

NOVEL, ROMANCE AND QUIXOTISM
IN RICHARDSON'S *PAMELA*



Pedro Javier Pardo García
Universidad de Salamanca

The paper discusses the presence of romance in Richardson's *Pamela* as a feature of its protagonist narrator, Pamela, rather than of its author, Richardson. For this purpose it analyzes the heroine's relationship with the character—Mrs Jewkes—who detects and highlights Pamela's use of romance idealism to frame or *emplot* reality in her narrative as well as to orient her behaviour, and who opposes a conflicting vision of reality, debased realism, to hers. Mrs Jewkes's attitude towards Pamela's romancing ultimately amounts to that of extreme scepticism, and her sceptical accusations are echoed and intensified by Mr B. Pamela's romantic *emplotment*, as revealed by these characters, makes her a female Quixote, and the second part of the paper compares Pamela and don Quixote to make this point clear and also to show the different roles romance plays in *Don Quixote* and *Pamela*. In both works, however, this role is certainly important, since romance is incorporated as one more perspective in a *dialogized* reality, that is, a reality that has ceased to be unitary or monological to become *dialogical*, a reality made up of different perspectives, which is a key feature of the novel as a genre.

The presence of romance features in a work which has been traditionally considered the paradigm of realism and one of the main agents in the "rise of the novel" has long ago been noticed by scholars and critics of *Pamela*. Sheridan Baker, Margaret Dalziel, Dieter Schulz, James Munro, Ronald Paulson, John Richetti, Jerry Beasley, and Hubert McDermott, among others, have analyzed this presence in their books and articles. Too frequently, however, as McDermott has noted, the presence of romance has been dismissed as "lapses of one kind or another, occasions on which his artistic genius [Richardson's] failed him and he was forced to resort to the standby of romance" (1989, 147). McDermott is right when he argues that, "It is only when Richardson's adaptation and transformation of romance themes and conventions are fully understood and appreciated, that a true appreciation of the extent of his achievement can be gained" (1989, 147). Romance in *Pamela* is not merely a series of *alien* features transplanted from a previous narrative mode, but an integral part of Richardson's work and one without which *Pamela's* novelty cannot be understood. This understanding, however, cannot be reached unless we realize that romance is not only a genre or formula, a series of features concerning plot and characterization—which have been already brilliantly discussed in relation to *Pamela* by the authors cited above—but, above all, a literary mode of representing reality, a way to depict or interpret reality, a specific kind of relationship between life and literature, which underlies all its generic manifestations at different moments in literary history (Greek romance, chivalric romance, French heroic romance, Gothic romance, etc.).

This modal perception of romance has been discussed by Northrop Frye, who characterizes romance or the romantic tendency, as opposed to realism or the realistic tendency, by its *vertical perspective* (1976, 49), that is to say, by the presentation of two separate and opposite worlds, the *idyllic* and the *demonic*, one above the level of ordinary experience,

the other one below it, which are the human or *displaced* counterparts of the heaven and hell of myth. The vertical perspective "partly accounts for the curious polarized characterization of romance, its tendency to split into heroes and villains" (1976, 50), who are the heavenly or demonic inhabitants of these two worlds,¹ and also accounts for the characteristic plot of romance, which is the "cyclical movement of descent into a night world and return to the idyllic world, or to some symbol of it like marriage..." (1976, 54). This vertical perspective which determines characterization and plot also determines the relationship of romance with reality, since reality, or rather, the world of experience, is projected into the two antagonistic worlds of romance, depending on the desires and fears of the writer and his readers, that is to say, on the dreams and threats a community sees in its environment. Romance does not imply the absence of experience, of the contemporary world, as many accounts of the genre suggest, but its mediation through the vertical perspective. Desired or positive reality is pictured in *idealized* terms, as an idyllic world, threatening or fearful reality is pictured in *demonized* terms, as a demonic world, but reality is still there, and in fact it determines the different historical actualizations or formulas romance adopts, the different generic shapes.² In romance the vertical perspective acts as an idealizing filter of reality, whereas in realism this vertical polarization and idealization of reality is substituted for a horizontal world which has a closer resemblance to the ordinary world of experience.

In addition to this vertical perspective, romance narratives make use of another duality, another vertical polarization of the world they present. They conceive the world as composed of the *actual* or *material world*, on the one hand, and the *real* or *intelligible world*, on the other, as Henry Knight Miller has argued, and conceive the *real* "as lying in a dimension beyond the mere 'actual' world of appearances" (1976, 154). This of course implies a conception of reality quite different from that of realism and its presentation of the unitary world of experience, a conception which of course is reflected in the literary form of romance, since that superior world directs the existence of the characters in the material world and determines a series of events, so it becomes a source of motivation and a principle of action. In romance incidents take place as a chain of chances, as if ordered or determined by Providence or by some sort of invisible principle which fits them into a pattern and endows them with ultimate meaning, whereas in realism incidents are ordered by possibility or probability, by causes and effects. In realism motivation for human action is placed in this world, in the character's personalities and decisions; in romance it is placed in a superior world that directs that action for *God knows* what purposes or *God knows* what meaning. Romances, using Frye's terminology (1976), are *and then* narratives, in which things happen to the characters, whereas realistic fictions are *hence* narratives, in which characters are the source of what happens.

¹ "The characterization of romance is really a feature of its mental landscape. Its heroes and villains exist primarily to symbolize a contrast between two worlds, one above the level of ordinary experience, the other below it. There is, first, a world associated with happiness, security, and peace ... I shall call this world the idyllic world. The other is a world of exciting adventures, but adventures which involve separation, loneliness, humiliation, pain, and the threat of more pain. I shall call this world the demonic or night world. Because of the powerful polarizing tendency in romance, we are usually carried directly from one to the other" (1976, 53).

² "The romance is nearest of all literary forms to the fulfillment dream, and for that reason it has socially a curiously paradoxical role. In every age the ruling social or intellectual class tends to project its ideals in some form of romance, where the virtuous heroes and beautiful heroines represent the ideals and the villains the threats to their ascendancy. This is the general character of chivalric romance in the Middle Ages, aristocratic romance in the Renaissance, bourgeois romance since the eighteenth century, and revolutionary romance in contemporary Russia" (Frye 1973, 186).

Despite the fact that realism reflects more closely the world of experience, it may be argued that both romance and realism are legitimate conceptions of the real and therefore they are equally *realistic*, since this category depends on how we conceive the real, a notion which is relative and therefore defies definition. Let's only observe that I will be using *romance* and *realism* as defined above, as different modes of representation of, or of relationship with, reality, and that the aim of this paper is not to argue that Pamela's vision of reality is inadequate in relation to that of *realism as represented by other characters*, but in relation to *reality as presented in the narrative*, that is to say, the aim of this paper is to show the discrepancies between Pamela's world-view and the world she presents herself in her writing, and how these discrepancies are determined by the romance mode she uses to frame or *emplot* reality. These discrepancies are highlighted by other characters who not only offer an alternative vision, but are themselves living proofs—as integral parts—of that reality which belies Pamela's *emplotment*. This does not imply that these characters' vision is the right one or is not distorted itself by other elements (in fact it is), but even so they reveal the fact that Pamela is not merely *romantic* but a *romancer*, that she perceives, interprets and depicts reality through a literary pattern, the double vertical perspective of the romance tradition—that is, of previous fiction—discussed above. In this sense we can say that Pamela is a female Quixote—and Richardson a Cervantean novelist. Both in *Don Quixote* and *Pamela* romance is not simply a lapse, but a major ingredient in the creation of the protagonist's personality and of the literary world. No matter how paradoxical it may seem, it is true that only by understanding the place of romance in *Pamela* we can appreciate Richardson's achievement as a novelist.

I CONFLICTING VISIONS OF REALITY: PAMELA AND MRS JEWKES

The relationship between Pamela, the heroine of the novel, and Mrs Jewkes, her guardian and antagonist during her captivity in Lincolnshire, is crucial to an understanding of the extent of Pamela's use of romance to frame reality and the place of romance in the work as a whole, since she is the narrator. Their evolving relationship during Pamela's captivity gives rise to tensions and conflicts which are mainly discrepancies in world-view. These discrepancies highlight the romantic bias and simplifications that distort Pamela's vision of reality and therefore call into question Pamela's reliability as a narrator. Mrs Jewkes uncovers the romance perspective that shapes Pamela's world-view and her narrative by offering an alternative perspective that rivals Pamela's and, most important, in the way that Pamela's view of Mrs Jewkes reveals her romantic distortion of reality. Consequently, Mrs Jewkes is a foil and a rebuttal to Pamela's romance world-view both as *object*, that is, as a victim of that vision, and as *subject* of a contrasting one, that is, as its mouthpiece, in a *passive* as well as in an *active* way. In accordance with this, this paper will examine three different ways in which Pamela's romantic bias in rendering reality is exposed: (1) by the connections of Pamela's depiction of Mrs Jewkes (object-passive) and other characters associated with her with the romance tradition and world-view—*romance idealism*; (2) by Mrs Jewkes's own statements (subject-active), which formulate a view of herself (2.1) and also of Pamela, Pamela's plight, and of reality in general (2.2)—*debased realism*—, which, if not accepted by the reader as the whole truth, at least forces him to re-examine Pamela's depiction of reality and recognize its romance perspective; (3) Mrs Jewkes's alternative perspective thus becomes a challenge to Pamela's claim to the truth of her narrative and this challenge—*extreme scepticism*—will be echoed and made explicit by Mr B.'s sceptical accusations against Pamela's romance idealism as shown both in her behaviour and in her writing.

1. ROMANCE IDEALISM

Mrs Jewkes' role as an object distorted by the romance perspective at work in Pamela's recording of reality is already clear in Pamela's description of their first meeting: "Then the *wicked* creature appeared, whom I had never seen but once before, and I was *frightened* out of my wits"[my italics] (1988, 144). Considering Pamela's *writing to the moment*, which makes impossible the use of Pamela's later knowledge of Mrs Jewkes at these early stages of their relationship, and the fact that she had only seen her once before, the judgement she passes on her ("wicked") does not seem to be very fair. As she implicitly recognizes ("I was frightened"), she is projecting her fright at her abduction and captivity upon the figure who appears to be the embodiment of her plight, a reaction—and a literary technique, since Pamela records her reaction—validated by hundreds of years of romance writing and reading. This reaction, however, is not justified by the actions of Mrs Jewkes, who, after being introduced to Pamela, kisses her and praises her beauty (1988, 144), although her kindness and compliments are of no avail. Pamela completes Mrs Jewkes' portrait in wickedness with a description which foregrounds Mrs Jewkes' ugliness and masculinity, and which is intended to function, in accordance with the romance tradition, as an external correlate of her evil nature: she is very strong and fat, has thick arms, huge hands, a nose flat and crooked, large eyebrows, "a hoarse man-like voice," and "a dead, spiteful, grey, goggling eye" (1988, 152). This association of inner and outer self, and of her fear with Mrs Jewkes' wickedness, is made clear in the concluding words of the portrait: "So that *with a heart more ugly than her face*, she is at times (especially when she is angry) *perfectly frightful*: and I shall be ruined, to be sure, if heaven protects me not; *for she is very, very wicked*" [my italics] (1988, 152).

Mrs Jewkes' portrait places her somewhere half-way between the ogress or the witch of fairy-tales and the giants of medieval romance, a demonic creature in any case. Her depiction certainly parallels that of another "wicked" servant, Colbrand, who is named after a giant in the English medieval romance *Guy of Warwick*, as some critics have noted, and who is described as such a giant by Pamela: "a giant of a man," with large hands, "huge whiskers and monstrous wide mouth," "eye-brows hanging over his eyes," and especially "great staring eyes, like the bull's that frightened me so" (1988, 206). The comparison of his eyes with the the bull's eyes is very significant, since the bull was the product of Pamela's apprehensions and fears, which made her see a bull where there was only a cow. This comparison is a clear indication that the same process of distortion, of projection of subjectivity into the outer world, is at work in the portraits of Colbrand and Mrs Jewkes, and it is a subtle comment on the way her personal feelings, her fright, colour and distort her perception of reality, as Ronald Paulson has aptly pointed out: "When Pamela describes Jewkes, we see a portrait distorted by fear and apprehension ... Her nightmare fantasies are collected in her portraits of Jewkes and Colbrand ..., and all the evil she is unwilling to see in her master is transferred to his underlings, as in another instance it is transferred to a bull..." (1967, 104).

In the literary universe presented by Pamela, despite its air of authenticity and reality, personal feelings, fears and desires, become principles of characterization, and this creates the polarization of reality into evil and good which characterizes romance. If Mrs Jewkes and Colbrand are presented as demonic creatures, and Mr B. as a "Lucifer," as Pamela calls him once and again (1988, 89, 93, 240, 248, 270), she casts herself in the role of the persecuted, helpless and virtuous heroine of "religious romance," as MacDermott has argued (1989, 151 *et seqq.*), or, in D.C. Muecke's more universal typology, in the role of "the abducted princess held prisoner in a giant's castle. Mrs Jewkes is the ogress ... and Mr B. is the ogre..." (1967, 468). This polarization of reality into two antagonistic worlds had been already hinted at by Pamela when she emphasizes Mrs Jewkes' wickedness by

contrasting it with Mrs Jervis' goodness, a strategy perfectly fitting in this romance logic of polarized characterization: "So I find I am got into the hands of a wicked procuress, and if I had reason to be apprehensive with good Mrs Jervis, and where everybody loved me, what a dreadful prospect have I now before me, in the hands of such a woman as this!" (1988, 145). Pamela realizes in this passage her transition from a friendly or benevolent world, the house in Bedfordshire, where the rest of the characters shared and encouraged her romance idealism and world-view and were ready to help her, to a hostile one, the house in Lincolnshire, where she confronts figures that take no heed of, or even threaten her idealism. Of course in Pamela's narrative, as is always the case with romance, characters who aid the ideal, those belonging to the benevolent world of Bedfordshire, are good, and those who oppose it and set obstacles to it in Lincolnshire are evil, as Mr B. himself declares after reading her narrative: "'Yes, yes,' said he, 'it must be *good* Mr Longman! All *your* confederates, everyone of them, are good; but such of my servants as have done their duty and obeyed my orders, and myself too, are painted out by you, in your papers, as black as devils'" (1988, 269). This perception of the action and the characters of her story perfectly fits into the vertical perspective and the two polarized worlds of romance, the demonic and the idyllic, examined above. In *Pamela* this perspective is clearly at work mediating reality: an aristocratic and male code of behaviour, a conception of sexual relationships associated with the prevailing social order, represented by Mr B. and his supporters, are *demonized*; Pamela, the servant-maid, and her allies, who represent new bourgeois moral standards and female patterns of sexual as well as social behaviour are idealized.¹ Reality appears idealized positively or negatively, it is seen through fears and desires. This romance idealism is made clear by the later development and outcome of the story, which turns the book into the wish fulfilment dream that characterizes romance narratives.²

¹ Ian Watt has perfectly explained how Pamela's conflict with Mr B. illuminates and reflects two specific aspects, social and sexual, of contemporary reality: "... [Pamela's courtship] involves a struggle, not only between two individuals, but between two opposed conceptions of sex and marriage held by two different social classes, and between two conceptions of the masculine and the feminine roles which make their interplay in courtship even more complex and problematic than it had previously been" (1987, 154). Richetti identifies in the popular literature of virtuous heroines in distress preceding Richardson the same conflict on the same two fronts: "Latent social antagonism—the values of corrupt aristocracy condemned by a sobriety and rectitude implicitly classless—and sexual antagonism—helpless and virtuous females destroyed by a malign masculine ethos ..." (1969, 124). Richetti's perception of these conflicts in popular literature, in romance, dramatized in similar terms as those of Richardson, is important because it connects the way *Pamela* presents contemporary reality with the romance tradition, and this connection is the main argument of his book.

² Gillian Beer has drawn attention to this romance feature of *Pamela* when she comments in her book about romance on the improbability of Pamela's story and how it implies the fulfilment of the aspirations and dreams of a social group: "Richardson's novel of the maidservant who withstood her master's advances and then married him give lineaments to many covert desires and expressed the fantasies of a wide social range of readers. Pamela is an ideal figure as well as a lively young woman (she shares her name with one of the perfect heroines of Sidney's *Arcadia*). Few maidservants could hope to withstand the assaults of their master and win through to marriage and enfranchisement; few men could hope for erotic and lawful gratification from a wife who was their servant and their moral superior. The book was in a sense revolutionary, under mining the common assumptions about the outcome of such a story ... It was based also on scarcely formulated longings and ideals which were hampered by the actual social system and by the current assumptions about the relationships between men and women. The closely realistic narrative surface allowed its first audience to accept it as a report from life without bringing to consciousness the

Of course Richardson, or rather the implied author, is ultimately responsible for this romance idealism, but he creates a narrator separate from himself, Pamela, who can be blamed for it. Pamela is what Booth (1983) has called a *dramatized narrator*, a kind of narrator that being a character himself in the story, with his own subjectivity and world-view, always implies a certain degree of unreliability. A direct consequence of this unreliability is that what this narrator intends as a picture of the objective, outer world, may become a picture of the subjective, interior one, since we tend to reconstruct his personality from the distorted way he sees the world. The world thus becomes world-view, and his writing a trait of characterization. This is the case with Pamela and her romance idealism, as Michael McKeon has pointed out very intelligently:

... she [Pamela] is a 'romancer,' and the more desperate her situation actually becomes, the more it is distorted by her overheated imagination, which 'paints' the landscape ... in the hyperbolic colors of romance. Critics are justified in stressing *Pamela's* indebtedness to the themes and conventions of popular romance, but to be precise we should assess the major debt less to Richardson than to Pamela herself ... This is to say not that Richardson is independent of the romance model, but that it is a rationalized and second-order dependence that is functional primarily in characterizing the volatility of his protagonist's imagination. (1987, 363)

In *Pamela* romance is essentially a feature of the character and her world-view rather than of the world. This is the result of Pamela's unreliability as a narrator, which is first glimpsed in the connection of her narrative with the romance tradition, highlighted by the way she depicts Mrs Jewkes. This, however, is not the only evidence of her unreliability. In order to make a narrator unreliable, writes Booth, the author must have "some method of showing what the facts are from which the speaker's interpretation characteristically diverge" (1983, 175). Richardson's way of showing these divergent facts is Pamela's conscientious and minute recording of reality, which allows the spontaneous introduction of facts that contradict or undermine her vision. Pamela's *writing to the moment*, the proximity between acting and writing, does not allow her to elaborate or analyze the data she records as thoroughly as she would in different circumstances, so she does not realize, or at least cannot prevent, the divergences. As a result, Pamela is a distorting mirror where reality is portrayed in the bright colours of romance, but also one that inadvertently reflects softer and less defined hues. The complexity of reality filters through her romantic picture, her minute recording of her experience surpasses the romantic patterns she uses in her recording. Pamela's transcription of the dialogues with Mrs Jewkes, in which Mrs Jewkes offers an alternative vision of herself and reality, and therefore an implied critique of Pamela's romantic vision—the rebuttal of *realism*—overtly formulated by Mr. B., together with the facts in the story that sustain this critique, especially the evidence throughout the story that neither Mrs Jewkes nor Mr B. are the monsters she pictures, but also other divergent facts pointed out by critics and earlier by parodists—the rebuttal of *reality*—, call her romantic emplotment into question and make her unreliability clear. These rebuttals create the distance between dramatized narrator and author which is the novelist's distance from romance. This distance, although coupled with a considerable degree of complicity on Richardson's part, is enough to prevent the work from being a romance in order to become, instead, the romantic narrative of an unreliable narrator. *Pamela* does not portray the imaginary world of romance, but the real world seen through a romantic consciousness, or, in other words, the operations of a romantic mind.

ways in which it released them from the inhibitions of their own society. Revolution is one function of romance" (1970, 13).

2. DEBASED REALISM

In Pamela's depiction of Mrs Jewkes we recognize the romance tradition with its characteristic world-view at work. In addition to this, Mrs Jewkes' words and especially her behaviour, although shown in the light of Pamela's phobias, (2.1) will prove her to be a more human and less wicked character, that is, will offer a different vision of herself, and also (2.2) a conflicting vision of the other characters and reality. Mrs Jewkes will thus be the touchstone of Pamela's reliability and perspective on reality not only in a passive way, as an object distorted by that perspective, but also in an active way, as an agent in the exposure of its inadequacies and limitations. Mrs Jewkes' critique and the evidence that supports it makes clear that romance idealism is a feature of the protagonist narrator, not of the world.

Mrs Jewkes explains her position as a simple-minded employee who does as she is bid by her employer in order to earn her living, and looks at life from a pragmatist and down-to-earth point of view, in a conversation with Pamela: "'Why, look ye, look ye, madam,' said she, 'I have a great notion of doing my duty to my master; and therefore you may depend upon it, if I can do *that*, and serve *you*, I will: but you must think, if *your* desire, and *his* will, come to clash once, I shall do as he bids me, let it be what it will'" (1988, 147). The statement is repeated on several occasions by Mrs Jewkes (1988, 147-48), in an attempt to show the inadequacies of Pamela's romantic perspective, and, at the same time, to mitigate and improve Pamela's extremist view of her wickedness by offering the common-sensical motivations which that view conceals. Why should she bother to do this if she is the wicked ogress Pamela presents? The answer is related to another feature of this ingratiating attitude on Mrs Jewkes's part that appears in the passage, her use of *madam* (or *fair mistress*, as later in the same passage) to address Pamela, a feature which epitomizes all the complexity of Mrs Jewkes's position and all her fallen humanity. Mrs Jewkes is a servant forced by her master to tyrannize someone who may later tyrannize her. She is placed at the same time in a superior and inferior position to Pamela. In fact, Mrs Jewkes' role is to promote Pamela to a superior position as *mistress* by helping Mr B.'s sexual assault. Her ingratiating attitude and respectful *madam* shows how conscious she is of this inversion of the roles of servant and mistress that may, and will actually, take place if Pamela becomes Mr B.'s lover. It also shows that she is not the wicked tyrant who torments poor Pamela, but rather another victim caught up in the complex net of Mr B.'s plot against Pamela and of human relationships in general.

The complexity of her position is recorded by Pamela, but it escapes her romantic simplification of reality, as the following words demonstrate:

She calls me *madam* at every word; paying that undesired respect to me ... in the view of its being one day in my power to serve or dis-serve her, if ever I should be so vile as to be a *madam* to the wickedest designer that ever lived ... a poor creature is this woman, *who can madam up an inferior fellow-servant in such views; and who yet, at times, is insolent enough; for it is her true nature to be insolent* [my italics] (1988, 146-47).

Pamela realizes the motives behind Jewkes's behaviour as well as the oscillations between the two aspects of her personality created by them—the *poor creature*, the servant conscious of the precariousness of her authority, and the *insolent* guardian who must exert that authority—but she is unable to understand their coexistence or to explain it in other terms than mere wickedness, because this escapes her black and white picture of the world. Pamela is unable to see Mrs Jewkes for what she is, the servant who has to please her

present master as well as her would-be mistress, because Pamela's moral rectitude and her romance idealism does not allow her to understand such complexities of reality and Mrs Jewkes's compromising with that reality. For Pamela, it is difficult to reconcile this new dimension of Mrs Jewkes with her portrait in wickedness, so wicked she will remain—no matter how facts prove her more complex and human than that—even after Pamela marries Mr B. Pamela refuses to see Jewkes for what she really is even after her plight is over and fear no longer distorts her vision.

We are particularly conscious of the fact that Pamela is too ready to apply the term *wicked* to actions and words which do not seem to be so (as we saw in their first meeting), and this consciousness creates a gap between Pamela's and the reader's view of Mrs Jewkes. This is particularly evident in a series of scenes where Mrs Jewkes's humorous comments, her common-sensical and coarse humanity, are misinterpreted by Pamela, in accordance with her romance patterns, as the taunts of a fiend who tortures Pamela with her wickedness. Mrs Jewkes's jokes and laughter produce extraordinary fits of indignation and anger on Pamela's part, who seems to take too much to heart what are intended as light-hearted remarks. It is as if Pamela perceived the critique to her world-view implicit in them—a critique that does not necessarily imply wickedness, as Pamela assumes, but simply a different outlook or at least a different background, although this is an insight lacking in the romance mode, in which difference is always assessed in terms of good and evil, and not of perspective.

A good example of this occurs when Mrs Jewkes epitomizes Pamela's romantic attitude in one of her poignant comments: "Prayers and tears you are a good one at, lambkin" (1988, 176). Pamela is extremely offended at this remark, so offended that she records her indignation twice, as a narrator—inserted between brackets inside Jewkes's speech—and as a character—her response in the actual dialogue. Her reaction as a narrator seems to be disproportionate and shows the inadequacy of Pamela's romantic depiction of Mrs Jewkes: "[Was she not an odious wretch? A woman! Surely she cannot have the nature of a woman!]." The virulence of this response, underscored by the fact that Mrs Jewkes's comment still arouses Pamela's indignation and that she cannot wait for her own reply in the dialogue to record that indignation, seems unjustified, since Mrs Jewkes's assertion simply shows a difference in the appraisal of Pamela's behaviour—which certainly includes a considerable shower of tears and moral sentiments. Pamela's answer in the dialogue, as a character ("You are a wicked woman ... thus to make a jest of the calamity of a poor young creature designed, as perhaps you know, for a sacrifice"), shows again how much Pamela resents Mrs Jewkes' humorous vision and how she equates it with wickedness. Mrs Jewkes' reply to Pamela's complaints will be simply to laugh at the romantic rhetoric of calamities and sacrifices. Pamela's irritation has no limits: "She only laughed—Ugly creature! She only laughed—You cannot imagine how ugly she is when she laughs. How must she look when she cries?" (1988, 176). Mrs Jewkes's humorous and sceptical attitude and Pamela's displeasure at it, the inadequacy and lack of correspondence between stimulus and response, will become the pattern which defines their relationship.

This pattern reappears in many other incidents, for example, when Mrs Jewkes hints at the possibility of a marriage between Pamela and Mr Williams. Pamela's refusal is wrongly interpreted by Mrs Jewkes:

'Why, indeed, as you say,' answered she ..., 'there are a great many fooleries among lovers, that would not so well become a starched band and cassock. E'fackins, thou hast well considered of the matter.' And she *neighed*, as I may say, if neighing be the laugh of a horse. I think I do hate her. Must not, my dear mother, this woman be a bad woman to the very core? She turns everything into wickedness. (1988, 182)

Pamela's reaction to Mrs Jewkes' jesting comment shows us the humourless prude in her, constantly over-reacting to Mrs Jewkes' jokes and confusing her comic and down-to-earth approach to reality with wickedness. Again, Pamela's hatred does not seem to be very justified, and her view of her as "a bad woman to the very core" appears clearly as a romantic distortion of one of the most attractive traits of Mrs Jewkes' personality, her sense of humour. It is evident that what Pamela resents most of all is Mrs Jewkes's laughter, which makes her compare it to a neigh. There are good reasons for it, since this laughter is the main enemy of Pamela's romance mode. Mrs Jewkes's comic perspective undermines Pamela's romantic approach to every single incident of the story. As the example makes clear, this laughter puts these incidents in a different light, becoming somehow the corrective of laughter to Pamela's melodramatic excesses.¹

The dialogues examined above betray the disparity between Pamela's distorted view of Mrs Jewkes and the character itself, that is, between Pamela's vision (epitomized by her view of Mrs Jewkes) and reality (epitomized by Mrs Jewkes as presented by her behaviour and by the facts of the story). Furthermore, in some of these dialogues we are presented with Pamela's idealistic and humourless approach to reality, on the one side, and Mrs Jewkes's down-to-earth, comic, and slightly debasing approach, on the other. In Mrs Jewkes's remarks and Pamela's responses we first see the clash between their conflicting visions of reality, which will be a main feature of their evolving relationship and the topic of the next point.

Mrs Jewkes first expresses her conflicting outlook in an explicit way in the dialogue about the *madam question* which has been already discussed. Later in the same dialogue Pamela will ask Mrs Jewkes not *to madam* her, using her elevated and high-sounding terms: "... I am but a silly poor girl, set up by the gambol of fortune, for a may-game; ... I was at best but a servant girl; and now am no more than a discarded poor desolate creature; and no better than a prisoner. God be my deliverer and comforter!" (1988, 147). Mrs Jewkes's reply shows how Pamela's romantic explanation of her situation is not the only one, and how that situation has shades that make it less desperate and at the same time less simple than Pamela's words suggest:

'Ay, ay,' says she, 'I understand something of the matter. *You have so great power over my master, that you will be soon mistress of us all* and so, I will oblige you, if I can. And I must and will call you madam; for I am instructed to shew you all respect, I assure you.' See, my dear father, see what a creature this is! [my italics] (1988, 147)

Mrs Jewkes is here the subject of an active rebuttal to Pamela's view of her situation, the mouthpiece of a different vision of reality. If Pamela stresses only her helplessness

¹ Another good example of this takes place when Pamela jumps out of her bed as result of a nightmare: "I told her my dream: the *wicked* creature only *laughed*, and said, All I feared was no more than a dream; and when it was over, and I was well awake, I should laugh at it as such. Was there ever such an abominable wretch?" [my italics] (1988, 207). As usual, *laugh* and *wicked* are side by side, but Pamela's hyperbolic response cannot prevent us from thinking that Mrs Jewkes, at least in this case, is simply the voice of common-sense, of a person with a very factual, although also crude, sense of experience and reality. A cruder example of Jewkes's comic approach is her hilarity at Mr Williams's robbery and beating. Pamela's indignation seems here justified, and we realize Mrs Jewkes' perspective is not completely free of distortion itself (although of the opposite kind, degrading instead of idealizing). Mrs Jewkes's reply, however, minimizes the moral objections her attitude may have raised: "I said I thought it was very barbarous to laugh at such misfortune. But she replied, As he was safe, she laughed; otherwise she should have been sorry: and she was glad to see me so much concerned for him. It looked *promising*, she said" (1988, 190).

("discarded poor desolate creature"), Mrs Jewkes draws attention to her power, to the potential for manipulation of Mr B.'s passion for her. Mrs Jewkes hints at this again in a later dialogue: "Well," said she, "but if he does [if he intends to make proposals to Pamela] ... you may have your own terms. *I see that you may do anything with him.*" (1988, 175). Pamela's final comment ("what a creature is this!") shows the same stubborn association of Mrs Jewkes pragmatism, and most important, of her alternative view, with wickedness.

Once more, however, Mrs Jewkes's view is sustained to a certain extent by the later development of the story and its denouement, since Pamela will have her own terms. In addition to this, Pamela's helplessness is more than dubious considering the determination of her resistance and the lack of determination of Mr B.'s attacks. Mrs Jewkes highlights the fact that the roles of the virtue-in-distress plot Pamela uses to frame her situation are somewhat inverted. On the one hand, there is a *weak* villain who is ready to do such unbecoming things for a villain as to disguise himself as a servant-maid or to hide in a closet, in order to get what a more resolute villain—or simply a villain—like the one Pamela has pictured, would have as soon as he pleased; and who, when at last his tricks put him in a position to satisfy his desires, is restrained from doing it by Pamela's fainting, to Mrs Jewkes's astonishment and even indignation (she probably realizes at that moment Pamela's power over Mr B. and his poor condition as a villain). On the other hand, there is a *strong* victim who seems to be more in control of the situation than the villain and uses all her resources to exert that control, who knows how and when to faint (in the rape scene, when she realizes that words and tears are of no avail), how to dress to inflame Mr B.'s passions and when she has to do it (her dressing as a farmer's daughter), and when she must stay or leave (she has frequent occasions to escape in Bedfordshire but she always finds some trifling excuse not to do it).¹ Mrs Jewkes's view is thus borne out by a few facts which validate her perspective and undermine Pamela's. Reality as presented in the narrative is more complex than Pamela believes or pretends to believe: the villain is not so villainous and the heroine is not so defenceless. Richardson the novelist is keeping his distance from Pamela the romancer.

This tension between Pamela's image of herself and the different light Mrs Jewkes and these incidents cast upon her, creates an ambiguity in the character, two possible interpretations of Pamela's behaviour, or, as Kreissman has called it, "two sets of dress" (1964, 15). This ambiguity or dual nature left plenty of room for the parodists, since they did not need to change the incidents of the story to offer a completely different portrait of

¹ Bernard Kreissman has pointed out these inconsistencies of Pamela's behaviour with the image of herself she presents in her narrative, which prove what he calls "Pamela's business-like attitude": "When Pamela intimates that he [Mr B.] is willing to meet Pamela's terms and marry her, she not only agrees to return, but is in such a hurry to do so that her impatience taxes the endurance of the coachmen and even the horses. This unseemly haste stems from more than her eagerness to 'close the deal.' Her presence in the flesh is part and parcel of her strategy: it is 'good for business' to keep B. constantly aware of the prize within his reach. (Viewed in this light, it is not hard to understand why Pamela stayed to embroider the waistcoat or to accompany Jervis, and failed to take advantage of the numerous opportunities to escape.) When marriage finally is offered to her, not for one moment does she consider refusing this villain whose courtship has consisted of revilement, incarceration, kidnapping, and attempted rape; indeed, so far is she from being indignant that she falls on her knees to thank him for his generosity. Moreover, in accepting him she unwittingly discloses the hypocrisy of her earlier repeated denials of the possibility of marriage between one so great and one so low. For when B. inquires how she will pass the time after her marriage, Pamela promptly presents a list of projected household duties whose extent and organization indicate hours of serious planning" (1964, 15).

Pamela's character and a different account of her story. They could simply adopt Mrs Jewkes's degrading vision, take it to its extreme—which amounts to depicting Pamela as a schemer who uses her power over Mr B. to trap him and get a profitable marriage—and substitute it for Pamela's.¹ Jewkes's vision is even more clearly stated in a series of scenes in which it appears in conflict with Pamela's romance idealism. In the following conversation, for example, the confrontation between two conflicting visions of reality is very clear:

'You will not, I hope,' replied I, 'do any unlawful or wicked thing, for any master in the world.' ... 'Suppose,' said I, 'he should bid you cut my throat, would you do it?' 'There's no danger of that,' replied she; 'but to be sure I would not; for then, I should be hanged; since that would be murder.' 'And suppose,' said I, 'he should resolve to ensnare a poor young creature, and ruin her, would you assist him in such wickedness? And do you not think, that to rob a person of her virtue, is worse than cutting her throat?'

'Why now,' said she, '*how strangely you talk! Are not the two sexes made for each other? And is it not natural for a man to love a pretty woman? And suppose he can obtain his desires, is that so bad as cutting her throat?*' And then the wretch fell a laughing...[my italics] (1988, 147-48)

Pamela voices the moral idealism which characterizes romance, using its characteristic grandiloquent terms, equating loss of virtue with loss of life, and choosing a very melodramatic and colourful death among the many possible ones ("cut my throat"). Mrs Jewkes dismisses Pamela's apprehensions of such a death as unjustified and the comparison between death and loss of virtue as inadequate, laughing at Pamela's moral idealism. She first introduces the corrective of reality: Pamela is not going to be murdered because, among other things, that would imply that Mrs Jewkes would be hanged. Then she offers her own vision of reality: to be seduced, or even raped, is not to be murdered, on the contrary, love between the sexes is part of the natural order of life. Mrs Jewkes thus opposes a kind of epicurean naturalism or debased materialism, to Pamela's moral idealism. Of course this vision implies also a distortion of reality, since it is biased by her subservience to her master's unlawful design on Pamela and her ignorance or lack of understanding of feelings and spiritual realities beyond her level of coarse experience, so it is limited by its moral debasement. Finally, she laughs at Pamela's ideas and language, she *laughs romance away*.

¹ This was the case in Fielding's *Shamela*, where Mrs Jewkes's perspective becomes the author's, and therefore shapes the world presented, so we have a new narrative which is a completely different account of the same story. In *Shamela* the protagonist does exactly what Mrs Jewkes tells Pamela to do, that is, to use Mr B.'s passion to her advantage, to have her own terms, as Shamela herself makes clear: "No, Mrs *Jervis*, nothing under a regular taking into Keeping, a settled Settlement, for me, and all my Heirs, all my whole Lifetime, shall do the Business—or else cross-legged, is the Word, faith, with *Sham*; and then I snapt my Fingers" (1972, 22). Pamela's saintly character is turned into its opposite, clad in the other set of dress, so she becomes a cunning hypocrite who feigns virtue and trades her body for a profitable marriage. This inversion also affects the rest of the characters, except Mrs Jewkes, who is exactly the same bawd as in *Pamela*. She holds the same opinions and views, and behaves as coarsely and rudely as in *Pamela*. This is very significant because it confirms that her perspective is the one used for the inversion. When the debased vision of reality she voices in *Pamela* is applied to the fictional world of Richardson's work to transform it into the world of *Shamela*, she will necessarily remain unchanged, at ease in a world shaped by her world-view, brought down to her degrading vision. It is also significant that the story also remains basically unchanged, since it confirms that reality as presented in Pamela's narrative bears out Mrs Jewkes's interpretation of it as much as Pamela's.

This confrontation is echoed in a later dialogue that further illustrates this dual perspective on reality:

'I dare say, you think yourself, that he intends my ruin.' 'I hate,' said she, 'that foolish word *ruin*! Why ne'er a lady in the land lives happier than you may do, if you will, or be more honourably used.'

'Well, Mrs Jewkes,' said I, 'I shall not at this time dispute with you about the words *ruin* or *honourable*; for I find I have quite different notions of both ...'

'Ruin!' said she, and put up her ugly horse-lip: 'it is what I would do, in your place; and if it was to be as you *think*, I should rather be out of my pain, than live in continual apprehensions, as you do.' 'An *hour* of innocence,' replied I, 'is worth an *age* of guilt: and were my life to be made ever so miserable by it, I should never forgive myself, if I were not to lengthen out to the longest minute the time of my innocency. Who knows what Providence may do for me?'

'Who knows,' said she, 'as he loves you so well, but you may move him in your favour by your prayers and tears? Prayers and tears you are a good one at, lambkin' (1988, 175-76).

In this conversation Pamela again insists on her desire to remain innocent and pure at the cost of her life; Mrs Jewkes replies that pain and suffering are strong enough reasons to yield virtue, debasement is better than death. The different notions of ruin, honour, and Providence, Pamela and Mrs Jewkes have, epitomize their different world-views. Mrs Jewkes cannot stand Pamela talking about her ruin because she can only think of *ruin* in material terms, and that is not certainly the case of someone whose material necessities are satisfied and who is therefore provided with an *honourable* and *decent* life. Pamela's interpretation of *ruin* is of course spiritual, moral, and to this sphere she turns her eyes and her prayers for help, to divine Providence, to deliverance through God's power. The possibility of such an intervention of Providence is of course alien to Mrs Jewkes's world-view, who interprets providence in human terms, that is, deliverance through the power of Mr B.'s love, or at least of his desire, and Pamela's ability to use it to her advantage. The dialogue perfectly illustrates the alternative between the romance and the realistic modes as explained at the beginning of this paper. Pamela looks forwards to her deliverance by God, that is, by a providential reversal or *peripetia*, so motivation for human action is placed in a superior world which directs that action; Mrs Jewkes only believes in deliverance by love, that is, as a result of Mr B.'s feelings and psychology, and of Pamela's manipulation of them, so motivation for human action is placed in this world, in the material world. Providence and causality, romance and realism, with their different relationship with reality, are confronted.

Pamela constantly appeals to that spiritual world above, which is the source of her moral idealism, of her notions of honour and virtue, and of her hope of a happy end. Mrs Jewkes, on the contrary, is a creature of this world, deeply rooted in it, in its lower and more debased spheres, and she does not understand other language and other notions than those of the material and prosaic order she belongs to. This complete ignorance of the moral and the ideal makes her realism a *debased realism*. In fact it can be associated with the debased vision of the picaresque and compared to that of Defoe's heroine Moll Flanders, whose plight reflects the same economic and social background as Pamela's. This background is the one that gave rise to the fiction of the *helpless female*, as Utter and Needham called it (1936, 3), the kind of fiction that, as explained by these critics and also by Ian Watt (1987), reflects the new economic difficulties of unmarried women in the eighteenth century, who had only two means to earn their living: domestic service or prostitution. Pamela and Moll are both unmarried servant-maids whose economic vulnerability and dependence jeopardizes their moral behaviour and leaves them helpless to the

corrupting advances of aristocratic seducers; both Pamela and Moll, as Utter and Needham have argued, are “confronted with the same dilemma” as a result of these advances: “dishonest livelihood or no livelihood, prostitution or death” (1936, 19). Their responses, however, are very different: Moll Flanders’s, like Mrs Jewkes’s, is realistic and immoral, so she will surrender to her seducer and will later choose prostitution and delinquency as a means of survival; Pamela’s response is moral and idealistic, since her refusal of her seducer’s proposals as well as of any indecent way of life exposes her to being dismissed and therefore to starvation. In *Pamela* reality is enchanted, transformed into a romance by Pamela’s writing—and her enchantment will be validated by the denouement, that is, by the author, which subjects reality to the romance laws of wish fulfilment. In *Moll Flanders*, on the contrary, reality is presented in the cruder terms of the picaresque, that is, in Mrs Jewkes’s terms. The conflict between the romance and the picaresque—or realism in its crudest form—represented by *Pamela* and *Moll Flanders*, is dramatized inside *Pamela* in the conflict between Mrs Jewkes’ debased realism and the heroine’s romance idealism.

What matters, however, is not which attitude, vision, or world-view, is the right one, or which is more in accordance with reality, since the answer will depend on what truth, moral or factual, is used as a norm. What matters is the presence, side by side in the narrative, of two opposed responses to reality. Mrs Jewkes and Pamela stand for different approaches to reality, the romantic and the realistic. Of course Richardson’s intention is to encourage Pamela’s romantic but moral approach and to dismiss that of Mrs Jewkes’s. But in so doing he shows them in dialectical confrontation, in a dialogue, and the two approaches can do nothing but criticize each other, *deconstruct* each other, exposing the other’s frailties and inadequacies: Pamela reveals Mrs Jewkes’s moral degradation; Mrs Jewkes unmasks the distortion of reality that Pamela’s moral stance implies. Here lies the significance of Mrs Jewkes’s position, in the fact that it illuminates the romantic inadequacies of Pamela’s relationship with reality. In this sense, using the terminology recently proposed by Michael McKeon in his account of the origins of the novel, her position is that of *extreme scepticism*.¹

3. EXTREME SCEPTICISM

Pamela writes and presents her story, in McKeon’s terms, as a *naive empiricist*. She validates the truth of her account with the documentary realism of her minute recording of reality and her *writing to the moment*, using many of the devices of authentication studied by McKeon as characteristic of *naive empiricism* (the eyewitness who offers first-hand experience, the letters and the journal which function as a perfect vehicle to frame that experience as authentic and not manipulated, circumstantial detail which creates the illusion of completeness, self-analysis which creates the illusion of the construction of the self).

¹ In McKeon’s view (1987), the rise of the novel was the result of a crisis in epistemology and social structure and of a series of changes in both spheres. As far as the epistemological changes are concerned, these are explained by McKeon as a succession of three attitudes about how to tell truth in narratives. (1) *Romance idealism* implied an epistemology based on received authorities and previous literary tradition as the foundations that guaranteed the truthfulness of a narrative. (2) This was challenged in the seventeenth century by the empirical epistemology of *naive empiricism*, which attacked the lies and the factual falseness of romance and declared historicity as the only valid criterion to claim the truth of an account. (3) This negation of romance, in its turn, was vulnerable to a counter-critique, *extreme scepticism*, which uncovered the elements of romance concealed in this pretence of historicity. In McKeon’s own words, “the naive empiricism of the claim to historicity purports to document the authentic truth; the extreme scepticism of the opposing party demystifies this claim as mere ‘romance’” (1987, 48).

The figure of Mrs Jewkes (in her statements as well as in the way she is depicted in Pamela's account) uncovers the romantic patterns that orient her *true* account of her experience, the romance concealed under the naive empiricist's claim to truth. The position occupied or represented by Mrs Jewkes thus corresponds to extreme scepticism, and it is in the fact that she negates the truth and exposes the distortion of Pamela's vision, rather than in her particular perspective on reality, in the critique itself rather than in its specific contents, that lies the significance of their dialectical relationship: it demystifies Pamela's account and vision as romance. In this context it is easy to realize the significance of her laughing at Pamela. Her laughter perfectly epitomizes extreme scepticism: it does not articulate a particular ideology or world-view, but simply and purely a counter-view. Laughter foregrounds the limitations of its object, while the reasons behind it can remain hidden. It defines Mrs Jewkes's position negatively, as anti-romance—*laughing romance away*—rather positively.

In this demystifying task Mrs Jewkes is not alone. The extreme scepticism epitomized by her laughter is echoed by that of Mr B., which is even more obvious because it is formulated in a very explicit and distinct way. Mr B.'s sceptical accusations against Pamela's romance idealism are twofold, since they are directed against Pamela herself and also against her narrative. Mr B. accuses Pamela of acting as a heroine in a romance, and also of writing a romance, of romancing reality in her narrative. Both accusations imply that historicity, the naive empiricist's—and Pamela's—basis of their claim to truth, is not the same as truth; the claim to historicity is not enough to guarantee the truth of a narrative. History can be falsified by its actors, by its chroniclers, or by both, as in Pamela's case.

Mr B. very early in the book describes Pamela's behaviour as literary and romantic. In a letter to her father he writes that "... ever since the death of her kind lady, she has given herself up to the reading of novels and romances, and such idle stuff, and now takes it into her head, because her glass tells her she is pretty, that every body who looks upon her is in love with her" (1988, 124). Of course Pamela is right as far as Mr B.'s love for her is concerned, and Mr B.'s assertions are actually intended to hide that love and his designs on Pamela, but it is nonetheless true that Pamela's behaviour throughout her captivity, as has been shown above, seems to sustain these assertions. Mr B. later insists on the romantic patterns that orient this behaviour when he suggests that once he seduces her she will behave as the heroines of romance, he calls her either "romantic idiot" or "romantic girl" (1988, 276), and he condemns her romantic acting ("I cannot bear this romantic, this stupid folly", 1988, 277). As McDermott has commented referring to these comments on Mr B.'s part, "Mr B. is certainly accurate if he meant to imply that Pamela was simply another in a very long line of girls from heroic, religious, indeed even Greek romance, who were willing to die rather than be violated. But Mr B.'s remark also implies that Pamela is simply adopting a pose she has read about so often in these particular romances, and that it is merely a pose" (1989, 152). This accusation of adopting a literary pose implicit in Mr B.'s words was made clear in an earlier passage, in the scene at the dinner table in Lincolnshire—and elsewhere in the book (201-3, 223, 225)—in which both Mr B. and Mrs Jewkes dismiss Pamela's behaviour as feigned and theatrical, and consider Pamela's tears and fainting as part of a performance, something which Mrs Jewkes had already hinted in her laconic "Prayers and tears you are a good one at, lam bkin" (1988, 176). Mr B. will call Pamela "the little hypocrite" and "mistress of all arts", and he will accuse her of being an actress: "When she has *acted* this her *first part* over, perhaps I will see her again, and she shall *soon* know what she has to trust to" (1988, 222).

However, extreme scepticism demystifying Pamela's emplotment of her life as romance is best seen in Mr B.'s comments on Pamela's narrative after his first reading of her letters.

The sceptical accusation against the romance idealism of her account is clearly stated when Mr B. asks her to show him the rest of her narrative:

'... I long to see the particulars of your plot, and your disappointment where these papers leave off. As *I have furnished you with a subject, I think I have a title to see how you manage it. Besides, there is such a pretty air of romance, as you tell your story, in your plots, and my plots, that I shall be better directed how to wind up the catastrophe of the pretty novel.*' [my italics] (268)

Mr B. at this point of the book is in the same position as the reader: he has read the same epistolary narrative that we readers have in our hands. And he notices the same air of romance, the same disparity between the subject he furnishes Pamela, the incidents, factual reality, and how Pamela manages it, emplotment, the perspective furnished by the romance mode, that has been examined above. This gap between story and discourse that Mr B. notices implies a realization of how emplotment may distort historical fact and falsify reality (a realization whose implications for history itself have only very recently been explored by Hyden White [1985]). Mr B. also notices the most prominent aspect of Pamela's emplotment of her story as a romance, the polarized characterization. He very early declares that "she has written letters ... to her father, and to *others*, as far as I know; in which, *representing* herself as an angel of light, she makes her kind master and benefactor, a devil incarnate" (1988, 68), and later he complains that all her "confederates" are good, but himself and his dutiful servants are painted "as black as devils" (1988, 269).¹

Mr B. clearly perceives that Pamela sees, frames and records reality through the eyes of romance, and also that she imitates it in her behaviour. Whether she carries out her imitation intuitively or on purpose, that is another question; the answer depends on whether we see her as a innocent romancer or as a shrewd hypocrite, and this has been a permanent bone of contention among readers and interpreters of *Pamela* since the work appeared, for both interpretations, the *two sets of dress* mentioned above, are supported by the facts narrated,

¹ In drawing this distinction between story and discourse, Mr B. is implicitly asserting the sceptical claim that factuality is not truth, as naive empiricism would have us to believe, since romance idealism may orient the perspective and distort truth. This sceptical claim is best observed in one dialogue between Pamela and Mr B. in which it is confronted with Pamela's empiricist claim to historicity. When Mr B. asks Pamela to show him her letters, Pamela's refusal is that of the naive empiricist who assumes that her narrative is a literal transcription of the facts and this guarantees its truth: "But *you* know as well as *I* all that they contain" (1988, 275), says Pamela—or, in other words, Mr B. does not need to read her narrative because it is the history of events he has witnessed himself, so, as such factual history it has no interest for him, since he has witnessed those facts and consequently already knows everything he is going to find in it. Mr B.'s reply shows the extreme sceptic's dissociation of truth and factuality: "But I don't know," said he, "*the light you represent things in*" [my italics] (1988, 275)—or, in other words, how she manages it. This immediately calls to mind Parson Oliver's statements at the beginning of *Shamela*, when he claims that the narrative "will set Pamela and some others in a very different *light*, than that in which they appear in the printed Book," (1972, 13), or that Pamela's narrative "is such a *Misrepresentation of Facts*, such a Perversion of Truth, as you will, I am persuaded, agree, as soon as you have perused the papers I know inclose to you ... " (1972, 14). What Parson Oliver is asserting is that the fact that the story is real, or rather historical, that it happened, does not mean that it is true, that is, the same sceptical accusation made by Mr B. Fielding's critique in *Shamela* as an extreme sceptic is that the naive empiricist claim to historicity is not a guarantee of truth, since romance idealism has misrepresented the facts, and therefore it has perverted truth. In fact Fielding will take for granted the historicity of the story, he will assume that Pamela really existed, and will simply alter the *light*, using the one provided by Mrs Jewkes, as has been shown, to illuminate his new account of *Pamela*.

by reality. This is the central ambiguity in Richardson's novel, and one which puzzles Mr B. as well as the reader. He first adopts the view of Pamela as hypocrite, which is also the view adopted by the parodists (Fielding, for example). But Mr B. will adopt the other view, as unconscious romancer, after reading her complete narrative. In fact the turning point in Richardson's novel is marked by this transition from one view to the other, by this change in Mr B.'s assessment of Pamela's romantic world-view which also signals a change in the status of this world-view in the work as a whole. This takes place exactly when Mr B. reads her account of the attempted escape and suicide:

When he came, as I suppose, to the place where I mentioned the bricks falling upon me, he got up, and walked to the door, and looked upon the broken part of the wall; for it had not been mended; and reading on to himself, came towards me; and took my hand, and put it under his arm.

'Why this,' said he, 'my girl, is a very moving tale. It was a very desperate attempt, and had you got out, you might have been in great danger ...'

'All I ventured, and all I suffered, was nothing, sir, to what I apprehended. You will be so good from hence to judge—' 'Romantic girl!' interrupted he, 'I know what you'd say,' and read on ... And when he came to my reasonings, about throwing myself into the water, he said, 'Walk gently before'; and seemed so moved, that he turned away his face from me; and I blessed this good sign... (1988, 275-76)

What we have here is extreme scepticism being conquered by the naive empiricist blending of history and romance. Mr B. checks the historicity of Pamela's account (the fallen bricks), and her tale proves to be authentic. Pamela's circumstantial details validate her naive empiricist claim to historicity, and their value as a device of authentication is made explicit by Mr B.'s sceptical test. Mr B., however, still recognizes Pamela's romantic behaviour ("Romantic girl!"), her romance idealism colouring her vision and rendering of reality ("I cannot bear this romantic, this stupid folly", he will say when he gets angry at Pamela on the next page, 277), although he now believes it to be sincere and is moved by its sincerity. Mr B. does not change his opinion about Pamela's distortion of reality, but about the motives behind it. This is very important to realize that her sceptical accusations were not simply the result of his design on her, but are independent of it, since once this design has been suspended and replaced by love, he still maintains his view of Pamela as a romancer, although he now submits to romance idealism as a result of this change. The ambivalence of this attitude—recognizing romance but nevertheless submitting to its rules and world-view, a submission which will be later reinforced by marriage and will be shared by Mrs Jewkes—is interesting to assess Richardson's position and use of romance, since the author shares with Mr B. a similar ambivalence towards romance, whereby distance is coupled with complicity. This position will be made clear by comparing Pamela with another romantic idealist, don Quixote. Both Cervantes and Richardson depicted characters who perform romantic emplotments of reality, and, in both cases, this depiction resulted in a narrative that transcended romance and created a new kind of fiction, the novel. They both advanced towards the novel through romance, although their use of romance, as we will see in the following part of this paper, was quite different.

II ROMANTIC EMPLOTMENTS OF REALITY: PAMELA AND DON QUIXOTE

The parallelism between Pamela and don Quixote as literary characters, although it has been ignored by all comparative studies of Cervantes's influence on English 18th-century fiction, is real and not far-fetched at all. Pamela has her own place in that extended family

of characters who descend from the Don and whose kinship results from their confusion of literature and life, or, in other words, who see reality through the eyes of literature. Like don Quixote, and like later female descendants of him (Arabella in *The Female Quixote*, Catherine Moreland in *Northanger Abbey*), Pamela uses romance to apprehend reality. They all respond to reality with their romance idealism, although that response ranges from Pamela's harmless delusion to don Quixote's problematic hallucination. They resort to literary models to frame and to make sense of the situations with which they are confronted. And, in the case of don Quixote and Pamela, their literary conscience goes beyond reading and imitating, and extends to the writing of their own story: Pamela lives to write, don Quixote to be written. Through the patterns and frame offered to them by romance, they both emplot their story.

Of course they differ in the particular kind of romance formula they take as a model and use. Don Quixote seizes on chivalric romance, Arabella on French heroic romances, Catherine on the Gothic romance. In the case of Pamela it is more difficult to identify the formula she makes use of because she does not make reference to any specific kind of romance, and, furthermore, her imitation seems to be carried out unconsciously rather than self-consciously, as in the case of the others. As far as the formula is concerned, the author is responsible for its evident connections with romance (since Pamela finds herself in a story she has not devised, she simply narrates it), and several accounts have been offered of Richardson's romantic sources or models.¹ Pamela's indebtedness to romance as a narrator is less a question of formulas than of a literary mode of representation, as I have shown above, of how she emplots reality, her story, in accordance with a previous tradition in fiction. She sees the world through a literary perspective, the double vertical perspective of romance, which implies the polarization and idealization of reality in two antagonistic worlds according to fears and desires as well as the separation of the universe into the sensible and the intelligible worlds, the latter providentially ordering and giving meaning to the former. Pamela thus represents the quintessence of romance idealism, and this quintessence, rather than the imitation of a concrete model, is the one which permeates her speech, her actions, and her writing.

The absence of an internal literary referent that identifies the character as a reader of a certain kind of romance alerts us to the differences between Pamela and the other quixotic heroines, and especially between Pamela and don Quixote. The literature-life theme is not central in *Pamela*, and this fact, together with other differences that will be discussed

¹ An examination of the fiction which precedes Richardson is necessary to decide from what formulas or specific type of romance he is drawing the romantic elements of his novels. John J. Richetti's analysis of the 17th- and 18th-century *amatory novella* in *Popular Fiction Before Richardson*, highlights the connection between Richardson and writers such as Mrs. Manley and Mrs. Haywood, who wrote *novels* which were actually *romances* in disguise. Richardson employed the same myth of the persecuted maiden, of virtue in distress, with the same sexual and social implications it had in these authors. His imposition of a moral framework on this pattern had been already foreshadowed by Mrs Aubin and especially by Mrs Rowe. Jerry C. Beasley in "Romance and the 'New' Novels of Richardson, Fielding, and Smollett" asserts that (1976, 444). And McDermott (1989) also endorses Richetti's view, but he is more specific: he overtly calls *romance* this kind of fiction that Richetti labels *popular*, and he makes explicit the distinction between two types of this fiction (passionate romance and religious romance) implicit in Richetti's separation—on moral grounds—of the pious Aubin and Rowe from her more mundane predecessors Manley and Haywood. For McDermott, these authors are the sources of the romance elements in *Pamela*, which performs a curious blending of the eroticism of passionate romance with the piousness of the religious type. McDermott supports his arguments by comparing *Pamela* with a romance of a very similar title, *Vertue Rewarded; or, The Irish Princess* (1693).

below, points to a divergence in the intentions behind Richardson's use of romance. Richardson does not want to attack a specific kind of romance, he is not interested in parody. Furthermore, he does not want to dismiss romance as inadequate or anachronistic but, on the contrary, he puts romance idealism to the service of his moral purposes. The field of his controversy is not literary, but moral. The similarities between *Don Quixote* and *Pamela* confirm the romance idealism of the latter and of Pamela's vision, and they help to delineate it and characterize it. The differences between them illuminate and explain the different attitudes of Richardson and Cervantes towards romance, as well as the complexities of Richardson's position—as a moralist and as a novelist—towards Pamela's romantic emplotment.

1. PAMELA AS A FEMALE QUIXOTE

1.1. *Similarities: Idealism and Realism.* Both *Pamela* and *Don Quixote* present romance idealism as a feature of their protagonists, at a distance from reality as presented in the narrative, that is, from the author who designs that reality, and in conflict with the debased realism represented by other characters. Pamela's idealized vision of herself and of her moral excellence, her reduction of the complexities of reality to the contest between good and evil, her belief in a Providential order which intervenes in the affairs of this world, in short, her substitution of the vertical perspective of romance for the horizontal one of life, have a clear precedent in don Quixote. The Don sees the world in the same polarized terms as Pamela. The persons he encounters in his adventures are either villains or knights, low or noble, victims or tyrants. His simplified world-view cannot accept such intricacies as a criminal who has been condemned and has therefore become a victim by his own deeds, as in the case of the galley slaves he encounters on the road (1979, I.22). The ambiguity of that position cannot be reconciled with don Quixote's romanticized judgement, so he will set them free, and they will immediately turn against the Don and thus act as the rebuttal of reality. This is the same lack of flexibility towards reality Pamela shows in her inability to understand the different aspects of Mrs Jewkes's personality and the complexities of her position, or to realize Mr B.'s conflict between social privilege and growing love, so her simplified vision of these characters will also be confronted with the rebuttal provided by the divergent picture of them which emerges as the narrative advances. Don Quixote also sees this world as ordered or presided by a ruling principle, which is named Providence or *the Enchanters* depending on the good or evil nature of its workings. His belief in Providence guiding the random adventures of the knight errant, taking him wherever his help is needed, and helping him in the permanent combat of good against evil, which is the principle that structures the narrative world of chivalric romance, is implicit in his letting Rocinante choose the way and lead him, and is rebutted by his continuous failures. For these failures, which obviously cannot be explained through Providence, since this always helps the heroes and is a positive principle guiding their actions, a kind of negative Providence, the Enchanters, is seized upon. This psychological mechanism of the Don's reveals the romance penchant to transfer responsibility and motivation for human actions out of this world, of the ordinary level experience, to some divine or magic—superior at any rate—source. This is the same penchant seen in Pamela and her hope of deliverance through Providence, which is also corrected by reality, by the transformation of this providential deliverance anticipated by Pamela into fully human means—Mr B.'s growing love and the evolving relationship between Pamela and Mr B.

In both novels, this romance idealism is in conflict with the forces of a hostile realism which besiege the protagonists. If in *Don Quixote* the response of realism to this idealism is represented by Sancho, in *Pamela*, as we have seen, this role is played by Mrs Jewkes.

Mrs Jewkes and Sancho embody the same debased realism opposed to the protagonist's romance idealism. The romantic emplotments of Pamela and don Quixote are highlighted and undermined by a foil who voices a debased vision of reality. Both Sancho and Mrs Jewkes represent a degradation or lowering of the ideal by laughter and the *bodily lower stratum*, by the *carnivalesque* and *grotesque realism*.¹ In both works, the conflict between romance and realism which is also a conflict between the ideal and the real becomes a conflict between opposed visions of reality dramatized in a dialectical relationship between two characters, one heroic and one prosaic. And, in both cases, the relationship works both ways: the prosaic shows epistemological insufficiencies, inadequacies when apprehending reality, in the heroic; the heroic shows moral debasement, limitations when appraising reality, in the prosaic. This, which is obvious in *Pamela* because the emphasis is clearly on the value and the validity of the ideal, is also true of *Don Quixote*, in which this aspect is perhaps obscured by the parodic or anti-romantic dimension of the book, but is not totally left aside. The Don, despite the mocking and the burlesque, has a heroic dimension, he is a hero as well as a fool—as the readings of Cervantes' work in the nineteenth century, especially by the German romanticists, underscoring, and as has been more recently and convincingly shown by John Jay Allen in *Don Quixote: Hero or Fool?*). He paradoxically represents the ideal as well as a parodied idealistic kind of fiction, and reality and other characters are negatively measured up to his ideal standards, their debased realism to his romance idealism, as Paulson has very aptly noted.² Of course this dialectical relationship between the heroic and the prosaic is much more complex in Cervantes, since it is the subject of his novel. The parallelism, however, cannot be denied. Both Pamela and don Quixote are confronted with realists who are also morally debased, inferior creatures.

1.2. *Similarities: Literature and Life*. Pamela also inherits part of the Don's literary madness, the quixotic pretence of living through literature. Although Pamela does not mention

¹ Mikhail Bakhtin explains these terms in *Rabelais and his World* as follows: "The essential principle of grotesque realism is degradation, that is, the lowering of what is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract; it is a transfer to the material level, to the sphere of earth and body in their indissoluble unity ... It is in this tradition of grotesque realism that we find the source of the scenes in which Don Quixote degrades chivalry and ceremonial" (1984, 19-20). Bakhtin adds below: "Sancho's materialism, his potbelly, appetite, his abundant defecation, are on the absolute lower level of grotesque realism of the gay bodily grave (belly, bowels, earth) which has been dug for Don Quixote's abstract and deadened idealism. One could say that the knight of the sad countenance must die in order to be reborn a better and greater man. This is a bodily and popular corrective to individual idealistic and spiritual pretense. Moreover, it is the popular corrective of laughter applied to the narrow-minded seriousness of the spiritual pretense (the absolute lower stratum is always laughing); it is a regenerating and laughing death. Sancho's role in relation to Don Quixote can be compared to the role of medieval parodies versus high ideology and cult, to the role of the clown versus serious ceremonial, to *charnage* versus *carême*" (22-23). It is clear how some of these words apply to Mrs Jewkes and Pamela.

² "Cervantes shows that the romance world is an evil insofar as it represents a cramping of one's own nature, a madness that sees giants where there are only windmills, or a code of manners that is inappropriate to the particular man who aspires toward it or the particular time in which he lives. It can also be a good, however, insofar as it represents a corrective to the petty forms of the present, man's natural instincts that have been fettered by the customs of society, a higher reality revealed by some divine madness, the world of imagination and poetry, or even (by extension) the true reality beneath the deceiving appearances of the world, and the ideal world we fall short of. Quixote's point of view can therefore be used as a two-sided satiric device: on one side is the pattern of the unreal, unnatural, and immoral; on the other is an ideal world of dedication and eternal fidelity against which to measure the behavior of fallen, self-centered man" (1967, 31-32).

any specific literary sources as a model, it is clear that, like don Quixote, she is acting according to literary models. This is the contention Mr B. repeats very frequently and made clear by Pamela's behaviour. Mr B. even suggests, as we have seen, that Pamela has gone mad from reading romances, which is the same as stating that she is a female Quixote. Although this accusation is used to hide Pamela's predicament, Mr B.'s insistence on Pamela's imitation of romance after this predicament is over, and the comparison between Pamela and the heroines of the romance tradition carried out by the critics cited above, make the statement accurate. Besides, her imitation of literature is not limited to romance, for her literary models are not only the romances suggested by her persecutor, but also *conduct books* and pious literature. In this sense, she exhibits some affinities to what Susan Staves has called *ideological quixotes* of the English eighteenth century, characters "driven mad by the reading of nonfiction" (1972, 200). Her usage of heterogeneous literary materials is very clear in the way she resorts to literature, to any literature, to deal with particular situations she has to face at different stages of her story. This is exactly the same thing don Quixote does in many of his adventures, when he takes literary characters and situations from romance and ballads and draws a parallel between them and himself. They serve the Don as an instrument to apprehend, or rather misapprehend, reality, and as a pattern to orient his response to that reality; they tell him how to act. Pamela has the same inclination to illuminate herself and her plight in the light offered by literature.

These *illuminations* are provided by miscellaneous sources. On one occasion it is Mr B. who offers her the literary model to orient her behaviour, but she elaborates on it to adapt it to her vision. The dialogue exhibits an interesting disparity in their interpretations of the exemplariness of the same story, in their reading of literature:

He then, though I struggled against him, kissed me, and said, 'Who ever blamed Lucretia? The shame lay on the ravisher only: and I am content to take all the blame upon myself; as I have already borne too great a share for what I have deserved.' 'May I,' said I, 'Lucretia like, justify myself by my death, if I am used barbarously?' '*O my good girl!*' replied he, tauntingly, '*you are well read, I see; and we shall make out between us, before we have done, a pretty story for romance.*' [my italics] (1988, 63)

Pamela seizes on the comparison with Lucretia, offered by Mr B. for quite different purposes, and is very willing to adopt it as a conduct model. Mr B. draws attention to Pamela's wide reading, and, realizing Pamela's penchant to live through literature, disguises his immoral propositions under the guise of romance. He does not realize how prophetic his words about making out a story for romance are, although, as with Lucretia's story, in a different way than he suspects. Their romance will be of a different kind from the one he expects: it will be religious rather than passionate romance, closer to the Pastoral than to the Gothic.

The dinner scene already discussed offers another example of Pamela's recourse to literature to frame her experience. Pamela is complaining about Mrs Jewkes before Mr B., who defends his servant. The dialogue that ensues is very interesting:

I arose, but said, with a deep sigh, 'I have done! I have a strange tribunal to plead before. The poor sheep, in the fable, had such a one; when it was tried before the vulture, on the accusation of the wolf!'
'So, Mrs Jewkes,' said he, 'you are the wolf, I the vulture, and this the poor harmless lamb, on their trial before us. You don't know how well read this innocent is in reflection. Her memory always serves her, when she has a mind to display her own romantic innocence, at the price of other people's characters.'

‘Well,’ said the aggravating creature, ‘this is nothing to what she has called me. I have been a Jezebel, a London prostitute, and what not...’ (1988, 224)

Pamela formulates her predicament in literary terms, in this case by means of a fable by Aesop. In this instance, as in the previous one, Mr B. notices “how well read” Pamela is, and how, like don Quixote, she can bring forward her numerous readings whenever she is in need of them. Mr B. also draws attention to the defectiveness of Pamela’s use of literature and how it results in an hyperbolic distortion of reality (“at the cost of other people’s characters”). He distinctly perceives romance as the organizing centre or core of her literary imagination (“her romantic innocence”), as the literary perspective that, beyond particular formulas or readings, orients her life. And he refers to romance not as genre, but as a more universal attitude, a feature of different literary forms and of literature in general, as the *romantic imagination* which Harry Levin (1970) sees as the core of quixotism and the quixotic conflict with reality.

1.3. *Similarities: Writing and Reading.* Pamela’s affinity to the Don as a literary-oriented creature goes even further and brings her closer to the Don, at least in this respect, than any other quixotic figure of the English 18th century (excepting, perhaps, Tristram Shandy). This is so because both don Quixote and Pamela have their story written during the course of their fictional lives, and this gives them a characteristic literary consciousness as characters and even as writers of their own stories, as protagonists of literature, which makes their life and behaviour *literary* in a deeper sense than other quixotic characters, in whom this is reduced to their drawing from literary sources, to literary imitation. Pamela and the Don are, so to speak, *literarily productive* too, and this literary activity has significant repercussions on other people and themselves. Both figures are literary characters in their own stories, both have these stories read by other people, and this reading causes a change both *in* their romancing and *towards* their romancing of reality.

Don Quixote does not write *stricto sensu*, but considering his continuous reference to the sage that follows him to write his story, his certainty that whatever he does will be recorded, and his very precise ideas about the kind of story he wants to be protagonist of (a chivalric romance), it seems rather reasonable to affirm that he writes such a story with his actions, instead of with a pen, as E. C. Riley (1962) has concluded. The consciousness of his destiny as a literary figure makes him an accomplice in its writing, since his behaviour must be necessarily mediated and influenced by this consciousness. Don Quixote, in this sense, not only draws his fictitious existence from literature, from his reading, but also exists for literature, for its writing. He lives for literature in both senses, literature determines his behaviour in both senses. The same happens with Pamela, and even more clearly, since she is the writer of her own romantic story. Her romantic emplotment affects her living and her writing, she imitates romance and writes romance. Don Quixote does both things at the same time, he writes with his life, he performs actions to be recorded, to be written. In Pamela writing and acting are separated, but her writing also determines her behaviour, since the fact that she is going to record what she does or says must necessarily be present in her mind when she acts or says something (in the same way as the presence of a camera in a shop causes us to behave in a different, self-conscious way). In this sense, she also writes with her self-conscious actions. Like don Quixote, she knows the kind of story she wants to be in, so she acts accordingly. For both the consciousness of a literary existence mediates their real existence.

For Pamela this is even more the case because sometimes the priority seems to be writing rather than acting, or the writing as the necessary condition for the acting, and not the other way round, as would be normal in any journal or autobiographic narrative. By

this I mean not only that Pamela acts in a certain way because her actions *are going to be written* (like don Quixote), but rather because of what she *has already written*; that is, she writes in a certain way because that allows her to act accordingly. The writing, in this sense, enables the acting, and not the other way round, since through her writing she creates the model, the ideal image of herself, she wants to live up. Hence the importance writing has for her in the ordeal she is going through, her sometimes implausible persistence in writing in any circumstance, and the outstanding energy she employs in providing herself with the necessary means to write in the most unfavourable conditions. Pamela's writing is a source of strength, courage, a vital support in her ordeal, and ultimately the means of her triumph in that ordeal: Mr B. is conquered by the reading of her letters. He is convinced of the sincerity and value of her romance idealism by her writing, not by her acting, which he had previously dismissed as feigned. The value of her writing, however, is not so much that it validates Pamela's romantic acting in the eyes of readers like Mr B., as that it does it in her own eyes: in her writing she finds the unyielding faith in her romantic vision and the determination to play her romantic part. Writing thus becomes a tactics of resistance against an undesirable reality, a weapon to combat a debased reality similar to the Don's sword and lance.

Pamela's response to reality is therefore even more literary than don Quixote's, since it relies not only on the literature she has read, but also, and mainly, on the literature she writes herself, which serves her as a model and source of exemplariness. Her literature, her own romance, replaces the romances of chivalry as immediate literary model, it becomes her own internal literary referent. She orients her behaviour according to that literary and ideal image of herself she constructs in her own narrative. This is a tremendously original variation and refinement of the quixotic pattern. *Pamela is a quixotic reader of her own fiction*. This completes the intensification of the literary essence of the quixotic figure Pamela manifests in several ways: her life and behaviour is literary (1) inasmuch as it is an imitation of literature; (2) inasmuch as it is going to be literature, it is going to be written, so she is conscious of being a literary character; and (3) inasmuch as she writes that literature herself, she produces herself the model of her behaviour—her own writing thus mediates her assimilation of literary models for her acting, so there is an intermediary step between quixotic reading and imitation, which is also literary and projects all romance attributes in a heroine, herself. In this fashion her own narrative becomes the point of departure (she imitates it) and of destination (she records her imitation) of her literary, quixotic existence.

Mr B.'s reading of Pamela's narrative, as has been pointed out, marks a change in his attitude—and with him everybody else's—towards Pamela's romantic emplotment. He accepts it because he accepts her sincerity, and in a certain way he joins Pamela's romance idealism to create a new type of romantic emplotment, the pastoral bliss of the second volume. Pamela, in her turn, drops her manichean romantic simplifications of reality and the rhetoric of the persecuted maiden, and engages herself in dealing with social and everyday realities in order to gain acceptance and integration in her new higher state and to demonstrate that she can be a good wife for an aristocrat. Something similar takes place in the second part of *Don Quixote*. The reading of the narrative, its reception, is included in the narrative itself: many characters in the second part have read the first one. This determines a change in their attitude: it is not a real acceptance, but at least an apparent one of don Quixote's emplotment (which is not so different from Mr B.'s acceptance, which is *critical*, since even though he accepts Pamela's perspective he still sees the romance in it). All the characters who have read his story take his romantic madness for granted, they pretend to adopt don Quixote's vision of reality, and, like Mr B., they even take a part in it, so they transform reality for him (although they still laugh at him). Don Quixote's

madness, in its turn, diminishes, he is more lucid, he starts to see reality through the deceptions of the other characters. He no longer transforms reality: hallucination, like delusion in Pamela's case, is no longer a feature of his behaviour. The change in the attitude of the other characters produces the opposite one in the quixotic figures. They drop or start to drop their romantic masks when the others accept it. And romance is accepted, or at least assimilated, when it is explained or made known by literature.

1.4. *Differences*. The similarities between don Quixote and Pamela help to realize the validity of Mr B.'s and Mrs Jewkes's sceptical accusations and to assess Pamela's romancing of reality by comparison with the prototype of all romancers. Both Cervantes and Richardson made romance a world-view of their characters and depicted the operations of the romantic imagination, which transforms the real world into the imaginary world of romance. They adopted, however, quite different attitudes towards their characters' romantic emplotment of reality, and these are reflected in the differences between Pamela and don Quixote. These differences are as important as the similarities.

The most obvious difference between don Quixote and Pamela is of course one of degree in the conflict between vision and reality, between world-view and world, which is the same as saying between character and author. Although don Quixote sees giants where there are only windmills and Pamela sees bulls where there are only cows, it is clear that the Don is mad whereas Pamela is not. The former is the victim of hallucination, the latter does not go beyond delusion. Don Quixote departs on a self-imposed crusade whereas Pamela's predicament is real. To put it in another way, don Quixote transforms reality both in formulaic and modal terms, her imagination provides the characters and incidents of chivalric romance lacking in his surrounding world, in reality, as well as the modal perspective of romance on that reality; Pamela's distortion of reality is only modal, she is the victim in a romance formula which is real and not invented by herself, she is abducted and suffers the sexual aggression of Mr B., so her literary imagination provides the modal perspective—partly as a result of the fears aroused by that aggression and as a way to combat it—but not the incidents and the characters, the formula. Don Quixote takes romance into the realm of action in a much more radical—mad, formulaic as well as modal—way, and, as a consequence, the rebuttal of reality is much more radical too: prostitutes instead of ladies, rogues and delinquents instead of knights, sheep instead of armies, etc. If in *Don Quixote* the corrective of reality is an open refutation, in *Pamela* it is a subtle criticism: a woman with a degrading and humorous vision of reality instead of a terrifying ogress, a vacillating seducer and would-be rapist whom she eventually marries instead of a demonic villain ready to kill her if necessary, deliverance through human instead of miraculous means. The formula don Quixote is making use of, chivalric romance, is proved to be too remote from contemporary reality and too defective to have a hold upon it or affect it positively. That is not the case with Pamela. Pamela is not using a branch of romance limited by a certain historical frame and therefore anachronistic, but something more general and universal, romance idealism. Despite the epistemological insufficiencies of this perspective—which are shown in a much more subtle way than in *Don Quixote*—its moral superiority and even its practical advantages are made obvious in Pamela's final triumph. Although her romance idealism is shown as quixotic by Mr B.'s and Mrs Jewkes's scepticism and by the distance between themselves—and other aspects of reality—and the way she depicts them, it is eventually proved more valid than debased realism and proposed as a new, alternative, moral code. The establishment of this new moral code is also a quixotic enterprise, a crusade against a corrupted world, and is surrounded by the same lack of understanding and support as the Don's, but, unlike don Quixote's, Pamela's enterprise is successful, and her romantic code proves to be an ad-

equate strategy of resistance against a debased reality—and a very advantageous pattern of behaviour. Romance contributes to the protagonist's accomplishment. In Don Quixote's case, it leads to failure and disillusionment.

The shorter or longer distance between world and world-view, the failure or success of the romance model, the formulaic or modal application of that model, the open rebuttal or the subtle illumination provided by reality, all clearly indicate the different positions of Cervantes and Richardson with regard to romance. Richardson endorses romance, and in fact he shows how romance idealism saves Pamela, how reality can be shaped by ideal patterns, how life may become romance instead of debased realism. "Do not surrender to debased realism," Richardson is telling his readers, "do the moral, ideal thing." Cervantes, for his part, parodies romance (in its chivalric variant) and writes an anti-romance. In *Don Quixote* romance is defeated by realism, in *Pamela* romance defeats realism. Richardson, although introducing the corrective of reality in his work in order to distance himself from Pamela's romantic emplotment, makes use of romance for his moral purposes. As has been mentioned above, this ambivalence of Richardson's position was already hinted at by Cervantes—who made don Quixote mainly a fool who acts according to outdated literary models, but occasionally a hero who stands for the ideal in the face of a debased and corrupted reality—but Richardson changes the emphasis from the former to the latter aspect.

Don Quixote and Pamela may be thus considered two basic models in the conflict between the romantic imagination and reality, two opposite archetypes of romancers. One represents the success of the romantic imagination, the other the failure. Pamela is a heroine, she is young, beautiful, victorious; Don Quixote an anti-hero, he is old, ridiculous, a loser. They correspond to the two ways a *novelist* can use and present *romance*, enchanting reality into a romance, or disenchanting romance into reality. This results in two kinds of narratives where either wish-fulfilment or disillusionment predominates, but which do not correspond to novel and romance, since, as far as both their protagonists are perceived and presented as romancers, we are in the hands of a novelist. The direction of enchantment is inverted, the emphasis changes, but, in both cases, reality is perceived through the patterns of romance imposed on it by the protagonists.

2. RICHARDSON AS A (CERVANTEAN) NOVELIST

The ambivalence of Richardson's position towards romance is perfectly expressed in the conflict between Pamela and Mrs Jewkes. Mrs Jewkes's debasement exposes not only the inadequacies of Pamela's romance idealism, but also its positive qualities: her idealism is morally positive. The corrective of realism is put in the mouth of a morally suspect character, so her unpleasant appearance, her unattractive personality, and her moral depravation, help to validate Pamela's views, at least on moral grounds. It is also significant that, in contrast to Pamela's heroic qualities, it is Mrs Jewkes who is anti-heroic, old, ugly, coarse. In the conflict dramatized by these two characters realism corrects the excesses of romance but romance idealism triumphs over the debasement of realism. Richardson uncovers the romance idealism underlying Pamela's behaviour through Mrs Jewkes, Mr B., and the divergent reality that filters through Pamela's vision, but he endorses it by making it triumph and by turning the book into an idyl of pastoral bliss (only disrupted by Lady Davers, Mr B.'s sister) after the heroine's wedding. His reasons for doing this are obviously moral.

2.1. The moral intentions behind the Richardsonian mixture of complicity and distance towards Pamela's romantic emplotment are hinted by Ian Watt when he formulates this

ambivalence as one between the moralist and the novelist: "As a novelist, then, Richardson is capable of considerable objectivity; but it is clear that as a conscious moralist he is completely on the side of Pamela..." (1987, 171). As a novelist, Richardson reflects the inadequacies of Pamela's emplotment of reality. As a moralist, he endorses the romance idealism which is responsible for these inadequacies. Mrs Barbaud had already commented on this mixture of the romantic and the realistic and the moral purposes behind it in her introduction to her edition of Richardson's letters, in which she writes that "There was still wanting a mode of writing which should connect the high passion, and delicacy of sentiment of the old romance, with characters moving in the same sphere of life with ourselves, and brought into action by incidents of daily occurrence" (qtd. in Dalziel 1970, 24). She assigns to Richardson the invention of this new mode of writing:

Richardson was the man who was to introduce a new kind of moral painting; he drew equally from nature and from his own ideas. From the world about him he took the incidents, manners, and general character, of the times in which he lived, and from his own beautiful ideas he copied that sublime of virtue which charms in *Clarissa*... (qtd. in Dalziel 1970, 24)

As Mrs Barbaud indicates, Richardson puts side by side romance idealism and realism, and he does so in quite Cervantean terms, that is, as the conflict between the romance idealist and the debased reality around her. But, unlike Cervantes, Richardson seizes upon romance to bring about not a literary controversy, that is, to dismiss a certain kind of romance—16th-century Spanish chivalric romance—as anachronistic and removed from reality, but a moral controversy, that is, to recover the moral idealism of 17th-century French heroic romances and of romance in general for its use in real life. Richardson carries out a new compromise between morality and reality, romance and realism, which had been split in two separate universes by the picaresque. The import of his literary enterprise, from this point of view, is the creation of an alternative to the degrading realism of the picaresque (as represented by *Moll Flanders* or, within *Pamela*, by Mrs Jewkes). Cervantes had also offered his alternative to the picaresque (a genre which he disliked, attacked, and transformed in his own picaresque *novellas*), although not so much to its immorality as to the limitations of its debased portrayal of reality which excluded other spheres of reality, not so much in terms of a new *moral* realism as of a more *comprehensive* realism. Richardson's alternative uses the road opened by the Cervantean superposition of picaresque debased realism and romance idealism, but he transforms it to accommodate his moral purposes. We can say that he opens a new way on the Cervantean road which links romance to the picaresque, but running in the opposite direction. He gives a new positive solution to the dilemma of the romantic imagination besieged by a degraded reality which had been negatively resolved by Cervantes. Here lies one of Richardson's great achievements as a novelist: he not only creates an alternative to the debased realism of the picaresque, but also to the Cervantean alternative to the picaresque.

How he does so has already been shown. The literary problem Richardson had to face was that showing the limitations of romance necessarily seemed to lead to its dismissal, especially after Cervantes' masterpiece. It is difficult to see how an author can possibly endorse romance (as a moral weapon) at the same time that he shows its inadequacies (as a depiction of reality), how he can highlight the insufficiencies of an approach to reality that he positively subscribes to. Richardson's solution to this dilemma lies in his narratorial device: the epistolary method with a *dramatized* first-person narrator who is unreliable and therefore responsible for the insufficiencies of perspective, so the romance features of the book become an element of characterization. Romance idealism is then a trait that Richardson, as moralist, encourages and approves (as he shows by making Pamela triumph over her enemies), but as novelist ("capable of considerable objectivity", as Watt

says), shows as a trait of the writing subject, not of the written object, as world-view and not world. Pamela is not reliable in her vision of reality, and that is shown by Mrs Jewkes's and Mr B.'s sceptical accusations (so romance is not a feature of the work, but of Pamela), but she is very reliable in her moral standards, and that is shown by Mrs Jewkes's debasement and Mr B.'s debauchery, and by the reward granted to her virtue (so this moral position is a feature of the work).

In this way, extreme scepticism plays two roles, one for the novelist and other for the moralist. For the novelist, it makes the narrator unreliable, it creates an *unreliable romantic narrator*. For the moralist, it dramatizes its defeat by romance idealism and thus enforces his moral view. This is central to understanding the interplay of novel and romance, of reality and morality, in *Pamela: Richardson incorporates extreme scepticism to have it defeated by romance idealism*. The romantic perspective of Pamela is proved to be defective, but that does not invalidate it as a pattern of behaviour, as a conduct model. Richardson is using the reality which suffuses Pamela's narrative and which readers can recognize as contemporary, not only to show them her romantic distortions, but also to persuade them of the feasibility of that romantic behaviour, of moral idealism, in the real world. He is using the novel to take romance idealism out of the remote and exotic settings of French heroic romances and bring it down to the world of experience. In this fashion Richardson can play both the novelist and the moralist, he can write a novel with all the idealism of a romance, he can have his cake and eat it. As a moralist, he has romance idealism conquering a debased realism. As a novelist, he has both that debased realism and romance idealism incorporated as different perspectives on reality. The artistic significance of this duality of perspectives can be understood if we briefly consider the ideas of Mikhail Bakhtin on the novel.

2.2. According to Bakhtin, novelistic discourse does not offer a unitary and absolute vision of reality, but a *dialogized* one. The novel presents a dialogue of languages and world-views associated with them continually illuminating and criticizing each other: "The language of the novel is a system of languages that mutually and ideologically inanimate each other. It is impossible to describe it and analyze it as a single unitary language" (1981, 47). Bakhtin insists on this idea when he affirms that, "To a greater or lesser extent, every novel is a dialogized system made up of the images of 'languages,' styles and consciousnesses that are concrete and inseparable from language" (1981, 49). This dialogue of languages or *polyglossia* is the linguistic or surface reflection of the dialogue of perspectives and world-views which express themselves through them, of the *dialogical principle*, and this is the corner stone of Bakhtin's theory of the novel. Only through this dialogical principle can reality be apprehended, since no language or vision can comprehend the whole of reality in its multiple aspects—factual, moral, psychological, etc.—by itself. Bakhtin affirms that, "Just as all there is to know about a man is not exhausted by his situation in life, so all there is to know about the world is not exhausted by a particular discourse about it; every available style is restricted, there are protocols that must be observed" (1981, 45-46). This was Cervantes's great insight and his response to the limited perspective of the picaresque. *Don Quixote* perfectly illustrates Bakhtin's theoretical principles and in fact the Russian critic often exemplifies his ideas using Cervantes's work. The dialogical principle is well illustrated by the discrepancies in world-view or perspective between the Don and Sancho (and also other characters), between Quixote's idealism and other characters' realism, which is perfectly reflected by their respective languages, by the variety of registers and styles that are woven into Cervantes's masterpiece. This dialogue not only affords a more comprehensive picture of reality, but also shows the limitations and flaws, the incompleteness and insufficiencies, of each of its participants. Polyglossia, says

Bakhtin, creates a distance between world-view and world, and that is the case in *Don Quixote*. “The conflict between life and the romantic imagination,” which Harry Levin (1970, 58) called the *quixotic principle* and considered the source of Cervantes’s enduring influence on later novelists, is nothing but a specification of the bakhtinian *dialogical principle*, of the conflict between reality and vision.

In this context it is not difficult to realize the significance of the conflict of perspectives or visions of reality represented by Pamela and Mrs Jewkes. In including and sustaining Mrs Jewkes’s alternative vision and critique (echoed by Mr B.), Richardson is taking a leap from a unitary model of language and consciousness to a dialogized one. Romance idealism is shown in its epistemological insufficiencies and limitations, as it had been in *Don Quixote*, and this is the result of its exposure to other languages and visions, those of debased realism, whose moral deficiencies, in its turn, are exposed by romance idealism, again as in *Don Quixote*. The dialogical principle, the Cervantean separation of world and world-view, together with its linguistic expression, polyglossia, is clearly at work in the dialogues between Pamela and Mrs Jewkes. Mrs Jewkes draws attention to this linguistic counterpart of their discrepancies in perspective. She is extremely sensitive to the linguistic barrier that separates them and their consciousnesses. “How strangely you talk!” (1988, 148), she exclaims after one of Pamela’s speeches about cutting her throat and the robbery of her virtue. Pamela expresses herself with the high-sounding rhetoric of romance heroines, Mrs Jewkes replies with the plain terms of spoken and colloquial language, and she seems to be aware of the fact that this difference prevents communication between them because they speak almost different languages or, even worse, because the same words have different meanings for them because of their different world-views. This is clear in one of the arguments quoted above, which is to a great extent an argument about words and language:

‘I dare say, you think yourself, that he intends my ruin.’ *‘I hate,’ said she, ‘that foolish word ruin! Why ne’er a lady in the land lives happier than you may do, if you will, or be more honourably used.’*

‘Well, Mrs Jewkes,’ said I, *‘I shall not at this time dispute with you about the words ruin or honourable; for I find I have quite different notions of both: but now I will speak plainer than I ever did. Do you think that he intends to make proposals to me, as to a kept mistress, or kept slave rather, or do you not?’ ... ‘What, Mrs Jewkes, invite my ruin?’*

‘Ruin!’ said she, and put up her ugly horse-lip... [my italics] (175-76)

The way that the conflict between languages expresses and results from the conflict between world-views is made clear by this dialogue. *Ruin* and *honourable*, as Pamela notices, epitomize their different world-views. It is also interesting how Mrs Jewkes resents Pamela’s usage of language and how Pamela drops the abstract language of romance and adopts the concrete language of reality to get an answer from Mrs Jewkes, or, in other words, how Pamela voluntarily changes register to enable communication, after Mrs Jewkes’s linguistic sensibility has shown Pamela that there is no way they can understand each other if she keeps talking in her romantic fashion. Later in the dialogue (see above), when Pamela has attained what she wants, she will return to her romantic bombast. The following words by Bakhtin describing the novelistic “interanimation of languages” (1981, 76) suit the dialogue so well that they seem to have been written with it in mind: “... the languages that are crossed in it relate to each other as do rejoinders in a dialogue; there is an argument between languages, an argument between styles of language ... it is a dialogue between points of view, each with its own concrete language that cannot be translated into the other” (1981, 76).

There is another element, in addition to polyglossia, which also contributes to dialogize a certain language or world-view, a factor which played an important role in what Bakhtin calls "the prehistory of novelistic discourse": laughter, the ridiculing of another's language and another's direct discourse. The dialogical principle operates not only through the corrective offered by other languages and perspectives but also through the corrective of laughter, and this is seen at its best in parody: "Parodic-travesty literature introduces the permanent corrective of laughter, of a critique on the one-sided seriousness of the lofty direct word, the corrective of reality that is always richer, most fundamental and most importantly too contradictory and heteroglot to be fit into a high and straightforward genre" (1981, 55). It goes without saying that laughter and parody play a key role in the dialogization of romance and the creation of a dialogized picture of reality in *Don Quixote*, and there are numerous studies on these aspects of Cervantes's work. The role they play in *Pamela*, on the contrary, has passed unnoticed, since *Pamela*, unlike *Don Quixote*, is far from being a parody of romance. And yet the corrective of laughter, although in a much more subtle way, works in a similar way. We have seen in the first part how Mrs Jewkes's laughter ridicules "the one-sided seriousness of the lofty direct word" of Pamela, and how Pamela seems to realize it, to judge from her angry reactions. Mrs Jewkes's laughter, which is the best expression of extreme scepticism since it does not imply a world-view but simply a counter-view, as well Mr B.'s mocking sceptical accusations, dialogize Pamela's romance idealism. Her humorous and mocking attitude towards Pamela verges on parody when she appropriates Pamela's language—her insults to Mrs Jewkes, her literary similes about the lamb, the wolf and the vulture—to have it dialogized by her ironical quoting:

'You are very wicked,' said I. 'I know it,' replied she: 'I am a Jezebel, and a London prostitute, you know.'

'You did great feats,' said I, 'to tell my master all this poor stuff! But you did not tell him how you beat me.' 'No, *lambkin*,' (a word I had not heard a good while) 'that I left for you to tell; and you was going to do it, if the vulture had not taken the wolf's part, and bid the poor lamb be silent!' 'No matter for your fleers, Mrs Jewkes,' said I; 'though I cannot be heard in my defense here, yet a time will come when I shall be heard, and when your own guilt will strike you dumb.' 'Ay, spirit!' said she, 'and the vulture too! Must we *both* be dumb? Why that, *lambkin*, will be pretty! When that times comes ... you'll have all the talk to yourself! And how will the tongue of the pretty *lambkin* then bleat out innocence and virtue, and honesty, till the whole trial be at an end!' (1988, 234)

What Mrs Jewkes is performing here is a kind of parody of Pamela's romantic discourse, as Bakhtin's words about parody make clear: "The genre itself, the style, the language are all put in cheerfully irreverent quotation marks, and they are perceived against a backdrop of a contradictory reality that cannot be confined within their narrow frames. The direct and narrow word was revealed, in all its limitations and insufficiency, only after it had become the laughing image of that word..." (1981, 56-57). Mrs Jewkes quite literally provides the "cheerfully irreverent" quotation and the laughing image of Pamela's words, in quite a similar fashion and with quite similar effects to Sancho's parodic quoting of the Don's chivalric and outmoded style and words.

Parody, however, is not the key to *Pamela's polyglossia*. The dialogue of languages and world-views that defines the novel does not have to be necessarily parodic. Bakhtin explains how there are cases in which the author may see and expose the insufficiencies and limitations of a language and perspective, but he may choose to speak in that language and consider it the most adequate, for whatever reasons, despite its limitations. In this case, author and language are not in the territory of dialogical parody but in that of what Bakhtin calls *dialogical contact*, in which there is mutual illumination, *interanimation*, but not

ridiculing or dismissal. Both are the two extremes of a wide range of possibilities of attitudes of novelists towards romance as represented by their characters' world-views, and these extreme positions are well illustrated by Cervantes and Richardson. In both authors we find a dialogue between romance idealism and debased realism. In Cervantes this dialogue is basically anti-romantic, romance is disqualified or dismissed as world-view by reality and laughter. In Richardson it is illuminated or criticized by reality and laughter, but not negated, in fact it triumphs over them. *Pamela* is a re-affirmation, although showing its inadequacies and limitations, of romance and romance idealism as an instrument to shape and sway reality. The distance between the character's vision and the author's, between dramatized romancer and implied novelist, is abysmal in Cervantes, very subtle in Richardson. Cervantes did not speak in the language of romance, but against it. Richardson did so, although exposing that language to the dialogical contact of other languages.

However this may be, Cervantes and Richardson clearly evince that the way towards the novel passes through romance. As Northrop Frye has realized, "Characters confused by romantic assumptions about reality ... are central to the novel..." (1976, 39), and it is precisely Richardson's use of such a character and of the interplay of romance idealism and debased realism that makes him a Cervantean novelist, or, at least, give him a place in the Cervantean tradition in fiction, a tradition which is well defined by Ronald Paulson in the following statement:

I have stated this cervantean balancing of romance against reality in moral and social terms, whereas the final effect of *Don Quixote* may suggest an epistemological problem. Again and again in the modern novel we encounter a protagonist who aspires to the idealized life of romance (literary, historical, heroic, aristocratic) and thereupon sees reality distorted through those aspirations; this life, with its code, aspirations, and way of thinking is contrasted to the protagonist's real world and true self. (1967, 31)

Cervantes was the first author of fiction to pose the question of how we know reality, the question of the disparity between world and world-view, of the distance between author, narrator, and characters, the first one to investigate reality through a variety of perspectives and visions. This realization of the dialogical and problematic nature of reality is the quintessence of the novel. The unified world-view of romance, where author, characters and world are integrated as a whole, disintegrates into a multiplicity of figures (characters, author, narrator) with distinct and separate languages and consciousnesses, with different world-views, and this opens the gap between reality and vision which characterizes the novel and its dialogical form. But as important as this, and perhaps of more direct and enduring consequence, was the fact that Cervantes reached this dialogical form by incorporating the discarded romance world-view as one of the main participants in the dialogue of world-views, by making the confrontation between romance idealism and debased realism the basis of the dialogue, by investigating the romantic imagination separated from the world. This feature inspired many later authors and initiated a narrative tradition especially fruitful in 18th-century English fiction—but also in 19th-century European Realism—in which Richardson developed new possibilities by bringing to it new techniques and concerns. In this tradition, romance became a world-view which could establish different kinds of dialectical relationship with other world-views within the novel. The possibilities of this relationship were many. Cervantes and Richardson, as I have argued above, simply represent the two opposite extremes.

WORKS CITED

- Allen, John Jay 1969. *Don Quixote: Hero or Fool? A Study in Narrative Technique*. Gainesville: U. of Florida P.
- Baker, Sheridan 1964. The Idea of Romance in the Eighteenth-Century Novel. *Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters* 49: 507-22.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail 1981. *The Dialogical Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U. of Texas P.
- 1984 (1968). *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Helene Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana U.P.
- Beasley, Jerry C. 1976. Romance and the 'New' Novels of Richardson, Fielding, and Smollett. *Studies in English Literature* 16: 437-50.
- Beer, Gillian 1970. *The Romance. The Critical Idiom*. London: Methuen.
- Booth, Wayne 1983 (1961). *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: U. of Chicago P.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de 1979 (1605, 1615). *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Ed. Juan Bautista Avallé-Arce. Madrid: Alhambra.
- Dalziel, Margaret 1970. Richardson and Romance. *Journal of Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association* 33: 5-24.
- Fielding, Henry 1972 (1741, 1742). *Joseph Andrews, and Shamela*. Ed. Sheridan Baker. The Crowell Critical Library. New York: Crowell.
- Frye, Northrop 1973 (1957). *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton U.P.
- 1976. *The Secular Scripture*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U.P.
- Kreissman, Bernard 1964. *Pamela-Shamela*. Nebraska: U. of Nebraska P.
- Levin, Harry 1970. The Quixotic Principle: Cervantes and Other Novelists. *The Interpretation of Narrative: Theory and Practice*. Ed. Morton W. Bloomfield. Cambridge: Harvard U.P. 45-66.
- McDermott, Hubert 1989. *Novel and Romance: The Odyssey to Tom Jones*. London: Macmillan.
- McKeon, Michael 1987. *The Origins of the English Novel 1600-1740*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins U.P.
- Miller, Henry Knight 1976. Augustan Prose Fiction and the Romance Tradition. *Studies in the Eighteenth Century* III. Ed. R.F. Brissenden and J.C. Eade. Toronto and Buffalo: U. of Toronto P. 241-255.
- Muecke, D. C. 1967. Beauty and Mr B. *Studies in English Literature* 7: 467-74.
- Munro, James S. 1975. Richardson, Marivaux and the French Romance Tradition. *Modern Language Review* 70: 752-59.
- Paulson, Ronald 1967. *Satire and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century England*. New Haven: Yale U.P.
- Richardson, Samuel 1988 (1740). *Pamela*. Ed. Peter Sabor. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Richetti, John J. 1969. *Popular Fiction Before Richardson: Narrative Patterns 1700-1739*. London: OUP.

- Riley, E. C. 1966. *Cervantes's Theory of the Novel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Schulz, Dieter 1973. 'Novel', 'Romance', and Popular Fiction in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century. *Studies in Philology* 70: 77-91.
- Staves, Susan 1972. Don Quixote in Eighteenth-Century England. *Comparative Literature* 24: 193-215.
- Utter, Robert P., and Gwendolyn B. Needham. 1936. *Pamela's Daughters*. New York: Macmillan.
- Watt, Ian 1987 (1957). *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding*. London: The Hogarth Press.
- White, Hayden 1985 (1978). The Historical Text as Literary Artifact. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U.P. 81-100.

* * *

 **INDICE**