

THE IDEA OF THE SEQUEL:
A THEORETICALLY ORIENTED STUDY OF LITERARY SEQUELS
WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THREE EXAMPLES
FROM THE FIRST HALF OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Submitted in accordance with the requirements
for the degree of PhD

Christopher
Paul Richards
School of English
The University of Leeds

October 1989

**ORIGINAL COPY IS
TIGHTLY BOUND AND
TEXT IS CLOSE TO THE
EDGE OF THE PAGE**

ABSTRACT

The literary sequel has received little sustained or comprehensive critical attention. In view of this neglect the aim of this thesis is to present the sequel as a fruitful subject for discussion and analysis. The task undertaken here necessitates three interrelated procedures, the first of which seeks to produce a widely applicable definition of the word "sequel".

The second procedure is the describing of the sequel as a literary form. This process demands a theoretical approach which views the sequel as a concept, or, as the thesis title indicates, an idea. In order to give coherence and unity to this activity the range of reference is limited almost exclusively to prose fiction in English from the late sixteenth century to the present day. In the three main central chapters the focus further narrows to consider in turn three examples of the sequel drawn from the first half of the eighteenth century.

The close analysis of individual works highlights paradoxical aspects of the sequel. These special characteristics derive from a governing paradox common to all sequels: a sequel both continues a prior work and has an independent existence.

The sequel cannot, however, be fully characterised without reference to its immediate historical circumstances. A third procedure examines the ways in which the contemporary response to a first part can prompt the composition of a sequel and influence its content and structure.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE	Introductory: Theoretical Background, Preliminary Descriptions, and Definitions	1
General Aims		2
Section (i)	Preliminaries and Boundaries	8
Section (ii)	Ways of Approaching the Sequel	25
Section (ii)a	Singling Out the Sequel	25
Section (ii)b	Modulation and Mimesis	34
Section (iii)	The Influence of Closure Theory On Definitions	49
Section (iii)a	Closure Theory and Sequels	49
Section (iii)b	Two Main Types of Sequel	57
CHAPTER TWO	"The Quixotism of R. Crusoe"	64
Introductory		64
Section (i)	The Occasion For a Sequel	70
Section (ii)	"Waiting the good time"	84
Section (ii)a	"By turns and returns"	85
Section (ii)b	"Windings and blind ways"	103
Section (iii)	Conclusion ?	137
CHAPTER THREE	"Treating the public too much like a bookseller" and "An intellectual fondness": Two Contrasting Examples of the Reformative Sequel	147
Section (i)	Controversy, Conflict, and Two Sequels of 1741	153
Section (ii)	<i>Pamela's Conduct In High Life Unto The Time of Her Death and its Relationship With Pamela In Her Exalted Condition</i>	174
Section (iii)	The Reluctant Sequel	202
Section (iv)	Conclusion	232
CHAPTER FOUR	"Exhausted novelty": A Reformative Sequel In a Pornographic Environment	237
Introductory		238
Section (i)	Pornography in Prison, Litigation Out of Prison	242
Section (ii)	"As a Consequence of my no-education"	254
Section (iii)	"A flashy, enervated enjoyment"	268

Section (iv)	Conclusion	292
CHAPTER FIVE	Conclusion and Modifications	295
Introductory		296
Section (i)	Opening Conclusions	300
Section (ii)	A More Flexible Use of Terminology	306
Section (iii)	A Larger World, A Smaller World	341
Section (iv)	Concluding Thoughts	358
NOTES		362
BIBLIOGRAPHY		376

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My special thanks go to my Supervisor, Mr. Alistair Stead, to Richard Traub and to Albert Chatterley for their assistance in the presentation of this thesis.

My thanks also go to the following: John Breese; Simon, Susannah, Valerie and Michael Cohen; Dr. Frank Felsenstein; David Guthrie; Antony Hasler; Phil and Jenny Langran; David Lindley; Anna Nicholas; Jane Oliver; Angela Owen; Bill Reiss; Keith and Valerie Richards; Miss Audrey Stead.

Notes For The Reader

1) Editions of Main texts.

-Daniel Defoe, *Robinson Crusoe* Parts I, II, and III, (1719-1720).

The Constable Edition (London: Constable 1925) fulfilled my requirements for an adequate edition which covers Parts I, II, and III. However, references to Parts I and II have been cross-checked for accuracy against the more reputable *Shakespeare Head Edition* of Parts I and II only (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1927, 3 Vols.). For abbreviation method, see Chapter 2, note 1

-Samuel Richardson, *Pamela* Parts I and II, (1740-1741).

I refer to the *Shakespeare Head* edition of *Pamela* Parts I and II, edited by William King and Adrian Bott, in *The Shakespeare Head Edition of The Novels of Samuel Richardson* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1929-1931). However, the edition of *Pamela* is limited. Hence, I also offer page references to the Everyman Edition of Parts I and II, (London: J.M. Dent and Sons 1914), which is more readily available. See Chapter 3, note 14, for abbreviation method.

-John Cleland, *Memoirs of A Woman of Pleasure* (1748-1749)

I refer to the recent edition edited by Peter Wagner, (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1985).

2) As a general rule works of fiction regularly cited are, after initial annotation, referred to by full or abbreviated title in parenthesis. On the whole, works by literary critics are fully annotated on first appearance, and then cited by name of author, date of publication and page no., in parenthesis: Eg. (Genette, 1980. p.7).

CHAPTER ONE

Introductory:

Theoretical Background, Preliminary Descriptions,

and Definitions

And I have found Demetrius like a jewel,
Mine own, and not my own.

(*A Midsummer Night's Dream* Act IV, sc.i, ll.188-189)¹

A French journalist once asked him if he'd ever described himself as a bum and a drifter: Eastwood denied it. "Then what are you?", the journalist persisted. "A bum and a drifter", Eastwood said wistfully.

(Michael Pye, "Clint Eastwood: A Profile")²

People now ask me what I am going to do next. I feel I can hardly write a sequel to *A Brief History of Time*. What would I call it? *A Longer History of Time*? *Beyond the End of Time*? *Son of Time*? My agent suggested that I allow a film to be made about my life. But neither I nor my family would have any self-respect left if we let ourselves be portrayed by actors. The same would be true to a lesser extent if I allowed and helped someone to write my life. Of course, I cannot stop someone writing my life independently as long as it is not libellous. But I try to put them off by saying I am considering writing my autobiography. Maybe I will. But I am in no hurry. I have a lot of science that I want to do first.³

Professor Hawking appears to rule out the possibility of writing a sequel to his unexpected best seller, *A Brief History of Time*.⁴ He expresses his sense of the absurdity of producing a second part by juggling with mock titles. Yet, his strategy of disdain carries a degree of diffidence and equivocation. The dismissal of the sequel idea is effected interrogatively and consultatively. In response to the question of whether or not a sequel should be written, more questions are asked. This suggests doubt and deferral rather than downright denial.

Moreover, the sequel option is considered first, over and above the various coolly itemized means of feeding his life-story to a hungry public. Apart from a concern for privacy, Hawking senses, perhaps, that a biography would act as a summation of his life's work, when he feels that his endeavours are far from over. Hawking's parting shot, "I have a lot of science that I want to do first", indicates that if there were to be any further communion with a lay audience, then it would be much more likely to be concerned with the work than the life: In which case, some kind of addition to, or revision of *A Brief History of Time* would be the most fitting format.

The closing paragraph of the newspaper feature begins by ridiculing the sequel option and ends by leaving a tentative opening for it. The book which

prompts the article, however, goes farther than this. Acting as spokesman for his fellow cosmologists, Hawking states early on in the book, "Our goal is nothing less than a complete description of the universe we live in".⁵ As the work progresses, it becomes clear that this destination is still on the distant horizon, or even beyond it. Hawking is fairly sure of the opening of his narrative: The universe almost certainly began with the "Big bang".⁶ Accurate prediction of the ending is, though, more problematic, and Hawking had to revise one of his own theories (formulated with Penrose) about the last days of the universe in the light of developments in quantum mechanics.⁷ Predicting "The End" would depend on a unified theory of the universe, and would, claims Hawking, require an integration of science and philosophy.⁸ This is more of an ideal than a tangible target, as is implied by Hawking's Conclusion.⁹

Hawking is keen to stress that, should such a unified theory ever be formulated, "...It should in time be understood in broad principle by everyone".¹⁰ The description of a climate of uncertainty in Hawking's final chapter is tempered by what amounts to an admission that a sequel will be necessary, and an ordinance that one should be written (assuming that writing is still an effective means of mass communication in the distant future).

Recognising a need for a sequel and promising to write one are, however, two different things, and perhaps this accounts for the disparity between Hawking's defensiveness in the article and his certainty of purpose in the book. The disparity is itself worth further examination. Hawking would prefer to think of a sequel to his book as being at the end of a long fuse, arising from genuine scientific advances. The article, on the other hand, shows him

caught in the front line of his literary success. He is having to respond to demands for something "next", more immediate, on a shorter fuse. Furthermore, since one of the initial motives behind the book was the payment of his daughter's school fees,¹¹ the temptation to capitalize on *A Brief History of Time*, while it is still fresh in the public memory, cannot be overlooked (although this possibility may not have occurred to Hawking himself).

Reconciling the two needs, the one integral to Hawking's scientific work, and long term, the other integral to public demand (or a recognition of it), and short term, is problematic. The article reveals the strain. On the one hand, the idea of a sequel is treated parodically, kept at arm's length. On the other hand, a second part is actually conceptualised by drawing on a tradition of sequel naming which has its roots in commercially driven popular cinema. *Son of Time* echoes titles such as *Son of Dracula*, *Son of Frankenstein*, and *Son of Lassie*. *Beyond the End of Time* connotes a title such as *Beyond the Poseidon Adventure*. *A Longer History of Time*, meanwhile, hints at a function of the sequel which is other than that of continuing narrative: namely, of revising or contextualising. This emerges as one of the chief purposes of at least one of the sequels studied in this thesis.

Thus, in resisting the pull of the mechanistic pattern of a success followed by calls for more – calls met by the sequel, which satisfies (or not, as the case may be) the demand – Hawking is caught up in its workings. As a final confirmation of this, the mock titles do not exactly mock the title *A Brief History of Time*. They are in fact perfectly in keeping with its deceptive simplicity and compressed wit. Indeed, in this light, one of Hawking's three choices could well make a perfectly plausible title for a future sequel.

It is the general intention of this thesis to explore two issues raised by the article and discussed above. The first issue is encapsulated by Hawking's, "What shall I call it?" This question, whose frame of reference I am deliberately expanding, itself breaks down into two areas of uncertainty. There is initially the problem of arriving at an adequate definition of the literary sequel, and then of providing sub-definitions which will account for different types of sequel. The second area is that of broad description, involving finding a way to discuss and understand the sequel as a literary shape.

The second issue raised by the article concerns itself with the compromised and compromising nature of the sequel. The thesis seeks to discover and outline the uncertainties, embarrassment, and twists of paradox created by this sense of compromise. Hence, whilst the sequel itself is rather an unstable entity, the hope here is to give a more stable impression of its identity and nature than has been done heretofore.

It should be stressed at the outset that the range of enquiry is, on the whole, limited to prose fiction in English, with a special emphasis on examples from the first half of the eighteenth century. However, the sequel's occurrence in other genres and media is informative and will be occasionally alluded to.

The word "thesis" has its origins in the Ancient Greek word "thesatis", which has a sense of "to locate", or "to place". This objective of orientation will have primacy over assertive argument. The sequel has received little direct or sustained critical attention, which is surprising, considering developments in literary theory on the continent, in America, and in this

country, especially in the last thirty years. Hence, because I am entering relatively new critical territory, I have felt it important to establish guidelines rather than to offer definitive, unyielding dictums.

This flexible, inclusive approach necessarily precludes excessive, assertive judgment of sequels, either individually or as a generic group. On the other hand, a discriminating assessment of certain sequels will sometimes be required. For, if sequels can be a literary equivalent of sleight of hand, it is worthwhile to ascertain how well the trick has been executed.

The purpose of this Introduction is to contextualise focused discussion of texts in the central three chapters, and to give some background to the more general discussion in Chapter Five. This procedure draws on different areas of literary theory and falls into three parts. In Section (i), the sequel phenomenon, as it may loosely be termed, is sketched in, and the critical response, or lack of response, to it is outlined and discussed. I then indicate how I would like to rectify critical neglect of the sequel, and this entails indicating the limits and borderlines of this study: what methodologies will, or will not be utilised.

The second section, in order to initiate the definitional process, locates the sequel within the context of the literary forms to which it is most closely related, and offers some theoretical background. Section (ii)a begins the search for a workable definition of the sequel, by distinguishing it from its neighbours, the sequence and series. Section (ii)b continues the defining activity by analysing the sequel's relationship, first, with genre, and then with the concept of imitation. Section (iii) raises a fourth definitional problem: That posed by the disconcerting relationship of the

SECTION (i)

Preliminaries and Boundaries

The sequel form was the first to strike Hawking when considering ways of consolidating his success with *A Brief History of Time*. And concealed behind the arras of his jesting lies a potential case for continuation of his bestseller. Yet, from one angle, it seems remarkable that Hawking should think in terms of sequels at all. In part this is a tribute to his eclectic intelligence, and a wry acknowledgement of the fictional characteristics that his essentially non-fictional exegesis acquires. However, it is also a signal of the pervasiveness of the sequel in a contemporary Western culture in which printed word and screen vie for attention.

If the sequel can enter the sights of a cosmologist at Cambridge, then it must be difficult to miss for anyone with less specialized concerns. For the sequel, especially the unexpected addition to an established work, can certainly grab the headlines. In April 1988 it was announced that the estate of Margaret Mitchell had commissioned a sequel to *Gone With the Wind* (1936). Alexandra Ripley (born in Atlanta, Rhett Butler's town), was selected as the author out of a shortlist of a dozen hopefuls, all of whom had submitted summaries of their planned continuation. Publishers were invited to New York, in April 1986, to bid for the rights to Ripley's work at a starting price of six million dollars.¹² They were staking their claims on merely the first thirty nine pages (out of a projected thousand), or the first two chapters, of the exercise.

The headline writers had a field-day with captions such as: "Re-born in the Wind",¹³ "Another Day for Scarlett"¹⁴ and "Scarlett is Back with the Wind"¹⁵. The vast amount of money involved in the commission would be sufficient to guarantee the media interest. There is also an element of corporate control over the project, which gives it a veneer of glamour and high intrigue. For instance, a detail relished by the feature writers is the command from the Mitchell estate lawyers that Ripley should not open any of her mail whilst writing her epic.¹⁶ This is to prevent her coming under the unwitting influence of plot suggestions which might leave her open to expensive litigation after publication. Apart from this, there is, perhaps, a proprietorial unease about the fate of a myth which has, by means of film and book, lodged itself in the public imagination. There is a tendency in the reporting of the story towards establishing Ripley's credentials. The underlying uncertainty centres on the question of whether or not this Southern belle, "*d'un certaine âge*", can be trusted with the narrative.

The idea of a sequel, then, is certainly capable of making waves, and of arousing more than straightforward curiosity. It can provoke an ambivalent reaction of excitement at the thought of new wine in old bottles, as well as an energetic anxiety that the wine will neither be too old nor too new. However, the above example is very much the tip of the iceberg where this particular narrative form is concerned. For adding to, or regularly supplementing, a set of narrative "givens", is now a familiar, even routine activity for the purveyors of popular culture. It seems especially suited to the mass media, such as television, radio, cinema and video. The subject of this study is, of course, the literary sequel, but a glance at the sequel's manifestations in other media is necessary in order to place it in a broad

context. Such occasional glances will be a feature of the thesis as a whole.

The film sequel is as much in vogue now as it was in the twenties and thirties, when titles such as *Don Q, Son of Zorro*, the second part of *The Mark of Zorro*, appeared in Hollywood. Michael B. Druxman points out the convenience of sequels to the major studios. They are

...usually less expensive than the original film because of their ability to reuse already completed sets, costumes and props.¹⁷

Moreover, film rights do not usually have to be purchased for a sequel, since the studio already owns rights to the original. Such is the profusion of cinematic sequels today that the box-office magazine *Flicks* offers a regular bulletin, *Sequels Latest*. The May/June issue promises

...follow-ups to US mega-hits *Good Morning Vietnam* and *Three Men and a Baby*, then *Caddyshack II*, *Critters V*, *Friday the 13th. Part VII*...¹⁸

Meanwhile, the soap opera and sitcom, near relations of the sequel, abound on television and radio. Series such as *EastEnders*¹⁹ and *Neighbours*²⁰ sustain audience high ratings.²¹ They are also relatively cheap and convenient to produce.²²

The literary sequel emerges as a feature of this mosaic of mass entertainment. It is part of a cultural climate which embraces the method of adding, in measured doses, to a received narrative. As may be already becoming clear, this means of sustaining and fuelling narrative fiction transcends questions of artistic standards and quality. Film producers, script writers, and book writers make use of it and manipulate it in varying ways. The method itself does not determine the quality of the work that emerges. The sequential

means of story-telling is a technique which can be exploitative, and can lead to a cheapening of artistic material. But, this is very much in the hands of the author or, on a larger scale, the production team. Thus, in the literary arena, sequences such as Roth's "Zuckerman" novels,²³ and a sequel such as White's *The Beautiful Room is Empty*, complement the more obviously formulaic exercises such as *Morlock Night* (a sequel to Wells's *The Time Machine*), or Anna L'Estrange's *Return to Wuthering Heights*. This complementing of sophisticated and formulaic treatment of the sequel form determines that the present thesis does not restrict itself solely to popular fictions or to works within the established literary canon.

One way that sequel writers have of indicating a seriousness of purpose and a certain artistic integrity is, as it were, to ride on the back of an established classic, or at least a work comfortably placed in the literary canon. Joan Aiken's *Mansfield Revisited*, a sequel to *Mansfield Park* concentrates on the fortunes of Fanny's younger sister Susan and the Bertram family, with Fanny and Edward absent for much of the novel in the West Indies. One of the many, and most unusual sequels to *Wuthering Heights* is John Wheatcroft's *Catherine: Her Book*, which offers Catherine's private journal secretly etched between the lines of her 4 volume edition of Bunyan's works. Greg Matthews's *The Further Adventures of Huck Finn* gives an Australian gloss on Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, itself a sequel to *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*. In all these cases the sequel has an interpretative function as well as a purely narrative one. These works encourage a comparative view of past literary achievements.

It would be tempting to conclude from the foregoing discussion that the sequel, being especially suited to mass-produced entertainment, or (as in the

above-quoted examples) dependent on an assumed public knowledge of a long established literary canon, is an invention of modern times. Nothing could be further from the truth. A fiction that has been so bisected as to make two related, but distinct, works is a perennial feature of the literary arena. For example, the pairing of *Paradise Lost* (1667) and *Paradise Regained* (1671) follows this pattern, as does indeed one of its primary sources, The Bible. It is stretching a point to call the New Testament a sequel, in any accepted sense of the word. But, in the way that it provides a solution, a kind of conclusion, to the problems raised in the Old Testament; in its focusing on the arrival of a new character, prefigured in the first part; it certainly bears some formal traces of the sequel in prose fiction. But the pattern can be traced back further than this with the emphasis on a "return", a homeward journey in *The Odyssey*, giving the work a sequel-like relationship to *The Iliad*.

Within the area of prose fiction, the three main examples for this study are taken from the eighteenth century. But the configuration of first part followed by sequel can be found earlier than this. In Lyly's *Euphues and his England* (1580), the experiences of Euphues and his companion in England are recounted. This represents a change of setting from the Naples of the first part, *Euphues*. *The Anatomy of Wit* (1578). And, in the drama, Shakespeare's *King Henry IV, Part II* (1600), is a significant early example, although it falls into the larger scheme of the history cycle.

Two significant precursors of the novel form are *Don Quixote*²⁴ and *The Pilgrim's Progress*.²⁵ Although they are not habitually thought of as bisected works, they are both two-volume works with a distinct gap of time between the composition of their respective parts. *Don Quixote* Part I appeared in 1605,

with the second part appearing in 1615. Between both parts of *The Pilgrim's Progress* there was a six year period between 1678 and 1684. This kind of compositional break in itself is an indication that these two books were not conceived or written as unified wholes. In fact historical circumstance has as much of a role as artistic design. The first parts of both fell prey to spurious continuations by different authors, and the sequels of Bunyan and Cervantes are, at least in part, re-assertions of authorial control over the narrative. The sequels to these above-named works (those by their original authors, that is) are taken as the main texts for this chapter and will be referred to frequently in the subsequent sections. One reason for this is that they establish contrasting formal precedents for the main eighteenth-century examples.

The above brief sketch of bisected fictions indicates the formal and historical range of literature to which the word "sequel" could be applied with some accuracy. This makes it peculiarly problematic to sum up the response of the critical fraternity to the idea of the sequel.* However, some general points can be made. The most negative situation is when a sequel to a notable work has been offered by the original author, and, for one reason or another, is either ignored or rapidly dismissed, the emphasis remaining firmly on Part I. This happens for example, in the case of Gay's *The Beggar's Opera*, where critics almost wholeheartedly concentrate on the innovative drama, barely even noticing the sequel, *Polly*.²⁶ As will be seen in Chapters 2 and 3, the reaction to *Robinson Crusoe* and *Pamela* tends also to follow these lines.

The second situation is more hopeful. A sequel is assessed, but not expressly as a sequel. E.C. Riley, in his *Cervantes's Theory of The Novel*, offers a discussion of Part II as accelerating Don Quixote's drift into what

Riley sees to be madness.²⁷ However, his analysis rather stresses the second volume as a natural expansion of the fictional world of Part I, without highlighting the radical discontinuities between the two parts. What is missing is, as it were, a sense that a sequel should be recognised as a separable, definable entity before it is discussed in tandem with the first part. Another possibility, admittedly rarer, is for the sequel to be discussed as an independent achievement, in isolation from the first part. This has happened, especially since the 1940's, in commentary on *Huckleberry Finn*.⁴⁶ Louis J. Budd has stated (p.18) rather drily that "not many aesthetically sophisticated Americans "now consider *Huckleberry Finn* as a "sequel" to *Tom Sawyer*." ²⁸ However, this elevation of the sequel to a status of self-contained work is a critical equivalent of throwing the baby out with the bath water. In acknowledging a successful sequel, the work's nature as a sequel is denied. This seems especially lamentable in the case of a work which opens by gently nudging the reader into recognising the literary relationship:

You don't know about me without you have read a book by the name of *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, but that ain't no matter.²⁹

In the above cases, at least, works which happen to be sequels are recognised as worthy of analysis, even if not primarily as texts which have a discursive relationship with a predecessor. The problem remains one of focus and perspective. That is, the text is seen in a particular way, almost before criticism begins. This is not the case in the third category of commentary. Here, the sequel is not only acknowledged, but criticised as such. The discussion is weighted towards the second part, whilst the first is still borne in mind. In his article "Christiana's Key: The Unity of the Pilgrim's Progress", N.H. Keeble offers a spirited argument for the role of the second

part of the *Pilgrim's Progress* in qualifying and reducing the intensity of vision in Part I. The zeal and rigour of Christian's solitary experience are offset in Christiana's book by "Puritan joy and delight in human love rightly directed".³⁰

Another instance of sequel-oriented commentary is provided by Northrop Frye in his article, "The Typology of Paradise Regained". Here, the typological relationship between the two epic poems is discussed, but with the stress remaining firmly on the "sequel".³¹ Once more in the field of prose fiction, June Sturrock's article, "The Completion of Pamela", offers a defence of Richardson's sequel as an essential complement to the first part. I will be taking issue with this article in Chapter 3. But, at least it recognises the continuation as a respectable part of the Richardson oeuvre.³²

The third form of sequel criticism, then, seems to come closest to recognising it as a literary type worthy of discussion. But even this approach shares an underlying problem with the preceding two approaches or attitudes. There is no global sense of the sequel which informs the particular comment. The criticism lacks a broad theoretical framework, and any concomitant working definition of the sequel, or even a sense that the sequel needs to be defined. This lack of broadly applicable terminology may be a source for a second problem: an uncertain, defensive manner in discussing the work in question. This is summed up by Russell Davies "hoisting a hopeful umbrella" before hesitantly praising two Billy Bunter offshoots in a recent newspaper review.³³ If sequel readers and critics had a more general sense of the sequel's nature and function, then there would at least be less diffidence in handling the subject. There has been some over-arching discussion of sequels, most notably by Gérard Genette. Detailed assessment of this is reserved for

Section (ii), where it is integrated into an examination of sequel and genre. For the meantime, I would comment that the existing global views are not very comprehensive or sustained.

This thesis seeks to redress the balance by providing a broad view of the sequel, but through analysis of individual texts. This initial chapter raises the main theoretical issues to which the sequel is related. The central chapters on the *Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, *Pamela In Her Exalted Condition*, and *The Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure Volume II*, will seek to show how these issues are bound up with specific narratives; and particularly to show in detail how each second part displays the characteristics of a certain kind of sequel. The final chapter will focus on four sequels of the twentieth century, but will examine them in less depth than the eighteenth-century examples. The purpose of the chapter will be to establish the wider applicability of the terminology applied to earlier texts. This last chapter will, then, combine the mainly theoretical discussion of this Introduction with the specific analysis of the central chapters.

The above outline already indicates one course the thesis will not be following. It is not proposed to make a chronological survey of sequels in prose fiction, say, from the 1590's to the present. Such a scheme would preclude lengthy analysis of single works, and would therefore prevent the critic from reaching, or trying to reach the core of the sequel's formal nature. Another rather more pedestrian reason arises from the sequel's transhistorical character. As already indicated, there are sequels of one kind or another, belonging to a variety of genres in any age which allows for the possibility of the composition of a work being interrupted by the publication of a part of it. There would be a danger of the similarities between sequels

being over-emphasised, and of the diachronic account becoming repetitive.

However, the fact that the sequel is not being represented chronologically does not mean that historical aspects will be overlooked. The immediate circumstances of the sequel's production can inform and influence its narrative structure. Cervantes wrote the second part of *Don Quixote* partly as a means of rescuing his hero from the grasp of Avallaneda, the author of an alternative sequel.³⁴ Such information is indispensable to a full understanding of the way the second part unfolds. Sequels, like parodies and other dependent literature, do tend to be very much of the moment. They are often written mid-controversy and can form part of a "battle of the books". Whilst, of course, any novel has the potential to be topical the sequel can be especially and assertively so.

The demand made by the sequel for a historical perspective to inform the theoretical approach mainly accounts for the selection of the period 1700-1750 for special study. Concentrating on a single period helps to unify the historical remarks. It also facilitates interaction between chapters. Similarities and differences come more easily into focus. Another reason for choosing this period is more to do with the novel form. This is the era when, as Ian Watt has famously termed it, the novel is meant, souffle-like, to "rise".³⁵ Recent critics, such as John P. Richetti,³⁶ Lennard J. Davis,³⁷ and Michael McKeon³⁸ (to name only a few) have criticised and challenged many of Watt's assumptions and conclusions. The tenor of the criticism has been to encourage a more pluralistic view of the novel's development than is suggested by Watt's concentration on unyielding dialogues and opposites, such as the purported Fielding/Richardson divide.³⁹ The emphasis shifts onto a variety of fictional and non-fictional modes of writing which are drawn upon to produce

different kinds of prose fiction to which the term "novel" can only be loosely applied.

There is some evidence for a more flexible approach in merely considering that in just over twenty years works as diverse as *Robinson Crusoe*, *Gulliver's Travels*, *Pamela*, and *Tom Jones* could be produced. However, it is suspiciously easy to cock a snook at *The Rise of the Novel* these days. After all, there is much in Watt's commentary on individual authors (especially Defoe)⁴⁰ which is engaging and informative. The problems lie, perhaps, in accepting the overview which governs the analyses of particular writers. Hence, this thesis generally adopts the more recently developed "cornucopian" (my term) view of prose fiction.

There are definite advantages in studying the sequel in a period in which the form to which it attaches itself is unstable, and in some considerable ferment. To adapt a popular saying, the novel didn't even know it was born. An implicit argument running through this thesis is that the sequel had a part to play in defining and limiting the form. To "prove" this argument would go beyond the bounds of this study, which is not primarily an account of the early novel. However, it is hoped that it can be suggested that the sequel's dual role of innovation and regulation helped to clarify technical and formal problems that certain writers of this period had set themselves. The sequel emerges in its best light when it is helping fiction to sort itself out. Thus, the first half of the eighteenth century is a fruitful historical "site" in which to study second parts.

There is, finally, a more specific reason for selecting this era. As R.M. Wiles has pointed out, number or part books began to flourish in the first two

decades of the eighteenth century. The issue of large books in serial form he calls a "remarkable innovation...admirably simple and amazingly successful". Those who could not afford to buy a large tome in one purchase would be able eventually to possess it in full by paying small amounts for regularly issued sections, or "fascicules". Wiles claims that the book trade was accelerated by this scheme more than by any other single force.⁴¹ Furthermore, there is some evidence that the scheme also contributed to the rise in readership at this time.⁴² Number issue embraced what would be seen today as, historical, journalistic or informative literature: gaudy accounts of hangings, chronicles of sea voyages, atlases and dictionaries, ethical handbooks. Prose fiction in the form of playscripts and fantastic narratives such as the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*⁴³ makes an appearance in these formative years of serial issue, although is not as prominent as other categories.

However, even if prose fiction is a small category compared to the wealth of "non-fiction" surrounding it, the flourishing of number publication as a technique remains a significant historical development for the purposes of this thesis. For it suggests an economic milieu in which fragmenting a narrative as a means of making early contact with a potential readership and then sustaining that commercial relationship was an accepted, even routine, procedure. A picture emerges from Wiles's study of a bookselling community in the first half of the eighteenth century becoming increasingly aware of the kind of material readers wanted and of how best to profit from their needs. This impression is reinforced by R.D. Mayo's comments on the first serialisations of novels in the newspapers and magazines of this period.⁴⁴ Although his book is mostly concerned with the second half of the eighteenth

century, he gives some significant early examples.

There is, of course, a difference between part issue of a work, perhaps completed prior to publishing the first sheet, and the writing and publication of a sequel in response to a popular first part. Despite some overlap, as when a sequel was issued in number form,⁴⁵ these are, on the whole, two separate concepts. They are linked, though, by the general point that narratives were, for the first time (that is, the first time systematically, and on a large scale) being presented to the public in ways which were sensitive to the demand for them.

So far, then, in indicating the limits of this study, it has been stressed that it will not be a "historical" thesis in the sense of a chronological survey. Indeed, the project is primarily interested in showing how certain features of literary theory have a bearing on the sequel. But historical factors do in fact influence sequel composition, and these are best demonstrated, in my opinion, by concentrating on a single period. In the first half of the eighteenth century, developments in the literary and bookselling worlds coincide to make it a particularly fertile period for study. In the ensuing part of this section some further boundaries will be drawn, now referring more to matters of theory.

Underlying, even undermining, the discussion so far has been a potential conflict of methods. What is being proposed is a combination of formalist and historical approaches to the subject. This can seem like trying to reconcile two opposites. On the one hand, there is the view of a text epitomized by W.K. Wimsatt in his *The Verbal Icon*.⁴⁶ This book is one of the purest expressions of American New Criticism as derived from Russian Formalism.

Wimsatt argues that literary works, especially poems, are best appreciated as independent, self-sufficient entities. Trying to understand their historical context is, at best, an irrelevance, and at worst, a positive distraction from the realisation of their transcendent qualities. A contrasting attitude is epitomized by E.D. Hirsch Jr. in, say, his *The Aims of Interpretation*.⁴⁷ Hirsch advocates a hermeneutical approach to fiction which insists that a work's meaning is as much defined and limited by its historical context as by the words on its pages. A full understanding can only be achieved by a loving reconstruction of the cultural milieu in which the work was created.

These polarities contain a more specific difference over whether or not the fiction is a specific product of an author's "intentions". Roland Barthes's famous proclamation that the "author is dead" sums up a view of the primacy of the text which is a hallmark of much structuralist thinking.⁴⁸ Sequels may well invite an untraditional critical approach as embodied in certain strands of structuralism. However, it is a sign of their contrary nature that, in order to understand them, the details of the author's life and times must be incorporated into the analysis.

Reconciling a hermeneutical stance, which would include the author, and a formalist stance, which would play down the author's role, is not, however, as difficult as it seems. It is admittedly problematic if the two positions are seen as philosophically rooted dogmas. But, if they are viewed as interdependent approaches to a special linguistic pattern then bridges can be built. The movement in the argument has to come initially from the formalist side. The special, "defamiliarising" formal properties of a work can be recognised. But these do not have to be regarded as closing off the work from the society in which it originates. They are its distinguishing features but

not its isolating ones. This view is expressed by Medvedev and Bakhtin in a tract entitled *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship*:

The work cannot be understood outside the unity of literature. But this whole unity and the individual works which are its elements cannot be understood outside the unity of ideological life.⁴⁹

This quotation, like the book from which it is taken, is coloured by Marxist thinking. Nonetheless, a model of criticism which sees the text as an intersection of literary and social concerns is put forward. Again from a Marxist perspective, Tony Bennett in his *Formalism and Marxism* has furthered the case for combining the methodologies.⁵⁰ This thesis will not be sharing in Bennett's advocacy of Marxist critiques. However, he makes some useful general observations; as when he notes that both *Schklovsky* and Althusser have a fundamentally similar view of the literary text as an object which acts upon the perceptions of its audience.⁵¹

There are, then, precedents for an approach which draws on the immediate social context of a particular work. The centrepiece of the combined approach, which has just been advocated, is the sequel text itself. This suggests that the figure of the reader, as championed by "Reception theory" will not be receiving detailed or continuous attention. At an early stage in preparation I resolved that a systematic analysis of the reader's role in relation to the sequel, both as an agent in its composition and as the interpreter of the finished narrative, would require another thesis in itself. However, some specific contemporary readers of sequels are sometimes mentioned. When these figures are not being cited, the model of the reader adopted in the course of the thesis is that of Iser's "Implied reader".⁵²

As a brief aside, there is one aspect of the thinking of a pioneer in reception theory which is relevant to this project. In his "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory", H.R.Jauss proposes the reader as a pivotal figure in the ongoing dialogue between literature and history. The reader must be respected as a mediator between the book and its social environment. It is the reader who gives the book a life beyond the shelf and helps to establish its topicality. The logical extension of this view of the reader's dynamic role is a vision of the history of literature itself being infused with books as readings:

In the step from a history of the reception of works to an eventual history of literature, the latter manifests itself as a process in which the passive reception is on the part of authors. Put another way, the next work can solve formal and moral problems left behind by the last work and present new problems in turn.⁵³

The sequel provides a very clearly focused example of the sort of work which characterises an individual's reception of a preceding one. In this sense the sequel is itself a "reading" and acts as an interpretative problem-solver, or troubleshooter. Moreover, as will be indicated in later sections and chapters, the sequel can effectively exemplify how a responding work can "present new problems in turn".

This section has sought to accomplish three main objectives. First, it has aimed to give a brief introduction to the phenomenon of a narrative bisected by historical as well as literary circumstances, the pattern in which the prose fiction sequel can be located. Next, it has outlined critical neglect of this configuration (as a configuration) on a broad scale. Finally, it has indicated how the thesis will redress the balance, and what avenues will not be explored. The forthcoming section begins the essential process of

defining the sequel, both as word and idea, advocated during this section. My own definition of the word will not in fact be proposed until the end of Section (iii)a. It will then come as the culmination of the analysis of the problems presented by the concept of the sequel.

Three of these problems are discussed in the forthcoming section. The first is that of the sequel's relationship to the broad field of continuation and repetition in literature, the province of Section (ii)a. The second involves the sequel's relations with literary kind or genre. The third problem arises from the second and concerns the sequel's relationship with the notion of imitation. Both these matters are discussed in Section (ii)b.

SECTION (ii)

Ways of Approaching the Sequel

SECTION (ii)a: Singling out the sequel

In the previous section it was noted, in citing Shakespeare's *Henry IV Part II*, that the play cannot be read or performed purely as a sequel. It must be considered also as a number in the tetralogy beginning with *Richard II* and ending with *Henry V*. This indicates a need to distinguish the sequel as a member of a broad literary family whose narratives are apportioned between a number of single texts rather than read or published as complete, discrete works.

The first task, then, in trying to describe the sequel's individual qualities is to explain how it differs from the other kinds of work to which it is related within this literary family. An essential preliminary, therefore, is to define this family and then its main sub-groups. The most common feature of the literary field to which sequels belong seems to be a sense of linear or chronological progression. This is true, for instance, of trilogies, quartets, or sagas such as Galsworthy's *The Forsyte Saga*.

"Literature of continuation" is certainly a tempting descriptive option. However, it is not sufficiently comprehensive, for it does not take into account the fact that texts in this group do not always fall into strict sequence. Put crudely, they do not always begin where the previous book left off. A narrative can be expanded upon by means other than direct continuation.

For example, Keith Waterhouse's *Mrs. Pooter's Diary*⁵⁴ is a very peculiar kind of sequel to George and Weedon Grossmith's *The Diary of A Nobody*,⁵⁵ if it can be called a sequel at all. Here is offered an account which runs in ironic parallel to the original. Hence, it cannot strictly be said to continue the original or to create a governing sense of sequence. Rather, it re-tells the story from another character's viewpoint. A similar sort of anomaly is provided by Ayckbourn's trilogy *The Norman Conquests*.⁵⁶ Here, the same drama is played out by different sets of characters from three complementary perspectives. Hence, a sense of continuity between the items in the trilogy is replaced by a sense of parallel and comparison.

A description is needed that will account both for pairs or collections of texts which unfold chronologically and for works which unfold comparatively, or analogically. Both narrative possibilities do have a common characteristic. Over and above their representation of periods of time such pairs or groups all derive from the same compositional process: the act of adding one text to another in order to create a larger unit. Individual works are linked by a process of accretion. Hence, this extended family of pairs or linked texts could be characterised as "Literature of addition". A more concise description permitting an adjectival use of the concept of accretion is "incremental literature". My personal definition of incremental literature is as follows:

Works of fiction which build upon an existing work or set of works by adding to its narrative as a whole, or to a selected component or components of it.

The qualifying clause, referring to selection of a portion of preceding narrative, is inserted in order take into account books which focus on one

particular character, or episode, or both, from a predecessor. One example of this kind of text is Robin Chapman's *The Duchess's Diary*.⁵⁷ This novel is a kind of sequel to Cervantes's *Don Quixote*. However, it concentrates solely on the knight-errant's sojourn with the duke and duchess, with events being told in the duchess's voice. The work cleverly indicates that, compared to the deranged narrator, Don Quixote is a figure of relative calm and sanity. A perhaps more famous example of selective incrementation is provided by Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*.⁵⁸ Here, scenes from *Hamlet* are shadowed - now with an emphasis on the verbal gymnastics of the two supernumeraries -, their experiences offstage are foregrounded, and their joint fate is conceptualised dramatically.

Apart from the sequel itself, the main groups which come under the heading of "incremental literature" are the "Sequence" and the "Series". I would define "sequence" as:

A set of fictions which are written, published, and can be read, independently of each other, but, if read in a particular order, form a complete work; a work which is usually unified by the arranging of narrative chronologically, but which can be unified by other means.

This definition suggests that the effect of sequence depends at least as much on the segmented compositional mode as on the ordering of the narrative. The defining characteristic is that one part of a work should be followed by another. Taking this principle as the arbiter of definition it is possible to include under the heading of "sequence" works whose narratives are integrated in varied ways. For example, "romans fleuves" such as *A la Recherche du Temps Perdu*, or *A Dance to The Music of Time* do, in essentials, progress chronologically. In Cooper's "Leatherstocking" novels chronology is still the main determinant of overall shape but the individual works were written in

"reverse" order, so that the concluding work appeared first. These novels can now be rearranged by modern day readers, but when they were first issued in the mid to late nineteenth century, there was only one order in which they could be read. However, as the definition tries to show, there are ways of linking sequentially produced novels besides that of chronological progression. In Faulkner's "Yoknapatawpha County" novels there is a loose chronological thread running through the collection, but the sense of place is the most prominent unifying feature.

Sequences tend to be flexible and expansive narratives in which entire fictional worlds are realised and set in motion during a specified historical phase. A certain inclusiveness or comprehensiveness is sought. For instance, in *A Dance To the Music of Time*, Nicholas Jenkins is the central character, and his experiences are threaded through the work as a whole. But, the sequence is as much concerned with his world and society, and the characters he encounters, as with his individual biography. He is a filter through which collective experience can pass.

This tendency towards inclusiveness rather contrasts with the nature of what has been called the "Series". This word has slipped into the vernacular as a description of an arrangement of texts which can perform along more predictable lines than the sequence. I would define the "series" as:

A set of fictions in which any sense of overall sequence is superseded by the reiteration, in the course of each work, of a narrative formula, thereby removing any necessity to read them in a particular order.

The "narrative formula" mentioned above is best described by focusing immediately on an example of the series. Modern detective fiction often

appears in the series format, and Agatha Christie's collection of books centering on Hercule Poirot is amongst the most well-known. In these works there is a nominal sense of governing chronology. For instance, the final work in the series, *Curtain*,⁵⁹ is a sequel to the first, *The Mysterious Affair at Styles*.⁶⁰ In *Curtain*, there is an acknowledged past, signals of which being that Poirot has aged, and that the second world war has taken place and has intervened between the events of the first part and those of the sequel. However, these historical traces are not sufficient to unite the series and demand a particular reading order. For every item in it is a self-contained unit, with its own plot structure, opening and conclusion. Closure is tight because tying up loose ends and satisfying aroused curiosity is demanded by the sub-genre. Cross-reference between individual works would cause discomfort and disarray in equal measure.

Rather, the series is unified by the reappearance of Poirot, in a new situation (and "situation" here is virtually synonymous with "location") in each book, and the reiteration of a strict pattern of discovered crime, investigation, and revelation. This could be described as a formula in which a familiar character with a familiar way of performing his tasks is placed in environments which, within the series, differ from each other and therefore appear fresh. The narrative formula could be simplified in order to be made applicable to series in general: in each book a number of features common to the series as a whole interact with a number of variable features, or ones which are new to the series as a whole. A series may not depend strictly on a central character to unify it, and it is not exclusively the domain of detective fiction. Wodehouse's "Blandings Castle" novels (dependent on a recurring location) exemplify both these qualifications.

The series can be more inflexible and exclusive than the sequence. It tends to be more formulaic, and is especially associated with popular literature. There is a certain rigidity of approach, a tendency to follow tried and tested routes, a desire not to challenge the complacency of the readership, which does not always hold for the sequence. The series can lack the openness, innovation, and wide canvas of the sequence.

Space does not allow for further qualification of these definitions of sequence and series. For this reason, one caveat must be briefly offered. The above definitions, or descriptions, should not be taken as watertight. There is inevitably some overlap between both types of incrementation. However, some kind of crude characterisation has been offered on the principle that it is better than nothing. For a nominal understanding of these broad shapes of incrementation is crucial to the forthcoming definition of the sequel.

One way of regarding the sequel's position within incremental literature is to see it as having a potentially pivotal role within the sequence and series. This view can only be explained and justified by limiting the wide range of application of the word "sequel". It may have been noticed that in the above quotation from *Flicks* magazine "sequels" was used to describe not only second parts, but any numbered item in a sequence (eg. *Friday the 13th. Part VII*). The same usage is suggested by the titles to two catalogues of incremental literature: Mandy Hicken's *Sequels*⁶¹ and Janet Husband's *Sequels. An Annotated Guide to Novels in Series*.⁶² Both works survey sequences and series, making no distinction between these and pairs consisting of first part and sequel. Indeed, Husband's title explicitly equates the sequel with any item in a set.

From the perspective of a practitioner in the field of incrementation, John Updike, in a recent radio interview, referred to his "Rabbit" novels and Roth's "Zuckerman" novels as "sequels".⁶³ This does seem to be an accepted deployment of the word amongst lay readers and professional critics alike. It is accurate to the extent that any individual work in a sequence or series might well bear some characteristics of the sequel. In a sense, every work, in a sequence especially, is a sequel to the accumulation of novels which precedes it. However, this does suggest a double-meaning for the word "sequel": a specific one referring to the second part of a book; and a general one referring to all parts of a sequence or a series.

This double application seems to have entered common parlance, and such linguistic developments cannot of course be reversed. However, this does not mean that the deployment of the word in two contexts is necessarily a valid adaptation of it. I would contend that it is a source of confusion about the precise functions of a sequel. The sequel's literary role would certainly be clearer if the word "sequel" itself were restricted purely to second parts.

This recommendation stems from a wish to emphasise the way that the sequel as a second part can act upon a first part and change its status and also determine the likelihood and nature of any further continuation. That is, as part of a pair, it has a transformative function, but it is as well an item of special formal significance within the sequence and series, or within a potential sequence or series. That significance should be acknowledged in the descriptive vocabulary of incrementation.

This point can be substantiated by reference to parts I and II of the *Pilgrim's Progress*. The sequel changes the status of the first part, primarily

by rooting Christian's experiences within social and historical perspectives. Christian has established a precedent and a tangible reputation for himself within the City of Destruction, as Sagacity tells the narrator who has "dreamed again":

...all our country rings of him, there are but few houses that have heard of him and his doings, but have sought after and got the records of his pilgrimage: yea, I think his hazardous journey has got many well-wishers to his ways. (I, p.220).

As Bunyan's book has been received, so have Christian's "records" been heard of and read, within the fiction, by a public who once scorned Christian's beliefs and actions. Hence, the sequel confirms Christian's biography as something that can be looked back upon and used as a source-book by future pilgrims. Thus, the first part is displaced by a sequel in which the concerns of the inhabitants of the City of Destruction are uppermost. These preoccupations are expressed by the pilgrimage of Christiana and her family.

However, integral to this displacement effect is the statement the sequel makes about the nature of Part I's narrative. It creates the kind of framework which is open to continuation. The sequel has the pivotal function of projecting the first part into the arena of incrementation. Moreover, in demonstrating that pilgrimage is now a safe option, and not solely the province of a desperate divorcee, it indicates the format of any future additions beyond Part II. The journey to the Celestial City is now possible for many rather than a few. The struggles along the way are now within manageable proportions, not requiring the stamina of a hero to overcome them. The journey has been translated into diurnal experience and can therefore be treated in a formulaic way. Any future parts may well fall into the shape of a series rather than a sequence. The narrator is certainly aware at the end of

the sequel that the work as a whole has been opened out, or expanded, to create further narrative possibilities:

Shall it be my lot to go that way again, I may give those that desire it an account of what I here am silent about (II, p.373).

In fact, Bunyan never did feel the urge to re-open the spiritual tourist route established by his sequel. However, if he had created a literary series, the sequel would have had a key role in converting the narrative material of Part I into the stuff of segmented reiteration. In this respect, then, the sequel has a dynamic relationship with other kinds of incremental literature. Having changed the status of the work which precedes it, it deliberately invites questions about its own status as a secure addition to the first part. The sequel in turn can be displaced. Hence, it is perhaps preferable to regard the sequel not simply as a stable text, with specific formal demarcation lines, but as a historical action, an event, which both alters the context in which Part I performs and creates a stage for subsequent performances.

The next stage of the discussion takes this location of the sequel within incremental literature as a starting point and asks how this situation can be described in relation to genre and aspects of genre theory. This investigation also involves deciding to what extent the sequel can be described as a kind of imitation.

SECTION (ii)b: Modulation and Mimesis

The relationship of literary additions to genre has been considered, in differing degrees of detail, by two critics who reveal contrasting conceptions of literary theory and how it can be adopted: Alastair Fowler and Gérard Genette. Fowler's *Kinds of Literature*⁶⁴ is a wide-ranging, interpretative survey of genre theory. It is an extension in scope and method of Fowler's numerological accounts of Renaissance literature,⁶⁵ and displays a hermeneutical orientation. The book is dedicated to E.D. Hirsch Jr., placing it in a critical camp which emphasises the historical context of literary form as well as style.

Genette, as an idiosyncratic exponent of French structuralism, has a more radical concept of the critic's role. He or she enters into creative dialogue with the text on equal terms with it. A critic does not so much concentrate on a work's specific historical context, as on the plurality of ways in which it relates to the network of texts which inform it, and which it informs. Genette's *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré*⁶⁶ is the work which, to my knowledge, has come closest to providing a global definition and discussion of literary sequels. It is itself a sort of sequel to Genette's *Introduction A L'Architexte*.⁶⁷ Taken together, these works expound upon the concept of literature as a vast interconnecting system of relationships and influences in which any descriptive categories, in order to be effective, would cut across generic boundaries and traditional groupings. These books, as Fowler's book does for him, signal a mushrooming outwards of Genette's critical concerns into literary topology from the relatively narrow field of narratology, of which his work on Proust was central.⁶⁸

One of the first definitional questions that the sequel begs is that of whether or not it can truly be called a genre. In examining this problem it would help to have a definition of genre. Fowler insists on a concept of genre as mutable, and prefers to think in terms of "historical genre". He offers the following definition of this qualified term:

A type of literary work of a definite size, marked by a complex of substantive and formal features that always include a distinctive (though not usually unique) external structure. (Fowler, 1982, p.74)

The sequel cannot be accommodated into this definition. As the first section of this chapter indicates, it can append itself to a variety of "distinctive" kinds with each kind appearing in varying "sizes" or scales: for example, the epic poem, the drama, and the novel. It is not purely a brand of prose fiction. This protean "transgeneric" quality causes problems in integrating it into the generic hierarchy.

The sequel, then, is a type of work, rather like parody, which is appended to a text within a genre. Chameleon-like, it then adopts that genre's characteristics. However, it also has fixed qualities of its own which transcend its immediate generic circumstances. Both these facets must be accounted for in an effective categorisation.

Fowler, rather disappointingly, does not fully rise to the challenge. This is surprising, considering one of his initial recommendations that, "Literature should not be regarded as a class at all, but as an aggregate". (Fowler, 1982, p.3). Considering the exemplary aggregative nature of incremental literature, Fowler rather misses an opportunity in not giving sequels more attention than he does. When he does attend to them, in a chapter on mode and subgenre, he only gives them cursory mention.

Fowler qualifies his primary category. "types involving dependence on an antecedent" (Fowler, 1982, p.126), in two ways. First, imitations of an original, such as the parody, the burlesque, and the pastiche, are labelled "ectypes".(Fowler, 1982, p. 127). Fowler's second qualification is :

...the epicyclic or elaborative type: groups of works that exploit the fictive world of some great or popular predecessor. (Fowler, 1982, p.127).

He cites as examples the clusters of narratives, surrounding such works as *Robinson Crusoe*, *Gulliver's Travels* or *Jane Eyre*. The word "sequel" only appears in a descriptive aside:

Where the new work is a sequel to the original ... it is common to show specific points of departure from it - moments at which the reader can imagine himself looking, if you will, from the ectypic world through the door into the paradigm.(Fowler, 1982,p.127)

Fowler tantalizingly decides not to expand on this edifying descriptive metaphor. He makes his most successful contact with incremental literature on this metaphorical level. For the above terminology is wide of the mark on two counts.

First, he concentrates exclusively on "elaborations" of established works, without connecting these additions with the more widespread and routine examples of sequel writing which punctuate literary history. Whilst suggesting that the "elaboration" is an "important" and "numerous" type, he does not seem concerned to explain why it is so, treating his main examples as curious side-shows to the classics. The second problem arises from "elaboration" being an over general term. It does not distinguish between works which primarily re-enter the imaginative world of the original and in some way develop its narrative (eg., Defoe's *the Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*) and works

which cultivate their own imaginative worlds as creative imitations of the original (eg., Michel Tournier's *Vendredi: ou l'autre Isle*). Indeed, any sense of the narrative sequence between the original and its dependent work is entirely missing from the term "elaboration".

These two objections to Fowler's terms are bound up with a third, more general one about his overall attitude to literary increments. He implies that they are not worthy of extended consideration because of their failure to conform to a recognizable generic pattern. He concentrates on the parasitic nature of the addition. "Ectype" implies that the imitation comes close to, but just misses, acquiring the generic status of its parent work. He is keen to stress that "elaborations of an original have the latter as their context rather than each other", (Fowler, 1982, p.127). They are defined negatively, in terms of absence of genre, rather than positively, in terms of what they have to offer as literary spectacles.

Underlying Fowler's conception of sequels and related types is surely an opinion of them as inferior or second-rate works "which must be mentioned in order to be dismissed". However, his hierarchical, judgmental approach produces a clouded and unhelpful terminology. He is not prepared to contemplate sequels in any context other than as veiled in the shadows of an established classic. It might be retorted that sequels do not come under the scope of his study. But, surely, the ways in which they interact with genre are worthy of respectable treatment, however brief.

At one point in his analysis, Fowler describes the relations of an ectype to its predecessor as being "radial, not circumferential". (Fowler, 1982, p.127). If Fowler thinks of imitations as being clustered round an original in

a circle. Genette thinks of them in a more liberated manner; as being part of a continually varying flow-diagram. Genre, in the context of examining "*littérature au second degré*" is too constraining for Genette. He sees it as merely a part of the broad scheme of influences and patterns which converge upon a single text. He refers to this scheme as "*transtextualité*", a revision of his term "*architexte*", (Genette, 1980, p.7). "*Transtextualité*" is qualified as "*transcendance textuelle du texte*", (Genette, 1980, p.7 ["textual transcendence of the text"]). This is in turn defined loosely as:

tout ce qui le met en relation, manifeste ou secrète, avec d'autres textes. (Genette, 1980, p.7).

[all that which places the text in explicit or implicit relationship with other texts].

This definition is the passport to an alternative taxonomy of literature in which genre is subsumed by "*relations textuelles*". He perceives five types of these "*relations*", of which the fourth, "*hypertextualité*" (Genette, 1980, p.11) embraces literary addition as well as imitation (for example, parody, pastiche and burlesque). To consider all five tasks would be a massive project and *Palimpsestes* concentrates on "hypertextuality". It is defined as:

*...toute relation unissant un texte B (que j'appellerai hypertexte) à un texte antérieur A (que j'appellerai, bien sûr hypotexte) sur lequel il se greffe d'une manière qui n'est pas celle du commentaire.*¹¹² (Genette, 1980, pp. 11-12).

[...all relations uniting a B text (which I will designate the *hypertexte*) with an anterior A text (which I will term naturally the *hypotexte*) upon which it engrafts itself in a fashion which is not one of commentary].

The definition is a formalisation of "palimpsest", the metaphor embodied by

the title. Genette describes a palimpsest as a parchment upon which a newer manuscript is superimposed, thereby partially obscuring it. Traces of the previous manuscript are visible through the more recent one and there are points at which the two texts tend to blur imperceptibly into one. (see Genette, 1980, p 451):

Genette's conception of the hypertext is surely an advance on Fowler's "types involving dependence on an antecedent". For Fowler the textual bond is parasitic. Genette sees it as symbiotic. "*Toute relation*" leaves open the possibility of the dialogue between texts. Moreover, the relative neutrality of "hypertext" is preferable to "ectype" which connotes a diminutive work, if not in size, in value, lacking a referee to nominate it for admission to the gentleman's club of genre.

The qualification, "*qui n'est pas celle du commentaire*" requires glossing. It distinguishes hypertextuality from the third type of "textual transcendence"; metatextuality. This describes works which have a critical bearing on a forebear or forebears. Here the relationship is primarily discursive, whilst Genette is keen to stress that the term does not solely encompass literary criticism, offering Hegel on Rameau as his main example. (Genette, 1980, p. 10). Perhaps Genette is a little hasty in denying hypertextuality a metatextual function. Richardson's sequel to *Pamela*, to quote only one example, certainly has a critical role within its fictional substance as Chapter 3 will be indicating.

On the whole, though, in Genette's hands, incremental literature is provided with a more workable theoretical context than Fowler's. This discussion now proceeds to examine Genette's elaboration of his initial

terminology, and then to make some objections to it. Genette's account of sequels, the concern of chapters 28 to 38 (Genette, 1980, pp. 188-233) is sandwiched rather uncomfortably between an exhaustive anatomy of imitation, in a work which is epic in scale, running to well over 400 pages. His analysis of increments hinges on two key terms: "*continuation*" and "*suite*". (Genette, 1980, pp.181-182). "*Continuation*" refers to the English sense of "completion". "*Continuations*" for Genette bring a work that has either been left unfinished, or whose ending is uncertain, to a decisive conclusion. The term does not simply embrace "obvious" completions, such as recent attempts to finish Jane Austen's *Sanditon* and *The Watsons*. Genette would also see Marivaux's eventual completion of his own *Marianne* as a valid continuation. (see Genette, 1980, pp. 185-187).

The "*Suite*" is closer to our "sequel". But Genette gives the term a more limited scope of reference. The "*Suite*" recommences a work and prolongs it, necessarily or not, depending on the views of readers:

La suite...diffère de la continuation en ce qu'elle ne continue pas une oeuvre pour la mener à son terme, mais au contraire pour la relancer au-delà de ce qui était initialement considéré comme son terme. (Genette, 1980, p. 229).

[The "*suite*" differs from the continuation in that it does not continue a work in order to bring it to completion, but rather in order to re-launch it from the point at which it was originally considered closed.]

Genette's main examples of the "*suite*" are works which will be receiving attention in this thesis: *Don Quixote* Part II and the *Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*.

Genette qualifies his distinction between "*suite*" and "*continuation*" in a

way which is near-fatal to his categorisation. The latter becomes the "*achèvement allographe*" and the former becomes the "*prolongation autographe*", (Genette, 1980, p.181). A necessary distinction is made between an addition by the original author and one by a different author. However, as employed here, in conjunction with two particular forms of addition, it sabotages the terminology. The logical inference from the descriptions is that a work may only be considered incomplete if it is "continued" by another author. Furthermore, a work can only be re-started if the "*suite*" is written by the original author. Genette is suggesting that only the author of a first part is qualified to reconsider the ending of a book, and re-open it. Continuation, or completion, on the other hand offers a more open field, and can produce some fascinating, if variable, hybrids. The type of addition is determined by the type of author who essays it.

Hence, Genette's categories suffer from an over-rigid and premature binding of historical and formal factors. However, under closer scrutiny the terms "*achèvement*" and "*prolongation*", taken on their own, begin to reveal themselves as potentially confusing. Genette himself acknowledges this:

...on verra que la distinction théorique se brouille assez souvent dans les faits: on ne peut terminer sans commencer par continuer, et a force de prolonger on finit souvent par achever.
(Genette, 1980, p.182)

[It will be seen that the theoretical distinction can quite often become clouded in the face of the facts: you cannot end without commencing by means of continuation, and in order to extend you often finish by completing.]

Having wryly noted this conundrum, Genette does not fully explore its implications, and his terms certainly do not very satisfactorily register it.

The problem with adopting Genette's categories on the specific level are compounded by another difficulty, to do more with the general emphasis of the genial bear-hug of hypertextuality that constitutes *Palimpsestes*. For, Genette's chief concern is the branch of hypertextuality which involves imitation, and the bulk of the work makes increasingly fine distinctions between its various modes. Beginning with familiar terms such as "parody" and "pastiche", he progresses to his own coinages such as "transposition", (Genette, 1980, p. 237)

This orientation towards imitation, rather at the expense of sequels, and similar additions, may explain why, when Genette does come on to these, he is biased towards the *achèvement allographe*. For authors who take it on themselves to complete another's unfinished work adopt a creative stance that is easiest to classify as imitative. Genette is explicit about his stress on "allographic" hypertextuality:

La suite autographe, à prendre les choses de façon stricte, échappe à notre enquête puis qu'elle ne procède pas par imitation...un auteur qui se prolonge s'imite sans doute d'une certaine façon, à moins qu'il ne se transcende, ne se trahisse ou ne s'effondre, mais tout cela n'a plus chose à voir avec l'hypertextualité. (Genette, 1980, p.230).

[The original author's "suite", following things to the letter, eludes our examination since it does not progress by imitation...an author who prolongs himself undoubtedly, to an extent, imitates himself, unless he transcends himself, betrays himself, or undermines himself, but all this has nothing much to do with hypertextuality.]

Genette may be too hasty in suggesting that an author's deviation from the path taken by the original work is not a hypertextual concern. But this view arises from Genette's perception of imitation and its workings, and when it focuses on sequels, it is blurred by a premature introduction of the authorial role.

Hence, Genette's discussion of increments is helpful in places, but can be confusing. An underlying reason for this could be his jettisoning of genre as a reference point. His transgeneric approach can be as perilous as it is exciting. For, whilst the five features of transtextuality are initially presented as perspectives through which individual texts can be viewed, they must on occasion act as all-embracing categories, as replacements for a genre system. However, as categories they would, in each case, embrace a vast variety and quantity of literature, with a high degree of overlap (little else could be expected from only five principle categories). The awkward question, then, begged by hypertextuality is whether it is one of a plurality of perspectives for viewing a single text, or a single criterion for defining a plurality of texts. In the broad sense, Genette's system is so flexible as to be potentially unworkable.

Thus, neither Fowler nor Genette offer comprehensive or wholly reliable assistance in characterising the sequel's relationship with genre. The analysis so far has thrown up two main areas of doubt: the nature of the sequel's function within genre, and the extent to which a sequel should be defined as an imitation. The remainder of this section now looks at these problems in more detail, taking the imitation question first.

One way of approaching this first issue is by envisaging the sequel as presenting a number of technical problems, and then assigning priorities to them. The initial problem (as pointed out by Genette, but not followed through) is that of resumption. The sequel writer is obliged to begin a story again, however open-ended the conclusion of the first part. The narrative must then be sustained in a way which is both consistent with the first part and yet departs from it in a manner which holds the reader's interest. Resuming

and sustaining a dependent narrative, are matters related to the logistics of story-telling. It is surely this re-articulation of previously received narrative that is the primary technical problem. If imitation is demanded by this process of reactivation and reiteration then it is a secondary technical problem. Furthermore, the scope and orientation of the imitation will be determined by the need to establish tangible interconnections between the two parts.

Some general predictions can be made about the kind of imitation that will emerge. If the imaginative world of the original is to be re-represented convincingly the imitation has to be respectful and serious-minded. However much a sequel tries to establish its own sense of direction it is obliged, at the very least, to convey the spirit of the original. Genette, in another context, uses the phrase "*imitation sérieuse*", (Genette, 1980, p.237) which usefully communicates a non-parodic intention. However, "faithful", or "close" might be more suitable adjectives to describe the kind of imitation undertaken in a sequel, be it *autographe* or *allographe*.

Distinguishing features of a close imitation are inclusiveness and thoroughness. The predecessor's fictional world has to be re-created in full, even if it is to receive significant addition and transformation. That is, the sequel must follow the narrative of Part I, or at least follow up its implications. In either case, there has to be some kind of adherence to the style, tone, themes, chronology, settings and characterisation of the original.

By way of contrast, other types of imitation, such as parody and burlesque, both deliberately deviate from the original, and are selective

rather than inclusive. They borrow from the model only that which is sufficient to remind readers of the flavour of the original. Fielding's *Shamela*,⁶⁹ parodies Richardson's *Pamela* by concentrating on particularly vivid episodes, such as Mr. B creeping up on Pamela in her chamber, (*Shamela*, pp.12-13). Hence, the original work is truncated. This allows for Fielding to distort Richardson's style at will. On the other hand, Richardson's sequel to his *Pamela*, the subject of the third chapter of this thesis, offers a wholesale re-creation of the voices, styles, and many of the characters of the original. Within this framework, it does depart from the first part, but not by straying from its imitative axis.

Bearing in mind the specialized nature of imitation that occurs in literary incrementation, another term could be deployed to characterise it. I would suggest "mimesis". Despite the wide-ranging implications of the word it still seems a more suitable word than "imitation" which has such specific connotations of reworking, alteration and distortion, especially in Genette's vocabulary. Describing a sequel as "mimetic" evokes the "miming" and "mimicry" that are especially demanded of the sequel writer. Furthermore, "mimesis" captures the comprehensiveness of the sequel's re-creation of a fictional world more effectively than does "imitation", which tends to suggest a series of local technical procedures.

It must now be stressed that the sequel's mimetic character does not exclude the possibility of it developing independent qualities. The attempt at mimesis is, as it were a starting point, a minimal technical requirement for sequel-writing. Moreover, whilst it can be included in a definition of a sequel, it is not the primary definitional characteristic. The concept of mimesis helps to clarify the sequel's dependent nature, but it still does not

establish the place of the sequel's dependent relationship within the generic scheme. This problem will now be negotiated.

It was suggested in the earlier discussion of the sequel's relations with the sequence and series that a sequel has a pivotal role in bringing out a novel's potential, if any, for further development. Along similar lines, the sequel has a function beyond the group of novels it may initiate, within the genre in which it features. That is, it is a means of stabilising and/or challenging generic conditions.

This is achieved by an intensifying of focus on the ways in which fictions are constructed. A first part will draw on a variety of sources and antecedents with which it has implicit relationships. A sequel has as its main derivative a single book with which it has an explicit historical and literary relationship. Any other sources would be incidental to this dialogue. A sequel works primarily with the fictional materials provided by the predecessor. It tends to single out and exaggerate those characteristics of the original work which make it peculiar to its genre, filtering out, or at least downgrading other generic influences.

This process is especially evident in the two main texts of this chapter: the *Pilgrim's Progress*, Part II and *Don Quixote* Part II. The first part of the *Pilgrim's Progress* draws on various sources, including spiritual autobiography and romance literature. The second part, however, concentrates upon and develops that which is innovative within Bunyan's novel. Within this context of working mainly with fictional raw materials, the opportunities for the exploration of what a particular genre or sub-genre has to offer increase exponentially. At the very least, this can produce a celebratory consolidation

of the former achievement. At the most, it can produce a redoubled creative intensity, a chance for even greater innovative strides. The sequel to the *Pilgrim's Progress* works on and enhances the tendency of the first part to stretch its allegorical framework.

However, the sequel to *Don Quixote* is not content with such a regulatory role. It actually transforms the conditions in which the knight-errant performed in the first part. Cervantes doubles the stakes on his own literary playfulness by making the first part the prime imitative subject of the sequel instead of the body of romance literature which the first part parodied. Cervantes's procedure here will receive greater attention in the next section of this chapter.

For the moment, both the respective works serve to demonstrate a regulatory function, as well as one of concentrated innovation, for the sequel within a particular genre. In this case, the genre is prose fiction, or the novel. However, there is no reason why the same activities should not be evident in other kinds, such as poetry. For example, Barbara Lewalski has famously explored the way Milton, with *Paradise Regained*, modifies and takes further his revival of the epic poem genre in *Paradise Lost*.⁷⁰

A possible term for the sequel's task of regulation and/or alteration is "moderation" or "modulation". I prefer "modulation", since it manages to suggest both the sequel's stabilising and its possible destabilising activities. It presents the sequel as an agent of change and as a means of maintaining the status quo. Modulation thus also incorporates the formulaic nature of the series, and the more expansive, exploratory aspects of the sequence, either of which the sequel, in its pivotal position, can initiate.

In this context, a revealing etymological connection is indicated in *Nuttall's Pronouncing Dictionary of the English Language* (1908). The verb "modulate" is related to the verb "to modify", in that both terms indicate regulation through alteration. One of the definitions given of "to modify" is "to extenuate". Prolonging, or drawing out a narrative which has supposedly been at least partially completed is one of the sequel's activities. The dictionary forges a useful connection between the role of modulation and of continuation by means of variation through repetition.

This sub-section has arrived at a concept of the sequel as a mimetic modulator. But this concept can only come more clearly into focus when the sequel's relationship with closure has been more clearly established. As Genette pointed out, the sequel does ostensibly have a completive purpose. However, as he also realised, this can only be realised on the abstract level. Within the worlds of the texts themselves the situation is rather more contradictory and complex than this, as the final section of this chapter hopes to show.

SECTION (iii)

The Influence of Closure Theory on Definitions

SECTION (iii)a: Closure theory and sequels

This sub-section initially provides a background to some contributions to closural theory made in the last thirty years, with the intention of indicating how the idea of the sequel is informed by it. Despite broad agreement among various critics about the nature of closure, there is room for debate. It is within this context of disagreement that the sequel's role is introduced. For its identity is shaped by the way in which it can support both sides of the argument simultaneously. Finally, the sequel's dual nature in regard to closure is incorporated into the definition of the sequel which will inform the rest of this thesis. Section (iii)b re-introduces the concept of generic modulation, in order to offer the sub-definitions of the sequel, upon which discussion of the main eighteenth-century examples will be based.

Samuel Beckett's latest work, a prose miniature called *Stirrings Still*, was recently made available to a wide English public when it was reproduced in *The Guardian* newspaper. The work was reviewed in the same paper, on the same day as its appearance, by Frank Kermode. He comments:

Just as *Imagination Dead Imagine* is about the last wisp of the power of the mind to perceive and transform the world, *Stirrings Still* is about the survival of the minimal spark of life itself.⁷¹

It seems fitting that Kermode should be reviewing a text so concerned with finality and the ability to make last words linger; and that he should take

note of the tendency of the prose to chisel its way out of the grave it digs for itself, towards some chink of light.

For it is this kind of paradoxical condition that Kermode, the mandarin of closural theory, explored in his ground-breaking *The Sense of An Ending*.⁷² He provided a neo-philosophical overview of closure, which despite, or maybe because of its thick texture and occasional opacity, has inspired a variety of more closely focused "follow-ons", of article or book length.

Four examples of these critical increments feature in the foregoing discussion: Herrnstein-Smith's *Poetic Closure*;⁷³ Richter's *Fable's End*;⁷⁴ Torgovnick's *Closure in the Novel*,⁷⁵ and a special edition of the journal *Nineteenth Century Fiction*, entitled *Narrative Endings*.⁷⁶ Herrnstein-Smith's book ranges widely in period and type of poem scrutinized. Richter, in his study of "rhetorical" novels, or apologues, covers an almost equally broad spectrum, although his emphasis is on twentieth century examples. Torgovnick concentrates on nineteenth- and early twentieth-century European and American novels. The special edition speaks for itself, although it too has a transatlantic focus.

Despite the variety of literature considered in these works there is a remarkable degree of consistency in the general observations made about closure. This consistency is revealed in four main strands. First, there is a stress on the value of endings in establishing or "finalising" the shape of a work. Herrnstein-Smith's lucid expression of this notion, although confined to poetry, summarises the views of the other critics. Closure

...gives ultimate unity and coherence to the reader's experience of the poem by providing a point from which all the preceding elements may be viewed comprehensively and their relations as part of a significant design. (Smith, 1968, p.36).

Second, to varying degrees the critics distinguish between completeness and closure. Richter sees the difference as crucial, and even incorporates it into his sub-title, (see note 74) For him, "completeness" is synonymous with wholeness, or Aquinas's "*integritas*" (Richter, 1974, p. 6), and is concerned with the sense of satiety and satisfaction that a work in its entirety can give a reader. Closure, on the other hand, is the deployment of specific tropes of narrative, such as marriage or death, which can end a book. Torgovnick preserves the distinction but, in her terminology, Richter's "closure" becomes her "ending" and his "completion" becomes her "closure". (Torgovnick, 1981, p.6). Her paraphrase of "closure" is more modest than Richter's reverence of "completion". She merely detects a "sense that nothing has been omitted from a work". (Torgovnick, 1986, p.6).

Third, there is a general acknowledgement that the end of a work, rather like the opening, is a point at which interaction with the world of the reader is especially overt and intense. Often, at the end of a book, an author may make an appearance as the narrator of an epilogue. (Richardson does this in *Pamela* Part I.) An ending pulls in two directions. It can confirm the timeless fictional nature of a work, and at the same time acts as a historical signature (literally, in the case of Joyce's signature at the end of *Ulysses*).

The fourth common factor in closural criticism is a recognition that the nature of endings eludes final or decisive theoretical pronouncements and categorisation. The last thing a critic can do, it seems, is have the last word on closure. "We conclude, then, a la mode, with paradoxes", writes Herrnstein-Smith (Smith, 1968, p.270), towards the end of her masterly study. She has been considering examples of "anti-closural" poems, such as the "concrete poetry" of Ian Hamilton-Finlay, (see Smith, 1968, p.268). Richter

opens his conclusion with the suggestion that "...many more questions have been raised than have been answered", (Richter, 1974, p.166). The reaction to this sense that closure as a subject cannot easily be abstracted and embraced by taxonomy is to concentrate on its role in individual texts. Torgovnick, of all the authors on the subject, provides the theoretical framework for such analysis that can be most easily adopted, and adapted, by others. She offers a set of terms which "...provide a flexible, non-polemical way to describe endings and closures", (Torgovnick, 1981, p.19):

These broad convergences, however, can be undermined by implicit and explicit debate. The sequel's relations with closure are illuminated by the terms of this disagreement. Torgovnick, in her Introduction, takes issue with the "Deconstructionists", who, she claims, have lost sight of readers' desires for narrative coherence. She proceeds to cite Hillis Miller's introductory thoughts on closure in *Narrative Endings*:

Endings, we are told, both "ravel" and "unravel" the text, with interpretation a constant and constantly self-cancelling act. Such ideas have a tantalizing newness and a certain abstract validity. But they violate what common sense and practical experience tell us: novels do have forms and meanings, and endings are crucial in achieving them. (Torgovnick, 1981, p.4).

However, perhaps Hillis Miller's assertion of an ambivalence endemic to literary conclusions cannot be so easily dismissed. His argument is supported by a semantic point which Torgovnick overlooks:

The word ravel already means unravel. The "un" adds nothing not already there. To ravel up a story or to unravel it comes to the same thing. (Hillis Miller, 1978, pp.6-7).

This emphasises the view that the very act of finishing is also an act of continuation. Even death, which carries such closural force for the other

critics, is for Hillis Miller "the most enigmatic, the most open-ended ending of all", (Hillis Miller, 1968, p.6).

Hillis Miller's essay is probably too concise for its own good, and is something of a playful googly bowled at his hapless fellow contributors. Yet it makes two valuable points. He is suggesting, first, that endings have to be, by their very nature, artificial. At the most, they can expose the fictionality of literary structures, but they cannot seal off a text's implications, the myriad of connections it has already established with existing and, most importantly, pre-existing texts. He cannot accept a zealous boxing up of texts into self-supporting unities. He is also suggesting that endings have always had this inherent ambivalence. It is perennial. Hence, the divide, noticed for instance by Herrstein-Smith between "closural" and "anti-closural" poems, is not historical. In this respect, uncertain closure is not heralded by modernism and post-modernism. This point in itself would be sufficient to worry a critic such as Torgovnick, who makes much capital out of the proto-modern characteristics of a number of her texts.

Hillis Miller's way of perceiving literary forms is revealingly analogous to Derrida's conception of the way meaning, or a delusion of meaning, is conveyed in language, or writing, as he would prefer to see it (writing for Derrida is the primogenitor of speech). He sees no precise correspondence between signifier and signified. Instead, we interact linguistically by perpetually deferring what we are trying to communicate:

...there have never been anything but supplements; substitutive significations which could only come forth in a chain of differential references...And thus to infinity. 77

If this vision of language were applied to the "grammar" within which texts

function then literature would consist of an ever-expanding knot of interlocking chains in which ultimate closure was deferred "...to infinity", and individual works could only be assessed according to a criterion of "difference".

The sequel, with its stress on resumption and continuation, would have an integral role in such a scheme. Indeed, with its ability to disrupt closure, and its potential to defer it perpetually it appears to endorse exuberantly the deconstructionist perspective. It certainly challenges Richter's comfortable distinction between closure and completion. Thus, he discusses Richardson's *Pamela* as arriving at an unusual but decisive sense of satiety by extending beyond the conventional marriage ending. He dares only mention the sequel parenthetically: "Richardson did write a sequel to *Pamela*, but that is another story", (Richter, 1974, p.3). The problem is that the sequel is only partially another story. It relates in many ways to the original and challenges its seeming integrity and autonomy. Its presence cannot be side-stepped. What appeared to be decisive completion has been deemed retrospectively to be notional closure. It is unfair, but necessary, to point out that Richter's confident advocacy of *Catch-22* as Heller's "Achievement of Shape" is now challenged by the recent announcement that Heller is preparing a sequel.⁷⁸

The sequel has, then, a displacing effect on closure. It acts as a reminder that our sense of a work's final form can only be provisional. This form may be altered by future developments, just as these changes in turn may be subject to revision. However, to adapt Richter's metaphor, this is not the whole story. The sequel does not thrive purely on a disruptive, uprooting function. In order to develop this point, the nature of the above debate

requires clarification. In a way, it is not really a debate at all. Neither side can "prove" their points. Torgovnick can only call on "common sense" and Hillis Miller can only portray formal uncertainty. The disagreement is more a striking of attitudes towards the whole question of how literary shapes are made, and the spirit in which they should be received.

Kermode, in *The Sense of An Ending*, calls upon Sartre's description of the construction of literature from the materials of diurnal discourse as "faking", (see Kermode, 1966, p.148). Deconstructionists might well view closure as that part of a novel which merely confirms and reveals the act of "faking", the frail forgery demanded by literary language. On the other hand, closural theorists such as Torgovnick, Herrnstein-Smith and Richter, have a more optimistic view of endings. Endings multifariously celebrate the ways in which a transcendent illusion (rather than a fake) has been executed.

However, it is possible to hold both attitudes simultaneously, or at least, for a fiction to display both attitudes simultaneously. For a sequel both reveals the artificiality behind literary structures, by shattering our dreams of conclusion, and itself has to draw on whatever materials are available to restore and sustain the pretence, the artifice. After all, sequels have to establish the sense of an ending too, even if only a provisional one. This characteristic duality is neatly represented in "that old joke" with which Woody Allen ends his film *Annie Hall*:

...this - this - guy goes to a psychiatrist and says, "Doc, uh, my brother's crazy. He thinks he's a chicken. And, uh, the doctor says, "Well, why don't you turn him in?" And the guy says, "I would, but I need the eggs". 79

Allen uses the joke to sum up the absurdity of human relationships. However,

it can also be adapted to describe the way in which a sequel questions and pesters the "chickenness" of prose fiction, sometimes to the point of turning it in. But, within this very rhetorical gesture it goes on to become the chicken and lays the eggs.

Derrida, in a very different context from the above, also provides a means of focusing upon the sequel's dual function of usurpation and reassurance. In *Of Grammatology* he stresses that a text has no fixed place in the literary network. Its relations with preceding and subsequent works can never be decisively defined. The most a work can do is present an illusion that it is a stable entity which is invulnerable to encroachment from other texts. Derrida makes this point with the aid of dendritic imagery:

...if a text always gives itself a certain representation of its own roots, those roots live only by that representation, by never touching the soil, so to speak. Which undoubtedly destroys their *radical essence*, but not the necessity of their *racinating function*. (Derrida, 1976 [1967], p.102).

Derrida's noting of a text's "racinating function" qualifies his vision of closure as perpetually deferred. The literary sequel demonstrates vividly the necessity for such a qualification through its relations with a prior text. For the sequel "deracinates" its predecessor by resuming it and offering a fresh perspective on its fictional world. However, the sequel must then itself recreate the illusion of, and necessity for, closure. It is obliged to "reracinate" the text it has uprooted.

An academic definition of the sequel should take into account the sequel's ambivalent attitude to closure. It should recognise that sequels are as much concerned with restoration, perpetuation, "Returns to...", and "Sons of...", as with disruption and displacement, (represented by a title such as

Catherine: Her Book, which, in its pun on "book" wrests the initiative from the more universal *Wuthering Heights*). The definition will also attempt to register the point made about historical context in Section (i) and about the sequel's relationship with the sequence and series mentioned in Section (ii)a. The term "mimesis", arrived at in Section (ii)b, will also be deployed. I will now define the "sequel" as follows:

A mimetic addition to a previously published work of fiction which either resumes, continues, and completes that work; or, resumes and continues it but arrives at a conclusion which encourages further continuation.

It may be objected that this definition does not follow the OED's example in stressing that the sequel is a complete work in itself.⁵⁰ However, sequels are not always self-contained. Independent status is what some sequels try to attain, but not something that all sequels automatically acquire. Relative autonomy is not, then, a definitional characteristic. The following section proceeds to offer some sub-definitions of this main definition.

Section (iii)b: Two main types of sequel

The concept of generic modulation introduced in Section (ii)b was excluded from the preceding definition of the sequel. This was a deliberate omission, since generic modulation is more valuable in providing terminology for describing different types of sequel. This section does not intend to provide a comprehensive taxonomy, but rather to show how the proposed terminology can be applied to individual texts by concentrating on two specific examples.

The previous sections have noted that the sequel tends to embrace dual possibilities. In modulating it may seek radical departure from the original,

or it may seek to stabilise the original. In re-opening a work it may seek to close it decisively, or leave room for further continuation. In order to describe different formal possibilities for the sequel, I would propose combining the concepts of modulation and closural purpose, taking note of the ambivalence which each concept embodies.

However, the modulating function will provide the two primary categories, with each sequel coming under the aegis of one or the other. The first category is that of regulation, or moderation. the *Pilgrim's Progress* part II falls under this heading. It builds on the achievements of the first part, and establishes a formula for pilgrimage as social ritual. In this respect, it might be more suitable to call the sequel "consolidatory". It consolidates and reinforces the rhythms and patterns of narrative established by Christian in the first part.

Don Quixote Part II has a different modulating function: one of transformation. In this sequel the first part is presented as a literary triumph, and Don Quixote achieves fame and notoriety. This has the effect of drastically reducing the scope of the hero's imitative project. Rather than imitate the knights of chivalric romance, Don Quixote is primarily forced to imitate himself. This gives those characters presented as his readers a chance to exercise their creative imaginations in a way which was not true of the first part. It also makes the Don's antics seem more stage-managed, especially in the company of the duke and duchess, (see *Don Quixote*, II, pp.662-734). Thus, the first part's pattern of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza wandering the plains of La Mancha with no fixed itinerary is altered. The itinerary is more structured in the sequel. Don Quixote is directed more by others. A term for this sequel, then, could be "reformative".

"Transformative" is, perhaps, too strong an adjective, implying a reworking more like Graham Greene's *Monsignor Quixote*.⁸¹

The primary terms, "consolidatory" and "reformative" can, however, be further qualified, according to the way in which each work closes. As has been already indicated, the second part of the *Pilgrim's Progress* establishes a pattern of ritualistic reiteration. Within its own terms, it closes satisfactorily, since Christiana and her children reach the Celestial City. However, in terms of the work as a whole, it reaches an open-ended conclusion. Further re-activation of the now established narrative patterns might be possible.

On the other hand, *Don Quixote* Part II closes far more decisively. Cervantes reminds readers of his Preface that the knight, in this book is presented, "at greater length and this time dead and buried", (*Don Quixote* II, p.470). It was a priority for him to terminate his hero's antics, especially in the light of Avallaneda's spurious continuation. Indeed Cervantes makes his hero a victim of playful readers partly in order to impose a sense of finality. The reformative function is linked to the closural purpose. The duke and duchess, especially, in allowing Don Quixote to act out as many of his ideas as possible, assist in exhausting his creativity. At the same time, he is temporarily separated from Sancho Panza, who has taken up his governorship, (*Don Quixote*, II, pp.740-745). This means that the knight has no one to mediate for him between his fantasy world and everyday life. Thus the preparation for Don Quixote's death is worked into the text by sapping him of his imaginative energy. He is quietly and almost painlessly domesticated. The defeat by Samson Carrasco (*Don Quixote*, II, 890-891) in the joust is merely a token of the Don's loss of initiative in controlling the narrative direction.

Hence, a fuller description of the two sequels would take into account the ways in which they end. The *Pilgrim's Progress* Part II can be described as "consolidatory sequel leading to open-ended conclusion". *Don Quixote* Part II can be called a "reformatory sequel leading to decisive conclusion". These two descriptions indicate ways in which the terminology, based around modulation and closural direction, will be applied. The three main examples will establish a formal spectrum which will embrace a range of possibilities. There are, of course, further means of qualifying the main descriptions, and these are more related to the thematic features of a particular sequel. These features tend to cut across the main categorisations. For example, *Don Quixote* is exhausted literally and metaphorically. Exhaustion is often depicted in a sequel, usually through a central character. It can signal a loss of artistic inspiration or forthcoming closure. Expansion is another thematic trend. In the *Pilgrim's Progress* Part II, Christian's concerns become those of an entire society, with a matriarch as a figurehead.

Sometimes these thematic patterns merge with the formal ones, but not consistently. However, in the above two cases *Pilgrim's Progress* Part II can be satisfactorily described as a "consolidatory sequel leading to open-ended conclusion by means of expansion" and Cervantes's second part could be called a "reformatory sequel leading to decisive closure by means of exhaustion".

These two contrasting examples illustrate how a terminology which combines the concepts of modulation and closural purpose can be utilised to describe individual texts. It is not the purpose of the following chapters to seek out every possible permutation in the definitional scheme. Rather, the aim is to examine individual examples in order to give substance and vitality

to the outer shell of description. This process begins, in the next chapter, with an exploration of Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* trilogy, emphasising of course the role of the sequel within it.

So far, a picture is beginning to emerge of the sequel as an ambivalent and elusive literary form. It belongs, and yet does not belong, to a previously created fictional world. It can adopt the characteristics of many genres, and yet is not in itself a genre. It can seek to close one work of fiction, and can seek to open out another. It can reinforce the achievements of one work, and re-direct the achievements of another. It appears to respond to a mischievous deconstructionist critique, and yet, at the last moment, can coyly reject the critic who courts it with his frenchified vocabulary. A more traditional approach, it seems, must moderate the theoretical excursion. However, precisely because the sequel's nature is so enigmatic and contradictory, the courtship must continue.



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby
West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ
www.bl.uk

**MISSING PAGES ARE
UNAVAILABLE**

CHAPTER 2

"The Quixotism of R. Crusoe"

Introductory

When the third part of *Robinson Crusoe* was published, on August 6th. 1720, it was accompanied with an illustration and a Preface.¹ Both appendages assist in demonstrating the chief concerns of this chapter. The illustration (see below, p.66) that was folded into the frontispiece of Part III directs the attention to events occurring on and around Crusoe's island in the preceding two parts. The title of Part III purports to bring us the "Serious Reflections During The Life" of Crusoe. However, in the illustration there is little emphasis on the solitary part of that life which is what most readers remember Crusoe for, and the phase upon which most critics concentrate. The "Life", during which Crusoe has been reflecting, it is suggested, should be interpreted as filling a much wider canvas than purely his years of solitude. The island is indeed depicted as disconcertingly populous.

The only token of Crusoe's twenty-eight character-forming years alone is a barely perceptible central cartoon caption floating up from the thick foliage protecting his castle home: "Poor Robin Crusoe". The tag is delivered by the pet parrot Poll and refers back to the incident in Part I when Crusoe was surprised by this initially unidentifiable imitation of his laments (I, pp. 166-67). The foreground of the illustration is devoted to other events in Part I, but all involving new arrivals to the island. For example, in the

bottom right of the picture, Will Atkins begs for his life, recalling the denouement of the mutiny in Part I (I, p.316). Only in this context of the narrative is Crusoe explicitly depicted, and, even here, is seen not alone but accompanied by his faithful manservant. The background of the picture displays episodes from the sequel (such as the battle with the savages, II, pp.97-104), which have their roots in the socialization of the island, as figured in the foreground pictures.

A reader coming fresh to Part III, with no knowledge of the sequel, and blind to the implications of the conclusion of Part I, might well be "surprised" (in Crusoe's sense of the word)² by the microcosm of unresolved conflict, distress, and activity which is crowded into this picture. Surely, this is nothing like the kind of world that Crusoe has left behind and is about to reflect upon in his third, now purely cerebral, excursion. Yet indeed it is, for the sequel has left an indelible mark on the narrative of Part I,



ILLUSTRATION



and on the trilogy as a whole.

Another facet of the illustration provides a transition into the Preface. All the events depicted had originally occurred, of course, as parts of a narrative sequence. The illustration, of necessity, must remove all sense of chronology in order to give some sense of inclusiveness. Its priority is to show the variety of events, not how they are strung together. Functionally, it serves as a preparation for the suspension of narrative in Part III or, at least, of any continuous, sustained story-telling. The illustration is, literally, an overview which helps to establish a change of direction for the trilogy. It jogs the memory, it sums up preceding narrative and it shifts the emphasis onto kind, rather than order, of situation. Look, it urges, at the sort of thing that will be reflected upon.

"Robinson Crusoe's Preface" negotiates the switch to a discursive style in the following manner:

As the design of every thing is said to be first in the intention, and last in the execution; so I come to acknowledge to my reader, that the present work is not merely the product of the two first volumes, but the two first volumes may rather be called the product of this: the fable is always made for the moral, not the moral for the fable. (III, v).

Crusoe is implying a prior scheme into which the first two parts can be incorporated. He is now merely supplying a key to the "fable", one for which the main body of narrative was constructed. He is trying to reverse the order in which his trilogy has been received, to give it a didactic gloss retrospectively. But he is, in a sense, shutting the stable door after the horse has bolted.

"Fable" might well have had a more general connotation for Crusoe than

for readers today. He might have meant simply, "A fiction from which can be extracted a moral lesson". However, as Gildon says, in relation to the didactic interpolations in Part II, (Part III had not been written by the time Gildon finished his Epistle):

...This Use and Instruction should arise from the Fable itself in an evident and useful Moral, either exprest or understood.³

Gildon here stresses that there is little a writer can do after the event. After all, it is surely not the felicitous exercise that Crusoe implies to impose a series of didactic consequences on a rambling travelogue and then make them stick. One of the main suggestions of the chapter is that this wilful act of reversal represents an attempt to control a radically wayward and unstable text. Part III is concerned with repossessing a narrative in the way that the narrative itself, in both parts, is concerned with loss and repossession.

The forthcoming chapter seeks to discover how it is that Crusoe should be put in the position of having to reconstruct his preceding works, of having to suspend them, to call a halt to proceedings, and to explain himself. It argues that an explanation can be found for this in the pivotal role of the sequel within the trilogy. The note of uncertainty that Part III tries to resolve has its origins in the structure of Part II. However, the argument also embodies a justification of the sequel and a defence of it as a valuable and provocative literary adventure.

The discussion containing this broad argument is divided into three main sections. Section (i) begins with a brief resume of some critical opinions of the sequel, and attempts to place it in its immediate historical context, in

order to show that it was demanded as much by the circumstances arising from Part I's publication as by the terms of Part I's ambivalent conclusion. Section (ii), the most substantial of the chapter, considers Part II as a considerably more inventive and provocative literary invention than even its more sympathetic critics have allowed. Section (ii)a examines the narrative format of Part I, and especially its final portion, in order to suggest that the ground is prepared for a second part, should one be desired. Section (ii)b concentrates upon the sequel itself, examining how it consolidates and develops the narrative layout of the first part by radically dividing Crusoe's concerns. It points out that whilst the sequel is formally reiterative, it is innovative in the way it scrutinizes and exposes its hero. Section (iii) sums up the preceding observations and, relatively briefly, examines Part III in an advocacy of it as a sort of "*folie de clôtûre*", a grand closural gesture which endeavours to put a check to Crusoe's fiction-making and relieve the more journalistic forms with which his creator was familiar.

SECTION (i)

The Occasion For a Sequel

I am afraid that Robinson Crusoe reserv'd so much Opium for his own Use, when he dispos'd of the rest to the Merchant of Japan, that he has scarce been thoroughly awake ever since; and has communicated that somniferous Quality of the Drug to his writing thro' the whole second part, which every where prepares you for sleep.
(Dottin, 1923, p.109)

Whilst critical commentary on *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* does not aspire to imitate Gildon's amusing staged weariness, there is little, if any, disagreement with the substance of his verdict. Walter de la Mare, in his refreshingly improvisatory *Desert Islands and Robinson Crusoe*, comments:

This wanton attempt of an author to ruin his finest piece of handiwork is, so far as I know, unparalleled in English literature.⁴

Pat Rogers, making out a sound case for the composition of Part II following the reception of Part I, remarks:

...we could reasonably suppose that Defoe was writing in the same flow of inspiration, even if the quality of his second performance prompts an opposite point of view.⁵

This is a slightly more restrained observation, but still hardly counts as a recommendation.

On the other hand, some critics are more than willing to integrate *The Farther Adventures* into their analysis of Crusoe's life. James Sutherland concedes that the nature of Crusoe's itinerary in the second part makes it "...a very different sort of story".⁶ Maximillian E. Novak, in an article

which will receive attention later, insists that:

...we must regard the *Surprizing Adventures* and the *Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* as a single work concerned with the political evolution of a society in a state of nature... 7

In a long, but useful, footnote to a long, but unfortunately less useful, philosophical essay on all three parts, Thomas S. Schrock accounts for his overview, regretting a failure, or refusal, amongst critics, to treat the work as a whole as an "authentic trilogy":

I take all the neglected writings [Parts II and III] seriously...because I believe that, when an author presents a work of ostensibly connected parts, all said to come from the mind and experience of of the same protagonist-narrator, the presumption...is that he wants us to read them as connected, ie., as parts of a whole which, as such, are likely to be more reliable guides to the interpretation of each other than are any extraneous documents. 8

Schrock's point about connections between the parts is important, and deceptively simple. For, surely, one source of the objections to the sequel is a resistance to any seemingly unnecessary addition to the first part. This problem will be discussed from the literary viewpoint in Section (ii). However, a review of the sequel's historical context in this section will help to establish a view of the sequel as a necessary, almost inevitable reinforcement of success.

Speculation about literary motives is always tendentious, and can prove fruitless. Nonetheless, in the light of available evidence, it seems fair to conclude that there was a strong economic impulse behind the *Farther Adventures Of Robinson Crusoe*. However, two qualifications must be made at the outset. First, it was certainly not solely or primarily Defoe who stood to benefit from a sequel; and second, the profiteering motive was tempered by one

of artistic hubris or sense of propriety.

Part I, was published by William Taylor at *The Ship* in Paternoster Row on 25 April 1719, having been registered in the Stationers' Register some two days earlier. Part II appeared after an interval of merely four months on 20 August. In spite of the brevity of this interval and the fact that the first edition of Part I included a precis of Part II, evidence suggests or conforms with the conjecture that Part II had not yet been composed at the time of the first Part's appearance. In fact, the precis itself gives evidence (discussed in the next section of this chapter) that Defoe was not prepared to commit himself to the writing of a sequel until he was sure that his public wanted one. Further support for this conjecture can be inferred from the conspicuously small output of published material representing the normally prolific Defoe over this period. Given the knowledge of his capacity for writing at great speed, it is not inconceivable that the time was taken up with the sequel's composition. Since there is little evidence to suggest otherwise, it is quite probable that *The Farther Adventures* represents a direct response to the success of Part I. ⁹

However, if this popularity is deemed the mainspring of the sequel it must be characterised and measured. Contemporary critical reaction to the work is unfortunately sparse. But Gildon's *Epistle to D- De F-*, with its vigorous and bracing rhetoric, surely indicates that *The Surprizing Adventures* had already acquired a certain public reputation. The *Epistle* was published on September 28 1719, after Defoe had produced his sequel. The success of Gildon's text in its own right serves as a tangible reflection of the impact of both Parts. Priced at a shilling, the pamphlet had run to two editions and prompted a Dublin piracy within the year.¹⁰

Gildon's text also gives a revealing, if crude and caricatured, signal of the extent and nature of Defoe's public. In the inspired dialogue between hero and author which precedes the Epistle, they disagree over Crusoe's status:

D-1: You are my hero, I have made you, out of nothing, fam'd from Tuttle-Street to Limehouse-Hole; there is not an old woman that can go to the price of it, but buys thy *Life and Adventures* and Leaves it as a Legacy with the *Pilgrim's Progress*, the *Practice of Piety*, and *God's Revenge against Murther*, to her posterity.

Cru: Your Hero! Your Mob Hero! Your Pyecomer Hero! On a foot with *Guy of Warwick*, *Bevis of Southampton*, and the *London Prentice*. (Dottin, 1923, pp 71-72)

This oft-quoted exchange is worth recording again because it gives a rare hint of the quantity and nature of the contemporary readership. Especially noteworthy is the way that Crusoe downgrades the company which his narrative keeps. However, in this respect, it might be worth bearing in mind Johnson's famous remark:

Was there anything yet written by mere man that was wished longer by its readers, excepting *Don Quixote*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and the *Pilgrim's Progress*?¹¹

Even though these comments come virtually half a century apart, they perhaps point to the universal appeal of Part I especially. The book probably belonged to both "camps" of readers suggested by Crusoe and his author.

However, this is pure speculation and is not sufficient to establish a valid, watertight case for the popularity of Part I. Such glimpses merely flavour whatever case is made. Pat Rogers regrets the "paucity of comment" in Defoe's day on his most well-known creations. (Rogers, 1979 p129) The difficulty is partly caused by a dearth of fiction reviewing in the magazines

and newspapers of the early eighteenth century, as Mayo points out (Mayo, 1962, pp.16-17).

Instead, the response to Part I (and subsequent volumes) is best measured by reference to edition quantities and associated matters. *The Surprising Adventures* ran to eleven editions between 1719 and 1753. According to Charles C. Mish, on this basis, it comes eighth from the top in a list of the leading eleven bestsellers for the period 1700-1750. At the head of this list comes Swift's *A Tale of A Tub*, with seventeen editions. *The Pilgrim's Progress* Parts I and II, as well as *Guy of Warwick*, are present, although, more significantly for our purposes, *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* is included, in eleventh position, with its eight editions. However, it must be stressed that this is probably not a sure sign of the sequel's popularity, for it was issued with and "carried" by Part I from 1722.¹²

Mish, in these terms, gives a general impression of the popularity of both parts as the century progressed. However, a more specific picture is provided by looking at quantities for the crucial four-month period within 1719. There were four main editions within five months in 1719. Their dates were: 25 April, 9 May, 6 June, and 7 August. Keith I. Maslen refines this data by commenting that the third edition had two distinct issues, as did the fourth. In effect this amounts to six "editions" overall.¹³ However, for clarity's sake it is preferable to bear this revision in mind, but to retain the notion of editions coinciding with the four main dates of issue. Each issue within each edition ran to one thousand copies, (see Maslen, 1965, p.145).

Maslen argues that this figure for copies per edition was not abnormally

large, at least by the standards of one of the printers of Part I. Considered against the statistics of *Gulliver's Travels*, for example, he suggests that the figure of one thousand per edition borders on the average (see Maslen, 1969, pp.148-49). However, he nevertheless concludes:

Still, six editions in less than a year, even if each were no more than one thousand copies, constitute a quite exceptional publishing record. (Maslen, 1969, p.147).

For Maslen, then, the most reliable signal of Part I's appeal is not so much quantity of editions, (or even number of copies per issue), but quantity within a given period or frequency of editions, (Maslen, 1969, p.150). In this respect, he comments, the first part compares favourably with *Gulliver's Travels*, *Pamela* Part I, and *Tom Jones*.

Another sign of demand for Part I is its shared printing. That is, Taylor farmed out the printing of various sheets, for the first four editions (or six in Maslen's terms) to three different printers, Parker, Meere and Bowyer.¹⁴ This suggests a need for copies that could not be satisfied by any single printer.

The unofficial versions of Part I, mainly piracies and abridgements, which rapidly followed the two official first editions offer a less statistical gauge of its perceived commercial viability. One such version is best categorised as a serialisation. Within six months of the first Part's publication Heathcot began to serialise it in his thrice-weekly newspaper, *The Original London Post or Heathcot's Intelligence*. The serial ran without break from 17 October 1719 to 30 March 1720 (issues 125-202) and immediately continued with the serialisation of Part II on 1 April, this being completed on 9 October 1720 (issues 203-289).¹⁵ This was something of a historic

exercise, being probably the first serialisation in a newspaper of a full-length work of fiction.¹⁶ (Although it is primarily the aim at this stage to enumerate the currency of Part I, that of Part II deserves a passing comment here. Evidently, the sequel does not seem to have been as unpopular in its own day - at least in Heathcot's commercially-oriented estimation - as it is in ours.)

This serialisation abridged both parts quite substantially. However, it began after Part II was published, and this section is mainly concerned with the effect of the unofficial versions prior to the sequel's publication. It is at this stage that the emphasis of this survey shifts. Hitherto, material has been offered which substantiates the notion of Part I (in the main) as a bestseller. Now, three piracies are discussed which, besides giving further substantiation to this notion, also provide some focus to speculations on the rapidity with which Part II was written and went on sale.¹⁷

One edition in particular appears to have triggered a considerable degree of concern. It was issued from the Amsterdam Coffee House, the premises of Thomas Cox, and publication can be dated at around 1 August 1719. It was priced at two shillings, that is, three shillings less than Defoe and Taylor's initial editions of *The Surprizing Adventures*.

Hutchins calls Cox's edition a "piracy", (Hutchins, 1925, p.142) but in its rewriting and drastic cutting it is more of an abridgement. (In fact, most recent critics of Part I refer to it thus.) Hutchins points out that Taylor's first part is, typically, an octavo of 364 pages, 37 lines to a page. Cox's volume is a duodecimo of 255 pages, 32 lines to a page, (see Hutchins, 1925, 154). The reason for this disparity in size is that Cox's version excluded all

passages of reflection and ratiocination occurring in the original, preserving only the substance of the narrative. The purpose of this, as acknowledged in its Preface, was to make the book more "portable", and cheaper, (Hutchins 1925 p152).

Taylor reacted against this edition by putting a warning notice in *The St. James Post* on 7 August 1719. Complaining at the way the original has been tampered with, he concludes:

It's hoped the Publick will not give Encouragement to so base a Practice, the Proprietor intending to Prosecute the Vendors according to the law. (Quoted in Hutchins, 1925, p143).

Taylor carried out his threat and commenced a suit in Chancery against Cox. Cox vigorously defended himself against Taylor's offensive, as will be shown later.

This piracy was not alone in increasing the initial circulation of Part I. Another, printed for Grierson in Dublin, appeared early in June 1719, only six weeks after Taylor's first edition; it is a fairly reasonable, unabridged reproduction of the original and is estimated by Hutchins to be probably the first unofficial publication of the work. (Hutchins, 1925, pp.148-150). A third, heavily abridged, piracy was also printed before the publication of Part II, on behalf of a syndicate of London booksellers.¹⁰

No attempt will be made here to argue that there is a direct causal link between any one of these piracies and the initiation of the sequel project. However, Defoe was writing *The Farther Adventures* whilst the piracies were either in preparation or being published. It seems reasonable to suppose that, even if the sequel was not a direct counter to particular spurious versions of

Part I, it was, at least in part, a literary reaction to the sense of pressure and unease that they together created for the copyright owner and author. To this extent the sequel can be seen as a vital re-assertion of the ownership of the *Crusoe* "patent". In one sense the sequel can be seen as an attempt to revive the kind of interest manifested in response to the release of Part I, and therefore to distract the public from the efforts of the pirates.

This point is supported by the fact that Taylor added the above-quoted advertisement to the verso leaf of the Preface to *The Farther Adventures*. More importantly, the Preface, which was almost certainly written by Defoe, in the guise of editor, is primarily a spirited condemnation of the Cox piracy. A substantial extract will now be quoted, because the remarks on this piracy are made in the context of the sequel as a literary exercise:

The second part, if the editor's opinion may pass, is (contrary to the usage of second parts), every way as entertaining as the first, contains as strange and surprizing incidents, and as great a variety of them; nor is the application less serious, or suitable, and doubtless will to the sober, as well as ingenious reader, be every way as profitable and diverting: and this makes the abridging this work, as scandalous, as it is knavish and ridiculous, seeing, while to shorten the book, that they may seem to reduce the value, they strip it of all those reflections, as well religious as moral, which are not only the greatest beauties of the work, but are calculated for the infinite advantage of the reader...

The injury these men do the proprietor of this work, is a practice all honest men abhor, and he believes he may challenge them to shew the difference between that and robbing on the highway, or breaking open a house. If they can't show any difference in the crime, they will find it hard to shew why there should be any difference in the punishment: and he will answer for it, that nothing shall be wanting on his part, to do them justice. (II, vii-vii)

There are aspects of this passage for which comment is reserved until the second section. In relation to the current discussion, the passage makes a link between the sequel and the piracy of Part I which repays further examination. Defoe extols the comparative merits of the sequel. He is giving

it a "hard sell" which is only to be expected. Rather more revealing is the way in which the sequel's qualities are then deployed as a means of fortifying and reinforcing Part I against abridgements. The second part, in continuing in the same diverting yet edifying manner as the first, will act as a means of re-vitalizing a work which may have been sapped of its moral fervour by alternative versions. This is one way in which the sequel's "consolidatory" character is beginning to emerge.

There is, however, a refinement to this statement of purpose which gives a further insight into Defoe's conception of the sequel. It is contained in the transitional phrase "...and this makes the abridging this work". There is an ambiguity in "this work". On a casual reading, the epithet seems to be referring to the "second part" which is, after all, the main subject of the sentence. This, though, would mean that the "Abridging", discussed in the present tense later in the paragraph, could only be hypothetical, something to be prevented, but which has not yet happened. However, the offence has already been committed against Part I. The warning must therefore be directed retrospectively, as well as prospectively, and "this work" must refer to both parts. The paragraph in question, then, has a double function of condemning past incursions into Part I, and warning against any future attempts to pirate either Part I or its sequel.

A confirmation of the sense of "this work" is provided by the opening phrase of the Preface, "The success the former part of this work has met with in the world...". This, combined with the subsequent label "second part", suggests a categorization by the author along these lines: The "work" is an overarching description which can only be defined by that which it contains at the moment of the word's use. The parts are the components which, when added

to the "work", change its character. This use of "work" as a primary descriptive category for both parts is confirmed by the way Defoe continues with it for the remainder of the Preface. "Parts" are no longer cited. Rather, "the work" or "this work" are deployed.

Defoe's descriptive vocabulary, then, implies a view of the sequel as not only an indispensable rhetorical adjunct to Part I, but also as intertwined with it. The "second part" is an extension and development of the "work". Here, then, is a substantiation of a view of Part I as not an entirely self-contained entity. However, it is of some significance that this perception of the disposition of narrative arises within a specific social context. In talking about the parts in the way he does, Defoe is helping to construct an image of a sound literary "property" which is capable of defending itself against intruders. That both parts, as a "work", are protected by the condemnation of piracy makes the defence seem all the more resolute and implacable. The paralleling of piracy to "robbing on the highway, or breaking open a house" in this respect seems all the more justified. The metaphors have a vivid and dynamic quality creating a sense of urgency and outrage. Accordingly, when the author finally goes on the offensive with the closing veiled legal threat, it seems quite appropriate.

In summary, the historical background to the sequel has provided two complementary pictures of *The Farther Adventures*. The first is of a reliable commercial proposition, a book written partly on the grounds that the remarkable sales of its predecessor will guarantee further profit. However, the sequel also finds itself a protector of the property to which it is attached. It cannot technically be called a guardian of copyright, but this is the kind of role suggested by its Preface.

Before leaving the historical context, two further items of evidence may help to clarify the above conclusions. They shed a little shadowy light on how much the profit motive actually mattered to Defoe himself, as opposed to his publisher. Also, a narrative, that of the controversy over the Amsterdam Coffee House piracy, has been started and requires a brief conclusion. Cox published a reply to the accusations made against him in the sequel's Preface, and which were followed up by Taylor's suit in Chancery. The self-vindication appeared in *The Flying Post* on 29 October 1719, about two months after the publication of the *Farther Adventures*.¹⁹ He quotes from the Preface to Part II, paraphrasing the robbery metaphors. This, in itself, indicates the potency of these images. They plainly hit the desired target. He proceeds to deny any involvement with the publication of the piracy, claiming to be in Scotland at the time of printing.

He then offers an intriguing anecdote, claiming this to be his sole source of knowledge of the matter:

...a certain person, a few days before I left London, came to me with a part of a sheet, as a specimen of the paper and print, and desired me to buy some of them; and at the same time told me that there had been a wrangling between Mr. Taylor and the author about copy-money for the second volume: upon which, I immediately concluded that the author had done it himself in revenge to Mr. Taylor, because he could not bring it to his own terms. (Quoted in Hutchins, 1925, p.144)

Cox also reports going to Taylor and stressing his innocence in the affair. This seems to have resolved the problem, for Taylor did withdraw his legal suit against Cox. However, Cox has left for posterity a tantalizing tale of differences between Defoe and Taylor over "copy money" for the sequel. He even suggests that Defoe penned the abridgement in a fit of pique. Surely, the mere evidence that Defoe wrote the sequel rules out the possibility that he would

simultaneously be working on a bastardization of his own first part.

But, even if Cox came to the wrong conclusion about the consequences of an argument between Defoe and Taylor, the possibility of a dispute remains. It is tempting to conjecture that Defoe, an elderly man by now, a bankrupt more than once in his life, was as much surprised by the success of his first part as anyone else. Under the circumstances, the merchant and tradesman in him might have come to the fore and insisted on better terms of payment from his publisher (a considerably younger man) where the sequel was concerned. There is a fragment of evidence to support this conjecture. Taylor's *Sales Catalogue* gives a reference to what is most likely the above-mentioned "copy-money". Parts I and II are mentioned in a single entry:

Robinson Crusoe, in 2 vol. 8 vo and 12 mo, with Cuts, 10£ to be paid for every 1000 of the first Part and 10£, 10s. more when every 1000 of the 2d part is put to printing, and 5£ more when 500 of the 2d. vol. are sold; just going to the press. (Quoted in Hutchins, 1925 p. 40)

It seems likely that Defoe was the unstated recipient of these payments. If this is the case, then the payment terms for the sequel are marginally better. Defoe receives an extra ten shillings per thousand copies, plus an extra five pounds on the sale of the first five hundred copies of the sequel. This evidence neither confirms or denies the rumour of a *dispute* between author and publisher. But it does indicate a concession that the value of the rights to Part I had been underestimated, with the payments to the author for the sequel compensating for this.

Hence, there is some sign that Defoe was concerned about the profit to be made from his bestseller, and its successor. But, in a period when authors were generally under-rewarded for their efforts,²⁰ it was Taylor who stood to

gain the most from *Robinson Crusoe*. There is no way of telling exactly how much profit Taylor made. But if all six thousand copies of Part I were sold, at five shillings a copy, then he would have done extremely well from his venture. Of course, against this it must be borne in mind that he had his overheads, primarily the payments to the three printers of Part I. Maslen has stated that claims of a profit of one thousand pounds for Taylor are extravagant, (Maslen, 1969, p.148). Nevertheless, whatever the exact amount, Hutchins has proposed that the combined profit from both Parts accrued between 1719 and 1720 was at least sufficient to enable him to acquire more favourable bookselling premises. He moved into *The Black Swan*, adjoining *The Ship* in Paternoster Row. It was from here that Part III was issued, (Hutchins, 1925, p.46).

The fact that Taylor gained the most from the sale of both parts, rather puts into perspective Defoe's economic involvement with the two novels. Undoubtedly he needed and sought money. He earned his living primarily as a writer, especially in his latter years. But there is a case surely for Defoe also being fired by literary as much as financial concerns in the production of the sequel. In his wording of the Preface to Part II, there is a distinctly heavier emphasis on the matter of respecting literary property than on that of the "success of the former part of this work".

The purpose of the next section is to explore this literary property, and, more specifically, to suggest that the content of the two volumes considerably qualifies and transforms the confident language with which Taylor and Defoe fought off their competitors.

SECTION (ii)

"Waiting the Good Time"

The previous section described a dispute in the London bookselling world over attempts to imitate and capitalise on one of the eighteenth century's most notable bestsellers. It appears that the Amsterdam Coffee House Piracy especially riled Taylor and his author. It was not simply the act, in itself, of printing an unauthorized alternative version that was provocative. It was specifically the way in which the original *Surprizing Adventures* was bowdlerized which really stung its proprietors. Reflective and didactic passages had been struck out of Crusoe's account. The Cox piracy was not concerned with the "instruction of the reader" which the Preface to Defoe's work had highlighted as a crucial ingredient of the concoction. At least part of the stated purpose of the sequel was to remind readers of the aspects of "improvement" offered by the work as a whole.

The prefatory language of both of Defoe's parts displays a confidence that spiritual and worldly concerns have been successfully balanced in the work as a whole. However, the bravado with which both books are introduced conceals a more complex, darker, and ironic, interaction of these narrative features than the author and publisher would have their readers believe. The first part and sequel, it will be argued, actually constitute an exploration of how to live in a difficult world and yet preserve contact with a governing divinity. The main argument is that the sequel actually reinforces Part I, but not in quite the way that its proprietors might have desired. For it brings

to a crisis the problems in assembling Crusoe's autobiography that were latent in Part I without genuinely resolving that crisis. Hence, justification of the sequel in this section is a far more bittersweet affair than in the previous section.

The argument moves in three stages, with the first two stages, presented in Section (ii)a, acting as preliminaries to the more extended analysis of the sequel itself. First, some critical views are considered which argue, implicitly or explicitly, that the first part is self-contained and not in need of incrementation. The sequel is then justified by making a broad point about the narrative construction of *The Surprizing Adventures*; a point developed by focusing on the final section of Part I. In Section (ii)b Part II receives close attention as a consolidatory sequel which, whilst it does not solve problems latent in the first part, goes a long way towards clarifying them.

SECTION (ii)a: "By turns and returns"

Walter de la Mare's bracing verdict on the *Farther Adventures* has already been quoted. He does qualify his comment, and his remarks are reproduced here, because they home in stimulatingly on the relationship between the two parts:

...like the ever rolling stream of Time itself, Defoe's one difficulty in fiction, for various reasons, was to leave off. This is hardly a sufficient excuse for his thus going on, but how otherwise can we explain and forgive his having peopled those sacred solitudes with Spaniards, mutineers, black women, coffee-coloured piccaninnies, blacksmiths and carpenters, and even saddling them with marriage laws? (de la Mare, 1930 pp.39-40).

Despite the distasteful racist orientation of his remark (made in the 1930's) de la Mare raises two pertinent points. First, there is Defoe's inability to "leave off", especially in the case of *The Surprizing Adventures*. If this problem is seen in terms of Defoe creating a hero whose life and circumstances make it very difficult for him to enforce decisive closure, then it opens out and yields more to analysis. It can be seen as a positive source of creative tension. De la Mare also resents the particular way Defoe chooses to continue Part II, namely, by invading his hero's "sacred solitudes". It will be argued later that perhaps Crusoe is never quite as solitary a figure as some imagine him, and that a social dimension enters his island life long before the sequel begins. Indeed, this is precisely another factor which makes it difficult for Defoe to "leave off".

Pat Rogers offers a subtler analysis which tries to disentangle *The Surprizing Adventures* from the tentacles of the sequel. For both parts he uses the abbreviations *RC1* and *RC2*:

The attempt to yoke together the providential meanings of *RC1* and *RC2* is not altogether a happy one: the "crimes" for which he [Crusoe] was to be punished must principally be those recounted in the former part, but a shipwreck already *has* brought retribution here. After his conversion, Crusoe is not allowed to do anything reprehensible; yet his creator wants to go on using him as a vessel of God's purposes. The consequence is that the second part depends for its *moral* content on the narrative features of the first volume, which *inseparably* devalues the story we are actually following in *RC2*.

More rewarding is the structure of *The Strange and Surprizing Adventures*, considered as a separate unit. (Rogers, 1979, p. 111).

Peeping through the delicate twists of this argument is a concept of the first part as falling into a coherent structure which culminates, or at least peaks, with Crusoe's "conversion": Rogers perhaps shares with De La Mare a pressing urge to protect the sacredness of Crusoe's "solitudes" in Part I.

Crusoe, it is suggested, ultimately has his problems solved. After his conversion he can rest on his laurels and await the end of his book. If this really were the case then the sequel would be a redundant work, unnecessarily exhuming the sinful side of Crusoe's nature, which has been punished enough by the shipwreck, and made manageable, if not eradicated. This interpretation will be disputed by exploring the sequel not as an example of literary overkill, but as a renewed attempt to grapple with the problems presented by Crusoe's nature: problems which simultaneously demand and resist a governing structure.

Others have denied, by implication, that the sequel is related to Part I by restricting their analyses to the latter, and implying that it arrives at decisive closure. For example, J. Paul Hunter in his *The Reluctant Pilgrim* sees Crusoe's particular experiences as emblematic of stages on a journey towards enlightenment and salvation. Hunter divides Crusoe's life into three main phases: "Rebellion and punishment", "repentance" and "Deliverance", claiming that this arrangement perpetuates the tradition of spiritual autobiography, and extrapolations from it, such as allegorical journey narratives. He is even willing, for instance, to date the conversion mentioned above by Pat Rogers, to 4 July 1660.²¹

In his *Defoe and Spiritual Autobiography*, G.A. Starr is more flexible in his exegetic terminology than Hunter. For instance, he writes of Crusoe's "gradual regeneration" rather than cast-iron deliverance. Crusoe becomes, for Starr, a type of the pedagogic guide, a father figure who develops from the rebellious son.²² However, even with his less literal approach, Starr vigilantly notates the parallels with early spiritual autobiographies. Not everyone interprets the first part as securely anchored to past narrative

modes. Everett Zimmerman in *Defoe and the Novel* offers a far bleaker reading. He views Crusoe from a combination of psychoanalytical and philosophical perspectives, concluding that he is a dislocated entity forever in search of a self in a world full of distractions and obstinate objects. There is a "conflict between Crusoe's abstractions and his actions".²³ Moreover,

Instead of efficacious repentance we are shown unremmiting activity...much space is traversed but we end where we began.²⁴

Zimmerman is referring to both parts here. However, he only briefly discusses the sequel, which is unfortunate, since it would greatly assist his argument.

Nonetheless, the following discussion will be taking its cue from Zimmerman while avoiding his tendency to strip Crusoe of his capacity to realise that reason and spirituality are at least possibilities within his reach, if not within his grasp. Crusoe might be a forked creature, but he is not a bare forked creature. He believes in himself just as much when ratiocinating as when he is aimlessly rambling. For Crusoe they are both equally genuine conditions. It is the tension between them which gives Crusoe's narrative as a whole its convoluted energy. This suggests that the valuable contextualising of Hunter and Starr cannot be completely discounted. For it is not easy to deny the influence on Defoe of Puritan literature, and, more importantly yet, Puritan style and rhetoric; just as travel-writing also makes its mark. It is the way that these authors interpret the spiritual and moral dimension in the first part that will be challenged.

Those critics who perceive in Part I a successful integration of Crusoe's contemplative and active sides are indirectly making a point about the work's formal integrity. The ensuing questioning of their observations is

a reminder that in defining sequels it can be essential to establish how the first part ends, in order to have a context in which to examine closure of the second part. The argument that Part I is a self-contained work to which the sequel is irrelevant, hinges on a concept of the island as an ultimate destination for Crusoe, spiritually if nothing else. In disputing this inference a general point about form is supported by a specific one about the final section.

The argument for the island imposing order and a concomitant finality on Crusoe's experience is, to begin with, undermined by the topographical rhythm of Crusoe's ramblings. This rhythm is epitomised by his second main exploration of the island just after his third anniversary. He describes the course of his reconnoitre:

I never travelled in this journey above two miles outright in a day, or thereabouts; but I took many turns and returns, to see what discoveries I could make, that I came weary enough to the place where I resolved to sit down for all night; and then I either repos'd my self in a tree, or surrounded my self with a row of stakes set upright in the ground, either from one tree to another, or so as no wild creature could come at me, without waking me. (I, p. 127).

His advance, as he heads for an uncharted seashore, is slow and circuitous, involving frequent doubling back. When he does settle down for a night at a fixed point he duplicates, in miniature, the home-making and defensive activities which marked his early days on the island. But his stay is only brief, and he moves on to the next tree or patch of ground. This means of "seeing what discovery I could make" is an enactment of the way the narrative progresses on a larger scale. Crusoe tends to accumulate a set of destinations from which he "turns" and to which he "returns", as a means of establishing variation and contrast in his relatively spontaneous itinerary. In each

location, before moving on, he creates the outer shell of a home, the potential for settling down.

For instance, before departing from London for his second voyage to the Guineas he has "200£ left...which I lodged with my friend's widow, who was very just to me...", (I, p.19). This is a minimal investment in London as a base. However, after his deliverance he returns like a homing pigeon to the widow in London after 35 years' absence in order to capitalize on it:

My benefactor and faithful steward, who I had left in trust with my money, was alive (I, p. 327).

Although, in the end, Crusoe does not retrieve his money from the old lady (he insists she should keep it as a reward for her fealty), it is significant that he goes through the motions of realising an opportunity he set up for himself decades previously. But despite this attempt to formalize and clarify his re-adoption of London as his home he still keeps his options open, considering settling finally in his Brazilian colony, (see I, p. 337). Here his fortunes have fared better in his absence than in London, and he has made considerable profit. Again, this is as a result of the partial home he has established for himself. Before leaving the colony on his fateful voyage he left his partner in charge, "...and took all possible caution to preserve my effects etc and keep up my plantation", (I, p.45). The reason for his original departure from the Brasils is yet another voyage to the Guineas, this time to collect negro slaves for the colony, (I, p. 44).

The episodes prior to and following the island captivity surely confirm that Crusoe does not make one continuous journey. Rather, he makes a series of small journeys between particular destinations. All these locales, London,

Guinea, his colony, provoke in Crusoe eventually a desire to depart, and stir in him, at some stage, an urge to "return" to them. Even on his island he has two possible residences; his "town house" and his "country house". A pattern, then, emerges of a life constructed around "turns and returns" between potential final havens. Because Crusoe can see possibilities for stability within each location, and invests each with a social and economic significance, then the likelihood of any one setting acquiring transcendent significance is reduced by the influence of the others. Discontinuity and alternation disrupts any sense of sustained spiritual growth. In this context, the island experience cannot enforce finality and definition on the whole. For Crusoe's island is merely one among many ports of call, and merely the one at which he spends the longest period.

Thus, Crusoe's is not a linear narrative in which his itinerary lucidly corresponds on a one-to-one basis with a divine plan. This is where it spins off wildly from the well-trodden path of Puritan allegories, such as the *Pilgrim's Progress*. This naturally makes it very difficult for readers, let alone Crusoe himself, to "follow" his spiritual education and the ethical digressions he is driven to make. Lennard J. Davis discusses *Robinson Crusoe* as an early example of a novel in which "objects are included and described outside an exterior, fixed system of meaning such as that provided by allegory".²⁵ Davis says that *Robinson Crusoe* Part I develops into this kind of novel whilst Crusoe is on the island and forced to describe and occupy it as a three-dimensional space. Perhaps this rather neglects the dimensionality of Crusoe's voice, with its layers of sub-clauses, its dense foliage of doubt, a voice which is present throughout the work.

This view of the novel as not keyed into a clear symbolic system

indicates why it falls into the broad pattern of mini-journeys between alternate havens rather than a progression towards an ultimate destination. For, the topographical toing and froing is, literally, a map of Crusoe's own internal vacillations as he tries to resolve the conflict between the life of a comfortable merchant in the middle station and the lure of exploring for exploring's sake. *The Surprizing Adventures* is, in one sense, a noisy debate between complacent stasis and ever-curious movement. Unfortunately, this is presented so convincingly as a human problem that it is not easily settled by invoking the voice of providence. Crusoe is trying continually to impose symbolic significance on the material world he so resolutely inhabits.

Hunter and Starr read the island experience as resolving Crusoe's internal conflict between a steady, stable existence and perpetual empirical questioning. However, the alternating movement merely continues, whilst the man himself stays still in the same location. The stop-start rhythm seems to have been halted by the shipwrecking of Crusoe, but it is merely internalised and intensified. The island becomes more a microcosm of the world in which Crusoe has been trying to orientate himself than a means of halting the hero and transforming him. Crusoe travels round the island as he travelled on the seas, although now, because he has less space to explore, his rambling becomes more cerebral.

For example, in his first year on the island, he interprets his sprouting barley as a miracle, a signal that he is in communion with a higher power. This kind of insight could be seen as leading Crusoe towards a more acquiescent, pious lifestyle. However, he cannot help but inquire further into the nature of the revelation, and he seeks some kind of guarantee of the message's validity. He tries to ascertain, "peering in every corner, and

under every rock" (I, p.90), to what extent the barley growth is an isolated occurrence. Surely, if the signal were genuine then the barley would be springing up over a wider area. However..."I could not find any" concludes the restless settler. He proceeds:

...at last it occur'd to my thoughts, that I had shook a bag of chickens meat out in that place, and then the wonder began to cease; and I must confess, my religious thankfulness to God's providence began to abate too upon the discovering that all this was nothing but what was common. (I, pp. 90-91).

The bag of chicken meat bathetically registers the pedestrian human involvement in a miracle which is beginning to seem less and less miraculous. This incident precisely indicates the dilemma between what Crusoe's father, in his lecture to his son, termed "fate or fault" as the moving force behind Crusoe's actions. Gildon does not have to tell Crusoe that he has been "Coining Providences". Crusoe himself is only too aware that this is a possibility. Thus, on the island Crusoe now flits between intellectual options in the same way that, in his travelling, he journeys between alternate destinations. The oscillating movement which pulses through Part I merely takes on a different character on the island.

So far, then, it has been argued that the narrative format of *The Surprising Adventures* is determined by the uncertainty caused by the creation of a central character who presents his life as directed by divine providence, but who lives within a crowded, confusing world and is subject to an inner conflict - factors which both resist the possibility of such intervention. As a result the narrative progresses as a series of "turns and returns" between geographical locations and contradictory options arrived at in periods of reflection, and rumination. This does not place the work's didactic project on

a very sure footing. Moreover, it makes definite closure less tangible. On the other hand, it stimulatingly explores the question of how to present ethical concerns to readers within a framework of continually shifting perspectives and absolutes.

The final section of the *Surprizing Adventures* throws light on this general analysis, for it becomes caught up in the oscillating movement that has characterized the novel so far. Any decisive closural gestures are undermined by an account of a complex series of events, which lay the foundations for a sequel, should one be required. When Crusoe looks back, in Part II, on his earlier adventures, he deems that it would be reckless to set out again, partly because they were "closed in so happy and easy a manner" (II, p. 5). However, surely he is deceiving himself. The ending may have produced a degree of happiness for Crusoe, but the extent to which it is "easy" is in doubt.

For, in the elaborate stage business which releases Crusoe from his island captivity, he is turning, or helping to turn the island into precisely one of those locations chequering the novel from which he is unwilling to make an unqualified departure. Crusoe converts the island more than the island converts him. Towards the end of Part I it becomes a kind of settlement which resembles the Brasils colony. Crusoe leaves enough residue there of his own experience to make a "return" a distinct possibility.

The advent of Friday and the arrivals of the Spaniards and the pirates between Crusoe's twenty fourth and twenty eighth years on the island all contribute to Crusoe's ultimately equivocal attitude to his deliverance. But before any of these arrivals, before even the adoption of Friday, Crusoe has

begun to contemplate the island as not so much a prison as his own personal dominion. The most striking example of this is the portrayal of himself as "my majesty the prince and lord of the whole island" (I, p. 173), dining with his subjects, his pets. The image appeals to Crusoe, partly because of its gentle comedy, but also because it is so idyllic and secure. Crusoe can easily cope with a model of sovereignty such as this, with "no rebels among all my subjects". It is a mute and hollow representation of the kind of society Crusoe would like to see on his island, should he ever find any companions. If such a kingdom were developed then it would possibly contribute towards a decisive closure of Part I. In one sense, the image is a closural fantasy. It is untouched by any of the vicissitudes of history.

As Crusoe himself acknowledges, its fantastical nature derives from the fact that it lacks the one crucial element which would make it more realistic and potentially more problematic. Listing the benefits of his sovereignty Crusoe ironically concludes:

...neither could I be said to want anything but society, and of that in some time after this, I was like to have too much. (I, p.173).

Crusoe notes the need for his territory to be inhabited by human subjects. However, difficulties arise from "too much" society. His island becomes populated in so many different ways that the narrative of the one book alone cannot "contain" them all. The whole process of socialization is considerably more untidy and strife-ridden than is anticipated by the tranquil frieze of Crusoe with his parrot, cats and sterile dog.

The sighting of Friday's footprint lifts the curtain on a "new scene of my life", (I, p.179). Indeed, the grand historical movement which incorporates

the sequel is here initiated. However, Friday himself has little place in the steady accumulation of loose ends which demand continuation. Of all the new arrivals, Friday is the most easily incorporated into Crusoe's routine of pious obsequies and estate management:

In this thankful frame I continu'd all the remainder of my time, and the conversation which employ'd the hours between Friday and I, was such, as made the three years which we liv'd there together perfectly and compleatly happy....(I, p.259).

Most significantly, Friday is the only character whom he takes with him when he leaves the island. Friday has become an indispensable appendage to his master but not part of the vested interest that Crusoe has in the island as his property. It is more Friday's father who becomes part of this concern.

Indeed, there is an eight-year interval between Crusoe's sighting of the footprint (I, p.179) and his rescue of Friday (I, p.238). In this period its mere image, reverberating through Crusoe's consciousness, has far more influence on his relationship with the island, and the need for a sequel, than does the man who made the imprint. In his twentieth year, five years after the sighting, he reflects on the "life of anxiety, fear, and care, which I had liv'd in ever since I had seen the print of a foot in the sand" (I, p.230). The fact that it is a single footprint proves especially threatening to Crusoe since it leaves a lingering fear that the incursion is incomplete. As Part I heads towards its ending, this general sense of incompleteness, symbolized by the imprint, is enhanced. It is tempting to suggest that it even epitomizes Part I itself, the single book requiring a consolidatory resumption of narrative.

Crusoe's fear has, however, a more specific character. For the footprint

brings the painful realisation that he is not the sole vessel of the island's history. It is the proof the footprint brings that others have occupied the island that unsettles him:

...not that I did not believe the savages had frequented the island even all the while, and might have been several hundreds of them at times on shore there; but I had never known it, and was incapable of any apprehensions about it. (I, p.230).

This knowledge brings a realisation that the island is part of a broader geographical and historical scheme than he is able to impose on it.

It is, then, the world which Friday's prior presence lodges in Crusoe's imagination more than Friday himself which unsettles the captive in the long term. The first clear message Crusoe receives from this broader environment is the Spaniards' shipwreck, which, incidentally, he sights before encountering Friday. This is especially significant for the development of the sequel, because it indicates not so much a means of satisfying escape for Crusoe as a new beginning for the novel. Crusoe's trip out to the wreck, (I, pp.223-227) and his plundering of it for goods and money is a parallel sequence to his excursions to his own shipwreck in his first year.

The effect of these trips was to reinforce a sense of arrival and Crusoe's realisation that he should prepare for a long stay. In responding to the Spaniards' ship in the same way Crusoe is acting as a kind of advance party for the Spaniards who have been cast away on a nearby island and taken by savages. However, there is one difference between Crusoe's earlier mission and this one. The latter is of no practical value to him:

I got very little by this voyage, that was of any use to me; for as to the money, I had no manner of occasion for it: 'twas to me as the dirt under my feet. (I,p.226).

Crusoe's comment not only stresses the relativity of material needs. It also indicates that he is a marginal, inconsequential figure in the chronicle which belongs to the Spaniards. The feeling of irrelevance which sweeps over Crusoe cuts both ways. It is the Spaniards' life on the island which he is opening. He will have somewhat less significance in the era of island history he is ushering in.

The third main incursion on the island is by the English mutineers. It is precisely this element of revolt which makes it difficult to accept that Crusoe's deliverance is "easy" or in any way final. A ship arrives offshore which is already in conflict. The very vessel that comes to relieve Crusoe from his years of solitude and internal strife is itself in a state of turbulence and distress. Moreover, Crusoe's conversation with the English captain confirms that Crusoe is far from a passive figure in his own rescue:

Look you, sir, said I, if I venture upon your deliverance, are you willing to make two conditions with me... (I, p.300).

"Deliverance" is offered by Crusoe to the captain before it is offered to him. What emerges from this exchange is that Crusoe is beginning to use the island itself as a cherished pawn in negotiations. Far from dismissing it as merely a location of which he must efficaciously rid himself, he treats it as a mediator in the conflict which provides the incidental means of his departure. In the short term, the island is a source of arms and protection for the English captain. In the long term, Crusoe's machinations reinforce a concept of the island as a place which is developing a history of its own in and around his narrative. And the conflicts, between Spaniards and savages, English mutineers and their senior officers, in which Crusoe becomes entangled, become "too much" (see above quotation) for his own account within

Part I to assimilate.

At the same time, the events which crowd out Crusoe's last years on the island produce in him an ambivalent attitude to it. In being forced to protect it as his territory and to make contracts involving it, he is implicitly acknowledging it as yet another potential permanent home. He is, almost despite himself, creating a future for it. Thus, the island's status is confirmed as another stage in Crusoe's restless, wayward travels, which reiterate a pattern of accepting, then rejecting the middle station. However, there is one difference from the previous locations. Defoe, with the help of his narrator, has developed and explored the island in immeasurably more detail than he has any other port of call. It thus begins to acquire independence from Crusoe's own story, forging a past and future for itself. Thus Crusoe's attempt to retain full possession of it is an awkward, edgy affair.

This is clearly signalled in the oft-quoted "my island is now peopled" speech (I, p.283), in which Crusoe points out the microcosmic quality of the group of new subjects over whom he is the "absolute lord and lawgiver". The situation rather uncomfortably echoes the earlier image of Crusoe dining with his pets. After all, this picture may have "Society" in it to give it substance, which is what was previously lacking. But there are still no "rebels among my subjects". Perhaps Crusoe, in saying "it was a merry reflection which I frequently made, how like a king I looked", is humorously acknowledging the partial truth of his evocation.

A far better indication of things to come is provided in Crusoe's last evening on the island, when he gives "every part of my own story" to Will

Atkins and the other two new inhabitants. Crusoe leaves a legacy of narrative, but it is in a practical context, (I, p.326). The story must be used, just as the "garden seeds" he leaves must be planted, the "bag of pease" he delivers is to be stored away, and the "two barrels of gunpowder" will help defend them. His story becomes absorbed into a framework of future action and, as it turns out, conflict. This makes Crusoe's investment in the future far more fragile than, say, his instructions given to his trusty partner on leaving the Brasils.

Moreover, Crusoe leaves his narrative with the three "rebels" who now grimly complete his idyllic picture of a "peopled" island. The equivocal, unresolved note of his departure is enhanced by its context of betrayal. The Spaniards are absent and Crusoe had promised to greet them on their return. As a reminder of this the Spanish coins, which Crusoe had pilfered from the wreck, are the last items listed in his haphazard inventory of belongings taken from the island. The relatively new Spanish coinage overlays his own money originally lifted from his wreck. The older money, by comparison, is "grown rusty, or tarnished, and could hardly pass for silver, till it had been a little rubb'd and handled". This might be read as a metaphorical account of the condition of the old narrative, requiring to be "rubb'd and handled", as it were, becoming commingled with the world of the new narrative, glistening expectantly in the "money I found in the wreck of the Spanish ship", (I, p.327).

Thus, the oscillating movement which pulses through Part I in its closing sequences focuses on Crusoe developing an equivocal attitude to the island itself. On the one hand, he craves deliverance from the place. He wants to "turn" from it. On the other hand it is the one location in which he has

stayed the longest of anywhere in his life, including York (which he left at the age of eighteen). He has made it his own, and in trying to keep things that way, his sense of possessiveness is enhanced, as is indeed the possibility that he might "return". Thus, Defoe's difficulty in "leaving off" as De La Mare sees it lies in his transference of Crusoe's inner restlessness to the story of the island itself. It becomes a location in historical motion, requiring further exploration. The Brownian motion of narrative which Crusoe initiates is certainly hard to check in these circumstances.

It is really quite logical that a novel which thrives on advocating simultaneously alternative possibilities should end on a note of doubt, and ambiguity. Part I actually concludes with a sketch of Part II. This precis has a double function, serving, in Torgovnick's terminology, as both "epilogue" and "linkage" conclusion, (Torgovnick, 1981, p.11 and p. 14) As the previous section indicated, it does not seem likely that Defoe had actually written the sequel before publishing Part I. However, from the evidence of the precis he had a clear idea of the narrative outline. What is confirmed is Defoe's emphasis on the "Life" of Robinson Crusoe in its totality, as the original title page to Part I stresses. Defoe is keen to focus on the island experience in Part I. But he wishes to trace how it reverberates through Crusoe's remaining years as one of his most significant, and yet contradictory, experiences. The argument of this section has tried to make clear that it was not only the sales of the first part that suggested a need for a sequel. The restless, itinerant narrative format of the first part also justifies the continuation.

In the last two paragraphs of Part I the narrative and commercial interests coincide:

But all these things, with an account how 300 Caribbees came and invaded them, and ruin'd their plantations, and how they fought with that whole number twice, and were at first defeated, and three of them kill'd; but at last a storm destroying their enemies canoes, they famish'd or destroy'd almost all the rest, and renew'd and recover'd the possession of their plantation, and still liv'd upon the island.

All these things, with some very surprizing incidents in some new adventures of my own, for ten years more, I may perhaps give a farther account of hereafter, (I, pp.360-61).

Crusoe has reserved this mention of the wars with the savages till last in his summary, so it is out of synchronization with the preceding account. He highlights it because it is probably the most sensational episode in the sequel. Hence, he is definitely whetting the reader's appetite, and inviting a demand for continuation. The repetition of "All these things..." gives the advertisement a declamatory theatrical quality, which creates a feel of suspense. The phrase "I may, perhaps..." suggests that the decision is being left to the reader. In a way, he is leaving a legacy of narrative, rather in the way that he did for Will Atkins and his cohorts. His action as narrator will be bound up with the commercial activity and, as it turns out, the conflict over property which is to follow the publication of Part I. Thus, Part I enters the world hovering between the alternatives of whether or not a sequel will see the light of day.

The conclusion is not resolutely commercial. It also hints at a crucial characteristic of the ensuing sequel format, in the balancing of the general "All these things" with the particular, "some new adventures of my own". This clear division into two types of story indicates a departure the sequel will be making from the bulk of Part I. For it explores Crusoe's difficulties in integrating his individual experience into the broad historical development of his island.

SECTION (ii)b: "Windings and blind ways"

In Section (i) a public notice by Cox was cited, in which he stated his innocence in the matter of the piracy emanating from his premises. He concludes his account with some snipes at Defoe, including a characterization of him as the "author of Crusoe's Don Quixotism". This comment was made two months after the publication of the sequel and is probably referring to both parts in sequence. It made an impression on Defoe, for in "Robinson Crusoe's Preface" to the *Serious Reflections* he answers the "malicious, but foolish writer" who, "in the abundance of his gall spoke of the *Quixotism of R. Crusoe*," (III, p.vi). It could be that Defoe is referring to a writer other than Cox.

However, even if Cox was not the source of the insult, it clearly stung Defoe, and, through the voice of his hero, he produces an elaborate, but rather strained, defence against it.²⁶ However, the comparison to *Don Quixote* has some validity and relevance to this analysis. Other critics, notably Davis²⁷ and Richetti, have compared the two novels before, but not, so far as I know, from the point of view of narrative pattern. For, like Robinson Crusoe, Don Quixote progresses through the first part of Cervantes's novel in an alternating motion. He attempts a chivalric feat. The exercise fails owing to the disparity between the imaginary world Don Quixote perceives and the physical world he inhabits. However, he is not disillusioned and starts immediately on a new task. Cervantes improvises brilliantly on this reiterated pattern, essentially making the most out of a single joke.

Crusoe's pattern is different. It is more untidy, and bleaker. Crusoe, for instance has no companion like Sancho Panza to egg him on. Richetti has

pointed out that there is no intermediary in Crusoe's narrative, whereas Don Quixote at least has Amadis de Gaul.²⁸ Crusoe's repeated figure commences with restless departure from a homestead of some kind. He travels and meets either misfortune or divine punishment (it is not certain which). He resolves to head for and settle down in a new place, or stay where he happens to end up. But soon he is on the move again. Common to both patterns is the difficulty of enforcing stasis and a concomitant sense of direction on the wanderings of the two men. Cervantes, especially in the light of Avallaneda's alternative continuation, realises the full nature of the problem and its implications for his artistic integrity. He decides to do something about it.

As mentioned towards the end of Chapter 1, Cervantes's solution is to exhaust his hero's imaginative capabilities as entertainingly as possible, to the point where death seems the only appropriate option. This produces a reformatory sequel which, through exhausting its hero, brings the work to a decisive conclusion. Defoe undoubtedly recognizes the narrative problem posed by his first part, for Crusoe comes close to discussing it as such in the sequel. However, Defoe, in his sequel explores the problem more energetically than he does in his first part, but does not use the sequel to solve it. Thus, comparing Defoe to Cervantes, we gain, with the former, in revealing story-telling "angst" what we lose in formal ingenuity. However, on the title page to his sequel Defoe is nearly as assertive as Cervantes in his prefatory declaration that Don Quixote will be presented "dead and buried" in the sequel. *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* are described as the "Second and Last Part of his Life", (title page, second edition). This implies an attempt to complement the first part and provide an element of finality. It is the first of a number of signals that Defoe is at least trying to impose

closure on the whole. Certainly, the sequel achieves a degree of satiety which the first part lacks. But it does not create a genuine or lasting impression of finality.

In the terminology proposed in Chapter 1 these formal conditions would make Defoe's work a consolidatory sequel. That is, it reinforces the ways in which the narrative was constructed in the first part, without significantly challenging them, or altering the established format. I intend to suggest that this does not make the work a failure. There is, within a consolidatory scheme, leeway for innovation and creative introspection.

The role of the sequel is clarified by its Preface. This has already been quoted from in the first section, for different purposes. For the reader's convenience, the passage I wish to discuss will be re-quoted:

The second part, if the Editor's opinion may pass, is (contrary to the usage of second parts,) every way as entertaining as the first, contains as strange and surprising incidents, and as great a variety of them; nor is the application less serious, or suitable and doubtless will, to the sober, as well as ingenious reader, be every way as profitable and diverting, (II p.vii).

Defoe, as editor, indicates an awareness of the problems in sustaining reader interest with a sequel. However, having promised that his work goes against the grain, or "usage", of second parts, he imposes limits on its achievement. He suggests that the increment is of equal status to its predecessor. It is not superior to it. The comparative construction of "as...as", suggesting similar levels of achievement, threads its way through the description: "every way as entertaining as the first...as profitable and diverting". The balancing, or paralleling, of descriptive clauses suggests, on the large scale, a smooth, complementary relationship between the two books. The

leisurely measured pace indicates that one book inherits the mantle of the other, sustaining and developing its concerns without disrupting them. Even the tags such as "strange and surprising", "diverting", and "application" are carried over from the first part's titular and prefatory material.

The ensuing examination of the sequel falls into two phases. First, its structure is discussed in general terms. Then, in order to substantiate the points made about structure the discussion focuses on a number of specific episodes from the work, with special emphasis on Crusoe's stay at the island. Part of the intention of the foregoing analysis is to note characteristics of the work, apart from its purely consolidatory nature, which are common to other sequels. These are formally noted in Section (iii).

It was noted above that Crusoe closed Part I with a promise to recount "all these things, with some very surprizing incidents of my own". For most of Part I this division of subject matter would not have been necessary. Developments in Crusoe's own life constituted the main body of narrative. However, in the last two years on the island Crusoe's own experience became rather more marginal, as he was forced to regale readers with segments of narratives which did not directly involve him. This shift of emphasis effected a transition into the sequel's world. This tendency to mingle general history with individual history developing towards the end of Part I becomes a fully fledged necessity for Crusoe throughout the sequel. As a result of this requirement the sequel in fact becomes two books. One book traces the island's history up to and including Crusoe's return to it. The other records Crusoe's travelling around "three parts of the Globe", as the title-page promises.

The division of *The Farther Adventures* into two alternative sequels is an

incorporation into its structure of the oscillating movement between different locations and mental attitudes which shaped Part I. However, it is precisely the radical nature of the rupture between the two narratives which brings to a head the issue of how Crusoe is to relate to the world around him in ways which are satisfactory to him. For Crusoe resists and challenges the way in which his own story appears to be separating out before his own eyes, even as his own voice tries to deliver it. That is, the sequel describes Crusoe's attempt to integrate his own experience into the communal experience of the island. That he only partially and transiently achieves this is a source of revealing tension. It is a problem that is peculiar to the sequel, and therefore it implies that the the first and second parts should not be read as one continuous text. They are related, but have their own problems and identities.

At this stage, Novak's assertion (quoted above) that both parts must be read as "a single work concerned with the political evolution of a society in the state of nature" (Novak, 1962, p.337), should be qualified. His description makes the literary relationship seem too organic. It does not account for the friction caused by Crusoe's equivocal interaction with the island's "evolution". The sequel is not purely about the island or purely about its narrator. This creates a sense of fraught dialogue between parts I and II rather than of seamless continuation.

The discussion will now focus on particular episodes within the sequel in order to illustrate the general point about the double format. In the course of the analysis, features of the narrative which exemplify general characteristics of the sequel as a form will be observed. The opening will be discussed first, and brief mention will be given to Crusoe's voyage to the

island. The stay at the island will then be analysed in two parts. The departure from the island, and related incidents, will receive separate attention. Finally, the remainder of Crusoe's travels is considered more briefly with the closing episodes being emphasised.

The opening of the sequel presents the creative problem of resumption, a technical difficulty already mentioned in Chapter 1 in the discussion of Genette. The author must pick up the threads of a narrative convincingly when it has already been closed. This difficulty is to some extent alleviated for Defoe, since the ending of the previous book was so indecisive. Nonetheless, the narrative must still be re-activated in a way which seems reasonably fresh. There is a degree of mutual embarrassment between author and reader, since both are aware of the shadow of the first part looming over the sequel and setting a precedent. The opening of a sequel is the point at which the awkwardness and sense of compromise caused by the need to balance autonomy and dependence are most exposed.

The awkwardness is surmounted by Crusoe assuming that his memory of his experiences can be shared with his readers. He can build on that collective memory by drawing a conclusion about his past which invites a consensus of agreement. The awkward sense of the preceding work is converted into a means of building a stronger rapport with the readers than was had previously:

That homely proverb used on so many occasions in England, viz. *That what is bred in the bone will not go out of the flesh*, was never more verify'd, than in the story of my life, (II, p.1).

The use of a proverb evokes a mood of collective understanding. It requires readers to nod in assent, and thereby endorse the ensuing project. "Homely"

and "England" also help to establish a leisurely familiarity. This paves the way for the concept of Crusoe as an exemplar within a society with which his first part has enabled him to converse more easily. He offers "verification" of a particular condition. That is, his malaise should not be taken as unique, just as the proverb itself is "used on so many occasions". Indeed the sequel will be shadowed by the life of Will Atkins (a renegade who inhabits Crusoe's island) which follows a pattern similar to that of Crusoe's peregrinations.

The sequel is even more securely anchored by the phrase, "the Story of my Life". This stresses that Crusoe's island sojourn was only one of many experiences in the course of his travelling. The biography taken as a totality is the foremost concern of the fiction. Hence, the phrase, just like "this work" in the Preface to the sequel (see section (i)) incorporates the first part, and suggests a role for the sequel in continuing the story. Altogether, the sentence simultaneously suggests summing up and anticipation.

Crusoe's greater confidence with his audience is confirmed by comparing this terse, direct opening sentence to the opening of *The Surprizing Adventures*, (see I, p.1). Here the information is communicated efficiently enough, but in a ragged accumulation of sub-clauses and qualification. And the subject is the name of Crusoe, defensively and circuitously communicated: "nay, we call our selves, and write our name Crusoe, and so my companions always call'd me." This is a very different act of verification than that announced at the opening to the sequel. For, in the sequel, Crusoe is acutely aware that his "name" is legion.

Hence, Crusoe establishes a more direct, confessional mode with his readers in the sequel. This, in itself, is the element of freshness and

spontaneity required for an effective resumption. However, it does not make what he goes on to say any less troubling, or reduce the tension of the ensuing account. Rather, it intensifies the focus on Crusoe's nature. With his narrative less shackled by a need to make excuses for himself, Crusoe can afford to be more honest about what does or does not motivate him. Thus, the opening, and the sequel as a whole, scrutinizes more deeply the narrator's *modus vivendi*. This exploratory, or revelatory, function is a general characteristic of other sequels mentioned in the thesis.

In the opening of the *Farther Adventures* the probing is achieved by a paring down of Crusoe's reasoning and by giving a blacker hue to his solitary status in the world. The subject of his reasoning, and the source of his proverb citation, is his rambling propensity familiar from the first part. This time it emerges as more formidable than in Part I, and less integrated into his decision-making. First, it begins to dog him again when, "if ever [Crusoe's emphasis], it might be allowed me to have had experience of every state of middle life", (II, p.1). Moreover, "it should be worn out", since he is now 61 years old, and by no means the young man who had all the reasons in the world to want to explore it. In his early days in London, his profits from trading "fill'd me with those aspiring thoughts which have since so compleated my ruin", (I, p.18). However, on the first page of the sequel, he is keen to draw a contrast:

Nay farther, the common motive of foreign adventures was taken away in me; for I had no fortune to make, I had nothing to seek. (II,p.1).

The vigour of his rambling propensity increases in proportion to the strength of the discouraging factors. Thus, Crusoe cuts away any reasons for the persistence of his restlessness apart from the driving motion of the

feeling itself. In this context of enhanced self-exposure he begins to describe the urge in a new way:

Yet all these things had no effect upon me, or at least, not enough to resist the strong inclination I had to go abroad again, which hung about me like a chronical distemper. (II, p.2).

To my knowledge, Crusoe has not previously diagnosed his malaise in such explicit medical terminology. The word "distemper" has occurred before in his account. For instance, his father reminds him that those who keep to the middle station are "not subjected to so many distempers and uneasinesses either of body or mind" (I,p.3), as those who live unpredictably. On his island he falls victim to a "strong distemper" (I, p.104), his ague, which he interprets as divine punishment. However, he now begins to see his psychological characteristic, previously a potential cause of illness, as an illness in itself. Nor is this a fleeting characterisation of the impulse. It accords with Crusoe's notion, in the sequel's first paragraph, that the "volatile part" of his nature should have been by now "fully evacuated, or at least condens'd", (II, p.1). And he later expands on the idea. An unforeseen blow from providence brings...

a deep relapse into the wandring disposition, which, as I may say, being born in my very blood, soon recover'd its hold of me, and like the returns of a violent distemper, came on with an irresistible force upon me, (II p.7).

The word "relapse", the emphatic "being born in my very blood", enhance the impression that Crusoe is suffering from a localised mental, and /or physical, condition. So far Crusoe has been talking metaphorically. His cast of mind resembles a distemper. However, by the time he is ready to depart on his nephew's ship, the description has lost its metaphorical shell. He refers

simply to, "my distemper of wandring". (II, p.9).

By indicating that the urge is coming so decisively from within himself - that it is a specific anatomical problem - he is denying it any contact with any possible outside sources, or remedy. He finds it hard enough to reconcile this impulse with his own reasoning powers, "such arguments as occur'd to my thoughts", (II, p.5). Thus, when he comes on to the converging of his nephew's plans with his own he sees it as "demonstration of a future state", (II, p.9). For there is a "concurrence of second causes with the ideas of things, which we form in our minds", (II, p.9). However, considering the now insistently physical nature of his travelling urge, it is difficult to see this "concurrence" as anything more than a coincidence. Putting it another way, the gap that Crusoe must now traverse in his oscillating movement from one state of mind to another has substantially widened since the first part. It is in this sense of reiterating the narrative format of the first part, but more overtly and intensely, that the sequel is consolidatory. For it concentrates on the narrative figure of alternating movement with renewed force and directness, leaving the reader in no doubt about the conflicts with which the narrator is faced.

The probing, revelatory concern of the sequel does not stop at enhancing a formal pattern. It also presents the hero as more solitary and detached than in the first part. His wife takes on the role of his father in the first part, mingling sound, rational advice against his travelling again with tearful emotional blackmail, (II, pp.4-5). However, the husband-wife relationship seems more reciprocal than that of father and son, for Crusoe is at least held down for the while by his wife, and he settles with his family in Bedford. It is his wife's death which, as he says, "unhing'd me at once", (II,

p.7). This is a further indication of how little control Crusoe now has over his "distemper". In Part I, he could at least decide when to follow his instincts. Now he is simply cut loose from his moorings by the loss of his wife, who "did more to guide my rambling genius, than a mother's tears, a father's instructions, a friend's counsel", (II, p.7) and is caught up uncontrollably in the sea-swell of his condition. In Part I he set out as the rebellious younger son. In Part II he sets out as the fraught widower.

The bereavement thus makes Crusoe seem far more helpless and isolated than in the first part. He is "...to the last degree desolate and dislocated in the world by the loss of her", (II, p.7). He adds, "when she was gone, the world look'd awkwardly round me". This last statement is an encapsulation of Crusoe's incongruity, especially in its use of "round me". Crusoe is surrounded by the sense of his displacement, just as he was surrounded by sea on the island. "Look'd" is apposite, since it evokes the way Crusoe used his eyes on the island to search for deliverance. The phrase implies perhaps that Crusoe has now become, more than ever, his own island.

It is in this context of exposure and a stretching out towards extremes and absolutes (note the drift towards superlatives: "if ever", "to the last degree"), that Crusoe's thoughts, in the opening section of the sequel, turn towards the island. His obsessive thinking about the island becomes, as it were, the most marked symptom of his "chronical distemper". The "strong inclination to go abroad again" (II, p.2), is qualified solely by reference to the island. He has:

...particularly the desire of seeing my new plantation in the island, and the colony I left there, run in my head continually. I dream'd of it all night, and my imagination run upon it all day...it even broke tiresome. (II, 2).

The language used to describe the island thoughts merges with that used to describe the distemper, especially when the preoccupation breaks "violently" into his conversation. The worries about the island are, at this stage, indistinguishable from the more general desire to travel.

That the anxieties should express themselves in dreams emphasizes their significance in Crusoe's ruminations. Hobbes's comments on dreams have some relevance here. He perceives dreams as manifestations in sleep of a troubled mental and /or physical state:

And seeing dreams are caused by the distempers of some of the inward parts of the body: divers distempers must needs cause different dreams.²⁹

He goes on to describe a reciprocal relationship between a particular emotion and temperatures of parts of the body. In waking hours, the emotions influence body temperature, in sleep, the aggravated parts of the body play on the emotions:

In summe, our Dreams are the reverse of our waking imaginations; the motion when we are awake, beginning at one end; and when we dream, at another.³⁰

The use of the word "distemper" makes Hobbes's analysis peculiarly applicable to Crusoe's condition. But even more, his sense of the perpetual cyclical "motion" between mind and body in waking and sleep effectively encapsulates Crusoe's predicament. The reciprocity between dream and "distemper" is highlighted.

Hobbes has one further useful observation. He notes that the senses are "benumbed" in sleep and concludes that, "a dreame must needs be more clear, in this silence of sense, than are our waking thoughts".³¹ Crusoe's dreams do

indeed help to clarify his objectives. They register the tendency of the sequel's opening to strip away inessentials, and bring Crusoe's immediate concerns sharply into focus. They are remarkably lucid and accurate prefigurations of his later history of the island. ³² He complains that one of them has "too much similitude of fact". However, their providential overtones are caught up, and even lost, in the perpetual "turning" and "returning" between his "fancy" and his "distemper".

The analysis of the sequel's opening has, then, progressed from an initial point that Crusoe makes full use of: the mutual familiarity between narrator and reader, provided for by the first part. First, he exploits it to launch his sequel. Then he uses it as a basis for a more direct, probing approach to his own story. This produces, in turn, a more pared down notion of his motivation and isolation. These conditions make his wishes to return to the island seem all the more urgent and pressing. In concentrating now upon the island sojourn, I will be arguing that the probing approach is sustained, but this does not prevent Crusoe's narrative from becoming increasingly detached from that which it seeks to embrace, and being painfully bisected.

If, at the opening of the sequel, Crusoe's "rambling genius", is fused with his fears for the fate of the island, then much of the rest of the book is concerned with his attempts to keep them this way. For, perhaps the true anxiety concealed beneath all that fervent dreaming is that the island is not as connected with his desires to quite the extent that he imagines.

It may be argued that Crusoe is distracted from his concerns for the island, even before he arrives there, by the two sea rescues he persuades his nephew to perform. (II, pp.15-19, pp. 25-32). However, these are both

indirectly related to the island history, since the French Catholic priest saved from the French ship later provides an indispensable service to the island inhabitants. The English maid and her young master on the Bristol ship both become useful citizens on the colony, with the maid later revealing a potential to become, in Crusoe's eyes, "governess to the whole island", (II p.170). The relevance of the episodes is revealed retrospectively.

of the Thus, the preamble to Crusoe's arrival confirms that the first two-thirds novel effectively concentrate on island affairs. Nonetheless, there are still indications early on of Crusoe developing an ambivalent attitude. Crusoe's ultimate purpose in visiting his settlement is not made clear. He has

...pleas'd my self with the thoughts of peopling the place, and carrying inhabitants from hence, getting a patent for the possession, and I know not what. (II, p.10).

This initially decisive purpose to go through managerial motions is clouded by the concluding "I know not what". For, the possibility of his settling, in his nephew's words, "where you once reigned with more felicity, than most of your brother monarchs in the world" (II, p.10) is undermined by Crusoe being engaged by his nephew to set off on a trading voyage to the East Indies and China which encompasses far more than a one-way trip to the island. Crusoe in fact asks his nephew to "land" him at the island, picking him up only on his return journey. At this stage, larger commercial concerns crucially intervene. Crusoe's nephew stresses:

...it could not be possible, that the merchants would allow him to come that way with a loaden ship of such value, it being a month's sail out of his way, and might be three or four: besides, sir, if I should miscarry, said he, and not return at all, then you would be just reduced to the condition you were in before. (II, p.10).

Thus, a privately agreed mercantile contract imposes specific conditions on Crusoe's scheme. He is caught up in the larger movements between set destinations of international trading. However, this condition of travel coincides with the doubts voiced by Crusoe's nephew, in response to which Crusoe remains silent.

The relatives reach a compromise which would enable Crusoe to quit the island should he become stranded there. His nephew proposes

...to carry a framed sloop on board the ship, which being taken in pieces, and shipp'd on board the ship might...be set up again in the island, and finish'd, fit to go to sea in a few days. (II, pp.10-11).

That Crusoe has his own detachable vessel within the ship betokens the way in which one narrative is separable from the other, although they can, as they do at this initial stage, interlock. However, the fact that the sloop, representing the island portion of the story, is contained and carried by his nephew's ship, and that it is presented as Crusoe's means of egress, rather indicates the eventual bias of the sequel.

So far, Crusoe's equivocal feelings about his old abode tally with his usual practice of taking precautionary measures before committing himself to a destination for any length of time. His perception of the colony, or his ability to influence it, has not yet been fundamentally jolted. However, on the approach to the island this situation alters. Crusoe is disarmed because he is coming to the island by a route differing from the one taken on his first fateful trip from the Brasils colony. Hence,

It was with no small difficulty that I found the place...I did not know it when I saw it, or know whether I saw it or no. (II, p.33).

It is not only Crusoe, then, who has been "dislocated" by events of recent years. So too has his sense of the island location. Now following a route demanded by the exigencies of trade "coming in between the main and the island", he has considerable difficulty orienting himself. The perspective through which he views the island is forced to change in accordance with the higher economic logic which is pulling him along. The island is, as it were, dislodged from Crusoe's sights by the unswerving adherence to an itinerary set by the merchants who are directing his nephew. The disorientation is of course primarily spatial, but it is also temporal in its prefiguring of the difficulties Crusoe will experience in recovering his hold on the island, or on its meaning for him.

The actual landing reinforces Crusoe's sense of unease, especially when he returns with the Spaniard to his old "castle", or central abode:

...alas, I could no more find the place again, than if I had never been there; for they had planted so many trees, and plac'd them in such a posture, so thick and close to one another; and in ten years time they were grown so big, that *in short* the place was inaccessible, except by such windings and blind ways, as they themselves only, who made them, could find. (II, pp.37-38).

The description of the trees, with its accumulation of anxious qualifications, especially communicates the way nature and history, layer by layer, have conspired to exclude the founder of the site. The feeling of exclusion is confirmed by the edgily emphatic, "as they themselves only".

It is tempting to speculate that both the above images of disorientation and exclusion were in Michel Tournier's mind when he wrote his excruciatingly brief sequel to the *Surprizing Adventures : Le Fin de Robinson Crusoe* or, *The End of Robinson Crusoe*.³³ In Tournier's short story, his Crusoe shares the

original's compulsion to return to the island. But he comes back to England frustrated. There are "months of unremitting search"³⁴ in place of the few hours taken in Defoe's work, and Crusoe eventually gives up. He reports to the mocking crowd who greet him upon his return to England his conviction that the island is definitely still to be found, although he was unlucky this time. He is assured, however, by an old helmsman that he did find it, but just didn't recognise it. He explains to the incredulous Crusoe, that this was because:

"...your island has done what you've done: it's aged! Don't you understand? - flowers turn into fruits, and fruits turn into wood, and green wood turns into dead wood. Everything happens very quickly in the tropics. And what about you? Look at yourself in the mirror, you idiot! And tell me whether your island recognized you when you passed it?".³⁵

Tournier is, with tender ruthlessness, imposing finality on Defoe's novel by stressing mutability and that the past is irrecoverable. Crusoe can only recognize he has changed, become an old man, in tandem with his island. In this respect, rediscovering it would be irrelevant. Crusoe cannot go back. Tournier's story acts, intentionally or not, as a sequel "contre" Defoe's sequel. For, in Defoe, Crusoe persists in finding his island and attempting to regain a foothold in its history and future. He doggedly resists changed circumstances.

Crusoe's attempt to force his way back into the current of island events is registered in two ways: in his chronicle of the island's past, and in his contribution to its present state and its imagined future. By "present" is meant the period of 25 days Crusoe spends there. This analysis will examine first the chronicle, and then the sojourn during which Crusoe the historian gathers his source material.

Discussion of the chronicle falls naturally into two parts, determined by the way Crusoe gives his account and the troubling content of his narrative. It is essential to quote in full Crusoe's preliminary comments on his lengthy history, because they clarify his attitude to the task he has set himself:

The history of their coming to, and conduct in the island, after my going away, is so very remarkable, and has so many incidents, which the former part of my relation will help to understand, and which will in most of the particulars, refer to that account I have already given, that I cannot but commit them with great delight to the reading of those that come after me.

I shall no longer trouble the story with a relation in the first person, which will put me to the expence of ten thousand *Said I's* and *Said he's*, and *he told me's*, and *I told him's*, and the like; but I shall collect the facts historically, as near as I can gather them out of my memory from what they related to me, and from what I met with in my conversing with them and with the place (II, pp.39-40).

Both paragraphs constitute a justification of what might seem to be a digression. But it is becoming a moot point in this novel as to what is and is not a digression. For, as Crusoe recognizes, the island history is now at least as relevant as his own biography. In the first paragraph he stresses that "the former part of my relation" has an explanatory function. Indeed, a knowledge of the final section of Part I will certainly help in grasping the strands of the ensuing account. Crusoe interprets his coming narrative as a natural extension of his earlier account of the informal establishment of the island as a colony.

But the sentence beginning "I cannot but commit them with great delight..." hints at a more uncomfortable intersection of this work with the "former part". The use of "delight" is intriguing. That Crusoe should deploy such a reader-oriented word confirms the change of perspective. He regards the foregoing material as newsworthy, diverting, and useful. He would certainly not perceive the story as primarily a source of "delight" if he had been more

involved in it. This mediating role is confirmed by the phrase, "those that come after me." This might be simply a reference to posterity in general. It could, however, be referring specifically to those who come to the island after Crusoe. If my speculation is correct, then Crusoe is imagining a future trajectory for the island which would involve him even less than at present. He is conceding that he is on a far broader historical canvas than much of his first part suggested, in which his work would serve as a useful resource.

This acknowledgment prepares the way for the transition into third-person narrative. Crusoe justifies the shift on grounds of convenience. However, there is more to it than this. This is the first formal acknowledgement in both parts that his story, in order to be comprehensive, must include events in which he himself had no part. He becomes a more marginal figure in the island history, in that he can only selectively report on and interpret the action during the years in which he was absent. He is forced, in the way he recounts the narrative, to admit that his attempt to reintegrate the island into his experience is not a smooth process. The third person narration is the technical equivalent of Crusoe needing assistance in negotiating the "windings and blind ways" leading to his old homestead. He has to rely on "what they related to me", and "conversing with them" in order to give a full account. However much Crusoe tries to appropriate the island story and adorn it with his own turns of phrase, it can be nothing else but a communal effort. This is the point at which the sequel most clearly begins to divide into two books.

At first it appears that Crusoe's chronicle (II, pp.39-109) registers his attempt to "collect the facts historically", and to order his narrative as objectively as possible. The ten year period from Crusoe's departure to the

development of a reasonably stable community is covered by a sweeping account which, in its swift changes of focus, resembles Defoe's style in other historical accounts, such as "The Histories of the Pirates". Crusoe tends to combine overviews, with cool, brisk reiterations of selected episodes. An example of the wide perspective is provided by the following description of the settlement after the first main attempt to discipline the three rogue mutineers:

Well, they submitted to all this, and as they had plenty of provisions given them all the while, they grew very orderly, and the whole society began to live pleasantly and agreeably together, only that these three fellows could never be persuaded to work, I mean for themselves, except now and then a little, just as they pleased, (II, 54).

The rhythm is steady and even, revealing a cool, detached viewpoint, and is established by the controlled intake of breath signalled by "Well". It progresses by the relaxed balancing of the collective units, "whole society", and "three fellows", whilst the adverbs "orderly", "pleasantly" and "agreeably" help to bolster up and pace the sentence, thereby establishing a stability which can absorb minor obstacles. Crusoe's delivery is consequently almost offhand. A passage like this certainly indicates a relatively blasé attitude to the story he has to tell.

Even in the more closely focused sequences, Crusoe's narrative rarely appears highly charged. He seems to be keeping firmly to his intention of arranging and efficiently communicating historical data. James Sutherland perhaps had in mind passages like the one discussed above, as well as the relation of particular episodes, in commenting on Crusoe's transition into the third person:

...we lose the sense of intimacy that we had with Crusoe in the first part, and we realize how much we were under the spell of the mariner and his serious, measured narrative. With the sense of immediacy we have also lost the powerful effect of Crusoe's solitude. (Sutherland, 1971, p. 140).

Sutherland correctly notes the widening of Crusoe's focus. However, his sense of solitude has been lost and found again before now, and the sense of immediacy is not fully surrendered. For Crusoe, throughout the account, struggles to include himself as often as he can, given that he feels he must comply with a historian's brief.

Crusoe's resistance is indicated in three ways. Firstly, he can still combine precision and intensity in a way which suggests that he was more a bystander at the time than a chronicler doing his duty years later. This is exemplified especially in the battle scenes, when he describes the casualties amongst the savages in gruesome detail:

...the second, which was the run-away Indian, was shot thro' the body, and fell, but was not quite dead: and the third had a little scratch in the shoulder, perhaps by the same ball that went thro' the body of the second. (II, p.91).

He also regularly relates the islanders' concerns to his own when he was the sole inhabitant. Thus, he critically compares his defensive measures on first witnessing savages to those taken by the settlers. (II, p.57). The effects of the first gunfire in the war were "...just as it was when I fir'd the first gun" (II, p.91). A variation on this paralleling is his attempt to show that he has had a positive influence on the history by leaving behind recommendations and materials. The two "good" Englishmen

...dug, and planted, and enclosed, after the pattern I had set for them all, and began to live pretty well. (II, p.91).

The third form of interpolation is didactic. Crusoe frequently interrupts the narrative in order to interpret it. And, just as frequently, he prevents himself from becoming too prominent. Thus, after lambasting the mutineers for their plans to steal slaves from the mainland, he has to drag himself back to his account: "But I leave observing, and return to the story", (II p. 72).

Hence, the relinquishing of first-person narrative is not unequivocal. The account is not so majestically impartial as it at first seems. Crusoe is, with almost grim pathos, trying to have a retrospective influence on the events he reports. That he cannot be very effective after the event is unimportant. The significance lies in the attempt. One reason why he is striving so hard to involve himself in the history of his colony may lie in the content of the story. For, whilst occasionally reassuring, it is hardly a trouble-free tale. It is a catalogue of internecine and peninsular conflict, expanding in concentric circles. The Englishmen battle amongst themselves, and then with the Spaniards. Finally, or not so finally, a bloody war ensues with the savages. During the struggles there are periods of tranquillity which gradually increase in length. Moreover, there is distinct progress, as signalled by the transformation of Will Atkins, and by the civilizing effect of the arrival of the women, (II. pp.77-84).

However, the underlying pattern of Crusoe's narrative is the equivalent on the social scale of the oscillation between alternate states of conflict and tranquillity which characterises the autobiography of Part I. Hence, it displays a similar degree of uncertainty. For example, the first sight of the savages tamed even the "English brutes", and "...for a great while after they were very tractable, and went about the common business of their whole society well enough", (II, p.62). However, even this cannot last, and Will Atkins's

restless scheming. "brought them into a great deal of trouble", (II, p.62). Another bout of civil war ensues. The difficulties in achieving a sense of decisive resolution that Crusoe experienced, and is still experiencing, are far greater when applied to an entire community, subject to disagreements within itself and assaults from without.

Novak helpfully provides some intellectual and historical contexts for Crusoe's portrait of a society in disarray. ³⁶ he does not locate any paradigms for this oscillating movement, similar to that of the narrator's own life, between phases of disorder and tranquillity. There is only one roughly contemporary view of history which I think parallels this one. (In no sense am I noting it as a paradigm.) It is Vico's view of human society developing in alternate phases of civilized and barbaric behaviour, by "*corsi e ricorsi*". Defoe would not have been aware of Vico's thought, but it is interesting that he should contemporaneously arrive at a fictional working out of a cyclical vision of history. ³⁷

Crusoe's urge to, as it were, correct the island history as he goes along surely stems from a feeling of remorse. If he had stayed, perhaps he could have held the various factions together and prevented war with the savages. The leader of the Spaniards, the unofficial governor, recalls for Crusoe his sense of desolation on discovering Crusoe's absence:

But nothing that ever befel him in his life, he said, was so surprizing and afflicting to him at first, as the dissapointment he was under when he came back to the island, and found I was not there. (II, p.38).

Moreover, the Spaniard makes clear to Crusoe that the troubles for the island began, "especially after they had the misfortune to find that I was gone".

(II, p.38). If Crusoe had adopted permanent residence he might have realised the closural fantasy that he developed towards the end of Part I. He could have relinquished his perpetual alternating movements as a means of stabilizing the historical development of the island.

Thus far, the discussion has shown how the bond between Crusoe's vacillating temperament and the island history described in the opening section is being gradually severed, confirming the sequel's tendency to divide into two books. The separation is the structural confirmation of Crusoe's failure to impose closure on the narrative as a whole by integrating his own wandering into the island's history. So far, he has been only able to do this equivocally. This has been revealed, first, in Crusoe's uneasy arrival at the island, and second, in his qualified and disjointed use of third person narration. Now, and for the remainder of his island stay, he resumes first-person narrative in one last concerted effort to restore his grip on island affairs. However, despite his respect for the islanders he proves unable to make the ultimate commitment to them of his residence.

The difficulty is revealed in a number of ways, all of which undermine Crusoe's attempts to impose order, discipline, and Christian ways of life on the island. Crusoe's attitudes and actions, and the way in which the islanders respond to them, all indicate unease.

Crusoe's intentions regarding his own future on the island are made plain in his lengthy dialogue with the Catholic priest. Crusoe points out that he is not likely to have time to implement the religious reforms suggested by the priest:

I am bound to the East-Indies, in a ship freighted by merchants, and to whom it would be an insufferable piece of injustice to detain their ship here, the men lying all this while at victuals and wages upon the owners account. It is true, I agreed to be allow'd twelve days here, and if I stay more, I must pay *31 sterling per diem* demorage, nor can I stay upon demorage above eight days more, and I have been here thirteen days already... (II, pp.137-38).

Crusoe is actually renting his time on the island, and even then he still has a limit imposed on his stay. The phrase "insufferable piece of injustice" is a clear indication of his long-term priorities. Presumably the idea of being left behind, with the sloop as insurance, has been quietly forgotten. He has surrendered to the exigencies of a commercial venture and the relative independence it brings him.

The extent of Crusoe's compromised commitment to the island is shown by his unwillingness to leave Friday behind to assist the priest in converting the Indians: "...I could not think of parting with him, and that for many reasons", (II, p.140). Perhaps the main reason is that Crusoe sees Friday now as an indispensable unit of his own "adventures", and cannot accept him crossing the boundary into the broader sweep of history represented by the island.

It is in this context of possessiveness and mercantile pressure that Crusoe tries to bring permanent peace and pious conduct to his domain. It is not too surprising, then, that, whilst he presents himself as a problem-solver and initiator of actions, he in fact adopts peripheral roles. Primarily, he is a suggestible delegator. It is the French priest's idea to introduce organized religion to the island using marriage as a starting point. Crusoe is certainly caught short by the priest's heightened awareness:

as for me, I had not so much entertain'd a thought of this in my heart before, and I believe should not have thought of it. (II, p.137).

Moreover, he is more than happy to accept his priest staying behind to perform good works if, in the priest's words to him, "you think yourself discharg'd from it". (II, p.138).

Crusoe's second marginal role is that of interpreter. He translates for the priest when he explains to Will Atkins and the others their sinful condition, (II, pp.144-45). When it comes to the weddings, Crusoe assists the priest who, of course, performs the service: "we married them", (II, p.167). Finally, he is a discreet spectator, or, less politely, a voyeur. He and the priest are concealed within a thicket of leaves, where it is "far harder to *see in* than to *see out*" (II, p.150), when Will Atkins first broaches Christian ideas to his common law wife. This image of Crusoe spying on a private exchange between two permanent residents confirms the ambivalence of Crusoe's visit. He is both a benefactor and an intruder. In trying to reform his citizens he is also interfering in a narrative which will take its course regardless of him.

These three roles, of delegator, interpreter, and spectator, all emphasize the way in which Crusoe is steadily losing sight of the island as any kind of solution to his "wandering distemper". However, it is not just Crusoe who has an unsteady perspective on the colony. There is no reason why he should hold the monopoly on restive feelings. He has to recognise that the settlers may well not want to stay for ever. A compromise is thus reached: "they all voluntarily engag'd to me not to leave the place without my consent" (II, p.122). An agogic climate is thus suggested. The inhabitants are waiting for a release at a time ordained by Crusoe. The conditional nature of their occupancy is well put by the young man who asks Crusoe to be installed on the colony. He does not want to continue on Crusoe's voyage because it "was so

exceedingly long and hazardous, and would carry him quite out of the reach of all his friends". He resolves to:

...settle himself here like a planter, waiting the good time, when, if ever I return'd to England, I would redeem him. (II, pp.169-170).

Thus, the island is certainly not an ideal haven for the young man. Rather, it is the place which offers the least problems to him for the time being. He chooses to stay because he does not find Crusoe's sea route appealing.

Hence, the island is as much a focus of doubt for its populace as it is for Crusoe himself. He is, nonetheless assertive in departure:

I have now done with the island. I left them all in good circumstances, and in a flourishing condition. (II, p.183).

The dismissive confidence with which Crusoe disembarks conceals the problematic relationship which has developed with the colony, and which will continue to resonate for Crusoe for a good while yet. For, the novel now enters a turbulent, cathartic transition from the island history into the second book, which concerns Crusoe's solitary travelling. "All these things" are now "done with". But unfortunately Crusoe was unable to do anything more constructive with them.

Central to this transition is the way in which Crusoe's attitude to the island becomes crystallized as he travels farther away from it. First, he re-establishes contact with his old partner from his All Saints Bay colony on the Brazilian coast. He uses his first colony as a base from which to supply the island. The sloop, which once was to provide Crusoe with means to stay a long while on the island, now merely has the function of ferrying goods from one colony to the other. This signals the way in which the island has been

demystified to the extent that it is merely a parallel location to Crusoe's first profitable settlement. Indeed, Crusoe hopes to start his new tenants on the road to prosperity by sending them sugar cane, (II, p.192).

However, his contact with the islanders becomes even more nominal, and more fragmentary. He receives a letter "five years after it was written". This in itself stresses how frail the communication lines are between the governor and his people. The letter numbingly reports of the islanders:

...that they went on but poorly, were male-content with their long stay there; That *Will. Atkins* was dead; That five of the *Spaniards* were come away, and that tho' they had not been much molested by the savages, yet they had some skirmishes with them; and that they begged of him [Crusoe's partner] to write to me, to think of the promise I had made, to fetch them away, that they might see their own country again before they dy'd. (II, p.194).

The motion of struggle and unrest continues. The letter confirms that the history Crusoe had begun with his immaculately-structured chronicle, and that he had hoped he could end happily, has thwarted all his creative plans and progressed in its own retrogressive way. The Spaniards, once Crusoe's constitutional mainstay, have begun to break away. Atkins, Crusoe's protege, has died. The islanders can only think of escape.

Novak rules that "Crusoe's island...reveals the development of society, but Defoe was unable to present this idea without removing his hero from the scene", (Novak, 1962, pp. 347-48). In his eagerness to characterise Crusoe's ragged narrative as Defoe's rigorous conceptualising, Novak rather hastily erases Crusoe's edgy unpredictable presence from the stage. For Defoe does not completely "remove" Crusoe from the island's history. Instead, he produces a compellingly frustrating account of his hero's attempts to get to grips with it. Novak's critique does rather suffer from its unwillingness to examine the

island episodes in the formal context of the sequel as a whole.

Crusoe now attempts this task himself. For the departure from the island provokes an uneasy discourse on his whole *raison d'être*, following his dispatching of supplies from the Brasils colony. The polarity between the middle state and Crusoe's own desire to explore has not before been so intensely exposed. When he quitted previous locations he was always, to some extent, abnegating responsibility and long-term commitment to a particular lifestyle. However, this time he has relieved himself of effective charge over an entire society, which he helped to establish, in order to answer the demands of his distemper. This is a derogation of an altogether different order, and it forces him to reflect on himself in a more forthright way than previously. However, as I have been arguing, another source of pressure on Crusoe to speak out is the structure of his narrative. For in the sequel, the oscillating movement between one potentially stable location and the "rambling genius" actually cleaves the work in two. Such a radical disjuncture gives Crusoe's outburst the double function of accounting for his behaviour and smoothing over the break between the two narratives.

Crusoe begins by constructing a picture of how things might have developed if his attitude to the island had been different:

...had I carried over cannon and ammunition, servants and people, to plant, and taking possession of the place, fortified and strengthen'd it in the name of *England*, and increas'd it with people, as I might easily have done; had I then settl'd myself there...had I...staid there my self. I had, at least' acted like a man of common sense; but I was possest with a wandring spirit, scorn'd all advantages, (II, p.193).

He frames the sense of finality that would have been created in terms of

national honour and duty. Crusoe here pinpoints his inability, or unwillingness to accommodate his motives within a broad political and national framework. A sentence later he focuses uneasily on this characteristic:

...I never so much as pretended to plant in the name of any government or nation, or to acknowledge any prince, or to call my people subjects to any one nation more than another; nay, I never so much as gave the place a name; but I left it as I found it...(II, pp.193-94).

Establishing the colony in the name of a larger community, and giving the island itself a name, would both have been ways of orienting it within the world at large, and giving it some kind of stable identity. Moreover, the act of naming would also have been a permanent means by which Crusoe could have established his own role in the world.

As it is, he has made no lasting impression on the island, and his rootless travelling starts all over again. The sequel structure has, however, ruthlessly exposed the dichotomy to the narrator, and provoked a revealing, impassioned outburst. However, the problem is only penetrated by Crusoe's response to the formal rupture. It is not solved. Crusoe is still left juggling diametric opposites. He has therefore no option:

...I must leave here the fruitless exclaiming at myself, and go on with my voyage. (II, p.195).

The exclaiming has, though, not been "fruitless". It has revealed more of Crusoe's nature than previously in both parts, centering on his unwillingness to name things and duly impose some kind of definite shape on his environment. For, if the environment were more defined, especially by him, this would be an invitation to settle into it.

The final indication that the concerns of the island have no lasting

significance for, or relevance to, Crusoe, is provided by Friday's death, (II, pp.186-89). Although Crusoe had previously considered him indispensable, it is clear that Defoe, when considering the direction his story is taking, thinks differently. Friday has made little contribution to the sequel so far and, in any case, his presence merely serves to remind Crusoe uncomfortably of his former association with the island. The severance from Friday is nonetheless painful. It could indeed be seen as the second significant death in the book, the first having been his wife's. Both bereavements have the dubious value of intensifying Crusoe's solitude and his desire to wander. Indeed, Crusoe now confirms the division of the sequel into two books by declaring open "the second part of the travels and adventures of Robinson Crusoe", (II, p.195).

In the fresh start demanded by the bisection of the sequel, Crusoe advertises his travels as taking a new turn:

...my disasters at sea were at an end; my future rubs and cross events were to befall me on shore. (II, p.196).

This is certainly a significant environmental shift for Crusoe, and the change of setting is a means of creating novelty common to sequels. However, the "new variety of follies, hardships, and wild adventures", (II, p.194) is not supported by a significant alteration to the formula of indecisive oscillation.

Such an opportunity had been offered by the return to the island and ultimately rejected by Crusoe. The second section of the book shows the work as a whole coming full circle, with Crusoe resuming the life of a merchant which launched his escapades in the first part. His journeying this time is "the notion of a mad rambling boy", (II, p.225). Crusoe's latest venture also

has a central crisis similar to the shipwrecking in the first part. Crusoe is cast off his nephew's ship at Bengal by the men who conducted the Madagascar massacre (II, pp.206-214), resentful at his continual upbraiding. Crusoe outlines his fresh dilemma:

I was now alone in the remotest part of the world, *as I think I may call it*; for I was near three thousand leagues by sea further off from *England*, than I was at my island. (II, p.220).

Crusoe tries to quantify his isolation according to his distance from England in order to persuade readers that his plight is worse than the island captivity. This strategy is, however, only partially successful, if at all. Relative distance is, after all only one indication of loneliness. More importantly, in Crusoe's itinerary, as has been already suggested, one absolute state can all too easily be replaced by another. Crusoe's assessment of his situation has more the effect of reiterating a familiar predicament than of marking a new phase in a coherent progression towards a final resolution.

Crusoe is presenting, then, a parallel situation that resembles the formulaic nature of the item in a literary series. This re-activation of the formula which shaped *The Surprising Adventures* ensures that Crusoe's closural gestures will seem ultimately insecure. Hence, before embarking on trading from Bengal he states:

I had a kind of impatience upon me to be nearer home, and yet, the most unsettled resolution imaginable which way to go. (II p.225).

ic of his An urge to complete the journey is undercut by the indecision which is so symptomatic of his distemper. This persistent uncertainty confirms that the journey across China and Russia does not, in Sutherland's above-quoted words, make the sequel a

"very different kind of book". The sequel's "difference" from Part I lies in the way it forces Crusoe to face up to the peculiarities and problems of his story-telling condition. In this regard, the novelty and excitement of the sequel are more confined to its first section.

It may be argued that Crusoe's journey in the sequel describes a broad circle, which gives the novel an edifying sense of completion. Moreover, Crusoe's final paragraph anticipates both permanent residence in one location and an even more permanent rest than that:

And here [in England], resolving to harrass my self no more, I am preparing for a longer journey than all these, having liv'd 72 years, a life of infinite variety, and learn'd sufficiently to know the value of retirement, and the blessing of ending our days in peace. (II, p.335).

This sentence has an endearing weariness and honesty. However, even here, there are two problems with accepting Crusoe's sense of satiety. First, he can only give his solemn word that he will no longer "harrass" himself. The usual problem of not being able to relate his statements to a higher controlling structure remains. Indeed, it will become one of the subjects for discussion in the third part. Also, the adjective "infinite" rather saps the conclusive thrust of the words. If the "variety" of narrative possibilities is infinite, then they can never be completely explored. What is more, Crusoe's has been precisely the kind of narrative that exploits this dilemma to the full.

A far more suggestive indicator of the sequel's true closural character is that provided by the acquaintance Crusoe strikes up with the exiled prince during his Siberian winter. Indeed, this "dark, dreadful winter", (II, p.319), in which Crusoe hibernates constitutes one of the most haunting episodes of the sequel. The subtle blending of a brooding icy climate with the characters'

moods makes for some of the best writing in either part. However, the atmosphere is charged with debate. The prince extols the virtues of anonymous retirement, whereas it is Crusoe who advocates the active life. This animated discussion was a trend established in the first part. Whenever Crusoe is forced to stay in one place, his physical motion is transformed into a programme of debate with himself or with others. Thus, the Siberian episode indicates that, although Crusoe's physical rambling is, literally, suspended in ice, there remain a number of unresolved spiritual and intellectual issues which cry out for further discussion. Crusoe is halted, but the questions of why he travelled at all, and why his journey fell into the oscillating pattern it did remain unresolved, yet blindingly illuminated.

The final section acts as a relatively brief conclusion to the chapter as a whole, and gives some consideration to the function and achievements of *Serious Reflections*.

SECTION (iii)

Conclusion?

The Farther Adventures can now be described as a consolidatory sequel leading to indecisive closure, according to the terminology outlined at the end of Chapter 1. By way of conclusion, this section intends mainly to look a little further at the characteristics of this sequel, in order to ascertain what it has in common with other sequels; but also to discover what it ultimately reveals about the nature of Crusoe, and Defoe. The form of the sequel and the character of its narrator both leave space for further continuation. The third stage of this section briefly considers the nature of *Serious Reflections* and its implications for the work as a whole.

This chapter began with Defoe trying to achieve the impossible by suggesting that the ways in which readers receive moral messages from fictions were somehow open to cool-headed retrospective interference. This proved symptomatic of his and Crusoe's troubled perception and management of the relationship between ethical concerns and human impulses throughout first part and sequel. This relationship, or technical problem, emerged as the bone of contention in a controversy sparked off by the remarkable popular response to *The Surprizing Adventures*.

It was in the conditions of this dispute, under the public gaze, that Defoe was best able to present his story as balanced and integrated. The prefatory language, of the sequel especially, represents a bold assertion of the edifying value of the work as a whole. Indeed, the sequel acquires a

strong, defensive character. This could account for its consolidatory nature, although the way in which the support for the first part is actually expressed does not exactly coincide with the sequel's confident prefatory rhetoric.

For however author and publisher conceived of both parts, or framed that conception in their announcements, within the worlds of the texts themselves the relationship between "diversion" and "instruction" is problematic. Defoe is quite capable of showing his hero developing a disciplined and pious cast of mind. But he is also stimulated by his hero's restless creativity (or vice-versa), and his waywardness.

At one point a contemporary comparison of Crusoe to Don Quixote was adopted. Some differences were underlined between Crusoe's "Quixotism" and the Don's own. However, perhaps the crucial distinction lies in the contrasting ways in which both men aspire to their perceived ideal states. Don Quixote's aspirations are uni-directional. He seeks to revive chivalric values and to re-enact chivalric behaviour. Crusoe's aspirations are, if such a compound exists, bi-directional. His goals are both the states of being outlined above. Zimmerman calls this "schizophrenia".³⁸ However, despite Crusoe's use of the word "distemper", I personally would prefer to see Crusoe's nature in less pathological terms. If anything, Crusoe suffers from a surfeit of honesty about the difficulties of reconciling human desires with spiritual and intellectual ones.

This brand of Quixotism defines the structure of both parts as a whole. The sequel brings to a cathartic head the issue of Crusoe's doubleness by becoming two books. To paraphrase a recent advertising slogan, it makes a structural drama out of an existential crisis. It is this graphic interaction

of formal layout and subject-matter that makes the sequel a stimulating and provocative read. It not only stands up as a necessary adjunct to the first part, but also, in its "windings and blind ways", has a uniquely darker hue, a paradoxically lonelier mood. However, it does not resolve fundamentally the problems raised by Crusoe's Quixotism, in the way that the sequel to *Don Quixote* ruthlessly resolved its hero's dilemma. Perhaps Crusoe's problems are more intractable. They are the kind that make it difficult for an author to "leave off" (in de la Mare's words). But, they do not invite easy solution simply through the act of continuation.

The unresolved character of the sequel makes it consolidatory. It reinforces, in both its sections, the narrative pattern of oscillation established by the first part. In the first section, the motion is primarily applied to Crusoe's chronicle of the development of a society. In the second section it can be traced, once again, in the hero's rambling, despite his proclamations that, once and for all, he is on his way home.

However, the sequel has other thematic characteristics which are common to other sequels, be they consolidatory or reformatory. In other words, these characteristics tend to cut across the formal categories outlined in Chapter 1. First, the sequel is expansive. The expansion, in this case, is primarily topographical. In *The Surprizing Adventures* Crusoe's ambit is circumscribed by England, South America, and Western Europe. In the sequel, Crusoe touches North as well as South America, he voyages on two oceans, and spans an entire continent on foot at pretty well its widest point. The tendency for a sequel to stretch outwards is an encapsulation of its search for new material and techniques beyond those adopted in the first part. In the case of Defoe's sequel, the expansion creates a surface novelty but not a profound "sea-

change" in the work as a whole. Secondly, the sequel is socially expansive, revealing, in the island section especially, a contrast to Crusoe's years of solitude. As in the sequel to the *Pilgrim's Progress*, the concerns of a lone hero in the first part become those of a society in the sequel. It is the case, after all, that Crusoe is married for ten years of his life, although this is rather easy to forget.

Related to expansion is the concept of multiplication. A sequel tends to produce marginal characters (although they may not remain marginal) who, in one way or another, resemble the hero, but also significantly vary from him or her. Will Atkins has already been mentioned in this respect. His life in its retrograde progression has a similar trajectory to Crusoe's, and the initial rebellions of both characters stem from rejecting a father's advice. The difference lies in the more violent and extreme qualities of Atkins's case. There are also strains of Crusoe in the young man, who has lost his mother, and whom Crusoe settles on the island. The young man is, in his own way, as isolated and bereft as Crusoe. The variation lies this time in the youth's relatively stable approach to his predicament. He is willing to see what the island has to offer. These refractions exemplify the sequel's general tendency to explore and explain. A sequel is relieved of the burden of exposition. It therefore is at leisure to indicate the applicability and universality of the issues and predicaments of the first part. In widening the canvas, however, it can also demonstrate that one character's dilemmas can manifest themselves in a variety of ways in other people, according to age, status, gender, temperament and so on. The sequel, then, has the chance to contemplate different ways of telling the original story within the framework of its own story.

Another characteristic of sequels in general, which is exemplified in the *Farther Adventures*, is revelation. That is, the sequel tends to focus more intensely than the first part on particular problems posed by the narrative or narrator, or the motivations of particular characters. The sequel can have an explanatory, analytical function. In Defoe's sequel the analysis is more energetic and thoroughgoing than in the first part, but it does not arrive at tangible conclusions.

Ultimately, perhaps, the strength of this particular sequel lies in its penetrating and revelatory qualities. For it manages to confirm and communicate more comprehensively and honestly the nature of the work's hero. De la Mare, in his phrase, "sacred solitudes" sums up an approach to the work as a whole which places a great value on Crusoe as a man who learns to come to terms with loneliness. But in fact, Crusoe's solitude is merely a means of establishing his perspective on a society from which he appears dislocated. He is separated from society purely in order to be able to anatomize its conflicts and contradictions, its "turns" and "returns". In this sense, Crusoe, for all his isolation, is a profoundly social being. His conflicts between life in the middle station and life in unregulated disorder are, in part, embodiments of two contrary, and interdependent, social conditions. The form that the island history takes confirms this view. Crusoe could be called the typical citizen rather in the way that Schklovsky termed *Tristram Shandy* the typical novel. ³⁹

Serious Reflections indeed develops this notion of Crusoe as emblematic of the problems experienced by society by explicitly making these difficulties the main subject of his ruminations. In the first essay, "Of Solitude", Crusoe in fact makes clear how he regards the concept:

...I can affirm, that I enjoy much more solitude in the middle of the greatest collection of mankind in the world, I mean, at London, while I am writing this, than ever I could say I enjoy'd in eight and twenty years confinement to a desolate island. (III, p.4).

How the individual lives in society, or rather, how society lives with its individuals: these are the problems that Crusoe wants to resolve. Both preceding parts have tortuously posed these questions in one guise or another.

They have only been able to ask questions. One of the purposes of the third part is systematically to seek an answer, and thus obliquely resolve the problem of closure left dangling at the nominal end of the sequel. To borrow a phrase from Derrida, first used in Chapter 1, Part III has a "racinating function". Taylor, in his Publisher's Introduction to the third part heralds the work as signalling a final victory over the pirates. And Defoe, as Crusoe, clearly sees the *Serious Reflections* as, in part, a riposte to Gildon, who had lambasted both parts for their inconsistency and lack of moral integrity.

However, the work is surely something of a pyrrhic victory. For it concedes that decisive closure cannot be enforced without relinquishing the mode of narrative, which, with its startling innovative qualities, so unnerved Gildon. De La Mare comments that the Preface to the *Serious Reflections* reads like "a succession of icy douches". (De La Mare, 1930, p.49). This effectively captures the way that the third part tries to dampen down and qualify the heated and exuberant historicizing of the previous parts.

Extended narrative is replaced by a discontinuous series of essays, which progresses outwards from the vantage point of the solitary individual to reflecting on matters of behaviour within society, and then to discussing how society is enveloped by a variety of religions which are unified by a single

providential voice. The work concludes with a self-contained text, *A Vision of The Angelic World*, in which Crusoe finally traverses in his imagination the heavenly spheres with which he was in such anxious dialogue in the previous parts.

The work only nominally presents reflections "During the Life" of Robinson Crusoe, as the title advertises. Precise links are rarely made. Mention is made of the faithful widow and his partner in the Brasils in the section on honesty, (III, p.18 and III, p.21-22). The countries he visited are remembered in the "Essay on the present state of religion in the world", (eg., III, pp.118-120). However, on the whole, Crusoe illustrates his lectures with fresh anecdotes from his own retirement in London, (eg. III pp. 68-70). There is, then, no precise adherence to the details of the earlier parts.

Instead, a new voice of unparalleled confidence becomes audible. It is by this indirect method that the authority is imposed on the preceding random occurrences:

As honesty is simple and plain, without gloss and pretence, so 'tis universal: he that may uphold an untainted reputation in one particular, may be justly branded with infamy in another. (III, p.64).

The ordered, logical progression of this sentence, its unhurried use of balance ("simple and plain"... "universal", "untainted reputation"... "infamy") typifies the rather austere turn that the prose takes in the third part. The tone is one of command and control. There is still room for doubt in Crusoe's intellectual excursions but it is managed and contained by this overpowering voice. Gone is the compelling note of fraught confession sometimes struck by the first part and sequel.

The voice in the *Serious Reflections* increasingly resembles Defoe's own in its more high-minded oratorical strains. The essays are similar in style and subject matter to a number of Defoe's shorter non-fiction prose works (his pamphlets and tracts on political and religious issues) and his journalistic writing. For example, in his chapter on "The Immorality Of Conversation" Crusoe calls for an "exemplar behaviour in our gentry" (III 88), that the poor can follow. This echoes Defoe's railing against hypocrisy in an article in the *Review*, written in 1704:

The punishing vices in the poor which are daily practised by the rich, seems to me to be sett'ng our constitution with the wrong end upward, and making men criminals because they want money. ⁴⁰

There is also a technical resemblance to Defoe's other writings, in the use of verse and formalised dialogue to make points more accessible (see, III, pp.75-76, pp.183-189, and pp.113-118). In a *Review Article* written in July 1712, Defoe resorts to verse to sing his praises to heaven. ⁴¹ Dialogue is often deployed in both volumes of Defoe's best-selling *Family Instructor*. ⁴²

Thus, closure is enforced on Crusoe's narrative by its being re-absorbed back into the author's own, more familiar modes of public address. Crusoe is thus negated by meeting up with his maker. This is the only significant "longer journey than all these" that he makes. This surrender of innovative narrative method, then, marks something of a "return" for Defoe himself in his early days as a novelist. The fictional format, on this occasion, was perhaps proving too hot to handle, so it was collapsed and transformed into a more established, essentially discursive means of communication with readers. Perhaps Defoe's artistic climb-down was perceived by readers. For, in its own day, the *Serious Reflections* only went to one edition. However, this might

have been a necessary regression in Defoe's circuitous, Crusoe-like career. It might have enabled him to arrive, through trial and error, at the conclusion that he had far more prose fiction in him than Gildon could have borne to read, had he lived.

However, in the light of the concerns of this chapter, it seems only appropriate to end on a note of qualification. For, maybe, the *Serious Reflections* does not impose such decisive closure on the two preceding parts as Defoe would have wished. Introducing his vision, which draws the third part to a close, Crusoe comments:

...my imagination, always given to wander, took a flight of its own; and as I have told you that I had an invincible inclination to travel, so I think I travelled as sensibly, to my understanding, over all the mazes and wastes of infinite space...as ever I did over the deserts of Karakathay. (III, p.279).

It may seem paradoxical that, at the very point at which Defoe as Crusoe (or, perhaps, Crusoe as Defoe?) is reaching out for the verification which will give his trilogy the seal of certainty that has so often eluded it, he should remind readers of his old wandering habit. Critics have responded to this kind of conundrum with the answer that Defoe loved paradox.⁴³ It has been a broad purpose of this chapter to demonstrate that this was not the case, but that the converse was true: paradox loved Defoe.



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby
West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ
www.bl.uk

**PAGE MISSING IN
ORIGINAL**

CHAPTER 3

"Treating the public too much like a bookseller", and "an intellectual fondness": Two Contrasting Examples Of The Reformative Sequel.

"...these undertakers of superstructure on the plans of others".
(Cleland, *Monthly Review*)¹

"In *Harry* we argued that it is sometimes necessary to go beyond the law, then, in the second film, we answered that proposition by saying it's not that simple. There are bad implications when you set yourself above the rules--no matter how just your cause".
(John Milius, Director of *Magnum Force*, sequel to *Dirty Harry*).²

Introductory

The preceding chapter concluded with the observation that Defoe was courted by paradox and uncertainty. This made him an ideal candidate for grappling with the contradictions of the literary sequel. Samuel Richardson, the man and the writer, appears as a more consistent figure, someone less eager to pander to the demands of the moment, and more concerned with meeting his long-term objectives. Unlike Defoe, who dabbled in a profusion of employments, Richardson stuck doggedly to a single profession, carving out a secure and respected niche for himself in the London book trade as a printer. Compared with the erratic zig-zagging of Defoe's career, Richardson's has a smooth upwards trajectory from his days as apprentice to John Wilde to his years as Master Printer with his own premises in Salisbury Court off Fleet Street.³ It would be hard to imagine him following Defoe's example and raising civet cats amongst his printing presses, or languishing, like his predecessor, in the debtor's prison.⁴

Yet, despite the relative stability of Richardson's career, he could still be surprised and thoroughly nettled by the demands for, and of, the sequel and become caught up in the commercial machinations that can envelop it. Indeed, it is in the context of popular success and its consequences that points in common between the two authors are highlighted. Both men were in their fifties when they took to writing prose fiction. Richardson's business had reached a plateau of prosperity and no longer required concentrated supervision.⁵ Defoe had been made virtually redundant as spy and pamphleteer by political changes and a bout of ill-health. Each took advantage of these pauses in his life to attend to his own creative impulses.⁶

The first novels of both men, produced under these circumstances, in fact have formal and technical resemblances. They make use of first-person narration, and both involve impersonation of a character whose youth contrasts with the maturity of the author. It is quite possible that Defoe's *Moll Flanders* and *Roxana* may have been two sources for Richardson's technique of impersonating a young woman. Both *Pamela* Part I and *The Surprizing Adventures* focus on individuals who are confined in solitude for lengthy periods against their will (although Crusoe is more alone than Pamela, of course), but who survive their trials and triumph over misfortune. Especially when their second parts are taken into account, the two works emerge as biographies with specific exemplary purposes. An anonymous correspondent with Rivington, Richardson's publisher, noted the similarity, and saw it as primarily stylistic:

...if she repeated the Sacred Name much seldomer, it wou'd have much less the Style of *Robinson Crusoe*. (Q. Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, p.123).

Above all, these two first novels were both exceptional, as well as controversial, commercial successes. There is more qualitative evidence of *Pamela's* notoriety, but the quantitative evidence indicates that the works paralleled each other as bestsellers. That both first parts trailed sequels in their wakes is another point in common. However, it is also, in terms of this study, the main source of contrast between Defoe and Richardson. Not only were the circumstances in which Richardson produced his continuation very different, but so also was his attitude to the whole project. Whilst one senses (there is no documentary evidence) that Defoe threw himself into his sequel with his customary gusto and verve whatever technical problems he was up against, Richardson's approach was more cautious and uneasy from the

outset. Indeed, a different type of sequel from Defoe's emerges from Richardson's labours. Defoe wrote his sequel partly to win back the moral high ground from pirates who had - literally - cheapened his first part. But there was also a strong economic motivation to extend the original narrative and reiterate many of its characteristics. Richardson, too, was aware of the strong economic case for prompt continuation of a novel which had paradoxically proved more popular than the popular novels whose values it was challenging, but he was ostensibly unmoved by it. He let it be known that he had no intention of capitalizing on the success of *Pamela* Part I. However, his narrative fell victim to an alternative continuation by another author during the year of 1741 (the first of three alternative sequels to be issued between 1741 and 1742).

Defoe was easily provoked into writing a sequel by a hasty piracy cobbled together by a jealous bookseller. Richardson was reluctantly drawn into the world of his sequel by an entirely new work continuing the narrative which he saw as his cherished property. Richardson continued *Pamela* out of a sense of sheer outrage and offended decency. He was bear-baited into writing a sequel.

It is the primary purpose of this chapter to look in detail at the immediate circumstances of the composition of Richardson's sequel to *Pamela* and to indicate how its format registers them. However, the intention is to achieve this aim comparatively. Unlike in chapters 2 and 4, two sequels are discussed. Kelly's increment is offset against Richardson's, with the analysis being biased towards Richardson. Hence, the chapter has a secondary purpose: it seeks to show contrasting ways in which the sequel form can be used in order to develop a popular story. A third subsidiary intention is to indicate through Kelly's sequel the difficulties faced by an author who chooses to

continue another's work with, what Genette terms, the "*suite allographe*". The other ^{alternative} sequels will be briefly noted but will receive little attention. This is primarily because they were issued either just before or some time after Richardson's own sequel and therefore could have had little influence on its first edition. Kelly's sequel, as a devastating pre-emptive strike, was anyway the one which seems to have upset Richardson and his publishers the most. It is the friction between the two authors and between their texts which is the most revealing feature of all the efforts to continue *Pamela* Part I.

In Section (i), the period in Richardson's life from November 1740 (when *Pamela* Part I was published) to December 1741 (when his sequel was published) comes under scrutiny, with special attention given, first, to the criticisms of Part I contained in the early "anti-Pamelas" and, second, to the conflict with the publisher and writer of the first alternative sequel, *Pamela's Conduct in High Life*. In Section (ii), this work of Kelly is discussed in general terms and its qualities underlined by direct comparison with Richardson's sequel, *Pamela in her Exalted Condition*. The paralleling will indicate the ways in which Richardson appeared to be answering Kelly specifically. However, it will also serve to introduce Richardson's more general rhetorical purpose in his sequel.

For, as the third section will point out, although Kelly's second part had initially provoked Richardson's sequel, the latter, as he wrote, began to see creative and didactic opportunities in his project which encompassed far more than a mere riposte to Kelly. This third section, by examining overall structure and certain specific passages, tries to show that Richardson was writing what could loosely be called an "anti-sequel" sequel. That is, he thoroughly explored those aspects of the sequel form which seek to arrest a

preceding narrative and subject it to explanation and analysis; whilst he avoided or circumvented the form's exploitative potential. Hence, Richardson seeks to avoid the excesses of his own first part and to resist developing a single, intense line of narrative in the sequel. As a result of adopting this stance of restraint and resistance, Richardson produces a sequel which defends and complements his first part. However, it will be argued that the ingenuity and interest of the sequel lie in the way that this gesture is itself used as an exemplary point of departure in the production of a guide to the provisional solving of a range of ethical and emotional problems.

SECTION (i)

Controversy, conflict, and Two Sequels of 1741

In September 1741, Richardson reported on his health in a letter to the Dublin writer Mary Barber. He complained of being

...sadly afflicted with the Old Complaint, bad Nerves, and Startings and Tremors, and Dizziness, and worse for the hot Weather. (Q.Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, p.143)

At about this time also, one of Richardson's regular correspondents, Dr. Cheyne of Bath, learned from a friend (Paul Bertrand), who had recently visited Richardson that the author appeared "full puffed short necked and Head and Face bursting with blood" (q. Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, p. 143). A triumphant winter, in which the snow covering London had been likened, in its whiteness and universality, to the first Part of his *Pamela*,⁷ had now given way to all this heat, trembling, and corpuscular turbulence. Richardson was having a difficult, frustrating summer.

One possible source of his frustration was that he had been drawn into writing a sequel to his successful novel against his will. The sequel was the end-product of a bitter conflict within the bookselling world which he would rather have avoided. Aside from this particular dispute, his first part had also been the centre of a lively controversy in which its qualifications as a promoter of virtuous conduct were energetically called into question. Both these aspects of Richardson's first year as a published novelist rather soured the initial jubilation. The details of the popular success which sparked off

the critical debate about, and the subsequent continuations of, *Pamela* have been thoroughly recorded by others. Given that this chapter is concerned with the ways in which Richardson's sequel responds to the combative or exploitative *Pamela* literature, only the barest outline is provided below of the initial impact of the first part.

The composition and publication of *Pamela* Part I owe much to Richardson's happy working relationship with the bookselling partners John Osborn Snr. and Charles Rivington. They commissioned Richardson to write the *Familiar Letters*, an epistolary conduct-book, the writing of which fired him to begin work on *Pamela*. The novel was written quickly, between November 1739 and January 1740. Following its completion, there was an eight-month delay, possibly to allow Richardson to revise his manuscript, but possibly also to ensure that publication would occur at the most commercially propitious time of year. Whatever the case, the first two volumes of *Pamela; or, Virtue Rewarded* were published on 6 November, 1740 (priced 6s.) at the height of the London season, when the town was at its busiest.⁹

The surest sign of the work's tremendous and rapid success is the fact that five editions were required between the winter of 1740 and autumn of 1741. The second edition appeared on 14 February 1741, the third on 12 March, the fourth on 5 May, and the fifth on 22 September.⁹ Although the editions of *Pamela* *furt I* did not follow each other with quite the rapidity of the initial editions of the *Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, (five editions in ten months of *Pamela*, as opposed to four editions in five months of *Robinson Crusoe*) Maslen's use of frequency of editions (see above, Chapter 2) as a gauge of popularity can be applied to Richardson's novel. The frequency of editions slowed down in the next two decades, suggesting an inevitable waning of the

excitement that had been catered for in the year of 1741. By October 1761 the eighth edition had been published. A further sign of the book's success is the promptness with which the first Irish edition appeared: it was already being advertised in late January 1741, (see Sale, 1936, p.16).

The statistical evidence of popularity is supported by a wealth of material, anecdotal, epistolary, and literary, which testifies to Part I's impact. Clergymen embraced the novel (a rare, perhaps unprecedented gesture where prose fiction was concerned), and Richardson received a number of unsolicited congratulatory letters.¹⁰ The voluble, yet articulate response to the novel must have reassured Richardson that, however wide-ranging, and far-reaching the public response to the novel, it was not indiscriminating. It was apparently being read in the manner encouraged by its stage-managed prefatory encomiums.

However, the critical reaction to Part I was not universally favourable. After all, the zealous enthusiasm with which Richardson and his associates had presented Pamela to her public had rather laid them open to attack. Unequivocal statements, not only of purpose, but that the set purpose had been easily achieved, were bound to beg questions as to whether or not the substance of the text could support the encomiums with which it was laden. Some thought it could not and saw the work as shot through with self-contradiction and insidious hypocrisy.

These views were expressed in a series of "anti-Pamelas", as they became known at the time.¹¹ This literature ranged from verses in periodicals to full length fictions, such as *Anti-Pamela: Or, Feign'd Innocence Detected*, (16 June 1741), attributed to Eliza Haywood. There were pamphlets, such as *Pamela*

Censured,¹² and there was even an example of explicit confessional autobiography: James Parry's *True Anti-Pamela* (June 1741). One of the most well known works in this sub-genre was also one of the first: Fielding's *Life of Miss Shamela Andrews*.¹³ His *Joseph Andrews*, a more sophisticated and polished *Pamela* offshoot than any of its predecessors, came out in 1742, and is therefore beyond the boundaries of this chapter, bearing in mind the emphasis on books which could have informed Richardson's sequel.

The ensuing remarks will draw especially from *Shamela* and *Pamela Censured* as illustrative examples. Along with a host of minor quibbles, there were two main objections voiced in response to Richardson's novel. In the third Section of this chapter these accusations will be considered more in relation to Richardson's sequel. For the moment, the priority is to communicate the nature of the attacks on Richardson. The first criticism concerned the relationship of Pamela to her much vaunted and highly rewarded virtue. It was argued that her letters revealed a coquettish young lady, artfully stringing her master along, offering much titillation to readers in the process. The novel's "tender" or "warm" (Richardson's adjectives) scenes - especially Mr. B's four attempts to ravish Pamela - were the main fuel for the complaints that were parodically or journalistically put against the novel. It was perhaps not simply the "risqué" nature of the scenes *per se* that was found offensive but their inappropriateness within a work which so insistently demands decorum and honourable conduct from characters and readers alike.

It was argued that the book and its heroine had failed to live up to their own high ethical standards. The point is summed up neatly in the versified "Remarks on Pamela. By a Prude", appearing in the *London Magazine* of May 1741.

Referring to the central attempted rape at the Lincolnshire estate, in which Mr. B has disguised himself as a serving-girl to gain unsuspected access to Pamela's chamber¹⁴ the author comments:

He might be sure that she would cry,
 And seem t'oppose his will,
 Whilst odious Mrs. Jewkes was by;
 And yet the girl laid still.
 (Q. Kreissman, 1960, p. 23)

It is suggested that, despite all her protestations to the contrary, Pamela secretly enjoys her near ravishment. After all, the critic argues, she remains silent when she could be crying for help. This accusation that Pamela secretly delighted in her predicament was made repeatedly by others and was sometimes used as the starting point for a characterisation of the work as implicitly pornographic, even obscene. Especially galling to the author must have been the following advertisement:

The pleasures of conjugal love revealed ... of the same Letter and Size with *Pamela* and very proper to be bound with it. (*Daily Advertiser*, 9 April 1741, q. Kreissman, 1960, p.6).

Fielding's Shamela cheerfully concedes that her defensiveness is merely a means of teasing Mr. B and of indicating that she is not an easy conquest. In a passage which mimics the early advances by Mr. B on the maidservant in Bedfordshire (eg. E I, pp.10-11; SH I, pp.16-17), Shamela gives an amusing, lively performance. Mr. B bursts in on her whilst she is reading, of all things, a volume of Rochester's poetry (in the original Pamela is more often reading the Bible or conduct books). Mr. B kisses Shamela "till he made my face all over fire". She responds as follows:

Now this served purely, you know, to put upon the fool for anger. O! What precious fools men are! And so I flung from him in a mighty rage, and pretended as how I would go out at the door; but when I came to the end of the room, I stood still... (*Shamela*, p.11).

Shamela emerges in complete control of the situation, partly by the way she scornfully dismisses the male race, and partly by her disorienting manipulation of the situation. She feigns rage, threatens to storm out, and on the very threshold, halts. This represents a damning interpretation of the original.

Fielding's critique of Pamela's character is made all the more devastating by an amendment of the original plot. From the outset it is revealed that Shamela is having an affair with Parson Williams, with whom no man can compare as a lover: "O Parson Williams, how little are all the men in the world compared to thee!" (*Shamela*, p.23) declares the heroine after her near ravishment by Mr. B. The affair has the effect of relegating the approaches of Mr. B to the status of an irritating, but financially and socially convenient, distraction.

The author of *Pamela Censured* offers analytical, rather than parodic, commentary on Richardson's novel. He focuses, like the author of the above-quoted poem, on the central crisis in Lincolnshire. Referring to Pamela's bedside votaries he remarks:

Can any Youth bear the image of Seeing her kneel naked, though at her prayers, without Emotion: A lewd scene fits but ill with religion. (*Pamela Censured*, p.60).

Summing up the scene as a whole, he concludes:

I defy the most innocent virgin to read it in Company without being constrain'd to stifle a Conscious Blush. (*Pamela Censured*, p.60).

This sort of interpretation is, of course, as much a reflection of the imagination of its author as upon the nature of the text itself. Indeed, precisely this argument is deployed in the sequel. However, Richardson must have been profoundly disconcerted to discover that his attempts to create a vivid dramatic situation, charged with fear of the unknown, could be read in this manner at all.

The second main objection to Richardson's book was related to the first, but was more concerned with its vision of social, rather than sexual, ethics. It was asserted that Pamela's guise of innocence concealed a scheming, opportunistic cast of mind: she knew exactly what she wanted and how to obtain it. The author of *Pamela Censured* asserts that Pamela,

...instead of being artless and innocent sets out at first with as much knowledge of the arts of the Town, as if she had been born and bred in Covent Garden, all her Life Time. (*Pamela Censured*, pp. 21-22).

Her resourcefulness is especially evident in Lincolnshire, for,

Confinement and Restraint will drive a woman to the most desperate Applications for a Remedy. (*Pamela Censured*, p.51).

The plot hatched with Mr. Williams (the Parson Williams of *Shamela*) is cited as an example of the heroine's native cunning. However, Pamela was seen as being artful on a much larger scale than one of merely devising abortive escape plans. Her behaviour was interpreted as blatant social climbing, aspiring to a wealth and lifestyle which her behaviour did not merit. Her resistance to Mr. B amounted solely to holding out for as long as her patience could stand in order to obtain the most favourable matrimonial conditions.

This view is irreverently expressed by Shamela:

I shall be Mrs. Booby, and be a mistress of a great estate, and have a dozen coaches and six, and a fine house at London, and another at Bath, and servants, and jewels, and plate, and go to plays and operas, and court; and do what I will, and spend what I will. (*Shamela* p19).

At the root of this criticism is the indictment that Richardson could only conceive of virtue, portrayed in his novel as a spiritual conceptualization of chastity, as being rewarded in a material way. Virtue, supposedly a possession of infinite value, would appear to have a price after all.

These, then, were the two main objections to the original novel to appear in the anti-Pamelas. Richardson was of course able to make some limited defence of himself and his book during the heady days of the *Pamela* vogue. The number of editions issued within 1741 became a useful means of updating the text and arming it against whatever recent criticisms the author felt were worth addressing. The later revisions especially indicate that Richardson was making some kind of considered response to public criticism. Of the five editions of *Pamela* Part I, the last was the most heavily revised. The tendency of the emendations is towards increasing respectability and reducing any suggestive sequences or seemingly vulgar language, (see Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, p.125). On occasion, these changes would involve complete rewriting. Initially, Richardson considered that the procedure of tinkering with his text, honing it down or nourishing it with fresh prefatory matter, was a sufficient means of defending his work and maintaining lines of communication with readers. However, events were to prompt him into adopting a more thoroughgoing and creative attempt to alter the status of the first two volumes.

Richardson was led to change his mind by a particular set of circumstances which will be outlined in the final part of this section. So

far, *Pamela* Part I had been challenged by a combination of caricature, debate, and even extended imitative fictions (as opposed to sequels). A sequel to the first two volumes, entitled *Pamela's Conduct in High Life*, was written by another author under the auspices of the bookseller Richard Chandler.¹⁵ There is a considerable difference between a parodic or discursive anti-*Pamela* and the incursion on another's literary territory demanded by an alternative sequel. A sequel, after all, feeds on every aspect of the original novel: its plot, characterisation, settings, and, last but not least, its commercial viability. *Pamela* had become a highly lucrative piece of literary merchandise.

The Chandler project was appropriating Richardson's property and wresting the creative initiative from him. It was a devastating attack on the control over his material which Richardson, as editor and printer, had so enjoyed exercising. Ironically, the alternative sequel, (the first of three) does challenge explicitly, or even intentionally, the values and assumptions of Richardson's first two volumes. It is not in, say, the *True Anti-Pamela* mould. However, to Richardson's eyes, an alternative sequel was capable of inflicting more lasting damage than any caricature or loose imitation. For a spurious continuation actually purported to be interconnected with his own work, thereby encroaching unashamedly on his own literary property.

A brief, roughly chronological, overview of Richardson's dispute with Chandler and his author will now be presented.¹⁶ Three aspects of the controversy will then receive more detailed attention.

Whilst the exact genesis of Chandler's plan for a sequel is not known, it is a fair estimate that the idea was broached in the first months of 1741. Sometime between January and April, Richardson heard that Chandler had

commissioned a little-known author, John Kelly, to write the sequel. Richardson complained to a friend of Kelly's about the scheme and this brought a conciliatory visit to the printer from Chandler, (probably in April 1741). At this meeting, Richardson said that he would be forced to continue himself if Chandler did not withdraw honourably. Chandler proposed in return that Richardson should co-author the sequel with Kelly, and offered to publish the finished work under Richardson's name. Richardson, as could only be expected, rejected this offer. Chandler replied with a proposal to forgo Kelly and take on Richardson as the sole author. The argument then returned to the starting point that Richardson had no intention of continuing his book.

The meeting ended with Richardson under the impression that Chandler was sympathetic to his arguments against any sequel being written. However, he was being over optimistic, for Kelly's work soon got under way, and Richardson was even sent four sheets of the first volume for his approval. It was primarily his reading of this extract that resolved him to begin his own sequel in mid-April of 1741. At this stage Kelly's first volume was well advanced, although Richardson now knew that Chandler and Kelly were planning a second volume. In late May 1741, Kelly's first volume appeared, its purpose partly to see how the public responded to this volume before proceeding in earnest with the second.

In early July 1741 the *High Life* camp advertised that they had been "obliged to Kill Pamela that neither Mr R-n or his accomplices might be guilty of Murdering her", (q. Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, p.138) On 13 August, Richardson advertised that his own third and fourth volumes were "in the PRESS", (q. Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, p.138). However, there was a long gap between this announcement and the publication of Richardson's sequel in December 1741.

Indeed there is evidence of him consulting friends on his new text throughout August and early autumn. However, he had finished writing by early October. Perhaps, then, the above advertisement was merely an attempt to inform Chandler, and the public at large, that Richardson was very much in the running. It seems unlikely that the book had literally gone to press at this early stage.

As it happened, Kelly's men were first into the bookshops again with their second volume (12 September 1741), this time with the words, "Unto Her Death" appended to the title, "Pamela's Conduct In High Life". Both volumes of Richardson's sequel (ie., *Pamela*, Vols. III and IV) came out together on 7 December 1741. The controversy was marked by a protracted advertising war between the two groups which ran from the Spring of 1741 through to the winter. This war became increasingly acrimonious, especially as Richardson's own sequel project began to become a reality. The summary would not be complete without a mention of the two other sequels which appeared during 1741. The first was the *Life of Pamela* which came out sometime in the early autumn of 1741. The work is a third-person account of Pamela's life, incorporating her death. It draws on aspects of Richardson's first two volumes and the whole of Kelly's work. The other sequel is a loose conflation of Richardson and Kelly, although it tends to stray in new directions of its own. It was entitled *Pamela in High Life: Or, Virtue Rewarded*, and first appeared in instalments in September 1741. Both these works stood less chance than Kelly's sequel of influencing Richardson, simply because they were published at a point when Richardson's work was at or beyond the revision stage.¹⁷

Three aspects of the Kelly controversy relevant to the next two sections

of this chapter now merit close attention. First, the dispute reveals much about Richardson's approach to the sequel and his plans for its structure. Second, the dispute gives some useful evidence that Richardson had sufficient knowledge of the first volume, and even the second volume, of Kelly's sequel to be able, explicitly or implicitly, to counter it in his own work. Third, the conflict forced a change in Richardson's view of his authorial status that manifested itself in his attitude to the task of writing a sequel.

Much of the above information, especially that concerning Richardson's initial meeting with Chandler, comes from a letter from Richardson to the Bath bookseller James Leake written in August 1741, while Richardson was in the midst of composing his sequel. The letter is not only valuable as narrative, but also offers immediate insight into his thoughts on the whole affair. Early on, Richardson describes how he laid out for Chandler the only conditions under which he was prepared to continue his narrative. If an attempt by another were made to write the sequel,

I was resolved [in which case I had resolved] to do it myself, rather than my Plan should be [basely] ravished out of my Hands, and, probably, my characters depreciated and debased, by those who knew nothing of the Story, nor the Delicacy required in the Continuation of the Piece. (Q. McKillop, 1968, p.51).

The use of "ravished" is significant considering that the fear of rape so preoccupies Pamela in the first part. It expresses the way in which Richardson, having helped his heroine fend off the recurring threat, is now finding it increasingly difficult to protect her book from a more insidious stylistic "ravishment". His use of "depreciated" and "debased" indicates an associating of high ethical qualities with literary value. His perception of his role reveals his sense of authorial kudos as inseparable from the

condition in which he has left his narrative and the characters within it. He presents himself as potentially a chivalric figure rescuing his heroine and her story from the clutches of commercially directed continuation. His sense of honour and duty to his text actually transcends his own judgment on whether or not Part I needs a sequel.

This conception of the values espoused by the text actually influencing the author's decision about whether to resume the story is reinforced as the letter progresses. He tries to persuade Chandler of the "Baseness as well as Hardship" that an author

could not be permitted to end his own Work, when and how he pleased, without such scandalous attempts of Ingrafting upon his Plan. (Q. McKillop, 1968, p.52).

"Ingrafting" confirms Richardson's view of a possible sequel as a forced, unnatural activity that defies the organic integrity of the original work.

It is clear that, in the immediate aftermath of his encounter with Chandler, Richardson was still thinking in theoretical terms about the problems caused by "ingrafting". However, when he received the four half-sheets from Kelly, via a friend, and when he was taunted by Chandler for being a "Dog in the Manger wou'd neither eat myself nor let them eat", he was fast projected into a tortuous dilemma. In expressing his predicament, he illuminatingly expands on his view of the validity of undertaking a sequel:

By these I saw all my characters were likely to be debased, & my whole purpose inverted; [for otherwise, I believe I should not have prevailed upon myself to continue it; for Second parts are generally received with Prejudice, and it was treating the Public too much like a Bookseller to pursue a Success till they tired out the buyers; and the Subject to be pursued as it ought, was more difficult and of Consequence, my Leisure, my Health and my capacity to do it were all Objections to the attempt...(q.McKillop, 1968, p. 52 - bracket closed later by Richardson).

Richardson's distrust of sequels echoes Defoe's remark made at the opening of his Preface to the *Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. Richardson displays an established printer's lofty disdain for the bookseller's more exploitative arts. Whilst he was quite prepared to ride on the crest of the wave created by his first novel, he was also more than happy to let the work's success take its natural course.

In the following paragraph Richardson indicates what "treating the public too much like a Bookseller" meant for Chandler and Kelly. He informs Leake of his intimation that, following their second volume there were ["still more and more intended possibly by them, so long as the public would receive them"], (q. McKillop, 1968, p.53). Furthermore, he ascertained that these volumes "would by the Bookseller's Interest and Arts, generally accompany the Two *I had written*," (q. McKillop, 1968, p.53). The words "more and more" vividly convey Richardson's anxiety that the debasement of his novel would follow a kind of infinite regress. On top of this, the thought that his own original volumes would, by cunning presentation, be made accomplices to this sharp practice must have been intensely galling.

Hence, Richardson resolved to write his sequel in order to provide an alternative to the the kind of humiliating treatment it was receiving from Kelly and Chandler. However, he was caught in the painful conundrum that in commencing a second part he was in danger of himself merely capitalising on his success. He had to produce a second part which would confidently and comfortably rise above its economic circumstances.

However, if Richardson was provoked into writing his sequel initially by Kelly's efforts, and if it is to be argued that Richardson's text is in part

a riposte to Kelly's, then it must be established that Richardson was at least familiar with Kelly's volumes. It has already been mentioned that Richardson was sent four half-sheets of Kelly's first volume at a stage when Kelly was well advanced on his project. There is no evidence to indicate from what section, or sections, of Kelly's volume the sheets came. Richardson does mention his "characters" being debased by Kelly which perhaps implies the major figures in his (Richardson's) cast. If this were the case, then it would be reasonable to assume that the four half-sheets came from a stage where Kelly's first volume had made some headway. For in the very opening section only Mr.B and Pamela feature prominently, whereas towards the middle of the volume most main characters from Richardson's first part have been reintroduced, especially Lady Davers.

There is, though, a more specific indication of Richardson's familiarity with Kelly's first volume in an advertisement placed in the *Daily Gazetteer* (a pro-Walpole newspaper which Richardson printed from the 1730's at least until 1746)¹⁸ on 4 June 1741. The long advertisement, more like a short article, appears on the top left-hand corner of the newspaper's front page: a priority position. The notice consists of an extract from Kelly's first volume which is interspersed with comments from a writer (or writers) on Richardson's side. The comments appear at the head and foot of the passage as well as in parentheses within the text. The passage quoted runs from pages 125-126 in the first edition of Kelly's first volume and contains primarily a justification by Pamela, with reference to philosophers, of her drinking two bottles of wine whilst pregnant.

The passage is introduced with contemptuous irony:

In order to convince the publick how well the Volume call'd Pamela in HIGH-LIFE, deserves that Title, the following Specimen is given from it...

The writer mocks the way in which Pamela claims to be of elevated status but still addresses her narrative to Mr.B's Bedfordshire housekeeper:

To make short, my dear Jervis, [the Housekeeper, to whom all her Letters are written, because she is now in HIGH-LIFE the reader must remember]...

At the end of the extract the following remark is appended:

N.B. The Publick is assur'd that the *whole* volume is written with *equal* Spirit and Propriety; and if this succeeds, (as who can doubt it!), the honest High-Life Men in their Introduction give Hopes of another Volume.

The *Daily Gazetteer* advertisement is revealing in two ways. First, if we can assume that Richardson had anything to do with the wording of the annotations to the passage (which seems likely considering his close links with the newspaper), then it shows that he had quite a specific familiarity with Kelly's first volume, even if details were passed onto him by his associates. Furthermore, the passage is cited as exemplary of the rest of the text. Hence, someone in Richardson's camp must have read much of Kelly's first volume, possibly Richardson himself. Secondly the advertisement anticipates the line of counter-attack Richardson will be taking against Kelly in his sequel. Richardson indeed tends to concentrate on the details of Pamela's aristocratic lifestyle, detaching her from any of unseemly qualities of her former social class.

There is less evidence that Richardson had specific knowledge of Kelly's second volume. Moreover, Kelly's second volume appeared on 12 September 1741,

by which time Richardson had written much of his sequel and had begun consulting family and friends on it. However, according to Eaves and Kimpel there is no evidence that Richardson had finally finished writing until 8 October. This would have given him time to absorb Kelly's volume, even if only in outline form. It could be, after all, more than coincidence that Richardson follows Kelly's second volume in putting Pamela through a crisis arising from Mr. B's adulterous conduct. Whatever Richardson's knowledge of the fine details of Kelly's second volume may have been, and whether or not he responded to them, he had good advance knowledge of Kelly's broad narrative strategy. He would have known from the above quoted advertisement, in which the *High Life* men stated their intentions of killing off Pamela, that his heroine was not going to survive Kelly's sequel. Richardson had a summer in which to decide on a fate better than death for his Pamela. Indeed, as will later be argued, one of the main formal difference between the two sequels centres on their respective closural strategies.

If Kelly's two volumes had some influence on the way Richardson wrote and shaped his sequel (the following section will be offering some textual comparisons to support this point), then the nine month controversy from which Richardson's third and fourth volumes emerged had an effect on his attitude to his authorial role. It would be incorrect to say that the *High Life* men forced Richardson to surrender his cherished anonymity. In fact, he never officially relinquished this stance. Neither *Pamela Part II*, nor *Clarissa*, nor *Sir Charles Grandison* (see Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, p.220 and p.401) have Richardson's name as author on the front of any volume. He persists, on his title pages and in his Prefaces, with the fiction that he is an editor who has happened across some genuine documents. For instance, *Clarissa* was

declared to be "*Published by the EDITOR of PAMELA*" and "Printed for S. Richardson", (q Eaves and Kipel, 1971, p.220). However, during the sequel conflict of 1741 the strategic value of adopting this stance was considerably dissipated.

The difficulties for Richardson, as he puts it in his letter to Leake of August 1741, were not so much caused by the *High Life* men revealing Richardson's authorship (there is no evidence that they in fact did this in a direct or public manner), as by their suggesting that he was not the author of *Pamela* Part I, (see McKillop, 1968, p.53). They circulated the rumour (whilst not actually advertising it) that the first part of *Pamela* had been written by an overseer of Richardson's who had since died. Hence, it was not in Richardson's capabilities to write a sequel that could in any way compare to the first part. They then had a basis for contesting Richardson's advertisements for his forthcoming sequel which argued that it was the *bona fide* second part. The *High Life* men replied that their sequel was "Printed from Original Papers, regularly digested by a Gentleman more conversant in High Life than the vain Author of Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded", (q. Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, p. 137).

It is of no matter that the story about the overseer was now contradicted. The point was that Chandler and Kelly were able to exploit Richardson's anonymity and thereby put him in an awkward position. His anonymity had, so far, enhanced the historicity of Pamela's papers. However, by playing down the element of personal invention Richardson was presenting them as general public property. There was nothing to stop others claiming that additional documents had now been uncovered.

Therefore, in order to repossess Pamela's papers Richardson had no option but to be more open about his authorship. The only signal of this shift given to the public at large appears in the Preface to Richardson's sequel, *Pamela...in Her Exalted Condition*. Instead of the Editor's Preface of the first two volumes there is now the "Author's Original Preface" to the sequel. This is a qualified relinquishing of the initial suggestion that Pamela's narrative had merely required diligent editing before being presented to its readers. It is an acknowledgment that the concept of authorship goes some way towards imposing a stamp of authority and integrity on a text.

If description of the sequel's Preface indicates Richardson's increasingly flexible attitude to his authorial role, his discussion of his sequel with friends, as he wrote it, is further evidence of his altered perception. Initially he had only wanted the authorship of *Pamela* Part I to be known to "6 Friends and those in Confidence" (q.McKillop, 1968, p53). However, where the sequel was concerned, from its very commencement, he was far more open, and eager for comment.¹⁹

There is little literary significance in much of the correspondence that Richardson entered into about the sequel whilst planning and writing it, for he took very little of the advice that was offered. On the other hand, the correspondence valuably registers Richardson's increased confidence in and ease with his new vocation. His anonymity had traversed from being a secret to being an open secret. He appears able to conceive of himself now as at least a semi-public writer. And his scrupulous consultation of those he respected shows that he saw his literary activity as more of a professional occupation, requiring every detail to be perfected, than had been the composition of Part I. In this context, it is perhaps worth noting that whereas Part I was written

in a highly charged two months, Part II took a relatively laborious seven months to complete, if pre-publication revision is included.

Richardson certainly treated the copyright arrangements for the sequel with a sharpness that had not characterized his early dealings with the first part. He reported to Stinstra that, for the first two volumes, he had accepted a mere 22 guineas for two-thirds of the copyright, such was his estimation of the work's importance, and had reserved a third for himself. (EK 145). However, a year later, on 4 December, he entered the third and fourth volumes in the Stationers' company entirely in his own name. (see Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, p. 145). This indicates not only Richardson's awareness of the profitability of his novel as a whole, but also his desire to give himself a higher profile in the production of the novel.

In his letter to Leake about the background to the sequel and its composition, Richardson gave an idea of the circumstances of his writing:

...it is no easy Task to one that has so much Business upon his Hands, and so many Avocations of different Sorts, and whose old Complaints in the Nervous way require that he should sometimes run away from Business, and from himself if he could. (McKillop, 1968, p. 53).

This description contrasts with his declaration to Hill, in a letter of early 1741, that he finished the first two volumes in response to eager demands from the women of his household:

This encouraged me to prosecute it, which I did so diligently, through all my other business...²⁰

With Part I he was willing to set his "other business" aside in order to complete his work. The sequel on the other hand is a source of discomfort to one who has "so much Business upon his Hands". There is a sense that writing

the sequel lacks the spontaneity and sheer pleasure that the composition of Part I had had for its author. Richardson's description for Leake sums up the way in which he has changed from being an enthusiastic apprentice novelist writing for his family's benefit as much as anything else, into a semi-professional author under considerable pressure to deliver the goods, and this time writing in order to defend the values of his literary property within a voracious and merciless book trade.

The following sections will consider both Kelly's and Richardson's attempts at sequel-writing within a highly competitive environment. Section (ii) will characterise Kelly's sequel, partly through comparison with Richardson's. Section (iii) will treat those aspects of Richardson's sequel that do not relate exclusively or explicitly to Kelly's.

* * *

Section (ii)

*Pamela's Conduct in High Life Unto the Time of Her Death And its
Relationship with Pamela in Her Exalted Condition*

The discussion in this section seeks to ascertain in what ways Kelly interprets and tries to exploit the character of Pamela and her story, and what kind of sequel emerges from the process. Underlying the argument is an attempt to illustrate the kind of problems that can be encountered in writing a sequel to a novel by another author, what Genette termed the "*suite allographe*". In this context, Kelly's approach is contrasted with Richardson's.

The section opens with a summary of Kelly's novel, necessarily included because the book is not easily accessible today. (There are copies in the British Library.) The analysis then falls into two stages. First, it is suggested that Kelly, despite efforts to remain faithful to the ideals of Richardson's first part, in fact plays into the hands of the anti-Pamela authors, by presenting a wayward and inconsistent heroine and narrative. This results in a highly unstable response to the original book. Rather than playing down any uncertainties in Richardson's first part, Kelly graphically highlights them, converting them into blatant irreconcilable opposites.

In order to demonstrate this point, Kelly's sequel is first examined on a general level in order to show the extent to which it is packed with dichotomies and discontinuities. These are evident in the character and voice of the heroine, in thematic clashes, and in the way the work alternates

between main narrative line and stories within the story. The second stage of the section consists of the paralleling of Kelly's text with Richardson's with the aim of exemplifying the points about *Pamela's Conduct in High Life*, and introducing the concerns of Richardson's second part. The section concludes by indicating how the adultery episode in Kelly's work has so traumatic an effect on the narrative framework that it is pivotal in enforcing closure.

Kelly's sequel opens in London, whilst Mr. B and his wife are still in the honeymoon phase of their marriage. As part of her education, Pamela is taken on a sightseeing tour of the city, including a visit to the Tower of London and Stock Exchange. They journey to Kent to check that Pamela's parents are comfortably installed in the new home which Mr. B has provided for them. In Kent, while staying at her parents' house, Pamela makes the acquaintance of the local gentry. It is revealed by Mr. Andrews that he and his wife are in fact distantly related to the two wealthy families of the neighbourhood: those of Mr. and Mrs. Jinks, and Sir Simon and Lady Andrews. Lady Davers and her nephew Jackey pay a visit and her ladyship's hostility to Pamela is contained by a combination of good humour and gentle guile. Whilst in Kent, Pamela also makes the acquaintance of the pastor, Mr. Brown. He has many discussions of religion and social conduct with her and her entourage, and regales the company with a moral tale of sexual honour set in Genoa.

The couple next travel to Lincolnshire via London, the main event of their journey being their experience of a highway robbery between Sevenoaks and the capital. In Lincolnshire Pamela becomes re-acquainted with the family of Lord and Lady Darnford, and the first volume ends with Pamela nervously enjoying the social whirl centering on relations between the newly-weds and the Darnford family. The second volume opens with the couple still in

Lincolnshire, and again the emphasis is on Mr. B. educating his wife. This time he ostentatiously gives her the key to his study, and thereby encourages her to open her eyes to the literature therein. The pair now journey to Bedfordshire, where Pamela acquires Miss Goodwin as a companion and befriends her neighbour, Mrs. Brooks. The couple set out for London where Pamela gives birth to her first child, a son. Whilst in London she visits court, has an audience with Queen Anne, and hears with inconsolable grief of the deaths of both her parents in close succession.

The stay in London is interrupted by a visit to Bath, where Pamela encounters a critic of her behaviour brought forward from Richardson's first part. Back in London, Pamela is abducted by an admirer from a masked ball, and Mr. B preserves his honour, and to an extent hers, by killing the villain in a duel. The couple then begin more extensive travelling, including a journey to Paris and Montpellier. Whilst they are in Montpellier, Pamela hears of Mrs. Jervis's death. Staying next in Aix-la-Chapelle, the couple are courted by a treacherous brother and sister who had first noticed the pair on their visit to Bath. Lady Frances seeks to seduce Mr. B and Lord P seeks to seduce Pamela. Lady Frances wins Mr. B, and Pamela, on discovering the adultery, is devastated. However, Mr. B conceals his own misdemeanours by accusing Pamela of an affair with Lord P, after hearing Lord P on his death-bed calling for Pamela. He dispatches Pamela back to Bedfordshire, where he orders her to repent. Meanwhile he lives a life of indulgence on the continent with Lady Frances, only returning when she tires of him and seduces yet another man.

After a seven year separation, Mr. B returns to his wife in Bedfordshire and the couple appear to be happily reunited. In the ensuing years Pamela gives birth to three more sons and three daughters. Her death, dated 13 April

1730, and which closes the book as a whole, is vividly described, and she writes a final letter to Lady Davers close to the event.

The above outline, revealing a story at times lively and explosive, indicates already a different approach to the sequel from Richardson's. One way of further understanding the contrasts (and occasional similarities) between Kelly's and Richardson's sequels is to clarify Kelly's creative intentions and the interpretative problems that he faced in extending Richardson's first part. As a sequel writer, Kelly was taking on an imaginative world created by another author who had met with more success with his first book than Kelly had experienced in his entire literary career. In order to capitalize on the remarkable popularity of *Pamela* he could not afford to subvert the very qualities which had made the book so successful.

Kelly was therefore in the ironic position of trying to gain the rhetorical upper hand over Richardson whilst maintaining a fundamentally respectful stance towards Richardson's book. The problem of achieving compatibility with the first two volumes was genuine and pressing. After all, as Kelly was writing, edition after edition of Richardson's novel was spinning off the press. With his literary model so widely available and read, and with plans afoot to sell his attempt alongside Richardson's first two volumes, there was considerable pressure on Kelly to produce a worthy successor.

The Preface to *Pamela's Conduct in High Life* reveals Kelly setting out the terms for a seriously intended sequel. His first task is to construct a prefatory apparatus which will convince readers of the historical truth of the ensuing pages, and which will match the statements that preface Richardson's first part. Kelly presents an exchange of letters between an editor, "B.W."

and a certain Mrs. Mary Brenville, Mrs. Jervis's well-to-do niece. Mrs. Brenville has in her possession "the papers of Mrs. Jervis written by Pamela to her aunt", (I, i). The editor persuades Mrs. Brenville to relinquish these letters so that Pamela's "example of Virtue" can be perpetuated. Also, perhaps with veiled irony, he points out that with the "profit that will certainly arise from their sale...you may succeed your aunt in the post of almoner", (I, iii-iv).

Kelly thus tries to create a basis for his fiction which is as convincing as Richardson's original account of coming across Pamela's papers recording various unusual events that befall her some years prior to the starting point of his narrative. In a sense, Kelly has the easier task. Richardson had to build an element of verification into his fiction. Kelly, on the other hand, can make full use of the vivid epistolary world provided by Richardson, and has a ready made narrative to plunder. It would seem perfectly reasonable to expect Pamela to continue letter-writing in the course of her married life, and that the recipient of her letters should deem them of sufficient value to keep.

However, Kelly has a further, more incisive and direct, means of gaining parity with Richardson and thereby stealing his critical thunder. Kelly's Preface actually defends Richardson's first part against its critics. Singling out the author of *Pamela Censured*, he argues that those who berate the first part are merely using the work to display their own depravity, (I, xiii-xv). He concludes:

...how sensual and coarse their ideas, how inhumane their sentiments, how immoral their principles, how vile their endeavours, how unfair their quotations, how lewd and weak their remarks. (I, xiii).

Kelly thus skillfully stands up for Richardson's work, thereby re-orienting it into his own fictional design.

Having established his credentials, Kelly still had the problem of himself avoiding the kind of accusations that Richardson's work had provoked. He was, after all, inheriting a work which can be read as self-contradictory and inconsistent. Bernard Kreissman partially agrees with the anti-Pamela authors in detecting a wily cunning which belies the heroine's protestations of innocence. A.M Kearney has written of Pamela delivering her account in two voices which are not entirely reconcilable.²¹ Certainly, in making use of high drama and immediacy in order to reinforce a puritanical moral message Richardson was running more of a creative risk than perhaps he and his associates were aware. He created a book that is undeniably open to misinterpretation, even if it is not fundamentally ambiguous.

Kelly, having defended Richardson's book in his Preface, tries to keep to the moral high ground in his main text. However, wittingly or unwittingly, he fast becomes unstuck. He cannot resist exploring further the features of Richardson's book which had made it so controversial, and contributed to its becoming a bestseller: intrigue, suspense, the hint of eroticism, and well-staged physical action. While Richardson had made sparing use of these more sensational ingredients, and would give them attention in later revisions, Kelly works them into his text indiscriminately. This results in his heroine's, and her book's, philosophical and spiritual pretensions being undermined and, towards the end of the second volume, overturned.

Pamela's voice especially registers the divisions within Kelly's work. Whilst, as Kearney notes, Richardson's Pamela does adopt different stylistic

stances, Richardson, in his first two volumes at least ensures they are mediated by tonal variation, and are consistent with the motions of the plot. However, in Kelly's case, there almost seems to be a vaunting of his own Pamela's inconsistencies. The *Daily Gazetteer* advertisement discussed in Section (i) referred caustically to Pamela's habit of making Mrs. Jervis her main correspondent. This does sum up the way in which Pamela is only too keen to remind readers of her humble origins. In Kelly's portrayal, Pamela remains very much a visitor in Mr. B's world. One part in particular of the passage singled out by the Richardson camp for mockery illustrates Pamela's style and concerns:

I would fain have one of these men of reason, who are for calling upon the creator to account to their reason his decrees, and refuse belief to whatever is not demonstrable as a problem in the mathematicks, to assign a reason why a pregnant woman shall not be affected with six times the quantity of wine, which at another time would deprive her of sense and motion. (I, p.127).

In the advertisement the passage is mocked because of the way Pamela so openly indulges in behaviour considered undignified for a lady of her status and condition. However, what makes the passage so absurd is not so much the act of drinking as the language used to examine it. She is converting her amazement at her ability to hold down two bottles of wine into a philosophical problem. The pedantic specification of the exact amount ("six times the quantity of wine"), in an effort to express the problem precisely, compounds the incongruity. Kelly's Pamela is here using a sledgehammer to crack a nut, striking a bathetic note which is rarely absent from her narrative and her reflections therein.

Indeed, Kelly always prefers to stress Pamela's sheer ordinariness, whatever efforts she makes at self-improvement. This is conveyed effectively

by a passage in which Pamela reflects upon herself. Towards the end of the first volume she is to be found at her dressing table preparing for a visit to the Darnford household. She stares at herself in the mirror, and this induces her to drop the guard usually preserved in company:

You love praise, indeed Pamela you do, and tho' you have sense enough to disguise this weakness of the mind yet believe me you would have more sense if you got the better of it. (I, p310).

She then enlarges upon herself to Mrs. Jervis in the third person:

I assure you, if I was not always tutoring her, she would grow a little, impertinent proud hussey. (I, p 311).

The tone of easy confession and gently laughing self-rebuke, ("indeed Pamela you do") helps to confirm the deflation of Richardson's Pamela that Kelly has achieved in the course of his first volume. It is difficult to imagine Richardson's Pamela speaking in this way, especially about herself, and especially in the latter portion of his first part.

The division between the mundane and the elevated in Pamela's voice is also incorporated into the rhythm of daily activities that forms a large part of the book. Discussion on corruption in the clergy (I, pp.79-81), and debate on the relative merits of plain style and rhetorical ornamentation (I, pp.110-111), her pious versifying of a psalm (I, pp.29-31), are counterpointed by elaborately minuted eating and drinking, socializing, and earthy chatter. Richardson is of course keen, in first part and sequel to incorporate domestic matters and routine into the text. Kelly, on the other hand, exaggerates Richardson's attention to detail to the extent that it conflicts with the attempt to suggest a decorous, refined lifestyle.

Kelly's urge to particularize ultimately becomes reductive. For example, Pamela tends to describe nearly every detail of every main meal for most of the first volume. As a dinner guest of a Mr. Brown in London, the couple partake of:

...a very rich soupe, four Ortelans, a white Fricassee of two small Chickens, and a ragout of veal sweet-breads. Everything was elegantly dressed and all the service plate, with the finest damask linen". (I, p. 9).

Kelly also points out that high life does not always guarantee gracious behaviour and language. After opening his house to his Kentish tenants and spending an afternoon drinking with them, Mr. B is only too happy to admit to ulterior motives for his hospitality, in terms which hardly become the reformed rake:

'tis a terrible thing...that a man must be enslaved to brutes; had I not kept those hog-troughs Company, and given them as much wash as the Swines could Suck up, I should have had the character of a proud and stingey Man. (I, 53).

Mr. B's beneficent attitude to his tenants, then, is solely a matter of keeping up appearances and performing an onerous duty. Kelly is clearly finding it difficult to recall, or perhaps, to believe in, the tolerant and generous landlord of the final part of Richardson's novel.

Kelly is, then, seeking to characterise aristocratic life in two distinct ways. On the one hand it involves polite, informative discussion, developing educational potential, and spiritual improvement. In this respect it is exemplary, demonstrative of correct "conduct", as the title suggests. On the other hand, Kelly gives such prominence to banal domestic detail and unbecoming behaviour that it subverts, rather than supports, his didactic

purpose. He seems to want to give a more cynical, knowing picture of high life than does Richardson (in his first part and sequel), whilst at the same time he idealises it in a manner which borrows much from him.

A blending of two different approaches is also the hallmark of the narrative technique of Kelly's sequel. Pamela's long journal-style letters (the main narrative method of Part I) are interpolated with a number of tales delivered by her friends and relatives. Often the plots of these tales re-work Richardson's plot of an attempt by a member of one social class to seduce a social inferior or, in some cases, a superior. For example, on a coach journey to Maidenhead, Mr. Brown regales Pamela and her mother with the story of the French maid Beatrix, abandoned by her mistress in Genoa, who becomes the object of the machinations of Varino and Palavicino, "two young gentlemen of Considerable fortune". (I, pp.58-63 and I, pp.85-90). Closer to home, Pamela hears how the daughter of the wealthy clergyman, Mr. Peters, (who had spurned Pamela in Richardson's first part) has been "ruined by a coachman and is big with child". (I, p.277). In another story, appearing in volume II, a gentleman disguises himself as a lady's footman in order to gain an intimacy with her that would not otherwise have been possible, (II, pp. 145-168).

All these variations on the original narrative provide further evidence that "multiplication", a concept introduced in Chapter 2, tends to occur in a sequel. Multiplication can mean that the focus is no longer continuously upon the central character of the first part. Undoubtedly, in Kelly's work (and in his first volume especially), Pamela's role becomes increasingly that of auditor and spectator. Her increased detachment is summed up by her ability to make a generalisation about the type of story she is commonly hearing, without seeing or pondering the relevance of the comment to her own situation:

...a great many young people, of birth and fortune of either sex, have thrown themselves away, and married their parents' servants, by their being accustomed to keep them company. (II, p.170).

However, the stories do not simply affect the status of the heroine by indicating a plurality of versions of her own experience. They also challenge the historical particularity of her story. Kelly's Pamela attempts to create an immediately recognisable, realistic world by a dogged documentation of minutiae that far outreaches Richardson. And there are also efforts to incorporate this scrupulously manufactured world into a larger social background, as in Pamela's audience with the queen, (II, p.100). Significant events are ostentatiously recorded, such as the death of Cromwell, (II, p.171) and Ormand's proclamation of a ceasefire between Britain and France, (II, p.172).

Yet the stories which intersperse this account undermine its claims to verisimilitude. With their elements of suspense, disguise, exotic locations, remarkable coincidence, symmetry of plot, they tend to pull the book in the direction of formulaic romance. Hence, Kelly continues his practice of foregrounding a feature of Richardson's narrative that was merely hinted at in the first two volumes. Richardson, despite his protestations to the contrary, does in fact draw on aspects of romance tradition in his novel.²² It is precisely his relocation of this tradition in a concrete epistolary world that makes his work so innovative. Yet, Kelly is far more happy to draw on popular romance traditions without seeking to absorb them into his realistic framework. Thus, there is a disorientating alternation of narrative style and subject-matter, to the point where it becomes impossible to ascertain which is predominant. This is especially the case when a tale within the tale can extend over 30 pages, as regularly happens in Kelly's book.

This instability of narrative technique is especially perilous considering that Pamela's own epistolary journal could at any point be influenced by the stories that encroach upon it. As will be shown later, this indeed proves to be her fate. So far, then, it has been argued that Kelly's sequel is a ramshackle structure of extreme contrasts. It tries to realise a number of conflicting goals. Through debate and discussion he earnestly develops the didactic strain running through Richardson's first part. Yet, at the same time, he gives such a cluttered, and frank, picture of the life of Mr. and Mrs. B that the work can never remain for long on the pedestal it constructs for itself. Kelly tends to exaggerate both the zeal and the physicality, the particularity, of Richardson's text, to the extent that they de-stabilize each other.

Pamela's project of recording and noting her activities as thoroughly as possible (which she pursues even to the extent of writing to Mrs. Jervis to tell her there is nothing to report) is also insecure on another front. It becomes the most prominent of many stories surrounding it, which, although labelled by their tellers as true, owe much to the popular romance tradition. A picture of the kind of sequel that Kelly's work represents is beginning to emerge. In the way that it stretches and distorts Richardson it is clearly reformative. It is also expansive, since Pamela is introduced to a broader world, educationally, religiously, and socially. Multiplication abounds, as it did in Defoe's *Farther Adventures*, this time in the regular variations on the heroine's experiences in Part I. It is also becoming clear that taking on a sequel to a first part written by a different author is a peculiarly difficult task. Kelly actually gauges matters of plot and story quite effectively,

putting aside for the moment his surrounding of his main plot with romance-based tales. His real difficulties lie in re-creating a convincing and consistent fictional world, and bringing it to life with voices which can at least echo those of the first part.

A clearer idea will be given of the kind of sequel Kelly is producing, and of his creative problems, in the next stage of this section. Two sequences from Kelly's work will be compared with two similar sequences from Richardson's second part. The purpose of these comparisons is threefold: first, to provide a more intense focus on Kelly's style and treatment of narrative; second, to introduce the ways in which Richardson approaches his sequel, as it were, in the context of Kelly; finally, since the last episode, in Kelly's case, has a closural impact, to assess Kelly's sequel in the light of its ending.

It was suggested in Section (i) that Richardson in fact had some opportunity to gain a first-hand knowledge of Kelly's sequel whilst writing his own. And, according to Eaves and Kimpel, he was still working on his sequel when Kelly's second volume came out in September 1741. Bearing in mind that Richardson's sequel was published in early December 1741 and that he had finished writing by early October, a month was therefore available for him to make strategic changes to his sequel in the light of Kelly's second volume if he wished. There is another possibility, albeit purely speculative, that Richardson was able to obtain either copies of, or information upon, Kelly's second volume before it was published. Hence, he would have had knowledge of Kelly's designs for a sequel during the period of its composition in the summer of 1741. Given that Richardson had reliable contacts in the bookselling world, including the unidentified friend through whom he first

established contact with Kelly and Chandler before the dispute erupted, this is not an entirely unreasonable conjecture.

Having suggested that Richardson was bearing Kelly's work in mind in the writing of his own sequel, it is not the primary intention of the forthcoming comparisons to establish precise verbal correspondences that "prove" that Richardson was defending his heroine specifically against Kelly's stylistic and structural ravages. The intention is to make use of similar passages within both books in order to gain a surer grasp of the strategies of the respective sequel writers. If, as a result of this exercise, the impression is reinforced that Richardson was trying to respond to Kelly directly, then this would be an illuminating by-product of the analysis.

The first two sequences paralleled are those which touch upon Pamela's relations with her parents near the openings of both books. Kelly's sequel opens in London, but very soon the couple are in Kent helping to settle Mr. and Mrs. Andrews into their new abode. In fact, Mr. and Mrs. B spend much of Kelly's first volume in the Kent area. During their stay a surprise is sprung. Pamela's father reveals that his family bears the same coat of arms as Sir Simon's and, indeed, that Mr. Andrews is Sir Simon's cousin. He states that he can prove the relationship:

...if your Family Pictures are still remaining in the Long Gallery, on the North Side this House, I can show you among them, his, who derived to me a Right to bear those arms. (I, p.35).

Consternation follows as Mr. Andrews reveals that he is the son of Sir Henry Andrews who had married a Danish countess, the daughter of one Baron Strome.

This kind of stage-managed twist to the plot is typical of Kelly's work

as a whole. In this case, however, the effect of surprise and novelty is achieved at the expense of a lynchpin of both the plot and didactic scheme of Richardson's first part. It is vital to the polemical vitality of Richardson's novel that Pamela should genuinely be of humble origins. The reader must feel the full force of Lady Davers's remark in Part I, "Could I think that a Brother of mine would so meanly run away with my late dear Mother's Waiting-maid?", (E I p.228; SH II, p.20). Richardson's message initially is that it is possible, indeed desirable, to ascend from the lowest to the highest class without compromising personal integrity and values. Having charted Pamela's triumph over adversity, Richardson then wants to show how the best qualities of her social background can have a benign influence on the most venial and decadent qualities of Mr. B's world. Pamela is to bring a much-needed natural, luminous honesty to her new milieu. "There is such a noble Simplicity in thy Story, such an honest Artlessness in thy Mind," says Lady Davers, towards the end of Part I, (E I, p.413; SH II, p.300).

If Pamela is shown to have aristocratic origins, then she will no longer possess the serene detachment necessary to modify the behaviour of those around her. Kelly, by explicitly stating that Pamela is, after all, of noble birth, effectively short-circuits the moral project of Richardson's first part. Moreover, the revelation encourages a re-appraisal of Pamela's unusual, supposedly spontaneous, verbal and literary facility of her early days in Bedfordshire. If Pamela has aristocratic blood in her veins it is little wonder that she should seem incongruous below stairs. She would no longer be a shining example amongst the lower orders, but a victim of misfortune from Mr. B's class. Apart from the retrospective damage he inflicts on Richardson's first part, Kelly also dissipates, at an early stage, any potential tension in

his own sequel. He denies himself the narrative interest that could be created by testing Pamela in a world which is still very new to her and into which she was not born.

The nature of Kelly's sabotage of Richardson regarding Pamela's original status is well conveyed by Kelly's heroine's reaction to the news:

I could not help crying out, O, how inscrutable, how merciful are the ways of the Almighty! I thought nothing could have added to that Happiness, which the generous Mr. B has raised me to, from a most abject situation; but I own, as this Discovery must necessarily give him a particular Satisfaction by the world (which often judges by Prejudice) looking on me as more worthy of the Honour he has conferred on me, I feel a joy unspeakable. (I, p.38).

Kelly borrows Pamela's frequent praising of God, a ritual which becomes more frequent towards the end of Part I, but applies it completely inappropriately. The true gift from heaven is her new found status. If discovering that she was of that status all along is also a divine beneficence then the first gift is not supplemented by the second, but cancelled out. The benign almighty, as it were, needn't have bothered in the first place. Once the short-lived effect of outstanding coincidence has worn off, the most that Pamela can do is heave a rather cynical sigh of relief.

The revelation of Pamela's true origins exemplifies Kelly's frequent overuse of superlative and surprise as a means of propelling the action forwards. It further indicates how romance characteristics are beginning to tempt the author away from the terms of his loyal defence of Richardson's book in the Preface to *Pamela's Conduct in High Life*, (see opening of this section). This viewpoint is, of course, complicated by Kelly's celebration, as the work progresses, of Pamela's coarser attributes. Whilst confirming Pamela's high birth, he makes her act more like an ill-educated maidservant

than Richardson could have done. Kelly wants the best (or worst) of both Pamela's worlds.

In Richardson's re-introduction of Pamela and her parents, no such disparities are presented. If he did read Kelly's opening volume, he must have been annoyed at Kelly's manhandling of his carefully dramatized interaction between two people from opposing ends of the social spectrum. Perhaps it is no coincidence that Richardson devotes the first five letters of the sequel (E II, pp.1-17; SH III, pp.1-29), to affirming his conception of the relationship between Mr. and Mrs. Andrews and the newly-weds. Richardson's attitude to the filial bond emerges from the opening words of the book:

My dear Father and Mother,

We arrived here last Night, highly pleased with our Journey, and the Occasion of it. May God bless you both with long Life and Health, to enjoy your sweet Farm, and pretty Dwelling, which is just what I wished it to be! And don't make your grateful Hearts too uneasy in the Possession of it, by your modest Diffidence of your own Worthiness. (E II, p.1; SH III, p.1).

A visit to Kent has taken place, but Richardson chooses not to elaborate upon it, instead opening his book on Pamela's return to Bedford. Hence, the geographical and social distance between parents and daughter is emphasized. Pamela's tone, a blend of concern and slight condescension ("which is just what I wished it be"), indicates a lack of dependence on the elderly couple which compares strikingly with her anxious reliance on them early in Part I.

In this way, Richardson tries to keep consistent with one of the main themes of his first part. As Pamela becomes absorbed into the domestic routine of her Lincolnshire confinement, her attachment to her parents becomes less intense and she develops a new resourcefulness. In his sequel, Richardson does not wish to unsettle this impression of the heroine's recently acquired

independence in relation to her parents by focusing too intently on Mr. and Mrs. Andrews. Indeed, although never forgotten, they remain very much in the background in the sequel. Richardson, then, in contrast to Kelly, concentrates on the economics, the practicalities, and on setting the emotional levels of the filial relationship.

In her wish that her parents should not be "too uneasy" in accepting a house from their son-in-law, Pamela is anticipating Mr. Andrews's anxieties about receiving the unreciprocated gift. His awareness of, and discomfort with, the social gulf between himself and Mr. B emerges as a concern that he and his wife are not deserving of such treatment:

...we kneel together every Morning, Noon and Night, and weep and rejoice, and rejoice and weep, to think how our "Unworthiness" is distinguished, and how God has provided for us in our latter Days; when all that we had to fear was, that, as we grew older, and more infirm, and worn out by hard Labour, we should be troublesome, where not our Pride, but our industrious Wills, would have made us wish not be so. (E II, p.4; SH III, pp.6-7).

Mr. Andrews picks up ironically on his daughter's use of "worthiness". He sees Mr. B as an agent of divinity providing for them in their latter years. In this larger context of inexpressible gratitude and excessive humbleness before God, it is possible to accept that Mr. Andrews and his wife feel that they do not merit such assistance. However, the use of "unworthiness" does not bear this interpretation alone. For, Mr. Andrews's perception of his spiritual wretchedness cannot be detached from his experience of his material wretchedness. The elderly couple can never be "worth" anything like someone of the value of Mr. B. He acquires angelic attributes in their eyes, primarily because he is an awesome figure of wealth and grandeur, whilst they, in stark contrast, are merely dependent on whatever manna can be thrown down from

heaven.

This ambivalence is sustained when Mr. Andrews, in the second half of the sentence, evokes, in very physical terms a harsh, uncompromising picture of what old age would have been like had the couple not been assisted. There is a potent image of their being forced unwillingly to becoming "troublesome" after enduring years of "hard labour". Here is a vivid reminder of the burden of poverty which the couple have always had to bear. Moreover, by starkly contrasting, through Mr. Andrews's words, the imagined life of dependent poverty and the life of self-contained comfort that has been thrust upon the couple, Richardson emphasizes the abruptness of the transition for them. Indeed, he goes to pains to indicate that the gulf between the familiar and unfamiliar routine is not easy to bridge.

Mr. Andrews, in order to satisfy his pride, remains anxious to repay Mr. B in some way, even if without the squire's knowledge. The elderly man tells his daughter how he proposed to Mr. Longman a scheme by which he could pay a clandestine rent, (E II, pp. 5-6; SH III pp.8-10). This is rejected by Mr. Longman, for reasons of loyalty, and outrages Mr. B when his wife, inevitably, shows him the letter, (II, pp.7-8; SH pp.11-13). However, a compromise is reached by Mr. B making Mr Andrews the estate manager in Kent, thereby restoring his sense of responsibility.

Richardson, then, enlarges upon the friction caused by the doubts of Pamela's parents about their sudden elevation. However, the uncertainty over the new parental role has a significance beyond the terms of these intense epistolary negotiations. It has a structural relevance, indicating one of the main purposes and formal qualities of the forthcoming sequel. In Part I, the

focus was primarily upon Pamela and the high drama of her assimilation by Mr. B's world and values. In the sequel, this story will be both reconsidered and revised. However, Richardson will also be seeking to show others having similar problems in gaining entrance to the realms of the aristocracy. In the aftermath of Pamela's triumph, variants of her story will recur.

At the opening of the sequel her parents are experiencing, after all, a problem of the same genus as their daughter's in the first part. The offer from Mr. B that they are pressured into accepting is an economic one, whereas Pamela's had been primarily sexual. In both cases Mr. B assumes his offer will be accepted without conditions. However, he is in both situations surprised by the stealth and pride of the Andrews family. Indeed, there is a faint echo of the first part in Mr. Andrews's conversation with Mr. Longman. Mr. Andrews, in trying to go behind Mr. B's back, recalls his daughter's cunning ways. However, Mr. Longman's faintly sinister word of warning reminds readers that Mr. B's darker side is still to be taken into account, as is the wealth-based authority which enables him to give it free reign at will:

I can tell you, said he, the Squire will not receive any thing from you, Goodman Andrews. Why, Man, he has no Occasion for it: he's worth a Power of Money, besides a noble and a clear Estate in Land. Ads heartlikins, you must not affront him, I can tell you that: For he's as generous as a Prince where he takes; but he is hasty, and will have his own way. (E II, p.6; SH III, p.9).

In comparison with the opening of Part I the roles that parents and daughter take in the drama are now reversed. This time the parents seek Pamela's advice on how to respond to Mr. B's generosity. This inversion, then, serves as a potent thematic emblem of the direction the second part will be taking. However, the nature of the dispute and the way it is resolved, depart from Part I as much as they recall it. The compromise is arrived at smoothly

and rapidly, with Pamela herself mediating. The format of the controversy is long-distance debate, rather than stage business in the closet and at the pond-side. The conciliatory tone, and discursive structure of Richardson's sequel has been effectively signalled.

However, in the light of Kelly's sequel, Richardson's opening also establishes another vital feature of his second part: its defensive, even combative, strain. It seems likely that Richardson was trying, amongst other things, to counter Kelly's devastating social re-orientation of Pamela's parents. It is worth remembering in this respect that Kelly's first volume, in which he makes his cheap revelation, came out in May 1741, when Richardson had only just begun crafting his third volume. Kelly's shameful re-moulding of the elderly couple would have been a painfully recent literary event to the original author. Richardson deliberately emphasises the tensions arising precisely from the true status of Pamela's parents.

So far, Richardson's sequel is emerging as a work whose main purpose is to re-establish authority over a narrative which has been adopted by another author, by means of avoiding excesses, making deft artistic strokes, and calmly developing the unfinished business of the preceding work. Richardson also has the advantage of not having to strain to recover the distinctive voices of the preceding part. Meanwhile, the commercially-derived volatility of Kelly's sequel is enhanced by the parallel.

The next comparison between the two sequels reinforces these observations. Both Kelly and Richardson put their heroine through the trial of adultery committed by her husband. As indicated above, owing to the dates of issue of Kelly's second volume and of Richardson third and fourth volumes, it

is less easy to be sure that Richardson could have read Kelly's adultery episode in time to be able to incorporate a direct reply to it in his own text. However, the way in which both authors treat the experience of adultery fruitfully clarifies their artistic stances in relation to sequel writing.

The comparing of the sequences will concentrate on how the heroines respond to the news and the subsequent confrontations with their husbands. Since Richardson's adultery sequence is of such pivotal importance to his novel as a whole, it cannot solely be viewed in the context of comparison with Kelly. In section (iii), it will also receive attention from another angle.

Kelly's Pamela writes to Lady Davers from Aix-La-Chappelle saying she can confirm her suspicions of her husband's infidelity:

I saw my dear faithless husband recline his head on the bosom of the hypocritical Lady Frances, one arm embraced her waist, and her hand was in his. I saw her lips meet his, while her glowing cheeks spoke the guilty passion. (II, p.295).

Kelly here combines an ornate, elevated style with graphic physical detail - an intemperate mixture from which Richardson would recoil.

Kelly compounds his heroine's emotional turmoil by making her prey to the advances of Lord P while she is still in shock from her husband's actions:

Afflictions like the waves of the sea, seem to rowl the one upon the other. (II, 65).

Lord P's advances (prior to his convenient death from smallpox) not only raise Pamela's rhetoric to a fever pitch. They also convert the episode into a more decisive, and far-reaching account of adultery and its effects than it otherwise would have been. Pamela herself is caught up in the web of intrigue

initiated by Lady Frances and her brother. Mr. B capitalizes on this, accusing his wife of being unfaithful, whilst studiously denying his own activities. He confronts his wife late at night, brutally turning the tables:

"Pamela...though I am not satisfied, it would be the highest Impertinence to let my servants suspect I have Reason to doubt your Conduct. Prepare for your Return to England...where you will be respected as my wife." (II, p.312).

Mr. B's measured, steely tone and his calculated concern for the reputation of his marriage makes his hypocrisy seem all the more outrageous. At the same time, Pamela's bland obedience contradicts the defiant spirit that had predominated in Part I.

Any illusions the reader may have had about the ideal nature of Pamela's marriage, and her "high life", are finally shattered by Kelly's presentation of adultery as being virtually irreparable. For his central characters it leads to a bleak seven-year separation. Richardson's treatment of infidelity, by way of contrast, is altogether less extreme. He avoids the high points and hysteria of Kelly's account, and concentrates instead on depicting a dark, brooding, tense interlude in a marriage that has developed a steady rhythm and harmony. The fracas introduces an almost refreshing note of worldly uncertainty into a marriage which had hitherto been too perfect. It serves as a rejoinder to Pamela's remark to her parents near the opening:

But what shall I say? - Only then I may *continue* to be what I am; for more bless'd and happy, in my own Mind, surely I cannot be. (E II p.2; SH III, p.3).

Richardson's more muted, more subtle, approach to the drama of infidelity is conveyed by the way the news is first broken to us, the readers, and to one of Pamela's own readers within the text, Lady Davers. In Kelly's

book *Lady Davers* was also Pamela's confidante throughout the crisis. However, Richardson's Pamela tends to bite her lips and unburdens herself less to her correspondent than does Kelly's:

I have been a little in Disorder, that I have. Some few Rubs have happened. I hope they will be happily remov'd. I am unwilling to believe all that is said. But this is a wicked TOWN, though. I wish we were out of it. (E II, p.281; SH IV, p.141).

Richardson creates a greater feeling of suspense than Kelly by suggesting, in the accumulation of brief, breathless, clauses a suppressed panic, an attempt to rein in internal disorder. The casual, "a few rubs have happened" is an especially effective deployment of understatement.

Richardson does not of course deny Pamela the capacity for displaying strong emotion - as she does by bursting into tears during a conciliatory visit from the countess, for example. However, Pamela's tears are integrated into a well paced, carefully modulated series of encounters between husband and wife, who are, as Mr. B puts it, "getting apace into the matrimonial recriminations" (E II, p.299; SH IV, p.171). It is precisely because Richardson works so hard at making the sequence credible that his attempt to resolve the dispute becomes acceptable. He stages a lengthy, highly-charged debate between husband and wife (E II pp.303-307; SH IV, pp.179-186), in which they cajole one another into accepting their own negotiated reconciliation. The scene makes a remarkable contrast to the frosty private dissolution foisted on Kelly's Pamela by Mr. B. It as if Richardson were asserting that it is more difficult to stage a restoration of good relations than it is to chart a semi-permanent rupturing of them.

It is vital both to Richardson's moral scheme and to the structure of his

sequel that the B's marriage should survive. This observation will be amplified upon in the forthcoming section. In the meantime, its survival can be seen as an attempt to rescue his main characters from Kelly's exuberantly destructive approach.

Richardson's sequel is far more temperate, and artfully composed than Kelly's. He does not of course deny the gravity of an occurrence such as adultery. But his overall strategy in the sequel is to provide his characters, and thereby his readers, with a verbal and emotional repertoire to enable them to armour themselves against any variety of setbacks. In fact, Richardson's sequel is primarily concerned with the acquisition of strength as a means of self-defence - part of its brief inevitably being the defence of a beleaguered first part and, ultimately itself.

A key problem with Kelly's sequel is that it has no such single, or single-minded purpose. It is beset with a bewildering multiplicity of intentions and strategies. In the way that it ravenously consumes every feature, every implication, of Richardson's first part and expels it all in a grotesquely distorted manner, Kelly's sequel reveals an ironic enthusiasm for the work of a man with whom he was in such bitter conflict. If Kelly's eccentric appendage can be characterised at all, it would be best described as a reformatory sequel leading to a definite conclusion by means of exhaustion.

The exhaustion is primarily signalled in the way that Kelly tries to be so comprehensive and inclusive in his developing of Richardson's narrative. Pamela is not only an articulate, educated preceptor, setting a supreme example to her devotees, she is also a cheeky young girl who enjoys horseplay with Mr. B, a drink or several with her tenants, and a crude joke with Sir

Jacob Swynford. It is as if Kelly were energetically constructing two Pamelas simultaneously but without the creative resources to piece them together. At the same time, he is offering the definitive, historically verifiable continuation of the Pamela story, whilst besieging it with romance-derived variations upon it. He appears to be desperately clinging to a fresh literary product whilst being unable to resist returning to one of the generic worlds from which it derives. Kelly is constantly deracinating and reracinating Richardsons's Pamela and her story to a point of frenzied weariness.

This point is reached precisely at the stage of adultery. The drama precipitated by Mr. B's infidelity proves to have a strong climactic force. It represents a formal as well as a psychological crisis in Kelly's bold literary adventure. The restless to-ing and fro-ing between tale-telling and ordered, methodical Richardsonian narrative cannot continue forever. Something has to give in the conflict between the two modes. Pamela's own journal-like account becomes sucked into the network of stories that surround it. This is primarily signalled by the way in which the "editors" take over the book prior to the adultery narrative. They interrupt Pamela's journal just after the birth of her second son, (see II, P.277), seemingly with the purpose of summarizing the letters of congratulation to the proud mother. However, the resumption of third-person narrative allows for a sudden shift of perspective. The characters of Lady Frances and her brother are introduced, and Pamela's plodding notation of her daily life is stopped dead in its tracks.

Thus, the adultery appears to be a consequence of the plotting within the story of Lady Frances, which has been superimposed on Pamela's own narrative. Therefore, Pamela's chronicle becomes merely an adjunct to the tale that has absorbed it. Her story, which had been carefully set apart from

the surrounding tales, has lost its special independent status through ruthless editorial intervention. Although Pamela regains control of the narrative during the main crisis, she never keeps it for long. The editors are always on hand to confirm the way in which her account has been swallowed up by the mechanisms of romance and associated improbabilities. There is some significance surely in the way Kelly sets the infidelity in foreign climes. The distance suggests a new fictional realm. Moreover, the role of Lord P helps to give the story a symmetrical structure. There is an implication of pairs of lovers flouting marital convention, even though Pamela herself refuses to surrender to the atmosphere of mutual deception.

Thus, by finally collapsing the historical particularity of Pamela's narrative, and converting it into one of many tales which punctuate the book, Kelly concedes that his exploration and reconstruction of Richardson's methods has finally run out of steam. The adultery episode makes way for a cobbled together conclusion, in which the editors, by means of paraphrase, hasten Pamela towards her death. It is claimed that in her latter years, Pamela arrives at a happy reconciliation with Mr. B. This is absurdly improbable in the light of her earlier treatment. It is as if Kelly has suddenly changed his mind and tries to resurrect the former happily married Pamela and her mode of narrative. But he must realise that the vividness of the adultery story has made this a technical, formal, and thematic impossibility. Hence, her death seem to be the only honest solution, a means of conceding victory to the romantic machinery which now holds sway over his novel.

Kelly can only return to Pamela in first-person format whilst she is on her death-bed. Here a rhetoric can be mustered which is consistent with the florid language of the adultery episode. The third person narration which has

chequered the narrative since the adultery episode is duly dropped, and one last letter from Pamela to Lady Davers is inserted:

You see by what slow gradations I travel to my grave. I was some time, by my distemper, imprisoned in my house; it then urged me closer and denied more liberty than what my chamber afforded; now it has chained me to my bed, and the next step makes me a close prisoner to my grave. (II, p.334)

Ostensibly, Pamela is describing the degrees of confinement that presage death. And she revealingly makes a direct causal link between the aftermath of Mr. B's affair and her decline. However, she is perhaps also charting the way in which her author is, stage by stage, running out of creative options. His book relentlessly closes in on itself. Kelly begins as a squatter in a house of fiction which he has all to himself. But, through zealously overcrowding the rooms with conflicting possibilities, he is left with nothing but the last epistolary gasp of his final sketch of a heroine whose original daunting consistency forever eluded his manipulations.

Kelly's sequel gives an overall impression of fragmentation. Wherever one looks one can find edifying, entertaining, outrageous, informative bits and pieces of stories, letters, and reportage. The problem is that these occasionally satisfying fragments fail to cohere within their own terms, and probably Kelly's. In Richardson's sequel, the subject of the next section, cohesion, consistency, discipline and authority are the chief creative priorities. On a personal note I would add that sometimes in the midst of Richardson's masterly, unswerving imposition of order on his own fiction, it is possible to miss, if only for a moment, the exuberant chaos of Kelly.

Section (iii)

The Reluctant Sequel

In the previous section, Richardson was shown to be answering, directly or indirectly, Kelly's "ravishment" of his characters by offering deftly constructed alternative readings of two problems in Pamela's family life with which Kelly, as Richardson would see it, has cack-handedly interfered. Whilst it highlighted some of the excesses of Kelly's sequel, the intention of the paralleling was also to characterise a function of Richardson's sequel, one which could be called "rhetorical", in the sense of debate and discussion. More precisely, Richardson saw, in his sequel, the opportunity for providing a literary apologia: a dynamic novelistic manual which acts as a text-book, not only for understanding the first part, but also for getting to grips with a variety of ethical and social problems. Obviously this brief entailed far more than a defence of his first part against Kelly's bizarre, at times entertaining, distortion of its values. However, this objective extended beyond the countering of the work of a rival, as this section will seek to show. Richardson had other assaults on Part I to answer in his sequel, apart from Kelly's.

The main analysis is preceded by a brief account of critical responses to Richardson's sequel, which takes as its cue Richardson's own apparently negative remarks in the work's Preface. The argument of this section is then outlined. In essentials, it is suggested that Richardson makes a bold, experimental use of the sequel form and its potential which, although only a

qualified success, has much to offer. A reformative sequel is produced, whose shape is determined by its dialectical bias. I return to the Preface, and cite one of Richardson's letters, in both of which he stated his intentions, so as to support the initial assertion. Next, in order to substantiate further the case made for the sequel, its epistolary form is discussed. First, it is contrasted with the use of the form in Part I. Second, the implications of the contrast for the sequel, indeed the work as a whole, are examined in general terms. The argument then focuses on three specific episodes or exchanges in the sequel, concentrating initially on the notion that the defence of the first part, far from being incongruous, is cunningly used as an intellectual primer for the work as a whole.

Having characterised the sequel as a more complex, indecisive, and multi-layered work, than has been previously allowed, the analysis focuses on the question of its closure. It is suggested that, in radically altering the formal terms of the first part, Richardson is faced with a seemingly insuperable closural problem. He resolves it by satisfactorily suspending the work, and its multiple narratives, rather than emphatically ending it. The formalisation of Pamela's authorial role, it is argued, plays a crucial role in this strategy.

Richardson made clear in his Preface to *Pamela in Her Exalted Condition* that he had not wanted to continue his first part:

...it having been left to his own choice, in what manner to digest and publish his letters, and where to close the work, he had intended, at first, in regard to his other avocations, to have carried the piece no farther than the First Part. (E II, p.v; Preface omitted from SH)

This admission signifies that Richardson's sequel, in terms of its relations to the end of Part I, is the opposite example to Defoe's *Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. With that work a sequel was explicitly anticipated and prepared for in the first Part by making a summary of ensuing events serve both as a coda to Part I and as a bridge-passage. Also, in many respects the end of the book was indecisive. Richardson's sequel, however, was entirely the product of particular historical circumstances, and was neither demanded nor foreseen by the main narrative or conclusion of the first part.

Richardson's situation highlights how a sequel can undermine the sense of security and aesthetic satisfaction that can be created by apparently decisive closure. The degree of contrivance involved in this literary goal-post moving is suggested by Richardson's amendment of the closural declaration which commenced his epilogue to the first part: "here end the letters of Pamela to her parents". (E I, p.450; not in SH). Between the fourth and fifth editions of Part I the announcement was changed to "Here end, at present, the letters of Pamela to her parents" (see also Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, pp.134-35). The creation of the fresh future implied by the insertion of this qualification, presented considerable artistic problems for Richardson. After all, he had already deliberately breached the traditional marriage ending, with a substantial portion of the first part offering insights into Pamela's first months of married life and recollection in tranquility of her former trials. It is difficult to see what justification could be found for, as it were, re-opening the case.

It is surely the sense that Richardson was artificially extending his novel and duly creating a superfluous, inevitably unspontaneous, work which is at the root of the many critical objections to the sequel. The criticisms

imply a revulsion at a procedure which seems remarkably perverse for a novelist who had so celebrated natural writing and behaviour. Presumably his accusation against Kelly that he was "ingrafting" onto the first part, could, to some extent, also be directed at him. The comments made on Richardson's sequel at the beginning of the nineteenth century by the first editor of his correspondence, Anna Laetitia Barbauld, established the precedent for many later appraisals:

These volumes...are, like most second parts, greatly inferior to the first. They are superfluous, for the plan was already completed, and they are dull, for instead of incident and passion, they are filled with heavy sentiment, in diction far from elegant. A great part of it aims to palliate, by counter criticism, the faults which had been found in the first part. It is less a continuation than the author's defence of himself. ²³

McKillop extends this analysis to include his opinion that Richardson, through placing Pamela in a safe, prosperous milieu, was unable to revive the dramatic tension of the first part, with dire artistic consequences:

...the result...is the poorest performance within the extensive compass of his three novels. (Mc Killop, 1968, p. 57).

For Eaves and Kimpel the sequel is simply "Richardson at his worst - pompous, proper, proud of himself, and above all dull", (Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, p. 153).

Not all critics have been so damning. In the last 30 years or so there have been attempts to rehabilitate the sequel, or at least to give it a vigilant parole. One argument in the work's favour has been to concede that, on its own terms, it is a near failure, but to assert that it is of interest as a technical stepping stone to the later novels. Mc Killop points out that the sequel "presages" Richardson's future work (Mc Killop, 1968, p.60), and

this line is most comprehensively developed by Donald Ball in his "*Pamela II : A Primary Link In Richardson's Development As A Novelist*".²⁴

The basis for his analysis is the way in which Pamela's small-scale correspondence in the first part (mainly with her parents) is expanded in the sequel to form a veritable network sustained by her eager epistolary apprentices. This allows Richardson to increase his range of characters, (see Ball, 1968, pp.336-337) and the ways in which their predicaments can be communicated. He can also, in this wider framework, vary the tone and style of his work to a greater extent, whilst widening the thematic and educative scope of the book. Richardson, claims Ball, creates a prototype of the miniature societies to be found in *Clarissa* and *Sir Charles Grandison*.

Nonetheless, Ball still sees the sequel as "not a novel at all" but a "narrative conduct book", (Ball, 1968, p.334). He cannot accept it as having any worthwhile qualities of its own. June Sturrock, something of a voice in the wilderness, in her article *The Completion of Pamela* offers a spirited defence of the second part as amounting to much more than a "novelist's workshop".²⁵ She sees the work as organically fused with Part I, with its main characteristic being a switch to Mr. B as the centre of attention. She argues that Part I leaves much work to be done in order to make his reformation credible, with the adultery sequence as a crucial test for the man and his marriage, (Sturrock, 1982, 228-229). This is a persuasive argument, but perhaps the emphasis is placed too firmly on Mr. B, and the other features (mainly formal and technical) which give the sequel a life of its own, and could support Sturrock's defence, are not cited. Perhaps she rather over-stresses the case that the sequel and first part form a unified whole, when it is precisely the sequel's often tense dialogical relationship with the

predecessor which gives it its unique flavour. The forced quality of the sequel's genesis cannot, after all, be denied. A "Completion" (in the way that Sturrock envisages it) was never planned by the author, and is not precisely what he delivers, as I hope to indicate.

Finally, Terry Castle has provided an illuminating re-assessment of the sequel from a more theoretical vantage point than Sturrock's in a chapter in her book, *Masquerade and Civilisation: The Carnavalesque in 18th. Century English Culture and Fiction*.²⁶ She examines the masquerade sequence in the sequel, and sees it as a point of entry into a Bakhtinian critique of the work. A fascinating reading emerges, and there is some attempt at widening the frame of reference to include discussion of general traits of sequels. (~~see footnote for these~~). However, I would argue that Castle mistakenly sees the masquerade, and ensuing adultery, as an incongruous, contrary sequence, which offsets the problematical dullness of the remainder of the text. Rather, the adultery drama (I do not cover the masquerade itself in this discussion), is a critical and climactic episode in a book which is as much about problem-solving as anything else.

There are aspects of all the above approaches and attitudes to *Pamela in her Exalted Condition* which are valid and, as the ensuing discussion progresses, points of agreement (or, if necessary, disagreement) will be noted. However, proposed below is a rather different characterisation of the book than has, to my knowledge, been offered hitherto. The point of departure is to consider the work primarily as a particular type of sequel, rather than, for instance, Richardson's second stab at novel writing. What such an approach reveals is an idiosyncratic engagement with the idea of a sequel. In many ways, for a writer who so delights in the art of reaching agreement, and

who habitually counters an answer with a further question, the sequel is an ideal literary format. Richardson was in the uncomfortable, unenviable position of having to transgress his own judgement that a second part was not required. There seemed no better resolution than to celebrate in the work itself the ethos of compromise and negotiation that the sequel form engenders. In this context, Richardson's apparent prefatory confession of his reluctance to proceed with the sequel appears in a different light. Surely his very unwillingness itself was instrumental in forcing him to realise the potential of the sequel form.

The opening paragraph of the Preface helps to clarify Richardson's intentions. He states

that the letters which compose this Part will be found equally written to NATURE, avoiding all romantic flights, improbable surprises, and irrational machinery; and the passions are touched, where requisite; and rules equally *new* and *practicable*, inculcated throughout the whole, for the *general conduct of life*. (E II p.v; not in SH).

"Romantic flights" and "improbable surprises" are especially evocative of Kelly's narrative world, indicating that his work will be receiving some oblique comment. However, more revealing is the way in which the editor talks in terms of "avoiding" these features. The word implies that such facets of narrative are there to be circumvented. It is as if they were a strong temptation. After all, Kelly's main source was Richardson, and the latter had been made acutely aware of the way his first part had tended, particularly in its earlier pages, towards the sensational.

The phrase "passions are touched, where requisite" is a pointed indication of restraint. "Where requisite" comes across as something of an

afterthought, instantly softening the impact of "touched". This narrative, if that is the right word, will only be going so far, and no farther. And the effect of the phrase as a whole is soon smothered by the emphatic promise of "rules...inculcated throughout the whole". The forceful progression of short snappy syllables leaves no room for doubt about the author's plans for his book and its readers. Indeed, with the italicised "practicable", Richardson is stressing that his book is to be of use. It is as much manual as prose fiction and to be as much consulted as read. Richardson then saw his work as deliberately not "treating the public too much like bookseller" as Kelly had done. His attitude to the task in hand is summed up by his statement to Cheyne, in a letter written during composition, that he wanted to "avoid inflaming Descriptions; and to turn even the Fondness of the Pair to a kind of intellectual Fondness", (Carroll, 1964, p.47). Richardson does not here deny mutual physical attraction and affection. Rather he wishes to place it in a cerebral context. Likewise, the book itself, within its expansive episodic structure, is not devoid of tension and dramatic substance, as I hope to indicate. However, the uncertainties and conflicts are always fed back into the machinery of dialogue and discussion.

It will be argued that Richardson does succeed in energising his project, to the extent that it repays close attention and becomes a book worth reading, although, it must be stressed, very much on its own terms. What gives it vitality and interest is the flexibility with which Richardson presents his ideas and their exemplars. Authority is not imposed upon the work from above, and there are no ready-made solutions foisted on characters and their predicaments. Rather, a structure is devised which gives primacy to conversation, debate, negotiation and conciliation. What could be described as

a talking-writing-reading book is the result. The pleasure to be derived from the fiction is the relatively subtle one of seeing numerous individual and social problems being solved and re-solved in a variety of fresh contexts. As a result, ideas and difficulties are continually being surmounted and re-encountered. The security of Pamela's new world is not the "given" perceived by Mc Killop. Pamela and others have continually to re-establish their moral bearings.

The lynchpin of this discursive framework is epistolary form and the fuller realisation of its possibilities than in the first Part. Whereas Donald Ball concentrated the significance of Richardson's expansion of this technique for his later novels, I will be stressing its significance for the sequel itself and its relations with the first part. In Part I Richardson mainly adopted the letter form as a means of vividly conveying Pamela's responses to her rapidly changing situation. The letters guarantee instant access to the rhythms of Pamela's voice and her emotional and spiritual trajectory. However, lacking from this exploitation of the letter form largely for narrative purposes is any sense of response or reply, and therefore of dialogue. There is no instantly perceptible correlation between what Pamela writes in one letter, or in a portion of a letter, and her daily experiences.

Janet Gurkin Altman, in her *Epistolarity: Approaches to a form* offers a useful theoretical perspective through which to view Pamela's epistolary habit:

Given the letter's function as a connector between two distant points, as a bridge between sender and receiver, the epistolary author can choose to emphasize either the distance or the bridge.²⁷

Richardson, in his first part, chooses to stress the distance. Pamela's

experience cannot be mediated by the solace from her parents which is so abruptly terminated shortly after the opening of the novel. Part I is also concerned with distances in a general sense, since the heroine has to cross the wide gulf in social class between herself and Mr. B.

Indeed, it is the attempting of Mr. B to bridge the gap between himself and Pamela that precisely enforces the break in the regular exchange of letters between Pamela and her parents. He disrupts the even reciprocal rhythm of letters I - XII. One of the first indications of Mr. B's uncivilised behaviour is the way he crassly interrupts Pamela's attempt to sign her first letter (I, p2). This establishes at the outset the point that Mr. B is creating an environment in which the more usual and desirable forms of communication and understanding are denied not only the heroine, but all the characters. In Lincolnshire, the uni-directional nature of Pamela's account is confirmed, as she reports her experience "journalwise" (E I, p.82; SH I p.128). Richardson is referring to the strange hybrid of Letter XXXII (E I pp.71-450; SH I, pp.111-333), possibly the longest in any epistolary novel, which mingles the introspection of a diary with the confiding tones of a letter. The formal compromise registers the unhealthy, stifled atmosphere that has been manufactured by Mr. B.

However, Pamela's letter-like journal, which extends for the length of the first part, does not go unread. Indeed, her "packets" are intercepted and devoured by Mr. B, eager for the literary possession of his quarry to compensate for the thwarting of a physical possession. His rapacious reading is instrumental in forcing him to accept her on her terms. Indeed, as her awareness of his reading of her text continues, it becomes clear that her

writing is her way of wooing him: the contrary courtship that parallels his own. It is implied that Pamela's ability to articulate her plight compellingly has much to do with saving her virtue. However, at this stage within both parts of the novel, this linguistic facility merely feeds back into her own circumstances. It is an agent of release and relief within her plot. Mr. B's resolution to deprive Pamela of a wider audience still resonates even after the couple reach terms of agreement. His interception of her writing short-circuits their didactic efficacy, as it were, returning it to sender.

The overall impression of the first part, then, despite the feeling of liberation wrought by the eventual union of the couple, is one of confinement, claustrophobia and secrecy. This is well summed up in the rather anticlimactic wedding, an edgily brief and private affair in the family chapel, with only servants and Pamela's father in attendance. The epistolary character of the first part is overwhelmingly defined by senders, finders, and keepers.

There is, however, a partial opening out of the first part in the phase following the couple's resolution to fall in love, (see [I, pp.223-26; SH II, pp.12-17). The work acquires a more episodic, reflective quality as the tension dissipates. Pamela becomes gradually acquainted with her neighbours, especially the Darnfords, and her previous adventures become a source of discussion. Moreover, the critics of Pamela's conduct and Pamela's later defences of her former conduct are anticipated in the grilling she receives from Lady Davers and Jacky. The final stages of Part I, then, initiate the debate and discussion which will predominate in the sequel. However, in the first part, these discursive features *lack* an appropriate formal context. Pamela's journal, on the whole, continues to be the sole means of communication. Her parents remain the official recipients of her daily

writings. There are slight hints of the form the sequel will take, as when Pamela agrees to send her packets to Lady Davers, (E I, p.411; SH II, p.298) and resolves to correspond with Polly Darnford. (E I, p.414; SH II, p.303).

The sequel takes up these hints, providing a broad epistolary network in which the debating initiated towards the end of Part I can flourish. As with Defoe's first part and sequel, there is a marked overlap between *Pamela: Or, Virtue Rewarded* and *Pamela in Her Exalted Condition*. Both authors give prominence to a feature only beginning to emerge in the predecessor. As Part I was about senders, Part II is about senders and receivers in equal measure. The letter network introduces the element of reply and response which was so minimally represented in the first Part. The rhythm of exchanging letters that was broken by Mr. B's activities is re-activated, but now on a much larger scale.

For instance, Pamela has extended reciprocal exchanges with Lady Davers and Polly Davers, whilst having brief communications with minor characters such as Jackey and Mrs. Jewkes. Her parents, as mentioned in the second section, are no longer the main recipients of her letters. Another feature of the network is that Pamela does not initiate, or participate in, all the correspondences. Mr. B has an exchange with Sir Simon Darnford, (E II, pp.71-79; SH III, pp.126-143), and there is a sharp epistolary exchange between Mr. B and his sister during the adultery episode, (E II, pp.336-38; SH IV, pp.240-243). Also Polly Darnford writes to her parents with the details the birth of Pamela's first child, (E II, pp.247-252; SH IV, pp.48-57).

These examples indicate the way in which the work is considering the

problems of a particular community, in contrast to the first part which dwelt upon an isolated heroine. A technical pointer to this shift of emphasis is that in Part I, if there were any letters written by other characters, Pamela would dutifully transcribe them. This ensured that any stray fragments of the narrative for which she could not be responsible, would still, as it were, go "through" her. In the sequel this transcribing function disappears.

Hence, the sequel's format displays, in contrast to the first part, a miniature society in which there is a regular flow of information and ideas. The sustained narrative of the first part is superceded by a number of interlocking epistolary dialogues. As a result, a plurality of small-scale narratives emerge, which are controlled and restrained by analytical dialogue. Thus, as with Kelly's sequel there is a breakdown of the novel into small units of story and debate. However, in Richardson's case the effect is not one of scattered fragmentation, but of an ordered separating out of aspects of collective life. This is made possible by Richardson making a considered and consistent use of a letter network, whereas Kelly was erratic and technically indecisive.

So far an impression has been given of a sequel which makes quite a radical departure from its predecessor in terms of over-arching structure. There is a fairly exact reversal of formal method between the two books. In the first part the journal method has prominence over regular epistolary exchange, and in the second part the latter predominates. In this sense Richardson's sequel complements the first part but is not organically attached to it, as Sturrock insists. Indeed the relationship between both parts can be somewhat uneasy.

The discussion now proceeds to consider some examples of exchanges within the epistolary structure as a means of gauging its effectiveness. Since the sequel's relations with Part I help to clarify its identity and intentions the first illustration will be taken from the regular defences of the first part in the early stages of the sequel. From the analysis will emerge a picture of the sequel's unifying concern with the palliative influence of reading and writing. One of the first objectives of the sequel is an assertive re-appraisal of Part I in the light of the anti-Pamelas.

It has already been indicated in the second section that Richardson counters maltreatment of his characters with subtle, reasoned rhetoric. He makes them talk or write themselves out of trouble. When dealing with explicit criticisms of the first part he offers a more finely focused version of this approach. Specific objections to the first part raised by characters within the sequel receive particular answers from other characters. There are many passages of self-defence, in volume III especially, of the sequel. Mr. B gives his own version of the first part in order to exonerate himself as best he can. (E II, pp.102-119; SH III, pp.104-213). The accusations of opportunism and money-grabbing are countered with an emphasis on Pamela's good works. A sense of continuity is suggested by the announcement that Mr. B "has made me an almoner, as I was my late dear lady's" (see II, p.50; SH III,p.86). It is also stressed that Pamela is a responsible manager of her household. However, only by considering one such instance of countering criticism, is it possible to realise that this process was by no means an end in itself within the structure of the sequel.

It is given to Lady Davers, in a letter to Pamela, to defend the heroine against the charges that Pamela's descriptions of Mr. B's attempted rapes were

thinly veiled attempts to titillate readers. Lady Davers presents three arguments in favour of the graphic nature of the descriptions. The first is that "except one had heard every Tittle of your Danger" (E II, p.27; SH III, p.44), she would have been unable to determine the strength of Pamela's resistance. Hence, the scenes had for her the double effect of dramatizing her brother's lust, and of proving, rather than calling into doubt, Pamela's virtue. Indeed, she would have been worried "if there had been any room to think he could have had you upon easier Terms", (E II, p.27; SH III, p.44).

The second argument is directed towards those who read the scenes as erotic, and is that used by Kelly in his Preface to his sequel: that such an interpretation says more about the "unvirtuous mind" (in Lady Davers's words, E II, p.27; SH III, p.44) of the reader than the ambivalence of the passages. The final argument resembles the first, but has a somewhat different emphasis, and is the most interesting:

Besides, Child, were not these things written in Confidence to your Mother? And, bad as his Actions were to you, if you had not recited all you could recite, would there not have been Room for any one who should have seen what you wrote, to imagine they had been still worse? And how could the Terror be supposed to have had such Effects upon you, as to indanger your Life, without imagining you had undergone the worst a vile Man *could* offer, and so to put a Bound, as it were, to one's apprehensive Imaginations of what you suffered, which otherwise must have been injurious to your Purity, tho' you could not help it? (E II, p.28; SH III, p.45 [(misprinted p54)].

Lady Davers helpfully sees Pamela's descriptions not as attempts to make

dramatic or, heaven forbid, erotic, capital out of Mr. B's advances but as efforts to meet the demands of logical necessity. Pamela was providing essential documentation rather than superfluous, suggestive excitement. She was forced to go as far as she did, to recite all she could recite, in order to prove that she went no further.

Lady Davers reads Pamela's accounts as issuing from an urgent need to go as far as the very boundaries of decency, rather than from a rash desire to cross them. Therefore, with the use of hindsight, she projects Pamela's language into the realms of pre-meditated, rational self-expression. Lady Davers discusses the writing in terms appropriate to the world of the sequel. The way in which she shapes and phrases her argument supports this strategy. The points are made in three assuaging rhetorical questions, each successively more persuasive. The case is put by constructing a series of interlocking and collectively irrefutable clauses. One statement balances, qualifies, or supports another, ("Bad as his actions were...if you had not...would there not have been") mimicking, in the movement of the argument, the sense of compromise that motivated the heroine. Moreover, the use of repetition and superlative, ("recited all you could recite", "had been still worse"), evokes the extremities of Pamela's predicament.

The statement "and so to put a Bound, as it were, to one's apprehensive Imaginations of what you suffered, which otherwise must have been injurious to your Purity", is especially revealing of Lady Daver's purpose. For, in a sense, she is as much "putting a Bound" on the "tender parts" of Pamela's narrative as the waiting maid herself was doing. Lady Davers is carefully setting interpretative limits. She is using casuistry to re-define the terms by which the first part should be read. She makes clear the importance of her

hermeneutical role in the phrase "one's apprehensive Imaginations of what you suffered". It is the "apprehensive Imaginations" of the discerning reader which might have been "injurious", not what Pamela might have suffered.

The argument's concluding emphasis on Lady Davers's role as a mediator serves as a pointer to the wider social and epistolary context in which the advocacy of Part I is set. In isolation the argument, adroit as it is, would indeed seem dry and unspontaneous. It would tend to support the criticisms of the book as undiluted sermonising. It is precisely the way in which Richardson makes Lady Davers's ratiocination assist his sequel as well as Part I that make it absorbing and satisfying. For Lady Davers's points, however much she tries to give them a definitive air, are made in an atmosphere of doubt. The three question marks in the above passage confirm that Lady Davers, whilst seeking to reassure Pamela about her previous writing, is herself seeking reassurance from Pamela about her powers of reasoning, her own potentialities as a writer.

The defence of Pamela's conduct is integrated into the correspondence between Lady Davers and Pamela when it is at an initial sensitive stage. Lady Davers is only just beginning to find her epistolary voice:

As to my own Part, I begin to like what I have written myself I think; and your Correspondence will possibly revive the poetical Ideas that used to fire my Mind, before I entered into the drowsy married Life; for my good Lord Davers's Turn happens not be to Books; and so by degrees, my Imagination was in a manner quench'd, and I, as a dutiful Wife should, endeavoured to form my Taste by that of the man I chose. (E II, p.34; SH III, p.55).

Lady Davers delights in the capacity for correspondence, and in turning to "Books" to transcend mundane circumstances; and this is one of the main concerns of the sequel. Yet, she is still tentative about her own

literary ability.

Pamela, however, is also a little uneasy about commencing the exchange, mentioning "a greater Delight than I can express, notwithstanding the mingled Awe and Diffidence that will accompany me in every Part of the Agreeable task" (E II,30; S/H III, p.49) Some of this "Awe" must surely stem from a consciousness of her extended audience. For Lady Davers reads all her letters to her husband, her nephew, and her friend Lady Betty. Moreover, Pamela's side of the new correspondence is complicated by the fact that her former correspondence, the "packets" from Part I are still being read and discussed by this very same group. She is concerned about how the men in this coterie, Lord Davers and Jackey, will react to the more impassioned passages from her first part, (see E II, pp. 21-22; SH III, pp. 35-36). It is to set Pamela's mind at rest on this score, to ensure that the men have responded appropriately, that Lady Davers launches on the above defence of the "warm" scenes.

In the framework of a burgeoning epistolary network, then, Lady Davers's interpretation is of crucial significance. The first part becomes a focal point for the resolving of these uncertainties. A more secure exchange of letters between Lady Davers and Pamela can be established by this kind of discussion. In defending the first part, Lady Davers seeks to reassure its writer that she has a sympathetic, although sometimes questioning, audience for her missives, and will continue to have for future ones. On her side of the dialogue, Lady Davers is able to flex her muscles as a literary critic. She is able to indicate to Pamela, not only how Part I should be read, but also how it should be written about.

Hence, Richardson actually makes a constructive use of the self-reflexive aspects of his sequel, its contemplation of its own literariness. Like Cervantes with his sequel to *Don Quixote*, Richardson incorporates the first part into the second. However, in Richardson's case, the first part is not represented as a published, acclaimed work of fiction. Within the sequel it is re-constituted into the sealed packets from which the zealous editor worked. He is thus able to emphasize that Part I needs further revision and comment in the light of its reception.

However, the critical or editorial function of the sequel is incorporated into its overall structure by making the commentary on the first part indicate in itself the value of letter-writing; its role as a means of sustaining literate, reciprocal communication and, most importantly, of problem-solving. Richardson, then, re-assesses his first part; but, in return, he expects it to serve as a case-study to aid the cultivation of finely tuned, and penned, responses to such social and ethical problems as those addressed over the course of the sequel. The way we read and write about Part I is the way in which we should generally lead our lives. In broad terms, Richardson is expanding upon the concept that Pamela's journal was instrumental to her deliverance in Part I. By constructing his sequel in a way that emphasises the discursive and sacrifices continuity of plot, he is able to illustrate extensively the relevance of writing and reading in other social contexts and thus, over its pages as a whole, to convey the idea of their efficacy in alleviating such problems generally.

Richardson, then, has made use of literary criticism within the epistolary network as a model for demonstrating the benefits of articulate debate and negotiation. Much of the remainder of the sequel seeks to

demonstrate how these qualities can be usefully developed in "the general conduct of life". The sequel is full of problem-solving at different levels of intensity or seriousness. As was shown in section (ii), the work begins with an agreement reached between Mr. B and John Andrews about the latter's role in the running of the Kentish estate. Pamela responds to the news of Mrs. Jewkes's adopting of a Christian way of life (E II, pp.46-48; SH III, pp.80-83), with a letter confirming her forgiveness of her and promising to further her religious education (E II, pp.63-65; SH III, pp.112-114). The exchange is prompted by the intercession of Polly Darnford who includes the former jailer's letter in one of her own to Pamela. It is quite common in the sequel for one beneficial correspondence to spark off, and sometimes to contain, another.

The correspondence between Polly Darnford and Pamela initiates a lively dialogue between Sir Simon Darnford and Mr. B. over the way Pamela has rebuked Sir Simon for throwing a book at his daughter's head. This epistolary discussion exemplifies the way in which Richardson gives a sharp edge to a seemingly trivial issue. In his official complaint to Mr. B, Sir Simon remarks:

...what better Use can an offended Father make of the best Books, than to correct a rebellious Child with them, and oblige a saucy Daughter to jump into her Duty all at once? (E II p.72; SH III, p128).

He also complains about Pamela upbraiding him for his use of "that dear polite *double entendre*, which keeps alive the attention and quickens the apprehension", (E II, p.72; SH III, p129). Beneath the amusing irreverence is a fundamental difference with Pamela about the values of literature and the usage of language. Pamela resents the "double entendre" because it implies ambivalence and deception rather than directness and honesty.

Richardson skilfully weaves into the argument the awkward question of the extent to which a former libertine can be trusted, even if apparently reformed. Underlying Sir Simon's objections is his request for Mr. B to intercede on his behalf. The retired rake writes to the reformed rake, thus uncomfortably reviving memories of Mr. B's past. This highlights an ambiguity in Mr. B's position. He has some sympathy with an old friend who has been patronised by the "bold slut", and yet also is trying wholeheartedly to adopt his wife's values. The tension comes to a head when Pamela questions her husband's assertion that Sir Simon is willing to change his ways, and "forget" his familiar habits:

"Ah! but, Sir, Sir...can you say he is *willing* to forget them?—Does he not repine in this very letter, that he *must* forsake them...? (E II, p.75; SH III, p35).

This questioning is awkwardly double-edged, bearing in mind that it is Mr. B who claims to have faith in such a dubious character—reformation. The awkwardness is enhanced by the setting of the discussion between husband and wife, as Pamela herself is the first to point out (see E II, p.73; SH III, pp. 131–132), in the closet where Mr. B made his first advances on the heroine.

The closet conversation, however, is fundamentally humorous, and Mr. B records for Sir Simon the way that he and his wife laughed at the old gentleman's moodiness. This gentle mockery makes room for a compromise to be reached, summed up by Sir Simon's formulation "...though I cannot be a *Follower* of her virtue in the strictest Sense, I can be an *Admirer* of it", (II, p.79; SH III, p142). Moreover, he relents and gives permission for his daughter to stay with Pamela, a planned visit that had been another bone of contention between the two households. Hence, Richardson indicates

entertainingly how letter-writing can produce balanced solutions to minor disagreements. However, underlying the good humour and apparent triviality of the debate is a sense that the resolution is not final or decisive. Uncertainty lingers over the credibility of Mr. B's conversion as he defends the dubious values of a friend in a setting which pointedly evokes his former conduct. This subtle blending of easy informal style, and gentle humour with intimations of darkness and loss of trust is almost too easy to miss. However, the sequel contains many such moments.

Hence, the particular use Richardson is making of the epistolary form in his sequel, is exemplified by the above debate. It is stressed that letters are merely the machinery for airing and resolving problems. They do not provide final answers. The letters in *Pamela* Part II recommend that communication is always better than outraged silence or protracted conflict. Issues and arguments may well re-emerge in fresh situations, and an adaptable open-mindedness is required. Indeed, the potential for reply in any correspondence, makes letter writing an ideal means by which a society can communicate with itself. For there will always be room for new ideas and solutions. It is a progressive, optimistic mode of communication. It is, perhaps, this dynamic, fluid aspect of the sequel's structure which, above all, has been played down, or neglected altogether by critics who imply that Richardson was feeding into his text a succession of fixed ideas and petty dogmas.

The crisis over Mr. B's near adultery effectively demonstrates how a matter merely hinted at in previous exchanges can become the main focus of attention at a later stage; thereby forcing a re-adjustment of perspectives and a negotiation of new solutions. The trauma starkly and vividly emphasises

that letters can only be a point of departure in restoring tranquility. They cannot be the only means of negotiation.

Indeed, during the sequence, Richardson indicates in two ways how letter-writing can be misused or abused if not supported by verbal verification and analysis or discriminating reading. After Pamela has stormed out of the room during the Countess's conciliatory visit, Mr. B retires to his closet, refusing any contact with his wife. Consequently Pamela writes to him within his own house, and he replies in like manner (E II, pp.298-90; SH IV, p169-174). Here, the frosty, formal letters between husband and wife underline a failure of genuine or useful communication. The letters set up boundaries, barriers, of the wrong kind. Only a face-to-face confrontation will help to restore healthy marital relations.

The anonymous letter Pamela receives, in which she is told that Mr. B and the Countess plan to "liue as man and wiffe" (E II, p301; SH IV, p.175), is a further example of maltreatment of the epistolary idiom. The malicious intent is deliberately associated with semi-literacy and a gross breach of literary propriety. However, of equal significance is Pamela's panic-stricken reading of the letter:

...if this letter says Truth, I know the worst: And there is too much Appearance that it does, let the Writer be who it will...(E II, 302; SH IV, p175).

Such is Pamela's heightened emotional state that she discards her powers of reasoning and discrimination, and assumes the letter to be true. She is duped by its knowing and confiding tone, and does not pause to ponder the validity of its substance.

The palliative effects of both reading and writing are, then, unsettled by the adultery sequence. Even the correspondence with Lady Davers is affected when Pamela fails to make her usual signature to a letter, merely appending the curt "P.B.". Lady Davers instantly reacts with "Why does not my sweet girl subscribe sister, as usual?". At the same time, Pamela's increasingly tense correspondence with Lady Davers is counterpointed by the suspicious exchange of letters between Mr. B and the Countess, (See E II, pp.307-308; SH IV, pp184-187). It is being suggested vividly and compellingly that reciprocal epistolary exchange in itself is not of any great significance in the context of a more fundamental breakdown of communication. When husband and wife do finally start talking (see E II, pp303-317; SH IV pp.178-201), they are thus not only trying to save their marriage, but also the validity of the book's epistolary structure.

A number of the ways in which Richardson develops and explores the epistolary network within the sequel have been now been demonstrated. The sequel emerges as a book which advocates compromise and restraint through dialogue and diplomacy, deploying its own intercession on behalf of the first part as a point of departure. However, the adultery sequence confirmed that letter-writing is not the only way of celebrating the cultivation of reading and writing within an articulate community. Indeed, in an unhealthy moral climate, letters can have a destructive as well as a cohesive effect. Moreover, an over-concentration on epistolarity would produce a closural problem. The next stage of the discussion speculates on this problem, Richardson's attempt to settle it and the role of Pamela herself in this scheme.

Referring to closure in the epistolary novel, Altman observes:

Epistolary endings move towards two contradictory possibilities: 1) the potential finality of any letter given its conventional mechanism for closing, for "signing off" and, 2) the open-endedness of the form-in which the letter writer is always in dialogue with a possible respondent, and in which any letter appears as part of a potentially ongoing sequence. (Altman, 1982, p.148).

Given the uni-directional nature of the letter-writing in Part I, closure derives from the first "possibility". There are no substantial replies to complicate or protract the extended narrative of letter XXXII. Moreover, Pamela is only formally addressing her mother and father. There is only one correspondence, rather than a plurality of exchanges, to be terminated. As Altman points out, the formal closure of Part I is signalled by the anticipated visit of Pamela's parents to Bedfordshire. The receivers of Pamela's missives are united with the sender, hence negating any need for further letters, (Altman, 1982, p.145).

However, in the case of the sequel, closure must derive from the "open-ended" aspect of letter-writing: the fact that a reply is always possible, however emphatically a letter, or even an entire correspondence, has been terminated. For Richardson deliberately explores the dialogic aspects of epistolary exchanges as an antidote to the narrative excesses of his first part and to Kelly's second part, as well as to the many criticisms of his earlier works. Moreover, he has also stressed the pluralistic features of letter-writing - its ability to stabilise a social group. As a result, multiple correspondences have been developed and followed up within an episodic narrative. Thus, closure is exceptionally difficult to enforce, bearing in mind that there is no single plot, or storyline, no single correspondence to bring to an end. Richardson had so stressed the discursive at the expense of sustained narrative that he now could not close the novel as

a whole by drawing on a conventional trope of narrative, such as death. Kelly's solution to the closure of his sequel would be utterly inappropriate. More precisely, Richardson had manoeuvred himself into a position in which a conventional closural course would be unthinkable. Indeed, Richardson's solution to his closural problem was most likely a subtle riposte to the endings of not only Kelly's sequel but those of the other sequels as well.

Richardson's creative problem with the ending of his sequel and the work as a whole is similar to Defoe's in the third Part of *Robinson Crusoe*. Defoe embarked on a didactic mission which would arrest the preceding narrative and resolve its uncertainties. However, this was not sufficient on its own to enforce overall closure. He thus made his hero's utterances and beliefs resemble his own, to such an extent that author and speaker became, at times, merged. Richardson adopts a parallel strategy. He focuses on the development of his heroine, indicating that it reaches a peak. The ending of the novel depends on creating a sensation that Pamela has completed her spiritual and intellectual journey. The first stage in this procedure is to establish Pamela's position as a detached, quasi-author figure. It has already been noted how, in the sequel, she is not consistently the centre of attention. She is not being turned into a marginal figure, or, as Sturrock argues, being replaced by Mr. B as the central figure. Rather, she is being elevated above the action, becoming more an observer and commentator in a manner similar to Crusoe in his sequel.

This new function of governing-observer is epitomised in the scene when Pamela spies through the keyhole Jackey and Polly Barlow frolicking in her own apartment. (E II, p.186; SH III, p.362). Pamela happens on a vivid version of her own situation in the first part (although Polly Barlow is perhaps a

more willing party). However, she can now direct the unfolding narrative in a manner she chooses, making full use of the authority which validates her voyeurism. The encounter between the foolish young rake and the seemingly innocent waiting-maid is abruptly interrupted and terminated with a lengthy and penetrating interrogation of Mr H helping to vitiate his desire.

The scene encapsulates the way in which the novel tends to compromise with sensationalism, letting a particular plot unfold to a certain point before it is reined in and stifled by analysis and debate. Pamela's own intrusive authorial role in this episode underlines the way the book continually resists the development of any single fragment of plot to a point of extreme confrontation and struggle. She is here trying to re-write her own past in her decisive suppression of the latent sexual activity in this episode.

By making Pamela his most vocal representative in the text, Richardson is going some way to establishing a mood of closure. For the heroine blends in with her creator to such an extent that the work which sustains her is increasingly deprived of its purposes. The more Pamela transcends her text (thereby rendering it redundant) the more closure seems to be a possibility. However, Richardson further focuses on Pamela's new status by featuring and "printing" her literary, emphatically non-epistolary, efforts. Lady Davers observes how Pamela benefits from her own "itch of scribbling", and that she has been "flint and steel too, as I may say, to yourself", (E II, p.33; SH III, p.54). The self-generating aspect of Pamela's writing ensures that it is continually exploring new avenues, seeking new forms of expression. Pamela's *an no UNCC* account to Polly Darnford that, like the "Spectator authors", she will be treating more serious subjects on a Sunday (E II, 136; SH III p. 249), is an

early indication that Pamela's exploration is taking a distinctly more public, journalistic turn. An indication of this is the way in which Pamela introduces Lord H's misdemeanours to Polly as a narrative "example" of bad conduct, in a way which resembles Addison and Steele giving accounts of individual edifying episodes.

However, the journalistic tendency is only explicitly realised in the second volume during the stay in London, the literary and bookselling centre of the country. Here also, Pamela's increased literary proximity to Richardson himself is geographically emphasised. She tries her hand at theatre and opera reviews, (E II, pp.252-258; SH IV, pp57-93), announcing to Lady Davers that they will form part of a "little book, which I will present to your ladyship, on my poor observations on all the dramatic entertainments I have seen, and shall see, this winter" (II p.262; SH IV, p.101). This exercise confirms an increasing professionalization in Pamela's writing, and indicates that she is beginning to rise above the particular concerns of the letter network she initiated. However, this point only becomes clear through her extended project on Locke's philosophical writing - a critical exegesis of his *Treatise On Education*.

In commissioning his wife to write this latest book, Mr. B states, "I confine you not to time or place", (II, p.372; S/H IV, p.298). Pamela's reviews were clearly framed by specific events within the narrative. However, the work on Locke, as Pamela indicates vaguely, "covers three or four years". It is divided into letters merely for the sake of convenience and has no tangible relationship with the other correspondences in the work. For the first time her own diurnal existence is detachable from what she writes.

To stress the point that the first draft of a book is in preparation, the Locke letters are kept within the family, and are addressed to Mr. B. Thus Pamela is now at the stage of imitating Richardson in his composition of the novel in which she figures. For *Pamela* was first seen and heard by Richardson's intimate family circle. It is a moot point whether or not Richardson over-uses the rhetorical gesture of converting his heroine into a writer in the case of her book on Locke. In making her essay so long, he perhaps loses the thread of the original novel in which it is intended to have a closural impact. The one possible justification for this exercise is that it helps to contextualise a text that is so much concerned with aspects of education, formal and informal, structured and unstructured. The "book" could be seen as the sequel's epistemological engine room.

However, Richardson, perhaps wisely, decides to end the sequel, and the novel as a whole, on a more upbeat note. Pamela, in a letter to the now married Polly Darnford (Mrs G.), recounts how she tells one of her collected *Nursery Tales* to her assembled group of infants. (II, pp. 461-71; SH IV, pp436-452). These tales are the practical and accessible product of her ruminations on Locke. By closing on an example of her educational theories being put into practice Pamela is looking ahead to a trouble-free future for her family as well as for her, now highly literate, self. Moreover, the bond with Richardson himself is sealed, since he too had published his edition of *Aesop's Fables* before commencing work on the *Familiar Letters*.

The emphasis on the future is a reminder of the coup de grace of Richardson's closural strategy. He wants to achieve a sense of tranquil and credible finality, without having to follow Kelly in descending into the vulgarities of death. In stressing Pamela's role as a published, or at least

eminently publishable author, he guarantees her an immortality in print. With this self-referential compromise, in a sequel so steeped in compromise, Richardson removes his heroine from the worldly concerns of her text, without depriving her of the dignity and promise of a productive life ahead.

By closing his book on an emphasis on Pamela's written texts Richardson, of course, sacrifices the sense of irrevocable finality that could be communicated with more common narrative figures, such as marriage and death. His own Epilogue confirms that there is a future for all his characters, as yet unexplored. He cannot, after all, deny or negate further narrative possibilities in a work which has not sought to develop beyond fixed points any particular possibilities in the first place. There will always be stories to suit whatever moral point needs to be made within the expansive fictional framework Richardson has created.

However, what Richardson does achieve is a sense that the discussion and debate has arrived at a plateau of stability, the focal point of which is the realisation of the heroine's ambitions to become an author. In an advertisement appended to the back of the sequel, Richardson indeed makes it clear that he is willing to continue his work, but this time only nominally in the form of issuing more of Pamela's published work. It stands, perhaps, primarily as a warning that Richardson is willing to compete with any future spurious continuations. This never proved necessary and finality was imposed on Richardson's partial conclusion by posterity, just as a new beginning was forced on the sequel by the pressure of historical circumstance.

Section (iv)

Conclusion

In the second volume of the *The Monthly Review*,²⁸ John Cleland reviewed another sequel concerned with the fortunes of a young couple in married life. It was the anonymous continuation of *Tom Jones* entitled *The History of Tom Jones the Foundling, in His Married State*. Cleland briefly dismisses the work itself in a few lines, and, in his final paragraph comments tersely, "saying no more of it is having said enough". He uses his review more as an excuse for some commentary on sequels in general:

The public is however, in general, so indisposed to all those second parts where the subject seems naturally ended, even where the authors themselves of the first carry them further, that they are commonly looked at in a catch-penny light. Yet there is surely much greater reason to think that an author, especially in the works of pure imagination, will keep the chain of it on, with a greater continuity of spirit, than another who only catches a story up where the original author has thought fit to drop it, and thinks to pass his continuation under favour of the good reception given by the public to the first genuine performance.

There is one consideration, that, one may presume, misleads these undertakers of superstructure on the plans of others, which is, that when a work is generally esteemed, as, for example, the history of *Tom Jones*, any thing that carries the same name, or seems to be a continuation of the work, will be in more or less request, if but for the sake of completing, and taking all in, which is wrote on the subject. But experience is generally against this presumption. The public is...rarely tempted by such superficial consideration...

The first idea, then, that naturally occurs is, that such second parts, and especially such as are known not to be the works of the author of the first, are spurious, mercenary ingraftments; so that such work must be excellent indeed, to overcome so strong a prejudice.

It would be well, then, if authors who deal in works of imagination, would consult their own interest so far as to raise a work from their own foundation, and not, like unadvised architects, run up an edifice, already completed, a story higher than it will bear; especially with borrowed, or sorry materials, which must of course fall to the ground, (Cleland, 1749-50, pp.25-26).

Much of this critique speaks eloquently for itself. It is, however, worth noting that Cleland, like Richardson, sees sequel writing, especially when the first part has been decisively completed, as a form of "ingrafting".

This chapter has examined two sequels to a first part which had, indeed, been closed satisfactorily within its own defined limits. In Cleland's terms this desire to "run up an edifice...a story higher than it will bear" is ill-advised, even when acted upon by the original author. However, the chapter has been implicitly, and sometimes explicitly, arguing that perhaps the exercises undertaken by Kelly and Richardson do not conform precisely to Cleland's observations. Firstly, they make fascinating reading simply as literary-historical phenomena: here are two opposing works uneasily handcuffed together by their compositional circumstances. However, each book in its own right makes edifying reading. Kelly's text has a frantic, cornucopian energy, which occasionally can surprise and disarm. The multiplicity of conflicting styles and techniques is, according to high literary standards, disastrous. And yet, individual features of the mosaic, as when Kelly's distorted version of Pamela confronts her own image in the mirror and upbraids herself, can be relatively refreshing.

Richardson's sequel offers a subtle, complex, and demanding read. It succeeds in elevating Pamela's story several "Stories" higher than either her own first part or Kelly's second: some would say one storey too high. However, I would argue that its quality lies precisely in its ability to confront its own nature as an "ingraftment", to concede its own artificiality, and then boldly to work this into its didactic structure. The work thrives on the interpenetration of the sequel's broad formal identity as a reply with the variety of epistolary replies which chequer the work on the local level.

Both sequels have, in their own ways, illuminated the theoretical observations of the first chapter. Kelly's text has demonstrated the ways in which an alternative sequel is likely to become reformatory, as it were, by default. The search for, what Cleland calls, "the continuity of spirit", can, and did in Kelly's case, produce wildly fluctuating results; a text which bears few traces of the original's style or tone. Indeed, it seems almost as if the work is imploding under the pressure of its search for consistency. In this context, Kelly's work provides one of the first main examples in this thesis of closure being effected through exhaustion. In this case the loss of energy was as much formal as thematic.

Richardson's sequel is reformatory in a far more ordered, and premeditated fashion. It radically re-orders the way in which the narrative of the work as a whole is structured. The alteration is determined by the need to re-orientate the work towards a more all-embracing didactic purpose. The result is an especially extreme illustration of the way in which the sequel form can be conveniently adapted to specific rhetorical purposes.

Finally, both works point to ways in which the sequel can act as a generic modulator. They reveal how modulation can be a peculiarly paradoxical process. Kelly's sequel, for instance, clings on insistently to the innovative immediacy of Richardson's first part, trying desperately to restore Pamela's journal-wise method. Yet, at the same time, it collapses into a series of ever more protracted romance-based tales. Moreover, Kelly chooses to end his text with the relatively predictable topos of death. Hence, Kelly's work tones down and moderates Richardson's achievement whilst attempting, vainly, to consolidate it.

Richardson's sequel too acts as a modulator, in the senses of both innovative alteration and restoration. On the one hand Richardson expands ingeniously on his epistolary technique, in a way which stands him in good stead for his later novels. On the other hand, he is seeking to moderate the daring content and radical implications of his first part. In tacit support of this procedure of restoring familiar values, the epistolary network is at times transcended by kinds of long-established proto-novelistic writing: journalism, heavily didactic literary criticism, and the most secure of all, the fable. It is a typical Richardsonian contradiction that he should end a sequel full of bold technical experimentation with citation of a book of nursery tales. As with Defoe, the tendency to turn is inevitably complemented by the urge to return.

In the next chapter the efforts of Cleland himself to grapple with the format of the sequel are considered within a context distinctly at odds with the taut serenity of Pamela's exaltation: that of pornography.



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby
West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ
www.bl.uk

**PAGE MISSING IN
ORIGINAL**

CHAPTER 4

"Exhausted Novelty": A Reformative sequel In a Pornographic Environment

I wrote *The Trip* in 1963 when I was in San Quentin. Whenever guys would gather like on the weekends, in the yard, in your cell...one guy would invariably say to another guy, "Hey Louie, take us on a trip".

And so...you're very lonesome. You don't have your woman, you don't have your freedom, you're just there with a bunch of men, and all these things become magnified. The things that you took for granted as a free person, once you become locked up they become more and more important, and you begin dreaming about those things...Things other people don't even think about...just become the most important things in the world.

So you'd start telling about some experience that you had...that was really exceptional...And the guys became great storytellers because of this...Everyone could just talk and talk and talk, for hours...and they're just living the whole thing with you. You talk about a woman that you love and you describe the whole sexual thing, the whole sexual trip you went on, from the beginning to the end, just like a book, like a novel...That's how you survive; otherwise you'd go completely crazy. I realised that these storytelling trips were like playing jazz. The person with the most experience and the most knowledge of words, the person who could paint the best word picture, was the best storyteller, and its the same with music. (Art Pepper, Tape recorded interview, 1 Nov. 1976).¹

Variety exhausted, indolence and, above all, my sensible experience of the futility and nonsense of the course in which I had been bewildered, had all favourably disposed me to a suspension, at least, of my follies (Cleland, *Memoirs of A Coxcomb*, p.160).²

INTRODUCTORY

In comparison with Defoe and Richardson, John Cleland was a young man when he produced his first novel. Even so, he was already 37 and approaching middle age when he began concentrated work on *Memoirs of A Woman of Pleasure*,³ or, as it has become widely known, *Fanny Hill* (the abbreviation *Memoirs*, when referring to the book as a whole, will henceforth be used). Up to this point his career can be compared to Richardson's in its consistent course, although it had been quite unlike his in substance. (Between 1728 and 1740, Cleland performed civilian and military duties in Bombay for the East India Company, and rose through the ranks to become secretary of the Bombay Council, holding the post for four years.) Moreover, on a more specific level, there are some technical and formal points of comparison between *Memoirs* and *Pamela* Parts I and II (to be noted later). However, in terms of the broad literary career which was initiated with *Memoirs* in the late 1740's Cleland begins most to resemble Defoe. With both men there appears to be an interconnection between spells of impecunity and their willingness to try their hand at all kinds of writing. As the author of prose fictions, plays, poetry, reviews, political articles, para-medical and linguistic treatises, Cleland was as versatile as Defoe.

The periodic financial insecurity of Defoe and Cleland is highlighted by the spells each spent in the Fleet Prison for debtors. Cleland's incarceration was, however, substantially longer than Defoe's 11 days in March 1713.⁴ Indeed, Cleland spent just over a year behind bars (February 1748-March 1749), suggesting that his case was rather more desperate than Defoe's. An indication of the extremity of Cleland's predicament is that he embarked on a

particularly mercenary use of his literary talents, writing a pornographic novel as a means of securing his release. So far this thesis has not encountered an example in which the conjunctions between economic necessity, the act of writing, and the location in which the writing was done have been so starkly and vividly manifested.

Before outlining the purpose and structure of this chapter I wish to clarify my critical approach to *Memoirs*. I have deliberately not offered a definition of "pornography" since such a task would be beyond the bounds of the thesis. However, I have been working with the following Concise OED definition of the word in mind:

Explicit description or exhibition of sexual activity in literature, films, etc., intended to stimulate erotic rather than aesthetic feelings.

It is the "explicit" nature of *Memoirs* which, for me at least, places it in the spectrum of the pornographic rather than that of the erotic. Recently pornography has been valuably interpreted by feminist writers as a graphic indicator of the ways in which men seek to possess and dominate women in all areas of modern life. Andrea Dworkin has approached pornography polemically⁶ and Susan Griffin has approached it philosophically.⁶ Both writers emphasise the debasing, exploitative nature of pornography.

Anne Robinson Taylor, in her *Male Novelists and Their Female Voices* reads *Memoirs* within the latter critical framework. She stresses Cleland's impersonation of Fanny as an appropriation of female experience; an attempt to maximise the potential for male fantasy.⁷ Nancy K. Miller, on the other hand, in *The Heroine's Text*, underlines, as she terms it, the "Euphoric" nature of *Memoirs*.⁸ She regards the narrative as poetic and vivacious. Moreover, she

treats Fanny as a woman independent of her author, and as a dignified, detached figure within her milieu, (see Miller, 1980, especially, p.65). I will be taking my cue from Miller's more positive feminist reading of the novel. However, I am not myself offering a feminist interpretation. Rather, I shall be concentrating on the ways in which the form of the novel is mediated by its poetic strategy. Implicit in my analysis is the point that Cleland's manipulation of language establishes a dynamic and discursive relationship with the pornographic environment. This flexible use of language, especially evident in the contrasts between the two volumes, confirms, for me at least, that *Memoirs* cannot easily be labelled as a malign example of pornography.

It is the purpose of this chapter to examine Cleland's novel as a peculiar exercise in literary prostitution, but also to emphasise the effects on the work as a whole of its being divided into two distinct parts. Here, it will be suggested, is a case of the second volume within a self-contained novel acting as a kind of sequel. Unlike, say, Volume II in Richardson's *Pamela* or in Fielding's *Tom Jones*, the second volume of *Memoirs* contrasts sufficiently with its first part for it to qualify as a type of reformative sequel. It will emerge later that it is not certain as to whether or not the second part of *Memoirs* was written after publication of the first. However, even without the historical lacuna (in which Part I is published and received), associated with previous sequels mentioned in this study, I will still be arguing that *Memoirs* Vol. II has the impact of a sequel.

This analysis will fall into two sections. First, Section (ii) of the chapter examines Cleland's strategy in writing pornography, relating it to some theoretical issues he raises in his Preface to the second part. Section (iii) examines how the second volume, acting as a sequel which enforces

decisive closure of the whole, is primed to stretch the literary strategy of the first part to its very limits. This gesture too has its theoretical implications. Whilst the immediate historical context of *Memoirs* does not shed light on its second part in an exclusive or particular manner, I still feel that some description of the background to, and aftermath of, the publication of both parts of *Memoirs* will provide a valuable point of departure for later discussion: most notably, it will support later parallels made between the economic situations of the book's author and its heroine. Hence, the first section of the chapter briefly looks at the genesis and impact of *Memoirs*. Initially a roughly chronological summary of the critical period February 1748–circa April 1750 is provided. Then, two aspects of the *Memoirs* controversy, illuminated by this overview, are discussed: Cleland's financial predicament and his professional relationship with Ralph Griffiths which salvaged him; and evidence that there was a pause between publication of Volume I and the writing of Volume II. In the light of this latter evidence, the argument for viewing Volume II as a sequel will be enhanced.

SECTION (i)

Pornography in Prison, Litigation out of Prison

Cleland's relatively successful colonial career was effectively terminated in the summer of 1741, when he was called back to England to pay his last respects to his dying father. * The return to London from Bombay seems to have blighted his prospects within the East India Company for good. The waning of his professional fortunes appears to be paralleled by a change for the worse in his financial circumstances, resulting from his father's death (September 1741). Cleland's mother inherited her husband's estate and now controlled the family purse-strings. There is evidence that she did not consider supporting her eldest son to be one of her priorities. In any event, as the decade progressed, John Cleland fell into severe debt.

On 23 February 1748, unable to supply bail, he was committed to the Fleet Prison "on charges of trespass and nonpayment of debt", as a result of the combined prosecutions of Thomas Cannon (to whom Cleland owed £800) and James Lane (to whom Cleland owed £20). One difference from the dispensation of punishment today is that, in the cases of debtors such as Cleland, a release date was not set. Cleland was behind bars, as it were, in lieu of paying bail, rather than specifically as a punishment for falling into debt. This point is significant because it confirms the extent to which the onus was on Cleland himself, apparently deserted by his family, to muster sufficient funds to procure his freedom.

The urge for liberation must have been especially strong given the

appalling conditions of life in the Fleet in the mid-eighteenth century. A semi-autobiographical description of these conditions appears in Cleland's novel *A Woman of Honour*. The inmates experienced

...penury, cold, hunger, filth, want of free air and exercise, hardships of all kinds, and especially corrosive grief for the coolness or desertion of tired-out friends, (q. Epstein, 1974, p.63).

As a means of raising money, Cleland resolved upon a peculiar variation on the prostitution that was rife all around him. He began to remould an erotic prose fiction, a version of which had apparently been in his possession for some twenty years. Apart from Cleland's own statement (to be considered in detail later) that he was re-drafting in jail, there is a bizarre item of evidence which suggests that a manuscript of his novel was in circulation in the late 1730's. In November 1737, the members of an obscure private club based in Anstruther, Scotland, held their annual initiation ceremony. It was recorded in the minutes of the evening that, as part of the festivities, "Fanny Hill was read", (q. Epstein, 1974, p. 70). It will be argued later, that, especially where the second volume was concerned, Cleland was, during his sojourn in jail, engaged in generating text from scratch to a greater extent than this tantalisingly terse record implies.

At some point during the composition of his novel, Cleland made contact with Fenton and Charles Griffiths, the brothers involved in publishing it, and some kind of bargain must have been struck. For, while Cleland was still in the Fleet, the first volume of *Memoirs* was published in late November 1748, priced 3s. and "printed for G. Fenton". (The latter is an inversion - perhaps for purposes of disguise - of Fenton Griffiths). Cleland's name does not appear on the title page. The "Second and Last Volume" appeared some two and a

half months later in mid-February 1749, at the same price, with the title page barely altered. Some three weeks later, on 6 March 1749, Cleland was released from prison.

In terms of sales figures (of which more will be said later) and of immediate public reaction, the novel as a whole (or taken volume by volume) does not appear to have had an effect which can parallel that of *Pamela I*, or *The Surprising Adventures of Robinson Cruose*. However, it may be that the work did cause an instant furor of which there is simply no record today. On the other hand, surviving legal records indicate beyond doubt that it was quick to achieve notoriety, even if there was a delay before the authorities clamped down on the work and its producers.

The contemporary legal action in which *Memoirs* became embroiled can be described as falling into two briefly separated movements. The first attempt to prosecute was initiated on 8 November 1749 when Newcastle, the Secretary of State, probably prompted by the clergy, issued a warrant for the arrest of the author, publisher and printer of *Memoirs*.¹⁰ Accordingly, Cleland found himself under lock and key once more, this time in the house of the Messenger of the Press on Dartmouth Street. Cleland, Ralph Griffiths, and the printer Thomas Parker gave statements on 13 November to Lovel Stanhope, the Law Clerk in the Secretary of State's office. That Ralph Griffiths was called before Stanhope, rather than Fenton, in whose name the book was published, indicates that Ralph was perhaps more involved in the production of the book than he ever publicly acknowledged. Certainly, his later professional relations with Cleland and his purchasing of the copyright for a later edition would support this conjecture. It is assumed by some today, as a matter of course, that Ralph Griffiths was the true first publisher of *Memoirs* and that Fenton was

used all along as a cover. ¹¹

Cleland, in fact, did not appear in person before Stanhope on 13 November but wrote a letter to him that day seeking to exonerate himself. Stanhope accepted £100 each from the three men as "recognizances" (payments of bail) for an impending appearance at the Court of the King's Bench. Unfortunately, no records appear to survive of a subsequent court hearing, or of any prosecution or punishment.

The second movement in the official action against the work was provoked by the publishing of an abridged version (the work is compressed into one volume, and all explicit scenes are excised) in early March 1750. On 15 March The Bishop of London, Thomas Sherlock, wrote to Newcastle seeking prompt action to

"...stop the progress of this vile Book, which is an open insult upon Religion and good manners, and a reproach to the Honour of the Government, and the Law of the Country". (q. Foxon, 1965, p.56).

Even the abridged version, then, was considered sufficiently inflammatory to merit further suppression of the text. On the same day a warrant was issued, once again, for the seizure of author, publisher, and printer. On 20 March, Ralph Griffiths appeared for a second time before Stanhope. However, any prosecution that may have ensued took some while to set in motion. It was not until 27 November 1750 that Newcastle wrote to the Attorney-General stating that Cleland, Griffiths and Parker, (as well as a number of other booksellers - probably those who had persisted in selling *Memoirs*) were due to appear before the King's Bench, and should be prosecuted, (q. Foxon, p.58). Despite searches by Foxon, and later Epstein, no details have been found of this scheduled appearance.

There is, then, only an incomplete picture of the earliest litigation in which *Memoirs* was involved. However, the information as it stands does indicate that the book was causing much concern. If it was not a bestseller on a par with the first part of *Pamela*, the official response to *Memoirs* surely indicates a fear of its becoming one. The initial punitive action moreover, casts a spotlight on the motivations, and milieu of exploitation, in which both parts of the novel were produced. It clarifies, for example, the reason why Ralph Griffiths enlisted Cleland to write the abridgement published in March 1750. Clearly the establishment's clamp-down on the work had influenced profits for the worse. Quite possibly, copies of the book were seized during the first arrest of the author and publisher in November 1749. (See Epstein). The expurgated edition must have represented a compromise between complying with the law and restoring maximum profitability. Thus the harsh realities of an exclusively commercially-oriented publishing escapade are thrown into relief by the legal wrangling in progress backstage.

More specifically, the controversy provides, mainly through documented statements to Lovel Stanhope, valuable insights into two aspects of the novel's historical context: the relationship with Charles Griffiths, which assuaged Cleland's poverty; and the significance of the book's division into two volumes.

Cleland's letter of self-exoneration to Stanhope, written on 8 November 1749, gives a brief account of the work's genesis, and the circumstances in which it was written, as part of an elaborate plea for clemency. (The letter is reproduced in full, Foxon, 1965, pp.54-55). The statement is laced with delicious irony, and projects an air of wounded dignity and pride which cleverly counteracts the writer's abasement. Central to his argument is the

plea that his decision to write the novel was bound up with his dire circumstances. He argues that being reduced to such measures could surely be seen as punishment enough:

In short, my offence was really of itself a very severe punishment: condemned to seek relief, not only from the meanness of writing for a bookseller, but from becoming the author of a Book I disdain to defend, and wish from my Soul buried and forgot. (q. Foxon, 1965, p.54).

Cleland's attempt to disassociate himself from his novel is, perhaps, not to be taken at face value, considering that he was trying to win a reprieve from Stanhope. Even so, Cleland may genuinely have been regretting his involvement with the work, not having fully anticipated the repercussions of publication. More revealing is the phrase, "the meanness of writing for a bookseller". It suggests that Cleland had established a specific relationship with one of the Griffiths brothers (almost definitely Ralph), which had required him to produce work on demand. "Meanness" implies that Cleland saw the liaison as degrading, and suggests that he was hardly in a position to name his terms.

There are two further allusions to Cleland's impecunity in the letter to Stanhope which confirm that any form of employment must have been gratefully received. First, there is the rather coy, understated "...being made to consider it as a ressource, I published the first part," (q. Foxon, 1965, p. 54). It seems highly unlikely that Cleland only perceived the commercial viability of his text when prompted by others. The remark is another indication of Cleland cunningly trying to distance himself from the affair whilst implicating others (in this case, the Griffiths brothers). He is much less equivocal about his role and purpose in composing the novel when he later refers to his "...Present low abject condition, that of a writer for

Bread". In regard to these depictions of his own financial state by Cleland, a point made earlier must here be reiterated: he had to create the terms of his own release. This helps to clarify the sense of pressure communicated by the locution, "being made to consider it...".

It would seem, then, that Cleland's hopeless situation was being thoroughly exploited by Ralph Griffiths and that the author gained little from the arrangement, except another spell of confinement in November 1749. This view appears to be supported by the pitiful sum of 20 guineas that Griffiths paid Cleland for the copyright,¹² prior to producing the abridged edition of March 1750. In a near contemporary anecdote it was suggested that Griffiths made as much as £10,000 profits on the book as a result of the copyright purchase. But, it is now the consensus of modern Cleland scholars that this was, however attractive a notion, a great exaggeration. After all, only 750 copies were sold of the first edition, and probably many copies from later printings were seized. However, Epstein emphasises that the abridgment probably sold well, (see Epstein, 1974, p.72).

All available evidence, then, indicates that Cleland made little direct profit from the book itself. However, it is most likely that the actual writing of the work achieved the desired effect of his release from the Fleet. It is surely no coincidence that Cleland left jail (6 March 1749) just three and a half weeks after publication of the second volume. It has been speculated by Epstein that Ralph Griffiths either paid off much of Cleland's debt, or, more likely, simply transferred it, so that Cleland now owed him the money. This interpretation of events is supported by a portion of Griffiths' statement to Stanhope in his second appearance before him (20 March, 1750), this time to explain away the abridged edition:

The examinant says his motive for asking the Favour of Mr. Cleland [ie., Cleland's composition of the abridged edition] was that Mr. Cleland owed him a sum of money & as Cleland was going abroad he thought it was the only Method to get his debt paid. (q. Foxon, 1965, p.57).

Another, more substantial, indication that Cleland derived some benefit from his association with Charles Griffiths is the corpus of reviews that Cleland contributed to the *Monthly Review* (a journal started in May 1748 and of which Griffiths was the owner-editor) between 1749 and 1774. Altogether, thirty of his reviews appeared, among them the review of the spurious sequel to *Tom Jones* cited in the Conclusion to the previous chapter.

Memoirs by no means permanently solved Cleland's debt problem. However, it did put him in a position in which he was able to control it. For it established him, through his liaison with Griffiths, on his new career as a writer.

This section now concludes by examining another aspect of the production of *Memoirs* which is illuminated by the early legal controversy: the extent to which the second part was written, and even conceived, separately from the first part. Peter Wagner, in his Introduction to the edition used for this chapter, seems to conclude (it is not altogether clear) that Cleland had a manuscript version of the whole novel to hand on his entry into prison, and that during his sojourn his work on the novel was confined to revision. (Wagner, 1985, pp.12-13). Wagner himself quotes a passage from the opening stages of Cleland's letter to Lovel Stanhope (see above) to support his case, but surely he overlooks the distinction Cleland himself makes between the two parts, in this account of the novel's genesis:

The plan of the first Part was originally given me by a young gentleman of the greatest hopes that ever I knew, (Brother to a nobleman now Ambassadour at a Foreign Court,) above eighteen years ago, on an occasion immaterial to mention here.

This I never dreamt of preparing for the Press, till being under confinement in the Fleet, at my leisure hours, I altered, added to, transposed, and in short new-cast: when, on showing it to some whose opinion I unfortunately preferred to my own, and being made to consider it as a ressource, I published the first part. And not till near four months after the Second: which had been promised, and would most surely have never have been proceeded to had I been in the least made sensible of the first having given any offence. (q. Foxon, 1965 p.54).

One aspect of this intriguing account has already been discussed above. (ie., "being made to consider it as a ressource") It remains now to assess why Cleland makes such a clear distinction between the two parts. There seems no reason to dispute that a manuscript of Part I did exist in the earlier 1730's, and this might help to explain the reading in 1737 at the secret club in Anstruther.

It is revealing that Cleland should be so keen to stress the origins specifically of the first part. And, it was exclusively "This" that he "altered, added to, transposed, and in short new-cast". There is no mention of any prior version of the second part existing before Cleland entered jail, or even before he was contracted to re-draft the first part.

There is a possible argument that Cleland did have the second part ready before the first part was published, and that Griffiths had merely recommended testing Part I in the market-place before publishing the complete text. However, if this was the case, it would not be consistent with Cleland's statement that the second part had been "promised", and then "proceeded to". "Promising", used in the context of a work of fiction, surely does not indicate its prior existence. Rather it suggests that a text is, as it were,

"in production" and will be delivered at a future date. "Proceeding with" implies, to me at least, "getting on with", even "commencing". Taken together both these verbs surely suggest that, even if Cleland had a working plan for the second part, he still had to write it. This, in my opinion, is a better explanation for the four month gap. Cleland was actually composing a sequel.

If this were the case, then it would help to explain the stylistic and structural disparity between the two volumes, which will be the subject of the next two sections. It could be that Volume II is so different from Volume I because it is a later work, conceived "above eighteen years" after the first part. The second part could be seen as the work of an older, more jaded Cleland, and this view would be substantiated by the text itself with its darker hue.

The verb "promised" evokes the figure of Ralph Griffiths. He too is a source of evidence for the separate composition of the second part. In his first appearance before Stanhope his description of how his brother Fenton had consulted him about the suitability of *Memoirs* for publication was recorded:

...some time last Winter his brother Fenton Griffith came to him and asked his advice whether it would be safe for him to Publish the said book; That at that Time there was only one of the said Volumes finished & the said Fenton Griffith giving the Examinant a discription of the said Volume the Examinant did advise him to publish it, (q. Foxon, 1965, p.53).

The first volume was published in early November 1748. This coincides with the statement that by "some time last Winter" only the first volume had been completed. The phrase "discription of the said Volume" underlines the specificity of reference to Part I. This statement surely confirms that before Cleland was admitted to the Fleet, he had no continuously-composed version of

the whole novel in his possession. Moreover, it indicates strongly that there was a clear break in the writing of the work even during Cleland's confinement.

Additional evidence for a break in composition is to be found in the Preface to Volume II itself. In general terms, it is surely significant that Cleland should choose to write a Preface to the sequel at all. It highlights the break between the two letters which make up the narrative. Moreover, as will be shown in the third section especially, it explicitly seeks to indicate how the second part should be distinguished from the first. More particularly, in the opening paragraph, Cleland gives Fanny the following apology:

MADAM, If I have delayed the sequel of my history, it has been purely to afford myself a little breathing time, not without some hopes that, instead of pressing me to a continuation, you would have acquitted me of the task of pursuing a confession, in the course of which my self-esteem has so many wounds to sustain. (II, p.129).

The details of the prefatory style will be examined later. In relation to the purposes of the current section, it is revealing to observe the presence of the word "sequel". This usage must be handled cautiously, since it is more likely to imply simply a "resumption" after a pause. However, the next two sections will be suggesting that, in his deployment of the word, through the articulate Fanny, Cleland is in effect anticipating the more familiar modern use, which connotes a detached continuation. Thematically and tonally, it will be argued, the second Volume of *Memoirs* certainly urges modern readers to pick up on the narrator's use of "sequel". And, in the forthcoming sections, I will have little hesitation in using the word to describe the second part.

Finally, other aspects of the paragraph, within the fictional framework of Fanny addressing an intimate friend about the technicalities of composing

her memoirs, support the argument for discontinuous composition. "Breathing time" implies a pause, a break from the compositional task, while "pressing me to continuation", is perhaps an allusion to pressure put upon Cleland by Ralph, or Fenton, Griffiths, to "proceed" with the work. It may even be an allusion to a popular success and demand for a second part, during the winter of 1748-49, about which there are no extant historical records.

In conclusion, whilst the story of the composition, publication, and public impact of both volumes of *Memoirs* is filled with lacunae, and is essentially incomplete, it gives sufficient data to flesh out two aspects of the historical context: first, Cleland's poverty, and his symbiotic relationship with Ralph Griffiths; second, that first part and sequel were separately composed to the extent that a reading of the sequel as a distinct literary response to the compositional problems raised by the first part is substantiated.

The next two sections, taken as a unit, will consider the two volumes of *Memoirs* as primarily complementary rather than as constituting a seamless single work.

* * *

SECTION (ii)

"As a consequence of my no-education..."

Towards the end of the former section it was indicated that Cleland raises the problem of aspects of sequel writing in his Preface to the second volume. This feature of the Preface, and the nature of the sequel, will be focused upon in the third section. The main purpose of this section is to contextualise the forthcoming close discussion of the sequel by concentrating upon the rhetoric and the idiosyncratic fictional world of the first part. At one stage, however, in order to make a point about Fanny's education, there is a glance ahead to the end of the second volume.

The analysis commences with a comment on Fanny's relations with the reader of her letters, as it is manifested in the Prefaces to the first part and sequel. This is taken as the cue to make a wider theoretical point about the parallels between different modes of exploitation which can inform pornography. It is then proposed that Cleland, through Fanny, devises his own way of coping with the problems of exploitation that are bound up with the kind of novel he is writing. This means of engaging with the demands of pornographic writing can be seen operating in miniature, as it were, in the the Preface itself. Within the text, it depends on a particular blending of the words of the older Fanny with the experiences of the younger Fanny. The way in which this rhetorical strategy influences Part I is then illustrated on the local and the global level.

Fanny's Prefaces to both the first and second parts suggest that, in a gentle, semi-humorous manner, she is at the service of her reader - a woman

similar to herself who has "too much knowledge of the *originals* themselves to snuff prudishly and out of character at the *pictures* of them", (I, p.39). It has already been pointed out how Fanny has, only after a fleeting "breathing space", sought to satisfy the impatience of her companion with a sequel. The opening of the first part is an even more uncomplaining and unequivocal utterance of obedience: "MADAM, I sit down to give you an undeniable proof of my considering your desires as indispensable orders", (I, p.39). In the context of a secure exchange of intimacies between friends, Fanny toys with a concept central to pornographic writing.

There are, of course, many types of pornography, as, for instance, the range of texts studied in Maurice Charney's *Sexual Fiction* illustrates.¹⁴ Moreover, Wagner has comprehensively illustrated the variety of modes of pornographic or erotic writing available to Cleland in his own day.¹⁵ Hence, generalisations can be perilous. However, I feel that it is possible to make one general observation about texts in which sex is depicted explicitly and repeatedly. This is that there tends to be a correspondence between the writer's wish to arouse and the reader's anticipation of becoming aroused. In fact, this could almost be taken as a defining characteristic of the sub-genre. The reader's need for gratification becomes virtually interchangeable with the writer's intention to satisfy it. In addressing her reader, of course, Fanny is indirectly including us, the voyeuristic readers, who look over her shoulder as she writes, (or, perhaps, who look over "Madam's" shoulder as she reads).

Arising from this compatibility of expectation and textual performance are specific demands made on both parties: the writer is compelled to provide constant reiterations of the sexual drama, and the reader is, as it were,

compelled to read the book in only one possible way. Hence an element of compulsion, or obligation, is introduced into the act of writing and, to an extent, of reading, pornography. The contract with the reader must be fulfilled. In the case of *Memoirs* this contractual feature is emphasised by the way in which the text is informed by two modes of mutual exploitation which parallel one another.

First, Cleland's skills as author were being exploited to the full by Ralph Griffiths, who was able to perceive, articulate, and act upon public demand for explicit pornography. He helped to persuade Cleland to see his novel as a "ressource", and encouraged him to churn out the pages. Viewed from another angle, Cleland and Griffiths were seeking to exploit a book-buying public, greedy for salacious material. There is also a parallel between the profession into which Fanny is initiated and the task of producing pornographic literature for commercial ends. Fanny's partners (barring Charles, perhaps) use her for her body but; on the other hand, she both accumulates a private fortune and gains much intense enjoyment from her liaisons.

Charney calls *Memoirs* an "entrepreneurial" sexual fiction. I would suggest that this label can have a multi-faceted application. For in the novel (or maybe "around" the novel), three forms of opportunistic relationship converge and feed off one another: the relations between narrator and reader(s); the historically bound commercial relationship between the writer and his publisher (and, in a wider sense the reading public); and the relationships between Fanny, as kept mistress and courtesan, with her parade of male partners.

Potentially, such a network of contractual ties, especially as it is configured in *Memoirs*, could drastically reduce the author's creative options. Cleland had to satisfy Griffiths commercially, his readers sexually, and Fanny herself both sexually and economically. In theory, this meant that he was severely limited in the kind of world he could create for his heroine, and the ways in which he could show her interacting with her fellow human-beings. It is no wonder, in this regard, that pornography is often described as "claustrophobic", and is often set in enclosed, confined spaces.¹⁶ Meanwhile, the reader would in turn have been faced merely with the endless reiteration of his or her required response of arousal if Cleland had succumbed to the pungent atmosphere of commercial exploitation, and heady desperation, which hovered over his endeavours like the dank air of the Fleet.

But Cleland did not kow-tow obligingly to the pressures of this milieu. Rather, he created a work which engaged in a florid, articulate dialogue with the circumstances of its own composition and production: a book striving always to transcend its historical character, but doomed never quite to succeed. The work's capacity to resist its debased origins, and depraved nature, derives primarily from Cleland's creation of Fanny the narrator; a character who must be distinguished from the younger Fanny (I will refer to the two figures mostly as the "older" and "younger" Fanny). The narrator is a prosperous, happily married mother, writing for amusement rather than money, and serenely detached from her past. Hence, the social environment from which the epistolary narrative is delivered helps the book to rise above both the setting in which it was actually written and, more importantly perhaps, the world of back-streets, back-rooms, and candle-lit liaisons inhabited by the younger Fanny.

More significant for the narrative than the source of its delivery is, of course, the voice which delivers it. For Cleland creates a repository of wonderful and varied language, a fusion of salty vernacular and elevated prose diction. The older Fanny is ever-stimulating company, forever seeking to expand and enlarge her horizons, always on hand with her repartee. She is, in a sense, a female incarnation of Cleland himself, liberating his stifled, imprisoned sensibility with her native wit and wisdom. She was the ideal prison visitor for Cleland. As part of her penetrating defence of pornographic literature, "The Pornographic Imagination", Susan Sontag resents the attempt to treat as literature only those works which appear to engage with the "human" and, equally, the urge to filter out the "inhuman". She prefers to think in terms of an "infinitely varied register of forms and tonalities for transposing *the human voice* into prose narrative", (Sontag, 1982 p.89). It is a pity that she early on rejects *Memoirs* as meriting serious attention (Sontag, 1982, p.84), and thereby misses the opportunity of tuning in to one of the most oddly resonating voices in the pornographic canon.

In the Prefaces to Parts I and II of the novel, the older Fanny appears in her most refined, purified form, suspended between the worlds of fiction and non-fiction, rather like a pantomime dame filling an empty stage with her words while waiting to be joined by the rest of the cast. Her prefatory style provides a useful preview of how her rhetoric will function in the main body of text:

Truth! stark naked truth, is the word, and I will not so much as take the pains to bestow the strip of a gauze-wrapper on it, but paint situations such as they actually rose to me in nature, careless of violating those laws of decency, that were never made for such unreserved intimacies as ours. (I, p.39).

The initial declaration, "Truth! stark naked truth, is the word" sets the tone for the remainder of the sentence. On one level, this appears to be a simple statement that all will be revealed. However, on another level, it seeks to complicate and adorn the promise of erotic revelation. The eye eagerly follows the "Truth", as it appears in splendid isolation, and then is qualified with adjectives which focus on and increase its potential to satisfy. However, the reader next abruptly collides with the word "word". "Truth" is not merely a quality of erotic revelation - it is also a "word" in itself, with its own emphasis and weight. Thus, at the very moment when the "Truth" seems to be fulfilling its semantic promise, delivering itself up to us "stark naked", we must fleetingly consider it as a linguistic entity, the stuff of poetry. Hence, Fanny is going beyond the erotic "Truth" which she summons up, to hint at what the semiotic unit itself can achieve as manipulated by her.

This attempt to tease and manipulate the reader should prepare us for the next trick in the sentence. In stating that she will "not so much as take pains to bestow the strip of a gauze-wrapper on it", Fanny manages to postpone the revelation that she will be painting the situations according to nature, and forces the eye to focus upon precisely the "gauze-wrapper" itself. It is anyway such a potent image that it floats over the remaining sentence, conspicuous by its promised absence. We are required to peel away the very wrapping that Fanny had assured us would not obscure the "Truth".

This complex, oblique approach to communication introduces an element of play into the text. Thereby the origins of the work in modes of exploitation are resisted and suppressed. The first question raised by this manipulation of language in order to conceal, or suppress the circumstances of composition

is: how did Fanny acquire her formidable linguistic skills? Before considering the effects of this style on the main text, this question will be examined.

In the Preface to Part II Fanny comments that she has been writing

...in a mean tempered with taste, between the revoltingness of gross, rank, and vulgar expressions, and the ridicule of mincing metaphors and affected circumlocutions... (II, p.129)

Fanny here describes how she has tried to steer a fine course between two stylistic extremes. On the one hand, she has sought to avoid explicit language. Her use of "rank" is echoed by Cleland in his letter to Stanhope when he stresses "my avoiding those rank words in the work..." (Foxon, 1965, p.55). On the other hand, she has also tried not to get carried away by over-fanciful language which would distract her from the main purpose of arousal.

The discrimination between the two possibilities is directed by Fanny's "taste". The main source of this "taste" is her sojourn with the pedagogic bachelor towards the end of the sequel (see II, pp.210-212). A "rational-pleasurist",

he it was who first taught me that the pleasures of the mind were superior to those of the body, at the same time that they were so far from obnoxious to, or incompatible with each other that, besides the sweetness in the variety and transition, the one served to exalt the other to a degree that the senses alone can never arrive at. (II, 211).

The phrase, "pleasures of the mind" is especially evocative, suggesting that it was in the company of the bachelor that Fanny first developed intellectual pursuits and began to acquire her formidable descriptive vocabulary. However,

she then proceeds to indicate, in a reiteration of contemporary French libertine philosophy,¹⁸ that the interaction of mind and body enhances the potential of both.

However, it is essential for a full understanding of how the narratives of both parts function to realise that it was the bachelor who "first taught" Fanny. She has had no formal education to speak of up to this point. For she applies her education retrospectively to her autobiographical account. She comments wistfully at one point that she is writing at a stage when "...all the tyranny of passions is fully over and...my veins roll no longer but a cold tranquil stream", (I, p.79). This retrospective narrative method highlights a contrast between *Memoirs* as a whole and *Pamela* Part I. Pamela's use of her education is contemporaneous with the main events in the first part. Indeed, Pamela's acquired articulacy helps to effect satisfying closure. With Fanny, on the other hand, closure is signalled by an indication that her formal education is only just beginning. Hence, Fanny's articulacy is applied to the story from an unspecified future point. Pamela's verbal skills are developed concurrently with the unfolding of the plot. In a sense, then, *Memoirs* is a more contrived, forced novel than *Pamela* I and II. For, in *Memoirs*, the action is stage-managed from above by a secure and settled Fanny.

It may be argued that Charles gives Fanny the tangible beginnings of an education as early as mid-way through the first part. "He carried me to plays, operas, masquerades and every diversion of the town...explaining everything to me", recalls Fanny, (I, p.90). He instructs her "...in a great many points of life that I was, in consequence of my no-education,

perfectly ignorant of", (I, p.90). However, this initiation is too abruptly interrupted for it to have any lasting effect. It is merely an anticipation of the more thoroughgoing tutelage to come at the end of the novel.

Therefore, I would contest that the older Fanny makes use of her formal, cerebral education to describe the experiential education that constitutes the bulk of the text.¹⁹ The older Fanny "overwrites" the younger. It is in this context that the ludic prefatory rhetoric discussed above can now be more fully appreciated. However, more importantly for the specific purposes of this section, the way in which Fanny the narrator superimposes herself on the sexual explorations of her youthful self is crucial in determining the style and structure of the first part.

Fanny, recounting her arrival at Mrs. Brown's brothel, describes herself as gulled by Martha's enthusiastic endorsement of life at the establishment, whose function is as yet a mystery to Fanny. Indeed she was at that stage

...an unpractised simpleton who was perfectly new to life and who took every word she said in the very sense she laid out for me to take it. (I, p.46).

The younger Fanny is completely literal-minded, unable to perceive any ambiguities or hidden meanings in the world around her. With her narration the older Fanny, as it were, improves on this parlous state of affairs by imposing a multi-dimensional linguistic frame of reference on the world of the relatively naive apprentice prostitute.

An example of this process in operation, in all its aspects, is provided by Fanny's first encounter with the messenger, Will, during her time as Mr.

H's kept mistress. Fanny, in fumbling with Will's breaches happens upon a "stiff hard body that my fingers could discover no end to". She eventually manages to free the penis, which is "a maypole of so enormous a standard" that it initially instils fear into her. The vision inspires her to ascend to fresh descriptive heights:

Yet I could not, without pleasure, behold and even ventured to feel such a length! such a breadth of animated ivory, perfectly well turned and fashioned, the proud stiffness of which distended its skin, whose smooth polish and velvet softness might vie with that of the most delicate of our sex, and whose exquisite whiteness was not a little set off by a sprout of black curling hair round the root, through the jetty sprigs of which the fair skin showed as, in a fine evening you may have remarked the clear light ether, through the branchwork of distant trees, overtopping the summitt of a hill. (I, p.109).

The passage is remarkable for its management of a smooth, effortless, transition between two metaphorical possibilities. Initially the image of smooth ivory, at least vaguely resembles that of the male member described. However, by the end of the long sentence, through the transformative intrusion of wisps of pubic hair, the reader finds himself (or herself) in a dark forest at night looking up through the trees at the "clear light ether". There is thus a movement outwards from describing the penis in a way which evokes its shape and feel, to picturing a topographical landscape which does justice to the less tangible feelings of amazement and wonder at the seemingly endless, sky-like space that the penis is capable of occupying.

Furthermore, the hushed, whispered delivery compounds the sense of awe. Considered as a whole, this passage exemplifies the ways in which the older Fanny builds upon and amplifies the younger Fanny's sexual encounters with layer upon layer of allusion and illusion. She provides an echo-chamber of imagery and rich, overlapping metaphor, which counteracts the essentially debased and degrading aspects of Fanny's opportunistic lifestyle.

It must be stressed, however, that the older Fanny also has a knowing, witty, and cynical side, and she is often keen to establish a mundane context for her breathless poetic excursions. For instance, Fanny's seduction of Will arises from the entirely unromantic wish to avenge herself against Mr. H for his unfaithfulness. More specifically, the above rhetorical flight has as its point of departure a vivid and amusing foreplay sequence in which Fanny tries to attract the boy to her by increasingly less subtle means, finally having to catch hold of his shirt sleeve and pull him towards her as she reclines on the couch. (I, p.108).

This confirms that the older Fanny's "tasteful" poetic strategy never seeks to deny the often distasteful particularities of the world she inhabited as a young kept mistress and prostitute. Rather, the strategy good-humouredly incorporates the banal features of everyday life, but then furnishes the younger Fanny (and her readers) with an often bizarre set of metaphorical "escape-routes" which, as the above example illustrated, can develop a life of their own.

A vital feature of these peculiar wordscapes is the way in which they play on incongruous perspectives. Penis-size is not the only feature of the fictional world to be transposed into a supra-human landscape of scales disproportionate to the context of confined sexual practices in which they figure. The sex scenes are chequered with citations of the machinery of war, of pastoral scenery (incorporating "hillocks" and "mounds"), and of floodings, the opening of sluice-gates, and drowning, to list only a small portion of the metaphorical repertoire. This kind of pervasive improvisation on the matter of Fanny's everyday circumstances has a broad effect of countering the sense of confinement, both spatial and spiritual, that is integral to her profession.

The way in which the older Fanny buoys up and eggs on the younger by literally expanding her world is neatly summed up when Fanny arrives at her new, and more humble lodgings with Charles. They are "extremely fine, though ordinary enough even at the price":

but had it been a dungeon Charles had brought me to, his presence would have made it a little Versailles. (I, p.88).

Moreover, the older Fanny's rhetorical technique of amplification and sophistication also influences the first part's temporal perspectives. The outer layer of events, made up largely of arrivals and departures or separations and betrayals, is recounted in a compressed, summary manner (although not without some effective attention to detail, and humorous observation). "I pass over a very immaterial scene of leave-taking" remarks Fanny near the opening (I, p.42) in her haste to propel the narrative towards London. On the other hand, the sexual encounters are recalled in a decorous slow-motion in which all sense of sequence or measurable time seems to be lost. The older Fanny draws the reader into this unfamiliar, dream-like world in which conventional temporal reference points are subsumed by the dislocated cadences of her extemporisations.

So far, then, the section has been suggesting that the education of the older Fanny, alluded to at the end of the novel, produces a rhetoric which is applied retrospectively to the account of her youth in London. The purpose of the rhetoric is to resist, or counter, the strands of exploitation which frame the novel. It achieves this resistance primarily by enabling the younger Fanny to transcend the commercial, exploitative aspects of her environment. It has been shown that the use of language has a concomitant effect of creating

enlarged, imaginative other-worlds for Fanny which are characterised by the distortion of spatial and temporal perspectives. At this point, the discussion will reflect further upon the disparity between Fanny as narrator and Fanny as sexual initiate, and examine briefly the relationship of this difference with the structure of the first part.

The primary reason why the deployment of the rhetoric in the first part is so exuberant and energised is that the gap between the older and younger Fanny is so wide. Although Fanny of course technically loses her virginity in the first part, and she becomes acquainted with the ways of the town, she is still a relatively gullible individual. For instance, the older Fanny recalls how easy it was for Mrs. Jones to dupe her and Charles, (see I, p.89). However, it is not so much the young woman's naivety which interests the narrator as her seemingly infinite potential to discover.

The younger Fanny, throughout the first part, is forever seeking new and exciting sexual experiences. She remains a sort of *tabula rasa* upon which her superior eagerly writes. It may be argued that towards the end of the first part, the younger Fanny has become calculating enough to seduce and initiate Will. However, it is stressed that the encounter in many ways is as remarkable and novel for Fanny as it is for the boy. This is confirmed after his second assault, which is so vigorous that he draws blood: "that monstrous machine of his...had now triumphed over a kind of second maidenhead", (I, p.112). The scene has for Fanny the impact of a "second" first time. The interaction of the younger Fanny's capacity to wonder²⁰ with the more sophisticated Fanny's fund of ornate and vivid vocabulary provides the optimum conditions for the effectiveness of the narrator's rhetorical strategy. And, as will be suggested in the next section, it is impossible for these conditions to be sustained.

Finally, the structure of the first part supports and fuels the strategy of amplifying and improvising on Fanny's initial voyage of sexual discovery. For Fanny's first year or so in London is characterised by her uncertainty of her location and destination. She is shunted, or sometimes shunts herself, from setting to setting, with no guiding principle behind the peregrinations. I am not here denying that Fanny's life progresses through set stages. Peter Wagner has noted the parallel between the novel as a whole and Hogarth's *The Harlot's Progress*, (Wagner, 1988, pp. 237-38). However, what is crucial to the tone and mood of the first part is the way in these stages are arrived at randomly. Fanny's early sexual encounters are completely unregulated; they are accompanied by a feeling that possibilities are infinite. After all, even in the relative confinement of Mr. H's hired apartment, she manages to have one of the most liberating encounters of the whole first part.

The sense of unbridled potential which pervades Part I is enhanced by the foregrounding of uncomplicated sex between young people, whose whole lives stretch out before them rather like, in the case of the men, their sexual organs. There are of course some scenes played out by older, more degenerate figures, such as Mrs. Brown. However, these are kept very much on the periphery of the narrative. By way of conclusion, I would suggest that the first part of *Memoirs* comes closest, in the novel as a whole, to evoking a "pornotopia", Stephen Marcus's term for "the imagination of the entire universe beneath the sign of sexuality".²¹ Towards the end of the first part, a change in the status of the text is signalled by Fanny's arrival at Mrs. Cole's brothel. Only in the sequel is it revealed how Fanny's idiosyncratic erotic universe is fragmented by the way in which the governing "sign of sexuality" reveals the darker side of its nature.

SECTION (iii)

"A flashy enervated enjoyment"

The purpose of this section is to make out a case that the second volume of *Memoirs* can be usefully read as a specific kind of sequel: one that so contrasts with its predecessor that it can qualify as reformatory; and one whose closural strategy, which depends on instituting a process of exhaustion, is intimately bound up with its reformatory quality. The notion of exhaustion has been introduced previously in the discussion of Kelly's *Pamela's Conduct in High Life*. So far, however, it has not been discussed in relation to a work in which both parts are written by the same author. The peculiar practice of an author deliberately draining his own fiction of energy is one which deserves careful delineation.

The discussion moves in three broad phases. There is first an examination of Cleland's own prefatory thoughts on the problem of repetition in pornography. It is then suggested that, in the light of Cleland's observations, there is a fertile two-way link between pornographic reiteration and the idea of the sequel. In the second phase it is argued that Cleland's treatment of his material in the particular sequel under discussion displays a ruthless solution to the problems of repetition he has aired in his preface. In the next stage of the second phase it is suggested that Cleland activates his idea for a sequel by introducing two new features into the narrative. It is shown, by close description of them, how they produce two specific closural impulses. It is then argued that these features promoting closure effectively

work in tandem in a way which stretches to breaking point the rhetorical strategy devised for the first part. In the third phase of the analysis some examples are given of the way in which the narrative method is thrown out of kilter. Finally, the last pages of the book are briefly discussed in the light of preceding observations.

In Section (i) a passage was quoted from the Preface to the second part which described Fanny steering a course between two stylistic extremes, and navigating with a "taste" acquired late in life. Her description of her style is offered in the context of a discussion with her interlocutor about the "extreme difficulty of continuing so long in one strain, in a mean tempered with taste...", (II, p.129). "Extreme difficulty" especially communicates the sense of pressure involved in sustaining such a perilous stylistic course. The "mean", however golden and serene a concept, will not endlessly renew itself, or do Fanny's writing for her. Fanny has to hold it in place with her own imaginative powers.

However, the specific nature of her subject-matter stretches her imagination to an almost intolerable degree. She has taken the narrative to a certain point, and now the "breathing space" before recommencing has forced her to confront directly the demands of the kind of book she has, in a sense, being trying not to write. For even her elevated rhetorical scheme, designed to flood the erotic world with a cornucopian vocabulary, must, at some point, yield to the pernicious problem of repetition in pornography. She writes to her friend:

I imagined, indeed, that you would have been cloyed and tired with the uniformity of adventures and expressions, inseparable from a subject of this sort, whose groundwork being, in the nature of things eternally one and the same, whatever variety of forms and modes the

situations are susceptible of, there is no escaping a repetition of near the same images, the same figures, the same expressions, with this further inconvenience added to the disgust it creates that the words *joys, ardours, transports, ecstacies*, and the rest of the pathetic terms so congenial to, so recieved in the *practice of pleasure, flatten* and lose much of their due spirit and energy by the frequency they indispensibly recur with, in a narrative of which that *practice* professedly composes the whole basis. (II, p.129).

Especially revealing is the phrase "there is no escaping a repetition of...", for it encapsulates the way in which Fanny has been unable to avoid the cumulative effect of constantly reproducing the same activity for the readers throughout the first part. Cleland, by way of Fanny, forces this point home by making use of emphatic repetition itself during the complaint. "The same", heavily stressed, appears three times in one line. Particularly vivid also is the evocation of her stock of vocabulary losing its potency through over-use.

The offsetting of "eternally one and the same" against "whatever variety of forms and modes" alerts us to a more general, theoretical feature of the observation. For Cleland, after all, gives Fanny these disconcertingly honest and penetrating remarks in the Preface to "the sequel of my history". The remarks and the literary form in which they appear are not unrelated. Pornography provides surely one of the most, if not the most, graphic, unqualified, model of repetition through variation in literature; in this genre is to be found the "truth", the "stark naked truth" of the technical process. This is perhaps because, so far as sex and repetition are concerned, each is the sole justification of the other. Sex could not appear in a pornographic novel without the need to repeat it, and repetition would not be deployed without the need to display sex. This absolute compatibility of a particular technique and the subject matter it treats is, perhaps, unique.

The literary sequel, of course, enacts a kind of repetition through

variation, but on a broad intertextual level. However, when it figures within a sub-genre which so depends upon, and alludes to, its own repetitiveness, the sequel's reiterative nature and functions are highlighted and called into question. There is an intense focus on the dilemma that the author faces of whether to continue in the same vein as the first part, or to change course and offer a different, although related, reading experience. In other words, in the pornographic context, the choice between a writing consolidatory or reformative sequel is especially pressing since the sensitive issue of the nature of the reader's arousal is at stake.

It would seem from Cleland's Preface to the sequel that he, through Fanny, has reluctantly agreed to offer a reiterative consolidation of the first part. On the contrary, he is subtly hinting that he is going to set in motion and accelerate the very process of linguistic exhaustion which he apparently fears. This, paradoxically, will produce a more absorbing sequel, since the terms of the narrative will be radically altered. For Cleland varies Fanny's sexual encounters in such a way that she, and we, become quite rapidly sated; and left with a sensation that she can progress no further. If Cleland had merely consolidated the exuberant narrative style of the first part by infinitely duplicating the same tropes with slight variation (a theoretical possibility), then he would have had no control or influence over when or how the narrative burned itself out, or over the point at which readers lost interest, or ceased to be aroused.

However, in his reformative sequel he is able to effect a controlled extinction of his text by hastening Fanny through the final, and bleaker, stages of her sexual education. Thus, he makes use of the sequel form to create a disturbing riposte to the ecstatic explorations of the first part. It

is suggested that the heady early days of sexual discovery can never be recovered, and the world of carnal relations is not exempt from complexities, ambiguities, and problems.

The sequel's reformatory character is prepared for by two significant changes to the narrative, both related to Fanny's move to Mrs. Cole's quarters, and which gain a closural impetus as the second part proceeds. These alterations are encapsulated in Fanny's assessment, in the final pages of Part I, of the merits and demerits of coming under Mrs. Cole's charge:

...I could not have put myself in better or worse hands in all London: into worse, because keeping a house of conveniency, there were no lengths in lewdness she would not advise me to go, in compliance with her customers, no schemes of pleasure, or even unbounded debauchery, she did not take a delight in promoting; into better, because nobody having had more experience of the wicked part of the town than she had, was fitter to advise and guard one against the worst dangers of our profession; and what was rare to be met with in those of hers, she contented herself with a moderate living profit upon her industry and good offices and had nothing of their greedy and rapacious turn. (I, p.124).

Mrs. Cole gives access to a new repertoire of sexual practices, which will enable Fanny to push her curiosity to its very limits. However, this portion of the quotation will be discussed later on, since the closural functions of the "better" aspects of life at Mrs. Cole's provide the context for understanding the full implications of the erotic variations alluded to above.

In her role as experienced adviser and protector Mrs. Cole is able to offer Fanny a degree of security that has so far eluded her. In fact, Fanny settles in the one location in "R- Street, Covent Garden", until the very end of the sequel. The primary effect of this shift to a single habitation for Fanny is to stabilise the narrative and excise the randomness of the first

part. There is no longer an infinite capacity for sexual activity fuelled by chance meetings in a variety of settings. Rather the exchanges are now determined by the particular needs of the visitors to the brothel. Thus, the onus is less upon Fanny to seek out periodically sources of income. Rather, her clients come to her, and the sexual activity becomes more integrated into a steady domestic routine. The domesticity is underlined by such phrases as "little family of love" (II, p.131), used to describe the inhabitants of the house. Fanny even refers to Mrs. Cole as "my temporal mother".

It is therefore possible to see in Fanny's new Covent Garden lifestyle a prototype for her later more settled existences, both with the bachelor preceptor and with Charles in married life. The regime of Mrs. Cole's brothel thus imposes order, and a latent sense of finality on the wayward, unpredictable first part.

There are, however, further elements of the "better" side of life at the brothel which prepare the novel as a whole for closure. In two different ways the younger Fanny becomes more detached from her narrative. First, Fanny, as she herself puts it, progresses from being "a private devotee of pleasure to a public one", (II, p.130). This is an allusion to the close-knit community of the brothel in which sex is openly celebrated, performed and discussed. The brothel is still "private" in the sense of being a secret, enclosed world. However, once inside its four walls, either as a client keenly vetted by the scrupulous Mrs. Cole, or one of her "daughters", then collective pleasure-seeking becomes the standard mode of behaviour. This atmosphere of communal enjoyment is effectively communicated by the orgy scene early on in the second part (II, pp.149-164), one of the "general parties of pleasure" (II, p.132) which form a regular part of life at the brothel.

As a result of this fresh emphasis on sex as an accepted practice within a miniature society, Fanny's earlier individual experience no longer seems so unusual or extraordinary. She does not have the privilege of being unique which she accorded to herself in the first part. Thus she is often relegated to the position of spectator or auditor, recording the stories of others: as, for example, when she transcribes the stories of Emily, Harriet and Louisa, (II, pp.134-149). Each woman records the circumstances in which she lost her virginity. The impact of Fanny's own cherished "first time" with Charles is dissipated by this evocation of the universality of the experience.

The other area in which Fanny becomes distanced from the details of her narrative is that of the relationship between her sexual performances and her need for money. In the above description of Mrs. Cole, her good-natured generosity and fairness in financial matters is stressed. Hence, she furnishes Fanny with a considerably less pressurised economic environment. As the sequel progresses, there is a diminishing sense of a tangible, or relevant, connection between Fanny's sexual explorations and her need to make money. This becomes especially evident after the death of Mr. Norbert, by which time she has accumulated a reasonable sum of money through her dealings with him (although she wrily resents that he died before he could make a will). In a state of increased financial independence she now enjoys what she terms the "friendship" of Mrs. Cole, and the latter offers Fanny assistance in finding a suitable sexual partner. However, states Fanny,

I was now in a state of ease and affluence enough to look about me at leisure. (II, p.180).

The bond between sexual relations and commercial exploitation which produced the highly charged, explosive episodes of the first part is

gradually, but irrevocably, severed in the sequel.

There is a common denominator in both the aspects of Fanny's increased detachment discussed above. Each indicates the younger Fanny adopting a quasi-authorial stance. As the spectator and recorder of events involving others she is acquiring the objectivity that can be associated with the act of writing. As a relatively free agent in the sequel, increasingly able to pick and choose her sexual encounters, she is able to pause and contemplate her own narrative with an amused interest which parallels the later retrospective recounting of it.

As the sequel unfolds, therefore, it becomes evident that the younger Fanny, in the way she experiences and responds to, the events of the narrative, begins to acquire attitudes and perspectives which correspond to those of the older Fanny. Hence, the disparity between the two figures, which was so linguistically fertile in the first part now lessens in the sequel. The younger Fanny is of course not as educated as the older, and is not as articulate. If this were the case, the retrospective framework of the account would lose its validity altogether. The more mature woman must still be able to "inform" the escapades of her younger counterpart. However, it is the case that in the sequel, the younger Fanny is far less naive. She begins to share the knowingness, and cynicism of her narrator.

This blurring of values between first-person narrator and performer, when it operates in tandem with the other main reformative feature of the sequel, strains and distorts the rhetorical scheme of Part I; as will be illustrated in the forthcoming passages of close analysis. But before this analysis commences, the second main closural aspect of the sequel must be considered.

Fanny, in the above-quoted assessment of Mrs. Cole's brothel, sees as the chief disadvantage the fact that "there were no lengths in lewdness she would not advise me to go". However much the older Fanny might affect disapproval, it is irrefutable that the variety of pleasures offered at the new establishment enable the younger Fanny to complete her experiential education in convenient and relatively comfortable surroundings. It may seem at first a quirky paradox to suggest that a profusion of outlandish sexual practices should be instrumental in enforcing the novel's closure. Surely, it might be argued, there is greater opportunity than ever before for exploration, and the novel could be infinitely protracted. However, it must be asserted in return that many of the sexual exchanges in the sequel generate a sense of exhaustion and satiety as a result of the context in which they appear. Cleland places Fanny in a fixed location in which sex is readily available and the sense of confinement minimal. Moreover, there is little prevailing pressure to indulge in sex purely to make money.

Hence, Cleland skilfully creates the optimum conditions in which Fanny will rapidly surfeit herself. There is an accelerated potential even for her eager curiosity to be sated. Moreover, as will be stressed, Mrs. Cole plays a vital role in directing and hastening Fanny towards a point of satiety by filtering out conventional sexual possibilities and presenting Fanny only with increasingly bizarre ones.

Next, by examining three main sequences (some other passages will also be alluded to briefly), it will be demonstrated how the two primary closural agents of the sequel so far highlighted, the younger Fanny's increased detachment (deriving from her more domestic lifestyle), and the exhaustion of erotic possibilities, act in combination upon the narrative. The first two

episodes are taken from the account of Fanny's relationship with Mr. Norbert, (II, pp.164-180).

Fanny's first engagement with Mr. Norbert is the product of Mrs. Cole's insistence that Fanny should "pass for a maid and dispose myself as such on the first good occasion" (II, p.130). This is not only a form of initiation ceremony into the new world of high-class prostitution which Fanny has entered. It is also, crucially, a means of obtaining a rich reward. For there are certain clients who will pay an extremely high price for the privilege of relieving a young woman of her virginity.

Fanny thus prepares to lose her maidenhead for a second time. There is an obvious parallel with her first and genuine defloration in Part I. And, the disparities between the two episodes, graphically highlight the more general contrasts between the two volumes. It is as if, with this stage-managed session, the book as a whole is beginning again on its own discomfiting terms. The younger Fanny's willingness to engage in a contrived loss of virginity is in itself a pointer to a wider loss of innocence and related enthusiasm for novel sexual experiences. A cynical, caustic opportunism replaces the capacity to wonder which so defined her in Part I. Furthermore, as far as Mr. Norbert is concerned, the encounter with Fanny will anyway have very little new to offer, since he is something of a specialist in defloration. He is a victim of

his over-violent pursuit of the vices of the town, in the course of which, having worn out, and staled all the more common modes of debauchery, he had fallen into a taste of maiden-hunting, in which chase he had ruined a number of girls. (II, p.166).

Mr. Norbert's "maiden-hunting" , then, diminishes the special significance of defloration in the canon of sexual experience by making it a last, rather than

a "first", resort. He makes a desperate attempt to recover and re-activate, through his female prey, his long-lost spontaneous enjoyment of sex. Yet, he is merely doomed to tire of each new mistress and try again with another to seek the ever-elusive satisfaction. In a sense he betokens the complex relationship that is developing between the exuberant first part and increasingly lassitudinous second.

Hence, the older Fanny is faced with the problem that both the male and female protagonists in this forthcoming drama display varieties of disillusion and jadedness. This has the effect of diminishing her opportunities, as narrator, to impose her glistening, improvised prose-poetry on the younger Fanny's actions. She no longer has free rein to extemporise on Fanny's innocence, since this is becoming vitiated with each new encounter in the more sophisticated milieu of the Covent Garden brothel. The younger Fanny has embarked on a course of action which gives her narrator less space, less room, for linguistic manoeuvre and poetic performance.

This can be initially demonstrated by comparing the preliminary stages of Fanny's first encounter with Charles and those of her engagement with Mr. Norbert. The period leading up to Fanny's escape with Charles is characterised by her eager, hungry impatience:

...every minute seemed to me an eternity. How often did I visit the clock, nay, was tempted to advance the tedious hand, as if that would have advanced the time with it! (I, pp. 74-75).

The narrating Fanny tolerantly smiles upon the antics of her youthful self. The retrospective perspective is registered by the corrective aside, "as if that would have advanced the time with it!". Yet, the distance enables the older Fanny to assist, rather than mock the younger's child-like efforts,

literally, to manipulate time. The tone zealously supports Fanny's attempts to alter the fundamentals of her situation. The interaction between the two figures brings out the humour of the girl's response to delay, whilst enhancing its genuine, elemental character.

However, the preliminaries to Fanny's meeting with Mr. Norbert are very different. They are marked by extended negotiations and wheeling and dealing by Mrs. Cole on Fanny's behalf, (II, pp.167-68). The impatience of the first part is replaced in the sequel by a forced procrastination, itself part of the strategy to extract the highest possible price from Mr. Norbert. Furthermore, the presence of an intermediary in the preparations underscores a lack of spontaneity which contrasts with Fanny's instant decision to flee from the brothel in the first part (I, 74). The older Fanny's language in the sequel is inevitably sensitive to this loss of impetuosity:

Regardful, however, of not carrying these difficulties to such a length as might afford time for starting discoveries or incidents unfavourable to her plan, she at last pretended to be won over by mere dint of entreaties, promises and, above all, by the dazzling sum she took care to wind him up to the specification of... (II, p.167).

The older Fanny herself comes under the sway of Mrs. Cole's machinations. The narrator has little option but to report the intricacies of the negotiations as coolly as possible. There is no place for flights of fancy here. Rather, the account has a clinical precision (emphasised by the mechanistic "wind him up"), tinged with a faint amusement at the duping of Mr. Norbert.

It is now not the case, in this bartering with Fanny's maidenhead, that Fanny the narrator "knows more" than her youthful counterpart. For the younger Fanny is kept fully informed, and amused, by Mrs. Cole on the progress of the deal. There is nothing here that the older Fanny can tell the younger. In

this situation, the former's range of creative options becomes greatly reduced. It is well-nigh impossible for her to impose verbal virtuosity on a subtly managed commercial arrangement.

The contrived nature of the liaison does not bode well for the older Fanny's rhetorical method during the sexual encounter itself. Her description of the naked Mr. Norbert sets the tone for the whole scene:

...by the glimpse I stole of him, I could easily discover a person far from promising any such doughty performances as the storming of maidenheads generally requires, and whose flimsy consumptive texture gave him more the air of an invalid that was pressed than of a volunteer on such hot service.

At scarce thirty, he had already reduced his strength of appetite down to a wretched dependance on forced provocatives, very little seconded by the natural powers of a body jaded and wracked off to the lees by constant repeated overdraughts of pleasure, which had done the work of sixty winters on his springs of life, leaving him at the same time all the fire and heat of youth in his imagination, which served at once to torment and stir him down the precipice. (II, p.170).

The older Fanny imposes a metaphorical structure on the description in a way that recalls the first part. Thus, the language of assault and war figures in the first paragraph, and that of seasonal change in the second. However, the stylistic contrast with Part I lies in the way in which the imagery is so confined and compressed by the object which it adorns.

For Mr. Norbert is not a figure that can sustain florid elaboration. He has a "flimsy consumptive texture". These words evoke a physical frame upon which the older Fanny can gain no secure poetic hold. She has, quite literally, very little of substance to go on. The stylistic inhibition of the older Fanny stems from the imbalance and distortion which cling to Mr. Norbert's constitution. His mind rages with sexual energy, yet his body cannot support the inflamed desire. This results in him burning himself out in an

accelerating vicious cycle. The more his body frustrates him the the more his appetite increases; and he further saps himself of his finite supply of energy.

The disproportion of mind and body is complemented by a temporal distortion. He is "scarce thirty", yet "repeated overdraughts of pleasure...had done the work of sixty winters on the springs of life". His young body is so riven that it appears to be twice its natural age. Hence the joyous play with temporal perspectives in the first part is here inverted. In Part I Fanny invoked young men who seemed to deny, or defy, the conventional demands of mortality. The strapping Genoese sailor, Charles, the messenger Will, file past the reader, like participants in a male beauty contest on Mount Olympus. They have exaggerated, seemingly infinite potential and stamina. Mr. Norbert, on the other hand has unusually and excessively limited potential. Thus, whereas the young men of the first part were depicted in terms of expansion, Mr. Norbert is depicted in terms of contraction, and compression.

In this context of frailty and emphatically finite sexual opportunity there is, then, a merging of, rather than a disparity between, what the younger Fanny actually saw and what the older Fanny is able to remember for the reader. This accounts for the precise directing of metaphor and economy of imagery in the above-quoted paragraphs. The function of amplification, so prevalent in the first part, is replaced here by one of clinical documentation, made in a terse, compact language. The descriptive process is exemplified by an attempt to arrange, and dispose information in an accessible order. First there is a brief, relatively personal paragraph, a quick reconnaissance of Mr. Norbert's capacity. Idiomatic words and phrases, such as

"doughty" and "hot service" indicate that he is being subjected to a quick contemptuous once-over.

The second paragraph is more formal. Its purpose is to exemplify the preceding, more intuitive, observations. The tone is one of offhand enumeration, stressed by the quantification of Norbert's age in two different ways ("thirty..."sixty"). There is, moreover, a careful balancing of the qualities of mind in the first half of the paragraph against those of body in the second. The steady progression of clauses of roughly uniform length enforce a measured, calm rhythm which enhances the detachment of the description.

Mr. Norbert's intensified mortality, the way in which he almost slips away before our eyes, and Fanny's response to it, is encapsulated in the phrase, "by the glimpse I stole of him". A man so much in the grip of the ravages of time, so obviously a fleeting presence in Fanny's erotic world, deserves a means of perception which matches his case. A glance, a "glimpse" implies that the object seen forms part of a broader sequencing of vision. The older Fanny is unwilling, or rather unable, to confer on this man the dignity of a more extended, concentrated way of seeing him; a way which would suspend him above the circumstances of his self-induced decline. There is a revealing contrast here with the way in which Fanny describes the naked Charles after the defloration scene in the first part, (see I, pp.81-82). Fanny is not content with stealing a glimpse in this case, but remembers "feasting my sight with all those treasures of youthful beauty I had enjoyed", (I, p.81). She proceeds to transport the body of her lover into her own artist's dreamworld in a way which would be ludicrous and impossible if applied to Mr. Norbert.

Mr. Norbert's frailty and instability in stasis gives way to a fragmentation and discontinuity in action. His attempts to besiege Fanny (II, pp.170-174), are interrupted by spells of fatigue and near-impotence on his part and feigned pain and terror on Fanny's. The desperate disjointed comedy of the exchange is captured by the way in which Fanny has to indicate to Mr. Norbert that he has succeeded in his task. Making use of Mrs. Cole's artfully concealed flasks, she coats a sponge and squeezes between her thighs "a great deal more of the red liquid than would save a girl's honour", (II, p.173). However, this furtive gesture is effected while Mr. Norbert is asleep beside her, "Tired...at length with such athletic drudgery", (II, p.172). The separating of the production of "blood" from any related sexual activity indicates a breakdown of continuity on the broad dramatic level - one which parallels Mr. Norbert's intermittent sexual performance. In comparison, the scene in which Charles first draws blood from Fanny (I, p.78) represents an unbroken stream of mixed emotions, rising to a climax during which Fanny passes out. (I, p.78).

Thus, in the context of defloration, the dramatic intensity of the first part is replaced by fumbling stage business in the sequel. Moreover, even as sexual theatre the feigned loss of maidenhead is listless and lacking in energy. After all, during the coup de grace of the whole episode, when Fanny has to make use of Mrs. Cole's prop, any possible tension is instantly dissipated by Mr. Norbert being fast asleep. At the conclusion of the episode Fanny anticipates a question from her reader:

You will ask me, perhaps whether I enjoyed any perception of pleasure? I assure you, little or none; till just towards the latter end, a faintish sense of it came on mechanically, from so long a struggle and frequent fret in that ever sensible part. (II, p.174).

Fanny encapsulates the sense of uneasy frustration of this peculiarly choreographed encounter. She highlights the lack of any mutual or reciprocal satisfaction attained between her and Mr. Norbert by pointing to a selfish pleasure which seeped over her as if by default. Moreover, as the older Fanny, she is perhaps indicating that she has gained little "pleasure" from narrating the episode. After all, nowhere in the whole sorry episode was she able to find a foothold for the kind of rhetorical improvisation that was so frequently possible in Part I. Her familiar poetic style is so stretched and manipulated by the circumstances of sexual exhaustion that it is converted into clinical reportage.

The second main sequence to be focussed upon (in less detail than the previous one) is drawn from the final stages of Fanny's relationship with Mr. Norbert. The previous episode indicated the way in which the sequel narrative can fragment into component parts on the local level. The purpose of this next example is to indicate how this tendency can also be traced on the global level, since the sequel tends, especially as the ending approaches, to emphasise the discontinuities, rather than continuities, between the two parts.

Fanny becomes Mr. Norbert's kept mistress and classifies herself as part of a group of women whose masters are "enervated by nature, debaucheries, or age". (II, p.176). These relationships, whilst inducing material satisfaction, can leave the mistresses feeling that their sexual experiences are frequently left tantalisingly incomplete. The master may only have sufficient energy to bring about "a flashy enervated enjoyment" for himself. Meanwhile, his partner has been highly stimulated but not fully satisfied. The result is that she often seeks or finds full satisfaction elsewhere. Mr Norbert would

habitually dawdle with Fanny for hours at a stretch whilst she lay naked before an open fire. If and when he finally gained an erection,

...he would perhaps melt it away in washy sweat, or a premature abortive effusion, that provokingly mocked my eager desires; or, if carried home, how faltered and unnervous the execution! how insufficient the sprinkle of a few heat-drops to extinguish all the flames he had kindled. (II, p.177).

The presentation of three alternatives, each couched in tired cynical terms, none of which are particularly satisfactory, firmly orientates this description in the uneasy world of the sequel. After one particularly frustrating evening in front of the fire with Mr. Norbert, Fanny is accosted by a young sailor, with whom she has passionate anonymous sex (II, pp.177-78). What makes this latter encounter remarkable is its juxtaposition with the account of Mr. Norbert's failings and Fanny's dissatisfaction.

For the meeting with the sailor represents a brief but ecstatic return to the language of the first part. The nautical imagery (compatible with the man's profession) in this passage is sustained right up to the point of climax in which all Fanny's "raging conflagration of desire" is "drowned in a deluge". (II, p.178). The older Fanny's talent for extended extemporisation on a particular metaphorical theme is once again, however fleetingly, required. It is needed precisely because, Fanny has briefly recovered a capacity for spontaneous, uncomplicated enjoyment. Moreover, this nautical engagement on a table at an inn, echoes the chance meetings of the first part which gave it such a liberated structure.

Yet, this meeting is curiously intertwined with Fanny's evening of hopeless titillation at Mr. Norbert's lodgings. Fanny finds with the sailor a satisfaction of the desires aroused earlier in the evening. These two scenes,

completely contrasting, yet linked by the heroine's presence in both, and the intensification of her sexual appetite, surely represent a microcosm of the relationship between the two parts of the novel. Fanny is unable to gain a complete sexual experience with one single individual, setting, or literary style. Mr. Norbert's teasing in the flickering firelight is necessary to arouse her, and the sailor's single-minded confidence is necessary to sate her. Only with the two complementary perspectives is it possible to gain a full picture of the range of sexual experience from uncertainty and exhaustion to certainty and ecstasy.

The final main episode to be discussed here is the notorious sodomitical passage. It should, however, be stressed in passing that there are other encounters in the sequel occurring before and after this one that have a particular closural force. The flagellation sequence (II, pp.182-189), for instance, has parallels in tone and style to the mock-defloration scene. Also, Louisa's experiment with the "natural" (II, pp.196-202) has a massive climactic energy, as well as having a disturbing undertow to the pleasure-seeking which conforms with the general tone of the sequel. However, the scene is more directed towards closing Louisa's portion of the narrative than Fanny's. Louisa "did not long outstay this adventure at Mrs. Cole's" and she disappears abroad with her wealthy young man, (II, p.203). It is as if nothing could now follow the explosive exchange.

The sodomy sequence (II, pp.193-196), is especially illuminating because it reveals both the final exhaustion of the younger Fanny's curiosity and a crisis point for the deployment of the expansive narrative technique which has been so stretched and distorted in the sequel up to this point. Male homosexuality has been referred to before now in the sequel, and even

obliquely encountered by Louisa after a masked ball. (II, pp.190-193).

However, for the younger Fanny it remains a mystery, the only variation of sexual experience in which she cannot herself participate, (ie., she has access to lesbian sex, heterosexual sex, but not sex between men). Hence, it is on the very periphery of her erotic world. The sodomy scene, then, suggests that Fanny is reaching the limits of her exploration of sexual variety. However, unlike in previous scenes in the sequel (discussed above), the sense of exhaustion is not registered by the language used to describe the sexual activity itself, as will be shown in a moment. There is no weariness about the way that the two men gamely grapple with one another. Rather, a sense of satiety is communicated by the reaction to the scene of the older and younger Fanny. It is the way in which the sodomy passage jars so violently with its own context that produces a sense of satiety, and compounds it, creating a mood of stunned, inarticulate finality.

Fanny is describing two men, with strong physiques in perfect working order, delighting in sex. Moreover, the younger Fanny's sense of surprise must be accounted for by attention to detail. Thus the poetry of the scene must be ornate and delicious, and it resembles the language characteristic of the first part:

Slipping then aside the young lad's shirt, and tucking it up under his clothes behind, he showed to the open air those globular, fleshy eminences that compose the mount-pleasants of Rome, and which now, with all the narrow vale that intersects them, stood displayed and exposed to his attack. (II, p.195).

The older Fanny produces an ornate rhetoric, laced with outrageous topographical metaphors, and previously reserved for heterosexual or lesbian encounters, in recounting sodomy between two men. This language is, however,

implicity challenged by the narrator herself, within the framework of her recorded reaction to the sequence:

All this, so criminal a scene, I had the patience to see to an end, purely that I might gather more facts, and certainly against them in my full design to do their deserts instant justice, and accordingly, when they had readjusted themselves and were preparing to go out, burning with rage and indignation, I jumped down from my chair, in order to raise the house upon them, with such an unlucky impetuosity that some nail or ruggedness in the floor caught my foot, and flung me on my face with such violence that I fell senseless on the ground... (II, pp.195-96).

Here there is a complete coincidence of attitude between Fanny the younger and older. The merging is enhanced by the younger Fanny's voyeuristic perspective, and her literal elevation above the action, giving her a semi-authorial stance. Hence, the narrowing of the gap in attitudes to sex between narrator and performer, precipitated by the sequel, now reaches a critical point. The younger and older Fanny are united in their rejection of male homosexuality, and in this view conform to a common eighteenth-century attitude. Male homosexuality was a capital offence at the time.²²

There is a sense that both narrator and heroine have taken the exploration of sexuality quite far enough, if not too far - to a stage at which it crosses boundaries of accepted sexual practices, even according to Fanny's bizarre norms. Thus the hysterical reaction becomes part of an attempt to impose, after the event, a disparity between the sexual action recorded and the lush language used to describe it. The older Fanny's recollection of her reaction to the sequence seeks to disable and suppress the sensual resonances and linguistic freedom of her own preceding account. The increase in pace, the hasty stage business conspire to dampen down any possible erotic response to the homosexual passage.

The sodomy sequence is significant in the way it awakens in Fanny a regret at overstepping the mark. This then produces a final realisation that the strategy of imposing ornate, liberating language on past sexual experience is only effective within certain strict parameters. It can incorporate lesbian sex, or joyous sex between healthy, resilient heterosexuals. However, in the context of frailty, accelerated mortality, or sexual variations such as flagellation, it becomes strained, and is transformed into a kind of expressive reportage. When it lights on male homosexuality it is completely rejected, like a foreign organ after a transplant operation, by the broad moral climate which Fanny inhabits.

The crisis over her poetic language, centering on a realisation of its boundaries, is encapsulated by the way in which Fanny trips and falls flat on her face. This perhaps is a symbolic reflection of the way in which Fanny, as narrator, and as voyeur, has "tripped up", or come a cropper, in her zeal for achieving a comprehensive treatment of sexual experience in all its dimensions and varieties. As the rhetorical system upon which the first part was based receives its most devastating assault, and at the point at which Fanny's curiosity has been exhausted, she lands on the floor with a thud, and is knocked into a state of stupified silence. This seems the only valid response to the impasse to which the book has been brought.

However, it could also perhaps be a way of registering a deeper shock: the possibility that as viewer, the younger Fanny, and as narrator, the older Fanny, both secretly enjoyed the homosexual sequence. It could indeed be a sense of revulsion at a stirring of pleasure within herself that causes the younger Fanny to react so abruptly, and to condemn "this so criminal a scene" in such strong terms. Certainly the rejection by Fanny of the episode

was complemented in later editions of the novel, right up to the present day, by the excision of the sodomitical passage altogether. Perhaps the later editors appeared to share Cleland's view, voiced by the older Fanny, that he had possibly written the sodomy sequence too well.

Earlier on in the narrative Fanny refers to her life at Mrs. Cole's

which I led in truth with a modesty and reserve that was less the work of virtue than of exhausted novelty, a glut of pleasure and easy circumstances... (II, p.190).

This statement neatly epitomises the formal direction of the sequel up to this point and beyond. It has been suggested that the sodomy episode is the one in which Fanny, ironically as a non-participant, experiences most decisively a glut of pleasure.

The book has reached a point where only an unqualified return to sex which is fully compatible with the older Fanny's desire to embroider and enrich the experience would be acceptable. In other words, the only possibility would be a reversion to the stylistic values of the first part. In bringing the book to a point at which it can only resort to a mode of narration whose assumptions have been challenged and undermined, the sequel enforces decisive closure on the whole.

It might well be argued that the work does indeed reinforce the values of Part I in its final pages, with the bathing orgy, the serene relationship with the preceptor, and the passionate reunion, and marriage, with Charles. However, I would argue that these scenes, taken together, constitute a valedictory coda. In explaining how Fanny developed the potential to write a novel, these scenes exemplify the sequel's role in providing a credible

context for events in, or stylistic traits of, the first part.

Memoirs, then, has two interconnected endings. The first is the troubled response to sodomy which "flung me on my face" and leaves Fanny, and perhaps us, in stunned silence. This indicates that Fanny's voyage of sexual discovery as a whole has arrived at a dead end, which only permits the revival of a previous approach to recounting her adventures. This approach is outlined in the more obviously didactic coda in which the darker, and possibly starker, world of the sequel, is cast aside in favour of a set of notes towards a beginning. Having made use of a sequel to exhaust his narrative, Cleland certainly does not deny or contradict its effects in what is apparently a reinforcement of more conventional values in his final pages. Rather, he delivers a token ending that explains how Fanny came to write such a naive, yet such a cynical, pornographic book.

* * *

SECTION (iv)

Conclusion

In the conclusion to Chapter 3, John Cleland's predominantly dismissive views of sequels were cited. He did not make a reference to his own second part to *Memoirs*, perhaps because he did not regard it as primarily a self-contained sequel. (Also, of course his review was anyway anonymous, as, officially, was his authorship of *Memoirs*). I have, however, been arguing that the second volume can be regarded as a specific kind of reformative sequel. Moreover, in its radical alteration of the style and structure of the first part, it is perhaps the only type of sequel that Cleland, according to the terms of his review, could have borne to have written. An anti-formulaic sequel which hastens the work towards its own end must surely have been palatable to an author who, to all intents and purposes, resented unnecessary or spurious protraction of narrative. I would conclude that, especially in the context of producing a pornographic book on demand, Cleland saw a need to draw his work to a close as decisively and dramatically as possible.

The next chapter will mark the close of this thesis. However, in accordance with the contrary nature of the sequel, it will, as a means of securing closure, seek initially to expand on what has gone before. There will be a transition to a new historical period, with the main concern being to look for continuities and divergences in the formal tropes already characterised. Moreover, the concluding chapter will take a leaf out of Fanny Hill's book, and at times glance backwards to the opening chapter.



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby

West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ

www.bl.uk

**MISSING PAGES ARE
UNAVAILABLE**

CHAPTER 5

Conclusions And Modifications

This was ridiculous. It was all ridiculous. Manhattan could as well have been another part of the forest, and his dignity handed over to Oberon and Puck. And handed over to them by himself! (*Zuckerman Unbound*, p.119)

The sequel to this may perhaps be reckoned highly conventional; but a sequel there is and so it must be produced (M.R. James, "A School Story").

Petite Lawyer, 26, seeks Lord Peter Wimsey to her Harriet Vane. ("Lonely Hearts" advertisement, *Time Out*, 13-20 September 1989, No.995)

Introductory

In his essay "Circles", Emerson wrote:

Every ultimate fact is only the first of a new series; every general law only a particular fact of some more general law presently to disclose itself. There is no outside, no enclosing wall, no circumference to us. The man finishes his story, - how good! how final! how it puts a new face on all things! he fills the sky. Lo, on the other side rises also a man, and draws a circle around the circle we had just pronounced the outline of the sphere. Then already is our first speaker not man, but only a first speaker. His only redress is forthwith to draw a circle around the circle we had just pronounced the outline of the sphere.²

Emerson's statement has three implications for this chapter and its intentions. First, he himself is only too aware of the resonances for literature of his concept of "ever-widening circles" (D.H. Lawrence), in his prediction of what is likely to ensue when a man "finishes a story". However, this thesis has so far been trying to establish that Emerson's observation has a particular relevance to the "work" of a sequel, its function within the literary arena. It seems worth bearing in mind this defining characteristic of usurpation or displacement, at the beginning of a concluding chapter on the idea of the sequel.

Second, the statement provides terms for describing the purpose and outline of this chapter. In the forthcoming first section some general observations are made about the preceding three chapters and the main texts discussed in them. The circumference of the circle created by the preceding analyses is thus "defined". However, this summing up is only part of the process of conclusion. It is also essential to see if the terms originated in Chapter 1 and deployed in chapters 3 to 4 can be applied more generally to

prose fictions from other periods and to works in sub-genres other than fictional autobiography. Hence, in Sections (ii) and (iii) a wider circumference is drawn around the first. Consequently there is some modification, not so much of the earlier terminology in itself, but of the way in which it has previously been applied.

I have chosen to concentrate, in Section (ii), upon three novels from the early to late twentieth century. The first is Samuel Butler's *Erewhon Revisited* (1901)³, a sequel to his *Erewhon* (1872).⁴ The second text is Dorothy L. Sayers's *Clouds of Witness* (1926)⁵ an example of a sequel within a series, and one which offers new insight into the concept of consolidation, introduced in Chapter 2. It is a sequel to *Whose Body?* (1923).⁶ The last work discussed in detail in this section is Philip Roth's *Zuckerman Unbound* (1981)⁷ a case of a sequel within a sequence, and one which offers a fresh perspective on the relationship between the sequel and fictional autobiography. It is a sequel to *The Ghost Writer* (1979).⁸

In Section (iii) the activity of expanding the circumference of the earlier circle is continued and brought to a point of terminus with a discussion of one work: David Lodge's *Small World*, (1984)⁹ a sequel to his *Changing Places*, (1975).¹⁰ This novel contains in its sphere, as it were, many of the formal characteristics noted in previous examples, both in the former section and the earlier chapters. It therefore provides a means for collecting together and focusing upon some, although of course not all, conclusions. It cannot be stressed enough that there is no precise, "text to text" correspondence between the examples referred to throughout this chapter and the main examples drawn from the eighteenth century. It is not the intention of the chapter to make specific parallels. Rather, the idea is to

indicate formal or thematic features of twentieth-century sequels which seem analogous to eighteenth-century ones. The possibility that a modern example may have parallels with more than one earlier text is therefore not ruled out.

There will be barely any emphasis in these sections on the historical contexts of the sequels discussed. It is hoped that in the previous chapters, some idea was given of how the immediate historical context can influence the form of a sequel. Rather, there is an attempt to examine, in a way which makes no claims to being comprehensive, the way in which the sequel functions in the more playful, exploratory environment of the modern (contemporary in the cases of Roth and Lodge) novel. I am of course not suggesting that the eighteenth century was a period lacking in innovation and adventure. Indeed, the use of the sequel form in the period precisely demonstrates the variety and energetic uncertainty of prose fiction in the first half of that century. Yet, there were limits to what could be achieved, simply because the process of discovery was still in its early stages. It seems essential to look at the sequel's place in a world in which the novel form has been developed in a variety of directions, in terms of form, style, and subject-matter embraced.

I have confined myself to twentieth-century examples in order to give some consistency and internal logic to the forthcoming discussions. It is hoped, however, that in demonstrating the applicability of the terms used in describing eighteenth-century sequels to twentieth century texts, a more universal applicability of the critical vocabulary will be suggested if not proven.

The third implication of Emerson's words on circles concerns the nature of the attempt in this chapter to widen the circle created by eighteenth-

century sequels in earlier chapters. Naturally, this resolution will not produce a final statement on sequels. It is more than likely that there will be later revisions of the terminology and the modes of analysis offered by this thesis, thus describing a circumference wider than the present one. This possibility will be alluded to in Section (iv). However, the main purpose of that section will be to defy Emerson and provide some last words on the sequel which will be definitive at least in terms of this study.

SECTION (i)

Opening Conclusions

In the first chapter of this thesis a broad twofold purpose was stated. First, it was intended to define the sequel, not only by providing a definition of the word "sequel", but also by providing a set of terms that would facilitate description of individual texts. The second purpose was to reach a surer understanding of the sequel's quirky and contradictory nature. In carrying out these two aims, in the course of Chapter 1 itself and in ensuing chapters, it emerged how strongly interrelated they were. The means of sequel definition feeds off the sequel's idiosyncrasies as a transgeneric form; and vice-versa. However, for the sake of clarity in summarising progress so far, the two aims will once more be treated as separate in the following paragraphs.

I see no value in reproducing the actual definition of "sequel" given in Chapter 1. As a workable definition I feel it has stood the test of close discussion in chapters 2 to 4. However, it would perhaps be useful to recapitulate the ways of describing a sequel arrived at in the first chapter and put into operation in later chapters. As a first stage it was proposed that all literary sequels fall into two categories, depending upon the ways in which they modulate the preceding part. These two categories are adjectivally constructed as the "consolidatory" and the "reformative". A consolidatory sequel, it was suggested, seeks to reinforce the set patterns, tropes, and formulaic tendencies of the first part. A reformative sequel, on the other

hand, seeks literally to alter or transform the format of the first part's narrative.

This primary method of description, focusing on the idea of generic modulation, was qualified by two further means of description. After orienting the sequel within a discussion of closure, it was suggested that a sequel could usefully be described according to the nature of its ending. For example, it may end decisively and yet promise further reiteration of the narrative in series form. It may end indecisively and indicate forthcoming development within a sequence pattern. It may end in such a way as to discourage any further continuation by the present author or anyone else. A third means of description assists in highlighting the individuality of a particular sequel. It relates not to the way in which a sequel ends, but the way in which it reaches its ending, a slightly different matter. The third method relies on the two pivotal terms "expansion" and "exhaustion".

Finally a description of a sequel could be further qualified by reference to the motifs which recur in sequels generally and which cut across the above formal boundaries. Examples are "multiplication" (present in all three main eighteenth-century examples), "contextualisation" (present in *Pamela* Part II), and "reply" or "riposte" in which the values of the first part are implicitly challenged by aspects of the sequel (this is most evident in *Pamela* Part II).

With the aid of the terminology outlined above it was possible to characterise the three main texts in ways which will now be reiterated. *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* was termed a consolidatory sequel which reached an uncertain conclusion by means of expansion. *Pamela* was termed a reformatory sequel which reached a point of tranquil suspension by means of

expansion. *Memoirs of A Woman of Pleasure* Volume II was described as a reformatory sequel which reached a definite conclusion by means of exhaustion.

I would now like to propose for this chapter a modification of the way in which the terminology is deployed. The main texts have so far been defined in a way which maximises clarity and certainty. The intention was to state as decisively as possible what kind of sequel was being analysed. Moreover, the descriptions are not fundamentally incorrect in relation to terms set out in the first chapter of the thesis.

However, one means of qualifying the descriptions yet further has been reserved until this concluding chapter. The qualification is concerned with the ambivalent nature of the sequel, its ability to embrace two or more different possibilities for the development of its narrative. That is, a sequel may suggest that it is taking a reformatory and a consolidatory path. It may reveal traits of exhaustion as well as expansion. Reflection and debate could be combined with a dependence on formulaic reiteration. For example, *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* reiterates the narrative pattern of Part I but in such a self-questioning and doubtful way that the book at times borders on the reformatory. The second volume of *Memoirs* deliberately sets out to exhaust its potential. At the same time Fanny inhabits a community which is suggestive of expansion. The sequel's capacity to contain apparently contradictory possibilities surely derives from its dependent nature. It both pays homage to the world of its predecessor and must depart from it in some significant way.

What tends to ensue is that the double or multiple perspectives are not sustained in equal measure throughout the sequel. One or other narrative

orientation is foregrounded or becomes prominent, and this is the way in which the relationship with the first part is finally determined. Hence, a sequel might be described as mainly consolidatory or reformative. It might lead to conclusion primarily by means of exhaustion. In the preceding chapters of this thesis, this implication within the descriptions of alternative directions has been overlooked in order to communicate the central or governing principles behind a particular sequel.

In the examples considered below, I will pay more attention to the ways in which a sequel can, as it were, hold within its sights two or more narrative possibilities, ultimately establishing one as predominant. This refinement of the previous approach is perhaps especially compatible with the experimental, and sometimes playful, qualities of the twentieth-century examples.

Two general conclusions about the nature of the sequel, which will have some bearing on the ensuing discussions, are now offered.

The three main eighteenth-century sequels were all contributions to fictional autobiographies. The representation of the span of a human life is a particularly useful vehicle for demonstrating an important facet of the sequel's nature: its capacity to re-think, re-appraise, and revise preceding fictional material to which it is linked by a continuity of character, plot, theme, and setting. Often in a person's life the first experiences of youth are repeated in different contexts in later years. An older, more fragile, Robinson Crusoe finds himself isolated off the coast of Bengal in a way which recalls his earlier desolation on the island. Pamela's attempt to convert Sir Simon Darnford is a miniature version of her former efforts to alter Mr. B.

Fanny Hill's feigned loss of maidenhead grimly echoes the genuine encounter with Charles. In demonstrating this particular mode of repetition through variation the sequel comes into its own. Its ability to offer a fresh perspective on the past is highlighted.

The second main observation concerns the sequel's capacity to focus upon, and give the reader access to, the creative processes involved in producing fiction. The overbearing presence of the first part forces the writer and reader alike to concentrate upon how the sequel is being constructed. Again, fictional autobiography proves valuable in illustrating the particularities of this enhanced awareness of backstage activity.

For all three central characters in the novels studied are writers, chroniclers of their own lives. In this context, the actual author's problems in producing the sequel are integrated into the world of the fiction itself. Hence, an abstract area of unease over how to sustain the narrative becomes a concrete concern of the text itself. The central character's writing is highlighted as a subject of the autobiography. This is most evident in the case of Pamela who actually becomes a publishable author. However, both Fanny Hill and Robinson Crusoe additionally experience formalisations of their authorial roles in their sequels. Crusoe's duties as a historian come to the fore, and Fanny strives to monitor and record the daily life of her new community. Moreover, in the second volume of *Memoirs*, Fanny traces how she acquired her ability to write.

Fictional autobiography, then, has proved a helpful means of illustrating in specific terms those features of the sequel which allude to the processes of fiction making, and to the roles of writing and writers in particular.

There will be particular reference to this feature of the sequel in the coming discussion of *Zuckerman Unbound*, a modern-day incarnation of fictional autobiography. However, it is hoped to show, by reference to the other texts, that this emphasis on backstage activity is a feature common to sequels which figure in sub-genres other than fictional autobiography.

These above conclusions concerning the naming and nature of the sequel will now be enlarged upon by discussing three twentieth-century texts.

* * *

SECTION (ii)

A More Flexible Use of Terminology

In the fourth chapter it was shown how the values of a trouble-free pornotopia were questioned and undermined by a sequel which displayed a darker side to sexual relations. The sense of disillusionment was created by suggesting that exuberant sexual activity has its natural lease of life. Exhaustion of curiosity and, in some cases, of physical capacity is inevitable. Intimations of immortality in the first volume were usurped by vivid images of mortality and decay in the second.

Butler's *Erewhon* represents a non-pornographic utopia, and its sequel, *Erewhon Revisited*, both reconsiders the values of this utopia and develops it historically. There is a technical parallel with Cleland in that exhaustion plays a part in this process of transformation. However, the action of closure in *Erewhon Revisited* is more complex and double-edged than that of Cleland's pornographic novel. For in Butler's text two alternative closural gestures are interwoven, one exhaustive, the other expansive, to constitute an idiosyncratic reformative sequel.

At first it would appear that the sequel is solely driven by Higgs's desire to return to Erewhon. (In this discussion Higgs Snr. will be referred to simply as "Higgs", and Higgs Jnr. as "John"). As with Crusoe, Higgs's homecoming in 1872 leaves him with a lingering restlessness which finally prompts him to set out again after his wife's death. Arowhena's death, "not so much from active illness, as from what was in reality a kind of *maladie du*

pays' (ER, p.201), exacerbates Higgs's remorse at taking her from her native land. The combination of a wish to revisit Erewhon in order to make amends, as it were, to his dead wife, combines with an eager curiosity to satisfy his curiosity, once and for all, about the progress of his discovered country. He is soon in the grip of an obsession, as his son John reports:

...his passionate longing for the journey became so overmastering that nothing short of restraint in prison or a madhouse could have stayed his going. (ER, p.202).

After a gap of 18 years, then, Higgs departs for Erewhon in 1890. He makes a series of discoveries during his sojourn which create a sense that his encounter with the country has been completed. The most significant discovery (in terms of the sequel's structure) is that he has unwittingly created an Erewhonian family which parallels his English one. Within hours of his arrival at the statues he meets his illegitimate son George, (see especially ER, p.232). The strong bond that Higgs develops with George, and the highly charged reunion with Yram, (ER pp.338-39) reassure Higgs that, although he cannot settle permanently in Erewhon, he has made a lasting and definable contribution to the country's destiny. Hence, finality is communicated by the suggestion that Higgs has learnt all he can from, and given all he can to, the country within the confines of his life. The valedictory nature of the visit is enhanced by its relative brevity (barely a month compared to the unspecified number of years for the first visit). Indeed John is surprised by how soon his father returns (ER, p203).

The decisive and final-seeming nature of the trip is signalled by the periodic bouts of weakness, the symptoms of accelerated physical and mental decline to which Higgs, now an elderly man, is prone. "You are not much

changed, but you look haggard, worn, and ill" are Yram's first softly spoken words to Higgs on her prison visit (ER, p.338). The "strange giddiness and momentary loss of memory" which precede Higgs's lunch with the mayor are described by John as marking the onset of "serious brain exhaustion", (ER, p.352). He is hastening towards a death which coincides with, if not a deep contentment, at least feelings of reassurance, as well as the more certain knowledge of his contribution to Erewhonian developments.

The images of Higgs's decline are potent, and it is only too easy to read them as indications of the mode of closure for the novel as a whole. However, they merely help to define and limit Higgs's experience. As will be indicated, the fictional world encompasses more than Higgs's personal vision of it. The sequel is as much about the history of Erewhon as it is about Higgs's limited interaction with it. Thus the narrative only contains an element of exhaustion. This is counterpointed by stronger and more distinctive formal features which pull the narrative in an expansive direction. It will now be argued, then, that in *Erewhon Revisited* a utopia is redefined, but in a way which transcends exhaustion.

There is a strong early indication that Higgs's death should not be taken as closing the novel in all its aspects. Higgs's death, in June 1891, is vividly described in the opening chapter of the sequel (ER, pp.205-206). This positioning of a conventional ending at a book's opening could indeed be seen as a typically Erewhonian inversion. The event is naturally reiterated at the end (II pp. 369-70) but has token significance. By that stage it is merely reinforcing the impact of the initial description. The proleptic account of Higgs's death is surely a signal that the sequel has other equally pressing, if not more pressing priorities than the last days of Higgs.

The placing of Higgs's demise at the opening of the book does not exactly diminish its significance. But it establishes an emphasis on what follows the death. The bulk of the narrative is retrospective and records the final year of Higgs's life. Yet, as a posthumously compiled and written account it can more easily incorporate events beyond Higgs's own life, and anticipate a future beyond the novel as a whole.

The prospective qualities of the sequel are underlined by the fact that it is narrated by John, Higgs's son. He recomposes from his own frantically jotted notes his father's fragmented and elliptical story (see ER, pp.204-207), thereby giving it an individuality and independence from the first part. The pattern of variation through continuity delineated by first part and sequel is here enacted in the transfer of the narrative from father to son. A sure sign of the robust autonomy of John's account is that his father is not adopted as the sole source for the text. In recounting the compromise reached to ensure Higgs's safe passage out of Erewhon, John states that "the knowledge of what ensued did not reach me from my father", (ER, p.335). By now he has begun to rely as much on George's testimony as Higgs's. This hints at the way in which Higgs's story is being integrated into a broad, expansive (rather than exhaustive) historical framework.

The switch to a new narrator, one younger and fresher even than the narrator of the first part, is an indication that the narrative will be reformative in a way which includes, but supercedes, the exhaustion of Higgs. This more positive, forward-looking aspect of the reformative sequel is revealed in two related ways.

First, the narrative style of *Erewhon Revisited* contrasts, at times

markedly, with that of *Erewhon*. The former has a fresher, even racier, feel. There is greater deployment of informal dialogue in the sequel which generates a lighter tone. This alteration is imposed on the sequel at the outset with the witty sparring between the two professors and Higgs on his arrival at the statues, (ER, pp.215-218). Amusing social comedy is also in evidence at Yram's dinner party, (ER, pp.247-255). Here fragmentary snippets of conversation are cited out of context in order to mock their banality:

Miss Bawl to Mr. Principal Crank: ... "The manager was so tall, you know, and then there was that little mite of an assistant manager - it was so funny. For the assistant manager's voice was ever so much louder than the ... [extract terminated by Butler at this point] (ER, p.253)

The greater emphasis on casual conversation in the sequel is only one aspect of its more overtly dramatic nature. A source of suspense throughout the work is Higgs's decision to penetrate *Erewhon incognito*. His secret identity highlights his vulnerability to the factional infighting currently prevalent in the country. The tension reaches its climax in the Dedication sequence when Higgs interrupts Hanky's sermon (ER, p.317). This kind of episode stresses the contrast with the first part, in which exposition and analysis tend to predominate (although there are some tense moments at the outer extremities of the the narrative of *Erewhon*).

The change in tone and narrative technique, creating a tighter, more concentrated text than *Erewhon*, helps to enforce the second main alteration to the world of the first part. For the *Erewhon* of the sequel is more human than that of the first part. The informal, only too ordinary, exchanges between characters tend to diminish the uniqueness, the quirky dreamlike qualities of the country as revealed in *Erewhon*. Giving his verdict on Higgs's proposal

of self-sacrifice as a means of abolishing Sunchildism. Dr. Downie points out that it is too late now for the Erewhonians to revert to previous practice:

This...is a counsel of perfection. Things have gone too far, and we are flesh and blood. (ER, pp.355-56).

Although mortality is not exactly denied in the first part, it tends to be obscured by concentration on the "world of the unborn", (E, pp.115-120). In a sense it is the sequel's broad purpose to modify the cerebral intensity of Erewhon and stress that its inhabitants are indeed made of "flesh and blood".

Hence, in the sequel the resemblances between Higgs's world and Erewhon are brought to the fore, just as in Part I the contrasts were stressed. Sunchildism has a part in effecting the transformation. However, its influence lies not so much in the specific doctrine it produces (although this does create a set of alterations to the Erewhonian belief-system not touched upon here) as in its function as a religion which parallels Christianity. The adoption of a distorted version of Christianity, in effect a parody of it, brings about social behaviour, based on Higgs's own deportment, which parallels closely in its conventions that of the England from which Higgs has just departed.

Many of the peculiar reversals of the first part are, as it were, corrected in the sequel. There is now no longer any attempt to deny chronology so as to try to make time stand still, and watches are freely worn (this is one of the first changes that Higgs notices [(ER, p.213)]). The possibility that Erewhon has had a history and is beginning to set it in motion once more is therefore acknowledged. As part of the historical process, machines are once more accepted, as is the concept of a vocal proletariat (Hanky warns of

the "materialistic tendencies of the artisans", (ER, p.315)). Moreover, with the recognition of a currency which has a relational value within an international context, rather than an arbitrarily and independently imposed value, Erewhon confirms its identity as a nascent nation state.

On the broad scale, then, Erewhon is gradually being forced to compromise with its own utopian nature. From the very day of his first arrival at Erewhon in Part I, Higgs initiated a historical movement which is vitalised by his escape. However, the development is one which far outreaches his own contribution to the sequel narrative, and it is clearly going to stretch far beyond the boundaries of John's account following his father's death. The book closes with Erewhon, in George's words, "at sixes and sevens" (ER, p.388). It is teetering on the brink of civil war, and the king has proposed that it can only be saved if it is annexed by England.

Hence, Butler is peering ahead to the undoing of his utopian vision as Erewhon is speeding at an exponential rate into the modern world. The extent to which Erewhon is losing its privileged identity is epitomised by the increasing closeness of the two brothers. The final sentence indicates that John is hastening towards George, in the first year of the twentieth century, to offer him some pragmatic English advice on the modernisation of Erewhon. The work concludes, then, on a note of some uncertainty, anticipating a future which even the prophetic Butler could only speculate upon.

I would, therefore, argue that *Erewhon Revisited* cannot be read purely as Higgs's story, with its sense of finality and completion. Nor, on the other hand is it exclusively a return to Erewhon with little emphasis on Higgs. He is, after all, thought of as the Sun Child. The work is in fact a reformative

sequel which primarily represents Erewhon as expanding outwards historically. Yet, at the same time, a moving personal history is incorporated, and concluded by means of exhaustion. These accounts are so interwoven as to produce a sequel with two complementary endings. The first is the death of Higgs, signalling decisive closure, whilst the second, and more forceful conclusion is the departure of George, indicating room for further continuation of the narrative. In describing this sequel, then, apparently contrasting terms have to be applied in order to give a full picture of it.

Butler believed that the after-life consists of a human being living on through a combination of the remembrance and activity of those that he or she has left behind.¹¹ This philosophy of immortality is expounded by Professor Gurgoyle in *Erewhon Revisited* in his pamphlet, "The Physics Of Vicarious Existence", (ER, pp.269-276). The sequel can itself be read as a literary exemplification of the belief. Higgs, the father lives vicariously through his son; the first part lives on through the second. Butler, then, in the same way that Richardson used the sequel form to demonstrate his advocacy of compromise, deploys a sequel to exemplify a particular strand of his thought.

*

Dorothy L. Sayers did not seek to make such virtuosic and ludic use of the sequel form. Her primary purpose in *Clouds of Witness*, the second novel in the Lord Peter Wimsey series (1923-1937), was the reinforcement of the glittering fictional world created in the first novel *Whose Body?*

Defoe's *Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* was treated in Chapter 2 as a consolidatory sequel, because it reiterated a narrative formula of

topographical and spritual oscillation. However, it is fruitless trying to locate one single formula which will unite the Wimsey series, for Sayers avoided delivering situations and plots which could be easily compartmentalised. Thus a qualification of previously used sequel terminology is once again required. The following discussion tries to illustrate briefly some of the ways in which Sayers tried simultaneously to expand upon, and consolidate, her fictional world, with the emphasis on the relationship between *Whose Body?* and *Clouds of Witness*. It will be suggested that the formulaic features of her narratives ultimately predominate and the expansive features acquire a mainly decorative function.

In a letter to Gollancz, in which she outlined the kind of detective fiction she preferred to write, Sayers remarked:

I am always afraid of getting into a rut, and like each book to have a slightly different idea behind it.¹²

This indicates a general intention to resist formulaic writing. Indeed, in comparison with the neat patterning of Agatha Christie's Hercule Poirot series, Sayers is successful in varying each book within the Wimsey series. Her "new idea" may involve a fresh way of presenting and unravelling the events which lead to a death. Or, it may involve the meticulous construction of an unusual, and educative, backdrop to a case. For instance, in *Clouds of Witness*, the reader is given a wealth of detail about the procedural niceties which bear upon the trial of a peer before the House of Lords (see especially, *Clouds*, p.111). There is always an effort to supplement the mechanics of the plot with a colourful context.

Furthermore, there is less attempt to conceal the murderer's identity

than in Christie's novels. Sayers is more concerned with Wimsey's detection of "why" and "how" a murder, or suicide, occurred than with "who" perpetrated the act. Sayers's Wimsey novels are, in this respect, more analytical and less dependent on the effects of surprise than Christie's novels in series.

Sayers's wish to write detective fiction that could not be easily classified is also indicated by the construction of the Wimsey series according to a loose sense of chronology. The books do not have to be read in any particular order and so cannot be described as constituting a sequence. However, there is a progression from Wimsey's days as a confirmed bachelor, in the earlier novels, to his courtship of and marriage to Harriet Vane described in four later works, starting with *Strong Poison* (1930). Wimsey's fictional biographer, his uncle, Paul Austin Delagardie, notes how the relationship has mellowed Wimsey (WB, p.202).

Sayers's desire to create circumstances which will force her hero to change over the years is encapsulated in two subtitles. The sub-title to the first American edition of *Whose Body?* (the first novel in the series) was: "The Singular Adventure of the Man With the Golden Pince-nez".¹³ It clearly roots the novel in the detective fiction genre by alluding to a vital, although bizarre, clue in the case. However, the last novel in the series, *Busman's Honeymoon* (1937), has the following sub-title: "A Love Story with Detective Interruptions".¹⁴ This sub-title emphasises a transition into a fictional world in which Wimsey's flair as an amateur detective is only called upon intermittently. The romantic development in his life now has priority.

However, Sayer's imposition of chronology and her efforts at modulating her use of a popular genre can be overstressed. She took little trouble to

conceal that she was writing the Wimsey novels primarily for money, (see Hitchman, 1975, p.85). She could surely not afford, in every sense, to overcomplicate or distort her fictional world. To confuse Wimsey's public might have been the first step towards losing it. Despite Sayers's efforts to modify Wimsey's character Janet Hitchman notes only "slight physical variations". Apart from these,

...Wimsey scarcely alters through thirteen books and fifteen years, in spite of the fact that Dorothy conscientiously adds to his age. He is supposed to have been born in 1890, which would have made him 48 when the last book appeared, a little old for marriage, and almost a pensioner by the time his third son was born. (Hitchman, 1975, p.89).

The attempt to impose historicity on the narratives is compromised by their formulaic demands. Lord Peter ages technically but not perceptibly in terms of behaviour, physiognomy, or psychology. In other words, the elaborate contextualising and attention to detail decorate the conventional or predictable features of the novels, but do not transform them.

This point will now be elaborated upon by reference to the relationship between *Whose Body?* and *Clouds of Witness*. It was suggested earlier that it is not essential to read the books of the Wimsey series in any particular order. This generalisation could be revised by the suggestion that, where certain texts within the series are concerned, a sequential reading is necessary for a full and serious critical appreciation. This qualification would certainly apply to the internal sequence concerned with the affair between Wimsey and Harriet Vane. However, it must also surely apply to the first two works in the series. For, the second novel acts as the sequel which confirms and consolidates the world of *Whose Body?* It helps to establish the patterns and narrative motifs which prepare the ground for a series. In other

words, *Clouds of Witness* has a definitional role within the series, and a reading in order of composition will clarify this role.

Sayers herself wittily establishes a sequential connection between the two novels. Lord Peter is luxuriating in Corsica at the opening of the sequel:

After his exertions in the unravelling of the Battersea Mystery, he had followed Sir Julian Freke's advice and taken a holiday. (CW,p.9)

The statement suits both readers who have read *Whose Body?* and those who have not. The latter group are notified that this book should be looked upon as a form of continuation, simply through the reference to a former mystery. Those who have read *Whose Body?* initially are rewarded with the delicious irony that Sir Julian Freke gave his casual advice to Wimsey prior to going on trial for murder. This treatment of those who have already absorbed *Whose Body?* indicates a concern on Sayers's part that the function of *Clouds Of Witness* as a sequel should be properly understood.

However, what is especially significant is that those readers unfamiliar with *Whose Body?* would have no means of being able to share the in-joke about the distinguished neurosurgeon and calculating murderer. No plot details have been given away. Thus, the nature of the sequential relationship is signalled neatly to both groups of readers. There will no interconnection of plot between the two books.

Rather, the sequel consolidates the fictional world of its predecessor. Before examining the consolidatory aspects of the sequel, I would like to examine the ways in which it expands upon and contrasts with the first novel in order to establish an identity of its own.

First, the nature of the case in *Clouds of Witness* differs markedly from that of *Whose Body?* The latter was a clever variation on the "whodunnit" involving two bodies rather than one. The work represented an ingenious plan for the perfect murder devised by one of the medical profession's finest brains. *Clouds of Witness* offers a strong contrast. The basis of the story is not murder, but a suicide which, through a concatenation of coincidences, comes to look like a murder.

Moreover, Sayers goes to much trouble in establishing a fresh motivation for the deed. Sir Julian Freke was consumed with a lifelong sexual jealousy. Denis Cathcart, who takes his own life in *Clouds of Witness*, is driven to the act by a recognition of the failure of his own life. Sayers's painstakingly reconstructs Cathcart's character and background (See especially CW, pp. 97-104), demonstrating that Cathcart's loss of his beloved mistress, Simone Vonderaa, to a wealthy American is only the culminating point in a life which has been wrecked by the First World War. Sir Impey Biggs sums up Cathcart's predicament in his summing-up speech before the House of Lords:

"Like thousands of other young men, he went gallantly through those five years of strain and disillusionment, to find himself left, in the end, with his life and health indeed, and, so far, happy beyond many of his comrades, but with his life in ruins around him". (CW, p.259).

Hence, the motivation for the suicide has only superficial resemblance to Freke's motivation in *Whose Body?* (Both men are touched by thwarted sexual passion) Meanwhile, the evocation of the war and its long-term financial and psychological effects establishes an autonomous and convincing historical context for the sequel.

Other aspects of the sequel reveal that Sayers is trying to expand the

milieu of her first part. The predominantly rural setting in the sequel contrasts with the largely urban, metropolitan milieu of *Whose Body?* There are also episodes set in Paris and New York, introducing an element of glamour and sensation to Wimsey's world. This topographical expansion enables Sayers to broaden Wimsey's repertoire as an indefatigable hero, especially with his thrilling (and unusual at the time) last-minute dash over the Atlantic with the vital evidence that will save his brother. (CW, pp. 241-47).

Finally, Sayers seeks to make the sequel independent of *Whose Body?* by giving *Clouds of Witness* a wide intellectual and literary frame of reference. There was some attempt to give *Whose Body?* a scholarly background by sketching in Wimsey's bibliophilic interests (WB, pp.12-13), occasionally footnoting the text (WB, p.158), and by making the murder the culmination of years of study and applied thought (WB, p.183). This hint of a learned and informative context in *Whose Body?* becomes a predominant feature of the sequel. Many chapter titles are quotations from the literary canon and all have one or more epigraphs.¹⁵ The epigraphs range from aphorisms delivered by distinguished figures in public life (for example, Lady Astor, p.113), to quotations from fairy stories, from other detective fictions (CW, p.126), from the poetry of Donne (CW, p.158), the novels of Dickens, (CW, p.57) and from Shakespearean tragedy, (CW, p.256). By contrast, the chapters in *Whose Body?* are untitled and lack epigraphs.

Moreover, apart from Wimsey's regular attempts to illustrate the poetic and literary implications of his predicaments through recitation, the author strives to place Cathcart's suicide on an elevated plane of high tragedy. In the course of his summing-up Sir Impey Biggs cites Racine and Shakespeare in quick succession in order to evoke effectively Cathcart's frame of mind during

his final hours, (CW, p.250).

However, I would suggest that Sayers's careful construction of an intellectual framework in the sequel does not transform its reiterative features. Rather, it creates an elaborate and colourful context for a reassuring and consolidatory fiction. Listing all that he finds objectionable about the Wimsey series, Julian Symons concludes with a comment upon Lord Peter's much-vaunted learning:

All this might be more endurable if Wimsey ever appeared to have the knowledge of history, antiques, music, gastronomy and other matters that he is said to possess, but these qualities are asserted rather than demonstrated... ¹⁶

Whilst I do not fully agree with Symons's dismissive account of Sayers, I feel that he here makes a point which could be applied to all her attempts to expand on her fictional world. The expansive features are "asserted" but do not fundamentally alter the world's security and reassuring qualities.

Lord Peter exudes perfection and he can never be too deeply touched by the imperfections of the world around him. Any attempt to vary his environment or to complicate his character can only be so much filigree. Hence, the sequel's primary purpose is to reinforce Wimsey's character and the patterns of behaviour and language which make it so appealing and reassuring. This aim is initially achieved by confirming that Lord Peter has a set method in approaching a case and seeking a solution. As in *Whose Body?* he is determined, at first, to examine minutely every detail of the site where the body was found. His monocle, through which he scrutinises everything with a clinical eye, plays a key role on such occasions in both first part and sequel, (see WB, p.17 and CW, p.50). Such appendages as his monocle, and his

stick which doubles up as a ruler (the "Detective's vade mecum" as Wimsey calls it) help to establish both Wimsey's theatricality as an eccentric gentleman and his method as an amateur sleuth.

The procedural parallels between first part and sequel are also evident in the division of labour between Wimsey, Parker and Bunter. The techniques employed by all three men in *Whose Body?* are established as set patterns in *Clouds of Witness*. Wimsey is the imaginative thinker who makes inspired connections, but who can be lazy in covering the groundwork of a case. Parker is the patient dogsbody who compensates for Wimsey's sloth and is always willing to dirty his hands in search of the smallest clue. It is Parker, in *Clouds of Witness*, who goes to Paris to research every aspect of Cathcart's residency there whilst Wimsey stays in England playing with various hypotheses. It is Bunter's duty to collect forensic evidence and interview the servants. His flirtatious conversation with Ellen in *Clouds of Witness* (CW, pp.67-69), parallels his inquisitive chat with Sir Ruben Levy's housekeeper in *Whose Body?* (WB, pp.51-54).

If the sequel, by means of reiteration, clearly sets out Wimsey's working method and the way it combines with the duties of those in his entourage, it also consolidates an even more vital aspect of his immediate environment: the relationship with Bunter. The master-servant bond is a haven of mutual support and congratulation. It confers on each book in the series a warm, sensual glow. Bunter's faultless coffee-making, his scrupulous washing, shaving, and dressing of his master preserve Wimsey literally as a gleaming, larger-than-life creation. *Clouds of Witness* generously offers a profusion of details about the intimate bond that is to sustain the whole series. Sayers lovingly choreographs their every intimacy, as when, for example, breakfast is served

one morning:

Lord Peter was awake, and looked rather fagged, as though he had been sleuthing in his sleep. Mr. Bunter wrapped him solicitously in a brilliant Oriental robe, and placed the tray on his knees. (CW p.82).

Finally, the most important aspect of Sayers's consolidatory scheme in *Clouds of Witness* is to re-affirm the character and voice of Lord Peter himself. In general terms this affirmation is effected by devising a case which centres upon Wimsey's own family. This enables Sayers to give a more comprehensive picture of his aristocratic background than in *Whose Body?* Moreover, a cast of minor characters is created, who will lend substance to later books in the series. Wimsey's redoubtable mother, the Dowager Duchess, figures prominently in the sequel, and is described as "living heroically in furnished lodgings" (CW, p. 81) in Northallerton during her son's internment there. The highly strung Mary, Wimsey's sister, appears for the first time in *Clouds of Witness*. She is destined to become Parker's bride in a later novel. And the Duke of Denver's innocuous friend Freddy Arbuthnot (who has been described as a "twenties silly-ass type"; Hitchman, 1975, 92), makes his entry into the series. Hence, a gallery of characters is established in the sequel. These are all individuals who, being of Wimsey's class, give him maximum potential to perform.

More particularly, Wimsey leaves an indelible imprint on the narrative through his irrepressible good cheer and ceaseless flood of high-pitched commentary on all that he encounters. Especially striking is his unexpected storming of the gloomy Sunday morning breakfast at Ribblesdale after the inquest:

The door waltzed open. "Mornin", dear old things, said the newcomer cheerfully. "How are you all? Hullo, Helen! Colonel, you owe me half a

crown since last September year...Well, Mr. Murbles, how d'ye like this bili-beastly weather? (CW, p.39).

The use of "waltzed" signifies that Sayers herself is smiling upon this stage-managed early morning call. She relishes her creation's irreverence, his refusal to conform to the mood of gloom and despondency, his ability to be impervious to circumstances that would drag others down. The emphasis throughout the sequel on Wimsey's unassailable good humour and capacity to survive anything and everything, confirms that his author's purpose was primarily consolidatory.

This section has so far tried to indicate the value of a more comprehensive application of terminology to individual sequels. In previous chapters the main formal direction of the narrative was carefully depicted. This was perfectly adequate bearing in mind that various permutations of the sequel in prose fiction were being introduced. It is hoped that the above two examples have demonstrated that a sequel can often embrace alternative formal possibilities apart from the one that inevitably predominates. Thus, *Erewhon Revisited* is a reformative sequel which mainly progresses by means of expansion. However, it also integrates into its narrative the exhaustion, literal and metaphorical, of Higgs. *Clouds of Witness* is a consolidatory sequel whose character is determined by its reassuring, reiterative qualities. It also, however, incorporates a vivid expansive quality which manifests itself in the work's broad intellectual and topographical frames of reference. However, in contrast to *Erewhon Revisited*, the expansive facets of Sayers's sequel cannot transform or "reform" the narrative of the first part. The impulse to consolidate the gains of the first part is simply too strong. Hence, the expansive aspects take on a secondary, largely decorative, role.

This point is surely underlined by the fact that there is no imaginative interaction with the wealth of literature proudly cited in the sequel. The engagement is purely on the relatively superficial level of quotation.

*

Citation has a far less comfortable, and comforting role in *Zuckerman Unbound* than it has in *Clouds of Witness*. For Zuckerman has been stormed by a trauma, the epicentre of which is that he feels only able to cite, and is besieged by citations of, his own most recent literary effort. In the aftermath of his first major literary triumph, one which promises liberation, an "unbound" existence, Zuckerman's literary range of reference is drastically delimited. Before examining the relation of this dilemma to the sequel form, some background to the forthcoming discussion is offered, partly as a means of indicating how I shall be tackling the sequel.

With *Zuckerman Unbound* this thesis makes a return to the realms of fictional autobiography, the sub-genre to which the main eighteenth-century texts belonged. (For reference purposes, a check-list of Roth's "Zuckerman" novels up to and including *The Facts* is provided in note 22 to Chapter 1). There are some points of contrast between Roth's approach to this sub-genre and the approaches of Defoe, Richardson, and Cleland which are relevant to the ensuing analysis. The three eighteenth-century authors produce texts in which the protagonists are the writers of their own lives. However, their roles as surrogate authors essentially illuminate their other, non-literary activities. Robinson Crusoe is primarily a travelling merchant and Fanny Hill primarily a prostitute. Pamela becomes a semi-professional author, but only in a way which illuminates her roles as devoted wife and mother, and as the

preceptress of her aristocratic community. The literary abilities of all three figures, then, helped them to negotiate the world around them.

In Roth, the emphasis on the authorial role as represented in the fiction itself is rather different. Roth creates a set of fictions in which Nathan Zuckerman engages with his world through, or by means of, his engagement with his author. This interaction is made possible by the fact that Zuckerman, like Roth, is an established writer. With author and hero sharing the same professional territory, the possibilities for Roth to exploit and play with exaggerations, distortions, or diminutions of himself are maximised. Hence, Roth's fictions are considerably more playful and flexible inventions than the main eighteenth-century examples.¹⁷ This creative stance, as will be indicated, ensures that a Roth sequel is "bound" to defy straightforward descriptive approaches. Furthermore, it also ensures that "fictional autobiography" becomes too reductive a term to describe either the Zuckerman sequence in particular or the Roth oeuvre in general.

Before proceeding further, then, the term "fictional autobiography" must be qualified in order to incorporate Roth. In a broad sense, Roth writes "fictional autobiography", in that his male protagonists,¹⁸ most notably of course Zuckerman, are versions of himself. This emerges strongly in his first-person narratives, such as *Portnoy's Complaint* and *The Professor of Desire*. However, he also writes in the third person, and in his most recent novel, *The Counterlife*, he deploys a multiple-narrative technique. And, more relevant to our discussion, both *Zuckerman Unbound* and *The Anatomy Lesson* are third-person narratives. Technically these two last-mentioned novels are not fictional autobiographies. Rather they stand as contributions to a broad, multi-volume, fictional biography of Nathan Zuckerman which also happens to be

autobiographical, as it relates to its author, Philip Roth.

The distinction is complicated, as is inevitable in Roth's particular hall of mirrors, by the fact that Zuckerman, the subject of Roth's biography, is himself a writer of autobiographical fictions. Nonetheless, especially in the context of the sequel to be discussed, it is essential to make some kind of distinction, however makeshift, between Roth's biographical writing about Zuckerman, and Zuckerman's professional writing, which resembles Roth's own.

This brief background sketch of Roth's relationship with fictional (auto)biography indicates that a single text within the Zuckerman sequence responds best to a combination of two approaches. First, it must be examined from the vantage point of Roth himself as a controlling author re-orienting his hero, and viewing him in each book through yet another set of perspectives. Then, a text can be read from the vantage point of Zuckerman, a wayward yet brilliant figure who dramatises and anatomises the problems of living life as a perpetrator of fictions (in the particular and general sense). It is only when these approaches are merged, or at least related to one another, that the richness and multi-faceted nature of a Zuckerman novel begins to emerge. This dual approach is best clarified through discussion of *The Ghost Writer* and *Zuckerman Unbound*.

It has been noted before in this thesis, and in this chapter, that a sequel can be characterised in terms of its intensity of focus on one particular preceding book. A first part has a number of implicit and explicit relations with a variety of texts none of which has great prominence over another. A sequel may well also display a profusion of intertextual

relations. However, these are overshadowed by the tight bond with the first part. The relations with the prior text, as it were, require all the sequel's attention. A sequel then embodies a movement from a widely focused, inclusive spectrum of allusion and reference to other literature, towards a narrowly focused, exclusive spectrum of reference. Roth and Zuckerman, with the bravado and showmanship only to be expected of their double-act, produce a stimulating variation on this concept in *Zuckerman Unbound*.

Zuckerman is, to all intents and purposes, Roth's creation, although Zuckerman might well, at times, prefer the statement to be the other way around. Accepting for the moment that Roth is the puppet-master, then *Zuckerman Unbound* plays a crucial role in affirming Zuckerman as a central character in the Roth fictional world. It is possible to find traces of Zuckerman in the constantly self-questioning and perpetually questing David Kepesh of *The Professor of Desire*. And the obsessive, cracked laughter of Portnoy (the hero of *Portnoy's Complaint*) is sometimes echoed by the only slightly less desperate Zuckerman. The traces of Zuckerman to be found in these protagonists solidify into a concrete character in *My Life As a Man*. Here Zuckerman is represented as the somewhat idealistic creation of the author Peter Tarnopol. Thus Zuckerman makes his debut in Roth's fiction within the "Useful Fictions" of another of Roth's fictional alter egos.¹⁹

The Ghost Writer, with its emphatic first-person narration, establishes Zuckerman as a figure in his own right. Yet, even in the book devoted to his early twenties (the work is set in the late 1950's but recalled ten years later by a more jaded Zuckerman), Zuckerman has to share the stage with the meticulous Lonoff, the distressed Hope, and the enchanting Amy Bellette. It is only in *Zuckerman Unbound* that Zuckerman emerges as a strongly defined

character at the very centre of the novel. He has no Lonoff to revere, no Amy Bellette to recreate in his imagination, and no Hope to placate. The focus is unrelentingly upon Zuckerman.

Hence, *Zuckerman Unbound* defines *The Ghost Writer* retrospectively as the first part in a sequence concerned with the fortunes of an American Jewish novelist. The sequel marks the culminating point of a progression within Roth's fiction from the earliest novels towards the creation of a definite, reproduceable, fictional version of himself. Hence, the sequel's function of narrowing the intertextual range of a work emerges in the way that Roth steadily adapts his fiction to incorporate the Zuckerman ego. The progression is especially evident in the titles of first part and sequel. *The Ghost Writer* is ambiguous. It appears mainly to refer to Amy Bellette, but could also be alluding to Nathan's "ghosting" of Amy's post-war experience. *Zuckerman Unbound*, on the other hand, with the heavy stress on the "Z" sound, states that Zuckerman has been given pride of place in the Roth canon.²⁰ It is the only title to a Roth novel to include the name "Zuckerman". Hence, the pivotal role of this sequel within the Zuckerman sequence is confirmed. Roth will be making full use of the sequel to consolidate the character that has been "ghosting" him in the course of his novel-writing career.

Roth, then, in his sequel, makes a concentrated exploration of his budding fictional creation. The exploration relies upon an ingenious self-referential gesture. In order to explain this gesture my discussion now considers Zuckerman's perspective on the relationship between first part and sequel. Zuckerman has reached a point of prominence in Roth's work through a gradual and improvisatory process of filtering out a variety of fictional material that does not relate to Zuckerman directly. The activity has now

reached a stage where Zuckerman meets himself face to face, as it were. Roth ingeniously elaborates upon and formalises this positive process of selection and filtering, and gleefully makes Zuckerman a victim of it. Roth produces a sequel about a writer who has such a success that he is unable to cope with it and is dominated by the influence of a single book. Hence, Zuckerman is under the sway of a single text (*Carnovsky*), rather than a plurality of texts, just as is the sequel in which he appears (Roth's sequel relates primarily to *The Ghost Writer*).

The full effects of Roth's cruel literary joke on his protagonist are only grasped through reference to *The Ghost Writer*. At the opening of *The Ghost Writer* Zuckerman, aged 23, is "like many a *Bildungsroman* hero before me, already contemplating my own massive *Bildungsroman*" (GW, p. 7). Even Roth could not have known how prophetic this conceit would turn out to be. However, in this first part of the grand project, Zuckerman is still in search of an authentic voice - one that, will at least ring true to himself. Asking Lonoff where he has so far gone wrong in his writing, Lonoff impatiently retorts:

"Look: I told Hope this morning: Zuckerman has the most compelling voice I've encountered in years, certainly for somebody starting out"
 "Do I?"
 "I don't mean style...I mean voice: something that begins around the back of the knees and reaches well above the head. Don't worry too much about "wrong". Just keep going. You'll get there." (GW, p. 66).

Zuckerman, with his ferocious energy and lust for life, has little difficulty in persevering. His problem is discovering a literary direction in which he can "keep going", in which his voice can, as it were, begin to hear itself. He has come to Lonoff, a spiritual father, for some guidance.

The novel provides no simple answers. Rather, Zuckerman, in the seclusion

of a late December evening in New England, develops a focused awareness of the tradition of American Jewish fiction to which he, with all the temerity and arrogance of youth, hopes to contribute. A strong background presence representing this tradition is Babel, a writer of pellucid Semitic folk stories. Zuckerman sees Lonoff as Babel's "American cousin", (GW,p.44). Then there is the daunting corpus of Lonoff's own short stories. They are represented here as brilliant, uncompromising miniatures, which transcend literary fashions, and are scorned, or simply forgotten, by the New York literary set. Felix Abravanel, on the other hand, writes in a brash, showy style, and creates a steamy blend of Jewish aspirations and American low-life: "Deep reflective Jews a little lovesick at the sound of all that un-Talmudic bone crunching", (GW, p.45). It is revealing, in terms of Zuckerman's later career, that he has a qualified admiration for Abravanel as a man, and has more time for him as a novelist than does the discriminating Lonoff. (GW pp.52-60).

Apart from this allusion to the "family" of professional writers, in which Zuckerman is seeking a place, *The Ghost Writer* also makes reference to the text of an amateur: *The Diary of Anne Frank*. This work, unlike the other writings cited above, is a text which still burns with the heat of the holocaust. It cannot be classed with the works by the above authors, which, written in America, are distanced from the traumas which have fired and energised the international Jewish literary tradition. Zuckerman's re-writing of *The Diary of Anne Frank* is partly an attempt to possess Amy Bellete, but is also an effort to strip the text of its historical particularity and give it some literary spit and polish, (GW pp.107-135). Roth thereby provides us with a working example of the young Nathan finding his voice, through his

engagement with the family life, and pubescent delights of the incarcerated Anne. Furthermore, the serene genius of Henry James, through his story, "The Middle Years", also beams down upon the struggles of Lonoff and Zuckerman, (GW p.69, 101-102). Hence, by means of a story which, in its plot, echoes *The Ghost Writer*, the mainstream American literary tradition also makes its presence felt in this first work in the Zuckerman *Bildungsroman*.

Finally, Nathan's own story, "Higher Education", is obligingly paraphrased for us by the eager apprentice, (GW, pp. 73-75). This story is the point of entry into another aspect of *The Ghost Writer*, which complements its intertextual concerns. The story, for which Nathan is about to find a publisher, has caused great offence to Zuckerman's family and especially his father. Zuckerman's search for a voice, in the rooms of Lonoff's spartan house, coincides with a crisis point in the young man's life directly caused by his writing. Thus, *The Ghost Writer* does not consider Nathan's search for a literary identity in isolation. It explores, ruthlessly, whether or not it is possible for Nathan to reconcile his search with his upbringing, and more broadly, his cultural background. Family matters impinge upon literary ideals and uncertainties.

Roth thus swathes his stripling hero in sheets of allusion to different varieties of writing, in a way which both insulates him from and exposes him to the gulf between him and his father. No certainty is provided as this brilliant discursive text nears its conclusion. Rather, a fictional world has been opened out and a sequel prepared for (although whether Roth definitely intended one at this stage is not easy to ascertain). However, there is a hint of the direction that the *Bildungsroman* is taking in the final description of Zuckerman occupying Lonoff's house, as the elderly writer, in the autumn of

his years, heads out into the snow to recover his fleeing wife. As Zuckerman is left alone, "to make feverish notes", on Lonoff's impish recommendation ("I'll be curious to know how we come out someday. It could be an interesting story" [GW, p.155]) there is a sense that he is making the first cautious steps towards taking up the mantle of his adoptive father.

One of the many paradoxes in which *The Ghost Writer* revels is the pleasure to be gained from, the reassurance furnished by, uncertainty. There is a kind of bliss which accompanies not knowing. Lonoff's house, nestling in the hills of New Hampshire, however much it reverberates with marital strife and frustrations with the artist's lot, offers a haven for Nathan from his family and relationship problems. However perverse the young man's encounter with pastoral, it is still pastoral that he encounters. Nathan feels really quite at home and at ease snuggled up in Lonoff's study bed, furtively masturbating in response to what he imagines he overhears in the "parental" bedroom above his head.

On the other hand, The central paradox of *Zuckerman Unbound* is that certainty, decisive action, can trail in its wake immeasurable and unforeseen uncertainties. Zuckerman, during a ten year period following his long night *chez Lonoff*, has found an authentic, fictional voice and made a decisive statement with it. He has published the sexually explicit *Carnovsky*, a work which resembles Roth's *Portnoy's Complaint*. A caveat must now be issued about the role of Zuckerman's *Carnovsky* in this discussion of the relationship between *The Ghost Writer* and *Zuckerman Unbound*. The introduction of *Carnovsky* into the maelstrom of allusion and citation which hovers above these two novels is a deft stroke by Roth. For it reinforces the interconnections between himself and his protege hero. Moreover, within the context of the Roth

(as opposed to the Zuckerman) oeuvre, it makes the playful suggestion that *Zuckerman Unbound* can be read as a reflective sequel to *Portnoy's Complaint*.

I would suggest that this secondary possibility is a brilliant offshoot of Roth's idiosyncratic handling of fictional biography. However, my main concern is to examine how *Zuckerman Unbound* departs from *The Ghost Writer*, which is its primary literary predecessor. In this context Carnovsky does have a role. For Roth makes use of the text to provide a bleak, black fictional representation, within *Zuckerman Unbound*, of the switch from a broad range of allusion to a narrow range that accompanies the switch from first part to sequel. Zuckerman's relationship with a potential "first part" (*Carnovsky*) becomes a means by which Roth can outline the relationship of *Zuckerman Unbound* to an actual first part, *The Ghost Writer*. Indeed, Roth confirms the link between *Zuckerman Unbound* and *The Ghost Writer* by giving the sequel's epigraph to Lonoff:

Let Nathan see what it is to be lifted from obscurity. Let him not come hammering at our door to tell us that he wasn't warned. (ZU Epigraph, and see GW p.140).

Zuckerman's problem in the sequel is a surfeit of success - success on a scale which far outweighs the oddities of Lonoff's early morning mail-delivery. The sense of expansion and liberation which public acclaim can bring is bedevilled by a sense of contraction and confinement. Zuckerman cannot avoid *Carnovsky* wherever he goes. Being a literary man, Zuckerman expresses the impact of *Carnovsky* on his constitution in terms of the current status of his book collection. From his earliest college days, his books have followed him to every change of address, first in a suitcase, then in cartons, then in boxes, as his stature and income have grown. On arrival at each new

abode the books are always the first items to be dealt with. However, his occupation of his post-Carnovsky apartment has seen a break in routine:

...though two months had passed, and though books were generally the first possession to find their proper place in his home, they remained this time in their boxes. Half a million pages untouched, unturned. The only book that seemed to exist was his own. And whenever he tried to forget it, someone reminded him. (ZU, p. 39).

Amongst the unpacked books would perhaps be collections of short stories by Lonoff, Babel, and James, novels by Abravanel, and even a copy of *The Diary of Anne Frank*. There would also be copies of works by Zuckerman himself, including "Higher Education". However, Zuckerman is denied, or denies himself, access to the range of reference and allusion which informed and enriched *The Ghost Writer*. He can only make reference to his own book and its effects upon him. Carnovsky cuts him off, both as reader and writer, from his literary past.

Indeed, his situation of popular success makes him a potential sequel writer. He seems to have started work on a sequel to *Carnovsky* without knowing it. He receives a cutting from *Variety* announcing:

"Independent Bob "Sleepy" Lagoon paid close to a million for Nathan Zuckerman's unfinished sequel to the smasheroo..."
Oh did he? What sequel? Who is Lagoon? (ZU, p. 45).

It is fairly certain that the sequel which Bob "Sleepy" Lagoon has in mind would be very different from the subtle and playful sequel in which Zuckerman himself is appearing.

The threat of a sequel which has not yet been written is, however, the least of Zuckerman's worries. The reassuring private doubt of *The Ghost Writer* has given way to a terrifying public certainty in the sequel. Others seem

infinitely more sure of him than he himself is. Some of the effects on Zuckerman of his predicament will now be considered.

First, *Carnovsky* has plunged Zuckerman into solitude. His involvement with the novel has broken up his marriage. The work has jolted him into a realisation of the differences between himself and his WASP wife Laura. He is now trapped in an apartment on the Upper East Side attempting to grapple with his fame single-handed, and beginning to miss the "Bank Street boredom" of his routine with Laura. The apartment is, in his own words, "Lonely. Very lonely", (ZU, p. 116). The fate of the marriage is now indissoluble from the fate of *Carnovsky*: Zuckerman has "written" himself out of his marriage. The book has suggested to him valid reasons for separation. Now the effects of the novel's publication make reconciliation impossible. The celebrity status conferred on Zuckerman does more permanent damage to the marriage than Nathan's initial hasty departure. He is now, in Laura's eyes, a distant figure whose romantic assignations, genuine or not, are gossip column fodder, (see especially ZU, pp. 119-120).

Moreover, Zuckerman detaches himself from his social circle. His agent complains at Zuckerman's troubled, introspective response to fame, arguing that he should accept, even enjoy, the aftershock of becoming the "decade's latest celebrity". He asks Nathan "Why you won't at least see old friends". Nathan replies, significantly enough to himself, rather than to Andre:

Simple. Because he could'nt sit complaining to them about becoming the decade's latest celebrity. Because being a poor misunderstood millionaire is not really a topic that intelligent people can discuss for very long. (ZU, p. 90).

His fame has created circumstances in which the accepted rituals of friendship

cannot be sustained. Just as Zuckerman's capacity to relate to a broad range of literature has been limited by success, so his ability to communicate meaningfully with his friends has been denied him. He is a prisoner in his own life.

Zuckerman of course has some social contact, but almost solely with fellow inmates of the celebrity camp. He finds that he can only mix with people who, in the circumstances of their lives, resemble him. Chiefly, and most painfully, Zuckerman becomes entangled with Alvin Pepler. In his notebook Zuckerman records his horrified recognition that the author and the redundant game-show king share common ground. "P. as my pop self?" (ZU, p.112), he asks. Both men are victims of their brilliance. They have made highly individual and unusual responses to "Americana". Pepler knows too much about it, and, it is implied, certainly too much for a Jew. In the fifties his knowledge had the potential to make him unchallengeable and unbeatable, a status that America cannot accept. Zuckerman has made a selective, imaginative response to Americana on a higher plane than Pepler. He does not know too much, but tells too much. Zuckerman too can provoke hostility and rage, besides ecstasy.

The difference between the two predicaments is that Pepler could be dispensed with in a flash. His powers were instantly communicable and instantly forgotten. Zuckerman, on the other hand, can recover and write again. His is the kind of acclaim which can last, and this is perhaps why Pepler, with his Newark cunning, clings to Zuckerman. Pepler sees that imagination, rather than spewing facts, is the key to eternal fame. Hence, Zuckerman's experience of acclaim is complemented by Pepler's short-lived, though even more destructive, "pop" version.

Zuckerman's other main encounter is with Caesara O'Shea. The evening with her, recalled by Zuckerman in his besieged barren flat, acquires a slippery elusive quality. Even the name "Caesara O' Shea" melts away on the tongue like icing-sugar. Fame has for so long been a way of life to her that she has been re-invented by it. She is literally nothing but a compound of public perceptions. Her acting debut, playing Anne Frank, at the age of nineteen in Ireland (Conemarra) allows for an implicit contrast between the unreal certainty of the sequel and the tangible doubt of *The Ghost Writer*. The contrast is highlighted as Zuckerman meditates on the debut in the lobby of the *Pierre*:

He was thinking of Caesara starting at nineteen as the enchanting Anne Frank, and of the photographs of film stars like the enchanting Caesara which Anne Frank pinned up beside the attic bed. That Anne Frank should come to him in this guise. That he should meet her at his agent's house, in a dress of veils and beads and cockatoo feathers. That he should take her to Elaine's to be gaped at. That she should invite him up to her penthouse suite. Yes, he thought, life has its own flippant ideas about how to deal with serious fellows like Zuckerman. (ZU, p.66).

The lulling rhythms of the passage, its use of repetition ("That he...That he...That she"), and the way in which Anne becomes interchangeable with Caesara, all serve to communicate the ghostly qualities of both women. It is impossible to tell which "she" is inviting Zuckerman up to the penthouse suite. The meditation furthermore reveals that Zuckerman is now at many removes from the inspirational figure of Anne Frank. After all, in *The Ghost Writer* he all but had breakfast with her. What is more, he was close enough in time and spirit to make a genuinely felt literary contact. Now he can only find her as the ghost of an apparition high up in a New York penthouse suite. The effect of *Carnovsky* on Zuckerman's literary and historical perspectives is thus dazzlingly suggested. The gulf between first part and sequel visits the reader as if in a dream.

Up to the point where Zuckerman receives his urgent call from Miami (ZU, p.121), Roth continues to dangle him in the nightmarish world of success. In his representation of Zuckerman being stifled by *Carnovsky* (a potential first part) Roth has created a sequel which makes oblique, exaggerated commentary on the ruthless process of filtering out which has helped him (ie. Roth) to produce that sequel. In a sense Zuckerman is protesting against the terms of the contract which forces his appearance in Roth's sequel.

However, the sequel cannot sustain itself on its game-playing forever. Some kind of resolution is required, which has no truck with financial consultants, ghosts, and walking filing-cabinets. Roth's solution is the death, and more importantly the dying, of Zuckerman's father. On the broad scale, this enables links to be re-forged with *The Ghost Writer* through the evocation of the dispute between father and son over "Higher Education". Roth does not resolve the dispute but intensifies the defiance of the son and the rage of the father, since now *Carnovsky* is the bone of contention. Henry Zuckerman alleges that, indeed, it is *Carnovsky* that kills the chiropodist. (ZU, pp. 151-152). Thus, the final chapter makes a return to the decisive and effective uncertainties of the first part. A unity is achieved between the two books by paralleling the two disagreements.

On the local level, Dr. Zuckerman's death gives Nathan the sense of release for which he has been pining. At last, he has some real pain, a concrete problem, involving momentous last breaths and misheard last words, to contend with. However, it is essential in this respect that Nathan, during the dying, should be ignorant of Dr. Zuckerman's knowledge of *Carnovsky*. For Nathan, in imagining that he is finding comforting words for his father as he leans over the hospital death-bed, is also finding comforting words for

himself. Nathan's text (also Stephen Hawking's text), derived from an airport paperback, is the origin of everything, in the big bang, and the passing of everything, in the eternal workings of the universe. (ZU, pp. 133-135). At the point of his father's extinction, the son gains at last the sense of space which has been eluding him since the opening of the novel, and possibly since his night of intellectual and onanistic passion on the Lonoff camp-bed.

The realisation that Dr. Zuckerman really did utter "Bastard" is in a sense excruciating, but ultimately this devastating final rejection compounds Nathan's sense of catharsis. For he senses that paternal rejection is more tangible than public acclaim. At the end of the novel Zuckerman announces to himself:

You are no longer any man's son, you are no longer some good woman's husband, you are no longer your brother's brother, and you don't come from anywhere anymore either. (ZU, p.156).

Even if he is defining himself in negative terms, at least he, Nathan Zuckerman, is doing the defining; not Alvin Pepler, Caesara O' Shea or the autograph-hunting attendant at the Frank E. Campbell funeral parlour. Roth reaches far down into his conjuror's black top hat, which muffles Zuckerman's despairing laughter, and produces not more white rabbits and doves, but a moving conclusion to both sequel and first part. Moreover, as is only to be expected of an ending to a sequel which has confirmed that a *Bildungsroman* is under way, it anticipates, in its act of positive negation, that the process of definition will be continued.

Zuckerman Unbound, then, is a reformatory sequel which plays adroitly with the situation of a writer overwhelmed by, drowning in, literary success. Indeed, such is the energy of the public response that Zuckerman is overtaken

by reports of an imminent sequel which he has not yet begun to write. In order to respond to this kind of literary chicanery, previously used terminology has had to be used in a flexible and open-ended manner. *Zuckerman Unbound*, to a greater extent than the two preceding examples, has demonstrated the aim of this chapter, which has been to widen the application of my terms without fundamentally altering them. In the next section, which concentrates on David Lodge's *Small World*, this procedure is confirmed and reinforced.

* * *

SECTION (iii)

A Larger World, A Smaller World

Introductory

In his "Author's Note" to *Small World*, David Lodge describes his novel as "...a kind of sequel" to *Changing Places*. The phrase has two possible meanings. The first meaning, probably the one Lodge intended is, "partial sequel", or "semi-sequel". Lodge, in an introductory essay to *Small World* rather underplays the relations between the novel and its predecessor, and a defensive use of the word "sequel" in his "Author's Note" would tally with this attempt to confer autonomy on *Small World*.²¹ It is possible that Lodge does not wish *Small World* to be bracketed with commonplace reiterative sequels.

The second meaning, possibly unintended by Lodge, is "type of sequel", hinting that it is a rather out-of-the-ordinary example of the form; a sequel that resists easy classification. In this section, I will suggest that the second meaning of Lodge's label is valid. This thesis has provided terminology that facilitates a description, and reading, of the novel as a fully-fledged sequel. However, the terminology must be responsive to the contradictions that will inevitably arise in such a comprehensive vision of the gyrations of academia.

The initial stage of the discussion will be emphasising the sequel's consolidatory aspects. However, it will then be stressed that the sequel's

reformatory qualities outweigh its consolidatory ones. The work proceeds by expanding, in a variety of ways, on the world of *Changing Places*. Two modes of expansion are outlined, and their chief effects are considered. In the last stage of the analysis it is asserted that this sketch of Lodge's exuberant world must be qualified, if only because it qualifies itself. For it has the potential to confine as much as it liberates its characters. The world is as claustrophobic as it is spacious. The reformatory movement of expansion incorporates diminution, impotence, and exhaustion.

*

In the discussion of Dorothy L. Sayers in Section (ii) it was noted that the first part and sequel, *Clouds of Witness*, did not strictly have to be read in order of composition to be appreciated. However, it was suggested that a full understanding of the sequel's consolidatory relationship with its predecessor could only be gained by a sequential reading. The pair of novels, *Changing Places* and *Small World* present a similar case. Lodge makes it clear in his above-mentioned introductory essay on *Small World* that the two novels were conceived separately. Discussing how he was struck by the magnitude of an MLA conference, based in New York, and which he attended in December 1978, Lodge indicates that the germ of a creative idea was being planted in his mind. But he stresses:

The idea of writing a novel about international conference-going didn't, however, occur to me until the following June, when I attended the 7th. International Joyce Symposium. (Lodge, 1988, p.71).

This indicates that not even a vague notion of *Small World* was in his mind whilst he was writing *Changing Places*, which was first published in 1975.

However, Lodge points out that, at the end of *Changing Places*, he had left the fortunes of Zapp and Swallow "conveniently indeterminate", (Lodge, 1988, p.72). The final chapter of *Changing Places*, written in the style of a film script, concludes with the camera freezing Philip as he holds forth on the unpredictability of fictional endings, and shrugs. (CP, p.251). The marital crises of both the Swallows and the Zapps have not been fully resolved, although it is perhaps possible to predict that Philip and Hilary, creatures of habit, will somehow be reconciled. I would suggest that this indeterminate conclusion is in accord with the uncertainties of the time in which the novel is set. It is an appropriate ending for a work which emphasises, as its title suggests, process and alteration. The chapter is, after all, entitled "Ending", not "End". However, unresolved questions remain, and *Small World* helps to answer them. It is the way in which *Small World* establishes a relationship of continuity with *Changing Places* which I shall initially be considering.

At first, it appears as if Lodge will be content with making a witty backwards glance towards his first part. Philip remarks to Morris in the Rummidge conference bar, presumably with no irony intended, "Hilary is dying to see you". Rupert Sutcliffe, in an aside to Persse, supplies the sense of irony: "Hmmm. That should be an interesting reunion", (SW, p.21). Sutcliffe proceeds to give a titillating recapitulation of *Changing Places*, with a brief addendum:

"The Swallows returned together. We gathered they were going to give the marriage another chance". (SW, p.21).

This epilogue, which fits neatly into Sutcliffe's departmental gossip, gives no hint of the way in which the sequel will be stretching beyond the

boundaries of *Changing Places*. For a sustained consolidation is offered of those facets of the latter work which involve Philip, Hilary, Morris and Desiree. The consolidation process begins with retrospective story-telling and updating during Morris's stay with the Swallows, (SW, pp.58-79). Some narrative patterns, familiar from the first part, then reverberate through the sequel. Only towards the end of the sequel is a sense of resolution, which embraces both novels, arrived at.

Although Philip and Hilary were reconciled in 1969, it is evident that their marriage lacks vitality and substance. It has never fully recovered from Philip's six months on Morris's campus. Philip has spent the last ten years trying to find elsewhere the "intensity of experience" which Essephe offered (see SW, p.66). In his search for his lost paradise he has become a compulsive traveller to the extent of neglecting his professorial duties: "Lately he seems more absent than present", observes Sutcliffe drily (SW, p.22). And Philip confides to Morris during their late-night communion:

It's the only thing that keeps me going these days, travelling. Changes of scene, changes of faces. It would defeat the whole object to take Hilary away with me on these academic trips. (SW, p.66).

Indeed the "whole object" of Philip's nomadic life is to seek respites from a marriage which he found even more stifling on his return from the States in 1969.

Hence, the pattern set by *Changing Places* of Philip setting off for foreign climes, whilst Hilary stays at home with her washing machine (SW, pp.240-241), has been reiterated in the ten year interval which divides the two narratives, and threads its way through the body of the sequel. The infidelity which is intertwined with Philip's first departure becomes a

recurring event within the pattern as it establishes itself. Through his first sexual encounter with Joy Simpson (SW, p.64), Philip is able to regain the sense of blissful release which accompanied his days at Euphoric State University. His rediscovery of Joy, and their subsequent affair, parallel his liaisons with Melanie and Desiree in *Changing Places* (CP, pp.102-103, pp.167-170), and help to confirm both Philip's insatiable desire for novelty, sexual as well as geographical, and the precarious nature of his marriage. Philip can only remain married to Hilary if he spends half the year acting as if he is not.

Some bleak variation in the pattern of consolidation drawn by the sequel is furnished by Hilary. In *Changing Places* she is a rather reluctant member of the transatlantic wife-swapping party. But she eventually reciprocates her husband's behaviour and gives herself a taste of freedom, after Zapp, pursued by Masters with shotgun, enters her home for protection, (CP, pp.230-236). However, in *Small World* (SW, pp. 58-64), there is no reciprocation. Her post-prandial discussion with Morris, in which her frustrations with Philip come to the fore, starkly complements her post-coital bath with him ten years earlier (CP, pp. 233-234). Her life, since her return with Philip, has been preoccupied with domesticity and devoid of interest and amusement. She is consumed by her remarkable capacity for toleration of her husband's peregrinations.

However, in a clever conceit, Lodge makes her the figure who at last brings some hope of stability to the Swallow household. Philip notices a new, more spontaneous Hilary when she breaks her routine to meet him at the airport after his Turkish adventure, (SW, p.227). She has become a marriage counsellor, and it has given her a new lease of life. Not only is she able to

repair the Dempsey marriage, but also, ironically, her own. Her newfound independence merges with Philip's desire to return to the fold, having exhausted his *Wunderlust* through a psychosomatic inducement of the symptoms of Legionnaire's disease. (see SW, p.316 and p.336).

Therefore, by means of reiteration and parallel, Lodge consolidates the account of the Swallow marriage which is left unresolved at the end of *Changing Places*. Moreover, the story of the marriage gets embroiled in the closural proceedings of the sequel which confer upon it a satisfying conclusion. *Small World*, then, revises the ending of *Changing Places* by making it more decisive. As Morris caustically puts it, in Hilary, Philip has found a new mother for his latter years (SW, p.316).

By way of contrast, the separation of Morris and Desiree, which was initiated in *Changing Places* is confirmed by the sequel. However, the very behaviour of both characters in *Small World* confirms that the events of *Changing Places* are still influencing them. Desiree has, certainly in material terms, fared rather better than Morris. She, in sharp contrast to Hilary, has consolidated her adoption of feminism in *Changing Places* by producing a semi-autobiographical account of her marriage (in which Morris is portrayed as a male chauvinist sex fiend), *Difficult Days*, (SW,p.52). And, within Lodge's sequel, she herself is working on a more bluntly titled sequel to *Difficult Days*, - *Men*. (SW, p.330).

Morris, on the other hand, has developed an aggressive bachelor's independence, characterised by even more frenetic travelling than Philip's. He proudly announces to Hilary that he has given up sex and taken up a philosophy of jet-propelled work, (SW, p.59). Yet, as Desiree wrestles with a

writing block, and pops sleeping pills, at her writers' colony (SW pp.86-87), and as Morris prepares for yet another flight, there is an increasing sense that both figures are fundamentally lonely. However defiantly they carve out their separate lives, the impression is that they are still coming to terms with divorce.

In *Changing Places* Morris and Desiree have a mutual grudging respect and share a caustic wit, at its most effective when directed at one another. (CP pp.120-122, pp.124-128). This tension between familiarity and contempt is sustained throughout *Small World*. Lodge, wisely, does not stretch probability by reconciling the couple. But, he does dollop out individual portions of happiness to them in his generous conclusion. Zapp is to marry Thelma Ringbaum, and Desiree is convinced that her book is not so bad after all. (SW pp.329-330).

In the course of *Small World*, then, Lodge develops the two complementary perspectives on marriage which so helped to define his first part. I would argue that, in *Changing Places*, it is the examination of the effects of a changing sexual and social climate upon an American marriage and an English marriage, which is Lodge's chief concern. The concept of the short-term exchange is the vehicle for this examination and the peculiarities of English and American academic life provide an amusing background to it. However, *Small World* reverses the structural priorities. It foregrounds academic life, making it the chief concern of author and reader alike.

The sequel is primarily an energetic and comprehensive account of a profession in all its grandeur and pettiness. The examination of the Swallows' marriage and the Zapps' divorce, within this framework, falls into the

background. Moreover, this relegation of a specific social concern to a less significant position in the narrative mosaic also applies to more general political and human matters. A broken marriage, a plane crash, the collapse of the Turkish economy, in this novel will only be treated as they relate to the machinations of corporate academia.

It is through its foregrounding of academic life as a fund of fictional material that *Small World* becomes primarily a reformatory sequel, and only secondarily a consolidatory one. Moreover, integral to Lodge's project in the sequel is the purpose of giving a more comprehensive picture of academic life than he offered in *Changing Places* (and also perhaps his other novels which explore the academic world). Lodge wishes to go beyond the particular concerns of the "two campuses" which are related in the "tale" (see subtitle, CP) of *Changing Places*, and explore the "global campus" to which they belong.

The sequel's reformatory strategy is thus governed by an impulse towards expansion. Lodge initiates his expansion on *Changing Places* by two related adjustments to the nature and technique of his narrative. At the opening of *Changing Places* Lodge casts himself as the narrator of a "duplex chronicle" (CP, p.7). "Duplex" is chosen carefully since it suggests more than "double" or "dual". In a "double" narrative, two stories would be told in one, but would only perhaps be vaguely related. "Duplex", on the other hand, suggests that the two narratives have a reciprocal effect on one another. They are interrelated. Lodge's term can be conveniently adapted to describe *Small World* as a "multiplex" chronicle. For, in this work, Lodge applies the techniques of simultaneity and parallel narration developed in *Changing Places* to bind together not two, but a plurality of narrative strands. He thus creates a multirelational text.

The second means of expansion in *Small World* is to exaggerate the ways in which *Changing Places* cites other literature. In *Changing Places* citation can take the form of direct allusion. For instance, Morris's obsession with Jane Austen is registered in the names of his twins: Elizabeth and Darcy. On the other hand, citation can be stylistic and unspecific as to its particular sources. For instance, the chapter "Corresponding" makes a veiled reference to the sub-genre of epistolary narrative. (CP, pp.119-151). The chapter "Reading", consisting entirely of invented newspaper clippings (CP pp.153-166), is an indirect tribute to the kind of narrative experiments conducted by Joyce in *Ulysses*.

In *Small World*, citation, in all its varieties, is far more an integral feature of the text. It is deployed more systematically and thoroughly. The use of the Grail legend enables Lodge to unify and "underwrite" (my quotation marks) his plot (or plots), and he confirms the importance of the myth to his design in his introductory essay, (Lodge, 1988, pp. 72-73). However, the citation does not stop with the Grail legend. Rather, the legend serves as a basis for an elaborate network of allusion to, quotation of, and deliberate misquotation of, a variety of literature. One of the more sophisticated jokes is to cite works which have been devised along similar principles to *Small World*. Thus Eliot's *The Waste Land*, a work which also makes use of the Grail legend, is quoted at the very beginning of the work by Perrse, ("April is the cruellest month", [SW, p.3]). And, of course, *Ulysses* hovers in the background of *Small World* as well as *Changing Places*, since Joyce's novel too made ironic contact with a myth.

These two modes of expansion, the multiplex chronicling, and the increased range of citation, acting in tandem, have two related main effects

on the text. The first main effect is the establishing of a wide-ranging, exuberant narrative. This exuberance is suggested by Lodge's range of characterisation and use of comedy. The multiplex technique enables Lodge to increase his cast of characters and widen his geographical scope. Hence, in one virtuosic chapter, he is able to parallel the activities of a host of characters based in eleven different locations: Ankara (Turkey); Tokyo; Helicon, New Hampshire (USA); Berlin, Paris, Chicago, Rummidge, Oxford, London; and the passenger cabin of a TWA plane en route from Chicago to London, (SW, pp83-113). Moreover this high-flying narrator switches to the appropriate time zone for each location with considerable accuracy.

The range of characters encompassed by this sophisticated global narrative method is vital in communicating the reformative nature of the sequel. Persse is the main new addition, and his search for Angelica supersedes the activities of Philip and Morris. Introducing two newcomers to the conference circuit allows Lodge to emphasise a continuity of generations within his academic world. Persse's naivety and optimism (compounded by the fact that he is based at an agricultural college in the Southern Irish outback) complement the urbane cynicism of Morris, an old conference hand. The major characters are supported by an array of minor characters who help to convey the eccentricities and idiosyncrasies to be found on the international conference circuit.

Two main types of comedy arise from the interaction of the characters within the expanded framework. First, there is a crude, at times farcical, humour derived from accident and coincidence. Accident is a rich comic source in a professional world which relies on different communication networks to hold it together. Misunderstandings and overhearings abound. For instance,

the lecture title suggested by Akbil Orak for Philip's Turkish tour is garbled by the telex service linking Turkey and the British Council in London (SW, p.181). Lodge also enjoys the physical comedy to be gained from Philip's diarrhoea in Turkey: in the midst of a power cut Philip mistakes the first five pages of his lecture, "The Legacy of Hazlitt", for the toilet paper hastily packed for him by the dutiful Hilary. (SW, p.190). One of the most entertaining and cathartic coincidences is Persse's encounter with the father of Bernadette's child on a boat which appears to be sinking during a trip out to Yeats's "Lake Isle of Innisfree". (SW, pp.254-55).

The second type of comedy is more intellectual and cerebral, involving the reader's ability to share, partially or fully, in the novel's varied use of allusion. For example, in the story he tells Morris that Philip compares Joy to Milton's Eve and himself to Milton's Adam waking from a dream to find her by his side. (SW, p.72). This attempt to elevate the encounter by reference to Milton is anyway undercut by another previous reference to Milton in the same chapter. Hilary has only just shown to Morris, in Philip's absence, an examination answer to the hackneyed question: By what means did Milton try to "justify the ways of God to Man" in "Paradise Lost"?, (SW, p.60). A female student uses her answer as a means of blackmailing Swallow, who, she claims, seduced her satanically on the floor of his departmental room. Hence, the earlier citation of Milton ironically de-romanticises the later citation of the poet. A knowledge of Milton's ornate style, with its ornate cadences, would certainly give a richer appreciation of Lodge's subtle double-use of the mock heroic in this chapter. The example, then, confirms how Lodge's use of comedy operates on two complementary levels.

The spacious exuberance of *Small World* is signified, then, by its range

of academic humankind and its wide geographical scope; its knockabout comedy; and its intellectual chicanery. It was suggested earlier that Lodge's two modes of expansion, acting in combination, had two main effects upon the narrative. The second main influence will now be briefly characterised. Through his multiplex method Lodge has the opportunity to indicate the range of opinion and debate that informs the contemporary academic world on an international scale. He is able, then, to give his narrative an educative, or informative quality.

The reader is informed by Lodge linking particular trends in literary criticism with particular individuals. The chief trend is deconstruction, if only because it weaves its way into the relativistic narrative structure of the novel itself. This brand of criticism is represented by Morris Zapp, through energetic conversation, and his amusing, oft-repeated, lecture on textual striptease (SW, pp.24-28). Michel Tardieu is a spokesman for French narratology. Siegfried Von Turpitz advocates a reader-based criticism, and Fulvia Morgana is an Althusserian Marxist. By ensuring that each academic resides in the country in which their advocated critical method is commonly deployed, Lodge gives his novel the status of a compendium, or guide-book. This sequel, then, has something in common with Richardson's sequel to *Pamela In Her Exalted Condition*. Both novels have manual-like functions, which are integrated into the dramas of the narrative line.

From the above points, it would appear that Lodge, in *Small World*, creates a glistening multirelational and multidimensional fictional world. He manages to expand on *Changing Places* with such vigour, and in such a variety of ways, that his sequel creates the illusion that it is infinitely capacious. However, the discussion will now suggest that in fact Lodge's expansive

strategy is deeply qualified by paradox and doubt. In an unfavourable review of *Small World* Peter Kemp commented:

In several ways, *Small World* wobbles between opposing poles. Though flinging its story-lines around the world, as characters journey from Amsterdam to Ankara, from Heathrow to Honolulu, it remains, in essence, trapped inside the lecture room.²²

I wish to approach Kemp's criticism from a somewhat different angle, and thereby go some way towards vindicating Lodge. My argument will be that Kemp's point about the treatment of space in the novel is valid, but that what he sees as a failing actually strengthens the novel and gives it a richer texture. Lodge is surely a sufficiently shrewd observer of the academic community to be aware of its claustrophobic potential.

Kemp is suggesting that there is only a superficial sense of place in the novel. For a particular location is always defined for us by the academics who travel to it. Moreover, their experience of a place will always be strictly limited and controlled by their ritualistic modes of discourse. For instance, the treatment of the International James Joyce Symposium at Zurich, only leaves a fleeting impression of the city. This is primarily because the main dialogue is set in the James Joyce Pub on Pelikanstrasse, (SW pp.234-235).

Academic gossip and fervent debate in a simulation of a Dublin pub do not exactly give a wide-ranging impression of Zurich. When Persse steps out of the station forecourt at Lausanne he is besieged on all sides by Eliot quotations ("Stetson!"..."Stetson!"). It emerges that he has stumbled across a contribution, in street theatre form, to the triannual *T.S. Eliot Newsletter* conference, (SW, pp.261-262). Literary versions of distant cities

are being superimposed upon Lodge's own literary version of a particular city by his itinerant troupe of academics. Often the cited literary city takes priority (as with the James Joyce Pub), and is "written" over the city in which Lodge situates his conference, creating a kind of topographical palimpsest.

This zealously literary treatment of place can be taken to an extreme point. Setting can be altogether transcended by the hermetic nature of the academic community. Rudyard Parkinson reluctantly visits Vancouver to accept an honorary degree. He is so obsessed with an error of emphasis in his dinner conversation with Jacques Textel that, on the plane home, he has already forgotten from whence he is flying:

Vancouver, of which he had in any case seen little except rainswept roads between the airport and the University, had already faded from his memory. (SW pp.164).

The novel reiterates the idea that critical and literary discourse is easily transportable, and has very little tangible relationship either with that which transports it, or with the place to which it is being taken. Fulvia Morgana can read her Althusser essays on a plane bound for Milan, and Morris Zapp can sit next to her with Philip's book on Hazlitt perched on his knees, (SW, pp.117-118). Robin Dempsey spends much of his time trapped in Darlington, and yet, as he says to Ronald Frobisher of the Darlington Centre for Computational Statistics,

I'm it, so it's wherever I am. That is, wherever I am when I'm doing computational statistics...It's not so much a place as a headed notepaper. (SW, p.183).

Moreover, running through the novel is the intrigue over the UNESCO chair,

which is purely "conceptual". It is not attached to any single location.

Lodge is, surely, in such a self-conscious novel, conscious of its distortion, and occasional transcendence, of place. For I feel that, in indicating the limited ways in which his characters can inhabit their locations, he is making a more profound point about the ways in which the academic profession relates, or fails to relate, to the broader environment outside, as Kemp calls it, the "lecture theatre". Lodge indicates that, for all its frenetic activity, for all the wealth of printed matter it scrutinises and itself produces, the academic industry is, in relation to the non-academic world, fragile, and easily collapsible.

The novel communicates this fragility by revealing the helplessness of certain characters when troubled by concerns outside their normal purview. These concerns may be sexual or political. For instance, Persse can only respond to his stimulated libido by reading Keats's "Eve of St. Agnes", (SW, p. 46). However, his attempt to translate his desire into literary-critical terms merely reinforces his own sense of inadequacy. ("Persse Mc Garrigle needed to know whether or not sexual intercourse was taking place here", [SW, p.46]). The "correct" decisive reading (should such a thing exist) of this deeply ambiguous poem, will not help him to attain Angelica. In asking him to re-enact the poem Angelica is, rather cruelly perhaps, taunting him with his own text-bound nature.

From another angle academic responses can seem equally arid and futile when libido fails. Arthur Kingfisher's impotence has left him for years a mere shell of his professional self. (SW, p. 92-94). He has been so long impotent that he is now unable to tell which happened first: sexual failure or

professional dissatisfaction. Lodge's academic world, then, can under certain circumstances be a stifling one; an environment which can only translate strong inarticulate human desires, but which cannot adequately cope with them.

I am not of course arguing that the world outside the lecture theatre will be able to offer any "better" responses to potent human impulses, or be able to satisfy deep desires. However, I am arguing that when Lodge's novel incorporates frustrated desire or personal failure, the perspective on his exuberant academic world suddenly changes. Lodge's titles are usually ambiguous. Surely, the title of *Small World* does not promise solely a work concerned with multiple coincidence. It is also referring to a world which can, in certain circumstances, simply seem very small indeed. This point certainly occurs to Morris Zapp when he is kidnapped by Fulvia's Italian Communist associates. His kidnappers are ordering Morris to command Desiree to raise her ransom offer:

"Tell her and tell her good"

"It's not so simple", says Morris. "Every decoding is another encoding."

"What?"

"Never mind. Give me the tape recorder." (SW, p. 282).

This blank incomprehension of a phrase which Morris has proudly worn on a home-made lapel badge (SW, p.194), to the congratulation of his colleagues, may be a factor in his disillusion with deconstruction as he explains to Persse:

"...death is the one concept you can't deconstruct. Work back from there and you end up with the old idea of the autonomous self. I can die, therefore I am. I realised that when those wop radicals threatened to deconstruct *me*." (SW, p.328).

I would conclude, therefore, that *Small World* is a spacious novel which

has the potential to suggest confinement and bleakness. David Lodge integrates this paradoxical quality into his narrative, and presents characters who only too well perceive the spatial contradictions inherent in travelling. Lodge deliberately constructs a fiction which questions and doubts its own exuberance and good humour. In this sense, perhaps, Peter Kemp's above-quoted remark is more of an acidic personal reading of a book which parades its deeper uncertainties than a just criticism. In terms of the relationship of *Small World* with *Changing Places* there is a final paradox to ponder. For all its expansiveness, the sequel is perhaps less spacious and place-oriented than the first part. After all, *Changing Places* is as much about places that change as it is about the temporary exchange of academic positions. It is set on campuses which are based in thriving towns. Both these towns register, in different ways, the social revolution of the 'sixties. It would be hard to imagine student demonstrations being allowed to impinge on the discrete academic community of *Small World*.

Primarily, then, *Small World* could be termed as a reformative sequel which leads to definite conclusion by means of expansion. However, in its generous inclusiveness, it also embraces other features of the sequel form discussed in this thesis. First, it contains the kind of consolidatory movement which was highlighted in the discussion of Defoe, in its reiteration of narrative patterns from *Changing Places*. It also comprehends the kind of discursive and educative purpose which preoccupied Richardson in composing his sequel to *Pamela; Or Virtue Rewarded*. Finally, in the images of confinement and despair which occasionally figure in the novel there are traces of the kind of exhausted world depicted in Cleland's second volume to *Memoirs of A Woman of Pleasure*.

SECTION (iv)

Concluding Thoughts

This thesis began with an author asking himself, and his wider public, whether or not he should write a sequel to his popular book. This question of whether a particular book needs, or ever needed a sequel, will always be hotly debated. However, the thesis has been trying to show that, on a fundamental level, sequels are "needed". For sequels help literature to learn about itself, and encourage it to branch off in new directions. In this sense they can have a motoric function, driving literature onwards towards fresh discoveries.

The thesis has not only been trying to show how much sequels are needed on a broad scale. It has also been stressing how much they need to be taken seriously by literary critics and the general public alike. After all, if sequels operate within literature on a fundamental structural level, then surely they must reveal much of the processes by which literary fictions are constituted. I have tried to show how sequels tend to embody such processes in miniature, with often paradoxical and contrary results. Perhaps the paradox which most clearly characterises the sequel is the following one: a sequel responds to the most basic, child-like urges of both writer and reader to recover an enriching past experience; and yet the most sophisticated, subtle, formal and technical operations must be initiated in the mere attempt to recover that lost experience. The procedure is rather like telling a child that Father Christmas is really Daddy dressed up as Father Christmas, and then

making Daddy climb up to the chimney and jump down it into the hearth below in order to convince the child that Father Christmas exists after all.

Finally, the thesis has been trying to indicate that sequels are not merely of interest for what they reveal of technical and formal practice in the making of prose fictions. They can also be idiosyncratic, challenging, and enjoyable literary experiences, in their own right, and in terms of the broader narrative to which they are contributing. In *Zuckerman Unbound*, Nathan, after his father's funeral, flies home to New York. He feels a sense of relief and release on his departure. The plane, taking off, is described as being lifted "like some splendid ostentatious afterthought", (ZU, p.139). This would be an apt characterisation of the literary sequel when it is giving of its best.



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby

West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ

www.bl.uk

**MISSING PAGES ARE
UNAVAILABLE**

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1. Quoted from Peter Alexander ed., *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works* (London and Glasgow: Collins 1951).
2. Micheal Pye, "Clint Eastwood: A Profile", *The Observer*, 20 Novemeber 1988.
3. Stephen W. Hawking, "A brief history of A Brief History" *The Independent*, 31 December 1988.
4. Stephen W. Hawking, *A Brief History of Time* (London and New York: Bantam Books 1988). Hawking records in his article (see note 3) that his publishers were initially "taken by surprise by the demand" for the book. A feature in *The Daily Telegraph* (20 November 1988), "Best-Sellers of 1988" places *A Brief History of Time* second from the top in the "Non-fiction" category with estimated sales figures of 110,000.
5. *A Brief History of Time*, p.13
6. For Hawking's discussssion of the "big bang", see *A Brief History of Time*, p.46.
7. *A Brief History of Time*, pp.150-153.
8. Hawking laments that "the people whose business it is to ask *why*, the philosophers, have not been able to keep up with the advance of scientific theories, (*A Brief History of Time*, p.174).
9. *A Brief History of Time*, pp.170-175.
10. *A Brief History of Time*, p.175.
11. "The intention was partly to earn money to pay daughter's school fees. (In fact, by the time the book actually appeared, she was in her last year of school)", (see n.3)
12. "6 million dollar bids for unwritten Scarlett sequel" (*The Daily Telegraph*, 16 April 1988).
13. "Re-born on the Wind (*The Daily Mail*, 16 April, 1988).
14. "Another Day for Scarlett" (*The Daily Telegraph*, 11 Febuary, 1987).
15. "Scarlett is Back With The Wind" (*Today*, 16 April 1988).
16. For example, see Charles Bremner, "Going for Scarlett and Gold", (*The Times*, 16 April 1988).
17. Micheal B. Druzman, *One Good Film Deserves Another* (New York and London: A.S. Barnes and Co., 1977), p.16.
18. "Sequels Latest" (*Flicks Magazine*, May/June 1988).

19. Julia Smith and Tony Holland, *Eastenders*, (BBC, first broadcast, 19 February 1985, continuing - collective authorship).

20. Ian Holmes and Reg Watson, *Neighbours* (Grundy, first broadcast Australia 18 March 1985, first broadcast Britain, 27 October 1986).

21. The Broadcasters' Audience Research Board Ltd. (BARB), in its monthly summaries for May and June 1989, records that amongst the very highest audience figures, within the two months, were achieved by individual episodes of *Neighbours* (18.05 million), and *EastEnders* (18.00 million). These examples of high ratings are consistent with other BARB reports for 1989.

22. For the economic convenience of soap opera for television producers see Dennis Porter, "Soap Time: Thoughts on a Commodity Art Form", (*College English*, vol.38, 1977, pp.782-788), and James Oram, *Neighbours: Behind The Scenes* (London: Angus and Robertson, 1988), pp.17-18.

23. Since the "Zuckerman" novels of Roth receive prominence in Chapter 5, they are listed below with dates of first British publication (see Bibliography for further details):

<i>The Ghost Writer</i>	(1979)
<i>Zuckerman Unbound</i>	(1981)
<i>The Anatomy Lesson</i>	(1984)
<i>The Prague Orgy</i>	(1985)
<i>The Counterlife</i>	(1987)
<i>The Facts</i>	(1989)

24. Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra *Don Quixote* Parts I and II, trans. J.M. Cohen (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1950 [Part I: 1605; Part II 1615]). Henceforth referred to by part no. and page.

25. John Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, Parts I and II, ed. Roger Sharrock, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965 [Part I 1678; Part II 1684]). Henceforth referred to by part no. and page.

26. See Yvonne Noble, ed., *Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Beggar's Opera* (London: Prentice-Hall, 1975). Even though this anthology is devoted to *The Beggar's Opera*, it is still remarkable how little mention *Polly* receives.

27. Edward C. Riley, *Cervantes's Theory of The Novel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1962). See especially Chapter 6, pp.202-204.

28. Louis J. Budd, "Introduction", in Louis J. Budd, ed., *New Essays on The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1985), p.18.

29. Mark Twain, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1963), p.18.

30. Neil H. Keeble, "Christiana's Key: The Unity of *The Pilgrim's*

'Progress' in Vincent Newey, ed., *The Pilgrim's Progress: Critical and Historical Views* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 1980), p.13

31. Northrop Frye, "The Typology of *Paradise Regained*", *Modern Philology*, 53, (1956), pp.227-238.
32. June Sturrock, "The Completion of *Pamela*", *Durham University Journal*, 43, (1982), pp.227-232.
33. Russell Davies, "Life After Greyfriars", *The Guardian*, 15 September 1985. Davies reviews David Hughes's *But For Bunter* and Daniel Green's *Bunter Sahib*.
34. A list of sources on this subject can be found in Micheal Mc Keon, *The Origins of The English Novel 1600-1740* (London: Radius 1988), p.484 n.2
35. Ian Watt, *The Rise of The Novel*, (Harmondsworth: Pelican 1981 [1957])
36. John J. Richetti, in *Popular Fiction Before Richardson* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1969), highlights the role of popular fiction in the development of the novel.
37. Lennard J. Davis in *Factual Fictions* (New York: Columbia University Press 1983), examines the early novel as an expression of converging ideologies.
38. McKeon (see n.33), examines the early history of the novel as part of a broad dialectical process.
39. See *The Rise of The Novel*, pp.272-273.
40. See especially *The Rise of The Novel*, pp.66-152.
41. See Roy M. Wiles, *Serial Publication in England* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press 1957), p.2.
42. See *Serial Publication in England*, pp.25-26
43. See *Serial Publication in England*, pp.35-38.
44. See Robert D. Mayo *The English Novel in The Magazines* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press 1962).
45. Wiles (*Serial Publication in England*), notes Heathcote's serialisation of *The Female Deserters* (1719), a sequel to *The Lover's Week* p.28.
46. W.K. Wimsatt, *The Verbal Icon: Studies in The Meaning of Poetry* (Kentucky: Kentucky University Press 1954).
47. E.D. Hirsch, *The Aims of Interpretation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1978).

48. Roland Barthes, "The Death of The Author" in Roland Barthes, *Image-Music-Text*, trans. Stephen Heath, (London: Fontana 1977 [1968]) pp.142-148. "The birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the author", p.148.
49. P.N. Medvedev and M.M. Bakhtin, *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship: A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics*, trans. Albert J. Wehrle (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Univeristy Press 1978 [1928]) p.27.
50. Tony Bennett, *Formalism and Marxism* (London: Methuen 1979)
51. *Formalism and Marxism*, p.154.
52. Wolfgang Iser, *The Implied Reader* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press 1974). See especially Chapter 11.
53. Hans Robert Jauss, "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory" in Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, trans. Timothy Bahti, (Brighton: Harvester Press 1982), p.32.
54. Keith Waterhouse, *Mrs. Pooter's Diary* (London: Black Swan 1984).
55. George and Weedon Grossmith, *The Diary of A Nobody* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983 [1892]).
56. Ayckbourn, Alan, *The Norman Conquests* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1977).
57. Chapman, Robin, *The Duchess's Diary*, (London: Faber 1985 [1980]), revised reissue.
58. Tom Stoppard, *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* (London: Faber 1968).
59. Agatha Christie, *Curtain: Poirot's Last Case* (London: Collins 1975).
60. Agatha Christie, *The Mysterious Affair At Styles* (London: Collins 1987 [1920]).
61. Mandy Hicken, *Sequels*, (London: Association of Assitant Librarians, 1982).
62. Janet Husband, *Sequels: An Annotated Guide to Novels in Series* (Chicago: American Library Association 1982).
63. BBC Radio 3, Monday 7 October. Apologies to the readers, but I am still trying to trace the year of this interview at time of submission: it was between 1984 and 1986.
64. Fowler, Alastair, *Kinds of Literature : An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1982).
65. See, for instance, Alastair Fowler, *Spenser and The Numbers of Time*

(London: Routledge and Kegan Paul 1964).

66. Gerard Genette, *Palimpsestes : La littérature au second degré* (Paris: Editions du seuil, 1980).

67. Gerard Genette *Introduction A L'architexte* (Paris: Editions du Seuil 1979).

68. See Gerard Genette, *Figures of Literary Discourse*, trans. Alan Sheridan (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1982).

69. Henry Fielding, *Shamela*, ed. A.R. Humphreys, (London: Everyman 1973 [1741]). Henceforth referred to as *Shamela*.

70. Barbara K. Lewalski, *Milton's Brief Epic* (Providence: R.I. 1966).

71. Frank Kermode, "A Miserable Splendour", *The Guardian* 3 March 1989.

72. Frank Kermode, *The Sense of An Ending : Studies in The Theory of Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966).

73. Barbara Herrnstein Smith, *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press 1968).

74. David H. Richter, *Fable's End : Completeness and Closure in Rhetorical Fiction* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1974).

75. Marianna Torgovnick, *Closure in The Novel* (Princeton, Guildford: Princeton University Press 1981).

76. Alexander Welsh, ed. *Nineteenth Century Fiction*, Vol. 33: 1, (1978): Special issue in book form: *Narrative Endings* (Berkeley: University of California Press 1978).

77. Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, trans., Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore and London: 1976 [1967]), p.159.

78. See Annalena Mc Afee, "Heller Skelter", *The Evening Standard*, 20 October 1988.

79. Woody Allen, *Annie Hall*, in *Four Films of Woody Allen*, (London: Faber 1983), p.105

80. The OED definition: "The ensuing narrative discourse, etc.; the following or remaining part of a narrative, etc; that which follows as a continuation, esp. a literary work that, although complete in itself, forms a continuation of a preceding one".

81. Graham Greene, *Monsignor Quixote* (London: Bodley Head 1983).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1. *Robinson Crusoe* falls into three parts:
 Part I: *The Surprizing Adventures Of Robinson Crusoe* (1719)
 Part II : *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1719)
 Part III: *Serious Reflections of Robinson Crusoe* (1720)

Since the only adequate edition of all three parts that I have been able to obtain is the Constable (London: Constable 1925), pagination is from this edition. However, for purposes of accuracy, I have cross-checked my quotations from the first two parts against the *Shakespeare Head Edition* of the first Part and sequel (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1927). These two Parts are included in: *The Shakespeare Head Edition of the Novels and Selected Writings of Daniel Defoe* (1927-1928, 14 vols.) I cite each Part by referring to it in brackets and giving page numbers: Eg. (I, pp.232-233). I sometimes refer to the Parts by a shortened form of their title (eg. *The Farther Adventures*) or simply by Part number: Eg. "III, p.40"

2. Crusoe uses the word "surprize" in two of his titles in the trilogy.
3. Charles Gildon, *Robinson Crusoe Examin'd and Criticized*, ed. Paul Dottin, (London and Paris: J.M. Dent and Sons 1923[1719]), p.35. This work is henceforth referred to parenthetically as "Dottin".
4. Walter de la Mare, *Desert Islands and Robinson Crusoe* (London: Faber 1930), p.39.
5. Pat Rogers, *Robinson Crusoe* (London: George Allen and Unwin 1979), p.110.
6. James Sutherland, *Daniel Defoe: A Critical Study* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press 1971), p.140.
7. Maximillian E. Novak, "Crusoe the King and the Political Evolution of His Island", *Studies in English Literature*, 2, No.3 (Summer 1962), pp.337-351.
8. Thomas S. Schrock, "Considering Crusoe, Part I", *Interpretation*, Vol.1, No.1, (1970), pp.76-106. (quote from n6, p.79).
9. For further corroboration of this point, see Rogers, 1979, pp.8-9.
10. See Dottin, 1923, pp.57-58.
11. Quoted in Rogers, 1979, p.132.
12. See Charles C. Mish, "Early Eighteenth-Century Best Sellers in English Porse Fiction", *Bibliographical Society of America*, Vol. 75, (1981), pp.412-418: especially pp.416-417.
13. Keith I. Maslen, "Edition Quantities For Robinson Crusoe, 1719", *The Library*, Fifth Series, No.24, (1969), pp.145-150.
14. Keith I. Maslen, "The Printers of Robinson Crusoe " *he Library*, Fifth Series, No.7 (1952), pp.124-131. See especially pp.127-128.

15. This information is recorded Henry C. Hutchins, in his *Robinson Crusoe And Its Printing 1719-1731: A Bibliographical Study* (New York: Columbia University Press 1925), pp.157-158.
16. For further details on this, see Mayo 1962, pp.58-69.
17. In my account of the controversy over the Amsterdam Coffee House Piracy I follow Hutchins, 1925, pp.141-166.
18. This piracy is termed the "O" Edition: see Hutchins, 1925, pp.167-182.
19. The letter is reproduced in full by Hutchins, 1925, pp.143-144.
20. For further details on payment of authors in the first half of the eighteenth century, see John Feather, *A History of British Publishing*, (Kent: Croom Helm 1988), pp.102-104.
21. J. Paul Hunter, *The Reluctant Pilgrim* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press 1966), p.169.
22. See G.A. Starr, *Defoe and Spiritual Autobiography* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1965), p.123.
23. Everett Zimmerman, *Defoe and The Novel* (Berkeley: The University of California Press 1975), p.28.
24. Zimmerman, 1975, p.47.
25. Lennard J. Davis, *Resisting Novels: Ideology and Fiction* (New York and London: Methuen 1987), p.58.
26. See especially III, pp.vi-viii.
27. See Davis, 1983, especially Chapter 1: "Frame, Context, Prestructure"
28. See John J. Richetti, *Defoe's Narratives: Situations and Structures* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1975), p.15.
29. Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, C.B. Macpherson, ed., (Harmondsworth: Pelican 1968 [1651]), p.91.
30. *Leviathan*, p.91
31. *Leviathan*, p.90
32. See II, pp.3-4. Crusoe speculates on the literal truth of dreams.
33. Michel Tournier, "The End of Robinson Crusoe" in Michel Tournier, *The Fetishist and Other Stories*, trans. Barbara Wright (London: Methuen 1983 [1978]).
34. *The Fetishist*, p.15.

35. *The Fetishist*, p.35.
36. Novak, 1962: see especially his remarks on Defoe's assimilation of Hobbes, pp.337-341.
37. For a concise account of Vico's thought see Peter Burke, *Vico* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press 1985). Burke discusses Vico's cyclical vision of history, pp.54-64.
38. See Zimmerman, 1975, pp.8-10.
39. Shklovsky's comment "*Tristram Shandy* is the most typical novel in world literature" can be found in, for instance, *Russian Formalist Criticism: 4 Essays*, translated and with an Introduction by Lee T. Lemon and Marjorie J. Reis (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press 1965), p.57.
40. Daniel Defoe, *The Review*, Vol.III, No.16, (1706), in William L. Payne, ed., *The Best of Defoe's Review: An Anthology*, (New York: Columbia University Press 1951), p.206.
41. *Review*, 1951, pp.52-54.
42. Daniel Defoe *The Family Instructor* [1715, 1718], extracted in Laura Curtis, *The Versatile Defoe* (London: George Prior 1979), pp.419-449.
43. For an example of this trend, see Sutherland, 1971, p.142.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1. John Cleland, "Article VI", *Monthly Review*, Vol.2, (1749-50), pp.25-26.
2. Druxman, 1977, p.20
3. On Richardson's apprenticeship to John Wilde, see T.C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1971), pp.11-12.
4. For further details of Defoe's imprisonment, see John Robert Moore, *Daniel Defoe: Citizen of The Modern World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1958), p.352.
5. See Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, pp.87-88.
6. See Rogers, 1979, p.4.
7. Quoted in Alan Dugald McKillop, *Samuel Richardson: Printer and Novelist* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968 [1936]), p.44.
8. See William M. Sale, *Samuel Richardson: Master Printer* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press 1950), p.95.
9. For details of the Irish edition see William M. Sale, *Samuel Richardson: A Bibliographical Record of His Literary Career* (New Haven: Yale University Press 1936), p.16
10. For further details on public enthusiasm for *Pamela* Part I, see Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, pp.120-121.
11. In the ensuing discussion of Anti-Pamelas I draw on Bernard Kreissman's *Pamela-Shamela: A Study of the Criticisms, Burlesques, Parodies, and Adaptations of Richardson's Pamela*, University of Nebraska Studies, n.s., no.22 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press 1960).
12. Anon, *Pamela Censured* (April 1741).
13. Henry Fielding, *Shamela* (see chapter 1 of this thesis, n.69 for details).
14. Samuel Richardson, *Pamela* Part I, (E I, pp.174-183; SH I, pp.271-285). The above referencing method is now explained. Richardson's *Pamela* was written in four volumes. Volumes I and II two comprise *Pamela: Or, Virtue Rewarded* (1740) and Volumes III and IV comprise *Pamela In Her Exalted Condition* (!741). All quotations come from the *Shakespeare Head Edition* of *Of The Novels of Samuel Richardson* ed. William King and Adrian Bott, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1929-1931). In the parenthetical abbreviations I give the Edition ("SH"), followed by the VOLUME NO. and then the page no. Since the Everyman Editions of First Part and Sequel are more accessible I also give page references

from these: Part I and Part II, (London: J.M. Dent and Sons 1914). In quotations from these editions I give the edition ("E") followed by the PART NO (NOT VOLUME NO.), and page no.

15. John Kelly, *Pamela's Conduct In High Life Unto The Time of Death* (London: Ward and Chandler 1741, 2 Vols.). Henceforth this work is cited by volume no. and page no. (eg. "I, 34").

16. The following summary is based on a letter Richardson wrote to Leake in August 1741. The best reproduction of this letter is in McKillop, 1968, pp.51-54.

17. For an account of the two contemporary sequels to *Pamela* Part I alluded to here see Frank Gees Black, "The Continuations of *Pamela* ", *Revue Anglo-Americaine*, Vol.XIII, (1936), pp.499-507.

18. For further information on Richardson's involvement with *The Daily Gazetteer*, see Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, p.65.

19. For details of Richardson's consultation on the composition of the sequel, see Eaves and Kimpel, 1971, pp.142-145 and McKillop, 1968, pp.61-62.

20. John Carroll, ed. *Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1964), p.41.

21. See A.M. Kearney, "Richardson's *Pamela* : The Aesthetic Case" in John Carroll, ed., *Samuel Richardson: A Collection of Critical Essays* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall 1969), p.36.

22. For an exposition of Richardson's debt to romance see Carol Houlihan Flynn, *Samuel Richardson: A Man Of Letters* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press 1982), especially Chapter 4, "Horrid Romancing: Richardson's Use of The Fairy Tale". For precedents for Kelly's use of romance conventions see Richetti, 1969, Chapter V: "Mrs. Haywood and the Novella - the Erotic and the Pathetic".

23. Anna Laetitia Barbauld, ed. *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, (London: Richard Phillips 1804), p.lxxvii.

24. Donald L. Ball, "*Pamela II* : A Primary Link In Richardson's Development As A Novelist", *Modern Philology*, Vol.65, (May 1968), pp.334-342.

25. For details, see Chapter 1, n.33

26. See Terry Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-Century Culture and Fiction* (London: Methuen 1986); Chapter 4, "The Recarnavalisation of *Pamela*: Richardson's "*Pamela*," Part 2.

27. Janet Gurkin Altman, *Epistolarity: Approaches to A Form* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press 1982), p.13.

28. For details, see this Chapter, n.1 above.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

1. Art Pepper, transcribed from a tape recorded interview at Contemporary Records, on the sleeve notes to a gramophone record: Art Pepper, *The Trip* (Contemporary Records: S 7638).
2. John Cleland, *Memoirs Of a Coxcomb* (London: Compact Library 1964), p.160
3. John Cleland, *Fanny Hill or Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure*, Peter Wagner, ed. (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1985 [Volume I 1748; Volume II 1749])
4. See Chapter 3, above, n.4
5. Andrea Dworkin, *Men Possessing Women* (London: The Women's Press), 1981).
6. Susan Griffin, *Pornography and Silence* (London: The Women's Press 1981). Griffin stresses the ugly and degrading features of the modern pornographic industry (eg.pp.111-119).
7. Anne Robinson Taylor, *Male Novelists and Their Female Voices: Literary Masquerades*, (Troy, New York: The Whitston Publishing Company 1981).
8. Nancy K. Miller, *The Heroine's Text: Readings in the French and English Novel, 1722-1782* (New York: Columbia Press 1980).
9. See William H. Epstein, *John Cleland: Images of a Life* (New York and London: Columbia University Press 1974), p.54. For the ensuing biographic details I draw upon Epstein, pp.54-82.
10. See David Foxon, *Libertine Literature in England, 1660-1745* (New York: New Hyde Park 1965), p.53. For the following account of the first legal action against Cleland's novel I draw on Foxon, pp.52-58.
11. See Peter Sabor, ed., "Introduction" to *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press 1985), p.ix..
12. See Peter Wagner, ed., "Introduction" To *Fanny Hill or Memoirs of A Woman of A Woman Of Pleasure* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1985), p.8.
13. See Wagner, 1985, p.8.
14. Maurice Charney, *Sexual Fiction*, (London: Methuen 1981).
15. See Peter Wagner, *Eros Revived* (London: Martin Secker and Warburg 1988), especially Chapter 7, which covers a wide range of pornographic prose fiction contemporary to Cleland.
16. See Wagner, 1988, p.220.
17. Susan Sontag, "The Pornographic Imagination", in Georges Bataille, *The Story of The Eye*, trans. J. Neugroschel (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1982).

18. See Wagner, 1988, p.243.

19. Raymond K. Whitley in "The Libertine Hero and Heroine in the Novels of John Cleland", *Studies In Eighteenth-Century Culture*, Vol.9 (1979), pp.387-404, also discusses the role of Fanny's education in the novel. However, I differ from him in emphasising the differences between the older Fanny's formal education and the younger Fanny's experiential education. Moreover, he places less emphasis than I do on the differences between the two volumes.

20. Leo Braudy, in "Fanny Hill and Materialism", *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol.4 (1979), pp.21-40, suggestively describes La Mettrie's philosophy as concerned with "machines of wonder", (p.23).

21. Stephen Marcus, *The Other Victorians: A Study of Sexuality and Pornography in Mid-Nineteenth Century England* (London: Corgi 1969), p.245.

22. See Wagner, 1988, p.242.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

1. M.R. James, *The Penguin Complete Ghost Stories* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1984 [1931]), p.113.
2. Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Circles", in *Emerson's Essays* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1978), p.169.
3. Samuel Butler, *Erewhon in Erewhon and Erewhon Revisited* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons 1951 [1872]). In parentheses this text will henceforth be abbreviated to "E".
4. Samuel Butler, *Erewhon Revisited in Erewhon and Erewhon Revisited* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons 1951 [1901]). In parentheses this text will henceforth be abbreviated to "ER".
5. Dorothy L. Sayers, *Clouds of Witness* (London: Coronet 1988 [1926]). In parentheses this text will henceforth be referred to as "CW".
6. Dorothy L. Sayers, *Whose Body?* (London: New English Library 1988 [1923]) In parentheses this text will henceforth be referred to as "WB".
7. Philip Roth, *Zuckerman Unbound* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1983). In parentheses this text will henceforth be referred to as "ZU".
8. Philip Roth, *The Ghost Writer* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1980). In parentheses this text will henceforth be referred to as "GW".
9. David Lodge, *Small World* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1985). In parentheses this text will henceforth be referred to as "SW".
10. David Lodge, *Changing Places* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1978). In parentheses this text will henceforth be referred to as "CP".
11. See Desmond Mc Carthy, "Introduction" to the Everyman edition (see notes 3 and 4 of this Chapter), pp.ix-x.
12. Janet Hitchman, *Such A Strange Lady : An Introduction to Dorothy L. Sayers (1893-1957)* (London: New English Library 1988), p.94.
13. For further details see Robert B. Harmon and Margaret A. Burger, *An Annotated Guide to the Works of Dorothy L. Sayers* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1977), p.22
14. See Ruth Tanis Youngberg, *Dorothy L. Sayers: A Reference Guide* (Boston, Massachussetts: G.K. Hall and Co. 1982), p.6.
15. The title *Clouds of Witness* is an almost direct quotation from the Bible, *Hebrews*, 12:1 : "Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which so easily doth beset us..."

16. Julian Symons, *Bloody Murder: From the Detective Story to the Crime Novel: A History* (Harmondsworth: Viking 1985), p.101.

17. However, *Tristram Shandy* is perhaps one eighteenth-century novel which anticipates Roth's exuberant treatment of fictional autobiography.

18. *When She Was Good* (1967) is a rare example of a Roth novel with a woman as the central character.

19. See Philip Roth, *My Life As a Man* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1985 [1974]), especially the first two sections concerning Nathan Zuckerman, the fictional alter ego of Peter Tarnopol.

20. It should of course be acknowledged that the range of intertextual reference in *Zuckerman Unbound* is not entirely delimited by Zuckerman's experience. The Work's title, after all, alludes ironically to Shelley's "Prometheus Unbound" and also to "Prometheus Bound". My point, however is that Zuckerman's own experience of literature is drastically "bound", in this volume, by the games that Roth is playing with him. Zuckerman's promethean experience in this novel precisely centres on a paralysis; an inability to respond to literary allusion and illusion.

21. David Lodge, "Small World: an Introduction" in David Lodge, *Write On: Occasional Essays 1965-1985* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1988), pp.70-76.

22. Peter Kemp "The Professor's Romance, *The Sunday Times*, 18 March 1984.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SECTION (i)

Books Referred to or Cited

- AIKEN, Joan, *Mansfield Revisited* (London: Gollancz 1984)
- ALTMAN, Janet Gurkin, *Epistolarity: Approaches to A Form* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press 1982)
- ANON, *The History of Tom Jones The Foundling in His Married State* (1749)
-*Pamela Censured* (April 1741)
- AUSTEN, Jane, *Mansfield Park* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1966 [1814])
- AYCKBOURN, Alan, *The Norman Conquests* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1977)
- BARBAULD, Anna Laetitia, ed. *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, (London: Richard Phillips 1804)
- BENNETT, Tony, *Formalism and Marxism* (London: Methuen 1979)
- BRONTE, Charlotte, *Wuthering Heights*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1965 [1847])
- BUDD, Louis J., ed., *New Essays on The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1985)
- BUNYAN, John, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, Parts I and II, ed. Roger Sharrock, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965 [Part I 1678; Part II 1684])
- BURKE, Peter, *Vico* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press 1985)
- BUTLER, Samuel, *Erewhon in Erewhon and Erewhon Revisited* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons 1951 [1872])
-*Erewhon Revisited in Erewhon and Erewhon Revisited* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons 1951 [1901])
- CARROLL, John, *Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1964)
- CASTLE, Terry, *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-Century Culture and Fiction* (London: Methuen 1986)

- CHAPMAN, Robin, *The Duchess's Diary*, (London: Faber 1985 [1980])
- CHARNEY, Murice, *Sexual Fiction*, (London: Methuen 1981)
- CHRISTIE, Agatha, *Curtain: Poirot's Last Case* (London: Collins 1975).
-*The Mysterious Affair At Styles* (London: Collins 1987 [1920])
- CLELAND, John, *Memoirs Of a Coxcomb* (London: Compact Library 1964)
-*Fanny Hill or Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure*, Peter Wagner, ed. (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1985 [Volume I 1748; Volume II 1749])
- COOPER, James Fenimore, *The "Leatherstocking Novels"*, 1836-1841
- DAVIS, Lennard J. *Factual Fictions* (New York: Columbia University Press 1983)
-*Resisting Novels: Ideology and Fiction* (New York and London: Methuen 1987)
- DEFOE, Daniel, *The Family Instructor* [1715, 1718], extracted in Laura Curtis, *The Versatile Defoe* (London: George Prior 1979), pp.419-449
-*The Farther Adventures Of Robinson Crusoe* (London: Constable, 1925 [1719])
-*Serious Reflections of Robinson Crusoe* (1720)
-*The Surprizing Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (London: Constable 1925 [1719])
- DERRIDA, Jacques, *Of Grammatology*, trans., Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore and London: 1976 [1967])
- DRUXMAN, Micheal B., *One Good Film Deserves Another* (New York and London: A.S. Barnes and Co., 1977)
- DWORKIN, Andrea, *Men Possessing Women* (London: The Women's Press 1981)
- EAVES, T.C. and KIMPEL, Ben D., *Samuel Richardson: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1971),
- EMERSON, Ralph Waldo, *Emerson's Essays* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1978)
- EPSTEIN, William H., *John Cleland: Images of a Life* (New York and London: Columbia University Press 1974)
- FAULKNER, William, *The "Yoknapawpha County" novels* (1929-1959)
- FEATHER, John, *A History of British Publishing*, (Kent: Croom Helm 1988)

- FIELDING, Henry, *Joseph Andrews*, ed. A.R. Humphreys (London: J.M. Dent and Sons 1973 [1742])
- Shamela*, ed. as above (London: J.M. Dent and Sons 1973 [1741])
- Tom Jones*, ed. R.P.C. Mutter, (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1966 [1749])
- FLYNN, Carol Houlihan, *Samuel Richardson: A Man Of Letters* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press 1982)
- FOWLER, Alastair, *Kinds of Literature : An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1982).
- Spenser and The Numbers of Time* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul 1964)
- FOXON, David, *Libertine Literature in England, 1660-1745* (New York: New Hyde Park 1965)
- GAY, John, *The Beggars Opera and Polly* (London: Chapman and Dodd: 1923 [Beggars's Opera 1728; Polly 1729])
- GENETTE, Gerard, *Figures of Literary Discourse*, trans. Alan Sheridan (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1982)
- *Introduction A L'architexte* (Paris: Editions du Seuil 1979)
- Palimpsestes : La litterature au second degre* (Paris: Editions du seuil, 1980)
- GILDON, Charles, *Robinson Crusoe Examined and Criticized*, ed. Paul Dottin, (London and Paris: J.M. Dent and Sons 1923 [1719])
- GREEN, Daniel, *Bunter Sahib* (London: Hodder and Stoughton 1985)
- GREENE, Graham, *Monsignor Quixote* (London: Bodley Head 1983)
- GRIFFIN, Susan, *Pornography and Silence* (London: The Women's Press 1981)
- GROSSMITH, George and Weedon, *The Diary of A Nobody* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983 [1892])
- HARMON, Robert B., and BURGER, Margaret A., *An Annotated Guide to the Works of Dorothy L. Sayers* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1977)
- HAWKING, Stephen, *A Brief History of Time*, (London and New York: The Bantam Press 1988)
- HICKEN, Mandy, *Sequels*, (London: Association of Assitant Librarians, 1982)
- HIRSCH, E.D., *The Aims of Interpretation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1978)

HITCHMAN, Janet, *Such A Strange Lady : An Introduction to Dorothy L. Sayers (1893-1957)* (London: New English Library 1988)

HOBBES, Thomas, *Leviathan*, C.B. Macpherson, ed., (Harmondsworth: Pelican 1968 [1651])

HUGHES, David, *But For Bunter* (London: Heinemann 1985)

HUNTER, J. Paul, *The Reluctant Pilgrim*, (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press 1966)

HUSBAND, Janet, *Sequels: An Annotated Guide to Novels in Series* (Chicago: American Library Association 1982)

HUTCHINS, Henry C., *Robinson Crusoe And Its Printing 1719-1731: A Bibliographical Study* (New York: Columbia University Press 1925)

ISER, Wolfgang, *The Implied Reader* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press 1974)

JAMES, M.R., *The Penguin Complete Ghost Stories* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1984 [1931])

JAUSS, Hans Robert, "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory" in Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, trans. Timothy Bahti, (Brighton: Harvester Press 1982)

JETER, K.W., *Morlock Night*, (New York: Daw Books 1979)

KEEBLE, Neil H., "Christiana's Key: The Unity of *The Pilgrim's Progress*" in Vincent Newey, ed., *The Pilgrim's Progress: Critical and Historical Views* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 1980)

KELLY, John, *Pamela's Conduct In High Life Unto The Time of Death* (London: Ward and Chandler 1741, 2 Vols.)

KERMODE, Frank, *The Sense of An Ending : Studies in The Theory of Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966)

KREISMANN, Bernard, *Pamela-Shamela: A Study of the Criticisms, Burlesques, Parodies, and Adaptations of Richardson's Pamela*, University of Nebraska Studies, n.s., no.22 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press 1960)

L'ESTRANGE, Anna, *Return To Wuthering Heights* (London: Corgi Books 1978)

LEWALSKI, Barbara K., *Milton's Brief Epic* (Providence: R.I. 1966)

LODGE, David, *Changing Places* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1978)

-*Small World* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1985)

-*Write On:*

Occasional Essays 1965-1985 (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1988)

LYLY, John, *Euphues. The Anatomy of Wit* in
R. Warwick Bond ed., *The Complete Works of John Lyly* (Oxford: Clarendon Press
1902 [1578], 3 vols.), Vol. I

-*Euphues and His England* (above edition [1580]), Vol.2

MARCUS, Stephen, *The Other Victorians: A Study of Sexuality and
Pornography in Mid-Nineteenth Century England* (London: Corgi 1969)

MARE, Walter de la, *Desert Islands and Robinson Crusoe* (London: Faber
1930)

MATTHEWS, Greg, *The Further Adventures of Huck Finn* (London: Macmillan 1983)

MAYO, Robert D., *The English Novel in The Magazines* (Evanston:
Northwestern University Press 1962)

MCKEON, Michael, *The Origins of The English Novel 1600-1740*
(London: Radius 1988)

MCKILLOP, Alan Dugald, *Samuel Richardson: Printer and Novelist*
(Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968 [1936])

MEDVEDEV, P.N. and BAKHTIN, M.M., *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship: A
Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics*, trans. Albert J. Wehrle,
(Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press 1978 [1928])

MILLER, Nancy K., *The Heroine's Text: Readings in the French and English
Novel, 1722-1782* (New York: Columbia Press 1980)

MILTON, John, *Paradise Lost* in
FOWLER, Alastair, ed., *Paradise Lost* (London: Longman 1968 [1667])

-*Paradise Regained* in
CAREY, John ed., *John Milton: The Complete Shorter Poems* (London: Longman
1968 [1671])

MITCHELL, Margaret, *Gone With The Wind* (London: Macmillan 1936)

MOORE, John Robert, *Daniel Defoe: Citizen of The Modern World* (Chicago:
University of Chicago Press 1958)

NOBLE, Yvonne, ed. *Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Beggar's Opera*
(London: Prentice-Hall, 1975)

ORAM, James, *Neighbours: Behind The Scenes* (London: Angus and Robertson,
1988), pp.17-18.

PORTER, Dennis, "Soap Time: Thoughts on a Commodity Art Form", (*College
English*, vol.38, 1977, pp.782-788)

- POWELL, Anthony, *A Dance To The Music of Time* (London: Heinemann 1951-1975)
- PROUST, Marcel, *A La Recherche Du Temps Perdu* (London: Chatto and Windus 1981 [1913-1927])
- RICHARDSON, Samuel, *Pamela In Her Exalted Condition* (*Pamela*: Vols. III and IV [1741]) in William King and Adrian Bott, eds., *The Shakespeare Head Edition Of The Complete Novels of Samuel Richardson* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1929-1931)
- Pamela: Or Virtue Rewarded* (*Pamela* : Vols. I and II [1740]), William King and Adrian Bott, eds. *The Shakespeare Head Edition Of the Novels of Samuel Richardson* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1929-1931)
- RICHETTI, John J., *Defoe's Narratives: Situations and Structures* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1975)
- Popular Fiction Before Richardson: Narrative Patterns 1700-1739* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1969)
- RICHTER, David H., *Fable's End : Completeness and Closure in Rhetorical Fiction* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1974)
- RILEY, Edward C., *Cervantes's Theory of The Novel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1962)
- ROGERS, Pat, *Robinson Crusoe* (London: George Allen and Unwin 1979)
- ROTH, Philip, *The Anatomy Lesson* , (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1984 [1983])
- The Counterlife* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1988 [1987])
- The Facts* (London: Cape 1989)
- The Ghost Writer* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1980 [1979])
- My Life As a Man* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1985 [1974])
- Portnoy's Complaint* (London: Cape 1969)
- The Prague Orgy* (London: Cape 1985)
- When She Was Good* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1983 [1967])
- Zuckerman Bound : A Trilogy and Epilogue* (New York: Farrar, and Giroux 1985)
- PENGUIN
- Zuckerman Unbound* (Harmondsworth: 1983 [1981])
- SAAVEDRA, Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quixote* Parts I and II, trans. J.M. Cohen (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1950 [Part I, 1605; Part II, 1615])
- SABOR, Peter, ed. "Introduction" to *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure*

(Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press 1985)

SALE, William M., *Samuel Richardson: A Bibliographical Record of His Literary Career* (New Haven: Yale University Press 1936)

-*Samuel Richardson: Master Printer* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press 1950)

SAYERS, Dorothy L., *Clouds of Witness* (London: Coronet 1988 [1926])

-*Whose Body?* (London: New English Library 1988 [1923])

SHAKESPEARE, William, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in Peter Alexander, ed., *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* (London and Glasgow: 1951 [1600])

-*Henry IV Part II* (above Edition [1600])

SMITH, Barbara Herrnstein, *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press 1968)

STARR, G.A., *Defoe and Spiritual Autobiography* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1965)

STOPPARD, Tom, *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* (London: Faber 1968)

SUTHERLAND, James, *Daniel Defoe: A Critical Study* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press 1971)

STERNE, Laurence, *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy Gentleman*, Graham Petrie, ed., (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1967 [1759-1767])

SYMONS, Julian, *Bloody Murder: From the Detective Story to the Crime Novel: A History* (Harmondsworth: Viking 1985)

TAYLOR, Anne Robinson, *Male Novelists and Their Female Voices: Literary Masquerades*, (Troy, New York: The Whitston Publishing Company 1981)

TORGOVNICK, Marianna, *Closure in The Novel* (Princeton, Guildford: Princeton University Press 1981)

TOURNIER, Michel, "The End of Robinson Crusoe" in Michel Tournier, *The Fetishist and Other Stories*, trans. Barbara Wright (London: Methuen 1983 [1978])

-*Friday or The Other Island*, trans. Norman Denny, (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1974 [1967])

TWAIN, Mark, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, (London: Chatto and Windus 1963 [1884])

-*The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (London: Chatto and Windus 1959 [1876])

- WAGNER, Peter, ed., *Eros Revived* (London: Martin Secker and Warburg 1988)
- "Introduction" To *Fanny Hill or Memoirs of A Woman of A Woman Of Pleasure* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1985)
- WATERHOUSE, Keith, *Mrs. Pooter's Diary* (London: Black Swan 1984)
- WATT, Ian, *The Rise of The Novel*, (Harmondsworth: Pelican 1981 [1957])
- WELLS, H.G., *The Time Machine* (London: Heinemann 1978 [1895])
- WELSH, Alexander, ed., *Nineteenth Century Fiction*, Vol. 33: 1, (1978):
Special issue in book form: *Narrative Endings* (Berkeley: University of California Press 1978)
- WHEATCROFT, John, *Catherine: Her Book* (Exeter: Cornwall Books 1984)
- WHITE, Edmund, *The Beautiful Room Is Empty* (London: Picador 1988)
- WILES, Roy M. *Serial Publication in England Before 1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1957)
- WIMSATT, William K., *The Verbal Icon: Studies in The Meaning of Poetry* (Kentucky: Kentucky University Press 1954)
- WODEHOUSE, P.G., The "Blandings Castle" novels, (1915-1977)
- YOUNGBERG, Ruth Tanis, *Dorothy L. Sayers: A Reference Guide* (Boston, Massachusetts: G.K. Hall and Co. 1982)
- ZIMMERMAN, Everett, *Defoe and The Novel* (Berkeley: The University of California Press 1975)

SECTION (ii)

Articles and Reviews in Books, Periodicals or Newspapers

- BALL, Donald L., "Pamela II : A Primary Link In Richardson's Development As A Novelist", *Modern Philology*, Vol.65, (May 1968), pp.334-342
- BARTHES, Roland, "The Death of The Author" in Roland Barthes, *Image-Music-Text*, trans. Stephen Heath, (London: Fontana 1977 [1968]) pp.142-148
- BLACK, Frank Gees, "The Continuations of Pamela " , *Revue Anglo- Americaine*, Vol.XIII, (1936), pp.499-507
- BRAUDY, Leo, "Fanny Hill and Materialism", *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol.4 (1979), pp.21-40
- BREMNER, Charles, "Going for Scarlett and Gold", *The Times*, 26 April 1988
- CLELAND, John, "Article VI", *Monthly Review*, Vol.2, (1749-50), pp.25-26
- DAVIES, Russell, "Life After Greyfriars", *The Guardian*, 15 September 1985
- DEFOE, Daniel, *The Review*, Vol. VIII, Preface, (July[?] 1712), and Vol.III, No.16, (1706), in William L. Payne, ed., *The Best of Defoe's Review: An Anthology*, (New York: Columbia University Press 1951)
- FRYE, Northrop, "The Typology of *Paradise Regained*", *Modern Philology*, Vol. 53, (1956), pp.227-238
- HAWKING, Stephen W., "A brief history of A Brief History", *The Independent*, 31 January, 1988
- KEARNEY, A.M., "Richardson's Pamela : The Aesthetic Case" in John Carroll, ed., *Samuel Richardson: A Collection of Critical Essays* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall 1969)
- KEMP, Peter, "The Professor's Romance", *The Sunday Times*, 18 March 1984
- KERMODE, Frank, "A Miserable Splendour", *The Guardian* 3 March 1989
- MASLEN, Keith I, "Edition Quantities For *Robinson Crusoe*, 1719", *The Library*, Fifth Series, No.24, (1969), pp.145-150.
- "The Printers of *Robinson Crusoe* " *The Library*, Fifth Series, No.7 (1952), pp.124-131
- McAFEE, Annalena, "Heller Skelter", *The Evening Standard*, 20 October 1988

MISH, Charles C., "Early Eighteenth-Century Best Sellers in English Prose Fiction", *Bibliographical Society of America*, Vol. 75, (1981), pp.412-418

NOVAK, Maximillian E., "Crusoe the King and the Political Evolution of His Island", *Studies in English Literature*, 2, No.3 (Summer 1962), pp.337-351

PYE, Micheal, "Clint Eastwood: A Profile", *The Observer*, 20 November 1988

SCHROCK, Thomas S., "Considering Crusoe, Part I", *Interpretation*, 1, No.1, (1970), pp.76-106

SONTAG, Susan, "The Pornographic Imagination", in Georges Bataille, *The Story of The Eye*, trans. J. Neugroschel (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1982)

STURROCK, June, "The Completion of *Pamela*", *Durham University Journal*, 43, (1982), pp.227-232

WHITLEY, Raymond K., "The Libertine Hero and Heroine in the Novels of John Cleland", *Studies In Eighteenth -Century Culture*, Vol.9 (1979), pp.387-404

SECTION (iii)

FILMS AND TELEVISION PROGRAMMES

In Order of Director or Originators (in the case of soap operas)

- ALLEN, Irwin, *Beyond the Poseidon Adventure* (Warner 1979)
- ALLEN, Woody, *Annie Hall*, in *Four Films of Woody Allen*, (London: Faber 1983)
- CHANEY Jr., Lon, *Son of Dracula* (Universal 1943)
- FAIRBANKS, Douglas, *Don Q, Son of Zorro* (United Artists 1925)
- *The Mark Of Zorro*, (United Artists 1920)
- LAWFORD, Peter, *Son of Lassie*, (MGM 1945)
- RATHBONE, Basil, *Son of Frankenstein* (Universal 1939)
- SMITH, Julia, and HOLLAND, Tony, *Eastenders*, (BBC, first broadcast, 19 February 1985, continuing - collective authorship).
- HOLMES, Ian and WATSON, Reg, *Neighbours* (Grundy, first broadcast Australia 18 March 1985, first broadcast Britain, 27 October 1986).