagined real Characters, so if Time permits this Book to live to After-ages, the Reader will look upon it as fictitious, and not without the greatest Difficulty be brought to think that Nature ever cou'd produce a Monster such as Count Richard. (p. 29)

The interest that the story evokes allows Haywood to utilize all of her narrative artillery at the text-level to depict the tragic life of this 'unfortunate young nobleman'. By demonstrating how she employs character focalization to great effect it is possible to highlight, on the one hand, the virtuous nature of the hero, and, on the other, the perfidious nature of the uncle. This latter-mentioned character is often attacked by the ever-present heterodiegetic narrator who enters the story-level to make metanarrative comments on the actions of the characters, but also to make reference to the production of the text and how it should be read.

The text displays no prefatory material, apart from its title pages. That of Part I displays two evocative quotations, one from Luke XX. 14: 'This is the Heir; come let us kill him, that the Inheritance may be ours', and a second from *Hamlet* in which the Prince speaks of his Uncle: 'Foul deeds will rise, Tho' all the Earth o'erwhelm 'em to Men's Eyes' (I, title page). These set the tone for the kind of narrative stance utilised in the text. From the opening pages, the narratorial figure is established as a presence that is going to be vocal throughout the course of the narrative. In his/her opening comments, he/she apostrophizes:

Aid me, O Justice! be my Guide, O Truth! while inspir'd by the Love of you, most amiable Virtues! I attempt to paint the Distresses of helpless injur'd Innocence: to trace the mysterious Windings of deep Deceit: the cruel Paths of lawless Avarice and lawless Aims: to shew how fatal to their Posterity Variance between the Wedded Pair may sometimes prove; and how attentive Villany from thence may from the most successful Projects. (I, p. 1)

⁵⁵ Spedding, p. 386.

⁵⁶ Spedding, p. 384, p. 382.

These emotive declarations are then followed by a description of the character of Richard de Altamont, who

was a Man whom it may be said, without any Danger of being too severe, [...] had all the Vices center'd in his Composition: he was proud and mean at the same time -- vain-glorious yet avaritious -- ungrateful for good Offices -- revengeful for even imagin'd Injuries -- treacherous when trusted -- mischievously inquisitive when not so -- without the least Spark of Honour, Pity, or even common Humanity -- incapable by Nature of doing *any Good*, and qualified by an *extreme Subtilty for all kinds of Evil*. (I, p. 4; emphasis original)

These kinds of statements puncture the narrative throughout, so that readers are under no illusion as to how they should feel about this man. However, many of these statements are not presented as explicit addresses to readers, as it is assumed that Richard's actions speak for themselves and the only possible reaction to them is disdain and contempt. At times, any kind of narratorial annotation on his perfidious nature is omitted, as his actions are evidence enough. At the beginning of the text, when Richard is playing his brother and his wife off against each other, it is sufficient to present the direct speech of these two duped characters, whilst Richard's words are paralitically elided, in order to highlight how his wrong doing is affecting the lives of this family. The narrator declares:

How often in their different Closets did they unbosom themselves to this perfidious Brother in these kind of Exclamations: Heavens! would the Baron say, must my Estate be ruin'd -- the Honour of my family disgrac'd -- myself abus'd by a Woman whose Duty is to consult solely my Interest, Reputation, and Satisfaction! -- Does she imagine the little Beauty she is so vain of, shall make me bear her scandalous Behaviour?

What unhappy Star, cried the Baroness, ruled at my Nativity and destin'd me to a Man so every way unworthy of me! plain is his Person -- weak is his Understanding, what could my Father find in him to approve? (I, p. 7)

Richard's influence is felt, but his presence at the story-level is not repeated at the text-level, which has the effect of emphasizing his deceit and the lack of suspicion in his victims. His aim in creating a rupture between the Baron and his wife is to prevent a pregnancy that will lead to the birth of an heir. His fears about this possible event are presented through his character focalization. We learn that,

this ambitious Man trembled to think that what in near three Years had not hapned a Moment might produce, and that all his Views of Grandeur might still be defeated by the Baroness's becoming pregnant: he therefore aim'd by all ways he could to bring about a Separation, not such a one as should enable the Baron to take another Wife, but such a one as should put an End to his Apprehensions of his having any Issue by this. (I, p. 9)

Richard is unsuccessful in his attempts to prevent an heir, but this does not hinder him from gaining his ultimate ends, as he disposes of his nephew onto a ship that takes him to his thirteen year slavery in America.

Not all of Richard's plans are so triumphant, though. In fact, the narrator often points to the flaws in his plans and also indicates how those around him take advantage of his stupidity. After James has been found not guilty of murdering the poacher, a charge which Richard very much attempted to forward, his uncle is furious. The narrator tells how 'His Agents and Dependents endeavoured to bring him into better Temper [but] for a long time in vain -- they soothed -- they flatter'd every Passion -- they swore to retrieve all yet and either die or find some means to revenge him not only on the Pretender, as they call'd the Chevalier, but also on all that had espoused his Cause' (I, p. 247). Richard seems to be more content after these assertions, but readers are aware that he is simply being told what he wants to hear, as the narrator points out that,

To talk to him in this manner was the only way they had to continue their Impositions on him, and tho' no Man had more Deceit and Cunning than himself, yet was he so much blinded by his Vanity, that the very Artifices he practised on others, could at any time be made use of with Success upon himself. (I, pp. 247-48)

Again, Richard's direct speech is paralitically omitted from this scene, so that readers have to infer what his words are. However, whereas previously their elision highlighted his success at cunning, now, it indicates the deceit that he himself is under. As the narrator emphasizes, Richard's own methods of treachery are being turned against him, and this doubleness at the story-level is repeated at the text-level. It is significant and appropriate that choices in speech representation are used to suggest power relations in respect of Richard's standing. This is because it is the success of the speech of the witnesses that he has compiled against his nephew that will determine how his legal claims against James's legitimacy will prosper. In particular, the character of Charlotte, the Baroness de Altamont's (James's mother's) former aid, is a key witness for Richard's case and is conscious of the power of her evidence. She plays on this awareness when negotiating with Richard. Through the presentation of Richard's discourse with this character, and her conniving reactions through, first, character focalization and, then, indirect speech representation, readers are confirmed in the fact that she holds the power in their relationship at this point. We are informed that,

at length [he] told her, that as he fear'd it [the case against him] wou'd one Day be brought into a Court of Judicature, if she cou'd think of any thing for his Advantage in the meantime, he would not be ungrateful.

She easily understood what it was he meant; but also knowing perfectly well the Nature of the Person she had to deal with, resolved to do nothing without being on a sure Foundation.

She drop'd a thousand Curtsies, and with the most fawning Grin (which no Body knew better how to assume) replied, that she shou'd think herself extremely happy to be any way instrumental in serving his Lordship; but alas, she was so much reduced by the frowns of fortune, that she cou'd not make any Appearance in the World capable of gaining Credit to what she said. (II, p. 3)

Richard's insinuations are met with her counter insinuations, which the male schemer tries to defeat. However, Charlotte is not content with his subsequent proposals and we are told that, 'All he wou'd therefore have made her Hope, from his future Bounty, pas'd for nothing -- She was not to be fed with Air, as she knew some others had been' (II, p. 4). Charlotte's character focalization is employed so as to highlight that Richard is being subjugated by a woman who he endeavoured to bring under his control. This point is made even clearer by the juxtaposition of her point of view with that of the narrator-focalizer and then Richard's, who represents the second character-focalizer in the scene, as we learn that,

before she wou'd enter into any Negotiation with him, he was obliged to give her an immediate Order on his Banker for Four Hundred Crowns: A Sum which, to part with, drew drops of Blood from his Heart; but he knew the Prejudice she might be to him, by swearing to the Truth, and on that Account it was necessary to buy her off at any rate, whether she came into Court on his side or not. (II, p. 4)

Richard is desperate to maintain his titles and his position within society, despite the seeming unlikelihood for his success. He continues to flaunt his prosperity and so draws on him the contempt of many of the members of the public. The narrator informs the readers that,

the just and universal Ridicule upon him [did not] confine itself to what was said of him in is Absence -- a laced coat -- a gilt Chariot -- or more modish Landau, was not of the least Service to excite either Awe or Respect for the Owner. Not his pompous Titles, nor all the Shew he could make was able to silence the Tongues of the exclaiming multitude, or banish that Sneer which sat upon the Faces of those of the better Sort when ever he appear'd in Publick. (II, p. 11)

The disgust that he evokes is evident when his coach crashes and the public fail to come to his aid. Instead they relish in his trouble, as is made clear by the narrator's presentation of the scene in which are inserted several directly represented utterances from some of the multitude of characters present. Following his fall from the coach, whilst Richard is lying on the floor, one man declares:

If it were not more for the sake of the poor Horse than his Owner, he should lie and rot for me. -- Tis a judgement upon him, rejoins another, if his Nephew, the Chevalier James, that he sold to America, had his Right, he would have neither Coach nor

Horses. A third being ask'd to assist, cry'd, *not I, indeed*, unless it were to *draw him to the Gallows*. (II, p. 12; emphasis original)

Again, speech, Richard's key tool in his deceptions at the story-level, is used against him at the text-level. As the narrator points out, Richard was usually oblivious to the strength of feeling towards him and carried on in a deluded state regarding his standing. However, this event, 'in spite of his natural Audacity and Tenaciousness, forced him to be convinced of [...] [the] Truth [that the public hated him]' (II, p. 10).

The narrator is always present, if needs be, to signpost the perfidiousness of Richard. However, four times during the two parts of the text, he/she is forced to limit the amount of criticism aimed at this character, because the accusations being made by him/her against Richard cannot be sufficiently proved to justify an explicit reference to his guilt. For example, after the event of James's birth has been presented in the text, the narrator discusses Richard's lack of feeling for his nephew and states that, 'He [Richard] never heard that he was taken with any of those little Ailments to which Children are incident, but he wish'd they might be fatal to him; and indeed, considering the Cruelties he since has practised on him, nothing is more strange than that he did not contrive some Means to make them so' (I, p. 39). However, this idea is then qualified by the declaration that, 'if any such abhorr'd Design ever came into his Head, the Execution of it was frustrated by Providence, and as there is no Proof there ought to be no Accusation' (I, pp. 39-40). In retreating from an accusation because of lack of evidence, the narrator is covering himself/herself from counter incriminations of libel. However, the action of withdrawing is only cursory and therefore, for many readers, it will have little effect. They have been presented with the possibility of such actions, and so the seeds of doubt have been sewn, and the retraction only works at a surface-level. The ineffective nature of these retreats is even more evident when the narrator reports on the attempt on James's life following his visit to the theatre with Macario, stating:

Macario was with him one Night at the Representation of a Tragedy, when a real and more dreadful one was intended to have been acted on himself. The Inhuman Count Richard was now, indeed, near triumphing in a secure and lawful Possession of that Title and Estate he had so long usurp'd; and being entirely freed from all Anxieties and Terrors he had endured while holding them from the rightful Heir -- whether the Hellish Contrivance was his own, or whether he had any hand in it or not, we will not pretend to say, being determin'd to lay nothing to his Charge, but what can be proved by the most undeniable Evidences. The villainous Attempt therefore shall only be related, and left to the Reader to judge of as he thinks most reasonable and probable. (II, p. 21)

The unequivocal accusation is tempered by the reference to the need for evidence. However, the direct address to readers and the emphasis placed on their need to think about what is

most ‘reasonable’ and ‘probable’ undercuts anything said previously, because, as Wayne Booth notes ‘Commentary about the moral and intellectual qualities of characters always affects our view of events in which those characters act.’⁵⁷ In his discussion of the text, Spedding highlights these narratorial evocations, writing:

Textually, it is clear that most of [...] [the first volume] was written without knowing the outcome of the trial. From the start of the first volume Haywood is careful to avoid implying that Richard Annesley’s guilt had been proven, something that could be justified only after the trial had concluded. Also, on a number of occasions Haywood took care to state her uncertainty about Richard Annesley’s actions. However, as the narrative unfolds these qualifications become less frequent and are framed with more frequent attacks on Richard Annesley. By the time Haywood recounts the third attempt to murder Annesley half way through the second volume all pretence of uncertainty about Richard Annesley’s actions has ended.⁵⁸

As Spedding points out, Haywood was obviously aware of the need for caution. However, considering the nature of the qualifications utilised in order to fulfil this supposedly cautious approach, it cannot be assumed that they were seriously meant to aid her against attack. More successful is the employment of an outspoken and opinionated narrator who breaks free of the text-level and appears in the story-level, as Haywood can, to some degree, hide behind this figure as a fictional mouthpiece.

Spedding goes on to suggest that Haywood’s publishers were concerned about the implications of being associated with the text. He writes:

It is clear from the fact a false imprint was employed that Cogan [the publisher] thought that there was some danger in being identified as the publisher of *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman* and, therefore, as a supporter of Annesley. According to Haywood, he had good reason to do so. Haywood reproduces a letter close to the end of the second volume of *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman* that she claims was sent by Richard Annesley to a lawyer and ‘shewn about’ shortly before the trial ‘to deter every one from Writing any thing of the Truth’.⁵⁹

The epistle referred to by Spedding in the previous quotation is from Richard to a lawyer. It is presented by the narrator as evidence of the Baron’s continuing delusion regarding his chances of winning the lawsuit. It is striking because of the fact that it refers directly to the text in which it is contained. Richard writes:

[I] desire you, against my Arrival, to take proper Methods for the Punishment of those infamous, impudent Wretches, who have libell’d me in the publick Prints, particularly to the Author, Printer, Publisher, and whoever else may have vended a malicious Book, intituled *The Memoirs of an unfortunate young Nobleman, lately return’d from a thirteen Years Slavery in America, &c.* (II, p. 198)

⁵⁷ *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 2nd edn (London: Penguin, 1983), p. 196.

⁵⁸ Spedding, p. 387.

⁵⁹ Spedding, p. 390.

Its inclusion allows the fictional narrator of the text to demonstrate how the story that he/she has told has affected the main target of his/her contempt at a time when the main event of the whole narrative, the trial, is about to be presented. Whilst, if Spedding's assertion that the letter represents a real-life correspondence is correct, for the real-life author, the inclusion of this letter signals that she is demonstrating to her readers how powerful the narrative that they are reading has been. At different points in *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman*, the narrator does allude to the process of making this text, and also highlights that it is an important entity within the story of the Annesleys. When James's claim to his titles is being discussed, the narrator inserts a descriptive pause in order to digress from the events at the story-level and place focus on the text-level, asserting: 'whoever considers these *Memoirs* with any Attention, will find thro' the whole Course of them, that nothing served more to confirm the Validity of the Chevalier James's Claim, than the very Measures Count Richard took to destroy it' (I, pp. 206-7). The narrative is a document that charts the virtue of James and his character is placed in direct comparison to the evil one of his uncle. Therefore, it is a useful tool for concerned readers to have.

The narrative focus moves back and forth between the events occurring in James's life and those happening to his uncle, with metalepses often being used to signpost the move from one narrative thread to another. The most emphatic of these scene changes occurs when readers move from the depiction of Richard's life, during the time of James's captivity, to the actions of James at his return from the slavery that he has served. The narrator states that 'the Time was now at hand when the Contrast between them should be seen, as well as all those dark mysterious Projects brought to Light, by which the Innocence of the *one* had been betray'd, and the Treachery of the *other* so long successful' (I, p. 165; emphasis original). This comment, in particular, highlights the antithetical nature of these characters; however, it is a point referred to throughout the narrative. With the text starting in a state of *medias res*, Richard's perfidious nature has already been established by the time of James's birth, as has the newborn's fate. In a proleptic narratorial digression, readers are faced with this figure's apostrophizing at the hard fate of this boy. He/she exclaims:

O! who that then beheld the smiling Babe, Heir of three Baronies, and a much superior Title in Reversion, Idol of his Parents, and Object of the Congratulations and Rejoicings of a whole Province, could have imagin'd he was born to suffer Woes sufficient to make him regret he ever had Existence, and almost accuse Heaven of Partiality! Little, alas! does the fond Mother, when pressing her darling Infant in her Arms, think of the Miseries that may be destin'd for its Portion! (I, pp. 29-30)

However, despite this boy's fate to live his early life in misery, readers are reassured that he will gain some kind of recompense for the ills that he has suffered, because of the inclusion in the text of several references to 'providence' (fifteen in all occur within the two parts). For example, when the horror of James's slavery is being depicted, readers are put at ease that

[although] the Place he [was] sent [...] to, [and] the Station he [was] ordain'd [...] to, were such as according to all human Probability must have corrupted both his Soul and Body; yet so wonderfully did Providence interpose in favour of this young Innocent, that his pure and florid Blood flow'd thro' his Veins untainted either with the inclement Air, coarse Food, or hard Labour he sustain'd; and his Mind, at the same time, retain'd its sweet Simplicity, imbibing nothing of the Principles of those he was among, nor the least Tincture of their Manners. (I, p. 67)

These lexical references are used in order to implicitly emphasize to readers how the narrative will proceed and how they should continue to read the story of James Annesley. A more explicit instruction about how to consume the text is made by the narrator when he/she presents information on a dream that disturbs James, in which

He imagin'd that [...] a heavy Cloud o'erspread the Hemisphere, -- all appear'd brown and dismal, but chiefly that Part where the Dreamer lay: He turn'd his Eyes upwards and beheld a little above his Head a Balance of enormous Size, self-poiz'd, and hanging in the Air, each Scale by turns seeming more ponderous than the other, and threatening to descend and crush him with its Weight. (I, pp. 69-70)

The narrator relates the events of this dream in great detail and then pre-empt potential accusations of *paralepsis* by stating that,

The particular relation I have made of this Dream, will doubtless be look'd upon as a piece of Impertinence and Folly by those who pretend to be too wise to pay any regard to what they call only the Effect of a disturb'd Imagination; but whoever shall have patience to go through these Memoirs, and compare the Accidents which afterward befell the Dreamer with the Particulars of his Dream, they will be apt to confess with me, that it must be somewhat more than the vague and inconnected Ideas, which rise either from the Fumes of a distemper'd Body or disturb'd Mind. (I, p. 71)

When James is attacked by the brothers of Turquois (a young Indian girl who falls in love with James, and then kills herself because of this unrequited love), the narrator elicits readers to think back to this prophetic dream, saying that during James's recovery from his wounds, 'it came fresh into his Memory [...] [and] that significant Dream I made so copious a relation of was strong in his Head [...]. [H]e had ever look'd upon it as a kind of Prognostick of his future Fate' (I, p. 120). Everything that happens in James's life is important to his subsequent story, and so the narrator highlights the significance of these story-level events at the text-level.

James is shown to cope well with the traumas of his life. His good nature is often revealed through the insertion of his character focalization. For example, when he is on the ship returning home following his slavery, we learn that

His *Repose* would now have been perfectly *Tranquil*, had it not been a little disturbed with the *Reflection* that all the *Misfortunes* so commiserated by *Strangers*, had been brought upon him by those of his own *Blood* -- it troubled him to think that in asserting the *Rights* of his *Birth*, he must expose and bring to confusion the *Brother* of his *Father*; and that a *Family*, of which he had heard so honourable mention made, must have a lasting *Blemish* cast upon it by the vile *Practices* of one so near a-kin to him. (I, p. 169)

His concerns are constantly with his family, who at this point he has found little comfort from. He is even prepared to see good in the character of his uncle. Prior to the trial, Richard pretends to repent of his former behaviour and this heartens James. This hope is short lived, though, and James's disappointment at his Uncle's continued treachery is evident through his character focalization, in which we hear that he

had form'd a thousand pleasing *Ideas*, that he shou'd hear he [Richard] was endeavouring to wipe off the *Stains* his former *Actions* had cast upon his *Name* by the *Regularity* of his future *Conduct*; and now to find his *Conversion* was either counterfeited to serve some base *End*, or the *Desire* of it short-lived, and that he found himself obliged to continue to act toward him not as a *Nephew* but an *Adversary*, turn'd the late delightful *Prospect* of *Amity* and *Forgiveness* into so sad a *Reverse*, as he could not reflect on without the most deep *Concern*. (II, p. 149)

James does not seek revenge from his uncle, but some kind of justice, and he receives this when he wins the court case against him. The narrator delivers a kind of revenge on Richard for James, though, by referring to the 'Secret History' (II, p. 98) of his childhood, in which he/she relates a tale regarding his youth that could lead people to question his legitimacy. Again, the narrator emphasizes that this story cannot be 'set [...] down as *Fact*' (II, p. 98); however, he/she will 'leave every one to judge as he thinks most reasonable' (II, p. 98) about the truth of the tale presented. After relating the story, in which it is suggested that Richard was exchanged with another child during his infancy, the narrator ironically declares that,

But as things of this *Nature* are not always worthy of being credited; and where no *Proofs* can be given, we ought not to depend on what is merely *conjectural*, I shall leave this *Story* as I found it, without pretending to make any *Comments* of my own, or offering to obtrude my private *Opinion* on the *Minds* of others. (II, p. 101)

Again, the seeds of doubt have been planted, though, and the narrator succeeds in damaging the reputation of Richard, whilst claiming that this is not the intention at all. Haywood's use of such a dominant extra-heterodiegetic narrator is extremely striking in this text, especially as it is used in such a socio-political way. Its use makes it easy to reject any ideas that Haywood altered her narrative style following the publication of *The Dunciad*. In fact, it

probably suggests that she became even more adventurous in her use of narrative voice, which is a point that is to be further explored in the next chapter.

As John Martin notes, ‘Annesley’s experiences [...] [became] a *cause célèbre* in the literary world. The most detailed contemporary account in fiction was that provided by Smollett’s *Peregrine Pickle* [whilst] in the nineteenth century Annesley’s life provided the basis for accounts compiled by Sir Walter Scott in *Guy Mannering* and by Charles Reade in *The Wandering Heir*.’⁶⁰ However, Haywood’s account of Annesley’s life (that is omitted from Martin’s list) seems to have much more potential to be inflammatory than that published by her contemporary, Smollett. Despite the fact that when the two relations are compared the general depiction of events is very similar, it is Haywood’s use of an outspoken narrator that adds an extra controversial dimension. Lillian de la Torre has made comparisons between Haywood’s and Smollett’s telling of Annesley’s story (although, when writing her article, *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman* had not been recognized as Haywood’s). She refers to Haywood’s earlier effort as ‘an unreliable novelization of the Annesley affair’, because of the text’s depiction of William Henderson.⁶¹ However, I am not concerned with a comparison of the approach taken to the story, but rather the narrative approach taken by the two authors.

In Smollett’s 1751 novel, a lengthy account of the Annesley case is given in Chapter CVI by a Priest to Peregrine, the protagonist of the piece, who is in prison at the time. As Clifford points out, its inclusion ‘does appear to have a functional value’, as it is inserted

at the place in the narrative where Peregrine has reached his low point [...] [D]isillusioned and in prison, the digression helps to emphasize the hopelessness of his position. Right does not always triumph. The fact that Peregrine is himself speedily rescued from despair merely means that his is a special case.⁶²

The clergyman, who represents an intradiegetic narrators in the text, tells Peregrine the story of the case because in ‘every way [it is] the most important that ever came under the discussion of the courts of law in these kingdoms’.⁶³ He begins his account in medias res, at the point where Annesley arrives in London. However, Peregrine’s ‘curiosity’ (p. 692) is

⁶⁰ ‘James Annesley’ <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/564.com>>

⁶¹ ‘New Light on Smollett and the Annesley Cause’, *Review of English Studies*, 22 (1971), 274-81 (p. 276).

⁶² ‘Introduction’, in *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle*, ed. by James L. Clifford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. xv-xxix (p. xxvii).

⁶³ *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle*, ed. by James L. Clifford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 709. All subsequent references to the text will be given in parenthesis following the quotation.

piqued by the life of this man and he is so interested in discovering the whole history of his story that he interrupts his informer's account, and

said that there was something so extraordinary, not to call improbable, in the account he had heard of the young gentleman's being sent into exile, that he would look upon himself as infinitely obliged to the doctor, if he would favour him with a true representation of that transaction, as well as of the manner in which he arrived and was known at the island of Jamaica. (p. 711)

Peregrine represents the kind of audience that Haywood's narrator refers to when he/she states that some later auditors of Annesley's story will doubt its veracity, because of its 'romantic' and 'improbable' nature. However, Peregrine is soon converted to a believing auditor, because he is informed by a narrator who can verify the facts of the story, as he was present at the trial that he is depicting. This is highlighted when, describing the conclusion of the trial, he says that the

verdict [...] gave the highest satisfaction to all impartial persons that were within reach of being truly informed of their proceedings, and of the different genius and conduct of the parties engaged in the contest; but more especially to such as were in court (as I was) at the trial, and had the opportunity of observing the characters and behaviour of the persons who appeared there to give evidence. (p. 723)

As is evident from the previous quotation, this intradiegetic narrator presents himself as 'impartial'. However, like Haywood's narrator, he betrays his opinions through his lexical comments. For example, when he speaks on the separation of James's parents, he refers to 'A libel' that was 'void of any real foundation in truth', and when discussing Richard's attempt to have James found guilty of murdering a poacher, he says that, 'he employed a whole army of attornies and agents, to spirit up and carry on a most virulent prosecution; practised all the unfair methods that could be invented, in order that the unhappy gentleman should be transported to Newgate' (p. 720). He is particularly troubled by some of the reactions that he found in the public following the result of the trial and this evokes an explicit digression from him that takes the form of a descriptive pause. He stops his narration and declares:

These, Mr. Pickle, were my reflections on what I had occasion to observe concerning that famous trial; and on my return to England two years after, I could not help pitying the self-sufficiency of some people, who, at this distance, pretended to pass their judgment on that verdict with as great positiveness, as if they had been in the secrets of the cause, or upon the jury who tried it; and that from no better authority, than the declamations of lord An – a's emissaries, and some falsified printed accounts, artfully cooked up, on purpose to mislead and deceive.

But to return from this digression.

However, his opinions are not as forcefully expressed as those articulated by Haywood's narrator. This is because he is more concerned with presenting the events of the case rather

than the personalities of the characters involved, which is the focus of *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman*. Whilst Haywood is targeting a specific figure in society with the narrator's derogatory comments, Smollett is questioning the actions of society as a whole. In his text, the account of the Annesley case is externally focalized with no character focalization through which readers can obtain further insight into the natures of the personages, and so they are not drawn into the account as fully as they are into Haywood's text.

Smollett's version of the Annesley case contains negative evaluations of some of the characters involved. However, there is less in it that could evoke complaint in comparison to that contained in Haywood's text. In light of this comparison of Haywood's and Smollett's narrative depiction of the Annesley case, Haywood's bold choices with narrative voice appear even more striking, especially seeing as she was publishing her text at a time when it was at the forefront of people's minds. This chapter has attempted to demonstrate Haywood's continuing appropriation of literary trends and ever-evolving narrative development at a period when she supposedly shied away from the limelight. The three texts that are discussed in this chapter are relevant to a study that aims to question common misconceptions about Haywood's oeuvre, not only because they were published immediately before and after her supposed conversion, but also because they indicate that Haywood was an author alert to the developments and interests of her time. In these three texts, she responds to the political mood, popular literature, and contemporary events of the period. The case studies presented contribute to Haywood criticism in different ways: the analysis of *The Adventures of Eovaai* questions and adapts previous criticism on this complex text, discussion on *Anti-Pamela* allows for Haywood's narratological approach to be compared to that of two of her male contemporaries, whilst examination of *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman* brings a relatively unexplored Haywood text into the consciousness of critics. The next chapter continues in the same vein by attempting to emphasize the unconvincing nature of the assertion that Haywood underwent a 'moral' conversion in her latter years.

Chapter 4: ‘Moral Conversion’ or Literary Progression? The Fiction of 1744-56

Discussion of Eliza Haywood’s ‘bipolar career’ is present in much formative analysis of her body of work,¹ as critics conformed to the notion that she underwent a ‘moral conversion’, both personally and professionally, in the latter years of her writing. It is not surprising that this dichotomising of her career carried on for many years, as it was a view initially mooted in 1782 by Haywood’s first biographer. In his entry on ‘Mrs Eliza Heywood’ in the *Biographica Dramatica*, Baker traces her literary progress, writing

In the early part of her life, her natural vivacity, her sex’s constitutional fondness for gallantry, and the passion which then prevailed in the public taste for personal scandal, and diving into the intrigues of the great, guided her pen to works, in which a scope was given for great licentiousness. [...]. [But] whatever liberty she might at first give to her pen, to the offence either of morality or delicacy, she seemed to be soon convinced of her error, and determined not only to reform, but even atone for it; since, in the numerous volumes which she gave to the world towards the latter part of her life, no author has appeared more the votary of virtue, nor are there any novels in which a stricter purity, or a greater delicacy of sentiment, has been preserved.²

In Reeve’s *The Progress of Romance*, in which three characters, Hortensius, Sophronia, and Euphrasia, conduct a discussion on the history of this genre, a similar view of Haywood’s career and her journey to ‘morality’ is articulated. Following analysis of the careers of ‘Mrs. Behn’ and ‘Mrs. Manley’, whose works are regarded as ‘very improper to be read by, or recommended to virtuous minds, and especially to youth’, Hortensius, referring to Haywood, reminds his interlocutors of ‘one more Lady-Author of the same class’.³ He asks: ‘Why should she be spared any more than the others?’⁴ Euphrasia replies:

Because she repented of her faults, and employed the latter part of her life in expiating the offences of the former. -- There is reason to believe that the examples of the two ladies we have spoken of, seduced Mrs. Heywood into the same track; she certainly wrote some amorous novels in her youth, and also two books of the same kind as Mrs. Manley’s capital work, all of which I hope are forgotten. [...] [But] Mrs. Heywood had the singular good fortune to recover a lost reputation, and the yet greater honour to atone for her errors. -- So devoted the remainder of her life and labours to the service of virtue.⁵

¹ Paula R. Backscheider describes her career in this manner in ‘The Story of Eliza Haywood’s Novels: Caveats and Questions’, in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 19-47 (p. 43).

² ‘Mrs Eliza Heywood’, in *Biographica Dramatica, Or, A Companion to the Playhouse* (London: for Mess. Rivingtons; T. Payne and Son; L. Davis; T. Longman; and G. Robinson [and 4 others], 1782), pp. 215-16 (p. 215).

³ *The Progress of Romance, Through Times, Countries, and Manners*, 2 vols (Dublin: for Messrs. Price, Exshaw, White, Cash Colbert, Marchbank, and Porter, 1785), I, p. 117, p. 120.

⁴ Reeve, p. 120.

⁵ Reeve, pp. 120-1.

Haywood is portrayed as having been corrupted by Behn and Manley, but then as having repented her observation of their style of writing and as having converted to a moral approach. It can be questioned whether this assumed conversion really occurred, though, or whether early scholars were ascribing this behaviour to Haywood in order to fit her narratives into the stereotypical heterogeneous socio-literary types of the period. Backscheider gives this description of Haywood's publishing history a specific nomenclature and refers to 'The Story' of her career. In an article published in the 2000 edited collection of Haywood scholarship, she suggests 'extending our understanding of Haywood and of complicating, perhaps even revising, The Story',⁶ and poses two key questions about the way we analyse Haywood and her narratives. She asks 'Why are we content with seeing Haywood's texts as derivative and reactive rather than with studying her *agency* in the history of the developing English novel?' and 'How do we connect her texts, including those from the 1720s and from the 1750s, to each other in meaningful ways?'⁷ This chapter seeks, by employing narratological analysis, to make connections between Haywood's whole oeuvre and in doing so adds to the growing amount of Haywood criticism that establishes links between all of her texts, regardless of their time of publication.

The new aim of many branches of Haywood studies is to view her career as a complete whole, rather than as split into distinct periods. Merritt summarises this new approach by stating that 'Haywood studies have arrived at a point at which we can begin to take the long view of her career and recognize that she sustained a set of preoccupations and strategies over the course of nearly forty years as a professional writer.'⁸ Thematic as well as formal similarities between texts previously seen as antithetical entities are now being highlighted. For example, in her article on Haywood's final two novels, Nestor points to comparable scenes in *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless* and *Love in Excess*, in which the 'passionate tone and prose style' used in the later fiction to describe the actions of the lovers Betsy and Truworth 'bears a close resemblance to the sexually explicit scenes' in Haywood's earliest novella.⁹ She suggests that 'Although in her later, "reformed" period she [Haywood] clearly attempts to separate herself from these early texts, her open acknowledgement of Betsy's sexuality betrays her allegiance to this earlier, more permissive

⁶ 'The Story of Eliza Haywood's Novels', p. 20.

⁷ 'The Story of Eliza Haywood's Novels', p. 20.

⁸ *Beyond Spectacle: Eliza Haywood's Female Spectators* (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 2004), p. 5.

⁹ 'Virtue Rarely Rewarded: Ideological Subversion and Narrative Form in Haywood's Later Fiction', *SEL*, 34 (1994), 579-98 (pp. 588-89).

era.’¹⁰ Similarly, Backscheider sees similarities in the sexual scenes depicted in *The Mercenary Lover* and *The Invisible Spy* and states that ‘Haywood [does not] eliminate sexual scenes in her “moral”, “tamed” late fiction to the extent that some critics have claimed.’¹¹ She also draws thematic connections between ‘the basic plot’ of *The History of Betsy Thoughtless* and *The British Recluse*, and notes Haywood’s propensity to have her characters seek help from the law in her fiction; for example, in *The City Jilt*, *The Mercenary Lover*, and *The History of Betsy Thoughtless*.¹² Backscheider’s correlations do not end with thematic juxtapositions. She also points to formal associations throughout Haywood’s texts, declaring that ‘From her earliest publications, Haywood seems to have had an ironic self-consciousness about narrative voice that admits near-parody, metacommentary, deconstruction, and ironic double commentary into her texts.’¹³ Previous chapters have pointed to numerous extra-heterodiegetic narrators, for example, in *Love in Excess*, *Fantomina*, and *The Adventures of Eovaai*, who provide the kind of ‘double commentary’ that Backscheider is alluding to. They disrupt the levels of story and text by seemingly stepping into the diegetic level of the characters to pass comment on the action taking place. This kind of narratorial figure is also employed in *Dalinda* (1749) which provides the basis for the first case study in this chapter. It is a text that is comparable both thematically and formally to some of Haywood’s earlier fiction, and, therefore, it does not fit neatly into a ‘moral’ categorisation. Critics such as Baker and Reeve would not have considered this text when making their claims for a ‘moral’ Haywood, though, as it was not attributed to her until 1915 when Whicher made the connection thanks to ‘internal evidence’.¹⁴

Dalinda

The first link between this text and Haywood’s earlier output can be seen in its subtitle, ‘The Double Marriage’, as this appellation was previously utilised in 1726 as the main title for a short novella that was also designated ‘A True Secret History’.¹⁵ This earlier narrative follows the story of the lovers Alathia and Bellcour, who marry in secret when the latter’s father condemns their match. Shortly after their union, Bellcour is travelling to meet the

¹⁰ Nestor, p. 589.

¹¹ ‘The Story of Eliza Haywood’s Novels’, p. 25.

¹² ‘The Story of Eliza Haywood’s Novels’, p. 24.

¹³ ‘The Story of Eliza Haywood’s Novels’, p. 28.

¹⁴ Patrick Spedding, *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), p. 517.

¹⁵ *The Double Marriage: Or, The Fatal Release*, in *Three Novellas*, ed. by Earla A. Wilputte (East Lansing: Colleagues; Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1995), pp. 106-41 (p. 106). All further references to the text will be given in parenthesis following the quotation.

woman that his father wants him to marry, when he saves a young lady and instantly falls in love with her. This new object of his affection turns out to be his proposed match, Mirtameme. Blinded by his love for this lady, Bellcour marries her too. When Alathia finds out about their relationship, she confronts her now bigamous husband and then kills herself. As a consequence, he takes his life in a tragic end to the story. The general narrative thread of *Dalinda* is similar to that of *The Double Marriage* as it charts the turbulent relationship between Dalinda and Malvolio, who are two cousins that marry in secret as their match is condemned by their grandmother, but are then separated when he marries another woman, Flavilla. However, whereas in the earlier narrative the forsaken wives are not recompensed for their heartbreak, in the latter, readers witness a metamorphosis in the character of Dalinda as she moves from the realm of the naïve virgin to the wronged, yet enlightened, woman. After returning to the arms of her husband following his avowal that he will leave Flavilla (an event that never occurs), Dalinda finally becomes wise to Malvolio's perfidiousness. She reveals the entire history of his deceit to her brothers and threatens her husband with legal proceedings. Whereas Alathia temporarily disappears from the narrative whilst Bellcour is courting his second lover, Dalinda is an ever-present figure in the text, because of her growing power and independence from Malvolio. The repetition of 'The Double Marriage' as a title could be an innocent act by Haywood. After all, it cannot be denied that the reiteration of the bigamous act in the title is appropriate (although Malvolio actually turns out to be a triple offender!), especially as, again, Haywood is addressing a subject that is relevant and interesting to her readers. As Lawrence Stone documents in his book on divorce in England, there was

an extraordinary explosion of clandestine marriages between 1660 and 1753, first all over the country and then mainly in professional London marriage shops [...]. Although the problem existed in the early seventeenth century (when it was exacerbated by contract marriages), it was the events of the Interregnum which seem to have triggered the large-scale development of this curious social phenomenon.¹⁶

However, as has consistently been demonstrated in previous chapters, Haywood was a canny writer and publicist, so it could also be argued that this lexical repetition demonstrates a deliberate move by her to point back to her earlier work. In the preface to *Dalinda*, the text is held up as having didactic purposes and so Haywood could be highlighting how what was once a fiction is now a 'truth'.

The preface places the text in the realm of didactic prose by putting it forward as a 'Fable' which, readers are told, is a genre of writing that 'when well wrought up, and full of

¹⁶ *Road to Divorce: England, 1530-1987* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), pp. 119-20.

moral Meaning, has in all Ages of the World, been look'd upon as very conducive this way' (p. iv). It is asserted that 'great authors' should

employ their Pens, in exhibiting some useful Allegory to the Publick, wherein People might see, as in a faithful and undeceiving Mirror, the different Propensities to which Human Nature is incident, and thereby learn to correct the *Evil*, and improve the *Good* they find, in a more, or less degree, rise in themselves. (p. v; emphasis original)

This association with didacticism is seen as a trait of Haywood's later fiction, but it is not exclusive to it. The above statement from the preface of *Dalinda* is comparable to that made in Haywood's dedication to the Earl of Suffolk with which she prefaces *Lasselia* (1723), in which she declares: 'as I take it, the Aim of every Person, who pretends to write (tho' in the most insignificant and ludicrous way) ought to tend at least to a good *Moral Use*',¹⁷ and whilst more elaborate diction is used to articulate the message in the latter prefatory statement, the sentiment is similar in both. A further analogy between the later preface and the earlier dedication concerns the purpose of each of the ensuing narratives. In *Lasselia* it is declared that 'My Design in writing this little *Novel* [...] [is] only to remind the unthinking Part of the World, how dangerous it is to give way to Passion',¹⁸ whilst in *Dalinda* readers are told that

My sole Design, in the following Pages, is to shew both Sexes, the Danger of inadvertently giving way to the Passions of what kind soever -- all lead us into Error - - all have a Tendency to Vice; and too frequently bring us by degrees, to which our Natures and Inclinations were at first repugnant. (p. ix)

Whicher seems to have based his attribution of *Dalinda* to Haywood in part on the utilization of the phrase 'The Danger of Giving Way to Passion', as he notes that it is one of Haywood's 'favourite quotations' and 'a stock phrase' in her work.¹⁹ Indeed, the opening chapter of this thesis documents the importance of this phrase by pointing out that it is the title of Haywood's first collection. In repeating this phrase in *Dalinda*, Haywood is making connections between her whole body of work and is highlighting her continued purpose. As Backscheider points out, 'her novels offered experience and an education without the consequences of real-life missteps'.²⁰

Whilst *The Double Marriage* is put forward as a 'true history', none of its characters have, so far, been identified with real people. Therefore, it seems as if this text falls under the category of 'invented' secret history and is advertised in such a manner as to tap into the

¹⁷ *Lasselia: Or, The Self-Abandon'd*, in *The Injur'd Husband and Lasselia*, ed. by Jerry C. Beasley (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1999), pp. 103-49 (p. 105; emphasis original).

¹⁸ *Lasselia*, p. 105; emphasis original.

¹⁹ *The Life and Romances of Mrs. Eliza Haywood* (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing LLC, 2004), p. 77.

²⁰ 'The Story of Eliza Haywood's Novels', p. 35.

trend for gossip-driven fiction. In comparison, the personages that appear in *Dalinda*, a book that declares itself to be ‘The Genuine History of a very Recent, and Interesting Adventure’, do coincide with contemporary figures of the period.²¹ Spedding writes that

Despite Haywood’s concern for ‘innocent Posterity’ the ‘real Names’ concealed under ‘fictitious ones’ were immediately obvious to her contemporaries. The story of the affair between Thomas Cresswell and Elizabeth Scrope was too well known at the time for it to be otherwise.²²

Part of the reason for the notoriety of this affair occurred because, as Stone points out, it was ‘widely publicized, thanks to a pamphlet war between the contending parties’.²³ The account given by Cresswell (Haywood’s Malvolio) is positioned as responding to a letter by Lancelot Lee (Scrope’s friend who appears in *Dalinda* as Leander). This letter which was printed in the *General Evening-Post* ‘containing Falsities, Misrepresentations, &c.’ appeared in November 1747 and took the form of an extended epistle to one of Scrope’s brothers,²⁴ whilst ‘Miss Scrope’s Answer to Mr. Cresswell’s Narrative’ (Scrope being Dalinda in Haywood’s fiction) was dated as being written in August 1748 although it was published in 1749.²⁵ Therefore, the assertion in the preface to *Dalinda* that it contains ‘Examples of Facts drawn from real Life [...] such as every Reader, on a very small Enquiry, may convince himself have happened’ (p. v) can be assumed to be situated in truth. In fact, when some of the events in Haywood’s fiction, for example, Malvolio and Dalinda’s quoting of the marriage ceremony and Malvolio’s suggestion of elopement, are compared to those documented, particularly in Cresswell’s narrative, the similarities are striking.

As Wilson asserts in the chapter dedicated to *Dalinda* in her 2003 thesis, readers are positioned in a manner that affiliates them more with the female protagonist than with the male one, as within the text ‘the omniscient narrator’s sympathy lies entirely with Dalinda’.²⁶ This is evident because of the presence of metatextual narratorial comments that imply a kind of contempt for Malvolio that is not obvious in discussion of Dalinda. For example, when his reinvigorated passion for her, and the torment caused by it, are being described, the narrator

²¹ *Dalinda: Or, The Double Marriage* (London: for C. Corbett in Fleet-Street, and G. Woodfall at Charing-Cross, 1749), title page. All subsequent references to the text will be given in parenthesis following the quotation.

²² Spedding, p. 517. Within this citation, Spedding is quoting Haywood’s Preface to the text.

²³ Stone, p. 118.

²⁴ Thomas Estcourt Cresswell, *A Narrative of the Affair Between Mr. Cresswell, and Miss Sc—e* (London: for Charles Green, in Avemory-Lane, and Sold at the Pamphlet Shops at the Royal-Exchange, Temple-Bar, and Charing Cross, 1747), title page.

²⁵ Elizabeth Scrope, *Miss Scrope’s Answer to Mr. Cresswell’s Narrative* (London: for R. Baldwin, Jun. in Pater-Noster-Row, 1749).

²⁶ ‘Narrative Structure in the Novels of Eliza Haywood’ (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Ulster, 2003), p. 235.

breaks out of the extradiegetic level that he/she (there is no evidence of a specifically gendered narrator) inhabits to declare: 'Divided between these different Propensities, never Heart endured Conflict more severe [...] [It] drew on him all the Disgrace, Trouble, and Confusion, he afterwards met with, and which it must be acknowledged he deserved' (p. 210). In this way, despite a show of sympathy for the female protagonist, which one can assume is born out of Haywood's compassion for Elizabeth Scrope, the text, perhaps surprisingly, also demonstrates sympathy for the male side of the story. At the beginning of Haywood's depiction of the relationship between Dalinda and Malvolio, the narrator informs readers that Dalinda's

Eyes were never satisfied with seeing him, nor her Ears with hearing him -- she hated Night because it separated her from him, and longed for Morning to return him to her Presence; if he walked out she would needs go with him, if he chose to ride, she must also have a Horse, and told her Grandmother she found that Exercise agreed with her Constitution. (p. 11)

It is clear from this that it is the female lover who is portrayed as infatuated rather than the male party. This positioning conforms to Cresswell's version of events rather than Scrope's, as Scrope argues that it was in fact Cresswell that was obsessed with her. When relating a meeting between them early on in their lives, she recalls

'Tis true, he named not Courtship, but an Assiduity to please was so apparent, that any Girl, in my Situation, would have concluded that his Design. Whatever were my Thoughts, my Disposition was naturally reserved to all Mankind, but peculiarly so to him; as he has often since our marriage told me. I saw his Attachment to me gave my Grandmother Pain, for which Reason I discouraged him. Had she been pleased, I should, for he then bore a most extraordinary good Character.²⁷

Whilst she does not deny the attractions that Cresswell had for her, she vehemently denies that she was his active pursuer, as had been suggested in her ex-lover's version of events, declaring: 'He endeavours to persuade the World, that Love was my Motive, grounding on that Supposition those unreasonable, and indecent Advances he declares I made. This is my Reason for so early an Account [of my life].'²⁸ Haywood's reason for following Cresswell's account of events could be attributed to the fact that she was probably more familiar with his narrative than Scrope's, as it was published two years earlier than *Dalinda* and Scrope's reply. However, it could also be suggested that, from an entertainment point of view, the utilization of Cresswell's narrative is more appealing as the female protagonist becomes a more tragic figure when it is she that loves and loses constantly. The preface to *Dalinda* may purport to follow the 'Truth' of events, stating that 'I would not, for the sake of embellishing

²⁷ Elizabeth Scrope, p. 11.

²⁸ Elizabeth Scrope, p. 8.

my History, be guilty of injuring Truth, which alone has been my Guide, and to which I have strictly adhered, through every Incident in the whole work' (p. xi); however, at the same time, as is often the case in Haywood's fictions, the need to entertain is also alluded to when readers are told that 'among all of the various Productions that the Press is continually teeming, none seems to me, and I think, according to the general Sense of the World, more effectually calculated for answering that great End [didacticism], than such as convey *Precept* through the Channel of *Delight*' (pp. iii-iv; emphasis original). Haywood may be trying to write within the boundaries of both 'history' and 'fiction' so as to create an entertaining story, founded in truth.

By portraying Dalinda as the love-sick party, Haywood can present a powerless heroine who gradually gains power, which is a figure that she consistently uses throughout her career; for example, in *Love in Excess* and *The City Jilt*. At the start of the narrative, Dalinda's lack of power is narratologically indicated as she represents the focalized object rather than a focalizing subject. She is talked about by Malvolio and her grandmother and is pitied by the narrator who highlights her lack of experience when it comes to love and Malvolio's treatment of her. In a proleptic comment in which Dalinda's eventual fate is alluded to, the narrator declares:

little did the innocent Dalinda think that every kind Word he said to her, every Kiss he gave her, infused a Poison into her Soul, which neither her own Reason, nor his ill Usage afterward had the Power of expelling. -- She loved him without knowing she did so, and imagined the Pleasure she took in being near him was not any thing more than what was owing to the Nearness of Blood, and those Qualities which she fancied he possest above all others she was acquainted with. (p. 10)

The young girl has no idea of what is happening to her or the motives for the actions of those around her. When Malvolio becomes aware of her growing feelings for him, readers learn through his character focalization that

he resolved for the future to avoid her as much as possible for a Person who lived in the same House, never to say any thing to her, that she should have the power of interpreting as Love, never to toy or play with her as he had been accustomed, though without design, and in fine, rather to behave to her in a morose and churlish than an affectionate manner. (p. 16)

Whilst readers are aware of the reasons behind Malvolio's altered behaviour, Dalinda is left completely baffled and distraught by his change in humour. Through her character focalization, we learn of her distress as

She examined all she had ever done or said to him, and could find nothing which could give him any reason to be offended with her -- she was two or three times about to ask him, what she had been so unhappy to do, that had made him angry with her; but whenever she turned towards him, and was going to open her Lips, his forbidding

Looks stopt the Utterance of her Words, and obliged her to quit the Place, in order to give vent to the Anguish of her Soul in Tears. (pp. 17-18)

Dalinda is silenced at the story-level because she fears offending Malvolio further. This taciturnity is reflected at the text-level as Dalinda's voice remains unheard either through direct or indirect discourse within the opening pages of the narrative. When she does speak, her words are elicited by her concern that Malvolio has abandoned her during her time of need after she has swooned because of his behaviour towards her. When she comes to, the narrator tells us that 'All the Answers she gave to the kind Things they said to her, was Sighs and Groans for a considerable time; at last, looking wildly round the Room, and not seeing Malvolio there, Where is my Cousin, cried she, does he hate me so much as not to enquire after me in this Condition?' (p. 19).

Analysis of speech and focalization is very enlightening in respect of the narrative form of *Dalinda*. Such analysis, however, has to be conceptually more adequate and methodologically more accurate than it is in Wilson's study of the narrative features of Haywood's later novels. Wilson refers to the concept of focalization in her analysis of *Dalinda* when she states that 'Haywood experiments with an omniscient narrator who presents all the major characters' standpoints';²⁹ but she does not in fact present a full, detailed discussion of the technique. Regarding discourse representation, she writes that 'Haywood employs a mixture of narratorial and direct dialogues between the couple to reveal and highlight their differing attitudes.'³⁰ Whilst this is true, special attention needs to be given to how the antithetical emotions of the protagonists are presented using more indirect and mediated narrative techniques, as then the subtlety of Haywood's narrative method becomes evident. A key scene that demonstrates the skill at work in Haywood's use of narrative point of view and discourse is that which depicts Malvolio's first attempt at consummating his relationship with Dalinda. In order to portray the different emotions of the lovers and the confusion caused by the event, the metaphorical camera lens through which readers view the scene is zoomed in and out and is passed on to various participants so as to create a variety of effects. Firstly, the male perspective is presented as we learn that Malvolio felt 'Desires in him, which, though they could not justly be called Love, yet demanded the same Gratification' (p. 23). His assurance that he will get his way with Dalinda is revealed through further character focalization: 'not doubting but he might easily obtain all in her power to give, and also, that in taking the Advantage her Extravagance of Passion gave him

²⁹ Wilson, p. 236.

³⁰ Wilson, p. 240.

over her, what he did ought not to be deemed an Injury, since it seemed so necessary to the saving her Life' (p. 23). Any worries that Malvolio betrays through his focalization are put to rest by the external, narratorial point of view, as readers are told that 'He threw aside all scruples' (p. 23). Malvolio then addresses his lover with his plans to visit her at night in her room. His utterances are indirectly presented, as is Dalinda's response. This type of discourse representation, which is mediated through the narrator and has a distancing effect, occurs at a point when the conversation is based on Malvolio masking his actual intentions and on Dalinda's naivety. Readers learn that 'he told her, that he had a great deal to say to her, and asked, if she would not give him leave to come into her Chamber when the Family were in Bed [...]. She readily consented, and said, that after the Maid was gone, who always locked her in, she would rise and open the Door on the Inside, it being a Spring-Lock' (p. 23).

When the lovers finally meet at night, indirect discourse is abandoned for direct speech that emphasises the passion of the moment. Malvolio rushes to Dalinda's bed and asks her: 'won't you believe I love you?' (p. 23). The inexperienced Dalinda mistakenly believes that Malvolio is talking about true, romantic love, rather than desire-driven passionate love and so replies: 'I should be too happy to be sure of it' (pp. 23-24). In this enamoured state, the narrator informs the readers that Dalinda did 'not in the least resist[...] his Caresses' (p. 24). However, the situation soon changes when Dalinda realises Malvolio's true intent. Her shock is portrayed from an external position, with the narrator describing how

This [event] most terribly alarmed her, especially when he began to take some Liberties she had not the least Notion of before. -- She loved, it is true, with an Excess of Passion, but then she loved with Innocence. -- Kisses, Embraces and tender Words, were the utmost of her Wishes -- her Passion had not the least Tincture of Impurity in it, and this Behaviour in Malvolio shocked her to the Soul. (p. 24)

When the young lady does regain part of her composure, her character focalization is taken up and we hear that 'She, who before thought it Heaven to be near him, and was all Rapture at a Touch of his Hand or Lips, could not find herself naked in his Arms without a Horror, which left no room for the softer Emotions to operate' (p. 24). Dalinda's growing strength in the scene is highlighted by the narrator. Whereas previously she was positioned as the focalized object because of her lack of strength, she now gains narratorial attention and is given priority as focalizer over her male lover because of her control of the situation. We are told that 'The Resistance she made was not faint -- she struggled with all her might till she disengaged herself from him, and got out of the Bed, then protested, if he did not that Moment rise and quit the Chamber, she would raise the Family to be witness of his base Attempt' (p. 24). In the same way that external focalization takes on a different emphasis at

this point, so too does the indirect discourse found in the previous quotation. Previously it indicated deceit, but now it represents a show of strength from Dalinda. At this point, it is Malvolio who is speechless from shock as he did not expect Dalinda to rebuff his advances in such a manner. He now becomes the focalized object of the scene and we are told regarding his reactions that ‘This was a Turn he so little expected from her past manner of acting with regard to him, that he was not presently able to speak; he got up however, and put on his Gown, but it was with great Difficulty and ten thousand Oaths, to observe that Distance she required, that he prevailed on her to go into Bed again’ (p. 25). The exchange in power from the male to the female lover is complete as the scene ends. Malvolio is left pleading with Dalinda, his words reduced to a single statement that tells us ‘he fell on his Knees and asked her Pardon’ (p. 25), whilst she holds firm and her reproaches are directly presented. The narrator informs us that ‘the Remembrance of the Indecencies he had been guilty of to her, was yet so flagrant, that she could not bear even to look upon him, and all the Answers he obtained to the Excuses he made were, *leave me -- leave me, injurious Man -- begone: I’ll never see you more*’ (p. 25; emphasis original).

Dalinda’s power advantage over Malvolio does not last. Eventually, she does give in to his entreaties and commences a sexual relationship with him. However, she is not distraught by her ‘ruin’ as she believes that Malvolio truly loves her, having prevailed upon him to recite the marriage ceremony with her prior to consummation. Through her character focalization, we hear that she was ‘convinced she had so entirely the Possession of his Heart, that the Affections of it could never be alienated from her, much less capable of a Change in favour of another’ (p. 43). In reality, Malvolio is in not in love with Dalinda when they marry. It is not until he becomes disenchanted with his second wife that he realises his strength of feeling for his first. This change in attitude could surprise some readers because of the nature of its narratological presentation. Following his marriage to Flavilla, Malvolio becomes a key figure at the story-level of the narrative, but his presence is not felt as much as Dalinda’s at the text-level. It is her emotions that take up the majority of the text space, with us learning through her character focalization that

she reflected, how happy she might have been with Leander, and the Impossibility there now seemed of ever being so, gave her the most dreadful Shock. -- She was married to Malvolio, had been enjoyed by him, and though his second Vows had in a manner released her from those Engagements, yet she could not think of rewarding the faithful constant Passion of Leander with the Leavings of his unworthy Rival. (p. 117)

As readers do not learn of Malvolio's thoughts through his focalization, it is perhaps assumed by most that he is content with his situation having triumphed over two women. An explicit scene change, highlighted by a metalepsis, soon reveals his true emotions, though, and he is actually far from happy. The course of his marriage to Flavilla so far is described through an analepsis and we learn that

Flavilla, to her great Misfortune, was not of a Temper to engage the continuance of a Man's Affection [...] she grew the most sullen and discontented in the World. -- No civilities on the Side of Malvolio, could engage the least Complaisance with her, -- in private she treated him with Churlishness, and in publick with an ill Manners, which came very near Contempt. (pp. 120-21)

This behaviour in Flavilla, the narrator tells us, 'made him see more plainly than ever he had done before the Amiableness of Dalinda' (p. 122). The realisation throws Malvolio into a kind of madness caused by his love sickness and conviction that Dalinda is now in love with Leander, a man who has pursued her for a long time. As Wilson points out, Malvolio undergoes a 'reversal' that is 'Ironically juxtaposed with, and mirrors[...] Dalinda's change of heart',³¹ and his speech and thoughts about her echo those that the female protagonist was having at the height of her unrequited love at the start of the text.

Haywood wants her readers to recognise this paradoxical interchanging of roles and so highlights it through lexical repetition, which, as has been demonstrated in previous chapters in analysis of *Fantomina* and *The Adventures of Eovaai*, is a common technique utilized by her. For the opening third of the book, it is Dalinda's love that is described as 'excessive'. When she acknowledges her feelings for Malvolio, it is asserted that 'She loved, it is true, with an Excess of Passion' (p. 24); whilst in a letter to her lover she declares that 'the Love [...] I feel for you [is] to the greatest Excess that ever Woman did' (p. 41); and then when she is reeling over Malvolio's second marriage she acknowledges that it was a mistake that 'she had loved [him] with such Excess of Fondness' (p. 93). When Malvolio becomes enamoured with Dalinda, his main concern is that the subject of this 'Excess of Fondness' (p. 104) is now Leander, not him, and this distresses him because 'he now loved her to an Excess equal to that she once had felt for him, and [that] had been the Source of all her Misfortunes' (p. 124). Malvolio's 'excess' of love causes a 'Confusion of his Mind' (p. 127) that is narratologically represented through different types of thought representation.

³¹ Wilson, p. 231.

Interior monologue, or, to use Cohn's classification, 'quoted monologue',³² is a technique used by Haywood throughout her career in order to portray the inner thoughts of her characters. Indeed, around half of her prose-fiction texts incorporate this feature. It is used in *Dalinda* so that Malvolio's plans to reunite with his first wife are directly articulated to readers: 'Yet he said, to himself, if I once get rid of this Woman [Flavilla], it is in my Power to force her [Dalinda] to be mine. -- She is my first, my lawful Wife, and I may compel her to live with me' (p. 125). As Cohn points out, what is key to remember regarding the use of interior monologue is that despite its appearance of being seemingly mimetic and as directly quoted from the character, it is still mediated through the telling of the narrator and so 'our evaluation of what [...] [a character] says to himself remains tied to the perspective (neutral or opinionated, friendly or hostile, emphatic or ironic) into which the narrator places him for us'.³³ More revealing than this direct representation of Malvolio's final plan is actually the depiction of his disturbed thoughts through free indirect thought, or, to use Cohn's terminology again, 'narrated monologue'.³⁴ Regarding this form of narrative consciousness, Cohn writes that it has a

position astride narration and quotation. Linguistically it is the most complex of the three techniques [of thought representation]: like psycho-narration it maintains the third-person reference and the tense of the narration, but like the quoted monologue it reproduces verbatim the character's own mental language.³⁵

This mixture of narratorial presence and character consciousness is present in Haywood's portrayal of Malvolio's narrated monologue, in which his mind flits between thoughts of Flavilla and Dalinda, and his miserable present and potentially happy future:

How happy would he now have thought himself to have passed his whole Life with her [Dalinda], tho' in the meanest Station, and how truly miserable was he being yoked to Flavilla, with an Opulence of Fortune! -- A thousand Stratagems run through his distracted Brain to return to the one, and be separated from the other. -- Could he weary out Flavilla by ill Usage and continual Contraction of every Thing she wished to have done, how could he be sure Dalinda would forgive the Injury he had done her! (p. 124)

The insertion of external narratorial focalization in the middle of the narrated monologue adds to the feeling of distraction, one could almost say madness. At this point in the story Malvolio is not in control of his emotions; therefore, it seems appropriate that at the text-level the narrator has some control over his thought representation. Haywood's use of narrated

³² See *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 58-98.

³³ Cohn, p. 66.

³⁴ Cohn, pp. 99-140.

³⁵ Cohn, p. 14.

monologue can be attributed to the fact that it ‘is thus an essentially an evanescent form, dependent on the narrative voice that mediates and surrounds it, and is therefore peculiarly dependent on tone and context’.³⁶ Another type of thought representation might not have been as effective at presenting Malvolio’s troubled mental state at this point, because, as Cohn explains: ‘psycho-narration summarizes diffuse feelings, needs [and] urges [...] [whilst] quoted monologue distils moments of pointed self-address that may relate only distantly to the original emotion’.³⁷ In comparison, ‘narrated monologue shapes these inchoate reactions into virtual questions, exclamations [and] conjectures’.³⁸

Haywood’s more predominant use of this category of thought representation in *Dalinda* signals its more progressive and later-eighteenth century status, because, according to Cohn, the

growth of [narrated monologue] is [...] closely tied to a specific moment of the novel’s development: the moment when third-person fiction enters the domain previously reserved for first-person (epistolary or confessional) fiction, and begins to focus on the mental and emotional life of its characters.³⁹

However, this progression, which moves the text away from the narrative style of her earlier novellas, is soon undercut by the presence of a ‘garden scene’. By this designation is meant a scene in which the heroine of a fiction ‘retire[s] to bowers in lovely and lonely gardens in order to reflect on the tumultuous events that shape their careers’.⁴⁰ Macey Jr explains that ‘The secluded garden seat provides these heroines with a place in which to express feelings, either alone or to a privileged confidant, that would invite censure were the heroines to acknowledge them in public.’⁴¹ However, this tranquillity is often punctured by males who ‘gaze’ on these heroines as objects of their desire. This configuration of the ‘garden scene’ is often used by Haywood; for example, in *Love in Excess* when D’Elmont spies a thoughtful Melliora in the garden from a window following a quarrel with Alovisa; in *The Injur’d Husband* when a repentant Beauclair watches a sorrowful Montamour in the garden of a convent, having disguised himself in order to gain entry to the place where his loved one resides; and in both *The Secret History of the Court of Caramania* and *Lasselia* when the male lovers, Theodore and de l’Amye respectively, spy the objects of their affection, Hyanthe

³⁶ Cohn, p. 116.

³⁷ Cohn, p. 135.

³⁸ Cohn, p. 135.

³⁹ Cohn, p. 113.

⁴⁰ J. David Macey, Jr, “‘Where the World May Ne’er Invade?’ Green Retreats and Garden Theatre in *La Princesse de Clèves*, *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless*, and *Cecilia*’, *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 12 (1999), 75-100 (pp. 75-76).

⁴¹ Macey, p. 76.

and Lasselia, and then declare their loves for the first time. In *Dalinda* the garden scene occurs when Malvolio finally resolves to visit his first wife in order to rekindle her affection. She retires to the garden when she notes his arrival, not wanting to be near him, but he follows her. The narrator describes the scene, firstly, through external focalization, and then through Malvolio's perspective, writing:

She was laying on the grassy Turf on the Margin of this Canal, leaning her Head upon her Arm on the Foot of a Tree, when the fatal Undoer of her Peace approached. -- Buried in Thought she saw him not, and tho' the Impatience of discoursing with her would have made him immediately interrupt her Meditations; yet she appeared so lovely, so enchanting in that Posture, that he could not forbear stopping a few Paces short, to gaze upon her. (p. 129)

Haywood's inclusion of this kind of scene indicates that she is mixing elements of her earlier fiction within her latter work, and therefore highlights that the text represents an enigmatic quantity when it comes to generic classification.

Dalinda, like her predecessors, is eventually, after much dialogue between her and Malvolio, swayed by her lover's entreaties and confirmations of his love and agrees to reunite with him as long as he breaks with Flavilla. However, she soon questions her behaviour in a manner that sets her apart from previous heroines. When she has time to ruminate on her decision, she declares in disbelief: 'I must then consider myself [...] as the Wife of Malvolio -- nay more, must forget I ever had Cause to look on him as my Undoer -- must love him as much as before his Perfidy -- how is this possible?' (p. 141). At Malvolio's request for a meeting in her chamber at night, an event that she often condescended to during their earlier courtship, she refuses him entry and halts a repetition of previous scenes. The narrator signposts this move by Dalinda with lexical repetition in order to emphasize her growth and altering status, writing:

That Excess of Love she had been inspired with in her extreme Youth for him, being now in some measure re-kindled in her, made her tremble at the thoughts of having displeased him; yet conscious of having behaved as a Woman in her Circumstances ought to do, she waited his Approach with less Anxiety than she had formerly done, after committing any thing he deemed as an Offence. (pp. 146-47)

When Dalinda becomes completely aware of Malvolio's perfidy, she is rendered speechless. This silence does not compare to her earlier muteness as caused by Malvolio, though, as that was motivated by awe and this is driven by anger. At his proposal that Dalinda live as his mistress, the narrator informs us that

It was wholly owing to the Shock this infamous Proposal gave Dalinda, that she suffered him to go on so far without interrupting him -- at last she attempted to speak, but the swelling Passion was too big for Words -- she could only vent it on herself, which she did in tearing off her Head-Dress and Hair with it, which came off by

Handfuls, and in this Action fell into a Fit -- he threw Water on her Face, cut the Lacings of her Stays, and bent her forward, which soon brought her to herself -- on perceiving his Arm about her -- *Stand off – Serpent – Monster – Devil!* -- cried she, pushing him from her, *touch me not -- unless to kill me! But that,* continued she, weeping, *would be an Act of Charity thou art not capable of.* (p. 73; emphasis original)

From this moment on, Dalinda tries to speak as little as possible to Malvolio and the majority of their communication is carried out through epistolary exchange. Whicher suggests that the presence of these letters within *Dalinda* represents an ‘almost indubitable mark[...] of her [Haywood’s] handiwork’.⁴² Whilst he is correct in highlighting Haywood’s use of letters in her fiction throughout her career, the employment of them in *Dalinda* can partly be attributed to Haywood’s desire to remain faithful to the ‘truth’ of the story. In his *Narrative of the Affair*, Cresswell discusses the amount of epistolary contact he held with Scrope and her family following the breakdown of their relationship,⁴³ whilst, at the beginning of her response, Scrope states that she has the power to damage Cresswell’s account through ‘his own letters’.⁴⁴

Until the point that Dalinda cuts off communication with Malvolio, he is her main interlocutor and confidant. She converses little with her grandmother, who is against a match between herself and Malvolio, and has no female confidante to talk to. Similarly, Malvolio speaks to no one about his relationship with Dalinda. The actions, focalization, and speech of the protagonists dominate the text-level, whilst the other characters that are important in respect of the story-level of the narrative, such as Dalinda and Malvolio’s grandmother and Flavilla, are relatively unexplored. The grandmother plays a key role at the start of the narrative as it is revealed through her character focalization that she has noted the attraction between Dalinda and Malvolio. We hear that ‘she apprehended that so violent a Flame in so young a Creature, could not be kindled without some Efforts from the Object, and doubted not but Malvolio had secretly made his Addresses to her as a Lover’ (p. 13). As a consequence of her suspicions, this lady goes to her grandson and warns him to stay away from Dalinda. After this dialogue with Malvolio, though, she appears little in the text. Similarly, Flavilla’s character focalization appears at an important point in the course of the narrative. When readers learn of the state of her and Malvolio’s marriage, they finally get an insight into this lady’s emotions and it is revealed that ‘she found nothing in him [her husband], which made her think she should ever love him with that Tenderness might be

⁴² Whicher, p. 91.

⁴³ Cresswell, p. 55.

⁴⁴ Scrope, p. 2.

expected from her after she should become a wife' (p. 119). We also discover that she suspected an affair between her husband-to-be and his cousin, but that she was ignored by her mother when she informed her of her worries. Her dismissal at the story-level is reflected at the text-level as Flavilla plays no further role in the course of the text until Malvolio's affair is finally revealed. Out of all of the supporting characters, it is Leander that appears most in the text as his words and thoughts are often reported and his point of view is assumed. For example, readers witness his confusion at Dalinda's refusal of his love through, first, his character focalization and then his psychonarration, as we hear

His Passion, which had been strengthened and cherished by the most reasonable Hope, felt the Mortification of this Disappointment more severely. -- He reflected on all had past in the long Acquaintance they had together, and could find nothing that should make him think, there could be any Motive for rejecting as a *Lover*, a Person she had so much valued as a *Friend*, unless it were a prepossession in favour of some other. (pp. 100-1; emphasis original)

It is he whom Dalinda finally confides in regarding her relationship with Malvolio and so he plays a key role in the deceiver's comeuppance; therefore, his importance in the story is reflected in the importance he assumes at the text-level. Haywood could also incorporate this character more into the narrative in comparison to the other subsidiary figures, because of the importance that Lancelot Lee, Leander's real-life counterpart, played in the affair of Scrope and Cresswell, with his letter sparking the publication of Cresswell's account of events.

Haywood takes the lives of these real-life figures and presents them to her readers so as to entertain and to inform. Whilst the text looks back at and mirrors the style of some of her earlier novellas, it also looks forward and adapts previously used narrative techniques, such as thought representation, in new ways so as to create a more character-driven narrative that ends with a moral. The text concludes with many issues still unresolved between Malvolio and Dalinda, and the narrator declares that 'we must leave all these unhappy Persons, sincerely wishing their Example may be a Lesson to others, to avoid Errors, which, though, they may seem small in the Beginning, frequently terminate in Vices, to the Destruction of those who have neglected to check them in their Bud' (p. 288). However, despite the moral framing of Dalinda and Malvolio's story, which is further evident from the conduct book-like narratorial address that starts the text, *Dalinda* does not fit neatly into a 'moral' category. With its scandalous subject matter and continuous structure (aided by the absence of chapter divisions) and yet also its moral framing, it defies critics who try to pigeon-hole it into a distinct 'Haywood category'. Perhaps the Haywood text that is most easily defined as a 'moral' work is *The Fortunate Foundlings*, which is to be discussed next.

However, as narratological analysis of this text also demonstrates, Haywood still continues to utilise and adapt narrative techniques that she used throughout her career. This indicates that her oeuvre is marked much more by continuity than by radical change.

The Fortunate Foundlings

Published five years earlier than *Dalinda*, *The Fortunate Foundlings* (1744) also presents itself as a ‘Genuine History’ depicting the lives of ‘Colonel M – RS, and his Sister, Madam DU P – Y, the Issue of the Hon. CH – ES M – RS, Son of the late Duke of R – L – D’.⁴⁵

Whilst the characters referred to in the title can be identified with historical figures, Spedding questions whether Haywood’s account of the lives of these characters actually corresponds to the real lives of the figures they represent. He notes that the dates mentioned by Haywood make it very unlikely that she refers to the Second Duke of Rutland for ‘there is no record of a son by the name of Charles born to the First Duke of Rutland and any of his three wives’.⁴⁶ He concludes his discussion of character representation in the text by stating that ‘Whether there are any similarities between the First Duke of Rutland and Haywood’s character remains to be discovered’.⁴⁷ Therefore, the claim to historicity in *Dalinda* can be seen to be stronger than that in *The Fortunate Foundlings*. However, the claim to present moral and didactic figures with ‘the Motive [...] being only to encourage Virtue in both Sexes, by showing the Amiableness of it in real Characters’ (preface) is more convincing in respect of the earlier text. Here, it is asserted that *The Fortunate Foundlings* represents one of Haywood’s most overtly moral texts, as the male and female protagonists appear as unshakeable paragons of virtue. Unlike Betsy Thoughtless or Jenny and Jemmy Jessamy, Horatio and Louisa (the foundlings of the title) never sway from their virtuous paths, and also, unlike in the stories of the aforementioned characters, their portrayal as wholly ‘pure’ characters is not undercut by a comically interfering narrator, but is rather highlighted by their focalization and thought representation.

The story follows the lives of the foundlings, Louisa and Horatio, after they leave the care of their guardian, Dorilaus. Whilst Horatio’s departure is caused by his love of battle and entry into the army, Louisa’s occurs when her guardian proposes marriage to her. Louisa befriends a flirtatious lady called Melanthe with whom she travels. She is accosted by several bad men, but eventually falls in love with the virtuous Du Plessis. Their union is thwarted by

⁴⁵ *The Fortunate Foundlings* (London: for T. Gardner, 1744), title page. All subsequent references to the text will be placed in parenthesis following the quotation.

⁴⁶ *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood*, p. 415.

⁴⁷ Spedding, p. 415.

imprisonment and Louisa's entry into a convent, where she is tricked by perfidious nuns, but, at last, by the end of the narrative they marry. Meanwhile, Horatio gallantly fights in several battles and falls in love with a beautiful lady named Charlotta. Their union is impeded by her father who wants a more equal match for his daughter. In order to gain Charlotta's father's approval and therefore Charlotta's hand, Horatio goes off to seek improvement to better his prospects under the army of the Prince of Sweden. He is captured and imprisoned for several years, but on his release returns to France and marries Charlotta. Their match is now suitable because by this point Dorilaus has discovered and revealed his parentage of the twins that he rescued at birth. Spedding writes that *The Fortunate Foundlings*

was one of Haywood's most successful works. It was published three times in London and once in Dublin. It was also translated into French by Claude-Prosper Crébillon under the title *Les Heureux Orphelins* in 1754 and was translated back into English under the title *The Happy Orphans* in 1758.⁴⁸

However, he also notes that it has 'met with mixed criticism'.⁴⁹ Its status within Haywood's oeuvre is viewed in various ways by different critics. For example, Richetti categorises it in a way which assimilates it, pejoratively, with Haywood's earlier novellas. He writes that 'The difference between all the hectic activity [in *The Fortunate Foundlings*] and Haywood's 1719 bestseller, *Love in Excess*, lies precisely in the lip service paid to historical particularity, with Haywood's parade of real places, glamorous and famous persons, and actual events.'⁵⁰ He goes on to assert that

Alert and opportunistic, ready to exploit emotional moments for absolutely all they're worth, Haywood the narrative presence subordinates herself as of old to the projected needs of clearly implicit readers who want to be swept away by crisis after crisis, and her persona is simply an efficient means of delivering her romantic fable. *The Fortunate Foundlings* is a new and improved formula fiction, but Haywood's writing has, most of the time, the rhetorical transparency and efficiency of her earlier work as it delivers the thrills she assumes her readers want.⁵¹

Whilst Richetti denies any advance in technique in this Haywood text, Carnell sees it as an important indicator of her growing political engagement and quest for narrative realism. She states that, 'In *The Fortunate Foundlings*, Haywood conveys her increasingly pointed political views not only through increasingly subtle character development but through

⁴⁸ Spedding, p. 415.

⁴⁹ Spedding, p. 416.

⁵⁰ 'Histories by Eliza Haywood and Henry Fielding: Imitation and Adaptation', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 240-58 (p. 244).

⁵¹ 'Histories of Eliza Haywood and Henry Fielding', p. 245.

careful narrative circumlocution and political irony legible to those attentive to it.⁵² I follow Carnell's stance regarding the text and identify 'character development' within the narrative through the use of increased thought representation. Louisa and Horatio are constantly portrayed as thinking, in 'meditations' (p. 64), or in 'agitations of [...] [the] mind' (p. 36). However, whilst the protagonists of the narrative are often depicted as considering the best way to act, the lexical choices used in the narrative are simultaneously emphasising that they are actually being driven by 'fate'. The course of the narrative is described as a series of 'accidents' with the word appearing thirty-three times throughout the text. These 'accidents' are linked to a sense of fatalism within the story, with the word 'fate' being used eight times, whilst there are also references to 'providence' (p. 195, p. 261, p. 342), 'predestination' (p. 258), and 'futurity' (p. 297). The evocation of fatalism can be linked to the fact that the story follows 'foundlings' who discover the identity of their parents. Regarding this character type, Laura Schattschneider writes that

Like everybody else, foundlings possess generic attributes capable of inspiring sympathy, as well as the particular marks of bloodline, capable of inspiring intrigue. In the case of foundlings, however, these particular marks of bloodline are often unreadable, because a key to their significance is not provided by a parental story. Foundlings might thus be described as 'Hieroglyphics' [...] that is, encoded messages requiring a deciphering reader.⁵³

Louisa and Horatio are depicted as 'encoded messages', who inspire 'intrigue' because of the 'accidents' that surround their life, and whose true identities are revealed by the close of the narrative because their paths have been driven by 'fate'. The discovery of their parentage is made even more fascinating and surprising because of the secretive society that they live in (the word 'secret' and derivatives of it appear fifty-three times throughout the text), which hinders their unearthing of key facts and also creates further obstacles for the relationships that they are trying to form.

The first 'accident' (p. 2) of the narrative is Dorilaus' discovery of the infant Louisa and Horatio in a basket in his garden. Attached to this basket is a letter from the unidentified mother, in which the fatalism that characterises the progress of the novel is first alluded to, as the woman declares that 'Irresistible destiny abandons these helpless infants to your care' (p. 3). Dorilaus accepts the responsibility that has been bestowed on him and takes in the

⁵² *Partisan Politics, Narrative Realism, and the Rise of the British Novel* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 149.

⁵³ 'The Infant's Petition: An English Poetics of Foundling Reception, 1741-1837', *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, 33 (2004), 71-99 (p. 82).

foundlings. The early years of their lives are passed over by the narrator, who explicitly acknowledges the ellipsis employed, stating that

Nothing material happening during their infancy, I shall pass over those years in silence, only saying that as often as Dorilaus went down to his estate (which was generally two or three times a year) he always sent for them, and expressed a very great satisfaction in finding in their looks the change he had given concerning them so well executed. (p. 5)

When the text picks up the story thread during the teen years of the twins, the good nature of Dorilaus is stressed by the narrator, who exclaims: ‘What more could have been expected from the best of fathers! what more could children born to the highest fortunes, have enjoyed!’ (p. 6). However, these commendations are followed by a proleptic narratorial comment that points to the changing ‘fate’ of the foundlings. Discussing Dorilaus’ plans for his charges, the narrator states that ‘What he intended for them, however, is uncertain, he never declared his sentiments so far concerning them; and the strange revolutions happening afterwards in both their fortunes, preventing him from acting as it is possible he might design’ (p. 6). This declaration makes readers realise that the happy state that the children and their guardian currently live in is not going to last.

It is Horatio’s decision to join the army, which we are told he had ‘so strong a propensity [to] as something supernatural’ (p. 9), that precipitates the following ‘accidents’ that occur in the novel, as it is because of his departure that Dorilaus keeps Louisa close to him and subsequently falls in love with her. These new and unwanted emotions in Dorilaus cause him much mental anguish and make ‘the situation of his mind [...] very perplexing’ (p. 12). This disorder is narratologically highlighted through the use of different degrees of focalization and thought representation. At first, his situation is considered by the narrator through external focalization. Readers are told that:

The tender passion stole into his soul by imperceptible degrees, and under the shape of friendship and paternal affection, met with no opposition from his reason, till it became too violent to be restrained; then shewed itself in the whole power of restless wishes, fears, hopes, and impatiences, which he had often heard others complain of, but not till now experienced within himself. (p. 11)

We are then provided with primary evidence, in the form of Dorilaus’ character focalization, so that we can assess his state of mind. We learn that

all that he before had felt of love was languid, at best aimed only at enjoyment, and in the gratification of that desire was extinguished; but the passion he was possessed of for Louisa was of a different nature, and accompanied with a respect which would not suffer him to entertain a thought in prejudice of her innocence. (p. 11)

Dorilaus resolves to remove Louisa from his presence in an attempt to smother the passion that he is feeling for her. However, this only increases his love for her, and the narrator informs us that ‘Louisa was no sooner gone, than he wished her with him again, and was a thousand times about to send and have her brought back; but was as often prevented by the apprehensions of her discovering the motive’ (p. 14). His increasing passion throws his mind into further perturbations and the growing wildness of his thoughts is evident through the use of narrated monologue: ‘He had banished the object of his affections from his presence; he had painted all the inconveniences of pursuing his desires in the worst colours they would bear; yet all was insufficient!’ (p. 14). The exclamatives that deliver the words of the character, but in the tense and person of the narrator, and that are not modified by reporting clauses, are effective in portraying the unbounded nature of Dorilaus’ emotion. Haywood builds the narrative tension to mirror the tension within the character by gradually drawing readers in to the disturbance of Dorilaus’ mind. From external focalization to character focalization to free indirect thought representation, they are allowed to inch closer and closer into the consciousness of the protagonist.

Whilst Dorilaus is being tormented by his emotions for Louisa, she is unaware of the impending shock that is approaching her and is described with a hint of prolepsis as being in ‘happy ignorance’ (p. 15). However, she is not left in this state for long as Dorilaus finally declares his intentions to marry her. The announcement casts Louisa into the kind of mental confusion that readers have just witnessed in her guardian. At first, the narrator declares that ‘The confusion in which this speech involved her is even impossible to be conceived, much less can any words come up to its description: she blushed; -- she trembled; -- she was ready to die between surprize, grief and shame’ (p. 19). But then she finds her voice and her perplexed speech is directly presented: ‘Oh! sir, cried she, how is it possible for me to make any answer to so strange a proposition! (p. 19). When left to contemplate on the events of the day ‘the very thoughts of [...] [Dorilaus] regarding her with that sort of passion she now found he did, had somewhat in them terribly alarming’ (p. 20). Dorilaus is unaware of Louisa’s disgust at his proposal, though, as he thinks that she will warm to the idea. In a reversal of roles, it is now he that is proleptically described as being in a ‘sweet delusion’ (p. 21). Focalization is utilised to demonstrate the diametrically opposed views of Louisa and Dorilaus regarding his proposal, with the narrator presenting the character focalization of the female protagonist directly followed by that of her admirer. Whilst Louisa is worrying that ‘in refusing [Dorilaus] she [would] run the risque of being cast off, and abandoned to beggary and ruin; and what was still more hateful to her, being hated by that person who, next to her

brother, she loved above the world, tho' in a different way from that which could alone content him' (p. 21), Dorilaus is deluding himself by thinking 'of nothing but the happiness he should enjoy in the possession of the amiable Louisa' (p. 21). Even after Dorilaus becomes aware of Louisa's aversion to his offer of marriage, he still pursues his aim and kisses her. Again the gulf between the emotions of the two parties is demonstrated through the alternating presentation of their different narrative points of view. We are told that

she suffered him however to embrace her several times, and hold one of her hands close pressed between his [Louisa's character focalization], while he endeavoured to influence her mind by all the tender arguments his passion, backed with an infinity of wit, inspired [Horatio's character focalization]; to all which she made as few replies as possible [external focalization]; but he contented himself, as love is always flattering [narrator comment], with imagining she was less refractory to his suit than when he first declared it. (p. 23)

The kaleidoscopic focalization allows the reader to view the scene from all angles, whilst the insertion of a narratorial comment further highlights the delusion that Dorilaus is under. This self-deception damages Dorilaus at the story-level of the narrative as Louisa eventually runs away from him when his passion becomes ungovernable. It also removes him from the text-level, as at Louisa's departure he is paralytically removed from the narrative until he sends a letter to Horatio urging him to quit his military work and meet him in France. He blames his silence up until this point on 'Accidents, which at our parting neither of us could foresee' (p. 241). This sets up his climactic return in which he reveals his true parentage of the twins.

Louisa's horror at leaving her guardian and the thought processes that she goes through in making the decision are articulated through her narrated monologue, which we are presented with in this manner:

where to go indeed she knew not; -- she had no friend, or even acquaintance, to whom she might repair, or hope to be received. -- How should she support herself then? -- which way procure even the most necessities of life? -- This was a dreadful prospect! yet appeared less so than that she would avoid: even starving lost its horrors when compared either to being compelled to wed a man whom she could not affect as a husband, or, by refusing him, run the risque of forfeiting her honour. (pp. 26-27)

Her wish to retain her 'honour' over all other things emphasizes her virtue and this is a quality that is highlighted throughout the novel through representation of Louisa's focalization, discourse, and consciousness. It is also emphasised as Louisa is often surrounded by degenerate examples of female characters, such as Mrs. C – ge and Melanthe. The history of the latter character is depicted in an intercalated tale that is autodiegetically narrated. This kind of 'epistemic shift',⁵⁴ to use Nelles's terminology, is employed so as to

⁵⁴ *Frameworks: Narrative Levels and Embedded Narrative* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), p. 134.

encourage comparison to be made in respect of how the virtuous female protagonist acts differently from her friend. As Nelles points out, 'Epistemic embedding by means of a shift in narrator is characterised by emphasis on the process of communicating knowledge: who imparts what to whom'.⁵⁵ By having the more experienced Melanthe relate her story of a failed relationship to the innocent Louisa, Haywood is indicating how one wrong turn can set someone on the path from virtue to ruin. Melanthe tells of how she fell in love with Henricus and carried on an affair with him until she discovered his attachment to another woman, whom she describes as 'the daughter of a little mechanic' (p. 45). At the discovery of her lover's deceit, Melanthe reveals that she was more concerned about the loss of her pride rather than her love or reputation. She declares:

How severe a mortification was this to my pride, but had this good attending it, that it very much abated my love: -- to be abandoned for so mean a creature, and who had nothing but youth and a tolerable face to recommend her, shewed such a want of taste as well as gratitude, as rendered despicable in my eyes what had lately engrossed all my love and admiration. (p. 45)

This sets her apart from Louisa who puts little emphasis on pride and instead values 'those excellent morals, she had received from nature' (p. 31). The intercalated tale is 'not only metonymically but metaphorically related' to the main narrative thread of the female protagonist.⁵⁶ Melanthe is exactly what Louisa needs to avoid becoming. Indeed, she does successfully negotiate the various 'accidents' that happen to her and gains a happy and virtuous marriage, whilst Melanthe departs the story and text-level alone and discontented with her life.

Melanthe ends up in this state because she does not learn from her mistakes. At Vienna she starts a relationship with a man whom she acknowledges 'is not only like Henricus in his person [...] but appears to have the same inclinations also' (p. 151). De Bellfleur, the man that she develops a passion for, turns out to be just as perfidious as her original lover, as he courts her whilst also trying to start an amour with Louisa. Again, a mixture of kaleidoscopic focalization and indirect thought reveals to readers the difference in the emotions of these two characters regarding their relationship. When the characters attend a ball, the readers learn that

This night, however, lost Melanthe the heart she had thought herself so secure of; but little suspecting her misfortune, she treated the inconstant count with a tenderness he was far from deserving, and having transplanted all the affections she once had for Henricus on this new object, told him, at a time that such discovery was least

⁵⁵ Nelles, p. 134.

⁵⁶ Nelles, p. 143.

welcome to him, that she was not insensible of his merit, nor could be ungrateful to his passion, provided she could be convinced of the sincerity of it. He had gone too far with her now to be able to draw back, therefore could not avoid repeating the vows he before had made, tho' his heart was far from giving any assent to what his tongue was obliged to utter; but blinded by her own desires, she perceived not the change to his, and appointed him to come the next day to her lodgings, promising to be denied to all other company, that she might devote herself entirely to him. (p. 154)

As the point of view moves from an external position, to the indirect speech of Melanthe, then to her lover's perspective and to the focalization of the enraptured lady, readers are confronted with the deceit of Bellfleur and the stupidity of Melanthe. The juxtaposition of different types of focalization, with little narrative comment, means that readers are immediately drawn into the private emotions of the characters.

Focalization is a key tool throughout the narrative, as the story is set in a world that is based on secrets. Whilst characters hide things from each other, readers are made privy to all of the details of characters' opinions and emotions through narrative point of view. The majority of the relationships featured in the text are concealed from the wider world -- Melanthe hides her affair with Bellfleur from Louisa as she knows that she will not approve, whilst Louisa, in line with her virtuous nature, does not reveal her emotions for Du Plessis to anyone. The secret of Horatio's amour with Charlotta is maintained for a long time, but is eventually uncovered by Monsieur de Coigny, a man who himself holds pretensions for Charlotta. Ironically, the couple are caught out in the Tuilleries by de Coigny, which is a place that they consider to be safe for their meetings, because 'it might be judged they met by accident, and [this would] not give any grounds of suspicion, which hitherto they had been so fortunate as to avoid' (p. 117). After the affair is exposed, readers learn of the different emotions occurring in the three characters involved thanks to presentation, in turn, of their character focalization. First, we hear that Horatio 'was tempted by his first emotions to seek de Coigny, and call him to account for the affront he had put upon him, and either lose his own life, or oblige the other to secrecy' (p. 118). Then Charlotta's distress is made clear as we are told that 'she now blamed her own inadvertency in holding any discourses with Horatio, of a nature not proper to be over-heard, in a place so public as the Tuilleries, where others, as well as he, might have possibly been witnesses of what was said' (p. 119). Finally, the annoyance of de Coigny is made clear as we find out that he 'suffered little less from the turbulence of his nature, and the mortification it gave his vanity, to find a person, whom he looked upon as every way his inferior, preferred to him' (p. 119). Whilst Charlotta's and Horatio's focalization highlights their honour and good nature, de Coigny's selfish and

perfidious character is made evident through his point of view. There is no need for narratorial metacommentary, as the focalization utilised reveals everything necessary.

Like Louisa, Horatio is held up as a virtuous example. Both are exemplary in the way that they conduct themselves in their relationships with their lovers, and Horatio is also held up as a hero in battle; although some of his success is attributed to ‘remarkable accidents’ (p. 53) that occur when he is in action. The actions of these protagonists dominate the narrative and they are given an equal amount of text space, but they only occupy the same temporal space and scene at the beginning of the narrative before their departures from Dorilaus’ care, and then again at the end when they both discover their true parentage and marry their chosen partners. However, readers are provided with textual references that are meant to encourage them to remember the connection between the two characters. For example, both protagonists can be seen to choose partners that hold similar morals to themselves. When Du Plessis leaves Louisa to fight for his country, she tells him:

If you love me [...] you will endeavour to preserve yourself: -- I have now put myself under your protection, by consenting to do as you would have me, and have no other from whom I would receive those favours I expect from you: -- think not, therefore, that I will perform my promise, unless you give me yours, not to be so covetous of fame as to court dangers, nor, in too eager a pursuit of glory, to lose the remembrance of what you owe to love. (p. 217)

Her sentiments echo those of Charlotta when Horatio departs to work in the army of the Prince of Sweden. We learn through her focalization and then speech representation that

she had now no other disquiet than what arose from her fears for his safety, which she over and over repeated, conjuring him, in the most tender terms, not to hazard himself beyond what the duties of his post obliged him to: -- this, said she, shall be the test of my affection to you; for whenever I hear you run yourself into unnecessary dangers, I will conclude from that moment you have ceased to remember, or pay any regard to my injunctions or repose. (p. 144)

These kinds of textual reminders highlight that the fates of these characters are intrinsically linked. At the end of the text, when the siblings are reunited, the narrator declares that

By these examples we may learn, that to sustain with fortitude and patience whatever ills we are preordained to suffer, entitles us to relief, while by impatient struggling we should but augment the score, and provoke fate to shew us the vanity of all attempts to frustrate its decree. (p. 352)

Louisa and Horatio are rewarded for their virtue and the narrator is reminding us of this point.

Overall, the narratorial figure in *The Fortunate Foundlings* does not interrupt the narrative flow to a great extent, unlike in *The History of Jemmy and Jessamy*, which is the subject of the final case study of the thesis. In this text, the narrator is often evident through metanarrative commentary and is comparable to that used in Henry Fielding’s *Tom Jones*.

Whilst it may be tempting to compare Fielding's novel with *The Fortunate Foundlings*, because of the connection of the foundling protagonists, Haywood's final novel actually demonstrates the similarities between Haywood's and Fielding's narrative techniques in a more convincing manner.

The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy

The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy (1753) has received less attention than its predecessor *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless* (1751) and the criticism that it has evoked mainly focuses on its moralistic nature. However, in this novel, Haywood was further adapting not just her themes but her narrative methods, and particularly striking is her developing use of, to employ Wayne Booth's terminology, the 'dramatized observer-narrator'.⁵⁷ As previously discussed, Haywood often employs extra-heterodiegetic narrators, who sit outside the world of the text, but who also deliver comments and digressions in the first person. These narratorial figures have no influence over the action at the diegetic level, but they have varying degrees of power regarding the telling of the narrative. The narrator of *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy* occupies one of the most active positions seen in a Haywood text. This is similar to that of Henry Fielding's narrator in *Tom Jones* (1749), who is described in *The Nature of Narrative* in the following manner:

he sometimes adopts the role of *history* (there are things he cannot find out), of bard (he can reveal unspoken thoughts when he wants to), and of maker (he admits he is making things up and brings his artistic problems before the reader -- as when he wonders how he can rescue Tom Jones from jail and still not violate his modern standards of probability).⁵⁸

Haywood's narrator frequently addresses and advises the readers, but, significantly, does not always speak to a collective audience; instead this narrator's interpellations are often specifically gendered. The representation of this figure suggests that Haywood deliberately obscures the gender and narrative position of her narrator, because she wants to explore the issues faced by both men and women, and, consequently, she wants her narrator to appear gender-neutral. Her narratological choices further highlight this aim, as the thoughts and actions of both the male and female protagonist are explored, through direct-thought representation and anachronies. By drawing comparisons between the techniques utilised by Haywood and Fielding, it can again be demonstrated how Haywood was adapting and

⁵⁷ Wayne Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 2nd edn (London: Penguin, 1983), p. 153.

⁵⁸ Robert Scholes, James Phelan, and Robert Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative: Fortieth Anniversary Edition* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 268.

adopting the narrative features seen in other literature of the period in order to address the demands of a changing literary marketplace in a formal as well as a thematic manner.

The story follows the lives of the protagonists Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy, who have been betrothed to each other since their youth, and who share the same surname because they both ‘descend from two male branches of the same family’.⁵⁹ Both are perfectly content with this match, but, when it comes to the time of marrying, they delay their union in order to gain knowledge of the state of matrimony by observing the relationships of others. This delay causes many problems, though, as Jemmy’s friend Celandine, who wants the wealthy Jenny for himself, tries to split the couple up by making it seem as if Jemmy is being unfaithful. Celandine’s plans have some effect mostly because Jemmy and Jenny spend most of the novel apart -- Jenny having taken a trip with friends to Bath and Jemmy being delayed in joining her. After much confusion and upset, Celandine’s plots are discovered and Jemmy revenges himself on his supposed friend in a fight. Celandine survives, but because his survival is at first in doubt, Jemmy has to leave Jenny once again in order to flee the law. Eventually, the couple reunite and marry at the novel’s conclusion.

There are many subplots in the novel concerning Jemmy’s actual infidelity and the lives and loves of Jenny’s friends Lady Speck and Miss Wingman, and also six intercalated narratives. Like many of Haywood’s later texts, this novel is split into chapters, but the titles that are allocated to each one have more than a purely functional aim. Regarding *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless*, Ingrassia states that ‘At the beginning of each chapter, [...] [the narrator] offers a preview of the contents with a subheading that provides a narrative guidepost’, and the same is true in *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy*.⁶⁰ In these subheadings, the narrator often directly addresses the implied readers. For example, the chapter synopsis of Chapter XXII of Volume 1 states that what follows in the narrative ‘Affords some very useful and exemplary hints to young persons of both sexes; which if they are not the better and wiser for, it is wholly owing to themselves, and not the fault of the author’ (p. 107). This comically didactic assertion implies that the readers, if they properly engage with the text, should gain instructional value from its contents, and if they do not then they are at fault.

⁵⁹ Eliza Haywood, *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy*, ed. by John Richetti (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2005), p. 8. All subsequent references to the novel are given in parenthesis following the quotation.

⁶⁰ Catherine Ingrassia, *Authorship, Commerce, and Gender in Early Eighteenth-Century England: A Culture of Paper Credit* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 128.

Haywood's narrators, as Bacscheider recognizes, often 'explain how to read and admonish readers about textual emphases.'⁶¹ The narrator of *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy* takes this guidance to a new level, though, and becomes a quasi-editor of the history which is being presented. When introducing Chapter X of Volume II, the narrator tells us that it 'Is a digression of no consequence to the history, and may therefore either be read or omitted at discretion' (p. 179). A choice is given to readers in this instance, but, frequently, they are not given this choice, as parts of the text have been elided. These omissions often take the form of conversations between characters which are deemed 'too tedious to repeat' (p. 44), 'too trifling to be inserted' (p. 74), or as unnecessary, because they are not didactically significant. These ellipses, as well as the didactic chapter synopses, add a comic tone to the novel, which has been little noted by critics previously. This is often the case with the humorous elements of Haywood's works. The employment of humour adds a subversive undertone to the moralistic nature of the narrative. Haywood may be conforming to a change in the reading market by presenting a didactic text, but, at the same time, as Ingrassia notes, she 'offers a critique of the novel's increasing didacticism, [...] [and] also the ideology implicit in that genre.'⁶² Regarding *Tom Jones*, Bacscheider writes: 'Fielding self-consciously aligns his text with some genres, parodies some, embeds some, calls attention to others, and yet claims to be creating a new genre.'⁶³ Similarly, Haywood can be seen to be mixing genres to make a point about her text: she is mocking the authoritarian nature of didactic novels by presenting a parodic representation of a dominating, over-bearing narrator.

The narrator of *Tom Jones* states that ellipsis is a necessary tool in relating a 'History' as it omits unnecessary information. He tells his readers that 'if whole Years should pass without producing any Thing worthy his Notice, we shall not be afraid of a Chasm in our History; but shall hasten on to Matters of Consequence, and leave such Periods of Time totally unobserved'.⁶⁴ The employment of ellipsis is particularly humorous in this novel and similarly in Haywood's, because of the fact that these narrators insert several digressions, some of which are personal musings that do little to aid the telling of the narrative. The narrator's additions, particularly the frequent proleptic insertions, often have an anti-climactic

⁶¹ Bacscheider, 'The Story of Eliza Haywood's Novels: Caveats and Questions', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 14-47 (p. 29).

⁶² Ingrassia, p. 128.

⁶³ 'Literary Culture as Immediate Reality', in *A Companion to the Eighteenth-Century English Novel and Culture*, ed. by Paula R. Bacscheider and Catherine Ingrassia (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), pp. 504-38 (p. 505).

⁶⁴ Henry Fielding, *The History of Tom Jones, A Foundling*, ed. by Thomas Keymer and Alice Wakeley (London: Penguin, 2005), p. 74. All subsequent references to the text will be given in parenthesis following the quotation.

effect. These prolepses deflate potentially powerful moments by prematurely revealing information about the course of the action.

The kind of prolepsis used by Haywood, called an ‘annonce or “advance notice” [...] require[s] the construction of a minimal and usually incomplete mental representation which the reader must hold in memory and be prepared to recall at a later point in the reading process’.⁶⁵ In utilising prolepses, the narrator of *Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy* is highlighting the fact that the story being told is a ‘history’, and therefore the resolutions to the narrative are already known. As Tessa Bridgeman notes, ‘The emphatic textual anachrony of the annonce, constituted by its departure from the prevailing reference time frame [...] serves as a foregrounding device, flagging it as an invitation to speculate’.⁶⁶ Haywood exploits this function of the prolepsis so as to highlight that the narrator knows which parts of the novel are particularly important and didactically relevant to the readers -- we are to trust in what is being presented to us for the sake of our education. In general, Jenny, the female protagonist of the text, delivers moral treatises to the readers, but, occasionally, the narrator inserts his/her own didactic assertions. For example, regarding the emotion of jealousy, the narrator states that

doubts, suspicions, and jealousies, though arising from a tender cause, frequently hurry the person possess’d of them into such furious marks of resentment, as, if the lover has the least inclination to break off, gives him a fair pretence of doing so. (p. 85)

This narrator feels compelled to speak, and employs the personal pronouns ‘I’ and ‘me’ twenty times throughout the text. These ‘observations’ are justified, because, according to the narrator, ‘reason and a long experience has enabled me to make [them]’ (p. 155). The opinions of this figure are evident, even when they are not explicitly signposted, because of the use of revealing pre-modifiers. For example, Rodophil’s lover is pejoratively described as utilising a ‘hoydenish tone’ (p. 13), and Abigail, the Marloves’ maid, is branded ‘that malapert huzzy’ (p. 37), whilst Mrs. M’s extended tale is dismissed as a ‘tedious narrative’ (p. 127). Again, the narrator’s omnipresence adds to the humour of the novel and highlights the critical undertone that is at work.

The extra-heterodiegetic narrator is not the only narrator present in the text, though. As Richetti records, ‘the novel takes in as well the important interpolated stories of various

⁶⁵ Tessa Bridgeman, ‘Thinking Ahead: A Cognitive Approach to Prolepsis’, *Narrative*, 13 (2005), 125-59 (p. 125).

⁶⁶ Bridgeman, p. 131.

interesting and distressed female strangers who turn up in the narrative.’⁶⁷ He goes on to say that these

interpolated stories of female distress, some of them reminiscent of Haywood’s early amatory novellas of seduction and betrayal and of unhappy married life or patriarchal tyranny that forces young women into marriage, [...] [are] related as negative or destructive opposites to the situation of the two main characters.⁶⁸

These intercalated narratives, which are presented by autodiegetic narrators, provide educative examples for Jenny of how not to behave. She is sometimes very judgemental about these women’s tales, but she is not punished by the text’s narrator for this unfair behaviour; instead she is held up as a shining example for women. After the reader has heard Jenny’s opinions on her friend, Sophia, who has just delivered her story of female destruction by man, the reader is directly addressed by the narrator, who, inviting their agreement, praises Jenny’s reaction:

Happy would it be, both for themselves and others, if all those ladies who know themselves free from the weakness incident to some others of their sex were of Jenny’s way of thinking; but I shall say no more upon this head, -- the reader must have sufficiently observ’d, through all her actions, the sweetness and candour of her dispositions. (p. 338)

Like many of Haywood’s narrators, the extradiegetic narrator of *Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy* often directly addresses the readers of the text. Unusually, though, as already noted, the narrator of this novel does not always speak to a collective audience. Female readers, or ‘fair readers’, are often addressed in another act of implied consensus -- they are invited to sympathize with Jenny, who is the epitome of the ‘virtuous’ female. When Jenny learns that Jemmy’s arrival in Bath will be delayed, the narrator asserts that ‘this delay as my fair readers will easily believe, gave no small mortification both to her pride and love’ (p. 104). In comparison, addresses to the male readers of the text sometimes have an apologetic function. For example, after presenting a description of the character of Celandine, the narrator states that

The reader will perhaps imagine, that a character such as this, deserved not so particular a description; nor should I have troubled him with it had there not been an absolute necessity of my doing so, for reasons which will presently appear. (p. 113)

Earlier Haywood narratives have addressed ‘sensitive readers’ and occasionally specifically gendered readers; for example, at one point in *The Rash Resolve* the narrator addresses ‘female Perusers’ when talking about Emanuella’s feelings for her child.⁶⁹ However, the

⁶⁷ John Richetti, ‘Introduction’, in *History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy*, p. xxiv.

⁶⁸ Richetti, ‘Introduction’, p. xix.

⁶⁹ *The Rash Resolve: Or, The Untimely Discovery* (London: for D. Browne Junr. and S. Chapman, 1724), p. 95.

consistency with which the narrator of *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy* addresses different sets of readers demonstrates an awareness of the different expectations of the text's male and female readers.

Fielding's narrator in *Tom Jones* also speaks to both male and female readers at different points, but male readers are mostly called upon, and in acts of implied consensus as noted contributors, whereas female readers tend to be pedagogically addressed. For example, after relating an incident between Tom and his love, Sophia, the narrator reflects that this is 'A most unfortunate Accident, from which my fair readers will not fail to draw a very wholesome Lesson. And here I strictly forbid all Male Critics to intermeddle with a Circumstance, which I have recounted only for the sake of the Ladies' (p. 261). This affinity to male readers can be linked to the fact that the narrator identifies himself as male. He does this when propounding that 'Women are more inclined to communicate all Pieces of Intelligence to their own Sex, than to ours' (p. 87). Significantly, the gender of the narrator of *Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy* cannot be easily deduced, as he/she tries to show little affinity with either sex. When Jenny is held up as an example of female virtue, the narrator employs the third person possessive pronoun 'her' rather than the first person possessive pronoun 'my', in respect of the female gender, and, therefore, appears neutral, stating: 'Jenny was of a different complexion from the generality of her sex' (p. 85). Similarly, when discussing male behaviour, the narrator employs the general phrase 'The men' rather than any personal indicators, as in the assertion that 'The men are apt to be too partial to one another on this score' (p. 42). It is hypothesized that the gender of the narrator is not highlighted by Haywood, unlike in Fielding, because she wants her narrator to appear gender-neutral so that she can explore the issues faced by both men and women, whereas Fielding is most concerned with the life of his hero. This hypothesis can also be supported by examining other narratological choices which Haywood makes, regarding narrative consciousness and narrative temporality.

Within the course of the novel, Jemmy and Jenny rarely occupy the same scene or even the same temporal narrative space. However, a similar amount of text-space is devoted to each character. The reason for this is that Haywood employs metalepses. This temporal technique that distorts the diegetic levels occupied by the characters and the narrator is used by Haywood throughout her career. However, her earlier narratives tend to utilise more implicit scene changes that are signalled by temporal clauses or adverbials such as 'In the meantime'. The explicit metalepsis becomes more prominent as Haywood's style progresses. As Fludernik discusses, in narratives that are split into chapters 'the chapter beginning [is] a

salient point for temporal or locative shifts [whilst] in earlier narratives [...] internal narrative structure was handled by means of macroepisodic markers'.⁷⁰ In *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy*, several chapters are dedicated to one protagonist, then an explicit scene change is evoked by the narrator, and the actions of the other character are presented through extended analepses. For example, after readers have experienced Jenny's anguish over Jemmy's possible betrayal, and then witnessed her happiness because of her imminent reunion with her lover, they are presented with this narrative assertion:

But before we bring them together again, it is highly necessary that the reader should be made fully acquainted with the manner in which Jemmy had passed his time during this little separation, and also to clear up those parts of his conduct which have hitherto appeared mysterious. (p. 219)

As this quotation indicates, the narrator wants both of the main characters to have a fair hearing with the readers and so feels it necessary to delay the anticipated reunion, in order to present an external analepsis detailing Jemmy's actions, which up to this point are unexplained. However, as is recognised by the narrator, the long delay in hearing the reality regarding Jemmy's actions, and not simply the hearsay that Jenny has been faced with, does potentially damage Jemmy's character in the eyes of the reader, specifically the female reader. The narrator reflects:

I am very much afraid that poor Jemmy has lain for a great while under the displeasure of my fair readers, and that few among them will be quite so ready as Jenny has been to take his bare word for a sufficient proof of his honour, and the sincerity of his passion. (p. 219)

Haywood presents the actions of both the male and female protagonist in this novel because she wants to investigate the issues facing both sexes. However, Jemmy is not perfect; therefore, Haywood's presentation delays a full account of his actions in a way that possibly invites condemnation from readers.

Fielding also employs metalepses in *Tom Jones* when the principal characters do not share the same scene, and, as in *Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy*, sometimes their presence can be seen to disadvantage the male protagonist. For example, at the beginning of Chapter II of Book XI, after Tom's infidelity with Mrs. Waters, the reader is presented with an account of Sophia rather than Tom as the narrator wishes to 'leave the unworthy Lover a little longer to bemoan his Ill-luck, or rather his ill Conduct' (p. 502). Fielding's narrator also utilises these scene changes in order to keep the readers as informed as possible. Throughout the novel, the narrator implies that his actions are wholly influenced by his wish to please and

⁷⁰ 'The Diachronization of Narratology', *Narrative*, 11 (2003), 331-48 (p. 337).

accommodate the readers: ellipses are used to allow the Reader ‘an Opportunity of employing that wonderful Sagacity, of which he is Master, by filling up these vacant Spaces of Time with his own Conjectures’ (p. 107), whilst information is withheld from readers because it did not seem ‘proper to communicate it to the Reader’ (p. 205) in its chronological place.

Fielding’s and Haywood’s narrators hold many similarities but that of the former’s adopts even more control of the narrative that he is presenting. This is clear when we compare the use of focalization in the two texts, because external focalization is predominant in Fielding’s text but the opposite is true of Haywood’s in which character focalization is prevalent.

Whereas Haywood’s narrator allows her characters the chance to express themselves by portraying their own perspectives, Fielding’s characters are often under complete narratorial control.

Regarding speech representation in this novel, Richetti remarks that

the narrator of *Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy* gives a good deal of narrative space and expressive freedom over to the discourse of its characters, as the novel renders dialogue at some length and features much epistolary communication, the plot turning at several points on fabricated letters.⁷¹

It is not just dialogue that allows this expressive freedom, though -- Haywood’s employment of character focalization and indirect discourse is most revealing to the reader. This is evident if we look at what is said in the narrative regarding the relationship between Lady Speck and Celandine. The first volume of the novel ends with their connection being unexplained, and then the second volume opens with an analepsis that includes the wished-for explanation.

First, the reader is presented with the narrator’s external focalization: ‘Lady Speck had heard much of him before she saw him, but he was soon introduced to her acquaintance by a lady who frequently visited her, and had always spoke wonders in his praise’ (p. 137), and then Lady Speck’s character focalization, which also contains indirect representation of

Celandine’s speech:

It seem’d, notwithstanding, extremely strange to her, that amidst all the testimonies he endeavour’d to give her of his love, he never once mention’d marriage; but, on the contrary, would frequently in her presence ridicule the institution, -- say it was a clog upon inclinations, and only fit to link two people together who had no notion of the true joys of love, or of living politely in the world. (p. 138)

Through this kaleidoscopic structure, Lady Speck’s confusion and stupidity are demonstrated to the readers. It is important that we gain access to her perspective, because her relationship with Celandine is not something that she would discuss in conversation or refer to in a letter, as she employs no confidant(e) in this matter.

⁷¹ Richetti, ‘Introduction’, p. xx.

Celandine's rakish nature is also fully revealed through his indirect discourse. As highlighted throughout the course of this study, indirect speech makes the division between the narrator and the character indistinct -- the words are those of the character, but the tense, pronouns, and deixis are those of the narrator. Haywood presents Celandine's discourse indirectly, because it means that any artful techniques which the character may have used at the time of speaking are stripped away, and the reader is left, purely, with the character's real meaning, so that readers are more likely to condemn Celandine as a result of this presentation. The use of different levels of focalization and indirect discourse is important in this novel, because it is set in a society based on artificiality and direct discourse does not necessarily exhibit what people actually mean.

Despite the presence of indirect discourse, dialogue and epistolary communication do dominate the text with forty-five letters being sent between a large selection of characters. Similarly to the role they have in the works of Richardson, these letters are presented as important regarding the course of the narrative action. For example, Bellpine sends Jenny a letter pretending to be Jemmy's mistress; Mr Lovegrove challenges Celandine to a duel in an epistle; and Jemmy misdirects a letter meant for his mistress, Lady Hardy, to his betrothed, Jenny. However, unlike in Richardson's texts, these letters in Haywood's didactic novel do not have the power that they should. Bellpine's letter has little effect on Jenny, with her declaring that 'those on whom such little tricks have any effect must have a very small share of understanding' (p. 212); Lovegrove's letter leads to an anticlimactic contretemps between himself and Celandine, which even the magistrate finds pathetically humorous; and, despite initially suffering greatly from Jemmy's misdemeanours, which are revealed in his ill-directed epistle, Jenny forgives him. Haywood's use of ineffectual epistles represents more evidence to support my claim that the author is actually mocking the didactic genre that she is adopting in this novel.

As previously mentioned, Jenny is the key didactic figure in this text. Her discourse seems as if it is taken straight from a conduct manual. As Richetti notes, 'Jenny is a moralizing spectator and self-counsellor rather than a full participant in the fairly decadent social life around her.'⁷² She often conducts conversations with herself and drifts off into self-reflective reveries when in the company of others. Her self-counselling is most evident in her interior monologues, in which she considers such topics as marriage and correct female behaviour. Jenny's thoughts reveal little about her emotions, however. Her vulnerability is

⁷² Richetti, 'Introduction', p. xxxviii.

briefly depicted when we hear her thoughts after receiving Jemmy's misdirected letter (p. 160), but otherwise her introspections are simply full of moral maxims. Consequently, Jenny can seem a rather two-dimensional character -- Schofield describes her as a 'pasteboard figure'⁷³ -- but she is presented in this way for a reason. Haywood is using Jenny as a didactic tool, whilst the subsidiary characters of the novel, such as Lady Speck, provide the text's entertainment, and, therefore, the author's aim is not psychological realism when presenting her protagonist's thoughts. As Ingrassia recognizes, 'Haywood [...] emphasizes the fictionality -- the "unrealness" of the novel', in order to highlight its educative purpose.⁷⁴ At the same time, though, in making Jenny appear so perfect, Haywood, again, seems to be questioning the genre of the didactic novel and asking whether the presentation of paragons is really helpful.

It is not only Jenny's thoughts that are presented through direct thought representation, Jemmy's are too. Similarly to Jenny's interior monologues, Jemmy's introspections consider moral issues, such as the dangers of gaming and the necessities for a successful marriage. The only other character who has his consciousness revealed to the reader is Bellpine, and his interior monologue reveals how he plans to split up Jemmy and Jenny. Bellpine's thoughts are presented directly to the reader in order to emphasize his moral degeneracy in comparison to the correct conduct of the two main characters. Jemmy and Jenny are held up as the reader's moral examples and pedagogic guides, and this explains why their thoughts are provided through direct thought representation.

Richetti suggests that, 'Although he is no saint, Jemmy Jessamy is the most sympathetic and most plausible male character Haywood ever imagined.'⁷⁵ On the whole, this judgement is convincing, but Richetti does not take into account, when considering this figure's characterisation, the significance of the name given by Haywood to the male protagonist. Regarding character names in the novel, Richetti suggests that 'It may be significant that *Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy* is the only one of Haywood's novels in which the main characters do not have quasi-allegorical names but real Christian names and an actual, if uncommon, surname.'⁷⁶ I see the names as potentially allegorical, though. A 'jessamy', according to sense 4 of the noun in the *OED*, is 'A man who scents himself with perfume or who wears a sprig of jessamine in his buttonhole (?); a dandy, [or] a fop.' This definition then

⁷³ Mary Anne Schofield, *Quiet Rebellion: The Fictional Heroines of Eliza Fowler Haywood* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982), p. 111.

⁷⁴ Ingrassia, p. 129.

⁷⁵ Richetti, 'Introduction', p. xxi.

⁷⁶ Richetti, 'Introduction', p. xxi.

directs the reader to see sense 1b of the noun 'jemmy', which states that the phrase 'Jemmy Jessamy (Jessamine)' has the meaning of being 'dandified, foppish, [and] effeminate'. Admittedly, the *OED*'s first recorded use of this phrase occurs in 1786, which is thirty three years after the publication of the novel. However, as Richetti notes, the names which Haywood chooses for her protagonists are very uncommon, so it is reasonable to assume that she had a reason for picking them, and that possibly this phrase was in usage when Haywood was composing the text. This is not out of the question as the sense I have quoted for the noun 'jessamy' is recorded as being used in 1753, and the noun 'jemmy' is used in 1753, to connote 'A dandy or fop; a finical fellow' (*OED*, sense 1). Also, Haywood does use allegorical names for the rest of her characters. For example, there is the haughty widow, Lady Speck; her more marginalised sister, Miss Wingman; and the naïve songbird who is Miss Chit (to cite entry 4 for the noun, a 'chit' is an 'Obsolete name of a bird: the Tit, Titlark, or Meadow Pipit [so called from its short and feeble note]' [*OED*]). Again it is hypothesized that, in using allegorical names, Haywood is creating a subversive undertone to her text: Jemmy may represent a better figure of a man than many of Haywood's other male characters, but, as his name suggests, he is also highly foolish and unthinking at times in the narrative.

Twice, Jemmy betrays Jenny in the course of the novel, with Liberia and Mrs. Hardy, née Celia of the Woods; however, he is never condemned by the narrator of the text, who puts his faults down to 'the frailties of youth and nature' (p. 219). In presenting these justifications, the narrator is following the female protagonist's lead. As Richetti notes, Jenny is 'worldly enough to be wise to the sexual double standard that allows Jemmy to have affairs while she holds herself aloof from other suitors in anticipation of their marriage'.⁷⁷ Jenny, in fact, refers to this double standard, whilst releasing Jemmy from his guilt regarding a misdirected letter which he means to send to Mrs Hardy, but which he actually delivers to the hands of Jenny. The female protagonist tells her lover: 'all I desire is, that when we marry you will either have no amours, or be more cautious in concealing them' (p. 288). She has no false ideas or expectations about male behaviour, but, like the female protagonist of *Fantomina*, she does value her reputation. Through Jenny's character focalization, we learn that her main concern, regarding Jemmy's reputed inconstancy, is that she will be 'look'd upon as a slighted and forsaken mistress' (p. 103). Jemmy may be a cheat, but he is forgiven, because, as the narrator points out, 'no temptation whatever could have made him entertain

⁷⁷ Richetti, 'Introduction', p. xxii.

the least thought of any other woman for a wife' (p. 80) than Jenny. Jemmy recognizes the difference between the respect due to a mistress, in comparison to that of a wife, and, therefore, represents a reasonable example of the male sex, because he will never forsake his betrothed.

This case study of Haywood's final prose-fiction work demonstrates that she was still experimenting with thematic and formal complexities towards the end of her career. Also, it indicates that, like Fielding, Haywood utilises narrative techniques in order to achieve her thematic aims. *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy* is not simply a moralistic work -- it is a novel that conforms to but also questions thematic and formal conventions of the period. Much criticism has been focussed on Fielding's narratorial skill, but the formal achievements of Haywood have rarely been recognized. As Backscheider states, Haywood 'creates exceptionally complex narrators and narrative perspectives, and there always seems to be more in her writing than even the most experienced interpreter sees', and therefore 'Less generalized comment on Haywood and closer study of her texts is needed'.⁷⁸ Haywood needs to be viewed as not simply a woman writer but as an early-modern novelist alongside both Fielding and Richardson.

⁷⁸ 'The Shadow of an Author: Eliza Haywood', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 11 (1998), 79-102 (p. 83, 86).

Conclusion

Objectives and Outcomes

As this thesis concludes it is important to reiterate its intended aims and to address whether these objectives have been achieved. The main purpose of the study is to develop a detailed understanding of the narrative techniques of Haywood, a writer active during the period in which the form now known as the novel began to become established. The potential benefit of this kind of narratological analysis had previously been suggested by critics including Kvande and Croskery, with the latter asserting that

cultural historians of the novel might do well to examine closely the terms in which ‘Mrs Novel’s’ fictions have been dismissed both in her own day and in ours. Further, it seems worth taking another look at Haywood’s narrative techniques and her tricky blend of romance and novelistic narrative. What, one may wonder, was so recognizably ‘novel-like’ in the formula of Haywood’s narratives, long before the novel came to be recognized as a genre in its own right.¹

As is evident from the previous quotation, it was thought that narratological analysis could provide another critical viewpoint through which Haywood’s role in the metamorphosing status of the prose fiction of the period could be traced. This study has examined Haywood’s adoption and adaptation of different narrative techniques from various genres of prose fiction, including those utilised by the writers of pre-novelistic novellas as well as by those recognised as canonical novelists. Analysis of her formal methodology has been presented alongside that of informed case studies on the narrative techniques of her immediate predecessors and her most important contemporaries, and has demonstrated Haywood’s awareness of the changing literary trends of the period.

The aims of this thesis could be viewed as revisionist. It is true that by presenting a narratological analysis of this eighteenth-century woman writer, the hope is that the study has addressed the imbalance that is evident in Haywood studies between the amount of formal evaluation of her oeuvre being produced, in comparison to that which propounds a thematic objective. This kind of cultural and feminist criticism is still vital to the field and without it Haywood would, perhaps, still be languishing in literary anonymity as she did prior to the 1980s which saw her critical rebirth. However, as King notes, ‘Preoccupation with themes of gender has, arguably, so saturated our perception of Haywood as to swamp awareness of other elements of her texts’.² This narratological analysis indicates Haywood’s skill not just

¹ ‘Who’s Afraid of Eliza Haywood?’, *Literature Compass*, 4 (2007), 967-80 (p. 973).

² ‘Spying Upon a Conjuror: Haywood, Curiosity, and “the Novel” in the 1720s’, *Studies in the Novel*, 30 (1998), 178-93 (p. 184).

as a *woman* writer, but her invention as an eighteenth-century *author*.³ In making this statement, though, I do not want to fall into the trap of other revisionist works, as identified by King. She writes that

revisionist histories that attempt to hitch early women novelists to one or another 'rise' may, ironically, be effecting an erasure not wholly unlike the one accomplished by Richardson, Fielding, and their successors when they rewrote the history of the novel in such a way as to render invisible the work of their female predecessors. Certainly women writers of Haywood's generation would have been bemused by the celebratory claims that are currently being made on their behalf. No doubt triumphalism represents a welcome advance upon previous criticism that found little to notice in Haywood beyond sensationalism, scandal, and ineptitude, but it risks attributing to her fiction and that of other women of this generation meaning and values it could never have had for them.⁴

I am not trying to place Haywood on a pedestal by suggesting that every work that she published was narratologically progressive and unique. However, the case is being made that the derogatory 'formulaic' tag that has previously been attached to her career does not stand up in the face of narratological analysis of her work.

As Croskery points out, 'If Haywood's texts were actually "predictable" or "formulaic" [...], [the] type of overt contradiction [found in Haywood criticism] in the description of her narrative formula is surprising. Formulas, by definition, have recognizable characteristics that presumably repeat themselves.'⁵ If one was to place one of Haywood's early novellas against *The Inhumane Cardinal* (1696) by Mary Pix then the difference between experimental usage of narratological features and generic usage would become apparent. *The Inhumane Cardinal* tells the story of the innocent Melora who is tricked into marrying Cardinal Barbarino by the 'designing' Donna Olimpia.⁶ After they marry and she becomes pregnant, Melora learns of their treachery from the Cardinal's former servant, Francisco. However, the revelation comes too late and Melora is murdered by the pair after the Cardinal's lust abates and Olimpia seeks to eliminate the possibility of Melora broadcasting her depravity. Pix immediately makes clear in her novella who her intended audience is, as the title page of the text announces that it is 'Written by a Gentlewoman, for the Entertainment of the Sex'. However, unlike many of Haywood's narrators, Pix's extra-heterodiegetic narrator lets the action unfold without much metanarrative comment to the

³ This statement is meant to echo that made by Scott Black (quoted in the 'Introduction') in 'Trading Sex for Secrets in Haywood's *Love in Excess*', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 15 (2003), 207-26 (p. 207).

⁴ 'Spying Upon a Conjuror', p. 188.

⁵ 'Who's Afraid of Eliza Haywood?', p. 973.

⁶ *The Inhumane Cardinal, Or, Innocence Betrayed* (London: for John Harding and Richard Wilkin et al, 1696), p. 20. All subsequent references to the text will be placed in parenthesis following the quotation.

distinct female readership. At the denouement of the story, a didactic conclusion is provided addressing the audience in this manner:

Thus, Ladies, you are brought to the deplorable end of the Beauteous Melora. And as her Misfortunes must raise Compassion in the tender Bosoms of the Young and Fair; so they may stand a lasting Caution to beware the Insinuations of the designing part of your own Sex. (p. 243)

The moral feels rather added on, though, because of the lack of signposting earlier in the narrative, and so the effect is not as powerful as it could have been.

Rather than explicitly signposting the story with constant asides, the narrator makes proleptic insinuations by addressing the protagonist concerning her imminent danger, at one point exclaiming, ‘But (alas!) Unhappy Beauty, thy Malicious Stars have pointed Thee a sad and gloomy Fate; which she is thus conducted to’ (p. 89). Despite the novella’s ending, Pix’s aim is not education but, as the title page declares, entertainment. Her audience are like her protagonist and take ‘delight in nothing more than hearing the Histories of Persons’ (p. 122), and so this is what Pix provides with the story of Melora, and also with the intercalated histories of Alphonusus and Cordelia, and Emilius and Lovisa. However, her presentation of these different stories is quite mechanical when compared with that of Haywood when she utilises embedded narratives in; for example, *Love in Excess* (1719-20) and *The Adventures of Eovaai* (1736).

Pix’s, like Haywood’s, use of embedded narratives comes out of the tradition of the chivalric romance. These long romances involved, as Salzman points out, ‘an accumulation of subsidiary stories’.⁷ The ‘proliferating *récits* and subsidiary histories’ puncture and delay the main narrative thread, but ‘must be part of an overarched pattern, and related to the main history’.⁸ He goes on: ‘These histories do not form unconnected digressions, but are interwoven with each other, like a series of connected subplots.’⁹ In Pix’s novella, the interpolated tales have a dual role. In respect of the story-level of the narrative, they are used to aid the machinations of Olimpia and the Cardinal. Olimpia relates the story of Alphonusus and Cordelia to convince Melora that the Cardinal is the current Prince Alphonusus and therefore a suitable and worthy match for her. On a subsidiary level, Olimpia utilises it to demonstrate a woman’s eventual submission to the entreaties of her lover. The second history of Emilius and Lovisa is recounted by Francisco, who claims to have been privy to the intricacies of the story and has physical documentary evidence of it, and is used for the same

⁷ *English Prose Fiction 1558-1700: A Critical History* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), p. 182.

⁸ *English Prose Fiction*, p. 186.

⁹ *English Prose Fiction*, p. 186.

didactic purpose. On a text-level, these histories are incorporated as plot devices and are juxtaposed with the relation of Melora's history in order to indicate how a woman can be both careful and successful in love. Their purpose is not explicitly indicated by Pix, but if readers follow their progression then their intention will become apparent. In a case of story imitating text, Olimpia suggests the same thing to Melora regarding the function of her story, saying 'You must arm your self with Patience to hear a Story, that will be of a long continuance before it points at you Melora' (p. 23). However, whilst these embedded narratives provide 'interconnected' stories that readers can recognize the purpose of, they are not 'interwoven' in a manner that makes them exciting or helpful. Instead they are clumsily inserted so as to fulfil an obvious function.

Unfortunately, Melora is taken in by the two stories that are knowingly fed to her. They are perfectly pitched so that she is able to relate to them. This is not the case with the Cardinal's recalling of an 'Amorous Youth' who dies of love for a 'Cruel Maid' that ignores his 'Sighs and Prayers and Tears' (p. 97). This tale is ridiculed as a piece of 'Romantick News' (p. 98), with Melora commenting that 'the greatest Miracle she found in the story, was, the Gallant dying for Love; that being, in these Ages, altogether unpractis'd, and out of fashion' (pp. 98-99). Unlike Haywood, Pix does not comment on the form of her novella. However, it is indicated at several points throughout the text that she is aware of a change in the fictional tastes of her readers. Like her protagonist, who is assured by Olimpia that her story of love is relevant even though it 'might sound Romantick' (p. 86), Pix's readers seek a more realistic depiction of events than those found in romances, because, as Sulpita (the mother of Cordelia) says, in Romances 'all seen is Illusion' (p. 82). Whether they gain this is questionable, though, because of the narratological presentation.

Haywood's Narrative Techniques

Some may argue that in repeating her usage of an extra-heterodiegetic narrator in the majority of her narratives, Haywood is being 'formulaic'. However, the employment of this type of narrator offers Haywood many options regarding how involved her narratorial figures are in the texts. They can frequently break the diegetic limits of the story and the text so as to become commentators on the action, or they can remain on an extradiegetic plain and be, relatively, uninvolved. Similarly, they can focalize the majority of scenes, and so keep control of the diegesis, or attribute the role of focalizer to one or more characters, thereby providing a multi-perspectival narrative. The way in which Haywood employs this narratorial figure differs from text to text depending on its purpose. For example, in *Memoirs of Baron*

de Brosse (1724), the main narrator of the text is not overly predominant. This is because of the presence of three intercalated tales, two of which are intradiegetically narrated and the third autodiegetically narrated, that dominate the text-space. Whereas, in *The Mercenary Lover* (1726), which portrays a single narrative thread documenting the love triangle between Clitander, his wife Miranda, and her sister and his lover, Althea, the narrator often makes metanarrative comments. He/she digresses from the plot in order to vent his/her feelings on the actions of the characters. For example, whilst relating the perfidious designs of Clitander, the narrator exclaims: ‘The base are always Cowards, the same Meaness of Spirit which makes them the one, inclines them to the other also’.¹⁰ He/she gets so infuriated at times that he/she appears in the first person in order to emphasize his/her point. This is evident after Althea has uncovered Clitander’s villainy and the narrator addresses the readers by declaring:

It wou’d be as needless as impossible, to set forth, as it deserves, the distracted State in which this Night was past, both by Clitander and Althea, to be told what has happen’d between them, will better enable the Reader’s Imagination to conceive their present Wretchedness than any Thing I am able to say. (p. 37)

This narrator also exploits narrative temporality by utilising, at different points in the text, ellipsis, prolepsis, and analepsis to further emphasise important parts of the narrative and keep the readers enthralled. For example, after Althea’s ruin by Clitander, curious readers are allowed to see the effect of the event on both of the protagonists and this is highlighted by the use of analepsis, with the narrator marking the perspectival change from one character to the other by announcing: ‘In this Criminal Tranquillity let us leave her for a while, and return to her Undoer’ (p. 27). This narrator is opinionated and is allowed to express his/her thoughts because of their authoritative extradiegetic position.

When Haywood does experiment with a different type of narrator, she either employs an autodiegetic letter writer, as in *Bath Intrigues* (1724) or *Letters from the Palace of Fame* (1726), or an extra-homodiegetic narrator. The nearest she comes to producing an autodiegetic narrator, as favoured by Daniel Defoe during this period, is in *The British Recluse* (1722) and *The Fruitless Enquiry* (1727). In the earlier title, Cleomira and Belinda recall their tragic stories to each other; however, these accounts are framed by the comments of an extra-heterodiegetic narrator who also, at times, enters the diegetic level of the characters to interrupt their stories. Similarly in the later text, different characters tell their own stories to Miramillia, who is a mother trying to fulfil a prophecy in order to find her son.

¹⁰ *The Mercenary Lover* (London: for N. Dobb, 1726), p. 14. All further references to this text will be placed in parenthesis following the quotation.

However, all of these stories are positioned as intercalated tales that are framed by an outside narrator. Because of the frequent presence of an outside narratorial figure, Haywood's readers are always at a distance from the action. Therefore, it is as if they are being let into secrets or unknown intrigues. This is appropriate for a readership fascinated with secret histories, real or invented, which it seems, as has been discussed in the third chapter, is the kind of audience that Haywood was trying to appeal to.

Regarding the use of an extra-homodiegetic narrator, Haywood does this in several texts including *The Tea Table* (1725) and *The History of Clarina* (1728). This kind of narrator sits in an authoritative position regarding the telling of the narrative, but also appears as a character within the story-level. The degree of involvement for Haywood's homodiegetic narrators is cursory, like that of Behn's narrator in the final part of *Love Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister*, but their purpose is not to add to the events in the story, but to authenticate the story that they are telling. This is the case in *The Life of Madam de Villesache* (1727) that is advertised as being 'Written by a Lady, who was an Eye-Witness of the Greatest Part of her [Madam de Villesache's] Adventures'.¹¹ The story depicts the life of Henrietta who is bought up in the country where she falls in love with Clermont. Her father, who is a Duke, then claims her as his child and raises her status. She becomes Madam de Villesache and moves to the court. Before she leaves, though, she marries Clermont in secret. When at the court, she also marries the Marquis of Ab – lle, but continues to see her first husband. When the Marquis discovers this deceit he has Clermont imprisoned and Henrietta killed. The narrator of these events appears briefly as a character in the role of confidant for the confused Henrietta. She tells readers that 'The good Opinion she had of my Sincerity, and the part I took in her Grievs, made her conceal nothing from me' (p. 24). Her role as confidant means that she has access not only to the events of the story but also the thoughts and motives of Henrietta. Therefore, she feels able to defend some of Henrietta's more questionable actions. For example, when this lady is thinking about how to avoid Clermont following her arrival at court, the narrator explains

[it was] not that she hated Clermont; on the contrary, she had very great Remains of her former Passion for him, whenever she reflected on the Endearments which had past between them: but then she despis'd the Meanness of his Extraction, and the Thoughts that she had put him in possession of a Title, which gave him the Power, whenever he pleas'd to exert it, of calling her from the present Grandeur of her State, and obliging her to live with him in a mean Retirement; made all Desires instigated by

¹¹ *The Life of Madam de Villesache* (London: for W. Feales, and sold by J. Roberts, 1727), title page. All subsequent references to the text will be given in parenthesis following the quotation.

her Affection, immediately give way to that new Idol of her Wishes, Greatness! (p. 14)

She then takes her defence further by addressing readers to say

Methinks the severe Accusers of this unhappy Beauty's Conduct, ought to make some little Allowances for her Youth, want of Experience, and the suddenness with which she was transferr'd from one Extreme of Fortune to the other. None can be assur'd of the Stability of their own Hearts in so astonishing a juncture, nor how far they might be sway'd, if liable to the same Temptations she was. (pp. 14-15)

Her role at the text-level is to be Henrietta's biographer and defender, whilst also warning other women to take heed of the story and to learn from it. The narrative ends with the narrator declaring that 'If any of my Sex may reap so much advantage from this Relation of her Frailties, as to correct the appearance of them in themselves; I shall think the Time it has taken me up, could not have been more usefully employ'd' (p. 63). Haywood's choice of a homodiegetic narrator is appropriate for the delivery of this kind of moral. Also, having a narratorial figure who is party to the secrets of the story and its protagonist means, again, that Haywood can fulfil the requirement for gossip and scandal that her readership craved.

Haywood's use of narrators, therefore, cannot be called 'formulaic' because of her experimentation with the diegetic placement of these figures. Also, she employs some narrators who are specifically gendered, as in *Love and Excess*, *The Secret History of the Court of Caramania* (1726), and *The Adventures of Eovaai*, and others that appear gender-neutral, such as the one just discussed in *The Mercenary Lover*. As well as the use of extra-heterodiegetic narrators, focalization has also been established as a key narratological tool for Haywood to manipulate. Her use of, what has been termed in this study, kaleidoscopic focalization is particularly effective as many of the fictional societies that Haywood depicts are based on deceit and secrets. Through a mixture of external and character focalization that swaps between different parties, scenes can be viewed in a multi-perspectival manner. Speech representation is similarly key, especially in respect of depicting the power relations at work in the narratives. The choice between direct and indirect speech is an important one, because it determines how much power is given to a narrator over a character within a scene. Direct speech is supposed to represent the most mimetic form of speech, although it must be remembered that all of the words portrayed pass through the diegesis of the narratorial figure; therefore, every character's utterance is controlled in some way. Narrators have the power to choose which utterances to include and which to omit. Indirect speech, though, is mediated to an even greater extent because the words are those of the character, but the tense, person, and deictics are those of the narrator. Consequently, this kind of speech can blur the levels

between the narrator and the character. With direct speech readers feel as if they are being exposed to the actual words of a character, but indirect speech often seems as if it reveals the true character of an individual. For example, the use of indirect speech in *The Injur'd Husband* (1722) betrays the cunning of the Princess and Du Lache as readers know their true intentions and realise that their speech omits the most cunning details of their plans.

In respect of the status of characters, often the speech of weaker individuals, for example, naïve virgins or deceived lovers, is presented indirectly until power is assumed and then direct speech comes to the fore. The use of speech in this way is demonstrable in a short novella that Haywood published in 1728. *The City Widow* follows the plight of the virtuous Sylvander as he tries to persuade Bacchalia to marry him. She is a wealthy widow with 'libertine inclinations' who simply wants to satisfy her passion,¹² and who is unwittingly controlled by her servant, Betty, regarding her relationship with Sylvander. Both of these women are portrayed as stereotypically masculine in their behaviour. Bacchalia's passion is described in such a manner that she could be mistaken for a rakish male, with the narrator telling us during one of her meetings with her lover that, 'Tis certain, that whoever had been witness of their conversation, wou'd have imagined they had changed sexes, and that the modest Sylvander had been in danger of a Rape from the vehement extasies of the enamour'd Bacchalia' (p. 9). When Bacchalia finally thinks that she is getting her wish and is about to have her desire fulfilled by Sylvander, we hear that 'now certain of being happy in her long expectations [she] began to assume the woman again' (p. 14). Bacchalia is a character that can assume different gender roles in order to get what she wants. Similarly, Betty plays up to gender stereotypes. When trying to deceive either her mistress or Sylvander she acts the faithful woman servant, but when trying to establish her wishes she takes on a 'masculine' type of cunning. Her motives for halting the potential marriage between Bacchalia and Sylvander are paralitically kept from readers until around two thirds of the way through the text when the narrator declares that,

The Subtilty and Treachery of this creature is hardly to be express'd; but because the reader may perhaps wonder to what end she took all this pains, and did not rather forward Sylvander's designs, since she might have been a gainer of fifty pound, I must inform him, that while her Mistress continues in a single state, she is entrusted in the whole management of her affairs: her gains in which, by a modest computation, amounts to more than that sum every year; so cannot expect to have the same opportunity of cheating her, when marry'd. (p. 17)

¹² *The City Widow: Or, Love in a Butt* (London: for J. Roberts, and sold by booksellers and pamphlet shops of London and Westminster, 1729), p. 19. All further references to the text will be placed in parenthesis following the quotation.

She is driven by money and does not care whose lives she hurts in the pursuit of it. These two dominant female characters control the actions of Sylvander and his lack of power is narratologically portrayed through his speech representation. All of his utterances to Bacchalia and Betty are indirectly presented and this reflects his wish to please both of them. When Betty visits Sylvander to inform him that he must stop visiting Bacchalia, but that she will help him covertly meet with his lover, her words are directly presented: ‘she pretends not to deny herself the pleasure of seeing you in private, and hearing from you; to which end, you shall come to an adjacent tavern, and send for me, whose friendship you may depend on doing you all the good offices in my power’ (pp. 11-12); whilst Sylvander’s are summed up through a mixture of external focalization and indirect speech: ‘Sylvander could do no less than make his acknowledgements for the seeming kindness of these expressions; and the more, to secure her good will, made her promise of a bank note of fifty pound, the moment he shou’d become the husband of Bacchalia’ (p. 12). Sylvander’s words are finally presented directly at the text-level when he gains the most power at the story-level. This occurs at the point in the narrative when he starts to realise that he has been mistaken about Bacchalia’s virtue and honesty. In conversation with her cousin Hammonia, he declares: ‘Heavens Madam! [...] do you reckon me among the number of impertinent and unincourag’d addressors of Bacchalia? Are the Hopes, to which she has rais’d me, and the Favours she has conferr’d upon me, to be rank’d with those she vouchsafes to others!’ (p. 22). Following his enlightenment Sylvander goes to confront his lover, but, at this point, his strength again fades in her presence and his conversation with Bacchalia is again indirectly presented, with the narrator informing readers that, ‘He repeated to her all the tender things she had said to him; entreated she would call to mind the many happy hours they had pass’d together; and begged to know, why he was now depriv’d of the same enchanting softness’ (p. 24). Sylvander never regains his power and his defeat at the story-level is mirrored in his representational defeat at the text-level.

The difference between the story and the text-level is often exploited by Haywood as this conclusion has reiterated. This is evident in her use of anachronies. Analepses are used when embedded narratives are in employment, whilst proleptic comments often refer to the eventual fates of the characters. The degree of involvement of the narratorial figure has an impact on how often and how explicit these prolepses are, but they are a feature throughout Haywood’s oeuvre, because of the fact that she often purports to present ‘histories’. Metalepses, that are employed to indicate scene changes, are similarly affected by the dominance held by the text’s narrator. In those narratives that utilise ever-present narrators,

who are evident through their metanarrative commentary, the metalepsis takes on a more explicit function as narrators indicate their control of the text-level. Haywood's manipulation of narrative time, along with her imaginative use of voice, point of view, and discourse, means that she creates cleverly constructed narratives that appeal to her selected readership.

Review of Methodology

Throughout the thesis, these narratives have been analysed using the structuralist terminology of Genette. His categorisations are utilised in order to create a theoretical framework through which to analyse Haywood's formal technique. In the main, his designations based on diegetic levels are appropriate for examining Haywood's choice of narrator, especially because of her consistent use of embedded narratives, and her experimentation with voice. However, Haywood's use of narrators who sit outside the world of the characters but who interrupt the diegetic level below them are difficult to define using Genette's rather rigid distinctions. In analysis of Haywood's final novel, *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy*, Booth's term 'dramatized-observer narrator' is utilized,¹³ in order to bring out fully the nature of this controlling narrator. However, the use of this narratorial distinction does not seem so appropriate when referring to narrators who appear to address readers and make occasional comments, but, then, in general, let the narrative flow with little interruption. Consequently, it must be acknowledged that whilst narratological nomenclature of this kind is highly useful in formal analysis, its limitations in fully articulating the potential intricacies utilised by authors must also be recognized. Therefore, strict adherence to technical language is not always the most helpful approach to take, and flexibility in the use of analytical terminology is necessary.

There has been a concentration on a Genettian form of structuralist analysis that is interested in the level of narrative discourse. However, other narratological approaches could yield further interesting data regarding Haywood's innovative use of narrative structure. A detailed Bakhtinian analysis of narrative discourse could be particularly enlightening. In his seminal study, *The Dialogic Imagination*, Bakhtin declares that,

every novel is a dialogized system made up of images of 'languages', styles and consciousnesses that are concrete and inseparable from language. Language in the novel not only represents, but itself serves as the object of representation. Novelistic discourse is always criticizing itself.¹⁴

¹³ *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 2nd edn (London: Penguin, 1983), p. 153.

¹⁴ *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), p. 49.

He also states that, 'The novel can be defined as a diversity of social speech types (sometimes even diversity of languages) and a diversity of individual voices, artistically organized'.¹⁵ Haywood often uses a stratification of voices and discourses that collide and interact. For example, in *The Life of Madam de Villeshache*, description of Henrietta's early life evokes pastoral diction. She lives in a 'golden age', and 'regard[s] the charming Swain', Clermont, in her 'rural state' (p. 3). However, when she moves to the city, the language of desire takes over from the simplistic pastoral lexis. By contrast, in *The Arragonian Queen*, as is often the case in Haywood's novellas, the language of battle is used when discussing the love relationships at play in the text. In order to demonstrate the power of Zephalinda's passion for her 'conqueror' Abdelhamar, the narrator declares that, 'by the aid of Virtue only she resisted the Charmer, nor fell a Victim to the spoiling Conqueror, Love, [and] she now indeed is better arm'd; her Honour and her Duty join'd [she] beat back the bold Invader'.¹⁶ As Bakhtin points out,

the stratification of language -- generic, professional, social in the narrow sense, that of a particular world views, particular tendencies, particular individuals, the social speech diversity and language-diversity (dialects) of language -- upon entering the novel establishes its own special order within it, and becomes a unique artistic system, which orchestrates the intentional theme of the author.

Haywood can be seen to use different discourses so as to present the different types of characters present in her society, and the metamorphosis that they often undertake throughout the course of their textual representation. Therefore, alongside the kind of speech analysis presented in this thesis, thorough examination of Haywood's discourse choices, could further emphasize the power relations and gender roles at use in her work.

In his study on the narrative techniques of Jane Austen, Massimiliano Morini employs linguistics to evaluate the 'dialogic machines' that are Austen's novels. He writes that,

Austen's works are viewed as dialogic machines -- in the Bakhtinian sense -- not because all novels are dialogic (though that can safely be argued), but because these novels in particular are constructed as dialogues among voices whose struggle for power can never be finally decided (which is why opposing readings are possible and plausible).¹⁷

In taking this approach, Morini uses

¹⁵ Bakhtin, p. 262.

¹⁶ *The Arragonian Queen: A Secret History*, 2nd edn (London: for J. Roberts, 1724)

¹⁷ *Jane Austen's Narrative Techniques: A Stylistic and Pragmatic Analysis* (Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), p. 7.

evaluation theory [...] to understand which voices evaluate which events and characters [...], stylistics [...] to observe the ways in which Austen's narrators renounce their evaluative power [...] [and] pragmatics and conversation analysis [to] provide the terminology and the theoretical framework for a close study of how narrators and characters interact and produce meaning in and through their interaction.¹⁸

This kind of analysis could, potentially, be interesting when applied to Haywood's texts, in which stereotypical gender roles are questioned and inverted; for example, *Fantomina* and *The City Widow*. Linguistic analysis could also be fascinating, because, whilst carrying out close textual analysis, I have noted that Haywood seems to utilise an armoury of lexis throughout her oeuvre, with words, such as 'inclination', 'gratification', and 'condescension', being repeated numerous times in single texts and across her body of work. This form of data collection and analysis would further aid critics to view Haywood's career as a whole rather than as defined by distinct periods. Furthermore, it could help identify, in a more specific manner, the literary sources that Haywood consulted, and borrowed from, in her compositions. For example, DeJean regards 'inclination' as an 'influential concept' born from the romances of Scudéry.¹⁹ She writes that what Scudéry 'termed *inclination* [...] may be translated as "penchant" or "propensity", and [it] is clearly related to, but not to be confused with, love at first sight'.²⁰ It could be explored how far Haywood adopts and adapts this term from romance into her more modern novellas.

Further Research

The knowledge that has been amassed in this thesis could form the basis for an investigation into a more demanding question: how far, and in what ways, analysis of narrative discourse might be capable of casting light on the debate surrounding what has become known as the rise of the novel. Haywood represents a centrally important figure to this debate because her career spans the shift from earlier narrative models to those that become established in the emerging novel. In order to achieve this goal, an expansion of knowledge regarding the main narrative techniques of genres that are known to have fed into the novel, such as epic and satire, and of key narratives from the pre-novel period, is necessary. Of special importance for this kind of analytical expansion are texts from the Spanish picaresque tradition, such as *Lazarillo de Tormes* and *Don Quixote*, and also romances and *nouvelles* from 17th-century

¹⁸ Morini, p. 8.

¹⁹ *Tender Geographies: Women and the Origins of the Novel in France* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 88.

²⁰ DeJean, p. 87.

France, which were popular in Britain both in French and in translation. Key would be close examination of the development in narrative technique that was a consequence of the usurpation of the lengthy baroque romance, as epitomised by Scudéry's *Clélie*, by the shorter and contemporarily set *nouvelle*, as produced by authors such as Lafayette. The influence of these European prose genres on the narratives of Behn, Congreve, and Haywood that are considered as marginally or emergently novelistic could then be further explored. Also, possible links could be made to narratives that are established as canonical novels, by, for example, Defoe, Richardson, and Henry and Sarah Fielding.

This type of analysis would appeal to scholars and students interested not only in the debate over the rise of the novel, but also in the texts that are most often cited in that debate. At the same time, it would seek to widen the debate and make it less Anglocentric, especially through its work on seventeenth-century French narratives. The study's interpretative and analytical strategies would be of interest, too, both to students of the early-modern period and, through its wide scope, to post-classical narratologists.

Overall, it is hoped that this study's narrative analysis of Haywood's texts will open the door to further formal work, in the vein of that detailed above. Then, the hope is that Haywood's effect on the literary picture of the eighteenth-century can be fully appreciated.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Behn, Aphra, *The History of the Nun*, in *The Works of Aphra Behn*, ed. by Janet Todd, 7 vols (London: William Pickering, 2005), III, 205-58
- Congreve, William, *Incognita: Or, Love and Duty Reconciled*, in *An Anthology of Seventeenth-Century Fiction*, ed. by Paul Salzman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 473-525
- Cresswell, Thomas Estcourt, *A Narrative of the Affair Between Mr. Cresswell, and Miss Sc – e* (London: for Charles Green, in Avemory-Lane, And Sold at the Pamphlet Shops at the Royal Exchange, Temple-Bar, and Charing Cross, 1747)
- Fielding, Henry, *The History of Tom Jones, A Foundling*, ed. by Thomas Keymer and Alice Wakely (London: Penguin, 2005)
- , *Shamela*, in ‘*Anti-Pamela*’ and ‘*Shamela*’, ed. by Catherine Ingrassia (Peterborough, ONT: Broadview Press, 2004), pp. 228-76
- Haywood, Eliza, *Anti-Pamela; Or Feign’d Innocence Detected*, in ‘*Anti-Pamela*’ and ‘*Shamela*’, ed. by Catherine Ingrassia (Peterborough, ONT: Broadview Press, 2004), pp. 51-227
- , *A Spy Upon a Conjurer Or, A Collection of Surprising and Diverting Stories, With Merry and Ingenious Letters* (London: for J. Peele, 1724)
- , *A Discourse Concerning Writings of this Nature. By Way of Essay*, in *Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier* (London, for William Chetwood, 1721)
- , *Bath-Intrigues: In Four Letters to a Friend in London* (Los Angeles: Augustan Reprint Society, 1986)
- , *Dalinda: Or, The Double Marriage* (London: for C. Corbett in Fleet-Street, and G. Woodfall at Charing-Cross, 1749)
- , *Fantomina: Or, Love in a Maze*, in *Fantomina and Other Works*, ed. by Alexander Pettit, Margaret Case Croskery, and Anna C. Patchias (Peterborough, ONT; Plymouth: Broadview Press, 2004), pp. 41-71

- , *Idalia: Or, The Unfortunate Mistress* (London, for D. Browne, 1723)
- , *Lasselia: Or, The Self-Abandon'd*, in *The Injur'd Husband and Lasselia*, ed. by Jerry C. Beasley (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1999), pp. 103-49
- , *Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier* (London: for William Chetwood, 1721)
- , *Letters from the Palace of Fame* (London: for J. Roberts, 1727)
- , *Life's Progress Through the Passions; Or, The Adventures of Natura* (London: by T. Gardner, 1748)
- , *Love in Excess: Or, The Fatal Inquiry*, ed. by David Oakleaf (Peterborough, ONT: Broadview Press, 1994)
- , *Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots: Being the Secret History of her Life and the Real Causes of All her Misfortunes* (London: for D. Browne Junior, S. Chapman, and J. Woodman and D. Lyon, 1725)
- , *Memoirs of Baron de Brosse* (London: for D. Browne and S. Chapman, 1725)
- , *Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia*, Parts I and II (London: by the Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1725)
- , *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman*, Parts I and II (London: printed for J. Freeman, 1743)
- , *The Arragonian Queen: A Secret History*, 2nd edn (London: for J. Roberts, 1724)
- , *The British Recluse: Or, The Secret History of Cleomira, Suppos'd Dead* (London: for D. Browne, 1722)
- , *The City Widow: Or, Love in a Butt* (London: for J. Roberts, and sold by booksellers and pamphlet shops of London and Westminster, 1729)
- , *The Double Marriage: Or, The Fatal Release*, in *Three Novellas*, ed. by Earla A. Wilputte (East Lansing: Colleagues; Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1995), pp. 106-41
- , *The Fair Captive: A Tragedy* (London: for T. Jauncy, 1721)

- , *The Fortunate Foundlings* (London: for T. Gardner, 1744)
- , *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy*, ed. by John Richetti (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2005)
- , *The Injur'd Husband: Or, The Mistaken Resentment*, in *The Injur'd Husband and Lasselia*, ed. by Jerry C. Beasley (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1999), pp. 1-101
- , *The Life of Madam de Villesache* (London: for W. Feales, and sold by J. Roberts, 1727)
- , *The Mercenary Lover* (London: for N. Dobb, 1726)
- , *The Rash Resolve: Or, The Untimely Discovery* (London: D. Browne, 1724)
- , *The Tea-Table: Or, A Conversation Between Some Polite Persons of both Sexes, at a Lady's Visiting Day*, Parts I and II (London: for J. Roberts, 1725)
- , *The Unequal Conflict; Or, Nature Triumphant* (London: for J. Walthoe and J. Crockatt, 1725)
- Lafayette, Madame de, *The Princesse de Montpensier*, in *The Princesse de Clèves*, trans. by Terence Cave (Oxford: Oxford World Classics, 1999), pp. 157-88
- Manley, Delarivier, *The New Atalantis*, ed. by Ros Ballaster (London: Penguin, 1992)
- Pix, Mary, *The Inhumane Cardinal, Or, Innocence Betrayed* (London: for John Harding and Richard Wilkin et al, 1696)
- Pope, Alexander, *The Dunciad: An Heroic Poem. In Three Books*, in *The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope*, ed. by James Sutherland, 3rd edn, 11 vols (London: Methuen; New Haven, CONN: Yale University Press, 1963), V
- Scrope, Elizabeth, *Miss Scrope's Answer to Mr. Cresswell's Narrative* (London: for R. Baldwin, Jun. in Paster-Noster-Row, 1749)
- Smollett, Tobias, *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle*, ed. by James L. Clifford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983)

Sterling, James, 'To Mrs. Eliza Haywood on Her Writings', in *Secret Histories, Novels, and Poems*, Eliza Haywood, 2nd edn, 4 vols (London: for Dan Browne, Jun. and S. Chapman, 1725), I, ii-v

Waller, Edmund, 'To a Friend of the Different Successes of Their Loves', in *The Poems of Edmund Waller*, ed. by G. Thorn Drury (New York, Greenwood Press, 1968), pp. 102-103

Secondary Sources

Altman, J. G., *Epistolarity: Approaches to Form* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1982)

Anderson, Emily Hodgson, 'Performing the Passions in Eliza Haywood's *Fantomina* and *Miss Betsy Thoughtless*', *Eighteenth Century*, 46 (2005), 1-15

Aravamudan, Srinivas, 'In the Wake of the Novel: The Oriental Tale as National Allegory', *Novel*, 33 (1999), 5-31

Backscheider, Paula R., 'Literary Culture as Immediate Reality', in *A Companion to the Eighteenth-Century English Novel and Culture*, ed. by Paula R. Backscheider and Catherine Ingrassia (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), pp. 504-38

——, 'The Shadow of an Author: Eliza Haywood', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 11 (1998), 79-102

——, 'The Story of Eliza Haywood's Novels: Caveats and Questions', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 19-47

Baker, David Erskine, 'Eliza Heywood', in *Biographia Dramatica, or, A Companion to the Playhouse* (London: Printed for Mess. Rivingtons; T. Payne and Son; L. Davis; T. Longman; and G. Robinson [and 4 others], 1782), Vol. 1, pp. 215-6

Bakhtin, M. M., *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981)

Bal, Mieke, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, trans. by Christine van Boheemen, 2nd edn (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 1997)

- , 'Notes on Narrative Embedding', *Poetics Today*, 2 (1981), 41-59
- Ballaster, Ros, 'A Gender of Opposition: Eliza Haywood's Scandal Fiction', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 143-67
- , *Fabulous Orient: Fictions of the East in England, 1662-1785* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)
- , 'Introduction', in *Fables of the East: Selected Tales 1662-1785*, ed. by Ros Ballaster (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 1-12
- , 'Introduction', in *The New Atalantis*, ed. by Ros Ballaster (London: Penguin, 1992), pp. v-xxi
- , *Seductive Forms: Women's Amatory Fiction from 1684 to 1740* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992)
- Bannet, Eve Tavor, "'Secret History': Or, Talebearing Inside and Outside the Secretorie", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68 (2005), 375-96
- Barthes, Roland, 'Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives' in *Image, Music, Text*, trans. by Stephen Heath (London: Fontana, 1977), pp. 79-124
- , *S/Z* (London: Blackwell, 1990)
- Beasley, Jerry C., 'Introduction', in *The Injur'd Husband, Or, The Mistaken Resentment, and Lasselia, Or, The Self-Abandon'd*, ed. by Jerry C. Beasley (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1999), pp. ix-xxxvii
- , 'Notes to the Novel', in *The Injur'd Husband and Lasselia*, ed. by Jerry C. Beasley (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1999), pp. 151-58
- Benedict, Barbara M., 'The Curious Genre: Female Inquiry in Amatory Fiction', *Studies in the Novel*, 30 (1998), 194-210
- , 'Wants and Goods: Advertisement and Desire in Haywood and Defoe', *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, 33 (2004), 221-53

- Black, Scott, 'Trading Sex for Secrets in Eliza Haywood's *Love in Excess*', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 15 (2003), 207-26
- Blouch, Christine, 'Eliza Haywood and the Romance of Obscurity', *SEL*, 31 (1991), 535-52
- Booth, Wayne C., *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 2nd edn (London: Penguin, 1983)
- Bowers, Toni O'Shaughnessy, 'Collusive Resistance: Sexual Agency and Partisan Politics in *Love in Excess*', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000)
- Brewer, David, "'Haywood,'" Secret History, and the Politics of Attribution', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 217-39
- Bridgeman, Teresa, 'Thinking Ahead: A Cognitive Approach to Prolepsis', *Narrative*, 13 (2005), 125-59
- Carnell, Rachel, *Partisan Politics, Narrative Realism, and the Rise of the British Novel* (New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006)
- Clifford, James L., 'Introduction', in *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle*, ed. by James L. Clifford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. xv-xxix
- Cohn, Dorrit, *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983)
- Coppola, Al, 'The Secret History of Eliza Haywood's *Works*: The Early Novel and the Book Trade', *1650-1850: Ideas, Aesthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era* (Forthcoming)
- Croskery, Margaret Case, and Anna C. Patchias, 'Introduction', in *Fantomina and Other Works*, ed. by Alexander Pettit, Margaret Case Croskery, and Anna C. Patchias (Peterborough, ONT; Plymouth: Broadview Press, 2004), pp. 1-33
- , 'Masquing Desire: The Politics of Passion in Eliza Haywood's *Fantomina*', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten

- T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 69-94
- , ‘Who’s Afraid of Eliza Haywood?’, *Literature Compass*, 4 (2007), 967-80
- DeJean, Joan, *Tender Geographies: Women and the Origins of the Novel in France* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993)
- Fludernik, Monika, *An Introduction to Narratology* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009)
- , ‘Scene Shift, Metalepsis, and the Metaleptic Mode’, *Style*, 37 (2003), 382-400
- , ‘The Diachronization of Narratology’, *Narrative*, 11 (2003), 331-48
- Füger, Wilhelm, ‘Limits of the Narrator’s Knowledge in Fielding’s *Joseph Andrews*: A Contribution to a Theory of Negated Knowledge in Fiction’, *Style*, 38 (2004), 278-89
- Genette, Gérard, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, trans. by Jane E. Lewin (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980)
- , *Narrative Discourse Revisited*, trans. by Jane E. Lewin (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988)
- Gerrard, Christine, *Aaron Hill: The Muse’s Projector, 1685-1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)
- Grieder, Josephine, ‘Introduction’, in *The Secret History of the Present Intrigues of the Court of Caramania*, ed. by Josephine Grieder (New York: Garland Publishing, 1972), pp. 5-11
- Guskin, Phyllis, ‘Introduction’, in *Clio: The Autobiography of Martha Fowke Sansom (1689-1736)*, ed. by Phyllis Guskin (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1997), 15-50
- Hammond, Brean S., and Shaun Regan, *Making the Novel: Fiction and Society in Britain, 1660-1789* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005)
- , *Professional Imaginative Writing in England, 1670-1740: ‘Hackney for Bread’* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)

- Hunter, J. Paul, *Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction* (New York and London: Norton, 1990)
- Ingrassia, Catherine, *Authorship, Commerce, and Gender in Early Eighteenth-Century England: A Culture of Paper Credit* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
- , 'Introduction', in *Anti-Pamela and Shamela*, ed. by Catherine Ingrassia (Peterborough, ONT: Broadview Press, 2004), pp. 7-43
- Kern, Edith, 'The Romance of the Novel / Novella', in *The Disciplines of Criticism: Essays in Literary Theory, Interpretation, and History*, ed. by Peter Demetz, Thomas Greene, and Lowry Nelson (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1968), pp. 511-30
- Keymer, Thomas, and Peter Sabor, *'Pamela' in the Marketplace: Literary Controversy and Print Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- King, Kathryn R., 'Eliza Haywood, Savage Love, and Biographical Uncertainty', *Review of English Studies*, 59 (2007), 722-39
- , 'New Contexts for Early Novels by Women: The Case of Eliza Haywood, Aaron Hill, and the Hillarians, 1719-1725', in *A Companion to the Eighteenth-Century Novel*, ed. by Paula Backscheider and Catherine Ingrassia (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), pp. 519-45
- , 'Patriot or Opportunist? Eliza Haywood and the Politics of *The Female Spectator*', in *Fair Philosopher: Eliza Haywood and The Female Spectator*, ed. by Donald J. Newman and Lynn Marie Wright (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2006), pp. 104-21
- , 'Spying Upon the Conjurer: Haywood, Curiosity, and "The Novel" in the 1720s', *Studies in the Novel*, 30 (1998), 178-93
- Kramnick, Jonathan Brody, 'Locke, Haywood, and Consent', *ELH*, 72 (2005), 453-70
- Kubek, Elizabeth, 'The Key to Stowe: Toward a Patriot Whig Reading of Eliza Haywood's *Eovaai*', in *Presenting Gender: Changing Sex in Early-Modern Culture*, ed. by Chris Mounsey (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press; London: Associated Presses, 2001), pp. 225-54

- Kvande, Marta, 'The Outsider Narrator in Eliza Haywood's Political Novels', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 43 (2003), 625-43
- Lai, Amy, 'Self and Other: Narrativity in Xinran's *The Good Women of China* and *Sky Burial*', *Connotations*, 16 (2006/7), 194-218
- Lubey, Kathleen, 'Eliza Haywood's Amatory Aesthetic', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 39 (2006), 309-22
- Macey, Jr, J. David, "'Where the World May Ne'er Invade"? Green Retreats and Garden Theatre in *La Princesse de Clèves*, *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless*, and *Cecilia*', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 12 (1999), 75-100
- Martin, John, 'James Annesley', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2008)
<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/564.com>>
- McBurney, William H., 'Mrs. Penelope Aubin and the Early Eighteenth Century Novel', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 20 (1957), 245-67
- McKeon, Michael, *The Origins of the English Novel 1600-1740* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002)
- Merritt, Juliette, *Beyond Spectacle: Eliza Haywood's Female Spectators* (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 2004)
- Morini, Massimiliano, *Jane Austen's Narrative Techniques: A Stylistic and Pragmatic Analysis* (Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009)
- Nelles, William, *Frameworks: Narrative Levels and Embedded Narrative* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997)
- Nestor, Deborah J., 'Virtue Rarely Rewarded: Ideological Subversion and Narrative Form in Haywood's Later Fiction', *SEL*, 34 (1994), 579-98
- Novak, Maximillian E., *William Congreve* (New York: Twayne, 1971)
- Oakleaf, David, 'Introduction', in *Love in Excess; Or, The Fatal Enquiry*, ed. by David Oakleaf, 2nd edn (Peterborough, ONT: Broadview Press, 1994), pp. 7-27

- Onega, Susana, and José Angel Garcia Landa, 'Introduction', in *Narratology: An Introduction*, ed. by Onega and Landa (London: Longman, 1996), pp. 1-41
- Pearson, Jacqueline, 'Gender and Narrative in the Fiction of Aphra Behn', *Review of English Studies*, 42 (1991), 40-56
- , 'Gender and Narrative in the Fiction of Aphra Behn (Concluded)', *Review of English Studies*, 42 (1991), 179-90
- Pettit, Alexander, 'Adventures in Pornographic Places: Eliza Haywood's *Tea-Table* and the Decentering of Moral Argument', *Papers on Language & Literature*, 38 (2002), 244-69
- Potter, Tiffany, 'The Language of Feminised Sexuality: Gendered Voice in Eliza Haywood's *Love in Excess* and *Fantomina*', *Women's Writing*, 10 (2003), 169-86
- Prescott, Sarah, 'The Debt to Pleasure: Eliza Haywood's *Love in Excess* and Women's Fiction of the 1720s', *Women's Writing*, 7 (2000), 427-45
- Propp, V., *Morphology of the Folktale*, trans. by Laurence Scott, 2nd edn (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968)
- Reeve, Clara, *The Progress of Romance*, 2 vols (Dublin: for Price, Exshaw, White, Cash Colbert, Marchbank, and Porter, 1785), I
- Richetti, John, 'Histories by Eliza Haywood and Henry Fielding: Imitation and Adaptation', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 240-58
- , 'Introduction', in *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy*, ed. by John J. Richetti (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2005), pp. vii-xxxv
- , *Popular Fiction Before Richardson: Narrative Patterns, 1700-1739* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)
- , *The English Novel in History, 1700-1780* (London: Routledge, 1999)
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, 2nd edition (London: Routledge, 2002)

- Said, Edward, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin, 2003)
- Salzman, Paul, *English Prose Fiction 1558-1700: A Critical History* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985)
- , 'Introduction', in *An Anthology of Seventeenth-Century Fiction*, ed. by Paul Salzman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. ix-xxvi
- Saxton, Kirsten T., 'Introduction', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp. 1-18
- Schattschneider, Laura, 'The Infant's Petition: An English Poetics of Foundling Reception, 1741-1837', *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, 33 (2004), 71-99
- Schofield, Mary Anne, *Quiet Rebellion: The Fictional Heroines of Eliza Fowler Haywood* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982)
- Scholes, Robert, James Phelan, and Robert Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative: Fortieth Anniversary Edition* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006)
- Simon, Irène, 'Early Theories of Prose Fiction: Congreve and Fielding', in *Imagined Worlds: Essays on Some English Novels and Novelists in Honour of John Butt*, ed. by Maynard Mack and Ian Gregor (London: Methuen, 1968), pp. 19-35
- Spedding, Patrick, *A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003)
- , 'Shameless Scribbler or Votary of Virtue? Eliza Haywood, Writing (and) Pornography in 1742', in *Women Writing, 1550-1750*, ed. by Jo Wallwork and Paul Salzman (Bundoora, VIC: La Trobe University, 2001), pp. 237-51
- Spencer, Jane, *The Rise of the Woman Novelist: From Aphra Behn to Jane Austen* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986)
- Stanzel, F.K., *A Theory of Narrative*, trans. by Charlotte Goedsche (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)
- Stone, Lawrence, *Road to Divorce: England, 1530-1987* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990)

- Thompson, Helen, “‘In *Idea*, a thousand nameless Joys’”: Secondary Qualities in Arnauld, Locke, and Haywood’s *Lasselia*’, *Eighteenth Century*, 48 (2007), 225-43
- Torre, Lillian de la, ‘New Light on Smollett and the Annesley Cause’, *Review of English Studies*, 22 (1971), 274-81
- Varey, Simon, ‘Introduction’, in *Bath-Intrigues: Four Letters to a Friend in London*, ed. by Simon Varey (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, University of California, 1986), pp. iii-x
- Warner, William B., *Licensing Entertainment: The Elevation of Novel Reading in Britain, 1684-1750* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998)
- Watt, Ian, *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding* (Berkeley: University of Los Angeles Press, 2001)
- Whicher, George Frisbie, *The Life and Romances of Mrs. Eliza Haywood* (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing LLC, 2004)
- Wilputte, Earla A., ‘Eliza Haywood’s *Frederick, Duke of Brunswick-Lunenburgh*’, *SEL*, 41 (2001), 499-513
- , ‘Introduction’, in *The Adventures of Eovaai, Princess of Ijaveo: A Pre-Adamitical History*, ed. by Earla Wilputte (Peterborough, ONT: Broadview Literary Texts; Letchworth: Turpin Distribution, 1999), pp. 9-34
- , ‘Parody in Eliza Haywood’s *A Letter from H – G – g, Esq.*’, *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 17 (2005), 207-30
- , “‘Too ticklish to meddle with’”: The Silencing of *The Female Spectator*’s Political Correspondents’, in *Fair Philosopher: Eliza Haywood and The Female Spectator*, ed. by Donald J. Newman and Lynn Marie Wright (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2006), pp. 122-40
- Wilson, Eileen, ‘Narrative Structure in the Novels of Eliza Haywood’ (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Ulster, 2003)

Wright, Lynn Marie, and Donald J. Newman, 'Introduction', in *The Fair Philosopher: Eliza Haywood and The Female Spectator*, ed. by Don Newman and Lynn Wright (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2006), pp. 13-41