PATHETIC TEMPORALITY: AFFECT AND TIME IN THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY WOMEN'S EPISTOLARY NOVEL

by

COURTNEY A. HOFFMAN

(Under the Direction of Elizabeth Kraft)

ABSTRACT

This project investigates the intersections between time and emotion via the exchange of letters in the eighteenth-century epistolary novel. Those intersections, creating what I call "pathetic temporality," include attention within works to how long it takes for letters to reach their recipients, how correspondents understand the passing of time when their emotional state affects their perceptions of time, and the importance of time as a rhetorical device in what is written by correspondents. Drawing on both affect theory and theories of time and temporality, I briefly consider the implications of temporality in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister* and Eliza Haywood's *Love-Letters on All Occasions*. I then engage the ways in which Richardson's *Pamela* simultaneously utilizes and revises the forms of affect and temporality that appear in these earlier texts. Richardson's titular character immerses her reader in the possibilities for the expression of emotion through the concrete temporality of days, hours, and minutes, tying her emotional state to the passage of time. This represents a shift in the interactions of affect and time that Behn and Haywood produce, and influences the epistolary novels that come after *Pamela.* I argue that women writers like

Frances Sheridan, Frances Brooke, Charlotte Lennox, and Charlotte Smith reimagine *Pamela*'s epistolary temporality as both fluid and crucial to the interactions between people. The epistolary novel's structure is a space in which the necessary separation of characters produces and expands the passing of time between events, and combines with the genre's (necessary) use of the first person point of view that can and often must alternate between characters. This narrative form makes the epistolary novel a particularly forceful space to shape emergent connections between understandings of time and the emotions. To conclude, I consider how the failure of the epistolary structure in the nineteenth-century descendants of these texts, such as Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, emphasize the shift in narrative structures of both affect and temporality that lead toward the more dominant narrative construction of free indirect discourse, even as the vestiges of epistolarity remain in later novels.

INDEX WORDS: time, affect, sensibility, emotion, eighteenth-century epistolary novel, Samuel Richardson, Aphra Behn, Eliza Haywood, Frances Sheridan, Frances Brooke, Charlotte Lennox, Charlotte Smith

PATHETIC TEMPORALITY: AFFECT AND TIME IN THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY WOMEN'S EPISTOLARY NOVEL

by

COURTNEY A. HOFFMAN

B.A., Gettysburg College, 2002

M.A., University of North Carolina, 2004

M.A., Georgetown University, 2012

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2017

PATHETIC TEMPORALITY: AFFECT AND TIME IN THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY WOMEN'S EPISTOLARY NOVEL

by

COURTNEY A. HOFFMAN

Major Professor:	Elizabeth Kraft
Committee:	Beth Tobin
	Casie LeGette

Electronic Version Approved:

Suzanne Barbour
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2017

DEDICATION

For my Writing Group: a bunch of feminists, working in collaboration, whose efforts at peer review have been, above all else, a meeting of like minds. I love reading your writing. I love our chats. I love all of you.

For Holly Gallagher, also known as Her Majesty: my carpooling buddy, whose company and wise words I sorely miss now that we drive separately. Thank you for your friendship. I couldn't have had better.

And for my nieces, Jeni and Rachael, even though they'll probably never read this text. Reach for the stars, girls, because when you take the time and make the effort, you just might be able to grasp them. GuGu loves you and your warm hugs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project would not have been completed without the aid of several people. The Chawton House Library awarded me a month-long Visiting Fellowship in 2015, where I was able to conduct research that resulted in a complete revision of the structure of the project, one which I believe has helped to improve the quality of my work. Gillian Dow, Darren Bevin, and the excellent staff at the Library have my deepest appreciation for their aid while I was in residence in Chawton. I received a research award from the University of Georgia's Willson Center, for which I am extremely grateful. I gained insight into my ideas through conversations with Ros Ballaster, without whose advice, guidance, and critiques I could not have produced this text in this way. The UGA at Oxford program gave me the opportunity to conduct research in Oxford, at the Bodleian Library, and facilitated my work with Ros. Jamie McClung, Barbara Bradshaw, and Maggie Perry in particular deserve my deepest thanks. Without my participation in Michelle Ballif's Rhetorical Theory class, I may never have had the idea to consider affect and time as intricately connected. My committee members, Beth Tobin and Casie LeGette, have put in a great deal of time and effort into reading drafts of this dissertation. Most especially, I must convey my everlasting gratitude to Elizabeth Kraft, whose patience, words of wisdom, and mentoring have guided me through nearly every step of this process. Our weekly meetings helped me to shape myself into a better writer, scholar, and person. Thank you, Elizabeth, from the bottom of my heart, for the sense of pathetic temporality that has influenced this project and the entirety of my experience at the

University of Georgia from my first semester to my last. I will miss your comfy blue recliner. And last, but certainly never least, thank you to my parents, who have supported me on multiple levels since I decided to undertake this journey. You've never questioned whether I was right to do it, and have always given me the power to chase my dreams. Love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION:
PATHETIC TEMPORALITY AND THE EIGHTEEN-CENTTURY EPISTOLARY NOVEL

That the epistolary novel flourished in a century in which the writing of letters engaged society through both material and cultural means seems only natural.[1] That the epistolary novel is deeply entwined with constructions of temporality is perhaps not so obvious. But the genre is dependent on the structures of correspondence, and time and its corollary experiences of temporality are essential to the exchange of letters. Janet Gurkin Altman's thorough study of the characteristics of epistolarity defines what she calls "temporal polyvalence," suggesting that every letter in an exchange involves various moments: those of writing, of reading, of the event narrated, of the event remembered, of sending the letter on. Those moments are all filtered through the present tense, which functions as a "pivot" around which the experiences of the past and the anticipation of the future revolve, forming the "pivotal present."[2] Letters are involved with a never-ending and overlapping sense of presence—both in terms of physical presence, as the letter stands in for the writer, and in terms of the temporal present, as the writer composes the now even as the reader reads in their own now. The eighteenth-century epistolary novel is uniquely positioned to provide a glimpse into understandings of not only the ways time and temporality pervade the genre, but also the ways those filaments of temporality proliferate outside the pages of literature.

Temporality is not the only element at work in the trend toward epistolarity in the eighteenth century. Keith Opdahl suggests that, because the potential for emotion saturates every word, including its associations and connotations, feeling becomes a method for the cultural production and dissemination of meaning.[3] In a genre in which the writing of words to a specific audience forms the foundation of a text's plot, and in which those words conform to the strictures of temporal epistolarity, the conveyance of emotion is intricately linked to experiences of time. My project, essentially a narratological study, considers exactly that: the intersections between time and emotion via the exchange of letters in the epistolary novel of the eighteenth century. I see the conveyance of emotion between people as dependent upon temporality, and I investigate the ways emotion and temporality interact by attending to how long it takes for letters to reach their recipients, how correspondents understand the passing of time (particularly if their emotional state shapes their perceptions of time—which I suggest that it does), and the importance of time as a rhetorical device in what is written by correspondents. The epistolary novel—a particularly eighteenth-century phenomenon—and its unique structure is utilized by women writers of the period in order to engage with and question constructions of womanhood through epistolarity. The opportunities provided by the genre's specific conventions of affect and temporality emerge in a phenomenon that I have designated "pathetic temporality."

This term has its roots in Aristotelian rhetoric, where *pathos* is the use of emotion in order to persuade an audience. When combined with *logos* (the use of logic, reason, or proof) and *ethos* (credibility), *pathos* engages a listener on a visceral level—that is, it appeals to the feelings. In a novel, I would argue, this triumvirate works to convince a

reader of the believability of a setting, character, or event and connects with that reader on the emotional plane. Therefore, a reader would cry with one character, or feel passion with another; this definition is based on the idea of sympathy expressed by such eighteenth-century moral philosophers as Adam Smith, David Hume, and Henry Home, Lord Kames.[4] While sympathy and its close companion sensibility were generally understood as melancholic emotions in the eighteenth century, in neither Aristotelian rhetoric, which I take as my foundation for the examination of language and persuasive texts in my primary works, nor in the examinations of affect that are my touchpoints for modern interpretive analysis, are only the negative or sorrowful emotions expressed. In addition, the 1755 edition of Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language* defines "sensibility" as "quickness of sensation; quickness of reception;" a statement that connotes not only life but liveliness, as something that is "quick" is not dead.[5] Johnson's definition also contains a temporal aspect, indicating the speed with which sensations or perceptions are felt plays a role in creating sensibility. He does not indicate what sort of sensations are to be felt or expressed. In fact, happiness and passion are equally affective and easily communicated as sadness and shame, and can persuade an audience as effectively. Sara Ahmed argues that "we judge something to be good or bad according to how it affects us, whether it gives us pain or pleasure."[6] Therefore, scenarios, whether they are real or fictional, "are affective given the gap between the impressions we have of others, and the impressions we make on others, all of which are lively."[7] Thus, for my project, the terms *pathos* and pathetic temporality do not refer simply to events or people who cause tears or sorrow, but can also indicate the full gamut of emotional response.

In the transmission of feeling lies a central issue explored by many British women writers in the late eighteenth century and especially those with whose works I engage in this project: how does emotion—or affect—or sensibility—move between their characters, whose epistolary connection is predicated on distance? In this study, I wish to make the argument that this emotional exchange occurs through time, even in fiction. The use of letters in fiction is in flux in the eighteenth century, partially due to the instability of the definition of "novel" at the time, but also, I suggest, because of the inherently temporal nature of epistolarity itself. And because the genre changes *over time*, authors are influenced by those who come before them. Thus, when Richardson publishes his first novel, *Pamela*, in 1740, already epistolary conventions have been influenced by such writers as Aphra Behn and Eliza Haywood. Elements of both their epistolary proto-texts are repeated when he constructs his own, producing what is generally considered to the original "epistolary novel." Similarly, when Frances Sheridan, Frances Brooke, Charlotte Lennox, and Charlotte Smith write their own epistolary novels, each woman utilizes elements of the earlier works, including *Pamela*, and revises them so that her text meets the generic expectation of the epistolary novel as such, but also examines and critiques a different aspect of eighteenth-century British society. The result is a panorama of the potential for feminine subversion of masculine ideologies as portrayed by Richardson, one that, over the course of more than half a century, shifts the narrative focus of the epistolary novel from the performance of gender within the home to the perspective and influence of gender on events of national and international scope. For, as Smith argues in her preface to her only epistolary text, *Desmond* (1792), if women must live in a world shaped by events outside the home, they should also have the right to understand and

engage with it, a sentiment that remains as true today as it did on the eve of the Reign of Terror and the Peninsular Wars.

What is "pathetic temporality" in the epistolary novel?

The epistolary novel's structure as a space in which the necessary separation of characters produces and expands the passing of time between events makes it a particularly forceful space to shape emergent connections between understandings of time and emotions when combined with the genre's (necessary) use of the first person point of view that can and often must alternate between characters. Because the genre's form leaves little room for an outside narrator, those emotions expressed belong solely to the letter-writer, rather than being directed by that narrator. When such an outside voice is used (i.e., the framing "editor" of Frances Sheridan's *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph* [1761]), often it serves to explain the excerpting of some letters from the whole collection, which results in heightening a sense of time and therefore can produce gaps in the text that highlight emotional exchange through time. This artificial structuring of which letters are written and read serves to further emphasize what I wish to argue: in the exchange of letters, time and emotions are intertwined to create an economy of affect through pathetic temporality.

The empirical theories of eighteenth-century philosophers John Locke and Immanuel Kant can aid in demonstrating how fundamental the passing of time and temporality was to consciousness. Nancy Armstrong's important argument about the creation of the specifically gendered female subject in the eighteenth century stems from the premise of a subject being a reader and therefore influenced by the texts she

encountered.[8] Without the earlier works of fiction, the novels with which I am concerned could not have existed as they are. Even as philosophical questions of what it means "to be" are still being considered today, the strains of similar eighteenth-century philosophical inquiries are translated into the novels contemporaneous to them, including the epistolary. Locke's theories on education and the formation of the human mind are well-known; in reading or writing, or performing any task at all, Locke suggests, the mind must concentrate. This concentration can obscure our sense of time passing, particularly in our understanding of temporal duration. Consciousness depends on awareness, awareness produces concentration, and concentration or absorption in a task comes from our mood—and mood is generally produced by emotions.[9] Therefore, according to Locke, our understanding of temporality—that is, the experience of time passing—stems from the emotions that cause us to concentrate on a task like writing a letter. The eighteenth-century understanding of temporality would thus have had some basis in emotion, if we accept Locke, and therefore suggests that the experience of time creates affect, or sensibility, as affect was termed in the period. Kant also deals with time briefly, suggesting that time itself underlies all human intuition, and that it cannot be experienced without the understanding that it already exists. To experience time, Kant suggests, we are feeling an inner sense that cannot be adequately explained by outer influences, thus we create analogies to understand how time molds us. Time does not exist on its own without reference to subjectivity; that is, objects do not have their own time separately from ours and therefore, the experience of time is relegated to the subject, or the consciousness.[10]

As I see it, then, subjectivity is constituted by emotion and time. In particular, the subject itself moves through time, even as it is constructed by it, picking up pieces of information along the way. This accretion constitutes the *pathos* of the subject; because the subject experiences temporality via its state of mind, subjectivity is influenced by emotion. When its gears interlock smoothly and its mechanism remains wound, the clock, that material representative of time itself, does not move at a different pace. Nor does the Earth shift in its rotation around its axis as it circumnavigates its orbit around the sun. Instead, our emotions, our mood, dictate the way in which we *feel* the passage of time. Temporality depends on emotion; subjectivity, then, being constituted through its own inherent temporal nature, is itself dependent on emotion. As the subject passes through time, what that subject carries into its future, passing through its own already-having-been, depends on how the subject experienced that time, just as the experience of time itself depends on emotion. This movement through time is the method through which subjectivity can alter; the experience of being hinges on the affect of the world on the subject. The foundation of my reasoning here, then, is an approach to understanding a construction of subjectivity that is concerned with the actual experience of the world; that is, the subject is changed by the things around it, including, as Armstrong suggests, reading material. For my purposes, the letter, as a way for the subject to write itself into being for others to read and understand, is that crucial genre of text which aids in the formation of a specific kind of subject. And if emotion shapes the subject on its deepest level, I would argue that *pathos* is a crucial element in causing the shift in the gendered domestic paradigm for which Armstrong argues in *Desire and Domestic Fiction*. The very fact that Armstrong is able to trace a path for the manner in which the "domestic

woman" appears in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries through conduct books and novels, from Samuel Richardson and *Pamela* through Jane Austen's works and Charlotte Brontë's novels to Virginia Woolf's *Orlando* and even Freud, indicates that constructions of the domestic woman occur through time. I argue that effects on the subject as produced through what is read can also occur within time, and more specifically within the narrative structure of the epistolary novel.

Affect requires interaction and, like epistolarity, depends on some form of separation. Just as Altman notes that there must be some distance between letter-writers, Melissa Gregg and Greg Seigworth state that affect "arises in the midst of in-between-ness: in the capacities to act and be acted upon."[11] It is the distance between letter-writers that creates the "in-between-ness" that allows for affect to emerge, no matter how slight the separation in space and time. Correspondence's *pathos* works through the effect of letters on their reader, since the act of reading and understanding engages with the bodily affect of feeling emotion. The temporal nature of epistolary production relies on the erotohistoriographic nature of this exchange. According to Elizabeth Freeman, "erotohistoriography" is a method or tool by which the past may be encountered in the present through the manipulation of past feelings purposefully written on present bodies and through which pleasure—sexual or otherwise—could be felt or used as a way to understand the past.[12] This lingering of past feelings produces a kind of "wrinkle" in time, or what she terms "temporal drag"; by that, Freeman means the past sticks to and drags on the present, not necessarily holding back progress, but working as a force that cannot be loosed, a reminder of what has come and not quite gone. Erotohistoriography as Freeman defines it is the writing of past feeling on a present body or bodies—*pathos*

and time producing pathetic temporality. She argues that in the case of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818), the epistolary style of the narrative aids in creating a drag that alters the temporal coherence of meaning—though the reader is constantly in the present, the very nature of the epistolary narrative forces the intended reader of the letter format already to be late to the party. I want to suggest that while Shelley's novel—or any novel, more generally—has the potential to impact the texts that succeed it, the text itself is a product of those that came before it. Where erotohistoriography emerges in fiction, then, is not only in the texts that follow *Frankenstein*, but in the texts which precede it and take part in the production of a culture of sensibility in which the display of feelings is accepted as a matter of course, and the writing of them on a physical body is an imperative for performing gender. As Paul Goring argues, the construction of bodily performances in public were seen as crucial, and "fiction promoted the performance of a language of feeling … such fiction urged readers to rehearse a language of gesture, and presented both opportunities for the assertion of polite identities and a language of polite self-representation."[13] Texts in particular, then, produced ways in which the past could shape the present body.

How then, do epistolary novels such as Frances Sheridan's *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph* or Charlotte Smith's *Euphemia*, which, unlike *Frankenstein*, rely solely on the exchange of letters as the mode of narrative, work to produce affect and therefore a feminine subject based upon a socially constructed ideal of sensibility? In constructing a letter for another character, an epistolary narrator expresses in writing the events and *pathos* that he or she experiences, modeled, as Howard Anderson and Irvin Ehrenpreis suggest, on conversation between intimates—including a "substitute … for visible

gesture."[14] The letter-writer's narrating self iterates how she is affected by what she sees and experiences, interjecting her thoughts on how she ought to have behaved or to have felt, as well as how others have behaved or communicated their own feelings to her—how she affects them. But, unlike today, where an epistolary conversation can happen in real time through the speed of technology and might include emoticons in place of emotional affects expressed in words, the eighteenth-century writer/protagonist must wait to receive an answer from his or her correspondent; in essence, *pathos* builds due to the passage of time. Futurity is expanded for the narrator; what we as readers experience as presence, or near-past, is enhanced and exploded by the constraints of the narrative: the fact that time passes between the writing and reading of the epistle. Anticipation, hope, and sorrow build as the narrator waits for an answer, all the while experiencing—and possibly writing about—what is happening to her in her own present moment, producing, once again, a letter that will be read in the future, but that is written in its reader's past. The affect of the correspondent builds, as well, as it does for the reader of the novel. The author uses time in order to stretch *pathos* out to its maximal boundaries for each person who experiences the writing, so that the emotional exchange between correspondents doubles back upon itself as the letter-writer eagerly anticipates or dreads an answer and begins a new letter meanwhile.

The tension between past and present can result in emotional furor for a letter-writer. In discussing the representation of consciousness in the eighteenth-century novel, specifically the epistolary novel, Joe Bray suggests "the letter also offers the opportunity for reasoned, rational thought as characters order their experiences and present them to their correspondents. Often torn between the fevered passion of their experiencing self

and the calm reason of their narrating self, fictional letter-writers of the period experience turbulent and sometimes unresolvable psychological crises."[15] The separate consciousnesses of the "experiencing" and "narrating" selves that Bray identifies represent the separate temporalities of past experience and present narration, both of which participate in the event described as a letter is written, though weighted with distinct emotions: "fevered passion" and "calm reason."[16] The conflict between these selves opens gaps in letter narratives that overlap with both the spatial and temporal distance that separates the writers and readers. I suggest that these gaps are precisely the vehicle through which affect occurs, thus resulting in a fuller sense of exchange, of growth, and of time. This idea of temporospatial separation conflicts with what has been general opinion regarding epistolary novels. As Bray argues, epistolary texts are "often thought to represent a relatively unsophisticated and transparent version of subjectivity, as [their] letter-writers apparently jot down whatever is passing through their heads at the moment of writing."[17] Essentially, the narrative style seems to produce a stream-of-consciousness as a protagonist records the process of writing, something that imitates an inner monologue, as opposed to the free-indirect discourse which becomes more prevalent in fiction once the epistolary novel recedes in popularity.

Yet, though present thoughts can overwhelm the narration of past events, excepting a few emotional outbursts when letter-writing is interrupted by letter-reading, narrators tend to write only of those past events, mediating them in their letters through what Freeman calls "temporal drag." Indeed, Bray argues, "thoughts and feelings are not as unmediated and transparent in the fictional letter as has often been supposed."[18] The narrator, therefore—and more importantly, her emotional development—is made

available to readers, more specifically to her correspondents, as an erotohistoriographic text, a body to be read as her own writing inscribes emotions stemming from past events onto her present self and onto the page for her correspondent to read in turn. This cycle of repetitive reading allows for a unique style of temporality within the epistolary, a way of experiencing time that suggests emotive influences: a pathetic temporality. If the subject is formed through time, as Locke and Kant suggest, the play of time in the epistolary allowed for a formation of an eighteenth-century subject with sensibility that depended on the spatial distance between correspondents and necessarily required the past to intermingle with the present and anticipate the future.

The epistolary novel constructs an image of exchange and growth of emotion between letter-writers over, through, and in time, a paradigm that constitutes a type of economy of affect. This economy is in effect a fictional one—after all, the characters, settings, and plots that are part and parcel of a novel are not "truth" or "reality," no matter how real they seem or however based on actual events they may be. But the epistolary novel is, at its core, a reflection of these authors' knowledge of the interworkings of human nature and the connections which inevitably occur between people. Where the letters of actual people can tell us what that one particular person understood and felt, the fictional letters of a constructed exchange can hint to us how the exchange of emotions could be conceived as imperative, even constitutive, to human nature and relations in the period. The epistolary novel can thus bring what could be considered private feelings into a public arena, and therefore indicate how the expression of emotion—a phenomenon which can be termed sympathy, affect, or sensibility, depending on how it is defined—could be propagated within and through the community.[19] The genre itself, then, can be

considered as having helped to promote the values of the larger community, as they are modeled in the epistolary novels of the eighteenth-century, rather than as having idealized an individualized self-centeredness that might have undermined social structures.[20]

I bring this engagement with pathetic temporality in the epistolary novel to the long history of the "rise" of the novel and of emotion in the novel, e.g., the novel of sensibility. Previous examinations of the novel in the eighteenth century, including those works by Ian Watt, Michael McKeon, J. Paul Hunter, Margaret Doody, Nancy Armstrong, and many others, have engaged with ideas of the "rise" of the novel through various pathways, including formal realism, domestic concerns, the bourgeois female subject, public versus private spheres, and the idea that the novel actually has its roots in a much more ancient tradition.[21] Much has been written and revised by these critics and those who have followed them. Natascha Würtzbach, for example, examines the characteristics of the epistolary novel prior to Richardson, maintaining that the first-person narrative style, as well as the inability to separate the conventions of the true letter from the fictional epistle allow for the creation of a "truth-telling" story in which the reader puts their faith. She compares the epistolary novel to the autobiography and the diary forms, demonstrating the similarities in the genres, and suggests that the epistolary novel can be a place to consider the "rise" of the novel in the eighteenth century, given its popularity.[22] Not only did the epistolary novel proliferate during the period following Samuel Richardson's publication of *Pamela* in 1740 (not the first epistolary text, but perhaps the most influential and certainly the most famous, even today), but the epistolary novel offered a space for writing in which women were supposed to be expert.

Women were writing epistolary novels and personal letters, and they were also reading them. Barbara Zaczek suggests that the familiar letter opened venues for the type of spontaneity and emotion that had to be curtailed in other arenas, so that the novel became a realm of fluency of feeling for women.[23] Her argument assigns emotion to the writers, and more importantly, to their characters, though her idea that spontaneity supports much of what is written in epistolary fiction is one with which I disagree. Much of the narrative in the novels I examine in the following chapters stems from the events that have passed in a letter-writer's life, as opposed to what is happening at the time of writing—and of reading. As novels were considered to be a "feminine" genre, and wide-ranging debates about the value of such reading for women were conducted in educational material and even in the pages of novels themselves, the novel written for, by, and about women should be the focus of a study like mine. As I demonstrate, exploring avenues of criticism that do not evaluate literature on a grand historical scale (e.g., not taking a patriarchal line on analysis) elucidates spaces in these novels where women worked to question the status quo of gender politics.

Armstrong's interpretation of the emerging eighteenth-century self-governing identity as an inherently feminine subject and her analysis of *Pamela* (a text that I examine in the next chapter), informs my critical apparatus. I define how the epistolary novel—a particularly eighteenth-century phenomenon, as I have already mentioned above—and its unique structure is utilized by women writers of the period to express, manipulate, and demonstrate temporality's engagement with affect. Thus these writers can question, subvert, or revise masculine constructions of temporality and (usually patriarchal) ideological portrayals of gender performances. Many of the female writers

whose names we do know and whose works we do study, Charlotte Smith and Charlotte Lennox, for example, wrote epistolary novels which are generally ignored. Unlike Frances Burney, whose epistolary novel *Evelina* was her most successful work, the women whose epistolary works I have chosen to explore have all had limited acknowledgment for these novels. I hope to shed some light on how these relatively lesser known texts can help to explain the contributions these women writers made in shaping the novel. Though the epistolary novel as a genre enjoyed only a very brief period of popularity, its form is uniquely able to place our understanding of emotional exchange and discourse into conversation with the experience of time.

The structure of the project

To begin my engagement with the pathetic temporality of the eighteenth-century epistolary novel, in Chapter One, I briefly examine Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters Between a Noble-man and his Sister* (1684-1687) and Eliza Haywood's *Love-Letters on All Occasions* (1730). I argue that these two epistolary fictions, while not qualifying as "novels," portray aspects of a prototype of pathetic temporality. Each utilizes separate features of emotional writing and time, but neither constructs the sort of temporal engagement that Richardson will later indulge as he emphasizes the specific times of day, days of the week, and the amount of time that passes as Pamela narrates her imprisonment by Mr. B. Pamela's intention of reading her letters again and again creates a looping effect for emotions; she writes what she feels as she writes and what she has felt in the moment of the events she narrates, and then will experience those same emotions when she re-reads her journal-letters at a future time. The ways in which she is

affected by her own writing become enmeshed in the act of writing, as well as reading, and accumulate over time. Each time she rereads, she will feel more. The power of Pamela to affect others is so great, in fact, that the authors who follow in Richardson's wake will take to heart what she had accomplished: they, too, will engage with pathetic temporality, though they will do so through varied paths.

Frances Sheridan emphasizes the extent to which time and affect are entwined with materiality in her novel *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph* (1761), as I argue in Chapter Two. Acknowledging that writing, and writing letters in particular, is a specifically physical function, I use the theoretical framework of the body in which to explore this text. Sheridan sets her novel in the early eighteenth century, displacing her characters from the timeline of her readers. This historical movement, I suggest, allows her to question the gender-specific performances of sensibility through a reversal of common tropes whereby an unfortunate female body is punished for being overly feeling. Instead, the epistolary structure gives Sheridan a platform through which to construct a writing self that is a physical self—one that is gendered female, but not required to conform to a mind/body binary by which the ill body, as Sidney's is and can be, is erased in favor of the mind. Instead the body affects the mind, and vice versa, in and through time.

Temporality can be manipulated, condensed or stretched as the exchange of letters is regulated by the distance between the correspondents. In both of the chapters above, only one letter-writing character contributes the majority of the epistles constituting the narrative, though she may transcribe letters by another into her own texts. In the two novels I consider in Chapter Three, the epistolary communication consists of the

contributions of multiple letter-writers conversing across an ocean. In Frances Brooke's *The History of Emily Montague* (1769), more than ten separate writers produce missives that cross each in transit from Canada to England, while Charlotte Lennox's two primary protagonists in *Euphemia* (1790) correspond first in England and then across the Atlantic when the titular character travels there with her husband. Brooke's multi-voiced novel relies on a very precise time scheme for its narrative structure, as letters from England are rare and seem to pull the Canadian letter-writers into their pasts, forcing them to engage their memories in order to understand the missives from home. In contrast, Lennox's novel shifts midway so that Euphemia's letters from New York produce the main thread of communication, and thus, when there is a nine-year gap in the timeline of her writing, the temporality of England seems stable in comparison, even as letters from London are not available to the reader. Both novels present a sense of distance, though the characters are immersed in their own places of writing, connecting their emotions and affects to the land on which they live.

In Chapter Four, I examine how the final novel with which I engage here, Charlotte Smith's *Desmond* (1792), considers both place and time as crucial for the construction of feeling and the ways in which letter-writers experience pathetic temporality. Smith's protagonist, the titular Lionel Desmond, wanders around France for much of the novel, writing home to his mentor, Erasmus Bethel. Desmond left England because of his feelings for a married woman, Geraldine Verney, who, along with her sister, forms the second pair of principal correspondents in the novel. Desmond's descriptions of his travels are reliant upon understandings of temporality, as well as the effect the places he visits have on him, even as he critiques the political situation in

France. He is also consumed with thoughts of Geraldine throughout the novel, both when he is with her and when he is not. Those thoughts, I suggest, as he writes of them to Bethel, move him between his memories of the past, his engagement with his present moment, and the impossibility of achieving a future. Even when the novel concludes with Geraldine free to marry Desmond, this event cannot happen for several months, leaving Desmond unsatisfied, anxious, and concerned about her welfare as well as his own. Smith seems unable to conclude her novel happily, due to its immersion in its own political moment, leaving Desmond's future open-ended. She constructs a sense of emotional engagement—of affect—that has moved from being concerned solely with self, as Pamela's is in 1740, to one that is aware of and shaped by the movements of a global community, both within the pages of the novel and without.

Considering these texts chronologically, as I do here, results in what is, essentially, a teleological narrative of the evolution of the epistolary novel throughout the eighteenth century. Yet, the very form of the texts themselves is one of *kairos*—of involvement in their own moment, of the appropriateness of their subjects for the time in which they are produced. *Kairos*, as opposed to *chronos*, concerns the rightness of timing, of appearing at the proper time, rather than conforming to a sense of clock or calendar time—historical time.[24] The writing and reading of letters within the novels can conform to temporal ordering, being sent and read in a chronological manner. Often, however, they do not, and overlap in transit so that matters conveyed in writing are potentially irrelevant or forgotten by the time a reply has been read. Each letter text exists in its own temporality, just as each writer expresses her own self in time through her words. Past, present, and future mingle, as each is emphasized, erased, or enclosed within

another, all having the possibility of occurring in the space of a single epistle. Time and temporality seem to be endlessly acting on the writers and readers—intra- and extradiegetic—of epistolary novels. Infinitely affective, infinitely engaging, the genre draws its proponents into the worlds of its characters with exquisite care. It is to the care Pamela observes in documenting the time of her narrative to which I now turn.

CHAPTER 1

"SHE IS A MIGHTY LETTER-WRITER!": HOW RICHARDSON'S *PAMELA* REVISES PATHETIC TEMPORALITY IN EPISTOLARY FICTION

Of Samuel Richardson's *Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded* (1740), Michael Austin writes, "It was an uncontested phenomenon and, if not the first English novel, at least the first English novel with its own line of dinnerware."[1] And whether or not the novel strikes modern readers as deeply to the heart as it did its contemporary audience, I begin my study with a reading of this "uncontested phenomenon," diving head-first into pathetic temporality. The novel appears to have ensnared its readers in the morass of emotions portrayed by its protagonist through its uses of time and temporality, which are both complex and varied. Indications of the passing of time through incidents about which the titular character writes mingle with a careful record of the days of the week, as well as a dating system that depends on specific important events in her life. Integrating emotion into the feeling of time passing, Pamela explains how she feels about her position in Mr. B's Bedfordshire home as she pleads with her parents, "[D]on't be angry I have not yet run away from this House, so late my Comfort and Delight, but now my Anguish and Terror," and describes her experience of the passing of time itself, saying, "Well, you may believe how uneasily I passed the Time till his appointed Hour came. Every Minute, as it grew nearer, my Terrors increased; and sometimes I had great Courage, and sometimes none at all."[2] She demonstrates in these extracts that emotions

shift through multiple spans of time, both alternating in bursts within short periods, as well as completely reversing over longer stretches. She also emphasizes the fact that her temporality is contextualized through her experiences; that is, her feelings about the events in her life influence the way she understands her own sense of time. This conflation of time and affect—the feeling of emotion based upon events—is precisely what makes *Pamela* so instrumental as an epistolary text. Nancy Armstrong's influential study on the construction of female subjectivity and the novel makes the argument that *Pamela* functions to create a writing subject, one whose political power lays not only in her ability to write, but in her gendered performance.[3] I want to complicate that argument here: not only is Pamela a writer, but she is an epistolary writer who is writing to construct herself as existing in a specific, concrete temporality as much as she constructs herself as female. As a fictional self-recording of significant details in the life of a female character, *Pamela* represents an integral merging of eighteenth-century epistolary narratological traditions and the use and understanding of temporality within the generic frame of the novel.

Highlighting this amalgam of time and emotion in the narrative structure of *Pamela* is the text's front matter. In keeping with the novel's use of the letter, Richardson inserts a missive "To the Editor of the Piece intitled PAMELA; or VIRTUE REWARDED" just after the "PREFACE by the EDITOR," the position assumed by the author himself.[4] Signed "J.B.D.F," whom editors Thomas Keymer and Alice Wakely identify as Jean Baptiste de Freval, a French translator whose work was published by Richardson, this letter makes clear the connection between the time of writing and the

emotions expressed by that writing—as well as the power of the emotion that is assigned to the contents of the letters of the text by the reader:

> For, besides the beautiful Simplicity of the Style, and a happy Propriety and Clearness of Expression (the Letters being written under the immediate Impression of every Circumstance which occasioned them, and that to those who had a Right to know the fair Writer's most secret Thoughts) the several Passions of the Mind must, of course, be more affectingly described, and Nature may be traced in her undisguised Inclinations with much more Propriety and Exactness, than can possibly be found in a Detail of Actions long past, which are never recollected with the same Affections, Hopes, and Dreads, with which they were felt when they occurred.[5]

De Freval directly links the time of writing with not only the truth and accuracy of the events themselves, but of the feelings that are evoked by them. The "several Passions of the Mind" are therefore supposed to be more trustworthy, valid, and complete because they are not the product of a distant recollection, but stem from the comparatively shorter "immediate Impression of every Circumstance." As such, de Freval argues, *Pamela* "will infallibly be looked upon as the hitherto much-wanted Standard or Pattern for this Kind of Writing."[6] However, the rather vague term "this Kind of Writing" begs the question of what kind, exactly, does he mean? De Freval seems to specify the genre of novel in general, in the vein of Ian Watt's arguments regarding formal realism in *The Rise of the Novel*, as his letter goes on to name "lively Images and Pictures," "Incidents natural," and "Circumstances interesting to Persons in common Life, as well as to those in exalted Stations."[7] In utilizing these stylistic structures, Richardson's text appeals to a variety of readers, through interesting and vivid language, and reproducing situations of real life.[8]

Yet I believe the rather broad understanding of "this Kind of Writing" can be extrapolated to include the epistolary genre specifically, as de Freval also implies a certain value in the timing of the novel's publication, in addition to the use of time within the construction of the narrative. The liveliness of the images, the naturalness of the

incidents, and the interest of the circumstances portrayed in the novel all arise from their dispersal through the epistolary. It is, therefore, the very epistolarity of the text that allows it to be the unique textual experience de Freval suggests it is. As a didactic text, as a novel that promotes virtue—at least in the manner in which Richardson defines it—*Pamela* is essential in the historical moment at which it appears, de Freval states, as "[t]he reigning Depravity *of the Times* has yet left Virtue many Votaries" and it will be sure to be praised wherever it is read.[9] The particular circumstances "of the Times" call forth such a novel, making *Pamela* a particularly kairotic text, and, as the novel's identity does in fact revolve around its epistolary structure, its value and moment as a novel cannot, I believe, be separated from its epistolarity.[10] Thus, as the "Standard or Pattern" for the novel generally and the epistolary novel more particularly, *Pamela* occupies a place that had not yet been seen "hitherto" and would inevitably be influential to those writers who came after its publication. De Freval, in his short, congratulatory letter of praise for Richardson's debut novel, has articulated what is, in effect, the gist of my argument: *Pamela*, as a text, serves as the crux upon which the generic tradition of epistolary fiction turns in terms of the interaction between time and affect in the construction of letter-fiction.

To understand how exactly *Pamela* shapes pathetic temporality in the epistolary novel as a genre and how it inspires those novels and their female authors that came after it, I think it important to consider how a few female authors prior to Richardson's publication of the novel in 1740 fashioned temporality in their texts. It is a common argument that with *Pamela*, Richardson was the first to publish an epistolary novel.[11] Several prominent scholars have examined Richardson's use of the epistolary form,

negotiation of class structures, and the ideology and political implications of his work, including Toni Bowers, Thomas Keymer, Terry Eagleton, and John Dussinger, among others.[12] While he may have been the first to publish using this generic style in what we now understand the "novel" to be, epistolarity was not an invention of Richardson's. It had, in fact, been utilized prior to *Pamela*, by many authors, as Robert Adams Day notes in his study of epistolary fiction prior to 1740. Day traces the first text to use epistolarity exclusively to Nicholas Breton's 1602 *Poste with a Packet of Madde Letters*, and reveals that though the epistolary novel as we understand it may not have been in existence until Richardson took up the form, writers such as Daniel Defoe, Margaret Cavendish, Delarivier Manley, and others utilized the form in a variety of genres.[13] The two texts that concern me as examples of epistolary fiction are Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters between a Noble-Man and his Sister* (1684-1687) and Eliza Haywood's *Love-Letters on All Occasions* (1730). If, as de Freval suggests, *Pamela* is meant to serve as a pattern-card for the "Kind of Writing" that is encompassed by the novel, and more specifically the epistolary novel, the novels that stand as testament to "the hitherto much-wanted Standard" should be evaluated. And because to examine every piece of epistolary literature published in the years before *Pamela* is a project much beyond the scope of my argument now, Behn's and Haywood's texts will serve as my examples of the genre in British fiction. Both authors are well-known, though these particular texts are not necessarily the most famous of their works, and both women's prose works are typically categorized as amatory fiction—and therefore representative of the "Depravity of the Times" of which de Freval writes to "the Editor" and to which he compares *Pamela* favorably. These two very different epistolary texts can thus shed light on the uses and

understandings of the way in which affect and temporality were connected prior to *Pamela* and potentially why Richardson felt the need to revise conventions of epistolary fiction. While I do not wish to make a sweeping argument that *Pamela* is considered to be the first epistolary novel *because* of Richardson's use of pathetic temporality, I do believe that a consideration of the ways in which pathetic temporality is displayed as being intricately connected to the concreteness of time in *Pamela* compared to earlier works, in which temporality is structured as much more abstract, highlights the effectiveness of Richardson's techniques as the fulcrum around which epistolarity in the novel—and indeed, the origins of the epistolary novel *as* novel in our definition of the genre itself—functions as representative of real-world temporality.

"The reigning depravity of the times": epistolary fictions of Behn and Haywood

Behn's *Love-Letters between a Noble-Man and his Sister*, a novel in three parts, is a conundrum of sorts, particularly in thinking of the text in terms of its epistolarity, and because of its roots as a fictional account of factual events.[14] All three parts involve the use of letters as a method by which plot is conveyed to the reader; yet only the first is fully epistolary.[15] Parts II and III do use the exchange of letters between characters for narrative exposition, but in progressively decreasing proportions. Behn shifts from using letters as her primary narrative device, however, as the insertion of an omnipotent third-person narrator's voice connects the events described in the letters. The description of the influencing events beyond the characters' purviews becomes more and more lengthy through the later volumes. Part I, constituting one hundred and thirteen pages in Janet Todd's modern edition, including the dedication and "The Argument" of the text, consists

of fifty-six letters.[16] All but three are from Silvia to Philander, the eponymous nobleman and his sister-in-law (the familial conventions of the time would have considered Silvia, as sister to Philander's wife's to be his own sister) or vice versa. In contrast, Part III engages only ten letters over the span of nearly two hundred pages.[17] Those ten missives are relatively short and the prose between them resembles the narrative style of the later eighteenth- and nineteenth- century novels, as a very early prototype of free indirect discourse, in some ways anticipating the generic shift away from the epistolary novel as the eighteenth century progresses. In lieu of this shift in narrative form throughout the entirety of *Love-Letters*, then, I focus my examination of pathetic temporality within the text on the first part of the novel, where the epistolary exchange forms the basis of the narrative, and where it most closely resembles the type of epistolarity that Richardson embraces in *Pamela*.

In her dedicatory epistle, Behn, as Richardson later does, assumes the position of having translated her own text, claiming that "Having when I was at *Paris* last Spring, met with a little Book of Letters, call'd *L'Intregue de Philander & Silvia*, I had a particular fancy, besides my inclinations to translate 'em into English, which I have done as faithfully as I cou'd."[18] Todd suggests that this distancing of herself from the authorship of the text as a fiction of her own making allows Behn to avoid prosecution for libel over any similarities between the characters on the page and actual people and events, in addition to aligning her text with the earlier French traditions of "the genre of the 'secret history.'"[19] This framing strategy situates *Love-Letters* within a temporality of reflecting and considering events within her characters' personal, individual time-lines, as well as taking on the structure of a historical novel, where the events described appear to

portray the potential for having occurred a long time past. For my purposes, however, it is also relevant to consider not only that Behn begins her text with a letter addressed to a specific person, thus inviting her readers into the fictional realm of her textual epistles as participants, but also that her pointed reference to a translation of another text which has no date and thus no temporal setting opens the text up to a multiplicity of temporalities. The text's plot could have taken place in the last year or a century ago, or it could occur a century in the future. Without specific dating, the temporal structure of the novel is opened to vast possibility, implying that though the narrative itself is meant to reflect specific events of which its readership is most likely aware—and in which those readers probably have some political stake—the very lack of specificity within the text resists the grounding in those events. Philander and Silvia could exist in any time or space, despite the connections to France and French literary traditions, while the factual events on which the fiction is based simultaneously reins in the distancing implied in the dedicatory materials and firmly roots the narrative in contemporary England.

Taking advantage of the fabricated lack of specific historical moment in her "found" text, Behn emphasizes the absence of concrete temporality throughout the letters meant to construct the narrative of Part I. From the first letter presented, Philander locates his affective life firmly within his exchange of missives with Silvia. The letters' contents seem to be less about establishing a plot—that is, narrating or recording a series of events that leads to some dénouement for a reader—than about constructing an emotional exchange through what Stephen Ahern terms "a baroque aesthetic … that celebrates excess of all kinds."[20] Silvia and Philander do, in fact, tie their emotions to temporality, but in doing so, seem only to suggest that the time between their meetings is fraught with

despondency over their separation by both temporospatial distance and by the circumstances of Philander's marriage to Silvia's sister. Philander ends his first missive with the complaint that "I have liv'd a whole day, and yet no letter from my Silvia," conflating his own temporality with receipt of a note from her.[21] Later, he laments:

> Why then, oh why my cruel *Silvia*! are my joys delay'd? … an Age my fair Tormentor's past, Four tedious live long days are number'd o're, since I beheld the object of my lasting Vows, my eternal wishes, how can you think, oh unreasonable *Silvia*! that I cou'd live so long without you, and yet I am live I find it by my pains, by torments of fears and jealousies insupportable.[22]

Silvia similarly counts the time they are apart in how it makes her feel: "Not yet?—not yet? oh ye dull tedious Hours when well you glide away? and bring that happy moment on, in which I shall at least hear from my *Philander*; Eight and Forty teadious ones are past, and I am here forgotten still; forlorn, impatient, restless every where; not only of all your little moments (ye undiverting hours) can afford me repose."[23] The time in which Silvia and Philander are separated is "teadious" to both, so tedious in fact, that they are inspired to use that particular adjective fourteen times in Part I, as they bemoan the circumstances that keep them apart. That tedium is linked to the emotion they feel for each other as well as the time that passes while they are separated even more firmly by Philander, who writes to Silvia that "five tedious days are past since I sigh'd at your dear feet; and five days to a Man so madly in Love as your *Philander*, is a tedious Age."[24] The emotions that Philander claims to feel are so strong as to affect the way he understands time passing; "a Man so madly in Love" will feel the passing of five days differently than one does not feel the same, and thus what might be otherwise becomes "a tedious Age." In the same vein, Silvia suggests that the time they do spend together flies by too quickly: "Ah *Philander*, could you not have stay'd ten short years longer? Alas you thought that was an Age in Youth, but 'tis but a day in Love."[25] The emphasis is not on actually

feeling the passage of time here, but on the emotional effect of that time; that is, pathetic temporality. Silvia can experience a "happy Moment" as well as "dull tedious Hours" just as Philander is tormented by his emotions, his "fears and jealousies insupportable" in the "Age" that occurs between their meetings.

Yet, just as Behn blends the understanding of the passage of time with the emotions her characters express as representative of how they feel that temporality, she very rarely links those emotions with the concreteness of time. A specific day or time of day is mentioned in only six letters: the first two letters Silvia writes are dated "*Wednesday* morning" and "*Wednesday* night, Bellfont" respectively; Philander notes when he sends a letter to her that "'tis now six a Clock in the Morning, [his servant] *Brilljard* will be with you by Eight, and by Ten I may have your permission to see you;" in a separate note that same day, he again records the time as "Three a Clock;" Silvia writes in "a Leaf of a Table-book" that "on *Thursday* [she is] destined a Sacrifice to *Foscario*;" after she runs away, she dates a letter to Philander as "Paris, *Thursday*."[26] This paucity of dating suggests that it is not the actual clock time or date that truly matters in the letters exchanged by the couple. Instead, the emotions that they express ground the passage of time within the depth of feeling described. This emphasis on pathetic temporality for both Silvia and Philander is so frequent, however, that it serves to detract from that same emphasis in a case of profligate excess. Barbara Benedict argues that "sentimental literature, in rhetoric and structure, does not simply advocate feeling; it also warns the reader against some kinds of feeling or feelings associated with revolutionary or female culture," and therefore polices the types of feelings that can and should be expressed.[27] Though she focuses on the fiction of the later eighteenth century, I

would argue that her thesis holds true for Behn's text, and those later texts are reacting against the overwrought expression of emotions. Like the realization that too many tears eventually wash away all sympathy for those who shed them, too much emotion resists and eliminates its own power.

More than forty years after Behn's *Love-Letters*, another *Love-Letters* appears, the title of which indicates what its contents do: echo and revise the expressions of emotion over and through time in epistolarity. Despite the similarity of their titles—perhaps hinting at one of the, if not *the* most important, reasons for exchanging familiar letters between correspondents—Eliza Haywood's epistolary fiction is vastly different in style and structure from Behn's earlier work. Haywood's *Love-Letters on All Occasions* functions as a letter compendium and is obviously not meant to contain a coherent thread of plot running through the entire text.[28] Alexander Pettit's introduction to the modern Pickering and Chatto edition of the text mentions the unconnected nature of Haywood's fiction specifically, and refers to the similarities of Haywood's later text *Epistles for the Ladies* (1748-50) to this aspect of *Love-Letters*.[29] Certainly, like Behn's Philander and Silvia, the correspondents in *Love-Letters* produce texts that brim with affective language and traditional sensibility, and the emotions they express tend as much toward the farcical in their very strength of expression as the earlier missives of Behn's lovers do. Both male and female writers express their emotions with the typical language of sensibility: somewhat overwrought, it is laden with variations of 'I never felt so much before this,' all joy or all despair, or desiring only to be worthy of his or her partner. In multiple places throughout Haywood's letter compendium, the writers do discuss time—how it is measured (days, weeks, months, years); the aspect of the present versus the past or the

future ("it is easy for you to judge by the *Past*, what the *future* will be," writes Anexander);[30] what was felt or experienced before cannot compare to what is felt or experienced now; this moment, the next moment, in that moment; repetitions; memories that influence emotions as writing occurs. But Haywood's writers' letters rarely discuss temporality in the way I imagine it through this project—as the experience of time passing (i.e., time flies when you are having fun), and only occasionally in the sense of an emotion shaping that experience of time, such as when "the transported ANEXANDER" writes "to his adorable and lovely BARETTA" that he has spent "so many wretched Hours" awaiting her pleasure, or when Sylvander complains to Janthe that it has been a "tedious absence of five Days" since he last saw her.[31]

The structure of Haywood's *Love-Letters* as a compendium, and thus possibly purporting to instruct writers of love letters on what is proper for the composition of this particular genre, makes it difficult to compare to such texts as Behn's earlier epistolary novel, despite the fact that Haywood's lovers' use of "tedious" to describe the length of time apart recalls the same anguish expressed by Philander and Silvia in being separated. And though Pettit notes the similarities of epistolary tropes such as those used to halt writing in the moment or requiring a servant to await an immediate reply, *Love-Letters* is rather less similar to the later *Pamela* than it resembles it.[32] The fact that Behn's text has a specifically political purpose, as opposed to Haywood's and Richardson's immersion in the personal, further separates these works of fiction. However, though Haywood's epistolary fiction, taken as a whole, is quite different from both Behn's *Love-Letters* and Richardson's *Pamela*, the sustained exchange of correspondence between Theano and Elismonda presents an interpolated narrative that anticipates the style of epistolarity that

Richardson will utilize only a decade later. Like Richardson's own letter compendium, the instructional manual *Letters written to and for particular friends on the most important occasions* (1741), each of the sixty-two missives in Haywood's *Love-letters* serves its own rhetorical purpose, addressing diverse problems between lovers.[33] Only five pairs of conversing couples exchange letters, while twenty-five writers contribute a single missive: Brillante and Locutio write one letter each; Amanda and Lothario exchange three letters, two of which are written by her; both Julia and Antiphone and Aristus and Panthea compose a total of four letters between them; and Theano and Elismonda engage in a correspondence consisting of twenty-four letters, which constitutes nearly forty percent of the entire text and numbers only one letter fewer than the total of the remaining letters in the work, those presented to the reader without a correlating answer.[34] Because of the volume of this particular set of communications, the Theano-Elismonda letters most closely resemble the style and structure of the later epistolary novels, including Richardson's. The mini-narrative present within these pages, however brief, approximates the much longer, more complex narratives to come. It also recalls the fervent exchange between Behn's Sylvia and Philander, perfectly situating this section of Haywood's *Love-Letters* as an intermediary, an almost liminal piece of the text, the structure of which gestures both to its own literary antecedents as well as to its descendants, specifically *Pamela*.

As most of the letters exchanged by Theano and Elismonda are structured to bridge the gap between the separated lovers, there is little in terms of depth in their construction of pathetic temporality. Instead, the record of passing time is limited to such statements as when Elismonda proclaims that "never has my Soul endur'd a Shock more

severe, to be depriv'd of your dear Presence, as for some Days I must be," or, more clearly, when she writes, "This is the only Way I can find out to keep Hope alive, and the Day you neglect the Opportunity I give you, the most terrible of all the Passions will take entire possession of all my Thoughts, and Madness, or some horrid kind of Death, be the portion of *The Wretched* Elismonda."[35] Haywood connects temporality and affect through the expression of her characters' sense of loss at being separated by forces outside their control (in this case, a friend jealous of Elismonda's potential happiness), while simultaneously allowing for the possibility of a happy resolution. But that resolution can only take place after a period of time has passed, and should certain events not occur between the present blockage of action and the final denouement, the idea that emotions could become overwhelming in the meanwhile suggests that the temporal middle is a fulminating ground for the instability of feeling. There is no guarantee of success, nor a certainty of failure. There is only the possibility for change.

Once Theano and Elismonda are separated by more than simply a blocking character and scheduling mishaps, but by an actual expanse of space between town and country, temporality becomes more closely entwined with feeling in such a way as to point to the techniques Richardson will later employ. Theano writes to Elismonda that he will survive the time away from her by engaging himself in thoughts of her in a very specific time-table:

> What I already feel, in this short Time, convinces me that I shall stand in need of your utmost Tenderness to enable me to support an Absence of eight and Twenty Days.—Oh God! how many tedious Hours compose that space of Time! how would it be possible to beguile them without your kind assistance! But to shew you how studious I am for Happiness, I divide them into Weeks, one Day of which, I shall set apart for Expectation of receiving a Letter from you; the next, for indulging the dear Delight of Reading it a thousand and a thousand Times; the third for answering it; the fourth, for reflecting on what I have wrote, and forming

> an Idea to myself how obliging a Welcome you afford the Professions of my inviolable Integrity; then, return to the Hope of your reply, and so on, till the long Age is expired. Take Care, therefore, my dearest *Elismonda*! and be punctual in writing, for should you neglect one Post, you break the whole Machine my industrious Love has form'd for Hope, or Ease, to rest upon, and jealous Doubts, accompanied with a numberless Train of Inquietudes, will take Possession of my Brain, deform my Reason, and render me scarce to be known.[36]

The activity of Theano's days are given over very precisely to his connection to Elismonda via their correspondence: in reading and rereading her writing; in responding to her and reviewing what he has written; in thinking about what and when she will write again, all with the anticipation of repeating the events each week until he returns to London. Stating that the cogs of his "Machine" will be stuck, resulting in the "deform[ation of his] Reason" if she "neglect[s] one Post"—a very real possibility, considering the unreliability of the mail in the period—also ties his emotional state to the passage of time as it relates to the length of her silence and the length of his wait. A month is, to Theano, a space of time of "many tedious Hours," which again ties his emotional state to the clock, implying that time can be manipulated—"beguile[ed]," as it were—through his state of mind, with her "kind assistance." This sort of specific tie of affect via correspondence generally seems to rely on the exchange of letters, and thus precisely lays out the sense of pathetic temporality I suggest is possible between writers, and which is a particular characteristic of the epistolary novel in the eighteenth century. Theano and Elismonda's exchange ends abruptly in the text, as he returns to Town and they are once again within the same physical sphere. There is no dénouement of the pair's relationship, no end to satisfy or disappoint Haywood's readers. Instead, she simply moves on. Haywood's construction of a brief narrative correspondence between Theano and Elismonda contributes to the examples of epistolary fiction that approximate, but never quite reach, the generic expectations that accompany the appellation of "novel."

Nor, as Pettit argues, does Haywood return to this style of fiction in order to experiment with the style of exchange that she utilizes between these two lovers.[37] Just as Behn's full three part text drifts away from epistolarity, Haywood's letter compendium does not function as a "novel" in the way that we understand the genre. It is not for another ten years that the market would produce a text composed of letters compiled into a single exchange sustained from the opening to the last pages of the novel—one like *Pamela* and those epistolary novels that followed it would be. But if we accept that *Pamela* contains similarities to both of these earlier texts, though resembles neither completely, and temporality and its ties to affective writing are expressed in multiple ways throughout each, we can begin to see a path through which a pathetic temporality might be generated through the epistolary novel-texts written prior to *Pamela* in 1740. Richardson was not working with anything new when he wrote his first novel, but, instead, his unique combination of techniques utilized by earlier writers, not the least of which were Behn and Haywood, points to the possibility of a genealogy in the way that temporality and emotion were imagined and connected through the eighteenth-century epistolary novel, a genealogy of pathetic temporality.

"Well, my writing Time will soon be over": *Pamela*'s Pathetic Temporality

Drawing on earlier models of epistolarity, *Pamela* presents a conflation between the epistolary as exchange of letters between writers who both contribute to the correspondence and as an imagined exchange, where the writer produces letters addressed to someone else, but either does not send them, or offers no access to the reciprocal missives. While the novel begins with an exchange of letters between Pamela

and her parents, these thirty-one letters are mostly from Pamela to one or both of her parents, with only four being written to her from the Andrewses. After this exchange between writers, Richardson's Editor intrudes into the narrative to explain the shift in epistolary structure, noting that Pamela, while imprisoned by Mr. B, continued writing to her parents "Journal-wise, to amuse and employ her Time, in hopes some Opportunity might offer to send it to her Friends."[38] Though the editorial interruption can be interpreted as a plot device, Richard H. Costa argues Mr. B functions as Pamela's primary reader throughout the majority of the novel, and Pamela knows this—and manipulates it. Mr. B is thus the real audience to whom she writes, particularly after she leaves Bedfordshire.[39] But the difference in aggregate vocality—that is, the number of voices as indicated by writers—reflects more than simply a plot contrivance or the clever machinations of Richardson's protagonist; it also indicates an alteration in the significance of the use of temporality within the narrative itself, and not just within the pages of the novel. The sustained narrative of epistolarity as Richardson constructs it utilizes the same form with which both Behn in Part I of *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister* and Haywood in her Theano-Elismonda exchange of *Love-Letters on All Occasions* experiment. That narrative technique also expands the temporality required for a fully-realized, enlongated, plot-driven narrative, so that Pamela and her experience of time can flourish within the type of epistolary fiction that has claims to the appellation of "novel."

Richardson both condenses and elongates Pamela's time of writing as he switches between the exchange of correspondence and the isolation of journaling. The writing, sending, receiving, reading, and replying to letters between people, in terms of

practicality and materiality, is an inherently temporal process, as physically applying ink to paper requires time, communications must travel across sometimes lengthy spatial distances, and considering what one's correspondent has written in order to address the concerns raised must occupy what leisure time a working-class family, like Pamela and her parents, might have. Despite the letters not being dated, the passage of time is indicated in them, often by phrases such as "I hear nothing yet of going to *Lady Davers*. And I am very easy at present here," "My Master has been very kind since my last," and "Since my last, my Master gave me more fine things."[40] The amount of time between each letter is not specified, but time is passing, conveyed through Pamela's noting of her treatment, things she has received, and her feelings, though, as "at present" suggests, those could (and do) change at any moment. That she writes and about what signifies temporality in the early parts of *Pamela*; the very process of corresponding is what allows the reader to understand time has passed. In Letter XI, however, the first indication of an explicit measure of the passage of time is given: Pamela notes a conversation with Mr. B in which she asks, "[A]s you have no Lady for me to wait upon, and my good Lady has been now dead this Twelve-month, I had rather, if it would not displease you, wait upon Lady *Davers*."[41] Following this comment, in Letter XX, Pamela writes that it has been "fourteen Months, since my Lady's Death."[42] From Letter I, in which Pamela announces to her parents that her mistress has died, to Letter XX, a full year and two months has passed.

Yet, once the squire has Pamela locked in his Lincolnshire manor, she records her time as a prisoner there as lasting forty-five days, followed by ten days in which she is free and decides to marry him. She includes another eighteen during which she weds Mr.

B and then describes her married life, for a total of seventy-three days. This span (the majority of the text, in fact) occupies less than one-fifth of the chronological time between Letters I and XX. Time in Pamela's letters has shifted from being counted by the occasion of a letter sent as an inherently noteworthy event to being itself the underlying foundation of events. As she prepares to leave Mr. B's Bedfordshire estate, she notes the specific day on which she writes her letter and the day she is to depart: "This is *Thursday* Morning, and next *Thursday* I hope to set out; for I have finish'd my Task," and later, "It is now Monday….and I am to go away Thursday morning, betimes;" in the following epistle, she notes that it "is *Wednesday* Morning, and I shall, I hope, set out to you To-morrow Morning."[43] The journal Pamela begins in Lincolnshire is categorized as Letter XXXII, the final representation of a "letter" as such, and Pamela's detailing of her own temporality becomes more precise.[44] Her sense of temporality has become narrowed from ideas of weeks, months, and years to the days of the week, and even to the hours of the day, indicating an anxiety and closeness of consideration in the minute aspects of her days. Tasks are identified as occupying minutes, rather than hours, and her contemplation of her status in general becomes a reconciliation of her time spent in the minutiae of conversational detail. Time is, therefore, exponentially more important in the novel once Pamela's world has contracted to its recognition and consumption as her sole employment. She is, in fact, writing her own sense of temporality.

This new consciousness of temporality for Pamela seems to stem from her lack of occupation other than writing. At the Bedfordshire estate, while still able to write letters to her parents, Pamela notes that she has been engaged in her task of tending the linen when Mr. B complains of her writing: "[H]e says to Mrs. *Jervis*, This Girl is always

scribbling; I think she may be better employ'd. And yet I work all Hours with my Needle, upon his Linen, and the fine Linen of the Family; and am besides about flowering him a Waistcoat."[45] Pamela's "scribbling" is an occupation that intrudes on time that her employer believes should be spent in work for which she is being paid; because it is a personal pursuit, the letter-writing that Pamela performs is meant to be done only when she is at leisure. As a servant, her leisure time would undoubtedly be both scarce and precious. Tasks required of her in her position—the embroidering of Mr. B's clothing, for example—would need to have been completed before she was free to spend her time in activities of her own choosing.[46] For her to devote what leisure she had to writing letters to her parents indicates the importance of her narrative and, by extension, her experiences of temporality contained within it. Yet, neither Pamela's letters, nor those of her parents, are dated. Richardson instead allows only the marking of time passing to stand in for more specific records of calendar time. A very few details contained in the text point to its own historical moment: Mr. B's purchase of a "Birth-day Suit" in order to attend Court to celebrate the king's birthday and his mention of a member of the Hyde family marrying into the Stuarts, which, of course, leads to the ascension of Queens Mary and Anne to the throne following the Glorious Revolution.[47] Despite these specific references to late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century political and cultural concepts, without the precision of an exact calendar dating, Richardson separates the novel from any particular historical moment, producing a fiction that is both removed from its own time and deeply ingrained within it, as indicated by the text's front matter when de Freval notes that the book will address a desire for depictions of virtue as a balm for "the Depravity of the Times."[48] He also constructs a narrative that is equally precise in its

portrayal of time passing as it is vague in exactly *when* it is meant to transpire. A such, the text recall's Behn earlier work, but more importantly, firmly situates the reader within Pamela's temporality.

Despite more than fourteen months passing from the death of Lady B to the day that Pamela is abducted on her journey home and taken to Lincolnshire, and the lack of dating on the letters she sends from Bedfordshire, once she is imprisoned, her accounting of time becomes very fastidious. This precision is accomplished through the marking of the number of days that have passed since she left Mr. B's manor on what she thought was the carriage ride to her parents' home. Attached to each of those days is a variation on an interpretation of her condition as prisoner; "Monday, the 5th Day of my Bondage and Misery" is the first.[49] In tying Pamela's emotional state to the passing of time, Richardson constructs a temporality that is in itself constituted by its definition as affective. The very position of Pamela as a prisoner also relieves her of the obligations on her time as a servant; having released her from his service before pretending to allow her to leave his house, Mr. B opens Pamela's employment from what work she is required to perform as a female servant, and one who is not a maid (i.e. required to perform manual labor), to the possibility of constant leisure time. Dorothy Parker notes that as Pamela's situation changes, the style of her writing shifts as well: "Instead of dutiful weekly reports full of domestic minutiae with occasional nervous references to B.'s maneuvers, Pamela's letters are the irregular outpourings of one who is emotionally overwrought and has a desperate need to confide in someone."[50] She has no one to speak with, other than Mrs. Jewkes, whom she does not like and in whom she refuses to confide, and only the occasional visit from Mr. Williams to anticipate. She can walk in the garden, but her

boundaries are confined, and she must be accompanied by either Mrs. Jewkes or Nan the maid. Instead, being quite often solitary, by necessity and by contrivance, Pamela occupies her time by writing—the one labor she was critiqued previously for having performed in too great a quantity; she complains, "I have so much time upon my hands, I must write to employ myself."[51] Whether or not she now wishes, writing is her only option and she exploits it.

When heroines in other eighteenth-century novels pay close attention to their physical surroundings, Karen Lipsedge argues, the greater the interest in the rooms occupied by female characters, the more interiority and subjectivity could be demonstrated by and through those characters.[52] And while Pamela does write about her chambers in some detail, I want to suggest that she also constructs her own interiority and subjectivity through her engagement with time and temporality. In a sense, she not only has "time upon [her] hands," but her hands—and the writing they produce—are what *create* her temporality. The physical act of describing her days, of recording in minute detail each conversation, each action, each emotion she experiences, leads to a precise inscription of time passing for Pamela. The duration of every element of these events is painstakingly elaborated, and often repeated for emphasis. Morris Golden argues that Richardson often repeats plot devices, both within and among his texts, for various reasons, including indulging in his own interests, attempting to satisfy his readers, improving and revising specific techniques, or teaching a lesson in morals.[53] Here, however, the repetition of Pamela's affective life in and through time functions as the ticking of a clock enunciating every moment that passes. In constructing Pamela's narrative in such a way, Richardson weaves a sense of oppressive monotony that

manifests through layers of emotional response, until the levels of his protagonist's feeling are heavily saturated throughout her journal-letters. He repeats tropes of Pamela's affective response to her situation, her fainting episodes, her bursting into tears, her begging Mr. B to let her go, until the reader comes to expect specific reactions to occur in each letter Pamela writes. The very markers of her sensibility, which Markman Ellis identifies as a "repertoire of conventions associated with the sentimental rhetoric of the body: fainting, weeping, sighing, hand-holding, mute gestures, the beat of the pulse, blushing—and so on," become the actions that Richardson beats like a drum, a dull, continuous cycle of repetition that can only wear on both the reader's and Mr. B's patience.[54]

The careful counting of days that Pamela notes throughout her journal-letters reifies this monotony, as the tasks of walking in the garden, attempting to convince someone to allow her to escape, and returning to her writing, in which she begs God to give her strength and grant her mercy, occur again and again and again. Pamela notes "I am now come to MONDAY, the 5th Day of my Bondage and Misery," then "TUESDAY and WEDNESDAY," "THURSDAY," and so on to "THURSDAY, FRIDAY, SATURDAY, the 14th, 15th, and 16th of my Bondage" and beyond, connecting the days in her very descriptions of them as "Bondage," a state implying immobility, tension, and suffering.[55] Importantly, because there are no calendar dates associated with the days of the week, as time passes, it seems not to move forward, but to cycle repetitiously through those same seven days. And despite her counting of the days, because she does not mention the number with *each* entry, the reader is removed from the passing of those days, and must consciously count the days, much as Pamela herself does. In forcing his

reader to constantly question the length of time that Pamela has been imprisoned, Richardson mires that reader in the stasis to which Pamela is anchored. Thus temporality, as the understanding of time passing, is not—in fact *can*not—be marked in any way other than the state of mind that Pamela indicates infrequently in her headings. The "Bondage" Pamela endures as representative of her temporal engagement becomes interminable; there is no real end in sight, only an anticipation, an inescapable, heightened tension that at some point in the future Mr. B will arrive and she will be again in immediate danger. This tension lends itself to the monotonous nature of Pamela's writing, in its capacity to give her a sense of predictability and sameness—of safety. She repeats herself *because* she feels threatened; her anxiety in her "Bondage" dictates that she find some comfort in the repetition of her feelings, her thoughts, her words. Like her daily trips to the stone by the sunflower to deposit her journals, she attempts to contain her impending sense of doom through the recurrence of her affective writing.

But because she is unable to move beyond the possibility of some future harm, Pamela condenses her days into the writing of moments and transcriptions of conversations and letters exchanged between herself and the sympathetic Parson Williams. Despite the passage of stretches of time that should seem to be quick narratively, particularly when Pamela chronicles days 14 through 16 in two rather short paragraphs, the very sameness of Pamela's days results in a stretching of temporality, so that her writing places the reader in a sense of perpetual waiting for something to happen, something that seems never to come. A single day's activities may sometimes encompass over six pages in the novel, as does the "THURSDAY" that "completes a fatal Week since [her] setting out" from the Bedfordshire estate, in contrast to those two paragraphs

comprising three days, or the "SUNDAY" where Pamela adapts Psalm 137, which consists of approximately two full pages of the text, most of which is the Psalm itself.[56] This oscillation between long single days and short stretches of multiple days crammed into one journal entry implies an inverse relationship between emotion and writing in Pamela's sense of her own temporality. A long day, composed of much writing, indicates a great deal to say and the essence of activity and action, whereas a briefly chronicled stretch of time seems to suggest that there was not much about which to write, and thus, inaction and tedium. Therefore, for Pamela, experiencing a great deal of feeling produces a great deal of writing, whereas the experience of little emotion equals little writing. Costa attributes the increase in her amount of writing to the knowledge that Mr. B will read her letters, and so she purposely speaks to him through the recounting of their encounters and her reactions to them. B is thus the real audience to whom she writes, particularly after she leaves Bedfordshire.[57] Perhaps that is the case; but the production of both amounts of composition in her journal-letters have the same effect, no matter the identity of Pamela's imagined audience: Pamela's sense of temporality is linked to her emotions, and thus she is caught in a cycle of perpetual return to an emotional state that shifts between hope and despair. In this way, Richardson constructs his heroine so that she participates in what Nietzsche terms "the doctrine of the 'eternal recurrence,' that is, of the unconditional and infinitely repeated cyclical course of all things": the production of writing, for Pamela, confines her within her own affect in time, moving through and away from each feeling as she produces it.[58]

Pamela's repetitive actions and her fluctuating sense of temporality create a loop of anticipation, in that while she waits for Mr. B to arrive or for someone to help her flee

and any movement she makes to escape her stasis is blocked, both she and her reader are dragged further into the cycle of emotions. The days of her "Bondage" become "MONDAY, TUESDAY, the 25th and 26th Days of my heavy Restraint," before she "[is] come to the close of WEDNESDAY, the 27th Day of my Distress," and "THURSDAY, FRIDAY, SATURDAY, SUNDAY, the 28th, 29th, 30th, and 31st Days of my Distress."[59] Her focus shifts from the inability to leave the estate to her mental state, from the external to the internal, and as it does so, her consciousness of the number of days during which she has been imprisoned becomes more precise, as each day is counted and individually noted. Pamela's sense of temporality becomes even more constricted once Mr. B arrives in Lincolnshire. Her record of her days begins to include a more careful accounting of the time of day in which she sits down to write; though she has mentioned "MONDAY Morning," "MONDAY Afternoon," and "SUNDAY Afternoon," as well as the fact that on one night she writes at "Past Eleven o'Clock" prior to "FRIDAY, the 36th Day of [her] Imprisonment," it is not until this thirty-sixth day, the day that the squire arrives, that she is so careful about noting the passage of time in its smallest increments.[60]

This narrowing of Pamela's temporal frame serves to tighten the scope of her emotional state and to quicken the pace of her cyclical emotions, heightening the sense of peril of which she writes: whereas before this reduction in her temporality, days would pass where Pamela did not have much of import about which to write, after this particular Friday, Pamela's days are full of events that must be inscribed for her reader. The day of Mr. B's appearance is so fraught with emotional fluctuations that after she is instructed to dress so that she may be viewed by neighborhood ladies "against three or four o'Clock," she takes to her journal once "Five o'Clock is come" and again at "Seven o'Clock" to

detail her emotional state at the knowledge that Mr. B is present.[61] Richardson's repeated use of the exclamation point and em-dash in these two journal entries emphasizes the constricting of Pamela's emotions and, paired with the precise noting of time, her temporality: first, "What is to become of me! Here is my Master come in his fine Chariot!—Indeed he is!—What shall I do? Where shall I hide myself!—Oh what shall I do!" and then later, as she waits anxiously for two hours, "I can hardly write; yet, as I can do nothing else, I know not how to forbear! Yet I cannot hold my Pen!—How crooked and trembling the lines!—I must leave off, till I can get quieter Fingers!"[62] The material process of Pamela's writing is connected to her emotional state; with nerves impeding her ability to perform the physical dexterity required for handwriting, she indicates that she will wait for a later time, when she "can get quieter fingers." Anticipating that at some future time her fine motor skills will not be as inhibited as they are at the present moment, Pamela directly links her affective mindset to her composition through time. The passage of hours does in fact calm her, as her next entry on "SATURDAY Morning" states that she will "give [her parents] an Account of what passed last Night; for I had no Power to write, nor yet Opportunity, till now."[63] Though her state of imprisonment has not changed, nor has Mr. B left the estate and thus Pamela, the passage of time has allowed for a change in her own emotional state such that she is now capable of journaling the events that occurred between her last entry and the new one.

This cyclical constriction of temporality in Pamela's writing continues while she remains in Lincolnshire with Mr. B, opening into the journaling of days for a week after Mr. B arrives in the house, until the day when her letters, previously "hid under the Rose-bush," are discovered by Mrs. Jewkes and delivered to the squire. As Pamela's

discomfort grows, her temporality narrows into "SATURDAY Noon, One o'Clock," "Two o'Clock," and "SATURDAY Six o'Clock" while she notes her dread of Mr. B reading her letters after "*Sunday* Night, the 17th Day of my Imprisonment," which contain "all my Matters, from that Time, to *Wednesday* the 27th Day of my Distress."[64] Once Pamela has left the estate, though her letters continue to make note of the time in which events occur, the record of her time of journaling briefly expands into the precision of days, as she records the interactions between herself and Mr. B, before again condensing into the anxious hour-by-hour journaling she completes in the days leading up to and including her wedding day. On the day before she is to be married, she writes "NOW, my dear Parents, I have but this *one* Day, between me and the most solemn Rite that can be perform'd. My Heart cannot yet shake off this heavy Weight" before describing on "WEDNESDAY Evening" the following day as "the dreadful, yet delightful to-morrow."[65] In emphasizing the lack of time between writing and the event to come with "but this *one* Day," Pamela suggests how very highly she is aware of the time passing while simultaneously highlighting her emotional state in regard to that time. Her anxiety is further emphasized with her following entries on "THURSDAY, Six o'Clock in the Morning," "Half an Hour past Eight o'Clock," "THURSDAY, near Three o'Clock," "Eight o'Clock at Night," "Ten o'Clock at Night," and "Eleven o'Clock THURSDAY Night."[66] Richardson condenses Pamela's temporality in order to emphasize the events that occur during these times of anxiety; the very action of setting these days and times apart from the chronicling of clock time within Pamela's journals suggests that they hold a particular importance within the structure of the narrative itself. These are not simply notations of the time when glancing at the clock or looking out the window as a means of

reconciling oneself to the movement of the sun in the sky, and thus the earth around the sun. Each of these headings strikes a chord with the sense of narrative time; these times are crucial, as they record precisely how little clock time has passed while Pamela's emotions are running high. And because these notations never seem to occur when Pamela is happy (in fact, she writes most effusively when she is happy, as compared to the interruptions of em-dashes and her struggles to put her feelings into words when she is upset), they serve to suggest that Pamela's sense of time's passage is most acute—and most acutely *slow*—when she is anxious, nervous, or upset, which are all negative emotions. The laboriousness of time passing when she is negatively affected both emphasizes the importance of those events about which she writes, but also, and more importantly, it indicates that her emotions are critical to her understanding of the world and her place within it. While she is certainly able to do the same while she is happy, the ponderous nature of her writing when upset suggests that it is through those deepest, most poignant feelings that she is most aware of her self in the world. Just as the focus of the narrative is on that time, she is—and therefore we the reader are—as focused on the emotions that create the sense of time she feels and thus writes.

Pamela in her exalted condition

It is after she has been married that Pamela's sense of pleasure begins to emerge; she notes that it is "FRIDAY Evening" in her first entry post-wedding, before she labels the next as "SATURDAY Morning, the Third of my happy Nuptials."[67] Despite the notation of "SATURDAY, Seven o'Clock in the Evening," Pamela here begins to once again count the days, though she does so one at a time.[68] She has enough about which to

write with a positive emotional engagement, and therefore produces affects she can document, but does not possess so much in the way of feeling that it requires more than an indication through "SUNDAY, the Fourth Day of my Happiness" and "MONDAY, the Fifth" to highlight her emotional state.[69] The shift here from indicating the positivity of "happiness" as existing as a state of her "Nuptials" to possessing it herself—"my Happiness"—seems to relegate Pamela's own state to that of her marriage. The emotion knots together her self-awareness and that of her connection with her husband, so that it begs the question: is she happy because her marriage is so, or is her marriage a happy one because *she* is so? It also seems that once she has made the shift from unwed to married she ceases to document the time of her writing through intricate notation of the time of day, even when she is in a state of upset. On "TUESDAY Morning, Eleven o'Clock," she writes that Lady Davers has arrived unexpectedly.[70] Her text demonstrates the depth of her feelings with em-dashes and exclamation points: "And I wish, said I, they were all *three* hundred Miles off!—What shall I do!— … So I must go.—Sure she won't beat me!—Oh that my dear Protector was at home!"[71] Yet, rather than noting that it was, for example, noon or two o'clock when she returns from speaking to her sister-in-law, Pamela simply writes "Well, now I will tell you all that happen'd in this frightful Interview.—And very bad it was."[72] Once she is secure in her position as wife to Mr. B, she is no longer in a cycle of anticipation, awaiting the next time she will have the chance to write. Instead, she does not even note how much time has passed between when she left off writing because she "must go," and when she resumes her occupation.

The contents of her journal letter suggest that she does not record the details of her experience until at least the following evening, where she notes "About Seven

o'Clock, my Master sent word, that he would have me not expect him to Supper … so I follow'd my Writing closely."[73] She still experiences great emotional upheaval and therefore has much to write about—this single day encompasses approximately thirty-five pages of text, seventeen of which are her encounter with Lady Davers—but she is not as conscious of the temporality of her writing as she had been in her previous miserable state. In neglecting to be so precise in his dating of Pamela's journal, Richardson errs in his notation of the day following the "TUESDAY Morning" of Lady Davers's arrival at the Lincolnshire estate: it is again "TUESDAY Morning," but where the "MONDAY" two days prior had been "the Fifth," the day that should be Wednesday is "the Sixth of my Happiness."[74] Incorrectly recording the days, as well as Pamela's failure to write every day following "WEDNESDAY, the Seventh" due to travel or preoccupation with her husband and household, marks the point at which the specificity of time no longer holds its previous importance.[75] Instead, like the clock whose time she no longer is impelled to count, Pamela winds down into marriage, her writing fading as the preeminent purpose of her life. Conducting a statistical analysis of Pamela's language, Larry L. Stewart determines that the closer Pamela comes to marriage and settling into her life with Mr. B, the less "self-referential pronouns" she uses, suggesting that her language itself changes based upon the position she occupies in the novel.[76] And once she ceases to exercise her ability to write, her ability to write her own time, like her self-referential pronouns, follows suit. The act of writing has, for Pamela and for Richardson, reached its narrative temporal limits, as she—and her time—dwindles into a happy wife.[77]

What Pamela ultimately produces for her reader is a compendium of her temporal expressions of affect, one that can be read repeatedly. As Richardson explicitly ties Pamela's mood to her writing, such as when she indicates she wishes to "write my sad State … to send the melancholy Scribble," not only does she transcribe her mood onto the page, she transfers that state of mind to the writing itself. [78] Her "Scribble" is "melancholy"; it is not only that she may feel something as she writes, but that the feeling can transform the material product to itself be the feeling she has expressed. She has not said, "I will send you the writing I produce while I am melancholy," although she in fact desires to do so; she says, "I will send you my melancholy Scribble," as if that feeling has then been displaced from herself onto her writing. It is not simply a process of describing the way that she feels, but ascribing emotion to the writing itself. That feeling is then not simply lessened, nor depleted in her, but instead is doubled, so that both the writer and the writing are subsumed in it. Both *are* melancholy, as a state of being, particularly if we understand Richardson to be realistically depicting Pamela's journaling as the way that subjectivity can be produced in autobiographical writing, a conceit of self-writing, as it were (as, of course, a fictional character cannot actually write a self, in the way that real people can). Cycling back and forth between anxiety and contentment, agony and pleasure, Pamela takes her reader through her temporality, exacerbated by the emotions she feels. Indeed, Richardson's structure and use of an editorial intrusion between Letters XXXI and XXXII explicitly allows for Pamela to "afterwards thankfully look back upon the Dangers she had escaped, when they should be happily over-blown, as in time she hoped they would be; and that then she might examine, and either approve of, or repent for, her own Conduct in them."[79] Her "own Conduct" is what will affect her, either for

good or ill, but in her intention to "look back upon" her writing, Pamela expressly desires her own future thinking to be influenced by what she has written in the past. And, despite detracting from the epistolary frame of the novel as a whole, the editor's note is important because it further cements this sense of repetition for the novel reader, as the explanation given by the editor for the actions of Mr. B and the letter he gives the Andrewses from Pamela, written at his instruction, is repeated by Pamela, who both confirms and subverts Mr. B's account. As she has nothing to do but write "Journal-wise, to amuse and employ her Time," Pamela declares that she will "every Day now write my sad State; and in some way, perhaps, may be open'd to send the melancholy Scribble" to her parents, beginning with the morning of her departure from Mr. B's Bedfordshire manor.[80] After detailing the pain expressed by the other servants as she goes, her pleasure in the thought of going home, and her slow realization that she has been taken somewhere else, she comes to a reinscription of several letters Mr. B has sent along with the coachman in order to inform Pamela and the people who will host her of the arrangements he has made for her.

The effect of Richardson's choice in narrative structure is two-fold here. First, Pamela's copying of Mr. B's letters into her own functions to allow his voice to interject into hers. Yet, even as what we can assume is Mr. B's writing portrays aspects of the plot which we would not have known otherwise, Pamela's own voice is superimposed onto his, in that she recounts her reactions both prior to reading his letters and after doing so. She says that she "was ready to sink" and was "very faintish" as she was "left … to ruminate on my sad Condition, and to read my Letter, which I was not able to do presently. After I had come to myself," she reads Mr. B's message.[81] She establishes her

own state of mind before introducing her employer's words into the scene, and then returns to her own feelings once the letter is complete: "as … he had promised to forbear coming to me, and to write to you, my dear Parents, to quiet your Concern, I was a little more easy than I was before."[82] Not only does Mr. B's letter affect her, but, as she anticipates that her parents will have had the letter from him before they will have read this letter she has just inscribed, it will also trouble them once they read it, because it will contradict the information which they will have been given. The sandwiching of Mr. B's writing between Pamela's brings the focus of the writing back to her, and given that there is no guarantee that she would have inscribed the letter as it appeared—it can only be assumed, as the ultimate power of what to include is inevitably at the hands of the one doing the writing, and here, that is Pamela—we are asked to trust that she has not altered the missive in any way.[83] The filter is hers; we must take only what she gives us and the possibility that we cannot trust what she has transcribed for us remains.

Of course, Richardson is the ultimate story-teller as author, but if the conceit of the collection of letters found by the "editor" is to be believed, then the construct that Pamela's is the voice to whom we must submit as readers stands. John Zaixin Zhang, using Derridian deconstruction, argues that Richardson attempts to discredit Pamela's writing at various points in the novel, but "it is also privileged and protected," and "reaches both back and beyond as a shaper of Pamela's experience."[84] And John B. Pierce suggests that the authority of Pamela's writing comes from the fact that she claims to be writing her own history; while this claim produces a text that is somewhat hazy in terms of the accuracy and veracity of her account, her writing does permit the possibility of checking facts because it is available to be read and re-read: "The 'text' acts as an

objectified form for Pamela, having a reflective security and stability produced from but outside the constant threats to her virtue." Her truth—though suspect—is supported by its compatriots of "scripture and fable" forms, resulting in an amalgam text relying on testimony.[85] It is therefore to Pamela that we owe the narrative, and we are left with Pamela's voice, heard through her writing. Even those voices occasionally sounding in contrast to Pamela's—Mr. B's letter begging her return, his offer to her to be his mistress, the notes Mr. Williams send to Pamela once he understands her situation—are tempered with her own, as she re-inscribes them into the journal-letters she writes for her parents as intended audience. It is her feelings, her thoughts, her interpretations, that are perpetuated and which change over time, as they are reported when she has the space, materials, and opportunity to write.

These re-inscriptions serve multiple purposes, bringing these other voices into context with Pamela's own and, more obviously, functioning as a narrative device to explain the plot for the text's extradiegetic readers. But most importantly for my reading of the novel, they also extend the temporality of the events themselves, allowing for not only a reconsideration of the letters' contents for the multi-layered readers of the novel's letters, but a sense of perpetual re-reading and re-experiencing of the emotional state of the writer and the reader(s) as well. The duplication of writing that occurs through transcription can be read in multiple ways. Tassie Gwilliam argues that the portrayal of femininity in the eighteenth century involves the quality of duplicity—that is, the act of deceitfulness and of being doubled through the separation of body and soul, as the ideas were gendered. She suggests that though Richardson attempts to allow for possibilities of self-expression in *Pamela*, the insidious nature of duplicity is nonetheless still found

within his construction of Pamela as a character, and, more specifically, as character with a feminine body.[86] I want to suggest that duplicity in *Pamela* can also refer to the temporality of re-writing and re-reading as acts that are performed in repetition, and not simply used by Richardson as a narrative technique. By embedding these doubled writings within Pamela's own, Richardson is able to produce an engagement with those emotions that seems almost to inscribe a lemniscate, the symbol of infinity: once affect is described, the reading and re-writing of it through Pamela's reinscription allows for production and reproduction of that emotion each time she reads it and her own commentary after that. The separate encounters function like the loops on either side of the lemniscate. On the path along one of these loops, the reader can only circle back around to the initiating event, thus reinforcing the originating episode while simultaneously allowing for the remembrance of both the feeling produced by the original text in the past and the current feeling of reading the text again. This feedback loop amplifies the emotional response of the reader each time the text is read and re-read. Pamela, as she reads her own writing, would similarly be altered with each separate encounter and each re-engagement with her own words and the memories of the events described.

The cycle seems inescapable; in fact, Pamela states that she does not want it to be, as she requests that her parents save her letters, "as it may be some little Pleasure to me, may-hap, to read them myself, when I am come to you, to remind me what I have gone thro'."[87] Her stated reason is so that she may appreciate "God's Goodness," but further, she would again experience the residual effects of what she feels, and, more precisely, of what she *writes* that she feels.[88] And, because Pamela's transcriptions are meant by

Richardson to represent her copying of a letter she has received into the journal that she herself is producing, the feedback loop of emotional response is actually begun by a doubling of the letter that is transcribed. It was first read by Pamela, who records her reactions to the letter, as well as the letter itself. Thus, she has read the letter at least twice by the time she has transcribed it and, though time may have passed since she first wrote, the sense of memory and immersion in her own writing would have the potential to symbolically erase those hours between the acts of writing and reading, emphasizing the looping effect of the lemniscate in the act of returning to the writing already produced. All of these repetitions are dependent on the time of her writing; she does not actually write to the moment here, despite the understanding of epistolary writing as doing so, as well as de Freval's claim of the same in his letter to the editor. In many cases, as this example demonstrates, Pamela narrates her story from a point beyond which that narrative occurs: once she has written about her journey from the Bedfordshire house to the Lincolnshire manor, she interjects her narrative with the notation that "I am now come down in my Writing to this present SATURDAY, and a deal I have written."[89] The grammar of this phrase indicates that she has written what has occurred before that point, where she "[*is*] *now*" at "this *present* SATURDAY." Her inclusion of her letter from Mr. B conflates the time of *his* writing with the time of her reading, as well as the time of *her* writing; and as she intends to re-read what she has written, the time of all three will be repeated each time she returns to her writing.

Though Costa suggests that Mr. B is Pamela's intended audience, and she thus gauges her writing to account for his reading of her text, I would argue that his own writing—intended for her perusal from the outset—will accomplish the same task,

melded with Pamela's. Arguing that Richardson produces a text that "is as much about the shaping power of the creative and creating mind, fueled by emotion, as the works of Wordsworth or Keats, even if his raw material differs from theirs," Wendy Jones claims that the reading of emotional content in Pamela's narrative produces actual changes in Mr. B's limbic system, as a reflection of the effect narrative has on the human mind in general. Thus, emotion shifts Mr. B's perspective, and his behavior *because* he reads Pamela's writing.[90] In a psychoanalytical reading of Pamela's emerging sexuality, Terry Castle suggests that the male/female dialectic present through the courtship narrative stems from a triangle of readers for Pamela's letters, where her parents represent two of the points of the triangle.[91] I would argue instead that triangle could in fact represent the triple temporality of her writing—she writes, she re-reads, and her reader reads/writes. Mr. B stands in for her parents as readers and occupies his own space and time as a writer. Though the gender of reader matters for Castle's argument, it is inconsequential in terms of temporality, where the act of reading which brings emotional connection and affect back to the point of writing produces the multiplicity of time. Mr. B's temporality is thus both subsumed into and emphasized as unique within Pamela's writing. Reading his letter within hers will always recall attention to his temporality as separate from Pamela's, but because she has incorporated his writing into her own, the temporality of her reading of the letter functions to produce another understanding of his writing, one that repeats his moment in time while being layered over Pamela's. This repetition highlights both his state of mind as portrayed through his writing, as well as Pamela's as being emotionally changed by him. There is therefore always a piece of Mr. B and his emotions within Pamela, as demonstrated through her writing. Once she has incorporated

his writing into her own, what follows will shift to reflect a blending of both their affects and their understandings of time: a perfect example of pathetic temporality.

"Better'd by her example": *Pamela* sets the tone

As delightful as it must have been, dinnerware was not the only legacy *Pamela* had to leave the reading public. Austin argues that the cognitive desire for narrative which leads to the production of stories in the first place, also requires an ending to those narratives, giving readers and writers the drive for not only the abrupt happily-ever-after with which Richardson concludes *Pamela*, but the vast collection of sequels, revisions, and reinterpretations that accumulate after 1740.[92] In their monograph, *Pamela in the Marketplace: Literary Controversy and Print Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland,* Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor address the various legacies of *Pamela*, including the sequels, spoofs, dramatic renderings, art (illustrations, engravings, paintings) depicting scenes from the novel, and the fact that Eliza Haywood is still dealing with the contents of the novel over a decade later, demonstrated by the plot of *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy*.[93] The novel was even adapted into a stage play and performed in both France and Italy.[94] These afterlives of the novel are more concerned with the contents of the plot than the structure of the form, however. Richardson's subsequent novel productions are both epistolary, signaling his own immersion with the form, much like Haywood is concerned with the details of the text's narrative. Kathleen M. Oliver suggests that Sarah Fielding's 1760 novel *The History of Ophelia* was meant as a revision of the flaws of *Pamela*, and even authors in the twentieth century felt the need to engage with Richardson's first novel, as Elizabeth Kraft

notes in her discussion of Upton Sinclair's *Another Pamela* (1950), arguing that the potential for social reform in Richardson's text influenced more than just his contemporary readers.[95]

Yet, perhaps the most important of Pamela's legacies is the one articulated by Nancy Armstrong in her pivotal analysis of the work performed by domestic fiction in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: that of the production of the woman by *her self*. In creating Pamela as he does, she argues, Richardson presents "a female self who exists outside and prior to the relationships under male control," one who has power within the household, "operat[ing] by reconstituting the subject out of words."[96] Pamela is a writer, first and foremost, and as she writes herself into being, she does so in and through time via the tool of the letter. Bonnie Latimer argues that Pamela, like Richardson's later heroines, possesses the capability of self-creation, as "they are distinguished by their ability to step back from cultural patterns, to analyse them, and to wield, impersonate, and deploy them as they consciously construct themselves as separate, autonomous, and conscious beings."[97] This characteristic of self-creation, identified by both Armstrong and Latimer, is carried over into epistolary novels written by the women who follow in Richardson's quill-steps. They, too, will utilize the letter in order to produce female protagonists—and male, in Charlotte Smith's case—who can write not only themselves, but their own temporalities, into being. Unlike Richardson, who performs the female voice through a process Madeleine Kahn calls "narrative transvestism" in order to obtain "access to a culturally defined female voice and sensibility but runs no risk of being trapped in the devalued female realm," these female authors speak to the experience of being female in the eighteenth century.[98] And if, as Armstrong argues quite persuasively,

the production of literature was able to influence the production of culture, rather than being merely a reflection of that culture, then the pathetic temporalities performed on the pages of epistolary novels of the early eighteenth century perpetrated and influenced those that followed in their wake. Thus, *Pamela* spawned a legion of progeny, several of which I examine in the following chapters, beginning with the engagement of temporality, affect, and the body in Frances Sheridan's *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph.*

CHAPTER 2

THE DISORDERED TEMPORAL BODY: ILLNESS, PREGNANCY, AND EMOTION IN FRANCES SHERIDAN'S *THE MEMOIRS OF MISS SIDNEY BIDULPH*

> Against the swarm of public print forms that proliferated in the early decades of the century, the letter became an emblem of the private; while keeping its actual function as an agent of the public exchange of knowledge, it took on the general connotations it still holds for us today, intimately identified with the body, especially a female body, and the somatic terrain of emotions, as well as with the thematic material of love, marriage, and the family.
>
> —Elizabeth Heckendorn Cook[1]

Though Frances Sheridan's *The Memoirs of Sidney Bidulph* (1761) purports to be a personal history, it is not presented as a diary.[2] The text is in fact a fictional compilation of the private, familiar letters written by Sidney Bidulph Arnold to her dearest friend, Cecilia, who, by virtue of her marriage to a member of the diplomatic corps, resides in France. Sheridan constructs her epistolary narrative via the same conceit Aphra Behn and Samuel Richardson use in their earlier texts: she frames the letters through the lens of having been collected and sorted by an editor. The prologue sets the stage, presenting Sidney's epistles as a type of "found" manuscript, much like Behn presents the correspondence of Philander and Sylvia. In Sheridan's text, an elderly Cecilia gives the collection to a visiting gentleman, who, upon her death, publishes the work as an "editor."[3] Judiciously selecting which letters are to appear in the text so that the narrative is as complete and lively as it can be, Cecilia conveniently removes portions that may seem obvious or boring to the reader, so that the didactic purpose of the text, which

partially lies in the goodness and virtue Sidney displays through her writing, can be fully realized with minimal intrusion.[4] Significantly, however, unlike the letters in *Pamela,* the letters comprising the text of *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph* are not meant to be read as if they are being produced concurrently to their reading. Sidney's compositions are introduced as having been the past creations of a long dead writer, whereas Pamela is constructed as "alive" by Richardson. As such, the novel's preoccupation with the disordered physical body and its connection with the spirit, and the sense that Sidney is writing to her reader from an era long past, as compared to Pamela's sense of presence, gives Sheridan's text a vaguely postmortem feel. Though a few letters are written by Sidney's maid Patty and a brief narrative is written by Patty's brother, the resultant narrative is one where the personality of the writing voice is confined to Sidney. Even where Sidney inscribes letters written to and by others for Cecilia—and thus the extradiegetic reader—to consume, the prevailing voice remains Sidney's, as she provides commentary to Cecilia regarding the contents of the transcribed letters, much as Pamela does with her letters from Mr. B. Yet, Sheridan's commitment to a one-sided narrative leads to gaps: gaps in the timing of writing, gaps in the information conveyed in the letters, and gaps that connect directly to the ability of the writer to physically write. And because so little of the other characters' narratives are permitted to fill the temporal gaps in writing when Sidney cannot do so herself, Sheridan further accentuates Sidney's material capacity to write, linking the physical self closely to the writing self by connecting the time of writing and the emotions portrayed on the pages of her text to the wellness of her characters' minds and bodies.

That writing self functions rather differently from the writing self of Sheridan's model in the earlier *Pamela*. Where Pamela continues to write through her emotional distress or physical illness, allowing only minimal interruptions in her composition (a fact that is made the butt of jokes by critics of the novel, as, for example, Henry Fielding does in *Shamela*), Sidney is occasionally prevented from writing due to the intrusion of ailments that restrict the material performance of her physical body. In her book *Epistolary Bodies*, Elizabeth Heckendorn Cook argues that, "[i]n epistolary narratives, the letter serves as a metonym for the body of the writing subject, vulnerable like it to markings, invasion, violence of all sorts. … Formally as well as thematically, the letter constructs the writing subject *as corporeal*."[5] Similarly, the letter functions as a representation of the embodied writer through time, connecting the letter to its writer, capable of being altered from within as well as from without. Sidney's letters seem constructed to convey an often melancholic reflective posture, looking back on past actions and narrating a history to her friend, only occasionally allowing her emotions to shine through in bursts of emotional writing describing her current moment and conflicts. And, as Cook notes, those letters are bodies in miniature, formed to represent the writer's corporeal and temporal selves. I take, therefore, a path through my analysis in this chapter that relies on the notion that, as Elizabeth Grosz has argued, "bodies are always understood within a spatial and temporal context, and space and time remain conceivable only insofar as corporeality processes the basis for our perception and representation of them," creating a theoretical construct of the body that is both physical and psychological—one that can be represented through the material transcription of thoughts in and through time onto the pages of correspondence.[6] As such, the affective

possibilities of epistles are dependent upon both the time of writing *and* the time of reading, as the letters themselves interact with the bodies they encounter. In what Janet Altman describes as the "pivotal present," the epistolary narrative is ingrained in the genre's temporal nature: "epistolary language is preoccupied with immediacy, with presence, because it is a product of absence. … [T]he word *present* in the letter is charged with both its temporal and its spatial meanings; it signifies 'now' as opposed to the 'then' of past and future events or contact."[7] The letter thus situates the writer's body within a specific sphere of space and time, so that his or her feelings are grounded within the narrative even as they may fluctuate while being written.

The layered nature of the epistolary text allows for an openness of temporality, one where the physical and the mental can integrate and separate, flowing through the presentness of the various voices contributing to the narrative. Thus, as *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph* demonstrates, illness may be concurrent to the event of writing, producing descriptions of pain within those sketches' own temporal moments; gaps may occur within the narrative, either between moments of writing in a single day, or between letters that may be months apart; a narrator may describe the events and feelings that lead up to a debilitating illness once he or she has regained the ability to write, as illness often precludes a writer from writing; or another narrator may take the place of the suffering writer, producing a gap in the narrator's own voice, but allowing the narrative itself to continue in another voice. In this manner, the affect that the writers both display and produce in Sheridan's text shifts within and through time, creating discrete pockets of temporal affect, and altering the linearity of the story's plotline such that not only are the affects—the feelings—themselves highlighted, but the effects on the minds of the

sufferers and the witnesses, including the novel reader, are indicated as being integral parts of the narrative experience. These gaps and specific affective moments obscure the expression of temporality in Sidney's letters: if she is dwelling in the past, rather than focusing on the present time of writing, her missives turn their readers' attention away from what occurs in conjunction with that writing. Sidney's emotional state when writing no longer appears particularly significant when compared to Pamela's very precise markers of continuous chronological temporality (i.e. the specific days of her confinement) within her narrative. Sheridan's careful construction of Sidney as attempting to perform a sense of objectivity when she writes seems to refute the idea of "temporal drag" that to this point I have argued is crucial to the construction of pathetic temporality in the epistolary novel.[8] Yet, Sidney remains entangled in her emotional state, unable to maintain a distance from her past feeling, even as she endeavors to portray herself as unaffected in her present writing.

Despite the apparent lack of feeling that Sidney herself conveys at the moments of her own writing, affect and sensibility appear frequently throughout the text. Culminating in the eventual mental incapacitation and death of Orlando Faulkland, Sidney's ill-fated first fiancé and persistently solicitous friend, the text's affective language and rhetoric of sensibility effectively unite emotion, time, and the body into a mélange of torrid illness. Told through the pen of Faulkland via Sidney's letters to Cecilia, his fall from health and comfort highlights the dangerous path taken by the too-emotional person in the eighteenth-century. The doubling of writing that occurs once Sidney transcribes Faulkland's letters confers secondary ownership of his emotions on her: just as Cecilia chooses what missives to include in the larger narrative, Sidney could paraphrase her

dismissed lover's words when she writes to her friend. But in deciding instead to re-write his communications, she puts her own stamp on them, dedicating her own hand to their proliferation. And, like Pamela's transcription of Mr. B's messages to her, Sidney simultaneously repeats her own act of reading as she writes. Thus, she is able to experience her own affect at learning what he has to convey, while also distancing herself from the expression of her feelings by merely copying his words, rather than creating her own.

Despite the complexities of time and affect of Sheridan's novel, the story itself seems an almost trite courtship narrative: boy meets girl, they fall in love, their engagement falls apart, they both undergo trials and tribulations, and eventually they are reunited in anticipation of future wedded bliss. The fabric of Sheridan's text is in no way straightforward, however. She has created a labyrinth of misfortunes and misunderstandings for her characters to navigate, containing pitfalls that seem gauged to perfectly imitate human nature even as they seem equally exaggerated. As a reviewer in the *Edinburgh Review* writes in May of 1761, the novel elicits a thoroughly affective response: "In the romance now before us, the author seems to have had no other design than to draw tears from the reader, by distressing innocence and virtue as much as possible."[9] That those tears may not be justified is one of the complexities of the text. Patricia Meyer Spacks notes that the sensibility which Sidney portrays leads to her goodness, but also is questioned as possibly contributing to her misfortunes.[10] Sidney Bidulph's plight comes from her decisions over whom to marry, and her subsequent entrapment in marriage with a man who makes poor choices. Sidney is interested in and emotionally engaged with Orlando Faulkland, to whom she is introduced by her brother.

But she refuses to marry him, according to the wishes of her mother after Lady Bidulph discovers that Faulkland has sired an illegitimate child with another young lady, Miss Burchell. In continuing to follow what she determines is her filial duty to her mother, Sidney instead accepts the proposal of Mr. Arnold, a gentleman of some wealth and property who claims to love her. She lives with him happily for about two years, having two daughters within that time, until the Arnolds remove to one of their houses in the country, and Sidney discovers that her husband is having an affair. Arnold becomes suspicious of Sidney's behavior after Faulkland arrives to visit a relative nearby. After Sidney finds herself in a mistakenly compromising situation orchestrated by her husband's mistress, Arnold insists she leave his house and their children, despite her innocence. Called to her mother's sickbed, Sidney eventually learns that Faulkland eloped with Arnold's mistress in an attempt to aid Sidney and save her marriage. In the meanwhile, Arnold has mortgaged properties and is deeply in debt due to losing a lawsuit, which reverts his inheritance to a niece born posthumously to his brother's wife—and whose paternity is in some doubt.

Though Sidney is briefly reconciled with her husband, she and her daughters are left penniless after Arnold's death. Feeling it her duty, and engaged by a promise to the woman, she convinces Faulkland that his honor demands he marry Miss Burchell. Lady Bidulph's death removes any support Sidney had, and she and her children are forced into penury, a state in which she nearly dies from illness. Only her kindness restores her to wealth, when her distant cousin pretends to be poor in order to test both Sidney and her brother's true natures. Sidney and Faulkland eventually marry, despite her misgivings, after Faulkland believes he has accidentally killed his wife and her lover in a fit of rage.

The marriage is ill-fated, however, as Faulkland dies in Europe, where he has been exiled, upon learning that his wife is still alive. She had only fainted at the sight of her husband shooting her lover. When Mrs. Faulkland succumbs to an illness, Sidney is left to raise their son, along with her two daughters. Sidney's duty and her passion are never able to unite, and, despite having embodied "proper" sensibility and behaved as a "proper" lady would, she is, as she tells Cecilia, "born to sacrifice my own peace to that of other people; my life is become miserable."[11] Those characters who make immoral choices all suffer unhappy fates, ending with the punishments of illness and death: Mr. Arnold commits adultery and squanders his wealth; Mr. Faulkland engages in an affair with an unmarried lady whom he is later forced to marry, is miserable with her, eventually commits murder, bigamy, and fraud, and apparently commits suicide; Miss Burchell, who seduced Faulkland, gives birth to his bastard son and later marries him, and commits adultery. The novel seems to indicate that immorality results in physical ailment, often tied up with mental illness, and death. In *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph*, to misbehave is to literally lose one's life.

In situating her protagonist in such a way, Sheridan works to overturn the essentialist dichotomy of the rational man and the woman of overwrought sensibility, instead reinscribing her archetypes by replacing Sidney's feelings with those of the men in her life. The sensibility upon which Sheridan's characters elaborate is rooted in their bodies, stimulated by feeling—and feeling too much at that. Sheridan's novel creates a complex relationship between mind and body, illustrating the necessary connection between the mental and the physical, the "feelings" that can be elicited through thought and action. In following the tropes of the eighteenth-century novel of sensibility in her

text, Sheridan produces an epistolary novel that works to restrict the exploration of physical pleasures and bodily feelings and, even while describing bodies in tune with the mind, suggests that a separation between the mind and body is crucial for the "proper" woman. This paradox, painful and unsatisfactory, plays out through the ill body in multiple ways throughout the text: first, in the retrospective consideration Sidney gives to past events and the effect they have on her emotional state at the time of her writing, particularly on the occasion of a character's death; second, in the careful plotting that results in Sidney's position as missing or absent writer over a period of time in which her body is physically altered, a mechanism which Sheridan supplements with the repetition of gendered material transformation in the form of pregnancies; and third, in the comparison between Sidney's and Faulkland's states of temporal affective being (that is, in their physical bodies through time and through emotion).

"Day after day rolls on": journal-letters and the record of Sidney's life

Because Sheridan's text is such a maze of winding turns and plot shifts, the precision in dating the moments of Sidney's writing becomes vital to the novel's structure. Like Richardson, Sheridan constructs a conceit for the novel, by which an anonymous editor is presented with a manuscript of letters compiled by Cecilia. He then purports to "give it to the world, just as [he] received it, without any alteration, excepting the proposed one of a change of names."[12] In structuring her premise in this manner, Sheridan is able to present a predominantly univocal narrative, where Cecilia stands in for Sidney's imagined audience and which allows for a story that is told in letters from only one side of the correspondence. Thus, like Pamela, Sidney constructs her narrative

through her dedication to letter-writing, compiling her individual day's writings into packets to be sent when convenient. When the anonymous gentleman editor receives the manuscript from Cecilia, she tells him that:

> It was our continual practice from children to keep little journals of what daily happened to us; these, in all our short absences were, were a matter of entertainment to us; we constantly communicated them when we met, or if we chanced *to be separated by any distance*, we made a mutual *exchange by the post* of our little diurnal registers, having made each a solemn promise, not to conceal an incident, or even a thought of the least moment, from the other; and this promise I believe was religiously kept up during a *correspondence of many years*.[13]

Thus, despite the absences of reciprocal correspondence from Cecilia, Sidney's writings are in fact meant to be letters. This structure is reinforced by the fact that at the time of the narrative's commencement, Cecilia is living on the Continent after marrying "an English gentleman, then resident in Vienna; this occasioning [her] continuing there some years, and it was during that space of time that [she] had the occurrences of [her] friend's life from her own hand."[14] Just like *Pamela*, then, the passage of time is not counted by the exchange of letters between writers, but through the careful counting of both the days and the effects of the events that occur on those days.

Unlike *Pamela*, however, which relies on its being temporally and historically unmoored, *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph* is temporally anchored by not just the days of the week, but by the specific dating of those days in a particular historical moment. The preface marks the novel's plot as occurring "in the beginning of queen Ann's reign" and the first journal-letter Sidney writes to Cecilia is dated April 2, 1703.[15] Though Sheridan does not make the reason for setting her novel at this point in the century clear, there seem to be a few possibilities. If Cecilia is near death, with grandchildren who have friends old enough and with the freedom to travel around the

country, her receipt of these letters from Sidney, who would have been of a similar age, must have occurred when they were quite young. Sidney is, in fact, "almost nineteen," just before her marriage.[16] She and Cecilia would have been nearly eighty years old in 1761, when the novel was published, which would explain not only Sidney's earlier demise, but the good fortune of Cecilia to have lived so long, as well. The early years of the century were also fraught politically, with Queen Anne's ascension marking one of the few points in British history when a woman reigned alone. With monarchal power shifting from the possession of a man to a woman at this particular moment, Sheridan may have seen "the beginning of queen Ann's reign" as a time in which gender roles could be examined and potentially subverted within the pages of a novel, as I shall address in an examination of Faulkland's integration of mind and body in a later section of this chapter. The distance between the publication of the novel and its setting in the past would allow for questions of gender performance to be interrogated without the appearance of advocating for such reversals to be enacted in the present. Whatever Sheridan's motivation, the majority of the subsequent moments of writing throughout the novel are noted as occurring on precise dates which acknowledge the somewhat confusing practice of noting both the British and the Continental styles of determining the position of the new year. Therefore, when she includes letters from Sidney dated "February 29" and "February 30," Sheridan has not mistakenly added two days to the month; the Julian calendar used by England before 1752 included those dates.[17] Such careful attention to detail allows for the production of a realistic chronology within the structure of the novel, as it simulates the process by which correspondence was

exchanged between writers, while simultaneously creating the distinct moments in which affect periodically bursts forth from Sidney's usually subdued style.

It is not until the letter dated June 29, 1708 that Sidney breaks from this pattern of precisely noting the date on which she writes. Even while Sidney is unable to write, her surrogates Patty Main and Patty's brother, Dr. Main, assume the responsibility of detailing the events of her life for Cecilia to read, maintaining the careful dating of their acts of writing.[18] There are occasionally gaps between dates (these are incidents to which I will return with a great deal more detail later), but until this particular day at the end of June, each moment has been catalogued and denoted by its calendrical date. The letter written on June 29 begins with an affective appeal: "Gracious God! for what am I yet reserved? My trembling hand can scarce hold my pen, but I will try to tell you the event which yesterday produced."[19] It goes on to detail Faulkland's arrival at Sidney's home, where he informs her that his wife is dead by his hand and he must leave the country, begging her to accompany him. Most important about this letter, however, is not the plot points elucidated within, but the fact that subsequent to this dating, Sidney uses days of the week to denote the passage of time between incidents about which she writes, rather than dates: "Tuesday night twelve o'clock," "Wednesday morning," and "Thursday" denote her moments of writing, as opposed to "June 30" or "July 1," before the next letter is dated "July 2."[20] In this shift from dating calendrically to the more claustrophobic dating by day and by time, Sheridan emphasizes the affect produced and experienced, as well as recorded, during this period. Sidney becomes less concerned about reflecting on the past here, and more concerned with the current events she describes, much as

Richardson demonstrates by the narrowing of temporality through close attention to clock time in *Pamela*.

But, unlike in *Pamela*, with its frequent use of em-dashes, exclamation points, and ellipses to symbolize Pamela's disordered emotions, this letter contains the first instance that Sheridan utilizes punctuation to symbolize extreme emotion at the moment of writing. Janine Barchas notes that Sarah Fielding uses dashes in *The Adventure of David Simple* to indicate emotional silences and pauses, as "a way to express silent sentiment concretely on the page."[21] Here, Sheridan's accidentals execute a similar purpose and emphasize the affect Sidney cannot express in words on the page as she writes to Cecilia. Sidney's anxiety is palpable as she narrates her desperation and despair in regards to the promise that Faulkland has demanded from her, at the pain of his own death:

> I hope he will not obstinately persist in pressing me to what I dare not comply with ……. My Brother is just come to carry me to Mr. Faulkland. Heaven grant I may find him restored to his right mind!
> ..... Just returned from my visit to Mr. Faulkland. What a scene! he wrung my very heart. I would I had never seen him.[22]

The use of extended ellipses here is not a mistake in the text, nor my own contrivance; they are replicas of the punctuation on the page, used by Sheridan to demonstrate her protagonist's emotional state. Overwrought, but unwilling to sacrifice control of the narrative to a surrogate, Sidney indicates her momentary pauses in writing through punctuation conventions. While the second ellipsis in this passage denotes the time in which she is physically away from her writing, connected as it is with the ellipsis just before it which does signal emotional agitation, and combined with the exclamation points on either side, it serves to heighten the effect Faulkland's own upset has on Sidney. He has, apparently, not been "restored to his right mind," or if he has, the effort required to accomplish this feat was enough to have "wrung her very heart." Her claim

that she "would that [she] had never seen him" suggests that that affect is so great, she wishes to erase her past, since Faulkland has been so intertwined with the events of her life after that meeting. In this case, Sheridan establishes in her protagonist a desire to eliminate the present feeling wrought by the accumulation of past interactions, to slough off the accretion of emotions gained through the entanglement of bodies in time. To do so would, of course, change not only Sidney's acquaintance with Faulkland, but her entire past and thus her present as well.[23]

Examples of these extended ellipses, usually symbolizing the pause Sidney requires to recover her breath and reorganize her thoughts, occur three further times in the novel. In each case, Sheridan has positioned Sidney as engaging in an act of reflection, in considering the entanglement of past events with her present circumstances. There is no separation between the effects of what Sidney has done, what she does, or what she is contemplating doing. Not only have her past actions helped lead to her present situation, but the very act of remembering and second guessing what has passed, as well as considering the possibility of her future actions, contributes to her feelings in the moment of writing. Sheridan specifically ties the materiality of writing and the physicality of Sidney's emotions through her use of the long ellipsis:

> When I reflect on the past, when I survey the present, and my foreboding heart whispers to me the future sufferings of our dear Mr. Faulkland, all my philosophy forsakes me. I have born up under my own sorrows—his quite subdue me—I must lay down my pen—my eyes are brim-ful of tears
> ……..Ah, my dear, what will become of us? I am almost dead with apprehension.[24]

Sidney indicates that her own feelings cannot overwhelm her on their own, but the anticipation of adding Faulkland's to them "subdue" her so that she "must lay down [her] pen." The juxtaposition of Sidney's confession of her inability to write with the note that

her eyes are "brim-ful of tears" links her feelings with the material process of writing. Like Pamela, the physical expression of her emotion prevents her from writing at this moment. Unlike Pamela, however, Sidney does not prove her state to us via the claim of an amalgamation of tears and paper. Instead, Sidney's use of "brim-ful" suggests that those tears are not yet overflowing, but as they have filled her eyes—to the brim—they impede her vision. The product of her "foreboding heart," the loss of "all [her] philosophy," and the fusion of her "own sorrows" and his, they prevent her from fulfilling her obligation to write to Cecilia in this moment.

Yet, it is not this layering of emotion that is so crucial about this passage. Instead, it is the particular use of the plural possessive in "*our* dear Mr. Faulkland" that creates tension: there is no indication that Faulkland belongs to anyone but Sidney in this context. Cecilia does not actually know him, Sidney does not attribute any possession of Faulkland to her brother, and she has been articulating her reservations about his proposal and his state of mind. To whom, then, does Sidney refer with her plural "our"? She could be fusing her writing self with Cecilia as reader, claiming ownership through a union between the two halves of the corresponding assemblage of which she is a part. But I think it more likely that, as Sidney has just enumerated past, present, and future in the same sentence, she means that Faulkland is part of all three temporal valences of her life. Sheridan, therefore, attributes possession to three temporally entangled Sidneys, as one does not and in fact cannot exist without the others, particularly as Sidney's existence is only made material through her letters. As such, Sheridan unites her protagonist's stages of life and the progress of her courtship narrative through the plurality of the possessive pronoun: a single "our" functions to elide the strati of Sidney's life, and to further

emphasize how affect is essentially temporal, so that a single incident chronicled on paper manifests the multiplicity of feelings occurring in, through, and over time. Indeed, for her reader, the letter-writing "Sidney" is inevitably a construction that must incorporate her past and present iterations, with the anticipation of a future version always hovering within the reader's consciousness, just a turn of the page or a new letter away.

Sheridan continues to connect these emotive pauses with the materiality of writing, affect, and temporality in order to reveal the potency of feeling as it is exhibited via correspondence. Just as Pamela writes more when most affected, when Sidney is most emotional, as she is in this narration, she begins to write to the moment and records events without filtering them through hindsight:

> I took up my pen as soon as he departed, and have scribbled thus far without suffering any reflections to stop me. Let me now lay down my pen, to pause before I leap into the frightful precipice that opens before me……. To-morrow! Ah, my Cecilia, what is that morrow to produce? it joins me for ever to Mr. Faulkland! the chosen of my heart, my first love! the man who adores me; who deserves all my affection, who has obliged me beyond all recompense. Who has a claim to my warmest gratitude, to my esteem, to my whole heart. I save his life, I have the power to make him happy; my brother, my kinsman urge me; my own heart too prompts me. Why cannot I then reconcile myself to my lot? Oh that question is answered by a fearful image that starts up to my fancy—I am not superstitious, yet believe me, my dear, I am at this instant chilled with horror.[25]

In this case, Sidney's reflections occur during the pause, and she articulates them to Cecilia after she has taken the time to "lay down [her] pen," needing the respite where she is physically detached from her writing implement and thus separated from the repetition of emotion that she experiences while detailing the circumstances that have affected her so greatly she feels she is at the edge of a "frightful precipice that opens before" her. After her meditations on her past and present, it is the future that looms

before her. The possibility of marriage to Faulkland, to whom she feels she owes much, makes her "chilled with horror" and does not allow her to "reconcile [her]self to [her] lot." She cannot anticipate happiness, despite the prospect of adoration by a man to whom she owes her "affection, [her] warmest gratitude." Reflection and the memories elicited by the act of rendering her thoughts into a material account have not made the idea of her "lot" sanguine; in fact, the very use of the word "lot" indicates less anticipation and more resignation to a fate she is unable to resist, despite the fact that, in marrying him, she claims to "save his life" and to have "the power to make him happy," acknowledging she does possess some level of agency.

Similarly, anxiety is reflected in Sheridan's final use of the long ellipsis, though in a manner that creates the opposite effect: "I am dressed and ready. I wait for my kinsman, or my brother, one of whom, or both perhaps, will be here presently…… Mr. Warner is come; I have but just time to tell you my brother and Mr. Price are with Mr. Faulkland."[26] Here, Sheridan positions her protagonist as being unable to reflect, rather than needing the pause to collect and evaluate her thoughts. Sidney is incapable not because she does not have enough time, but rather because, in spite of the fact that she is "dressed and ready" and awaiting her relatives, she cannot put her thoughts to paper. She has "passed the whole night in endeavoring to fortify [her] mind against the important event that a few hours will accomplish."[27] The amount of writing for this day, noted only as "Wednesday morning," is scant compared to what she has related in her two entries immediately previous to this one, though she indicates that it is "hours" before "the important event" scheduled for the day—that is, her marriage ceremony.[28] Her detached state is confirmed in her next day's

narrative, in which she tells Cecilia, "There is something amazing in all this, I can scarce credit my sense; but my life has been a series of strange, strange events! I am so bewildered, I cannot connect my thoughts; but I will try to give you my yesterday's *vision*, for I can hardly persuade myself that what I recollect really happened."[29] She indicates her desire to detail the events of the previous day, writing of the past from a future present, which allows her to assume a retrospective posture, to consider that what she remembers may be influenced, and possibly distorted, by her mental disarray, caused by the effect of her emotional load. The attempt to "fortify [her] mind" of the night before has been ineffective, leading to incredulity and the sense that the entire episode contains elements of fantasy, rather than reality.

These unusual instances of the material evidence of Sidney's emotions are notable in their very scarcity. The vast majority of Sidney's letters contain the recounting of the events of her life, but often with the sense of detachment that stems from a certainty of having done what was right and proper in the moment, of having been justified in her choices and actions, rather than with the heightened emotion derived from regret or transgression. Even when she is unsure of her course of action, she is guided by her morality: "In short, I am bewildered," she writes when she and Faulkland meet in country society after her marriage to Mr. Arnold, "and know not what to wish for, but must e'en let things take their course, and rest satisfied in the integrity of my own heart."[30] This apparent sense of righteousness does not, however, exempt Sidney from being affected. Rather, when Sidney expresses her own emotion and bodily sensations, they are the more significant because they are so rare in comparison to those expressed by her fellows, particularly Faulkland—or at least those which she describes to Cecilia. The moments

when Sidney pauses in her descriptions of past events and the reactions of her family and friends to them in order to reflect on her present state serve to highlight how intertwined Sidney's own usually tightly bottled emotions are with her memories of those events. In so carefully controlling Sidney's record of her own interiority and consideration of her personal emotional state, Sheridan connects Sidney's writing to the past, thus inscribing feelings, both past and present, onto Sidney's remembering body. Even in the moment of contemplating her childhood home, now that Cecilia is not present to share it with her, Sidney is affected by her memories:

> With what delight do I recal the days of my childhood, which I passed here so happily! … Oh, Cecilia! how exquisite are the pleasures and the pains that those of too nice feelings are liable to! You, whose sensibility is as strong as mine, know this. From what trifles do minds of such a turn derive both joy and grief! Our names, our virgin names, I find cut out on several of the old elm trees: this conjures up a thousand pleasing ideas, and brings back those days when we were inseparable. But you are no longer Rivers, nor I Bidulph. Then I think what I have suffered since I have lost that name, and at how remote a distance you are from me; and I weep like a child—But away with such reflections: I am now happier, beyond comparison happier, I think, than I was before my afflictions overtook me.[31]

The recollections of the past are written for Sidney in both mind and physical space: the "old elm trees" contain the material remnants of "the days of [her] childhood," which serve as permanent reminders of her "thousand pleasing ideas." Embodying what Elizabeth Freeman terms "temporal drag," the past Sidney-who-has-written on the tree affects the present Sidney-who-is-writing on the page, as her environmental graffiti "conjures up" thought and "brings back those days when we were inseparable," effecting a kind of magic through memories.[32] Yet, in remembering those days, she must also consider what has passed since then, and especially since her marriage, emphasizing how distant Cecilia is to Sidney, not just in terms of space, but in time as well, causing her to "weep like a child." Like the childhood that has passed, Sidney is only able to reflect on

what is gone, and though she aims to remove "such reflections," she cannot remove the memory of her "afflictions" as easily as she can walk away from the elms.

As the outlet for Sidney's contemplations, Cecilia as letter-reader serves as the part of Sidney that can be set at a distance and examined. In joining their names, their characters ("You, whose sensibility is as strong as mine"), and their pasts ("those days when we were inseparable"), Sheridan conflates the two women, allowing her writing protagonist the conceit of asking for Cecilia's approbation and support for her own opinions and actions. Yet, the very distance between the women and the time between receipt of any answer to her letters renders the possibility of either sanction or input from Cecilia a mere formality, given that any objection or urging for reconsideration would arrive too late to be of any real effect. Sheridan's choice to fabricate a univocal narrative has presented her readers with a letter-writer who writes to what amounts to an imagined past self, thus an audience who can be imagined only by the writer, and who remains obscured to the reader. The irony of this construction is highlighted by the fact that Sidney's most "present" writing, when she writes to the moment in describing her affective being, occurs when she addresses Cecilia directly. Sidney's addresses to Cecilia therefore seem to be appeals to her own conscience, especially since the contents of Sidney's letters generally omit concern for the details of Cecilia's life; nor is Cecilia's own writing self present, except as evidenced by the occasional intrusion into the narrative where "the editor" notes that Cecilia has excerpted some material. It is these gaps that I turn to now, examining them as the framework for the connection between passing time and the gendered material body.

"Nothing material … but the birth of a daughter": the sexed temporal body

An editorial intrusion follows a brief letter on May 20, 1704, in which Sidney mentions her new husband has been engaged in renovating the gardens of their home, though she wishes he would not expend money in the improvement of an estate that they may be forced to surrender in consequence of losing a lawsuit currently in litigation:

> *[The following is writ in the hand of the lady who gave the editor these papers: "Here follows an interval of four months; in which time, though the Journal was regularly continued, nothing material to her story occurred but the birth of a daughter; after which she proceeds."]*[33]

Not only does this addendum remind the reader that Sheridan has constructed her narrative as the edited collection of letters written by Sidney, compiled by Cecilia ("*writ in the hand of the lady*"), and published by an unnamed gentleman friend of Cecilia's son ("*the editor*"), but it drives home the problem of describing the temporal, material, gendered body over a period of several years. This aside is not the first instance of a break in the continuity of Sidney's journal-letter writing; that occurs early in the novel, during a period between July 14-27, 1703, when she became ill and the information regarding Mr. Faulkland's indiscretion with Miss Burchell is revealed to her mother, leading to the dissolution of Sidney's engagement to him.[34] But this particular intervention, the pointed documentation of an outside narrative voice that uses italics to emphasize its difference and distance, marks a pivotal aspect of how the body is gendered in this text: that of pregnancy, and the attending temporality that is signified by the changing feminine body in this state. Sidney's pregnancy here is a moment in which her voice is censored from the narrative, and presents a time at which the female body conveys the prospect of waiting and the potential for change. The litigation she mentions just prior to this annotation is caused by the timing of a birth, and Sidney's interactions

with Faulkland following the revelation of his affair are dictated by Miss Burchell's pregnancy and the existence of their child. Sheridan utilizes gaps like the one described here to quicken the pace of her narrative, as well as to emphasize the affective component of the passage of time within the story when Sidney's missing voice is either elided or replaced. That lack of voice denotes time when she cannot write, a pathetic temporality that is highlighted as simultaneously present and absent.

The gap in Sidney's journaling that occurs during July 1703 stems from her becoming ill after having "walked a long time in the garden" at Kensington on the 13th.[35] Here, there is no editorial notation over the cause of her break in diligence; instead, her own writing explains that, on July 27th, "After a fortnight's, a dreadful fortnight's intermission, I resume my pen."[36] Having been incapacitated by her illness, she "remember[s] nothing, but that, in [her] intervals of reason, [she] always saw [her] mother by [her] bedside," and is thus left to "try to recollect all the circumstances of this miserable interval, and relate them as well as [she] can" as she writes to Cecilia of her disappointed hopes for marriage to Mr. Faulkland.[37] In this particular case, Sidney's emotional upheaval is expressed through her writing *after* the events that cause that turbulence. Sheridan positions her protagonist's writing self so that she can only reflect on her circumstances, the bulk of which occur while she is uninvolved, due to the effects the illness has on her body, and subsequently, her mind. She has gone from requiring bed rest and blood-letting to having been "deprived of [her] senses" by "[t]he violence of [her] disorder."[38] That deprivation, as well as the physical weakness stemming from the "disorder," prevent her from writing and remove her from the incidents that lead to her mother's withdrawing her approval of Faulkland as a suitor for Sidney, and thus the end

of the betrothal. Sheridan demonstrates an interconnection between mind and body here, sustaining the time in which Sidney cannot write by suggesting that physical illness can prevent the mind from functioning, even as the body is similarly afflicted. Sidney's body prevents her from writing because her mind is debilitated, so that only the aftermath of the missing days can be supplied, after Sidney has been "harassed by a cruel disorder, and hardly able to crawl out of bed. All this had fallen on [her] with these last fourteen black days" when the "near prospect of—of—oh! let [her] be ingenuous, and say happiness, vanished."[39] She tells Cecilia that she was weak at the news, and wished nothing more than to "melt into tears," but the presence of her mother, who is so "rigid in her notions of virtue," prevented her; instead, she "suppressed the swelling passion in [her] breast, and, with as much as composure as [she] could assume," agrees with her mother's actions in forbidding Faulkland from coming to the house.[40] As she so frequently does, Sidney confines her true feelings and does not allow them to show. She is relegated to merely relating that she was affected at the time of the event, rather than writing to the moment. Because she was unconscious of the events occurring around her, she must rely on the recitation of those events by her mother and brother. Unable to bestow her own emotional life on the missing days, she is trapped in contemplation of the past as though from the outside, rather than considering her own emotional responses at the moment of occurrence. The only instances of her expression of affect while composing her illness narrative for Cecilia come when she reflects on the events she has recorded as they were told to her, and attributes her reactions in the moment of her writing to reasons fashioned by her contemplations of the unremembered past as she writes.

Later in the novel, when Sidney succumbs to illness brought on by her attendance on her two sick daughters, her maid Patty substitutes for her as narrator, providing Cecilia, and thus the reader, with "an account of [their] melancholy days."[41] There are only five letters recorded between November 26, 1706 and January 20, 1707, one of which includes a reproduction of a letter to Sidney from Lady V—, and Sidney resumes her own narrative with a letter that is "[After an interval of six weeks written by Mrs. Arnold in a hand scarce legible]" to say "Restored at length by the mercy of God from the jaws of death! restored to my children, to my dear Cecilia, and just able to tell her with a feeble hand that her Sidney lives."[42] The tenor of her writing changes slightly once she is able to write again, as she does not dwell on the events of her illness, but rather seems to be looking toward her future instead of lingering in the past:

> I am now able, my dear, to reassume that task, once the most pleasing of my life, when health, joy, and prosperity gilded all my days. The scene is now changed; and I think I have nothing the same about me, but the feelings and affections of my mind. You cannot imagine, my Cecilia, how I am altered; you would not now say, that you envied my white and red; you would hardly know me, and it is not to be wondered at, preyed on as I have been for near two months by a slow but tormenting fever. It is with difficulty that I hold my pen, but my willing hand obeys my heart when it would pour itself out to thee.[43]

Patty has previously noted that "the doctor says, [Sidney's] disorder is chiefly on her spirits; and, though it is not dangerous, he is afraid it will be very tedious."[44] Yet, Sidney herself indicates that she has been most affected physically by her illness, rather than having been altered in mind or heart: "I think I have nothing the same about me, but the feelings and affections of my mind." Sheridan again connects the physicality of the body to the immateriality of emotions, so that Sidney's body and her ability to write is impaired by the "disorder … on her spirits," leaving her with a body that can only slowly "reassume that task, once the most pleasing of [her] life, when health, joy, and prosperity

gilded all [her] days." The act of writing connects pleasure, an affective state, to physical well-being in the past, while "a willing hand" is left by the ravages of illness, with "difficulty," to follow the dictates of her "heart when it would pour itself out" in the present. The gilding has been tarnished, and Sidney is now "altered" over time, such that she can only look to a future when she is recovered from "a languishing bed of sickness."[45] That illness has left a void, only partially filled by Patty, into which Sidney cannot relate the events of her days, nor the state of mind in which she has suffered, as she had during her past episode of ill health.

In contrast to the illnesses that cause Sidney's inability to correspond, the remaining instances in which Sidney is unable to write—as opposed to having portions of her writings redacted, as the editorial intrusion above notes, to which I will return—are evidence of her agitated emotional state. On May 15, 1706, "*Mrs. Arnold's maid Patty continues the journal*" after Mr. Arnold has a riding accident and is dying, because "My poor dear lady is in such trouble, she has not the heart to write, nor scarcely to do any thing."[46] Patty and her brother, Dr. Main, relate the particulars of Arnold's incident and the process of his passing; Patty in particular dwells on Sidney's agitation while sitting with her dying husband, which manifests in fits of tears: "I could hear her bursting into tears as soon as she was without side the door; then she would come in again, and sit by him, till her heart was again so full, she was forced to go out to give it vent."[47] Sidney, when reading over what Patty has written in the space of time in which she could not, "shed so many tears … that the paper was quite wet" when she returns it to the maid to be posted.[48] When she is finally able to resume the "melancholy narrative," Sidney explains to Cecilia that "for the first time, I have taken a pen in my hand for more than two

months; but my eyes are much better."[49] Though Sheridan has mistaken her own dating here (Sidney's last entry is on May 12, before continuing on June 20, a time of only slightly more than one month), she ties the capacity to write to the emotional state of her protagonist once again, specifically with tear-filled eyes. For Sidney to say that she is now writing because her "eyes are much better," in the absence of any explanation of a malady of her own other than her grief over Arnold's death, suggests that it has been the tears she has shed that have obstructed her ability to see, and therefore write. Grosz notes that the sexed body carries with it specific connotations in terms of the bodily fluids that emerge from it, and tears represent a "cleansing and purifying," so that Sidney's experience of such overwhelming emotion producing tears allows her to wash away what she felt in the past, and now feels well enough to write again in her present.[50]

Sheridan simultaneously constructs a space of reading for Sidney, as she reads over the diurnal history Patty and Dr. Main have been recording in her place and experiences the affect of the events a second time as she reads. Though she is not reading her own writing, the episode has the power to bring her to tears as she is no doubt remembering her own feelings while she studies the portrayal of herself which Patty has completed. Marta Kvande has argued that Patty's substitution for Sidney upsets the privacy of Sidney's letters in being an exchange between intimate friends, and that Patty can express feelings that Sidney does not allow herself to write, I point with which I concur.[51] The distancing of Sidney's writing as replaced, even temporarily by Patty, doubles the affective nature of the events, as Sidney experiences emotions, then peruses them as they have been captured by another, a multiplication of feeling and temporality that is reminiscent of the manner in which Pamela intends to read her own journals in

Richardson's earlier novel. But rather than effecting the lemniscate of reading and re-reading in the manner constructed by *Pamela*, in this episode, Sidney stands in for the novel reader: she does not intend to examine her own writings repeatedly, but instead only verifies the report of another writer before authorizing the dispatch of those writings in her place and sending them to their intended recipient. Patty-as-writer in this novel is the equivalent of Mrs. Benson writing in place of the titular Euphemia in Charlotte Lennox's 1790 novel, which I examine in my next chapter;[52] though Patty is not Sidney, she functions as narrative placeholder, filling the gap of time in which Sidney cannot write because of the affects, both physical and mental, overwhelming her. As such, Patty-as-writer serves as the embodiment of pathetic temporality: her writing is the effect of emotion obscuring Sidney's ability to write over time.

Sheridan utilizes this substitute narrator in order to bring the physical expression of her emotions close to the surface of the writing, while also distancing the reader from those emotions. Because affect occurs between things and people, in distancing Sidney from her original feeling, then allowing her to read about the effect her emotion has on Patty, Sheridan has demonstrated the potential for affect to occur. She has also decreased the power of that affect, since a removal from the recording of the affective event could also lessens the efficacy of the eventual effects of reading.[53] That distancing simulates the effects of temporality. The abrupt end of a narrative can have the same impact, as Sheridan demonstrates by suspending Sidney's writing just as she discovers that her second marriage is bigamous, writing, "Adieu, my Cecilia, adieu; nothing but my death should close such a scene as this."[54] Given that the conclusion of the novel is constructed as an editorial intrusion, with a denouement composed by Cecilia sandwiched between

notations by the unknown gentleman, it seems almost as if Sidney does die here—or at least her potential for writing perishes as it "should." The episode that concludes Sidney's writing is fraught, and, as the gentleman tells his reader, a truncated expression of affect: "Here, to the editor's great disappointment, Mrs. Arnold's interesting story broke off … But as this seemed to be one of the most affecting periods of her life, his curiosity induced him to enquire of the gentleman from whom he had received those papers" if he knew anything more.[55]

Sheridan has her protagonist *end* in *medias res* here, a reversal from the usual beginning in the middle which propels a narrative. The reader is left with the voices of the editor and "CECILIA'S NARRATIVE, &c. BEING A SUPPLEMENT TO Mrs. ARNOLD'S JOURNAL," a supplement that is not nearly so "affecting" in tone as Sidney's final words.[56] The sharp curtailing of Sidney's voice and its replacement with the much less emotional tenor of Cecilia's does not equal the affective substitution that Patty-as-writer performs in the earlier journal entries. Instead of conveying a similar, though distanced, element in her voice, Cecilia restricts and rejects the affective nature of her narrative, attempting to portray an objective stance to her account, one that purports to view events from a distance, despite Cecilia's current spatial proximity to Sidney. Sheridan constructs Cecilia as though the character must feel obligated to erase as much emotion from, and to be as perfunctory about, Sidney's story as possible, "after the receipt of [Sidney's] last journal, the melancholy close of which had exceedingly terrified and afflicted" her.[57] In this way, Sidney herself does not expire and is confined instead, becoming "settled in her quiet retreat in the country," her continuing story only heard through a translation that strips it of its affective value.[58] It is no wonder, then, that

Sheridan has her editor conclude that he is, "to his great mortification, compelled to offer this fragment" only;[59] Sidney's confinement through Cecilia's narrative disintegrates both her voice and the novel's epistolary structure.[60]

The restriction of Sidney's epistolary voice is not the only confinement to appear in the novel, though the term itself is used to convey a gendered physical state, rather than imprisonment. When Sidney succumbs to illness after tending her daughters, Sheridan uses the variants "confined" and "confinement" four times within the space of eight brief letters over five pages to describe Sidney's limited ability to both write and leave her bed.[61] But, more significantly, "confinement" refers to the condition of child-birth in the eighteenth century, and Sheridan's usage of the term in relation to two women who give birth in the novel has specific connotations on the plotting of events.[62] Neither of these women is Sidney; despite her having been "confined" twice during the course of the novel, Sidney's pregnancies are dismissed as having "nothing material" to do with the narrative, as the editorial intrusion I mention above alludes. I will return to Sidney's absent pregnancies in a moment, but first, I wish to examine the pregnancy of the other Mrs. Arnold, Sidney's husband's sister-in-law, and that of Miss Burchell. Both signify a state of waiting, a period in which life continues, but its particulars are in many ways suspended. On November 20, 1703, Sidney writes that "the widow of Mr. Arnold's brother is found to be with child," a circumstance that endangers her husband's inheritance.[63] Mr. and Mrs. Arnold had been living apart at the time of his death, and "[t]he lady pretends that she was not conscious of [her state] herself till within this fortnight; yet her husband has been dead four months."[64] Despite the suspicion surrounding her conception, the child has the potential to disinherit Sidney's husband,

even with suspect paternity, because "[i]f this child should make its appearance in the world time enough to prove the possibility of its being the offspring of the late Mr. Arnold … it must be considered by the law as his heir."[65] When she is born, Sidney writes on May 6, 1704, "upon an exact calculation, this little girl has made her appearance just twelve days later than she ought to have done, to prove her legitimacy."[66] Because "some physicians, who have been consulted on the occasion … declare they have know instances of children being born, even so long after the stated time allotted by nature for their coming into life," the Arnolds are embroiled in a lawsuit over Mr. Arnold's patrimony, which is not settled until December 1705.[67]

It is not just the timing of the birth that matters, however, as Sheridan specifically connects temporality with pregnancy in the body of the child: "within this fortnight," "four months," "time enough to prove," "exact calculation," "time allotted by nature." This period of uncertainty is represented in the body of the widow Arnold, whose conception and gestation produce another material body that impedes the Arnolds' peaceful settlement in life, though that peace is disturbed by other events (Mr. Arnold's adultery being the most prominent, as well as the Arnolds' move from London to the country, and the birth of their two daughters). The child's eventual designation as the legal Arnold heiress is a small, but significant piece of the narrative that leads Sidney to poverty and her own physical debility over time, reducing the Arnolds' circumstances by nearly one thousand pounds a year when the estate was already taxed by Mr. Arnold's poor choices.[68] Similarly, the status of Miss Burchell as pregnant with Faulkland's child positions both mother and child as roadblocks to Sidney's potential happiness almost from the beginning of the novel. Their bodies act as pre-existing conditions working as

detriments to Sidney's union with Faulkland throughout the entire text, given that Faulkland's intercourse with Miss Burchell occurs prior to his meeting Sidney, and it is only the false assumption of Miss Burchell/Mrs. Faulkland's death that allows Faulkland to pressure Sidney into wedding him, at great cost to them both, as I have noted above.

Yet, for as much as Sidney dwells on Miss Burchell's and the widow Arnold's pregnancies, devoting space to either a brief mention or a long narrative about one or the other of them in fifteen of the twenty-five letters she writes between November 2, 1703 and July 1, 1705, the only mentions of her own pregnancies are the brief annotations of editorial intrusion. The first, detailed at the beginning of this section, appears after May 20, 1704, while the second appears two pages later following the entry from October 7 of the same year, stating:

> *[Here ensues another interval of nine months, in which nothing particular is related, but that Mrs. Arnold became a mother to a second child. This last circumstance, with a few others preceding and succeeding that event, are related in the Journal by her maid Patty; after which Mrs. Arnold herself proceeds.]*[69]

Since they are italicized, as all of the editor's interjections are, they would seem to suggest an emphasis on the information contained within. Yet, these particular editorial comments elide Sidney's own bodily changes, calling the events that might be documented during these spaces of time "nothing material" and "nothing particular," despite the fact that, as Mary Terrall has argued, conception and gestation were considered very material processes in the eighteenth century, melding both the physical and the mental in order to produce healthy offspring.[70] The implication that the birth of a child signifies "nothing particular" is incongruous with the fact that the first editor's interjection marks the third birth that occurs over a span of seven months appearing over six pages of writing. The very material products of her own marriage, Sidney's children

are rather conspicuously absent; as the ultimate sufferers when Mr. Arnold's inheritance is revoked, they are the counterpoints to their cousin, the daughter of the widow Arnold. Even the fact that Patty substitutes for Sidney in this second excerpted section of the journal is inconsistent with the later instances in which Patty's writing replaces Sidney's. It is almost as though Sidney's own "confinements," when not caused by illness, are immaterial to the plot, and therefore, serve as markers of temporality only in the very fact of their absences. Her first and her second, inserted into the narrative two weeks after the initial pregnancy, serve as voids of temporality, where the novel notes that time has passed, but where little exists to constitute it as such: only the editor's testimony and the subsequent though minimal presence of two more bodies serve to denote the passage of a total of thirteen months. This absence of Sidney as existing as a biologically female body suggests that for Sheridan's protagonist, the body itself is not important. If the body is gendered female by pregnancy, Sheridan rejects that sexing for Sidney and instead, locates Sidney's power in her writing and her affect as described through composition. While Sheridan provides abundant proof that Sidney affects and can be affected in and through time, ultimately it is the contrast in the performance of the connections of affect, the body, and time in Sidney as opposed to her most prominent male character Faulkland—the only male character to contribute substantial amounts of letter-writing in the text, I should note—that illustrates Sheridan's overarching argument that too much emotion can be debilitating. In the following section, I demonstrate how Sidney's body as a constructor of semiotic meaning in regards to her state of mind is portrayed in a fashion that highlights the overly meaningful presentation of Faulkland's body as Sheridan

subverts a dichotomy that privileges male over female in terms of connections between the mind and body.

"Nothing is so conducive to the body's health, as the mind's being at ease": illness and the mind/body dichotomy

As demonstrated by Sidney's illness following the nursing of her children, often what begins as mental pain in Sheridan's text descends into physical infirmity, illustrating the intricately connected nature of the suffering mind and body. Because of the epistolary structure of the novel, illness can be described by a letter-writer who conveys his or her own narrative to the reader, giving the sufferer the chance to produce his or her own pain in words, performing through language bodily materiality even as the writer feels or remembers it, though Sidney does not generally do so. These generic conventions allow for the overlap of present writing with past experience, so that present feelings may be conveyed through a tale of an event that has gone by. Altman suggests that epistolarity, where "both time lags and absence play such a large role, lends itself to the temporal ambiguity whereby past is taken for present."[71] As such, Sidney's record of her daily life is constructed for the most part through her narrative of the immediate past, with the occasion interjection of her current feelings or narration of her mood. The notation she makes on December 23, 1705 as she describes her anxieties over her reconciliation with Mr. Arnold highlights her state of mind as she writes, as well as her hopes for her future prospects: "With a heart elated with pleasure, my dear Cecilia, I have scribbled over the occurrences of this morning. God grant I may be able to close my journal of today with the happy wished-for event!"[72] That event is the meeting between herself and her husband, arranged by Lord and Lady V—, which she anticipates with

ambivalent emotions while hearing about the interview between Mr. Arnold and her benefactors. "Though I had shed many tears, whilst lady V— was describing Mr. Arnold's behaviour at the beginning of her discourse," Sidney tells Cecilia, "I heard this latter part of her account with a composed attention."[73] Her narration admits to her emotional turmoil in a somewhat subdued manner, remarking on her tears quickly before claiming to have resumed a calm stance, but her confession that in the expectation of seeing her husband in person later that same day, she reacts with much more confusion, manifesting in physical symptoms:

> You never, my Cecilia, experienced such a situation as mine, and therefore can have no idea of what I felt, in expectation of seeing the person, whose presence I most ardently wished for, and yet was afraid of the interview. My fears were not on my own account: conscious as I was of my innocence, I had no apprehension on that head: but I could not bear the thoughts of beholding poor Mr. Arnold, in the state of humiliation in which I supposed I should find him. I wished the first encounter of our eyes over; and as the appointed hour approached, my anxiety increased: I was faint, and seized with universal tremors. My mother did all she could to encourage me, and a little before five o'clock, I was put into a chair, and carried to Lord V—'s house.
>
> My lady met me on the stairs; I could scarce breathe. She carried me into her dressing-room, and made me sit down till I recovered a little; she was affected herself, but endeavored to raise my spirits. I wish, said she, smiling, you had been in my lord's hands, he would have prepared you better than lady Bidulph has for this meeting; he has been trying to make Mr. Arnold drunk, in order to give him courage, he says, to face you. Poor man, he could scarcely credit me when I told him you were to come this evening. She proposed my taking a few drops, which I agreed to; and bidding me pluck up my spirits, said she would send Mr. Arnold to me.[74]

Sidney is so greatly affected by her "anxiety" in her trepidation over being physically in the same space as her husband, as "the first encounter of our eyes" implies, that she is unable to control her body. Her faintness, shaking, and breathlessness seem to indicate an involuntary reaction by her autonomic nervous system, perhaps the deepest nature of an affect available to the human body.[75] Sidney's claim of having been "put into a chair"

and being "carried into her dressing-room" by Lady V— point to a bodily lassitude resulting from her unsettled mind.

In addition, the idea that Sidney could "pluck up [her] spirits" contains the implication that "spirits" can be clasped and lifted, ascribing a materiality to a mental state. Just as Mr. Arnold appears to require the courage found in a bottle, she, too, agrees to "taking a few drops"; whether those drops are of liquor, the British cure-all of tea, or some kind of tonic, Sheridan does not specify. The fact that Sidney requires the application of an external aid to soothe her emotions suggests that some physical ailments, even—and perhaps most particularly—those originating in affects on the mind, cannot always be moderated by the alleviation of those affects, thus more firmly fusing mind and body. As such, the physical body can produce meaning without words, as Sidney notes, writing, "He approached me speechless; my arms were extended to receive him; he fell into them; we neither of us spoke; there was no language but tears, which we both shed plentifully."[76] Though Sidney—and, more specifically, Sheridan—must use the written word to convey the scene to her—their—reader, the implication is that tears need no foundation in vernacular; instead, they function as semiotic surrogates for the affect that is determined by the reader. For and over whom Sidney and Mr. Arnold each cry, we cannot know. We can only assume the intent and origin of those tears.

Similarly, as Sidney writes to Cecilia, she is only able to convey her own interpretations of the behavior of those around her. She often remarks on her brother's disposition, commenting, "So much for Sir George's tenderness," when he denigrates Mr. Arnold rather than comforting Sidney, and later, "I saw Sir George's resentment was roused to the highest pitch; his eyes sparkled with indignation, and his whole frame

seemed agitated," when he claims to desire to defend her honor, and by extension that of the entire family, following Mr. Arnold's banishment of her.[77] In these cases, Sidney deduces Sir George's mood through his physical display. Eve Kosofsky Sedgewick and Adam Frank suggest that affect exchanged through embodied interaction—when people affect people through visual cues—is essentially an effect of body language, particularly of facial manipulations.[78] Therefore, just as the weeping she and Mr. Arnold perform at their reunion signifies language in that particular situation, so too do Sir George's flashing eyes and "agitated" frame convey meaning which is only available to Cecilia and the novel reader second-hand. Yet, Sir George's role as rhetorician is more limited than that of Faulkland. As the focus of Sidney's first and last romantic desires, Faulkland serves to emphasize her own interpretive abilities, concentrating the amalgam of mind and body through her engagement with his actions and words. Sheridan constructs Faulkland in the role of "the one who got away," or, perhaps more precisely, "the rake in want of reforming"; he remains a counterpoint to Sidney throughout the novel.

Early in the text when Sidney feels poorly before their engagement is broken off, he is worried about her, so much so that she attempts to assuage his fear: "He appeared so anxious and unhappy about my indisposition, that I affected to make as light of it as possible; though indeed I find myself very out of order. With what a kind sorrow did he observe my looks; sighs now-and-then stole from him, as his eyes were fixed on my face."[79] Despite his solicitude, however, Sidney grows more ill, and once her mother discovers his liaison with Miss Burchell, Lady Bidulph dismisses him, ending Sidney's engagement to him. As she describes the confrontation to Sidney after she is recovering from her illness, she tells Sidney that "He said some frantic things (for the man seems of

a violent temper)," enforcing a notion that Mr. Faulkland, whom Sidney has heard described as having "no fault … but a violence of temper when provoked," is unable to maintain a balance between his reason and his passions.[80] Kathleen M. Oliver has suggested that Faulkland's behavior and susceptibility to love for Sidney place him within the realm of the feminine, rather than in the masculine. This sort of behavior in male characters is not unusual in eighteenth-century texts, and is often valorized as performing a female fantasy, Oliver argues, but Faulkland performs it incorrectly: "While he indeed displays the sensitivity and devotion necessary in a feminized hero, his feminization expresses itself less through the display of positive feminine attributes and fine feminine feelings and more through negative feminine experiences and emotions: he is manipulated, victimized, silenced, and degraded; he is hysterical and histrionic."[81] His behavior, when his passions overthrow his reason, allows for the ambiguity of a man who suffers from the effects of his loss of good sense, portraying him as weak and easily manipulated, and who becomes ill when his passions are overheated. Just as Behn and Haywood created male characters who rage about love in correspondence in their earlier epistolary fiction, Sheridan highlights her tragic hero's propensity for bombastic affective language through the use of Faulkland's own writing, allowing his own words to act as proxy when he is away from Sidney.

The contribution of Faulkland's voice to the novel when Sir George receives a letter from Faulkland that explains his supposed elopement with Mr. Arnold's mistress, which Sidney then transcribes, further cements the correlation between mind and body that Sheridan is at pains to create throughout her text: Faulkland's confession of his own physical state as being a consequence of both his actions and his mental well-being is

more powerful when conveyed through his own words, though not his own hand. Though Helen Deutsch argues that the male body has become invisible, such that it is the body looked *through*, not looked *at* as female bodies are, when the male author writes about his physical self, he fashions a body through "imaginative objectification."[82] Faulkland's focus on his own body as text when he writes to Sir George requires that his body become an object for display, particularly after George shares Faulkland's letter with Sidney—who then shares it with Cecilia. Sidney's physical writing of the letter overrides Faulkland's embodied contributions here, given that the text is constructed so that Sidney informs Cecilia that she has "sat me down to give you a copy of it," when she is able to "scribble on as fast I can, while I have no interruption."[83] Her re-writing of Faulkland's words reverses his own control over his writing and reinscribes his body as though it is an object to be examined—looked at—rather than the object through which the reader sees.

Over the course of two long packets, consisting of nearly seventy pages of the novel, Faulkland offers a narrative, describing his kidnapping and subsequent settlement of Mr. Arnold's mistress, Mrs. Gerrarde, into marriage with his valet.[84] Dated from Boulougne, France on November 25, 1705, the first part of Faulkland's journal-letter arrives in Sidney's hands on December 1; Sidney transcribes the second half, which includes a dating of December 6 and the information of Faulkland's having been too ill to write for at least five days during the interval, on December 16.[85] In the first packet, Faulkland indicates that his mental agitation affects his ability to rest, resulting in material consequences: "I am fatigued with writing so long a letter—I feel my disorder increase upon me."[86] That "disorder" has its origins in Faulkland's reaction to the news that Sidney had been exiled by her husband due to Mrs. Gerrarde's manipulations:

> I own to you, Sir George, in the first motions of my *rage*, I could have stabbed Arnold, Mrs. Gerrarde, and myself; but my lord V— calmed my *transports*, by telling me that it was your sister's earnest request that this detestable secret should be kept from my knowledge; and that lady V—, who had intrusted him with it, would never forgive him, if she knew he had divulged it. This reflection brought me *back to my senses*, and I *burned with impatience* to execute my first plan, which Mrs. Gerrarde's repeated crimes now called upon me to accelerate.[87]

Faulkland demonstrates the ability of the mind to regulate the body, once reason is allowed to unite with passion; the language he uses: "rage," "transports," "burned," all indicate a heightened sense of feeling, of being affected in such a way as to forget to think. Those "transports," though Faulkland was brought "back to [his] senses," grow as he contemplates his actions and result in his abduction of Mrs. Gerrarde. Once they are in France, he takes the time to write this letter to Sir George, telling him that "I had been ruminating on my project all the way as I rode. When we arrived in Boulogne, I found myself a little out of order, having caught cold; and … I was really somewhat feverish."[88] This illness gives him the time and space to reflect on and transcribe the events of his adventure; it in fact seems almost to necessitate Faulkland's composition, as he writes, "Not well, not sick enough to go to bed, I threw myself however down on it; and after revolving in my mind all the occurrences of the three or four past days, I started up again, sat down to the desk, and have given you, my Bidulph, a faithful narrative of my proceedings down to the present time, being November 25, eight o'clock in the evening."[89] The memory of the recent past drives Faulkland's writing, compelling him to record the events that had been "revolving in [his] mind." Yet, simultaneously, Sheridan indicates that Faulkland's "ruminating" might have contributed to his poor health; with the juxtaposition of his ruminating ride with his feeling out of order, she firmly connects his aroused, enraged mental state to his physical well-being—or lack thereof—indicating a change through time.

Faulkland does in fact fall more seriously ill, and, bestowing on him a supreme awareness of self, Sheridan allows Faulkland to diagnose the signs and symptoms of his own disorder: when his mind and body are misaligned, and his sense of affect is dominated by passion more than reason, he is afflicted. He tells Sir George in the second packet that:

> Nothing is more conducive to the body's health, as the mind's being at ease. I have proved the truth of this observation; my soul had been racked with suspence and uncertainty during my illness; the uneasy state of my mind increased my disorder; the disorder itself had chiefly given rise to my apprehensions, as pain and sickness are naturally accompanied with a gloominess of thought. Thus the cause and its effects were united in mutual league against me, and reciprocally assisted each other to plague and torment me.[90]

Faulkland explicitly links mind and body here, positioned by Sheridan to attest to "the truth of this observation" in his own words. Portraying the looping of affective feedback, like Pamela's reading and rereading of her own letters, Sheridan's antihero conveys the lemniscate effect of the physical and mental in concomitant interaction, each heightening the other to create a downward spiral of misery and pain. He is an example of what Steven Ahern states is the trap of sensibility in the eighteenth century: "To possess an exquisite sensibility is as much to have a disease, a disorder of the body, as it is to have a capacity for joyful bliss. The melancholic man or woman of feeling shares with the pining lover of amatory fiction a mode of being that is characterized by a state of morose morbidity and punctuated by moments of hysteric paralysis."[91] To be affected can be powerful, as Michael Hardt argues; but, as Sheridan's text illustrates, it can also be detrimental when overindulged and processed without the corresponding reason to control it, as the loss of emotional control can result in a loss of autonomy.[92]

Faulkland's mental state continues to affect his health at the end of the novel, when he comes to Sidney, confesses that he has killed both his wife and her lover, and

begs her to marry him, now that they are finally both free. Sidney narrates the tale of her encounter with him when he stops to see her before he flees to the continent, the chosen place of exile for murders: "He drew his sword like a *madman*, and with a *dreadful imprecation*, which made me shudder, swore that if I did not that minute, promise to bear him company in his flight, he would *plunge it into his breast*, and die before my eyes."[93] Faulkland seems intent on dying if she refuses to marry him, as later when Sir George and Sidney's kinsman Mr. Warner visits him in his hiding place, he proclaims that Sidney will never agree: "*Yield*, he repeated, no, no, Sir George, she has a stubborn heart. I once thought it otherwise; but it is turned to stone, nothing but my death will satisfy her, and she *shall* be satisfied."[94] Later, Sidney recounts her reaction to him when she arrives for their wedding: "I saw him an exile, likely to be deprived of a notable fortune, his *heart pierced* with remorse for an involuntary crime. I saw too that he loved me; loved me with a *fervent and unconquerable passion*. Of this, in *the anguish of his soul*, at a time when he was wrought up to *phrenzy*, he had given but too strong demonstration."[95] In each instance, Faulkland's behavior is overwrought, even to the point of "phrenzy," where he is physically uncontrollable, prepared to act drastically and kill himself due to the force of his passion. His temper, as Sir George earlier told Sidney, is indeed violent, even when he threatens only himself. He is eventually brought to calm: "I thought indeed he appeared a little constrained, and that he seemed to keep a constant guard over himself, lest he should betray any symptom of too much heated imagination: but my kinsman afterwards observed to me, that this denoted nothing more than a consciousness in Mr. Faulkland of the unhappy wandering that had before so much alarmed us all."[96] Unable to reconcile the memories of what happiness he anticipated with Sidney to his own present

despair, Faulkland returns again and again to a mental state in which the only possibility is an optimistic future.

In his insistence that Sidney marry him, Faulkland seems determined to relive and revise the past, despite the intervening years. His emotional attachment to Sidney has remained unchanged, and he assumes that now that the previous barriers to their union are eliminated, they can and should be wed. Sheridan's investigation of morality, which Margaret Anne Doody suggests is the underlying theme of the novel, continues to haunt both Faulkland and Sidney. Where Lady Bidulph had stood as a testament to the pain of past relationships while she lived, advising Sidney against marriage to a rake, now Faulkland's own behavior prevents Sidney from accepting him gladly. "Out of the past," Doody writes, "came the self-consciousness of the characters about right and wrong, fear of old failure, and caution about self-denying decisions that lead to misery, as well as a continuing penchant for self-denial. The past repeats itself with every attempt to escape it."[97] Past actions and affect have stuck to both Sidney and Faulkland, and are now re-writing themselves onto their own present bodies, preventing the possibility of a happy future, as Sidney highlights in stating, "I saw him an exile, likely to be deprived of a notable fortune." Faulkland's repeated threats of self-destruction emphasize that his future can only exist when Sidney is married to him. Ending his own life once he learns that his wife is actually alive, and he has become a bigamist—and more importantly, that Sidney will never be his—Faulkland emphasizes the association of mind and body. "His death was natural," Cecilia notes in her narration at the end of the novel; yet, Sir George's account of Faulkland's demise indicates that after leaving him one night, George is alerted that "Mr. Faulkland was found dead in his bed" the next morning,

though "[t]here were no symptoms discovered on the body that could let us into the occasion of his death."[98] Faulkland seems, then, to have willed himself to death overnight. His circumstances changed so drastically and so suddenly that — in either an immense loss of control of his sensibility such that his affect destroys his body or, quite possibly, a firm, heavily controlled act of autonomy of will over physicality—he can no longer go on living, his past so strongly overwhelming his present that his future ceases to exist.

"It may serve for an example": questioning gender politics in the epistolary novel

Sheridan's novel, for all its wallowing in sentimentality and a tear-jerking plot, figures the eighteenth-century female body as an agent which is dynamically engaged in its own temporality in comparison to a male body that remains mired in a past to which it can never return. Much as Richardson's heroine writes herself into being, becoming, as Nancy Armstrong suggests, a corpus of language, Sheridan's protagonist takes another step towards constructing her own materiality through the process of correspondence.[99] Significantly, both novels that I have examined in depth thus far have concentrated their narratives through the pens of a single writer (Sheridan's very brief uses of a surrogate aside). As such, Richardson and Sheridan have linked the letter-writing heroine's pathetic temporality to her own writing exclusively. Though both intersperse their own compositions with the inscriptions of other characters' missives, the very fact that both Pamela and Sidney re-write those supplemental epistles diminishes the agency of those who wrote them. Instead, the reinscription forces the interspersed writing to fulfill the position of narrative devices, providing information and plot twists, rather than standing

in for the self-writing, and thus the interiority, of the characters who write the original letters. The subsequent novels I analyze will include an actual exchange of correspondence between two or more writers, all of whom provide missives that are not copied, and instead function as integral parts of the epistolary economy being worked out in imitation of real life.

Before I leave *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph* in the past, however, I want to suggest that the same type of interrogations of gender, gender performances both in epistolary form and in real life, and the role of sensibility as the display of pathetic temporality in which Sheridan is engaged throughout the novel will in fact appear in later texts, including those to follow here. Though the letter is an essentially embodied product, as Cook has argued, the genre is not merely concerned with the female body only. Sheridan's emphasis on the overly affective nature of Faulkland's actions, eventually leading to his death, suggests that if the female body is constructed as overly emotional and lacking in rationality, there remains potential for such behavior among the male bodies engaging in society, as well. Sex and gender do not preclude the possibility of requiring censure, and though the passage of time can result in changes in either body or mind, what has happened in the past can always affect bodies in the present and the future. Sheridan begins her protagonist's narrative just after a statement that ties the affective nature of temporality to the body: "The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong."[100] In choosing this notion, one the unites physicality with temporality without any designation of gender or sex, Sheridan sets the stage for her reversal of essentialist assumptions in terms of the patriarchal primacy of mind to body, and male to female. When Sidney lives despite the trials of sensibility she must undergo, culminating in her

participation in a bigamous marriage, while Faulkland dies, seemingly due to his surrender to his passions and his loss of hope in a future, Sheridan overturns the usual sentimental tropes portrayed in eighteenth-century literature. Those future authors who follow her will explore and attempt to subvert similar ideas within various patriarchal structures of society, on British shores and beyond.

CHAPTER 3

EMPIRE OF HEARTS: PATHETIC TEMPORALITY IN THE TRANSATLANTIC EPISTOLARY NOVELS OF FRANCES BROOKE AND CHARLOTT LENNOX

Charlotte Lennox's 1790 novel *Euphemia* opens with a letter from Maria Harley, who has just returned to her uncle's country manor in England from an exilic journey in France, to her friend Euphemia Neville, who is residing in London waiting for her new husband to receive orders to deploy to New York colony.[1] Maria, despite the relative ease of correspondence between France and England, has only just learned of Euphemia's changed circumstances:

> One of the *greatest pleasures* I proposed to myself, on my return to England, was to meet my *dear* Euphemia; to bind, if possible, in faster bands, that *tender friendship* which has united us from our earliest years; to live in *sweet society* together: to *suffer* only short absences; rendered tolerable by frequent letters, and the *dear hope* of meeting soon again. But how are these expectations *destroyed*! You are going to leave me; and, too probably, *for ever*. Long tracts of land, and an immeasurable ocean, will soon divide us. I shall hear from you once or twice in a year, perhaps: my *dear* Euphemia will be lost to me; and all that now remains of that friendship, which was *the pride and happiness of my life*, will be the *sad remembrance of a good I once enjoyed*, but which is *fled for ever*![2]

Wrapped in the language of sensibility—"pleasures," "my dear Euphemia," "tender friendship," "sweet society," "sad remembrance of a good I once enjoyed," "fled for ever"—are the markers of Maria's temporal moment. What she "proposed" while in France "was to meet," "to bind," "to live," and "to suffer" with her friend when she came home in the future; those wishes have been shattered, however, now that future has

become her present. Euphemia's new connections and responsibilities foreclose any possibility of a permanent "sweet society together" with Maria, and she must instead be relegated to a future distance from Euphemia that cannot be bridged easily: "frequent letters" will become correspondence only "once or twice in a year." Lennox's commencement *in media res* serves not only to establish the identities of the letter-writers but also to suggest movement and instability in the epistolary economy, even beyond the norm for a separation within England. Both Maria and Euphemia have lives and narratives that occur before Letter I; these characters experience, and therefore write about, their own temporalities and have an emotional connection that dates to prior to the novel reader's introduction to them. Their present moments become the extradiegetic reader's present moment, aligning the text's overarching temporality with the time of the initial act of writing. The history of the women's relationship is only mentioned in hints; it is not relevant to the continuing narrative. Instead, Maria's words suggest the present moment is burdened with an understanding of the past and a dread of the future—what Janet Altman describes as the "pivotal present."[3]

These three sentences, written by a Maria overwhelmed with disappointment, encapsulate what is, at its core, the crux of the transatlantic nature of two eighteenth-century epistolary novels: *Euphemia* and its predecessor, Frances Brooke's *The History of Emily Montague* (1769).[4] Whereas communication between individuals who are in the same country—even the same general realm of influence, as Europe and Britain tended to be at the time—is relatively easy, as demonstrated in both *Pamela* and *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph*, the insertion of the Atlantic into the epistolary equation stretches, nearly to the breaking point, the temporalities of correspondence. In both novels I

examine in this chapter, the exchange of letters nationally and across the ocean exhibit differing levels of affect over and through time, depending on the distance those letters must travel in order to connect their writers and reader. Crucially, as opposed to the novels I have already considered in this project, the movement of letters is multi-directional; that is, there is more than one writer whose letters appear in significant numbers, rather than a narrative consisting of a single writer's product. The letters in *Euphemia* traverse the English countryside, before crossing the Atlantic, and returning, briefly, to cross England again. In Brooke's text, the opening letter is sent just as Edward Rivers is embarking on his voyage, and the majority of the epistolary writing emanates from characters residing in first Canada then later in England when they have all returned from the colony, with a few missives making the westward journey to Canada from England.[5] The ebbs and flows of epistolary communication of these books emphasize the essentially peripatetic nature of eighteenth-century epistolarity, both at home in England and abroad, in novels and in the business and pleasure of real life.

Each of these novels is reflective of the foundational elements that time can provide in the structure of the epistolary novel, and both emphasize the varying temporalities of England and of the colonies, as the physical aspects of the exchange of letters across thousands of miles via ship is contrasted to the relative ease of correspondence between residences in neighboring cities, across counties, or between bedrooms. The addition of the transatlantic element of these novels plays with temporalities between England and the colonies in ways that suggest that the experience of time, and therefore the affect of that time, functions differently in these separate locations. As the focus of Brooke's novel shifts from the instability of courtship in

Canada to the fixed nature of marriage in England, and that of Lennox's novel shifts from the hectic nature of Maria's courtship in England to the fluctuating emotional journey that is Euphemia's sojourn in New York, the authors both use the passage of time within correspondences to create spaces in relationships that stretch over the ocean. While the temporal aspects of *The History of Emily Montague* highlight the ability of the epistolary form to ground letter-readers and -writers in specific locations—here colonial Canada—*Euphemia* instead emphasizes the emotional nature of the separate temporalities created by the separation of letter-writers across continents. Both texts question the foundation of the masculinist pursuits of eighteenth-century imperial projects.

Narrative flow across the ocean

In *Empire of Letters*, Eve Tavor Bannet considers the materiality and culture of transatlantic correspondence in letter writing manuals. Her discussion of the history of exchanging letters of both personal and public concern over the Atlantic suggests that the process was fraught with danger and with emotional excess, as letters could bring news either joyful or melancholy, allow correspondents to experience tidbits of gossip from far away, but there was always the possibility that they might be lost at sea.[6] Despite examining historical examples rather than fictional constructs, Bannet's arguments inform my own discussion of *The History of Emily Montague* and *Euphemia*, whose authors paid close attention to the realism of transatlantic correspondence, including the precise narrative choice to highlight the most important events of their characters' lives. Bannet suggests that realism is crucial in epistolary composition, as well as the fact that travel across thousands of miles of ocean was a lengthy undertaking, even for

government ships. As a simulacrum of real-life correspondence, the epistolary genre lends itself easily to the realism of letter exchange, as is plain in both of these novels. By imitating the reality of transatlantic communication, Brooke and Lennox create the structures of these novels in order to illustrate separate temporalities within different settings when the daily events of their characters' lives are catalogued through the writer's deliberate choice—as are the specific letters that appear in the texts. Including only certain letters in an exchange focuses the extradiagetic readers' attention on the events in those letters while simultaneously stretching the time within and between those letters according to the narrative requirements of the plot.

Several scholars have examined eighteenth-century fiction that engages with an historically distant location, one that allows for the transmission of tales and descriptions of other cultures, as both of these epistolary novels do. Ros Ballaster in *Fabulous Orients* discusses the possibilities for reimagining British fiction through the constructs of the fables and tales imported from the "East"—that is, Turkey and Persia, India, and China—with trade goods and luxury items.[7] She argues that instead of creating "unchanging and repetitive images" of eastern culture as Edward Said suggests in *Orientalism*, the migration of narratives allows, and in fact forces in some respects, readers to be aware of the temporal aspects of those narratives. The written text can thus reinscribe new meanings within the tension of a spatially located image—an idea or a visual representation of the exotic foreign lands in the east—as compared to those tales:

> The temporal dimension of narrative introduces the potential for movement, process, acts of becoming and creation, as opposed to the spatial aspect of representation which apparently reflects, mirrors, or reproduces an already given relation. Scheherazade's tales can 'move' their recipient(s), transport them geographically, psychically, politically into new positions or conditions, or rather leave them in a state of permanent narrative becoming/transformation. Such a

> state is remarkably close to the preferred method of representing European empire itself in this period: excessively mobile (because based on maritime success in the case of England particularly), accretive, and transformative rather than a set of already inscribed precepts inscribed on an alien culture.[8]

That is, temporality can unhinge the stable nature of a narrative, even as that temporality may remain spatially fixed. This instability is precisely how these transatlantic epistolary novels function in terms of opening up new ways of exploring temporality of the North American colonies in the eighteenth century: the exchange of correspondence across the ocean fluctuates temporally, while, even with the spatial movement of characters within either England or the colony abroad, the spatiality of the separate nations remains distant, as each is preserved by either memory or descriptive narrative. Though it may take months for letters to reach their recipients, and a single letter might contain the narrative of several days, weeks, or months, the spatial distance between correspondents is relatively unchanged. Thousands of miles of ocean must be crossed for letters to reach their addressee, while the original writer may begin writing a new letter.

Said argues that time itself can take on metaphorical significance, such that its only meaning lies within the imaginary idea of it, just as the ideas of specific spaces and places function as representations of the cultural significance of those locations. The knowledge of histories—of nations, states, religions, cultures—all originate in the imaginations of those who have written about them; even the meaning inscribed on any given time and place by an historian cannot "totally dissipate the imaginative, quasi-fictional quality one senses lurking in a time very different and distant from our own."[9] That imaginary meaning is amplified by the writing and reading of events and places in both North America and England, through the memory of correspondents and the descriptions of new lands. The transatlantic epistolary novel creates and re-creates

imaginary temporalities via the process of exchanging letters across an ocean, a task that is by nature a lengthy one, serving to emphasize the time between the writing and reading of letters in different spaces. Each letter produces affects in its reader, on whichever side of the Atlantic, in comparison to his or her own surroundings, what is remembered about the originating space of the letters' compositions, and what is transmitted through the rhetorical choices and intentions of the writers. Knowing that the events about which one reads took place at a distance of time—either hours, days, months, or years, depending on the location of the writer and the reader, and whether a letter is read for the first time or re-read for the tenth—aids in structuring the intradiegetic letter-reader's ideas about his or her own position as well as the writer's: "For there is no doubt that imaginative geography and history help the mind to intensify its own sense of itself by dramatizing the distance and difference between what is close to it and what is far away."[10] In reading a letter sent from a correspondent a world away, that distance need not be dramatized; the letter has been, in fact, literally at a distance.

This distance aids in formulating a temporality that is potentially able to break free from the strict interpretation of time and history as based in a sense of European time that revolves around warfare and commerce, Julia Kristeva argues in her consideration of "Women's Time." She categorizes Euro-centric time as linear and masculine, whereas feminine time breaks away from an imagined eternal time that locates Europe—and thus Britain—as the space of history.[11] In this feminine imagined temporal space of history that rejects Euro-centrism is the temporality of the colonial space, in which, as Louis Montrose, Annette Kolodny, and Patricia Parker have all noted, the rhetoric of the discourse surrounding the discovery, exploration, and colonization of North America

genders the land as female, and thus both fertile and exploitable under the rule of Western European nations, including—and perhaps in this case, *especially*—Britain.[12] Sarah M. S. Pearsall also argues that the bodies inhabiting the North American colonies were gendered bodies, establishing hierarchies based on nationality, race, and class within those gendered positions.[13] I would add temporalities to the list of gendered hierarchies in the colonial sphere; if England and Europe are the sites of history, the New World then would be the site of futurity, a place where new temporalities may be born, separate from the historical temporality of the Old World. And since these senses of time are gendered as much as the land itself is, the feminine temporalities of the New World are just as subjected to the violence of warfare and economic conquest.

What complicates this idea of gendered spatial and temporal separation in *The History of Emily Montague* and *Euphemia* is the fact that in both texts, one of the primary letter-writers leaves England, travels to the colonies, and then returns to England to be reunited with the correspondents that were left behind. The journey eastward across the Atlantic marks a potential of cyclical renewal for both the opposing senses of the teleological, masculine temporality of the Old World and the feminine temporality of the New. In the case of *Euphemia*, Euphemia Neville spends much of the first half of the novel in England waiting to leave for New York colony with her husband, before her voice subsumes that of her correspondent, Maria Harley, in the second half of the novel while she is writing from New York, before returning home in the book's final pages. In *The History of Emily Montague*, Colonel Edward Rivers leaves England in order to improve his finances abroad. His voice, as he writes home most often to his sister Lucy, intertwines with that of his friend John Temple, whom he leaves in England, Arabella

Fermor, the daughter of one of Rivers's military acquaintances, and Emily Montague, the woman with whom Rivers falls in love. Several other characters also write letters as part of the narrative, but Rivers, Arabella, and Emily are those whose voices are most prominent. Eventually, Rivers returns home and marries Emily, while Arabella marries her own beau and they join the Riverses in England. Despite being connected to the conquest and occupation of the continent by the British Army, neither of these novels' driving purpose is about the settling of the colonies in North America; instead, the characters' residences in the colonies are relatively short. The Nevilles reside in New York at various outposts along the semi-settled frontier for twelve years. Rivers travels to and returns from Canada within the space of a year. The premise in both novels is that the protagonists (Rivers and, through her husband, Euphemia) cannot subsist in England on their current incomes, at least not at the level to which they are accustomed—Rivers because he refuses to support his mother in any manner that is below that which she lived with her husband and the Nevilles because Mr. Neville has lived in a manner that has disgusted his uncle, whose heir he is and who provides him income—yet both eventually return for sentimental reasons.[14] Emotional attachments, therefore, trump monetary motivations. Letters, and particularly the pace of their exchange, are the vehicle through which these emotions are expressed, and expressed through and in time, though in a very different manner in *The History of Emily Montague* than in *Euphemia.*

Despite—or rather because of—the differences between the novels, both can illuminate the ways in which the epistolary serves to fashion affect through temporality. Written after, though set before *The History of Emily Montague*, Lennox's 1790 *Euphemia* differs from Brooke's work in several ways, not least of which is the location

of her titular characters and the number of narrative voices. Brooke's text involves the interweaving of multiple voices, expounding on a multitude of topics, and highlights the material process of exchanging correspondence across the Atlantic. The very expansiveness of Brooke's letter-writing cast opens temporalities in ways that Lennox closes and must renegotiate through the limitation of voices to her two main protagonists: *Euphemia*'s journal-like correspondence that contains years-long gaps is forced by the nature of the narrative continuity to collapse and to reimagine the passage of time through an expression of novelistic interiority, so commonly a feature of the eighteenth-century novel, in ways that the continual, quick composition of anecdotal missives cannot. Equally striking is the ability of the fast-paced flurry of letters in *The History of Emily Montague* to capture a particular moment in colonial history, one that, as editor Mary Jane Edwards notes, resonated with contemporary readers.[15] Though Brooke's novel is not as engaged with the deep, emotional ties between its letter-writers as Lennox's text is, it is, I think, important to examine *The History of Emily Montague* as a lens through which to understand how the later *Euphemia* is able to utilize its transatlantic setting to expand upon the type of temporality constructed prior to its publication.

"Gone to people the wilds of America:" Brooke's complex novelistic temporalities

In a letter dated November 23, *The History of Emily Montague*'s most prolific correspondent, Arabella Fermor, writes to her friend Lucy Rivers in London:

> I have been seeing the last ship go out of the port, Lucy; you have no notion of what a melancholy sight it is: we are now left to ourselves, and shut up from all the world for the winter: somehow we seem so forsaken, so cut off from the rest of human kind, I cannot bear the idea: I sent a thousand sighs and a thousand tender wishes to dear England, which I never loved so much as at this moment.

> Do you know, my dear, I could cry if I was not ashamed? I shall not absolutely be in spirits again this week.
>
> 'Tis the first time I have felt any thing like bad spirits in Canada: I followed the ship with my eyes till it turned Point Levi, and, when I lost sight of it, felt as if I had lost every thing dear to me on earth. … Adieu! for the present: it will be a fortnight before I can send this letter.[16]

Bell, living with her father in Canada, expresses here how very closely the transatlantic epistolary exchange as well as the emotional connection garnered by correspondence depended on the weather and the time of year in the eighteenth century. She appears despondent: watching "the last ship" sail away, signing-off "for the present" since a letter might not now be sent for "a fortnight," feels to her "as if [she] had lost every thing dear to [her] on earth." Even as her very act of writing indicates that she remains able to portray her thoughts and emotions via epistolary communication, the time until the physical separation of letter and writer, the sense of having completed the task of correspondence through the departure of a missive, is lengthened. The distance between letter-writers evokes a sense of loss when the vehicle for transmitting their words to each other is less frequently anticipated, as the passage of ships through the Gulf of Saint Lawrence, and down the Saint Lawrence River to Montreal and Silleri, where Bell lives, is hindered by winter's ice. That space of the Canadian landscape is, of course, in addition to the journey across the Atlantic, which can take approximately two months even in the summer, as indicated by the first two letters of the novel, in which Edward Rivers writes first from Cowes on April 10, 1766 to his friend John Temple in Paris and then from Quebec on June 27 to his sister Lucy in London.[17] Brooke is very conscious of the voyage's temporality and how transatlantic communication is encumbered by distance. She writes this spatial separation into the construction of her novel through not only the "melancholy sight" and tender regards for England that Bell records, but also in

the precise ordering of the letters that constitute the text. Not for nothing are the first four letters dated in April 10, June 27, April 30, and July 1 respectively, as Letter 3 is a reply from Temple to Rivers's Letter 1, written shortly after the original's receipt, but only received by Rivers after it had traversed the temporospatial distance between them.[18] Brooke places her readers within the temporality of her Canadian protagonists, carefully separating both them and her audience from England.

That partition of temporalities is produced by the very material presence of the Atlantic Ocean lying between Great Britain and the North American continent. The place from which a correspondent writes is crucial as a marker of the epistolary genre, given the necessary separation of writers that prompts the composition of letters.[19] For Brooke's text, the place of writing and the space that must be traversed by correspondence lays the foundation of the narrative: a courtship could occur in any place or time, but the specific characteristics of Rivers and Emily's relationship and many of the difficulties preventing its culmination stem from their reasons for residence in Canada.[20] This novel, like other eighteenth-century texts set in places other than the British Isles, does not ignore the distance between continents, though it does treat that expanse in a unique manner. What is important for my argument here is that Brooke does not include a narrative written during an ocean crossing, either when Rivers journeys to Canada, or when he and Emily return from the colony on their respective trips. The single letter composed during a crossing is written by Bell, and that is simply to inform her correspondent of her party's safety, only sent because "it is possible [that ship] will arrive first."[21] The lack of letters written mid-transit is in sharp contrast to Lennox's later text, where Euphemia constructs a narrative of her voyage to the colonies, one that lasts more

than fourteen pages, though the journal-letter she writes is not sent until her ship reaches New York.[22] As such, the epistolary exchange in Brooke's novel is very much grounded in the actual ability to send and receive letters: people would certainly be active and able to write while onboard ship, but it seems that Brooke was not concerned about her characters describing their internal lives and feelings while confined to their cabins. Instead, her use of the epistolary is a necessary element to the construction of a narrative that spans the ocean, suggesting that the connection of the colonies to England is not dependent on the voyage itself, but on the words that those on either side of the Atlantic committed to paper. This emphasis on communication rather than movement designates the ocean as a void in both space and temporality, as Bell writes in the single mid-voyage missive that "the time passed there is a total suspension of one's existence: I speak of the best part of our time there, for at least a third of every voyage is positive misery."[23] The miles between countries do not change, but the time it takes to cross the ocean exists as both nothing and everything, a "suspension of one's existence." Brooke erases the time it takes to cross the ocean when nothing is written by those who are experiencing the voyage, while simultaneously weighting the text itself with letters that must make the trip in order to arrive at their intended audience, and thus emphasizing both the effect and the *affect* of that time.

It is not just that her characters' letters must travel across this oceanic void that emphasizes their significance; that more than half of the letters exchanged in the novel are required to traverse the Atlantic speaks to the importance of maintaining communication between England and her colonies. The weight of the transatlantic missives comes when letters *from* England are included in the text. Of the one hundred

thirty-two letters that cross the ocean, only twelve are written by correspondents in England, for not quite ten percent of that particular subset, and just over five percent of the total letters in the novel, placing further emphasis on the characters' temporality as originating in Canada, despite their eventual return to England. These letters from England are not organized so that they appear immediately following the letter to which they reply, but instead are placed according to when they would arrive chronologically, harkening back to their time of writing, despite the passage of time. Thus, as the reader follows the narratives of the Canadian writers, the majority of the plot occurs through their observations and words, and the inclusion of letters from England interrupts both the narrative thread and the temporality of the writers, usually with some important news, either happy or dire. In choosing to be so precise in her structure, Brooke emphasizes the contents of those letters, rather than the dating of them, since they are so rare compared to the letters being sent between characters in Canada and to correspondents in England. What is written in them shifts the content of the letters written in reply, as well as the thread of the plot. The way that Brooke inserts these infrequent missives allows them to attach to their readers, affecting them by bringing what is past into the present, in a process that Elizabeth Freeman terms "temporal drag." Freeman argues that the collection of items and bodies that have been set aside as belonging to a past in which someone no longer participates allows those items to linger. Focusing on queer bodies, she suggests that time can stick, resulting in a performance of the past in a present moment and on a present body.[24] I want to suggest that this kind of sticking, of connecting the past to the present can also be accomplished through the affect of reading letters. For Brooke's characters, the emotions elicited by those letters from home, while not negating the

feelings caused by the letters exchanged within Canada, are given greater importance within the narrative and can cause crucial shifts in the plot, if only because the news they bring is already old.

Part of the emphasis placed on these letters stems from the fact that there are so many letter-writers in *The History of Emily Montague*: a total of ten designated correspondents who send letters to each other.[25] The majority of the letters are written by Colonel Edward Rivers and Arabella Fermor, who together send one hundred fifty-eight, numbering seventy-five and seventy-eight respectively, which is more than half of the two hundred twenty-eight total letters in the novel. Most of these (specifically eighty-eight) are addressed to Rivers' sister Lucy. Lucy replies to her brother and Bell, as does Rivers's friend, John Temple, for a total of nine letters coming to Canada from England, though both Bell and Rivers sometimes mention letters they have received but which are not included in the narrative. My point here is not that these letters are of greater import than those sent between those writers in the colony, but rather that the different temporality that these transatlantic letters creates merges with and often redirects the understanding of temporality that is displayed in the short, quick exchange of letters within North America. The very infrequency of the letters sent from England that Brooke integrates into the overall structure of the novel further highlights their contents as important; we may hear the response to missives sent by Lucy when Rivers writes back, but if what is written is what is considered necessary, this paucity further suggests the impact of those letters that are available to the reader. The hopeful sense of futurity gained by living and working in the colony where a man is able make himself a success if he works hard enough is impeded by the recollection of a past, even a relatively

immediate past of a letter written a few short months prior to its receipt, when that past is hampered by the actions and financial situation of one's parents, dependents, and friends.[26]

Overlapping with these transatlantic epistolary exchanges are those that occur between characters who are located in Canada. Short, precise dating of these missives intermingles with the temporal pull of the past that occurs when letters from England arrive in the colony, just as the arrival of winter requires more compiling of letters to be sent in packets, rather than as individual entities posted via the next ship departing for London. This compilation of packets is contrasted with the exchange of notes between the bedrooms of Bell and Emily or the close proximity of Montreal and Silleri. Brooke uses brief letters to illustrate the passing of time for her characters, and to create a realistic sense of the time it takes to actually write a letter. Even the contents of a packet being sent overseas are separated by a notation of the date on which each letter was written and generally include a salutation and a signature. If a writer leaves his or her correspondence and returns without beginning a new letter, the date or sometimes the time of the new moment of writing is included. Of the two hundred and twenty-eight letters in the novel, only thirty-one do not include the date upon which they were written; of those, eleven indicate the day of the week, if not the approximate time of day, on which they were written: "Saturday noon," "Sunday morning, six o'clock," for example.[27] With such precise consideration of the time of day, day of the week, and date, Brooke carefully manages the temporality of her text and retains a sense of the continual passage of time and seasons. Her narrative progresses with a teleological thrust, as Rivers, Bell, and occasionally Bell's father, Captain Fermor, write home to friends in

England, describing the landscape, the French community's engagement with the British colonists, and critiques of Catholic religiosity lingering from the recently lost French colonial ownership of Canada.[28] Stephen Carl Arch suggests that because of the distance and time missives must travel, the novel is constructed of various interregnums: of politics, of family relations, of travel—which "takes on spatial, temporal, and social dimensions. Things are 'in between' in the world of *Emily Montague*":

> So, for example, in the letters that Rivers exchanges with his sister, Lucy, and with his best friend, Temple, the reader experiences a disconcerting temporal effect: letters written in heightened emotion and confidential whispers and hurried closings are received two or three or four months after their "spontaneous" compositions. … The recipient and the novel reader are supposed to experience these emotions vicariously, sympathetically identifying across the distance imposed by circumstances. However, by the time Lucy had received her breathless missive, Arabella has long since moved on to other concerns, a fact that the reader actually knows and that Lucy must have sensed, even as she wrote. Those emotions are no longer alive and relevant when the letter is received. Brooke's reader, in other words, is asked to pretend that the letter sent from 3,000 miles away is, nevertheless, written immediately and spontaneously, to pretend that the letter writer believes that dropping a letter addressed to 'Clarges Street' in London in the post in Quebec is exactly the same as dropping a letter addressed to 'Clarges Street' in the post in Holborn or Pall Mall.[29]

Arch is correct in suggesting that the affect of letters that take months to arrive at their intended destination has the potential to be blunted. But he has, however, neglected to consider that England is not the only destination for correspondence in the text, given that Lucy's and Temple's letters from home do reach Rivers and Bell in Canada.

Nor is the novel reader functioning solely as surrogate for the recipient in England. Arch has assumed that England's temporality has primacy in the narrative structure. Instead, the exchange of letters between the characters in Canada, though fewer than those directed homeward, opposes the vitiating effect of those letters sent to London by constructing a cycle of exchange within Canada itself, thus retaining the novel's emphasis on Canada's temporality. Rather than recording moments and ideas of historical

and imperial note, the sets of letters dealing with daily activities and matters of domestic importance—marriages, balls, and visiting neighbors—serve to highlight the mundane as the driving force behind the need to colonize. The bouncing between voices that is created by brief, direct missives traded back and forth between Bell and Emily in Letters 73-79 and 106-113, much like a tennis volley, imitates spoken conversation.[30] When juxtaposed with the longer, descriptive letters intended to be sent to England, the brevity of those notes emphasizes their contents so that once a more detailed piece of correspondence is inserted into the narrative, the minutiae of that lengthier letter seem of more relevance. This effect functions reciprocally to impart more importance to the intranational exchanges, so that when the correspondence between Emily and Bell appear, they are not dismissed precisely because they do not contain matters of historic and imperial significance. As brief as they are, these moments of quick, lively engagement in letter-writing remind the reader that the microcosmic home is intertwined with the globalization of the empire, and center the narrative's temporalities in the personal matters that constitute much of the Canadian letter-writers' thoughts.

This quick pacing is, in some ways, indicative of the superficial nature of both Bell's character and the narrative itself. Brooke's complex structure is illuminating and quite brilliantly plotted temporally, but its very complexity reduces the novel's ability to highlight the deeper interiority of character that many eighteenth-century novels explore. Arch's argument that the distance between Canada and England lessens the impact of Bell's "breathless missives" and that "[t]hose emotions are no longer alive and relevant when the letter is received" applies for nearly all of the letters written, but for a different reason: that very breathlessness illustrates the insubstantiality of the feelings expressed

by all of Brooke's characters. Despite Bell's claim that she is depressed by the sight of the last ship leaving for England, sending a "a thousand sighs and a thousand tender wishes to dear England, which I never loved so much as at this moment," and that she "shall not absolutely be in spirits again this week" in the letter I examined at the beginning of this section, that same letter continues on December 1, a week later, stating that "happily for [her and Emily]," Rivers and Captain Fitzgerald have been snowbound with them.[31] Melancholy and homesickness are easily forgotten in the wake of constant attention from such gallant gentlemen. Physical distance is not necessary for the cessation of Bell's emotions, only distraction.

While Brooke's text explores and highlights the complexity of epistolary narrative based on multiple writers, Lennox confines her correspondents to two in *Euphemia*. As such, she is able to deepen the connection between her characters, and express the separate temporalities in England and the colonies by intertwining time and affect in more complex interactions than Brooke creates in *The History of Emily Montague*. In the case of these two novels, the transatlantic exchange of letters, the affect those letters convey, and the shifting temporalities created by those letters function similarly in terms of place and space: both involve quicker paced exchanges juxtaposed with the lengthier time between the receipt of correspondence conveyed via ship. Both situate their temporalities with regard to the location and writer from which the majority of the letters originate. Yet, Lennox's treatment of time and affect within her letters, rather than between them, portrays a much deeper consideration of feeling and connection between people. The complexity of affect of these two novels is inversely proportionate to the complexity of their rhetorical structure. While *The History of Emily Montague* is only

shallowly engaged with affect and the language of feeling, but contains multiple writers expressing that vocabulary, *Euphemia*'s very few writers focus almost exclusively on their relationship and emotional connections.

"A kind of journal from the day I leave England": Euphemia's epistolary interiority

As Lennox's final work and sole epistolary novel, *Euphemia* allows for a dynamic consideration of temporality and affect in ways that differ sharply from Brooke's novel.[32] Very little has been written about *Euphemia*, despite the general abundance of criticism regarding the epistolary novel as a genre, and it is often considered to be a rather unsophisticated narrative by those few critics who do mention the novel.[33] Even within this limited body of work, *Euphemia* is rarely examined as an epistolary novel in and of itself; instead, the novel tends to be read as a travel novel, concerned with painting a picture of the landscape of colonial New York, or in conjunction with Lennox's earlier work, *The Life of Harriot Stuart*, where *Euphemia* functions as a corollary to the author's first attempt at a novel reflecting her own life story.[34] Consisting of the collected letters between Euphemia Neville and Maria Harley, with five letters written to Maria by Euphemia's companion Mrs. Benson out of a total of forty-nine, this novel exploits the temporospatial gaps produced by the epistolary genre through the separation and eventual reunion of the protagonists. Euphemia travels to the American colonies, specifically New York, with her officer husband, detailing her journey and the events, people, and landscapes she encounters for Maria, who remains at home in England. Spending over a decade away from Britain, Euphemia endures childbirth, encounters with Dutch settlers

and Native Americans, and the tragic loss and return of her son, all while finding solace in her communication with the friend she left behind.

The temporality of *Euphemia*'s epistolary structure shifts throughout the progress of the novel. At first, letters are exchanged between Maria and Euphemia at a relatively fast pace; even if a reply has not been received to the letter she has just sent, the letter-writer begins a new letter in continuation of her narrative. This sense of constant communication differs from the finitude of the letters in *The History of Emily Montague*: while Brooke's letter-writers might refer to letters they have received and to which they respond, each letter is a separate entity in a correspondence that might be interrupted by the receipt of a letter from another writer. In contrast, Lennox creates a steady state of correspondence, where her writers are always already in a moment of composition and a new letter to read seems to mark the chance to add to what is currently being written, even when her characters are in close proximity. Yet, once Euphemia embarks on her voyage across the Atlantic, the length of the letters she and Maria write increases as opportunities to send their epistles becomes fewer. The pace of their correspondence therefore decreases the longer Euphemia remains in the colonial sphere until Euphemia's voice carries the narrative almost exclusively in the second half of the novel, when the span of the Atlantic creates difficulties in the exchange of letters which the postal system between London and the country did not. Through the increasing instability of Euphemia's life in the colonies, not only does the distance between the women increase but the time between the performances of writing letters grows as well. The narrative gaps inherent to the epistolary genre expand, forcing the novel's temporality to shift with them.

Maria and Euphemia seem to experience the flowing of time in different ways; Maria's letters demonstrate what is almost an immovable, fixed point even as years pass for Euphemia, evidenced by the events of her experiences in New York colony. The fact that Maria fades from the narrative once Euphemia travels away from England contrasts with the interruptive time which Brooke's letter-writers produced from England, and instead exaggerates the separation in time between Maria and Euphemia. This fragmented temporality, stretching and fracturing between England and America, deviates from the quotidian, teleological time which moves towards an ending—that time which produces a history and a future. Instead, *Euphemia*'s epistolary scheme works towards a temporality of moments, of interesting and important events, and leads to a kairotic, eschatological time that avoids endings and privileges continuation. In exploring the eschatology of colonial time through the letters written by and to Euphemia Neville, *Euphemia* undermines the masculine temporality of a stable England in order to promote a feminine temporality that is always shifting and unstable. The difference in the much more measured pacing of composition for Lennox's correspondents, compared to the quick, breathless exchanges of Brooke's characters, allows Lennox to shift the focus of the transatlantic epistolary novel from the ever-present potential for return to England to the diurnal, relaxed pace of daily life in New York colony.

Through her use of these shifting temporalities, and the variable nature of the affective nature of letter-writing that accompanies the transatlantic voyage, Lennox emphasizes the economy of affect that occurs through the letter exchange. That is, her characters' expression of emotion through writing may not be presented as quite as urgent when the composition of a letter occurs with the knowledge that the reader may

not be able to sympathize with or soothe those emotions for a much greater length of time. While still considering the romantic marriage plot with her inclusion of Maria's narrative, Lennox allows the relationship between her female protagonists to carry her story as one leaves home while the other waits, Penelope-like, for her return.[35] By overturning this male/female binary of travel, Lennox is able to highlight the possibility for a relationship built on love and commitment between women in which the separation of the characters by an ocean is overcome by the imaginative power of letter-writing. As Altman argues in her survey of the generic conventions of the eighteenth-century epistolary tradition, the intended recipient of a letter always exists in the writer's mind, as a way for the writer to sustain a dialogue with her correspondent. This imaginary presence of the letter-reader serves to focus the letter-writer's attention and thus emotional understanding simultaneously on both the connection of her self and her feelings to those of her reader, as well as the separation between her self and her reader in terms of actual physical locations. Absence is thus as important as presence in writing letters; Altman suggests that this significance is related to the "pivotal present" of correspondence, not only in terms of temporality, but also in spatiality. In fact, the time of the narrative in any novel is important in producing a sense of realism; it is more so in the epistolary novel, Altman argues, because the composition of a letter revolves around its own moment of creation. As what she terms the "pivotal present" of the letter, the act of writing exists as a space for the conflation of what is being written about—the past—and when the letter is to be read—the future. [36] The writer therefore becomes entwined with the event of corresponding. The present-ness of epistolary narrative is precisely what creates the shifting temporalities in *Euphemia*. Moments in which either Euphemia

or Maria write connect them to the *present time* of the other, while the reading and the writing of answering letters constantly brings the other woman to mind, allowing for her *presence* in spirit, if not in body. In writing the present/presence of her correspondent, *Euphemia*'s letter-writers enact an epistolary temporality that shifts with the passage of time within the overarching narrative.

The novel's epistolary temporality hinges on the exchange of letters between correspondents who are separated by spatial distance. The convention of separation is as crucial for the formal aspects of epistolarity as it is for the conveyance of affect between letter-writers, given that affect relies on the "in-between-ness" conveyed through distance.[37] Altman notes that the writer in "epistolary discourse always situates himself vis-à-vis another; his locus, his 'address,' is always relative to that of his addressee. To write a letter is to map one's coordinates—temporal, spatial, emotional, intellectual—in order to tell someone else where one is located at a particular time and how far one has traveled since the last writing."[38] Maria positions herself temporally in relation to Euphemia's spatiality throughout the text's opening letter, writing, "You are going to leave me; and too probably for ever. Long tracts of land, and an immeasurable ocean, will soon divide us."[39] She weeps as she writes her first letter: "My tears efface my letters as I write," and she feels no compunction in shedding them upon reading Euphemia's subsequent letters: "I have effaced almost every word of your tender and affecting narrative with my tears."[40] She looks toward the future in which Euphemia's "locus" will shift, destabilizing the connection between them, while simultaneously referring to her own rupture of their bond in her travels to France, a break which also prevented an epistolary exchange in that lost present. In the past, Maria's unstable positioning

precludes a regular correspondence; in this writing moment's future, it will be Euphemia's lack of a fixed address that does so. This fracturing of spatial distance, however, does not occur immediately, despite Maria's regret that miles of sea will "soon divide" them.[41] For nearly two volumes of the four volume novel, Euphemia remains in England, waiting for her husband to receive his orders for departure to New York. The women correspond faithfully, relating narratives of their lives, both past and present, during those two volumes, weaving in histories with the materiality of writing to the moment. Maria's tears in particular work to illustrate Altman's point that the epistolary genre relies on the immediate effect of the letters-texts' contents. But more importantly, Maria's statement of her blotting Euphemia's missive reveals a temporal shift; while the writing of Maria's letter implies a present moment, her comment about reading her friend's letter refers back to Euphemia's writing moment, which is itself a narration of events that occurred even earlier in Euphemia's timeline. Through her immersion in Euphemia's writing, Maria is inserted into Euphemia's past, learning for the first time events Euphemia has experienced twice—once as she lived through them and again as she narrates them.

This temporal folding of a narrative is inherent to the first-person narrative style; the doubling of the narrator (one who experiences and one who retells) shifts between the generic conventions of memoirs and those of the epistolary text, not only because of the reliance of the memoir on what is past, rather than the epistolary immediacy of the present writing moment, as Altman and others have noted, but because of the immediate presence of a intradiegetic textual reader.[42] The letters' affective capabilities are therefore emphasized over the generic temporal expectations of a fictional narrative. As Maria

reads Euphemia's narration of her father's death and the revelation of the family's ruin, she is pulled into these past events by her identification with Euphemia as a sufferer. The tears with which she so sentimentally waters the paper represent the affective nature of Euphemia's letter and Maria's sympathetic feelings for her. But Maria does not need this physical expression in order to enter into Euphemia's narrative; she is already present within the text as Euphemia writes it. Because of the construction of epistolary narrative from a first-person perspective, where the writer positions herself in relation to the person to whom she writes, the writer invokes the presence of her correspondent from the moment she picks up her pen. The letter cannot, in fact, be written without an idea of the person to whom it is addressed, and its existence, therefore, must necessarily be preceded by the reader. Euphemia's letter not only refers back to the letter from Maria to which she is replying, but it opens by evoking an image of Maria from its first words: "Why does my dear Maria imagine I would chide her for a sensibility so amiable in her, so flattering to me who am the object of it?"[43] After detailing a part of her history, Euphemia halts her narrative, signing off by again addressing Maria directly:

> But here let me break off for the present: I will continue my narrative some other time. This free communication of my misfortunes to a dear and sympathizing friend, seems to lessen their force. … I will go on, then, and speak to you.— But, my Maria, remember, you must give me the remainder of your little history as soon as possible; you will easily imagine how much I am interested in it.[44]

Euphemia and Maria's stop-and-go narratives ("let me break off for the present," "give me the remainder of your little history"), punctuated by recollections and addresses to each other, even the use of the em-dash to indicate hesitation, upset the potential for the linear, teleological temporality of fiction, despite their constant indications of futurity.

Each woman's subsequent letter draws on both the past and the future, even as it is written, read, and reread in successive and distinct temporal moments, occasionally

working to position Maria or Euphemia as both reader and writer simultaneously. As Maria concludes one letter to Euphemia, another arrives, the opening of which Maria begins to respond before finishing her most recent letter: "But here I will conclude for the present. A letter from you is this moment brought to me; does it or does it not bring an answer favourable to my wishes?— I break the seal with eagerness.— Ah, my dear Euphemia, your first words destroy my hopes."[45] Heightening the tension in what could be a slow-paced narrative, this overlap of receipt and composition of letters serves to bring Euphemia's past into Maria's present, which, when the letter is received by Euphemia, will function reciprocally to insert Maria's present now made past into Euphemia's present. Instead of relying on specific dates and times for the establishment of a timeline, the majority of the letters include no mention of either. Lennox creates a constant looping effect in which the past of one writer continually drags on the present of the recipient before returning to drag on the original writer-turned-recipient through the references of the recipient-turned-writer. The strategy contrasts with *The History of Emily Montague*, where Brooke's colonial letter-writers only briefly gesture to correspondence received before moving forward with their own narratives. In the insertion and looping of past events and feelings into Euphemia and Maria's present via their epistolary exchange, the letters' temporalities become distorted as the past drags on the act of writing, pulling it farther away from its teleological end and becoming more immersed in the eschatological events of the past. [46] Even as the women's letters tow remnants of the past through the post, each one draws Maria and Euphemia closer to the moment of Euphemia's departure from England. What had seemed "soon" when Maria first writes, now lingers in what seems to be an ever-lengthening future, leading to increasing

instability in the expectation of time and events; rather than proceeding towards a determined date, the narrative stretches until the Nevilles' embarkation appears to be sudden. And while this looping as reader and writer respond to each other seems just another feature of the epistolary novel, it relies on the ability of letters to be sent and received relatively quickly; once Euphemia departs England and her letters become more journal-like, her connection to Maria is maintained by memory, rather than constant communication. Whereas in *The History of Emily Montague*, Brooke emphasizes the importance of letters through infrequency of reciprocation through a mostly uni-directional vector of information contained in a barrage of separate missives, in *Euphemia*, Lennox delves into the depth of content and emotional loss that stems from a continuous narrative composition.

In order to examine that depth, Lennox constructs Maria's romance as parallel to Euphemia's preparations to leave home. After concluding the retellings of each woman's histories in the first volume, Maria and Euphemia begin to travel within England, resulting in a shifting between their fixed locations. No longer can the post be counted on to deliver letters in a timely fashion: Maria pens a short note to Euphemia, informing her of the Harleys' journey, which Euphemia does not receive until after she has recounted her first meeting with her husband's commanding officer and his family, with whom she will be travelling, and who will be her companions in New York. She had not waited, it seems, for Maria's reply to her last before beginning a new story:

> Yesterday Mr. Neville told me he had been to pay his respects to Colonel Bellenden, whose first Lieutenant he now is, and who is appointed commander of the forces stationed at New York, under the governor, who, it seems, is captain-general. … we received a polite invitation to dine there to-day, which we accepted. … the colonel leading me again to the drawing room, the discourse

> turned upon matters relating to our intended voyage, and the country we were going to, till it was time to take leave.
>
> I am apprehensive this voyage will take place sooner than I expected; but I could easily reconcile myself to all the difficulties of it, except parting with you, my dear Maria.— Alas! This is a subject I dare not trust myself to write on.
>
> This moment your short letter (which to make amends for its shortness, it must be owned is very sweet) is brought to me. … Write to me soon; let me know all that passes in this little excursion.[47]

Lennox emphasizes the visceral nature of waiting here, juxtaposing the commonplace event of dining with the inability to express the uneasiness of separation that Euphemia cannot "trust [her]self to write on." Where Euphemia seems stationary here, dreading her trip, Maria is in turn beginning to upset that stability in undertaking a "little excursion." Euphemia's letter, though narrating an event that she has already experienced, proceeds in a straight-forward, generally calm manner; the only disruption is the intrusion of Maria's letter.

Maria, on the other hand, sends Euphemia missive after missive, the tone urgent and fractured, as she is rushed by a departing coach and disordered emotions. Four letters from Maria appear before Euphemia is able to answer, each burdened with interruptions. The first is cut short by her uncle's readiness: "My uncle this moment sends to let me know that he is ready, and the carriage is at the gate."[48] The second contains the first mention of a specific time ("THREE O'CLOCK") and shifting locales.[49] From the Bell Inn, Maria writes of her inability to rest, while later at Greville Park, she elucidates further on the subject that has led to her anxiety: "I cannot sleep, the tempest without is so violent; and, to say the truth, the agitations of my mind have raised a kind of tempest within me. I am risen, and I am got again to my pen. I dread seeing my uncle; his uneasiness affects me greatly. … Alas! My dear Euphemia, the wounded man I saw brought in is Mr. Harley [his hated kinsman]!"[50] Obligations in the neighborhood in

which she is visiting detain her writing to Euphemia "for some days past" in her third letter—during which time she has not received an answering letter from her friend.[51] The insertion of two separate letters into Maria's fourth missive succeeds in further destabilizing the correspondence between them. Maria anticipates that Euphemia has read her previous communications—"By this time you have received my last letter … I am impatient till you give me an account"—and copies both a letter to her from her cousin Mr. Harley and one from her to him into her letter to Euphemia.[52] The arrival of Maria's fourth letter upon her return interrupts Euphemia's response to an earlier missive and Mr. Harley's letter becomes a matter of discussion between them as Euphemia judges and advises Maria in her behavior. This inclusion invites Mr. Harley into the temporalities of both Maria and Euphemia, dragging the present moment of both readers in a new vector. Once Maria and Mr. Harley settle their courtship, she becomes involved in a new present, one in which Euphemia cannot participate to the extent she previously has been privileged and where a letter to Maria has the potential to become a letter to them both. Maria's epistolary temporality is then stabilized by her marriage to a man with prospects of land-ownership, locked into one location where she resides with her husband in the fulfillment of the eighteenth-century courtship narrative trajectory; Euphemia, despite also being married, remains temporally unmoored. Through these separate domestic trajectories, Lennox suggests that the possession of money and land can influence the temporal trajectories of those women who must rely on men to support them.

Lennox therefore contrasts Maria's spatial immobility, and thus her ability to compose a narrative, with Euphemia's mobility as she visits acquaintances and pays "farewell visits."[53] Maria expands the time between the writing and reading of the letters

Euphemia sends and receives, stretching Euphemia's epistolary temporality. Euphemia also continues to consider her own pending travels, which will, by necessity, further curtail the stability of her temporal moment:

> We are to dine to-morrow on board the man of war which is to carry the colonel and his family, of which we are considered as a part to New York. I know the mention of this circumstance will raise some tumult in your breast; but you must accustom yourself, my dear Maria, to bear these preludes to our parting. … I shall be able, when I write next, to tell when our voyage is determined upon. Adieu! … Well, my dear friend, I have six weeks good yet."[54]

Pushing the moment of departure further into the future until the final two letters of the second volume, Lennox ensures that Euphemia's present moment is confined to the temporality of Maria's letters as she relates her courtship with Mr. Harley. By allowing Maria's voice to dominate this volume, so that Euphemia's presence must haunt the letters as Maria writes to her, Lennox creates an act of writing itself which calls Euphemia into being in Maria's mind, as well as the mind of the reader. As Altman argues, the epistolary genre functions as dialogic discourse: "For the letter writer, to write someone is to speak to him, but in order for this illusion to be maintained in a lengthy letter, the other person's voice must somehow be heard. … The partner is *re*presented through his own words."[55] Rather than solely representing Euphemia in the letter as though Maria is conducting a conversation with her, instead, Maria records her interactions with other people and weaves monologic asides intended for Euphemia into her narrative. In this manner, while acting as narrator in describing her own life, Maria still speaks to Euphemia, but without an expectation of receiving an answer—either a real or imaginary one. Lennox uses Maria's directed commentary to produce an image of Euphemia that lingers in the pages of her correspondence.

The same is true for the way in which Lennox constructs Euphemia's letters to Maria once she boards the ship heading for America. After the Nevilles' passage from England begins, Maria only writes two letters that appear in the final two volumes. In separating her protagonists from each other for over a decade, Lennox ensures that their letters grow in length and in the time between their posting, reflecting the fact that the Atlantic lays between the writers and their correspondent. Each letter which must cross the ocean produces a specter of the other as the writer addresses an imaginary correspondent, one whose portrait does not change within her friend's mind. Given that time inevitably passes as Euphemia makes her home in the various stops on her scenic travels in colonial New York and Maria begins her married life with Mr. Harley, each can only write to a woman "who is an image persisting from the past; likewise, the [reader] who receives the message exists in yet another time, which was future to the [writer] sending the message."[56] That image is carried with each of the women, acting to anchor them together to create a version of temporal drag, retaining increasing amounts of emotion as more and more time passes, and enhancing both the weight and the value of the image and the emotions.[57] The portrait of the other which both Maria and Euphemia hold in their memories is, at best, that of their parting when Maria visits Euphemia prior to the Nevilles' leaving. "It is done, I have taken a long, long leave of you, perhaps for ever, for my heart sinks within me, and tells me I shall not live to see your return," Maria writes to Euphemia in her first letter after her stay, "do not chide me, my dear, my valuable friend, pardon the weakness of a vulgar mind … but methinks my grief is to me in the place of my friend."[58] Though there is no description of either Euphemia or Maria to allow the reader to picture either woman herself, Maria conflates her last view of

Euphemia with grief, allowing it to stand "in the place of [her] friend." Just as letters are able to provide a material substitute for a body through language, Lennox conflates grief with the correspondent, marking the emotion as significant enough to replace a "valuable friend." While this melancholy view of Maria remains with Euphemia and is the one to whom she writes, Euphemia sends a portrait to her friend—"My picture will accompany this letter"—so that Maria possesses a simulacrum of Euphemia to whom she can write.[59]

In fact, when Euphemia writes to Maria that she desires to continue the correspondence while she is away, she specifically suggests that in doing so, Maria will be able to accompany her on her travels:

> You may render absence tolerable to me by frequent letters. Continue your charming narratives; while I read your lively descriptions, I see, I converse with you—I partake your fears, I am elevated by with your hopes, I sympathise with your sorrows, and enjoy your happiness.
>
> As for me, it will be the chief comfort of my life to write to you, and make you acquainted with all the events of it. I propose to devote some part of every date to this dear *converse* I will call it, which will make you present with me.[60]

As Euphemia writes her letters to Maria, then, she purposefully invokes Maria's presence, so that as the Nevilles move from London to Portsmouth to New-York, Albany, and beyond, this image of Maria is all she possesses; neither she nor Maria ever mention if Euphemia also receives a portrait. In lieu of a physical representation of Maria, then, Euphemia "creates an image of a present addressee, with whom one can converse comfortably. Imagination substitutes what reality cannot supply."[61] Euphemia anticipates being affected by Maria's "lively descriptions": "I partake your fears, I am elevated by your hopes, I sympathise with your sorrows, and enjoy your happiness." Here Lennox firmly connects the ability of letters to influence and affect their readers. And despite the actual presence of Euphemia's companion and maidservant, Mrs. Benson and Fanny, respectively, in New York, Euphemia speaks less frequently to them in her narrative than

she does to Maria, continuing to address the woman away from whom she sailed, just as if Maria were with her on her voyage.

Though representing Euphemia's connection to the fixed point of England, Maria's presence through the third and fourth volumes of *Euphemia* diminishes in terms of her materiality; the two letters she does write are separated not only by the span of the Atlantic ocean and the dangers of its crossing, but by an expansive gap of nine years between Volumes III and IV in which no correspondence appears. The stability of location that Maria personifies, locked into her comfortable life and happy marriage, strengthens even as the temporality of the women's epistolary exchanges becomes skewed, Euphemia's voice lingering where Maria's disappears. Euphemia writes of meeting the colonial governor, describes the landscape, and details the crops grown by the natives in her first letter composed on American shores; she continues to write in and of her present moment, though Maria's connection to that present as a reader—rather than as a spectral image to whom Euphemia writes—stretches temporally. The postal service that might have taken three days now takes three weeks at minimum: "My letter will, perhaps, reach your hands in three weeks, if the wind is favourable, and the ship not becalmed as ours was; and, perhaps, one from you is upon its road to me," Euphemia hopes.[62] Euphemia's narrative continues as she gives birth, tells Maria about her interactions with the Bellenden and her opinions of her husband's fellow officers, and the family moves from fort to fort, following Lieutenant Neville's career choices. Maria's, on the other hand, becomes more and more entrenched in the past and in events that do not further her connection with Euphemia. Her first letter to Euphemia after the Nevilles arrival in New York is full of the denouement of her courtship with Mr. Harley with little

intervention of the details of Euphemia's correspondence, though it has been "now five months since [she] left England"; only at the very end of Maria's missive does she note that she has received "this moment your dear, your welcome packet. … What a feast do you prepare for me, by writing thus to the moment, and making me present to all the occurrences of your life."[63] Though she is not physically with Maria in England, through the process of reading the letter Maria has sent, Euphemia feels that she is "made present" in Maria's life, thus reducing the imaginative distance between them and combining their temporalities, if only in her own mind—even as Maria will have done the same as she read the letter. Euphemia has no time to respond with more detail, as "the messenger waits for my packet," leaving the shared temporal loops to run a more teleological course.[64]

Euphemia's letters similarly shift away from the interpenetrative and ambiguous temporal frame of the overlap of her own present with Maria's as she narrates her life in New York. Yet, because her story has no sense of a goal, no ending in sight while she remains with her husband in the colonies, and because she continues to write to Maria's presence, she persists in writing away from teleological temporality: "My dear Maria, I have this moment delivered into my hands a large packet from you. I cannot chuse a better time to conclude this long letter, than when I am in possession of so much happiness, as these dear papers will afford me.—I go to enjoy your conversation, and by the force of imagination, to have you present with me."[65] Even as Maria is present in Euphemia's mind, however, she and her temporality disappear from the novel. As Euphemia remarks on the Bellenden daughters' marriages and the arrival of a new commander after Colonel Bellenden is killed, she represents a fecund colonial space

where time moves forward even as Maria remains in the past. The more events Euphemia narrates, it seems, the farther from Maria and from home, her sense of the epistolary moment becomes; without the reciprocity of continual communication, Euphemia's letters drift away from a shared temporality even as they remain tethered to the presence of the Maria to whom she writes. This stretching of the epistolary temporality allows for the growth of a feminine time opposed to the masculine nature of teleological, historical time in which Maria dwells. Just as Euphemia's letters travel between continents, they travel equally between the wild, eschatological temporality of colonial moments and events and the staid, domestic temporality of the gossip, marital histories, and tragic endings for imprudent females of the contents of Maria's final letter.

Back home again

It is the very domesticity that Maria articulates, a sense of femininity and grace within England, which functions to help complicate the gendered temporalities between colonial North America and the British homeland. Elizabeth Tasker-Davis notes that "Euphemia relies on the descriptions of Maria's comparatively mundane life in England for emotional stability, but Maria's world fades into the background midway through the novel."[66] Given that emotions are so deeply connected with temporality, that very stability which Maria's letters provide serves to cement England as existing within a stable temporality—one that is more teleological and masculine, even though the contents of Maria's letters may be gendered feminine. Further, the very fact that the stability of Maria's missives wanes when their frequency declines, and Euphemia's voice becomes the dominant presence, underlines the instability of temporality within the colonial

sphere, and therefore creates an eschatological temporal narrative. Yet, while the banality of Maria's narratives serves to illustrate a stable temporality, the very same domestic concerns within Bell and Emily's letters in *The History of Emily Montague* function in the opposite manner: the triviality of their content and the quick pace of their composition, particularly in Bell's correspondence, upset any stability of temporality conveyed through a similar domesticity about which Maria writes. Instead, the reminders of the past contained within the missives sent to Canada highlight how unstable a colonial temporality can be, compared to an English temporality that seems to exist in a vacuum where people, places, and things must always remain as they always were. Only in the colonies can change occur, can temporalities and emotions shift. Even while some remnant of the past lingers, dragging on the colonial correspondents, that past represents tradition, stability, and historicity, while the possibilities of shifting temporalities and the emotions that affect letter-writers' understandings of them open the North America colonies and the people who live there to new, unstable presents and futures. Lennox and Brooke, therefore, attempt to critique the structures that create the illusion of stability and patriarchy, much as their predecessors did, and like Charlotte Smith, writing only two years after Lennox, will continue to do, even as the French Revolution is exploding political stability across Europe.

CHAPTER 4

"WHEN I LOOK BACK UPON THE PAST, OR CONSIDER THE PRESENT": PERPETUAL WAITING AND THE INABILITY TO REACH A FUTURE IN CHARLOTTE SMITH'S *DESMOND*

In the penultimate letter of Charlotte Smith's epistolary novel *Desmond* (1792), Jonville de Montfleuri, the French acquaintance of Smith's titular character, elucidates hidden details of Desmond's life.[1] He resolves what mystery remains before musing on a France gripped in the midst of a bloody revolution, and signs off with an optimism that belies the seriousness of the lingering political considerations in his homeland, saying:

> In the mean time, however, let us not waste the moments, as they are passing in dark speculations on the future; which, after all, we cannot arrest or amend.—it is more foolish to embitter the present with useless regret; and, as to the past,
>
> 'Mortels!—voulez-vous tolérer la vie?
> Oubliez, & jouissez,'
>
> is a very good maxim.[2]

Montfleuri conveys the affective nature of temporality with a soupçon of the international nature of the text, using Voltaire's advice of "Mortals!—Do you wish to tolerate life? / Forget, and enjoy" to suggest that memories of the past and worries for the future can only inhibit the pleasures of the present. Though this axiom arrives too late in the narrative to prevent Desmond from the agonizing moments of which he writes, it does portray the novel's fundamental engagement with pathetic temporality.

Consisting of three volumes with a total of sixty-one letters written by eight different characters, *Desmond* portrays the importance of epistolary communication

between friends and family separated by both countryside and the Channel, and highlights the anxiety produced when letters do not arrive when expected or are not dated from a specific time and place. Smith opens the novel with a preface begging her readers to excuse her intrusion into the world of political commentary, particularly given her sex: "But women it is said have no business in politics.—Why not?"[3] To give her case more weight, she argues that though the story itself is fiction, the basis for the "political passages dispersed throughout the work" stems from "conversations to which [she has] been a witness, in England, and France, during the last twelve months."[4] In doing so, she places her novel within a particular historical moment. Where de Freval sees *Pamela* as occurring in a historical moment in which the morals portrayed by Richardson were greatly needed to inform the reading public, Smith has created a text of *kairos* that is purposefully engaged with the politics of the French Revolution on an intimate level. This narrative could not exist at any other point in time.

Despite—or rather, *because of*—the text's engagement with the events of its own time, Loraine Fletcher argues that, according to "Georg Lucac's [sic] definition of historical novel," *Desmond* would qualify, given the "imprinting of a historical moment on the consciousness of the characters."[5] And *Desmond* certainly hits that mark: immersed in its own moment, the novel's letters span a period of twenty-one months between June 1790 and February 1792. The novel encapsulates the foment of a period of both change and stagnation, a reflection on what has passed and anxiety over what is to come. Smith cements this consideration of history in her preface, situating her claim to legitimacy as a female political writer in the accepted practices of education for women: "Even in the commonest course of female education, they are expected to acquire some

knowledge of history; and yet, if they are to have no opinion of what *is* passing, it avails little that they should be informed of what *has passed*, in a world where they are subject to such mental degradation."[6] The very structures of the epistolary, as Smith claims of women, suggest that consideration of the past is necessary for awareness of the present. As Janet Altman argues, the present of epistolary reading is so ambiguous that "past is taken for present" and thus the understanding of what is present must always be informed by what has passed.[7] Scott C. Campbell claims that *Desmond* represents a "remarkable 'failure'" regarding "literary ambition," while also allowing for the examination of the epistolary genre through the genre itself—something the Jacobin literature of the 1790s was wont to do. But the assertion that the novel fails counters what he calls the "remarkable deployment" of epistolarity's formal elements and neglects the potential for the epistolary temporalities within the narrative.[8] Smith's choice of the epistolary to form what Fletcher calls "her most overtly feminist novel" grants her the possibility of examining the very present she wishes to engage, of writing to her literal moment.[9]

Yet, when the present described by an epistolary writer is in such turmoil, it only *seems* that the past can bring enlightenment to the chaos of the moment. *Desmond* is constructed in such a fashion: when the titular character, Lionel Desmond, is overwhelmed with memories of his past and has little recourse to calm, he resorts to a recitation of another present, one that he observes, rather than one in which he participates. Essentially, as his personal emotional life becomes more and more chaotic, he attempts to inscribe the fulminating political evolution at work in France as a means of escaping his own affective engagement with his acquaintances. Desmond desires to find solace in rational discussion of revolution, allowing Smith to indulge in her own political

commentary. The novel itself traces the course of Desmond's love affair with Geraldine Verney, from his departure from England because she is unavailable to him due to her married state, to their eventual engagement after her husband is killed while attempting to subdue the rabble with members of the aristocracy in France. Smith argues that, far from condoning the adulterous pursuit of a married woman, she instead aims to portray a love whose very status as unattainable makes it most honorable: "no delineation of character appears to me more interesting, than that of a man capable of such a passion so generous and disinterested as to seek only the good of its object; nor any story more moral, than one that represents the existence of an affection so regulated."[10] Just as the political circumstances Smith presents in the novel seem to exist in a period of waiting, Desmond lives within a moment of inertia, not yet able to move forward, but prevented from returning. He cannot have Geraldine, but he cannot forget her.

The pivotal present of Desmond's letters involves descriptions of his own history as evidence of his affective state, and in each place he visits on his travels around France and England, when he encounters a new acquaintance, he first records that person's or place's history for his correspondent, Mr. Erasmus Bethel. The journey of Smith's protagonist serves to elucidate the possibility for stagnation even in the face of potential progress. Desmond counters the cautionary tone Bethel adopts when describing his own history and contacts with Geraldine's family with his own pointedly upbeat attempts at optimism and objective recording of the social conditions in France. Desmond leaves England, "rather because [Bethel desires] it, than because [he is] convinced that such an affection as [he feels], ought to be eradicated."[11] Mirroring this emotional limbo in which Desmond persists through most of the novel, the letter-writers themselves repeatedly

refer to the anticipation of receiving communication from their correspondents. Bethel is confused when Desmond refrains from dating several of his letters in Volume III, while Geraldine's silence concerns her sister, Fanny Waverley, to whom she writes from her various residences over the course of the text. For the writers here, the security of a permanent home seems directly linked to the stability of their emotions and to the strength of the effect their letters will have on those to whom they write. At an historical moment in which the precarious equilibrium of the political situation so profoundly influences Smith, it seems only fitting that she would compose her characters such that their own narratives would so closely conform to a real-world temporality that allows neither a progression nor a retreat.

The Past: rural tour as affective escapism

Smith presents France as a place of escape for Desmond, as he cannot remain in England in close proximity to Geraldine; location thus becomes important in terms of the construction of temporalities within the epistolary form—and not simply as part of the generic requirement of distance between correspondents, but as part of the affective nature of the letter exchange within the novel. Careful to structure her text to emphasize the movement of the letter-writers in *Desmond,* Smith therefore mimics the effects real-world travel would have on correspondence. Attaching significance to the writing and receipt of missives, Smith herself annotates the text each time a letter is referenced by a character, but not included in the narrative, as well as when a letter's dating is chronologically out of order from the ones previous to it. Such precision indicates how assiduously Smith's fictitious scenario adheres to the conventions of the epistolary

tradition while still maintaining its objective of making a political statement. Smith's careful dating of her characters' letters, Margaret Anne Doody notes, allows her to conflate her fictional time with the timing of actual events of the Revolution.[12] As Bethel's letters follow Desmond around France and England, so, too, do his emotions and anxieties about Desmond's actions and engagement with the circumstances of revolutionary France. Equally, Desmond's emotional state and his preoccupation with the past are altered by his location; the farther into the countryside he travels, the more distinctly is he haunted by his memories. Narrating his feelings about the Revolution, the country-side, and his longing for Geraldine Verney, Desmond's letters to Bethel convey the manner in which the generic expectations of epistolarity can be closely linked to constructions of pathetic temporality by conflating political ideologies with both feelings and place.

Because Desmond does not stay in one place very long throughout the course of the novel, Bethel cannot anticipate the length of time it will take for his letters to reach Desmond and for a letter from Desmond to return. After a letter dated June 20, 1790 from his estate of Hartfield, another letter from Bethel does not appear until September 20. Meanwhile, after Desmond wonders "When shall I hear from you?" in a letter dated June 19; "The ten last have past without my receiving a single line from you" on June 20; and "It is very uneasy to me, my dear Bethel, to have been so long without hearing from you.—I am willing to believe, that you are absent from Hartfield … on one of your usual summer tours; and that, therefore, you have not received my letters, and know not whither to direct" on August 4, Bethel himself writes that he has "no expectation of hearing from you very soon again, as from your last letter, this seems likely to be long in

reaching you."[13] Once Bethel's communique from September 20 does appear, it is followed by another from Desmond in Auvergne, dated "September 14," after Desmond has moved from Paris to Montfleuri and then to his current locale.[14] Bethel's Letter XI is a function of the past intruding on Desmond's present. Despite its contents addressing what Desmond records in Letter X of "August 29," which appears just prior to it in the novel, Desmond does not answer it until his Letter XV of "October 10."[15] Smith herself notes Letter XV is in answer to "letter xi" (the September 20th missive), after Desmond has sent the epistle from "September 14" and two more, dated "September 30" and "October 2," back to England."[16] It has taken so long for this exchange to culminate, in fact, that Desmond writes that he does not remember his exact words to his friend, but has instead been consumed with thoughts of Geraldine's miserable marriage:

> What did I say to you, dear Bethel, in my letter of the 29th of August, that has given you occasion to rally me so unmercifully about Madame de Boisbelle; and to predict my *cure* as you call it—I cannot now recollect the contents of that letter; but of this I am sure, that I never was more fondly attached to the lovely woman, from whom my destiny has divided me than at this moment; or ever saw the perfections of other women with more indifference—Were it possibly for you, my friend, to comprehend the anguish of heart which I have felt ever since your last letters gave me such an account of the situation of Verney's affairs—you might be convinced, that time, absence, and distance, have had no such effect in altering my sentiments; and that the sister of my friend Montfleuri, were she even as partial to me as some trifling occurrences I have related, may have led you to imagine, can never be to me more than an agreeable acquaintance.—Far from being able to detach my mind from the idea of Geraldine's situation—I have undergone continual raillery from Montfleuri, for my extreme dejection, ever since I heard it.[17]

Though Bethel has encouraged Desmond to find a new object of affection and to put Geraldine firmly in his past, the very reports Bethel's own messages convey to Desmond have the effect of bringing Desmond's past to the fore. He cannot "detach [his] mind" from his attachments *because*, even if he had attempted to do so, his communications with Bethel revive those feelings each time he receives them. These three letters reaching

Desmond in France draw him back mentally, though not physically, to England and do not allow him to escape his past.

While he maintains that "time, absence, and distance have had no such effect in altering" his feelings for Geraldine, Desmond's letters to Bethel, in which he describes the juxtaposed tableaux of revolution and tradition in France, demonstrate the conflict between the memory of a stable, if painful, personal history and the potential for an exhilarating future sentiment. Desmond's function as traveler, while also working to destabilize the temporal trajectory of the epistolary exchange between the correspondents in this volume, serves to allow Smith to designate spaces as representative of tradition and history within the letters Desmond writes so that, as he conveys information to Bethel about the places he visits, he is able to connect specific kinds of political value to certain locations. As such, those locations become sketches of moments, fixing them into a particular temporal existence which depends upon the attitudes of the inhabitants, often in such a way as to illustrate distinct emotional responses as being appropriate for the shifting historical events into which Smith inserts her story. One place, Paris, the nexus of the recent revolutionary actions, becomes a space of potential and possibility to Desmond: it is here that he meets "the *ci-devant* Marquis de Montfleuri," who, by virtue of his progressive mindset, symbolizes a future for France, where men have the promise of freedom and advancement.[18] The city is distracting, as Desmond writes on July 19, when he has "been some days in this capital, without having had time to write to you; so deeply has the animating spectacle of the 14th, and the conversation in which I have been engaged, occupied my attention."[19] Entertained by Parisians' celebrations of the anniversary of the storming of the Bastille, he attributes his time in the city to having

improved even his positive opinions on "this revolution," so that now he believes he will be able to convince Bethel to be "as warmly anxious, as I am, for the success of a cause which, in its consequence, involves the freedom, and, of course, the happiness, not merely of this great people, but of the universe."[20] Desmond is assured of an optimistic future full of hope, yet is prompted to such an affirming outlook by the remembrance of a past event.[21] Similarly, just as Montfleuri signifies the evolution towards advancements and autonomy for not only "this great people, but of the universe," Desmond represents his conversations with his new friend as being based on an acknowledgement of the lessons of the past. The "sketch of his character and his history," as Desmond depicts him, relies on transcriptions of Montfleuri's disdain for the corruption of the church and the conventions of arranged marriages, his reasons for which are revealed in harangues on the historical prevalence for the church to enrich itself through property and coin, and lessons on the history of the monarchy in France.[22] Smith constructs Montfleuri as a man looking towards a future national character transformed by the recognition of the mistakes of the past, and built upon the labor of like-minded men in the present.

As Desmond travels with Montfleuri from Paris to his new friend's estate, he moves from a Parisian present which is looking towards a future while celebrating the past to a pastoral present that is built upon a crumbling past. At the rural estate, Desmond writes to Bethel in order to "endeavour to give you an idea of the habitation of Montfleuri, and of the country round it, where his liberal and enlightened spirit has, ever since he became his own master, been occupied in softening the harsh features of that *system of government, to which only the poverty and misery of such a country as this could, at any time, be owing*."[23] Smith's political intentions for the novel are stated baldly

in her protagonist's words here, but for my purposes, the crucial connection is between the double Montfleuri—man and estate. Montfleuri the man, being "liberal and enlightened," has demolished the parts of his house, leaving only "what was actually useful to himself"; has purchased a neighboring monastery and its lands in order to preserve the ancient structure for its aesthetic rather than its religious function; and has reformed the farming processes of his tenants so that they utilize the soil more efficiently, creating what appears to be a pastoral utopia of Montfleuri the estate. In doing so, he improves the condition of "the people, happy from their natural disposition … and now more rationally happy, from the certainty they enjoy," so that Desmond conflates their attitudes with beauty of the landscape as "the expression of exultation and content on their animated faces is one of [his] most delicious speculations."[24] Montfleuri's progressive ideals have led him to convert the monastery into a "house of industry" for those of his peasants who cannot toil in the fields.[25] Desmond is enamored of the scheme, and states that he will institute the same policy on his own estate, when he returns to it. Leanne Maunu suggests that the descriptions of Montfleuri's home are representative of instilling British middle-class values in French society.[26] While that may have been Smith's intent in constructing Montfleuri (man and estate) as she does, the fact that Desmond wishes to emulate his friend, rather than vice versa, subverts Maunu's argument. Instead, the comparison of his own property as it was, as it is now, and as it could be to Montfleuri's current state integrates past, present, and future into Desmond's contemplation of return to a home at a distance point of time. Yet, the memory of his own land, even with the prospect of enacting a concept that would potentially benefit the

people who depend upon him for their welfare, brings with it the spark of melancholy that is attached to Desmond's past and his feelings for Geraldine.

The possibility of emulating Montfleuri's arrangement, rather than generating anticipation for the future improvement of his own manor, instead places Desmond in a limbo of uncertainty. After opening the likelihood of his return, he writes, "whenever I settle there."[27] The ambiguity of the term "whenever," as opposed to "when," certainly suggests that Desmond is unsure of his own plans, and creates a sense of indecision as to whether Desmond might return at all, a sense that is emphasized when he continues:

> Whenever I settle there!—Ah! Bethel, that expression recalls a thousand painful ideas from which I have been vainly trying to escape.—Alas; I shall never settle there! or, if ever I do, it will be as a solitary and isolated being, whose pleasures will soon become merely animal and selfish, because there will be no one to share them:—a being who, though weary of the world, will find no happiness in quitting it.[28]

Desmond's imagination of his own future holds no pleasure, no expectance of happiness. The vision of his estate brings only "a thousand painful ideas," leaving him to wallow in the thought of his own misery, both as he contemplates the future and as he writes it in the present. Further, as Desmond connects Montfleuri's estate with remembrances of England, both as he thinks of his own estate and as he views his friend's lands ("were it not for a few obstinate and prominent features that belong to French buildings, which it is almost impossible for him to remove, it would be easy for me to imagine myself in some of the most beautiful parts of England," he writes to Bethel), even the possibility of future happiness seems out of his reach.[29] He describes the languishment of his future self at a moment in which he admits that "the lovely, the bewitching Josephine [Montfleuri's sister] herself, is waiting for me to walk with her."[30] Even the present charms of a pleasant companion only serve to further remind Desmond of his lonely state, since the

opportunity for spending time with Josephine only makes him to desire that "were it but Geraldine who expected" him.[31] Desmond's past is forever a part of his mind, which he has "been vainly trying to escape," and of which his surroundings and interactions are constantly a reminder.

As such, it is only when Desmond and Montfleuri travel to visit the home of Montfleuri's uncle, the extremely conservative Comte d'Hauteville, in Auvergne, that Desmond is able to replace his own misery and reminders of his own past with symbols of the deprivation and social injustices of France's past. Departing from Montfleuri, the two men were "neither of [them] in very gay spirits," their somber mood exacerbated as they traverse into a landscape that further depresses their mood: "within about three leagues of the *chateau* d'Hauteville, [the country] opens into one of the extensive plains that are … not so usual in this part of France. … A few plantations of vines had here an even less pleasing effect.—In some of them, however, people were at work, but [they] no longer heard the chearful songs, or saw the gay faces that [they] had been accustomed to hear and see" at Montfleuri.[32] Driving further onto d'Hauteville lands, Desmond specifically connects the state of his surroundings to the melancholic atmosphere, so that Smith makes clear the correlation between the affect of place and the traditionalist foundation upon which Montfleuri's uncle manages his manor. "Slowly, and through a miserable road, we traversed this melancholy avenue," Desmond tells Bethel, "without seeing, for some time, a human creature."[33] The dearth of inhabitants and the state of the road seems to lengthen the time of travel, and once the travelers arrive at the house itself, the walk and courtyard are decrepit, covered in overgrowth and creaky from disuse. Time appears to have disassociated from the humanity of the estate, so that the natural

processes of aging materials outpaced the temporal progress of the residents, resulting in a gloomy, gothic structure complete with oppressive weather patterns and nightmares.

Later, in relating his conversations with the Comte, Desmond identifies the Comte's attitudes as stemming from the "antiquity of titles, as if that were an irrefragable proof of their utility."[34] Despite the nobleman's assertions that the principles of his forefathers in creating hierarchies among their subjects were based in wisdom, so that without them, "the world will become a chaos of confusion and outrage," Desmond argues that such notions of "chivalry" are antiquated and "will never … return" and "it is time to recall our imaginations from these wild dreams of fanaticism and heroism—time to remove the gorgeous trappings, with which we have drest up folly, that we might fancy it glory."[35] In juxtaposing these opposing points of view, Smith situates the Comte within a world where the fantastical narratives of knights and battlefield heroics earned men the right to call others their inferiors, while Desmond refutes those notions with a sense of justice and rational argument centered around the exchange of time and goods for money.[36] Capitalism as modern advancement supersedes chivalry for Desmond, so that the depressed state of d'Hauteville only accentuates the legitimacy of his argument. D'Hauteville itself, conflated as Montfleuri is with the man who answers to the same name, is stuck in a past that can never be revived. Nor can it bestow positive affect on those who live and work there, or on those visitors who must eat meals that are "very ill dressed, and served in very dirty plate" and sleep "in a sort of state bed-chamber; one of those where comfort had formerly been sacrificed to splendor, but which now possessed neither the one or the other: and, on opening the door, I was sensible of that damp, musty smell, which is perceived in rooms that have been long unfrequented."[37] The neglected

suite, which Desmond calls, "one of the most funereal apartments I ever remember to have been in," further emphasizes the connection Smith wishes to draw between an archaic feudal system and the impossibility of progress while immersed within its influence.[38] As Desmond journeys further into the symbolic past of a France that has chosen to forge ahead, he becomes increasingly mired in disheartening reminders of his own emotional morass, culminating in a nightmare about Geraldine. Despite his attempts to escape his memories of her, she remains in his mind. Just as the future of France will be built upon the rubble of its oppressive past, Desmond cannot move forward into his own future without intruding recollections of his past affective state. Desmond, like France, must conquer his past emotional attachments as characterized by Geraldine and his love for her.

The Present: epistolary affect through temporospatial proximity

Geraldine appears as a writer in Volume II of *Desmond*, her first letter to her sister Fanny Waverley grounding the reader in the characters' present. She composes her missive from London in "Upper Seymour Street, Nov. 10, 1790," telling Fanny she has "been very ill ever since the receipt of this melancholy" note from France, informing her of Desmond's injury on behalf of her brother, "and it is only to-day, though I received it on Thursday, that I have had strength enough to forward it to you. I am now so near being confined, that the people who are collected about me weary me with their troublesome care, and will not let me have a moment to myself."[39] Expressing the extensive effects negative news of Desmond has on her, Geraldine's correspondence conforms to many of the epistolary characteristics of pathetic temporality which I have previously discussed:

the reading of a letter makes her ill and she is incapable of writing for several days; she states that she is close to being "confined" here, something that specifically recalls the various pregnancies occurring in *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph*;[40] a letter is enclosed with this one, though she does not copy it and thus allows the writer his own voice, rather than subsuming it herself; that correspondence has traversed the Channel, thereby inserting a relatively distant past into the writer's and the reader's presents; and she performs sensibility, both through stating it—"Is it that I set out in life with too great a share of sensibility?"—as well as through using coded language to signal that performance to the novel's reader: "render me more miserable," "I am so distressed, so hurt, that it is with the utmost difficulty that I write," "I am really so shaken by this intelligence, that it is not without great difficulty that I can write to you," "Yet while I write, he suffers—perhaps dies!"[41] Geraldine further conforms to the generic conventions of epistolary heroines in mentioning her anxiety over the length of time between her writing present and when she will receive more news of Desmond: "How miserable is the suspense I must endure till the arrival of the next letters!"[42] Mirroring Desmond's own frequently mentioned disappointment and angst when he does not receive a rare missive from Geraldine, the focus of the novel's epistolary affect has shifted from Desmond in Volume I to Geraldine in Volume II.

Whereas Desmond contributed twelve of the sixteen letters comprising Volume I, his voice is considerably reduced in comparison in Volume II, leaving his five of nineteen letters to rank second after Geraldine's six and only slightly more than Bethel's four. Maunu has argued that the move from Desmond to Geraldine in terms of voicing information about the French Revolution signals Smith's connection of nationality to

gender, suggesting that Geraldine's focus on the idyllic nature of the French countryside produces within her an awakening that is the most powerful of the novel, and presents the reader with the pattern card for thinking about cross-Channel politics.[43] While I agree that Geraldine presents a lens through which Smith attempts to direct her reader's attention, I would instead argue that Geraldine's importance in the novel stems from her ability to focus and subvert Desmond's engagement with his own temporality. Though she has appeared only as a figment of Desmond's emotional imagination and as the core of his memories to this point, her introduction as the primary correspondent in Volume II allows Smith to transfer the spotlight from her titular character's sentiments, which return repeatedly to speculations about Geraldine and thus center on the past, to Geraldine's present. While Desmond remains in France, his now infrequent contributions to the epistolary narrative continue to contain information about the foment across the Channel as he attempts to escape his emotional tether to Geraldine. But once Geraldine emerges as a writer able to convey her own perspective and affective life to her reader, the narrative thread diverges from a study of the past to one that examines an unstable and ever-changing present. Every letter now brings details of some new challenge relating to the interactions of a woman and the people around her. Through the shift from an emphasis on the past to highlighting the present, Smith redirects her political aims from the sphere of the politics of the national and the international to that of the politics of the domestic.[44]

Before she herself is a writer in the novel, however, Geraldine's status as an imagined figure within Desmond's letters contributes to her position as representative of Desmond's lived past influencing the emotional life of his writing present. It is to the memory of her that he turns when writing to Bethel, in brief anecdotes or queries between

his informative spurts of political writing. And it is the mention of Geraldine which constitutes the majority of the excerpts of each missive of Desmond's and Bethel's correspondence that are in answer to previous letters from the other. She thus becomes the connecting strand of their communication; while Desmond begs for intelligence of her between descriptions of his surroundings and the political arguments of those he meets, Bethel delivers a report only when he believes that his protégé has begun to move beyond his obsession with Geraldine, saying, "I look upon your cure as nearly perfected, and by the time this letter reaches you, I doubt not, but that you will have begun to wonder how you could ever take up such a notion, as of an unchangeable and immortal passion, which is a thing never heard or thought of, but by the tender novel writers, and their gentle readers."[45] This comment is, of course, an ironic jab by Smith at both herself and her readers, especially since the novel concludes with Desmond's passion unchanged, "immortal," and in anticipation of consummation via his marriage to Geraldine, but more importantly, it signals that for Bethel, at this moment, Geraldine is herself a representation of what is both past and passed, as something that has gone before, and something that has been left by the wayside. It is safe for him to convey word of her straightened circumstances *because* he believes Desmond has relegated her to his past. Bethel therefore relates the misfortunes Geraldine has suffered because of her husband's profligacy, including the seizure of her home in London and the encumbrance of her husband's estates due to debt.

For Desmond, however, while Geraldine remains a symbol of his former residence in England and pleasant moments spent in her company, though one whom he remembers with "with such an affection" that he feels "ought to be eradicated," he cannot

forget her and her good-bye at his departure, spoken "in that soul-soothing voice which I always hear with undescribable emotions.—More tremulously sweet than usual, it still vibrates in my ears, and I still repeat to myself her last words—'Farewell, Mr Desmond, may all felicity attend you.'"[46] Each time he repeats her statement and in each instance that he asks for word of her when he writes to Bethel, his memory is piqued, bringing his thoughts back to an image of her. Like Pamela's re-reading of her journal-letters, as I argue my first chapter, each time Desmond recalls Geraldine, his affective state circles back in lemniscate fashion to his feelings upon leaving her. His requests for knowledge about her condition, whether that condition is physical, mental, financial, or matrimonial, serve to return him to an emotional state that is never soothed by distance from her, nor time apart, but instead is heightened due to the layered nature of his contacts with her, his memory of those incidents, and Bethel's sketches of her present circumstances. When he must endure a lack of information from Bethel, such as the decrease of letters from Bethel reaching him throughout Volume I, this lack only further exacerbates Desmond's unease over Geraldine's situation. Though the letter from Bethel, written on September 20, is numbered Letter XI and thus appears before Letter XII, which is written by Desmond and dated September 14, it is the missive from Desmond on the 14th that emphasizes the concerns Desmond harbors three months after the commencement of his journey which is meant to aid him in conquering his feelings for her. In Letter XII, Desmond recounts the nightmare he experiences while at Hauteville after he attempts to "seek in sleep, relief against the uneasy thoughts that had dwelt upon [his] mind about Geraldine."[47] The reader of the novel has privileged information regarding Geraldine's financial woes, but Desmond remains in ignorance and the dream, in which she appears

to be stranded in a storm outside his window "in all the agonies of maternal apprehension," until finally she succumbs to death as he watches "the last breath tremble on those lovely lips—it was gone—Geraldine lost for ever!" indicates that his concerns have raised his anxiety to a fevered pitch, exhibited through the activity of his unconscious mind.[48] Geraldine represents Desmond's own emotional turmoil, dragging him into an imagined past over and over again.

In Volume II, however, the writing of letters becomes centered around the present circumstances of all the letter-writers, rather than remaining focused on Desmond's memories of Geraldine and his speculations about her imagined present, as Geraldine's correspondence with her sister, Fanny Waverley, accounts for the majority of the letters exchanged. Concerned for her sister, whose situation grows more desperate and impoverished as the Volume progresses, Fanny lives in Bath with their mother. Forbidden from visiting Geraldine during her confinement, Fanny remains in a stable location while Geraldine moves from Upper Seymour Street at the beginning of the volume on "Nov. 10, 1790," to "Sheen, near Richmond" on the 19th of February of the next year, back to "Seymour St" on "27th April, 1791," and finally to an unnamed place, from which she writes on "May 29th, 1791."[49] Fanny presumably knows where to direct her correspondence to her sister, but Smith does not indicate the locale in this first letter Geraldine writes "three days since [she] has settled into her new abode."[50] Without a fixed position, though Geraldine is obviously somewhere, she appears to be writing from nowhere. Location of the epistolary writer is a crucial part of correspondence, Altman argues, as "To write a letter is to map one's coordinates—temporal, spatial, emotional, intellectual—in order to tell someone else where one is located at a particular time and

how far one has traveled since the last writing."[51] But without identifying a location, the writer cannot confirm her own temporality through spatial fixation. Therefore, an unnamed place is unmoored from temporality, as time cannot exist without occupying and reciprocally creating a space, and an unknown place possesses the possibility of being simultaneously anywhere and nowhere. Geraldine's present, like her location, thus becomes equally paradoxical, in that it is both immersed in its own moment and is also outside of time itself. With the potential to occur at any time or no time congruently, once she is able to write from her new home, her correspondence resonates with her own present moment, resulting in a "returning tranquillity, I mean outward tranquillity (for that of the heart and spirit can never more be mine), gives me a little time to collect my troubled thoughts."[52] She feels she cannot enjoy a future peace, but her present state of affective affairs allows her to rein in the anxieties stemming from her past experiences. She in fact needs no sense of hope for a future without disquiet *because* her present is so fully occupied with "tranquillity," and she occupies a space in which only the present matters: if time seems not to be progressing, there is no future looming on the horizon.

Because of her physical location, Geraldine notes on "6th June, 1791" that "opportunities I have of sending to the post are so few, my dear sister, that though I write whenever I have any thing to say which I imagine you wish to hear, or whenever it relieves my heavy heart to pour out its sorrows to you, yet I know my letters do not reach you regularly."[53] Smith has omitted any letters between those written on May 29th and June 6th, leaving only Geraldine's present admission that she writes, but the product of her writing, focusing on her present feelings and condition, remains with her physically until she is able to "send to the post," further emphasizing both her unmoored physical

position, particularly in relation to mail circulating through her house, and her persistent presentness that appears to erase the presence of time itself. She is immersed in her own temporality, isolated from other people, such that she even describes the surroundings as having been carved by "the hand of time, rather than the art of man," attributing agency to time in such a way as it has the potential to shape her as well.[54] Geraldine's escape from the timelessness of an unnameable location occurs only when Desmond arrives and he names his own place—and therefore, her place as well—in a letter to Bethel.

Desmond has recuperated in France and, injury healed, he travels north across the Continent to return to England. His movements parallel Geraldine's as she has similarly convalesced following the birth of her third child before undergoing her journey away from London to the unnamed place of her present residence. Her passage, while representing the uncertainly and instability of her marriage, both in its present circumstances and in its future prospects, appears structured in comparison to that of Desmond.[55] He tells Bethel from Marseilles on "8th Jan. 1791" that he "shall, I believe, as soon as I am quite well enough to be dismissed from the care of Mr Carmichael, go by slow journey towards Switzerland, and from thence to Italy."[56] His present physical condition, with "a weak and trembling hand," makes the act of writing difficult for him. This letter is, he says, "the second" missive he writes, as the "first letter I was able to write, was to Geraldine"; Desmond "use[s] another hand" an earlier note to Bethel, who replies, "Continue, I beg of you, to write by another hand till you can use your own."[57] Though Desmond's physical impairment might afford him a topic of conversation that centers on himself, he instead admits that he cannot "avoid writing on what constantly occupies [his] mind—how dismiss from thence, even for a moment, what weighs so

heavy on my heart … those sources of painful and fruitless regret, which I am, perhaps, too fond of cherishing."[58] This topic is, of course, Geraldine, who is never absent from Desmond's thoughts:

> I have often been very unhappy, but I never was quite so wretched as I am at this moment. My anxiety for the fate of Geraldine tears me to pieces; and I cannot return to England *immediately*, where I should, at least, be relieved from the long and insupportable hours of suspense which the distance now obliges me to undergo … but there are circumstances which render it difficult for me to quit this part of France *immediately*. … and you will see by the manner in which this is written, that I do not at present boast of so perfect a restoration to health as to make any *immediate* determination necessary.[59]

Desmond's moment of writing is immersed in his imaginings of Geraldine's own present moment: the "sources of painful and fruitless regret" have merged with "anxiety for the fate of Geraldine," and the distance he has travelled in an attempt to banish his connection to her has instead intensified the very feelings he has meant to relinquish. The receipt of Bethel's Letter V, written from London on "Dec. 17, 1790" and containing information of Geraldine's troubles, has heightened Desmond's discomfort to an "insupportable" level, to the point of exacerbating his feelings of impotence as regards her life: he cannot see her, he cannot "ward off some of those misfortunes … she is hourly exposed," he cannot "quit this part of France."[60] Perhaps most importantly, however, he cannot relieve his tension through "talking to [Bethel] on paper of all [he] feel[s]."[61] Desmond's imagines Geraldine as existing in perpetual suffering—an impression that Geraldine's own writing bears out. Simultaneously, however, Desmond is stranded in a situation which he cannot alter "immediately." Desmond's use of this particular term, one that indicates urgency and a requirement for action in the present moment, three separate times within this relatively short excerpt, stresses his engagement with the now, rather than anticipation for future action. While the Geraldine described in

this missive still possesses hints of the past as a figural representation of affective memory, of "painful and fruitless regret," for Desmond, Bethel's letter cements her as a present concern, where the reports of her actual circumstances outweigh the nostalgic emotion Desmond expressed for her and are replaced by visions of her "misfortunes."

Yet Desmond's next letter, written from "Lausanne, April 10th, 1791," retreats from immersion in Geraldine's present position and returns to a recitation of political events in France, leaving the subject which had previously "constantly occupie[d]" Desmond's mind to only briefly bookend his letter.[62] An encomium on her conduct under such strain at the beginning of the missive and a fleeting reference to his deeper emotions are all that Smith attributes to her titular character as he travels across Europe. Much like Geraldine hesitates to write until she is settled into a new home, Desmond's communiques are distant and restrained in this volume. He confesses only that the "moment I am in solitude, the image of Geraldine in distress, Geraldine contending with irremediable misfortunes, recurs to me; and other subjects of regret add bitterness to my reflections. Perhaps, therefore, I should so wisely to mix more in society."[63] Alone, mired in his thoughts, Desmond returns to imaginings of his friend and her straitened circumstances, amplifying the affective nature of those "reflections" with the sentiments he experiences in his own present. Without identifying a particular "moment" in which this remembrance occurs, the effect of his proliferation of emotion has the potential to repeat any time Desmond is "in solitude," a condition that might arise even should he "mix more in society." He is always vulnerable to being returned to a state of heightened anxiety, never truly free of the constantly resurrecting cycle of his increasingly affective memories, despite his stated desire to put her from his mind. Desmond does not dwell in

this letter from Switzerland on the "regions of heroics [in regard to Geraldine] that are, you say, beyond the reach your reasonable and calm comprehension," in deference to a prior request by Bethel.[64] When he does write to Bethel again, it is not until nearly two months later: stating that "I, who am, as you have often said, a strange, eccentric being, and not much like any other, am going to … acknowledge my folly without even trying at palliation," Desmond writes "From Bridge-foot, a small cluster of Cottages in Herefordshire, June 8th, 1791," a location that "is within half a mile of the residence of Geraldine."[65] Once he has named the place in which Geraldine has been, and he now is, living, their temporalities merge. Geraldine no longer inhabits a temporal limbo; Desmond's present begins to coincide with her own, as they are now existing within a shared space—only "half a mile" apart.

When Geraldine narrates their encounter, emphasizing the surprise with which she greets Desmond when she discovers him speaking with her children, she tells her sister, "extraordinary it certainly is.—I know not from whence Mr Desmond last came, nor whither he is going—I know not where he has taken up his present abode. … I know not why [I retired to my pillow and tears], unless the suddenly meeting an acquaintance, a friend, who has certainly a great claim to my gratitude and good wishes, had more than usually fatigued my spirits."[66] Desmond's journey from Switzerland is itself cloaked in some mystery—though he left within "four-and-twenty hours after the receipt of [Bethel's] last letter" and "in six-and-thirty hours afterwards was at Dover."[67] The details of his trip are missing, leaving the impression that he has moved more quickly through space than the time seems to have passed, which would, of course, be a physical impossibility. Yet, the lack of information unmoors Desmond from a temporality that

would correlate with his movements across the Continent and the Channel. Just as Desmond's mind has been pulling him out of his own present and into an imagined temporal moment in which Geraldine is the primary force, his flight from St. Germains—the place where Bethel directs his last communication, dated "May 18, 1791," on the assumption that Desmond had been staying there as indicated—has the effect of detaching him from the space through which he has been moving.[68] His letter to Bethel on June 8th, in which he confesses his journey and describes his encounters with first Geraldine's children and then Geraldine herself, restores him to an identifiable temporality within the space he occupies in close proximity to her. Though their letters narrate the incident from their separate view points, and with separate originating feelings, Geraldine and Desmond act as writers at simultaneous moments. At eleven o'clock the morning after they meet, they each note the time and tell their correspondents, "I have an opportunity of sending this letter, or rather this enormous pacquet, to the post," and "I have an opportunity of sending this to the post," respectively.[69] Entwined by their shared temporality and spatial proximity, Desmond's scribbling echoes Geraldine's, as his Letter XVI immediately follows her Letter XV, though neither writer is made more calm by the shortened distance between them. If anything, both are more apprehensive at the prospect of meeting again: Geraldine experiences a "ridiculous flutter, which the idea of a visitor gives" her, while Desmond is "as anxious as if the fate of [his] whole life depended on the next three hours."[70] Smith has so firmly linked Geraldine and Desmond's present moments that they no longer seem to be disparate from each other. Indeed, she has created a demonstrably synchronous moment which they both inhabit. Their act of writing about thoughts of each other unites them as though they are two

halves of the same whole, working in tandem. They are inextricably present together: present to each other in space, and writing—and therefore *existing*—in literally an identical affective present moment.

Despite the perpetual presentness of temporality and of epistolarity, Desmond and Geraldine cannot remain in their simultaneous moment; their circumstances do not allow for the continuation of their synchronity of location. A letter to Bethel concludes Volume II, detailing the misery he feels at having to leave Geraldine, as leave he must, at a time when she is harassed by the Duc de Romagnecourt, who has been sent by Mr. Verney to bring her to meet him in France: "You see I conclude cheerfully, which I account for by telling you, that whenever I am to see Geraldine, I feel in heaven … Yet, till I am assured that she is completely relieved from his insolent importunities, my heart, I find, must be subject to frequent fits of anxieties and indignation."[71] Geraldine fears the duc will continue to press her sexually, as he did when they met previously in London, and is angered by her husband's suggestion of leaving their children with her mother, Mrs. Waverley, in Bath. Desmond reports all of this information to Bethel, lamenting, "Oh, Bethel! why could I not, at that moment, have taken this lovely, injured woman and her children openly under my protection?—Why could I not aver that ardent, yet sacred passion I feel for her?"[72] This desire is, of course, part of the chivalric drive Desmond feels in regard to Geraldine, which Essaka Joshua suggests that Desmond both supports and denigrates throughout the novel, and of which reminders perpetually emerge in attempts to drag Desmond back into an imagined heroic past, while also allowing him to picture a future where he possesses the right to protect her.[73] The present becomes constraining for Desmond; while he may celebrate being in Geraldine's presence, and

having seen her, the very fact that he is so close to her limits him in ways the earlier distance between them could not.

Whereas he was previously able to imagine that he could alleviate Geraldine's suffering in significant ways, when in proximity to her, Desmond is faced with the reality of his powerless state with regard to her safety and comfort. He is confined to offering only minimal aid to his beloved because, "at that moment," to be open with his protection, to "aver that ardent … passion," would be to destroy both their reputations socially. Though they are not occupying the same household, nor are they in the same country, Geraldine remains tied to her husband. Desmond and Mr. Verney have reversed locales and, in some ways, positions in exactly the manner Desmond had wished. Yet, while his dreams might have seemed to have become reality, Geraldine is still not, and cannot be, his. A present in which she and Desmond may exist together in their current arrangement is an impossibility. Desmond had already taken an emotional leave of Bridge-foot in order to travel to Bath, intending to meet Bethel, when he composes his final letter of the volume, explaining his tardy arrival and declaring that "[t]o tear myself from her was now more difficult than I ever yet found it."[74] As his desire to do what is right to protect Geraldine from speculation and rumor conflicts with his need to shield her from the unwanted advances of the duc, Desmond ultimately extends his present with Geraldine until mid-June, when, after he accompanies her and her children to Gloucester on the way to Bath, he leaves them to "go into Kent for a few days; after which, there will surely be no impropriety" in his visiting Bethel in Bath as he had planned.[75] Separated from Geraldine once again, Desmond progresses from anxiety for the future into a realm in which he appears to be without anchor in either space or time, before

returning to a sense of temporality that produces the possibility for future happiness through the course of Volume III.

The Future: waiting with expectation

Desmond writes nine of the twenty-six letters that constitute the novel's final volume, each of which contribute to either alleviating or exacerbating Bethel's concern over his actions and his mental state. Highlighting the suffering Bethel claims, in both his letters to Desmond and in an almost equal number to Fanny Waverley (he directs four letters to Desmond and three to Fanny), is the fact that Desmond does not divulge his whereabouts to Bethel for nearly three months. Haunted by images of Geraldine while staying at his estate, Desmond is unhappy after leaving her to travel on to Bath alone. He tells Bethel that:

> It is in vain, my dear Bethel, for me to attempt calling off my mind a moment from Geraldine … But I was about to relate the effect that my former friendly and innocent intercourse with this lovely woman, has on my present frame of mind; and how it touches, with peculiar sadness, every object around me. … I have been most decidedly miserable ever since I have been here: every body tires me, and business or conversation alike disgust and teize me.—I fancied that after an absence of twelve months, the former might, for a time, occupy my mind.[76]

Surrounded by the objects and landscapes that remind him of Geraldine, Desmond cannot escape either the memory of her or the disquiet he feels over the possibility of what she is suffering. His home becomes a space in which he is trapped in the past, where "[d]ay after day I linger here in tortures, even greater than you are aware of."[77] There is only the hope of some relief from his worry in the anticipation of receiving news from either Bethel or Geraldine herself: "I rise in a morning only to count the moments, till the return of the messenger I send for letters; and then to become splenetic for the rest of the day, if

he does not bring" intelligence from Bath."[78] When Desmond had been in France, the anticipation of information from England could be elongated, as the process by which missives were sent was necessarily long and he knew that Bethel's communiques would not reach him immediately. Now, however, with the distance between Kent and Wiltshire being much less than between Bath and the south of France, or even Paris, and with the ability to distract himself with politics nonexistent, Desmond is consumed by his emotions, left to "wander about like a wretched restless being" and to beg his friend, "Relieve me soon, dear Bethel, from this miserable state, or in a fit of desperation, I may set out for Bath."[79] Though he had been able to find a path away from the past and into the present in his travels, and has now become immersed in a present that exists with Geraldine, Desmond's inability to move beyond his present unhappiness forces him again to revive his own personal past, which is connected to the space of his estate and simultaneously prevents him from imagining a future. He counts the minutes in expectation of a future letters, resulting in depression when they do not arrive; he threatens to journey to Bath without regard for the consequences of such an action because that is the only path he sees that will allow his emotions some assuagement.

Bethel's reply, containing the news that Geraldine has made her own arrangements to leave Bath and travel to France to meet her spouse, prevents Desmond's proposed journey, but between Letter V, written on June 24, and Letter VII, his next letter, which he dates "Sedgewood, July 2, 1791," Desmond plans to depart his manor without a set destination: "I have business which will inevitably call me from hence—and I shall set out to-morrow on an absence of a few weeks, perhaps: but as I do not know exactly where I shall be, and shall have my letters sent after me as soon as I do know,

continue to direct hither."[80] This business—which is later revealed to be the birth of his child by Josephine, Montfleuri's sister—remains deliberately veiled; and as it plays a part in dictating that Desmond travel to some unspecified location, he moves outside of the realm of epistolary temporality made concrete through notations made on letters by their writers. Though, earlier in the novel, Geraldine previously existed in a temporality made unknowable by a lack of place and Desmond seems to have moved through space as if time did not pass as it should, his purposeful actions of removing himself from the temporality constructed by the adherence to the formal devices of recording the date and the location from which a missive is written serves to eliminate him from temporality altogether. Once at a distance from his correspondent, he is both signified by and only signifiable through his writing. If that writing appears to come from an unspecified point in time and space, as Desmond's letters do in the months between his composition from Sedgewood on July 2 and that from Paris on October 1, the information that allows Bethel as his reader to identify Desmond as correspondent is missing the vital pieces that can place Desmond within a recognizable temporality—one that corresponds with Bethel's own. And given that connections between people, and most especially epistolary connections, depend on some coherent and logical assemblage of experienced temporalities that are expressed through both clock time and calendar dates, the lack of a date to indicate the time which has passed since the information contained in any given epistle was recorded would produce confusion and consternation for the recipient of the letter that appears to be sent from no where at no time. Though Smith's displacement of Desmond within his own temporality harkens back to Behn and Haywood's separation of their texts from a specific historical moment, *Desmond* is itself too much a novel of

kairos, of its own connection to Smith's world, that the novel itself cannot be disconnected from the political events it describes. That anchoring of the novel within the revolutionary movement of the 1790s results in detaching only Desmond from his temporality—unlike the earlier Pamela who remains firmly, perhaps obsessively temporal within her own narrative.

Bethel indicates the irregularity of Desmond's temporal reticence, asking him, "And are you really going, you know not when, you know not whither?—Is it quite like my friend, even under the influence of this unhappy passion, to be so unsettled in his plans?—It is, however, more unlike him to be disingenuous."[81] Clearly, Desmond is usually much more forthcoming with his mentor, even when traveling through a France turbulent with revolution and with no specific destination in mind. Where Bethel might have understood and accepted some mystery in terms of firm dates for Desmond's journey if Desmond himself had some set itinerary, it is the fact that "*you* know not when, *you* know not whither" that disturbs him. There is not simply secrecy suggested by the sense that "*you* know not," but an itinerancy that dislocates Desmond from his correspondent. To have no schedule, nor a plausible design contributes to emphasizing Desmond's distance in both space and temporality. Further complicating Desmond's disappearance is the fact that his first letter after leaving Sedgewood appears after Geraldine's letter to Fanny dated "Sept., 7, 1791."[82] Where prior letters appeared dis-ordered in the narrative, they remained identifiable through the notation of the date on which they were composed: Bethel's infrequent letters in Volume I are interspersed with the products of Desmond's prolific letter-writing, their dates indicating that though Bethel wrote them in reply to an earlier letter, Desmond had continued to write without

waiting for a reply, the effects of which I have discussed above. Here, without an indication of composition date, Bethel's—and thus the novel reader's—only clue as to when Desmond writes is his own statement that "I have been long in writing to you, Bethel."[83] Without a reference point, however, "long in writing" is immeasurable: length, either in space or in time, cannot be measured if there is no comparison point.

Desmond links his location to both his sense of time and his mood in Letter XII as well, writing that he can "now hardly know whence to date my letters, as I am, and have been, and shall be, upon the ramble for some time.—I am unhappy, and the unhappy are always restless."[84] Anticipating that his circumstances will not change further cements his unspecified temporality. He is, and has been, and "shall be" in motion, but does not date his letters from any particular place or time *because* he is not happy. Without a sense of happiness, or of hope, he has no sense of futurity, of potential for change. He may shift location, he may pass time somewhere, but he remains in a kind of temporospatial stasis, neither past, nor future, but an unrelenting present that never crosses or interacts with that of his correspondent, as Bethel's reply, dated, as Desmond's is not, on "Sept. 10, 1791" suggests. Indicating that the placement of Desmond's missive between Geraldine's of the 7th and Bethel's of the 10th is due more to the timing of its receipt by Bethel than of Desmond's composition, Letter XIII from Bethel includes his exhortation of: "When will the time come to which I have so long and so vainly been looking forward?—When shall I see you living in Sedgewood, in that most respectable of all characters, the independent English gentleman?—I never wanted your society so much as I do now; but, perhaps, never was so unlikely to have it."[85] Bethel asks Desmond to anticipate and expect a future, in a distinct space and time, in which Desmond will assume his proper position,

even as Desmond's refusal to record his own temporality severs him from the possibility of doing as Bethel has "so long and so vainly been looking forward" to seeing him do.

The future to which Bethel directs Desmond's imagination appears unattainable while Desmond is employed in obfuscating his own temporality; yet, though Desmond hides his wheres and whens in further letters directed through "Messrs Sibthorpe and Griffith, bankers in London, on whom I draw for money as I want it," Bethel is not the only letter-writer considering the future.[86] Geraldine, now ensconced in an apartment in Meudon, France, writes to Fanny on "August 16th, 1791" in answer to a letter from her sister who laments Geraldine's situation and her prospects, her worry growing as she imagines what Geraldine faces.[87] "Oh! how anxiously I long to hear from you," Fanny says, "how painfully does my imagination dwell on the difficulties you may encounter, unprotected as you are … It is with a bleeding heart, my dear Geraldine, I say this; and, with a bleeding heart I await your letters, which heaven grant may bring me better accounts of you than my affrighted fancy suggests."[88] Layering memories of what Geraldine has suffered previously over what her mind now conjures as potential hurts that her sister may endure, Fanny sees the possibility of relief in the form of communication from Geraldine. The distance between them forces the time between the sending and receiving of Fanny's expressions of concern and Geraldine's answers. Though Geraldine's letter of the 16th of August follows this missive from Fanny, Fanny has written of her trepidations on July 18th, resulting in more than a month in which she is unable to find a reprieve from her queries of: "Where are you, my dear sister? and how shall I quiet my anxiety about you?"[89] There seems little hope for the alleviation of Fanny's apprehension, however, even once she reads Geraldine's reply, where Geraldine

relates the depth of her forebodings in writing, as she says, "to my sister, to my second self."[90]

Connecting Fanny to her own sorrows seems in part to allow Geraldine to write with honesty and self-awareness of her own emotional state in her present moment; that moment, however, is riddled with regrets and the inability to see beyond the miseries in which she is immersed—and to which she paradoxically seems to have found some immunity:

> I find, that from a habit of suffering, the mind acquires the power to suffer; and, if it resists at all, becomes every year less acutely sensible. It must at least be so with me, for I now look forward with melancholy composure to events that appear inevitable, of which the bare idea a few years, or even a few months ago, would have driven me, I think, to frenzy.—I see no end of my calamities but in the grave—and having in a great measure ceased to hope, it were ridiculous to fear.—Fate can have nothing worse in store for me than separation from those I love, embittered by poverty and contempt.—Long lingering years, varied only by different shades of wretchedness, is all my prospect.—Torn for ever from my dearest connections, and doomed to be the unresisting victim of a man, whose conduct is a continual disgrace to himself, his family, and his country.[91]

With constant exposure to dread, the strength of that uneasiness begins to diminish, creating a cycle of negative affect over time, where the more she feels, the fewer effects it has on her as she becomes acclimated. Geraldine begins to feel powerful in *not* having perpetual fear to drown her mind, the overwhelming sense of helplessness dissipating in having been experienced too much—the very perpetual nature of constant feeling becomes the source of its own decreasing impact. Without the idea of an end to her angst, she accepts that her future will remain the same as her present, with death as only the finale, and her financial and social circumstances will spiral further deeper into misery before that end arrives. Despite Susan Allen Ford's suggestion that motherhood and family have potentially "restorative power" even as marriage can be destructive, Geraldine seems to have lost sight of any future happiness after feeling so melancholy for

so long.[92] She does not even mention her children, nor the potential of their own futures, having "ceased to hope" there will be a change over the "[l]ong, lingering years" to come. Concluding this letter and opening the following with the report that "I every moment expect to receive a summons to depart—for—Alas! I know not whither," Geraldine illustrates a vulnerability she claims to have lost.[93] Her lack of information in terms of both when Mr. Verney will write to her and where he will ask her to proceed effectively places her in a similar limbo to the one Desmond occupies. Though she herself is grounded in the space and temporality of "Meudon, Sept. 7, 1791" in the second letter she writes to Fanny, the fact that she does not know how long she may stay, nor where she will go next, means that she has no future time or place to imagine.[94] While Desmond is unknowable to his correspondents, Mr. Verney is equally unknowable to Geraldine, and thus pulls her into his own sphere of temporospatial absence by virtue of their connection.

In fact, once he does contact her, she enacts the same type of disappearance. In her letter of "Oct. 3, 1791," Fanny asks Mr. Bethel if it would not be inappropriate for him to write to Montfleuri, who has come to Bath and to whom Fanny has been introduced, to discover news about Desmond, and "if it is, pray forget my asking; and forgive it, in consideration of the excessive anxiety I feel.—I have had no letter from Geraldine; and every hour encreases that solicitude, which I can neither satisfy nor repress."[95] Only through the sharing of Letter XX, written by Desmond to Bethel and dated "Paris, Oct. 1, 1791," which Bethel encloses in a separate letter to her, does Fanny receive the information she desires, learning that her sister has departed Meudon "on a moment's notice for the South of France, by the direction of her husband. Alone!"[96]

Because of the break in communication between both Geraldine and Desmond in France (which he reveals has been his location) and Fanny and Bethel in England, Letters XXII, XXIII, and XV, comprising three of the novel's final five missives, relate the circumstances in which Desmond and Geraldine were employed while they were in France and incommunicado in some length. Montfleuri, writing to Bethel, provides details of his own appearance in England as companion to his pregnant sister in Letter XV. These letters pull the narrative into the histories of its protagonists, cycling backwards in time in order to resolve the plot's details before moving forward into a future. Geraldine's missive reveals her own burgeoning self-awareness of the fact that her past affections for Desmond are more persistently present, and likely to remain so in the future, than she could previously admit—even if she will not act upon them. "I break my melancholy narrative to say this," she writes, "because I owe it to truth, I owe it to myself.—Indulge me then with yet a word on this delicate and painful subject, because I may, perhaps, speak upon it now for the last time," since she does not know whether "unhappy Verney lives or dies."[97]

Desmond's own narrative is much longer, as he explains to Bethel where he has been living and what he has been doing, information he has been previously unwilling to reveal. As he tells of following Geraldine and once again living near her in Meudon, this time in disguise, Desmond indulges in fantasies of what life might have been like for her if she had been in a happy marriage (presumably with himself): "But whither am I wandering?—in what dreams am I indulging myself?—dreams of what *might have been*; as if to embitter the sad reflection of *what is*; or to irritate the terror with which my soul recoils from the picture of *what may be.*"[98] Referring to each facet of time, he

acknowledges both the transient nature of his thoughts, moving as they do between temporalities, as well as the potential for their permanence and the void of uncertainty in the future generated in his heart. In writing this letter, Desmond's narrating self has information that Bethel does not yet possess, without having read Desmond's full account of past events. Yet, Desmond cannot help but hint at the possibility of either elation or misery in his future, and the present in which he anticipates both: "Yes! my dear friend, at the moment I am writing, and with apparent composure, this long narrative, I know not whether the most miserable destiny is hanging over *me*; and, at all events, I am certain that Geraldine must go through as much and as painful suffering as can be felt by innocence."[99] The fact that his future is unknowable opens for him a "state of suspence" which "may, perhaps, last much longer" that he can anticipate.[100] It is not until November 10, nearly three weeks after the date of this letter, that Desmond can begin to feel some relief from that tension, as he informs Bethel in Letter XXIV that Verney has died, leaving Geraldine a widow and free to accept Desmond's addresses.

This turn of events, the culmination of Verney's participation in an attempt to subdue the unruly populace by the Comte d'Hauteville and Duc de Romagnecourt, highlights the connections between the political and the domestic for Desmond. The letters written while he was "upon the ramble" are full of details of the revolution in France as he once again resorts to describing the political present as a way to obscure the details of the personal present he chooses not to reveal. Verney's death, which creates a new sense of future possibility for Desmond and Geraldine, intertwines not only the politics of the national with the politics of the domestic, but does so in such a way as to involve the potential for positive affect. Desmond asks Bethel, "Will it seem unfeeling if

I *say* that I am a *happy* fellow? I do not know—but I am sure I should be very *stupid* if I did not feel that *I am so*—I mean, however, only comparatively happy, for I intend to be a great deal happier; but I know that it must be many tedious months first."[101] Where Desmond had previously been anticipating a "most miserable destiny," he can now foresee becoming "a great deal happier" in the future. His final letter, written from "Bath, Feb. 6, 1792," bringing the novel to a close, references the sketch of his blissful prospects: "dare I trust myself with the rapturous hope, that on the return of this month, in the next year, Geraldine will bear *my* name—will be the directress of *my* family—will be my friend—my mistress—my wife!"[102] Projecting his desires onto a future that rests on the temporality of a calendar that returns to replay the same dates, on which day a year ago he was in a sick-bed in France and Geraldine was in London at the mercy of her husband's extravagances, Desmond illustrates the potential for change over time and the affective nature of idealizing the future. Yet, there remains no guarantee that the happiness he predicts will transpire; beseeching Bethel to write him, he proclaims, "But till that hour arrives, when the assurance of such felicity is more completely given me—Oh! lend me, dear Bethel, some of your calm reason to check my impatience; and soothe, with your usual friendship, [my] agitated heart."[103] Smith leaves her protagonist without a firm resolution or a tidy denouement. Instead, she leaves open the potential for continued disappointment and consigns Desmond to impatience and an "agitated heart." In doing so, she situates Desmond as waiting, indefinitely, in expectation of the consummation of an entire novel-full of desires, and thus emphasizes the indeterminate nature of futurity as always waiting, always expecting, and never fulfilled, much like the Revolution that so inspired him.

"Their future destiny": *Desmond* leads the way

Smith's conclusion leaves something wanting; Desmond exists once again in a stasis of pathetic temporality, a place where he can only hope to gain future fulfillment of his desires. This lack of a firm "ending" is, in some ways, a result of the genre. Altman notes that closure in the epistolary form, which "ultimately drops off into silence," requires the conditions of "polar limits—total presence (reunion) and total absence (death)—that constitute the conditions obviating the letter," so that there is no longer a need for the exchange of correspondence.[104] Yet in *Desmond*, Smith creates neither one limit, nor the other: Desmond is not with Bethel, and he will never be, given they own separate estates, and both are alive and (presumably) well at the finale. The potential for these writers to continue engaging in correspondence seems high. The silence in which Smith leaves her writers, however, attaches specific affect and sense of time to Desmond. Frozen in his perpetual anticipation and anxiety, he does not achieve the status of happiness or satisfaction and has only a sense of time stretching out before him. Smith thus ends her novel in a curtailed state that confirms what Mary Anne Schofield argues is common among the women writers of the eighteenth century: where male writers tended to tie up their narratives with neat, patriarchally approved bows, "female writers subvert happy, satisfying closures and instead present unfulfilling, nagging, worrisome, tragic endings that underscore the sense of separateness in which women exist and write."[105] Unlike *Pamela*, where the courtship narrative ends with a marriage that Richardson purports to be happy—and shall continue so—*Desmond* provides no such recourse to closure. Though the possibility of such a "'happy,' whitewashed" conclusion is in sight, Desmond must wait for such a future, leaving the reader waiting and worrying with

him.[106] The novel continues, like the other works I have discussed in this project, to question expectations of genre, of form, and of the ways in which gender roles are portrayed in print even beyond the final pages of the text. Pathetic temporality in the epistolary novel has provided what, I hope, is a productive lens through which to engage with issues of gender politics in the eighteenth century.

The state of the epistolary novel in general seems to float in the same sort of limbo in which Desmond waits for his marriage to Geraldine. A particularly eighteenth-century phenomenon, the epistolary novel's future is somewhat curtailed in the 1790s and early 1800s, until, like in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters Between a Noble-man and His Sister*, the form slowly disappears. It gives way to the primacy of the third-person narrator, the first-person narrator who speaks to the extradiegetic reader rather than to an imagined intradiegetic reader, and the free indirect discourse that mark the "novel" as it is understood through the nineteenth century. Smith may have engaged with political discourse in Desmond, but she was far from the only author to do so; Campbell argues that "[t]he Jacobin novel that developed next to and through Smith's work in the years to come continued to explore *the error that makes us wiser* by featuring fractured and failed versions of recognizable types from the eighteenth-century novel."[107] Perhaps the epistolary novel, though not an "error," made writers wiser, as even those authors who attempted the genre in later years, such as Mary Shelley with *Frankenstein*, could not or would not produce a fully-formed text with a narrative constructed strictly of letters. Instead, Shelley's text, epistolary at its core, is a "fractured and failed version" of the eighteenth-century structure able to convey affect through and in time on its pages, even

as it points the way toward the more common conventions of the novel in the nineteenth century and beyond.

CONCLUSION

"IN MY LAST LETTER"

In a moment of serendipity, tuned into NPR during my morning commute, I listened to a segment with Paul Watson, who had just published a text called *Ice Ghosts*.[1] It tells the story of how Watson, who was part of a scientific mission on an icebreaker in the Arctic a few years ago, came across two ships buried in the ice. Those ships had been part of the Franklin expedition in the 1840s, whose goal was to find the Northwest Passage—the path over the northernmost span of the planet. Given my plans to work on this conclusion, centering on Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, the frame of which involves the letters of a captain undertaking just such an expedition, I am not sure if I could have experienced a clearer example of *kairos*.[2] The timing was perfect: this story came on the radio at just the right time, or else I was driving my car at just the right moment to hear it. *Kairos*, indeed.

Frankenstein was the first thing that popped into my head when the subject of Watson's interview became clear. The connection was not just because the names are so similar—Frankenstein and Franklin, Walton and Watson—although it might have helped. Instead, the novel was on my mind as I considered the best way to conclude my discussion of pathetic temporality in the epistolary novel. Though the vast majority of Shelley's first novel is consumed with the recounting of Victor Frankenstein's explorations of "Whence … did the principle of life proceed?" and the disastrous effects

of his experiments, it is, in many ways, an epistolary novel.[3] That the novel begins with four letters written by Captain Robert Walton to his sister Margaret Saville, and ends with the continuation of Walton's journal of his encounter with Victor and his creature, is a fact often disregarded in the consideration of the text's other features. Criscilla Benford likens *Frankenstein*'s narrative structure to Russian nesting dolls, where Walton is the largest, external doll.[4] Anna E. Clark, in her study of which of the three narrators in *Frankenstein* should be considered the protagonist, calls Walton, "the first and least notable of [the] first-person speakers, even thought the scale and idiosyncrasy of his pursuit—a route through the North Pole—foreshadows a significance that his narrative frame never delivers."[5] But while Clark identifies Walton as a story-teller, she does not address the fact that *his* story is told through epistles, signaling that the form of Walton's narrative is less significant than its content. The internal plot of *Frankenstein*, however, Victor's own narrative and the narrative of his creature, comprises the substance of Walton's journal-letters, directed to his sister. As he tells Margaret: "I have resolved every night, when I am not imperatively occupied by my duties, to record, as nearly as possibly in his own words, what he has related during the day."[6] In doing so, Walton sets out a plan for pathetic temporality, one he believes will "afford [Margaret] the greatest pleasure: but to me, who know him and who hear it from his own lips—with what interest and sympathy shall I read it in some future day!"[7] He anticipates the tale will produce affect, and not just once. Indicating that he will return to his transcription of Victor's verbal account, Walton confirms the potential for repeated emotional engagements with the text he produces. Like Pamela nearly eighty years before him, Walton assumes he will engage in a lemniscate looping of a future return to the past

emotional state in which he will experience again what affects him, layering past feelings onto his present sentiments. Through her epistolary narrator, Shelley demonstrates that the affective nature of texts continues the production of pathetic temporality well into the second decade of the nineteenth century.

But though considerations of Shelley's narrative form do take Walton's participation into account, even when only briefly mentioning the epistolarity of his contribution, the important detail for my purposes is that those analyses of Walton's letters *can* only be brief. The novel's larger structure as layered personal narratives is too compelling, and the letters are only a small part of the whole. Epistolarity, though forming the frame of the text—the outermost Russian doll, to use Benford's metaphor—quickly disappears beneath the weight of Victor's own words. The very fact that what makes *Frankenstein* nominally epistolary is so short, only a gesture, really, seems to be what discounts that epistolarity's importance. The text's epistolary structure essentially falls apart; though the book opens and closes with Walton's addresses to his sister in London, like the Russian doll, those letters' value derives most prominently from what lays inside them, and not from the fact that they simply exist. Walton's composition takes the form of his missives; the rest is a detailed record of someone else's words and history, creating what Scott C. Campbell terms a "fractured and failed version of recognizable types from the eighteenth-century novel."[8] Though Campbell refers to the political novels of the 1790s, most of which deal with the repercussions of the French Revolution and the wars in which Britain and France will be involved until 1815, Shelley's text can be considered at least a fractured, if perhaps not failed, version of the epistolary novel, a very "recognizable type." That the novel does not conform to standard epistolary generic

expectations, however, does not mean that even its slight utilization of epistolarity should be ignored.

In a queer reading of Shelley's novel, Elizabeth Freeman's *Time Binds* engages with not only *Frankenstein*, but also Edmund Burke, Thomas Paine, and Adam Smith, in order to describe the temporality involved in what she terms "erotohistoriography."[9] Freeman investigates the production of this man of feeling through the highly publicized debate regarding the French Revolution between Edmund Burke and Thomas Paine in the early 1790s.[10] Burke establishes that a feeling of traditional and nation pride stems from feeling a historical connection to fellow countrymen and -women, gaining a temporal drag from those ancestors who came before. Paine argued that there was no history in feeling, that one could never feel what an ancestor felt, and any national pride should come from the moment. Freeman goes on to further consider the production of the "man of feeling" from a sympathetic response to the world surrounding him—i.e. what Adam Smith defines in his *Theory of Moral Sentiments* as the ability to imagine oneself in another's position and feel what you believe you would feel in that case. What each of these men suggest, though Freeman does not explicitly state it, is that emotional response is key to understanding the world, specifically through temporality entwined with affect, as I have defined it throughout this study.

For Freeman, Shelley's novel interacts with time in complex ways through both the character and the narration of the creature, through Victor Frankenstein, and then again through Captain Walton—which are then taken up via later works.[11] Her argument highlights the correlation between the stitched together histories embodied in the monster's own flesh and the interwoven temporalities elucidated in Virginia Woolf's

Orlando and, even later, in Hillary Brougher's film *The Sticky Fingers of Time*.[12] In the case of *Frankenstein*, Freeman argues, the epistolary style of the narrative aids in creating a "temporal drag" that alters the temporal coherence of meaning; as in Janet Gurkin Altman's theory of the "pivotal present," though the reader is constantly in the present, the very nature of the epistolary narrative forces the intended reader of the letter format to learn of events that have occurred in the past.[13] I would argue that, while this novel is indeed a narrative of epistles, the structure of exchange inherent in the nature of letter-reading is exploded soon after Walton begins recounting the tale he learns from his half-frozen passenger. Freeman, in her desire to include all aspects of temporality within the novel, fails to consider how very small is the actual involvement of the reader of *Walton's* letters to the overall point she makes regarding queerly embodied history in Shelley's novel.

Frankenstein, then, seems to stand as an example of the change taking place within the narrative structure of novels at the turn of the nineteenth century. Epistolarity no longer holds the reins as the driving force of narrative, becoming relegated to a mere plot device. Still retaining the power to represent the inner thoughts of a character other than the protagonist, letters begin to function only as frames for longer narratives directed by free-indirect discourse or sustained first-person accounts of the events of a character's life. But, as Freeman demonstrates, that break-down of epistolarity needs not restrain scholarly inquiry from engaging with discussions of either affect or temporality as they pertain to fiction, either pre- or post-1800. Though I have applied pathetic temporality specifically to only a few eighteenth-century British novels here, the theoretical construct

can—and I would argue *should*—be applied to literature from other periods, other genres, and other languages.

As I close, I return briefly to Paul Watson's interview and the *kairos* of my hearing it just as I was about to begin work on this conclusion. In Walton's final missive of *Frankenstein*, a letter not even marked in the text as such, as the earlier epistles are, he writes to his sister that he is:

> encompassed by peril, and ignorant whether I am ever doomed to see again dear England, and the dearer friends that inhabit it. I am surrounded by mountains of ice, which admit of no escape, and threated every moment to crush my vessel. … what, Margaret, will be the state of your mind? You will not hear of my destruction, and you will anxiously await my return. Years will pass, and you will have visitings of despair, and yet be tortured by hope. … My unfortunate guest … endeavours to fill me with hope; and talks as if life were a possession he valued. He reminds me how often the same accidents have happened to other navigators, who have attempted this sea, and in spite of myself, he fills me with cheerful auguries. … We are still surrounded by mountains of ice, still in immanent danger of being crushed in their conflict. The cold is excessive, and many of my unfortunate comrades have already found a grave amidst this scene of desolation.[14]

I am struck by Walton's description of his environment, of his anticipation of Margaret's emotional state, of his attempts to be optimistic in the face of potential death. Knowing the fate of the Franklin expedition, I wonder at how prophetic Shelley's text seems. Drawing on information about past voyages ("the same accidents have happened to other navigators") while referencing future grief ("Years will pass"), Shelley paints an affective picture, one that acknowledges the temporal nature of Walton's consciousness. As *Frankenstein* depicts just how those men on Franklin's ships must have felt, and what they must have seen, twenty-seven years before these new "navigators … attempted this sea," here is pathetic temporality: time and affect intertwined as emotions reflect on the past, the present, and the future.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

[1] Dena Goodman writes, "along with conversation, letter writing became one of the ways in which eighteenth-century elite women displayed and demsonatrated their refinement, but it also shapted the way they established and sustained relationships with others. And it emerged as women's primary site of reflection and self-reflections; in letters women were able to articulate a gendered subjectivity at a time when gender expectations were changing and often contradictory." *Becoming a Woman in an Age of Letters* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009), 2.

[2] Janet Gurkin Altman, *Epistolarity: Approaches to a Form* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1982): 118.

[3] Keith M. Opdahl, *Emotion as Meaning* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2002).

[4] See: Henry Home, Lord Kames, *Elements of Criticism*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1762). ECCO (CW3310985945, CW3310986375, & CW3310986839); David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature,* ed. Ernest C. Mossner. (New York: Penguin Books, 1969); Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 2 Vols. 6th ed. (London, 1790). ECCO (CW332035648 & CW3320355147).

[5] Samuel Johnson, *Dictionary of the English Language* (London: W. Strahan, 1755), n.p.

[6] Sara Ahmed, "Happy Objects," in *The Affect Theory Reader*, ed. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, 29-51. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010): 31.

[7] Ibid., 37.

[8] Armstrong's text, *Desire and Domestic Fiction*, is an important critical text concerning the effects of conduct literature and novels on women in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Her argument revolves around the premise that while written texts may reflect the ideologies and structures of the cultures in which they were produced, they also possess an influential role in determining and constructing that same culture. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

[9] John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1995).

[10] Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason* (New York: Penguin, 2007).

[11] Altman, *Epistolarity*, 13; Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, "An Inventory of Shimmers," in *The Affect Theory Reader*, ed. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, 1-25. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010): 1. See also: Joe Bray, *The Epistolary Novel: Representations of Consciousness* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 44.

[12] Elizabeth Freeman, *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), xxviii.

[13] Paul Goring, *The Rhetoric of Sensibility in Eighteenth-Century Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 14.

[14] Howard Anderson, Philip B. Daghlian, and Irvin Ehrenpreis, ed. *The Familiar Letter in the Eighteenth Century* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1966), 275.

[15] Bray, *Consciousness*, 81.

[16] The difference between the "experiencing" and "narrating" consciousnesses also represent a doubling of private and public self, an issue that is considered frequently. Clashes of public and private are played out through the publication of letters throughout the eighteenth century, particularly in *The Spectator*, Michael McKeon argues: "Even in itself, correspondence - personal sentiments exchanged with another person - evokes the mediating doubleness of the private made public." *The Secret History of Domesticity* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 80.

[17] Bray, *Consciousness*, 1.

[18] Ibid., 2.

[19] For in-depth discussions of the definition, performance, and construction of "sensibility" in the eighteenth century, see: Stephen. Ahern, *Affected Sensibilities: Romantic Excess and the Genealogy of the Novel, 1680-1810* (New York: AMS Press, Inc., 2007); G. J. Barker-Benfield, *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Joseph F. Bartolomeo, *A New Species of Criticism: Eighteenth-Century Discourse on the Novel* (Newark, NJ: University of Delaware Press, 1994); Barbara M. Benedict, *Framing Feeling: Sentiment and Style in English Prose Fiction, 1745-1800* (New York: AMS Press, 1994); Syndy M. Conger, ed. *Sensibility in Transformation: Creative Resistance to Sentiment from the Augustans to the Romantics: Essays in Honor of Jean H. Hagstrum*. (Rutherford NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1990); Markman Ellis, *The Politics of Sensibility: Race, Gender, and Commerce in the Sentimental Novel* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Paul Goring, *The Rhetoric of Sensibility in Eighteenth-Century Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Jean H. Hagstrum, *Sex and Sensibility: Ideal and Erotic Love from Milton to Mozart* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); Janet M. Todd, *Sensibility: An Introduction* (London: Methuen, 1986); Ann Jessie Van Sant, *Eighteenth-Century Sensibility and the Novel: The Senses in Social Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Walter Francis Wright, *Sensibility in English Prose Fiction, 1760-1814; a Reinterpretation* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1972); Barbara Zaczek, *Censored Sentiments: Letters and Censorship*

in Epistolary Novels and Conduct Material (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1997).

[20] In her scholarly engagement with sociability in the novel, Betty A. Schellenberg suggests that novels that may have been dismissed as failed examples of the genre by critics in the past might instead be promoting the same type of resistance that I propose here: a sense of communal interaction that pushes against individualistic urges and instead values past as having influenced present. *The Conversational Circle: Rereading the English Novel, 1740-1775* (Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 1996).

[21] See: Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction*; Margaret Anne Doody, *The True Story of the Novel* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1997); J. Paul Hunter, *Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction* (New York: Norton, 1990); Michael McKeon, *The Origins of the English Novel, 1600*-1740 (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987); Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1957).

[22] Natascha Würtzbach, *The Novel in Letters: Epistolary Fiction in the Early English Novel 1678-1740* (Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press, 1969).

[23] Barbara Zaczek, *Censored Sentiments: Letters and Censorship in Epistolary Novels and Conduct Material* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1997).

[24] For a discussion of *kairos* and *chronos*, see: Phillip Sipiora and James S. Baumlin, ed., *Rhetoric and Kairos: Essays in History, Theory, and Praxis* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2002).

CHAPTER 1

[1] Samuel Richardson, *Pamela; or, Virtue Rewarded*, ed. Thomas Keymer and Alice Wakely, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Michael Austin, *New Testaments: Cognition, Closure, and the Figural Logic of the Sequel, 1660-1740* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2012), 103.

[2] Ibid., 24, 33.

[3] For an in-depth discussion of the female subject as a product of her reading material, and of Pamela as a writing subject who manipulates her own political agency, see Nancy Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

[4] Ibid., 5, 3.

[5] Ibid., 6, 5; Keymer and Wakely identify the writer of this encomium on the novel in a note on page 526.

[6] Richardson, *Pamela*, 6.

[7] Ibid., 6.

[8] Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1957). In his seminal work in novel studies, Ian Watt argues that what sets the novel apart from its predecessor genres in the eighteenth century is its emphasis on realism in terms of character, plot, and temporality. In contrast, however, Pedro Javier Pardo Garcia argues that rather than being a novel of realism, *Pamela* is instead a purposefully romantic novel, in the vein of *Don Quixote*. "Novel, Romance, and Quixotism in Richardson's *Pamela*," *Atlantis* 18.1/2 (1996): 306-336.

[9] Richardson, *Pamela*, 6 (my emphasis). For further information on the construction of virtue and morality in *Pamela*, see: Jerry C. Beasley, "Richardson's Girls: The Daughters of Patriarchy in *Pamela, Clarissa,* and *Sir Charles Grandison*," in *New Essays on Samuel Richardson*, ed. Albert J. Rivero, 35-52. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996); David K. Jeffrey, "The Epistolary Format of *Pamela* and *Humphrey Clinker*," in *A Provision of Human Nature: Essays on Fielding and Others in Honor of Miriam Austin* Locke, ed. Donald Kay, 145-154. (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1977); Judith Laurence-Anderson, "Changing Affective Life in Eighteenth-Century England and Samuel Richardson's *Pamela*," *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 10 (1981): 445-456; Jacob Littleton, "'My Treacherous Heart': Non-Rhetorical Registers of Truth in Pamela's Ascent," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 10.3 (1998): 287-301; Alberta J. Rivero, "The Place of Sally Godfrey in Richardson's *Pamela*," in *Passion and Virtue: Essays on the Novels of Samuel Richardson*, ed. David Blewett, 52-72. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001); Werner Wolf, "Eighteenth-Century Sensibility and its Ambivalent Position in the 'Herstory' of Gender Roles," in *Framing Women: Changing Frames of Representation from the Enlightenment to Postmodernism*, ed. Sandra Carroll, Birgit Pretzsch, and Peter Wagner, 125-150. (Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer, 2003).

[10] Phillip Sipiora argues that the Greek concept of *kairos* carries the implication of "'timing,' or the 'right time.'" Therefore, when de Freval suggests that *Pamela* acts in contrast to "the Depravity of the Times," he is in fact stating that the time is right—and ripe—for the style and themes it presents. "Introduction," in *Rhetoric and Kairos: Essays in History, Theory, and Praxis*, ed. Phillip Sipiora and James S. Baumlin, 1-22. (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2002), 1.

[11] Judith Kegan Gardiner argues that, rather than Defoe or Richardson, Behn is in fact the first "novelist" to appear in Britain, which would therefore make *Love-Letters* the first British "novel"—and thus the first epistolary novel. I am not concerned with arguing the point in this study; rather, the argument that I make regarding *Love-Letters* in comparison to the structure of *Pamela* as epistolary relies on the fact that *Love-Letters* is not wholly epistolary. Therefore, whether or not *Love-Letters* would supersede *Pamela* in terms of

chronology does not matter—in fact, it may prove my point: Richardson uses the example of what came before to experiment with his own style. "The First English Novel: Aphra Behn's *Love Letters*, the Canon, and Women's Tastes," *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 8.2 (1989): 201-222. For further discussion of *Love-Letters'* place in the canon, see: Janet Todd, "Fatal Fluency: Behn's Fiction and the Restoration Letter," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 12.2-3 (2000): 417-434 and "Love-letters and Critical History," in *Aphra Behn (1640-1689): Identity, Alterity, Ambiguity*, ed. Mary Ann O'Donnell and Bernard Dhuicq, 197-204. (Paris: Harmattan, 2000); William B. Warner, "The 'Woman Writer' and feminist literary history; or, how the success of feminist literary history has compromised the conceptual coherence of its lead character, the 'woman writer,'' *JEMCS* 4.1 (2004): 187-196.

[12] See: Jane Blanchard, "Composing Purpose in Richardson's 'Pamela,'" *South Atlantic Review* 76.2 (2011): 93-107; Kristina Booker, "Richardson's *Pamela*, Defoe's *Roxana*, and Emulation Anxiety in Eighteenth-Century Britain," *The Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 14.2 (2014): 41-61; Toni Bowers, *Force or Fraud: British Seduction Stories and the Problem of Resistance: 1660-1760* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); James Cruise, "'Pamela' and the Commerce of Authority," *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 87.3 (1988): 342-358; Margaret Ann Doody, "Richardson's Politics," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 2.2 (1990): 113-126; John A. Dussinger, "Love and Consanguinity in Richardson's Novels," *SEL* 24 (1984): 513-526 and "'*Ciceronian* Eloquence': The Politics of Virtue in Richardson's *Pamela*" in *Passion and Virtue: Essays on the Novels of Samuel Richardson*, ed. David Blewett, 27-51. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001); Terry Eagleton, *The English Novel: An Introduction* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub, 2005); Heidi Giles, "Resolving the Institution of Marriage in Eighteenth-Century Courtship Novels," *Rocky Mountain Review* 66.1 (2012): 76-82; Raymond F. Hilliard, "*Pamela*: Autonomy, Subordination, and the 'State of Childhood,'" *Studies in Philology* 83.2 (1986): 201-217; Julian Jimenez Heffernan, "Pamela's Hands: Political Intangibility and the Production of Manners," *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 46.1 (2013): 26-49; Thomas Keymer, "Pamela's *Fables*: Æsopian Writing and Political Implication in Samuel Richardson and Sir Roger l'Estrange," *XVII-XVIII. Bulletin de la société d'études anglo-américaines des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles* 41 (1995): 81-101; Charlotte LeFever, "Richardson's Paradoxical Success," *PMLA* 48.3 (1933): 856-860; Elizabeth Kukorelly Leverington, "Domesticating the Hero: Norative Masculinity in 'Robsinson Crusoe' and 'Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded," *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies* 13.1-2 (2007): 147-164; Greg Morgan, "'Give Me the Consideration of Being the Bondsman': Embarassment and the Figure of the Bond in the Sentimental Fiction of Samuel Richardson," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 28.4 (2016): 667-690; Vivasvan Soni, "The Trial Narrative in Richardson's *Pamela*: Suspending the Hermaneutics of Happiness," *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 41.1 (2007): 5-28; Arlene Fish Wilner, "'Thou Hast Made a Rake a Preacher: Beauty and the Beast in Richardson's *Pamela*," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 13.4 (2001): 529-560.

[13] Robert Adams Day, *Told in Letters: Epistolary Fiction before Richardson* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1966).

[14] For research concerning the connections between politics and the historical events to which Behn alludes in this text, see: Ros Ballaster, "'The story of the heart': *Love-Letters between a Noble-Man and his Sister*," in *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn*, ed. Derek Hughes and Janet Todd, 135-150. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Toni Bowers, "Seduction Narratives and Tory Experience in Augustan England," *The Eighteenth Century* 40.2 (1999): 129-154 and "Behn's Monmouth: Sedition, Seduction, and Tory Ideology in the 1680s," *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 38 (2009): 15-44; Alison Conway, "The Protestant Cause and a Protestant Whore: Aphra Behn's *Love-letters*," *Eighteenth-Century Life* 25 (2001): 1-19; Karen Gevirtz, "From Epistle to Epistemology: *Love-Letters* and the Royal Society," *Women's Writing* 22.1 (2015): 84-96; Kathy Howlett, "The Entangled History of Legal and Ficitonal Discourse in *The Trial of Ford Lord Grey of Werk* and Aphra Behn's *Love Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister*," *Critic* 58.1 (1995): 25-35; Mona Narain, "Body and Politics in Aphra Behn's *Love Letters Between a Nobleman and his Sister*," *Women Writing 1550-1750* (2001): 151-162; Ellen Pollak, "Beyond Incest: Gender and the Politics of Transgression in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters between a Nobleman and His Sister*," in *Rereading Aphra Behn*, ed. Heidi Hutner, 151-186. (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1993); Margaret Reeves, "History, Fiction, and Political Identity: Heroic Rebellion in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister* and *Oroonoko*," in *1650-1850: Ideas, Æsthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era*, vol. 8, ed. Kevin L. Cope, 269-294. (New York: AMS Press, 2002); Albert J. Rivero, "'Hieroglifick'd' History in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister*," *Studies in the Novel* 30.2 (1998): 126-138; Francis F. Steen, "The Politics of Llove: Propaganda and Structural Learning in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters between a Nobleman and His Sister*," *Poetics Today* 23.1 (2002): 91-122; Helen Thompson, "'Thou Monarch of my Panting Soul': Hobbesian Obligation and the Durability of Romance in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters*," in *British Women's Writing in the Long Eighteenth Century*: *Authorship, Politics, and History*, ed. Jennie Batchelor and Cora Kaplan, 107-120. (London: Palgrave Macmillan: 2005); Donald R. Wehrs, "*Eros*, Ethics, Identity: Royalist Feminism and the Politics of Desire in Aphra Behn's *Love Letters*," *SEL* 32 (1992): 461-478.

[15] Sonia Villegas López argues that Behn is exploring the possibilities of multiple genres of fiction in this text, including pastoral romance, female complaint, and epistolarity, while G. Gabrielle Starr suggests that lyric plays a role in Behn's prose style. López, "'The Conscious Grove': Generic Experimentation in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister* (1684-87)," *Women's Writing* 22.1 (2015): 69-83; Starr, "Love's 'Proper Musick': Lyric Inflection in Behn's Epistles," in *Aphra Behn (1640-1689): Identity, Alterity, Ambiguity*, ed. Mary Ann O'Donnell and Bernard Dhuicq, 111-124. (Paris: Harmattan, 2000). Further research on the genre of Behn's text includes Susannah Quinsee, "Deconstructing Female 'Virtue': Mariana Alcoforda's *Five Love Letters from a Nun to a Cavalier* and Aphra Behn's *Love Letters between a Noblemand and his Sister*," in *Eighteenth-Century Women: Studies in Their Lives, Work, and* Culture, vol. 2, ed. Linda V. Troost, 1-22. (New York: AMS Press, Inc., 2002); Janet Todd, "Who is Silvia? What is she? Feminine identity in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and his Sister*," in *Aphra Behn Studies*, ed. Janet Todd, 199-218. (Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 1996); Susan Wright, "Private Language Made Public: The Language of Letters as Literature," *Poetics* 18 (1989): 549-578.

[16] Aphra Behn, *Love-Letters between a Noble-Man and his Sister*, vol. 2 of *The Works of Aphra Behn*, ed. Janet Todd (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1993).

[17] For a discussion of the way in which Silvia's character shifts between Parts of the text, see Warren Chernaik, "Unguarded Hearts: Transgression and Epistolary Form in Aphra Behn's 'Love-Letters' and the 'Portuguese Letters'," *The Journal of English and German Philology* 97.1 (1998): 13-33.

[18] Ibid., 3.

[19] Todd makes this reference in a footnote on page 3.

[20] Stephen Ahern, "'Glorious ruine': Romantic Excess and the Politics of Sensibility in Behn's 'Love-Letters'," *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700* 29.1 (2005): 30.

[21] Behn, *Love-Letters*, 12.

[22] Ibid., 20. Janet Todd discusses the ways in which Behn displays desire between her characters in the text. "'The hot brute drudges on': ambiguities of desire in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and his Sister*," *Women's Writing* 1.3 (1994): 277-290.

[23] Behn, *Love-Letters*, 21-22.

[24] Ibid., 28.

[25] Ibid., 49.

[26] Ibid., 13, 14, 28, 31, 96, 103.

[27] Barbara M. Benedict, *Framing Feeling: Sentiment and Style in English Prose Fiction, 1745-1800* (New York: AMS Press, 1994), 1.

[28] Lacy Marschalk, Mallory Porch, and Paula R. Backscheider identify such "epistolary miscellanies" to be "one of the most popular forms of epistolary fiction throughout the century" in "The Empty Decade? English Fiction in the 1730s," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 26.3 (2014): 394.

[29] Eliza Haywood, *Love-Letters on All Occasions*, in vol. 1.1 of *Selected Works of Eliza* Haywood, Ed. Alexander Pettit (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2000) and *Epistles for the Ladies*, in vol. 1.2 of *Selected Works of Eliza Haywood*, Ed. Christine Blouch (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2000). Stephen J. Hicks also discusses the use Haywood makes of epistolarity in three other texts, *Bath Intrigues, Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier*, and *Philidore and Placentia; or, L'Amour Trop Delicat*, but none of these other works portrays the type of epistolarity present in *Pamela*, nor even the Theano-Elismonda exchange in *Love-Letters*, and one is an adaptation of a French text (*Letters*

from a Lady of Quality). "Eliza Haywood's Letter Technique in Three Early Novels (1721-27)," *PLL* 34.4 (1998): 420-436.

[30] Haywood, *Love-Letters*, 142.

[31] Ibid., 141, 143.

[32] "Introduction" to Haywood, *Love-Letters*, 123.

[33] Though the letters in *Love-Letters* do not explore concerns of relationships other than those that would conform to strictly hetero-normative standards, they do repeat issues of importance to courting couples. There is jealousy provoked by a woman's reception of multiple suitors' advances, as Brillante suggests to Locutio (Letter XVLI), which he answers with the stipulation that because she is unconcerned for her reputation, he will have no more to do with her (there are some rather obvious critiques of both patriarchal control of a woman's interactions and the public behavior of women within these letters). This pair of letters echoes and reverses the opening letter, in which Darian simultaneously accuses, apologizes, and pleads with Climene over her actions in inviting his jealousy (Letter I). Several letters discuss a woman's reaction to her engagement in sexual intercourse with her suitor and the consequences of that — Lysetta is left pregnant and unwed, begging for Lyonides to marry her for the sake of their child if not for her (Letter LV), in a reversal of the earlier sustained correspondence between Elismonda and Theano, who seem to be heading for matrimonial bliss after their illicit sexual encounter (Letters XIII-XXXVI). Haywood highlights the ambivalence in human nature by introducing aspects of courtship from multiple points of view and then engaging the same problem with a different voice and a different solution—or non-solution, in some cases. The letters tend to stand alone, though some have responses, as the backgrounds of the characters who write them are as flat as their fantastical names.

[34] Haywood, *Love-Letters*, Letters XLV-XLVI; L-LII; XL-XLIII; IX-XII; XIII-XXXVI.

[35] Ibid., 154-155.

[36] Ibid., 164.

[37] Pettit, "Introduction," 124.

[38] Richardson, *Pamela*, 98.

[39] Richard H. Costa, "The Epistolary Monitor in *Pamela*," *Modern Language Quarterly* 31 (1970): 38-47.

[40] Richardson, *Pamela*, 17, 18, 19.

[41] Ibid., 23.

[42] Ibid., 46.

[43] Ibid., 53, 77, 82.

[44] Ibid., 98.

[45] Ibid., 22.

[46] Laura Rosenthal discusses the implications of "work" in *Pamela*, as not only physical labor, but the potential for prostitution. "Pamela's Work" *The Eighteenth Century* 46.3 (2005): 245-253.

[47] Richardson, *Pamela*, 68, 422.

[48] Ibid., 6.

[49] Ibid., 119.

[50] Dorothy Parker goes on to argue that Mr. B.'s character can be assessed and possibly vindicated somewhat by a careful temporal parsing of his own interpolated story as it appears throughout the narrative produced by Pamela's letters. "The Time Scheme of *Pamela* and the Character of B.," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 11.1 (1969): 696.

[51] Richardson, *Pamela*, 149.

[52] Karen Lipsedge, *Domestic Space in Eighteenth-Century British Novels.* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

[53] Morris Golden, "Richardson's Repetitions," *PMLA* 82.1 (1967): 64-67.

[54] Markman Ellis, *The Politics of Sensibility: Race, Gender, and Commerce in the Sentimental Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 14. For further discussion of the performance of sensibility in the eighteenth century, see: G. J. Barker-Benfield, *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Barbara M. Benedict, *Framing Feeling: Sentiment and Style in English Prose Fiction, 1745-1800*; Paul Goring, *The Rhetoric of Sensibility in Eighteenth-Century Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Jean H. Hagstrum, *Sex and Sensibility: Ideal and Erotic Love from Milton to Mozart* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); Alan T. McKenzie, *Certain, Lively Episodes: The Articulation of Passion in Eighteenth-Century Prose* (Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1990); Keith M. Opdahl, *Emotion as Meaning* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2002); Janet M. Todd, *Sensibility: An Introduction* (London: Methuen, 1986); Ann Jessie Van Sant, *Eighteenth-Century Sensibility and the Novel: The Senses in Social Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Walter Francis Wright, *Sensibility in English Prose Fiction, 1760-1814; a Reinterpretation* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1972).

[55] Richardson, *Pamela*, 119, 121, 125, 145.

[56] Ibid., 125, 140-142. For further research on the use of Christian ideology and Biblical text in *Pamela*, see: Frank Ardolino, "Richardson's *Pamela*," *Explicator* 66.2 (2008): 78-82; Linda V. Itzoe, "The Chapel-Church Motif in Pamela: An Analysis," *Essays in Literature* 8.1 (1981): 91-96; Lisa O'Connell, "The Theo-political Origins of the English Marriage Plot," *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 43.1 (2010): 31-37 and "Vicars and Squires: Religion and the Rise of the English Marriage Plot," *The Eighteenth Century* 52.3-4 (2011): 383-402; John B. Pierce, "Pamela's Textual Authority," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 7.2 (1995): 131-146; Donald R. Wehrs, "Novelistic Redemption and the History of Grace: Practical Theology and literary Form in Richardson's *Pamela* and Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*," in *Theology and Literature in the Age of Johnson: Resisting Secularism*, ed. Melvyn New and Gerard Reedy, 1-26. (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2012).

[57] Costa, "The Epistolary Monitor in *Pamela*," 43.

[58] Friedrich Nietzche, *Ecce Homo*, in Ned Lukacher, *Time-Fetishes: The Secret History of Eternal Recurrence*, (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998), 7.

[59] Richardson, *Pamela*, 161, 167, 170.

[60] Ibid., 150, 154, 178.169.

[61] Ibid., 182.

[62] Ibid, 182.

[63] Ibid, 182.

[64] Ibid., 226, 228, 226.

[65] Ibid., 332-333.

[66] Ibid., 339, 340, 342, 351.

[67] Ibid., 353, 360.

[68] Ibid., 364.

[69] Ibid., 367, 377.

[70] Ibid., 378.

[71] Ibid., 380-381.

[72] Ibid., 381.

[73] Ibid., 438.

[74] Ibid., 415.

[75] Ibid., 452.

[76] Larry L. Stewart, "You Must Alter Your Style, Madam: *Pamela* and the Gendered Construction of the Narrative Voice in the Eighteenth-Century British Novel," in *Stylistics and Social Cognition*, ed. Lesley Jeffries, Dan McIntyre, and Derek Bousfield, 141-151. (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007), 148.

[77] Of course, there are differences between Pamela and Congreve's heroine Millament, who, in *The Way of the World*, desires that her fiancé Mirabell treat her as if they were not married until she settles into their marriage and "dwindle[s] into a wife." Pamela, on the other hand, is ready for the role before her wedding. William Congreve, *The Way of the World*, in *The Comedies of William Congreve*, ed. Anthony G. Henderson, 307-407. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

[78] Richardson, *Pamela*, 99.

[79] Ibid., 98.

[80] Ibid., 98, 99.

[81] Ibid., 104.

[82] Ibid., 105.

[83] For considerations of the political implications of Richardson as author assuming a female voice, see Franz Meier, "Gender Identity in Sentimental and Pornographic Fiction: *Pamela* and *Fanny Hill*," in *Mediating Identities in Eighteenth-Century England: Public Negotiations, Literary Discourses, Topography*, ed. Isabel Karremann and Anja Müller, 45-55. (Surrey, England: Ashgate, 2011); Madeleine Kahn, *Narrative Transvestism: Rhetoric and Gender in the Eighteenth-Century English Novel* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991).

[84] John Zaixin Zhang, "Free Play in Samuel Richardson's *Pamela*," *PLL* 27.3 (1991): 307.

[85] Pierce, "Pamela's Textual Authority," 133, 135.

[86] Tassie Gwilliam, "Pamela and the Duplicitous Body of Feminity," *Representations* 34 (1991): 104-133.

[87] Richardson, *Pamela*, 44.

[88] Ibid.

[89] Ibid., 111.

[90] Wendy Jones, "*Pamela* and Creative Cognition," *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 34.2 (2011): 185.

[91] Terry J. Castle, "P/B: *Pamela* as Sexual Fiction," *SEL* 22 (1982): 473.

[92] Austin, *New Testaments*, 103.

[93] Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor, *Pamela in the Marketplace: Literary Controversy and Print Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

[94] Ann Hallamore Caesar, "Richardson's *Pamela*: changing countries, crossing genres," *Journal of Romance Studies* 10.2 (2010): 21-35.

[95] Katheen M. Oliver, "Over the Garden Wall: Sarah Fielding's *Ophelia* as Critique of *Pamela*," *Eighteenth-Century Novel* 8 (2011): 119-146; Elizabeth Kraft, "Writers that Changed the World: Samuel Richardson, Upton Sinclair, and the Strategies of Social Reform," in *On Second Thought: Updating the Eighteenth-Century Text*, ed. Debra Taylor Bourdeau and Elizabeth Kraft, 141-157. (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2007).

[96] Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction*, 113, 133.

[97] Bonnie Latimer, *Making Gender, Culture, and the Self in the Fiction of Samuel Richardson: The Novel Individual* (Farnham, England: Ashgate, 2013), 27.

[98] Kahn, *Narrative Transvestism*, 6.

CHAPTER 2

[1] Elizabeth Heckendorn Cook, *Epistolary Bodies: Gender and Genre in the Eighteenth-Century Republic of Letters* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), 6.

[2] Frances Sheridan, *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph*, Ed. Heidi Hutner and Nicole Garret (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2011).

[3] The incident which brings Cecilia and the anonymous "editor" together is a reading of John Home's play *Douglas*. For a consideration of the political atmosphere surrounding both the tragedy and Sheridan's novel, see Betty A. Schellenberg, "Frances Sheridan Reads John Home: Placing Sidney Bidulph in the Republic of Letters," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 13.4 (2001): 561-577.

[4] Marta Kvande argues that Sheridan's conceit of Cecilia's editorial work in constructing the narrative represents an examination of what is meant to be public versus private textually; that is, the authorship of the fictional letters suggests a level of privacy between the writer and the intended reader (Cecilia), but the nature of the narrative as a published work of fiction exposes that private exchange to public view. "Frances Burney and Frances Sheridan: Epistolary Ficiton and the Public Sphere," in *Everyday Revolutions: Eighteenth-Century Women Transforming Public and Private*, ed. Diane E. Boyd and Marta Kvande, 159-187. (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2008).

[5] Cook, *Epistolary Bodies*, 32 (my emphasis).

[6] Elizabeth Grosz, *Space, Time, and Perversion: Essays on the Politics of Bodies* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 84. Gayle Salamon also suggests that "The body schema is an image, a representation of the body, but it is also more than this. It is the perception, immediate and certain, that the body comprises a unit … The postural model of the body changes over time, even from moment to moment." *Assuming a Body: Transgender and Rhetorics of Materiality* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010): 31.

[7] Janet Gurkin Altman, *Epistolarity: Approaches to a Form* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1982), 135.

[8] Elizabeth Freeman, *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010): xxiii, 65, 69.

[9] "Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph, extracted from her own journal and now published." *Edinburgh Review* 24 (May 1, 1761): 257.

[10] Patricia Meyer Spacks, "Oscillations of Sensibility," *New Literary History* 25.3 (1994): 505-520.

[11] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 166.

[12] Ibid., 47.

[13] Ibid., 46 (my emphasis).

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid., 48, 49.

[16] Ibid., 96.

[17] Ibid., 389. In 1582, Pope Gregory determined that the calendar was not reflective of the passage of the Earth around the sun in terms of dating, and to correct the error, added essentially erased 11 days from the year, stating that October 4 would October 11, and dating would continue from that date. This was termed "New Style" and was not adopted in England until 1752, when September 3 became September 13. Any dating was thus reconciled by acknowledging the difference of 11 days in the date of correspondence prior to that year. Leofranc Holford-Stevens, *The History of Time: A Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005): 35-38.

[18] For a discussion of Dr. Main's role as physician in the novel, see: Candace Ward, "'Cruel Disorder': Female Bodies, Eighteenth-Century Fever Narratives, and the Sentimental Novel," *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 32 (2003): 93-121.

[19] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 425.

[20] Ibid., 443, 450, 455.

[21] Janine Barchas, "Sarah Fielding's Dashing Style," *ELH* 63.3 (1996): 645.

[22] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 438.

[23] In her book, *Meeting the Universe Halfway*, Karen Barad discusses the intra-actions between space, time, and matter, stating that "The world is an ongoing intra-active engagement, and bodies are among the differential performances of boundaries and properties, including those of spacetime. Technoscientific and other practices entail space-time-matter-in-the-making. Nothing stands separately constituted and positioned inside a spacetime frame of reference…*Embodiment is a matter not of being specifically situated within the world, but rather of being of the world in its dynamic specificity*." That is, the experiences gained by Sidney through her participation in relationships with others affect her, just as she affects them. To change one thing is to change them all, and to wish away those interactions with Faulkland specifically would fundamentally alter her as a body in space—and as a letter-writer in time. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007), 377.

[24] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 442.

[25] Ibid., 449-450.

[26] Ibid., 450.

[27] Ibid., 450.

[28] Ibid., 450.

[29] Ibid., 451.

[30] Ibid., 157.

[31] Ibid., 283.

[32] Elizabeth Freeman, *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010): xxiii, 65, 69. Though Freeman focuses on queer bodies, I would argue the same type of remembrance can occur through writing and, particularly, through writing letters.

[33] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 145.

[34] Ibid., 71-72.

[35] Ibid., 71.

[36] Ibid., 72.

[37] Ibid., 73.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ibid., 87.

[40] Ibid., 84.

[41] Ibid., 363.

[42] Ibid., 363-366.

[43] Ibid., 366 fn. Hutner and Garret note that "white and red" refers to Sidney's "complexion: the standard of beauty was pale skin and blushing cheeks and lips."

[44] Ibid., 363.

[45] Ibid., 366.

[46] Ibid., 297.

[47] Ibid., 300.

[48] Ibid., 304.

[49] Ibid.

[50] Elizabeth Grosz, *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994), 195-196.

[51] Kvande, "Epistolary Fiction," 165-166.

[52] Charlotte Lennox. *Euphemia*. ed. Susan Kubica Howard. (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2008).

[53] Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth argue that "Affect arises in the midst of *in-between-ness*: in the capacities to act and be acted upon," and thus requires separation of some kind in order to occur. "An Inventory of Shimmers" in *The Affect Theory Reader*, ed. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, 1-25. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010): 1.

[54] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 459.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid., 466.

[59] Ibid., 467.

[60] John C. Traver suggests that the "prolongation of narrative" is mean to "expose the flaws of partiality and rigidity in judgment in female characters." "The Inconclusive

Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph: Problems of Poetic Justice, Closure, and Gender," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 20.1 (2007): 36.

[61] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 363, 365, 366, 367.

[62] The *Oxford English Dictionary* notes that the usage of "to be confined" and "confinement" as relative to delivery was used in the *Autobiography and Correspondence* of Mary Delany, with dates of 1772 and 1774, respectively. However, as it is used by Sheridan in this novel, the term was in usage prior to this dating. *Oxford English Dictionary, s.v.* "confinement," accessed December 6, 2016, www.oed.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/view/Entry/38840#eid8499286.

[63] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 135.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid., 136.

[66] Ibid.,143.

[67] Ibid., 143, 262.

[68] Kaley Kramer notes that, in the subplot involving the Widow Arnold, "desire for material property is linked to sexual impropriety," as part of a larger consideration of the implications of women's property rights in the text. "The Limits of Genre: Women and 'History' in Frances Sheridan's *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph* and Elizabeth Griffith's *The History of Lady Barton*," *ABO: Interactive Journal for Women in the Arts, 1640-1830* 2.1 (2012): 10.

[69] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 147.

[70] Mary Terrall, "Material Impressions: Conception, Sensibility, and Inheritance," in *Vital Matters: Eighteenth-Century Views of Conception, Life, and Death*, ed. Helen Deutsch and Mary Terrall, 109-129. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012).

[71] Altman, *Epistolarity*, 132.

[72] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 265.

[73] Ibid., 269.

[74] Ibid., 272-273.

[75] Gregg and Seigworth note, "Affect, at its most anthropomorphic, is the name we give to those forces - visceral forces beneath, alongside, or generally *other than* conscious knowing, vital forces insisting beyond emotion - that can serve to drive us toward movement, toward thought and extension, that can likewise suspend us (as if in neutral) across a barely registering accretion of force-relations, or that can even leave us overwhelmed by the world's apparent intractability." "Introduction," 1.

[76] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 273.

[77] Ibid., 186, 188.

[78] Eve Kosofsky Sedgewick and Adam Frank, Ed. *Shame and Its Sisters: A Silvan Tomkins Reader,* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995), 30.

[79] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 72.

[80] Ibid., 83, 70.

[81] Kathleen M. Oliver, "Frances Sheridan's Faulkland, the Silenced, Emasculated, Ideal Male," *SEL, 1500-1900* 43.3 (2003): 685.

[82] Helen Deutsch, "Symptomatic Correspondences: The Author's Case in Eighteenth-Century Britain," *Cultural Critique* 42 (1999): 38.

[83] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 196.

[84] Ibid., 196-214, 215-252.

[85] Ibid., 195, 196, 215, 217.

[86] Ibid., 214.

[87] Ibid., 199 (my emphases).

[88] Ibid., 212.

[89] Ibid.

[90] Ibid., 217.

[91] Stephen Ahern, *Affected Sensibilities: Romantic Excess and the Genealogy of the Novel, 1680-1810* (New York: AMS Press, Inc., 2007), 20.

[92] Michael Hardt, "The Power to be Affected," *Int J Polit Cult Soc* 28 (2015): 217. Kym Maclaren argues that the loss of emotional control stems from the potential of choice, that to choose to be emotional negates the ability to be rational, and therefore is representative of a loss of freedom: "Emotional Metamorphoses: The Role of Others in Becoming a Subject," in *Embodiment and Agency*, ed. Sue Campbell, Letitia Meynell, and Susan Sherwin, 25-45. (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009): 25.

[93] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 427 (my emphases).

[94] Ibid., 447.

[95] Ibid., 453 (my emphases).

[96] Ibid., 454.

[97] Margaret Anne Doody, "Frances Sheridan: Morality and Annihilated Time," in *Fetter'd or Free?: British Women Novelists, 1670-1815*, ed. Mary Anne Schofield and Cecilia Macheski, 324-358. (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1986), 350.

[98] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 465, 464.

[99] Nancy Armstrong discusses Pamela's writing and language thoroughly in her important study on the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century domestic woman, *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

[100] Sheridan, *Sidney Bidulph*, 49. The quote itself, Ecclesiates 9:11, comes from the King James Version of the *Bible*. Herbert Marks, Gerald Hammond, and Austin Busch, *The English Bible, King James Version* (New York: Norton, 2012).

CHAPTER 3

[1] Charlotte Lennox, *Euphemia*, ed. Susan Kubica Howard (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2008).

[2] Lennox, *Euphemia*, 57 (my emphases).

[3]Janet Gurkin Altman, *Epistolarity: Approaches to a Form* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1982).

[4] Frances Brooke, *The History of Emily Montague*, ed. Mary Jane Edwards (Don Mills, Ontario: Carleton University Press, 1985).

[5] Given that following the Seven Years War, Canada was deeded to Great Britain by France as part of its North American colonial territory, I am considering *The History of Emily Montague*, with its 1769 publication date, as a British, rather than Canadian, novel for the scope of this study.

[6] Eve Tavor Bannet, *Empire of Letters: Letter Manuals and Transatlantic Correspondence, 1688-1820* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

[7] Ros Ballaster, *Fabulous Orients: Fictions of the East in England, 1662-1785* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

[8] Ballaster, *Fabulous Orients*, 17.

[9] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 55.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Julia Kristeva, "Women's Time," trans. Alice Jardine and Harry Blake, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 7.1 (1981): 13-35.

[12] See Louis Montrose, "The Work of Gender in the Discourse of Discovery," *Representations* 33 (1991): 1-41; Annette Kolodny, *The Lay of the Land: Metaphor as experience and history in American life and letters* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1975); and Patricia Parker, *Literary Fat Ladies: Rhetoric, gender, property* (London: Methuen & Co, Ltd. 1987).

[13] See Sarah M. S. Pearsall, "Gender" in *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, ed. David Armitage and Michael J. Braddock, 113-132. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

[14] Julie Ellison notes that this "economic insecurity [is] a motif typically bound up with a courtship narrative," which in Brooke's case, is true; Lennox's courtship tale takes place prior to Euphemia's departure from England. Ellison goes on to argue that personal morality seems to be intimately joined with this financial motive for emigration: "Because economic distress reflects personal qualities—bad judgment, arrogance, a lack of personal discipline, restlessness, ill-advised generosity to irresponsible friends and relations—and since character flaws, conversely signify instabilities in household economy, the class transformations that are spatially plotted in these novels have as much to do with modulating desire was with moderating expenditure." "There and Back: Transatlantic Novels and Anglo-American Careers" in *The Past as Prologue*, ed. Carol H. Hay with Syndy M. Conger, 303-324. (New York: AMS Press, Inc, 1995), 305-306.

[15] Mary Jane Edwards, "Editor's Introduction" in *The History of Emily Montague*, ed. Mary Jane Edwards, xvii-lxi. (Don Mills, Ontario: Carleton University Press, 1985), li-liii.

[16] Brooke, *Emily Montague*, 96.

[17] Ibid., 3, 5.

[18] Ibid., 3, 5, 7, 9.

[19] Altman notes that the writer of "epistolary discourse always situates himself vis-à-vis another; his locus, his 'address,' is always relative to that of his addressee. To write a letter is to map one's coordinates—temporal, spatial, emotional, intellectual—in order to tell someone else where one is located at a particular time and how far one has traveled since the last writing." *Epistolarity,* 119.

[20] Regarding the courtship of Rivers and Emily, see Ann Edwards Boutelle, "Frances Brooke's *Emily Montague* (1769): Canada and woman's rights," *Women's Studies* 12.1 (1986): 7-16; Robert Merrett, "The Politics of Romance in 'The History of Emily Montague,'" *Canadian Literature* 133 (1992): 92-108; Jane Sellwood, "'A Little Acid is Absolutely Necessary': Narrative as Coquette in Frances Brooke's 'The History of Emily Montague,'" *Canadian Literature* 136 (1993): 60-79; Jodi L. Wyett, "'No place where

women are of such importance': Female Friendship, Empire, and Utopia in *The History of Emily Montague*," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 16.1 (2003): 33-57.

[21] Brooke, *Emily Montague,* 309.

[22] Lennox, *Euphemia*, 197-212.

[23] Brooke, *Emily Montague,* 310.

[24] Elizabeth Freeman, *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010): xxiii, 65, 69.

[25] There are actually eleven separate letters writers, if the inscribed letters detailing the interpolated tale of Fanny Williams near the end of the novel is counted. Within the scope of my argument, however, given that Fanny's letter is undated and does not affect my argument regarding the temporality of the letter-writing events and structure, I do not feel it necessary to consider her as a separate entity. For more on the effect of Brooke's use of such a large cast of writers, see Robin Howells, "Dialogism in Canada's First Novel: *The History of Emily Montague*," *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 20.3-4 (1993): 437-450.

[26] Brooke seems to refute a Kantian philosophy of a utopian future here, which suggests that it is human nature to move towards an Ideal future where justice in civil constitution exists, gained though enlightenment that comes from freedom. David Couzens Hoy, *The Time of Our Lives: A Critical History of Temporality* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2012): 143-146.

[27] Brooke, *Emily Montague,* 189, 194.

[28] For examinations of Brooke's narratives on landscape, Canadian colonial policy, and the integration between the England and French in mid-century, see: Emily Bowles, "Language 'Like A Thousand Little Stars on the Trees and on the Grass': Environmental Inscription in Frances Brooke's *The History of Emily Montague*," in *Ecofeminist Approaches to Early Modernity*, ed. Jennifer Munroe and Rebecca Laroche, 195-210 (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Dermot McCarthy, "Sisters Under the Mink: The Correspondent Fear in *The History of Emily Montague*," *Essays on Canadian Writing* 51-52. (1993): n.p.; Emily Smith, "Frances Brooke's Environmental Vandalism: Carving Sexual Resistance on Trees in *The History of Emily Montague*," in *Everyday Revolutions: Eighteenth-Century Women Transforming Public and Private*, ed. Diane E Boyd and Marta Kvande, 94-115. (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2008); Frances Teague, "France Brooke's Imagined Epistles," *Transactions of the Eighth International Congress on the Enlightenment,* 711-712. (Oxford: The Alden Press, 1991).

[29] Stephen Carl Arch, "Frances Brooke's 'Circle of Friends': The Limits of Epistolarity in *The History of Emily Montague,*" *Early American Literature* 39.3 (2004): 468.

[30] Brooke, *Emily Montague,* 141-147, 189-197.

[31] Ibid., 96-97.

[32] Interestingly, Lennox's first novel, though not her first successful work, entitled *The Life of Harriot Stuart, Written by Herself*, also utilizes letters as a narrative tool; however, I am not engaging with this novel in my work here.

[33] Godfrey Singer, *The Epistolary Novel: Its origin, development, decline, and residuary influence*. 1933 (New York: Russell & Russell, Inc., 1963): 126. In his 1933 study of the epistolary novel, Godfrey Singer mentions Lennox as "an author of considerable worth who did not do her best work in the epistolary field … *Euphemia*, by the author of *The Adventures of Arabella; or, The Female Quixote* (1752), a work which was a distinct innovation in its day, is an epistolary novel no better than passing fair."

[34] See: Susan Kubica Howard, "Seeing Colonial America and Writing Home About It: Charlotte Lennox's *Euphemia*, Epistolarity, and the Feminine Picturesque," *Studies in the Novel* 37.3 (2005): 273-291; David McNeil, "Charlotte Lennox's Fictionalization of New York: Gender, Curiosity, and Colonial Venture," in *Transatlantic Crossings: Eighteenth-Century Explorations*, ed. Donald Nichol et al., 39-48. (St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland Press, 1995); Eve Tavor Bannet, "The Theater of Politeness in Charlotte Lennox's British-American Novels," *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 33.1 (Autumn 1999): 73-92; Temma F. Berg, "Getting the Mother's Story Right," *PLL* 32.4 (Fall 1996): 372-373. David McNeil suggests that Lennox attempts to "capitalize on interest in the New World," where the novel "becomes a kind of *curio*-cabinet holding and showing various cultural items for the diversion of an audience" (39-40). Utilizing Schopenhauer's theories on the power of will, McNeil argues that feminine desire and will exerts itself through domesticity as the epistolary exchange between Euphemia and Maria relies on a contrast to the overtly masculine displays of military ceremony and colonial exploration. Susan Kubica Howard notes that the letter itself crossed the boundaries between the public and private, while Euphemia's descriptions of the colonial landscapes, functioning as a travel narrative, appropriated the "aesthetic eye," which usually portrayed the view of patriarchy: "Lennox's use of the women's perspective changes the picturesque and thereby denies imperialistic England one of its colonizing tools" (274). Not only, then, does the letter form itself allow for a subverting female voice to overturn masculine prerogative in New York, Howard contends, but through her observations in her letters, Euphemia is able to insert herself into a position of agency within the colonial project. In considering *Euphemia* in conjunction with *Harriot Stuart*, Eve Tavor Bannet argues that both novels emphasize the use of manners and strict social structure in order to establish hierarchies among the fluctuating populations of the New World: "Euphemia still uses her politeness to affirm her superiority to those who are objectively her social and economic betters; but she now uses a politeness completely dissociated from any objective correlative or material base" (89). Social graces have then become a method of control, according to Tavor Bannet. Temma F. Berg likewise juxtaposes Lennox's transatlantic texts, but focuses on the relationship between women in both novels: "*Euphemia* subverts the conventions of the epistolary novel to empower the mother and tell the story of what a woman can do, if she is willing to listen to her mother's story and affirm the powers of mothering, female friendship, the mother/child relationship, and

female subjectivity" (372-373). In emphasizing the bond between Euphemia and Maria, Berg claims, *Euphemia* opens up possibilities for feminine empowerment.

[35] Karen R. Lawrence discusses the Homeric western tradition of Odysseus and Penelope, in which Odysseus travels and Penelope waits at home. In this particular case, Euphemia enacts the Odyssean part, while Maria is Penelope. *Penelope Voyages: Women and Travel in the British Literary Tradition* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994).

[36] Altman, *Epistolarity*, 117-118. The expressions in letters are "relative to innumerable moments: the actual time that an act described is performed; the moment when it is written down; the respective times that the letter is dispatched, received, read, or reread."

[37] Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, "An Inventory of Shimmers" in *The Affect Theory Reader,* ed. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, 1-25. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), 1. Seigworth and Gregg write in their introduction to *The Affect Theory Reader* that "affect arises in the midst of in-between-ness: in the capacities to act and to be acted upon."

[38] Altman, *Epistolarity*, 118-119.

[39] Lennox, *Euphemia*, 57.

[40] Ibid., 57, 69. This materiality of Maria's tears hints of Richardson's Pamela, acting as a form of temporal drag through its recalling of past text and writing it onto the present work.

[41] Lennox, *Euphemia*, 57.

[42] See Altman, *Epistolarity*, 122-124; Fred Kaplan, "'Our Short Story': The Narrative Devices of *Clarissa*," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 11.3 (1971): 554; Ştefan, Anca. "Aspects of Epistolary Representation." *Petroleum - Gas University of Ploiesti Bulletin, Philology Series* 61.1 (June 2009): 76.

[43] Lennox, *Euphemia*, 62.

[44] Ibid., 69.

[45] Ibid., 76.

[46] Freeman, *Time Binds*, xxiii, 65, 69.

[47] Lennox, *Euphemia*, 114; 120-121.

[48] Ibid., 123.

[49] Ibid., 127.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Ibid., 141.

[52] Ibid.146.

[53] Ibid.148.

[54] Ibid.149.

[55] Ibid., 137-138.

[56] Altman, *Epistolarity*, 132.

[57] Freeman, *Time Binds*, xxiii, 65, 69.

[58] Lennox, *Euphemia*, 158.

[59] Ibid., 197.

[60] Ibid., 179.

[61] Altman, *Epistolarity*, 139.

[62] Lennox, *Euphemia*, 216.

[63] Ibid., 150-151.

[64] Ibid., 151.

[65] Ibid., 333.

[66] Elizabeth Tasker-Davis, "Cosmopolitan Benevolence from a Female Pen: Aphra Behn and Charlotte Lennox Remember the New World," *South Atlantic Review* 76.1 (2011): 40.

CHAPTER 4

[1] Charlotte Smith, *Desmond*, Ed. Antje Blank and Janet Todd, (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2001.

[2] Smith, *Desmond*, 412; Smith herself notes that the maxim is from Voltaire, while Blank and Todd attribute the quote to his *Dictionnaire philsophique* (n. 444).

[3] Ibid., 45.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Loraine Fletcher, *Charlotte Smith: A Critical Biography* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 145. Lukács argues that Walter Scott creates the historical novel, but while

Wilbur L. Cross identifies the fact that Scott seems to have read *Desmond* ("decidedly the worst of [Smith's] compositions"), there is no proof that he was attempting to revise the earlier text: "An Earlier Waverly," *Modern Language Notes* 17.2 (1902): 44-45.

[6] Smith, *Desmond*, 45. Jacqueline Labbe notes that Smith's "Preface" contains an undertone of Wollstonecraftian feminism and advocacy for female rationalism that is undeniable. *Charlotte Smith: Romanticism, poetry, and the culture of gender* (New York: Palgrave, 2003), 139 (n. 5); Pat Elliott argues that the epistolary form in Desmond has the advantage of giving the author distance from the narrative, which the presence of diegetic narrator does not have, thus giving Smith more room to examine the political discourse in which she is engaged: "Charlotte Smith's Feminism: A Study of *Emmeline* and *Desmond*," in *Living By the Pen: Early British Women Writers*, ed. Dale Spender, 91-112. (New York: Teacher's College Press, 1992), 106.

[7] Janet Gurkin Altman, *Epistolarity: Approaches to a Form* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1982), 132.

[8] Scott C. Campbell, "'Disagreeable Misconstructions': Epistolary Trouble in Charlotte Smith's *Desmond*," in *Enlightening Romanticism, Romancing the Enlightenment: British Novels from 1750 to 1832*, ed. Miriam Wallace, 55-68. (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), 57-58; Nicola J. Watson relates *Desmond* and Smith's characters' predicaments to Rousseau's *Julie, ou La Nouvelle Héloïse*, arguing that such a rewriting of the earlier French text lends credence to the argument that Smith is working out Jacobin ideals in the novel: *Revolution and the Form of the British Novel, 1790-1825: Intercepted Letters, Interrupted Seductions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

[9] Fletcher, *Critical Biography*, 150. Furthering this idea, Anne K. Mellor notes that Smith "insists on her right as a woman to engage in political debate" and her "female characters—whether conservative or radical in their political opinions—repeatedly assert their right to hold such opinions." *Mothers of the Nation: Women's Political Writing in England, 1780-1830* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2000), 120; Kari Lokke argues that Smith uses the historical novel form in order to question gender politics and marriage: "Charlotte Smith's Desmond: The Historical Novel As Social Protest," *Women's Writing* 16.1 (2009): 60-77; In contrast, Eleanor Wikborg suggests that once Desmond moves beyond politics to the sentimental mode, he is no longer working against patriarchy, but becomes part of the machine: "Political Discourse Versus Sentimental Romance: Ideology and Genre in Charlotte Smith's *Desmond*," *English Studies* 6 (1997): 522-531.

[10] Smith, *Desmond*, 45.

[11] Ibid., 51.

[12] Margaret Anne Doody, "English Women Novelists and the French Revolution," in *La Femme en Angleterre et dans les colonies américaines aux XVII^{e} et XVIII^{e} siècles*, 176-198. (Lille: Pub. de l'Universite de Lille, 1975), 182.

[13] Smith, *Desmond*, 89, 99, 99, 123.

[14] Ibid., 124, 108.

[15] Ibid., 108, 152.

[16] Ibid., 124, 133, 144.

[17] Ibid., 152.

[18] Ibid., 87.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Immanuel Kant suggests that the human obsession with futurity relies on its sense of hope for something beyond the temporal (in this case, the material world), thus placing confidence in the potential for continued existence after the now (i.e., life after death, or life after materiality). As such, to have hope for the future, there must be some future time for which to hope. I would argue that this must be a material existence, and therefore, Desmond's desire for the French to gain happiness in future freedom stems from the knowledge of past oppression. *Critique of Pure Reason* (New York: Penguin, 2007), 26.

[22] Smith, *Desmond*, 90, 99: see Letters VIII and IX in Volume I. Mellor notes that Smith portrays Montfleuri as an "example of the way in which political revolution can produce beneficial social reorganization": *Mothers of the Nation*, 109.

[23] Smith, *Desmond*, 112.

[24] Ibid., 112-115.

[25] Ibid., 118.

[26] Leanne Maunu, *Women Writing the Nation: National identity, Female Community, and the British-French Connection, 1770-1820* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2007), 90.

[27] Smith, *Desmond*, 118.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid., 114

[30] Ibid., 118-119.

[31] Ibid., 119.

[32] Ibid., 124-125.

[33] Ibid., 126.

[34] Ibid., 135.

[35] Ibid., 137-138.

[36] Essaka Joshua notes that the underlying tones of the romance genre within *Desmond* should suggest conservative leanings in the text, as they do in many other texts of the period, but Smith utilizes the chivalric foundations of romance such that they underpin the radical assertions of the text: "Charlotte Smith's *Desmond*: Romance and the Man of Principle in the Domestic and Public Spheres" in *The Eighteenth-Century Novel* vol. 5, ed. Albert J. Rivero, George Justice, and Margo Collins, 277-319. (New York: AMS Press, Inc., 2006); Fletcher calls the estate "particularly threatening" and connects the dismal state of Hauteville to the dangers of marriage through Desmond's nightmare image of Geraldine: *Critical Biography*, 146-148; Mary Anne Schofield suggests that Smith's characters create a mask of romance in their own writing in *Masking and Unmasking the Female Mind: Disguising Romances in Feminine Fiction, 1713-1799* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1990), 156-159; Chris Jones suggests that Geraldine is a "parody-heroine, carrying conventional behaviour to a ludicrous extreme, while at the same time engaging in activities which subvert traditional standards": "Radical sensibility in the 1790s," in *Reflections of the Revolution: Images of Romanticism*, ed. Alison Yarrington and Kelvin Everest, 68-82. (London: Routledge, 1993), 74; Michael McKeon argues that the "romance" genre of the Restoration period stems from a mixing of genres, specifically those of love and war, in order to help sustain the patriarchal and hierarchical structures d'Hauteville passionately defends here: *The Secret History of Domesticity* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 394-400; Margaret Anne Doody's thesis in *The True Story of the Novel* is that, far from emerging from the heads of eighteenth-century male writers like Athena from Zeus, novels were in existence since ancient times, as "Romance and the Novel are one": (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1997), 15.

[37] Smith, *Desmond*, 128-129.

[38] Smith, *Desmond*, 129. Fletcher notes the similarities between Smith's descriptions of Hauteville's crumbling structure to the "nightmare Gothic of the kind Radcliffe developed in the nineties. It is associated with death and decay, and convincing as a correlative for a morbid social and psychological state": *Critical Biography*, 147. Katherine Ellis argues that if Desmond is not a Gothic novel itself, it utilizes Gothic tropes to question gender roles: "Charlotte Smith's Subversive Gothic," *Feminist Studies* 3.3/4 (1976): 51-55.

[39] Smith, *Desmond*, 159.

[40] Geraldine asks Fanny if she remembers the way Sir George treats Sidney in "the novel of Sidney Bidulph (one of the best that we have in our language)," before lamenting, "Perhaps there is a little similarity in our destinies—But *I* have *no Faulkland*!" (334). The irony is that Geraldine does have a Faulkland of sorts in Desmond—one who does not go mad or will himself to death when he cannot marry her. Alison Conway argues that Smith uses the female body to write nationalism, both British

and French (Josephine's pregnancy especially recalls Sheridan's text): "Nationalism, Revolution, and the Female Body: Charlotte Smith's *Desmond*" *Women's Studies* 24 (1995): 395-409. As another case of intertextual influences, Jillian Heydt-Stevenson suggests that Jane Austen was drawing on *Desmond* when she wrote *Northanger Abbey*: "*Northanger Abbey*, *Desmond*, and History," *Wordsworth Circle* 44.2-3 (2013): 140-148.

[41] Smith, *Desmond*, 159-161.

[42] Ibid., 61.

[43] Maunu, *Women Writing the Nation*, 112.

[44] Susan Allen Ford suggests that Smith "created a novel that puts the domestic at the center of the drama of revolution": "Tales of the Times: Family and Nation in Charlotte Smith and Jane West," in *Family Matters in the British and American Novel,* ed. Andrea O'Reilly Herrera, Elizabeth Mahn Nollen, and Sheila Reitzel Foor, 15-29. (Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1997), 18; Katherine Binhammer likewise argues that the lines between the political and the domestic are particularly blurry in *Desmond*, which is precisely the goal Smith aims to achieve: "Revolutionary Domesticity in Charlotte Smith's *Desmond*," in *Women, Revolution, and the Novels of the 1790s*, ed. Linda Lang-Peralta, 25-46. (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1999). Fuson Wang argues that Smith's resolution without the less radical Bethel signals a move towards cosmopolitanism in a Kantian sense: "Cosmopolitanism and the Radical Politics of Exile in Charlotte Smith's *Desmond*," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 25.1 (2012): 37-59.

[45] Smith, *Desmond*, 120. Mellor notes that Smith claims the novel as "uniquely qualified to consider political questions," as when Fanny is forbidden by her mother to read them, Geraldine defends the genre as "superior … [and] more moral and more probable" than drama: *Mothers of the Nation*, 120.

[46] Smith, *Desmond*, 51.

[47] Ibid., 130.

[48] Ibid., 131.

[49] Ibid., 159, 188, 218, 233.

[50] Smith, *Desmond*, 233.

[51] Altman, *Epistolarity*, 119.

[52] Smith, *Desmond*, 233.

[53] Ibid., 242.

[54] Ibid., 244.

[55] Ford also connects the novel's focus on the domestic to Smith's personal life, and while the connection is certainly viable as a theory, given Smith's own unstable marital situation, that is beyond the scope of my argument here: "Tales of the Times," 18; Jacqueline Labbe notes that Smith named Geraldine's children after three of her own: "Introduction" in *Charlotte Smith in British Romanticism*, ed. Jacqueline Labbe, 1-11. (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2008), 4; Mellor concurs, stating, "Smith grounded her political novel on her own standpoint, a marginalized standpoint which enabled her to see beyond the self-serving patriarchal interests that determined and sustained all the major political systems—ranging from conservative to republican to anarchical—of her historical moment": *Mothers of the Nation*, 121.

[56] Smith, *Desmond*, 180-181. Mr. Carmichael is the physician who treats Desmond's gunshot wound, received in a duel over Geraldine's brother's promise to marry an unsuitable French girl, a pledge gained through trickery, Letter XVI explains, 154.

[57] Smith, *Desmond*, 180, 166, 180.

[58] Ibid., 180-181.

[59] Ibid., 181.

[60] Ibid., 181.

[61] Ibid., 181

[62] Ibid., 200.

[63] Ibid., 212.

[64] Ibid., 202.

[65] Ibid., 249-250.

[66] Ibid., 248.

[67] Ibid., 250-251.

[68] Ibid., 231.

[69] Ibid., 249, 256.

[70] Ibid.

[71] Ibid., 273-274.

[72] Ibid., 271-272.

[73] Joshua states, "Lionel is a hero who both attacks and endorses chivalric principles": "Charlotte Smith's *Desmond*," 301.

[74] Smith, *Desmond*, 260.

[75] Ibid., 282.

[76] Ibid., 293-297.

[77] Ibid., 298.

[78] Ibid., 298-299.

[79] Ibid., 299.

[80] Ibid., 310.

[81] Ibid., 312.

[82] Ibid., 334.

[83] Ibid., 341.

[84] Ibid.

[85] Ibid., 344.

[86] Ibid., 341.

[87] Ibid., 323.

[88] Ibid., 322.

[89] Ibid., 316.

[90] Ibid., 326.

[91] Ibid., 330.

[92] Ford, "Tales of the Times," 22; Jennifer Golightly argues persuasively that the radical novel of the 1790s means to disrupt the family as the place where women can find solace. In *Desmond*, she points out, Mrs. Waverley is a terrible mother, Montfleuri's mother sacrificed her daughters to the church and bad marriages, and Geraldine is asked to raise her future husband's illegitimate daughter: *The Family, Marriage, and Radicalism in British Women's Novels of the 1790s: Public Affection and Private Affliction* (Lewisburg, PA; Bucknell University Press, 2012).

[93] Smith, *Desmond*, 334.

[94] Ibid.

[95] Ibid., 367.

[96] Ibid., 368.

[97] Ibid., 401.

[98] Ibid., 379.

[99] Ibid.

[100] Ibid.

[101] Ibid., 408.

[102] Ibid., 412, 414.

[103] Ibid., 414.

[104] Altman, *Epistolarity*, 149, 150.

[105] Schofield, *Masking*, 9.

[106] Ibid.

[107] Campbell, "Disagreeable Misconstructions," 67.

CONCLUSION

[1] Paul Watson, *Ice Ghosts: The Epic Hunt for the Lost Franklin Expedition* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2017).

[2] Mary Shelley, *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus*, ed. Maurice Hindle. (London: Penguin Books, 1992).

[3] Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 52.

[4] Criscilla Benford, "'Listen to my tale': Multilevel Structure, Narrative Sense Making, and the Inassimilable in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*," *Narrative* 18.3 (2010).

[5] Anna E. Clark, "*Frankenstein*; or, the Modern Protagonist," *ELH* 81.1 (2014): 248-249.

[6] Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 31.

[7] Ibid., 31-32.

[8] Scott C. Campbell, "'Disagreeable Misconstructions': Epistolary Trouble in Charlotte Smith's *Desmond*." in *Enlightening Romanticism, Romancing the Enlightenment: British Novels from 1750 to 1832*, ed. Miriam Wallace, 55-68. (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009): 67.

[9] Elizabeth Freeman, *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010).

[10] Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003); Thomas Paine, *The Rights of Man: Being an Answer to Mr. Burke's Attack on the French Revolution* (Auckland, NZ: The Floating Press, 2010).

[11] In one such example of issues of time in the novel, Essaka Joshua considers the chronology of Victor's narrative in "'Marking the Dates with Accuracy': The Time Problem in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*," *Gothic Studies* 3.3 (2001).

[12] Virginia Woolf, *Orlando: A Biography*, ed. Brenda Lyons. (London: Penguin Books, 1993); *The Sticky Fingers of Time*, DVD, directed by Hillary Brougher (1997; New York: Strand Releasing Home Video, 2001).

[13] Freeman, *Time Binds*, xxiii, 65, 69; Janet Gurkin Altman, *Epistolarity: Approaches to a Form* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1982).

[14] Shelley, *Frankenstein*, 215-216.

WORKS CITED

Ahern, Stephen. *Affected Sensibilities: Romantic Excess and the Genealogy of the Novel, 1680-1810*. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 2007.

———. "'Glorious ruine': Romantic Excess and the Politics of Sensibility in Behn's 'Love-Letters'." *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700* 29.1 (2005): 29-45.

Ahmed, Sara. "Happy Objects," in *The Affect Theory Reader*, edited by Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, 29-51. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.

Albert, Pamela J. *Transatlantic Engagements with the British Eighteenth Century*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Altman, Janet Gurkin. *Epistolarity: Approaches to a Form*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1982.

Anderson, Howard, Philip B. Daghlian, and Irvin Ehrenpreis, ed. *The Familiar Letter in the Eighteenth Century*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1966.

Arch, Stephen Carl. "Frances Brooke's 'Circle of Friends': The Limits of Epistolarity in *The History of Emily Montague.*" *Early American Literature* 39.3 (2004): 465-485.

Ardolino, Frank. "Richardson's *Pamela*." *Explicator* 66.2 (2008): 78-82.

Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Austin, Michael. *New Testaments: Cognition, Closure, and the Figural Logic of the Sequel, 1660-1740* Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2012.

Ballaster, Ros. *Fabulous Orients: Fictions of the East in England, 1662-1785*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———. "'The story of the heart': *Love-Letters between a Noble-Man and his Sister*." in *The Cambridge Companion to Aphra Behn*, edited by Derek Hughes and Janet Todd, 135-150. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Bannet, Eve Tavor. "The Theater of Politeness in Charlotte Lennox's British-American Novels." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 33.1 (1999): 73-92.

———. "Domestic Fiction and the reprint trade" in *Transatlantic Literary Studies, 1660-1830*, edited by Eve Tavor Bannet and Susan Manning, 186-201. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

———. *Empire of Letters: Letter Manuals and Transatlantic Correspondence, 1688-1820*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Bannet, Eve Tavor and Susan Manning. *Transatlantic Literary Studies, 1660-1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Barad, Karen. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.

Barchas, Janine. "Sarah Fielding's Dashing Style." *ELH* 63.3 (1996): 633-656.

Barker-Benfield, G. J. *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Bartolomeo, Joseph F. *A New Species of Criticism: Eighteenth-Century Discourse on the Novel.* Newark, NJ: University of Delaware Press, 1994.

Beasley, Jerry C. "Richardson's Girls: The Daughters of Patriarchy in *Pamela, Clarissa,* and *Sir Charles Grandison*." in *New Essays on Samuel Richardson*, edited by Alberto J. Rivera, 35-52. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.

Behn, Aphra. *Love-Letters Between a Noble-man and His Sister*, vol. 2 of *The Works of Aphra Behn*, edited by Janet Todd. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1993.

Benedict, Barbara M. *Framing Feeling: Sentiment and Style in English Prose Fiction, 1745-1800*. New York: AMS Press, 1994.

Benford, Criscilla. "'Listen to my tale': Multilevel Structure, Narrative Sense Making, and the Inassimilable in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*." *Narrative* 18.3 (2010): 324-346.

Berg, Temma F. “Getting the Mother's Story Right.” *PLL* 32.4 (1996): 369-398.

Binhammer, Katherine. “Revolutionary Domesticity in Charlotte Smith’s *Desmond*.” in *Women, Revolution, and the Novels of the 1790s*, edited by Linda Lang-Peralta, 25-46. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1999.

Blanchard, Jane. “Composing Purpose in Richardon’s ‘Pamela.’” *South Atlantic Review* 76.2 (2011): 93-107.

Booker, Kristina. “Richardson’s *Pamela*, Defoe’s *Roxana*, and Emulation Anxiety in Eighteenth-Century Britain.” *The Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 14.2 (2014): 41-61.

Boutelle, Ann Edwards. “Frances Brooke’s *Emily Montague* (1769): Canada and woman’s rights.” *Women’s Studies* 12.1 (1986): 7-16.

Bowers, Toni. “Behn’s Monmouth: Sedition, Seduction, and Tory Ideology in the 1680s.” *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 38 (2009): 15-44.

———. *Force or Fraud: British Seduction Stories and the Problem of Resistance: 1660-1760*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

———. “Seduction Narratives and Tory Experience in Augustan England.” *The Eighteenth Century* 40.2 (1999): 129-154.

Bowers, Toni and Tita Chico, ed. *Atlantic Worlds in the Long Eighteenth Century: Seduction and Sentiment*. New York: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2012.

Bowles, Emily. “Language ‘Like A Thousand Little Stars on the Trees and on the Grass’: Environmental Inscription in Frances Brooke’s *The History of Emily Montague*,” in *Ecofeminist Approaches to Early Modernity*, edited by Jennifer Munroe and Rebecca Laroche, 195-210. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Brooke, Frances. *The History of Emily Montague*. Edited by Mary Jane Edwards. Don Mills, Ontario: Carleton University Press, 1985.

Burke, Edmund. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.

Caesar, Ann Hallamore. “Richardson’s *Pamela*: changing countries, crossing genres.” *Journal of Romance Studies* 10.2 (2010): 21-35.

Campbell, Scott C. "'Disagreeable Misconstructions': Epistolary Trouble in Charlotte Smith's *Desmond*." in *Enlightening Romanticism, Romancing the Enlightenment: British Novels from 1750 to 1832*, edited by Miriam Wallace, 55-68. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009.

Castle, Terry J. "P/B: *Pamela* as Sexual Fiction." *SEL* 22 (1982): 469-489.

Chernaik, Warren. "Unguarded Hearts: Transgression and Epistolary Form in Aphra Behn's 'Love-Letters' and the 'Portuguese Letters'." *The Journal of English and German Philology* 97.1 (1998): 13-33.

Clark, Anna E. "*Frankenstein*; or, the Modern Protagonist." *ELH* 81.1 (2014): 245-268.

Conger, Syndy M., ed. *Sensibility in Transformation: Creative Resistance to Sentiment from the Augustans to the Romantics: Essays in Honor of Jean H. Hagstrum*. Rutherford NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1990.

Congreve, William. *The Way of the World*, in *The Comedies of William Congreve*, edited by Anthony G. Henderson, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Conway, Alison. "Nationalism, Revolution, and the Female Body: Charlotte Smith's *Desmond*." *Women's Studies* 24 (1995): 395-409.

———. "The Protestant Cause and a Protestant Whore: Aphra Behn's *Love-letters*." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 25 (2001): 1-19.

Cook, Elizabeth Heckendorn. *Epistolary Bodies: Gender and Genre in the Eighteenth-Century Republic of Letters*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Costa, Richard H. "The Epistolary Monitor in *Pamela*." *Modern Language Quarterly* 31 (1970): 38-47.

Cross, Wilbur L. "An Earlier Waverly," *Modern Language Notes* 17.2 (1902): 44-45.

Cruise, James. "'Pamela' and the Commerce of Authority." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 87.3 (1988): 342-358.

Day, Robert Adams. *Told in Letters: Epistolary Fiction before Richardson*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1966.

Deutsch, Helen. "Symptomatic Correspondences: The Author's Case in Eighteenth-Century Britain." *Cultural Critique* 42 (1999): 35-80.

Doody, Margaret Anne. "English Women Novelists and the French Revolution." in *La Femme en Angleterre et dans les colonies américaines aux XVII^e^ et XVIII^e^ siècles*, 176-198. Lille: Pub. de l'Universite de Lille, 1975.

———. "Frances Sheridan: Morality and Annihilated Time." in *Fetter'd or Free?: British Women Novelists, 1670-1815*, edited by Mary Anne Schofield and Cecilia Macheski, 324-358. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1986.

———. "Richardson's Politics." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 2.2 (1990): 113-126.

———. *The True Story of the Novel.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1997.

Dussinger, John A. "Love and Consanguinity in Richardson's Novels." *SEL* 24 (1984): 513-526.

———."'*Ciceronian* Eloquence': The Politics of Virtue in Richardson's *Pamela.*" in *Passion and Virtue: Essays on the Novels of Samuel Richardson*, edited by David Blewett, 27-51. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Eagleton, Terry. *The English Novel: An Introduction.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub, 2005.

Elliott, Pat. "Charlotte Smith's Feminism: A Study of *Emmeline* and *Desmond*." in *Living By the Pen: Early British Women Writers*, edited by Dale Spender, 91-112. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1992.

Ellis, Katherine. "Charlotte Smith's Subversive Gothic." *Feminist Studies* 3.3/4 (1976): 51-55.

Ellis, Markman. *The Politics of Sensibility: Race, Gender, and Commerce in the Sentimental Novel.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Ellison, Julie. "There and Back: Transatlantic Novels and Anglo-American Careers." in *The Past as Prologue*, edited by Caral H. Hay with Syndy M Conger, 303-324. New York: AMS Press, Inc, 1995.

Festa, Lynn. *Sentimental Figures of Empire in Eighteenth-Century Britain and France*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Fielding, Henry. *Joseph Andrews* and *Shamela*. London: Penguin Books, 1999.

Fletcher, Loraine. *Charlotte Smith: A Critical Biography.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Ford, Susan Allen. "Tales of the Times: Family and Nation in Charlotte Smith and Jane West." in *Family Matters in the British and American Novel*, edited by Andrea O'Reilly Herrera, Elizabeth Mahn Nollen, and Sheila Reitzel Foor, 15-29. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1997.

Freeman, Elizabeth. *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.

Gardiner, Judith Kegan."The First English Novel: Aphra Behn's *Love Letters*, The Canon, and Women's Tastes." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 8.2 (1989): 201-222.

Gevirtz, Karen. "From Epistle to Epistemology: *Love-Letters* and the Royal Society." *Women's Writing* 22.1 (2015): 84-96.

Giles, Heidi. "Resolving the Institution of Marriage in Eighteenth-Century Courtship Novels." *Rocky Mountain Review* 66.1 (2012): 76-82.

Goodman, Dena. *Becoming a Woman in an Age of Letters*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009.

Golden, Morris. "Richardson's Repetitions." *PMLA* 82.1 (1967): 64-67.

Golightly, Jennifer. *The Family, Marriage, and Radicalism in British Women's Novels of the 1790s: Public Affection and Private Affliction.* Lewisburg, PA; Bucknell University Press, 2012.

Goring, Paul. *The Rhetoric of Sensibility in Eighteenth-Century Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Gregg, Melissa and Gregory J Seigworth, "An Inventory of Shimmers" in *The Affect Theory Reader,* edited by Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, 1-25. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.

Grosz, Elizabeth. *Space, Time, and Perversion: Essays on the Politics of Bodies.* New York: Routledge, 1995.

———. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism.* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994.

Gwilliam, Tassie. "Pamela and the Duplicitous Body of Feminity." *Representations* 34 (1991): 104-133.

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

Hardt, Michael. "The Power to be Affected," *Int J Polit Cult Soc* 28 (2015): 215-222.

Haywood, Eliza. *Epistles for the Ladies*, in *Selected Works of Eliza Haywood* vol. 1.2, edited by Christine Blouch. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2000.

———. *Love-Letters on All Occasions*, in *Selected Works of Eliza Haywood* vol. 1.1, edited by Alexander Pettit. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2000.

Heydt-Stevenson, Jillian. "*Northanger Abbey*, *Desmond*, and History." *Wordsworth Circle* 44.2-3 (2013): 140-148.

Hicks, Stephen J. "Eliza Haywood's Letter Technique in Three Early Novels (1721-27)." *PLL* 34.4 (1998): 420-436.

Hilliard, Raymond F. "*Pamela*: Autonomy, Subordination, and the 'State of Childhood.'" *Studies in Philology* 83.2 (1986): 201-217.

Holford-Stevens, Leofranc. *The History of Time: A Short Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Howard, Susan Kubica. "Seeing Colonial America and Writing Home About It: Charlotte Lennox's Euphemia, Epistolarity, and the Feminine Picturesque." *Studies in the Novel* 37.3 (2005): 273-291.

Howells, Robin. "Dialogism in Canada's First Novel: *The History of Emily Montague*." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 20.3-4 (1993): 437-450.

Howlett, Kathy."The Entangled History of Legal and Ficitonal Discourse in *The Trial of Ford Lord Grey of Werk* and Aphra Behn's *Love Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister*." *Critic* 58.1 (1995): 25-35.

Hoy, David Couzens. *The Time of Our Lives: A Critical History of Temporality*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2012.

Hume, David. *A Treatise of Human Nature.* Edited by Ernest C. Mossner. New York: Penguin Books, 1969.

Hunter, J. Paul. *Before Novels: The Cultural Contesxts of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction.* New York: Norton, 1990.

Imbarrato, Susan C. “Life writings” in *Transatlantic Literary Studies, 1660-1830*, edited by Eve Tavor Bannet and Susan Manning, 60-74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Itzoe, Linda V. “The Chapel-Church Motif in Pamela: An Analysis.” *Essays in Literature* 8.1 (1981): 91-96.

Jeffrey, David K. “The Epistolary Format of *Pamela* and *Humphrey Clinker*.” in *A Provision of Human Nature: Essays on Fielding and Others in Honor of Miriam Austin* Locke, edited by Donald Kay, 154-154. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1977.

Jimenez Heffernan, Julian. “Pamela’s Hands: Political Intangibility and the Production of Manners.” *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 46.1 (2013): 26-49.

Johnson, Samuel. *Dictionary of the English Language.* London: W. Strahan, 1755.

Jones, Chris. “Radical sensibility in the 1790s.” in *Reflections of the Revolution: Images of Romanticism*, ed. Alison Yarrington and Kelvin Everest, 68-82. London: Routledge, 1993.

Jones, Wendy. “*Pamela* and Creative Cognition.” *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 34.2 (2011): 185-196.

Joshua, Essaka. “Charlotte Smith’s *Desmond*: Romance and the Man of Principle in the Domestic and Public Spheres.” in *The Eighteenth-Century Novel* vol. 5, edited by Albert J. Rivero, George Justice, and Margo Collins, 277-319. New York: AMS Press, INC., 2006.

———. “‘Marking the Dates with Accuracy’: The Time Problem in Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*,” *Gothic Studies* 3.3 (2001).

Kahn, Madeleine. *Narrative Transvestism: Rhetoric and Gender in the Eighteenth-Century English Novel.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Kames, Henry Home, Lord. *Elements of Criticism*, 3 vols. Edinburgh, 1762. ECCO. (CW3310985945, CW3310986375, & CW3310986839).

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason.* New York: Penguin, 2007.

Kaplan, Fred. “‘Our Short Story’: The Narrative Devices of *Clarissa*.” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 11.3 (1971): 549-562.

Keymer, Thomas. "Pamela's *Fables*: Æsopian Writing and Political Implication in Samuel Richardson and Sir Roger l'Estrange." *XVII-XVIII. Bulletin de la société d'études anglo-américaines des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles* 41 (1995): 81-101.

Keymer, Thomas and Peter Sabor. *Pamela in the Marketplace: Literary Controversy and Print Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Kolodny, Annette. *The Lay of the Land: Metaphor as experience and history in American life and letters*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1975.

Kraft, Elizabeth. "Writers that Changed the World: Samuel Richardson, Upton Sinclair, and the Strategies of Social Reform." in *On Second Thought: Updating the Eighteenth-Century Text*, edited by Debra Taylor Bourdeau and Elizabeth Kraft, 141-157. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2007.

Kramer, Kaley. "The Limits of Genre: Women and 'History' in Frances Sheridan's *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph* and Elizabeth Griffith's *The History of Lady Barton*," *ABO: Interactive Journal for Women in the Arts, 1640-1830* 2.1 (2012): 1-15.

Kristeva, Julia. "Women's Time." Translated by Alice Jardine and Harry Blake. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. 7.1 (1981): 13-35.

Kvande, Marta. "Frances Burney and Frances Sheridan: Epistolary Ficiton and the Public Sphere." in *Everyday Revolutions: Eighteenth-Century Women Transforming Public and Private*, edited by Diane E. Boyd and Marta Kvande, 159-187. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2008.

Labbe, Jacqueline. "Introduction." in *Charlotte Smith in British Romanticism*, edited by Jacqueline Labbe, 1-11. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2008.

———. *Charlotte Smith: Romanticism, poetry, and the culture of gender.* New York: Palgrave, 2003.

Latimer, Bonnie. *Making Gender, Culture, and the Self in the Fiction of Samuel Richardson: The Novel Individual*. Farnham, England: Ashgate, 2013.

Laurence-Anderson, Judith. "Changing Affective Life in Eighteenth-Century England and Samuel Richardson's *Pamela.*" *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 10 (1981): 445-456.

Lawrence, Karen R. *Penelope Voyages: Women and Travel in the British Literary Tradition*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.

LeFever, Charlotte. "Richardson's Paradoxical Success." *PMLA* 48.3 (1933): 856-860.

Lennox, Charlotte. *Euphemia*. Edited by Susan Kubica Howard. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2008.

———. *The Life of Harriot Stuart, Written by Herself*. Edited by Susan Kubica Howard. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickenson University Press, 1995.

Leverington, Elizabeth Kukorelly. "Domesticating the Hero: Norative Masculinity in 'Robsinson Crusoe' and 'Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded." *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies* 13.1-2 (2007): 147-164.

Lipsedge, Karen. *Domestic Space in Eighteenth-Century British Novels.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Littleton, Jacob. "'My Treacherous Heart': Non-Rhetorical Registers of Truth in Pamela's Ascent." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 10.3 (1998): 287-301.

Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1995.

Lokke, Kari. "Charlotte Smith's Desmond: The Historical Novel As Social Protest." *Women's Writing* 16.1 (2009): 60-77.

López, Sonia Villegas. "'The Conscious Grove': Generic Experimentation in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister* (1684-87)." *Women's Writing* 22.1 (2015): 69-83.

Maclaren, Kym. "Emotional Metamorphoses: The Role of Others in Becoming a Subject." in *Embodiment and Agency*, edited by Sue Campbell, Letitia Meynell, and Susan Sherwin, 25-45. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.

Marks, Herbert, Gerald Hammond, and Austin Busch. *The English Bible, King James Version.* New York: Norton, 2012.

Marschalk, Lacy, Mallory Porch, and Paula R. Backscheider. "The Empty Decade? English Fiction in the 1730s." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 26.3 (2014): 375-426.

Maunu, Leanne. *Women Writing the Nation: National identity, Female Community, and the British-French Connection, 1770-1820*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2007.

McCarthy, Dermot. "Sisters Under the Mink: The Correspondent Fear in *The History of Emily Montague*." *Essays on Canadian Writing* 51-52. (1993): n.p.

McKeon, Michael. *The Origins of the English Novel, 1600*-1740. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

———. *The Secret History of Domesticity.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.

McKenzie, Alan T. *Certain, Lively Episodes: The Articulation of Passion in Eighteenth-Century Prose*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1990.

McNeil, David. "Charlotte Lennox's Fictionalization of New York: Gender, Curiosity and Colonial Venture." In *Transatlantic Crossings: Eighteenth-Century Explorations*, edited by Donald Nichol et al. St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland Press, 1995.

Meier, Franz. "Gender Identity in Sentimental and Pornographic Fiction: *Pamela* and *Fanny Hill*," in *Mediating Identities in Eighteenth-Century England: Public Negotiations, Literary Discourses, Topography*, edited by Isabel Karremann and Anja Müller, 45-55. Surrey, England: Ashgate, 2011.

Mellor, Anne K. *Mothers of the Nation: Women's Political Writing in England, 1780-1830.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2000.

"Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph, extracted from her own journal and now published." *Edinburgh Review* 24 (May 1, 1761): 257-260.

Merrett, Robert. "The Politics of Romance in 'The History of Emily Montague.'" *Canadian Literature* 133 (1992): 92-108.

Montrose, Louis. "The Work of Gender in the Discourse of Discovery." *Representations* 33 (1991): 1-41.

Morgan, Greg. "'Give Me the Consideration of Being the Bondsman': Embarassment and the Figure of the Bond in the Sentimental Fiction of Samuel Richardson." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 28.4 (2016): 667-690.

Narain, Mona."Body and Politics in Aphra Behn's *Love Letters Between a Nobleman and his Sister*." *Women Writing 1550-1750* (2001): 151-162.

Nietzche, Friedrich. *Ecce Homo*. in Ned Lukacher, *Time-Fetishes: The Secret History of Eternal Recurrence*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998. Originally published with Walter Kaufmann, trans. New York: Vintage Books, 1969.

O'Connell, Lisa. "The Theo-political Origins of the English Marriage Plot." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 43.1 (2010): 31-37.

———. "Vicars and Squires: Religion and the Rise of the English Marriage Plot." *The Eighteenth Century* 52.3-4 (2011): 383-402.

Oliver, Katheen M. "Frances Sheridan's Faulkland, the Silenced, Emasculated, Ideal Male," *SEL, 1500-1900* 43.3: (2003): 683-700.

———. "Over the Garden Wall: Sarah Fielding's *Ophelia* as Critique of *Pamela*." *Eighteenth-Century Novel* 8 (2011): 119-146.

Opdahl, Keith M. *Emotion as Meaning.* Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2002.

Oxford English Dictionary, s.v. "confinement," accessed December 6, 2016, www.oed.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/view/Entry/38840#eid8499286

Paine, Thomas. *The Rights of Man: Being an Answer to Mr. Burke's Attack on the French Revolution.* Auckland, NZ: The Floating Press, 2010.

Pardo Garcia, Pedro Javier. "Novel, Romance, and Quixotism in Richardson's *Pamela*." *Atlantis* 18.1-2 (1996): 306-336.

Parker, Dorothy ."The Time Scheme of *Pamela* and the Character of B." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 11.1 (1969): 695-704.

Parker, Patricia. *Literary Fat Ladies: Rhetoric, gender, property*. London: Methuen & Co, Ltd. 1987.

Pearsall, Sarah. M. S. "Gender" in *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, edited by David Armitage and Michael J. Braddock, 113-132. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Pierce, John B. "Pamela's Textual Authority." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 7.2 (1995): 131-146.

Pollak, Ellen. "Beyond Incest: Gender and the Politics of Transgression in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters between a Nobleman and His Sister*." in *Rereading Aphra Behn*, edited by Heidi Hutner, 151-186. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virgina Press, 1993.

Quinsee, Susannah. "Deconstructing Female 'Virtue': Mariana Alcoforda's *Five Love Letters from a Nun to a Cavalier* and Aphra Behn's *Love Letters between a Nobleman and his Sister*." in *Eighteenth-Century Women: Studies in Their Lives, Work, and Culture*, vol. 2, edited by Linda V. Troost, 1-22. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 2002.

Richardson, Samuel. *Pamela; or, Virtue Rewarded*. edited by Thomas Keymer and Alice Wakely. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Reeves, Margaret. "History, Fiction, and Political Indentity: Heroic Rebellion in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister* and *Oroonoko*." in *1650-1850: Ideas, Æsthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era*, vol. 8, edited by Kevin L. Cope, 269-294. New York: AMS Press, 2002.

Rivero, Albert J. "The Place of Sally Godfrey in Richardson's *Pamela*." in *Passion and Virtue: Essays on the Novels of Samuel Richardson*, edited by David Blewett, 52-72. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

———. "'Hieroglifick'd' History in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister*." *Studies in the Novel* 30.2 (1998): 126-138.

Rosenthal, Laura. "Pamela's Work." *The Eighteenth Century* 46.3 (2005): 245-253.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.

Salamon, Gayle. *Assuming a Body: Transgender and Rhetorics of Materiality.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

Schellenberg, Betty A. "Frances Sheridan Reads John Home: Placing Sidney Bidulph in the Republic of Letters." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 13.4 (2001): 561-577.

———. *The Conversational Circle: Rereading the English Novel, 1740-1775* (Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 1996).

Schofield, Mary Anne. *Masking and Unmasking the Female Mind: Disguising Romances in Feminine Fiction, 1713-1799.* Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1990.

Sedgewick, Eve Kosofsky and Adam Frank, Ed. *Shame and Its Sisters: A Sylvan Tomkins Reader*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995.

Sellwood, Jane. "'A Little Acid is Absolutely Necessary': Narrative as Coquette in Frances Brooke's 'The History of Emily Montague.'" *Canadian Literature* 136 (1993): 60-79.

Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein, or The Modern Prometheus*, edited by Maurice Hindle. London: Penguin Books, 1992.

Sheridan, Frances. *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph*. edited by Heidi Hutner and Nicole Garret. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2011.

Singer, Godfrey. *The Epistolary Novel: Its origin, development, decline, and residuary influence*. (1933) New York: Russell & Russell, Inc., 1963.

Sipiora, Phillip and James S. Baumlin, ed. *Rhetoric and Kairos: Essays in History, Theory, and Praxis*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2002.

Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. 2 Vols. 6th ed. London, 1790. ECCO. (CW332035648 & CW3320355147).

Smith, Charlotte. *Desmond*, edited by Antje Blank and Janet Todd. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2001.

Smith, Emily. "Frances Brooke's Environmental Vandalism: Carving Sexual Resistance on Trees in *The History of Emily Montague*." in *Everyday Revolutions: Eighteenth-Century Women Transforming Public and Private*, edited by Diane E Boyd and Marta Kvande, 94-115. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2008.

Soni, Vivasvan. "The Trial Narrative in Richardson's *Pamela*: Suspending the Hermaneutics of Happiness." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 41.1 (2007): 5-28.

Spacks, Patricia Meyer. "Oscillations of Sensibility." *New Literary History* 25.3 (1994): 505-520.

Stanton, Kamille Stone and Julie A. Chappell. *Transatlantic Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011.

Starr, G. Gabrielle. "Love's 'Proper Musick': Lyric Inflection in Behn's Epistles." in *Aphra Behn (1640-1689): Identity, Alterity, Ambiguity*, edited by Mary Ann O'Donnell and Bernard Dhuicq, 111-124. Paris: Harmattan, 2000.

Steen, Francis F. "The Politics of Love: Propaganda and Structural Learning in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters between a Nobleman and His Sister*." *Poetics Today* 23.1 (2002): 91-122.

Ştefan, Anca. "Aspects of Epistolary Representation." *Petroleum - Gas University of Ploiesti Bulletin, Philology Series* 61.1 (2009): 73-78.

Stewart, Larry L. "You Must Alter Your Style, Madam: *Pamela* and the Gendered Construction of the Narrative Voice in the Eighteenth-Century British Novel." in *Stylistics and Social Cognition*. edited by Lesley Jeffries, Dan McIntyre, and Derek Bousfield, 141-151. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007: 148.

The Sticky Fingers of Time, DVD, directed by Hillary Brougher (1997). New York: Strand Releasing Home Video, 2001.

Tasker-Davis, Elizabeth. "Cosmopolitan Benevolence from a Female Pen: Aphra Behn and Charlotte Lennox Remember the New World." *South Atlantic Review* 76.1 (2011): 33-51.

Teague, Frances. "France Brooke's Imagined Epistles." *Transactions of the Eighth International Congress on the Enlightenment*, 711-712. Oxford: The Alden Press, 1991.

Terrall, Mary. "Material Impressions: Conception, Sensibility, and Inheritance." in *Vital Matters: Eighteenth-Century Views of Conception, Life, and Death*, edited by Helen Deutsch and Mary Terrall, 109-129. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012.

Thompson, Helen. "'Thou Monarch of my Panting Soul': Hobbesian Obligation and the Durability of Romance in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters*." in *British Women's Writing in the Long Eighteenth Century*: *Authorship, Politics, and History*, edited by Jennie Batchelor and Cora Kaplan, 107-120. London: Palgrave Macmillan: 2005.

Todd, Janet M. "'The hot brute drudges on': ambiguities of desire in Aphra Behn's *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and his Sister*." *Women's Writing* 1.3 (1994): 277-290.

———. “Fatal Fluency: Behn’s Fiction and the Restoration Letter,” *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 12.2-3 (2000): 417-434

———. “Love-letters and Critical History.” in *Aphra Behn (1640-1689): Identity, Alterity, Ambiguity*, ed. Mary Ann O’Donnell and Bernard Dhuicq, 197-204. Paris: Harmattan, 2000.

———. *Sensibility: An Introduction*. London: Methuen, 1986.

———. “Who is Silvia? What is she? Feminine identity in Aphra Behn’s *Love-Letters Between a Nobleman and his Sister*.” in *Aphra Behn Studies*, edited by Janet Todd, 199-218. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Traver, John C. “The Inconclusive Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph: Problems of Poetic Justice, Closure, and Gender.” *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 20.1 (2007): 35-60.

Van Sant, Ann Jessie. *Eighteenth-Century Sensibility and the Novel: The Senses in Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Wang, Fuson. “Cosmopolitanism and the Radical Politics of Exile in Charlotte Smith’s *Desmond*.” *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 25.1 (2012): 37-59.

Ward, Candace. “’Cruel Disorder’: Female Bodies, Eighteenth-Century Fever Narratives, and the Sentimental Novel.” *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 32 (2003): 93-121.

Warner, William B. “The ‘Woman Writer’ and feminist literary history; or, how the success of feminist literary history has compromised the conceptual coherence of its lead character, the ‘woman writer.’’ *JEMCS* 4.1 (2004): 187-196.

Watson, Nicola J. *Revolution and the Form of the British Novel, 1790-1825: Intercepted Letters, Interrupted Seductions.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Watson, Paul. *Ice Ghosts: The Epic Hunt for the Lost Franklin Expedition.* New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2017.

Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1957.

Wehrs, Donald R. “*Eros*, Ethics, Identity: Royalist Feminism and the Politics of Desire in Aphra Behn’s *Love Letters*.” *SEL* 32 (1992): 461-478.

———. "Novelistic Redemption and the History of Grace: Practical Theology and literary Form in Richardson's *Pamela* and Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*," in *Theology and Literature in the Age of Johnson: Resisting Secularism*, edited by Melvyn New and Gerard Reedy, 1-26. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2012.

Wikborg, Eleanor: "Political Discourse Versus Sentimental Romance: Ideology and Genre in Charlotte Smith's *Desmond*." *English Studies* 6 (1997): 522-531.

Wilner, Arlene Fish. "'Thou Hast Made a Rake a Preacher: Beauty and the Beast in Richardson's *Pamela*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 13.4 (2001): 529-560.

Wolf, Werner. "Eighteenth-Century Sensibility and its Ambivalent Position in the 'Herstory' of Gender Roles." in *Framing Women: Changing Frames of Representation from the Enlightenment to Postmodernism*, edited by Sandra Carroll, Birgit Pretzsch, and Peter Wagner, 125-150. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer, 2003.

Woolf, Virginia. *Orlando: A Biography*, edited by Brenda Lyons. London: Penguin Books, 1993.

Wright, Susan. "Private Language Made Public: The Language of Letters as Literature." *Poetics* 18 (1989): 549-578.

Wright, Walter Francis. *Sensibility in English Prose Fiction, 1760-1814; a Reinterpretation*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1972.

Würtzbach, Natascha. *The Novel in Letters: Epistolary Fiction in the Early English Novel 1678-1740.* Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press, 1969.

Wyett, Jodi L. "'No place where women are of such importance': Female Friendship, Empire, and Utopia in *The History of Emily Montague*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 16.1 (2003): 33-57.

Zaczek, Barbara. *Censored Sentiments: Letters and Censorship in Epistolary Novels and Conduct Material.* Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1997.

Zhang John Zaixin. "Free Play in Samuel Richardson's *Pamela*," *PLL* 27.3 (1991): 307-319.