



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
JOURNALS + DIGITAL PUBLISHING

Pamela and the Duplicitous Body of Femininity

Author(s): Tassie Gwilliam

Source: *Representations*, No. 34 (Spring, 1991), pp. 104-133

Published by: [University of California Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2928772>

Accessed: 03/01/2011 14:11

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ucal>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of California Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Representations*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Pamela and the Duplicitous Body of Femininity

PAMELA IS A NOVEL SPLIT BY Samuel Richardson's impulse to reproduce and mimic contradictory aspects of the ideology of gender, particularly the ideology of femininity. Its narrative is, in part, constituted by—and even promotes—a model of femininity it explicitly repudiates. The novel seems to set itself against hypocrisy and duplicity, as well as disruptions of gender identity, but it cannot do without them. In fact, feminine duplicity's transforming powers and numerous attractions pervade a novel which represents itself as the defender of female truth and virtue.

Duplicity, of course, is one of the cardinal sins in the traditional model of femininity that Richardson both employs and questions; it recurs as a basis for attacks on women throughout history.¹ Although the dichotomy between body and mind has been attributed to both genders, women have been seen as most duplicitously responsible for, and most damagingly constituted by, that split. In the Restoration and the eighteenth century, accusations of feminine duplicity, while traditional in nature, also directly reflect contemporary concerns. Katharine Rogers sees the Restoration impulse to attack women's deployment of artifice as part of a more general "stripping away of idealization" arising from the "neoclassical emphasis on reason as opposed to misleading appearance and sentimental illusion."² According to Rogers, the analysis of women's deceptive appearance revives the classical philosopher Lucretius' "conviction that, since romantic love is irrational, *no* woman's attractiveness can survive a keen analysis by reason";³ Lucretius directs the man who would escape love to the dressing room, thus becoming a source of the "lady's dressing room" poems so popular in the Restoration and earlier eighteenth century.⁴ On the other hand, historians and literary critics have also seen in the course of the eighteenth century a movement away from the overt misogyny of using women to exemplify monstrous physicality and toward the "Cult of True Womanhood." This ideological change has been linked to women's presumed loss of productive work and to an increase in leisure under capitalism, and thus to the new status of women as "consumers rather than contributors to the household economy."⁵ Marlene LeGates argues that the idealization of womanhood enabled the shift to capitalism: "The idea of the morally superior woman contributed an ideological prop to the family seen as a means of social consolidation in an increasingly class-conscious society." Fur-

ther, in its literary manifestation, according to LeGates, “the drama of the aggressive male checked by the virtuous female is paradoxically a reaffirmation of the patriarchal authority of the family.”⁶ Ruth Bloch describes the change in sex roles as a movement from “differences in degree” between the sexes in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to “differences in kind” in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In the eighteenth century, she perceives an increasing separation of male from female imagery and activities, as well as a stronger contrast between male “rational” and female “affective” styles.⁷ These broad alterations in sex roles to some degree penetrate all levels of discourse, but at times the apparent transformations seem simply to reorient, rather than to diminish, anxieties about women’s deceitful display.

In the details of representations of femininity in the eighteenth century, we can see over and over again the attempt to settle unsettling questions about duplicity. The meaning of the female body is reorganized and reshaped, but that body’s uncertainty, its doubleness or multiplicity, repeatedly troubles representation. Richardson’s works engage directly with this question, and *Pamela* is itself the problematic embodiment of a reinscription of its meaning. Nancy Armstrong depicts *Pamela* as a novel that alters the meaning ascribed to woman’s divided nature; for her, *Pamela* describes and promotes the rejection of the female aristocratic, ornamental body—the female body as spectacle—in favor of the ideal of a woman whose “depths” were more valued than her “surface.”⁸ This change, says Armstrong, “redirects male desire away from the surface of the female body and into its depths.”⁹ But this presumably beneficial change, and Armstrong’s depiction of it, depend on the same metaphors—the body as surface and the soul or metaphysical self as depths—that Armstrong suggests the eighteenth century was rejecting, the same metaphors that are used to posit a disfiguring fault in the female subject. In fact, the finding of value in “inner” qualities does not transform existing ideologies of femininity as much as it reinscribes them. In my view *Pamela*, as well as the reactions it provoked, illuminate instead a complex interaction and confusion between surface and depths, and evidence the persistent attractions of the body under the purportedly new ideology of femininity.¹⁰

To describe femininity in terms of surface and depths is to employ a problematic metaphor, one that refuses the resolution it seems to promise. This irresolution arises in part because the female *body* is itself persistently represented as double both in its accretion of artificial, alluring surfaces and in its liability to transformation by age or disease; even the division is subdivided. If the female body is itself figured as being split between surfaces and depths, then this fragmented body ceases to be available as one of the two contrasting terms in the conventional dichotomy between body as “surface” and soul as “depth.” The female body’s multiplicity also disrupts the supposedly originary distinction between the sexes; one half of the original couple is already so fragmented that it can only with difficulty be recuperated to unify a symmetrical pair.

These metaphors for women's bodies reproduce and support the accusations of duplicity to which women were so frequently subject; they explain the unsettling effects women seem to have by purporting to settle certain contradictions in the ideology of femininity. In the eighteenth century, thus, the hostility to feminine duplicity operates symbiotically with covert requirements that women behave in ways that could be construed as duplicitous: women's behavior and bodies were supposed to provoke desire, but women were forbidden from intending to provoke desire, or from being conscious of their desirability. Thus the woman who is metaphorized in terms of surface and depths could easily be seen as the duplicitous agent of the division in herself. But metaphors that attribute multiplied bodies or selves to women tend also to reinforce anxieties about feminine abilities to cover and conceal a "true self" (or lack of self)—or a "true body" (or body's lack)—through arts of dress, cosmetics, and performance.¹¹ The metaphors themselves, as metaphors of doubleness, are always haunted by the ghost of duplicity and hypocrisy, the characteristic sins of women.

What lies beneath—and the question of beneath what—is not only problematic in itself but peculiarly resistant to representation, as an inflammatory mid-century attack on marriage and women suggests:

Take [woman] as Nature made her *naked*, or look upon her stript of her borrowed Feathers, and she'll be but little amiable, if at all; nothing desirable: She'll be, perhaps, rather an Antidote against Love. True Love is grounded on *Virtue*, not on these low, mean, sordid Outsides: Shadows, Vanities, Fooleries all! Ask *Travellers*, if you'll not believe me; they'll tell you, when they converse with Women, whose Custom is always to go naked as they were born; they have no amorous Fancies, no Desires, they rather loath the Thoughts of them, they detest a *Woman* as a *Beast*, shall I say! why they are so much alike, they scarcely make any Difference between them; so little are they provoked by *seeing all*. A laced Shoe, a Silk Stocking, or a rich Petticoat, will tempt thee more, and make thee mad, after THAT which they were not moved for when they saw Hundreds of them.¹²

This diatribe, which leaves the reader in the classic pose of the fetishist solaced by shoe, stocking, or petticoat, conflates two surfaces—body and clothing—apparently to contain the horror of absence in the female body. In this energetic description of revulsion it is not entirely clear whether the woman's body or her "borrowed Feathers" are the "low, mean, sordid Outsides." The passage gestures vestigially to virtue as what is ideally contained by the woman, but the nausea provoked by the female body swamps the passage, receding only with the return of the gaze to clothing.

When metaphors and images of surfaces and depths—or any terms of doubleness—are used to describe women, the disorienting divisions in the female body that result threaten to disclose the unstable relations of surface to depth. As a consequence, the use of these metaphors can ultimately provoke a restabilization that denies women depths or attempts to render invisible what has been revealed when a "surface" is removed and the depths uncovered. The long mi-

sogynist tradition that sees women as empty creatures of show attempts to clarify the relation of surface to depths by depicting women as empty containers; there should be nothing left after the surface or clothing or make-up is peeled away. But as this passage shows, the nothing that is revealed can be extremely ambiguous.

Woman's duplicity underwrites—and undermines—other varieties of metaphorical language. For example when John Locke, in the *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, compares women to eloquence, he does so in such a way that women's duplicity, their physical attractions—and masculine investment in both—seem as palpably present as eloquence itself: “*Eloquence*, like the fair sex, has too prevailing beauties in it to suffer itself ever to be spoken against. And it is in vain to find fault with those arts of deceiving wherein men find pleasure to be deceived.”¹³ This tendency of the female body to take over, to become an alternate subject, reinforces the sense of its deceptive powers.

But Locke's perception of man's pleasure in being deceived by the fair sex as much as eloquence opens an alternate path for the investigation of duplicity as well as offers an explanation for some of the effects of *Pamela*. If some of the duplicities attributed to women, for example, are actually the product of masculine desire and identification, both sexual difference and duplicity will seem different.¹⁴ In Richardson's fictions, for example, the woman is produced in part by an imaginative transvestism on Richardson's part that sometimes gives the effect of a masquerade. However, this masquerade, because it is seen as primarily an attribute of femininity, seems for many readers to revert to the female character who is its object, rather than to its male author. Feminine hypocrisy and duplicity are convenient fictions potentially covering masculine identification with femininity.

Although the ideology of sexual difference seems to require that masculinity and femininity be mutually exclusive categories, efforts to proscribe resemblances between the sexes show how pervasive the belief in such resemblances and identifications is. The eighteenth century produces innumerable examples of the taboo and its attendant anxiety. As a newspaper commentator in 1738 wrote:

There is nothing more observable than that the same Qualities, which are extremely decent and ornamental to one Sex, are very misbecoming and reproachful in the other, as it is encroaching upon the Boundaries, assign'd to each, for a proper Distinction and Discrimination between us.¹⁵

Richardson himself at times tries to construct a utopian model of sexual difference as the basis for a symmetrical, reciprocal, and mutually responsive relation between men and women. But his novels' acuteness about the social realities of that relation, and the inherent contradictions between symmetry and hierarchy, identification and opposition, repeatedly break down these attempts, despite their narrative and ideological power.

Masculine desire as the identification with the feminine has left its traces in the plot and action of *Pamela* as well as in its narration and authoring.¹⁶ *Clarissa* articulates and thematizes this problematic aspect of desire,¹⁷ while in *Pamela* masculine desire as identification troubles the text and refuses assimilation. Richardson, in privileging his identification with the feminine, embeds his novels so deeply in his own duplicitous desires that they cannot break free.

The numerous readers who attack Richardson's heroine and his novel for hypocrisy, and who confuse text and woman, are not simply misguided; they are responding to the troubling confusions and contradictions in the novel itself. Even Fielding's attacks on Pamela's hypocrisy in *Shamela* are only echoes of similar attacks by Mr. B in the novel. But why should feminine duplicity in a work of fiction represent a threat, represent power, and thus provoke contempt? To accuse a woman or a book of hypocrisy, duplicity, and disguise is to pick up a double-edged sword; although the accusation seems primarily to denigrate and devalue women, it also attributes to the woman the power to repel investigation and penetration. If women are constituted by duplicity, there is no sure way to know when one has arrived at some kernel of "truth," or even if there is a kernel to find. The reading of the novel and/or woman as hypocritical and duplicitous derives from the text's refusal to give up duplicity's transforming and responsive powers. Feminine duplicity is too fruitful to abandon, and femininity is too closely intertwined with duplicity for Richardson to eliminate duplicity once its usefulness has ended.

I

*Naked in nothing should a woman be;
But veil her very wit with modesty:
Let man discover, let not her display,
But yield her charms of mind with sweet delay.*¹⁸

The attractions of the veiled female body underlie and eroticize Edward Young's description of how woman should allow her wit to be "discovered" or uncovered by man in this stanza. In fact, that metaphorical body eclipses the "charms of mind" that ostensibly concern the poet. Young covertly acknowledges the woman's planning and participation in the scenario of intellectual delights for the male voyeur, thereby making his pleasure dependent on her. Man's pleasure resides in the foreplay; those charms of mind, and the woman's submissive activity, seem to gain their value from the veil and from the delay in revelation, not from any inherent properties. But there is a paradox in this relation of "surface" to "depths": the woman is not supposed to be naked in anything, but once her charms of mind are yielded up, will she not be unclothed? Or does modesty remain a veil inseparable from the modest body?¹⁹

The problems suggested by this passage—problems of metaphors that turn into bodies, of the requirement of feminine un-self-consciousness joined to a masculine obsession with effect, of fruitful duplicity—inform as well much of the conduct literature of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. If one reads the descriptions of feminine behavior in conduct books it is possible to glimpse the cultural machinery that constructs this duplicitous female body.²⁰ Such literature, like Richardson's fiction, provides a view of how a woman is imagined to construct herself under the ideological constraints of her culture. Dr. James Fordyce, for example, celebrates the ideal woman's management of contradictory traits:

There are not perhaps on earth many objects of more dignity or attraction than that female, who, though endowed with beauty, and skilful in dress, yet discovers nothing conceited on either score, no conscious attention to herself when taken notice of for either.²¹

The ideal woman must not only construct herself for a vigilant—and perhaps capricious—male gaze, she also must not *see* herself as the object of the gaze she courts; her skill in dress must be unreflecting, her response to responses inattentive. Dr. John Gregory, in *A Father's Legacy to His Daughters*, directly confronts the problem for a woman of *seeming* to be modest while encouraging admiration, but he also explicitly justifies duplicity: deliberate concealment lures the masculine imagination.

A fine woman shews her charms to most advantage, when she seems most to conceal them. The finest bloom in nature is not so fine as what imagination forms.²²

Gregory's analogy of the concealed bloom reveals the matter—reveals the body as well as the canny use of it—that other writers on feminine propriety themselves tend to gloss over; he engages in revelation pragmatically, in the service of his daughters. In writing this *Art of Love* for women, he openly describes what Mary Wollstonecraft attacked as a “system of dissimulation,”²³ but his openness is not unreflecting misogyny; rather than simply exposing or requiring feminine calculation he offers rules for its use, and he does so by offering two viewpoints, one the woman's, the other that of the man looking at her.²⁴

Gregory elsewhere reveals the tendency of masculinity to see itself reflected in the mirror of the “retiring” woman:

One of the chief beauties in a female character is that modest reserve, that retiring delicacy, which avoids the public eye, and is disconcerted even at the gaze of admiration. . . . When a girl ceases to blush, she has lost the most powerful charm of beauty. That extreme sensibility which it indicates, may be a weakness and incumbrance in our sex, as I have too often felt; but in yours it is peculiarly engaging.²⁵

The absence of the desired sign—in this case, the blush—signals loss or lack. But the loss belongs not to the woman but to her male observer; significantly, it leads the observer to consider his own resemblance to the blushing woman. The “mas-

culine" woman, who no longer blushes, is not the object of the man's identification; the writer identifies instead with the extreme sensibility of the (absent) girl who blushes under the gaze of admiration. The same quality, which in his sex is a "weakness and incumbrance," becomes in hers "peculiarly engaging." Gregory seems to express a kind of nostalgia for his sex's own renounced or emasculating sensibility, and to refocus that nostalgia as a desire for the woman's vanished blush, the vanished woman's blush.²⁶

Masculine investment in—and identification with—feminine wiles emerges repeatedly in these accounts; many desires are disallowed, but women's desire to seduce and entrap men is actually celebrated. Fordyce, in *Sermons to Young Women*, warns against open aggression but endorses the use of covert wiles:

To get into men's affections, women in general are naturally desirous. They need not deny, they cannot conceal it. The sexes were made for each other. . . . When you show a sweet solicitude to please by every decent, gentle, unaffected attraction; we are soothed, we are subdued, we yield ourselves your willing captives. But if at any time by a forward appearance you seem resolved, as it were, to force our admiration; that moment we are upon our guard and your assaults are vain.²⁷

The man in this scenario offers himself up as willing, even eager victim, happily instructing women to capture him. He predicates all on his own sex's absolute desirability, but he also implicitly presents himself as a dupe; both strategies he attributes to women are tacitly assumed to be aggressive in aim, but the woman who triumphs conceals her aggressive intentions from her willing victim by masquerading as a submissive female. Although her purpose cannot be completely concealed from the penetrating man, because he already knows her purpose, she can deflect accusations of activity by not appearing "forward." Fordyce implicitly suggests that femininity is duplicitous, but that duplicity is the price willingly paid by men for women's submissive focus on their desires.

The effect of inversion or parody in Fordyce's identification with the feminine is explicit in the description of female "force" and "assaults," and male "captivity" and "yielding," culminating in oblique descriptions of the guarding of a masculine citadel. Fordyce first plays the compliant woman, seduced by (feminine) wiles, but as soon as the seducer reveals her aggressive wish to capture/captivate him, he turns into the retreating virgin. This fantasy of seduction seems to show the two figures contending for the feminine position; Fordyce's woman fails to seduce when she ceases to conceal her presumed masculinity and aggression. Fordyce's sexual scenario briefly allows both men and women to be feminine, but forbids overt masculinity to women.

Joan Riviere defines "womanliness" as something that "could be assumed and worn as a mask, both to hide the possession of masculinity and to avert the reprisals expected if she was found to possess it." Riviere questions the distinction between "genuine womanliness and the 'masquerade,'" seeing them as identical.²⁸

If femininity is a mask, it is “a mask, behind which man suspects some hidden danger,”²⁹ and it is, for a woman, a dangerous tool which can be turned back on her in the form of accusations that she is duplicitous, hypocritical, or a usurper of masculine prerogative. Luce Irigaray offers “mimicry”—her subversive version of the masquerade of womanliness—as a strategy that, through “playful repetition,” can make visible “the operation of the feminine in language.”³⁰ Whether femininity as masquerade hides masculinity or conceals what Irigaray calls “the feminine in language,” it seems to be associated with concealment and duplicity, thus strangely, but consistently, containing its opposite.

Femininity as masquerade destabilizes sexual difference by threatening to reveal the possibility of cross-gender identification.³¹ In fact, in a move that reveals the masculine need to contain the threat perceived behind the masquerade, a woman’s impropriety is characterized as femininity’s perverse “opposite,” female masculinity. Fordyce gives a picture of the unnatural woman:

Paint to yourself, by way of contrast, a woman who talks loud, contradicts bluntly, looks sullen, contests pertinaciously, and instead of yielding, challenges submission. . . . How forbidding an object! Femininity is gone: Nature is transformed: Whatever makes the male character most rough, and turbulent, is taken up by a creature, that was designed to tranquillize and smooth it.³²

Lack of submission in a woman deforms nature and overturns sexual difference, threatening all by unnaturally mingling genders. Richard Allestree, in *The Ladies Calling*, laments women’s

virile Boldness, which is now too common among many even of the best Rank. Such a degenerate age do we now live in, that every thing seems inverted, even Sexes; While men fall to the Effeminacy and Niceness of women, and women take up the Confidence, the Boldness of men. . . . Nor is that [i.e., women’s boldness] design’d to terminate in it self, but it is to carry them on, till they arise to a perfect Metamorphosis, their Gesture, their Language, nay sometimes their Habit too being affectedly masculine.³³

The enabling dream of symmetry is disturbed; the woman’s metamorphosis disrupts and interrupts the circuit of mutual dependence by mirroring back a distorted parody of masculinity rather than the desired endorsement, complementarity, and support. The masquerade of femininity induces fears that femininity laid bare contains a lurking masculinity. Careful control and constant vigilance are needed to keep femininity from straying into masculinity’s province—because that is where it came from.

Duplicitous femininity will always evade control because not only are the metaphors of the body that support accusations of it fragmented, but so is the body itself; the female body’s multiplicity refuses assimilation to the binary oppositions in the service of which it is invoked. Once femininity’s doubleness is extolled for its ability to provoke pleasure or to create identification, the woman’s power to use duplicity—her body’s multiplicity—for her own ends has been set in motion,

and cannot be recalled. Thus the need to denigrate feminine duplicity alternates and combines with the desire to invest it with transforming and magical powers.

II

Richardson's personal involvement with feminine duplicity emerges in his accounts of early epistolary masquerades, first at the age of eleven when, "assuming the Style and Address of a Person in Years," he wrote a moral exhortation to a flighty widow, and later, at thirteen, when he wrote love letters for young women in his neighborhood.³⁴ Richardson presents these imitations of the voices of others as the buried genesis of his career as a writer, and as a source for his knowledge of the human heart. Mimicry and performance thus link Richardson to Pamela; to some readers, however, femininity's disruptive duplicities mar both writers, and the perception of the duplicity of one is used to attack the purported duplicity of the other. Pamela as character has been called an "artless miss" with "a Machiavellian side" and concealed goals. According to Bernard Kreissman, who catalogues and contributes to the attacks on *Pamela*, "An attentive reading of the novel reveals behind the Pamela who minces across its pages the Shamela whom Fielding exposed."³⁵ The anonymous eighteenth-century author of "Critical Remarks on Sir Charles Grandison, Clarissa, and Pamela" remarks that "Pamela is a pert little minx whom any man of common sense or address might have had on his own terms in a week or fortnight."³⁶

Both Kreissman and the anonymous writer are responding not only to the formal problems created by this particular first-person narrator, but also to effects engendered by the project of representing femininity. Kreissman offers *Shamela* as the correct reading of *Pamela*—Shamela as the truth about Pamela—but he does so in terms that uncover something other than he seems to intend. Using the language of undressing as sexual exposure and humiliation, Kreissman says that Fielding "exposes" the Shamela inside the "mincing" Pamela. In contemptuously claiming that he or any other man of common sense and address could succeed where Mr. B so signally failed, the author of the "Critical Remarks" also claims what is essentially a wish to penetrate a text. This eagerness to expose, penetrate, or triumph over Pamela (or *Pamela*) suggests that woman or novel poses a threat that requires exposure and redress.

Formalist critics have defused and avoided some of the problems these readings raise by focusing their discussions of the novel on issues of narration. This shift away from exposing the duplicities of the novel has produced far more interesting analyses of the novel than seemed possible before, but it has also tended to obscure both the sexual and political threat, *and* the uneasy analysis of femininity, that *Pamela* does offer.³⁷ Both Kreissman's pleasure in observing Fielding's exposure of Pamela as Shamela, and the anonymous critic's faith that he could easily

seduce Pamela, respond to something disturbing about the novel. Kreissman aligns himself with Fielding against Pamela/Shamela, while the anonymous critic pushes aside B; both men identify with another man's desire in order to defuse a feminine threat.

The anti-*Pamela* literature sees the relation of Richardson to his heroine, for example, as an obvious but perverse self-reflection. For Kreissman,

Richardson in telling the story of Pamela unwittingly has given us a self-portrait. He is a Pygmalion whose Galatea is modeled on what he perceives in the mirror of his own vanity; he invests her with his complete repertoire of virtues, she is his own reflection, his alter ego. The result is not only the portrait of Pamela but also of the man.³⁸

Kreissman quotes Aurelien Digeon's parallel view: "One feels that his view of the world is the same as hers, narrow and conventional. In painting her he has laid bare the secret of his own soul."³⁹ Covertly present in these attacks is the belief that Richardson's identification with Pamela renders his representation of her morally reprehensible, not only because he himself is morally reprehensible, but because he has transgressed the boundaries of gender. Richardson's novel becomes a perverse spectacle of a man looking in the mirror and seeing himself as a woman, or pretending to be a woman, or seeing the woman in himself. None is acceptable.

Richardson's supposedly too close relation to women also appears in the conventional contrast of Richardson's "femininity" with Fielding's "masculinity." For example, Martin Battestin says that, while the relation between Richardson and Fielding "could hardly be called a marriage . . . from the rude and often hilarious conjunction of Richardson's feminine sensibility and Fielding's robust masculinity, the modern novel was born."⁴⁰ This account figures the birth of the novel (in *Shamela* and *Joseph Andrews*) as the result of a generative sexual assault on Richardson's receptive and vulnerable "sensibility." These slighting analyses not only devalue femininity itself, they evidence distaste for the apparent presence of both sexes in one body (of writing). Thus gender confusion seems to be part of *Pamela's* very constitution, because it is part of its author's constitution. There is a strong sense that Richardson, by the fact that he has written a novel under cover of femininity, has already created a kind of scandal.

The disruptive effects on readers of the novel's problematic gender and its connection with feminine duplicity are reflected in early praise of *Pamela*. In celebrating *Pamela*, these writers find themselves unable to extricate surface from depths, body from text, or author from heroine. The relation of surface to depths—and of woman to text—gets out of control in the discourse. In one of the laudatory passages with which Richardson prefaced the second edition of *Pamela*, William Webster focuses on the transparency of Pamela's language. Pamela, he says,

pours out all her Soul . . . before her Parents without Disguise; so that one may judge of, nay, almost see, the inmost Recesses of her Mind. A pure clear Fountain of Truth and Innocence, a Magazine of Virtue and unblemish'd Thoughts.⁴¹

In a novel so vigilant about the surveillance and penetration of the female body, this picture of the mind is necessarily tinged by the woman's body that supports it; other (gendered) recesses are inevitably suggested by those Webster cites. Webster's relief at the absence in those recesses is instructive in light of the problem of the feminine masquerade; there is, in fact, nothing to see, only reassuring transparency. Webster urges Richardson to leave *Pamela*'s language simple, direct, and "natural":

I could wish to see it [*Pamela*] out in its own native Simplicity . . . and, should you permit such a murdering Hand to be laid upon it, to gloss and tinge it over with superfluous and needless Decorations, which, like too much Drapery in Sculpture and Statuary, will but incumber it; it may disguise the Facts, marr the Reflections, and unnaturalize the Incidents. . . . No; let us have *Pamela* as *Pamela* wrote it; in her own Words, without Amputation or Addition. . . . The flowing Robes of Oratory may indeed amuse and amaze, but will never strike the Mind with solid Attention. (7–8)⁴²

"Amputation" sticks out like a sore thumb in this passage. The rest of Webster's language defends the natural text/natural body from the decorations that will "marr the Reflections" (both ruin the didacticism and, perhaps, ruin the book and woman as mirrors) by blocking the viewer's access to the body/text. But by proscribing "amputation," Webster attributes to the body/text a phallic power that needs to be protected from castration. The invocation of sculpture and statuary also undermines Pamela's artlessness by letting in through the back door the idea that *Pamela*/Pamela is a nude and thus an art object, not self-created. Webster's whirling metaphors confuse woman with novel, and radically confuse both with the woman's body. Pamela in this passage becomes a statue disturbingly come to life. The question of the text's sex—the need to sex the text—troubles Webster's desire to praise the woman and the novel for their transparency, their lack of duplicity.

Webster later counters his own celebration of *Pamela*'s naked charms, valorizing disguise when he moves to define the novel's artistic effects; when he moves, in fact, from feminine text to masculine author:

Yet, who could have dreamt, he should find, under the modest Disguise of a *Novel*, all the *Soul* of Religion, Good-breeding, Discretion, Good-nature, Wit, Fancy, Fine Thought, and Morality? (9)

The (probably feminine) covering of "*Novel*" here modestly falls away to reveal a plenitude of (presumably masculine) virtues. Rather than concealing "native simplicity," here the (discarded) drapery or disguise sets off the attractions of what it covers. The pleasure, like the pleasure in Young's couplets, now resides in the

power of unveiling the treasure concealed in a humble genre, and, it appears, the pleasure and power of finding the man behind, or inside, the woman—the novelist behind the novel. The ultimate source of all the virtues Webster uncovers is thus not Pamela, but Richardson:

Where, and how, has he [the author] been able to hide, hitherto, such an encircling and all-mastering Spirit. . . . The Comprehensiveness of his Imagination must be truly prodigious! (10)

Richardson as the invisible, omnipotent, and masculine creator, whose gaze penetrates reader and character, but who remains himself unknowable and unknown, is the reassuring final source and image of the artlessly artful woman. The voyeur who sees into Pamela's recesses does not find the woman's body (which might reveal either reassuringly or threateningly that there is nothing there to see); instead he comes before the mystified, disembodied presence of God the author, a presence that encircles and masters reader, text, and woman. Webster makes Richardson the *deus ex machina* of the novel, showing him in control of the seductive body of the woman and the text. But the narrative voice seems always to be subverting that transcendence by its refusal to be disembodied, and its reliance on the metaphors of the body.

III

Richardson invokes duplicity and hypocrisy in his representation of Pamela. Although these terms, along with disguise, are repudiated by Pamela, and by the novel's support of her honesty, Pamela's constitution of herself is shown as directly dependent on forms of duplicity and disguise.

When, early in the novel, Pamela decides she will have to return to her family, she prepares for her departure by dressing in clothes "fit for [her] Condition" as a daughter of the Andrews family:

There I trick'd myself up as well as I could in my new Garb, and put on my round-ear'd ordinary Cap; but with a green Knot however. . . . A plain Muslin Tucker I put on, and my black Silk Necklace, instead of the *French* Necklace my Lady gave me, and put the Earrings out of my Ears; and when I was quite 'quip'd, I took my Straw Hat in my Hand, with its two blue Strings, and look'd about me in the Glass as proud as any thing.—To Say Truth, I never lik'd myself so well in my Life. (60)

This description can be read as a spectacle that breaks down the coherence of the narrative in order to create a picture, or as what one critic disparagingly calls "a fashion plate."⁴³ But Pamela herself fixes the scene as an illustration by framing herself in the mirror. Pamela's assumption of her role as country girl partakes of a masquerade of femininity in Luce Irigaray's sense, in part because her trans-

formation—what Mrs. Jervis calls her “metamorphosis”—is both playful and powerful.

Annette Kuhn suggests that “clothing as performance threatens to undercut the fixity of the human subject,” and particularly the fixity of gender. Pamela’s disguise of herself as the country girl disrupts her identity, and is later echoed by Mr. B’s cross-gender disguise as the maidservant Nan. Mrs. Jewkes and Mr. B both fail to recognize Pamela in her country garb, and B then takes her (or pretends to take her) for Pamela’s perhaps more amenable, more natural, rural sister. When he “recognizes” her as Pamela, he asks:

Who is it you put your Tricks upon? I was resolved never to honour your Unworthiness, said he, with so much Notice again; and so you must disguise yourself, to attract me, and yet pretend, like an Hypocrite as you are. (62)

Mr. B accuses her of the linked transgressions of disguise and hypocrisy, assuming that her self-transformation is in service of her desire for him. Pamela repudiates the accusation of disguise and hypocrisy, but she lets slide the question of desire:

I was out of Patience, then; Hold, good Sir, said I; don’t impute Disguise and Hypocrisy to me, above all things; for I hate them both, mean as I am. I have put on no Disguise—What a-plague, said he, for that was his Word, do you mean then by this Dress?—Why, and please your Honour, said I, I mean one of the honestest things in the World. I have been in Disguise indeed ever since my good Lady, your Mother, took me from my poor Parents. (62)

Pamela’s response to B’s attack itself evades not only desire but other aspects of the problem of disguise. Essentially she makes a claim for the present honesty of her dress, but she buttresses that claim by making disguise a property of her past. The rhetorical value of disguise is greatest when disguise is being removed. The “real,” undisguised Pamela stands before him; the other version has been the creation of external forces, specifically B’s mother, whose clothes she has been wearing. The earlier embodiment of “Pamela” does not thereby become false, but the emphasis is wholly on the validity and truth of the present version. Disguise is thus displaced into the past, and onto clothing, away from the female body itself onto something that can be put on and taken off.

In fact Pamela is making a claim for self-definition and self-representation, even though she anchors this claim in her identity as the child of her “poor Parents.” If she can choose to represent herself in her “round-ear’d Cap,” she can define her clothing’s use rather than being defined by it. The eighteenth-century fear that clothes were ceasing to function as a reliable guide to status, and especially to status and virtue in women, is here confronted through a reversal. The usual anxiety was that women servants, in wearing the cast-off clothes of their mistresses, were becoming indistinguishable from their mistresses. Pamela rejects her mistress’s clothes in favor of those she has made herself, apparently following society’s edict against sumptuary presumption, but she is actually using clothes as

a part of a performance. Although it is a performance as herself, the meaning of that self has been put in doubt. While Terry Castle sees costume as ideally representing “an inversion of one’s nature,”⁴⁴ it is clear that here Pamela’s “costume” is actually a kind of double reversal—it underlines and almost parodies the “poor Pamela,” who has no power except in her virtue.

In rejecting clothes given her by Mrs. B in favor of clothes that she herself has made, Pamela marks her rejection of a role because of its sexual danger, but her pleasure in herself and her appearance shows that this rejection is not a rejection of her own body. Since she does eventually replace her mistress Mrs. B, Pamela’s repudiation of Mrs. B’s clothing is a step on the road to becoming her own version of Mrs. B. But that move takes place, to some extent, on her own terms; she is, of course, rejecting the clothes partly because they have passed through the hands of Mr. B. The “stockens” of his mother that B gives Pamela in the first pages of the book are transformed by passing through his hands into emblems of sexual commerce; by asserting her control of clothing she refuses B’s version of the relations between the sexes and the classes.⁴⁵

Pamela’s control of the masquerade remains explicitly in the service of family and virtue—it is not a naked assertion of her own independence. The fact that Pamela “disguises” herself in order to resist Mr. B’s sexual encroachments also underscores the novel’s claim that she manipulates her image for heroic and necessary reasons, not because she is duplicitous. But Pamela’s pleasure in her garb is so clearly superfluous to these claims that the claims begin to seem to excuse rather than to justify.

The novel asserts Pamela’s lack of hypocrisy all along, even while showing the heroine engaged in equivocal transformations of self. But *Pamela* also ritually expels hypocrisy, only to represent its irrepressible return. In fact, it seems that Richardson seizes the return of hypocrisy as an opportunity to reorient Pamela’s disguise so that it can be shown to serve masculine authority and patriarchal power.

In the last half of the book, for example, Mr. B’s sister arrives to see for herself what her brother has been up to. She encounters Pamela, who is now (secretly) married to B, and she attacks Pamela by accusing her of theatricality:

And I’ll warrant, my little Dear has topp’d her Part, and paraded it like any real Wife; and so mimicks still the Condition!—Why, said she, and turn’d me round, thou art as mincing as any Bride! . . . Pr’ythee, Child, walk before me to that Glass, survey thyself, and come back to me, that I may see how finely thou canst act the Theatrical Part given thee! (322)

Like B when he sees Pamela in her country apparel, Lady Davers wants Pamela to acknowledge her duplicity; Lady Davers thinks she can effect this acknowledgment if she forces Pamela to confront her image *as image* in a mirror. Lady Davers assumes that the mirror’s revelatory properties will strip away Pamela’s artificiality and artfulness, and that Pamela will be unable to sustain her performance once

it has been exposed as a performance. Pamela's earlier appropriation of the mirror's power suggests that this attempt at exposure is doomed to fail, although it now becomes clear that Pamela is no longer just performing the part of her "self," because the construction of that self is dependent on others' definitions of her. Lady Davers's wish to catch Pamela out in her lines—to disrupt the performance—clashes with Pamela's own positive sense of being something she does not appear to be, of embodying not a shameful but a triumphant doubleness:

If, said I, to attend your Ladyship at Table, or even kneel at your Feet, was requir'd of me, I would most gladly do it, were I only the Person you think me; but, if it be to triumph over one who has received Honours, that she thinks requires her to act another Part, not to be utterly unworthy of them, I must say, I cannot do it. (323)

If Pamela were single (in both senses of the word), she would do what Lady Davers requests, but since she is Pamela B or Pamela *and* B, she would be falsifying herself to accede to those demands. Pamela claims that her identity with and her indebtedness to B control her actions, and that therefore Lady Davers has no power over her. While earlier, in the scene of the country garb, Pamela has identified herself and her virtue with her parents against B, she now identifies herself with the newly reformed Mr. B against Lady Davers, who herself now speaks for B's apparently disowned family (and class) pride. Thus doubleness is again valorized; the terms used to castigate women are converted by Pamela, and by circumstances, into praiseworthy qualities.⁴⁶ The covert possession of masculinity in the feminine masquerade may have ominous implications for women, but here the possession *by* the masculine—Pamela's marriage to and identification with B—is presumed to create an untroubled pairing in Pamela herself, and thus to defuse duplicity's threat.

The structure of this scene recalls Webster's description of Richardson as the effaced masculine power behind the feminine text; Pamela's feminine theatricality can also be peeled away to reveal Mr. B's "all-mastering Spirit." B's presence as an aspect of Pamela creates the effects of theatricality and doubleness. This masculine presence in feminine duplicity suggests that Richardson's own investment in Pamela may not be a simple matter of a male author seeing himself as a female character, as Kreissman suggests when he calls Pamela Richardson's "own reflection, his alter ego." In fact, Richardson's relation to his heroine seems often to be represented in the novel by the identification of B with Pamela; the relation sometimes appears as B's identification with Pamela and sometimes as Pamela's identification with B.

With his conversion B ceases to perceive Pamela as duplicitous and hypocritical, but Lady Davers briefly takes over his position. Accusations of duplicity and hypocrisy retain a place in the novel, but Lady Davers, not B, makes them. But although Lady Davers continues for a while to reproach Pamela for her duplicity, she then replays in miniature B's conversion to Pamela-worship. As in B's con-

version, Lady Davers moves from total opposition to Pamela to a desire to be a part of Pamelism, to be a Pamelist. Duplicity and hypocrisy are qualities—or accusations—that seem to be deeply embedded in the economy of the novel, and they consistently resurface in new permutations, often to be again banished.

Pamela's displaced duplicity continues to haunt the novel, a ghost that cannot be laid to rest; it finds a new home as the attribute of another character, a woman who functions (briefly) to threaten B's happiness with Pamela. Sally Godfrey, whom B has seduced, impregnated, and abandoned, seems to be the monitory example of what Pamela might have become, but she also seems to represent what some readers have thought Pamela is: a canny manipulator using her virginity to buy her way into the upper classes. Sally fails, Pamela succeeds, but it then emerges that even Sally is not quite the figure she seems to be; the schemer was Sally's mother, not Sally herself, and Sally has nobly repudiated any gains to be obtained from B by sailing to America and a new identity. Duplicity is thus further split between these two women; the mother schemes, the daughter weakly succumbs to desires, and then suffers—although she escapes the usual fate of seduced maidens by escaping the country. The effort to find a scapegoat, a woman who can fully embody the duplicity and masquerade of femininity, is again thwarted or diluted; Sally Godfrey's mother is not even a character in the novel. Duplicity and disguise must continue to circulate without either being fully embodied or fully expelled. Richardson seems to back away from either possibility, as if to do so would upset the delicate balance necessary to his project.

Sally Godfrey embodies Pamela's averted fate, and thus heightens the value and effect of Pamela's triumphant virtue. Pamela also manages to fulfill what Sally (or her mother) dreamed of, and Pamela succeeds without trying, or without appearing to try. The novel seems to endorse the feminine vigilance and unconsciousness so central to the conduct books, but again the difference between the woman as hypocrite and the woman as ideal figure of innocence becomes blurred. Pamela's success, as much as her innocence in using her virginity and beauty, separates her from Sally, but it is easy to see how the line separating the woman who performs for an audience without knowing it from the woman who consciously performs for that male audience can blur. But that line is blurred and criss-crossed in its inception—blurred by a masculine investment irreparably divided between judgment and identification.

IV

Even a brief scene from one in the series of “attempts” Mr. B makes to seduce or rape Pamela illuminates the issues of feminine performance and masculine investment. Despite the scene's restricted compass, it elicited an extravagant attack in *Pamela Censured*, indicating the disorienting power of the double

presence of masculinity and femininity in one figure, particularly when desire and the female body are at stake.

During this early “attempt,” in which Mr. B tells Pamela she will be blameless if he rapes her, Pamela has such a hair’s-breadth escape that she leaves a bit of her dress caught in the door. She reports:

I just remember I got into the Room; for I knew nothing further of the Matter till afterwards; for I fell into a Fit with my Fright and Terror, and there I lay, till he, as I suppose, looking through the Keyhole, spy’d me lying all along the Floor, stretch’d out at my Length. (42)

Pamela portrays herself prostrated and unconscious—absent from the scene—while imagining Mr. B at the keyhole; she offers a glimpse of what her unconscious presence, stretched out on the floor, might look like to Mr. B. The syntax reinforces Pamela’s double state; she at once experiences her prostration and reports the gaze that observes it. Tania Modleski describes the implications of what she calls the “Man-in-the-closet plot device” so frequently used in *Pamela*:

As readers we are at the same time with Pamela in her supposed isolation, and with Mr. B watching and judging her. We possess the guilty knowledge that Pamela must lack; we experience a split consciousness in order to be reassured that a whole one is possible.⁴⁷

But this scene, along with the responses to it, points to an effect more complex than the creation of a split consciousness in the reader and its suppression in the character. Pamela does not know she is being watched because she is literally unconscious, but she represents the gaze of the man watching her, and represents her body under that gaze. Because Pamela is temporarily “absent” in unconsciousness, Mr. B’s consciousness and gaze briefly supplant hers as the governing forces of the scene. But Mr. B, although he is here a watcher, is produced through—and subject to—Pamela’s hypothesis of his presence, and cannot be separated entirely from her. This lack of separation between Mr. B and Pamela can be reread in terms of a male identification with woman as spectacle. Mr. B here is not simply the voyeur of Pamela; he is identified with her through the medium of her voice. The man who identifies with woman as spectacle is himself constructed through the gaze of the Other, and is not in control of the gaze, not simply a voyeur watching and judging.⁴⁸

Pamela Censured responds to this brief scene with almost violent distaste. Richardson is the primary target of the attack, but in the course of defining the scene’s effects, *Pamela Censured* (perhaps unwittingly) pays tribute to the disturbing power of the female body as spectacle:

And here the author (fearing lest his Male Readers should have no Entertainment . . .) contrives to give us an Idea of *Pamela*’s hidden Beauties, and very decently to spread her upon the Floor, for all who will peep thro’ the Door to surfeit on the Sight.⁴⁹

Pamela Censured accuses the author of using his heroine as a spectacle for the greedy eyes of male reader-voyeurs, but itself supplies added details of that spectacle:

The Young Lady by thus discovering a few latent Charms, as the snowy Complexion of her Limbs, and the beautiful Symmetry and Proportion which a Girl of about fifteen or sixteen must be supposed to shew by tumbling backwards . . . has her Laces cut, and all the pretty little necessary Things that the most luscious and warm Description can paint, or the fondest Imagination conceive.⁵⁰

The anonymous author dilates on the bare bones offered by Richardson, gradually fleshing out the picture—and clothing it—to render its effect palpable. The discoverer of the “latent Charms” is, of course, *Pamela Censured*. Richardson does not dwell on Pamela’s snowy limbs, or on the symmetry and proportion of the body tumbling backward onto the floor. But the body alone is not the determining element in the scene; the posture of the audience, placed at the keyhole, creates the pornographic effect:

How artfully has the Author introduced an Image which no Youth can read without Emotion! The Idea of peeping through a Keyhole to see a fine Woman extended on a Floor, in a Posture that must naturally excite Passions of Desire, may indeed be read by one in his grand *Climacteric* without ever wishing to see one in the same Situation, but the *Editor* of *Pamela* directs himself to the *Youth* of both Sexes.⁵¹

Up until this point the reader has been male, a stand-in for Mr. B, subject to uncontrollable desires to reproduce the scene. As the didactic claims of the novel receive attention, the audience becomes male and female, and feminine duplicity and masculine manipulation reenter the scene:

Therefore all the Instruction they can possibly receive from this Passage, is, first, to the young Men that the more they endeavor to find out the hidden Beauties of their Mistresses, the more they must approve them and for that Purpose all they have to do, is, to move them by some amorous Dalliance to give them; a *transient View* of the Pleasure they are afterwards to reap from the *beloved Object*. And secondly, to the young Ladies that whatever Beauties they discover to their Lovers, provided they grant not the last Favour, they only ensure their Admirers the more; and by a Glimpse of Happiness captivate their Suitor the better.⁵²

Pamela Censured tries to resolve the brief confusion of Mr. B and Pamela by dividing the readers’ responses along the lines of gender, but there is a residue that can only be taken care of by blaming that female figure, unconscious on the floor, as a duplicitous and canny user of her body. Pamela’s unconscious self-exposure teaches young ladies deliberately to “discover” their “hidden Beauties” in order to captivate men. The exposure of the female body to the eyes of a voyeur seems inevitably to become the responsibility of the woman. *Pamela Censured* tries to rationalize and reorganize the scene by supplying voyeuristic details and by attaching to Pamela’s consciousness the exposure that occurs in the scene.

But this double move, which also includes an attack on the author, merely reproduces¹ the uncertainty of the scene itself.

Richardson rings changes on the keyhole scene in an effort to settle the problems raised by the presence of B at the keyhole or in the closet. Late in the first novel, and again in the continuation of *Pamela*, Richardson transposes the scene to place Pamela herself at the keyhole. Near the end of part 1 she observes B and Lady Davers through the keyhole, and in part 2 she watches from her closet a reenactment of a scene from her past; her maidservant Polly and Mr. H (Jackey), Lady Davers's nephew, appear in place of Pamela and Mr. B:

I heard a kind of rustling and struggling, and Polly's voice crying, "Fie—How can you do so!—Pray, Sir."

This alarmed me much, because we have such orderly folks about us; and I looked through the key-hole; and, to my surprise and concern, saw Mr. H.—foolish gentleman!—taking liberties with Polly, that neither became him to offer, nor, more foolish girl! her to suffer . . . the girl sometimes encouragingly laughing, as at other times, inconsistently, struggling and complaining, in an accent that was too tender for the occasion.⁵³

Polly, even more than Sally Godfrey, enacts Pamela's repressed hypocrisy; Polly is radically double-voiced, her behavior at odds with her speech, and her words at odds with her tone. She is the scapegoat for hostility to Pamela's social rise; she embodies precisely those characteristics of which Pamela must be shown to be free. Polly's hypocrisy also softens the novel's revolutionary edge, and placates the forces of conservatism. Yes, it says, most maidservants (if not most women) are like that, but no, Pamela was not and is not.⁵⁴

The scene's structure also defuses the narrative threat of the earlier voyeurism. Instead of Pamela's original position—complicit in the production of herself as the object of voyeurism—she is here a fully conscious observer whose revoked identification with Polly allows her an absolute moral superiority.

By displacing Pamela's hypocrisy onto this minor figure, whom she herself castigates, Richardson aims at reinforcing Pamela's untainted nature; by defusing the voyeurism of keyhole scenes, he reinforces his narrative's untainted nature. But the resemblance between Pamela at the keyhole and Mr. B at the keyhole can easily backfire. Rather than inducing the kind of amnesiac reading that Richardson sometimes seems to aim at—that is, a reading that retrospectively grants Mr. B virtuous motives for suspect acts—the insistence on the virtue of Pamela's voyeurism suggests that Richardson's investment in scenes of voyeurism is not primarily moral or didactic.

The galvanizing effect of the original scene at the keyhole, registered by *Pamela Censured*, does not derive only from the spectacle of the disheveled, unconscious woman spread on the floor, or even from the possibility of viewing her through a keyhole; the excitement generated by this scene comes from the representation of Pamela seeing herself as a man would see her through the keyhole,

itself perhaps the fantasy of a man imagining himself a woman being watched by a man.

V

In Mr. B's culminating attempt to rape Pamela, Richardson most explicitly confronts the conjunction of feminine duplicity and cross-gender identification. Richardson literalizes and embodies in Mr. B both the masculine identification with the feminine and the feminine duplicity that have been haunting the text. This embodiment—which is neither final nor complete—forms part of the same pattern as Pamela's positive assertion of her doubleness, a doubleness informed by Mr. B, when she confronts Lady Davers. Richardson seems to see the rapprochement of the opposing figures under the sign of patriarchy as the only way out of the double binds facing femininity.

In this scene Pamela is closeted with Mr. B, who wears the clothes of the servant Nan, and with Mrs. Jewkes, whom Pamela sees as having an ambiguous gender and sexuality.⁵⁵ As the scene builds to its climax of averted rape, a complete dislocation of gender definitions seems to take place. This radical confusion enables the reorientation that follows; first, feminine alliances and the maternal are devalued and replaced by a movement toward the paternal. The paternal is represented initially by Mr. B's link with the idea of the Father, and then by Pamela's identification of B with her own father, whom he eventually displaces.

In her letter to her parents about the attempted rape, Pamela proleptically identifies herself as part of B by signaling her obedience to the rules of master-servant relations, rules she has elsewhere seen as broken by B's sexual advances.⁵⁶ Pamela worries about the ethics of telling her "little history," since she perceives herself as no longer its sole owner:

Do you think *Nan* could hear me talk of my Master's Offers? No, no, said [Mrs. Jewkes]; she was dead asleep. I'm glad of that, said I; because I would not expose my Master to his common Servants; and I knew *you* was not Stranger to his *fine* Articles. (175)⁵⁷

Solidarity with the master (her future husband) here begins to replace class and gender solidarity via a distinction between "common" and uncommon servants; Pamela will not expose Mr. B to his common servants, although she is content to describe his actions to Mrs. Jewkes because she already knows them. While she worries about exposing B to himself, she is physically exposing herself to B. Pamela's exposure of B's deeds thus explicitly parallels the exposure of her body; in fact Pamela suggests that neither is actually an exposure if one has the right audience. But Pamela's "unconscious" exposure of herself to Mr. B recirculates the issue of feminine duplicity because, as in the keyhole scene, there are too many openings for the voyeurist: the man masquerades as a woman to be privy to a female conversation that endorses his desire by focusing on his desire; a woman

undresses for the viewer's visual pleasure but without being aware (or without acknowledging) that she is doing so. The scene's covert fulfillment of the voyeur's desire is a force that the narrator's voice cannot abolish because the voice's body reproduces the voyeur's desire too precisely.

The letter Pamela writes to her parents about the attempted rape shows the effects of oscillation and double vision—the danger of duplicity. Pamela's narrative moves between her lack of knowledge at the time the scene occurred and her retrospective comprehension of events. But Pamela also fuses or confuses the moment of experience and the moment of writing. Richardson tries to enforce this distinction as a way to protect Pamela, but it does not hold up. Because the situation of telling is presented as all female, Pamela's innocence is supposed to be protected; her belief that only women are present allows Richardson to claim she is free of coyness and coquetry. But while Pamela believes that she is telling her story to one female servant (Mrs. Jewkes) in the presence of another (Nan), she also implicitly conveys to the reader her later knowledge that her body and story have created an enticing visual and aural spectacle for Mr. B. But these two versions of the scene achieve a temporary suspension, with Nan/Mr. B as one Janus-faced figure and Mrs. Jewkes as another. Pamela's belief in Mrs. Jewkes's masculinity distracts attention from and displaces the fact that Nan *is* male. Mrs. Jewkes tends to take over Mr. B's position as sexual villain; part of the scene's sleight-of-hand involves the transfer onto Mrs. Jewkes of the most vicious aspects of Mr. B's desires.

As the scene reaches its climax of averted (sexual) climax, gender becomes more and more significant because the interpretation of each gesture, each tremor depends on the sex of the performer. "Nan's" transformation from drunken maidservant to seducing master occurs in a landscape of shifting signs and shifting pronouns:

But, I tremble to relate it, the pretended She came into Bed; but quiver'd like an Aspin-leaf; and I, poor Fool that I was! pitied her much.—But well might the barbarous Deceiver tremble at his vile Dissimulation, and base Designs. (176)

At the moment when opposition—moral and sexual—seems to define Pamela's relation to B, the two are united in their trembling as well as, for an instant, in their sex. Pamela trembles to tell, and B ("She") trembles ambiguously with lust, anticipation, or, as Pamela retrospectively imagines, at the knowledge of *his* own duplicity. The bed contains three people, but they may be either three women; one man and two women; one man, one hermaphrodite, one woman; or two hermaphrodites and one woman.

Because sex and gender are in question, the gender of the audience also becomes an issue. Pamela wants to protect the paternal eye from certain kinds of sexual knowledge:

What Words shall I find, my dear Mother, (for my Father should not see this shocking Part) to describe the rest, and my Confusion, when the guilty Wretch took my Left-arm, and laid it under his Neck, as the vile Procureess held my Right; and then he clasp'd me round my Waist! (176)

As the pronoun shift is completed—"Nan" consistently becomes "he" in the *description* before Pamela in the scene recognizes that "Nan" is Mr. B—Pamela tries to recreate for herself a female audience by excluding her father as reader. But this insistence on a female audience, specifically a maternal reading audience, merely presages the paradoxical reentry of the paternal; at the moment of her father's exclusion, the awful voice of God the Father at the Day of Judgment sounds:

Said I, Is the Wench mad! Why, how now, Confidence? thinking still it had been *Nan*. But he kissed me with frightful vehemence; and then his Voice broke upon me like a Clap of Thunder. Now, *Pamela*, said he, is the dreadful Time of Reckoning come, that I have threaten'd. (176)

The shift from sexual threat to the invocation of patriarchal power takes place against the ground of a reshuffling or dislocation of gender. Pamela's virtue triumphs over Mr. B's transgressive desires but does so on the basis of Pamela's identification with B himself, and with B's patriarchal power.

As B begins to align himself with Pamela—and Pamela with B—Mrs. Jewkes, who has been the other focal point of gender confusion, retreats into her "natural" state of servitude, and into her "natural" gender.⁵⁸ Mrs. Jewkes almost literally shrinks; from the monstrosity hermaphroditic, and monstrosity maternal, presence of the novel's first half she becomes an overweight, vulgar, but essentially unthreatening female servant. Without B's mastery—and B's desires—inflating her, and without the burden of Pamela's search for a substitute mother, Mrs. Jewkes dwindles and becomes (uncomfortably) feminine and (awkwardly) servile.

Mr. B and Pamela begin to bridge their differences by turning away from the confusion of genders represented by Mrs. Jewkes, and by turning toward the father. This bridging allows a benign reading of sexual difference. The intervention of the idea of the father, and B's increasing identification with the figure of the father, signal the shift. Pamela begins to reassess Mr. B by using her father as index and touchstone:

But sure, at least he [B] must be sincere for the *Time*!—He could not be such a practised Dissembler!—If he could, O how desperately Wicked is the Heart of Man!—And where could he learn all those barbarous Arts?—If so, it must be native surely to the Sex!—But silent be my rash Censurings; be hush'd, ye stormy Tumults of my disturbed Mind; for have I not a Father who is a Man!—A Man who knows no Guile!—How then can I think it is native to the Sex? (189)

B's disguise as Nan seems first to reveal and then dispose of the masculine body's own disguised nature, and now B's link with Mr. Andrews again brings up, only to deny, the possibility of masculine duplicity. B's newly revealed sincerity is underwritten by Mr. Andrews's guilelessness, simply on the basis of their common gender and Pamela's desire. Pamela and B meet triumphantly as the former possessors of ambiguous and duplicitous bodies.

Although *Pamela* seems to offer the integration and transformation of male and female principles in the union between Pamela and B, it actually only reinscribes the problems it appears to have settled. In the first part of the novel, not only does Pamela embody a disturbing conjunction of masculine and feminine, and behave in ways that Mr. B can label as duplicitous, she also engages in activities that threaten to usurp masculine privilege. In the first part of the novel, for example, Pamela's letter writing provokes B's complaint that, "You mind your Pen more than your Needle" (55). Her letters even create a kind of paper pregnancy, suggesting that she is self-fertilizing, capable of producing offspring without Mr. B.⁵⁹

But I begin to be afraid my Writings may be discover'd; for they grow large! I stitch them hitherto in my Under-coat, next my Linen. (120)

Pamela here almost literally embodies femininity's fruitful duplicity; she secretes in her clothing the material results of her resistance to Mr. B, keeping "depths" of self-representation in a separable "surface" that is both part of her and not part of her.

Richardson partly "solves" the disturbing aspects of femininity and masculinity that *Pamela* brings up by shifting the meaning of spectacle in the novel's second half. Mr. B's identification with Pamela as spectacle ceases to be a disruptive force in her narrative when Mr. B begins to treat Pamela as a spectacle for *other* people's voyeurism and admiration. For example, Mr. B offers the neighbors the edifying tableau of Pamela's reunion with her father in a scene that requires Mr. B to exhibit authorial control and a talent for stage-managing (249–50). B exhibits Pamela to the others at a moment when her absorption in her emotions is so intense that she becomes unconscious of her audience, just as she was when spied upon from the closet or through the keyhole. The realized presence of an audience and a (male) stage manager attempts to separate those functions—and the authorial function—from Pamela, who earlier seems to be author, object, and audience. But Mr. B's new legitimacy as editor and co-author of the heroine's text, while it brings B's identification with Pamela out from underground, and out from its disruptive place in her narrative voice, also reinscribes Pamela as Mr. B's representative. Masculine identification with the feminine essentially moves out into the open, to be celebrated in Mr. B's uxorious displays of his wife's beauties and virtues. But this movement of masculine identification into the open, a move-

ment that seems to free the feminine from duplicity, actually depends on the novel's continued investment in the feminine hypocrisy and duplicity that have constituted its narrative and its heroine.

The consolidation of masculine and feminine seems at first intended to exorcise feminine duplicity and dissimulation, but the second half of the novel makes clear instead that Pamela, her body, and the body of her text have become integrated into the patriarchal family of Mr. B. Thus the self-display and putative deception so dangerous to Mr. B in the unmarried Pamela are transformed into positive attributes to be used in service of the husband. Ellen Pollak describes the difference between the unmarried woman who uses art and the married woman who dissembles:

The very art of managing appearances—for which the coquette and prude are criticized—is actively encouraged in the wife. . . . As long as a woman subjected herself to social, legal, and economic dependence on a man by becoming his wife . . . conniving attempts on her part to gain advantage within the limits of that dependency were condoned. Dissimulation on the part of women was not only permissible when it remained interior to a masculine desire, but it was often necessary to sustain the desired relationships of power.⁶⁰

Within the system of propriety Mr. B can now—and does—call on Pamela to serve his own desires, but Richardson presents Pamela's education in this new service as highly problematic. Richardson's recuperative plot attempts to show the reform and softening of the patriarchal family, but it refuses—or is unable—to eliminate the contradictions or the pain. When Mr. B lectures Pamela about her attempt to placate him on behalf of his sister, Pamela first reproduces his remarks and then reduces them to a list of rules that mimics the advice given by conduct books. B's requirements for a wife's behavior can barely be distinguished from requests for dissimulation:

Then I must have been morally sure, that she preferr'd me to all Men; and, to convince me of this, she must have lessen'd, not aggravated, my Failings; she must have borne with my Imperfections; she must have watch'd and study'd my Temper; and if ever she had any Points to carry, any Desire of overcoming, it must have been by Sweetness and Complaisance; and yet not such a slavish one, as should make her Condescension seem to be rather the Effect of her Insensibility, than Judgment of Affection. . . .

And if I was not always right, that yet she would bear with me, if she saw me set upon it. . . .

This would be so obliging a Conduct, that I should, in Justice, have doubled my Esteem for one, who, to humour me, could give up her own Judgment; and I should see she could have no other View in her Expostulations, after her Compliance had passed, than to rectify my Notions for the future; and it would have been impossible then, but I must have paid the greater Deference to her Opinion and Advice in more momentous Matters. . . .

That therefore she would draw a kind Veil over my Faults; that such as she could not hide, she would extenuate. (367–68)

Pamela's reproduction in list form of some of these "rules" suggests the ambivalence Richardson felt about the system he seems bound to uphold—not only for religious reasons, but perhaps because at this point he sees no alternative:

23. That a Woman gives her Husband Reason to think she prefers him before all Men. *Well, to be sure this should be so.*

24. That if she would overcome, it must be by Sweetness and Complaisance; *that is, by yielding, he means, no doubt.*

25. Yet not such a slavish one neither, as should rather seem the Effect of her Insensibility, than Judgment or Affection!. . .

30. That if the Husband be *set* upon a wrong Thing, she must not dispute with him, but do it, and expostulate afterwards.—*Good-sirs! I don't know what to say to this!—It looks a little hard, methinks!—This would bear a smart Debate, I fancy, in a Parliament of Women.*

The last rule in the list that Pamela thus internalizes should make them "all very tolerable": "That a Husband who expects all this, is to be incapable of returning Insult for Obligation, or Evil for Good; and ought not to abridge her of any Privilege of her Sex" (372). Pamela concludes by telling her parents that "after all, you'll see I have not the easiest Task in the World," but she cheerfully proposes to do her best, believing she will not "willfully err" (372). Pamela plans to submit, but her response to B's authoritarian designs suggests that she will retain a distance between her judgment and her behavior; her outward conformity will not always match her inward perceptions.

In the continuation of *Pamela*, a darker, more pessimistic view of marriage emerges. In teaching Miss Goodwin (the child of B and Sally Godfrey) about her future, Pamela describes the "*married state*" as

a kind of state of humiliation for a lady, [in which] you must think yourself subordinate to your husband; for so it has pleased God to make the wife. You must have no will of your own, in *petty* things; and if you marry a gentleman of sense and honour, such a one as your uncle, he will look upon you as his equal; and will exalt you the more for your abasing yourself. (part 2, pp. 467–68)

In *Pamela* Richardson attempts to legitimize possible means of self-display and self-exploration for women, while confronting the compromise and contortion necessary for living within a system that so strictly controls and limits women's possibilities. Although Pamela has been triumphantly cleared of the sins of duplicity and hypocrisy, they continue to circulate in the novel, irrepressible and apparently unkillable elements of the eighteenth-century ideology of femininity.

Notes

1. See Katharine M. Rogers, *The Troublesome Helpmate: A History of Misogyny in Literature* (Seattle, 1966), for a historical survey of literary expressions of misogyny. For a more

extensive survey of Restoration and early-eighteenth-century attacks on women, see Felicity A. Nussbaum, *The Brink of All We Hate: English Satires on Women, 1660–1750* (Lexington, 1984).

2. Rogers, *Troublesome Helpmate*, 165, 163. Rogers quotes Robert Gould's "A Satyr Against Wooing" (1698?) to illustrate "stripping":

Strip but this Puppet of it's Gay Attire,
It's—Gauzes, Ribbons, Lace, Commode and Wire,
And tell me then what 'tis thou dost admire?

.....
If in her Bed you e'er perceive her fast
Mind how her Face is crusted o'er with Past,
Or nasty Oils us'd nightly to repair
Her skin, quite spoil'd—with taking of the Air.

(164)

3. Ibid., 49.
4. Richardson himself, in the scene of Mrs. Sinclair's death in *Clarissa*, uses this motif to anathematize the whores and further exalt Clarissa. Belford, after describing the whores' nightmarish physical monstrosity when in deshabille, says, "I admire and next to adore a truly virtuous and elegant woman: for to me it is evident that as a neat and clean woman must be an angel of a creature, so a sluttish one is the impurest animal in nature." In a footnote Richardson defends himself from the taint of impropriety: "Whoever has seen Dean Swift's *Lady's Dressing Room* will think this description of Mr Belford not only more natural but more decent painting, as well as better justified by the design, and by the use that may be made of it"; Samuel Richardson, *Clarissa, or, the History of a Young Lady* (Harmondsworth, Eng., 1985), 1388.
5. The phrase is from Mary Poovey, *The Proper Lady and the Woman Writer: Ideology as Style in the Works of Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Shelley, and Jane Austen* (Chicago, 1984), 5. The standard discussion of the "trivialization" of women under capitalism can be found in Alice Clark, *The Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1919).
6. Marlene LeGates, "The Cult of Womanhood in Eighteenth-Century Thought," *Eighteenth Century Studies* 10 (1976/77): 21–36.
7. Ruth Bloch, "Untangling the Roots of Modern Sex Roles: A Survey of Four Centuries of Change," *Signs* 4 (1978): 237–52.
8. Nancy Armstrong, "The Rise of the Domestic Woman," in Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse, eds., *The Ideology of Conduct: Essays on Literature and the History of Sexuality* (New York, 1987), 114.
9. Nancy Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel* (New York, 1987), 120.
10. Mary Poovey says that "far from dismissing the specter of female sexuality, in fact, the late eighteenth-century ideal of feminine propriety simply transmutes it into its opposite"; *Proper Lady*, 19. See also Ellen Pollak, "The Eighteenth-Century Myth of Passive Womanhood," in *The Poetics of Sexual Myth: Gender and Ideology in the Verse of Swift and Pope* (Chicago, 1985), 22–76.
11. To divide women into surface and interior almost always leads to the scapegoating of the surface as a trap: "Another Ground and Reason of Love, with such Love-sick Gentleman as you, is *Apparel* and *Deportment*; this for certain is one of the greatest Baits to entrap *Fools*, that regard the Shell, and neglect the Kernel"; Anon., *Reflections upon Matrimony, and the Women of this Country, in a Letter to a Young Gentleman* (London, 1755), 29.

12. Ibid., 30.
13. Paul de Man, "The Epistemology of Metaphor," in *On Metaphor*, ed. Sheldon Sacks (Chicago, 1978), cites this passage from John Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (book 3, chap. 10), and comments on the disruptive presence of the female metaphor:

Nothing could be more eloquent than this denunciation of eloquence. It is clear that rhetoric is something one can decorously indulge in as long as one knows where it belongs. Like a woman, which it resembles ("like the fair sex"), it is a fine thing as long as it is kept in its proper place. Out of place, among the serious affairs of men ("if we would speak of things as they are"), it is a disruptive scandal—like the appearance of a real woman in a gentleman's club where it would only be tolerated as a picture preferably naked (like the image of Truth), framed and hung on the wall.

14. John Berger, in *Ways of Seeing* (Harmondsworth, Eng., 1972), has presented an influential analysis of the split consciousness of women:

Men survey women before treating them. Consequently how a woman appears to a man can determine how she will be treated. To acquire some control over this process, women must contain and interiorize it. . . . Women watch themselves being looked at. This determines not only most relations between men and women but also the relation of women to themselves. The surveyor of woman in herself is male: the surveyed female. (46–47)

This sympathetic and suggestive description of the effect of "surveillance" on women, however, represents as a simple incorporation the complex cross-identifications that traverse the female body and mind. Berger's explanation of men's investment in women's vanity as portrayed in visual arts tries to stabilize the problem of feminine doubleness partly by transferring hypocrisy to the male artist and viewer:

The mirror was often used as a symbol of the vanity of woman. The moralizing, however, was mostly hypocritical. You painted a naked woman because you enjoyed looking at her, you put a mirror in her hand and you called the painting *Vanity*, thus morally condemning the woman whose nakedness you had depicted for your own pleasure. (51)

But as I will show, hypocrisy does not cease to be a problem when men are presumed guilty of it.

My reading of *Pamela* is indebted to Berger, and to Tania Modleski's use of his ideas in a few pages devoted to *Pamela* in her book, *Loving with a Vengeance: Mass-Produced Fantasies for Women* (New York, 1982), but I believe that Berger tends at times to remain caught in the splits he describes.

15. "The Universal Spectator. Nov. 25. No. 529," *The Gentleman's Magazine, and Historical Chronicle* 8 (June 1738): 591.
16. Here I differ from Terry Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction* (Stanford, Calif., 1986), who sees Richardson as refusing identification:

In the rationalized moral cosmos of Richardson and Burney (two authors particularly concerned to enclose and neutralize the unstable realm of the masquerade), otherness remains the object of charity, but never of identification. (107)

My own essay shows the crucial status of identification in Richardson's work.

17. See my article, Tassie Gwilliam, "'Like Tiresias': Metamorphosis and Gender in *Clarissa*," *Novel* 19, no. 2 (1986): 101–17.

18. Edward Young, "Love of Fame, the Universal Passion," in *The Works of the Author of Night-Thoughts*, 4 vols. (London, 1744), 1:144.
19. For an illuminating discussion of the meaning of the veil, see Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's essay, "The Character in the Veil: Imagery of the Surface in the Gothic Novel," in *The Coherence of Gothic Conventions* (New York, 1986).
20. Mary Poovey explains the value conduct material has for anyone who wishes to gain access "both to the ways in which this culture defined female nature and to the ways in which a woman of this period would have experienced the social and psychological dimensions of ideology"; *Proper Lady*, 16. My own interest is less in recovering women's experience of ideology than in investigating aspects of the construction of "female nature." Poovey's revealing analysis of "the proper lady" and Kristina Straub's discussion of Frances Burney's divided relation to propriety in *Divided Fictions: Fanny Burney and Feminine Strategy* (Lexington, Ky., 1987) both develop our understanding of conduct's meaning for women in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.
21. James Fordyce, *The Character and Conduct of the Female Sex, and the Advantage to be Derived by Young Men from the Society of Virtuous Women* (London, 1776; reprint ed., Boston, 1781), 30.
22. John Gregory, *A Father's Legacy to His Daughters* (New York, 1775), 23.
23. Mary Wollstonecraft, *The Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (Harmondsworth, Eng., 1975), 111. Wollstonecraft's detailed attacks on Gregory, and on Fordyce, are at the center of her project in *The Vindication*.
24. This construction will recall John Berger's well-known description of women as split internally between viewer and viewed. The difference comes, of course, in the fact that this split is produced through a man's view. Identifying women as split offers, as I have suggested, certain equivocal pleasures.
25. Gregory, *Father's Legacy*, 14.
26. In "Making Faces: Physiognomy and Fashion in Eighteenth-Century England," *Etudes anglaises* 38 (1985): 385–96, Roy Porter describes the anxiety produced by a woman wearing rouge: this "artificial blush, which (men feared) all too readily camouflaged lost innocence, that inability to blush, hid the bare-faced cheek of the shameless woman."
27. James Fordyce, *Sermons to Young Women* (Boston, 1767), 38.
28. Joan Riviere, "Womanliness as a Masquerade," in Victor Burgin et al., eds., *Formations of Fantasy* (London, 1986), 35–44.
29. *Ibid.*, 43.
30. Luce Irigaray, *This Sex Which Is Not One*, trans. Catherine Porter with Carolyn Burke (Ithaca, N.Y., 1985), 76.
31. My use of the term "masquerade" owes more to Irigaray and Riviere than to Terry Castle. Castle sees the "controlling figure" of masking as antithesis: "One was obliged to impersonate a being opposite, in some essential feature, to oneself. The conventional relationship between costume and wearer was ironic, one that replicated a conceptual scandal"; *Masquerade*, 5. Castle's focus on the world turned upside down is not mine; my own interpretation of the masquerade of gender in Richardson suggests that impersonation is more likely to play out and explore the body's desires and meanings on its surface than in an inversion.
32. Fordyce, *Character and Conduct*, 42.
33. [Richard Allestree], *The Ladies Calling, in Two Parts* (Oxford, 1673), 12.
34. Richardson describes his life in a series of letters to Johannes Stinstra. The relevant

- letter is 2 June 1753; *The Richardson-Stinstra Correspondence and Stinstra's Prefaces to Clarissa*, ed. William C. Slattery (Carbondale, Ill., 1969), 26.
35. Bernard Kreissman, *Pamela-Shamela: A Study of the Criticisms, Burlesques, Parodies, and Adaptations of Richardson's "Pamela"* (Lincoln, Neb., 1960), 15–16.
 36. Quoted in *ibid.*, 53.
 37. Michael McKeon has produced an important reading of the politics of *Pamela* in his monumental *Origins of the English Novel, 1600–1740* (Baltimore, 1987). As my own discussion shows, I disagree with McKeon's depiction of *Pamela* as containing a "utopian achievement" of social "empowerment" (380).
 38. Kreissman, *Pamela-Shamela*, 28–29.
 39. Quoted in *ibid.*, 29.
 40. See Martin Battestin's introduction to Henry Fielding, *Joseph Andrews* (Boston, 1961). An interesting permutation of this argument appears in the exchange in *Novel* about whether Richardson or Fielding has the better feminist credentials. See Katharine M. Rogers, "Sensitive Feminism vs. Conventional Sympathy: Richardson and Fielding on Women," *Novel* 9 (1976): 256–70; and Anthony J. Hassall, "Critical Exchange: Women in Richardson and Fielding," *Novel* 14 (1981): 168–74.
 41. In Samuel Richardson, *Pamela: or, Virtue Rewarded*, ed. T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel (Boston, 1971), 7. All subsequent citations to the first part of *Pamela* are to this edition.
 42. In *Shamela*, Fielding barely twists this language to "reveal" its potential for sexual meaning:

"The Thought is every where exactly cloathed by the Expression; and becomes its Dress as *roundly* and as close as *Pamela* her Country Habit; or as *she doth her no Habit*, when modest Beauty seeks to hide itself, by casting off the Pride of Ornament, and displays itself without any Cover;" which it frequently doth in this admirable Work, and presents Images to the Reader, which the coldest Zealot cannot read without Emotion . . . Oh! I feel an Emotion even while I am relating this: Methinks I see *Pamela* at this Instant, with all the Pride of Ornament cast off.
 - Henry Fielding, *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews* (London, 1741; reprint ed., New York, 1974), 2.
 43. Anne Hollander, *Seeing Through Clothes* (New York, 1980), 441.
 44. Castle, *Masquerade*, 5.
 45. See Carey McIntosh, "Pamela's Clothes," *ELH* 35 (1968): 75–83, for an analysis of clothes as a "symbolic leitmotif" in the novel. Two recent articles treating the subject of clothing are: Caryn Chaden, "Pamela's Identity Sewn in Clothes," in *Eighteenth-Century Women and the Arts*, ed. Frederick M. Keener and Susan E. Lorsch (New York, 1988); and Sheila C. Conboy, "Fabric and Fabrication in Richardson's *Pamela*," *ELH* 54 (1987): 81–96.
 46. Terry Castle sees the masquerading pregnant Pamela in part 2 as "a walking contradiction [who] literalizes the festive image of the double body"; *Masquerade*, 160.
 47. See Modleski, *Loving with a Vengeance*, especially chap. 2, for an analysis of *Pamela* and romance fiction based on John Berger's influential description of the split consciousness of women in *Ways of Seeing*.
 48. Kaja Silverman, "Fragments of a Fashionable Discourse," in *Studies in Entertainment: Critical Approaches to Mass Culture*, ed. Tania Modleski (Bloomington, Ind., 1986), 139–52.

49. Anonymous, *Pamela Censured*, printed with *Shamela* in *Richardsoniana*, 3 vols. (New York, 1974), 2:28.
50. *Ibid.*, 31. It is important to note that the “luscious and warm Description” and “fondest Imagination” belong to *Pamela Censured*, not to Richardson.
51. *Ibid.* 52. *Ibid.*, 31–32.
53. Samuel Richardson, *Pamela*, vol. 2 (London, 1978), 186.
54. See Castle, *Masquerade*, 147, for a reading of this scene which focuses more on the thwarting of repetition than on the voyeurism or the interest in hypocrisy.
55. Terry Castle, in “P/B: *Pamela* as Sexual Fiction,” *Studies in English Literature* 22 (1968): 469–89, describes Mrs. Jewkes as a phallic woman, and discusses the use of hints of homosexuality in her character.
56. This identification is also present in the scene with Lady Davers discussed above.
57. Pamela is referring to B’s formal proposal to make her his mistress.
58. Terry Castle, in “P/B,” also discusses Mrs. Jewkes’s “shrinking” after Pamela’s marriage.
59. Mr. B, as principal subject of the letters, would also claim he is in some sense their father.
60. Pollak, *Poetics of Sexual Myth*, 68.