This thesis examines the figure of the rake as portrayed in the eighteenth-century English novel, a character strangely neglected in critical studies.

The first chapter examines 'libertine' writers of the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, notably Bernard de Mandeville; and the dilemma faced by educators of the day over the benefits of virtue on the one hand, and of worldly wisdom on the other. While Mandeville and other lesser defenders of the rake were very much a scandalous minority early in the eighteenth century, it appears that by about mid century a more moderate strain of libertinism received wider, but by no means universal acceptance (Johnson, Chesterfield, Smith, Hume).

The second chapter seeks to define the classic conception of the rake as a young upper-class prodigal, and the standard anti-libertine view that gentleman rakes, by their neglect of social and political duties, were a serious threat to established social and political order. The chapter concludes with various examples of the standard rake in minor eighteenth-century novels that both defend and vilify him.

Chapters III to V concentrate on each of the three principal novelists of mid century (Henry Fielding, Samuel Richardson, Tobias Smollett), and their particular uses of and moral conclusions about the conventional rake. The sixth chapter suggests some conclusions to be drawn, mainly from the previous three chapters, and especially the ways in which Fielding, Richardson and Smollett comment on the rakes in each other's fiction; and examines the continued use of the rake topos right to the end of the century and at least into the early nineteenth, in differing types of fiction (novels of manners, of Sentiment and of radical ideas, the Gothic novel).
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A Beau to the Life! a fine Spark, by my Soul,
You drunken young Rake-hell, come out of your hole:
Let us see in the Light what a figure you make;
A most exquisite Sot, a true Orthodox Rake....

[Ned Ward],
*The Rambling Fuddle-Caps* (1709)
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CHAPTER ONE
‘With Design, We Conceive, to
Debauch the Nation’

The title and epigraph of this thesis are intended as glosses on its two principal contentions: first, that in the abundant bibliography of the eighteenth-century novel there must be something like Richardson’s ‘thousand wrecks’; and secondly, that the existence of the rake as a standard character in eighteenth-century fiction has, to a large extent, been hidden in the gloom of a cave only recently penetrated by the lamp of scholarly attention, and has yet to be held up to bright light and full examination. This is not to say that the rake has been utterly ignored by literary historians and critics, but it is true that little has been said beyond making some cursory parallels between William Hogarth’s _Rake’s Progress_ and contemporary novels, casually labelling a fictional plot as something of a similar progress. What appears not to have been discussed, or perhaps even noticed more than superficially, is the degree of eighteenth-century consensus on the definition of a rake, and the widespread agreement about the moral and social threat posed by rampant upper-class libertinism. This, combined with the sheer number of instances of the rakish type, seemingly almost to the point of ubiquity, should not suggest, however, that the figure of the rake is a kind of compleat key to the eighteenth-century novel and its moral concerns; but it is fair to say that many of the period’s fears about vicious tendencies in human nature and in society found their embodiment in the fictional rake. It is the third major contention of this study that the
libertine was so well-known and conventional a literary type, especially in fiction, that even three of the greatest practitioners of the novel -- Fielding, Richardson and Smollett -- base their own plots, characters and moral discussions in part on the received eighteenth-century views on rakery and on less sophisticated but highly popular rake-novels of the first half of the century. Recent scholarship seems to bear out such a view, for now that large numbers of eighteenth-century minor and ephemeral novels have been catalogued, historians of the genre have begun to arrive at a sense of the importance of the lesser predecessors of the great novelists, of the influence of the minor on the major (as well as vice versa) in the development of the new species of writing. Studies by John J. Richetti, Margaret Anne Doody, Robert Adams Day, William Park, Jerry C. Beasley, Michael McKeon and others elucidate the context of eighteenth-century fiction, and place Tom Jones, Clarissa and other greats, previously considered the miraculous products of some sort of literary parthenogenesis, in relation to a well-established corpus of popular fiction with its own set of conventions. These studies tend to take a 'taxonomical' approach, identifying a number of narrative patterns and stock characters, the most germane of which for my purposes here being the biographies and 'autobiographies' of whores, highwaymen and other rogues, and the secret histories of amorous intrigue that flourished in the first three decades of the century. It seems odd, however, that none of these scholars makes much or anything of amorous, upper-class, intriguing rogues as the main characters of fictional progressions. There is, in fact, a good deal of evidence to suggest that eighteenth-century critics and novelists regarded the rake as one of the staples of the genre, even to the exclusion of other types of characters. Thus we find in the 'Dedication' of Francis Coventry's novel The History of Pompey the Little (1751) to Henry Fielding, the author's identification of 'beaux,
rakes, petit-maitres and fine ladies' as those 'whose lives are spent in doing the things
which novels record',4 and goes on to burlesque the life of a rakish man about town
by putting a Bologna lap-dog in his place in a series of adventures and vicissitudes.
In the 'Preface' of the elder George Colman's play Polly Honeycombe (1760) (sub-titled
'A Dramatick Novel in One Act'), an extract from 'the Catalogue of the Circulating
Library' is included, and the choice of titles, all novels, is significant. The play's heroine
has a 'whimsical passion for Novels'5 and is, against her parents' wishes, in love with
the hack novelist Mr Scribble. Polly sees herself as the heroine of a romantic fiction,
and her lover as the hero, a veritable 'Bob Lovelace' (10). The choice of novels in the
catalogue extract in the Preface encompasses most of the well-known fiction from
Defoe to Richardson, but concentrates on two types: the inflaming secret histories of
Manley, Haywood and others that define Polly's expectations of female character in
fiction and in herself, and novelistic biographies of rakes that determine her view of
men in literature and in life. Colman's implicit moral (although the treatment of it is
comic) is that novels have corrupted the standards of character of their readers,
especially young female ones. So, as counterparts to works like The New Atalantis, the
Prostitutes of Quality, Lady's Advocate and Theatre of Love, which set an example of
amorous indiscretion and abandonment to young ladies, there are titles like The
Accomplished Rake; The Adventures of a Rake; The History of Will Ramble, A
Libertine; The Intriguing Coxcomb and The Temple-Beau, or the Town Rakes, which
make girls yearn for a novelistic rakish hero as a suitor (ix-xiii). This is, I think, what
underlies Colman's choice of books in his preface, but Samuel Richardson makes the
point explicitly in the 'Conclusion' to Clarissa, where Polly Horton has in a more
dangerous way than Polly Honeycombe fallen for licentious fiction, for her novel-
reading brings about her ruin and subsequent prostitution. 'She glowed to become the object of some Hero's flame, and perfectly longed to begin an intrigue, and even to be run away with by some enterprising Lover...'

and when she sees Lovelace at the opera it is as just such a rake-hero out of books (XII. 297). In his 'Concluding Note' to *Sir Charles Grandison*, Richardson clearly has rake-fiction in mind, probably including the novels of Fielding and Smollett, when he observes:

> It has been said in behalf of many modern fictitious pieces, in which authors have given success (and *happiness*, as it is called) to their heroes of vicious, if not of profligate characters, that they have exhibited Human Nature as it is. Its corruption may, indeed, be exhibited in the faulty character; but need pictures of this be held out in books? Is not vice crowned with success, triumphant, and rewarded, and perhaps set off with wit and spirit, a dangerous representation? And is it not made even *more* dangerous by the hasty reformation, introduced, in contradiction to all probability, for the sake of patching up what is called a happy ending?

> The God of Nature intended not nature for a vile and contemptible thing. And many are the instances, in every age, of those whom He enables, amidst all the frailties of mortality, to do it honour. Still the *best* performances of human creatures will be imperfect; but such as they are, it is surely both delightful and instructive to dwell sometimes on this bright side of things; To shew, by a series of facts in common life, what a degree of excellence may be attained and preserved amidst all the infection of fashionable vice and folly. (XVIII. 329)

Richardson's rationale, then, for portraying the virtues of Grandison is to offer a corrective to novels that celebrate, either tacitly or explicitly, the exploits of rakes, but it is the latter which are the prime concern of this study.

Before proceeding any further, it is worth defining precisely what is meant by the term 'rake'. Its etymology is somewhat doubtful, but this is not necessarily
problematic. 'Rake' is an abbreviation of the earlier 'rakehell', again of uncertain derivation but quite possibly referring to the stirring up of infernal coals by young libertines. Another possible origin is suggested by the Earl of Surrey's 'When Winder walles ...' (1547), where the poet yearns for 'The rakhell life, that longs to loves disporte'; and where 'rakhell' is glossed as 'careless, unrestrained', from the Middle English 'rakel' (itself a variant spelling of 'rakehell') or 'rackle' ('rash, violent, headstrong, fearless; disorderly, riotous, unruly'). The third possible etymology is Dr Johnson's, which tentatively links 'rakehell' with the French racaille ('rabble'). In the end, I think it might be wise to reject Johnson's theory (which the OED does not take up), in light of the likelier-sounding Middle English stem. It is more probable that 'rakehell' is something of a conflation of 'rakel' and 'rake hell', which seems to give a better sense of a rakish definition and its origins. (Another reason to reject Johnson's derivation is the invariable gentlemanly social background of the rake in the eighteenth century, which I shall discuss at greater length in Chapter Two.) 'Rakehell' seems to have been current from circa 1550 to 1725, according to the OED, when the short form begins to predominate, but it is worth noting that most of the sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century citations (including ones from Spenser and E.K.) confine the meaning of 'rakehell' to 'scoundrel or rascal' (which latter may be a cognate). It appears that only after about 1650 does the word 'rakehell' begin to mean 'a vile debauchee or rake', 'a man of loose habits and immoral character, an idle dissipated man of fashion' (the definition that is more specifically the concern of this thesis) — roughly simultaneously with the new usage of the abbreviation 'rake' in the same, more particular sense. The first example of 'rake' cited is in Henry More's Antidote Against Atheisme (1653), which alludes to 'These dissolute Rakes.' Usage of 'rakehell', 'rakel' and
'rakehell' in the general, merely rascally sense seems to have persisted as late as 1690, but from its first appearance, 'rake' identifies the libertine specifically.

It is probably no accident that 'rake' as a word and as a concept emerges in the 1650's, refining the original 'rakehell', for the rake does seem to be a social and literary phenomenon only from the later seventeenth century, especially after the Restoration of Charles II. It is true, however, as Justice Scruple in Gay's *Mohocks* suggests, and as Thornton Shirley Graves in a learned article has demonstrated, that organised groups of rakes had been drinking, whoring, breaking windows and beating up the Watch in the reigns of Elizabeth I and James I (which I shall further discuss in Chapter Two) — but it is also fair to say that rake flourishes only from about the Restoration, and on the stage in particular. Why is this so? Certainly the example of the Merry Monarch and his dissolute Court was partly responsible, but it is worth remembering that Henry More spots his rake during the Protectorate, seven years before the return of King courtiers and players. Even so, the character of the Restoration owes much to that of Charles II himself, as portrayed by Dryden in *Absalom and Achitophel* and by the Earl of Rochester in a number of scurrilous verses and epigrams. It owes even more to Lord Rochester himself, who is, according to all commentators, the pre-eminent rake of the period (whether or not he was the original of Etherege's Dorimant) — together with his 'merry Gang' (Sedley, Buckingham, Dorset, Mulgrave, Etherege, Wycherley), and both in the extravagance of his dissipation and in his celebrated death-bed repentance under the guidance of Bishop Burnet. As remarkable as these men were, and in spite of Boswell's famous assertion that Englishmen 'In Oliver Cromwell's time ... were all precise, canting creatures. And no sooner did Charles the Second come
over than they turned gay rakes and libertines; they cannot have been solely responsible for making the era seem libertine. It is probably better to regard these men, with their contemporaries, as part of larger intellectual and social trends in the seventeenth century, the same philosophical climate that produced Hobbes's *Leviathan*. Although Shadwell's *The Libertine* (1676) is an English version of Molière's *Festin le Père* (*Dom Juan*; 1665), and thus of Spanish Don Juan material, and although David Foxon links the proliferation of continental pornography in England in the seventeenth century with a general European revolt against political and spiritual authority — *à la française* in particular — most recent scholarship has concluded that there is perhaps not so much connexion between the free-thinking, politically radical French *libertin* and the free-living, heedless English rake. English libertinism does owe a great deal, however, to the seventeenth-century revival of interest in the writings of Epicurus (as transmitted by Lucretius, and however vulgarised as mere sensualism), which the translations of Thomas Creech and John Dryden helped to popularise — to the extent that even the publican poet Ned Ward refers to Epicurus. In his study of the Restoration rake-hero, Harold M. Weber suggests that the rise of the rake character in the literature of the period, while it does have origins in Elizabethan, Jacobean and even mediaeval drama, is more the product of a change in seventeenth-century views of the erotic: away from demonic sexual imagery, towards a new conception of sex purged of some of its sinfulness, which in turn permitted a new, 'libertine' approach to human relationships. Weber also draws a connexion between this shift in sexual values and the social change charted in Lawrence Stone's *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*. Stone argues that the collapse of moral Puritanism in the 1660's allowed a more liberal attitude to sex,
which manifested itself both in the new companionate marriage (based on love rather
than money) and in a greater tolerance of extra-marital sexual relations. (Or, possibly,
extra-marital sex might have been taken for granted in the days of financially motivated
marriages, and only seemed anti-matrimonial and 'libertine' with the rise of the love-
match.)

All of this should suggest that the phenomenon of libertinism in the
seventeenth century is a complicated one, with a variety of origins. Recent scholarship
has also warned against grouping all seventeenth-century literary rakes together,
suggesting instead a more detailed and sophisticated taxonomy. In 'The Rakish Stage:
The Myth of the Rake in "Restoration" Comedy', Robert D. Hume argues against many
common assumptions about seventeenth-century comedy: first, the belief that the plays
of the period are anti-matrimonial and portray rakes that do not or do not meaningfully
repent in the fifth act; secondly (and more importantly for my purposes), that there are
major differences in the types of rakes depicted between 1660 and 1700, which is why
Hume objects to the term 'Restoration' as a description for the whole of the later
seventeenth century. Brief examination of these strains of rakishness might be useful
here. The first distinction that Hume draws is between the 'Polite Rake' and the
'Debauchee'. The former he defines as 'a young man of wit and breeding. He flouts
society's rules, but he is accepted by the best society' (Hume, 154) — Wycherley's Horner
and Etherge's Dorimant are perhaps the best examples; and the latter as one of any
number of contemptible vulgar whoremasters: the country blockhead in town, the
hypocritical puritan, the dirty old man (155). These are the two basic types, but there are
a number of sub-species. Hume dismisses the rakes of mere bedroom farces for offering
little insight into the libertine character, and those whose excess is largely just 'an excuse for loudly touted reform' (159). The first major sub-group for Hume is, then, what Robert Jordan earlier identified as the 'Extravagant Rake' — a frantic, wild, reckless, comic, likeable and usually reformable libertine. Examples are Celadon in Dryden's *Secret Love* (1668) and Wildair in Farquhar's *The Constant Couple* (1699). The second major category is that of the 'Philosophical Libertine', as Hume calls it (Jordan's 'Judicious Rake'; Hume, 159-63). This type is closest to the character of the Court Wits of Rochester's circle — sceptic but materialist, Epicurean in the vulgar sense, scandalous in behaviour but an occasional conformist to religious and social values (Hume, 144). Hume suggests that this category is in fact a rather small sub-set of rakes, but it does include some of the most famous libertines of the seventeenth-century stage: Rhodophil and Palamede in Dryden's *Marriage A-la-mode* (1672), Horner in Wycherley's *The Country Wife* (1676), Dorimant in Etherege's *The Man of Mode* (1676), Longvil and Bruce in Shadwell's *The Virtuoso* (1676), in Dryden's *The Kind Keeper* (1678), and Truman and Valentine in Otway's *Friendship in Fashion* (1678). These rakes are by no means uniform in character (this is particularly true of Horner and Dorimant, both highly individual), but they do share a number of qualities: refinement, love of intrigue for its own sake, voracious sexual appetite combined with self-control, a certain detachment and cynicism, and a measure of cruelty.

Hume, Weber and Maximillian E. Novak identify a reaction in the later seventeenth century against this rakish product of the 1670's: Hume in the 'Vicious Rake', and all three writers in the tamer versions of the rake that appear in the comedies of the 1690's. The Vicious Rake, of whom Dryden's Limberham, Shadwell's Don
John and Nathaniel Lee's Nemours in *The Princess of Cleve* (1682) are the best examples, was set up to be despised and condemned — a message that the audiences of *Mr. Limberham* largely failed to see. But by far the more important reaction to the libertine (and possibly the libertinism) of the 1670's, which Weber and Novak call Hobbesian, was the emergence of a softer rakish character, without the cruelty and aggression, tempered with the neo-Epicurean sensibilities espoused by Sir William Temple (Epicurean more in the true sense than the debased), closer to the *honnête homme* than the viler sort of rake. C.D. Cecil perceives the germ of this new rake in figures as early as Horner and Dorimant (rakes Hume and Weber place with the 1670's type), but there is general agreement that the new modified type reaches its fullest seventeenth-century development in the witty heroes of Congreve, in Mirabell and Valentine above all.\(^{22}\) Weber calls *this* the 'Philosophical Libertine' (in contrast to Hume), but the terminology need not confuse, for the phenomenon of the moderate rake in the 1690's is obvious enough. Weber sees in Congreve an attempt at 'redefining the rake's lust for pleasure without sacrificing the energetic being that helps make the rake a "hero"' (129), at 'controlling his predilection for disorder and misrule' (97), at 'socialising the rake's sexual energies and taming the rake's aggressive passions ...' (97). Weber admits that Congreve ultimately gives up trying to reconcile sexual licence and social order, but even an unachieved synthesis of this kind is an important precedent for the rakes of eighteenth-century literature, especially those in the novels of Fielding, Richardson and Smollett.

Eighteenth-century writers take up many of the rakish stereotypes of the previous century (for of course seventeenth-century plays were frequently read and performed in the eighteenth), but with considerable fragmentation, dilution, alteration
and recombination of many of the constituent elements. Richardson's Lovelace is an excellent case in point, for he is an amalgam of many seventeenth-century rakish types. And consciously so, it would appear, for as many excellent studies have shown, *Clarissa* is extensively indebted to and conscious of Restoration drama (in particular to the heroic tragedies of tyrannick love, but also to figures like Dorimant). Even Tom Jones remarks to Sophia on his reformation that she has a sufficient pledge for his constancy to her:

There, behold it there, in that lovely Figure, in that Face, that Shape, those Eyes, that Mind which shines through those Eyes: Can the Man who shall be in Possession of these be inconstant? Impossible! my Sophia. They would fix a *Dorimant*, a Lord *Rochester*

— nor is it coincidental that Sophia herself lets Southerne's *The Fatal Marriage* (1694) fall from her hand as Lord Fellamar bursts in on her, with rape on his mind. It may then be useful to suggest how the seventeenth-century types outlined above survive into the eighteenth century, in order to understand the historical background of the eighteenth-century rake, and the ways in which eighteenth-century writers use, discard or play with earlier stereotypes of rakish conduct. The Vicious Rake is perpetuated in the debauchees depicted by moralists like John 'Estimate' Brown and Vicesimus Knox, who fulminate against the evil consequences of libertinism; in *Clarissa*, in the character of the impenitent, dying Belton and in Lovelace as he appears at the end of the novel, mad, cruel and doomed; in the sinister seducers of Mackenzie and of Cleland's *Surprises of Love* (1768); and in the villains of the Gothic novel. The Extravagant Rake is more difficult to find later on, but there is the appropriate combination of the wild,
the freakish and the rather likeable in the pranks of Peregrine Pickle, in descriptions of
the Mohocks by Steele and Gay that defend or are amused by their antics, and in some of
the jolly descriptions of libertines in Ned Ward's miscellaneous verse and his *Secret
History of Clubs* (1703, 1709, 1711, c. 1720). With the charming, genial qualities
removed, the Extravagant is to be found in Lovelace's coxcombical friend Tourville;
and, possibly, in Lord M.'s characterisation of Lovelace himself as a wild and crazy, but
jolly fellow, or even in Lovelace's own freakish (but black) comic letters. The
Debauchee, as defined by Hume, is identifiable in the boorish seducers of Cleland's
*Surprises*, in Goldsmith's Squire Thornhill in *The Vicar of Wakefield* (1762), and to
some extent in the hypocrite Square in *Tom Jones*. Hume's 'Philosophical' and
Novak's 'Hobbesian' libertine reoccurs in characters like the urbane, cynical,
Mandevillean 'noble Lord' of Fielding's *Amelia* and in the title character of Samuel
Jackson Pratt's *The Pupil of Pleasure* (1776) — though it is worth pointing out that in
both cases we are dealing with a nastier version of the Restoration type, and that Pratt's
Pupil is also ostensibly a Chesterfieldian neo-Epicure. It is also probable that Lovelace
and his gang of rakes are at least partly modelled on Rochester and his set of Court Wits,
who themselves in part define or exemplify the 'Philosophical' libertine of the 1670's.
Every polished modern fine gentleman of the eighteenth century perpetuates the earlier
'Polite Rake': examples include Mary Davys's Sir John Galliard in *The Accomplish'd
Rake* (1727), Tom Rakewell attended by his levée in the second scene of Hogarth's
*Progress* (1733-4, 1735), the sophisticated Lovelace, Cleland's Coxcomb (1751), Eliza
Haywood's Jemmy Jessamy (1753), Peregrine Pickle in his moments of social success.
But by far the most important survival into the eighteenth century is that of the
Congrevian moderate rake, whose neo-Epicureanism is expounded in Lord Chesterfield's *Letters to His Son* (1774), and whose limited libertinism is found in fiction above all in Fanny Hill's 'rational pleasurism', in Joseph Andrews's Wilson, in Tom Jones, and in Smollett's Random and Pickle. (It is thus perhaps no accident that Congreve was co-opted by the Scriblerians, with whom both Fielding and Smollett identified themselves; and by the Patriot faction — see the statue of Congreve's monkey in the politically allegorical gardens at Stowe — with whom Fielding sympathised.) Both Fielding and Smollett, it seems to me, try to reconcile a tamed form of libertinism with social impulses (Fielding with greater consistency and sophistication, Smollett more haphazardly), as I shall attempt to demonstrate in Chapters Three and Five. There are aspects of this taming of the rake, after the manner of Congreve, in Richardson too, for although Mr B. at first seems to be a Vicious Rake, he is later shown to be 'The sober Rake' and 'The genteel Rake', capable of reformation and of performing his proper social duties because he is not profoundly debauched. Belford, Clarissa's advocate and the only true reformed rake in that novel, is a more convincing rake of this type than B. Lovelace tries to present himself as another such limited libertine, and his good qualities do nearly make him one, but he is ultimately damnable. (Indeed, his deserved fate is as black as Tom Rakewell's, mad in Bedlam, or Don John's in *The Libertine*.) Sir Charles Grandison, who is said to display traces of rakishness, takes the removal of libertinism's sting to its fullest extent — nearly to the point where it is no longer a question of rakishness at all.

The taming of the rake is one mechanism for his reformation in late seventeenth-century comedy that carries over into eighteenth-century literature.

Another that warrants brief mention here is the reforming 'charm' of a virtuous and
beautiful woman, which David S. Berkeley traces to *précieux* neo-Platonism. In the eighteenth-century novel the love of a good woman is used for the reclamation of rakes by Pamela, Sophia Western, Emilia Gauntlet, and perhaps by Lady Vane (in an odd way, as I shall suggest in Chapter Five); is tragically insufficient in *Clarissa*; and is rather curiously transferred, it seems to me, to the exemplary and reforming Sir Charles Grandison.

It should be apparent from the preceding, rather tentative identification of seventeenth-century characteristics in later rakes, and from the problems of nomenclature and classification in Hume, Weber and Novak, that rigid categorisation of libertines, seventeenth-century or eighteenth, may be neither possible nor advisable. Lovelace is again an excellent illustration of this, for as we have seen, he combines a number of rakish strains in one Protean character, as though Richardson were attempting to depict the Anatomy of a Rake in one composite personage. The broad distinctions are important, however, in that they show how a more modestly rakish character like Tom Jones or Peregrine Pickle can validly and usefully be regarded as a libertine, as much so as more extreme cases like Lovelace or Galliard. The differences are, then, of degree or particulars rather than of kind. In some ways, indeed, the distinctions made between rakes might seem arbitrary or over-subtle — eighteenth-century critics of Tom Jones thought him as vile a rake as Lovelace, and Robert D. Hume despairs of Sir Richard Blackmore for putting all rakish characteristics together in the Preface to *Prince Arthur* (1695), in effect for failing to adopt Hume's own classifications.

The *Man of Sense* and the Fine *Gentleman*
in the Comedy, who as chiefest Person propos'd to the Esteem and Imitation of the Audience, is enrich'd with all the Sense and Wit the Poet can bestow; this Extraordinary Person you will find to be a great Defender of Religion, a great Admirer of Lucretius, not so much for his Learning, as his Irreligion, a Person wholly Idle, dissolv'd in Luxury, abandon'd to his Pleasures, a great Debaucher of Women, profuse and extravagant in his Expences, and in short, this Finish'd Gentleman will appear a Finish'd Libertine.

— but I think in this is, in the end, an argument for inclusiveness rather than selectiveness in a discussion of seventeenth- or eighteenth-century rakes. Certainly many rakes do combine all the stereotypical elements (in the eighteenth century one might again cite Lovelace, or Tom Rakewell, especially as characterised in The Rake's Progress: Or, Humours of Drury-Lane (1735)); but the eighteenth-century writer, for whom the Restoration rakish stereotypes must have been so well established and familiar, had the option either to delineate every libertine quality or to pick and choose while remaining within the broad type. I shall argue that Fielding, Smollett and others are particularly at pains to do the latter, in order to find a place within conventional morality for certain rakish qualities and a limited brand of libertinism.

My second chapter will be devoted to further sketching out the attributes and career of the standard rake of eighteenth-century literature, in particular the novel; to examining the common association of libertinism with the decay of social and political institutions; and to discussing the defences of libertinism made by some eighteenth-century novelists. Before this can be done, it will be necessary to examine some of the arguments that were advanced, hesitantly or boldly, in favour of rakery in the late seventeenth century and early eighteenth, and that were partly responsible for
fuelling paranoia about the rake and his effect on society. By no means all eighteenth-century moralists regarded licence with the horror of an 'Estimate' Brown, nor did all the novelists of the period advocate the narrowest and most rigid code of behaviour for young men. Having outlined the two sides of the argument in my first two chapters, and defined the 'classic' eighteenth-century rake in the second, in Chapters III, IV and V I shall examine the rakes of Henry Fielding, Samuel Richardson and Tobias Smollett. What I wish to suggest there is that these novelists, like so many of their contemporaries, were aware of the stock aspects of the rake and of the received wisdom on the subject of libertinism; and that in having their own fictional rakes both conform to and diverge from the conventional, they use the rake topos in order to make their own differing points about personal morality, about the rôle of the individual (more particularly, of the gentleman) in society, and, perhaps most importantly, about each others' rakes and novels. I shall conclude with glances at the rake in later eighteenth-century fiction: the novel of sentiment, the novel of manners, the Gothic novel, the radical novel. My guiding critical principle throughout the thesis will be to let the primary texts 'speak for themselves' as much as possible, in order to arrive as nearly as one can at what people in the eighteenth century thought of libertinism. This is consistent, I believe, with my efforts to cite and catalogue a large number of rakes in eighteenth-century fiction, in order to establish the context and conventions of rake-fiction. The passage of time inevitably makes a perfect understanding of eighteenth-century thought impossible (nor should it be assumed that the century spoke with one voice), but I hope that enumeration of minor texts and close reading of major ones (especially novels as carefully constructed as *Tom Jones* and *Clarissa*, which seem to warrant such a reading) will go some way to elucidating eighteenth-century opinions.
At times this approach will necessarily seem to make some conclusions about authorial intention, but I hope I shall do so sufficiently tentatively and giving adequate supporting evidence from other places in a particular author's work. I shall also try to show primary material may be qualified or contradicted by statements or suggestions elsewhere in an author's work. In some cases (particularly those of Eliza Haywood, Samuel Richardson and Tobias Smollett), I shall be at pains to point out the inconsistencies within individual texts or from work to work, in terms of characterisation, apparent moral purposes or indeed conclusions about libertinism. In these instances, I trust I shall make no unjustified conclusions or overly dogmatic pronouncements, either leaving questions open or advancing my own theories while recognising contrary opinion.

First, however, it is time to investigate those who remained unconvinced that libertinism was the danger some made it out to be; and also those who were prepared to say that it was a good thing for young men and even for society, though usually within certain carefully prescribed limits. Outside this boundary, of course, lies the rich province of eighteenth-century pornography, but there are a number of reasons for leaving that body of literature out of the discussion here. One of the aims of this study is to identify and discuss attempts to legitimise libertinism by finding a place for the rake within a modified but still conventional morality, but pornography is by nature anti-social and underground, revelling in its own sense of perversion and unlawfulness, and thus lies beyond the pale for my purposes. It is questionable, furthermore, whether outright pornography (as opposed to lascivious but conventional works like the novels of Mrs Manley, though admittedly the distinction is often hazy) had much effect on any but a minority of abnormal readers in arguing
a libertine position. In any case, the pornographic literature of the period has been admirably discussed elsewhere. In the more sober reign of the last of the Stuarts, Restoration literature as a whole must have seemed libertine indeed, and surely provided some inspiration to those in the eighteenth century who wished to advance genuinely (as opposed to underground) libertine arguments. The historical development of these ideas is discussed by John Sekora in *Luxury: The Concept in Western Thought, Eden to Smollett* (1977), a wide-ranging study of the Western response to extravagance and excess (both attacks and defences), from the Old Testament to the end of the eighteenth century. The first half of Sekora’s book ambitiously (but largely successfully) covers the period from Genesis up to Smollett, the development of the traditional view of luxury as ‘a fundamental and generic vice from which other, subordinate vices would ensue’, and the source of social instability. The eighteenth century represents a departure from this tradition for Sekora, in that from about the 1750’s he notices a counter-trend in the writings of Hume, Gibbon, Smith and Johnson that legitimised libertinism. The threat to society posed by libertinism again began to be discounted, and some were even prepared to make a qualified defence of it (100-09), while still denouncing notorious earlier proponents like Bernard de Mandeville. The obvious implication is that the opinions of seventeenth-century writers and of Mandeville, very much those of a controversial and scandalous minority in their own times, had gradually become more and more acceptable to mainstream thought.

There was, without doubt, considerable soul-searching on the part of ethical writers and educators who tried to determine whether contact with a corrupt world could give a young man practical experience and wisdom without seriously debauching his morals, and if so, how much contact was desirable or possible. In his educational
programme *Some Thoughts concerning Education*, John Locke attempts to combine discipline suitable for a child with responsibility suitable for a rational, if not yet adult being, and the question of experience *versus* corruption evidently causes him some uneasiness. Locke is very keen about inculcating mastery over the passions from the earliest possible age, but he makes some allowance for youthful sallies:

I say not this, that I would never have a young gentleman accommodate himself to the innocent diversions in fashion, amongst those of his age and condition. I am so far from having him austere and morose to that degree, that I would persuade him to more than ordinary complaisance for all the gaieties and diversions of those he converses with, and be averse or testy in nothing they should desire of him, that might become a gentleman, and an honest man... (198)

Fashionable recreations, if consistent with virtue, and even youthful over-spending (200), are thus permissible, but what has Locke to say when the diversions of youth are more dangerous to morality? And, more generally, about intercourse with a society that is positively vicious? Locke is prepared to keep a boy sheltered and unpolished if a public school means exposing him to vice, for 'virtue is harder to be got, than a knowledge of the world; and if lost in a young man, is seldom recovered' (55; 53-8 generally) -- but he admits that in this case, 'both sides have their inconveniencies' (54). The appropriate degree of necessary contact with the corruption, but also with the benefits of the world is difficult to arrive at, but Locke hopes that good education earlier on can reconcile virtue and worldly wisdom as nearly as possible:

I know it is often said, that to discover to a young man the vices of the age is to teach them him. That, I confess, is a good deal so, according as it is done; and therefore requires a discreet man of parts, who knows the world, and can judge of the temper,
inclination, and weak side of his pupil. This farther is to be remembered, that it is not possible now (as perhaps it formerly was) to keep a young gentleman from vice, by a total ignorance of it; unless you will all his life mew him up in a closet, and never let him go into company. The longer he is kept thus hoodwinked, the less he will see, when he comes abroad into open day-light, and be the more exposed to be a prey to himself and others.  

There is possibly an inherent chicken-and-egg problem in this passage (how is the wise and worldly governor to become so himself, if not through the means Locke is so desirous to avoid?), but here, as elsewhere in Some Thoughts, the issue is left unresolved. Towards the end of the treatise, Locke considers the benefits and defects of the Grand Tour, and again he worries about the getting of wisdom in the world; travel may be exposure more to foreign vice than to foreign languages, art, history and polite society (201-03). His conclusion is that the Tour should be made either earlier than is customary (between the ages of seven and sixteen rather than at the 'boiling boisterous part of life' between sixteen and twenty-one; 201), or much later, when boiling is past and inculcated virtue is strong enough to withstand attack (201-02). But in the penultimate paragraph of the Thoughts, Locke admits with an almost embittered sense of resignation that the modern Grand Tour is unlikely to change for the better: parents will never hazard a young boy's travelling, even though the moral risks are greater in adolescence; and a later Tour is impossible, for 'he must be back again by one-and-twenty, to marry and propagate' (204). Locke rather cynically abandons the young bridegroom not to his wife but to his mistress (204), and rapidly concludes 'Of Education'.

Eighteenth-century moralists continued the debate, some, like Swift in Intelligencer or Richard Hurd in his Dialogues on the Uses of Foreign Travel (imagined conversations between Shaftesbury and Locke) (1764), taking a Lockean middle position of
making some allowance for youthful excess; others, with Vicesimus Knox in *Liberal Education* (1781), absolutely forbidding the introduction of 'boys to scenes of immoral and indecent behaviour ...\(^3\)

There were, of course, advocates of greater tolerance than the rigid Knox, for example the 3d Earl of Shaftesbury, whose *Characteristics* suggests that restraint or persecution of licence is likely to lead to greater and worse excess. Lord Shaftesbury means primarily poetic licence, but there is perhaps room in his discussion for a measure of rakish free-thinking:

> as to private society, and what passes in select companies, where friends meet knowingly, and with that very design of exercising their wit, and looking freely into all subjects, I see no pretence for any one to be offended at the way of raillery and humour, which is the very life of such conversations; the only thing which makes good company and frees it from the formality of business, and the tutorage and dogmaticalness of the schools.\(^{33}\)

In other respects, however, Shaftesbury is critical of unrestrained passions and vices, and of the licentiousness of upper-class young men in particular\(^3\) -- a position taken again and again in the eighteenth century, as we shall see later in this chapter and in the next. But Shaftesbury's view of man as naturally inclined to goodness (unless perverted by acquired vices)\(^3\) leads him to suppose that libertinism can hold little attraction for very long:

> Let such gentlemen as these be as extravagant as they please, or as irregular in their morals, they must at the same time discover their inconsistency, live at variance with themselves, and in contradiction to that principle on which they ground their highest pleasure and entertainment. (I. 89-90)
The implication of this sentiment, whether Shaftesbury realised it or not, is that if libertinism runs counter to basic human nature it cannot therefore be too serious because it is necessarily impermanent and superficial. Shaftesbury is certainly the source for writers like Fielding who were convinced that all but the most depraved young men soon grow tired of excess, and return in good time to virtue and conduct truer to nature. This is the charge of Sir John Hawkins in his *Life of Johnson*, where he calls Fielding's moral doctrine not only 'a system of excellent use in palliating the vices most injurious to society', but also 'Shaftesbury vulgarised'.

Shaftesbury's distinction between vices that stem from perversions of natural social impulses (companionable debauchery, for example), from excessive 'self-passions' (selfish luxury), and, more seriously, from unnatural passions (sexual perversion) (I. 292-311) seems related to the distinction in Fielding and others that separates folly from true vice, and makes some forms of youthful indulgence less serious than others. In another way that anticipates Fielding, Shaftesbury is critical of those writers on moral topics who denigrate human nature by depicting it as selfish and bestial, particularly Hobbes.

*Leviathan* 's view of human nature is decidedly more cynical than Shaftesbury's, but it seems to me that Hobbes's critics were unfair to call him the apologist of purely self-interested naturalism or indeed of libertinism; the state of nature in Hobbes is one thing, but it is only one half of Hobbism. Man in the state of nature is indeed bestial and motivated by an unrestrained desire to gratify his physical needs, but Hobbes also assumes that man in society is, if unchanged in appetites and passions, at least restrained by the tacit contracts that erect a commonwealth. The state of nature seems, indeed, hypothetical rather than historical, unless remotely so. Within Hobbes's conception of society there is in fact very little room for libertinism, which infringes on the rights of others, thereby
threatening the unwritten contractual bonds that keep society together. \(^{38}\)

Hobbes was not the apostle of vice that his detractors made him, for man's rather grim condition in the theoretical state of nature is always mitigated in practice by social impulses; but Mandeville, clearly influenced by Hobbes, seems to take up the view of the detractors of Hobbes by turning the state of nature into the nature of society itself, in *The Fable of the Bees*. As Sekora has suggested, moralists and others in the eighteenth century came around to accepting a number of Mandevillean principles, but there always seems to have been discomfort, or in some quarters disgust, over the bald (but far from simplistic) formulation of the *Fable*. Mandeville's views continued to shock, and he remained the subject of occasional controversy until the end of the 1700's, \(^{39}\) but it seems that his name lost its currency just after mid-century. At the same time, fears over the effects of libertinism persisted throughout the century. It is not, then, very surprising that among the ethical subjects discussed in Henry Fielding's *Amelia* (1751) is Mandeville's provocative theory that the vices of a few can actually be useful to society in that they promote trade and economic growth without any notable deleterious effects on the moral fibre of the nation. I shall elaborate on Henry Fielding's objections to Mandeville's doctrines and on some other, less famous writers apparently sympathetic to rakishness at some length below, but at present it is worth examining Mandeville's *Fable* and the controversy it aroused in detail, in order to give a further idea of the contemporary outrage at what was ostensibly a defence of libertinism, and therefore of what was bent on destroying civil order.

It is well known that when Bernard Mandeville published a pamphlet containing his jaunty little poem 'The Grumbling Hive: Or, Knaves turn'd Honest' in 1705, there was little public reaction. Eighteenth-century readers were also relatively in-
different to the first edition of *The Fable of the Bees*, Mandeville's extended commentary on 'The Grumbling Hive', when it appeared in 1714. It was only with the addition of 'A Search into the Nature of Society' and 'An Essay on Charity, and Charity-schools' in the 1723 edition that he horrified clergymen and scandalised common readers, so much so that the *Fable* was called 'the most execrable Book that ever was wrote' by Pope's editor, Bishop Warburton, and brought before the Grand Jury of the County of Middlesex as a pernicious book, fit to be suppressed.40 What shocked Mandeville's contemporaries so deeply was his theory of 'private Vices, publick Benefits' (as he puts it in the motto on the title page of his book), a perversion of what we have seen as the received view that the sins of individuals, especially of those whose duty it is to govern, could bring about the ruin of the commonwealth.41

Mandeville responded quickly and eagerly to his first critics, incorporating the 'Presentment of the Grand Jury' into 'A Vindication of the Book, &c.' in the 1724 edition of the *Fable*, and eventually restating his position in *The Fable of the Bees, Part Two* (1728). In the 'Vindication', Mandeville quotes his accusers:

We the Grand Jury for the County of Middlesex have with the greatest Sorrow and Concern, observ'd the many Books and Pamphlets that are almost every Week Published against the sacred Articles of our Holy Religion, and against all Discipline and Order in the Church, and the Manner in which all this is carry'd on, seems to us, to have a direct Tendency to propagate Infidelity, and consequently Corruption of all Morals. (I. 383-4)

The Grand Jury go on to observe that 'such flagrant Impieties' (I. 384) can only provoke the wrath of God and bring on a visitation of the plague (I. 384), the same outbreak of pestilence that so concerned Defoe at about the same time.42 Not only this, but irreli-
gious publications, especially *The Fable of the Bees*, were also seen as a threat to the security of the Sovereign and of the Protestant Succession itself (I. 384-5). The Jury made five specific charges against what it perceived as 'Zealots for Infidelity' (I. 384): first, that they denied the doctrine of the Trinity and were attempting to revive the Arian heresy; and secondly, that by affirming 'an absolute Fate' (I. 384) they rejected divine Providence. Thirdly,

They have endeavoured to subvert all Order and Discipline in the Church, and by vile and unjust Reflexions on the Clergy, they strive to bring Contempt on all Religion; that by the Libertinism of their Opinions they may encourage and draw others into the Immoralities of their Practice.

Fourthly, That a General Libertinism may the more effectually be established, the Universities are decried, and all Instructions of Youth in the Principles of the Christian Religion are exploded with the greatest Malice and Falsity.

Fifthly, The more effectually to carry on these Works of Darkness, studied Artifices and invented Colours have been made use of to run down Religion and Virtue as prejudicial to Society, and detrimental to the State; and to recommend Luxury, Avarice, Pride, and all kind of Vices, as being necessary to Publck Welfare, and not tending to the Destruction of the Constitution: Nay, the very Stews themselves have had strained Apologies and forced Encomiums made in their Favour and produced in Print, with Design, we conceive, to debauch the Nation. (I. 384-5)

It is clear that some of this applies to deistical books, the other target of the 'Presentment', and not to the *Fable*— the Arian denial that Christ is consubstantial with God the Father is just not one of its concerns. The principal religious objection to apparent Mandeville's book, apart from its advocacy of vice, was that it espoused a moral theory of 'unintended consequence' and seemed to deny the individual's responsibility for the effects of his actions. Anglican orthodoxy, particularly of the Latitudinarian strain
(professed by Fielding and others), was at pains to disprove this disclaimer of moral accountability. (Interestingly, the Latitudinarians criticised the preference of Calvinists, Methodists and other Dissenters for faith over good works on similar grounds.)

Leaving the finer points of religious controversy aside, I would like to examine Mandeville's book and some of its critics, as preparation for the general debate on the subject of libertinism in Chapter Two. I shall then discuss some other 'libertine' moralists, who, with Mandeville, suggest that not everyone in the eighteenth century was prepared to believe that rakishness was necessarily harmful or catastrophic in its effects. To begin with Mandeville, the debate takes one from the flurry of attacks on the *Fable* in the 1720's and 30's to the writings of Fielding in the middle part of the century, and right up to the current scholarly disagreement over Mandeville's teasing and ambiguous presentation of 'private Vices, publick Benefits'. Assuming, for the present, that Mandeville's *Fable* can be taken straightforwardly as meaning more or less what it says (something recent critics are not always prepared to do; but more of this hereafter), it does seem to advocate private vice, which is frequently private rakishness in Mandeville's analysis, as a means of encouraging manufacture and promoting the well-being of society. In his 'Preface', Mandeville proposes some kind of defence of

> those Vices and Inconveniences, that from the Beginning of the World to this present Day, have been inseparable from all Kingdoms and States that ever were fam'd for Strength, Riches, and Politeness, at the same time (I. 7)

and certain of the Remarks in the *Fable* proper apparently justify the private practice of vice. Rakishness is not the only thing that counts as vice in *The Fable of the Bees*, of course, for Mandeville is concerned with the social function of the miser, the
merchant, the prostitute, the coiner and the thief as well as that of the rakish prodigal. But it seems fair to say that the rake holds something of a special place within the scheme of the *Fable* because so many of the Remarks on 'The Grumbling Hive' apply to him or single him out (Remarks (C), (E), (H), (I), (K), (L), (M), (O), (R), (Y) – ten out of twenty-three); because Mandeville elsewhere discusses human conduct with frequent and specific reference to the libertine (in *A Letter to Dion*, *Free Thoughts* and *Wishes to a Godson*); and because he devotes other works to particularly rakish issues (the stews in *A Modest Defence*, duelling in the *Origin of Honour*). At times, however, Mandeville suggests that limits should be placed on prodigal excess, whether by legal constraint (I. 37, 369) or by counterbalancing it with qualities more self-interested and acquisitive. He argues that 'Avarice and Prodigality are equally necessary to the Society' (I. 250), in order that run-away consumption does not bring about utter bankruptcy. The ideal society is compared to a good bowl of punch (but note the convivial rather than austere metaphor), where 'Avarice should be the Soursing and Prodigality the Sweetning of it' (I. 105; see also 100-03, 249). For all this balance, however, acquisitive vices are desirable only in so far as they permit profligate ones:

Was it not for Avarice, Spendthrifts would soon want Materials; and if none would lay up and get faster than they spend, very few could spend faster than they get. (I. 101)

Avarice is ultimately 'a Slave to Prodigality...' (I. 101), which Mandeville calls 'That noble Sin' (I. 103). It seems that in the *Fable* prodigality exemplifies private-vice consumerism, and that the rake figures largest (or at least most frequently) in Mandeville's description of privately vicious, publicly beneficial prodgals:

the sensual Courtier that sets no limits to his Luxury; the fickle Strumpet who invents new Fashions every Week; the haughty Dutchess that in Equipage would imitate a Princess; the profuse Rake and lavish Heir, that scatter about their Money
without Wit or Judgment, buy everything they see, and either destroy it or give it away the next Day; the covetous and perjur'd Villain that squee'zd an enormous Treasure from the Tears of Widows and Orphans, and left the Prodigals the Money to spend... (I. 355)

In the end, prodigal private vice is more likely to spread public benefit because it spends, consumes, employs; Mandeville is in general less interested in talking about vices like avarice, partly because they are less entertaining and less outrageous, but also - and perhaps more importantly - because they are not as conducive to economic growth. In the passage on prodigals it takes an inheriting rake to make the miser's hoard useful to society. It therefore seems justifiable to suppose that rakishness is at least a typical, and at best a pre-eminent private vice in Mandeville's scheme, and to concentrate on the prodigal side of his social equation for the purposes of this study.

Remark (H.) is Mandeville's first major investigation of prostitution and its place in society, and, predictably, he comes out strongly in favour of it. In his defence of the stews in the *Fable*, Mandeville maintains that prostitutes provide a necessary outlet *ad expurgandos Renes* (I. 99) and prevent both attempts on 'the Honour of our Wives and Daughters' (I. 96) and sodomy, 'a Filthiness of a more heinous Nature' (I. 100). Mandeville expanded on this Remark in a later pamphlet, his *Modest Defence of Publick Stews* of 1724, which he provokingly dedicated to the members of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners.

There he concludes,

that as long as it is in the Nature of Man (and *Naturam expellas furca liceat usque recurret*) to have a Salt Itch in the Breeches, the *Brimstone* under the Petticoat will be a necessary Remedy to *lay* it; and let him be ever so sly in the Application, it will still be found out: What avails it then to affect to conceal that which if carried on openly and above-board, would become only less detrimental,
and of consequence more justifiable? (MDPS, xv-xvi)

While admitting 'the several bad Effects of Whoring' (MDPS, 6) as it stood in his own day, Mandeville suggests how they may be turned into benefits, re-iterating the points made in Remark (H.) of the Fable and giving additional reasons. Legalised, publicly maintained brothels would, he argues, not only eliminate the risk of 'the French-Pox' (3), but also make possible 'the Golden Mean so much desired' between 'too strict a Chastity' and 'the other Extreme of Lewdness' (29), and strengthen the institution of marriage by teaching a man valuable lessons about women before he chooses a wife (28-9, 35-9) and by giving him a holiday from domestic worries when he needs it (34-5). In its assessment of human nature, the Modest Defence takes libertinism for granted:

As there is constantly in the Nation, a certain Number of young Men, whose Passions are too strong to brook any Opposition: Our Business is to contrive a Method how they may be gratify'd, with as little Expence of female Virtue as possible. (62)

Just as some women are born to be whores (9), so 'violent Love for Woman is born and bred with us; nay, it is absolutely necessary for our being born at all...' (MDPS, 6; see also FB, II. 228). This being the case, Mandeville claims that legalised prostitution would be advantageous, as would all things that allow free exercise of man's essentially vicious nature.

Along the lines of Mandeville's two defences of whoring are Remark (G.), in part a justification of the consumption of alcohol (I. 89-93), and (I.) and (K.), which advance the position that prodigality and profusion, rightly understood, are socially beneficial if personally disruptive or even devastating (I. 100-06). The
final section of Remark (R.) is devoted to proving the good consequences of duelling (I. 218-23), the argument being that if it were prohibited 'every ill-bred Fellow might use what Language he pleas'd without being call'd to an Account for it' (I. 219), therefore depriving society of its polish; and that men need to fight on occasion in order to preserve a general peace (I. 219-20).

The author's position is that luxury (which is what he most often means by vice) is good for the economy as a whole. This mercantile opinion is expressed in Remarks (L), (M), (Q.) and (T.) in particular (I. 107-23, 124-34, 181-98, 225-38). (L) and (M.) explicate the lines in 'The Grumbling Hive' where Mandeville says,

- Luxury
  Employ'd a Million of the Poor,
  And odious Pride a Million more    (I. 25)

and he continues his economic argument in (Q.) and (T.), which comment on the disastrous results when knaves do turn honest and luxury is given up for frugality (I. 181-98, 225-38). And in 'A Search into the Nature of Society', Mandeville makes his splendid final pitch for the consumers in society as the benefactors of all, in the passage from I. 355 cited above. Mandeville does seem, then, to be what his critics claimed, the apologist of extravagance and debauchery, and his insistence on the rake, the lavish heir and miscellaneous profligates suggests that these libertines and spendthrifts have a special place in his scheme. The author is in certain places at pains to defend them: Remark (L.), for example, speaks of wild rakes, who had actually impair'd their Healths, and broke their Constitutions with Excesses of Wine and Women, that yet behav'd themselves with Conduct and Bravery against their Enemies.
in the field of battle (I. 122-3). The same remark contradicts conventional views of libertinism, not only accepting the proto-utilitarian mercantile theory expressed elsewhere in the *Fable*, but also denying that luxurious private vices have effeminising effects on those who indulge in them (this last in spite of what has been said earlier; see I. 100-06, cited *supra*):

The greatest Excesses of Luxury are shewn in Buildings, Furniture, Equipages and Clothes: Clean Linen weakens a man no more than Flannel; Tapestry, fine Painting or good Wainscot are no more unwholesome than bare Walls; and a rich Couch, or a gilt Chariot are no more enervating than the cold Floor of a Country Cart. The refined Pleasures of Men of Sense are seldom injurious to their Constitution and there are many great Epicures that will refuse to eat or drink more than their Heads or Stomachs can bear. Sensual People may take as great Care of themselves as any: and the errors of the most viciously luxurious, don’t so much consist in the frequent Repetitions of their Lewdness, and their Eating and Drinking too much, (which are Things which would most enervate them) as they do in the operose Contrivances, the Profuseness and Nicety they are serv’d with, and the vast Expence they are at in their Tables and Amours. (I. 119)

In spite of his assertion that luxury is to be encouraged in all classes, relative to income (I. 107-08, 118-19, 123), it does seem to be the privilege of a rakish upper class, Mandeville’s Courtier, lavish Heir, Dutchess and assorted prodigals;

For how excessive soever the Plenty and Luxury of a Nation be, some Body must do the Work, Houses and Ships must be built, Merchandizes must be remov’d, and the Ground till’d. (I. 119-20)

Later, the author observes that,

to be frugal and saving is a Duty incumbent only
on those, whose Circumstances require it, but that a Man of good Estate does his Country a Service by living up to the Income of it.... (I. 233)

In the section of the *Fable* that most antagonised its readers, the 'Essay on Charity, and Charity-schools', Mandeville also favours exclusively ruling-class rather than universal licence. The 'Essay' makes the unpopular observation that some are born to promote the public welfare through their extravagance, and some to clear away the plates afterwards. It follows from this that any attempt to educate the working class, in this case in the schools set up by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge and other bodies dedicated to the reformation of manners, will disrupt the desired course of the economy by raising labourers to expectations above their station. If the poor are taught to think, they will no longer want to work, thus hampering the upper class's function as luxurious livers. As Mandeville puts it,

> it is manifest, that in a free Nation where Slaves are not allow'd of, the surest Wealth consists in a Multitude of laborious Poor; for besides that they are the never-failing Nursery of Fleets and Armies, without them there could be no Enjoyment, and no Product of any Country could be valuable. To make the Society happy and people easy under the meanest Circumstances, it is requisite that great Numbers of them should be ignorant as well as poor. Knowledge both enlarges and multiplies our Desires, and the fewer things a Man wishes for, the more easily his Necessities may be supply'd. (I. 287-8; see also I. 314)

Finally, in the second part of the *Fable*, Cleomenes the Mandevillean describes the ideal gentleman to Horatio the Shaftesburyite (II. 66-74). The author's spokesman concludes that this Grandisonian figure is not to be met with in real life, and he claims that the Gentleman's basic motivation is not virtue or honour but pride, or rather 'self-
liking' (II. 75f.). At one point, Horatio guesses that Cleomenes's purpose is ultimately
to prove, that this complete Person you have
describ'd, acts from a vicious Motive: And if that be
not your Design, I cannot see what you drive at. (II. 80)

Cleomenes replies, 'I told you it was' (I. 80). Since this is the case, and the Gentleman is
driven by his desire to go on reaping personal advantage from serving or dominating
others (II. 183-4), there is every reason to suppose that his life is a moral free-for-all.
Mandeville's adherent reduces the distinction between a gentleman and a rake, and
perhaps implies that they are one and the same:

The same Passion, that makes the well-bred Man
and prudent Officer value and secretly admire
themselves for the Honour and Fidelity they display,
may make the Rake and Scoundrel brag of their
Vices and boast of their Impudence. (II. 90)

One could say, therefore, that Mandeville seems to be, as his opponents
declared, the libertine's advocate and the rake's apologist. There are, however,
numerous places in The Fable of the Bees that contradict the view that the author is the
proponent of sheer licence, as I have suggested above in my discussion of the necessary
balance of avarice and prodigality in Mandeville. Perhaps only throwing a sop to those
who attacked him (or else trying to antagonise them further by refusing to recognise
their objections as valid), Mandeville points out in Part Two that

it is always wrong for Men to pursue Gain or Plea-
sure, by Means that are visibly detrimental to the
civil Society, and that Creatures, who can do this,
must be narrow-soul'd, short-sighted, selfish
People; whereas wise Men never look upon them-
selves as individual Persons, without considering
the Whole, of which they are but trifling Parts in
respect to Bulk, and are incapable of receiving any Satisfaction from Things that interfere with the Publick Welfare. This being undeniably true, ought not all private Advantage to give way to this general Interest; and ought not it to be every one's Endeavour, to increase this common Stock of Happiness; and, in order to it, do what he can to render himself a serviceable and useful Member of that whole Body which he belongs to? (II. 46)

The exact nature of what is socially detrimental is left unclear, but in the 'Preface' to the Fable II, Mandeville insists that his purpose was always to expose and not to encourage vice (II. 6). It is true that in Part I he says,

When I assert, that Vices are inseparable from great and potent Societies, and that it is impossible their Wealth and Grandeur should subsist without, I do not say that the particular Members of them who are guilty of any should not be continually reprov'd, or not be punish'd for them when they grow into Crimes (I. 10)

and that what defence he does make of vice refers to purely worldly advantage. It is also stated that the avarice of some should balance the prodigality of others, like the sour and the sweet ingredients of a good bowl of punch, to use Mandeville's famous metaphor (I. 105-6, 249-51), and this ideal of equilibrium would seem to set some kind of limit on the practice of private vices. Mandeville's visions of the state and of economics turn out not to be as laissez-faire as one might expect; as 'The Grumbling Hive' has it, 'Vice is beneficial found,/ When it's by Justice lopt and bound...' (I. 37). Some measure of interventionism is implied, thus restraining the rake, and it is only 'by the dextrous Management of a skilful Politician' that vices 'may be turned into Publick Benefits' (I. 369).49

Or, as F.B. Kaye remarks in his classic introduction to his edition of the Fable,

the real thesis of the book is not that all evil is
a public benefit, but that a certain useful proportion of it (called vice) is such a benefit (and ... is on that account not really felt to be evil, though still called vicious). (I. lx)

Mandeville himself seems to have agreed with Kaye's reading of his fable. Responding to the excoriation in Bishop Berkeley's _Alciphron_ (1732), Mandeville insists in his _Letter to Dion_ of the same year

that the _Fable_ of the _Bees_ was a Book of exalted Morality; they [the critics of the _Fable_] refuse to believe me; their Clamours against it continue; and what I have now said in Defence of it, will be rejected, and call'd an Artifice to come off; that it is full of dangerous, wicked and Atheistical Notions, and could not have been wrote with any other Design than the Encouragement of Vice. Should I ask them what Vices they were; Whoring, Drinking, Gaming; or desire them to name any one Passage, where the least Immorality is recommended, spoke well of, or so much as conniv'd at, they would have Nothing to lay hold on but the Title Page. 50

He claims only to have exposed human nature for what it is, and to have shown how human society all too often operates:

tho' it has been insinuated, that I was an Advocate for all Wickedness and Villainy in General, there is no such thing in the Book. I have said indeed, that we often saw an evident Good spring up from a palpable Evil, and given Instances to prove, that, by the wonderful Direction of Providence, Robbers, Murderers, and the worst Malefactors were sometimes made instrumental to great Deliverances in Distress, and remarkable Blessings, which God wrought and conferr'd upon the Innocent and Industrious; but as to the Crimes themselves, I have never spoken of them, but with the utmost Detestation, and on all Occasions urg'd the great Necessity of punishing all, that are guilty of them, without Favour or Connivance. (LD, 32-33)
Though this seems at times to have no relation whatsoever to the actual content of the *Fable*, what Mandeville (like Kaye) is implying, of course, is that to take *The Fable of the Bees* too literally is to do it a disservice, and that the argument is more subtle than it at first appears. Cleomenes himself hints in this direction in the third dialogue of Part Two: he suggests to Horatio that the encomium of duelling in Part One is in fact ironic to some unspecified extent (II. 101-02), and goes on to say that this irony therefore restricts the possibility of private vice's metamorphosis into public benefit (II. 103-06). But these observations are made in passing, and because Horatio is often rather slow off the mark he never presses Cleomenes to say just how far we are to take the *Fable* seriously. All the same, Mandeville's vague 'Cautions', 'Proviso's' and limitations on vice (I. 248) may still allow a measure of gentlemanly corruption. He says of the gentleman in 'A Search into the Nature of Society',

> Gross Vices, as Irreligion, Whoring, Gaming, Drinking, and Quarrelling I won't mention; even the meanest Education guards against them; I would always recommend to him the Practice of Virtue, but I am for no voluntary Ignorance, in a Gentleman, of any thing that is done in Court or City. It is impossible a Man should be perfect, and therefore there are faults I would connive at, if I could not prevent them; and if between the Years of Nineteen and Three and Twenty, Youthful Heat should sometimes get the better of his Chastity, so it was done with caution; should he on some Extraordinary Occasion overcome by the pressing Solicitations of Jovial Friends drink more than was consistent with strict Sobriety, so he did it very seldom and found it not to interfere with his Health or Temper; or if by the Height of his Mettle and great Provocation in a just Cause, he had been drawn into a Quarrel, which true Wisdom and a less strict Adherence to the Rules of Honour might have declined or prevented, so it never befel him above once; If I say he should have happened to be Guilty of these things, and he would never speak, much less
brag of them himself, they might be pardoned or at least over looked at the Age I named, if he left off then and continued discreet for ever after. (I. 338-9)

The author then makes the wise and interesting conclusion that 'the very Disasters of Youth have sometimes frightened Gentlemen into a more steady Prudence than in all probability they would ever have been Masters of without them' (I. 339).

It must nevertheless be remembered that these cautions, provisos and qualifications were incorporated into the Fable in answer to the barrage of criticism that greeted earlier editions and in anticipation of further scandal. (I. 248f. were added to the book in 1723 and subsequently; see I. xxxiv.) This habit of Mandeville's of saying one thing (and with an uncertain degree of irony) and then repudiating it later has created critical confusion ever since. As early as 1883, William Minto advanced the theory in his article on Mandeville in the Encyclopaedia Britannica that Mandeville did not really mean what he said, and that the Fable (and presumably other works) was meant entirely as satire, even if the technique is often opaque. Is one, then, to read Mandeville's output as one does Swift's Modest Proposal or Defoe's Shortest Way with Dissenters? Kaye, as we have seen, took Mandeville not completely at face value, and another critic in the early part of this century, Paul Bunyan Anderson, went one step further. In an article in PMLA in 1939, Anderson ascribed the anonymous pamphlet A Dissertation Upon Drunkenness (1708) to Mandeville, on stylistic grounds and because it anticipates the discussion of gin in Remark (G.) of the Fable in some ways. The Dissertation, it happens, is an anti-gin tract, a Grub-street counterpart of Hogarth's depiction of Gin Lane, and Anderson assumed that he had discovered a key to the Fable, which he declared an exposé of vice rather than an encomium. As it turns out, Anderson was wrong about the authorship of the Dissertation, but a great number of
critics since have accepted his conclusions about the meaning of *The Fable of the Bees*.

In some quarters, the great, and to Mandeville's contemporaries, unthinkable critical revolution has taken place, many scholars being of the opinion that the *Fable* is indeed 'a Book of severe and exalted Morality' (I. 404). The extravagance of Mandeville's tone and argument are perhaps difficult to interpret in any other way. Surely, it could be argued, he is trying to provoke those easily provoked by saying the outrageous things he does about whores, duelling and keeping the poor in their place. To take him seriously all the time must be either obtuse or perverse. On the other hand, another school of critical thought takes Mandeville straightforwardly, as the champion of a cynical but realistic utilitarianism. In the *Letter to Dion*, Mandeville self-righteously exclaims, 'Tho' I have shewn the Way to Worldly Greatness, I have, without Hesitation, preferr'd the Road that leads to Virtue' (31), and even though he never does recommend vice except as a means to wealth, power and other temporal benefits, it is possible that he constructed his thesis so as to have this kind of self-defence in reserve. He was definitely shrewd enough to have predicted the response that would meet his book, and to have prepared expressions of mock-surprise that such wicked things could ever have been read into his innocent, his benevolent, his public-spirited book. (Mandeville admits as much in the preface to the second part of the *Fable; FB*, II. 4). I am not alone, I suspect, in regarding Mandeville's horrified protestations of virtue and good intentions as disingenuous, and there is much to be said for those critics who suggest that Mandeville was a practical, secular utilitarian, or what one might broadly call capitalist, libertarian and conservative. What is immediately more important than modern critical dissent is to see how Mandeville was taken in his own day, in order to see how he fits into eighteenth-century discussions of libertinism and its wider consequences,
and to relate his writings to some of the other 'pro-libertine' polemics of the period. As M.M. Goldsmith reminds us, 'for Augustans, public virtue and private virtue were intimately connected; private vices were not the sole concern of private men for they were causally linked with civic corruption.' Almost without exception, Mandeville's contemporaries regarded him in this light: he was considered with genuine horror as the propagandist of vice, the apologist of the rake, the defender of libertinism and the champion of debauchery, and therefore as the bane of civil society.

One of the most influential of Mandeville's adversaries was George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne. In spite of early comments in his Commonplace Book that 'Sensual Pleasure is the Summum Bonum. This is the Great Principle of Morality' and 'I'd never blame a Man for acting upon Interest. he's a fool that acts on any other Principle,' by the time the Fable was published Berkeley had clearly become an intellectual enemy of Mandeville. In 1732, he published Alciphron: or, the Minute Philosopher, a series of dialogues in which Euphranor and others argue against a Mandevillean spokesman, Lysicles. The latter, clearly intended to portray the classic rake, speaks in favour of drunkenness, gambling, prostitutes and highwaymen (VI. 66-8), and Berkeley displays his talents as a skilful parodist of The Fable of the Bees. Crito, the host and umpire of the assembled disputants, wittily explodes Lysicles's sophistical theories:

Cleophon, a minute philosopher, took strict care of his son's education, and entered him betimes in the principles of his sect. Callicles (that was his son's name), being a youth of parts, made a notable progress; insomuch that before he came of age he killed his covetous old father with vexation, and soon after ruined the estate he left behind him, or in other words, made a present of it to the public, spreading the dunghill collected by his ancestors over the
face of the nation, and making out of one overgrown estate several pretty fortunes for ingenious men, who live by the vices of the great. (VI. 70)

Lysicles refuses to give in, insisting that the benefit accrued from luxury 'is universal, and the damage only particular to private persons or families' (VI. 70), but Euphranor counters, 'some wise men have thought a family may be considered as a small kingdom, or a kingdom as a great family' (VI. 74-5), and asserts that private vice necessarily has repercussions in the macrocosm. Crito sums up the case against luxury and licence:

such methods as multiply inhabitants are good, and such as diminish them are bad, for the public. And one would think nobody need be told that the strength of a State consists more in the number and sort of people than in anything else. But, in proportion as vice and luxury, those public blessings encouraged by this minute philosophy to prevail among us, fewer are disposed to marry, too many being diverted by pleasure, disabled by disease, or frightened by expense. Nor doth vice only thin a nation, but also debaseth it by a puny degenerate race. I might add that it makes labour dear, and thereby enables our more frugal neighbours to undersell us; and also as it diverts the lower sort of people from honest callings to wicked projects. If these and such considerations were taken into the account, I believe it would be evident to any man in his senses that the imaginary benefits of vice bear no proportion to the solid real woes that attend it. (VI. 81-2)

Mandeville was quick to reply to *Aeliphron* in his own *Letter to Dion*, where he indignantly charges that his book has been misrepresented, his argument distorted. He claims there that his sub-title 'private Vices, publick Benefits' was no more than an attention-getter and a deliberate paradox (38), and exclaims,

I defy all my enemies to shew me, where I have recommended Vice, or said the least Titl, by which I contradict that true, as well as remarkable Saying
of Monsieur Baile. Les utilités du vice n’empêchent pas qu’il ne soit mauvais. Vice is always bad, whatever Benefit we may receive from it. -- But I have been strangely treated. (34)

He accuses Berkeley of making mere 'lawless Libertines' the exponents of pseudo-Mandevillean doctrine, and insists that his analysis of society is not nearly as crude as Berkeley would have it:

Believe me, Sir, to understand the Nature of Civil Society requires Study and Experience. Evil is, if not the Basis of it, at least a Necessary Ingredient in the Compound; and the temporal Happiness of some is inseparable from the Misery of others. They are silly People who imagine, that the Good of the Whole is consistent with the Good of every Individual; and the best of us are insincere. Every body exclaims against Luxury; yet there is no Order of Men who are not guilty of it; and if the Law-givers are not always endeavouring to keep up all Trades and Manufactures, that supply us with the Means and Implements of Luxury, they are blamed. To wish for the Encrease of Trade and Navigation, and the Decrease of Luxury at the same Time, is a Contradiction. (49)

I believe that this passage comes close to Mandeville's real meaning, but it is worth remembering, as I have suggested above, to take the outrage of the Letter to Dion with a pinch of salt; but in any case, by this point Mandeville's appeals were mostly to those who had already made up their minds and condemned him.

The Bishop of Cloyne had certainly done so, and never reverted to his original view as expressed in the Commonplace Book; three years before his death in 1753, Berkeley published 'Maxims concerning Patriotism' (VI. 253-4), a neat recapitulation of his beliefs on ethical subjects. As item 27 has it,

The patriot aims at his private good in the public. The knave makes the public subservient to
his private interest. The former considers himself as part of a whole, the latter considers himself as the whole.61

Bishop Berkeley was not alone in making condemnations, explicit or implicit, of our author. An anonymous work, An Enquiry whether A General Practice of Virtue tends to the Wealth or Poverty, Benefit or Disadvantage of a People? (1725), which Kaye has conclusively ascribed to George Bluet, is another example of the fulminations written against the Fable.62 Bluet goes through Mandeville's book systematically, concluding his analysis of that 'senseless Heap of Irreligion and Paradox' (177) thus:

the Conduct of private Men is always prejudicial to Society, in Proportion as it deviates from the Rules of Virtue. And without taking into the Account any particular Blessings from Heaven, as a Reward for Virtue and Goodness (a Notion the Author [i.e. Bluet] is pleased to divert himself with) upon the whole, it would appear after a full and impartial Examination, a POLITICAL TRUTH, that Righteousness exalteth a Nation; and what Tully so often repeats is certainly true with Regard to a whole Society, quicquid honestum, idem utile. All this I say may be done without calling in the Authority of Revelation. (175)63

More colourfully written is Vice and Luxury Publick Mischief by John Dennis, critic of and later the butt of Pope.64 Dennis demonstrates how vice and luxury brought about the ruin of the Hebrews, of Athens, Sparta and Rome (16-22), and opines on the fate of British civilisation, itself threatened by these two great social evils. 'The Liberties of Great Britain were never so Precarious', he maintains, 'as they are at present from the Vice and Luxury, and Corruptions of the People...' (25). A little later Dennis states,

when the Plague of Luxury is once become Epidemical, and has throughly infected a Nation; when there is a
general Emulation who shall excell in it; when there is a general Contention who shall out-do and out-shine his Neighbour in the Pomp and Splendor of it; in the Pomp and Splendor of Buildings, Furniture, Gardens, Apparel, Equipage, and Sumptuous Tables; when that Respect is paid to Vice and Folly, which to Wisdom and Virtue is only due; then Riches, the Food and Support of Luxury, are sought with insatiable Avarice, and to obtain them, the most solemn Obligations are infring'd, the most sacred Trusts are violated. Now the most Sacred of all Trusts, is that which our Country reposes in us. (26-7)65

Not everyone, however, was quite so hard on Mandeville. I think it is fair to say that Lord Hervey, in *Some Remarks on the Minute Philosopher* (1732), was more sympathetic to Mandeville than was Bishop Berkeley (Hervey being, after all, both a Court Whig, like Mandeville, and a luxurious liver—if not a rake as I have defined the term), but he too condemns the *Fable* in the end.66 Surprisingly, however, there is a genuine, if rather odd, defence of the *Fable: The True Meaning of the Fable of the Bees* (1726). For many years this curious piece was attributed to Mandeville himself, until F.B. Kaye proved that the ascription was mistaken.67 The thesis of *The True Meaning* is bizarre but interesting:

As I have read him [Mandeville] throughly and throughly, search'd as narrowly into him, as he professes to have done into all Degrees and Stations of Men, I have at length found, that when he says _private Vices are publick Benefits_, he means _private Vices are private Benefits_, or in other words, that Vice is a Benefit to some particular sorts of People; and that whenever he affirms Vice is a benefit to the _Publican_, the _Society_, the _Nation_, the _Whole_, &c. he does not mean that it is a benefit to the Many, but to the Few. (5)

By the few, according to our anonymous criticaster, Mandeville has in mind his 'skilful
Politicians' (see *Fable*, I. 369; *LD*, 42-6; *True Meaning*, 42-3, 45, 48). Now having said this (though without any convincing proof), the pseudo-Mandevillean could have distorted his original only somewhat, by saying that private vices are beneficial to those who practise them and harmless to society at large, but as Kaye points out, the misconstruction of Mandeville in *The True Meaning* is not merely partial, but total. In fact, the pamphlet holds that 'a National Luxury inevitably brings on a National Ruin' (4), and perversely maintains that Mandeville is covertly attempting to rouse public fury against venal politicians who plunder the state's coffers to enrich themselves. The target of the *True Meaning* is obviously the Prime Minister, Sir Robert Walpole, who was always represented by Tory satire as an embezzler of public funds and seller of sinecures. As we have seen, it is possible that Mandeville's intent was in fact satiric to a certain extent, but as I have hinted (in note 55), I find it hard to believe that Mandeville really was a stern if perverse moralist. Rather, I think he saw the advantages first of cutting through hypocritical moralising and secondly of liberalising certain laws and attitudes. He must have mischievously enjoyed provoking his detractors to fury and confusion by putting his proposals in the most extreme terms possible, keeping his teasing ambiguities in reserve, as a casuistical defence against anticipated criticism, or perhaps coming to the realistic conclusion that no one would take him seriously anyway, no matter how moderately he expressed himself. And very few did take him seriously for two hundred years or so. Whether this reading is correct or not, it is impossible that the *Fable* could be an exposé of the Machiavellian politicians of the day, if only for the simple reason that Mandeville was a Whig of Walpole's faction and a protégé of Lord Macclesfield, the Lord Chancellor, and therefore someone most unlikely to adopt the opinions of the Tory opposition.
Indeed, the Tories considered Mandeville not only the defender of the rake but also the vindicator of all the vices and crimes they attributed to Sir Robert and his administration, which they regarded as nothing less than the manifestation of libertine principles in government. Lord Bolingbroke, opposition leader and intellectual hero of the Scriblerus Club, echoed the accepted notion of the implications of the private virtues and vices of the upper class when he wrote in *The Idea of a Patriot King*:

> The iniquity of all the principal men in any community, of kings and ministers especially, does not consist alone in the crimes they commit, and in the immediate consequences of these crimes: and, therefore, their guilt is not to be measured by these alone. Such men sin against posterity, as well as against their own age; and when the consequences of their crimes are over, the consequences of their example remain.70

Bolingbroke's sentiments here are, not surprisingly, also to be found in the editorials of *The Craftsman*, the organ of the opposition to Walpole and the Robinocracy. In number 166 (6 September 1729), Sir George Freeman, a country Tory, warns Mr Timothy Shallow, a Londoner who has unthinkingly swallowed the Whig line,

> you will find yourself very much mistaken if you calculate the Riches of the Kingdom from the Luxury, Extravagance and Profusion, which are to be seen in this Town. It is well known that *some Persons* have amassed immense Fortunes by *Rapine*, *Oppression* and the *Calamities* of their Fellow-Subjects, which enable them to maintain the State of Princes; and others, from a Spirit of Vanity or Ambition, run into the fashionable Vice of imitating their Superiors and spending the *Fee Simple* of a large Patrimony in two or three Years time. This is commonly done in Town, where there are so many Temptations and Encouragements to such a way of Living. *London* therefore will be the last Place, that feels the *Effects of a general Poverty*; though if our Information is true, you are
not without Complaints of this Kind already. But I wish you would make a Progress into the Country and see what a terrible Scene of Distress is opened there. You will find the *Landed Gentlemen* almost generally incumber'd; their Tenants scarce able, with all their Industry, to maintain their Families and pay their Rent; the *Manufacturers* quite unemploy'd and the *labouring* Poor reduced to such *Necessity* by Want of Work and the great Dearth of all kind of Provisions as to throw Themselves upon their Parishes or live on the Contributions of their Charitable Neighbours. You must have heard of the Tumults and Disorders which these Calamities have already occasioned in several Parts of the Kingdom; and if Providence had not bless'd us, this Year, with a plentiful Harvest, I dread to think of the Consequences, which they might have produced.\(^1\)

Significantly, the bad governor of the state is compared to the bad steward of an estate in the same paper (2). Some years later, in issue 291 (29 January 1731/2), another editorial, this one in the form of a letter signed 'Philanthropus', indicts writers like Mandeville for their part in bringing misery to the kingdom:

*True Charity* consists in publick, or private Beneficence; in relieving the Necessities and Distresses of particular Persons, or doing Works of general Use and Service to Mankind; but there have been so many Instances of *false Charity*, that They have almost brought this celestial Virtue itself into Contempt. From hence it proceeds, that some *modern Writers* have resolved it into the sordid Principles of *self-Love*, *Ostentation* and *vain Glory*; and if We were to judge of former *Times* by the *present*, it would almost incline one to be of their Opinion, and to suspect the fairest Pretensions to *publick Spiritedness* of some *private* and scandalous Design.\(^2\)

The Tories perceived Walpole's maintenance of public affairs and Mandeville's theories as symptoms of each other and of the same rot that had infested the land since the
coming of the Hanoverians, the flight of Bolingbroke, the bursting of the South Sea
bubble and the rise of the Prime Minister. According to the charges of the Tories, Sir
Robert practised what Mandeville preached, relying on *The Fable of the Bees* to justify
the corrupt actions and untenable position that were destroying the nation. As Isaac
Kramnick observes in his very important study of Bolingbroke and his circle, the
Opposition were convinced that 'the decline of ancient Rome, and of an unaware
England, began with the extinguishing of ancient honour by luxury, ambition, and a
careless and profligate reign'73 -- and Mandeville was singled out in their minds as the
theoretician and 'apologist of a corrupt age'.74 Kramnick goes on to make perceptive
comments on the anti-Mandevillean aspects of the writings of the major Scriblerians,
Pope, Swift and Gay.75

It should be obvious by now that *The Fable of the Bees* was one of the
major *succès de scandale* of the 1720's and 30's, the subject of debate as long as its
author was alive to defend his book. The reaction it provoked was so intense doubtless
because it hit one of the period's most sensitive nerves, the concern over the effects of
what appeared to be rampant libertinism and a break-down of all that was ordered and
safe. Kaye remarks,

Mandeville, with his teaching of the usefulness of
vice, inherited the office of Lord High Bogym-man,
which Hobbes had held in the preceding century. (I. cxvi)76

(Indeed, the names Hobbes and Mandeville were often uttered together in shocked
tones.) Interest in and familiarity with Mandeville lasted, it appears, until the 1750's,
after which he was referred to with less and less frequency until Kaye's single-handed
revival of his fame. It follows that Henry Fielding's references to the *Fable* and its teaching in the 1740's and 50's are late in the history of Mandeville's currency in the eighteenth century. Fielding evidently did not believe that the *Fable* was a dead issue, and he may also have been casting himself, as he had earlier, in some ways as the heir of the Scriblerian critics of vice and luxury. In Book III, Chapter v of *Amelia*, Miss Mathews, the young woman of no great probity who tempts Booth into infidelity to Amelia, declares her moral allegiance to 'that charming Fellow Mandevil'. In advance of his conversion at the end of the novel (about which I shall have more to say in Chapter Three), Booth manages to redeem some of his own moral foibles by his response to her protestation:

>'Pardon me, Madam,' answered Booth, 'I hope you do not agree with Mandevil neither, who hath represented human Nature in a Picture of the highest Deformity. He hath left out of his System the best Passion which the Mind can possess, and attempts to derive the Effects or Energies of that Passion, from the base Impulses of Pride or Fear. Whereas, it is as certain that Love exists in the Mind of Man, as that its opposite Hatred doth, and the same Reasons will equally prove the Existence of the one as the Existence of the other.' (115)

Fielding thus rejects the cynical moral Pyrrhonism of Mandeville on the one hand, and the naively optimistic benevolism of Lord Shaftesbury on the other. Elsewhere in *Amelia*, Fielding transforms the luxurious bees of the *Fable* into parasites,

>a Set of Drones, who have not the least Merit or Claim to their Favour, and who, without contributing in any Manner to the Good of the Hive, live luxuriously on the Labours of the industrious Bee. (188)

Fielding's periodical writings in *The Champion, True Patriot* and
Covent-Garden Journal also criticise Mandeville, if not usually by name. In The True Patriot 17, for 18-25 February 1746 (N.S.), he makes general comments against the teachings of Mandevilleanism, in terms of private indulgence and public ruin, self-interest versus true interest (i.e. public spiritedness). Fielding's most common method of attack is ad hominem; as he says in The Champion of 11 December 1739, 'those who deduce actions, apparently good, from evil causes, can trace them only through the windings of their own hearts...'. His conclusion is that such writers 'do a real dis-service to mankind' (Champion, 22 January 1739/40; 163) and actually hasten the decline of society into chaos. In Tom Jones VI. i ('Of Love'), the narrator makes similar allegations, comparing 'Political Philosophers' like Mandeville and Hobbes to 'Finders of Gold' -- a slang term for those who muck out lavatories.

The Method used in both these Searches after Truth and after Gold, being, indeed, one and the same; viz the searching, rummaging, and examining into a nasty Place; indeed, in the former Instances, into the nastiest of all Places, A BAD MIND.

Fielding is saying that if Mandeville were correct, all minds would be bad, and all men Blifils. The reality is that while Blifils do exist, human nature also has the potential for the virtue and benevolence that redeem Tom, and that make Mr Square, Bridget Allworthy and Squire Allworthy himself see the varying degrees of error in their ways, and reform. (I shall have more to say about Fielding and the private vices of rakes in Chapter Three.)

I believe that an implicit rejection of the theory of private vices, public benefits is to be found in other eighteenth-century fiction, in those novels that concern themselves in whole or in part with the morals of young men who are, or who
may become, rakes trying to live up to the private vices part of the formula. Their authors may not have had Mandeville or his book specifically in mind, because the idea had taken on an existence independent of the man and because Mandeville was merely one name in a long debate that had concentrated on him for a time, taken care of his particular strain of libertine social threat, and passed on to other specific cases, some of which will be dealt with below. Eventually it was no longer necessary to expose and disprove such a projector, for it had been taken for granted all along that his views were wicked and fallacious. It was only a matter of time before (as Dunciad (B) has it in another context) 'Mandevil could prate no more.' It took someone on the rakish fringe, therefore, to bring up the *Fable* once again, and to consider it sympathetically. In 1772, John Hall-Stevenson published his *Makarony Fables*, together with *The New Fable of the Bees: In Two Cantos*. *The New Fable* suggests a defence of the old *Fable* on Hall-Stevenson's part, even if it is a covert one -- but this too is significant. The poem is a rather tiresome satire on politicians of all parties, and in the 'Moral' appended to the two cantos the author writes,

*Tis anti-Mandivally true,
True as the Gospel, or St. Paul,
The private vices of a few,
Will be the ruin of us all.84

By private vices Hall-Stevenson here means the corruption of politicians, his target throughout the poem, prompting one to ask if perhaps he had read *The True Meaning of the Fable of the Bees*. But where then is the defence of Mandeville? Hall-Stevenson's joke -- for this and not inconsistency it must be, though admittedly it is not terribly funny -- is that he condemns one sort of private vice while practising another,
in his 'Address to the Reader' of the *Makarony Fables* and *New Fable*, Hall-Stevenson provides a gloss on the Makarony, Demoniac motto of his book, 'Beati non numerant horas', calling his band of rakes at Crazy Castle in Yorkshire and their like-minded brethren elsewhere the blessed, and punningly translating 'horas' as both 'hours' and 'whores' (I. 187-9). It is as though Hall-Stevenson wants to defend the original *Fable* but also realises how much weight will be lent to his case against politicians by agreement with the accepted view of Mandeville, and the fun to be derived from being forced into such an incongruous position by the opinion of the majority.

An anti-Mandevillean bias seems, then, to have been built into the moral and ethical discussion of the eighteenth century, in Fielding consciously and in others implicitly. Now whether the eighteenth century read Mandeville correctly is, as has been suggested, an academic point (in the fullest sense), unresolved even now. What is immediately more important is that there appears to have been consensus on the subject of libertinism *versus* public benefit, attested to by the sheer number of attacks on the *Fable*, and by a nice observation incorrectly attributed to Samuel Johnson, who is said to have described Mandeville's book as one that every young man had on his shelves in the mistaken belief that it was a wicked book. (Johnson is one of the few later defenders of opulence who openly names Mandeville; Adam Smith studiously avoids his name in the *Wealth of Nations*, although there may be some unacknowledged echoes of the *Fable* there.) The measure of the consensus on the issue in the earlier part of the century is indicated by the fact that Pope could agree on it even with some of the Dunces, including his old foe and object of scorn, Lord Hervey -- the Sporus of the *Epistle to Arbuthnot*.

Given this degree of agreement on libertinism, it is a wonder that any one
would have wanted to express opinions of society and ethics similar to those found in *The Fable of the Bees*, but a small number of writers did actually dare even early on in the century to join in Mandeville's challenge of accepted views and received notions of how society should treat the libertine and his kind. The *Fable*’s hypothesis that rakishness, within certain boundaries, is good for society is not the only one of its type, though other writers on the subject seem to confine themselves mostly to the sexual aspects of libertinism and seldom argue with the subtlety and thoroughness of a Mandeville. John Armstrong's *Economy of Love* (1736) maintains that whoring is the proper province of young men, and infinitely preferable to abstinence, masturbation or sodomy, although ideally Armstrong wants marriage to bring a man's, as well as a woman's, first experience of sex. Daniel Maclauchlan's *Essay upon Improving and Adding to the Strength of Great-Britain and Ireland by Fornication, Justifying The same from Scripture and Reason* (1735) promotes promiscuity largely on the grounds of God's command to "be fruitful and multiply." Soame Jenyns's *Free Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Evil* (1757) also makes some rather Mandevillean points about human nature and society. These works are, if fairly well known, still minor, and may have had little or no influence on public opinion, though they are part of the rise of new, positive attitudes to luxury (and related issues) that Sekora notices at about mid-century. Few had wanted to listen to Mandeville, but more moderate and more moderately phrased arguments in the 1740's and 50's seem to have influenced a number of novelists, who espoused a kind of limited libertinism in their books. I shall discuss these rakish novels towards the end of Chapter Two, but first it will be necessary to clarify the eighteenth century's conception of the classic rake, and to examine the large body of anti- rather than pro-libertine fiction.
CHAPTER TWO

'The Accomplish'd Rake:

Or, Modern Fine Gentleman'

WHEN the subject of Sir Charles Grandison's dissolute (but ultimately reclaimable) cousin Everard comes up in conversation in volume V, chapter xlv of Richardson's novel, Dr Bartlett remarks to Lady G:

And here, madam, allow me to observe, that there is such a Sameness in the lives, the actions, the pursuits of libertines, and such a Likeness in the accidents, punishments, and occasions for remorse, which attend them, that I wonder they will not be warned by the beacons that are lighted up by every brother libertine whom they know, and that they will so generally be driven on the same rock, overspread and surrounded as it is, in their very sight, by a thousand wrecks!

Dr Bartlett may find a sameness in the histories of rakes, but it is apparent that the subject, far from boring him, is a burning moral question. For the Doctor to have come to the conclusion that the lives of profligates are all lamentably the same, it follows that he has heard, or perhaps even read, of many such. By implication, it would also seem that Richardson is assuming a similar acquaintance on the part of the reader of Grandison, whom he intends will nod appreciatively at every wise pronouncement of the clergyman.

Richardson makes the further assumption that his reader is familiar with Mr B. and Robert Lovelace, Everard Grandison's brother libertines in Pamela and
Clarissa, but what I wish to argue is that the eighteenth century would have recognised these three characters as part of something larger. Libertinism is a topic that receives frequent treatment in the period, and it is the contention of this thesis that the literature of the rake constitutes some kind of literary sub-genre. The authors of the histories of rakes responded to what was regarded as a real and disturbing social problem, one that is therefore dealt with in many media -- on the stage, in poetry, satirical prints, popular songs, periodicals and Theophrastan character literature as well as in the pages of the novel. 3

It is worth refining the definition of 'rake' made in Chapter One before proceeding in order to appreciate fully the eighteenth-century sense of the rake as a violator of gentlemanly duty (and therefore as a danger to society as well as himself) — and to see how this theme is worked out in various examples of the literature of the period, including novels. In a popular and superficial account of the lives of several mostly eighteenth-century rakes, Henry Blyth cites the OED’s definition of a rake (discussed in Chapter One) as merely 'a man of loose habits and immoral character; an idle dissipated man of fashion.' 4 Blyth therefore feels justified in including base-born Richard ('Beau') Nash and 'Colonel' Dennis O'Kelly (c. 1723-1787), an upstart rogue of the turf, in his book. 5 So far, rakishness does not seem to be the preserve of any particular class or classes. Johnson's tentative derivation of 'rakehell' from racaille suggests a lower-class association, while his definition ('A wild, worthless, dissolute, debauched, sorry fellow') carries no especial social qualification. 6 Johnson's first Augustan example of the usage of the word, however, suggests that libertinism was viewed by writers in the eighteenth century as an exclusively upper-class phenomenon
(something that might, incidentally, be borne out by the 'man of fashion' clause in the *OED*):

*A rakehell* of the town, whose character is set off with excessive prodigality, prophaneness, intemperance and lust, is rewarded with a lady of great fortune to repair his own, which his vices had almost ruined. *Swift*

It is in this context that I would like to examine the figure of the rake, for I believe that writers of the period see him as Swift does, a young man of some fortune, always a gentleman but not necessarily anything grander, who is sent up to Oxford or Cambridge, to the Inns of Court or the West End, or on the Grand Tour, and whose debaucheries endanger his estate, his health and his chances of fathering a sound heir, and involve neglecting his duties as landlord, JP or MP. In addition to heavy drinking, gaming and frequenting the stews, his conventional pastimes include blasphemy, violent pranks against figures of authority (usually a tutor or governor, the Proctors or the Watch) and anti-social behaviour in general. And one other frequently represented event in the career of rakes in eighteenth-century novels is the abduction, drugging and/or violation of a beautiful young virgin, often a social equal, in a bagnio or brothel masqueraded as the house of the rapist's elderly and respectable relation and her numerous 'daughters'. The climax of *Clarissa* is one such, of course, but this is a standard element of the rake's progress much earlier and much later on. *(In subsequent chapters I shall discuss Henry Fielding's and Tobias Smollett's versions of this conventional material, and Richardson's working and re-working of it in *Pamela* and *Sir Charles Grandison*, as well as in *Clarissa*.)* It is these outward details of the rake's career and activities that are described by Dr Bartlett's 'Sameness', and which become the standard *curriculum vitae* in the
novels of the century.  

There may be no mention of social class in Johnson's definition of a rake, but he seems to have had this sort of figure in mind when he wrote 'A Short Song of Congratulation' on a young heir's coming of age, and other writers also take this well-bred rake for granted. In the 350th *Spectator*, Will Honeycomb 'gives us the picture of a converted Rake' (in fact himself), and in describing the typical case he conforms to the type I have described. Similarly, but more vehemently, the club of debauchees in Richard Ames's 'The Rake: Or, the Libertine's Religion' (1693) insist that a rake is not just any 'man of loose habits and immoral character', *pace* the *OED*.

It must not be said, that we,  
*By Drink* were overcome; for then,  
We level'd are with common Men:  
*Drunkenness* is not known to *Gentlemen*...  

The conduct of all classes was obviously a worry to moralists in the eighteenth century, but rakish licence does tend to be seen as a problem unique to the ruling class; in *Connoisseur* 22 (27 June 1754), the 'modish excesses of these times' boil down to 'the manner in which the younger part of the polite world is brought up...'. The title I have taken for this introductory chapter, that of the novel *The Accomplish'd Rake: Or, Modern Fine Gentleman* by Mary Davys, makes an unequivocal equation; in fact, the term 'modern fine gentleman' became something of a synonym for libertine. In the novel itself, Mrs Davys makes a demographic point with an ironic touch at the end:

How many young Gentlemen have we among the better Sort of Men, that are in a Manner wholly neglected and left to branch forth into numberless Follies, like a rich Field uncultivated, that abounds in nothing but tall Weeds and gaudy scentless Flowers. This is doubtless the Reason
why the Town is so stock'd with Rakes and Coxcombs, who wisely imagine all Merit is wrapt up in fine Clothes and Blasphemy...\textsuperscript{15}

In 1675, a pamphlet entitled 'The Character of a Town-Gallant' appeared, which described the whoring, violence and profanity of the bucks of Restoration London, and suggests that the term 'gentleman' be used for a different and better sort of man. A reply was published in the same year, 'News from Covent-Garden: Or, the Town-Gallants Vindication', presenting itself as a justification of libertinism by the offended rakes themselves. It rapidly becomes clear the defence of debauchery is ironic, but it is significant that one of the charges made by the 'Hero's of the Civilized VWorld' against their detractor in the other pamphlet is that he is not only low church, but also common.\textsuperscript{16}

And in the seventeenth \textit{Guardian} (31 March 1713), where Steele makes adulterers and rakes his subject, he says, 'I must not be rough to Gentlemen and Ladies, but speak of Sin as a Gentleman', thus subscribing to the accepted view of rakes.\textsuperscript{17}

Steele speaks elsewhere of the rake in terms that might palliate or excuse his offences (\textit{Tatler} 27), but even there he admits that 'he may talk of this person with too much indulgence',\textsuperscript{18} and it seems to be another commonplace in the eighteenth century that the vices of young men of rank and fortune were a serious issue, even a great danger. In the days when the \textit{Connoisseur}'s polite world not only set the fashion but also governed the land, rakishness among its youth was a grave threat to social and political order. According to Sir Roger de Coverley in \textit{Spectator} 6, also written by Steele, 'for the Loss of publick and private Virtue, we are beholden to your Men of Parts' (i. 29). A similar idea is expressed by Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury and confessor to that archetypal rake, the second Earl of Rochester, in his account of Lord Rochester's death-bed repentance. Writing of dissolute men of high station, Bishop Burnet
obsves,

Such persons are a Plague wherever they may come.
What Influence this has on the whole Nation is but
too visible; How the Bonds of Nature, Wedlock and
all other Relations are quite broken. 19

Nearly a century later, in the *Town and Country Magazine* for May 1773, a piece on
the rakes of Medmenham Abbey in Buckinghamshire is prefaced by this explanation:

Vice, immorality and prophaneness, are sub-
jects that require greater force than I am capable of
collecting to decry; yet it is my opinion, with sub-
mission, that every individual should exert himself
to the entire abolition of such practices as may have
a bad effect upon the whole community, and parti-
cularly so when when the patrons of these are
possessed of any particular eminence, by pointing out
their abandoned pursuits of pleasure, as well as the
seat of them. 20

The writer proceeds to do exactly this, giving an account of the seat of Sir Francis Dash-
wood, Bt (by that time Lord Le Despencer), supposedly the leading light of a notorious
hell-fire club. *Town and Country's* correspondent concludes by exposing some rakish
rites to public scrutiny:

They always at their meals chaunt a solemn Latin grace,
and act many other absurdities, that would better become
the Italian mimic [in the print] upon the stair-case, the
exact resemblance of themselves, than persons who, by
their fortune and abilities would, if directed properly, be
of service to the state and community; which otherwise,
by their employments, they are pilfering. (246)

Perhaps one of the most well known and most coherently argued (but, paradoxically,
one of the most hysterical) expressions of this recurring nightmare of the eighteenth-
century consciousness is John Brown's *Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times* (1757), a work so talked about in its own day that its author came invariably to be called 'Estimate' Brown. In two volumes plus an appendix-volume of restatement, Brown spells out the view that was widespread, whether at the backs of people's minds or, as in the *Connoisseur*, clearly stated: that a debauched upper class was bound to have a fatal effect on the constitution of government and of society itself. Brown analyses the irreligion, luxury and general moral deficiencies of the age, suggesting ways in which vices might be corrected and abuses rectified, but concludes that

> where the ruling Mischief desolates the Great, there, even the palliative Remedies cannot easily be applied: The Reason is manifest: A coercive Power is wanting: They who should cure the Evil are the very Delinquents: And moral or political Physic is what no distempered Mind will ever administer to itself.21

Elsewhere, he calls 'Luxury and Prodigality' a 'Violation of the social Duties',22 and explains further in the second volume of the *Estimate*, ascribing partial blame for the modern neglect of duty:

> How different a Scene does almost every modern great Family afford, from those of the ancient Nobles of our Country, where the Master was the Father, Instructor, and Friend of his Servants, and had a generous Regard to their Morals, Principles, and real Welfare? I need hardly tell the World, that they are now left to the Workings of unbridled Passions, heightened by Idleness, high Living, and dissolute Example. What can be the result of this Madness, but Profligacy in its Excess? Or what can come forth from such Scenes of unprincipled Licentiousness, but Pick-pockets, Prostitutes, Thieves, Highwaymen, and Murderers? These are your Triumphs, O Shaftesbury, Bolingbroke, Tindal, Mandeville, Morgan, Hume.23
Fears that upper-class libertinism were trickling down to create general lawlessness and disruption in every rank of society were not confined to moralising journalists or clergymen like Brown. Novelists were also worried, like the anonymous author of *The History of Tom Jones the Foundling in his Married State* (1750), an unauthorised continuation of Fielding's novel, which decries the gentlemanly custom of duelling, not only because it endangers life and runs counter to both religious and civil law, but also because it encourages inferiors to challenge their betters, thereby eroding the order that governs the land. In one of his long lectures to the newly married but not entirely tamed Tom Jones, Mr Allworthy inveighs against drunkenness, on all the obvious grounds (mental and physical health, avoidance of quarrels, prevention of concomitant sins like blasphemy and lechery), and because 'Wine is a Leveller' (230). The drunkard is 'divested of the Character of a Friend, a Gentleman, a Master, a Subject, and banisheth himself from all that is dear, and gives up all that is sacred to him' (227) when 'Quality and Peasantry pig together: And there is no Difference between the Lord and his Footman' (230). Likewise, the virtuous hero of Edward Kimber's *Maria* (1765) laments that young Fellows of rank and Fortune should give themselves over to their Vices, and disturb the Peace, and transgress those Laws they were born to be the Guardians of.

Similar sentiments are to be found in novels as diverse as Mrs Davys's *Accomplish'd Rake* (1727) and Robert Bage's *Barham Downs* (1784). In a less serious vein, Horace Walpole wrote to his friend Richard Rigby some time in the summer of 1745, adopting the pose of a rake in the reign of Queen Anne, calling himself 'Mac-Hack-Shock-Knock-O-Thunder-Blood, Late King of the Mohocks'. Walpole is alluding to the gang of well-born libertines who terrorised the
streets of London in the four last years of the Queen, and he too associates rakish con-
duct with a threat to order and good government:

Confound our royal soul, if it does not give us damned
pleasure to think our mighty empire is likely to rise
from its ruins, and again triumph over peace and law.27

Even taking the humorous tone into account, Walpole's comment illustrates the extent
to which the rake, and a particular group of them, had become conventionally asso-
ciated with some sort of danger to society.

By looking at the Mohocks, the club of young bloods referred to by Walpole,
one may begin to understand the power that the image of the rake exercised over the
consciousness of the eighteenth century. It seems that there were two major outbreaks
of Mohock activity, one in the autumn of 1709 and the second in early March 1712 (still
1711 by the old reckoning of the New Year). Steele responded to the former in Tatler 77
(6 October 1709; I. 527), where he finds them harmless and their pastimes rather witty in
comparison with similar gangs in the previous century (something I shall return to),
but in 1711/12 the tone of reports is usually worried and often frantic. Suddenly, the
Mohocks were of great public concern, even distracting public attention from a crucial
stage in the negotiation of a settlement to end the War of the Spanish Succession.28 In
the Journal to Stella, Swift writes that 'Grub street Papers about them fly like Light-
ning', 29 and on 12 March the Spectator gave the following report of the entertainments
of 'The Mohock Club':

The particular Talents by which these *Misanthropes*
are distinguish'd from one another, consist in the
various kinds of Barbarities which they execute upon
their Prisoners. Some are celebrated for a happy Dexterity in tipping the Lion upon them; which is perform'd by squeezing the Nose flat to the Face, and boring out the Eyes with their Fingers: Others are call'd the Dancing-Masters, and teach their Scholars to cut Capers by running Swords thro' their Legs; a new Invention, whether originally French I cannot tell: A third Sort are the Tumblers, whose Office it is to set Women upon their Heads, and commit certain Indecencies, or rather Barbarities, on the Limbs which they expose. But these I forbear to mention, because they can't but be very shocking to the Reader as well as the SPECTATOR. In this Manner they carry on a War against Mankind; and by the standing Maxims of their Policy, are to enter into no Alliances but one, and that is offensive and defensive with all the Bawdy-Houses in general, of which they have declar'd themselves Protectors and Guarantees. (n° 324; III. 187-8)

But the Mohocks were not the peculiar bugbear of Addison's Spectator; the day before, Lady Strafford had written to her husband in some alarm:

Here is nothing talked about but men that goes in party about the street and cuts peaple with swords or knives, and they call themselves by som hard name which I can nethere speak nor spell; but a Satturday night coming from the opera they asalted Mr. Davenant and drew there swords upon him, but he took won of them and sent to the round house, but tis thought 'twas sombody that would have been known and they gave mony and made their eskape, but what was the great jest about town was they said they had cut of his head of hare.

Lady Strafford's fear dissipates with a detail that is almost as amusing as her avowedly inadequate spelling, but when her husband's kinswoman, Lady Wentworth, writes three days later, the time for jokes has passed:

I am very much frighted with the fyer, but much more with a gang of Devils that call themselves Mohocks; they put an old woman into a hogshead, and rooled
her down a hill, they cut of soms nosis, others hands, and severe barbarass tricks without any provocation. They are said to be young gentlemen, they never take any mony from any; instead of setting fifty pound upon the head of a highwayman, sure they would do much better to sett a hundred upon their heads. (Wentworth Papers, 277n.)

A large part of the general concern, it seems, was that the Mohocks might be young me of social standing, in effect the future governors of the state. These fears were confirmed when arrests were made, and among those taken by the Watch or under suspicion of Mohockish activity were Lord Hinchingbrooke, the only son of the third Earl of Sandwich; Sir Mark Cole, Bt; and Thomas Burnet, son of the very prominent Bishop of Salisbury, the same divine who had heard Lord Rochester's famous confession some thirty years earlier. Thomas Burnet wrote to his friend George Duckett, apparently clearing himself of any involvement in the Mohocks' frolics, but illuminating a further worrisome aspect of the rakish gang, the fact that they offered 'violence to Ladys even of Quality.' Things have presumably reached a low ebb when gentleman ruffians turn on their own class.

Nevertheless, the Mohocks did not always inspire general panic and universal horror, though they seem to have been on almost everyone's mind in the spring of 1712. In the first place, a number of minor pieces of Mohockiana were published at that time which support or excuse the polite libertines, though it is possible they are the work of hack writers trying to cash in on public hysteria. In any case, among them is 'The Huzza', a song which purports to be one of their drunken anthems and which celebrates their mastery over the Watch and the town without displaying any signs of ironic intent or submerged anti-Mohock feeling. Similarly, 'The Mohocks: A Poem, in Miltonic Verse, Addressed to the Spectator' makes a declaration to this critic of the club
and to enforcers of the law:

YE partial Judges, who the MOHOCKS damn,
Reverse your Sentence now;

arguing that the legal measures taken against publicans, hackney carriage drivers and
whores ought not to be applied to these self-proclaimed heirs of the Homeric heroes. More importantly, John Gay takes a relatively light view of these *noceurs*, perhaps following Steele's lead in seeing their antics as amusing and excusable, this in a pamphlet that is almost certainly by Gay and in a play that is unquestionably his. The pamphlet, with its marvellous mock-sonorous title ('A Wonderful Prophecy Taken from the Mouth of the Spirit of the Person who was barbarously slain by the *Mohocks*. Proving that the said *Mohocks* and *Hawkubites* are the *Gog* and *Magog* mention'd in the Revelations, and therefore That this vain and transitory World will shortly be brought to its final Dissolution. Breath'd forth in the Year 1712'), wittily deflates the ridiculous level of fear occasioned by probably disorganised, unpremeditated and exaggerated events in the streets. The play is, of course, *The Mohocks*, but the focus there is somewhat less light-hearted than in the 'Wonderful Prophecy'. In Gay's play, the young blades capture the Watch, manage to change clothes with them, and get the Constable and his men (together with an unsuspecting beau, thrown in to heighten the comedy and confusion) brought before the magistrates for the Mohocks' own crimes. Everything is sorted out in the end, and justice makes a qualified triumph, but as in *The Beggar's Opera*, Gay is making the point that the breakers of the law are more or less interchangeable with its enforcers. While R.J. Allen is probably correct to assume that *The Mohocks* 'was not intended to reform the young rakes, satiric as it was',
even the rather whimsical and frivolous approach taken means that some comment is
made on the fact that society has sunk to the stage where the young members of the
ruling class are criminals who mimic and mock, rather than direct, the forces of law and
order, and where distinctions between criminal and constable are beginning to break
down. The plot, with its inversions and confusions of order, may have been suggested
by the arrested Mohocks' claims that they had been scouring the streets not in order to
disturb the peace but to apprehend noisy libertines on behalf of the Watch (Allen,
108-110). I also suspect, as I have hinted above, that Gay is poking fun at the reactions of
his contemporaries to nocturnal revels, for surely their terror was disproportionate to
what might be regarded as merely the uproariousness of young men in liquor and high
spirits; but at the same time he senses the dangers to society that are embodied by the
Mohocks. These perils are explored at the other end of the social spectrum in Gay's
'Newgate pastoral', *The Beggar's Opera*.

Gay and the anonymous Grub-street authors of 1712 do tend to disarm the
Mohocks, but that they discuss them at all indicates just how seriously the whole issue
was taken. Probably no one took it more so than Swift, whose paranoia, expressed in a
letter to Archbishop King of 29 March 1712 and especially in the *Journal to Stella*, is
hard to believe but nonetheless genuine. He 'came home early to avoid the Mohaks' (509) and in other places tells Esther Johnson that they caused him not only inconvenience but considerable fright as well. Furthermore, Swift viewed the entire business
not as spontaneous and undirected but instead as something organised and sinister;
early on, he declared, 'They are all Whigs ...' (*JS*, 509) and that he had been informed
that 'they had malicious Intentions agst the Ministers & their Friends ...' (*JS*, 515),
which may add up to 'some mischievous design in those Villains ...' (*JS*, 515). He
admits, 'I know not whether there be anything in this' (*JS*, 509), but by about 1714,
when he had collected his thoughts in *The History of the Four Last Years of the Queen*, Swift had formulated a wild theory of political conspiracy to explain the Mohocks. The Whig hooray Henries he told Stella about become 'a Crew of obscure Ruffians' hired by the Whig opposition under the Duke of Marlborough, and at the suggestion of Prince Eugene of Savoy, to create confusion and chaos in the streets.\(^\text{41}\) The ultimate design of the Prince and the Duke, according to Swift, was the assassination of the Earl of Oxford, the Queen's Tory Lord Treasurer and principal minister. The Mohocks were brought in, he alleges,

That this might easily be done, and pass for an Effect of Chance, if it were preceded by encouraging some proper People to commit small Riots in the Night, and in several Parts of the Town. (HFLYQ, 26-27)

Drinking and whoring companions are thus metamorphosed into political assassins, or at least into the carefully contrived smoke-screen for them. Whig historians of the 1730's like John Oldmixon and William Maitland not surprisingly regarded all this as a series of 'idle and fictitious Stories' aimed at discrediting their party, and some modern scholars admit that they may be correct.\(^\text{42}\) They even advanced the anti-Tory theory that the Mohocks did not exist at all. (Steele's Whig politics may also be the grounds for his excuse of the Mohocks in *The Tatler*, but Addison, though a fellow Kit-Cat, was genuinely frightened.\(^\text{43}\) One is to-day probably inclined to see the furore caused by the Mohocks as nothing more than a tempest in a port-glass, and perhaps to put Swift's extraordinary reaction down to a combination of extreme political partisanship and personal insecurity, but whatever the truth of the matter, the Mohock scare makes one appreciate the eighteenth century's understanding of the political and social consequences of rakishness, and the extent to which this becomes the subject of discussion in
various writers and *genres*. Indeed, if the Mohocks were more an imaginary threat than a real one, my point is only emphasised.

The issue of libertinism finds its way into larger, more general moral debate throughout the period, especially among those who, like Henry Fielding and the *Town and Country Magazine*, wished to argue against the Mandevillean position that private vice could mean public benefit. And with the Mohocks as part of the background to the development of the novel in the next decade, it is no wonder that the rake should become a staple of this new kind of writing as well. Furthermore, the rake was regarded as a problem of long standing, one that had plagued previous generations and that showed no signs of sparing subsequent ones. The Mohocks are in many places compared to similar groups in their fathers' days and even earlier. In *The Mohocks*, one of the Watch remembers 'the ancient *Mohocks* of King Charles' his Days' (ii. 115-16; p. 87) and Justice Scruple alludes to the *Mohocks* in Queen *Elizabeth's Days* (iii. 2-3; pp 93-4), the conclusion of the Constable being that 'there have been *Mohocks* in all Reigns and in all Ages ...' (ii. 119-20; p. 87). This is not just the opinion of some literary characters, for in an important article, T.S. Graves discusses the actual Elizabethan and Jacobean forerunners of the Mohocks, and one must also keep Rochester and his 'merry gang' in mind. According to one writer, the generation of Mohocks that harassed Gay's Constable in fact survived until nearly the end of the reign of George I. Admittedly, John Timbs's *Club Life of London* (1866) is not necessarily an authoritative source, but it is more difficult to disagree with Louis C. Jones's *Clubs of the Georgian Rakes* (1942), in which he remarks that 'those traditions of disorder and violence remained in the larger cities of the three kingdoms throughout the century.' The Mohocks themselves faded out of the picture, but their pranks remained in fashion, and
were the persistent object of censure, until the end of the century: nicking, scouring and other 'frolics' in the Mohock vein are described in, among others, Mrs Haywood’s *Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy* (1753), Goldsmith’s *Vicar of Wakefield* (1764), *The Adventures of Oxymel Classic* (1768), and even Robert Bage’s *Barham Downs* (1784).47

Also among the most important of the later rakes were the members of so-called hell-fire clubs, groups that appear to have begun to associate in the early 1720’s. The 234th *Spectator* (ii. 411-12) and the Swift excerpt quoted in Johnson’s *Dictionary* connect free-thinking and blasphemy with the literally dare-devil behaviour of the rake, as does James Puckle in his curious little book *The Club: Or, A Dialogue Between Father and Son* (1711). Puckle’s Son identifies the assorted types who meet at the Noah’s Ark pub, and one of these is 'A RAKE, That never open’d his *Mouth*, but to *Affront Christianity, Civil Society, Decency or Good Manners*...’ 48 *The Club* is just one of the works that identifies profanity as an integral part of the rakish character generally49, and predictably a specific group of impious debauchees seems to have caught both the popular and literary imaginations in the later years of the reign of George I. The *OED’s* earliest entries under 'Hell-fire' as a proper noun are 1720 and 1721, and by the beginning of the 'twenties three hell-fire Clubs are said to have been in existence in London.50 They were essentially like the clubs established by gentlemen in earlier days, but to the usual alcoholic, gambling and sexual over-indulgences they added the *frisson* of irreligion -- possibly even to the point of black masses, or at least a formal initiation rite like denouncing the Creed or saying the Lord's Prayer backwards. It might seem odd that a club of this type should figure in the pages of Defoe’s *Journal of the Plague Year*, which is set in 1665, but it is worth remembering that the novel was published in 1722, when hell-fire clubs were much in the news. Defoe is also expressing
the belief that the rakes of his day were acting as their earlier counterparts had, by inclu-
ding a club of blasphemous libertines in his novel. Furthermore, the *Journal*,
though it recreates historical events, is not simply an attempt to analyse history, but also a warning against the conditions as well moral as hygienic that might permit another visitation of the plague, which had recently raged in the south of France.\(^51\)

By 1721, the authorities regarded hell-fire activities as dangerous enough to warrant a Royal Proclamation ordering their suppression. One clause of the edict addresses the serious possibility that persons at Court and in the confidence of the King himself might be members of these societies: most prominent among them that extraordinary rake, the first Duke of Wharton.\(^52\) In the same year, the justices of Westminster and Middlesex advertised for information that would lead to the conviction of the blasphemous revellers, but measures on the part of authority seem to have had only temporary effects.\(^53\) Hell-fire rakishness in fact received the greatest amount of publicity and moral outrage in the 1750's and 60's, when the group surrounding Sir Francis Dashwood, Bt (later Lord Le Despencer) were the subject of considerable prurient speculation and scandal-mongering. There is a good body of evidence to suggest that many of the accusations and stories about Dashwood and his so-called 'Order of St Francis' are largely salacious fabrications, though it is clear that some kind of club, probably no more sinister than any other convivial society of country gentlemen, politicians and *littéra-teurs* in the eighteenth century, met at West Wycombe Park in Buckinghamshire, Dashwood's country seat. There were also gatherings at another of his houses, Medmenham Abbey near Marlow, which gave rise to the other popular name for the group, the Monks of Medmenham.\(^54\) Assuming for the moment that all the legends about them are true, they would have been unusual as rakes from the point of view of this
study, for their most celebrated riots were said to have taken place in middle age, not the hot period of youth. Even though they do not conform to the definition outlined *supra* (pp 54-5) by reason of maturity, the reports of their activities, whether true or not, caught the fancy of the public and, it could be asserted, helped to fix certain important aspects of the character of the libertine in the minds of their more staid contemporaries. As with the Mohocks, the 'Monks' find their way into the literature of their day, most notably in the enlarged editions of *Chrysal; Or, the Adventures of a Guinea* (1764, 1767) by Charles Johnstone (also Johnston or Johnson), which purports to give an eye-witness account of their rites.55 The myths about Medmenham are best discussed and sensibly dispelled in *Sir Francis Dashwood: An Eighteenth-Century Independent* by Miss Betty Kemp. Miss Kemp suggests that the libels of political enemies (one of whom Wilkes became after falling out with Dashwood) and the sensationalism of eighteenth-century journalism are largely responsible for the the Medmenham myth. She points out that *Chrysal*, the source of much of the legend and cited as historical evidence by many scholars, is wholly unreliable, being presumably neither an impartial nor an eye-witness account. (It is also worth adding that the Medmenham material was added in the later editions of Johnstone's novel, at a guess to spice up an otherwise not very interesting book with something topical and salacious.) The Dashwood MSS and other papers I have examined indicate that parties of pleasure were held by Dashwood and his friends at Medmenham and elsewhere, but a few jocular devilish references are not reason enough to suppose these gatherings satanic in any serious way. The truth of the matter (as is perhaps the case with the Mohocks as well) appears to be that people thought something more scandalous and sinister was taking place, or wanted to think it, and that contemporary hack-writers catered to a taste for secret histories and *chroniques scandaleuses*. If the fears over Medmenham were in fact groundless, my point about the eighteenth-century preoccupation with libertinism is only reinforced by this creation
of rakes and threats where none may have existed.\(^56\) It is almost surprising that reports of the wicked upper class did not come to be considered positively humdrum, but even as late as the reign of George III the behaviour of rakes still evoked the same kind of fears as in the days of the Mohocks. The issue of libertinism was by no means dead, as *Town and Country's* correspondent makes clear (see supra, \(^58\)), for the 'particular eminence' of the rake and his consequent 'bad effect upon the community' were as troubling to writers in the 1770's as they were in the days of Queen Anne. What is also apparent is that later generations of rakes kept alive what they too perceived as the spirit of Medmenham, exemplified in the motto inscribed on the pedestal of an obscene statue that is said to have stood in the gardens of the Abbey --

\[
\text{PENI TENTO,}
\]

\[\text{non}\]

\[
\text{PENITENTI.}\(^57\)
\]

John Hall-Stevenson, Laurence Sterne's Eugenius, visited Medmenham and is supposed to have taken his lead in forming the Demoniacs, his own circle at Crazy Castle in Yorkshire, from the Medmenhamites\(^58\). William Beckford and Lord Byron, later profili-gates at Fonthill and Newstead abbeys respectively, considered themselves very much part of a tradition inspired by the Rabelaisian tag 'Fay ce que voudras' over the door at Medmenham, whatever it was in fact that Dashwood and his friends were guilty of in doing as they pleased.\(^59\)

One must conclude, in short, that the deaths of individual rakes, the breaking up of particular clubs of libertines or the efforts of the law never effectively rid eighteenth-century England of a recognised evil, or the perception of one, though L.C. Jones argues that the close of the century brought about a revolution in the morals of young English gentlemen, making Byron's plan to rekindle hell-fire disturbingly
freakish rather than deplorably commonplace. But for a large portion of the century, and previously at least since the Restoration, the rake was a social problem of the first magnitude and therefore a constant topic in literature. And what underlies every one of the histories of rakes is yet another attempt to determine the extent of the danger posed by libertinism and also what can be done to reclaim the profligate; and, more remotely, to bring rakish readers to true repentance. In order to gain a clearer picture of the moral concerns involved, and to establish some of the conventions of the history of a rake as portrayed in the novel, we must turn to actual examples of what can be called 'rake fiction', starting with some minor, even anonymous examples and leaving the major authors, who play with the conventions with greater subtlety, for subsequent chapters of the thesis.

References to various eighteenth-century novels so far may have suggested that libertinism was a subject that maintained its appeal and sense of urgency throughout the century. The details of a rake's progress were standard, conventional material, but could be adapted to suit the inclinations, readership and particular moral purposes of different authors. Some fictional rakes thus end reformed, others unregenerate and damned; and the rake, while remaining a recognisable type in the novel, essentially unchanged during the course of the 1700's, was also subject to subtle shifts in the taste and sensibilities of both writers and readers. Contrasting attitudes and approaches to libertinism will be writ large in the chapters in this thesis on Fielding, Richardson and Smollett, but also in a heterogeneous group of minor authors I shall discuss briefly here, who are agreed that the rake is his own, and society's, worst enemy, but who make use of the rake topos in an interesting variety of ways. Mary Davys's Accomplish'd Rake, which has been cited previously in various places, is a nice illustration of a libertine's
progress: young John Galliard inherits his father's baronetcy and estate in the early pages of the novel and rejecting the advice of his tutor, chooses the pleasures of London over Cambridge and the Grand Tour (16, 31), thus entering a 'New World of Temptation' (41). Sir John rapes the daughter of Mr Friendly, a benevolent neighbour from the country (75-82), by means of 'a private Conveyance of some Opiate into a few Mack-roons (which was what the Lady greatly loved)' (76), but even as he prepares to debauch her he 'sometimes wished it out of his Power to ruin the Lady' (82). After some reflection, however, he resolves to 'regard not what is past, but study to gratify the present, and to come...' (88), and the deed is done. The narrator continues,

This sensual Soliloquy set our Knight upon searching after new Pleasures; he had heard very much of a Goodly Sett of Men, who distinguished themselves by the name of the HELL-FIRE CLUB; and thought, if he could but make Friends to get himself initiated a Member of the Glorious Dare-Devil Society, he should be a Compleat Modern Fine Gentleman. (88)

There follows a period of moral indecision, of self-reproach and self-indulgence, of resolutions not to sin and more frequent backsliding. After various misadventures with married women, jealous husbands and whores, Sir John gets a dose of pox. He regards this as the last straw, and at length

Time recall'd his former Health and Liberty; neither of which obstructed his Design of going into the Country, because he began to be tired of the Town. (186)

This does not exactly constitute reformation, but he is welcomed at Galliard Hall as the returning Prodigal (187), and does ultimately repent, particularly of his shocking treatment of Miss Friendly, whom he marries, though not without Mrs Davys's hints that
there may be 'false Steps or relapses' to come (196). The author's account of Galliard's career is the Ur-progress of the rake, in the eighteenth-century novel at least (the plot has antecedents in seventeenth-century drama, for one), for Hogarth almost certainly read and used it as the basis for his own phenomenally successful and influential *Rake's Progress* prints. It spawned at least one imitation, *The Finish'd Rake; or, Gallantry in Perfection* (1733), and may have given inspiration for the texts of the numerous 'compleat keys' to the *Rake's Progress* that traded on the more immediate popularity of Hogarth's engravings. It is also possible that the drugging and violation of Miss Friendly by Galliard is the direct prototype of attacks of a similar nature in later fiction, including those of Mrs Bennet in Fielding's *Amelia* and of Clarissa herself.

By 1750, about which time the anonymous novel *The Humours of Fleet-Street: And the Strand* was published, the history of the rake as found in earlier fiction and elsewhere had, presumably, become convention enough that one of the characters in *The Humours* can turn it around, and use it as the basis of a joke. The novel pretends to be the letters of Captain Henry Rakewell in town to his friend George Bellfield in the country, with one in reply at the end. Bellfield has retired to his estate as reformed rakes tend to do, disgusted by the whores, fine ladies and *mores* of London in general, and Rakewell attempts to persuade him out of his misogyny by relating the stories of famous prostitutes of the day. The whole nearly degenerates into a tiresome series of bawdy tales, but the anonymous author's point is moral rather than erotic; his brief biographies evoke pity, not titillate, being more often than not harlots' progresses from 'the top of the mode' to 'all the scenes of distress, diseases and poverty' (11). Many of the bawds and whores are easily recognisable as real instead of fictional ('FyM-ý' is Fanny Murray, the dedicatee of Wilkes's *Essay on Woman*; 17-25), and curiously, seven
out of the eleven described are said to have been born to good families. This is designed
to tempt Bellfield back to London to comfort these distressed ladies (in the fullest sense)
of the town. The approach is perhaps a little odd, but it contributes to the author’s own
moral message. The series of epistles begins,

I received your sanctified letter, containing
your pious resolution of renouncing the pleasures
of this wicked town, and spending the remainder
of your days in making plaisters and cordials for the
sick, with the good old lady your grandmother at
Bellfield-Hall. (1)

Standard stuff so far, but then Rakewell begins to invert the topics of retirement, calling
Bellfield’s repentance ‘a dangerous malady, bordering on madness’ (2), and unfair ‘pre-
judice and prepossession’ against London life (2). Rakewell contends that because fox-
hunting squires like his friend debauch country girls and poor relations, they are no
better than town rakes, and he concludes his introductory expostulation with the
following plea: ‘For God’s sake, George, leave their hypocritical company, and come to
town and sin like a gentleman ...’ (4). And Rakewell chooses an appropriately parodic
metaphor in his second letter, where he asks,

Who could have thought you would so soon have
turned recreant, and learned to blaspheme those
pleasures you tasted with so high a gout?  (5)

The ‘secret’ histories of ‘one or other of the ladies of pleasure’ (5) follow, but Rakewell is
in the end disappointed in his design. Bellfield writes back in the thirteenth and final
letter of The Humours, rectifying Rakewell’s jocular perversions of medical and reli-
gious metaphor. He calls his friend ‘a mere quack’ (94) and tells him,
you flattered yourself that you had touched my malady to the quick, and quite altered my opinion of the fair sorceress's [sic] of your metropolis, and concluded me a convert to your doctrine... (94)

Bellfield also relies on one's acquaintance with the classic libertine's character, and specifically one aspect of it, that of the worn-out but unregenerate debauchee, when he observes,

"You old rakes are strange creatures; when young you have all the same notions I have at present, but when old and past the active scenes of life, like witches, you read your prayers backward, and praise those creatures for angels, whom you have used like frail mortals, and once thought no better than Indian devils." (95)

Bellfield's persistent misogyny is not typical of reformed rakes, who normally reassert social duties and virtues by marrying suitable young ladies, but this is a further example of the slight variations that are possible only when the basic elements of the typical rake's history can be taken as understood.

Another conscious variation of the standard material is to be found in *The Pupil of Pleasure* (1777), by Samuel Jackson Pratt, who wrote under the pseudonym Courtney Melmoth. Pratt's villainous title character, Sedley, is the self-professed devotee of Lord Chesterfield's *Letters ... to his Son* (first published in 1774), and the twist on conventional libertinism is that 'Chesterfieldism' demands a politer and more sophisticated kind of rake than previously was the norm. 'The herd are contented to be libertines in the ordinary, shallow, shadowy way; those duller souls [who] content themselves with vulgar happiness; with yielding beauty, entrapt simplicity, and the mere defloration of female youth ...' (I. 9); while the Pupil aims at more refined, discreet intrigues with safely married women, or the secret seduction of willing, undrugged vir-
gins (I. 80-1). Above all, 'The CHESTERFIELD system admits not the fearful and filthy intercourse of *venal* women' in a brothel (I. 80). (See also I. 79, 116, 224-5 on the differences between the old-fashioned, 'harum-scarum rake' (I. 116) and the true Chesterfieldian.) All the same, Sedley is responsible for much misery and is left wretched and repentant at the end of the novel, and Pratt thinks him as much the cause of 'aggravated evils in society arising from the practice of such *perniciously-pleasing* precepts' (I. xii) as was the rake of old (see also I. xiii).

Perhaps even more startling a transformation, at first, is that of the rake in the novels of John Cleland, the much misunderstood author of the *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1748-9), more commonly known as *Fanny Hill*. Although the *Memoirs* has long had the reputation of being a 'libertine' book, it is, of course, ultimately a celebration of the heroine's (in spirit) monogamous yearning for Charles, her first and only love. It is true at the same time, however, that Fanny is not adversely judged by the author for her life as a prostitute; instead, it is she who makes moral judgments on some of her more unsavoury customers and others she encounters.67 But in the end it is because Charles 'came upon the rake with some of his young companions' (35) that the happy couple meet in the first place, and Fanny's prostitution that eventually gives her a fortune that makes her respectable and marriageable (175-6, 186); and in the midst of the not so very incongruously moral ending, Charles undertakes their son's education:

> anxious for his son's morals, with a view to form him to Virtue, and inspire him with a fixt, a rational contempt for vice, he condescended to be his master of the ceremonies, and led him by the hand thro' the most noted bawdy-houses in town, where he took care that he should be familiariz'd with all those scenes of debauchery, so fit to nauseate a good taste. (188)
This is advocacy of libertinism to an extent, but libertinism rectified and moralised (see especially 175), the practice of a 'rational pleasurist'. In the case of one of Fanny's keepers, the spent rake Mr Norbert, such a moderate course of rakishness brings him back to health, and even makes 'him lose his taste for inconstancy, and new faces' (142), though a relapse into mere debauchery eventually kills him. Although the story that Parliament paid Cleland not to write another *Fanny Hill* seems not to be true, for some reason he decided to abandon his sexually explicit style, and in fact becomes increasingly anti-libertine in the novels that follow the *Woman of Pleasure, Memoirs of a Coxcomb* (1751) and *The Surprises of Love* (1764). Cleland's second novel begins with Sir William Delamere repentant of his previous coxcombr (which encompasses rakishness as well as foppishness), but he admits,

> there is scarce a less merit in acknowledging candidly one's faults, than in not having been guilty of them. For my own part, I speak experimentally. I never felt so pleasing, so sensible a consolation for the misfortune of having been a coxcomb, and an eminent one too, as this proof of the sincerity of my conversion, in the courage of coming to a fair and open confession of the follies I drove into, in the course of that character (1-2)

-- as if to say that his past, though regrettable, was at least instructive. As Sir William later remarks, he appears 'predestinated not to arrive at wisdom, but through a course of follies' (98). To a reasonable degree, his sins are only the peccadilloes to be expected in young gentlemen (85, 89-90, 91-2); and unlike many a more vulgar rake, he is free from any desire to gamble (123), and conducts his amours with taste, discretion and not a trace of grossness (135-7, 247). When Delamere is at last persuaded to go to a brothel with
some companions, he is disgusted by its lowness, dirt and vulgarity (247-80). After some fruitless polite gallantry, he rediscovers the young lady whom he loved as a boy, before he began his career as a London libertine. The over-all tone of the novel is anti-libertine, but the palliation of Sir William's crimes takes rakishness, without openly defending it, at least for granted as a valuable (though also potentially dangerous) stage in the process of growing up.

The Surprises of Love takes a stronger line against rakishness in the four 'romances', each named for a time of the day (like another Hogarth series), that make up the novel. In the first, 'The Romance of a Day', Frederic, the young gentleman hero, goes to Greenwich Park, disguised as a 'prentice in order to pick up working-class girls. Cleland is careful to say, however, that he is not one of

Those indeed who are actuated by that spirit of debauchery, which is so far from being pleasure, that, in the truth of taste, nothing can be a greater poison to pleasure, [and who] trust to the heart's following the possession of the person.70

Frederic meets Letitia, a girl of his own class who is also in disguise as a frolic. Once identities and misunderstandings are sorted out, they fall in love and discover that their fathers were arranging a match between them anyway -- rakishness thwarted by disposition, circumstance and true love. In 'The Romance of a Night', the Earl of Veramore rescues a beautiful girl from her abductor, Sir Thomas Darkfield, marries her, and rejects his former womanising (149-50) -- outright rakishness defeated. In the remaining romances, which were added in the second edition of 1765, love at first sight overcomes the mild misogyny of Vincent ('The Romance of a Morning', 153-203), and Sir Lionel Heartly rescues the lovely Melicent from Squire Bullurst, who has carried her off on the Thames in his boat ('The Romance of an Evening', 207-74) -- again, the triumph of true
love over the forces of libertinism. Cleland reveals this as the principal message of *The Surprises* in its final paragraph:

The union of Sir Lionel and Melicent adds one more example of the power of Virtue to bless her votaries with a permanence of pure unadulterated joys, incomparably superior to those of libertines, which are at once, so void of taste, so poisonous, and so transient, while this inferiority of theirs is easily and solidly to be accounted for. The gratification of a vicious passion produces, in the true nature of corporal sensations, a momentary pleasure, shamefully subjected to the ingratitude of disgust, and to the pain of regrets; whereas the enjoyments of virtuous love, spiritualized by sentiment, partake of the immortality of their parent, the soul, whence they derive their great principles of duration. Vice may, indeed, sometimes give what is falsely called pleasure; but it is only for Virtue to give what is truly called Happiness. (273-4; see also 61, 155)

In fact, though the milieu and theme of *The Surprises of Love* and *Memoirs of a Coxcomb* seem at first to be often worlds away from those of the *Woman of Pleasure*, all three novels come to the same conclusion, that true love is monogamous ('chaste' in the full sense) and begins at first sight, though after *Fanny Hill* Cleland begins to restrict the libertinism that can take place before marriage. In this sense, then, there is a distinct change in tone from the first of his novels to the last: from lively and earthy to insipid and sentimental. The increasingly sentimentalised, anti-libertine tendency from novel to novel is taken even further in Cleland's last novel, *The Woman of Honor* (1768). The Earl Lovell, a rather pallid example of the novelistic rake, has designs on the beautiful heroine, Clara Maynwaring, but they fall just short of rape (compare the villains of *The Surprises*). In the end, Lord Lovell is overawed and reformed by her steadfast and virtuous example, content to watch her marry Sumners, a gallant hero of
At this point, one could move on to the rakes of later eighteenth-century fiction, whether novels of sentiment, manners or radical ideas or the Gothic tales that metamorphose the earlier libertine into villains like the Schedoni of Ann Radcliffe's *Italian*; but I shall preserve the roughly chronological arrangement of this thesis, and leave them for my concluding chapter.

The *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure*, if not Cleland's later fiction, should suggest that not every novelist in the eighteenth century came to his eventual anti-rakish conclusions, or, indeed, started from a position hostile to the libertine. Many were actually prepared to defend libertinism, though seldom in terms as explicit or as ingenious as those of Cleland's masterpiece. Foremost among the advocates of reasonable rakishness, it seems to me, are Henry Fielding and Tobias Smollett, but they both warrant more detailed treatment in the chapters to follow. It is important to discuss some of their lesser contemporaries first, in order to arrive at an understanding of this particular strain of mildly libertine novel. Eliza Haywood is of particular interest here, because her fictional career began in 1719 with *Love in Excess* and drew to a close with *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy* in 1753, three years before her death, thus bridging the gap between the days of Mandeville and Delariviere Manley (in many ways a less interesting novelist than Haywood, it seems to me), and those of the more liberal 1750's. (It must be said, however, that Mrs Haywood returned, perhaps oddly, to her earlier, scandalous style in *The Invisible Spy* (1759), her posthumous last novel.)

*Anti-Pamela: Or, Feign'd Innocence detected* (1742) is in all probability Mrs Haywood's work, and while not as famous or as successful as Fielding's *Shamela* as a parody of Richardson's novel, it is not inconsiderable, especially here. Like Shamela,
Syrena Tricksy (the anti-Pamela of the title) is a conniving minx who uses sexual entrapment to try to marry her master. While Shamela is for a time successful, Syrena's carelessness finds her out every time, and she is forced to try her luck elsewhere, in different households and then as a full-fledged prostitute. She is in the end packed off to the country by some respectable relations who find out what she has been doing in London. Whereas Richardson's Mr B. is as much the object of Fielding's satire as Pamela herself, the Anti-Pamela's men are always the innocent victims of female guile, and no boobies. The title page of Anti-Pamela advertises it as being 'Publish'd as a necessary Caution to all Young Gentlemen' and the author clearly puts the blame for the ruin of young servant girls on mothers who bring them up as tarts with designs on their masters, and not at all on the masters who are tricked into 'debauching' them (5-6, 34-5). The novel's men are not entirely virtuous, having fallen for Syrena's blandishments (46, 128, 142, 156), but compared to her downright wickedness their sins are venial indeed, and readily excused by their wives and fiancées. This sort of statement is typical:

Thus Mr. L-----, who in the Morning thought himself happy in the Possession of a beautiful innocent Creature, that loved him with the extremest Tenderness, found himself before the Sun went down, the wretched Property of a presuming mercenary, betraying, perjur'd and abandon'd Prostitutte ---- His Friends incensed ---- his Reputation blasted ---- his Liberty at the Disposal of the lowest and most despised Rank of Men, and his Life in Danger of the most shameful and ignominious End. (102)

To cover herself, Syrena has falsely accused him of rape, for which L----- may hang, but her lies are exposed and he retrieves his good character in full. Mrs Haywood is prepared to make many allowances for 'Youth and Inadvertency' (142), but none for the
women who take advantage of men in this condition.

In *Life's Progress through the Passions: or, the Adventures of Natura* (1748), Haywood describes the several scenes and stages of her hero's life, basing his conduct on her theory of 'the passions, those powerful abettors, I had almost said sole authors of all human actions ...' As she had earlier remarked in *Reflections on the Various Effects of Love* (1726), she repeats in *Life's Progress* her belief that Youth is naturally amorous and inconstant in its affections, with the result that Natura turns, as young men do at an appropriate age, to womanising. He also indulges in the activities of the classic rake (or 'perfect vagabond', as Mrs Haywood calls him (50)), but eventually reaches the age when 'LOVE and gallantry had already had their turns ...' with him (110). Other passions take over as he makes his progress through life: ambition in middle age and avarice in old age. Youthful rakishness is only part of the natural process, as in Armstrong's *Economy of Love*, and this is doubtless why the author forgives the hero's amour with a lady he meets by accident in a box at the opera in Rome during his Grand Tour. The force of the passions and the power of love in Haywood's novels, as in Mrs Manley's, reduce the extent to which the individual is responsible for his actions. Mrs Haywood writes,

> As this false step was merely accidental, wholly unpremeditated on either side, and by what can be judged by the [virtuous] character of the lady, and her behaviour afterwards, was no more on her part than a surprize of the senses, in which the mind was not consulted, and had not the least share, I know not whether it may more justly be called a slip of unguarded nature, than a real crime in her; and as for *Natura*, though certainly the most guilty of the two, whoever considers his youth, his constitution, and above all the greatness of the temptation, which presented itself before him, will allow, that he must either have been more, or less, than man, to have behaved otherwise than he did.
LET the most severely virtuous, who happily have never fallen into the same error, but figure to themselves the circumstances of this transgressing pair, and well consider on what manner nature must operate, when thus powerfully excited, and if they are not rendered totally incapable of any soft sensations, by an uncommon frigidity of constitution, they will cease either to wonder at, or too cruelly condemn, the effects of so irresistible an impulse.

WERE it not for the precepts of religion and morality, the fears of scandal, and shame of offending against law and custom, man would undoubtedly think himself intitled to the same privileges which the brute creation in this point enjoy above him; and it is not therefore strange, that whenever reason nods, as it sometimes will do, even in those who are most careful to preserve themselves under its subjection, that the senses ever craving, ever impatient for gratification, should readily snatch the opportunity of indulging themselves, and which it is observable they ordinarily do to the greater excess, by so much the longer, and the more strictly they have been kept under its restraint. (106-07)

Haywood is at her most 'libertine' (if one can indeed ascribe a consistent ideology or philosophy to her) in *The Lucky Rape: Or, Fate the best Disposer* (1727), admittedly a very minor work, but an extraordinary one. The heroine is a young Spanish lady called Emilia, who, to escape the restrictions of her father's jealous care, goes to a fair disguised as a country girl. There she meets a handsome young gentleman, with whom she falls madly in love, and most unwisely agrees to meet him again later, with every intention of offering him her honour. On the way to the assignation, however, she is accosted by a party of sparks, rescued by a passing gentleman and lured by him to an inn. Realising her dangerous predicament, Emilia swoons in fear and is violated. In *Clarissa*, this is the recipe for the most exalted tragedy, but here, as the title indicates, constitutes a lucky break for Emilia: the man at the fair she planned to go to bed with is in fact her long-lost brother, and the rapist is rather nice after all! The novellette ends with this rather abrupt and disconcertingly sanguine paragraph:
This Rape therefore which had the Appearance of the most terrible Misfortune that Female Virtue cou'd sustain, by the secret Decrees of Destiny, prov'd her greatest Good, since by it she was not only deliver'd from that manifest Danger of Incest she was falling into, but also gain'd a Husband, who, setting aside that one Foible of giving too great a Loose to his amorous Desires, which afterwards he very much rectified, was one of the bravest and most accomplish'd young Noblemen in all Spain.  

Mrs Haywood is nowhere else quite so accommodating to libertinism, but her numerous other works of fiction do palliate what other writers censured with indignation: her earlier fiction, while less explicitly libertine, is hardly puritanical. Her novels in the 1720's and 30's tend to have a moralising paragraph tacked on by way of conclusion, but their luscious descriptions of amorous misconduct certainly connive at, or at least accept, fornication and adultery. This sort of moral shallowness and carelessness places Haywood tacitly in the libertine camp. (Perhaps it was only later that she felt able to express her views on sex in full, in the mid-century liberalisation identified by Sekora's Luxury.) It is any case not surprising that Haywood earned for herself the sneering contempt of Pope in the Dunciad.  

In Mrs Haywood's next-to-last novel, The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy, the hero and heroine are distant cousins who have been betrothed since birth, and even though they genuinely love each other, they decide to postpone marriage until a year after they come of age, during which time they plan to acquire some knowledge of the world and its ways. Jemmy is happy with this arrangement because 

He had, in reality, met with some adventures of late which had given him too high a relish for the modish pleasures of the town for him to be able to quit them without reluctance, and which he had too much good sense not to know it would ill become him to indulge the
pursuit of after he should be a married man. 78

This in itself, as we have seen, is not an unusual statement for Haywood, but it is perhaps surprising to a modern reader that Jemmy faithfully reports his adventures, including his infidelities, to his intended bride, and more surprising that she is not jealous or upset. That is, except when the calumnies of Bellpine, who wants Jenny for himself, temporarily convince her that Jemmy is courting another lady, and with respectable, because matrimonial, intentions:

As Jemmy was a man of pleasure, and did not live without many transient amours, it may seem a little strange to some people that Bellpine, who by his intimacy with him, could not be a stranger to the errors of his conduct, did not chuse to get communicated to Jenny such things as a very small enquiry would convince her were true, rather than endeavour to alarm her with reports which had no foundation in fact.

But this was not Bellpine's way of reasoning; he rightly judged, that a woman of Jenny's understanding might easily be brought to forgive the frailties of youth and nature in a man of Jemmy's gay and volatile disposition; but would be implacable, if once made to believe he address'd any other upon honourable terms. (I. 152-3)

A pre-marital 'affair of gallantry' with an inferior, then, does not constitute real infidelity in Jenny's and Mrs Haywood's eyes, but 'making ... honourable addresses to a woman of condition' while affianced to another is a different, quite unforgivable thing. 79 Bellpine's deception is eventually cleared up, and the young couple marry as planned. Jenny does not really need or want excuses from Jemmy for his conduct, and ends the whole subject by exacting a promise from him to 'either have no amours, or be more cautious in them ...' (III. 58).

It is true that the morality of *Betsy Thoughtless* (1751), the best and most
famous of Haywood's novels, is less libertine than the others, probably in deference to the influence of Richardson, which affected even Fielding, on the sensibilities of readers of fiction in the 1750's. Betsy's rakish brother Thomas is therefore lectured pretty severely, and with every sign of the author's approval, by the virtuous Mr Goodman on the subject of kept mistresses, but Charles Trueworth, the heroine's eventual husband, is never once criticised for his pre-marital affair with Flora Mellasin (Betsy's half-sister and social superior) -- for which Mrs Haywood makes the usual excuses of natural warmth of humour and a higher fidelity to a virtuous woman.

Minor instances of rakish behaviour palliated or defended are to be found in a number of other novels, but the last work of this kind that I shall discuss in detail is the anonymous *History of a Human Heart* (1749). Like Eliza Haywood's *Life's Progress*, the *History of a Human Heart* subscribes to a mechanistic view of human motivation, in fact going into great physiological detail in the first part of the novel, which deals with the hero's conception, birth and childhood, in order to give largely physical, constitutional and humoral reasons for his inclinations and later conduct.

The first love affair of Camillo, the human heart of the title, is consequently excused by all but the most ridiculous and prudish characters in the novel. Though there is a moralising conclusion (314), in view of the general tone of the *History* and its occasional semi-pornographic descriptions (15-23, 123-41 (description of a sex show by the 'Posture Girls')), the novel could be said to take the line that the passions are better indulged than restrained (98n -- highly reminiscent of Mandeville's argument in *A Modest Defence of Publick Stews*, and his Latin proverb in the *Fable of the Bees* about purging the kidneys; see *supra*, 15-16), and that 'natural good Sense must sooner or later get the better' of all 'such Frolicks and Pranks as young Gentlemen, left to them
A number of strands that run through all of the novels I have cited, namely arguments excusing libertinism, are worth mentioning here, partly as a means of summarising my remarks on novels in this chapter, and because they will be seen to be exploited in the novels of Fielding and Smollett as well (see Chapters III and V).

The first main excuse made by authors on behalf of the rake is 'that how much soever he gave way to the Sallies of ungovernable Passion, yet he had preserved the Character of a Gentleman, and acted nothing that spoke him meanly wicked ...' or irretrievably debauched (HHH, 295). To make reformation practicable and moderate libertinism permissible, Haywood has Jemmy Jessamy's amours confined to women who are no threat to Jenny's position, either because they are lower class or because mere gallantry is understood to be Jemmy's only motive. Jemmy also eschews the worst vices of the libertine (blasphemy, I. 176; gambling, I. 111-16, 121-6). Even in the midst of the re-formable rake's excesses, Shaftesburian natural goodness of heart, fidelity to the beloved and virtuous heroine, and an incomplete surrender to vice all deprive libertinism of its sting.\(^85\) It is this view, it seems to me, which prevails in novels where the rake reforms -- especially in Davys, Fielding and Smollett, but, as I shall suggest in Chapter Four, to a surprising degree in Richardson too. Closely related to the view of repentance as the reassertion of essential good qualities is the tendency, in writers prepared to palliate the crimes of the rake, to ascribe events, and by implication moral choices, to the influence of what is variously called 'disposition', 'inclination', 'constitution', 'the passions' in general, or a single 'ruling passion', thus diminishing a young debauchee's account ability for his natural hot-bloodedness.\(^86\) Over-indulgent mothers and lack of parental discipline are also blamed.\(^87\) Another excuse is the view of human life that puts rakish
ness, especially if the conditions are those I have just described, down to being a distinct but temporary phase in a man's development, the *Life's Progress through the Passions* approach. Finally, one of the very frequent morals implicit in moderately libertine books is that wisdom is gained only through experience -- a point made by Cleland, the *History of a Human Heart*, by Mrs Haywood at every stage of her career, and by Henry Fielding, as we shall see in the next chapter.

It is rather strange, then, that Mrs Haywood should object so strongly to Fielding in *Betsy Thoughtless* (1751) on the grounds of his 'scurrility' (I. 76-7). As I hope to demonstrate in my next chapter, the basic elements of his treatment of rakery in *Tom Jones* are very like those in Haywood, though manipulated with infinitely greater sophistication, humour and intelligence. It will have to suffice here to say that the adverse comment in *Betsy Thoughtless* seems to stem from factional political considerations -- she alludes to Fielding's 'invectives against the ministry' and thwarted desires to 'wriggle himself into favour' (I. 76, 77). Nor would it be wise, before moving on to Fielding, to rule out plain professional jealousy.

The various examples of the rake in the novel of the eighteenth century that I have cited in this chapter, used in differing ways to condemn or excuse libertinism, but a more or less constant character type over the years of the century, will, I hope, indicate not just the perennial appeal of the libertine as a character in eighteenth-century fiction, but, more importantly, the continuance of the belief that upper-class licentiousness was threatening to destroy, or indeed had already corrupted, the order of traditional society and government -- this in spite of changing fashions and times. There is thus a basic assumption on the part of novelists from the first decade of the 1700's to the last that their readers will be familiar with 'the Sameness in the lives, the
actions, the pursuits of libertines' referred to by Dr Bartlett in *Grandison*, as well as the necessity for and practicability of the regeneration of both rake and society.
If Bernard Mandeville was, or claimed to be, dismayed by the hostile re-
action that greeted his _Fable of the Bees_,¹ imagine the surely greater chagrin of Henry
Fielding, who was without any pretence a serious (if comic) moralist, on being reviled as
the corrupter of youth, the seducer of innocence, and the object of God's wrath in send-
ing the seismic tremors that shook London in 1750.² No doubt both authors were in a
position to smile or laugh outright at some of their more fanatical, light-weight oppo-
nents, but equally there were those whose bad opinion must have deeply rankled, and,
in Fielding's case, have confirmed a suspicion that a whole race of reptile critics were
against him, whether as a playwright, a writer of comic epic-poems in prose, or even as
an individual. Indeed, it took years of dogged, even partisan determination on the part
of critics to clear first of all the man, and secondly his works, of the charge of the loosest
morals and the most pernicious effect.³ It is true, however, that Fielding does excuse or
perhaps even defend a certain limited libertinism in his attempts to come to terms with
the Lockean dilemma of useful worldly experience _versus_ dangerous worldly vices. As I
have suggested in Chapter One, Fielding's ideal moderate rake is highly reminiscent of
the heroes of Congreve's plays: a libertine with energy and passion intact, but deprived of
the violence and disruptiveness that render the rake a menace to society as a whole. In
this chapter I shall attempt to define the limits of permissible or desirable rakishness in Fielding, and their relation to what appears to be a reasonably cohesive moral and aesthetic system in which wisdom, understanding and character development are arrived at through experience, active participation and a measure of getting one's hands dirty in even the less strictly virtuous aspects of human life. This is hinted at in the *Champion* that appeared on 10 June 1740, where Fielding makes an important connexion between his own aims and those of Hogarth, specifically in *A Rake's Progress*, and suggests both a course of education for fathers to give to sons, and for novelists or painter-engravers to offer their audiences:

the force of example is infinitely stronger, as well as quicker, than precept; for which Horace assigns this reason, That our eyes convey the idea more briskly to the understanding than our ears. I shall venture to carry this speculation a little farther, and to assert that we are much better and easier taught by the examples of what we are to shun, than by those which would instruct us what to pursue; which opinion, if not new, I do not remember to have seen accounted for, though the reason is perhaps obvious enough, and may be, that we are more inclined to detest and loathe what is odious in others than to admire what is laudable.

Not to mention the trite story of the Lacedemonians, who exhibited drunken slaves to their children, I cannot pass by that of the old harper, who, as Pausanias informs us, sent his scholars often to hear a very sorry scraper, his neighbour, that they might by those means entertain an abhorrence of discord, and ill music. A method which, I apprehend, had more effect on them than the enchanting harmony of Handel's compositions would have produced, if that great man had enjoyed the use of speech two thousand years ago.

I have heard of an old gentleman, who to preserve his son from conversing with prostitutes, took him, when very young, to the most abandoned brothels, in this town, and to so good a purpose, that
the young man carried a sound body into his wife's arms at eight and twenty.

Perhaps, I may be told with a sneer, that these wretched scenes have not always the same effect; and it may be, I believe, necessary for a young man to have his monitor with him, to prevent his being cheated with the outward and false appearance of gaiety and pleasure. On which account, I esteem the ingenious Mr. Hogarth as one of the most useful satirists any age hath produced. In his excellent works you see the delusive scene exposed with all the force of humour; and, on casting your eyes on another picture, you behold the dreadful and fatal consequence. I almost dare to affirm that those two works of his, which he calls the Rake's and Harlot's Progress, are calculated more to serve the cause of virtue, and for the preservation of mankind, than all the folios of morality which have been ever written; and a sober family should no more be without them, than without the Whole Duty of Man in their house. (XV. 330-1)

First, however, it will be necessary to establish Fielding's divergences from Mandeville, that far more extreme apologist for libertinism; and to take care of the charge of some modern critics of Fielding that his characters show little individual development, maturing or moral growth.

One of the earliest misinterpretations of Fielding's aims in writing was the persistent identification by some readers of his moral message, particularly in *Tom Jones*, with Mandeville's doctrine of socially beneficial private vice. As it happens, their moral theories do have one or two points in common with each other, but the two writers soon part company, and the novelist is indeed the Christian censor (as one critic has called him4) that Mandeville could only ever half seriously claim to be. The very fact that some of their views run parallel to each other, if not precisely along the same track, accounts for the extensive pains Fielding took to dissociate himself from the teaching of *The Fable of the Bees*; it is no distortion to say that at every stage of Fielding's career there are brief, sometimes incidental, but always categorical rejections of
Mandevilleanism. The frequency and consistency of such statements throughout the collected works might suggest that Fielding was himself aware of some of his points of contact with Mandeville, and, while recognising their affinities to a degree, was all the more conscious of establishing where similarities ended and differences began, and in articulating the thoroughly un-Mandevillean aims of his writing. For example, in his plots Fielding uses the Mandevillean mechanism of benefit-creating vices, like Bridget Allworthy's secret sins, which ultimately lead to the happy ending of the novel, but refuses to admit that the vices themselves take on any virtue as a result. The most important of the apparent similarities between the two writers is their preparedness to allow a certain degree of indulgence in the sins of the flesh, their acknowledgment that such sins may be a good thing if properly understood. Mandeville, of course, makes this indulgence the cornerstone of his social and moral theory in the *Fable*. Fielding's position on the subject is subtle and complicated, but clearly the readiness with which Tom Jones is forgiven his peccadilloes and the ease with which Captain Booth is converted at the end of *Amelia* do indicate a measure of assent to the notion that physical pleasure is no bad, or at least no unforgivable, thing. At the same time, private vice in *Tom Jones* (Bridget's fornication) results in immediate personal misery for Tom and Jenny Jones, and beyond their sphere to include Sophia, Partridge, Allworthy and all those concerned for Tom and involved in his mysterious origins. If good does eventually come of the unhappiness, it is only because the vices of Bridget and her other son are in the end no match for the shining and uncommon virtues of Tom, Mr Allworthy and Sophia. Perhaps because the consequences of actions and events are unpredictable (Bridget, Blifil and Black George all think themselves safe from detection), Fielding insists that, whatever the outcome, it is motive that is the final test of personal morality.
and that makes an act reprehensible, in contrast to Mandeville's de-moralised view of intention.  

At the same time, Fielding is Latitudinarian enough to believe that active Charity is one of the greatest of the virtues, which Mandeville's rather heartless 'trickle-down' theory entirely omits. In issues of The Champion from 14 to 26 February 1739/40, Fielding castigates the extravagance of the age and its utter lack of charity, and, significantly, this series of papers closely follows a famous attack on 'political philosophers' like Hobbes and Mandeville (22 January; XV. 161-5) and three papers that assert the supremacy of virtue over vice (24, 26 and 29 January; XV. 165-9, 169-72, 172-77).  

From Mr Allworthy's conversation with his brother-in-law Captain Blifil in Tom Jones (93-97) and from stray comments on Allworthy's benevolence throughout the novel, it is evident that charity is a central aspect of Fielding's ideal squire and of the real men, especially Ralph Allen, on whom he is patently modelled.  

The author's position is made clear when he enjoins our duty to be generous in Tom Jones, XIII. viii:

I have in Truth observed ... that the World are in general divided into two Opinions concerning Charity, which are the reverse of each other. One Party seems to hold, that all Acts of this Kind are to be esteemed as voluntary Gifts, and however you give (if indeed no more than your good Wishes) you acquire a great Degree of Merit in so doing. --Others, on the contrary, appear to be as firmly persuaded, that Beneficence is a positive Duty, and that whenever the Rich fall greatly short of their Ability in relieving the Poor, their pitiful Largesses are so far removed from being meritorious, that they have only performed their Duty by Halves, and are in some Senses more contemptible than those who have entirely neglected it. (722)
It is plain which opinion is the right one, and what form charity ought to take, and this, together with Fielding's implicit and explicit criticism of Mandeville throughout his career reflects a desire to lay to rest once and for all the moral teaching of the opponent of the Charity Schools. The vehemence and frequency of the attempt may well suggest that Fielding recognised with some uneasiness his affinities with Mandeville, and was therefore all the more anxious to refute him. As Henry Knight Miller observes, Fielding felt the psychological but not the moral validity of *Leviathan* and *The Fable of the Bees*, but his anti-Mandevillianism is no less genuine for recognising some truth in *The Fable of the Bees*.

The last major example of the divergence between the two moralists is the most important, for it has to do with their fundamental views of human nature, which Mandeville regards as so corrupt that one might as well derive whatever benefit out of it that one can, while Fielding honestly believes in the goodness, or at least in the re-deemability, of human nature. I would argue that an understanding of Fielding's beliefs about human character and nature, especially good nature, is necessary before the boundaries of his moral system can be determined, or the place of libertinism in the scheme. Only such an understanding will allow one to see whether, or indeed how, human nature, especially that of the rake, is capable of reformation in theory and in practice. Some may even suggest that Tom is not really a rake at all. He is certainly no Lovelace, no Mohock, no Hell-Fire blasphemer; but this is precisely the point — especially his divergence from Richardson's great rake. Fielding clearly knew the rakish stereotype as I have defined it (as my discussion of his dramatic and miscellaneous works below should suggest), but he does seem to want Tom's faults to come close to, but fall just short of the complete rake's. Tom has rakish tendencies (womanising and drunkenness pre-eminently) and close shaves (something of a duel, a taste of dissolute high life), without
being seriously debauched. The reason for this is partly to allow an easy and unequivocal reformation of Tom; partly (and more importantly) to take the sting out of the rakish character as conventionally depicted, in order to make a point about fundamental, un-Lovelacean human good nature; and to allow a Congrevian assimilation of certain rakish characteristics (the warm and companionable ones), disintegrated from the socially unacceptable or disruptive ones, into a rejuvenated and humanised moral code — one that will renovate and preserve old values. This atomisation and accommodation of rakish qualities is made less extensively in *Amelia*, where Booth's weaknesses come perilously close to the noble Lord's vices; but even there one has the sense of Booth as the warm-spirited, good-natured man engaged in — but ultimately distinct from — a world where cold-hearted, unlimited libertinism has taken over. It seems to me no accident that the rakish stereotype is most broken up into its component elements and attributed least deeply and consistently to the hero where a political settlement with libertinism is most easily achieved (in *Tom Jones*); least broken up (and therefore closest to real vice) in *Amelia*, where society has been corrupted by the worst features of libertinism. By making Tom a moderate rake, Fielding runs the risk of making him a Sir Charles Grandison, nothing like a rake at all, but everyone in the novel (including Tom) certainly sees him as one (e.g. 307, 310, 383, 878, 959-60, 973). Indeed, to many eighteenth-century critics of the novel, Fielding's attempt to dissociate Tom from full-fledged libertinism was insufficient or too subtle. The gist of Richardson's criticism of the novel, and Dr Johnson's, is that Tom is a vicious rake, too lightly let off the hook; and *An Examen of the History of Tom Jones, A Foundling* (1750) makes the point explicitly, as do writers in *The Gentleman's Magazine* who refer to 'that rake Tom Jones' and 'Tom Jones, as much a libertine as he is ...'. I shall explain the ways in which Jones is, and is not a rake
at greater length below.

I have said that Booth is more of an unatomised rake than Jones, which at first may appear surprising. He is not a Lovelace, a Mohock or a Hell-Fire spark either, but again it is failure to measure up in these ways that permits his reformation. His worst faults (womanising, gambling, the bottle) are of a rakish cast, but it is his Mandevillean moral relativism that most makes him like the pyrrhonistic, cynical rakes of the novel, Colonel James and the 'noble Lord'. Booth is married, an adulterer rather than a seducer of virgins, and, like the two villains I have named, middle-aged; but these facts might still not disqualify him from consideration as one of Fielding's rakes, or at least as being among their company. It might actually be useful to regard Booth as something of an older Tom Jones, as Sir Walter Scott seems to have suggested. I suspect this is not a popular view these days, but it is borne out by the depiction of Tom in the unauthorised *History of Tom Jones the Foundling in His Married State* (1750), and by the common eighteenth-century (and later) view that the rakish Harry Fielding represented himself in all his heroes. As F. Homes Dudden puts it,

> When Scott describes this novel [*Amelia*] as 'a continuation of *Tom Jones*', he seems specially to have had in mind the resemblance between the principal male personages in the two books. 'Billy' Booth may, indeed, be regarded as a more mature Tom Jones — a Tom Jones whom added years, experience of marriage with the woman of his choice, and parental responsibilities, had unhappily failed to cure of his flightiness and folly. It is true that the characteristic virtues of Tom — good-heartedness, sweet temper, generosity — are reproduced in the older man; but the characteristic defects are also reproduced, and are less pardonable because they can no longer be excused on the grounds of ignorance and youth.

*Amelia* does seem in many ways like a *Tom Jones* tempered, even embittered by middle
age, experience of the World and too many disappointments by human nature. In any case, I shall not confine my examination of rakishness in *Amelia* to Booth (the noble Lord being a compelling and almost equally important figure in the novel). Booth is also worthy of consideration in this chapter because of his conversion, which is surely related to the reformation of rakes in *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones*, for the practicability and means of reform is a prime concern of rake-fiction generally.

In the case of Tom Jones, one might say that repentance is easy because he is never profoundly debauched, or that because there is less amendment than confirmation of largely static qualities and virtues. It may be more valuable, however, to recognise the ways in which Fielding holds fixity and development, innocence and experience in delicate, paradoxical balance, perhaps infuriatingly having *and* eating his cake. (But then, a desire to bewilder, tease and irritate the reptilian reader is Fielding's *modus operandi*, of course.) In 1959, John S. Coolidge published an important article on Fielding's characterisation, and more precisely his 'conservation' of it, in the novels up to but not including *Amelia*. His argument is that in *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones* the characters undergo no real alteration or development, and reflect a belief in the 'fixity of nature', but that in *Amelia*, according to the frequently cited phrase, the actors 'come into the story in the way that people come into our lives'. An implication of this theory that one gradually comes to know the characters of Booth *et al.*, and one that Coolidge does not tease out, might be that they do not really change either, our perception of them being the only thing that develops. The remarks on the first two novels seem to be a refinement and a systematisation of Ian Watt's analysis of Fielding's characters in *The Rise of the Novel*, where they are denied a Richardsonian psychological depth and growth. Watt calls them the 'characters of manners' rather than those
of nature, and critics have agreed in the main. There is, indeed, considerable evidence in the fiction (and elsewhere) that our author did conceive his characters as stable and largely incapable of psychological development, as chess pieces or playing cards of fixed and therefore usable value in the larger games of his narratives. In the first place, Fortune and Providence are forces of great if undefined and sometimes overlapping power in the novels, warring or complementary influences that appear to be in control at some points, thus reducing the ability of individuals to shape events. The issue of Fielding's commitment to either or both is unresolved, and I mention it only in passing, as something related but not central to my argument. More germane is Fielding's own clear statement at various points that Nature makes human character what it is and that education has only a limited capability to change it. Certainly Fielding's plots seem to vindicate the proverb that blood will tell. In *An Essay on the Knowledge of the Characters of Men* in the *Miscellanies*, the author alludes to the numerous differences between man and man, seemingly resulting from various types of education but in the end ascribed to nature:

> This original Difference will, I think, alone account for that very early and strong Inclination to Good or Evil, which distinguishes different Dispositions in Children, in their first Infancy; in the most un-informed Savages, who can be thought to have altered their Nature by no Rules, nor artfully acquired Habits; and lastly, in Persons who from the same Education, &c. might be thought to have directed Nature the same Way; yet, among all these, there subsists, as I have before hinted, so manifest and extreme a Difference of Inclination or Character, that almost obliges us, I think, to acknowledge some unacqured, original Distinction, in the Nature or Soul of one Man, from that of another. (*Miscs*, 154)

This distinction is what dissociates Joseph Andrews from the morally suspect Pamela
Andrews; he is in reality no Andrews at all, but a Wilson. There is no other proof of their dissimilarity that could be more conclusive. Two of Fielding's moral spokesmen, Abraham Adams and Dr Harrison, preach the benevolist doctrine that man is essentially disposed to goodness and that corruption is the effect of contact with the world (especially at a public school, à la Locke; see Amelia, 374; JA, 230:1). In Tom Jones, the narrator lends support to Coolidge's case, and provides him with his title, by discussing the importance of 'what the dramatic Critics call Conservation of Character'

(405), decrying

Our modern Authors of Comedy [who] have fallen almost universally into the Error here hinted at: Their Heroes generally are notorious Rogues, and their Heroines are abandoned Jades, during the first four Acts; but in the fifth, the former become very worthy Gentlemen, and the latter, Women of Virtue and Discretion: Nor is the Writer often so kind as to give himself the least Trouble, to reconcile or account for this monstrous Change and Incongruity. There is, indeed, no other Reason to be assigned for it, than because the Play is drawing to a Conclusion; as if it was no less natural in a Rogue to repent in the last Act of a Play, than in the last Act of his Life; which we perceive to be generally the case at Tyburn, a Place which might indeed, close the Scene of some Comedies with much Propriety, as the Heroes in these are most commonly eminent for those very Talents which not only bring Men to the Gallows, but enable them to make an heroic figure when they are there. (406)

Later, the narrator identifies the conservation of the characterisation of the vicious or the frivolous as an author's greatest challenge (525). The mention of unconvincingly converted rogues and jades might call to mind Richardson's Mr B. and Pamela, or rather Fielding's estimation of them as Booby and Shamela. Richardson is inevitably compared to Fielding when the subject of
characterisation arises, and there is a tendency among critics to prefer Richardson on the
grounds that he is more 'realistic' in his portrayal of human personality. 'Realistic' is a
dangerous term anyway, and one which fails to take into account the stock or typical
aspects of Richardson's characters, their romance, theatrical, mythic and, indeed, as we
shall see in Chapter Four, rake-novel origins, as well as the extent to which the actors in
his dramas, or in *Clarissa* at any rate, are locked in a relentless and inevitable process.

There is, unexpectedly, a fair amount of freedom and flexibility within the laws of Field­
ing’s province of writing to allow some development and reformation, and in the
passage from *Tom Jones* cited on the previous page it is perhaps only to improbable
changes in character that Fielding objects. Richardson is also lauded for the spiritual
depth of his characters, and it is true that we know far more of their inner lives, to an
extraordinary degree in fact, than we do of the much ‘flatter’ characters in Fielding. But
Fielding’s characters are ‘flat’ because he wants them so, convinced that presenting the
species rather than a uniquely streaked tulip is more morally instructive and useful (see
*JA*, 180; *JF*, 31-4). The character of Clarissa is a marvel of literary skill, but how much
is her experience our own? Fielding might argue that her extreme individuality, her
daunting (and impossible?) saintliness set her apart from us, and reduce the reformative
efficacy of the novel. A mixed character like Tom or Booth is more approachable, in a
way more realistic, and therefore more serviceable in the great task of amending the
manners of a whole nation of readers. It is generally supposed that Fielding's attitude to
his greatest rival gradually softened, and that in the end he recognised *Clarissa* as the
masterpiece it is. This is for the most part the case, and *Amelia* does come across as
more Richardsonian than mock-Richardsonian. While Fielding came to acknowledge
the merits of Richardson's work, he manages a few sly hits at *Clarissa* in *Tom Jones*,


which suggest that his much-vaunted admiration for Richardson's achievement did not preclude a little subtle satire of it as well. One might be justified in regarding *Tom Jones*, as Aurélien Digeon did many years ago (although to a lukewarm critical reception) and Howard Anderson more recently (see n. 18), as in some limited ways a parody of *Clarissa* and its affable hero as Fielding's attempt to refute all that is sensational and morally ambiguous in the characterisation of Lovelace. Fielding seeks to rewrite villainy as good nature, perdition as reformation, and tragedy as comedy. Perhaps even *Amelia* is a revision and re-working of Richardsonian material rather than the imitation of *Clarissa* that Claude Rawson calls it, though it is very far from being either parodic or a lewd and ungenerous engraftment (Richardson's celebrated phrase about *Joseph Andrews*). But this is digressive: back to Fielding's theory and practice of characterisation.

The notion of a 'ruling passion', which Fielding inherits in part from the *Essay on Man* and 'Epistle to Cobham', is presumably another manifestation of those forces that the individual cannot determine or overcome, another indication of the supremacy of Nature. Many scholars, notably George Sherburn, have placed a concept of ruling passions at the centre of Fielding's ethical thought. At the same time, subservience to the ruling passion theory, which amounts to an acceptance of Mandeville, is surely what Booth is converted from, and what Christianity denies, at the end of *Amelia*. Booth explicitly rejects a notion of ruling passions (511), and Dr Harrison suggests a view of the passions rectified (511-12); whether Fielding repudiates it in the end is a moot point (see n. 13; 'To John Hayes, Esq;' in the *Miscs* suggests he might; and see the discussion of Booth's conversion below, 98-100). For the present it is worth noting that while the critics mostly come out against Booth's regeneration, pointing out its super-
ficiality and its suddenness, it may be possible to see the climax of the novel in a more positive light if one can recognise how Fielding does think character, his own characters included, can develop and even change – and I think this has particular bearing on the practicability of the conversion of rakery into more socially acceptable behaviour.

Running counter to his comments on the conservation of character and the predetermined causes of behaviour are a number of instances where the idea of nature and the immutability of character is challenged and sometimes exploded. Joseph Andrews is no relation of Pamela's, but his sweetheart Fanny turns out to be her sister, and the relationship is in no way kept quiet, even when it could have been (336f.); actually, it is in Fielding's extensive narrative power to cut the Andrews family out of the picture entirely, by reason of genealogy as well as morals. The only thing, it follows, that makes Fanny sincerely virtuous and un-Shamelan is the fact that from an early age she has been brought up by Parson Adams, not by her parents and not with her sister.

What then does Fielding make of the ninth of the Thirty-nine Articles ('Of Original or Birth-sin')? More benevolist than Mandevillean, Fielding might be expected to be unhappy with a pessimistic view of man's depravity in the full theological sense, but at times he does take a rather gloomy position on the subject. In the *Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon*, written in Fielding's rather splenetic and disillusioned old age, he refers to 'that malevolence of disposition, of which, at our birth, we partake in common with the savage creation' (XVI. 201), and in *Tom Jones* to 'natural Infirmities' and flaws (107). But such statements are rare, and Fielding falls short of an acknowledgment of man's depravity in the fullest sense. Even amid the pessimism of *Amelia*, or perhaps as a rather desperate reaction to it, Dr Harrison states that 'The Nature of Man is far from being in itself Evil', though it is corrupted by improper education and bad habits (374). *Tom Jones* refutes the Man of the Hill's fallacious insistence that men are
naturally condemnable (485-6), and the course of the novel disproves the mistaken be-

lief that the hero is himself 'born to be hanged' (118). Partridge's absurd superstition,

and the possible derivation of his name from the astrologaster satirised out of existence

by Bickerstaff, indicate a similar unwillingness to see man as doomed from concep-
tion.\textsuperscript{21} Both Captain Blifil and Thwackum are held up as proponents of an errone-

ous conviction of human pravity.\textsuperscript{22} Furthermore, Fielding refuses to accept the some-
times not very comforting doctrine that Faith alone can win Salvation, partly because it

can be used by Thwackums and Blifils as an excuse for doing no good works, but also

because it will not recognise important human capabilities for good.\textsuperscript{23} When Fielding

refers to 'depravity', as in \textit{An Essay on the Knowledge of the Characters of Men} (c.

1739-40), where he alludes to 'the great Depravity of Human Nature' (\textit{Miscs}, 153), he

may not necessarily mean original and indelible sin; as a learned note in Henry Knight

Miller's Wesleyan \textit{Miscellanies} I points out, 'depravity' was not widely used to describe

that concept until the mid eighteenth century, a decade or so after the \textit{Essay} was pub-

lished, so there means simply 'corruption' or 'perversion' without any more dire

connotations (\textit{Miscs}, 153n.). Still, 1739 or 1740 is on the borderline, and in fact the \textit{OED}

has an example of the theological usage from as early as 1735, though it points out that it

was in common use only from about 1757, the date of Jonathan Edwards's \textit{Doctrine of

Original Sin} (\textit{OED}, IV. 485, sense 'c'). A further complication is that the terms super-
seded by 'depravity' in sense 'c', 'pravity' and 'depravation', are close enough to their

replacement to give it at least a few heavy overtones during the period in question. The

safest thing to say, since not even the Dictionary can resolve the difficulty, is to say that

there is an element of the theological concept in Fielding's thought. Henry Knight

Miller provides the best explanation of this little problem:
Both the confident and the sceptical views on the prevalence of good-nature [sic] in the world are perhaps equally typical of Fielding in different moods; but the sceptical ... has been frequently overlooked. In part, the inconsistency in his views can be explained only by admitting that in some moods he was willing to believe that good-nature was widely diffused and in other moods he was not -- it is as simple as that, and it represents an almost universal inconsistency of the inconsistent human animal. One can, however, make a further distinction. When he attempted to formalise or define his intuitions about good-nature, Fielding often fell back upon the theoretical bases of that benevolism which saw man in the abstract as, not naturally good, but naturally inclined to goodness; this theory asserted the general prevalence of the beneficent impulses (even when corrupted by bad customs). But an artist's rationalisations and formal opinions are not always of a piece with his artistic vision. In the novels and many of his essays, Fielding projected his own experience of men; and that experience told him that good-nature and benevolence were rare enough in the world -- he could scarcely have admired Lucian and Swift so much if he had not felt this. Hence, even in the 'optimistic' atmosphere of *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones*, the fools and villains outnumber the good-natured by a sizeable margin; in *Jonathan Wild*, the *Journey from this World to the Next*, and *Amelia*, the proportion is overwhelming.

Of course I am not saying that Fielding was essentially a pessimist who was really writing tragedies. Although one need not have an optimistic view of human nature to write comedy, I am sure that Fielding was an optimist. He was not ordinarily, however, a sentimental, and never a simple-minded optimist; and the complexity of his hard-won belief in basic human decency can be measured by the leavening mixture of practical pessimism that informs it.24

On the whole, then, Fielding's benevolent, latitudinarian humanism wins out, but not without some significant moderating influences, and his position is a compromise between Square and Thwackum (77, 126), who represent the two dangerous extremes of amoral materialism and Calvinist misanthropy.
This allows Joseph Andrews to say that education cannot overcome inclination (231), but at the same time lets Fielding satirise the proponents of Nature over Nurture. Nature is taken to ridiculous and vulgar lengths by people like Deborah Wilkins (77, 41), Blifil père (70-80) and Thwackum (126). Good Mrs Miller tells Tom, 'the Words dishonourable Birth are Nonsense, as my dear, dear Husband used to say, unless the Word dishonourable be applied to the Parents; for the Children can derive no real Dishonour from an Act of which they are entirely innocent' (759), and Tom's own birth adds weight to the case that upbringing and other circumstances (perhaps chance or God's design) have as much to do with determining character as anything else: Tom is the detestable Blifil's half-brother, and the fruit of the union of Bridget Allworthy and a man probably much like Captain Blifil under similar (i.e. pre-marital) conditions (940-3). But the closeness of their relation and the close similarity of their respective conceptions fail to make them in any way alike. Nature obviously influences the formation of character but does not always have the upper hand, Fielding's practice thus qualifying an aspect of his theory, which is mistakenly labelled simple-minded. In the opening chapter of Book VII of *Tom Jones*, there is a long essay on the theatre of life and literature, where the reader is 'acquainted not only with the several Disguises which are there put on, but also with the fantastic and capricious Behaviour of the Passions' (328). Removing the disguises may reveal the true nature of a Blifil (and the insistence of Fielding on discovering what lies behind hypocrisy is a major concern of his works25), but it is not everything; as Howard Anderson observes, the narrator keeps enough in reserve to be able to surprise us with unexpected conduct in Black George, to tell us that Allworthy has penetrated Thwackum's deceits early on, and to chide us for thinking a reader can know everything that the author does (77, 325-9).26 Speaking
of Tom's ability to judge Partridge correctly, the author remarks,

To say the Truth, there are but two Ways by which Men become possessed of this excellent Quality. The one is from long Experience, and the other is from Nature; which last, I presume is often meant by Genius, or great natural Parts... (427)

He concludes that the second quality 'is infinitely the better of the two', but his reasons are rather complicated:

not only as we are Masters of it much earlier in Life, but as it is much more infallible and conclusive: For a Man who hath been imposed on by ever so many, may still hope to find others more honest; whereas he who receives certain necessary Admonitions from within, that this is impossible, must have very little Understanding indeed, if he ever renders himself liable to be once deceived. As Jones had not this Gift from Nature, he was too young to have gained it by Experience; for at the diffident Wisdom which is to be acquired this Way, we seldom arrive till very late in Life; which is perhaps why some old Men are apt to despise the Understandings of all those who are a little younger than themselves. (427-8)

Since much of Fielding's satire is directed at those who only think they can judge infallibly and conclusively, and are thereby confined rather than conserved in character, and since the novel is about the getting of this 'diffident Wisdom', he wants it clearly understood that Nature is not the sole guide or determining factor.

Fielding is sometimes drawn to thinking that it is, but the opposite impulse, to a belief that we work out our own Salvation or Damnation, should by now be apparent. If it appears that Fielding wants to have most things both ways, it is, I think, because he really does try to do so, although most critics emphasise his 'conservation of character'/'ruling passion' side. To redress this, I should like to point out the moral
regeneration of certain characters in the novels; and although this takes place in limited ways, it is still important and much overlooked. The value of experience, that diffident wisdom, will come into it as well, for it is regarded as the necessary finish to good nature, the instrument of moral change and, in the end, the only thing that makes this possible and that worth while. One perceptive reading of Fielding (by Leo Braudy) sees his writing as an attempt 'to find a form for uncertainty, a structure for spontaneity, a pattern for contingency' and within this one may establish the boundaries of permissible rakery and a kind of reformation. A system, then, albeit a loose one appropriate to one not 'writing a System, but a History' (177, 651). Taking another hint from Henry Knight Miller, who has identified the novels' extensive debt to the romance tradition, and who sees Tom as a romance-style archetype of 'The Young Man (not merely a young man)', Fielding may be trying to include a measure of libertinism, a built-in and therefore tamed sowing of wild oats, as well as the ensuing, but of necessity not terribly profound amendment, in the life of The Young Man -- Wilson in *Joseph Andrews*, Jones, Wisemore in *Love in Several Masques* (1728), and maybe also Booth. I shall elaborate on the mechanism of such a defence of libertinism below, what Johnson in his irritation called a strategy 'to initiate youth by mock encounters in the art of necessary defence, and to increase prudence without impairing virtue.' The repentance of Mr Wilson in *Joseph Andrews* is genuine given these restrictions, and represents more than just a confirmation of his essential goodness. His amendment is not sudden or unprepared for; throughout the course of the rake's progress he relates, he alludes to moments of conscience (205-06, 208, 214), and his inability to remain satisfied with any particular aspect of London life reflects his own uneasiness with rakes, Templars, wits and free-thinkers. He moves, therefore, from one sphere to the next in a quest after happiness that appears increasingly fruitless (though his movement is also dictated by
debts; 215-19). But while Wilson never drinks very deeply of any one sin, he has committed enough of them (one, debauching the young woman, is almost sufficient to damn him), enough to be brought at length to a state of despair, 'a Condition too horrible to be described', although he senses that this could be an unfair reward for what is only 'a little Inadvertency and Indiscretion' (220). When Harriet Hearty offers to relieve his immediate financial distress, his own feeling of unworthiness at her generosity, and the conviction of his presumption in falling in love with her are sufficient, he says,

> to afflict my Mind with more Agonies, than all the Miseries I had underwent; it affected me with severer Reflections than Poverty, Distress, and Prisons united had been able to make me feel... (221; see also 222)

It would be perverse, following the build-up of all these avowals and confessions, to suggest that the regeneration of Wilson that subsequently takes place (221f.) is anything but sincere -- and, as far as Fielding is prepared to let it go, profound. Further proof of this is Wilson's resolution to quit London for the country (224f.): in other words, to have nothing more to do with people and places he no longer has anything in common with. There is no suggestion in *Joseph Andrews* that either Mr Wilson or his son undergoes any radical, extreme change (but even Joseph gains in wisdom by the end of the novel; see 231-5), but dramatic conversions are perhaps still possible; and the author makes the slightest allusion to the return of the Prodigal Son in the penultimate chapter of the novel (339 and n.), which might be significant. In any event, there is the germ of the idea that repentance is possible, which develops into something more in the later fiction.
Tom Jones's nature and the really very modest extent of his crimes also prevent any stunning reformation of him, but on the other hand Square undergoes just such a remarkable conversion, from deism (suspected of being atheism) to an orthodox Christianity which he actually practises in XVIII. iv. The objection that Square's recantation takes place on his death-bed, and therefore may not be sincere, is no doubt unfair, and any reservations of this kind should be evaporated when he admits his own and Blifil's connivance at the disgrace of Tom. He also makes a genuine and magnanimous defence of Tom's character and drunkenness (in V. ix and x) to Mr Allworthy:

When you lay upon your supposed Death-bed, he was the only Person in the House who testified any real Concern; and what happened afterwards arose from the Wildness of his Joy on your Recovery; and I am sorry to say, from the Baseness of another Person (but it is my Desire to justify the Innocent, and to accuse none.) Believe me, my Friend, this young Man hath the noblest Generosity of Heart, the most perfect Capacity for Friendship, the highest Integrity and indeed every Virtue that can enoble a Man. He hath some Faults, but among them is not to be numbered the least want of Duty or Gratitude towards you. On the contrary, I am satisfied when you dismissed him from your House, his Heart bled for you more than for himself. (927)

A wonderful revolution in Square, the narrator observes, but nevertheless a genuine one (928). And it is no accident that a letter from Thwackum arrives immediately after Square's, criticising Allworthy for not repenting of his weakness vis-à-vis his nephew, once more indicting Tom as an irretrievable villain, and confirming the reader's sense of Thwackum's canting failure to repent. If Fielding is so committed to the conservation of character, why then this excoriation of Thwackum for not seeing and amending the error of his ways, and the turn-around of a flat, narrow, stock character, who ought to be the most rigidly defined by type, humour and ruling passion, why
if not to suggest that at least occasionally there is conversion of character? In addition, the fact that Tom can prevent Nightingale from abandoning the girl he has seduced and made pregnant, and to convince him to do the decent thing (765-70), would seem to support my argument. Nightingale's superficiality, made plain by his unthinking behaviour and suitably flighty surname, only serves to make Tom look deeper by contrast, his reformation more deep-seated. I have accused Fielding of wanting to have things two ways, and Tom's is a case in point, for while Fielding has reasons for limiting his sinfulness (in ways I shall discuss in their place), he also wants the reader to recognise his real and meaningful moral improvement. This may further suggest two levels of character in Fielding: the flat and easily converted (if converted at all) versus the rounder and more resistent to change. The hero's speeches and the comments of others, including the narrator, show this (though there is also an element of his repentance and the happy end of the story's being taken for granted from the start, in fulfilment of the Prodigal Son motif). There are in fact a number of allusions to Tom's sincere penitence in the novel.30 If the parable of the Prodigal Son is a kind of gloss on Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones, there is in the latter as well the theme of the fortunate fall and redemption of Adam, invoked partly via Milton's Paradise Lost.31 That one is often reminded of Tom's regeneration by the narrator may be an attempt to add what is lacking in actual events, but this need not be regarded as a deficiency; Fielding enjoys and exploits the play and the gaps between theory and practice, and uses them as a further means of assuring his delicate moral counterpoise. Fielding does not seem to be foisting shallow or spurious conversions on the reader, for he is highly conscious of the difficulties of true repentance (as well as of the contemptibility of hypocrisy and self-deception), but never abandons hope that it exists as a possibility. The dedication of
Tom Jones to Lord Lyttelton expresses the author's conviction that 'it is much easier to make good Men wise, than to make bad Men good' (8), which at once sums up his opposing attitudes to the reformation of Tom and the persistence in sin of Blifil and Thwackum. A sense of the unlikeliness of amendment is heightened by Fielding's tendency to make it happen through an external agent -- the old cliché of the love of a good woman like Sophia or Harriet Hearty (or Amelia to an extent), through the forgiveness of Allworthy, even through the workings out of the designs of Providence or the hazards of unintended consequences. And one further example will attest to the novelist's reservations about the ease of reformation: the Man of the Hill. This sour old misanthrope has, like the hero, given over his follies and sincerely repented (474), but his gloomy and anti-social way of life is seen as an easy but dangerous way out, obviously contrasted with the preferable penitential style of Jones and Wilson, which rejects the company of the wicked but affirms the rôle of the penitent within the social order (Wilson is a little too reclusive, but Jones corrects this). In his lecture to Tom on the subject of repentance, Allworthy criticises retirements of the vicious into shameful solitude (960), and his words seem to apply to the Man of the Hill as well (960). The episode of the old man has been dealt with in a number of excellent studies and needs no further explication for the present, but what it does reveal is that reformation is no easy thing -- leading one to the conclusion that when Fielding does allow it to happen, he means us to take especial note.

The preceding discussion runs somewhat against the grain of much Fielding criticism, but stray comments in some other places lend some support to my view. To take all of this one step further, it may be possible to explain away some of the difficulties that crop up in considerations of the final conversion in Fielding's novels, that
of Captain Booth in *Amelia*. It seems to convince almost no one, and is usually branded a jarring, sanguine note in an otherwise cynical and despairing work. *Amelia* 's tone and mood are different from those of earlier works, but Fielding's last novel is not perhaps as complete a departure from *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones* as one might think. An awareness of the conversions in the novels that come before *Amelia* prepares one for the change in Booth, and helps to make it a little less problematic. Granted, in terms of the novel's plot development, the recantation of error and acceptance of Christianity come rather suddenly, possibly marring the immediate effect of *Amelia*, but at least such events are not inconceivable within the context of Fielding's larger *œuvre*. As with the earlier heroes, the narrator goes to some lengths to ensure that the reader never seriously doubts Booth's basic decency, though his weakness and his adultery with Miss Mathews are deplorable; and his eventual penitence is presented in exactly the same way as Tom's or Wilson's -- straightforwardly and without the slightest hint of its being other than genuine. Whether this comes off as Fielding intends is another issue, but Booth's reading of Isaac Barrow's sermons in the bailiff's spunging-house is apparently all that is necessary to inspire remorse:

*Booth* thus proceeded: 'Since I have been in this wretched Place, I have employ'd my Time almost entirely in reading over a Series of Sermons, which are contained in that Book,' (meaning Dr. Barrow's *Works*, which then lay on the Table before him,) 'in Proof of the Christian Religion, and so good an Effect have they had upon me, that I shall, I believe, be the better Man for them as long as I live. I have not a Doubt, (for I own I have had such) which remains now unsatisfied.' (511)<sup>36</sup>

Asked by Dr Harrison about his doubts, Booth explains, 'Indeed I never was a rash Disbeliever; my chief Doubt was founded on this, that as Men appeared to me to act entirely from their Passions, their Actions could have neither Merit nor Demerit' (511). The
Doctor then points out how a belief in the dominance of the passions may be reconciled with religion (511-12), but it is still the case that Booth has disabused himself of a mistaken view of morality, and convinced himself of the weakness and vice engendered by his old notions. There is a moral consistency in the conversion material, even if the artistic effect might be found somewhat wanting. It is quite true, however, that the happy ending is at odds with the fairly undisguised pessimism of the rest of the book. To borrow a term from Swift criticism that is appropriate here, a 'hard' interpretation of Amelia would stress the disillusionment that comes out in the pages of the novel, and tend to reject Booth's spiritual rebirth out of hand, but a 'softer' approach may be in order. It is possible to take the discordant note of the happy ending of Amelia not as evidence of Fielding's dotage or awkwardness in experimenting with yet another new province of writing, but instead as his beleaguered and last-ditch attempt to show that private virtue can, even on a limited scale, overcome or challenge the social ills and abuses that assail (but do not ultimately destroy) his faith in humanity, society and the established order. The attempt probably does not work, but it is made; and I think the pessimism is muted rather than heightened by the contrast of the ending of the novel. Incidentally, some of the critics' reluctance to accept Booth's redemption may stem in part from a secular antipathy to Christianity, a modern discomfort with Fielding's orthodoxy and unaffected piety. Or, indeed, it may be comfortable ignorance of the spiritual and physical privations that prompt the conversions of Wilson, Jones and Booth. Sudden repentances in even the most abandoned sinners, Lord Rochester most spectacularly, were doubtless much more credible possibilities in the eighteenth century than now, even given the spiritual dilemmas of two to three hundred years ago. As Allworthy observes to Mrs Waters,
The World, I do agree, are apt to be too unmerciful on these Occasions, yet Time and Perseverance will get the better of this their Disinclination, as I may call it, to Pity, for though they are not, like Heaven, ready to receive a penitent Sinner, yet a continued Repentance will at length obtain Mercy even with the World. (947)

With the world, perhaps -- but Fielding says earlier that 'if we judge [books] according to the Sentiments of some Critics, and of some Christians, no Author will be saved in this World, and no Man in the next' (77, 571).

Fielding's major rakes are saved, and it remains to be seen how this is fully accomplished. Fielding's views on human nature and its reformability, while they underpin the changes that take place in the characters of Wilson, Jones and Booth, are perhaps not confident and precise enough to effect a complete reclamation. So, having looked mostly at Fielding's theory, one must turn in detail to his practice in the novels to arrive at a sense of the important qualifications that permit his ultimate defence of a very specific brand of libertinism. The first of these limitations is his reluctance to admit even the existence of anything as diabolical as Richardson's Robert Lovelace or the Hell-Fire Club (as popularly perceived). It is observed in the celebrated 'Preface' to *Joseph Andrews* that Aristotle's dictum about comedy is to be followed in the new species of writing to be undertaken, 'that Villany is not its Object' (7). 'Great Vices are the proper Objects of our Detestation' (10), but by leaving them out of his comic scheme up until *Amelia* at least, for regeneration, Fielding implies that others are sensationalising them and getting unnecessarily overwrought (see 77, 526-7 as well). As a result, Fielding makes the fairly consistent and extremely important distinction between 'vice' or 'villainy' and mere 'folly' or 'indiscretion', just as consistently ascribing only the latter to his three
most significant rakish characters (Wilson, Jones and Booth), and leaving the former largely out of the picture (although in *Amelia* there is the complicating presence of the noble Lord, which I shall discuss below). In *Tom Jones*, XIV. i the author remarks:

There is not indeed a greater Error than that which universally prevails among the Vulgar, who borrowing their Opinion from some ignorant Satyr-ists, have affixed the Character of Lewdness to these Times. On the contrary, I am convinced there never was less of Love Intrigue carried on among Persons of Condition, than now. Our present Women have been taught by their Mothers to fix their Thoughts only on Ambition and Vanity, and to despise the Pleasures of Love as unworthy their Regard; and being afterwards, by the Care of such Mothers, married without having Husbands, they seem pretty well confirmed in the Justness of those Sentiments; whence they content themselves, for the dull Remainder of Life, with the Pursuit of more innocent, but I am afraid more childish Amusements, the bare Mention of which would ill suit the Dignity of this History. In my humble Opinion, the true Characteristick of the present *Beau Monde*, is rather Folly than Vice, and the only Epithet which it deserves is that of *Frivolous*. (743-4)

A satiric point is made in the early part of the passage about the less than virtuous diversions of the fashionable, but the tone changes and no one is accused of deep-dyed vice or mortal sin. Fielding makes the occasional idiomatic lapse in his vice/folly terminology, but not in his meaning -- and it is again worth remembering that a novel, for Fielding, is not 'a System, but a History' (77, 651). The narrator is careful to establish and to remind us of Tom's virtues -- his charity, honour, delicacy, mercy, conscience, fellow-feeling, honesty, integrity, warmth, fidelity of heart (if not of body), and, above all, his general good nature, a quality elevated to the status of prime good. Equally, these good qualities are recommended to us by contrast with the bad qualities of others. Tom is in a position to reprove his fellow lodger Nightingale for his behaviour
towards Nancy Miller (701, 753-6, 765-70), and the reader is invited, almost obliged to compare the hero's sterling attributes with the creeping malignity and hypocrisy of Blifil (657 and *passim*), with the low treachery of Ensign Northerton (522), the canting of the Quaker (364), the cavalier cruelty of Sir George Gresham (the Man of the Hill's corrupter; 453-4), and with the stoical misanthropy of the old man himself (exploded by the slightest smile of Tom's; 460-1, 471-2). Each of these foils reflects the lustre of Jones's very appealing humanity, and serves to emphasise the difference between his folly and their vice. The distinction is that 'Jones had the Vices of a warm Disposition', which are forgivable, and therefore not vices in the full sense of the word, being 'entirely free of those of a cold one', which are the true vices (677). When he is interrogated by his foster father about the paternity of Molly Seagrim's brat, Tom concludes his case by maintaining

> That tho' he must own himself guilty of many Follies and Inadvertencies, he hoped he had done nothing to deserve what would be to him the greatest Punishment in the World (310)

-- his expulsion from Paradise Hall. The narrator expects the reader to feel the justice of Tom's plea, both here and when he informs the scoundrel Northerton, 'tho' I have been a very wild young Fellow, still in my most serious Moments, and at Bottom, I am really a Christian' (383). He is patently more of a genuine one than either the sanctimonious Blifil or the bigoted Thwackum. In recognition of this, he receives the testimony of Squire Western, who knows 'a generous spirited Action' when he sees one (164; see also 166), and of Supple the curate (189-90). Mrs Miller, Tom's landlady in London and a woman of great wisdom and probity, is inclined to see Tom's follies as youthful high spirits, outweighing them with his virtues and giving me my chapter
'I do not pretend to say the young Man is without Faults; but they are all the Faults of Wildness and of Youth; Faults which he may, nay which I am certain he will relinquish, and if he should not, they are vastly over-ballanced by one of the most humane tender honest Hearts that ever Man was blessed with.' (878)

(Mrs Miller's 'all' seems to mean something like 'exclusively'; see also 894, 728). Mr Allworthy is himself eventually convinced that this is the case, and it is worth quoting his interview with his nephew towards the end of the novel at some length. Tom says there,

'Though I have been a great, I am not a hardened Sinner; I thank Heaven I have had Time to reflect on my past Life, where, though I cannot charge myself with any gross Villainy, yet I can discern Follies and Vices more than enough to repent and to be ashamed of; Follies which have been attended with dreadful Consequences to myself, and have brought me to the Brink of Destruction.' 'I am rejoiced, my dear Child,' answered Allworthy, 'to hear you talk thus sensibly; for as I am convinced Hypocrisy (good Heaven how have I been imposed on by it others!) was never among your Faults, so I can readily believe all you say. You now see, Tom, to what Dangers Imprudence alone may subject Virtue (for Virtue, I am now convinced, you love in a great Degree.) Prudence is indeed the Duty which we owe to ourselves; and if we neglect it, we are not to wonder if the World is deficient in discharging their Duty to us; for when a Man lays the Foundation of his own Ruin, others will, I am afraid, be too apt to build upon it. You say, however, you have seen your Errors; and will reform them. I firmly believe you, my dear Child; and therefore, from this Moment, you shall never be reminded of them by me. Remember them only yourself so far, as for the future to teach you the better to avoid them; but still remember, for your Comfort, that there is this great Difference between those Faults which Candour
may construe into Imprudence, and those which may be deduced from Villainy only. The former, perhaps, are even more apt to subject a Man to Ruin; but if he reform, his Character will, at length, be totally retrieved; the World, though not immediately, will, in Time, be reconciled to him; and he may reflect, not without some Mixture of Pleasure, on the Dangers he hath escaped. But Villainy, my Boy, when once discovered, is irretrievable; the Stains which this leaves behind, no Time will wash away. (959-60)

Allworthy continues long-windedly in the same vein, but his meaning is clear, and needs no further quotation. One is invited, then, to see that Tom's lamentations over the irretrievability of his soul are actually melodramatic misconstructions and exaggerations of his case, and thus to regard them as further proof of the sincerity and seriousness of his penitence (409-10, 928, 961). One disagrees, surely as the author intends, with those who call him, in Blifil's slanderous phrase, 'so profligate a wretch' and 'one of the worst Men in the World' (307). (Allworthy, Sophia, Mrs Fitzpatrick and Thwackum all have this clearly wrong impression at some point)

This moral scheme, based on the difference between venial folly and utterly debauched vice, actually more systematic in *Tom Jones* than Fielding's occasional fluidity of nomenclature would indicate, also applies in other works. The actions of Mr Wilson are judged according to the same criteria in *Joseph Andrews*, which is made clear in Wilson's own account of his career in London as a modern fine gentleman. In spite of Adams's punctuation of the interpolated narrative with groans and great groans (203, 204, 208), the 'vices' described are very superficial; the young Wilson sought the appearance and reputation of a man of fashion, not the actuality. Penniless soon after arriving in the capital, he wastes only credit, and therefore nothing tangible. Having furnished himself with the appurtenances of the beau -- rich suits of clothes and
fine periwigs (202) -- he merely pretends to be master of 'The next Qualifications, namely Dancing, Fencing, Riding the great Horse, and Musick' (203). He then puts on a show of rakery:

Nothing now seemed to remain but an Intrigue, which I was resolved to have immediately; I mean the Reputation of it; and indeed I was so successful, that in a very short time I had half a dozen with the finest Women in Town.

At these Words Adams fetched a deep Groan, and then blessing himself, cry'd out, Good Lord! What wicked Times are these?

Not so wicked as you imagine continued the Gentleman; for I assure you, they were all Vestal Virgins for any thing which I knew to the contrary. The Reputation of Intriguing with them was all I sought, and was what I arriv'd at: and perhaps I only flattered myself even in that; for very probably the Persons to whom I shewed their Billets, knew as well as I, that they were Counterfeits, and that I had written them to myself.

'Write Letters to yourself' said Adams staring! (203)

So, Wilson's going through the check-list of libertine pursuits only gets him a reputation without any real foundation, and when he says three years were devoted to 'this Course of Life', the Parson well asks, 'what Course of Life? ... I do not remember you have mentioned any' (204). Adams quite rightly observes that Wilson's London occupations were 'below the Life of an Animal, hardly above Vegetation' (205), but this prevents his follies from being anything worse. He eventually retires to the Temple and imparts his second-hand knowledge of high society to lawyer beaus happy to have it at third hand (206). At last, however, he does commit a real crime, the debauching of a young and innocent woman. Neither Wilson nor Adams holds back in branding this a wicked deed, calling it 'this barbarous, this villainous Action' (207). Yet Wilson's guilt is at the same time mitigated by his honourable sense of obligation to the lady, and by
his tenderness; and ultimately it is she who lets him down (207-08). Wilson is in any case capable, as we have seen, of reformation and of retiring to the country to recreate 'the Manner in which the People had lived in the Golden Age', as Adams puts it (229), so his sin cannot be all that heinous. Fielding puts into practice, then, that dictum of his Preface that 'the blackest Villainies' do not lie within his literary province (7), the extent of Wilson's errors being only 'Inadvertency and Indiscretion' (220).

The issue of folly and vice in Amelia, like much else, is given less confident treatment, and Booth comes the closest of the heroes in Fielding's novels to genuine irretrievability, in spite of his conversion, with the possible exception of Jonathan Wild. ('Possible' because it is difficult to regard Jonathan Wild as a novel rather than as an extended, somewhat Scriblerian satire, or at most as a satirical prose fiction with one or two novelistic aspects; the drama there is one of ideas not characters -- but Wild's unrepentance is undeniable, a foretaste of the pessimism of Fielding's last years.) But as for Amelia, though Booth sinks low, Fielding does take some pains to show his hero's amiable and even virtuous qualities (90, 93-4, 155), and while he treats his exemplary wife very shabbily indeed, Booth is accountable for shameful weaknesses not hopeless profligacy, demonstrated once again by repentance and conversion. And he never does the worst thing that is suggested to him, which is to sell the honour of Amelia to the anonymous peer for preferment in the Army. He may in the end be no more than feckless. But at the same time, the narrator is much less willing to excuse Booth for his amour with Miss Mathews during their confinement in Newgate, as is suggested by what (nearly) amounts, on Fielding's part, to leaving the reader to judge for himself:

We desire therefore the good-natured and
candid Reader will be pleased to weigh attentively the several unlucky Circumstances which concurred so critically, that Fortune seemed to have used her utmost Endeavours to ensnare poor Booth's Constancy. Let the Reader set before his Eyes a fine young Woman, in a manner a first Love, conferring Obligations, and using every Art to soften, to allure, to win, and to enflame; let him consider the Time and Place; let him remember that Mr. Booth was a young Fellow, in the highest Vigour of Life; and lastly, let him add one single Circumstance, that the Parties were alone together; and then if he will not acquit the Defendant, he must be convicted; for I have nothing more to say in his Defence. (154)

If it were not for that final drawing back, that shrug of the shoulders, this passage would be another of Fielding's urbane bullyings of the reader like the end of his chapter 'Of Love' in *Tom Jones* (271-2). Booth is still to a large degree exculpated, though with some hesitation, even amid the growing uncertainty that besets the novel but that cannot quite destroy his faith in human nature or his leniency to human foibles. The excerpt from *Amelia* in question seems nevertheless almost a parody of similar ones in *Tom Jones*, where a greater assurance about the difference between follies and vices leaves no doubt in anyone's mind about the veniality of Tom's sexual misconduct with Molly Seagrim, Mrs Waters (Jenny Jones) and Lady Bellaston. The seriousness of Tom's affair with Molly, for example, is dispelled by the laughter with which he discovers Square in a compromising position behind her curtain (231-4). As Ian Watt remarks of a drunken Tom's later encounter with Molly in the undergrowth (256-9), 'it is admittedly an imprudence which later contributes to the hero's expulsion, but Fielding's only direct comment is a humorous editorial development of the *in vino veritas* commonplace.'45 In the London section of the novel, the hero is forced into accepting the status of Lady Bellaston's kept man, and while this is considered an indiscretion with some
awkward and unenviable obligations, it is never any more or any worse than that. It appears that he does not initiate their 'particular Conversation' (717) and that once he is the recipient of her favours, both sexual and pecuniary, it is his sense of politeness that prevents him from terminating his relations with her sooner, and his knowledge that she is his only entree to the house where Sophia is staying in London. With Lady Bellaston, it could not be an abandonment to pleasure or irretrievable profligacy:

(Also 715, 726, 817-19.) The affair with Mrs Waters, Tom's putative mother, presents more of a problem, for the possibility that it is incest threatens to turn heedless folly into unintended but serious vice. In the end, however, it is nothing of the kind, as Mrs Waters is not Tom's mother. It is possible that Fielding wants our sigh of relief at the revelation of the truth to dispel all sense of the criminality at a stroke, and in any case Jones is portrayed as passive, the one taken advantage of, the citadel that at length surrenders to the arts and seductions of Mrs Waters in the 'Battle of the amorous Kind' that takes place at Upton (509; IX. v, passim, especially 513). His dalliances with Jenny Waters and Lady Bellaston torture Tom during his first interview with Sophia in
London, but neither one ought to concern him greatly, for she is worried only about his reputed freedom in toasting her by name in front of strangers, the allegations of which are in fact groundless (732, 956, 962). When Tom's infidelities do come up, Sophia is notably willing to forgive him (972) -- and it is perhaps justifiable to invoke the meaning of her Christian name at this point. Further aspects of Fielding's blinking away of Tom's guilt are his frequent use of circumlocutions and euphemisms like 'conversation' to gloss over any salacious and potentially damning details; his provision that Tom in fact does no injury to the virtue or reputation of his mistresses, for none of them is better than she should be (Molly was no virgin when Tom met her and he is not the father of her child (232-4), Mrs Waters is no novice, and Lady Bellaston a mere 'Demirep', 'whom every Body knows to be what no Body calls her' (817)); and his letting Tom off the hook, in the reader's eyes at least, by omitting Allworthy's lecture to him on the subject of unchastity (193). As a result, Tom's fornication is much less serious than Booth's adultery. All of these equivocations, qualifications, ironic asides and a certain amount of positive relish for Tom's activity permit Tom's own excuse for his love affairs, the old defence that though he has gone to bed with many women, he has loved only one (972). Such a sexual ethic was highly repugnant to Dr Johnson (in Rambler 4), but it seems indisputable that Fielding subscribes to what he sketches out in Joseph Andrews, expresses most clearly and confidently in Tom Jones, and still clings to in battered, modified form in Amelia.  

Fielding is without question harder on Booth than on his earlier male penitents, and denies him the exculpating benefit of a curious narrative strategy that, like the follies/ vices business, blunts the effect of the indiscretions of Wilson and Jones. In Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones, especially in the latter, the narrator gives
an extra dimension of experience to his characters, imaginatively if not actually, by adding to their wisdom at second hand, by making their actions fall just short of a particular vice, or by making groundless but resonant imputations about them. The second-hand nature of Wilson's experience in London, which is used to prevent him from sinking into any irretrievable badness, is elevated into a significant and carefully orchestrated technique in *Tom Jones*, and with a number of effects. The first of these is an extension and reinforcement of the folly/vice or sin-but-not-mortal-sin strategy and, more than this, is used as a kind of narrative shorthand to give the hero a touch more experience without seriously compromising his morals, and without requiring too many additional episodes along the road from Paradise Hall to London. Tom thus gets something of the soldier's life without seeing a campaign; a taste of duelling that satisfies honour and virtue in a way that not even Sir Charles Grandison can manage; a reluctant career as a modern fine gentleman; and from the Man of the Hill's interpolation, a knowledge of human baseness, of the career of a modern Oxonian, of gambling, of the Grand Tour -- even a potted 'brief History of Europe'. The Man of the Hill episode is beautifully done, placed like a great cross-road at the centre of the novel (in fact, Tom and Partridge are at an actual cross-road just before they meet him; 437 and n.), where Fielding simultaneously manages to point out the ways in which they are similar (thereby making the old man's experience in this odd way applicable to Tom, if only *in potentia*) and those in which they differ (403). The effect is to underscore the errors of the hermit, to indicate the various moral roads Tom wisely rejects or accepts, and in general to deepen his understanding by means of a moral surrogate or stand-in. Much has been said about the quickly discounted possibility that Tom's relations with Mrs Waters are incestuous, but it should be added that this otherwise puzzling detail may operate in an analogous fashion, as a means of widening Tom's action and of
testing the sincerity of his repentance and the limits of what is sexually permissible, without making him in any way culpable -- a brilliant stroke.\(^5\)

Surely related is the approach that is taken with respect to Squire Allworthy, whose deficiencies, like the Man of the Hill's, are used as a foil to reflect the virtues of Jones. Allworthy does have his limitations (\(\text{viz.}\), his harshness to Jenny Jones and to Tom, his gullibility, a certain degree of emotional coldness and reserve), but all the same he is no Matthew Bramble, and I would like to resist the estimation of him as someone 'who however well intentioned, demonstrates exactly those errors that the work in which he appears seems most interested in attacking,' or as 'a rather boring paragon of virtue.'\(^5\) As original and perceptive studies by Mark Kinkead-Weekes and Eleanor Hutchens suggest, the narrator may smile at the lacunae in Allworthy's understanding but never subverts his benevolence and virtue to any irreparable extent, and that though Allworthy is at times 'splendidly adrift' from other people at times, 'properly seen, he walks solitary and free, meditating benevolence, while the others from their angular hiding places calculate their own advantage, balance each other in competitive knavery, and cancel each other out.'\(^5\) In some ways, Allworthy is another, older version of Tom, and it is significant that, as godfather, he gives the foundling 'his own Name of *Thomas*' (78), which means, of course, 'twin.'\(^5\) In consequence, the narrator adopts something of the same tactic with Allworthy as he does with his younger counterpart, trying to get him into trouble by suggesting all sorts of things about him, and finally saying that none of them is true. The most obvious of these is Fielding's game of cat and mouse with the reader about Tom's paternity. It is generally only unreliable characters and village gossip that assume the Squire is the father of the Foundling.\(^5\) but the narrator's arch refusal to clarify the question indicates that he
hopes mud, once thrown, will indeed stick for as long as it suits him. His habit of hinting ('for it is not our Custom,' he says, 'to unfold at any Time more than is necessary for the Occasion' (803)) only reinforces this. In defence of Tom, Squire Western declares to the sceptical Supple that he is merely a chip off the Allworthian block:

'Why Allworthy loves a Wench himself. Doth not all the Country know whose Son Tom is? You must talk to another Person in that Manner. I remember Allworthy at College.'

'I thought,' said the Parson, 'he had never been at the University.'

'Yes, yes, he was,' says the Squire, 'and many a Wench have we two had together. As arrant a Whoremaster as any within five Miles o' un.' (190)

As it happens, Supple is correct; Allworthy is entirely self-taught and never was at Oxford (60, 194), but the chapter title which prepares us for 'The Penetration of Squire Western' with respect to Allworthy's character and past is only semi-ironic, for Fielding wants to establish the fact that Jones and Allworthy are literally and figuratively akin, and that their virtues are respectively Allworthian and Jonesian. And Allworthy is not really so chilly after all:

Allworthy was naturally a Man of Spirit, and his present Gravity arose from true Wisdom and Philosophy, not from any original Phlegm in his Disposition: For he had possessed much Fire in his Youth, and had married a beautiful Woman for Love. (284)

It is also his warmth and tenderness for Tom that allow his forgiveness (923). The purpose of showing Allworthy's warm side is to humanise what otherwise might be a rather frigid ideal, to prevent the reader from being able to condemn him for heartlessness, and to vindicate Tom's warm-bloodedness. The demonstration of his weaknesses
(and some of these, like his capacity to be deceived, are qualified and rendered virtues above the baseness of the worldly norm) and of his general lack of engagement in human concerns ('Mr. Allworthy withdrew to his Study, as was his Custom ...', 45) points to Tom's correction of them, his building on the foundation of his uncle's virtues rather than any deconstruction of the Allworthian edifice.

If the Squire is like his nephew, why does Fielding not come out with it, and make him a reformed rake too? The answer is that just as Allworthy wants Tom to add prudence and religion to his natural goodness, generosity and honour (244), Fielding has Tom add one major quality to the store of Allworthy's virtues, that of experience. 'Experience' can be a synonym of 'prudence', and many critics have written about the latter concept in *Tom Jones*, which is sound enough but rather misses the point unless the terminology is refined. On its own, 'prudence' is ambiguous, and Fielding in fact applies it in a pejorative sense (to mean a low, cunning kind of worldly wisdom) more often in *Tom Jones* than as a complimentary epithet. It is therefore sometimes a Blifilish kind of meanness. What Richardson celebrates at the end of *Pamela* II in 'the Character of PRUDENTIA! -- the Happy and Happy-making PRUDENTIA!' is in fact for Fielding 'the matchless Arts of that young Politician', Shamela -- her 'little Arts' and 'Pollitricks' (Shamela, t.p., 5, 52; also 56). What is more, prudence may only be a passive, native discretion of the sort possessed by Allworthy, and which Fielding regards as inadequate because it is a virtue in a vacuum. It is better than nothing, but can easily be deceived by a Blifil, the point Fielding seems to be making in III. vii (141). He is wary of theory unacquainted with practice, the pedantry that in a benign way characterises not only Allworthy, but also Abraham Adams in *Joseph Andrews* and Dr Harrison in *Amelia*, for virtue is not something to be passively possessed, but actively engaged in
the world. (Virtue is process in Fielding, not the static qualities that characterise a Clarissa.) Satire of pedantry is one of the things that Fielding inherits from the Scriblerians, though he tones it down considerably, and it is something that he passes on to Sterne and to Smollett. In *Joseph Andrews*, Adams is all for keeping children ignorant since he thinks it will keep them pure, à la Locke, but Joseph quite rightly objects (231-2); and when Adams claims that an armchair and a stack of books have given him a full understanding of the world (180-4), the narrator's chapter title calls it an example more of

' the honest Simplicity of his Heart than of his Experience in the Ways of this World'

(171). In *Tom Jones*, we are told of another Sort of Knowledge beyond the Power of Learning to bestow, and this is to be had by Conversation. So necessary is this to the understanding the Characters of Men, that none are more ignorant than those learned Pedants, whose Lives have been entirely consumed in Colleges, and among Books: For however exquisitely Human Nature may have been described by Writers, the true practical System can be learnt only in the World. Indeed the like happens in every other Kind of Knowledge. Neither Physic, nor Law, are to be practically known from Books. Nay, the Farmer, the Planter, the Gardener must perfect by Experience what he hath acquired the Rudiments of by Reading. (492)

Fielding hopes at the same time that his books will reform readers, and his technique of hints and discoveries, of gradually acquainting us with the characters in *Amelia*, of letting us make mistaken judgments and then correcting them, all is intended to make us learn in the same and only way that the characters in the novels can, through active participation. Human nature is the raw material of Fielding's works, the 'Provision' of his great bill of fare (77, 32), not dull precepts or bookish exempla -- indeed, the only
volume worth using for a model is 'the vast authentic Doomsday-Book of Nature' (TF, 489; also 377). This is presumably the reason that neither Allworthy nor Tom has had much formal education (60, 194, 374); and it is also why Tom is described as relatively beardless (415), and that Partridge, his companion on the road, is a barber (417) -- the getting of a beard through the experience of shaving it being a subtle analogue of the getting of wisdom in the world. Although there is that determinist streak in him, Fielding generally believes in man's free will to choose his own destiny, and this would seem to be another aspect of what I have been discussing.

The idea of reader participation suggests that Fielding is committed to experience as a guide not only intellectually and practically, but also aesthetically. The affinities of Fielding's art with that of his friend 'the ingenious Hogarth' (JA, 6) are very well known, but I think the painter may be brought in here in a way that, as far as I know, has not been done before, to add to the treatment of experience in Fielding, as was suggested at the beginning of the chapter in the long quotation from The Champion on Hogarth's Rake's and Harlot's progresses. Fielding falls back on Hogarth so frequently because both base their aesthetic creeds on the conviction that involving the reader or on-looker by presenting him with active scenes is half way to reforming him. Both also believe that the eye or mind is most pleased (and therefore most likely to be affected and improved) when it is drawn along lines carefully chosen and controlled by the artist, but which still follow 'a wanton kind of chace'; an analysis of beauty that allows a wealth of detail within over-all design; an aesthetic that is the theoretical underpinning of the ideal landscape of Allworthy's estate, complete with a Hogarthian serpentine river 'seen to meander through an amazing Variety of Meadows and Woods' (43); and that glorifies the activity and participation of both actor and audience. It is also the artistic
justification for a judicious narrative digressiveness that allows for the interpolations that crop up so often in Fielding’s novels, called by some critics excrescences but in reality encapsulations or reflections of the moral Fielding is trying to teach, and expressive of what learned critics have called his taste for ‘ecphrasis’ I apologise for another long quotation, but it is important that Hogarth’s treatise on art, *The Analysis of Beauty* (1753), be cited in some detail:

The active mind is ever bent to be employ’d. Pursuing is the business of our lives; and even abstracted from any other view, gives pleasure. Every arising difficulty, that for a while attends and interrupts the pursuit, gives a sort of spring to the mind, enhances the pleasure, and makes what else would be toil and labour, become sport and recreation.

Wherein would consist the joys of hunting, shooting, fishing, and many other favourite diversions, without the frequent turns and difficulties, and disappointments, that are daily met with in the pursuit? -- how joyless does the sportsman return when the hare has not had fair play? how lively, and in spirits, even when an old cunning one has baffled, and out-run the dogs!

This love of pursuit, merely as pursuit, is implanted in our natures, and design’d, no doubt, for necessary and useful purposes. Animals have it by instinct. The hound dislikes the game he so eagerly pursues; and even cats will risk the losing of their prey to chase it over again. It is a pleasing labour of the mind to solve the most difficult problems; allegories and riddles, trifling as they are, afford the mind amusement: and with what delight does it follow the well-connected thread of a play, or novel, which ever increases as the plot thickens, and ends most pleas’d, when that is most distinctly unravell’d?

The eye hath this sort of enjoyment in winding walks, and serpentine rivers, and all sorts of objects, whose forms, as we shall see hereafter, are composed of what I call, the *waving* and *serpentine* lines. (41-2)

This serpentine analysis of beauty, with its implicit corollary that what delights also in-
structs, is undoubtedly applicable to Fielding's novels. The artistic credo shared by
Hogarth and Fielding is the subject of some joking in *Tristram Shandy*, but also of
some admiration, as Sterne there plays with the jolly melancholy of so-called digression.
The line that Corporal Trim makes with a flourish of his stick in IX. iv as an argument
for the freedom of a bachelor, and the ornament of many a critic's and editor's title page
since, is Sterne's own crazy version of the serpentine line, and the digressive emblem of
his book. Like Hogarth, and like Sterne after him, Fielding expresses an eighteenth-
century love (one hesitates to call it either baroque or rococo) of pursuit for its own sake,
and because it is 'implanted in our natures, and design'd, no doubt, for necessary and
useful purposes' in Hogarth's phrase. The last thing that Fielding wants is for Sophia to
be an insipid stay-at-home, or for Tom to be 'like a polished Bowl' that rolls through the
world without being battered, like a man who 'runs through the World without being
once stopped by the Calamities which happen to others' -- or to himself (77, 761).

Having strayed slightly from the subject myself, but ever with my con-
clusion in mind, I must now bring together all that has been said so far, and define the
precise limits of libertinism in Fielding. Fielding's position should have suggested it-
self by now, and is that a measure of libertine conduct is like the dents that end up
chasing, only seemingly wantonly, a beautiful pattern on the polished bowl, like the
craquelage that adds to the value of china (77, 107). As far as specific libertine issues go,
Fielding's various writings display what sterner eighteenth-century moralists might have
called a dangerous inconsistency, but which seems to me either a conscious atomisation of
the elements of the rakish stereotype in order to accommodate some of them in society, or
at least a refusal to take a simplistic and doctrinaire anti-libertine stance. Drinking is all
right, as Tom Jones and Sotmore in *Rape upon Rape* demonstrate, with the proviso that
it reflect cheerfulness and good spirits, not despair. As for sex with women other than
prostitutes, it must fall within the limitations outlined above: innocence must not be
debauched, the woman's reputation must not suffer, and a young man must eventually
choose a virtuous woman to marry. Debauching virgins is an unambiguous sin,
something that only the extraordinary circumstances, early remorse and solid virtues of
Wilson can mitigate - without these, the corrupter of innocence is as bad as the noble
Lord in *Amelia*. Booth's adultery is clearly a greater cause for concern - if not ultimately
an irretrievable sin (*Amelia*, 153-4). Fielding furthermore recognises women's attraction
to rakes (Lothario, Macheath, Tom Jones) without making a Richardsonian point of it;
rather, he seems to regard it as a good and natural thing (see Henley, XV. 135; *CGJ*, 53; *TJ*,
190). As far as brothels are concerned, there is fairly conclusive condemnation of them in
*A Charge Delivered to the Grand Jury*, but a qualified defence by Meanwell and Draw-
cansir in the *Covent-Garden Journal* (276-80, 306-12) - though Tom and Wilson
significantly never frequent them. Gambling seems to be acceptable if it is confined to the
upper classes, Fielding says in *A Charge*; but duelling he condemns, most clearly in
*Amelia* (135, 364-7, 503) - and it is worth remembering that Tom is not a real duellist in
his encounter with Fitzpatrick. The Mohockish bucks in *Amelia* are in no way excused,
for they threaten in almost the same way as similar gentleman ruffians in Burney's
*Evelina* (395-8, 413). To hell-fiery rakishness Fielding seems a little ambivalent: one issue
of the *Covent-Garden Journal* condemns profanity (303-04), but the free-thinking club in
*Joseph Andrews* (211-13) is not terribly dangerous; and his description of the Hell-Fire
Clubs of the 1720's treats them comically, with echoes of Gay's 'Wonderful Prophecy'
(*CGJ*, 89-91). Not specifically anti-libertine, but a related concern about the morals of high
life, was Fielding's vehement opposition to masquerades, which he articulates
throughout his career.67 The libertine is thus either a feature of high life without being a
great social or political worry, a threat far less dangerous than the hypocrite or man of
malice, or little more than the clownish or coxcomical (see *CGJ*, 303-4). The scope of
Fielding's collected works thus gives a pretty clear idea of the limits of libertinism, which
are certainly narrower than those prescribed by Smollett, whose first novel is about a
young man named Random, and in whose second, *Peregrine Pickle*, the hero is allowed to drug and abduct his beloved with relative impunity. As though to insist that he does not advocate a Mandevillean libertarianism, the narrator of *Tom Jones* intrudes on the scene to comment on the main character's 'Tokens of that Gallantry of Temper which greatly recommends Men to Women' (139):

I ask Pardon for this short Appearance, by Way of Chorus on the Stage. It is in reality for my own Sake, that while I am discovering the Rocks on which Innocence and Goodness often split, I may not be understood to recommend the very Means to my worthy Readers, by which I intend to shew them they will be undone. And this, as I could not prevail on any of my Actors to speak, I myself was obliged to declare. (141-2)

Fielding's practice elsewhere suggests that this may be a sop thrown to the critics (rather than the crust of *Tom Jones*, XI. i); and the rocks seem to be a Scylla and Charybdis -- difficult to navigate safely, but not impossible. More indicative of his moral point is an admittedly slippery statement in XII. viii of *Tom Jones*, when the amorous goings-on in the inn at Upton, and Sophia's discovery of them, are assessed:

But so Matters fell out, and so I must describe them; and if any reader is shocked at their appearing unnatural, I cannot help it. I must remind such Persons, that I am not writing a System, but a History, and I am not obliged to reconcile every Matter to the received Notions concerning Truth and Nature. But if this was never so easy to do, perhaps it might be more prudent in me to avoid it. For instance, as the Fact at present before us now stands, without any Comment of mine upon it, tho' it may at first Sight offend some Readers, yet upon more mature Consideration, it must please all; for wise and good Men may consider what happened to Jones at Upton as a just Punishment for his Wickedness, with Regard to Women, of which it was indeed the immediate Consequence; and silly and bad Persons may comfort themselves in their Vices, by flattering their own Hearts that the Characters of Men are rather owing to
Accidents than to Virtue. Now perhaps the Reflections which we should be here inclined to draw, would alike contradict both these Conclusions, and would shew that these Incidents contribute only to confirm the great, useful and uncommon Doctrine, which it is the Purpose of this whole Work to inculcate, and which we must not fill up our Pages by frequently repeating, as an ordinary Parson fills his Sermon by repeating his Text at the end of every Paragraph. (651-2)

Out of a sense, as he says, that the great and useful doctrine is uncommon (unconventional and, to some, unspeakable), Fielding does not make a bald statement that a measure of good-natured, non-vicious libertinism is desirable, but it is unquestionably there for the reader to discern if he is able. Much of the evidence for this implied message has naturally been taken from *Tom Jones*, because it is his most assured, detailed and highly developed examination of the place of the rake within the system. At the same time, however, there is a considerable consistency in Fielding's treatment of rakishness throughout his career, as the enumeration above of his position on various libertine questions will attest. At the earliest stage of his literary life, as a playwright, Fielding lets his amiable rakes off extremely easily: Merital in *Love in Several Masques* (1728); Wilding in *The Temple Beau* (1730); Rakel in *The Letter-Writers* (1731); Lovegirlo in *The Covent-Garden Tragedy* (1732); Valentine in *The Intriguing Chambermaid* (1733); Mondish, Gaylove and Spark in *The Universal Gallant* (1735); and Millamour in *The Wedding Day* (1743). In the last play, Millamour's wild oats nearly prevent him from winning Clarinda, but in the end he can say:

I am now the happiest of mankind. I have, on the very point of losing it, recovered a jewel of inestimable value. Oh, Clarinda! my former follies may, through an excess of good fortune, prove advantageous to us both in our future happiness. While I, from the reflection on the danger of losing you, to which the wildness of my desires
betrayed me, shall enjoy the bliss with doubled sweetness:
and you from hence may derive a tender and a constant
husband. (Henley, XII. 145)

Not only does this passage suggest the ways in which a limited rakishness (for Millamour's vices are never very great; see XII. 112-13, for example), is in fact invaluable, but also how much at odds with Fielding's message is the unsatisfying moral tag that follows, and that concludes the play:

From my example, let all rakes be taught
To shun loose pleasure's sweet but poisonous draught.
Vice, like a ready harlot, still allures;
Virtue gives slow, but what she gives secures (XII. 145)

- unless one is aware of the difference between 'loose' pleasure and pleasure rightly understood (that is, the true Epicurean love of and delight in doing good, as manifested by Allworthy); between not only vice and virtue, but also vice and folly. Thus in *Rape upon Rape* (*The Coffee-House Politician*) (1730), he is much more concerned with the wrong-doings of Justice Squeezum, a Jonsonian judge with an admixture of Gay, than he is with the entertaining frolics of Ramble. This forgiveness (and therefore tacit celebration?) of rakishness is easy enough in light comedy or farce, but Fielding does not confine it there. In later works, he points out that the vices of Trulliber, of the passengers in the coach who deny succour to the naked Joseph, of Blifil, Thwackum and the 'noble Lord' in *Amelia* are the truly dangerous ones. In the last of the novels, it is fair to say that Fielding goes back to some extent on what he has previously said about sexual misconduct, as the critics have pointed out, but Booth's infidelity to Amelia is not quite Jones's to Sophia: Booth is adulterous and therefore harms others, and he is a middle-aged family man, past the age when wild oats can be sown without peril. But even so, he is forgivable, and there are sins greater than his, like the cynical depravity of the un-
named peer, the Pyrrhonism of Captain James, the Mandevillean amorality of Miss Mathews, and all the ills that afflict society in general. At this point it might be useful to consider Fielding's minor rakish characters in the novels, to see whether they contribute to or qualify his over-all moral message and conclusions about libertinism. The first such character is Beau Didapper in *Joseph Andrews*, who might be considered a rake because of his repeated attempts on the virtue of Fanny. But one or two feeble attempts, described in comic terms (303, 320-1, 330-3), do not quite make a rake; nor does Didapper's puny effeminacy (303, 312, 321, 332). It is worth remembering that he is a beau, a fop rather than a rake (though the characters sometimes overlap, here they clearly do not, to Didapper's frustration), and that a 'didapper' is a dabchick, a little grebe or moorhen (*OED*, IV. 627) - hardly a rapacious, rake-like bird of prey. The only rape the Beau is accused of is one that he does not commit (that of Slipslop, who is the aggressor during their tussle in the night, and who needs to cover up past indiscretions and mend her reputation for 'impregnable Chastity' by crying 'Rape!' (331)). Didapper boasts the following morning that he did in fact have his way with Slipslop, conveniently overlooking his ridiculous performance there and the original object of his desire, Fanny (336). In the end, Didapper could not be a rake if he tried, and Fielding gives him no greater place in the novel than he deserves. Didapper is little more than a vehicle for bedroom farce, and is never a serious threat; he appears in the novel only once Joseph and Fanny have been reunited, and once the happy conclusion of the novel is in sight. The only bearing Didapper's 'rakery' (if indeed one has any justification in calling it that) has on Wilson, the reformed rake of the piece, is to reinforce our feeling that he has been fortunate and wise to escape the follies of the town, which Didapper in part exemplifies; and to reinforce the view of the 'Preface', just as
Wilson's rather tame libertinism does, that thorough wickedness is unlikely. In *Joseph Andrews*, at least, the villains are laughable and easily defeated by virtue and good nature.

Lord Fellamar in *Tom Jones* is a similar character, but he poses something more of a threat. Sophia's description of his attempt on her virtue shows that she, at least, finds it pretty serious, and Lord Fellamar's plot with Lady Bellaston nearly does have disastrous consequences for Tom. Perhaps significantly, however, Tom's accidental duel with Fitzpatrick pre-empts Fellamar's press-gang plot, so the peer cannot even take the credit for Tom's worst and final scrape (863-4, 872-3). Fellamar is ultimately little more than Lady Bellaston's instrument, anyway. As for the attempt on Sophia's virtue, it proceeds only after Fellamar has backed out on account of un-rakish scruples (792-3), and then been urged on by Lady Bellaston in a passage that strongly suggests both general and specific impotence on Fellamar's part (795). And marriage, rather than rape and desertion, is his aim from the start (792, 795). Squire Western bursts in comically on Fellamar and Sophia in any case, averting any disastrous outcome, and, like Didapper, Fellamar is left looking ridiculous rather than menacing (798). The peer is a mere 'laced Coat' to the Squire (801), and when Tom is vindicated and freed Fellamar backs off, now thinking 'it behoved him to do every Thing in his Power to make Satisfaction to a Gentleman whom he had so grossly injured, and without any Consideration of Rivalship, (for he had now given over all Thoughts of *Sophia* ...)' (965). Nothing further is heard of Lord Fellamar, who is evidently not among those 'Persons who have made any considerable Figure in this History' at the end of the novel (979), and who is thus omitted from the narrator's final wrap-up of main characters (979-81). Because Fellamar makes no 'considerable Figure', his rakishness (though more convincing and more threatening to a happy end than Didapper's) is no serious obstacle to the accommodation of rakishness, as
modified by Tom Jones, within morality and society. At one point, Fellamar and Blifil are presented as Sophia's only approved suitors (Squire Western having been persuaded to change his mind about the laced coat; 888), so like Blifil he might be thought of as a foil to the virtues of Tom, but a distinctly minor one. Tom's true love and passionate nature correct Fellamar's simple lust (possibly lacking in animal spirits, as I have suggested above) and merely mercenary interest in Sophia (787), while his honesty and good nature rectify Fellamar's plots and stratagems.

A more problematic rakish character is another peer (there being a strain in Fielding of suspicion of the nobility), this time the anonymous 'noble Lord' of Amelia, who is the principal vicious character of the novel, and, it would seem, the prime embodiment of the cynicism, depravity and deceit that have corrupted the world of Amelia, and which good nature can no longer easily conquer. The noble Lord is undeniably a rake; even if he is older than the stereotypical libertine, he has had 'numberless Mistresses' (303) and is still 'most profuse in his Pleasures with Women ...' (251). He also resorts to the classic libertine device of an opiate or intoxicant in order to have his way with Mrs Bennet (295). I think the fact that Lord ........., like Booth, is middle-aged is a sign of Fielding's worry, new in Amelia, that libertinism is not so easily assimilated into society after all, or at least that if it survives longer than an acceptable period in youth it may become ineradicable and intractable. The noble Lord in any case represents what was inadmissible in Joseph Andrews, the thoroughly wicked, and suggests for the first time in Fielding that libertinism may well be as damaging to individuals and to society as more Brownian moralists had been saying all along. But there is an important distinction to be made, as in Tom Jones, between warm- and cold-hearted rakishness: the kind of libertinism that Lord ......... represents is unlimited,
unmodified, unrectified by all the restrictions that make Tom Jones a socially acceptable rake; and it is devoid of all Tom's warm, good-natured virtues. Part of the noble Lord's rôle, then, is to prevent Fielding's being charged with a wholesale defence of rakishness, to show just what is permissible and what is not. Booth, for all his weakness, is reined in by the same, decent, modifying forces as Jones, and also possesses his warm good qualities. Because Booth is fired by real love for Amelia and has the honour not to prostitute her, tragedy is averted; but there is a new, almost Manichaean opposition between rakishness and virtue, rather than a reconciliation. (I say 'almost' because good still triumphs.) It is as though Booth and the noble Lord represent the two possible kinds of rakishness as found in middle age — Fielding apparently saying with a shrug (as on p. 154 of the novel), 'It can go either way: virtue or vice.' The anonymous nobleman nearly corrupts Booth and nearly ruins Amelia, but human virtue and good nature of a recognisably Jonesian variety are still able to snatch victory from the jaws of defeat. Amelia is thus able to rewrite the tragic tale of Mrs Bennet (and we are meant to notice the close parallels; see 237, 296, 290, 291-2, 293, 421), and Booth the sordid one of the rakish Captain Trent, who did sell his wife's honour to the noble Lord (440-1, 469-71). In Amelia, Fielding seems to admit that goodness is not as widespread, perhaps not as efficacious as it appears to be in Tom Jones, but it exists, and can win out against the odds. Amelia is obviously a far less confident work than Tom Jones, but even in the later work Fielding does not utterly lose faith in human nature, which he still believes to be essentially good, vicious only when corrupted by 'Bad Education, bad Habits and bad Customs' (374; also 440). Dr Harrison even maintains that there is good in Colonel James, who has also tried to seduce Amelia (375). Debauched human nature is, however, more prevalent and more dangerous than in Tom Jones, which is perhaps why Fielding feels he needs to kill the peer off with a
venereal disease, as though getting him out of the way is the only thing that can allow the happy ending. But the intervention of VD is not the only thing that permits a happy outcome: Booth's Jonesian virtues and his conversion from scepticism are also responsible. The social consolidation and expansion of the concluding chapter of Tom Jones are not possible in Amelia, however. There is instead a more subdued ending in retreat from vice, a social contraction in order to insulate virtue from the world — but it is a happy ending nevertheless, and, if all I have argued is taken into account, a plausible one. Let us not forget that Dr Harrison is, even amid the gloom of the novel, able to argue with spirit for the existence of utopias (459-65), and though one suspects the clergyman is unrealistically idealistic, the Booth-Atkinson circle is painted very much in utopian colours at the end of the novel. (And the death of the noble Lord from VD may clear a little more room for virtue in the world.) For all its minor key, Amelia is still recognisably Fieldingesque, and of a piece with the other, more optimistic novels.

A phenomenon related to the increasing beleaguerment of virtue and the greater threat of the rake to happy endings in Fielding is the increasing presence of thorough 'Villany' in general. Thorough wickedness is proscribed by the 'Preface' to Joseph Andrews, and so largely absent or harmless in that novel. In Tom Jones, we find Blifil and Thwackum, who are thoroughly nasty and malicious (if not perfectly villainous) but ultimately defeatable; and also Ensign Northerton (372-82, 496-8, 519-22) and Sir George Gresham (453-4) — blacker villains but correspondingly more minor characters. In Amelia, a wicked world is exemplified by Lord —, Fielding's most thorough and most sinister vicious character ever. It is as though the gap between follies and vices grows increasingly narrow, making the difference between rakish heroes and nasty minor rakes less easily distinguishable — until in Amelia they are just about evenly matched —
and libertinism itself less easily assimilated both into a comic ending and into social order as a whole.

It may thus be fair to say that *Amelia* is a reworking of earlier Fielding-esque themes, from the point of view of disillusionment and disappointment, but where the limited variety of libertinism is still remediable. Permissible libertinism is there more strictly limited, but still a version of the settlement with rakishness made in *Tom Jones*. *Tom Jones* lies at the heart of Fielding’s views on libertinism, it seems to me, for there he makes his fullest and most assured integration of rakery into socially desirable behaviour. This is a statement that the Wilson material in *Joseph Andrews* anticipates, but hesitates to work out fully, and that is muted and qualified by the greater pessimism of *Amelia*. (Perhaps *Tom Jones* represents for Fielding the world as it should be, with goodness at its most effective; and *Amelia* (and to some extent *Joseph Andrews* as well) the world as it is, with vice cancelling out much of human goodness.) It therefore seems reasonable to conclude a chapter on Fielding’s general views on libertinism with their clearest expression, in *Tom Jones*, and to take Ian Watt’s words out of context to do so (for it is only the determinism of his theory of the rise of the novel that makes him condemn Fielding in the end, and fail to understand the subtleties):

He believed that virtue, far from being the result of the suppression of instinct at the behest of public opinion, was itself a natural tendency to goodness or benevolence. In *Tom Jones* he tried to show a hero possessed of a virtuous heart, but also of the lustiness and lack of deliberation to which natural goodness was particularly prone, and which easily led to error and even to vice. To realise his moral aim, therefore, Fielding had to show how the good heart was threatened by many dangers in its hazardous course to maturity and knowledge of the world; yet, at the same time ..., he had also to show that although Tom’s moral transgressions were a likely and perhaps even a necessary stage in the process of moral growth, they did
not betoken a vicious disposition; even Tom Jones's
carefree animality has a generous quality lacking in
Clarissa's self-centred and frigid virtue. The happy
conclusion of the story, therefore, is ... actually the culmi-
nation of Fielding's moral and literary logic.71

The only remaining issue is whether this really leaves Fielding in any other light than
he was cast by many of his detractors in the eighteenth century and, oddly, by his earliest
defenders in the nineteenth and twentieth -- as a 'jolly dog', fond of a wench and a
bottle, without much more in mind than a celebration of the boozy, sexy side of life.72
The jolly-dog interpretation, whether it damns or defends, is patently inadequate, if only
because it tends to ignore the limits Fielding places on indulgence. It also underesti-
mates his serious purpose as a Christian censor. A limited and healthy libertinism is
desirable in youth not simply because it is warm, funny and life-affirming; the recog-
nition of the boundaries of rakery is what makes Wilson the ideal squire that the
lapdog-killing hunter in *Joseph Andrews* is not, and what allows the human qualities
in Tom Jones that will reinvigorate and perpetuate the benevolent paternalism of the
squirearchy. The venerable established order will die out if childless Allworthys try to
apply virtue by the book and by the letter of the law; it will wither away if the anti-social
virtues of the frigid Clarissa (as Watt puts it) are allowed to triumph; and it will collapse if
the shires are over-run with selfish and malignant Blifils.73 It is left to Tom and Sophia to
renovate and recreate, for only he and Sophia, very much like a second Adam and Eve,
have the necessary experience for the job:

To conclude, as there are not to be found a
worthier Man and Woman, than this fond Couple,
so neither can any be imagined more happy. They
preserve the purest and tenderest Affection for each
other, an Affection daily encreased and confirmed by
mutual Endearments, and mutual Esteem. Nor is
their Conduct towards their Relations and Friends less amiable, than towards one another. And such is their Condescension, their Indulgence, and their Beneficence to those below them, that there is not a Neighbour, a Tenant, or a Servant, who doth not most gratefully bless the Day when Mr. Jones was married to his Sophia. (981-2)

The long process of courtship, with its fair share of libertinism, may superficially resemble what Mandeville or Lord Chesterfield says, but Tom’s and Fielding’s ends, the triumphant winning of Sophia and sophia respectively, make the all-important distinction. The meaning of the great, useful and uncommon doctrine inculcated in the novels and other works is not a glorification of unbounded libertinism (which Fielding ultimately recognises as dangerous), even in the interests of worldly advantage, but a brilliant and generous attempt at pleasure reconciled to virtue.
CHAPTER FOUR

"What Is the Love of a Rakish Heart?"

Richardson, Rakes and
Reformation

Dr Bartlett's 'thousand wrecks!' seems to describe the phenomenon of the rake in the eighteenth-century novel as a whole, and the abundant libertines of Samuel Richardson's own novels in particular. One of the aims of this chapter is to suggest Richardson's awareness of the rakish fictional characters who went before Mr B., Robert Lovelace and his gang, Sir Hargrave Pollexfen and Everard Grandison. The characterisation of Richardson's rakes reflects and is in part determined by contemporary assumptions about libertine conduct, its consequences and its chances for conversion into more socially acceptable behaviour. Like Fielding, Richardson rings changes on the standard rake as outlined in my second chapter, making a character like Belton conform to the type when he wants the reader to be able to make a quick and accurate judgment, or underscoring divergence from the characteristic (above all in the case of Lovelace) when he wishes to disprove old and pernicious clichés about libertinism -- for example, that a reformed rake makes the best husband, or indeed that the reformation of rakes is possible at all. Richardson's novelistic rakes seem to me to attempt a synthesis of various strains of libertinism, as though to provide the reader with the anatomy of
rakery in all its manifestations. Mr B. is thus the 'Vicious Rake' in the earlier part of *Pamela*, the companion of 'Extravagant' provincial rakes and, at the end of the story, very much like a 'Polite Rake' and Congrevian hero. As I shall suggest below, Richardson's characterisation of B. as different kinds of rake is rather awkward and inconsistent, but in *Clarissa* this approach to the rakish character comes off brilliantly. And in reverse: Lovelace at first appears to be a Polite Rake, seemingly capable of reformation, but turns out to be a Vicious Rake of the worst order. Richardson makes frequent and conscious reference to Lovelace's libertine context at its widest — seventeenth-century drama, eighteenth-century rake-fiction, Mandevillean libertarianism, Mohockism and Hell-Fire, all of which I shall discuss in some detail below. Richardson seems to be attempting in Lovelace a portrait of the rake *parexcellence*, and identifying the things that make such a character tick: power over and revenge against women, the desire for amusement, the tendency to despair, the stratagems of seduction for their own sake — rakish features wholly absent in the high-spirited, affable Tom Jones or the decent Wilson, present to some degree in Pickle but not so sinister, and characteristic (on a meaner, nastier scale) of *Amelia* 's noble Lord. The rakes of *Grandison* are as pallid as the hero, but they too are clearly associated with the rakish traditions of abduction and impenitence. There is, however, little attempt to penetrate very deeply into rakish psychology; these characters are more like Fielding's Fellamar than they are like Lovelace. What I hope to suggest in this chapter, then, is Richardson's acceptance of conventional wisdom on rakes, primarily that they are a danger to society, and his use of it to illustrate his own rather pessimistic views on rakish character and reclaimability.
What I would like to avoid, however, is the explanation of Richardson's fascination with libertinism that is current in some quarters. It is plain that the novelist was interested in rakes throughout his career, from his childhood story-telling days, to his later hero-worship of the Duke of Wharton (long thought to be the mysterious real-life prototype of Mr B. and Lovelace to whom Richardson alludes), through the *Familiar Letters* and all of the novels, spilling over into his extensive correspondence.² Morris Golden, Ian Watt and others have opined that Richardson was obsessed with libertines because he felt a subconscious desire to compensate for his own timidity, sexual repression, even sado-masochistic tendencies. Such theories might be plausible and appealing, but in their exemplary standard biography of the novelist T.C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel are wise, it seems to me, to draw back from such speculations on methodological grounds; psychological diagnosis is perhaps not the proper province of the literary historian or critic³ There is another good reason for hesitating to invade the territory of the psychoanalyst: those who stress Richardson's sneaking admiration for a character like Lovelace are inclined to down-play the seriousness of the anti-rakish moral message in the novels, and Richardson's genuine worries about the personal and social effects of libertinism. One of the most shocking aspects of B.'s overtures to Pamela is the fact that they represent a grave abrogation of a master's duty to his servant. Pamela moans, 'When a Master of his Honour's Degree demeans himself to be so free as *that* to such a poor Servant as me, what is the next to be expected?' (I. 35). Later, the heroine comments on rakish bad example:

Here's Shamelessness for you! Sure the World must be near at an End! for all the Gentlemen about are as bad as he almost, as far as I can hear! -- And see the Fruits of
such bad Examples! There is 'Squire Martin in the Grove has had three Lyings-in, it seems, in his House in three Months past; one by himself, one by his Coachman, and one by his Woodman; and yet he has turn'd none of them away. Indeed, how can he, when they but follow his own vile Example! There is he, and two or three more such as he, within ten Miles of us; who keep Company, and hunt with our fine Master, truly; and I suppose, he's never the better for their Examples. But, Heaven bless me, say I, and send me out of this wicked House! (I. 89-90)

Richardson is all the more concerned about B.'s misbehaviour because he is not only master and landowner, but also JP and MP (I. 74-5, 86-7, 132, 242). Clarissa bewails the fate of Lovelace because he too has wasted considerable talents and neglected the highest duties in the pursuit of pleasure. Early on in *Clarissa*, when Lovelace's specious charms still mask the blackness of his heart, the heroine reports that 'He has too great a stake in his Country, he says, to be guilty of such enterprizes as should lay him under a necessity of quitting it for ever' (VII. 111-12). When the full extent of his villainy is known, however, Belford reads a long lecture on libertinism as a violation of familial and social responsibilities (VIII. 140-8), and Clarissa's own conclusion about her undoer is:

> Poor wretch! I pity him, to see him fluttering about; abusing talents that were given him for excellent purposes; taking inconsideration for courage; and dancing, fearless of danger, on the edge of a precipice! (X. 459)

There is more of the same in the continuation of *Pamela*, and of course *Sir Charles Grandison* is one long paean to the virtues of the rake's antitype, the model squire. A recognition of Richardson's views on the dangerous social consequences of rakery may well serve to explain the undisguised conservatism of *Pamela* II and *Grandison*, which critics have found anomalous and unpalatable.
This feeling of critical distaste over Pamela's rapid absorption into the ruling class, and over Grandison's celebration of static social virtues is largely attributable to the desire to make Pamela and Clarissa revolutionaries before their time. It is undeniable that Pamela espouses the orthodox Christian view that all men are fundamentally equal and that rank is an artificial distinction (II. 22, IV. 305), but while all such distinctions will be levelled in the grave, she still recognises the temporal necessity of a social hierarchy (II. 23). It is left to Pamela not to overturn and supplant the established order, but of course to renovate and reinvigorate it. Thus the chapel of B. Hall is, at the new Mrs B.'s direction, cleared of the lumber that has cluttered it for two generations, and restored (II. 48, 86-7, 143); B. is urged to return to his parliamentary responsibilities (III. 104-05); and the quality of the neighbourhood gather round to be instructed and reformed by Pamela's example. When Clarissa asserts her independence with statements such as this,

I flung from him, declaring, that I would be mistress of my own time, and of my own actions, and not be called to account for either (VII. 71)

it must likewise be remembered that this means independence only from Lovelace's demonic parody of social order and control. Clarissa is emphatically not the enemy of marriage that Anna Howe plays at being (VI. 35, 190; VII. 316), and she is always conscious of her duty to her parents. It is true that the Harlowes perse do not represent the standard of parental virtue, being vulgar parvenus (V. 30, 249) and tyrants in their own way, but Clarissa accepts without cavil the theory of a father's dominance: 'God forbid,' she says, 'that I should ever think myself freed
from my Father's *reasonable controul* ...' (VI. 251). This explains, I think, the presence of the heroine's microcosmic ideal estate, her 'Dairy-house' (V. 6), within the grounds of her father's more debased version of the paradigmatic domain. If, like Pamela, Clarissa expresses levelling sentiments (V. 49, 90), it is not because she is anachronistically a progressive socialist, just as she is not a separatist feminist (if Richardson had been a feminist, he would surely have shown some sympathy for Mother Sinclair and her whores for being forced into a life of vice by oppressive male sexuality — they receive nothing but castigation and condemnation), but rather, as John Carroll observes, a 'radical Christian conservative.'\(^{11}\) Let us not forget Richardson's early rabid Whartonian Toryism, his snobbery, and the strain of reactionary 'True-born Englishman' or even 'True Patriot' thinking that runs through his writing. B. is the scion of a pre-Conquest family ('Old English Liberty'; II. 20-1, III. 307) and a modern-day independent in Parliament (III. 172-3); and Grandison for his part is the reviver of good old English manners (XIII. 207, XIV. 52, XVIII. 34).\(^{12}\) The character of Lovelace, then, cannot be Richardson's indictment of patriarchy, as more than one critic has unfortunately suggested,\(^{13}\) but rather of the abuse and lamentable decline of it -- things as they are, but not as they were and still should be.

Otherwise, Richardson's highly conventional rakes are utterly inexplicable, morally worthless and artistically gratuitous. But Richardson's libertines are, of course, none of these things, precisely because they are consistently presented in terms of their threat to the social fabric, as has been suggested in the preceding paragraphs. And as Chapter Two has attempted to demonstrate, such an understanding of rakishness was a full-fledged *topos* of moralists and novelists.
throughout the eighteenth century. Richardson’s rakish characters are conventional in other ways too, for they conform to a greater degree than their counterparts in Fielding and Smollett to the eighteenth-century definition of the quintessential libertine, which would seem to support the view that Richardson is a conventional and traditional moralist, and belie his more recent image as the herald of socialism and Deconstruction. In the section that follows, I would like to suggest how closely his libertine characters conform to the taxonomy of the classic rake in Chapter Two. I should also like to point out where Richardson, in this particular strangely like Fielding, is at pains to show how his rakes differ from the standard. He does this in order to excuse (but not ultimately to reform) them, or, in the case of Lovelace, to complicate the reader’s response to a character who combines deceptive virtues and the blackest vices. I shall conclude with Richardson's apparent conclusions about the possibility of reforming and saving the rake, which are not surprisingly much more pessimistic than Fielding’s sanguine expectations of human good nature.

What is interesting from the point of view of this study in the early pages of *Pamela* is the assumption on the part of the Andrewses that their daughter is almost certain to be ‘ruined and undone’ (I. 5) now that she is in the hands of ‘a fine Gentleman’ (I. 12). At first, Pamela cannot believe that this is possible (I. 10-11), but soon recognises her master as yet another exponent of an all too common type:

He may condescend, may-hap, to think I may be good enough for his Harlot; and those Things don’t disgrace Men, that ruin poor Women, as the World goes. And so, if I was wicked enough he would keep me till I was undone, and till his Mind changed; for even wicked Men, I have read, soon grow weary of Wickedness, and love *Variety*. Well then, poor Pamela must be turn’d
off, and look'd upon as a vile abandon'd Creature, and every body would despise her ....  

The fact that Pamela's knowledge of the libertine is based on what she has read is very important too, for it is Richardson's way of placing his own novel in relation to other fiction and, more specifically, other accounts of rakish behaviour. He is at once invoking the received portrait of the rake, and implying that there are important differences between the libertine heroes of other novelists like Manley and Haywood, and his own moral of virtue rewarded and vice redirected. When Mr B. has grandiosely likened himself to Tarquin, Pamela wonders,

After such Offers, such Threatenings, and his comparing himself to a wicked Ravisher in the very Time of his last Offer; and turning it into a Jest, that we should make a pretty Story in Romance; can I stay, and be safe? (L. 41-2)

B. himself admits to generic expectations when he asks to see the journal of Pamela's captivity:

But you will greatly oblige me, to shew me voluntarily what you have written. I long to see the Particulars of your Plot, and your Disappointment, where your Papers leave off. For you have so beautiful a Manner, that it is partly that, and partly my Love for you, that has made me desirous of reading all you write; tho' a great deal of it is against myself: for which you must expect to suffer a little. And as I have furnish'd you with a Subject, I have a Title to see the Fruits of your Pen. -- Besides, said he, there is such a pretty Air of Romance, as you relate them, in your Plots, and my Plots, that I shall be better directed in what manner to wind up the Catastrophe of the pretty Novel. (I. 316-17)

Once established in high life, Pamela criticises what one is surely justified by this stage to call 'rake fiction', and inveighs against the heroines of 'those pernicious
Writings, which not seldom make them fall a Sacrifice to the base designs of some vile Intriguer ...' (IV. 420; also I. 46, 125 and II. 5).

B. is therefore given all the attributes of the rake as understood by the Tatler and Spectator, by Davys, Swift, Johnson and even Fielding. He is an Etonian and possibly a Templar, a Grand Tourist of wide experience, a duellist, has a gang of rakish companions who are uproarious although too tame and rustic to be proper Mohocks, is a professed marriage-hater until Pamela works her magic, is a far from regular churchman (if not a downright atheist), and was dangerously indulged as a boy.16 As B. tells Parson Williams

\[\text{We Fellows of Fortune, Mr. }\text{Williams, take a little more Liberty with the World than we ought to do; wantoning, very probably, as you contemplative Folks would say, in the Sun-beams of a dangerous Affluence; and cannot think of confining ourselves to the common Paths, tho' the safest and most eligible after all. (II. 56)}\]

Pamela calls all of this 'those Crimes, of which young Gentlemen too often are guilty ...' (IV. 46).17

Richardson's B. is, at the same time, unshakably Fielding's Booby in many ways.18 Mr B. makes the claim that he has never undressed a girl in his life (I. 321; cf Lovelace's expertise, VII. 27), but this is either a fib of his or a slip of Richardson's if the Sally Godfrey episode is to be explained, and the accusations of Lady Davers about his other 'credulous Harlots' to be believed (II. 209, 199 and III. 191). This aside, B. has a hard time maintaining his character of 'a Gentleman of Pleasure and Intrigue' (I. 119). His attempts to take liberties with Pamela's person are notoriously feeble; on two occasions he appears in more than faintly ridiculous drag (I. 75-81, 277), needs Mrs Jewkes to pinion Pamela to the bed (I. 276, 278), and
fails to take advantage of his victim's fainting spell to finish the deed (I. 280-1). Clearly no accomplish'd rake, and Lady Davers is not far from the truth when she worries that her brother may be more of a fool than a knave (II. 252; also I. 287).

Considerably more subtle is the characterisation of Robert Lovelace, but even if he is more rounded and compelling than the flat and, it must be said, rather boobyish Mr B, he is nevertheless in many respects the stereotypical rake. A number of studies have shown Richardson's use of seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century verse and drama (mainly tragedies) to supply a context of literary and historical rakishness, and Lovelace himself names Mandeville as an apostle of the rake's creed: 'At worst, I am entirely within my worthy friend Mandeville's assertion, That private Vices are public Benefits' (IX. 240). The Harlowes, and later Anna Howe, recognise him as the genuine, despicable article, as indicated by their long litany of 'Libertine' and 'Vile Libertine,' and Lovelace has much of also followed the classic career (V. 7, 14, 24). Like Tom Rakewell in Hogarth's Progress, he even becomes towards the end of his life 'Mad as any man ever was in Bedlam' (XI. 465). He is himself fully aware of his character, and his love of 'the joys of the chase, and in pursuing a winding game ...' (VII. 78). Conscious of the libertine tradition and of making a place for himself within it, Lovelace cites both 'the Rakes [sic] Creed' (VII. 85; also VII. 94, 120 and VIII. 187) and 'Rakish annals' (VIII. 19, also 266). This sense of antecedents and of ethos is not only Lovelace's, for, like Pamela, Clarissa seems to know about rakes from her reading. Lovelace observes to his libertine friends Belford, Mowbray, Belton and Tourville, This dear Lady is prodigiously learned in
Theories. But as to Practics, as to Experimental, must be, as you know from her tender years, a mere novice. Till she knew me, I dare say, she did not believe, whatever she had read, that there were such fellows in the world, as she will see in you four. (VII. 353)²⁴

Also typically rakish is Lovelace's professed aversion to marriage, mentioned in a number of places in the novel, but nowhere so fully as in IX. 289-96, where he makes libertine witticisms on the marriage licence he obtains (but, one suspects, never really intends to use), and rather Mandevillean proposals for annual marriages. He also advocates polygamy.²⁵ Critics like Watt and Eagleton have tended to regard Clarissa in a vacuum, as unique and, like Minerva, born fully formed and independent; but since Margaret Anne Doody's A Natural Passion (1974), Richardson's debt to the literature, including the novels, of his own and earlier days has been recognised.²⁶ Samuel Johnson observed that the plot of Clarissa was 'formed on the stalest of all empty Stories ...',²⁷ and excellent evidence for this is to be found in the novel itself, where not just the conventionality of the rakery is apparent, but its very triteness is noted by the actors in the drama. In trying to excuse his anti-matrimonial prejudice to Clarissa, Lovelace cunningly admits that it is

so trite, so beaten a topic with all Libertines and Wittings; so frothy, so empty, so nothing-meaning, so worn-out a theme, that he is heartily ashamed of himself, ever to have made it his. (VI. 190)

Lovelace's various contrivances (like his interception and forgery of letters, his disguise at Hampstead, the ipecacuanha feint, the whores passed off as his female relations, the opiate that renders Clarissa insensible) are called 'unprecedented vile
arts' at one point (X. 386), but only owing to naïvety; his ipecacuanha-induced 'illness' he calls 'a trick of three or four thousand years old' (VIII. 280), and in considering possible devices rejects the 'proferred aids' of Mrs Sinclair's girls as 'trite and vulgar artifices' (VIII. 282). He does, however, consider laudanum (presumably what is put in the tea and small beer administered to Clarissa prior to the rape; X. 162, 185-90) something of a new twist on wine, the more usual intoxicant. He answers Belford's objections by saying,

Then, as to the worst part of my treatment of this Lady -- How many men are there, who, as well as I, have sought, by intoxicating liquors, first to inebriate, then to subdue? What signifies what the potations were, when the same end was in view? (XI. 3)

But earlier he has observed,

is not Wine itself an opiate in degree? -- How many women have been taken advantage of by wine, and other still more intoxicating viands? -- Let me tell thee, Jack, that the experience of many of the passive Sex, and the consciences of many more of the active, appealed to, will testify that thy Lovelace is not the worst of villains. Nor would I have thee put me upon clearing myself by comparisons (IX. 340; also X. 364)

-- and in any case, there are the actual fictional precedents in Davys's Accomplish'd Rake and other forerunners of Clarissa, where the heroines are not merely ravished, but also drugged beforehand.28 When Belford is attempting to anger Lovelace and shame him into repentance for his shocking treatment of Clarissa, he does so by pointing out the unoriginality of the act, in order to pique his friend's pride in his own invention:

I should be ready to censure some of thy contrivances and pretences to suspend the expected day, as trite,
stale, and (to me, who know thy invention) poor;
and too often resorted to, as nothing comes of them
to be gloried in; particularly that of Mennell, the
vapourish Lady, and the ready-furnished House. (VIII. 370)

It seems more than probable, too, that Richardson relies upon his reader's recog-
nition that Lovelace's contrivances and Clarissa's undoing are the stuff of the
worst sort of the 'inflaming' pulp fiction he so deplored, here reworked for the
highest moral and religious purposes. This accounts for the passage in the 'Post-
script' where Richardson hopes that

in an age given up to diversion and entertainment
he could steal in, as may be said, and investigate
the great doctrines of Christianity under the
fashionable guise of an amusement; he should be
most likely to serve his purpose.... (XII. 308)

The only way to combat the pernicious morals of fictional trash, then, is to
adopt their outward forms and 'pervert' their moral aims in the cause of virtue.
When Lovelace's brother rake Mowbray considers the rape of Clarissa, he com-
pares it to an unquestionably trite, stale and poor variety of the same tale, and
Richardson no doubt expects us, having followed the allusive build-up of the
novel for so many volumes, to recognise how close Lovelace is to the meanest
common or garden rapist -- and how much worse. Mowbray writes to Belford,

You, or I, or Tourville, in his shoes, would have done
as he has done. Are not all the girls forewarned? --
"Has he done by her as that Caitiff Miles did to the
farmer's daughter, whom he tricked up to town (a
pretty girl also, just such another as Bob's Rosebud!)
under a notion of waiting on a Lady? -- Drill'd her
on, pretending the Lady was abroad. Drank her
light-hearted; then carried her to a Play; then it was
too late, you know, to see the pretended Lady: Then
to a Bagnio: Ruined her, as they call it, and all the
same day. Kept her on (an ugly dog too!) a fortnight
or three weeks; then left her to the mercy of the
people of the Bagnio (never paying for any-thing);
who stript her of all her cloaths, and because she
would not take on, threw her into prison; where she
died in want, and in despair" -- A true story, thou
knowest, Jack -- This fellow deserved to be damned.
But has our Bob been such a villain as this? -- And
would he not have married this flinty-hearted Lady?
-- So he is justified very evidently. (XII. 45)

The truth is, of course, that the details of caitiff Miles's story parallel that of Love-
lace and Clarissa quite closely, and the main difference, that Clarissa is a lady of
birth and fortune and not some country wench, makes Lovelace not only 'such a
villain' as Miles, but rather far worse. It is surely intended that the reader answer
a firm 'yes' to the first of Mowbray's questions at the end of the passage, and an
equally firm 'no' to the second (and see below, 157), and that he deny Lovelace's
justification altogether.29

The novel often works in this way, frequently inviting the reader to see the
insincerity of rakish professions, or, as with the example of Mowbray on Miles, to
recognise the insufficiency, the fallacy, the wickedness of all the old clichés that
have hitherto allowed libertines to prosper in iniquity because a blind eye has been
turned on their exploits. This is also why Richardson gives us so much of the
inner life of Lovelace through his extraordinary letters: we are to see the cruelty,
the anguish and ultimately the madness that lie beneath a surface that is hand-
some, witty and charming, and might on its own delude the reader as Clarissa is
deluded. The most important of the palliating commonplaces about libertinism
that Richardson wishes to explode is 'that dangerous but too commonly-received
notion, That a reformed Rake makes the best Husband ..' (V. xv).30 Clarissa's
virtue demolishes the validity of the Rake's Creed, and its assumptions about
women's powerlessness to resist a rake. Platitudes are mouthed about the sowing of wild oats and the power of matrimony to reclaim a libertine (and Lord M. might even be said to personify false and shallow sententiousness, with his tiresome 'bead-roll of proverbs' (IX. 113, 253-60), but these are debunked by the horrifying death-bed despair of Belton and the exit of Lovelace himself, ambiguous at best, and at worst very dark. (I incline towards the latter view, for reasons that will be made plain in my discussion of reformability in Richardson.)

Sudden deaths and hardened hearts also contradict the excuse for libertinism that is suggested by various characters, and which could be drawn from Haywood's *Life's Progress through the Passions* or the anonymous *History of the Human Heart* discussed in Chapter Two. This willingness to overlook rakishness as merely 'a youthful frolick' (VII. 249) or 'the violence of a youthful passion' (IX. 197) is well expressed by Anthony Harlowe early in the novel, before he has changed his mind about Clarissa's suitor:

> Nor did it appear, that he was so bad a man as he had been represented to be: Wild indeed; but it was at a gay time of life[,] He was a man of sense: And he was sure that his Niece would not have him, if she had not good reason to think him reformed, or that there was a likelihood that she could reform him by her example. (V. 81-2)

Clearly not even Clarissa's example can reform a man as bad as Lovelace, and Richardson thereby wishes to show that 'Marriage, and the Wife's discretion' are hardly to be expected to 'perform wonders' (V. 338) in ordinary cases, when they are insufficient even in Clarissa's. Although Clarissa is at first drawn to Love-lace (whatever distinction Richardson quibbles about between 'Liking' and 'Love'),
and although Anna for a long time admits the attractiveness of a rake over a sober man like Hickman (VI. 7, 137), Clarissa's fate demonstrates how wrong it is to give any preference or encouragement to a free-liver. It is eventually only Lovelace who can claim that women love a rake because he is a Rake; and for no other reason... (VIII. 348). Not even Anna will agree with him in the end (X. 452).

The conclusion that Richardson seeks to lead one to about the standard palliations of rakery -- that it is a stage one grows out of, that it is harmless good fun (IX. 1, 218), that women prefer it in a man, that a reformed rake makes the best husband -- is that they are insincere in the first place (Lord M. is really vastly amused by Lovelace's rogueries; X. 216), and that they represent a truly reprehensible moral levity and laxity:

There are so many wretches who think that to be no sin, which is one of the greatest and most ingrateful of all sins, to ruin young creatures of our Sex who place their confidence in them; that the wonder is less than the shame, that people of figure, of appearance at least, are found to promote the horrid purposes of profligates of fortune and interest! (IX. 38)

Here, through Anna Howe, Richardson castigates the urbane, amused and cynical tolerance of libertinism from the Restoration onwards, which every writer of secret histories of court intrigue tried to emulate, and which, Richardson must surely have thought, received fresh impetus with the publication of Tom Jones in 1749, less than a year after the final volume of Clarissa. Richardson's moral outrage at Tom Jones's run-away success (no doubt tinged with professional jealousy) are well known.36

There is one final aspect of the standard rakishness of Lovelace that needs
to be examined before I consider the divergence of Richardson's libertines from the norm (and the implications of this concerning character and reformability). I would like to suggest glosses on Lovelace's imperial pretensions and on his rakish club that would identify him more closely with the historic libertine past. His declarations of lawlessness ('The Law was not made for such a man as me' (VIII. 45) and the like\(^{37}\)) are complemented by his habit of setting himself up as an autocrat, usurping the titles of General, Prince, Grand Signor, King and Emperor,\(^{38}\) and ally him generally with the rakish tradition of contempt for law and order. (And one might also cite the number of times he compares himself or is compared to specific monarchs, especially Tarquin and Herod.\(^{39}\)) The Turkish and imperial assumed titles are of my present purposes the most interesting. Lovelace finds sultans appealing because of their inevitable associations with seraglios, and it is just possible that Richardson alludes to the tradition of English interest in Turkey and polygamy that inspired the harem-keeping 7th Lord Baltimore and the Divan, a reasonably rakish dining society that aped Eastern costume.\(^{40}\) This is pure conjecture on my part, but the association of the Turkish with the libertine and the luscious had long been 'in the air'. There is a little more justification for supposing that when Lovelace is imperially styled, the associations are not simply Roman or vaguely oriental, but Mohockish; the leader of those rakes called himself 'Emperor' as well (see *Spectator* 347, and Chapter Two). Not only this, but Clarissa calls Lovelace 'a wild Indian' at one point (VII. 163) and later 'a savage' (VIII. 338). It is true that there are no window-breaking or Watch-beating episodes in the novel, but Lovelace does ask this Mohockish question:

\[
\text{Have we not defied the Civil Magistrate upon occasion?}
\]
And have we not attempted rescues, and dared all things, only to extricate a pounded profligate? (X.7)

-- and Lovelace, to Belford's delight (X.316), turns his mental agony after the rape into a physical punishment worthy of the Mohocks:

Already I can fancy, that to pink my body like my mind, I need only to be put into hogshead stuck full of steel-pointed spikes, and rolled down a hill three times as high as the Monument. (X.306)

A Mohock dimension is thus a possibility, especially when one remembers that nicking and scouring were staples of rake fiction right to the end of the century. One might keep this sort of activity, if not specifically the group who made it newsworthy in the four last years of Queen Anne, when one reads Anna Howe's comment that Lovelace is

the most villainous enterpriser in the world, who has always a gang of fellows, such as himself, at his call, ready to support one another in the vilest outrages. (IX.270)

I confess that I am not entirely convinced that Richardson did have the Mohocks specifically in mind, but it is not impossible. There can be little doubt, however, that he was thinking of Hell-Fire clubs when he provided Lovelace with his troop of subordinate libertines. One of the years that tallies with the precise and consistent dates of the letters in Clarissa is 1721, and it might be no coincidence that this is the year when rampant Hell-Fire paranoia is first recorded. Lovelace is not only 'the Prince and Leader of such a Confraternity as ours!' (VII.60-1) -- clearly a reference to rakish societies of one sort or another -- but also, according to Anna howe, one of 'a set of Infernals, and he the Beelzebub' (VII.374) -- undeniably
Hell-Fiery. He and his 'brother valets' are said to be 'casting about town firebrands and double death' (VIII. 20), and his injunction of libertine solidarity and secrecy to Belford, the word 'CABALA', may well be intended to conjure up images of mystery and black magic. There is also the increasing association of Lovelace with the Devil throughout the novel, but these references, while related to the Hell-Fire allusions, are also general, moral and religious, and without specific historical connotations. Carol Flynn has suggested that Lovelace's comments on Belford's 'Reformation humour' have Sir Francis Dashwood and the 'Monks of Medmenham' in mind:

Let me improve upon the thought, and imagine that, turned Hermits, we have opened the two old Caves at Homsey, or dug new ones; and in each of our Cells set up a death's head, and an hour-glass, for objects of contemplation -- I have seen such a picture: But then, Jack, had not the penitent fornicator a suffocating long grey beard? What figures would a couple of brocaded or laced-waist-coated toupets make with their sour screw'd up half-cock'd faces, and more than half shut eyes, in a kneeling attitude, recapitulating their respective rogueries? This scheme, were we only to make a trial of it, and return afterwards, might serve to better purpose by far, than Horner's in the Country Wife, to bring pretty wenches to us. (XI. 18-19)

There is, however, the slight problem of the historicity of Dashwood's monkish excesses, as I have mentioned earlier, but Richardson could just as easily be alluding to the gossip, rumour and fabrication that attended Sir Francis about his leisure activities. An additional difficulty arises with the Hell-Fire theory, but it is not an insurmountable one; and it will serve as an introduction to the next section of this
chapter, which will deal with Richardson's conception of the reformability of character, and rakish character in particular, based on innate good nature and the extent of the individual's falling short of complete moral degeneracy. But the Hell-Fire difficulty first. Part of the stereotype of the rake, and especially of the Hell-Fire variety as popularly perceived, is atheism and blasphemy, but Richardson rather oddly insists that the charge of irreligion cannot be levelled against Lovelace or his friends. In the 'Preface', it is noted that

here it will be proper to observe, for the sake of such as may apprehend hurt to the morals of Youth, from the more freely written Letters, that the Gentlemen, tho' professed Libertines as to the Female Sex, and making it one of their wicked maxims, to keep no faith with any of the individuals of it, who are thrown into their power, are not, however, either Infidels or Scoffers; nor yet such as think themselves freed from the observance of those other moral duties which bind man to man.

On the contrary, it will be found, in the progress of the Work, that they very often make such reflections upon each other, and each upon himself and his own actions, as reasonable beings must make, who disbelieve not a Future State of Rewards and Punishments... (V. xii)

It is true enough that Lovelace and Belford do profess basic Christian beliefs on a number of occasions, though Lovelace's confessions of faith are often made to Clarissa, and should not therefore be credited too easily (e.g. VII. 120 and possibly XII. 139). It is also suggested by Clarissa that Lovelace's actions, which turn out to be as premeditatedly bad as she fears, may amount to irreligion:

If his pretences to reformation are but pretences, what must be his intent? But can the heart of man be so very vile? Can he, dare he, mock the Almighty? (VII. 139)
After the rape she answers her own question when she cries, 'Heaven not less pro­
faned and defied by him, than myself deceived and abused!' (X. 194). She was cor­
rect earlier on to have doubts about Lovelace, about the fact

That allowing, as he does, the excellency of Moral
Precepts, and believing the doctrine of future Re­
wards and Punishments, he can live as if he des­
pised the one, and defied the other ... (V. 294)

Lovelace admits as much when he says to Belford that they are 'not Atheists, ex­
cept in Practice ...' (X. 106). Later, Lovelace jokes that he is not a blasphemer, out
of 'Civil Policy at least' (XI. 9; also 8-10), and much of his conduct and conversation
is effectively, if not always avowedly blasphemous, irreligious, anti-clerical or free-
thinking. And it is very difficult to interpret the following editorial periphrasis
in terms of anything but outright blasphemy:

*Here Mr. Lovelace lays himself under a curse,
too shocking to be repeated, if he revenge not himself
upon the Lady, should he once more get her into his
hands.* (IX. 27)

Either he damns himself (but Richardson is elsewhere willing to write this, with
'damn' written 'd-n'; VII. 188 and VIII. 116), or abjures God in some other, more
scandalous way. It is also worth taking into consideration the number of times
Clarissa is called 'goddess', 'angel' or 'saint' by her lover. His pseudo-religious
metaphors for her are more than just unmeaning rhetorical flourishes, for in an
interesting way Lovelace transfers worship of the Deity to Clarissa, accusing any-
one of blasphemy who does not acknowledge her superiority or accord her proper
respect (VII. 339), and worshipping her in church (VII. 355-6). On their own, such instances might not be important enough to consider as more than mere rakish prattle, but the death of Lovelace makes it clear that the novelist intends levity of language and playfully or semi-seriously misdirected devotion to stand for a real abandonment of Faith with the gravest spiritual significance. According to Lovelace's French travelling valet De la Tour, Colonel Morden wounds him mortally and begs, 'with the piety of a confessor, (wringing Mr. Lovelace's hand) snatch these few fleeting moments and commend yourself to God' (XII. 275-6). Lovelace calls on the dead Clarissa instead, in terms that seem to put her in the redemptive rôle of Christ (which, admittedly, the description of her Christlike sufferings has prepared one for):

He was delirious at times, in the two last hours; and then several times cried out, as if he had seen some frightful Spectre, Take her away! Take her away! but named nobody. And sometimes praised some Lady (that Clarissa, I suppose, whom he had invoked when he received his death's wound) calling her, Sweet Excellence! Divine Creature! Fair Sufferer! -- And once he said, Look down! -- And there stopt; his lips however moving. (XII. 276)

De la Tour continues, 'Blessed' -- said he, addressing himself no doubt to Heaven; for his eyes were lifted up ...' (XII. 276), but it is obvious that Lovelace is praying to Clarissa, his 'goddess', and not to God. It is hardly surprising, then, that Richardson felt obliged to defend his portrayal of Lovelace as a true believer, for there are, as we have seen, good grounds for supposing him in reality a kind of crypto-blasphemer. In material added to the 'Postscript' in the third and subsequent editions of the novel, Richardson addresses the issue:
It has been thought by some worthy and ingenious persons, that if Lovelace had been drawn an Infidel or Scoffer, his Character, according to the present worse than Sceptical Age, would have been more natural. (XII. 321)

Richardson fudges in admitting that he has drawn 'an Infidel only in Practice'; as Clarissa has pointed out, practice amounts to precept (VII. 139), and it is only by actions, not professions, that people are to be judged (V. 269). He goes on to argue that Lovelace's 'temporary Compunction' and 'frequent Remorses' are plausible only if he is something of a believer, and that by making Lovelace blameless in at least this one particular, he renders it impossible for any truly impious rake to make excuses that he is not as bad as a Lovelace (XII. 322). The main reason, of course, though Richardson tries to wriggle out of saying it, is that Clarissa, whose great Objection to Mr. Wyerley was, that he was a Scoffer, must have been inexcuseable had she known Lovelace to be so, and had given the least attention to his Addresses. (XII. 322)

Richardson's own pudicr comes into it too ('a curse, too shocking to be repeated'), but in the end he manages with quite Fieldingsque ingenuity, as with the designedly unspecific account of the rape, to make Lovelace every inch a rake if one is observant enough to pick up the clues, but without appearing to countenance libertinism by describing it fully,

which is not always to be found in the works of some of the most celebrated modern Writers, whose subjects and characters have less warranted the liberties they have taken. (V. xiii)

Now this brings me to the question of the good qualities in Lovelace, and in Mr B, that, like religious scruples in the profligates of Clarissa, mitigate the worst
aspects of libertinism. This will ultimately lead to an examination of what is necessary not simply to qualify or ameliorate rakish behaviour, but also what are the minimum requirements for actual reformation and redemption. In *Clarissa*, Lovelace differentiates himself from mere 'reptile Rakes' (IX. 164), later claiming that he has not availed himself of the excuses that 'more diminutive-minded Libertines' would use to extenuate their crimes (XI. 68). In some ways this is true enough, for Lovelace undeniably possesses an heroic grandeur that Mr B. or Everard Grandison could never even aspire to. In the first part of *Clarissa*, Richardson makes the reader aware that the long train of the Harlowes' abuse, especially that of the slighted and envious Arabella, is, as Lovelace claims, spiteful slander. He maintains to Clarissa that his vices and crimes 'were far less enormous than malice and envy had made them out to be' (V. 264). The author himself points out Lovelace's commendable 'decency, as well in his images, as in his language' (V. xiii), and in the early letters of the novel we are acquainted with Lovelace's generosity, judgment, taste, wit, physical attractiveness, reasonably good financial management, and the like. As Lovelace's vices are revealed, however, he is presented increasingly in terms of 'negative virtues' (V. 290) rather than positive qualities -- that is, he is no gamester, no horse-racer, no hunter, drunkard, keeper, niggard, spendthrift, blasphemer (V. 24, 264-5, 290-2). As things progress, his wickedness and evil deeds grow more glaring, his good qualities more insignificant, his professions of virtue and repentance more and more obviously hypocritical. What once seemed a generous and laudable action, like the sparing of Rosebud from ruin (V. 250-3), is revealed in a later editorial note for what it really is: the appearance of virtue out of low policy, and the gratification of pride (VIII.)
When Lovelace tells his agent and dupe Joseph Leman that he is not as awful as his enemies make out, and that in all his amours he has maintained a strict code of ethics, it seems merely callous and brutal, a point Richardson sought to drive home in his second- and third- edition additions, which draw out the interchange between master and servant, turning brief editorial paraphrase into more extensive verbatim 'transcription' (VII. 249-57). By the end of the novel, when Clarissa has been raped, arrested and held in the spunging-house, and brought to her death, one's opinion of Lovelace has undergone another transition, for ironically he is in every respect the vile libertine and sordid wretch that the Harlowes said he was, although part of the power of the tragedy is that, with the heroine, the reader also recognises the archangel blasted and the glory obscured, very much after the manner of Milton's Lucifer (IX. 124). It is a measure of Richardson's genius that Lovelace comes across as human as well as wicked, and that the reader, while benefiting from sporadic 'editorial' comment and a certain privileged objectivity, is at the same time taken in by him in much the same way as is Clarissa — fooled by his specious charms, by his wit and flattery, gradually more suspicious (e.g. VII. 370-1), and then bitterly disabused of all (or rather most) prepossession in his favour by the awful truth of rape, arrest and death. He is, in short, for all his humanity, and in spite of Lord M.'s wish to the contrary, 'quite as black as he is painted' (X. 251). The strategy is brilliant, and strangely reminiscent of Fielding's use of mixed virtues and vices in *Tom Jones*; but where Jones is open and straightforward, Lovelace is 'a perfect Proteus, 'more variable than the chameleon' (VII. 153-4; also XI. 210), and what serves to excuse Tom's peccadilloes is in Lovelace's case not only vastly insufficient to allow any extenuation, but in
addition actually has the curious and dazzling effect of making his crimes seem all the worse. 63

The approach Richardson takes in *Pamela* is in fact much closer to Fielding's practice in *Tom Jones*, although in Mr B.'s case the effect is rather crude and largely unsuccessful. B. comes very close (dangerously close from Richardson's point of view, one would have thought) to sounding like *Tom Jones*, XVIII. x in the opening part of his speech to Pamela:

> You know I am not a very abandon'd Profligate: I have hitherto been guilty of no very enormous or vile Actions. This of seizing you, and confining you thus, may, perhaps, be one of the worst, at least to Persons of real Innocence. Had I been utterly given up to my Passions, I should before now have gratify'd them, and not have shewn that Remorse and Compassion for you, which have repriev'd you more than once, when absolutely in my Power, and you are as inviolate a Virgin, as you were when you came into my House. (I. 292)

It seems entirely plausible to suggest that Fielding is consciously building on this sort of argument when he proposes his great, useful and uncommon moral doctrine in *Tom Jones*, altering it where he sees fit (Tom would never imprison Molly Seagrim). In a way that Tom never could, however, B. appears in ridiculous situations, and Margaret Doody has argued that these are intentionally comic, calculated to excuse B. by lightening the whole tone of his crimes. 64 But he is said to have better qualities than just his boobyishness: he is the predictable kind landlord (III. 19, IV. 121), he is not a duellist (II. 255, 267), and, though he 'has not deny'd himself any genteel Liberties', according to his sister, 'never was a common Town Rake, and always had Dignity in his Roguery ...' (III. 41; echoed by Pamela, IV. 430; also IV. 32). He apparently indulged in amours while a Grand Tourist, but, he
owns, has had 'very few Sallies, considering my Love of Intrigue, and the ample
Means I had to prosecute successfully all the Desires of my Heart' (III. 191). B. has
criticised others for their designs on servant girls (II. 38) and, from the start it is
said, struggled between obeying his mother's dying injunctions not to ruin Pamela
and his desire to be 'a true Libertine' (III. 205-06; also 199). All of these are signs of
conscience not to be found in utterly abandoned and remorseless profligates. In
the end (but perhaps only then), 'his good Actions go a great way towards atoneing
for his bad' (III. 102), and he may well deserve the epithets by which he is known
at home and abroad: 'The sober Rake', 'The genteel Rake', 'The handsome
Rake' (III. 189). It is possible that B. is merely trying to act the part of the rake,
reducing his reformation to inability to belie his own innate goodness, but the
lengths Richardson goes to in providing him with a classic libertine's CV suggest
otherwise -- that B.'s inadequacy as a rake is partly the author's fault. What then is
to be made of B.'s early affair with and child by Sally Godfrey, which threatens to
cause problems towards the end of Part One of Pamela (but in the end does not),
and of the business of the young Dowager Countess who poses a greater danger to
the Bs' marriage in Part Two? We know already that B. is not a keeper of mis-
tresses (II. 276-81) when the question of Sally Godfrey arises, and once it does, there
are a number of extenuating circumstances. B. neither seduced nor raped Sally, but
was lured into an intimacy with her by her scheming and ambitious mother (II.
335-6), and he is moved by Sally's plight from the very beginning (II. 340-1). More
importantly, forgiving B, 'the dear, once naughty Assailer of her Innocence' (II.
145), is less of an issue for Pamela than ensuring that the bastard daughter is well
provided for (II. 330-45). The fact that the Godfrey case is brought up after B.'s re-
pentance and reformation, when it can be no obstacle, at least from an artistic point of view, suggests that in a somewhat peculiar way the whole thing is designed to demonstrate that Pamela is unflappable and all-forgiving, rather than to show that B. is not thoroughly wicked. As for question of the young widowed Countess in *Pamela II*, B. appears to be 'innocent as to Deed' (IV. 196), and it turns out that the extent of his commerce with her and his further intentions have been slanderously exaggerated by one Turner, a jealous former lover of the lady's (IV. 189, 293). The Countess has made arguments for polygamy (IV. 156-7), but B. declares when it is all over,

As to the Notion of *Polygamy*, I never, but in the Levity of Speech, and the Wantonness of Argument, like other young fellows, who think they have Wit to shew, when they advance something out of the common way, had it in my Head. I thought myself doubly bound by the Laws of my Country, to discourage that way of Thinking as I was a Five hundredth Part of one of the Branches of the Legislature; and inconsiderable as that is, yet it makes one too considerable, in my Opinion, to break those Laws, one should rather join all one's Interest to inforce. (IV. 217)

In another explanation after the fact, the Countess tells her story, acknowledging blame and thereby deflecting it from B. (IV. 289-95, especially 290-1). One is not unjustified in finding all of this rather feeble, although B.'s relapse is perhaps more convincing than his initial conversion, and is easily the most interesting episode in Part Two. (The continuation of Pamela's history is not, incidentally, the pointless and tiresome sequel that most critics make it out to be, not much of a novel either, but important for its idea content and commentary on Part One, as we shall see.) Many of the other excuses for B.'s character and conduct are weak too, in that they are most often made in *Pamela II* -- as after-thoughts, or even as last-
ditch attempts to defend the unrealistic. B.'s claim about never having undressed a girl has been dealt with earlier, but surely no one believes him when he worries in Part Two that Pamela and Mrs Jervis will think his hiding in the closet is evidence of 'an Attempt of the worst Kind', and claims, 'really I had no such Intentions as they feared' (III. 210). He continues,

as to a form'd Intention to hide myself in the Closet, in order to attempt the Girl by Violence, and in the Presence of a good Woman, as Mrs. Jervis is, which you impute to me, indeed, bad as I was, I was not so vile, so abandon'd as that. (III. 211)

What else, then? The naïve Pamela does exaggerate in Part One, but B. is never anything less than a would-be rapist, if an inept one. B. is at first a professed marriage-hater (I. 261, II. 162), a rapid convert to matrimony and then an instant expert on the subject (II. 256, 285f.), and in spite of Sally Godfrey and the Dowager Countess 'the best of Gentlemen, and of Husbands' (IV. 287) by the end of Part Two. The result is a suspicion that there is no single B., although some good critics have attempted to demonstrate that there is real unity and plausible development in his characterisation. Richardson's ignorance of high life, save through reading and hearsay, is probably also revealed. It is possible that Lovelace represents something of an admission of the failure of B. as a character of mixed virtue and vice; in Lovelace, the two co-exist only uneasily, and there is an overwhelming preponderance of bad over good, instead of an unlikely equal mixture.

Minor rakes are introduced into Pamela, but, like the Sally Godfrey material, the Dowager Countess of Pamela II and the facts of B.'s Italian duel (II.
only after his conversion -- as though to reinforce the validity of reformation through reiteration -- but *only* then, once conversion has taken place, so as not to complicate or compromise the process of reformation as it happens. The arrival of 'Three mad rakes' (II. 148) *before* B.'s conversion might have urged him on to accomplish the violation of Pamela, or otherwise prevent her redeeming influence from affecting him; but because the mad three appear after Pamela has saved B., he is instead able to resist the invitation to join their 'merry Tour' (II. 150) and says,

> These confounded Rakes are half mad, I think, and will make me so! However, continued he, I have order'd my Chariot to be got ready, as if I was under an Ingagement Five Miles off, and will set them out of the House, if possible; and then ride round, and come back, as soon as I can get rid of them. (II. 149)

Lord Jackey (nephew of Lady Davers, and later called 'Mr. H'; IV. 386, 392) is another minor rakish character who enters once the conversion of B. has safely taken place. Not only is he another after-the-fact (and therefore tamed) rakish element in the story, but he is also, as rakes go, rather pallid. Although he swears and pulls out his sword (half-way, at least) like a Fine Gentleman, he is presented more as a beau than a rake (II. 197, 204, 207, 216); and in the scenes where he and Lady Davers mock Pamela (II. 197-217), Jackey is little more than his aunt's puppyish 'sidekick' (see II. 216, where she tells him to shut up and clear off). But Jackey does have importance beyond adding some foppish comedy to Pamela's trial by Lady Davers, for in *Pamela* II it is reported that
Jackey, ... who was the most thoughtless, whistling, sauntering Fellow you ever knew, and whose Delight in a Book ran no higher than a Song or a Catch, now comes in with an inquiring Face, and vows he'll set Pen to Paper, and turn Letter-writer himself... (III. 55-6)

It is significant, it seems to me, that the emphasis is on letters and reading rather than on the rakish, for the character of Jackey is here designed less to illustrate the libertine than it is to underscore Pamela's wide reforming influence through the medium of her letters and the journal of her captivity. Jackey is later said to have become a ridiculous frenchified coxcomb, in danger of turning papist on the Grand Tour (IV. 386-7), but Pamela still has hopes that he will sober up when he succeeds to his father's title and seat in the House of Lords (IV. 387-8). Jackey's next-to-last appearance in the novel occurs when we hear he has made an imprudent match to the debt-ridden (if nobly born) cast-off mistress of a duke (IV. 392-3), but in the end Mr B. is able to re-establish the fortune that Jackey's wife has spent, and to render Jackey both prudent and happy. The rôle of Jackey here seems to be to serve as proof of B.'s new-found virtue and certain conversion at the hands of Pamela — as elsewhere, as a subordinate reaffirmation and parallel of the main rakish reformation in the novel. Jackey, the 'Brother Rakes' who burst in and Sir Thomas Darnford (an old roué of a neighbour) also fill in more of a libertine context for Mr B.'s behaviour in the first three-quarters of Pamela I (where it is somewhat lacking), but their principal purpose seems simply to be brought into line by Pamela, and made good (II. 179, 350; III. 135-43, 387; IV. 43). In this they are no different, really, from Lady Davers and even the Dowager Countess, who also eventually recognise
and follow Pamela's virtuous example (II. 295ff; IV. 349-50). The minor rakes add little else by way of contrast or parallel to the character of B.; indeed, along with the revelations about his past that are made after the conversion, they merely confuse it by alluding to a libertine world that seems at odds with B. as he is depicted or turns out to be in most of the first part of *Pamela*. This confirms, I think, my suspicion that these minor rakes are intended primarily as further illustrations of the heroine's character and virtue, rather than as instances of the libertine stereotype.

When Richardson next attempted to depict an essentially virtuous character with rakish elements, he was careful to tip the scales so far towards goodness that libertinism is barely present in the equation at all. Sir Charles Grandison has traces of the rake in him, mostly to humanise an otherwise boring paragon, but the narrowness of the limits of his libertinism might also have something to do with the failure of B. (Part Two being in itself a tacit admission that *Pamela* could not on its own merits withstand parody and unauthorised imitation), and with the pessimism of *Clarissa* about the tendency of libertinism. Sir Charles is thus faintly rakish, a blameless heart-breaker (XIII. 277), amiably gallant (XVII. 169), naturally passionate and imperious (or so he insists; XIII. 315, XV. 388, XVI. 400, 413) -- in short, a rake rectified, inasmuch as the ideal gentleman subsumes and corrects all the faults of the Modern Fine Gentleman (XIII. 277-84). According to the frequently cited phrase, Grandison is like 'a decent Rake in his address, and a Saint in his heart' (XVII. 169), though it is worth adding that Harriet Byron, having said this, asks if there might be 'a better word than *Rake*?' In Richardson's 'Conclud-
ing Note' to *Sir Charles Grandison*, he addresses the criticism that the hero 'ap-
proaches too near the faultless character which critics censure as above nature'
(XVIII. 326), but disagrees for reasons that concern us here:

The Editor of the foregoing collection has the 
more readily undertaken to publish it, because he 
thinks Human Nature has often, of late, been shewn 
in a light too degrading; and he hopes from this 
Series of Letters it will be seen, that characters may be 
good, without being unnatural. *Sir Charles Grandison* 
himself is sensible of imperfections, and as the reader 
will remember, accuses himself more than once of 
tendencies to pride and passion, which it required his 
 utmost caution and vigilance to rein in … (XVIII. 326)

Richardson almost certainly has *Tom Jones* in mind when he speaks of degraded 
human nature, but it is striking that both novelists are attempting, in different 
ways and with different conclusions, to reconcile rakishness and stricter probity.

Here the issue of libertinism has very wide implications for the novel as a whole, 
for it is an integral part of the working-out of character in fiction, of the wrestling 
with a notion of mixed character and with the dangerous attractiveness of vice.

Mr B. is Richardson's first effort to cope with the dilemma of trying to make tamed 
rakishness a part of the ideal gentleman; but in *Clarissa* he draws back from such a 
possibility as much in the figure of the odious Solmes as in Lovelace (see XII. 172).

He seems to have doubts about a sort of 'compromise' character who lies between 
these two extremes: Belford is insufficiently realised and rather inconsistent too, at 
first merely a sounding-board for Lovelace, and then a convenient 'white knight' 
for Clarissa when she needs one -- yet fully in the know about Lovelace's wicked-
ness, and Hickman, the butt of Lovelace's and Anna Howe's jokes, is too mealy-
mouthed and pallid to be an appealing or viable alternative. Richardson's un-
willingness to grant Lady Bradshaigh's request for a 'moderate rake' is well
known. 73 Probably with *Tom Jones*’s accommodation of rakishness in mind, he
draws back still farther in *Sir Charles Grandison*, into the realm of the impossible
exemplar. After the claustrophobic horror of *Clarissa*, the expansion and social
reconsolidation of *Grandison* are refreshing, but there are also some gloomier
undercurrents that qualify the optimism about human nature. The abduction of
Harriet by Sir Hargrave Pollexfen is frightening enough (until we learn what a fop
Sir Hargrave is), there is the madness of Clementina della Porretta (whose story is
in some ways a reworking of Clarissa's), and the tangential but related history of
the misfortunes of Mrs Beaumont.74 More than this, the character of Sir Charles
may well suggest that elements of the libertine are admissible only as traces, and
only in the paragon and the prodigy. Although his good influence is wide and in
fact reclaims a number of rakish figures, I suspect the reader probably sympathises
with Kitty Holles, who feels daunted rather than encouraged by the hero: 'we
never, never can think of marrying, after we have seen Sir Charles Grandison, and
his behaviour' (XVII. 400). The slight libertinism of Grandison, then, may not
necessarily imply, as *Pamela* does seem to do, that the rake is redeemable, but that
rakish characteristics can exist safely only in one who seems predestined to do no
wrong.75

This is not to deny that there are reformations in Richardson, for one
might hold up the cases of B, Belford (and to a lesser extent Mowbray and Tour-
ville (XII. 284)), Colonel Morden (XI. 284-5), and, in *Grandison*, of Pollexfen, Gre-
ville, Jeronymo della Porretta, Merceda, Bagenhall, Lord W., and Sir Charles's own
father and cousin Everard. As has been suggested, however, Richardson is by no
means optimistic about reclamation, and his mechanisms for it are never easy and straightforward. There is, first of all, the real danger of relapse, which clouds the sunshine of *Pamela* II, and which also worries Belford (XII. 154-5).\(^7\) Belford regards himself as an exceptional and lucky case (XII. 250-1), and for every one like him, there is a Belton who dies an awful death of impenitence and despair, or a Lovelace, or a rake even worse than that (XII. 322). In *Sir Charles Grandison*, Harriet celebrates her suitor's 'large power, so happily directed!' in the reclamation of rakes and others (XV. 289), and Grandison seems largely successful with Lord W. (XV. 273-4, 363). But Merceda and Bagenhall meet Beltonian ends in spite of all their earlier good resolutions, Greville's reformation is regarded as suspect or impossible, and both Sir Thomas Grandison and Pollexfen reform only on their death-beds -- about the likelihood and efficacy of which, as Doody points out, Richardson was very, very doubtful.\(^7\) Everard's periods of penitence are always fitful and shaky, and instead of constituting true reformation only see him temporarily rescued from scrapes. In the end, Richardson and the Grandison circle more or less give up on him and his low and obviously ill-fated shotgun marriage -- 'No more need be said, than is, of Everard Grandison...'.\(^\) The author does not give up on the possibility of reformation, for his sense of obligation to higher moral and religious purposes will not allow him to, and Mr B. and Belford are still held up as hopeful examples amid the discouraging horde of a thousand wrecks.

The essential qualification for reformation in Richardson seems to come remarkably close to the concept of Good Nature in Fielding, as has been hinted in preceding paragraphs. B.'s conversion comes about because he is not an abandoned profligate, not thoroughly wicked and without principle. *Pamela* tells Lady
Towers that he

never was a common Town-Rake: He is a Gentleman of
Sense, and fine Understanding; and his Reformation,
secondarily, as I may say, has been the natural Effect of
those extraordinary Qualities. But besides, Madam, I will
presume to say, That the Gentleman, as he has not many
Equals in the Nobleness of his Nature, so is not likely, I
doubt, to have many Followers, in a Reformation begun
in the Bloom of Youth, upon Self-conviction, and alto-
gether, humanely speaking spontaneous. (IV. 430)

(Reformation is primarily owing to Grace, but I shall come to this.) B.’s later
chaste love for Pamela is in the end the same passion as his earlier wicked lust, but
redirected towards virtuous ends. B. explains to Pamela,

as I could not conquer my Passion for you, I corrected
myself, and resolv’d, since you would not be mine
upon my Terms, you should upon your own: And now
I desire you not on any other, I assure you. (II. 79-80)

The fundamental difference between Belford and Lovelace also concerns essential
qualities, a divergence of their natures: from his first letter in Clarissa, Belford
takes the heroine’s side against his friend (VII. 264-70; also XI. 48), and when
Clarissa first meets Belford she finds him ‘good-natured and obliging’ (VII. 369)
even given the rakish circumstances. Lord M. observes to Belford proverbially,
‘Tho’ you have kept company with a wolf, you have not learnt to howl of him’
(VIII. 127), and it is Clarissa who makes the all-important distinction between
Lovelace and Belford, between ‘this humane and that inhumane Libertine’
(VII. 111). This distinction, between the reformable good-natured rake and the
essentially wicked and irreclaimable one is maintained in Grandison, where the
former predominate anyway, and where Harriet divides up her many suitors into
the good, the not so good and, by implication, the irredeemably bad (XIII. 437).\textsuperscript{83}

To an extraordinary extent the wickedness of Lovelace is explained by the badness, the hardness, the blackness, the falseness, the devilishness of his heart,\textsuperscript{84} and in the sense that 'heart' means pity, sympathy and chaste love Lovelace is positively heart\textit{less} (as Clarissa suspects, V. 296; see also X. 344, 376). This is after all the point of the Lovelace-loveless pun that Richardson points to in the novel (V. 214, X. 136); and that his probable derivation of the name from a number of Lovelesses in Restoration drama also makes plain.\textsuperscript{85} His surname also neatly answers the question of my chapter title, 'What is the Love of a Rakish Heart?' (VII. 268) -- it is loveless. This is related to Richardson's view of the humours, of constitution and of predominant passions, all of which seem to have a determining effect on health, behaviour and even morality.\textsuperscript{86} It is true that Lovelace falls back on all of these influences as excuses for his own inability to face up to the seriousness of his deeds, but ultimately even Belford and Clarissa concede that human conduct is partly the result of innate physical forces.\textsuperscript{87} Richardson's view of character does incline to the deterministic; Lovelace is somehow constitutionally wicked, and the Harlowes have the 'family-fault' of implacability and unforgivingness. Clarissa is herself by nature fixed, adamantine and unassailable in her virtue, which Lovelace fails not to put down to mere familial stubbornness.\textsuperscript{88} Richardson goes to some lengths to explain the process by which character tends to become fixed, most fully in \textit{Pamela II,} where Locke's \textit{Some Thoughts concerning Education} are used, not without criticism but for the most part approvingly, as a Dr Spock for the growing brood of Bs. Pamela and Locke admit the existence of innate passions (IV. 308, and 307-09 generally), and are greatly
concerned that they be subdued and controlled in children from the earliest age, lest indulgence and spoiling render passionate excess habitual. *Pamela* diverges from Locke in that Richardson's conception of potentially ruling passions is much cruder, and in fact seems to approach something like innate ideas in its insistence upon the predisposition of mind or character.89 Pamela therefore instructs her children by means of an awkward landscape allegory of regulating desires and forming good habits: 'the *Banks of Discretion*', 'the *Trees of Resolution*', 'the *Shrubs of cautious Fear*' (IV. 416-17). The danger once passions have become habitual is that they will become ineradicable -- a hardening of the heart in the ways of sin that makes reformation less and less probable, and which lies at the root of Richardson's doubt about sudden conversions (see especially XII. 307) and last-minute repentances on death-beds. Richardson presents the process of the hardening of the heart in his depiction of Lovelace's inner conflict in the novel, as he 'goes on, after every short Fit of imperfect, yet terrifying Conviction, hardening himself more and more' (XIII. viii). He convinces himself of the need to live up to rakish expectations, to try Clarissa's virtue, to use force, to try her yet more, and is goaded by the letters of Anna Howe's that he intercepts and by the wicked exhortations of the whores. (The process is made more apparent and more horrifying in Richardson's second- and third-edition additions, which, as Mark Kinkead-Weekes has shown, make Lovelace's villainy more obvious to those readers of the first edition who fell for his charm and hypocrisy.)90 Clarissa declares,

*May my story be a warning to all, how they prefer a Libertine to a man of True Honour; and how they per-*
mit themselves to be misled (where they mean the best) by the specious, yet foolish hope of subduing riveted habits, and as I may say, of altering natures! (XI. 365)

How, then, is conversion to take place? Clarissa disproves yet another libertine cliché, that the love of a good woman can reform a rake, for her example and her love (Richardson may call it whatever else he likes) are not enough to reclaim her ravisher. Lovelace is thus given up for lost, being denied by Clarissa, Anna and Belford not only the ability to reform but also the hope of Christian forgiveness and even Salvation. What then are we to make of the reformation of Belford, who might perhaps be considered the pre-eminent reformed rake of eighteenth-century fiction? As I have suggested above, the reader is prepared for Belford's conversion right from his first appearance in the novel, which suggests a heart as much predisposed to reformation as moved by the sufferings inflicted on Clarissa by Lovelace – though inevitably the two are connected. Belford claims in his first letter to Lovelace that his appeals on Clarissa's behalf 'are not owing to virtue' (VII. 264), or 'honour in the general [ie., non-libertine] acceptation of the word' (VII. 265), yet Belford cites 'family-reasons', the unfairness of trying Clarissa's virtues and the value of preserving it, aristocratic social duty and even the precepts of religion in his attempt to save her (VII. 265-69), all of which place him in the camp of virtue and honour in spite of his professions. Belford is said, with Lovelace, to be the leader of their rakish gang (VII. 368), but the dictatorial Lovelace nowhere seems to acknowledge this joint command; and Belford is also said to have made Lovelace's acquaintance as a result of a duel (possibly over a woman; VII. 368) – but apart from these two assertions there is no further evidence in the novel of Belford's crimes, and his libertine credentials appear rather doubt-
ful. Indeed, if he were not known to be Lovelace's friend, the reader might well think him some friend of Clarissa's instead, because of the lack of rakish exploits on his part in the novel, and because of his constant preaching on behalf of virtue. Belford from the beginning appears to possess the fund of good nature, which Lovelace emphatically lacks, that makes him (and not his friend) the kind of rake capable of reform. The reader is surely intended to remark the fundamental, essential differences between Belford and the other rakes of Lovelace's gang. Belford is 'good-natured and obliging' (VII. 369), in contrast to the fiery and irreligious Belton (VII. 365-6), the 'bold and daring' Mowbray (VII. 366-7), and the extravagantly coxcombical Tourville (VII. 367). Belford is, then, the exceptional rake, one of the good-natured few who are afforded 'such awakening Calls' as allow reformation, and who are 'snatched ... as a brand out of the fire' (XII. 302). Belford is, significantly, the only such brand we can be sure of in the novel, his repentance and happy end in stark contrast to 'the shocking despondency and death of his poor friend Belton', 'the signal justice which overtook the wicked Tomlinson', 'the dreadful exit of the infamous Sinclair' (XII. 302) – and of course the tragic and horrifying death of Lovelace himself. Belford's goodness or reformation is largely powerless to influence any of his friends, especially Lovelace, and it is powerless to prevent the death of Clarissa. If Richardson had even slightly more faith in the ability of Belford's conversion to affect others, then there might be hope for Belton; instead, he gives us all the details of a very sordid end (XI. 137, 169-86, 202-10, 213, 266-7, 280), which suggests that this, and not Belford's, might be regarded as a typical rakish fate — Lovelace's death being exalted into tragedy only by his extraordinary qualities, and Belford's repentance being less
likely and effective because of its singularity. It is true that Mowbray and Tourville, at the conclusion of the history, are said to be 'shock'd and awakened by the several unhappy catastrophes before their eyes' (XII. 284), and to retire to their respective country estates,

Their friend Belford managing their concerns for them, and corresponding with them, and having more and more hopes every time he sees them (which is once or twice a year, when they come to town) that they will become more and more worthy of their Names and Families. (XII. 284)

It is worth noting however, that this is by no means full conversion, which seems a rather remote prospect in spite of their being shocked and awakened, in itself clearly not sufficient; that their recognition of past vices is owing, significantly, to 'having always rather ductile than dictating hearts ...' (XII. 284) - and therefore, it seems, to good nature, as with Belford; and that their moral improvement is given very brief treatment indeed (a mere paragraph instead of the pages on the impenitent Belton (and Sinclair and Tomlinson)), which necessarily mutes any optimistic conclusions we might draw from it. The case of Belton is given far greater prominence, and is almost important as that of Belford. It seems to serve a number of purposes in the novel: first of all, his shocking and impenitent death, described in letters interleaved with those relating the circumstances of Clarissa's last days (XI. 169-88, 194-6, 202-13), is doubtless meant as a contrast to the heroine's exemplary piety and resignation ('How unlike poor Belton's last hours, hers!' says Belford (XI. 442; also XI. 180)); secondly, as a way of emphasising Lovelace's failure to be affected by events he should apply to his own moral and spiritual condition (XI. 201, 211-13); and thirdly, as a parallel (on a lesser scale) to Lovelace's own last days
and death. The point of this last, it seems to me, is to remind us how Lovelace, for all his parts - even his greatness - really does end up like a run-of-the-mill, reptile rake like Belton, in the same way that he is implicitly compared with 'caitiff Miles' elsewhere in the final volume of *Clarissa* (XII. 45, and cited above). These sordid tales of lesser rakes emphasise the brilliance and uniqueness of Lovelace, but at the same time warn that no amount of extraordinary qualities can redeem a man if he combines talents with vice rather than virtue. Lovelace may be in some ways better than Miles or Belton, but he ends up no better in this world or the next — and very possibly worse. The effect of the comparison of Lovelace with lesser rakes is thus to heighten one's sense of regret that Lovelace's abilities could not have been used to virtuous ends and prevented tragedy; to deepen the reader's disappointment at being deceived by the specious, but ultimately insufficient or even sham virtues of Lovelace; and to show that wickedness in the great and in the ordinary alike is punished without partiality. Let us not forget, then, that *Clarissa* is one of the few tragic novels of the eighteenth century, or put too sanguine a construction on the first signs of remorse in Mowbray and Tourville, and on the reformation of Belford. As fortunate as Belford is at the end of the novel, and as sure as he is that constant rereading and reconsideration of Clarissa's letters will prevent relapse (XII. 154), he is aware that 'such awakening Calls are *hardly ever afforded to men of his cast ...'* (XII. 302). The tone at the end of the novel is far from happy or confident: Belford is only as completely happy as a man can be, who has enormities to reflect upon, which are out of his power to atone for, by reason of the death of some of the injured parties, and the irreclaimableness of others. (XII. 304)
The 'irreclaimableness' of Lovelace and the death of Clarissa will always overshadow and qualify whatever good has come of their tragedy – in this case, the conversion of Belford. It is as though Richardson, like Fielding in *Amelia*, has not absolutely given up hope for human nature, and therefore allows a rare instance of goodness and redemption, but comes to gloomier conclusions about the vast majority of human beings and the current of their affairs. In *Clarissa* Richardson appears unwilling to express the earlier and much more optimistic view of *Pamela*, where the journal of the heroine's captivity is held up as the fool-proof mechanism of B.'s conversion (II. 34; see also I. 292, 329, 330 and II. 324). The married Bs' example, especially Pamela's, also has a salutary effect on the tenants and neighbouring gentry. Sir Charles Grandison, as we have seen, is able to bring about some reformations, and it is even opined in that novel that 'the example of a good and generous man can sometimes alter natures' (XV. 362) -- Richardson's most optimistic comment about human nature ever -- but as has also been pointed out, Sir Charles never has to contend with deep-dyed Lovelacean vice in his somewhat charmed circle. There may yet be some grounds for Lady G.'s conviction that 'Bad habits are of the Jerusalem-artichoke kind; once planted, there is no getting them out of the ground' (XVII. 200-1). The only sure method of converting the vicious is, of course, divine Grace, which is cited dutifully by Richardson in all the novels. But for all Richardson's piety, Grace is not exactly abounding, at least not in *Clarissa*, where a Pauline Road to Damascus is simply not the possibility that Lovelace likes to think it is (VII. 163). In fact, the novelist increasingly ascribes power over human souls not so much to Grace or
Providence, as to Fate or Destiny. If the distinction between Providence and Fortune in Fielding's novels is often left unclear, then the difference between Grace and Fate is confused or confusing in Richardson. It is almost as though Richardson accepts the doctrine of Double Predestination -- of a pre-ordained damnation for the rake on the one hand, and assured salvation for Clarissa on the other.

Fielding's name should once again suggest some of Richardson's points of contact and of departure from the ethos and aesthetic that is most elegantly and coherently worked out in *Tom Jones*. In the first place, the two great rivals have widely differing conceptions of characterisation; the Richardsonian character is perhaps surprisingly more fixed and determined by nature than his counterpart in Fielding, but at the same time is less easily penetrated. Understanding of character in a Richardson novel comes only through the long and difficult processes (of which reading is the foremost) by which Pamela and B. come to know each other and themselves, by which Clarissa eventually discovers the perfidy and lies of Lovelace, Harriet Byron the virtues and affections of Grandison, and the reader the deep and complicated, if ultimately static, natures of all of them. Both Fielding and Richardson share the classic eighteenth-century view of the rake, but here, for the most part, they part ways. In the first place, Richardson seems to advocate the 'male-virgin' as the ideal of pre-marital upper-class male virtue, which Tom Jones would merely laugh at. Richardson is prepared to let the good-natured rake be reformed, but he is never willing to *excuse* him for that reason; and he always takes a rather Brownian view of the dangerous consequences of libertinism, no matter how good-natured, jolly and short-lived are the excesses -- in contrast to Fielding, who regarded hypocrisy and lack of charity, not rakery, as the worst
cankers in society, and suggested that those who love a wench and a bottle within limits may well have the warm human qualities necessary to combat these cold and capital vices. Surely Fielding’s pleading with Richardson for a happy ending to *Clarissa* reflects his greater sense of optimism about human nature, and his belief that Richardson was exaggerating the extent and the threat of libertinism.99

Here, then, is the principal difference between the two novelists: for Fielding, limited libertinism seems to represent a sincere if slightly misdirected warmth of feeling and love of humanity; while for Richardson, the rake is society’s worst enemy, and his own, for the love of a rakish heart is in fact no love at all.
Richardson's conviction that the rake posed a major threat to society and its morals puts him in the mainstream of eighteenth-century thought on the subject of libertinism (a tide of opinion that included novelists as well as moralists), but his certainty that any palliation of even apparently harmless and amusing rakish indiscretion represented the thin end of a perilous wedge places him at odds at least with the more urbane and liberal Fielding. To some extent the course of the development of the eighteenth-century novel depended upon the personal relationships of its major practitioners, for it might be said that the progress from Pamela to Joseph Andrews, from Clarissa to Tom Jones, Amelia to Grandison represents a certain amount of statement, counter-statement and restatement about the content and aims of the novel. From the point of view of this study, the process seems to revolve in part around the figure of the rake -- not because he is some hitherto unrecognised compleat key to the whole of eighteenth-century fiction, but because the issue of libertinism had been a staple of earlier prose fictions and, it seems to me, lent itself particularly well to the attempts in the 1740's and 50's to determine and develop the nature of fictional character, and to use the novel, previously the vehicle of gossip and amoral sensationalism to a
large degree, as a means of inculcating sophisticated systems of personal and social
morality. Fielding and Richardson's views on the acceptable bounds of a young
man's conduct and on the possibility of genuine change in human character have
already been discussed, but the treatment of these subjects in the novels of Tobias
Smollett remains to be examined. Smollett was also part of the extraordinary
period in the middle of the century that saw the maturation of the novel (if not its
birth or rise), and his works also concentrate on the figure of the rake. This is of
course partly a response to wider eighteenth-century concern about libertinism, but
also, I would suggest, Smollett's conscious attempt to put himself into the novel
istic fray with those great rivals, Fielding and Richardson. Smollett's Paper War
with Fielding over the similarity of their plots and characters, and his accusations
of plagiarism, are well known; and it seems fairly clear that Smollett, while friend
lier with Richardson, used *Peregrine Pickle* partly to satirise *Clarissa*, specifically
over the Rape. What I would like to suggest in this chapter, then, is Smollett's use
of conventional rake material in formulating his novels, and the ways in which
his treatment of libertinism in the main resembles Fielding's and differs from
Richardson's. Smollett's rakes are generally of the 'Polite' or 'Congrevian' variety
(as these terms have been applied in Chapter One), for their excesses are for the
most part not regarded as reprehensible, but in fact usually as generous, passionate
warm-heartedness and useful worldly experience. Smollett's rakes do tend, how­
ever, to be wilder, more extravagant, more freakish, more humorous (in the medi­
cal sense) than Fielding's. It is true that Smollett does seem to criticise some of
Peregrine Pickle's behaviour, particularly in the conduct of his amours, but as I
shall suggest below, Smollett is not very consistent or convincing in his adverse
commentary on the hero, excusing or even commending far more than he cen­
sures. Furthermore, it is bourgeois ambition rather than more aristocratic libertin­
ism in Peregrine to which the narrator of the novel seems to object; and in any 
case, Smollett's vicious characters are always other than rakish: hypocrites, petty 
tyrants, sodomites, cuckold, bullies, the malicious, or a low-born swindling im­
postor like Ferdinand Fathom. The 'Vicious Rake' is a character absent from 
Smollett's novels, as is largely the case with Fielding.

Like Fielding and Richardson, Smollett was fundamentally conservative, 
even reactionary, although as we have seen with Fielding (if not with Richardson), 
a desire to preserve the old order does not necessarily coincide with paranoia over 
the rake and his rôle in hastening decline and fall. A number of recent studies 
have perceptively and productively identified the Popean aspects of Smollett's 
œuvre, from his early verse satires 'Advice' (1746) and 'Reproof' (1747) to the 
culmination of his literary career in _The Expedition of Humphry Clinker_ (1771).¹ 
In fact, most of these studies concentrate on Smollett's final novel, where his affi­
nities with the Pope of the 'Moral Essays' and _Imitations of Horace_ are most pro­
nounced. As in Pope, the theme of _Clinker_ is the vice and folly of the town ver­
sus the virtues of pastoral retirement, and the desire to return to the well-ordered 
tranquility of earlier reigns. There are, for example, close parallels between the 
domestic extravagance and 'improvement' criticised in the Baynard episode of 
_Humphry Clinker_ and the section on Timon in Pope's 'Epistle to Burlington', 
and critics have identified the more general influence of formal verse satire on the 
novels of Tobias Smollett, to the point of calling _Clinker_ 'a comic pastoral poem 
in prose.'²
One good consequence of this relatively new view of Smollett as a satirist within the Augustan tradition has been the growing realisation on the part of critics that his *Travels through France and Italy* (1766), long erroneously considered autobiographical, is in fact an extended satirical piece on foreign enormities, on the splenetic, even the Smelfungian, English traveller as a type (turning the mockery of Sterne in *A Sentimental Journal* back on itself), and perhaps even on abuses and vices at home.³ (And this has had the further good effect of making critics hesitant to identify Smollettian characters, particularly Matthew Bramble, as strictly self-revelatory 'cameo' roles on the author's part.) If Smollett allied himself with the principal Tory satirist of the eighteenth century, it should not come as a surprise that modern critics have recognised his general social and political stance as landed-gentry, conservative, hierarchical and traditionalist. Donald Bruce might have called his book *Radical Doctor Smollett*, but the groundlessness of his argument that Smollett was some sort of premature Shelley of the 1750's is all too apparent.⁴ A more sensible left-wing approach has been to recognise Smollett's fundamental conservatism while refusing to agree with it.⁵ At the same time, it would be wise to admit G.S. Rousseau's *caveat* about 'maniacally conservative readers' who want to make Smollett the most reactionary and dogmatic of Tories.⁶ The ridiculous Jolter and the low, malicious Ferret are, after all, the staunchest Tories in *Peregrine Pickle* and *Ferdinand Count Fathom* respectively, and in *Humphry Clinker* Bramble arrives at a more moderate view after exposure to the fanatically right-wing Lismahago.⁷ A more balanced position is to regard Smollett
not so much in the light of his hack-work for Lord Bute's ministry in *The Briton*,
as of a less rigid and doctrinaire, more independent and open-minded belief in
'Augustan' values.\(^8\)

In any case, the view of Smollett that has emerged -- as (broadly speaking) a
conservative satirist of British society, a writer with what Paul-Gabriel Boucée calls
'préoccupations morales'\(^9\) -- is a useful starting point for further discussion. One
of the most important aspects of Smollett's social code is his belief in the funda­
mental rôle of the gentleman as an anchor of order, values and virtues. A gentle­
manly *ethos* is present in Fielding as well, of course, and from an outsider's ad­
miring point of view in Richardson, but neither of them expresses the creed of the
gentleman as explicitly and as dogmatically as does Smollett.\(^10\) In his first novel,
*Roderick Random* (1748), Smollett takes some trouble to ensure that the hero has
been given 'a favourable prepossession' by virtue of 'the advantage of birth and
education'.\(^11\) The exuberant welcome given the returning Randoms, *père* and
*filz*, by their tenants at the end of the novel (434) further suggests that Smollett
held the traditional view of the ideal gentleman as the benevolent and patri­
archal landlord of numerous happy tenants.

This being said, it is also the case in *Roderick Random* that Smollett has
some sense of the abuses of gentlemanly obligations and privileges that are taking
place in the world discovered by his hero, though it remains to be seen whether
rakishness is among these. John Sekora's *Luxury* puts Smollett in the anti-luxury
camp, indeed as its last proponent, but concentrates on Timonian rather than
Lovelacean excesses, and has surprisingly little to say about libertinism as we have
understood it, or, in fact, about any of Smollett's novels apart from *Humphry
Clinker*.\(^12\) Smollett appears to be worried that the 'absurd affectation and grimace'
of a Frenchified barber can pass 'for the sprightly politesse of a gentleman improved by travel' (298), and he is genuinely worried that gentlemanly authority is being abused by bigoted petty tyrants like Oakhum, Mackshane and Crampley aboard the *Thunder*, and by Roderick's own grandfather; that noble patronage is in the hands of ignorant hypocrites like Melopoyn's Lord Rattle and the pandering Lord Straddle; and that the young men of quality are exemplified by the sodomites Whiffle and Lord Strutwell, the feeble Lord Quiverwit and the boorish Orson Top-hall, Sir Timothy Thicket and Squire Bumper. Abuse of power seems to be the main object of Smollett's moral attack in the novel, insomuch as it victimises the hero and threatens the state, the inevitable consequence of the tyranny of a captain like Crampley being mutiny and chaos (209-10).

As in *Roderick Random*, Smollett reveals his conviction in *Peregrine Pickle* of the 'dignity and importance' of the country gentleman, though his conservatism in the second novel falls slightly short of the fanatical Toryism of Jolter, the hero's governor, who praises France because it is repressive and rigidly hierarchical, which rightly angers Pickle. At the same time, the hero is equally in the right to resent (and to defeat) a pretentious upstart 'son of fortune' (378; also 572), and to intervene, with another 'person of authority' when his manservant Pipes creates a public disturbance in the streets of Lisle (277-9). The whole novel celebrates Peregrine's final restoration to his 'rightful inheritance' and 'proper station' (768). And also as in the previous novel, there is a clear sense that gentlemanly obligations are being abused. Peregrine's indignation at the conduct of his French counterparts is the result of their acting unbecomingly, as *petits maîtres* rather than as the acknowledged legislators of the state. There is explicit criticism
of the corruption and mismanagement of public affairs by a 'state pilot' like the ironically named Sir Steady Steerwell (672), and an exposé of the 'diseases of the state' (677) in the chapters that describe the fraud and barratry that the hero discovers during his frustrating political career (608-77). The enormities perpetrated by men who should be prospering the state, not ruining it, are contrasted with the paradoxically happy, well-ordered microcosm of the Fleet prison, to which Pickle voluntarily commits himself (678, 679, 682), and, are adumbrated in the digressive tale he hears while in gaol, of the selfless Daniel MacKercher and the Annesley succession case, which exposes the perversions of justice and rightful inheritance that Smollett regarded as endemic to the society of his day.16 Something that does not appear to have been noticed is the author's apparent ascription of Peregrine's worst crimes to his origins in trade, and the Pickles' only recent admission to the gentry. This is just a suspicion on my part,17 but Smollett does seem to be implying that the hero's mercantile family background may be responsible not only for his ambitions to splendour beyond his rank and means (217-18, 352-3, 397, 426-7), but also, more importantly, for his treatment of Emilia. It is at the beginning of the novel that the 'small beginnings' (1) and subsequent success of the Pickles in the City are most frequently mentioned (1-3, 13-14, 19), but they are raised again, surely strategically, just before and just after the hero's attempted violation of Emilia. Peregrine tells Emilia's uncle, and reminds the reader, that he is 'descended from a race of merchants' (400) on the day before he makes his perfidious attempt. Shortly after it, Emilia's mother points out to him in her letter,

Give me leave to tell you, Sir, my daughter was no upstart, without friends or education, but a young lady as well bred, and better born, than most private gentle-
women in the kingdom: and therefore, though you had no esteem for her person, you ought to have paid some regard to her family, which (no disparagement to you, Sir) is more honourable than your own. (421)

Pickle is piqued 'at some stately paragraphs of the letter, [no doubt her remarks on his ancestry], in which (he thought) the good lady had consulted her own vanity rather than her good sense' (421). The third-person narration allows Smollett's judgmental parenthesis, and the suggestion that at least a certain amount of blame for the abduction is being laid to class origin. In thinking that he can buy Emilia's honour with 'notes to the amount of two thousand pounds' and the promise of ten thousand more on receipt of goods, as it were (407), Peregrine is no different from his pusillanimous bourgeois father, who wrote this celebrated 

_billet doux_ to his intended:

_Miss Sally Appleby_

Madam,

Understanding that you have a parcel of heart, warranted sound, to be disposed of, shall be willing to treat for said commodity, on reasonable terms; doubt not, shall agree for same; shall wait of you for further information, when and where you shall appoint. This the needful from

Yours, &c.

GAM. PICKLE (14)

The class comedy of the early chapters is no idle diversion, for it is in part a preparation for a commodity-oriented view of love during the rape scene. Emilia's response to the commercial transaction offered then by the fatherlike son is to call
his stratagems 'low and contemptible', utterly unbefitting a man of honour (408),
and the narrator dwells on her superiority and Peregrine's awed awareness of it
(408-9).

Though Smollett has such a high opinion of the dignity and importance of
the Gentleman, the rake does not in the end really come under his scrutiny and
censure as one of those gentlemen who, by their excesses, endanger the security of
the *status quo*. His discussion of libertinism and its consequences is fairly
straightforward (and exculpating), and led James Beattie to decry 'Smollett's system
of youthful profligacy'\(^{18}\) -- although it seems to me that Smollett's moral teaching
is only haphazardly systematic, as my discussion of *Peregrine Pickle* will suggest.
Smollett certainly seems to have been aware of the conventional aspects of the
rake *topos*, for in *Random* (and to a large extent in *Peregrine Pickle*) he traces
the classic libertine's career from high life to debt to hack-writing to gaol, and
Hogarth's prints have been identified as a specific source for this.\(^{19}\) Neither
Roderick nor Peregrine ends up, however, 'Mad in Bedlam' like Tom Rakewell.
The fox-hunting cousin who does Roderick out of his inheritance, 'having spent
the estate' (432), is not moralised upon to any great degree; the rake in this case is
forgiven (434) and by doubtless providential direction is not allowed to wreak such
havoc that the Randoms' paternal estate is alienated from them forever. Simi-
larly, the excesses of Strap's sometime master, the French marquis, on his travels
are enough to kill him, but seem to have no further consequences or importance
(253). The busybodyish Mr Medlar offers Random a word of warning about one of
his London companions, Banter:
the old gentleman took me aside, and said, he was sorry to see me so intimate with that fellow who was one of the most graceless rakes about town, and had already wasted a good estate and constitution upon harlots; — that he had been the ruin of many a young man, by introducing them into debauched company, and setting a lewd example of all manner of wickedness; and that, unless I was on my guard, he would strip me in a short time, both of my money and reputation. (289)

As it happens, however, Medlar is a soured as well as a decayed apple, having been the butt of Banter's teasing. His judgment is unfair and subjective, and Random gets a more balanced account of his friend from Dr Wagtail (289). Whatever the truth about Banter, nothing else is said of any public mischief caused by his private vice apart from his limited bad effect upon other young men. Furthermore, nothing really dreadful does happen to Random as a result of this acquaintance: it is true that going to Bath as a fortune- and a wife-hunter at Banter's suggestion briefly ruins Random and takes him to the Marshalsea for a while, but Banter is never identified as the efficient cause of any of the hero's misfortunes, and the trip to Bath allows Roderick to re-establish contact with his beloved Narcissa and, after intervening vicissitudes, to marry her.

But the examples of the hunting cousin, Strap's marquis and Banter are minor, and might escape the author's serious consideration on this account, or because Roderick, the first-person narrator, is not given to making moral judgments. (One of the most frequently cited drawbacks of Smollett's narrative mode in Random is its relative lack of opportunities for ironic or moral comment.20) The most important rake in the novel is the title character, and the manner in which his extravagances and peccadilloes are depicted must ultimately determine any sense of the novel's views on libertinism. That the hero is a full-fledged rake
is, as I have suggested, undeniable, judging by his course from the top of the mode to prison, \textit{via} the playhouse, the ladies of the town and the purlieus of Drury Lane, amorous intrigues, the gaming-table and the diversions of Bath in general.\textsuperscript{21}

What is uncertain is Smollett's attitude to all this, and to Random's occasional earlier behaviour as an aspiring fine gentleman. Random relates Narcissa's view, as conveyed by her waiting-woman, who is by a twist of fortune none other than his former mistress, Miss Williams:

\begin{quote}
\textit{altho' some situations of my life had been low, yet none of them had been infamous; that my indigence had been the crime not of me, but of fortune; and that the miseries I had undergone, by improving the faculties both of mind and of body, qualified me the more for any dignified station; and would of consequence, recommend me to the good graces of any sensible woman...} (342)
\end{quote}

This would appear, then, to acquit Roderick of any serious misdemeanours, according to the time-worn excuse that finds its way into \textit{Pamela}, \textit{Joseph Andrews}, \textit{Tom Jones}, \textit{Amelia}, \textit{Clarissa} (though it is insufficient there), and much minor fiction besides, like Eliza Haywood's \textit{History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy}; but one might also raise some valid objections to it. Miss Williams is telling Random what she assumes are the feelings of her mistress, and his third-hand account of them may be coloured by his passion for Narcissa. Miss Williams also advises the hero to give his beloved an edited version of his past if he wishes to succeed with her (342), and he does (362-3), so Narcissa's good opinion may not be worth all that much after all, being based on incomplete evidence, as well as being made 'with a partiality easily influenced in his favour' (342). Finally, Miss Williams may herself be a little partial to Roderick's charms even this long after their love
affair (117-38), and therefore willing to please him in any way possible, and her own rather loose moral code may forgive where Narcissa's cannot. (In fact, Narcissa's feelings are accurately represented, but this is not yet enough to go on.)

On a number of occasions, the author seems to allow a small measure of implicit criticism of the hero, when he flatters himself that his coxcombr[y is true gentlemanly behaviour:

I now began to look upon myself as a gentleman in reality; learned to dance of a Frenchman whom I had cured of a fashionable distemper; frequented plays during the holidays; became the oracle of an ale-house, where every dispute was referred to my decision; and at length contracted an acquaintance with a young lady...

whom he thinks an heiress but who is in reality a whore, and an unfaithful one at that (108; she is in fact Miss Williams -- see 116).

For all of this, however, a slight smile or a sense of mild embarrassment at these follies is all that is raised in either narrator or reader. More often, greater faults than dandyism are positively excused or treated with what is either a palliating neutrality of tone or a seeming unawareness on Smollett's part that any immorality or impropriety has taken place. Sins of the flesh may not, in the end, be so serious: he can see that a whore like Miss Williams can possess the proverbial heart of gold and virtuous qualities that outweigh her sins (and this is something that Fielding would allow, but Richardson never). The author seems to countenance, for example, the passionate and vengeful side of Roderick that prompts him to fight duels. The splenetic letter-writer of the *Travels through France and Italy* may decry 'the absurd and pernicious custom of duelling', but this is either
the view of the cantankerous satiric persona (as opposed to that of the author), or
an instance of Smollett's having changed his mind late in life, for in Roderick
Random (as in Peregrine Pickle), the hero's passes d'armes are invariably ap­
proved of, saving Narcissa from rape in one instance, and always just revenge.23
Elsewhere in the novel, a Mohockish ramble is suggested by one of Roderick's
libertine friends, but ends almost bathetically, with any stain of gross immorality
expunged: 'At length, it was proposed by Bragwell, that we should scour the hun­
dreds, sweat the constable, maul the watch, and then reel soberly to bed' (273).
More amusingly, Roderick allows himself to be seduced by a French country girl in
chapter XLII:

I must own, to my shame, that I suffered myself to be
overcome by my passion, and with great eagerness
seized the occasion, when I understood that the ami­
able Nanette was to be my bedfellow. -- In vain did my
reason suggest the respect I owed to my dear mistress Nar­
cissa; the idea of that lovely charmer, rather increased
than allayed the ferment of my spirits; and the young Pai­
sanne had no reason to complain of my remembrance. (240)

There are two possible interpretations of this curious passage. The first is that
Smollett, leaving no trace of evidence to suggest the contrary, in no way -- or at
least in no significant way -- regards Roderick's words as sophistical. Aspersions,
albeit jocular ones, have after all just been made on the hypocritical 'chastity' of
the hero's travelling-companion, the capuchin (240); and whereas even Fielding
has Tom Jones brought to an account by Sophia for his amours, Smollett is content
that Random's sexual past is no bar at all to his eventual union with Narcissa, and
that she should know nothing of his previous mistresses. Moreover, owing to the
good faith in Random's personal merits that has already been established, one
cannot but agree with him (as one does with Tom Jones and his defenders in similar instances) when he says,

I revolved all the crimes I had been guilty of, and found them so few and venial, that I could not comprehend the justice of that providence, which after having exposed me to so much wretchedness and danger, left me a prey to famine at last in a foreign country, where I had not one friend or acquaintance to close my eyes, and do the last offices of humanity to my miserable carcasse. (243)

It is equally plausible to suppose that the disconcerting tone of the excerpt from p. 240 is a sign of the author's uncertain control over a moral purpose that is at best rather muddled. It is not as though the author wishes to criticise Random, but fails through an attempt to do so with subtlety, but rather as though he is only dimly conscious that the hero's acts need commenting upon at all. Furthermore, these two readings do not seem to me necessarily mutually exclusive, for neither of them involves a condemnation of Roderick's conduct.

How else is the hero's libertinism deprived of its sting? One method that is employed to ensure that the reader never loses his sympathy for Roderick is, perhaps after the manner of *Tom Jones*, to keep him from real wickedness. Although at one point, when success with a beautiful young lady (not Narcissa) seems imminent, he says,

my pride soared beyond all reason and description; I lost all remembrance of the gentle Narcissa, and my thoughts were wholly employed in planning triumphs over the malice and contempt of the world. (303)
this (and his coxcombical folly (see above)) is about the lowest he sinks; for success
with this particular lady eludes him and for the most part he is faithful to Narcissa
in spirit if not in body - and this seems to be enough for Smollett. It should also
be noted that in this case of philandering he is not filled with wicked plans but
with a laudable desire to defy misfortune. Elsewhere, he decides to have no fur­
ther commerce with prostitutes (260), and in the course of another fruitless in­
trigue observes,

I was in no danger of dying for love of Melinda; on
the contrary, the remembrance of my charming
Narcissa was a continual check upon my conscience,
during the whole course of my addresses; and per­
haps contributed to the bad success of my scheme,
by controuling my raptures, and condemning my
design. (296; see also 345)

He has the delicacy and decency not to be drawn into copious drinking with Nar­
cissa's brother, 'afraid of risking her esteem, by entering into a debauch ...' (347),
and of course is not so libertine in his morals that he can countenance the
'correspondence', 'not fit to be named', that Captain Whiffle maintains with his
surgeon (199), let alone be taken in by Lord Strutwell's rather Mandevillian
'vindication' of what Roderick (quoting Smollett's own Advice!) calls

A vice! that 'spite of sense and nature reigns,
And poisons genial love, and manhood stains! (311; and see note
on 471)

In addition, the worst accounts of Random's crimes are explained away as slander,
rumour and the malice of others (92, 284, 359-61, 397) -- again, as in Tom Jones.

Conscience does on occasion get the better of Roderick, but its importance
is minimised. When taken up by the Watch on the false evidence of a whore after
a night on the town with his friend Beau Jackson, been mistaken by the incompetent justice for a well-known Irish felon and threatened with the full force of the law, he says,

I was in an agony of consternation, when the constable going into another room with his worship [the justice], acquainted him with the truth of the story: upon which he returned with a smiling countenance, and addressing himself to us all, said, it was always his way to terrify young people, when they came before him, that his threats might make a strong impression on their minds, and deter [sic] them from engaging in scenes of riot and debauchery which commonly ended before the judge. -- Thus having cloaked his own want of discernment, under the disguise of paternal care, we were dismissed, and I found myself as much lightened as if a mountain had been lifted from off my breast. (92)

He is in no way deterred from licentiousness, let off the hook because the whole idea of conscience and penitence has been made to look, or has made itself, ludicrous and out of touch. Similarly, Lavement renders reformation silly by his stage-French declaration that 'peutetre de good God give him de penitence' and because he too makes a false accusation, this time of theft (112). (Exculpation by means of ridiculous critics will be encountered again in Smollett, for it is an habitual modus operandi in Peregrine Pickle.) When he falls in love with Narcissa, having been forced by misfortunes to enter her house as a servant, and despairing of ever declaring his love on an equal footing with her, Roderick describes how he

passed the night without sleep, in melancholy reflections on the vanity of young men, which prompts them to commit so many foolish actions, contrary to their own sober judgment. (224)
But in the next breath, he continues,

Next day, however, instead of profiting by this self-condemnation, I yielded still more to the dictates of the principle I had endeavoured to chastize, and if fortune had not befriended me more than prudence could expect, I should have been treated with the contempt I deserved. (224)

Fortune does befriend him, and the inevitable inference to be drawn is that impetuosity and even a degree of vanity can make happy endings possible, while prudence, sobriety and resignation may leave a man empty-handed. In other places, regret for past follies is seen to be without effect: in chapter XLIII it is his accidental meeting with Strap (as d'Estrapes) that does him good, not any 'silent sorrow and melancholy reflection' (243). In prison, sorrow and reflection threaten to turn Random into a Man of the Hill or even the Tom o' Bedlam that Rakewell becomes in *A Rake's Progress*, but happily he is rescued from such a sorry state by the fortuitous arrival of his uncle Bowling (396-8). When he is first committed to gaol, Roderick's soul-searching leads him to thoughts of suicide (370), but to dissuade him, the sensible, latinate Strap quotes proverbs that amount to the haphazard moral *credo* of the novel: 'Durum patientia frango' and 'accidit in puncto, quid non speratur in anno' ('I alleviate hardship by patience'; 'Something happens in a moment, which you would not have expected in a year's time') (Strap's 'quid' should be 'quod'; 370 and note on 475 for translation). Responsibility for events, including moral responsibility, is surrendered to the force that Smollett variously and indifferently calls fate, fortune or providence. As I have suggested in Chapter Three, Fielding uses a similar tactic to keep Tom Jones from getting into too much trouble, but Fielding does so without total commitment, in order to
maintain his own control over events as narrator, and to give Tom just enough status as a moral agent. Smollett, in contrast, has every event out of the control of Roderick, whether good or bad. From the first page of the novel, the hero is passive and at the mercy of external forces. Roderick's condition in the world is introduced and circumscribed by means of a famous metaphorical dream:

During her pregnancy, a dream discomposed my mother so much, that my father, tired with her importunity, at last consulted a seer, whose favourable interpretation he would have secured before-hand by a bribe, but found him incorruptible. She dreamed, she was delivered of a tennis-ball, which the devil (who to her great surprize, acted the part of a midwife) struck so forcibly with a racket, that it disappeared in an instant; and she was for some time inconsolable for the loss of her off-spring; when all of a sudden, she beheld it return with equal violence, and earth itself beneath her feet, whence immediately sprung up a goodly tree covered with blossoms, the scent of which operated so strongly on her nerves that she awoke. -- The attentive sage, after some deliberation, assured my parents, that their first-born would be a great traveller, that he would undergo many dangers and difficulties, and at last return to his native land, where he would flourish with great reputation and happiness. -- How truly this was foretold, will appear in the sequel. (1)

(Morgan, Roderick's Welsh messmate on board the Thunder, reiterates the metaphor, when he desires that Oakhum no longer to treat him like 'a tennis-ball, nor a shittle-cock' (170).) The course of the novel proves the seer right, and one of the ramifications of this is that the main character (one could not say 'protagonist') will attain happiness no matter what he does, right or wrong -- though whether Smollett is fully aware of this is another question. The deliberate theme of randomness, built into Roderick's surname, also lends some structural unity to the novel, as critics have pointed out, or else serves as a convenient excuse for its
A further consequence of Roderick's battered, tennis-ball-like existence is that he is by nature always the innocent victim of fate or vicissitudes (a word often used), or of the knavery and treachery of genuine scoundrels. Not only this, but Fortune is the dispenser of every good thing too, not even allowing Random to achieve his own success. Perhaps at the expense of credibility, the author underscores the chance aspects of Roderick's stumbling across his long-lost father in the person of Don Rodrigo, at no less than the ends of the earth (the Argentine), and to the astonishment of everyone in the novel (413, 414, 425, 427, 435). Although Roderick could hardly be said to have developed personally as a result of all his ups and downs (indeed, he is the mere replica of his father, as their equivalent Christian names suggest), Smollett agrees with Fielding that experience of the world is the best education a young man can have. Honest Bowling and Mrs Sagely (note the name) both praise it (233, 213-14; also 29), and, as Roderick lets us know, so does Don Rodrigo:

I recounted the most material circumstances of my fortune, to which he listened with wonder and attention, manifesting from time to time those different emotions, which my different situations may be supposed to have raised in a parent's breast; and when my detail was ended, blessed God for the adversity I had undergone, which, he said, enlarged the understanding, improved the heart, steeled the constitution, and qualified a young man for all the duties and enjoyments of life, much better than any education which affluence could bestow. (415)

(Note the emphasis on the improvement of existing faculties and qualities, rather than on acquiring anything new.) While Don Rodrigo has his son's misfortunes in mind more than his rakish indiscretions, the latter are nevertheless among the
most material circumstances' of Roderick's history, it being safe to assume that the hero gives his father a fuller account than Narcissa gets, and his excesses are therefore to be considered an integral part of the school of life's curriculum. Finally, it would appear from Smollett's practice elsewhere, as I hope I have demonstrated, that the novelist seems to concur with this conclusion about Roderick Random's variety of libertinism.

Like _Random_, _Peregrine Pickle_ (1751) is in many respects a rake's progress, but in addition to broad similarities in plot and characterisation, there are important differences between the two heroes as rakes, in the methods in which they are depicted as such and, perhaps, in the author's conclusions about their morals. In a very important article, Rufus Putney suggested that _Pickle_ departs from _Random_ in criticising the hero's worst excesses and in structuring the novel more carefully, in line with the more consistent moral message. It seems to me, however, that the most one can attribute to Smollett on this score is indecision: he _does_ make adverse judgments on Peregrine in places, as though he feels he ought to, but by and large makes his old defence of the rake. The first and most important change from Smollett's first novel to his second is, of course, the style of narration -- from an unpointed first-person to a more ironic, authorially intrusive third-person. This new narrative strategy gives rise to Putney's theory of an increased moral depth in _Peregrine Pickle_, though in all fairness it also might be said that Smollett was searching for any device that would make his second effort less like his first than it already is, remembering that Thackeray quite perceptively remarked upon the slenderness of Smollett's invention in _The English Humourists_. There are, however, some new elements in _Pickle_, and one of them is this occasional harsh criticism of the hero when vanity and lust get the better of him,
something that never really happens or is commented upon very much in the earlier novel. All the same, Peregrine's conduct is excused in the same ways that Roderick's is -- indeed, more extensively than in Random. Rufus Putney is correct in very general terms about a greater sense of responsibility in Peregrine Pickle, but the new and moral Smollett is uncertain and inconsistent to a degree that suggests that the moralising is superficial and unable to conceal what is more coherently expressed, the same kind of defence of libertinism as that made in Roderick Random.31

As in Roderick Random, the nature of the hero, his disposition, humours and ruling passion, are also what in part exculpates him, though in Peregrine Pickle there is the further complication that the hero is said to undergo the reformation that Roderick never needs, even though his character remains largely unchanged; but I shall leave the conflict of Peregrine's disposition and his regeneration for the present, and return to it after pursuing the issue of Smollett's inconsistent criticism and vindication of his hero. The earliest adverse comment on Pickle comes in chapter XLII, where the author alludes to the 'guilty raptures' of the hero with Mrs Hornbeck (202), but one has to wait a few pages for an extensive assessment of Peregrine's conduct:

He had, in the hey-day of his gallantry, received a letter from his friend Gauntlet, with a kind postscript from his charming Emilia; but it arrived at a very unseasonable juncture, when his imagination was engrossed by conquests that more agreeably flattered his ambition; so that he could not find leisure and inclination, from that day, to honour the correspondence which he himself had solicited; and his vanity had, by this time, disapproved of the engagement he had contracted in the rawness and
inexperience of youth; suggesting that he was born to make such an important figure in life, as ought to raise his ideas above the consideration of any such middling connections, and fix his attention upon objects of the most sublime attraction. These dictates of ridiculous pride had almost effaced the remembrance of his amiable mistress, or at least so far warped his morals and integrity, that he actually began to conceive hopes of her altogether unworthy of his own character and her deserts. (217-18)

Commodore Trunnion, in his simplicity, 'could not believe that he was such a rogue in his heart, as to endeavour to debauch the daughter of a brave officer, who had served his country with credit and reputation' (360), but this is, sadly, a pretty accurate assessment of Peregrine:

Now that our hero found himself on English ground, his heart dilated with the proud recollection of his own improvement since he left his native soil; he began to recognize the interesting ideas of his tender years; he enjoyed, by anticipation, the pleasure of seeing his friends in the garrison, after an absence of eighteen months; and the image of his charming Emily, which other less worthy considerations had depressed, resumed the full possession of his breast. He remembered, with shame, that he had neglected the correspondence with her brother, which he himself had solicited, and in consequence of which he had received a letter from that young gentleman while he lived at Paris. In spite of these conscientious reflections, he was too self-sufficient to think he should find any difficulty in obtaining forgiveness for these sins of omission; and began to imagine, that his passion would be prejudicial to the dignity of his situation, if it could not be gratified upon terms which formerly his imagination durst not conceive.

Sorry am I, that the task I have undertaken, lays me under the necessity of divulging this degeneracy in the sentiments of our imperious youth, who was now in the heyday of his blood, flushed with the consciousness of his own qualifications, vain of his fortune, and elated on the wings of imaginary expectation. Tho' he was deeply enamoured of miss
Gauntlet, he was far from proposing her heart as the ultimate aim of his gallantry, which (he did not doubt) would triumph o'er the most illustrious females of the land, and at once regale his appetite and ambition. (352-3)

(Of the disclaimers and qualifications in the first paragraph of this excerpt, and in the passage from 217-18, more hereafter.) When Peregrine pays his first call on Emilia after his return from the Continent, and later when he stoops to abduction and seduction, the narrator is less equivocal and more effective in his condemnation of the hero:

Instead of that awful veneration which her presence used to inspire, that chastity of sentiment and delicacy of expression, he now gazed upon her with the eyes of a libertine, he glowed with the impatience of desire, talked in a strain that barely kept within the bounds of decency, and attempted to snatch such favours as she, in the tenderness of mutual acknowledgement, had once vouchsafed to bestow. (361)

He uses flattery and deceit to gain the confidence of Emilia (400, 402-3), and once he has drugged her at a masquerade (405) and conveyed her to a bagnio (406, 409), he uses low, 'libertine arguments' (407) to press her to give in to his desires, and according to the chapter heading to LXXII, 'makes a treacherous Attempt upon her Affection, and meets with a deserved Repulse' (404). Here at least, Smollett gets a single point of view across, that Peregrine's actions are reprehensible.

In spite of the author's general criticism of Peregrine's deception, treachery and base designs, in some respects the rape of Emilia is not as bad as it could be. Most obviously, it is only a rape in the earlier, more restricted sense of just an abduction, for no rape in the modern sense takes place, and it is notable for its lack of force and violence. The attempt does not ultimately affect the happy conclusion
of the book, Pickle's marriage to Emilia, and in these respects is unlike the horrifying and fatal rape of Clarissa by Lovelace. Furthermore, Smollett may be drawing some conscious parallels between his novel and Richardson's, in order to point to their differences on libertinism as an ethical issue and on moral questions in general. Like Lovelace, Pickle drugs his intended victim, and I think both authors are making use of well-known prototypical rake material, perhaps specifically Davys's *Accomplish'd Rake* (1727), in which Sir John Galliard drugs Miss Friendly under similar circumstances. (See also 473-5, 556 for more drugging and raping in *PP*.) Smollett's version of this archetypal business is, I am convinced, a parody of what takes place in *Clarissa* (1747-8), given that when *Peregrine Pickle* appeared in 1751 its readers must surely have cast their minds back only a few years to the most famous drugging and rape scene in the fiction of the period, and given that there are other seeming echoes of Richardsonian material in *Pickle*. Like Clarissa, Emilia is taken to a brothel, and their seducers both use the same lie to disguise the fact: the house in question is in both novels said to be that of a respectable elderly gentlewoman (*PP*, 406). After a torrent of perhaps Richardsonian passions (410), the hero, like Lovelace, takes to the road in pursuit of the escaped object of his desire (chapter LXXXIV), earthing her as Lovelace does at an inn (*PP*, 414). There is even the Lovelacean element of disguise in Smollett's rendering of the inn scene, but in *Peregrine Pickle* the roles are reversed: the lady wears the mask, not the seducer (413). She declares that 'she would adhere to the resolution she had taken, and perish rather than comply with his will' (418), her tone very much *à la* Harloue. As it turns out, however, the lady is not Emilia, but some wife making a bolt from a cruel husband, and Peregrine's success with Emilia is for the time being
thwarted. Thwarted for good is a *Clarissa*-like outcome, and Smollett seems to be making the point that hot-blooded young men, even when they stoop as low as Peregrine, are rarely as bad as Lovelace, if at all, and, that fortunately, young ladies are not as foolish and melodramatic (or, in the end, as prudish) as Richardson's heroine. Smollett's general conclusion about women, repeated in Crabtree's chastisement of a young lady unwise enough to think she can go off with her lover and escape with her virtue and reputation intact (556-7), is roughly that of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, who wrote, 'that model of Perfection, Clarissa, is so faulty in her behaviour as to deserve little Compassion. Any Girl that runs away with a young Fellow without intending to marry him should be carry'd to Bridewell or Bedlam the next day.' Smollett's deviations from the Richardsonian account of the rape are significant too. The drug that Peregrine administers, openly rather than secretly, is a stimulant (Coleridge's *tinctura lyttae*?) that seems to rouse Emilia's spirits. It is evidently beneath Peregrine to offer violence or render her insensible, and Smollett is in any case rather pleased with the effect: 'Her eyes began to sparkle with unusual fire and vivacity, a thousand brilliant sallies of wit escaped her, and every mask that accosted her, underwent some smarting repartee' (405). And Emilia is no fool; she sensibly refuses the offer of a second cordial (which admittedly might be a sedative; 407). When Pickle folds her in his arms, Emilia is level-headed and confident, demanding first a parley and then leaving him 'confounded and over-awed by [her] cutting reproaches' (408) -- all as though to say that Clarissa could have escaped with her life and her virtue, or rather that life and, by implication, virtue are not as they are represented in *Clarissa*; and also that Peregrine's acts, mitigated by circumstances orchestrated to make them fall short of the horrors of Richardsonian libertinism, are not outside the scope of
sophisticated toleration.\textsuperscript{35}

The latter supposition, about Smollett's willingness to excuse rakishness, or even to incorporate it into a Fieldingesque 'great, useful and uncommon Doctrine', is reinforced by the numerous ways in which the author palliates the conduct of his hero and weakens the effect of what little criticism of Peregrine there is in the novel. The means by which this is accomplished are essentially those found in \textit{Roderick Random}, but applied more widely. As we shall see, by preventing a great deal of potential moral comment to the detriment of the hero, Smollett confuses his own moral position and seriously mars the effectiveness of \textit{Peregrine Pickle} itself. One obfuscating habit of Smollett's has already been mentioned, his leavening of the passages that are hardest on his protagonist with indications that he is not bereft of good qualities or utterly beyond reclamation. In the excerpts quoted above, in which Peregrine Pickle sinks to his lowest point of moral degradation, he is, in spite of his manifest baseness, only 'warped' in his morals (218) and thus not completely and irretrievably corrupted, and the memory of Emilia is merely 'almost effaced' (218), not totally forgotten. On his return from France, swollen with vanity and ambition as he is, Peregrine is nevertheless eager to see his friends and family at the Garrison (352), and not only is he ashamed of his failure to reply to Godfrey Gauntlet's letters, but also 'the image of his charming Emily, which other less worthy considerations had depressed, resumed the full possession of his breast' (352). The narrator abruptly turns from these laudable sentiments to castigation of the hero, but the censure is to some extent neutralised by what prefaces it. The author also makes sure that the reader is aware of Pickle's good qualities: his generosity, spirit, honour, just resentment of oppression and
general good nature. In the rape scene, Peregrine maintains enough decency to feel remorse after the attempt (409); indeed, 'he found himself not only incapable of obstructing her retreat, but even of uttering one syllable to deprecate her wrath, or extenuate the guilt of his own conduct' (409), and, 'while he deeply resented her disdain, he could not help admiring her spirit, and in his heart did homage to her charms' (409).

This last clause I have quoted indicates a further way in which Peregrine's behaviour is partially excused: Smollett appears to accept the theory of a ruling passion that determines human behaviour more powerfully and automatically than reason can. Pickle in fact has a number of uppermost passions; 'vanity and pride were his ruling foibles', we are told at one point (397), and elsewhere they seem to be impetuosity or liquorishness. The force of the passions is, from Peregrine's youth, 'like a stream which being dammed, accumulates more force, and bursting o'er its mounds, rushes down with double impetuosity' (83). The author later says of Peregrine, 'He projected a thousand salutary schemes of deportment, but, like other projectors, he never had interest enough with the ministry of his passions to bring any of them to bear' (217). The logical deduction from all of this is that Peregrine, being at the mercy of impulses he cannot control, is not to be held fully responsible for his passionate acts. Glosses on the name of the hero further suggest that his actions are caused by his very nature: 'peregrination' suggests waywardness and erring, as well as meaning more specifically 'A course of travel', especially abroad, all of which ties in nicely with his deviations from the paths of virtue and his Grand Tour; a 'pickle' is, of course, a scrape or predicament like the many in which Peregrine finds himself, but also means 'A person, usually a boy,
who is always causing trouble...; a troublesome or mischievous child; ... a wild young fellow', while 'pickled', applied to a person, means 'thoroughly "imbued" with mischief; mischievous; roguish'. Of related interest is what is said about a baby's time in the womb as a determinant of character. As G.S. Rousseau points out, the episode early in the novel where the pregnant Mrs Pickle teases her sister-in-law Grizzle by pretending to crave pineapple (21-3) depends on one's knowledge that the fruit was believed by the herbalists to cause miscarriages, but Rousseau assumes that Smollett is satirising the credulity of midwives and of Mrs Grizzle in believing that the pica of a mother can affect the child in her womb. As a doctor, Smollett probably did discredit such traditional lore, but in the novel he seems to play with it, for Mrs Pickle's desire for abortive pineapple may presage her later unnatural behaviour to her son, and Peregrine inherits her teasing disposition, which he displays even in the cradle (51-2), and ever afterwards. One further illustration of Smollett's belief in the supremacy of nature over nurture is Peregrine's attempt to coach a beggarmaid in the manners of high society and pass her off there as a fine lady (596-603). The scheme is naturally a failure, sow's ears being what they are, and education unable to overcome birth. (The author also seems to imply that the ladies who are offended by this Eliza Doolittle, regardless of their veneer of refinement, are dominated by ruling passions as well.) Ruling passions and pica are not, however, the only physiological aspects of Peregrine Pickle, for the hero's remorse over his past misconduct and his increasing desire for reconciliation with Emilia are described in curiously medical, physical terms, as though reformation were all a question of glands and humoral secretions rather than of conscience and moral agency. Pickle's immediate reaction to Emilia's repulse is fever and delirium requiring plentiful bleeding and a tranquiliser (409). A
little later, another fever nearly carries him off, but it brings with it shame, remorse and a revival of 'his former sentiments in her favour' (419). As the author observes,

A seasonable fit of illness is an excellent medicine for the turbulence of passion. Such a reformation had the fever produced in the economy of his thoughts, that he moralized like an apostle, and projected several prudential schemes for his future conduct. (421-2)

The return of good health puts an end to these, and Peregrine is back to his old amorous ways. In chapter XCIV, when Pickle sees Emilia for the first time since the incident in the bagnio, at her brother Godfrey's wedding, the physical effect is quite stunning:

in the course of the country-dancing, when he was obliged to join hands with her, the touch thrill'd thro' all his nerves, and kindled a flame within him which he could not contain. In a word, his endeavours to conceal the situation of his thoughts, were so violent, that his constitution could not endure the shock; the sweat ran down his forehead in a stream, the colour vanished from his cheeks, his knees began to totter, and his eye-sight to fail: so that he must have fallen at his full length upon the floor, had not he retired very abruptly into another room, where he threw himself upon a couch, and fainted. (589; see also 587)

Physical contact with Emilia made, Peregrine is well on the way to reformation, and when the moment of complete reconciliation does come, it is couched in suitably physical terms amid heaving breasts and transports of sensual delight (774; also 93). Now of course Smollett is in part only trying to describe the physical effects and sensations of love, but his conception of love is significantly far more physical than spiritual or intellectual (witness the bestial, carnivorous atmosphere
of Smollettian wedding-nights) -- in fact, it is only at the level of sentimental
convention that his view of love seems to be other than physical at all. Given the
overwhelming accumulation of major and minor statements of the power of
birth, nature, humour and physiology in *Peregrine Pickle*, the rôle of conscious
choice and the applicability of moral scruples must be considerably diminished,
and the hero's intrigues and scrapes thus the inescapable consequence of hot blood
and youthful impetuosity, not anything that could be reined in by will or rational
choice.

Just as Peregrine never loses his respect and love for Emilia deep down, she
too cannot help loving him, even in spite of good grounds for resentment, as her
conduct at her brother's wedding makes clear (587-590). Emilia is also rather
oddly (in a novel that claims to criticise its hero where justified) presented in the
final volume of the novel as being in some ways not so much the injured as the
guilty party in some ways. Her brother and his wife, Emilia's best friend,

exhaust their eloquence in attempting to prove, that
the reparation which our hero had offered was adequate
to the injury she had sustained; that in reconciling her-
self to a penitent lover, who subscribed to her own
terms of submission, her honour would be acquitted
by the most scrupulous and severe judges of decorum;
and that her inflexibility would be justly ascribed to the
pride and insensibility of her heart. She turned a deaf
ear to all their arguments, exhortations and intreaties,
and threatened to leave the house immediately, if they
would not promise to drop that subject of discourse. (592; also 773)

The author is more than hinting that Emilia is being unreasonable (Peregrine
alludes to 'the cruelty of her unjustifiable pride', 595), her disdain disproportionate to the offence committed. Her resentment is also something of an act, especially as Peregrine has 'made such acknowledgements, and offered such atonement, as few women of her sphere would have refused ...' (595). Even her mother is on the side of Pickle and thinks her behaviour unjustifiable (421, 621-2). Happily, the lady yields to the arguments of her family, and everyone makes a joke of her earlier resentment as a prelude to formal forgiveness and reconciliation in 'Chapter the Last' (773-5). This subtle but perceptible shift of blame from rake to virgin is a significant step in the process of Peregrine's exculpation, and Emilia is not its only victim: during the fortune-telling scheme Crabtree blames a young lady for being drugged and raped, and not her buck of a boyfriend (556).

Less remarkable but no less important are other excuses for Peregrine's behaviour. Like Roderick Random, Pickle is on many occasions let off by the forces of authority with a laugh and an ineffectual warning; in Paris, for example, the city-guard, who having come across Peregrine and some rowdy companions after the hero has tried to seduce a pretty bourgeoise and caused a scene, 'respected them as foreigners, or inexperienced youths intoxicated with liquor, ... [and] gave them room to pass, without opposition' (206). Even after provocation their commanding officer,
But this is all he gets for his 'irregularity and insolence' as well as his 'gallantry and courage' -- no punishment whatsoever. Some time later in his Grand Tour, when Peregrine has intrigued and eloped with Mrs Hornbeck, and been reported to the British Ambassador by her jealous husband, the same sort of thing happens. The diplomat sees fit to pass up the opportunity to give a stern reprimand on the author's behalf:

his excellency, ... sending for the young gentleman that same evening, read him such a lecture in private, as exhorted a confession of the whole affair; not that he assailed him with sour and supercilious maxims, or severe rebuke, because he had penetration enough to discern, that Peregrine's disposition was impregnable to all such attacks; but he first of all rallied him upon his intriguing genius, then, in an humorous manner, described the distraction of the poor cuckold, who he owned was justly punished for the absurdity of his conduct; and lastly, upon the supposition, that it would be no great effort in Pickle to part with such a conquest, especially after it was for some time possessed, represented the necessity and expediency of restoring her, not only out of regard to his own character, and that of his nation, but also with a view to his ease, which would in a little time be very much invaded by such an incumbrance, that in all probability would involve him in a thousand difficulties and disgusts. Besides, he assured him, that he was already, by order of the lieutenant de police, surrounded with spies, who would watch all his motions, and immediately discover the retreat in which he had deposited his prize. These arguments, and the frank familiar manner in which they were delivered, but above all, the last consideration, induced the young gentleman to disclose the whole of his proceedings to the Embassador, and promise to be governed by his direction, provided the lady should not suffer for the step she had taken, but be received by her husband with due reverence and respect. (221-2)

The Ambasador's and the author's attempt at subtlety backfire, for the tone of worldly connivance seems to minimise Peregrine's guilt, whether it is intended to
do so or not. He is in any case only temporarily, so not profoundly, deterred and
eventually manages again to have his way with Mrs Hornbeck (314-15). The next
time he is brought before the envoy for his indiscretions (the boring episode of
Pallet tricked into drag and the resulting insult to a French Prince of the Blood at a
rout, 243-7), he is sent away with assurances of 'continual favour and friendship'
and 'letters of introduction to several persons of quality belonging to the British
court' (259). When the twice-cuckolded Hornbeck at last confronts Peregrine for
himself, although the hero is 'conscious of his own unjustifiable behaviour' (319),
the commander of musketeers who breaks up their altercation is convinced that
when Pickle appears before Charles of Lorraine, Governor of the Austrian Nether­
lands, 'the prince would consider the whole as a *Tour de jeunesse*, and order him
to be released without delay' (319). The Empress-Queen's representative is briefly
prejudiced against the hero by the slanders of the jealous husband, but when these
have been disproved,

the prince, convinced of the injustice his character had
suffered by the misrepresentation of Hornbeck, took
our hero by the hand, asked pardon for the doubts he
had entertained of his honour, declared him from that
moment at liberty, ordered his domesticks to be enlarged,
and offered him his countenance and protection, as long
as he should remain in the Austrian Netherlands. At
the same time, he cautioned him against indiscretion in
the course of his gallantries; and took his word and honour,
that he should drop all measures of resentment against
the person of Hornbeck, during his residence in that
place. (321)

The extent of the ethical comment is, then, 'Don't get caught'. (It should also be
pointed out that Hornbeck's name suggests that to be cuckolded is his fate, and
that Peregrine is only carrying out what is in some way pre-determined.)

Also as in *Roderick Random*, critics of Peregrine's behaviour (apart from the narrator) tend to be ridiculous and Polonian. The most important of these is Mr Jolter, the hero's governor both at Oxford and on tour on the Continent. Jolter is a High Churchman, a Jacobite and a Francophile (none of which was a recommendation to Smollett in real life44). The author says of Jolter,

> All his maxims were the suggestions of pedantry and prejudice; so that his perception was obscured, his judgment biassed, his address awkward, and his conversation absurd and unentertaining... (207)

His constant worries about and observations on the morals of his charge are ludicrous in consequence, as are his attempts to reform Peregrine according to a geometric plan of reformation, a sort of penitential parallelogram (133-4).45 Commodore Trunnion's admonitions about Woman, that 'painted galley, which will decoy you upon the flats of destruction' (136) or, like 'the gulph of Florida', suck Peregrine into an indraught are not to be taken seriously either, especially since the woman in question is the peerless Emilia Gauntlet. Nor can one give very much authority to the dram-drinking Mrs Trunnion or to the bigoted physician whom Peregrine meets on his travels.46 The reader's confidence in moral advice, at least as far as it is given by characters in the novel, is further undermined when it comes from Peregrine's hypocritically avuncular 'great man' and political patron (608-09, 627). The character who represents Pickle the most unfavourably, indeed the only one to revile him, is his monstrous and wicked mother, who calls him by 'the epithets of spendthrift, jailbird, and unnatural ruffian' (768) -- so unnatural herself that her ranting can safely be dismissed (see also 172).
Mrs Pickle makes her son look only decent and victimised, just as Hornbeck's libels make him look innocent and put-upon. Like Roderick, Peregrine is plainly a better man than most of the people he meets, and is often exposed to flattering comparisons with them. He is cheated by the Newmarket peer (606-07), and during his career as candidate for a borough he is deceived and fleeced by more scoundrels who pretend to give him good advice and take advantage of his good nature (chapters XCVI-CV).47 At other times, he is seen in marked contrast to groups of very typical rakes of the Mohock breed,48 and also to the Blifil of the piece, his younger brother Gamaliel. Gam's plans for his elder brother (some kind of mutilation, perhaps even castration; see 160) are incomparably worse than any of the merry pranks of the elder Pickle. Some vices are beyond the pale, for Peregrine's licentiousness, any more than Random's, does not extend to buggery, in this novel connived at by the Italian count (or marquis; the author is uncertain which; cf 234, 241, 242) and the German baron (and implicitly in the Doctor's Trimalchian feast and Pallet's transvestism?), which inspires in the hero 'a just detestation for all such abominable practices' (242). Like Gam Pickle and Hornbeck, the sodomites are appropriately punished, and indeed from about chapter LXXXIX Peregrine's practical jokes are increasingly moral in intent; they satirise, punish and even reform the vices and follies of others, particularly at the time when he and Crabtree operate their fortune-telling venture.49 Pickle's duels have virtuous ends, usually the punishment of French arbitrary power and petty tyranny, and his amours often have the laudable motive (among others less so) of defying the cruel and intolerable enforcement of Papist monastic chastity.50

The accumulation of so much that exculpates Peregrine Pickle seems to
overwhelm the few, isolated instances where the author condemns his actions,
and it is no wonder that at the end of the novel the hero enjoys his own again
with a sense of vindication rather than humility, repentance or plans for amend­
ment. As he goes to his father's house to assert his right of inheritance, the
narrator remarks,

Of all the journeys he had ever made, this,
sure, was the most delightful: he felt all the extasy
that must naturally be produced in a young man of
his imagination, from such a sudden transition, in
point of circumstance; he found himself delivered
from confinement and disgrace, without being
obliged to any person upon earth for his deliverance;
he had it now in his power to retort the contempt
of the world, in a manner suited to his most sanguine
wish; he was reconciled to his friend, and enabled to
gratify his love, even upon his own terms; and saw
himself in possession of a fortune more ample than
his first inheritance, with a stock of experience that
would steer him clear of all those quicksands among
which he had been formerly wrecked. (765-6)

His worst act, the attempt on Emilia's virtue, has been settled, 'even upon his
own terms', it should be noted, and all his misdemeanours glossed over and
swallowed up in the subscription to the Fieldingesque creed of experience. When
his late father's estate is finally his, he discovers that he is in possession of

a sum that even exceeded his expectation, and could
not fail to entertain his fancy with the most agreeable
ideas. He found himself immediately a man of vast
consequence among his country neighbours, who
visited him with compliments of congratulation, and
treated him with such respect as would have effectually
spoiled any young man of his disposition, who had
not the same advantages of experience as he had al­
ready purchased at a very extravagant price. (770; see also 696)
The tone of earlier passages, where Peregrine flattered himself with extravagant expectations, is repeated (cf 217-18, 352-3), but here there is no criticism of him and he is even offered the peer's daughter once considered beyond the deserts of his vain pretension (217-18, 352-3, 397, 426-7). The end product of all his indiscretions and offences is not retribution, but the prudence to resist worse temptations, as well as enormous wealth and the woman he loves -- an expensive but valuable and worthwhile purchase.

The last passage quoted suggests that the author wants his reader to detect at least some degree of reformation and amendment in Peregrine, in spite of the fact that he is inherently good to begin with, predisposed by heredity and the circumstances of birth, and little changed by the end of the novel. The conclusion of Peregrine Pickle in fact confirms and celebrates him as he has always been.

Smollett does make occasional nods to the idea of reformation all the same, perhaps because he feels obliged to, or in order to strengthen moral content that is shaky at best. Meeting Emilia and falling in love with her has the power of (temporarily) restraining Peregrine's passions (93), and at various points in the novel he is briefly tamed by *remords*, culminating in his rather shallow 'conversion' by the end.51 Although far too long to be artistically satisfying within the novel as a whole, Viscountess Vane's interpolated 'Memoirs of a Lady of Quality' are, it seems to me, intended to increase the reader's sense of Peregrine's reformation. Critics, if they find any value in Lady Vane's story at all, vaguely describe it as more satire of high life, but surely Smollett's point in inserting it is to show the hero and the reader the unfortunate consequences of unbridled passions. (Worse for a woman in the eighteenth century, though I suspect the rather sympathetic
portrayal of Lady Vane – which on stylistic grounds I would attribute entirely to
the lady herself, though she may have had editorial help – suggests that Smollett
thought this unfair.) We are doubtless intended to remark the similarities be­
tween Peregrine and Lady Vane from the point of view of mercantile social back­
ground, hot temperament and sudden exposure to high society, and it is perhaps
worth remembering that the 'Memoirs' were almost universally regarded in the
eighteenth century, by sympathisers and detractors alike, as an attempt to vindicate
Lady Vane and her indiscretions. But Lady Vane's history, while pointing out
some of the pitfalls that Peregrine heads for but ultimately misses, also illustrates
another Smollettian theme: namely, a liberal attitude towards sexuality that
includes a notion of chastity based on fidelity of heart rather than of body. The
educative effect of Lady Vane on Peregrine is further emphasised by two important
but strangely neglected instances where Lady Vane teaches Peregrine to control
his wayward appetites and direct them towards Emilia, their proper object (539,
676). But the awkwardness with which the 'Memoirs' are included in the novel
should also point to the moral bifurcation or diffuseness of the novel, which tries
to espouse conventional morality and, at the same time, circumvents that moral­
ity in the various ways that have been outlined. The ethical self-contradictions are
perhaps an intentional characteristic of the novel, possibly the result of a desire to
emulate Henry Fielding's subtle paradoxes and counterpoises in Tom Jones. This
seems to me a serious possibility, with the necessary corollary that Smollett's
attempt does not quite measure up to what in part inspired it. Lady Mary's initial
suspicion that Roderick Random was an inferior product of her cousin Harry's is
perhaps more astute than at first appears; and a credible explanation for Smollett's
bitter grudge against Fielding (expressed in *Habbakkuk Hilding* (1752), if it is indeed by Smollett -- not a certainty -- but in any case elsewhere) is that it arose from Smollett's own conscious or sub-conscious awareness of how similar his work is to Fielding's, of their being not fellow writers but very close rivals for the same chair in the college of authors. This would account for Smollett's sensitivity in *Habbakkuk Hilding* (assuming his authorship of it for the moment) about the strong similarities between Strap and Fielding's Partridge, between his own Miss Williams and *Amelia'*s Miss Mathews, and between Peregrine and Tom. Or perhaps he thought he could beat Fielding at his own game, and made the attempt to do so in his fiction. But neither of these is an hypothesis that appeals to Smollettians, who, like Boucé, denigrate ‘*les parallèles usés entre Fielding et Smollett, à l'avantage, comme presque toujours, de Fielding.*’ Use perhaps, but well grounded -- Boucé seems to me merely to be skirting one of Smollett's major weaknesses by dismissing its critics.

Leaving aside the possibility that Smollett copied Fielding in some ways (though one could never accuse him of outright plagiarism), there remains the issue of the moral content of *Peregrine Pickle* and the degree to which it conforms to Putney's moral plan or, conversely, has Putneian form imposed upon it. There are aspects of the novel which adhere to Putney's plan, but the sum of the evidence points to the latter conclusion; *Peregrine Pickle* is simply too much of a mess to be the carefully-plotted but overly-long book that Putney makes it out to be. The novel contains an unsettling number of incidents where the hero's excesses are laughed off, presented neutrally and without comment (and thus silently approved of?), or fairly openly encouraged. The vindication, more-
over, of the hero by 'Chapter the Last' and the see-sawing of good fortune and rakishness, and misfortune and reflection (an excellent instance of which is to be found in chapter C, 634-6; and what is examined above) seriously mars whatever moral purpose Smollett may ever have had. When Peregrine has been freed of the burden of his Eliza Doolittle, the narrator observes,

This affair being settled, and our adventurer, for the present, free of all female connexions, he returned to his former course of fast living, among the bucks of the town and performed innumerable exploits among whores, bullies, rooks, constables, and justices of the peace. (603)

This presumably means more reformatory pranks as well as more rakishness, so that fast living and the more usual, Mohockish variety of scouring are wrapped up and confused with Peregrine's praiseworthy satiric, even moral, urges. (Another example of this sort of mixture is to be found on 576-7). Part of the general problem is Smollett's reluctance, in spite of his narrative mode in the third person, to make intrusive remarks in the course of his story-telling, and he comments on this (a little paradoxically) in what must be, as James L Clifford, the Oxford English Novels editor points out, 'an obvious jibe at Fielding's technique in *Tom Jones* (see note in *ed. cit.*, 803):

I might here, in imitation of some celebrated writers, furnish out a page or two, with the reflections he [Pickle] made upon the instability of human affairs, the treachery of the world, and the temerity of youth; and endeavour to decoy the reader into a smile, by some quaint observation of my own, touching the sagacious moralizer: but, besides that I look upon this practice as an impertinent anticipation of the peruser's thoughts, I have too much matter of importance upon my hands, to give the reader the
least reason to believe that I am driven to such poultry shifts, in order to eke out the volume. Suffice it, then, to say, our adventurer passed a very uneasy night, not only from the thorny suggestions of his mind, but likewise from the anguish of his body, which suffered from the hardness of his couch, as well as from the natural inhabitants thereof, which did not tamely suffer his intrusion. (682-3)

The ironies are that this is Smollett at his most like Fielding, both in manner and tone, and that his novel and moral purpose could profit from more authorial 'intervention', instead of being eked out with odd episodes like Peregrine's inexplicable meeting and over-night stay with the squire who has the Van Dyck portraits of his ancestors painted over, to give them wigs and clothes of the current mode (771-2). Ronald Paulson perceptively identifies the other central weakness of the novel, which has been hinted at above:

Why ... is Peregrine Pickle still as a whole (and in spite of brilliant parts) an unsatisfactory performance? One pertinent answer is that every time Peregrine punishes a person, however unjust his motive, his satiric analysis of that person is true: Hornbeck is a Pynchwife and Pallet is a meddling fool; whatever one may think of Peregrine as a man (and Smollett is of course making this distinction), he is telling the truth as a satirist.57

Professor Paulson continues that 'it is questionable, finally, whether the themes of Peregrine's satire and of his moral decline ever come together', and that the novel's episodicity results in moral diffuseness.58 The fact that the revised, 1758 edition of the novel presents a text excised of some of the hero's crimes might be evidence of Smollett's perception of the weakness of his plan as executed, and a desire, in undertaking a second edition, to tighten and toughen up the morals of
*Peregrine Pickle* (à la Putney). Certainly some of the evidence points to this: the 1758 version omits Peregrine's affair with the chambermaid at Winchester (81), various amours of Peregrine and Godfrey (116-70, 388-91, 540-51), the chatting up of an innkeeper's daughter (199), 'guilty raptures' with Mrs Hornbeck (202), the attempted seduction of a Parisian *bourgeoise* (205-06), the sodomy of the two continental noblemen (149-51), and the intrigue with the nun (325-51). In the end, however, one must conclude with Howard Swazey Buck that rakishness is *not* the principal target of the revisions. Immorality was a charge levelled against the novel, but Buck shows that 'general vulgarity' (piss-pot jokes, in the main: see *PP*, 65-7), rather than rakery are the substance of revisions on that score, and that Smollett was in any case more concerned with stylistic improvements and the removal of libellous passages about Garrick, Lyttelton and Fielding (*PP*, 658-60), as the author's 'Advertisement' to the second edition makes clear. Buck points out, furthermore, that the 'immoral' history of Lady Vane remains intact in the 1758 edition (except in two instances where it is rearranged or augmented), as does the scene in the public stews in Amsterdam and, most importantly, the attempted rape of Emilia and the way in which it is forgiven. Smollett's intention may thus have been to satisfy the critics of the first edition by cutting the most indelicate parts of the book (or a reasonably acceptable number of them), while leaving enough so that his original design – of letting the hero off – is unaffected. It should be clear in any event that Putney both overstates the case for a well thought-out scheme for the novel, and under-estimates Smollett's technical deficiencies and his conscious or unconscious willingness to excuse Pickle's crimes. Smollett's criticisms of the hero's morals are at most fitful nods to conventional
prudery, and at least comments made to increase slightly the moral depth of his character, but certainly not to damn him.

The unsettling question of Smollett's intentions remains unanswered, however, for it is never entirely clear how much the collision of his moralising moments and his obvious sympathy for the follies of young gentlemen is accidental, and how much predetermined. Neither of Smollett's next two novels, *Ferdinand Count Fathom* (1753) or *Sir Launcelot Greaves* (1760-1), will provide many answers, for the attention paid to the rake in *Fathom* and *Greaves* is minor, and it is not until much later, in *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker* (1771), that Smollett returns to the novel and to rakishness as a major theme. The difference between the earliest novels and the last, as far as this study is concerned, is that instead of describing the career of a rake as it happens, much of the rakishness in *Humphry Clinker* has taken place years before the events that befall the several correspondents in the course of their whole tour of Great Britain, long ago in Matthew Bramble's 'days of hot blood and unrestrained libertinism'. As the novel unfolds, Bramble acknowledges and comes to terms with his past, including its hot days, and perhaps the book as a whole may allocate libertinism to its proper place in a Smollettian scheme of life. The place of rakery in *Clinker* points to ways in which Smollett's thinking about morality has changed, and indicates solutions to literary and ethical problems towards which he was groping in his earlier work. As many excellent studies have shown, *Clinker* is a fine late-flowering of Augustanism, a statement of a nostalgic, conservative ideal that encompasses aesthetics, politics and a view of social relations, and there is no real need to repeat what has been said so well already. It will, however, be useful, in light of what has been discussed at length above, to examine what *Clinker* has to say on the
subject of reformation, to see whether Smollett has improved on the perfunctory attempts at depicting it in the earlier novels. (There have been some good critical discussions of reformation in *Humphry Clinker*, but I must raise the issue again in order to round off my discussion; and a comparison of the approaches taken to reformation in the novels needs elaboration.) Aspects of the novel that warrant attention are the author's views on the practicability of reformation, and his assessment of the generation that is to succeed the reformed Matthew Bramble, leading up, of course, to his conclusions about the figure of the rake.

The first thing to recognise in *Humphry Clinker* is the undeniable change in Bramble, and that reformation of this profundity is quite unlike the shallow, merely conventional regeneration of Roderick Random or Peregrine Pickle (or, for that matter, Ferdinand Fathom). From the early letters of *Clinker*, Bramble is irritable of temper and costive both in mind and body, but by the end of the novel he has 'no occasion for the [purgative?] water' at Buxton (281), and writes to his friend Dr Lewis, hitherto the Arbuthnotian recipient of complaint (the Popean parallel is drawn on 350), saying,

As I have laid in a considerable stock of health, it is hoped you will not have much trouble with me in the way of physic, but I intend to work you on the side of exercise. -- I have got an excellent fowling-piece of Mr. Lismahago, who is a keen sportsman, and we shall take to the heath in all weathers. -- That this scheme of life may be prosecuted the more effectually, I intend to renounce all sedentary amusements, particularly that of writing long letters; a resolution, which, had I taken it sooner, might have saved you the trouble you have lately taken in reading the tedious epistles of MATT. BRAMBLE (351)
This constitutes a revolutionary alteration in Bramble, in attitude, temper and outlook more than in purely medical or physiological terms (one has, after all, the impression that much of his earlier ill health is psychosomatic). There is accordingly a gradual relaxation in Bramble's relations with others and in his own views. He has relaxed enough himself and been peeled of the 'disagreeable husk' he ascribes to Lismahago (339) to find the grotesquely humorous Scot less severe (333, 339). Exposure to the outre, fanatically right-wing opinions of the Scottish officer helps to moderate his own 'dry', but increasingly 'wet', conservatism, and Bramble's confrontation with Clinker's levelling (but not radical) Methodism, together with his eventual acceptance of Humphry within the world of Brambleton Hall, goes a long way in tempering and humanising Matthew Bramble's rather starchy brand of Toryism.66

Even more significantly, Bramble and Lewis's 'fellow-rake at Oxford' (320), Charles Dennison, whom the travellers happen upon in the course of their peregrinations, has made up for his youthful dissipation, and for that of his elder brother, a profligate 'fox-hunter and a sot' (321), by retiring to the country, living in Horatian simplicity and attaining 'that pitch of rural felicity' to which Bramble has been aspiring 'these twenty years in vain' (320) -- proof positive that human character can be reclaimed from disaster, and the land with it (321-3). There is every indication that Dennisonian economy will bring about the renovation of Baynard's estate (343), up till now plunged in vain excess worthy of Pope's Timon (285-6, 341-4).67 It is doubtless no accident that the Bramble party's ordeal by water, their near drowning while trying to ford a river in spate, that precipitates the discovery of Clinker's parentage, comes just after the visit to Baynard's, and leads the
group by chance to Dennison's, whose house happens to be the closest at hand -- a case of thematic as well as chronological connexion. But all that I have said about *Humphry Clinker* so far is well known.

The examples of Bramble, Baynard and Dennison suggest that regeneration, if not precisely a conversion from rakishness, is possible. It should be pointed out that Dennison seems to have reversed the effects of his elder brother's profusion more than his own, for Dennison minor was not the one to ruin the paternal estate. Baynard, for his part, is less an exponent of libertinism as it has been understood in this study than of a Sekoran luxury: the two concepts overlap, as in Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees*, but a rake is not quite the same thing as a Timon. Age may be the principal difference, for the rake may become a Baynard if he survives his excesses with at least some of his fortune intact (or, like Peregrine, inherits a second one when he has gone through the first) -- the temperament may be the same. Matthew Bramble too is long past his libertine days as an undergraduate, but of course this could be part of the point, for Smollett may be suggesting that regrets about past conduct come late (sometimes too late), if they come at all, and that only unforeseen circumstances can forcibly bring about a significant re-orientation of character and behaviour. Not owning up to one's sins of the flesh is a retention that sours the disposition, but one can still jog on as Bramble does, escaping altogether the awful consequences of libertinism predicted by more Brownian moralists.

The fact that Bramble's reformation occurs so late in life, largely as a result of chance meetings and extraordinary discoveries, and that he might easily, by choosing another route even, have continued in his cantankerous ways to the end
of his days, leads one to suspect that Smollett is to some degree pessimistic about the possibility of the re-creation of the individual, the estate and the nation. After all, London and Bath are getting larger and worse (34-8, 118-23), unless the two cities, like politics and personal relations, are subject to reassessment by the later, mellower Bramble (but we are never led to believe this is so). For every Dennison and re-educated Baynard there seems to be an Italianate fop like young Burdock, an inhospitable host like Burdock senior, a bad and destructive squire like Pimpernel, a boor like Sir Thomas Bullford, a justice Buzzard, and peers like the incompetent Duke of Newcastle and the unreformedly Timonian Lord Oxrnington. It would also seem that the author has a few reservations about what is to happen later at Brambleton Hall after the return of the travellers to Monmouthshire. A surprising number of critics take the talk of 'a happy little society' (343) without a grain of salt. Smollett draws back from presenting a picture of Brambleton Hall as 'matthewmurphy'd', in Win Jenkins's perhaps significantly botched phrase (337), into Paradise regained, and the novel ends with Tabitha unchanged by marriage (343-4, 351-2) and Win (now Loyd, and Humphry's wife) sowing seeds of snobbery and dissension, albeit comically (352-3). Win calls Bramble and the others 'a family of love' (338), but surely we cannot take her expression, with its overtones of Dissent (a danger sign in Smollett, as in Fielding) quite at face value, as Win's insincere desire to live on 'dissent terms of civility' with her former fellow-servants may indicate (353). In addition, two echoes of older Smollettian technique find their way into Humphry Clinker, and diminish the extent of Bramble's reformation and possibly the reader's surprise at it. First, the change in him is in part physiological, even humoral, so in some ways out of his control.
Second, his misanthropy, as Jery Melford points out, and as he himself occasion­ally admits, is only an affectation to conceal a fundamentally benevolent nature and a tender heart, the berry in the midst of the bramble-thorns. These, together with the purely fortuitous aspects of his conversion, suggest that the individual is not always completely responsible for or able to alter his moral condition.

There is one last thing in Humphry Clinker that hints at some built-in reservations about the rosiness of the ending of the novel, namely the presence of Bramble’s nephew, Jery Melford, who is too seldom taken into account. Jery is a genuine rake, for he meets the age qualification and his Oxford mœurs are suitably dissipated. In Melford’s fourth letter to Sir Watkin Phillips, his ‘fellow-jesuit’ (i.e. member of Jesus College, but there might be overtones of pseudo-Dashwoodian unholy orders), he denies having fathered the child of one Miss Blackerby, or of having had ‘any amorous intercourse’ (28) or other acquaintance with her (27-8). Jery has of course had other ‘connexions of that nature’ (27), and enters into the debaucheries of Edinburgh with a libertine’s relish (226-8). On the latter occasion, his uncle Matthew reads him a lecture:

In short, I have lived so riotously for some that my uncle begins to be alarmed on the score of my constitution, and very seriously observes, that all his own infirmities are owing to such excesses indulged in his youth -- (228)

Jery is a chip off the avuncular block, and one remembers that after the Blackerby affair Bramble tells him,

with great good humour, that betwixt the age of twenty and forty, he had been obliged to pro­vide for nine bastards, sworn to him by women
he never saw. (28)

Perhaps through inattention, some readers jump to the conclusion that there are eight other Humphry Clinkers waiting in the wings, but it is just possible that he is indeed the father of more than one bastard, judging by the dramatic irony of two of his earlier statements: 'what business have people to get children to plague their neighbours' (5) and 'I am conscious of no sins that ought to entail such family-plagues [here, specifically Tabitha Bramble] upon me --' (12). In any event, Jery seems to be retracing his uncle's path through young manhood, perhaps even its concealment of bastards and shirking of responsibility, and shows no signs of reformation. He remains unmarried at the end of the novel, rejecting the idea of a match with his sister's friend Miss Willis and regarding matrimony in general as a very distant prospect (313, 333-4, 336). He is the only character not participating in the assertion of sober, married, domestic virtues at the conclusion of the novel, and he may not even return with the others to Brambleton Hall (in its capacity as actual place and rural ideal), for he and Sir Watkin are 'ready to execute that scheme of peregrination which was last year concerted' between them (350) -- nothing less than a rakish Grand Tour. A shadow is thus cast on the triple wedding-feast, and perhaps on all it implies.

Jery's libertinism, all the same, is never depicted as dangerous, and there is no reason why he should not repent later on, like his uncle -- one of the major messages of the novel being 'Better late than never'. Any other reservations about the practicability of renovations moral and social are at the level of hints and undercurrents only, so only temper rather than destroy the general optimism of the novel. If Bath and London are vulgar, crowded, disorderly and dirty, Edin-
burgh and Glasgow are elegant and cultured (232-4, 245-6); if English squires and peers are mostly Pimpernels and Oxmingtons, there are notable exceptions, and once again Scotland is a pattern for England, with its munificent nobles and magnificent estates, that have transformed North Britain into a veritable replica of Eden (for all but the more temperate parts of Argyllshire, no mean feat). And as though to verify the possibility of reformation, Smollett reintroduces the character of Fathom, villain of his earlier novel, here metamorphosed and converted beyond recognition into the 'primitive Christian' apothecary Grieve (170; 165-71). Matthew Bramble may inveigh against 'our financiers ... [who] connive at drunkenness, riot, and dissipation, because they enhance the receipt of the excise ...' (104; see also 88), but this is the unenlightened Bramble speaking, and in any case his object of attack is grist more for the mill of Sekora's Luxury than for my own. Bramble remarks,

There is another point, which I would much rather see determined; whether the world was always as contemptible, as it appears to me at present? -- If the morals of mankind have not contracted an extraordinary degree of depravity, within these thirty years, then I must be infected with the common vice of old men, diffictis, querulus, laudator temporis acti; or, which is more plausible, the impetuous pursuits and avocations of youth have formerly hindered me from observing those rotten parts of human nature, which now appear so offensively to my observation (106-07)

-- but as it turns out, his first diagnosis is the correct one, the rest a vision through a miasma of ill humour. Once he is purged of his peevishness and spleen, and has undergone what he calls a 'conversion from illiberal prejudices which had grown up with my constitution' (231), Bramble and the reader see how youthful sins of
the flesh are favourably associated with his no longer suppressed benevolence (loosened bowels in the figurative sense, as one witty critic points out\(^7\)); his warm-bloodedness (319, 320) and his new régime of activity, designed to prevent being 'too sedentary, too regular, and too cautious' (339), and called by Bramble himself a healthy 'plunge amid the waves of excess' (339).

The subtlety with which Smollett makes his defence of humane rakishness, with which real changes are brought about, and with which he registers some quiet doubts about the extent or permanence of the comic resolution of the novel makes it at once a stunning departure from his earlier fiction and a confirmation of some of his youthful themes. In a muted form, *Humphry Clinker* articulates Smollett's adherence to the theory of ruling passions, and his continued belief that the nation is best ruled by the squirearchy, provided they are of a compassionate nature and, in the old sense, liberal sentiments. Although the luxury of the great does seriously threaten the ruin of the country in Smollett's analysis, it is viewed separately from the ultimately harmless diversions of red-blooded young gentlemen.

Rakishness reflects good and valuable qualities, provided it does not exceed certain bounds and ends in due season, a view expressed perhaps not fully consciously, or at least with insufficient clarity, in *Roderick Random* and *Peregrine Pickle*, but on Smollett's more mature consideration very much a deliberate element of his vision of regenerate man in *Humphry Clinker*. What is new in *Clinker*, along with an epistolary structure of some sophistication, is the importance, indeed the very possibility, of reformation. Although 'reformation' is again merely a recognition of inherent good rather than a genuine transformation, the conversions in the novel are nevertheless far more convincing and psychologically deeper than
ever before in Smollett, and more far-reaching in effecting immediate and positive changes to the society and landscape of England. In contrast to Fielding, Smollett's view of human nature seems to improve towards the end of his life, at least as far as *Amelia*, the *Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon* and *Humphry Clinker* are indications. Fielding's name inevitably creeps into the discussion, for his influence on Smollett is pervasive. It is uncertain, however, whether Smollett made up for his own lack of invention by pirating material from another novelist, just as in some ways he used real characters and digressive interpolations to eke out his volumes, or, by alluding to the material and methods of Fielding sought to comment on it and suggest a different aesthetic of the novel in his own works. Given what appears to me to be parody of *Clarissa* in *Peregrine Pickle* (and elsewhere), the latter is perhaps more likely; though not to give Smollett too much of the benefit of the doubt, the former is also plausible. But the whole issue is a vexed and probably unanswerable question. It is possible to say, however, that, like Fielding, Smollett does not regard the rake as the instrument of society's destruction, although in *Peregrine Pickle* he seems to feel obliged at times to deny his instinctive feelings about rakishness in favour of a more conventional moral code. In *Humphry Clinker*, Jery Melford goes to a feast given by the cawdies, or errand-boy pimps, of Edinburgh, at which there are, to the number of about fourscore, lords, and lairds, and other gentlemen, courtesans and cawdies mingled together, as the slaves and their masters were in the time of the Saturnalia in ancient Rome. (226-7)

Matthew and Tabitha Bramble may be shocked at this all-night revel, but within the context of Matt's realisations about his own past the episode seems to express
what Smollett had been attempting to say all along: that not only are youthful excesses harmless and instructive in their own way if, like all good parties, they come to an end, but also that a brief interlude of libertinism, like the Saturnalia, when Roman gentlemen seemed to forfeit their rightful place in the course of over-indulgence, actually helps to maintain and revivify the old order, not to bring it crashing down.
CHAPTER SIX

'The Finish'd rake: Or, Gallantry in Perfection':

Some Conclusions

I have taken the title of this last chapter from an anonymous novel published in 1733, but it is in fact with the fiction written towards the close of the eighteenth century that I would like to conclude this study. The turn of centuries, the seventeenth or the eighteenth, to a certain extent makes an artificial boundary, and it should be stressed that the rake or the rake-novel was not a phenomenon that suddenly appeared in 1701 or disappeared in 1800. Some hints of late seventeenth-century antecedents and of early nineteenth-century successors have been made, though there does seem to be enough consideration of the rake in the 1700's to warrant separate treatment. Towards the end of Chapter Two, it was suggested that the classic rake remained a popular character in fiction, and sufficiently stereotypical, that a novelist could assume his reader's instant recognition of the type, and vary it slightly for various effects. A few examples of the possible permutations within the *topos* were given there, mostly from the early and middle years of the century.

It is apparent, however, that rakishness remained a subject of concern right to the end of the century (in spite of a number of waves of opinion less hostile to the libertine), and that the rake is therefore as common a character in the novels of the 1790's as he was seventy or eighty years earlier. The biographical details of the
fictional rake do not change to a great degree (Mohockism retains its appeal as a pastime in the novel until the late 1770's at least\(^3\)), and the element of the deleterious social and political consequences of libertinism is exploited in both conservative and radical novelists even in the 80's and 90's. In an earlier reforming novel, Sarah Scott's *A Description of Millenium Hall* (1762), libertinism (as exemplified in Mr Lamont, the would-be rapist Mr Hintman, the extravagant Sir Edward Lambton and Earl of Brumpton, the wicked Lord Robert St George, and the previous owner of the country house of the title) is still society's bane, or rather the cause of society's complete worthlessness and corruption. Rakish values have so tainted the land that it is left to an enlightened minority, here a Bluestocking collective, to take over and renovate first Millenium Hall and then, presumably, the rest of the country.\(^4\) Robert Bage's *Barham Downs* (1784) also uses rakishness as the index of society's moral bankruptcy, citing conventional libertinism as evidence for the need to re-create society along entirely new lines; as does Thomas Holcroft in another radical novel, *Anna St. Ives* (1792); and Mary Wollstonecraft in *The Wrongs of Woman* makes the libertine one of the principal male oppressors of womankind.\(^5\) The rake is also the villain who lurks in the more conservative novels of manners of the last decades of the eighteenth century and the early decades of the nineteenth, the fictions of Frances Burney, Maria Edgeworth, Jane West, Mary Brunton and Jane Austen herself (in West's *A Tale of the Times*, rakishness is combined with modern scepticism and revolutionism in the character of Fitzosborne).\(^6\) The social dimension of rakery in these novels seems at times more constricted and local, in that it affects only a small, rather Grandisonian circle, but it is probably justifiable to suppose that a sense of the wider consequences is implied in them too -- especially given
the persistence of the subject of libertinism in moral debate, and given the view of
the universal bad effects of private vice in the precursors of these novels, above all
in the works of Richardson. Also without the feminist or radical element, but in
this particular not unlike Bage, are a number of the 'novels of sentiment' of the
later eighteenth century. There, the rake is no longer considered a member of a
dangerous minority that threatens to undermine the traditional values of society,
but as the representative of the morals of the World itself. In *The Vicar of Wake-
field*, young Squire Thornhill, rapist of Olivia Primrose and oppressor of her be-
leaguered and highly unconventional (because virtuous) family, is the norm for
landlords and Justices of the Peace; while the Vicar is everybody's victim because
he is good, and Sir William Thornhill positively freakish in being benevolent.
The sentimentality of what might otherwise be considered a realistic, if cynical
analysis of the world is the fact that the Vicar manages to convert all his fellow-
prisoners in the gaol, is liberated and exonerated by Sir William, and that young
Thornhill is discovered, punished and, without being fully worthy of Olivia,
reformed.7

In that prime text of Sensibility, Henry Mackenzie's *The Man of Feeling*
(1771), measures of Harley's goodness of heart include his utter failure to do what
is 'expected' of him in the brothel, and the disgust of the waiter there, who calls
him 'CULLY'.8 The reader, for his part, is expected to recognise the incongruity of
the title of chapter xxvi, 'The Man of Feeling in a brothel', and to make the com-
parison between the hero and Winbrooke, fine gentleman, Grand Tourist and de-
baucher of Emily Atkins (56-65), or between him and Respino in THE PUPIL A
FRAGMENT (chapter xl, 118-25) -- an otherwise rather pointless excrescence. Harley
makes it clear that the Heart, or Feeling is the antithesis of the World and all its vices (82-3), and as he dies he makes explicit the rejection of it that was implied in the brothel scene:

This world, my dear Charles, was a scene in which I never much delighted. I was not formed for the bustle of the busy, nor the dissipation of the gay: a thousand things occurred where I blushed for the impropriety of my conduct when I thought of the world, though my reason told me I should have blushed to have done otherwise. -- It was a scene of dissimulation, of restraint, disappointment. I leave it to enter that state, which I have learned to believe, is replete with the genuine happiness attendant upon virtue. (127-8)

In his final line, the writer of the fragmentary 'manuscript' that ostensibly makes up the novel himself rejects the men of the world (133), and it is one of these that Mackenzie made the subject of his second novel. In *The Man of the World* (1773), Sir Thomas Sindall ('sinned all?') corrupts the innocence of Billy Annesley while they are at Oxford together, in order to have his way with Annesley's sister Harriet; and Mackenzie seems to set up 'A Man of the World', a phrase he uses five times, each at the end of a paragraph, in his initial description of Sindall, as the opposite number of his earlier Man of Feeling:

And here let me pause a little, to consider that account of pleasure which the votaries of voluptuousness have frequently stated. I allow for all the delight which Sindall would experience for the present, or hope to experience for the future. I consider it abstracted from its consequences, and I will venture to affirm, that there is a truer, more exquisite voluptuary than he. -- Had virtue been now looking on the figure of beauty, and of innocence, I have attempted to draw. -- I see the purpose of benevolence beaming in his eye! -- Its throb is swelling in his heart! -- He clasps her to his bosom; -- he kisses the falling drops from her cheek; -- he weeps
with her; -- and the luxury of his tears; -- baffles description. (I. 189-90)

The Man of Feeling has reinvented rakishness, and re-created it in his own image. 10

Had the word-length of this thesis allowed, a whole chapter might have been devoted to the rake as metamorphosed into the villain of Gothic fiction, particularly Ann Radcliffe's evil Italians (Schedoni in The Italian being the prime case), or M.G. Lewis's Monk, or even Walpole's Manfred in Otranto. 11 It seems not unreasonable to regard Vathek, by the notoriously profligate William Beckford, which punishes the young Caliph's voluptuousness, blasphemy and neglect of duty with damnation in the halls of Eblis (but which manages to revel in it all at the same time), as another reflection of both the eighteenth-century fear of libertinism and fascination with it. 12

There is, I suspect, a tendency to regard Clarissa as the sole pattern and prototype of all the rake fiction that came after it, 13 but it is one of the major contentions of this thesis that Richardson's novel, though a landmark and a masterpiece, is itself only a part, if a conspicuous one, of a long literary and specifically novelistic tradition. (It is worth noting here that novels seem to have enjoyed a very long shelf-life in the eighteenth century: in 1760, Manley and Defoe are still in the 'Catalogue of the Circulating Library' in Colman's Polly Honeycombe; and in the 1780's the Novelist's Magazine, which printed condensed versions of popular fiction, relied heavily on the major works of the 1740's. 14) Richardson acknowledges this indebtedness by making Lovelace in many ways a standard rake, by distinguishing him from mere 'reptile rakes', and indeed by referring so scathingly
to the earlier rakish fictions which he seeks to rewrite in the interest of virtue. This should not be construed as an attempt to reduce Richardson's novels (or Fielding's, or Smollett's) to the level of something like *The Finish'd Rake* simply because all contain roughly similar libertines. But the fact that there seems to have been considerable agreement in the period about rakery, and that the masters of the eighteenth-century novel adopted some of the conventions of their lesser contemporaries and predecessors makes a novel like *The Finish'd Rake* worthy of some study, if only because it makes one aware of how a great novelist can use and transcend the stock and conventional.

An examination of the rakes in Fielding, Richardson and Smollett seems to me to lead to a number of main conclusions. First, one gains a better sense of eighteenth-century worries about the immorality or levity of the ruling class, and the fundamentally conservative cast of much eighteenth-century writing, including the novel. But as my earlier discussion may have suggested, this conservatism does not necessarily mean hostility to libertinism (Fielding, Smollett, Mandeville, Chesterfield are all conservatives, if of different persuasions). The solidly middle-class conservatism of Richardson leads him to take the standard anti-libertine line (which was discussed in Chapter Two) that the licence of the upper class was responsible for a more widespread and dangerous degeneracy. Fielding and Smollett, while admitting that the luxury of the great is a major problem for society, both exempt a certain type of excess from censure -- the ultimately harmless if short-lived and good-natured rakishness of boisterous youth. Fielding does so because he believes the warm-blooded qualities that make a moderate rake are in fact reflections or embryonic versions of the humane virtues,
especially benevolence, that alone can shore up and renovate the venerable insti-
tutions of society, and that can combat the truly pernicious vices of selfishness and
hypocrisy. There is something of this in Smollett's presentation of libertinism,
particularly in *Clinker*'s emphasis on the unclogged expression of human affec-
tions and social impulses (including companionable vivacity of a rakish cast), but
Smollett's earlier fiction seems to me to display a more unthinking relish for
youthful high spirits, with less of a coherent or indeed serious moral stance. Both
Smollett and Fielding subscribe to the view that gaining experience in the world is
vital to the education of a gentleman, although this was something educators had
for a long time been unwilling entirely to admit. This is why the heroes in both
novelists' books spend so much of their time on the road, pursuing various ad-
ventures and learning to bear life's vicissitudes. And in Fielding the process of
acquiring worldly wisdom seems to be part of an elegant and elevated aesthetic
credo and theory of fiction.

Secondly, a comparison of rakes in the major novels of mid century reveals
each author's attitudes to human nature and development. Looking at any other
group of characters (virtuous heroines, fathers, whores, for example) would pro-
vide much the same sort of thing, but an analysis of the various rakes lends itself
particularly well to elucidating some particular views: on the rôle of the passions,
constitution and habit on human conduct; and on the possibility and mechanisms,
if any, for repentance and reformation of morals and character. In many respects
all three novelists adhere in explaining human behaviour to the persistent notion
of ruling passions, and all three rely to some degree on this potentially determin-
istic, even mechanistic conception of motivation. Clearly related to this and de-
rived largely from Shaftesbury's *Characteristics*, if not necessarily originated
there, is the view that man is naturally inclined to goodness, the corollary being that moderate rakery does not necessarily mean utter depravity. Fielding goes one step further and suggests that thorough wickedness is rarely if ever to be met with, although there is a partial retraction of this view later in his career, notably in *Amelia* and the *Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon*; and both he and Smollett seem to base the return of their heroes to stricter probity on the assumption that Tom's, Wilson's, Booth's, Roderick's and Peregrine's essential decency prevents sheer abandonment to vice. Richardson, as I have suggested, also relies on Shaftesburian good nature in his characterisation of Mr B. and Belford, though this may appear inconsistent with his altogether darker view of human nature. *Clarissa* points to Richardson's conviction that people can be almost completely wicked (Lovelace has good qualities, but in some ways they are only mentioned to make the reader fall for a deceptive exterior as the heroine herself does, and to make him a plausible object of her affections), and that vice is far more prevalent than virtue. B. and Belford are excused and reformed, then, not because Richardson believes in the basic goodness of human nature, but because he needs to avoid compromising their morals too much by the company they keep.

It would appear, then, that Fielding, Richardson and Smollett all put some kind of limitations on the reformability of human behaviour because of each one's understanding of what motivates that behaviour in the first place. This sense of built-in, biological predestination is reinforced by the degree to which Providence, Fortune or Fate (or all of them) is invoked in the causation of events in their novels. It must not be forgotten, however, that each of these writers was a sincere Christian and must also have assented to some degree to the ideas of repentance, conversion and redemption, even of prodigal sons. Richardson's theological
leanings and his pessimistic cast of mind about human nature lead him to place the power of reformation in divine Grace, although his novelistic practice is in fact to give Lovelace up for lost, and allow penitence only where it seems not to be necessary. Fielding is for his part occasionally pessimistic about the human condition, especially in his later writings, but I would like to suggest that his more usual position on the subject is, broadly speaking, Latitudinarian and benevolent, in that a return from folly (if not vice) to natural goodness is a possibility. The resulting reformations in Fielding, those of Wilson, Jones and Booth, are perhaps necessarily rather shallow as a result (to the point where many critics have denied that Fielding's characters are capable of regeneration at all), but I am convinced that he means their moral renewals to be sincere and in their own way exemplary. The conversions of Roderick Random and Peregrine Pickle may well be perfunctory, shallow and unconvincing (in spite of Smollett's intentions, I would maintain), but the loosening-up of Matthew Bramble, that rake turned sour and costive old misanthrope, is something else again -- a genuine and believable reorientation of moral values.

The third major conclusion one might draw from a rakish study of Fielding, Richardson and Smollett is that their novels in many ways depend and comment upon each other. In Clarissa, Richardson was attempting in part to rewrite what he regarded as pernicious, rake-glorying fictional trash. Fielding parodied Richardson not only directly in Shamela, but also, it would appear, made an implicit comparison between Lovelace and Jones, Clarissa and Sophia. It is also possible that Amelia tries to reconcile a Richardsonian concern for domestic manners with Fieldingesque morality; and Smollett, it has been argued, parodied Richard-
sonian material (the Rape) in *Peregrine Pickle*, as well as indulging in the Paper War with Fielding over novel-content. The three authors clearly disagreed with each other, partly as a result of personality clashes, but also out of differing conceptions of the moral aims of the novel and of fictional characterisation. The debate over the morality of fiction and the presentation of human nature involves, or possibly even centres on, the figure of the rake and the issue of libertinism in society, which my discussion of reformation has already suggested. Critics like Frank Kermode and, more recently, Michael McKeon have described the growth of the fictional *genre* as a dialectic of novel and anti-novel, and the conflict of my three great practitioners over the question of rakishness may well suggest how this development through thesis and antithesis, statement and counter-statement, took place in the 1740's and 50's, shaping the course of subsequent novel-writing endeavours.

We have seen that there was broad agreement on the standard attributes of the rake in the eighteenth century, although moralists and novelists disagreed about the social and political implications of libertinism. Many thought it extremely dangerous, while others pooh-poohed what they considered mere alarmism over harmless youthful indulgences. But even there, in attempts to defend rakishness, there is a social emphasis; Mandeville, Fielding, Smollett and Chesterfield were all attempting to assimilate rakery into useful and beneficial human experience. The rake and his perceived effect on society seem to have been topical at every stage of the eighteenth century (and of course in the Restoration and Regency as well). This continued interest is, I think, nicely illustrated by an anecdote of the young Tom Burnet, rake of the four last years of the Queen and son of the dying Rochester's
spiritual director, which the editors of *The Gentleman's Magazine* offered their readers as late as 1779:

in the days of his youth and levity, his father one day seeing him uncommonly grave, asked what he was meditating? 'A greater work,' replied the son, 'than your Lordship's *History of the Reformation*. 'What is that, Tom?' 'My own reformation, my Lord.'

What I hope this study has demonstrated is that this was not just the obsession of one young man, but to a large extent the preoccupation of the age and its novelists.
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See my discussion of neglect of gentlemanly duty in Chapter Two.


For Defoe's worries, see Chapter Two.

Mandeville, *MDPhS*, ii of Cook's intro., iif. of Mandeville's 'Dedication to the Gentlemen of the Societies'. All subsequent references to this edition will be cited in the text.

See also Mandeville's *Wishes to a Godson* (London, 1712), 1-10.

 Cf [Daniel Defoe], *Some Considerations upon Street-Walkers* (London, [1726]), 5,7-8, 14-15, 16.

Viz., 'the French-Pox' (2-4); 'making People profuse, and tempting them to live beyond what their Circumstances will admit of' (4); 'the murdering of Bastard Infants' (4-5), 'Injury ... to particular Persons and Families; either by alienating the Affections of Wives from their Husbands, which often proves prejudicial to both, and sometimes fatal to whole Families; or else by debauching the Minds of young Women, to their utter Ruin and Destruction' (5-6).

Mandeville wrote at greater length on the motivations of honour in Part II of the *Fable* and in a later work, *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour* (London, 1732), in which latter see 3-6, 8-9, 30, 43-4, 53-76, 149. See also *FB* II. 81-99.

See *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour*, 149 for 'Instances where debauch'd Fellows and the greatest Rogues have fought well'.

Also Mandeville's *Free Thoughts* (London, 1720), 2-6, where he doubts that atheists exist in great numbers or that they have any effect on the pious, even credulous, lower orders (also 338-64). But compare his *Enquiry into the Causes of the Frequent Executions at Tyburn*, intro. Malvin R. Zirker, jnr, *ARS* 105 (Los Angeles, 1964), 20, 22-3, 43, where he is critical of rakes.


50 *LD*, 24-5. All further references to *LD* will be cited parenthetically in the text.

51 Cited in *FB* II. 445.

52 Paul Bunyan Anderson, 'Bernard Mandeville on Gin', *PMLA* 54 (1939), 775-84.


My own view is that Mandeville really does mean a lot of what he says, but has particular reasons for exaggerating his case. See *Free Thoughts*, 11: 'My Aim is to make Men penetrate into their own Consciences, and by searching without Flattery into the true Motives of their Actions, learn to know themselves' (also *FB*, II. 6-7). I shall discuss this further below.
Goldsmith, 480.


Subsequent references to this edition of Berkeley's works cited parenthetically in the text by volume and page.

By a 'minute philosopher', the Bishop means a free-thinker; see VI. 46.

For more strange treatment of Mandeville in Berkeley, see *Alciphron*, VI. 71-2, 82f, 91, 93-5, 98-101, 103, 106-11; 'An Essay towards preventing the Ruin of Great Britain', VI. 61-85; 'Maxims concerning Patriotism', VI. 253-5; and *A Discourse to Magistrates*, VI. 193-222.

See *FB* I. cxxviin.; II. 418-53; and below.

See also Maxims 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 20, 25 (VI. 253-5).

[George Bluet], *An Enquiry whether A General Practice of Virtue tends to the Wealth or Poverty, Benefit or Disadvantage of a People?* (London, 1725). All further references will be cited in the text.

See also Bluet, iv-v, 7, 37-8, 54, 70-2, 73-85, 87, 89-90, 90f, 144, 148-55.

John Dennis, *Vice and Luxury Publick Mischiefs* (London, 1725). All subsequent references will be cited in the text. For Dennis in the *Dunciad*, see n. 87.

See also in Dennis, *Vice and Luxury*, xii-xiii, xvi, xx-xxi, xvii-x, 5, 9, 12, 24-5, 25-8, 55-6, 57, 72-5. See also Dennis's *Essay Upon Publick Spirit* (London, 1711).


[John Hervey, 1st Lord Hervey of Ickworth], *Some Remarks on the Minute Philosopher* (London, 1732), 45-50. See also *FB* II. 412-14.

See also Hervey's *Memoirs*, 3 vols, ed. R. Sedgwick (London, 1931), 73-4, 92, 308-11, 447-8, 450-1, 485-6, 504, 700, 775, 858-75 (esp. 859, 862-75), 875-7.
67 *The True Meaning of the Fable of the Bees* (London, 1726). All further references will be cited in the text. See also 4, 7-9, 52, 54-5, 110.

For the authorship of *The True Meaning*, see Kaye, 'The Writings of Bernard Mandeville', 463-4 and *FB* II. 422.

68 Kaye, 'The Writings of Bernard Mandeville', 463. The rest of *The True Meaning* is a long, unconvincing re-statement and 'proof' of the author's misconception that *FB* is a satire on Whig politicians (see Kaye 'The Writings', 464).

69 Kaye, 'The Writings', 464.

70 Henry St John, 1st Viscount Bolingbroke and St John, *Works*, 4 vols (London, 1844), II. 373. See also I. 474-7 for Lord Bolingbroke's essay 'On Luxury'.

71 *Craftsman* 166 (6 September 1729), 1. Subsequent references to this number in the text.

72 *Craftsman* 291 (29 January 1731/2), 1. See also *Craftsman* 166 (6 September 1729), 2; 178 (29 November 1729), 1; 312 (24 June 1732), 1; 320 (19 August 1732), 1.


74 *Ibid.*, 204.


76 See also Kaye, 'The Influence of Bernard Mandeville', 89.

77 See *FB* II. 418-53.

78 It is well known that 'H. Scriblerus Secundus' appears as annotator on the title page of the revised, 1731 version of *Tom Thumb* as *The Tragedy of Tragedies*, and 'Scriblerus Secundus' as author on that of *The Grub-Street Opera*; see Henley, IX. 5 and 207.
79 Amelia, 114. Subsequent quotations from the novel will be cited parenthetically in the text.

In his introduction to Mandeville Studies, Irwin Primer suggests that the spelling 'Mandevil' is an intentional pun on the part of Fielding (and others). In the introduction to Harth's edition of FB I, a piece of doggerel is quoted that makes an explicit comparison between Christ as 'God-Man' and the author of FB as 'Man-Devil' (8).

For Mandevillian aspects of Fielding, see Amelia, 114n., 32 and n.; TJ, xxxv, 124 and n.; and Chapter Three.

80 TP, 221-6.

81 Champion (11 December 1739) in Henley, XV. 94. Subsequent reference will be made in the text.

See also ibid., 95-6 (11 December 1739) and 161-5 (22 January 1739/40); Covent-Garden Journal 4 (14 January 1752, N.S.) in CGJ, 38 (also 60-2, 183-7, 276-80, 306-12); Miscs, xxxvn., 9, 119, 226, 229; JA, 183, 213, 233-5; TJ, 93-7, 268-9, 881, 916; and nn 78, 79 and 82 in these Notes.

82 TJ, 269. See also xxxv, 93-7, 123-8, 485 and n.

83 Dunciad (B), II. 414 (p. 317 in Twickenham) and the Warburtonian and Twickenham editorial notes there.


see The Theory of Moral Sentiments (London and Edinburgh, 1759), 470-89, esp. 474-86.

87 For John Dennis, see Dunciad (A), I. 381 (p. 146), II. 231 (p. 128) and 271 (pp 134-5), III. 167 (p. 167); (B), I. 106 (p. 277), II. 239 (p. 307), III. 173 (p. 328).

William Law: (A), II. 381 (p. 146) and (B), II. 413 (p. 317); see also 437-8, 447.

Lord Hervey: (B), I. 298 (p. 291) and 306 (p. 306), IV. 103-4 (p. 351); also pp 41n., 93n., 212 and n., 370, 416n.; and of course in the Epistle to Dr Arbuthnot (Twickenham edn, 91, 178, 181, 184).

See also (B), IV. 275-336, 525-6, 579-98 (pp 370-6, 394, 399-402) for the rake in the Dunciad.


See also Philemon to Hydaspes (London, 1736) and Philemon to Hydaspes — A Second Conversation (London, 1737); [Patrick Delany], Reflections upon Polygamy (London, 1737), 1; Covent-Garden Magazine 2 (1773), 83-6, and 3 (1774), 61-2; [Martin Madan], Thellyphthora, 3 vols (London, 1781); Rambler's Magazine 1 (1783), 5-8, 10-12, 41-5, 65, 59, 81-3, 111, 121-4, 135-7, 161-3, 193, 201-3, 241-2, 281-3 and 2 (1784), 5-7, 136-8, 171-5, 323-4, 466 and 4 (1786), 43-5, 51, 203-05, 226-7, 250-1 and 5 (1787), 99, 505; 'The Voluptuary' in Bon Ton Magazine 4 (1794-95), 81-3, 122-4, 162-4, 227-9, 254-6, 295-6, 337-9, 373-4, 416-17, 462-5 and 5 (1795-96), 6-8 (also 2 (1792-93), 378-80, and 3 (1793-94), 26-7, 49-51, 242-3, 398-400, and 4 (1794-95), 28-9; 104-07, 136-40, 175-7, 221-4, and 5 (1795-96), 6-8).


S. Fawconer, An Essay on Modern Luxury (London, 1765), 4-5 admits the inevitability, and, grudgingly, the necessity of upper-class luxury; but the rest of the book is highly Brownian. The 4th Earl of Chesterfield, writing anonymously in World 189 (12 August 1756), seems to make the same point about class privilege as Fawconer. See also The Prosperity of Britain (London, 1757).
Chapter Two

1Samuel Richardson, The History of Sir Charles Grandison in Shakespeare Head, XVII. 21.

For similar observations, see [Henry Mackenzie], The Man of the World, 2d edn, 2 vols (London, 1773), I. 231; \textit{PP}, 766.

2See Chapter One, and nn 6, 7 Here.

3For a start, see R.D. Hume, 'The Myth of the Rake in "Restoration" Comedy', chapter 5 of The Rakish Stage (Carbondale and Edwardsville, Ill., 1983), 164-75; Shadwell's \textit{Scourers}; \textit{Spectator} 35; The Female Rake (London, 1736); [Elizabeth Griffith], The School for Rakes (London, 1769).

See Hogarth's series of prints and paintings, A Harlot's Progress (1732) and A Rake's Progress (1735), and the literature associated with them: for example, Theophilus Cibber's play The Harlot's Progress and the anon. play The Rake's Progress, both in ARS 181 (Los Angeles, 1977); the anon. compleat keys to the prints, with similar titles but in Hudibrastic verse, The Rake's Progress: Or, The Humours of Drury-Lane (London, 1735), The Rake's Progress: or, the Templar's Exit (London, 1753) and The Rake's Progress; Or, the Humours of St. James's (London, n.d.).


Periodicals: see Tatler 7, 27, 40, 143, 172; Guardian 17, 81; Spectator 75, 151, 154, 203, 260, 264, 336, 528, 530, 576; Connoisseur 22, 28, 50; GM 2 (1732), 853 and 23 (1753), 81-3; Oliver Goldsmith, The Citizen of the World (London, 1762), ix; World 23, 29.

See Samuel Butler, Characters and Passages from Note-Books (Cambridge, 1908), 32-3, 140-1, 186-7;'The Character of a Town-Gallant' (London, 1675); 'News from Covent-Garden: or, the Town-Gallants Vindication' (London, 1675); An

And see W.H. Irving, John Gay’s London (Cambridge, Mass., 1928), 223-82; Carol Houlihan Flynn, Samuel Richardson (Princeton, 1982), 333-4; and note 26, infra.

4 OED, XII. 144.


For the fact that the rake is a gentleman, see The Noble Prodigal, Spectator 528; John Gay, The Mohocks, iii. 159-60, The Rake’s Progress; Or The Humours of Drury Lane, 16; [Puckle], 79; ‘The Mohocks. A Song’ in T. D’Urfey, Wit and Mirth, 6 vols (London, 1720), VI. 336; [Dorman], The Rake of Taste; and others.
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don, 1762), 63; [John Cleland], The Surprises of Love, 2d edn (London, 1765), 54, 88-
130, 29-42; [Edward Kimber], Maria, 2 vols (London, 1765), I. 1-8, 101-19, 145-85 and II.
22-24, 79-90; [John Cleland], The Woman of Honor, 3 vols (London, 1768), I. 139-40;
Oliver Goldsmith, The Vicar of Wakefield, ed. Arthur Friedman (London, 1974), 87,
155-6; [Henry Mackenzie], The Man of the World, I. 236-57, II. 150-7, 236-7; The
[Samuel Jackson Pratt], The Pupil of Pleasure, 2d edn, 2 vols (London, 1777), II. 145,
234; [Mrs A. Woodfin], The Auction, 2 vols (London, 1777), I. 82-109, 113-30, 194-208
and II. 84-5; [Robert Bage], Barham Downs, 2 vols (London, 1784), I. 178-83 and II. 1-
2, 12-13, 68-72, 133, 137-81, 237; Entertaining Memoirs of Little Personages
(London, [c. 1783]), 106-12; Frances Burney, Evelina, ed. Edward A. Bloom with Lillian D.
Bloom (London, 1968), 195-6, 345-7 (and Evelina's mistaken fears about Lord Orville
seem to involve his Lovelacean potential); F. Burney, Camilla, eds Edward A.
387-94, 395, 613-15, 797-808, 810-16, 840, 856, 896-7; Thomas Holcroft, Anna St. Ives,
ed. Peter Faulkner (London, 1970), 391-469; [Jane West], A Tale of the Times, 3 vols
(London, 1799), III. 241-76, 297, 347-8; [Mary Brunton], Self-Control, 2 vols (Edin-
burgh and London, 1811), II. 296-328, 335-56, 402-44; [F. Burney], The Wanderer,
Also Spectator 357; Rambler 107, 170, 171; [E. Haywood and others], The Female
Spectator, 3 vols (London, 1755), I. 43-51 GM 43 (1773), 603-604; Rambler's Magazine
1 (1783), 19-20; GM 80 (1810), 25-6; Bon Ton Magazine 2 (1792-93), 187-8, 203-
04, 211-12, 245-6, 257-8, 305, 375-6, and 3 (1793-94), 132-33, and 4 (1794-95), 185-6, and 5
(1795-96), 284; Ranger's Magazine 1 (1795), 196-7.

Appropriately, Fanny Hill refers to, and on one occasion takes, aphrodi-
siac stimulants; see John Cleland, Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure, ed. Peter

See also John J. Richetti, Popular Fiction before Richardson (Oxford, 19-
69), 125, 146, 148-9, 155, 173, 181-2, 187; Susan Staves, 'British Seduced Maidens', ECS
14 (1980-81), 109-34; Jean B. Kern, 'The Fallen Woman, from the Perspective of Five
Early Eighteenth-Century Women Novelists', SECC'10 (1981), 457-68; Jane Spencer,

9 See [Francis Osborne], Advice to a Son (Oxford, 1656); [George Kings-
myll], Gallantry A-la-Mode (London, 1674); [Ames], ii; 'The Character of a Town-
Gallant', 6-8; The Levellers in 'Mundus Foppensis' and 'The Levellers', intro.
Michael S. Kimmel, ARS 248 (Los Angeles, 1988); Thomas Southern, The Fatal
Marriage, Li in Works, 2 vols, eds R. Jordan and H. Love (Oxford, 1988), II. 16; The
True-Born Englishman (London, 1701); The Tavern Hunter (London, 1702); [Ned
Ward], The London Spy, 3d edn (London, 1706), 165, 211-12; A.G., 13-18; [Ned Ward],
The Modern World Disrob'd, 169-77, 201-09; The Circus Or British Olympicks: A
Satyr on the Ring in Hide-Park (London, 1709); [Ned Ward], The Libertine's Choice
(London, 1709); [Ned Ward], The Rambling Fuddle-Caps (London, 1709); [Ned
'Mary' and 'The Wrongs of Woman', eds J. Kinsley and G. Kelly (London, 1976), 84-5, 97, 100, 106-13 (esp. 109), 130, 135, 137-9, 144, 146-50, 154-6, 196; The Man of Pleasure (London, 1800) (a presumably unauthorised abridgment of Cleland's Coxcomb); Maria Edgeworth, Castle Rackrent, ed. George Watson (London, 1964), 18-32; Charlotte Dacre (Rosa Matilda), The Libertine (London, 1807); The Man of Fashion (London, [c. 1825]).


I have been unable to locate the following titles, probably rake novels, in the Bodleian, the British Library, the Cambridge University Library or the University of Toronto libraries: ?Eliza Haywood, Persecuted Virtue (1727); The Reform'd Rake; or Modern Fine Gentleman (1729) (according to W.H. McBurney, A Check List of English Prose Fiction, 1700-1739 (Cambridge, Mass, 1960), 117, possibly a pirated edition of Mary Davys's Accomplish'd Rake); The Confederacy; Or, Boarding-School Rapes (London, 1741; published by Edmund Curll); from the 'Preface' of George Colman, snr, Polly Honeycombe (London, 1760), The Adventures of Dick Smart, The Adventures of Jack Smart, The Adventures of Jerry Buck, The Adventures of a Rake, The Intriguing Coxcomb (but for the last see James G. Basker, "The Wages of Sin": The Later Career of John Cleland, EA 40 (1987), 178-94); The History of Gay Bellario and the Fair Isabella (1763); Arthur Young, The History of Sir Charles Beaufort (1766) (hero debauched by female rake); The Rake of Taste or the Adventures of Tom Wildman (1768); The Reclaimed Libertine; or the History of the Hon. Charles Belmont and Miss Melville. In a Series of Letters (1769); The Precipitate Choice: Or the History of Lord Ossory and Miss Rivers (1772, 1783); Twas Right to Marry Him: Or the History of Miss Petworth (1773); Twas Wrong to Marry Him: Or the History of Lady Dursley (1773); The Reclaimed Libertine (1773); The Rake; or the Adventures of Tom Wildman, &c. Written by Himself (1773); The Royal Rake; or a Cabinet of Wit and Humour (1784); Mr Potter, Frederic, or the Libertine, including Memoirs of the Family of Montague (1790); August Heinrich Julius Lafontaine, The Rake and the Misanthrope, trans. Mary Charlton (1804; a Minerva Press novel).


11 Spectator, IV. 389-91. All further quotations of The Spectator in this chapter will be cited parenthetically in the text by volume and page. Where convenient, I confine myself throughout these notes to The Spectator plus the number of
the paper, and do likewise with other periodicals.

12[Ames], 8.


15[Davys], *The Accomplish'd Rake*, 6.

16See 'The Character of a Town-Gallant'; and 'News from Covent-Garden', 3-4.


20*Town and Country Magazine* 5 (1773), 245. Future references to this vol. will be made parenthetically in the text.

See also Charles Johnstone, *Chrysal*, '3d' edn, 4 vols (London, 1767), III. 164.

21[Brown], *Estimate*, 220; see also 181-2.
273


Compare [Mandeville], Free Thoughts, 3-6, 338-64; The Prosperity of Britain (London, 1757); and Chapter One.

For legal measures against libertinism, see the proclamations against the Mohocks and Hell-Fire clubs (cited in n. 52); V. G. Kiernan, The Duel in European History (Oxford, 1988), 165-222; and Sir William Blackstone's Commentaries, 4 bks (Oxford, 1765-69), IV. 41-2, 59-60, 64-5, 163-4, 170-1, 171-4. Blackstone's pleas for more extensive laws against gambling lend credence to the suggestion in T.C. Curtis and W.A. Speck, 'The Societies for the Reformation of Manners: A Case Study in the Theory and Practice of Moral Reform', Literature and History 3 (March 1976), 55-6 that vice laws were aimed primarily at the lower classes by upper-class legislators. This is perhaps why Brown and others felt the urgency of restraining the excesses of the ruling class.


The comments on drunken masters and servants pigging together, cited just below in the text, is a plagiaristic paraphrase of William Darrell's The Gentleman Instructed ... Part III, 126-7.

25 [Kimber], Maria, II. 132; see also II. 2, 19, 39, 108.

26 [Davys], The Accomplish'd Rake, 78, 124; [Bagel], II. 293.

See also Walker, Sally Salisbury, xiii, 122; The Finish'd Rake, 3; The History of the Human Heart, 302, 307 The Modern Fine Gentleman, I. 56-7; [Scott], 65, 144-7, 224-5; [Cleland], The Memoirs of a Coxcomb, 345-6; Mackenzie, The Man of Feeling, 40-1, 82-83 and The Man of the World, I. 56, 60,72, 77, II. 250-1; [Pratt], The Pupil of Pleasure, I. xiii, 144-5 and II. 12-18, 96-111, 211-21.


28 See British Mercury 308 (10-12 March 1712, N.S.), 2:

Notwithstanding that the War has been a great Drein for the hot rakish Humours of the young
Men of the Town, yet there has lately appear'd a Set of them, who scower the Streets every Night, under the Appellation of Mowhocks, falling on the Watch, and abusing whomever they meet.

29Swift, *Journal to Stella*, 2 vols, ed. Sir Harold Williams (Oxford, 1948), 511. All further quotations from the *JS* will be cited parenthetically in the text.

30For similar descriptions, see Gay's *Mohocks*, ii. 21-67 and iii. 36-45. The possible French origin of the Dancing-masters tricks is presumably another allusion to the War of the Spanish Succession.

31J. Cartwright, ed., *The Wentworth Papers 1705-1739* (London, 1882), 277. Subsequent references to these letters will be made in the text.


Notes said to have been scribbled by the Constable of the Watch on the night of 11 March 1711/12, when the Mohocks were arrested, are in the collection of Harvard University, but I have not had the opportunity to examine this extraordinary little piece of paper.

and nn 42 and 43, below.


35 Quoted in Allen, 117-18.


38 Allen, 117. Subsequent references cited parenthetically in the text.

39 Swift, *Correspondence*, I. 293.


41 Swift, *The History of the Four Last Years of the Queen*, 26. Future references to *HFLYQ* in the text.

42 See John Oldmixon, *The History of England, During the Reigns of King William and Queen Mary, Queen Anne, George I*. (London, 1735), 494; Maitland, 326.

Pope made the counter-accusation that Oldmixon falsified facts; see *Dunciad* (A), II. 199 and (B), II. 283, pp 125-6 and 309 in the *Twickenham Dunciad*.

It is worth pointing out here that Defoe's account of the Mohocks in the *Review* may be coloured by that periodical's pro-Harley bias -- Defoe was at that time a paid propagandist of the Tory ministry, though of course he was to change his allegiance to the Whigs in 1715.


43 Steele's willingness to excuse rakes is quite consistent: see *Guardian* 3, 17; *Tattler* 40, 77; and see Smeed, 74, 333.

Tom Burnet was 'a keen Whig' and a member of Addison's circle at Button's coffee-house c. 1715, according to J. Sutherland's 'Biographical Appendix' in *Dunciad*, ed. cit., 432. See (A), III. 173-80 and (B), III. 179-84 for Pope's nasty
comments on Burnet and Duckett (pp 168-70, 329).

44See T.S. Graves, 'Some Pre-Mohock Clansmen', SP 20 (1923), 395-421.


See also _Public Register_ (Dublin), VIII. 329 (9-12 March 1771) on fears of a revived Irish hell-fire club in the form of the 'Holy Fathers', a blasphemous club.

46Jones, 11; see also Pearson, 19.

47See [Darrell], _A Gentleman Instructed_ , 2 and _The Gentleman Instructed_ ... _Part III_ , 42; _Spectator_ 576; _The Ramble_ , 20-1, 32-3; _Universal Spectator_ , IV. 140; _Amelia_ , 395-8, 413; Coventry, 79-82, 146, 172-3 [Haywood], _The History of Jenmy and Jenny Jessamy_ , III. 171; Samuel Johnson, _Rambler_ 195 in _Works_ , gen. ed. Allen T. Hazen (New Haven and London, 1958- ), V. 255; _The Amours and Adventures of Charles Careless, Esq._ , II. 35-6; _The Adventures of Oxymel Classic_ , 24-9; Goldsmith, _The Vicar of Wakefield_ , 107; [Bagel], _Barham Downs_ , 125-31; _Covent Garden Magazine_ 2 (1773), 48, 97-8, 99-100, 447; Chesterfield, _Letters_ , I. 413-14, II. 8; _Rambler's Magazine_ 1 (1783), 74, 391 and 3 (1785), 426 and 8 (1790), 8 (the last plagiarised from _CGM_ 2 (1773), 447).

See also Capt. Charles Walker, _Authentick Memoirs of ... Sally Sals-

48[Puckle], 57-8; see also FB, II. 312-13, 315.


50 *OED*, VII. 121.

See *N & Q*, 2d series 9 (12 May 1860), 367 and 8th series 2 (27 August 1892), 178-9; also Allen, 119.


53Jones, 11, 21, 40-5, 51.


54Dashwood's principal partner in crime is alleged to have been John Montagu, 4th Earl of Sandwich, who was the great-grandson of Rochester and the
son of the Mohock Lord Hinchingbrooke (who died in the lifetime of his father, the 3d Earl). This may be an argument for a rakish gene, or alternatively, that serious serious depravity need not be a bar to procreation. See GEC, *The Complete Peerage*, revd edn, 13 vols in 14 (London, 1910-59), XI. 434-5.

55[Johnstone], '3d' edn (1767), III. 151-80 and '4th' edn (London, 1764), III. 231-80.

Other literary remains of and about the 'Monks' include Annual Register 39 (1797), 369-78; Charles Churchill, 'The Candidate' in Poetical Works, ed. D. Grant (Oxford, 1956); The Fruit-Shop, 2d edn, 2 vols (London, 1766), I. 46-7; Morning Herald, 16 December 1781; Nocturnal Revels, 2d edn, 2 vols (London, 1779), [A4r-Asr]; Town and Country Magazine 5 (1773), 245-6 and 6 (1774), 9; Walpole, Correspondence, XVIII. 211, XXII. 185 and n., XXXII. 327; Horace Walpole, Journals of Visits to Country Seats &c., ed. Paget Toynbee in the 16th vol. of the Walpole Society (1927-28), 50-1; John Wilkes, 'Medmenham Abbey' (Wilkes's notes to The Candidate; first appeared as 'Ld Despencers Gardens' in the Public Advertiser for 2 June 1763) and 'Description of West Wycombe', both in An Essay on Woman and Other Pieces (London, 1871), the latter also in The New Foundling Hospital for Wit, 6 vols (London, 1784), III. 75-80 as 'Curious Description of West Wycombe Church, &c.; The Correspondence of the Late John Wilkes, 5 vols, ed. John Almon (London, 1805), I. 17-18, III. 60-4; The Correspondence of John Wilkes and Charles Churchill, ed. Edward H. Weatherly (New York, 1954), 3; Sir William Wraxall, Memoirs, 5 vols (London, 1884), II. 18-19.


Accounts more plausible than Chrysal are to be found in the Political Register 3 (1768), 42-3; Town and Country Magazine 1 (1769), 122-3; and Morning Post for 11th April 1777.

I have examined the Dashwood MSS, on loan to the Bodleian from the present Sir Francis Dashwood, and have found no very flagrant hell-fire references (see Bodleian MS D.D. Dashwood Bucks B11/4, B11/8/2a, B11/8/9, B11/13c. 6, B11/14/7, B11/14/18, B12/4/3). For the preparation of his own book on the Dashwoods, the present Sir Francis has recalled MS D.D. Dashwood Bucks B19/8/7 -- a letter of John King to Lord Le Despencer of 3d Sept. 1770, and one of the few concrete references to activities at Medmenham. I have, however, examined Miss Kemp's transcription of it. The conclusion to be drawn from the letter is that parties of pleasure met at Medmenham, but not necessarily of a genuinely hell-fiery nature. There are brief references to parties of pleasure at Medmenham in a letter from Wilkes to Dashwood of 17th June 1762 (British Library Egerton MS 2136 f. 49), and one from John Hall-Stevenson to Wilkes of 5th July 1762 (British Library Addit. MS
Wilkes, *An Essay on Woman and Other Pieces*, 69. The pun is better than the Latin.

See also [Johnstone], '3d' edn (1767), III. 151-2 on persistence in sin.

George Bubb Dodington, 1st Viscount Melcombe Regis is said to have made an attempt to keep a Dashwoodian club going at his house in Hammersmith; see Wilbur L. Cross, *The Life and Times of Laurence Sterne* (New Haven, 1929), 266.


For the continuation of the tradition in general, see Jones, 9; Pearson, 19; Chancellor, *The Lives of the Rakes*, vols V-VI ('Old Q' and Barrymore; the Regency rakes); Allen, 123.


According to the *New Cambridge Bibliography*, II. 991, Davys's novel is 'much indebted to Restoration comedy.'

According to Ronald Paulson, *Hogarth: His Life, His Art and Times* (New Haven, 1971), I. 325, Mrs Davys's novel was without doubt one of the artist's principal sources for his *Rake's Progress*.

*The Finish'd Rake; or, Gallantry in Perfection* (London, [1733]). For the keys, see n. 3, *supra*. *The Reform'd Rake; or Modern Fine Gentleman* (1729), which I have not been able to locate, may be another imitation, or a pirated edition. See n. 9, above. *The Finish'd Rake* has a number of similarities with Smollett's *Peregrine Pickle*; see my 'A Possible Source for Smollett's *Peregrine Pickle*', *N&Q* 234 (n.s. 36) (1989), 58.

See n. 8, *supra*.

*The Humours of Fleet-Street: And the Strand* (London, c. 1750).
References cited in the text.

66[Samuel Jackson Pratt], *The Pupil of Pleasure*, 2d edn, 2 vols (London, 1777), 1. 7. Subsequent references in the text.


69[John Cleland], *Memoirs of a Coxcomb*, (London, 1751), 120-2, 123-6, 169, 245 and *passim*. Subsequent references cited parenthetically in the text.

70[John Cleland], *The Surprises of Love*, 2d edn (London, 1765), 44. Subsequent references cited in the text.


73See also 98, 136, 142-3, 168-9, 172-4, 229, 260-1 for other gentlemen let off the hook.

74[Eliza Haywood], *Life's Progress through the Passions: or, the Adventures of Natura* (London, 1748), 5. Subsequent references in the text.

75[Eliza Haywood], *Reflections on the Various Effects of Love* (London, 1726), 11-12, 30, 54-5. See also *Life's Progress*, 6, 63, 101-2.


In *The Tea-Table* 25 (15 May 1724), Haywood gives *The Fable of the Bees* a favourable if anonymous review.

77For Pope on Haywood see the Twickenham *Dunciad*, 13n., 52, 119-20,
152n, 162, 208, 303, 443.


[Eliza Haywood], *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy*, 3 vols (London, 1753), I. 90. Subsequent references to JJJ in text.

In vol. 2, the printer has muddled the pagination from p. 264, which is incorrectly called p. 246; and the error is continued right to the end of the volume, making every page number after 263 wrong by a figure of 18. In citations, I have corrected the mistake, but such corrections have been placed in square brackets to avoid confusion.

See also I. 232-3 and II. 64-5, 92-3, 98, 190, 192-3, 197, 216, 218-19, 233-4, 261-3, [271], [275]-[276] and III. 46-7, 74-5.

[Eliza Haywood], *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless*, 4 vols (London, 1751), IV. 13-14; also II. 90-1. Subsequent references in the text.

II. 93, 261 and III. 77-8, 248-9 and IV. 283.

See *The Finish'd Rake; or, Gallantry in Perfection; The History of Tom Jones the Foundling, in his Married State*, 274-80; [Perry], *The Temple Beau*, 35-7; *Memoirs of an Oxford Scholar*, 57, 60.

*The History of the Human Heart: or, the Adventures of a Young Gentleman* (London, 1749), 14, 15-23, 25, 27, 32n, 33n, 55-6, 64-7. Subsequent references to HHH in the text.


Compare [Edward Kimber], *Maria*, II. 37.

86 See *Reflections on the Various Effects of Love*, 11; *Life's Progress*, 5-6, 110, 227, 230; *HHH*, 14, 19-20, 25, 27, 55-6, 64, 65, 66, 67, 114, 186, 243, 285 (but cf 32n and 33n); *Memoirs of a Coxcomb*, 6-8, 18, 89, 123, 126, 180-1, 280, 310, 322-3; *JII*, II. 94, 167-8, 191 (but see III. 225-6); *The Adventures of Oxymel Classic, Esq.*, 19, 41, 97; *The Surprises of Love*, 100 and the description of each of the heroes surprised by love; *Maria*, I. 138-9, 144, II. 94; [Henry Mackenzie], *The Man of the World*, I. 35, II. 10, 38-9; *Rambler's Magazine* 8 (1790), 270. See also [E. Haywood], *Caramania* (London, 1727), 42; [E. Haywood and others], *Female Spectator*, I. 111 and II. 311.

Compare the objections to this rationalisation of rakishness in Thomas Cole, *Discourses on Luxury, Infidelity, and Enthusiasm* (London, 1761), 10-11.

87 [Davys], *The Accomplish'd Rake*, 6, 78; [Cleland], *Memoirs of a Coxcomb*, 4, 6 and *Surprises of Love*, 4-5; *Memoirs of an Oxford Scholar*, 23; [Mrs A. Woodfin], *The Auction*, I. 13; [Mackenzie], *The Man of the World*, I. 77-8; [West], *A Tale of the Times*, II. 197-8; [Brunton], I. 78, 357; and for Richardson on this, see Chapter Four, n. 89.

88 [Abel Boyer], *Characters of the Virtues and Vices of the Age* (London, 1695), 8-10; [Davys], 97; [Haywood], *Anti-Pamela*, 183-4; *Life's Progress*, 15 and passim; *HHH*, 67, 234, 295, 298; *JII*, II. 232-3; [Cleland], *Memoirs of a Coxcomb*, 5 and *Surprises of Love*, 4, 109; [Robert Bage], *Barham Downs*, II. 95; [Soame Jenyns], *Miscellaneous Pieces*, 3d edn (London, 1770), 393-4; [Mackenzie], *The Man of the World*, II. 122.
Chapter Three

1See FB, xxxiii-xxxvii, cxiv-cxvi.


Samuel Johnson's scattered animadversions on Fielding are neatly gathered together in R.E. Moore, 'Dr. Johnson on Fielding and Richardson', PMLA 66 (1951), 162-81. For Richardson on his great rival, see Chapter Four, and n. 72 there.


6See Sheldon Sacks, Fiction and the Shape of Belief (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967), 110-62.

7On charity specifically, see Champion, XV. 203-07; CGJ, 79-84, 183-7, 226-30, 246-51; JA, 233-5; TJ, 4-5, 37-8, 722, 815, 982; True Patriot, 151-7.

8See TJ, xxvi, xxviii, 4-5, 4n, 6 and n, 38n, 42n, 43n, 114n, 403-04, 404-05n, 523n, 612-13n, 687 and n, 718n; Amelia, xv, xxx, xxxix, 3-4, 3nn, 32n, 164n,
For Johnson on Fielding, see nn 2 and 29; for Richardson, see Chapter Four, n. 72.

An Examen of the History of Tom Jones, a Foundling (London, 1750), 5, 7, 48, 90, 95; GM 20 (1750), 252, 117.

Dudden, 824; Sir Walter Scott, Bt, Miscellaneous Works, 30 vols (Edinburgh, 1869-71), III. 111.

Henry Knight Miller, Essays on Fielding's 'Miscellanies' (Princeton, 1961), 209n.

See also C.J. Rawson, Henry Fielding and the Augustan Ideal under Stress (London, 1972), 14-17; and FB, II. 431.

John S. Coolidge, 'Fielding and "Conservation of Character"', MP 57 (1959-60), 246, 250; also 248, 250f.


For some reservations about Battestin's study, see Rawson, 'More Providence than Wit: Some Recent Approaches to Eighteenth-Century Literature' in Order from Confusion Sprung (London, 1985), 383-418, esp. 383-402.

See also 77, 623.
16 See also 924. Compare *JA*, 180 and the fixed characterisation of Jonathan *Wild*.


And see Aurélien Digeon in *The Novels of Fielding* (London, 1925), 130-50; Howard Anderson, 'Answers to the Author of *Clarissa*: Theme and Narrative Technique in *Tom Jones* and *Tristram Shandy*', *PQ* 51 (1972), 859-73.


19 See also E.L. McAdam, jnr, 'A New Letter from Fielding', *YR* 38 (1948-49), 300-10. The actual letter is now lost. Also *JF* for 2 Jan. 1748 (N.S.) in Wesleyan edn, 119-20, and 14 March 1748 (N.S.), 188; *CGJ*, 73 (number 10 (4 Febr. 1752)).

20 See *TJ*, 425n. and 440n.; as a possible prototype of Partridge the barber, see Robert Folkenflik, 'Tom Jones, the Gypsies, and the Masquerade', *UTQ* 44 (1975), 234 and 237 (n. 25 there).

21 For Partridge the astrologer, see *TJ*, 425n. and 440n.; as a possible prototype of Partridge the barber, see Robert Folkenflik, 'Tom Jones, the Gypsies, and the Masquerade', *UTQ* 44 (1975), 234 and 237 (n. 25 there).

22 *TJ*, 79-80, 216, 928-9.

23 See *TJ*, 93-7, 126, 163, 330; *Miscs*, 51-3; *Shamela*, 2 -- where Methodist Faith is the cornerstone of Shamela's 'religion'.


26 Also *TJ*, 135-6, 929-30.
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Other discussions of the romance aspects of Fielding's fiction are Sheridan Baker, 'Fielding's *Amelia* and the Materials of Romance', *PQ* 41 (1962), 437-49; Miller, 'The "Digressive" Tales in Fielding's *Tom Jones* and the Perspective of Romance', *PQ* 54 (1975), 258-74; Baker, 'Fielding's Comic Epic-in-Prose Romances Again', *PQ* 58 (1979), 63-81.


Fielding is, however, critical of Mrs Manley's view of unbridled sexuality in a number of places: see *JA*, 187 and n.; *TJ*, 596; *Shamela*, 37; *Champion* for 26 April 1740 (not in Henley; see *JA*, 187n. and *TJ*, 596n.)


31 *TJ*, 331 sees Tom banished from Paradise Hall: *The World*, as Milton phrases it, *lay all before him*; and *Jones*, no more than *Adam*, had any Man to whom he might resort for Comfort or Assistance; see also 321 and n, 436, 492 and n, 511, 683.

32 See also *TJ*, 406 (cited above), 911-12, 924, 967; *JA*, 46; *Amelia*, 155, 232-3, 445, 511, 516, 532.

33 Good woman: *TJ*, 871, 972-3, 981; *JA*, 222-4. Allworthy's forgiveness: e.g. 981.
34 The best of these are Battestin's *The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art* (Middletown, 1959), 93, 119-29; Sacks, 194-215; Maren-Sofie Røstvig, 'Tom Jones and the Choice of Hercules', in *Fair Forms* (Cambridge, 1975), ed. M.-S. Røstvig, 153-6.

35 What I take to be hints that character is, in fact, reformable in Fielding are the following: Dick Taylor, jnr, 'Joseph as Hero of *Joseph Andrews*', *TSE* 7 (1957), 91-109; Combs, 433, 435-6; Røstvig, 'Tom Jones and the Choice of Hercules', *passim*; Folkenflik, 'Tom Jones, the Gypsies and the Masquerade', 234-5; Braudy, *Narrative Form*, 180; Michael L. Hall, 'Incest and Morality in *Tom Jones*', *South Central Bulletin* 41 (1981), 101-04.


39 Rochester is referred to in *TJ*, 973 and his 'Satyr against Reason and Mankind' quoted, 360; Burnet is mentioned in *Amelia*, 256, and it is well known that many of the names in *TJ* and *Amelia* are to be found in the list of subscribers to the 1724 folio edition of Burnet's *History of His Own Time*, which Fielding possessed -- see Watt, 'The Naming of Characters', 335.

40 For example, *TJ*, 618, 652, 677, 946, 959, 961.


42 See also 189-90, 193-4, 215, 244, 257, 310, 410, 474, 526-7, 651-2, 657, 659, 732-3, 894, 899, 927, 946, 962.
See 310, 193, 216, 307, 693, 772, 962.

See Jonathan Wild in Henley, II. 23-4-4, 34, 89-90, 93, 104-05, 118-19, 150-1, 191-6, 197-8, 203, 207 (impenitence) (also 100-01, 142-3, 162-3); 23-4, 168, 184 (libertinism); 47-8, 139-40, 163-5, 204-05 (law, role of gentleman); 166 (follies vs vices). In A journey from this World to the Next, &c, see in Henley, II. 237-45, 266.

See also Rawson, Henry Fielding and the Augustan Ideal under Stress, 67-98.


See 257, 513, 717, 722, 726, 748, 821.

Alter, Fiction and the Nature of the Novel, 153-4; Shroff, 144-6.

TJ, 366-94; 871-4; 712-821; 453-6, 474-6, 452-6, 463-7, 480-3, 481.


See Empson, 218-19, 236-46 (cf Rawson, 'Professor Empson's Tom Jones' in Order from Confusion Sprung, 331-8); Hall, 102.


54] am indebted to Prof. P.C. Brückmann of Trinity College, University of Toronto, for pointing this out.

55] See 40, 44, 58, 59, 139, 190, 192, 194, 246, 258, 310, 311, 427, 442, 541, 561, 657, 721, 884, 923, 938.

56] See also 59, 660, 681, 705 among other places.


Surely related to the theme of the acquisition of prudence in the novels is the reader's own education in judgment at the hands of Fielding's narrators; see John Preston, 'Plot as Irony: The Reader's Role in Tom Jones', ELH 35 (1968), 365-80; Anderson, 861-7; Røstvig, 'Tom Jones and the Choice of Hercules', 150-1; Patricia Meyer Spacks, Imagining a Self (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1976), 249-53.

59] See 36, 45, 50, 58, 178, 320, 442, 564, 694, 818; versus 244, 658, 875, 938, 960.

60] Samuel Richardson, Pamela in Shakespeare Head, IV. 452.


62] See also 283, 683-7, 823.


68Folkenflik, 'Tom Jones, the Gypsies and the Masquerade', 236-7 (n. 21 there).

70Watt, 'The Naming of Characters', 337.


72The Jolly Dog School (a name I have coined with Squire Western's comment on Tom Jones in *TJ*, 133 in mind) is best represented by Saintsbury's various remarks on Fielding; his introductions to *TJ* and *JA* in the Everyman editions, his introduction to his own edition of *The Works of Henry Fielding* (London, 1893). Middleton Murry comes close to this view. It is best caricatured by Ford Madox Ford's caricature of Fielding, cited in Hassall, x-xi.

Jolly-Dogism, while it correctly notes that Fielding excuses, and expects us to excuse youthful indiscretion, at the same time fails to take into account the complexities of this excuse, and Fielding's moral purpose in making it in the first place. And it tends to perpetuate the myth of Fielding's own rakishness (see n. 3).


74Rawson, *Henry Fielding and the Augustan Ideal under Stress*, 3-34.

For the concluding phrase of this chapter, I am indebted to Folkenflik's illuminating article, 'Tom Jones, the Gypsies and the Masquerade, 229.

For Chesterfield on limited libertinism, see *Letters*, 2 vols (1774), I. 360, 388, 402, 406-07, 409, 413-15, 438-9, 455, 516-17, 519, 526, 534, 538-9, 554-5, 563-4 and II. 8-11, 11-13, 23, 52-55, 121-3, 316-17, 319.
Chapter Four

1 See Shakespeare Head, V. xv. Subsequent references to volume and page will be made in the text. (Pamela occupies vols I-IV, Clarissa vols V-XII, and Grandison vols XIII-XVIII.)


3 See Eaves and Kimpel, Samuel Richardson, 257-60.

4 See also I. 74-5, 86, 129, 181, 287, 332; II. 191-2, 229, 283-5.

5 See also VII. 268; VIII. 32, 34, 81, 170, 256; IX. 373-4; X. 108, 349-55; XI. 65; XII. 16.

6 See also III. 65, 104-05, 204, 385, 393; IV. 34, 329-31, 374, 387-8, 421.

Sir Charles Grandison as model squire: see for example XIV. 43f., 48-9, 138-9, 140; XV. 79-80, 235, 278; XVI. 156, 244-5, 394; XVII. 17-24, 219, 394, 404; XVIII. 20-51.

Dangers of libertinism in Grandison: XIII. viii, 401, 404-07; XIV. 80, 89-90, 289; XV. 43, 379-81, 383; XVI. 4, 103, 430; XVIII. 14, 56.
The concern for posterity, and the threat to it posed by rakishness, is compounded by the fact that both B. and Lovelace are the last males of their lines: see II. 32, 353; III. 42; IV. 30; IX. 104.


Clarissa is in many ways Lovelace's equal in spirit, independence and exalted qualities of mind, although in the direction of virtue rather than vice, and their similarity is occasionally remarked upon: V. 82, 190, 310; VI. 46, 49, 53-7, 114; VII. 115, 132; VIII. 185.


When Clarissa does break a vow, it is with biblical sanction: see VI. 320 and n.

See also *Selected Letters*, 139-41, 144-50, 150-7, 199-206.

Carroll's review of Eaves and Kimpel's biography, *RES* n.s. 23 (1972), 507.

See also Samuel Richardson, 'Clarissa: Preface, Hints of Prefaces, and Postscript', intro. R.F. Brissenden, ARS 103 (Los Angeles, 1964), 3; and in the novels, V. 49, 90.

For the view that *Clarissa* is a condemnation of society and social principles, see Watt, *Rise of the Novel*, 224; Eaves and Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson*, 271; Eagleton, 74, 76; Florian Stuber, 'On Fathers and Authority in *Clarissa*', SEL 25 (1985), 557-74.


12 See II. 20-1; III. 172-3, 307; IV. 140.
See also Harris, 2.

13 For view that Lovelace equals Patriarchy, see Eagleton, 12n., 13, 17, 34, 52, 56, 62, 73, 76, 79, 86, 89, 95, 97, 99; Castle, 25-6.

14 For fears of typical rakish plots and contrivances, see I. 7, 14, 90, 112, 120, 129, 228, 256-62, 269-70, 331 and IV. 262, 278; on worries specifically over a sham marriage, see I. 243-4, 307, 330; and A.D. McKillop, 'The Mock Marriage Device in *Pamela*', *PQ* 26 (1947), 285-8.

For Mrs Jewkes as a classic bawd, see I. 142, 244 and II. 243.


15 Richardson on rakish fiction: I. 41-2, 46, 125, 316-17; II. 5; IV. 419-20, 426; V. xiii; VII. 353; XI. 283; XII. 294-7, 307, 308; XVIII. 326, 329; *Selected Letters*, 46-7, 103, 117, 126, 128-30, 175; *Clarissa: Preface*, 4, 11.

See also The Richardson-Stinstra Correspondence, ed. William C. Slatte (Carbondale and Edwardsville, Ill., and London and Amsterdam, 1969), 110-12.

Richardson, 583-9; Jerry C. Beasley, 'English Fiction in the 1740s: Some Glances at the Major and Minor Novels', SN 5 (1973), 155-76 and 'Romance and the "New" Novels of Richardson, Fielding, and Smollett', SEL 16 (1976), 437-50 and Novels of the 1740s (Athens, Ga, 1982); Doody, A Natural Passion, 14-34, 45, 117n., 128-50; Morris Golden, 'Public Context and Imagining Self in Clarissa', SEL 25 (1985), 575-98 and 'Richardson's Repetitions'.

16 See I. 6, 119, 160-1, 261, 332; II. 59, 124, 147-8, 162, 250, 283-5, 324; III. 31, 41, 197, 383; IV. 5-6, 374, 380, 382, 421-2.

17 See also I. 89, 180; II. 196-7, 209; III. 41, 46, 91, 189, 206; IV. 32, 267-8, 430; Everyman Pamela, 2 vols (London and Melbourne, 1962), I. 451.


18 See [Henry Fielding], Shamela (London, 1741); Critical Remarks on Sir Charles Grandison, Clarissa, and Pamela, intro. A.D. McKillop, ARS 21 (Los Angeles, 1950), 21-2; Bernard Kreissman, Pamela-Shamela (Lincoln, Nebr., 1960); Eaves and Kimpel, Samuel Richardson, 263.


20 See also I. 83; VII. 66-7; VIII. 45, 257; IX. 2, 273, 292-6; X. 90, 234-5, 268; XII. 159.

Cf VI. 116, 270; IX. 382; X. 261-3, 295; XII. 122, 178; XVI. 258. (Anti- Mandevillean.)

22See also V. xv, 18, 72, 210n.; VI. 16, 21; VII. 20, 78, 80, 163, 260, 365-9; VIII. 34, 115, 131, 194, 350, 377, 378; IX. 45, 46, 67, 86, 271, 341-4; X. 199; XI. 68; XII. 45; *Selected Letters*, 77, 181.


24See also n. 15, *supra*.


26See n. 15, *supra*.


Compare Cleland in *Memoirs of a Coxcomb*, 2d edn (London, 1751), 99-100, where he is 'so sick and surfeited with the old story of masters falling in love with mamma's maid ...' (and later anti-*Pamela* comments, 100-11).

28See Chapter Two, n. 8.

29For more of Lovelace's trite devices, see V. xv; VI. 353-4; VII. 64, 249; VIII. 47, 371, 374; IX. 42; X. 66, 271; XI. 283, 284.

See also McKillop, 'The Mock Marriage Device in *Pamela*'.

30See also IV. 430, 431; XII. 67; XIV. 80; *Selected Letters*, 73, 94, 95, 123; *Correspondence*, ed. Barbauld, IV. 196; *Critical Remarks*, 16.
31See VII. 85, 94, 120, 162; VIII. 187, 265, 362, 376-8; IX. 357, 372-3; X. 28, 108, 247, 309; XI. 68; XII. 45, 162; XIII. 155; Selected Letters, 181; 'Clarissa': Prefaces, 1.
And see Kinkead-Weekes, Samuel Richardson: Dramatic Novelist, 179-82, 205-06, 227, 230.
The Centaur not Fabulous by Richardson's friend Edward Young (in Young's Complete Works, 2 vols (London, 1854), 487-97) has the same aim of exploding the clichés that tend to excuse libertinism. See also Bon Ton Magazine 2 (1791-92), 87 for the reformed-rake-as-best-husband platitude.

32See also V. 338; VIII. 253, 255.

33See also VI. 148; VII. 22, 120, 269; VIII. 121-2, 143-4, 383; IX. 113, 278; X. 55; XI. 365; VIII. 47; I. 179, 180, 181; III. 213, 214, 374; XIII. 6, 146, 169; Selected Letters, 47.

34VII. 23, 121; XI. 212. Cf XII. 303.

35Also V. 146; VII. 59-60; VIII. 146, 147, 150; XIII. 448; XIV. 218-19; Selected Letters, 164, 189; 'Clarissa': Preface, 8, 9.

Young, II. 517; Yates, 555.

36See n. 72, infra.

37See also V. 217, 220, 266-7; VII. 64, 67, 109, 354; VIII. 44, 140, 381; IX. 296, 340; X. 7, 53.

38King, Prince, General: V. 222; VII. 31, 33, 60-1; VIII. 24, 44, 92, 138, 238-9, 263, 379; IX. 67, 179, 286; XI. 12, 197.

Emperor: V. 222; VII. 30, 34, 188; VIII. 195, 235-6, 263, 354; IX. 173; X. 63, 382; XI. 12, 197.

Sultan, Grand Signor, Eastern monarch: VII. 26, 133; VIII. 195, 354.

See also Biggs, 54-7.

39Tarquin, Herod, other specific rulers: V. 72; VII. 90, 91, 177, 357-8; IX. 43, 67, 123, 168, 337, 350; XI. 13; XII. 163.

40See Flynn, 220-1; Feldmeier, 91, 105-13.

41See Chapter Two, n. 26; and on the Mohocks, Flynn, 214-15.

42See Eaves and Kimpel, Samuel Richardson, 239; Kinkead-Weekes, Samuel Richardson, 416. The other possible years are 1727 and 1732.
43See Chapter Two, and nn 51-3 there.

44See also VI. 165; VII. 344; VIII. 24, 45, 62; IX. 267, 270; X. 7.

45For satanic references, see V. 76; VII. 68, 92, 309, 369; VIII. 125, 372, 373; IX. 18, 49, 88, 89, 124, 267, 269, 323, 332, 333, 335, 346, 365; X. 6, 14, 112, 171, 196, 251, 263, 325, 328, 390; XI. 12, 351.

And see Gillian Beer, 'Richardson, Milton, and the Status of Evil', RES n.s. 19 (1968), 261-70; and Jean H. Hagstrum, Sex and Sensibility (Chicago and London, 1980), 14, 211.

46See also XII. 148-9, 268.

And see Chapter Two, and nn 54-9 there; also Flynn, 200, 201, 319-20; and S. Fielding, Remarks, 39.

47VII. 120, 269; VIII. 139, 338, 373; X. 429; XII. 139.

48VII. 331; VIII. 256, 340, 350; IX. 86, 113, 287, 289-91, 357; X. 53, 107, 243; XI. 305; XII. 139.


For the revision of 'damn' to 'd—n' and vice versa in the 2d and 3d edns of the novel, see Shirley Van Marter, 'Richardson's Revisions of Clarissa in the Second Edition', SB 26 (1973), 116 and 'Richardson's Revisions of Clarissa in the Third and Fourth Editions', SB 28 (1975), 144. In the latter (133-4) it is suggested that the 3d edn's Lovelace is more clearly blasphemous than in earlier versions of the novel.

50Also VII. 88, 361; VIII. 224; IX. 4; X. 27; XI. 167, 441.

51Eg. X. 292-3.


52See also XII. 277.

Doody, A Natural Passion, 181-2 and Hagstrum, 210-11 suggest that the fate of Lovelace is left undecided at the end of the novel, but I disagree. Richardson
himself mentions the certain damnation of Lovelace in the 'Preface' to *Grandison* (XIII. viii). It is still possible that he had grown gloomier as he got older, and decided to damn Lovelace posthumously where earlier he had left the issue open, but surely *Clarissa* is the dark work, and *Grandison* the sunny. See also *Selected Letters*, 118-22; and n. 91, below.

53See n. 90.

54See also *Selected Letters*, 121, 181; *Clarissa*: Preface, 6.

For Richardson's fear that treating Lovelace any better than he does will only encourage real-life rakes, see *Selected Letters*, 93, 106, 302; *Richardson-Stinstra Correspondence*, 112-114.

55Also VII. 93, 120; VIII. 381, 383, 384; IX. 14.

56Also V. 338, VI. 302.

57For all his professed decency of images and language, it seems to me that Lovelace makes a number of vaginal jokes: see VIII. 46, 50; IX. 230; X. 338. Richardson's sexually charged imagery was remarked upon in his own day. One might also cite Lovelace's plans to rape Anna and her mother (VIII. 268-77) and proposed frolic with Mrs Moore, Miss Rawlins and Widow Bevis (IX. 341-4) as examples of his *in decency*.

58Lovelace's good qualities: V. 2, 7-8, 17-18, 24, 72-4, 81, 82, 98, 159-60, 183, 189, 227-9, 253, 299-302, 312-13; VII. 22-3, 121n.; VIII. 3, 81, 376; *Selected Letters*, 82, 88-9.

See also Hagstrum, 209-10; John Carroll, 'Lovelace as Tragic Hero', *UTQ* 42 (1972-73), 14-25.


59See also VI. 168n.; and *Selected Letters*, 157-8.

60Lovelace's weaker and weaker professions: VI. 106, 148-9; VII. 112, 379; VIII. 33, 337, 376; IX. 14, 226; X. 83, 109-10, 238, 251; XI. 68; XII. 197; and see below, n. 91.

61And see n. 45.

62Selected Letters*, 92; *Clarissa*: Preface, 5, 9.
Lovelace pleads in the manner of Jones, but is not exculpated: VII. 120, VIII. 384, IX. 14.

Doody, *A Natural Passion*, 45, 47-50. See I. 75-81, 272-84, 321; III. 208-10.

See also III. 45, IV. 251.

See, for example, Harrison R. Steeves, *Before Jane Austen* (London, 1966), 71; Harris, 33. Donald L. Ball, 'Pamela II: A Primary Link in Richardson's Development as a Novelist', *MP* 65 (1967), 334-42 comes relatively close to a defence; June Sturrock, 'The Completion of *Pamela*', *DUJ* 74 (1982), 227-32 makes a rather embarrassed case for Part Two.

The inconsistencies are emphasised by II. 88 and IV. 430.


See also 'Clarissa': *Preface*, 3; *Selected Letters*, 181, 302; *Correspondence*, ed. Barbauld, IV. 197.

See also *Selected Letters*, 179, 185.


For Richardson's explicit (and always unfavourable) comments on Fielding, see *Selected Letters*, 126, 127, 128-30, 133, 175, 195-7, 198-9.

Richardson's unwillingness to grant Lady Bradshaigh's requests for a 'moderate rake' are well known; see *Selected Letters*, 170-2.
The history of Mrs Beaumont, hinted at in XV. 223, was expanded by Richardson in an unfinished fragment that was never included with Grandison, and may be the germ of a unfinished novel. It is to be found in Mrs Barbauld's edition of the Correspondence, V. 301-48.

See Doody, A Natural Passion, 282-3; Eagleton, 98.

And see Yates, 553.

Merceda and Bagenhall: XIII. 390, 392, 412, 443; XVI. 79-88, 104-05; XVII. 19, 255, 330; XVIII. 322.

Greville: XVII. 255-6, XVIII. 77-82.
Sir Thomas Grandison: XIV. 48-9, 102.

Death-bed repentances in Richardson: X. 334 and XII. 302, 307; Clarissa: Preface, 2-3; Selected Letters, 94; and Doody, A Natural Passion, 151-87.


The same sort of thing happens to Jackey in Pamela II (IV. 388) — but he ends well (IV. 454-5).

See also I. 287, 292; II. 33-4, 88, 308; III. 45, 211; IV. 431; XIII. 353-6, 359-61, 443; XV. 43, 45, 46, 363; XVII. 250, 255.

See also II. 139, 234; III. 84-5, 185-212.

That 'Love is a natural passion' in Grandison (XIV. 18, 25, 27) seems related.

Also VIII. 8-11; X. 212, 300, 325, 373, 406.

Also V. 196-7; VII. 163; VIII. 113, 147-8; XI. 111, 382; XII. 216.

Also XIV. 43, 339; XV. 46, 241-2.

V. xii, 11, 252, 265, 296; VI. 322, 360; VIII. 9, 28, 64, 103, 113-15, 201, 354; IX. 33, 124, 190, 314; X. 270, 284, 300, 305, 323, 326, 328, 421; XI. 72, 351.

See also S. Fielding, Remarks, 13, 15-16, 23; Carroll, 'Lovelace as Tragic Hero', 22; Eaves and Kimpel, Samuel Richardson, 608.

Lovelessness: VII. 338; VIII. 33-4; IX. 317; XIV. 219, 233.

Fielding, in his famous letter to Richardson, spells the name 'Lovelace' and 'Loveless' indifferently (see the letter, cited in E.L. McAdam, jnr, 'A New Letter from Fielding to Richardson', *YR* 38 (1948-49), 304-06).

Earlier Lovelesses are to be found in Vanbrugh's *Relapse* (spelt either way in the first and second quartos; see *Complete Works*, 4 vols, ed. B. Dobrée, (London, 1927-28), 219; Gibber's *Love's Last Shift* (1696), Richardson's likeliest inspiration; and in *The Debauchee* (1677; possibly by Aphra Behn), among other places.

Richard Lovelace, the Cavalier poet: see Ward, 'Richardson's Character of Lovelace', 498.

'Heart' in other novels: I. 34; II. 4, 13; IV. 419; XIII. 29; *Selected Letters*, 77; and see Dussinger, 'Conscience and the Pattern of Christian Perfection', 238-9.


Also *Selected Letters*, 47, 92, 93-5, 127, 151, 159, 170-2, 268; Richardson-Stinstra Correspondence, 71, 153.


Richardson is fond of a biblical tag that seems related to the question of humours, nature, &c.: 'who can touch pitch, and not be defiled?' (VI. 409; also VII. 268 and XIII. 30-1), a paraphrase of Eccles 13:1.

*Eg.* VII. 184; VIII. 14-16, 57; IX. 177, 285; XI. 343-7; XII. 37, 147, 149, 164. Belford and Clarissa in agreement with Lovelace: XI. 365; XII. 67, 153.

Clarissa stubborn, Harlowes implacable: V. 47, 54, 59, 135, 303-09, 349; VI. 27, 30, 49, 60, 331; VII. 2, 32, 44-5, 57-61, 184; VIII. 25, 57, 114; IX. 215, 229, 232, 249, 374, 381; X. 59, 92, 125, 126; XI. 332, 369-81, 391, 448; XII. 282-3.

On the education process, habit, spoiling young gentlemen, &c.: III. 281, 306; IV. 305, 306, 308, 326, 337-8, 342, 381, 388, 397, 416-17; I. 89, 332; II. 283-5, 344; V. 15, 19, 201, 265, 294, 295, 296; VI. 8, 127, 148-9; VII. 170, 224-5, 260, 266, 306, 362, 363, 381; VIII. 102-3, 127, 337, 380; IX. 88, 380; X. 28, 249, 343-4, 438-9; XI. 7, 244-5; XII. 146, 164, 212-13, 293-7, 302; XIII. vii; XIV. 48-9, 97, 218, 367; XV. 325; XVII. 200-1; XVIII. 77.
See also *Selected Letters*, 94, 116, 127; *Richardson-Stinstra Correspondence*, 71; *Clarissa*: Preface, 2.

For Locke on innate passions and habit-forming see *Some Thoughts concerning Education* in *Works*, 12th edn, 9 vols (London, 1824), VIII. 13, 19, 35, 36, 37, 39, 47-8, 92-3, 97, 103, 157, 193.


The change in the tone of the novel, and in the character of Lovelace, as Richardson made revisions to his text for the second edn of 1749 and third of 1751 (in answer to critics and to drive home the message to those who had missed the point) has been admirably discussed in Mark Kinkead-Weekes, 'Clarissa Restored?', *RES* n.s. 10 (1959), 156-71. The blackening of Lovelace is discussed on 157-61, 164.


For Richardson's claim (false, Kinkead-Weekes suggests in his article, 156; compare Van Marter, *SB* 26 (1973), 129) that the material added in the second and third editions constituted a restoration of passages suppressed in the first, see *Clarissa*: Preface, 13 and *Selected Letters*, 158, 174.

Richardson's narrative habit of going over the tragic details of Clarissa's history again and again has much the same effect as reiterating and intensifying Lovelace's wickedness: e.g. X. 162, 183, 185-90, 222-48, 270-305, 384-90.

Lovelace's genuine but temporary remorse: VII. 122-3, 241, 310, 338; VIII. 116-17, 225-6, 240-1, 322, 331, 387, 397-8; IX. 11-16, 82, 85, 192, 234, 240-2, 254-5, 319; X. 26, 28, 35; XI. 348, 436; XII. 144, 270-7; *Selected Letters*, 118.

Lovelace's admissions or Richardson's revelations of false repentance: VI. 107, 113; VII. 31, 76, 77, 82n., 95, 122-3, 128-9, 135, 139, 337-40, 356, 358; VIII. 387; IX. 116, 199-200, 215, 380; X. 50, 51, 83, 105, 108, 174n., 371, 426, 459; XI. 89-90, 196, 216; XII. 144, 146, 147, 164. And see Hagstrum, 198.

Hardening of Lovelace's heart: V. 89, 253, 256; VIII. 34, 117, 231, 240-1, 261, 330, 363, 369, 398; IX. 238-40, 281, 284, 305-6; X. 61, 303; XI. 170; XII. 136, 155, 206.


Lovelace's callous returning gaiety after the rape: IX. 326, 328, 334, 341-4, 378-9; X. 22, 51, 240; XI. 34-7, 170, 216, 341; XII. 147-50, 207-09, 211.

Clarissa is penitent, but doesn't need forgiveness: compare XI. 81-2 and 133; but see VIII. 234 for her views on supererogation.


Eagleton, 62 seeks to negate Clarissa's Christian triumph altogether; also Watt, *Rise*, 180.


Also XVI. 156, XVIII. 316 and *Selected Letters*, 331n.

On the optimism of *Sir Charles Grandison*, see Doody, *A Natural Passion*, 259-61, 268-9, 269-70, 274.


Another of Richardson's favourite biblical passages is 'There is more Joy in Heaven over one Sinner that repenteth, than over Ninety-nine just Persons that need no Repentance' (II. 96; a paraphrase of Luke 15:7; see also VII. 163-4, XVI. 209).


And see Frederick W. Hilles, 'The Plan of *Clarissa*', *PQ* 45 (1966), 238; Dussinger, 'Conscience and the Pattern of Christian Perfection', 236-7; Doody, *A Natural Passion*, 121; Alan Wendt 'Clarissa's Coffin'; Poovey, 'Journeys from this World to the Next'.

But see Anthony Winner, 'Richardson's Lovelace: Character and Prediction', *TSLL* 14 (1972-73), 53-75; Melvyn New, "The Grease of God": The Form of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction', *PMLA* 91 (1976), 235-44.

The static quality of Richardson's characters is remarked upon by Doody, *A Natural Passion*, 25-8; H. Steeves, 81; Klotman, 372, 368; Leo Braudy,

97 Male virgins: IX. 147, XVI. 186 and *Selected Letters*, 171.
Richardson's conviction that sex is a post-lapsarian curse is well known; see *Selected Letters*, 188, 189, 193, 297. Also Dussinger, 'What Pamela Knew', 388n.


99 See Fielding's letter in McAdam; *Selected Letters*, 99. Fielding, Lord Lyttelton, Thomson and Cibber were not the only ones to plead for a happy ending; pleas came from within Richardson's circle of female friends as well (see *Selected Letters*, 87, 90-7, 99 and n, 103-17). An alternative, happy ending written by Lady Echlin, sister of Lady Bradshaigh, has recently come to light; see *ECCB* n.s. 8 (1982), 510-12.
Chapter Five


2Korte, 188 and passim.


5Michael Rosenblum, 'Smollett as a Conservative Satirist', *ELH* 42 (1975), 556-579.

See also Leon V. Driscoll, 'Looking for Dustwich', *TSL* 9 (1967-68), 85-90; K.G. Simpson, *Roderick Random* and the Tory Dilemma', *SLJ* 22 (December

6Rousseau, 'Beef and Bouillon', 42.


11\textit{RR}, xxxv. Subsequent references cited in the text. See also 250-1, 254-6, 284, 295, 339, 344, 354, 359.


13See 139-210, esp. 158-9, 170-6, 208-09; 1; 395 and chapter LXIII generally; 306-12, 194-200, 306-12; 363-4; 220, 228-9, 347-50, 362, 364n., 428.

14See also 264, 383 (civic threat of Roman Catholic subversion), 346-7, 418-19, 421, 433, 435n. (punishment of villains).

15\textit{PP}, 768 ('dignity and importance') 268 (also 249-50). Subsequent references will be cited parenthetically in the text.

16See 691-735, esp. 714, 719, 720, 723, 725-6, 733-5.

17One of the few critics who relates Peregrine's social origins to his behaviour is Harrison L. Steeves in \textit{Before Jane Austen} (London, 1966), 136-7, but he does not make as much of the connexion as he could; see also Ian Campbell
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18James Beattie, Dissertations Moral and Critical (London and Edinburgh, 1783), 572. See also The Port Folio n.s. 6 (July-December 1811), 412-31.

But see John Cleland's sympathetic unsigned review of Peregrine Pickle in Monthly Review 4 (1750-51), 355-64; and the review of Humphry Clinker in GM 41 (1771), 317-21; and Jerry C. Beasley, Novels of the 1740s (Athens, Ga, 1982), 98-9.


For Hogarthian aspects of RR, see 131-2, 138 and n. (on 450), in addition to the broad parallels mentioned in the text.


21See 258-60; 273; 116-17, 240, 294-6; 316-21, 368-9; 323-69; 206, 257.


23See 25, 112, 151, 190, 194, 205, 228-9, 362.

24See Robert Alter, Rogue's Progress (Cambridge, Mass, 1964), 58-79; see also n. 27, below.


Victimised by others: 139-210, 213, 235, 243, 359, 397.

27Critics who observe that Random does not develop as a character include Paulson, Satire and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century England (New Haven


29See Putney, 'The Plan of *Peregrine Pickle*', 1051-65.


31But see Boucé, *Les Romans de Smollett*, 155; though he elsewhere admits the structural weaknesses to be found in Smollett's novels (see 195, 198-242).

32Samuel Richardson, *Clarissa* in Shakespeare Head, VII. 194-6, VIII. 47, IX. 297-8. See also Chapter Four, nn 14, 29.


See also 204, 380, 409-10, 423, 752 for references to his never-failing love.

See 51-2, 55, 82, 130, 259, 430, 577, 594, 604, 610, 616, 617, 746, 762, 765.


Edward S. Noyes, 'A Note on *Peregrine Pickle* and *Pygmalion*', *MLN* (1926), 327-30.

See *RR*, 430; *PP*, 779, 289, 290.

Also 421, 592, 621, 751, 773.


See also 114-15, 189, 248-9, 310-11 for more of Jolter's absurdity.

See 113, 136, 179-80; 168, 178, 353; 332. The Doctor's harping upon the 'degenerate days' in which he lives (344) may be being burlesqued, esp. in the celebrated, disastrous, mock-Petronian and anything but neo-Augustan 'Entertainment in the Manner of the Ancients' (233-43; also 605).

See esp. 608-09, 619, 667; also 671, 773.

See 561-3, 568, 573-5, 581-3, 671.

See 540-74, esp. 540-1, 556, 562-8, 571, 573-5; also 51-2, 603, 608, 610-12.


See 82-4, 140-1, 250, 258, 419-22, 595, 623, 636, 666, 678, 682, 735, 755.

See in the 'Memoirs': 451, 455, 457-8, 460, 482, 490-1, 532, 538 (celebration of sex, warm-blooded urges); 440, 442, 456, 457, 462, 463, 532 (value of experience); 432-3, 443, 452, 456, 457, 480, 483, 485, 492-3, 504, 507, 519, 521, 528, 532 (supremacy of love, fidelity to ideal of love -- if not strict physical chastity); 433 (middle-
class background like Peregrine's); 441, 443, 451, 457, 480, 504, 521, 524, 528, 532
(value of love over money, ambition -- a lesson Peregrine learns).

Eighteenth-century detractors of Lady Vane and her 'Memoirs': [Richard
Graves], 'The Heroines: or, Modern Memoirs' in London Magazine 20 (1751),
135-6; [John Hill], The History of a Woman of Quality: Or, the Adventures of Lady
Frail (London, 1751) and A Parallel Between the Characters of Lady Frail, and the
Lady of Quality in Peregrine Pickle (London, 1751); An Apology for the Conduct
of Lady Frail (London, 1751); Samuel Richardson, Selected Letters, ed. John
Carroll (Oxford, 1964), 173 and n. 202; Horace Walpole, Correspondence in the
Yale Edition, XIV. 48 and XX.230 (see also XVII. 459, XX. 439, XXX. 295); A Letter to
the Right Honourable the Lady V----------ss V-- (London, 1751). Compare [Cleland],
Memoirs of a Coxcomb (London, 1751), 362-3; Lady Mary Wortley Montagu to the
Countess of Bute, 16th Febr. 1752 N.S. in Complete Letters, III. 2-3; [David Henry],
The Tell-Tale, 2 vols (London, 1756); GM 21 (1751), 95 and 58 (1788), i. 368.

See also Rufus Putney, 'Smollett and Lady Vane's Memoirs', PQ 25 (19-
46), 120-6; William Scott, 'Smollett, Dr John Hill, and the Failure of Peregrine
Pickle', N&Q 200 (n.s. 2) (1955), 389-92; G.S. Rousseau, 'Controversy or Collu-
sion? The "Lady Vane" Tracts', N&Q 217 (n.s. 19) (1971), 375-8; W. Austin Fland-
ers, 'The Significance of Smollett's Memoirs of a Lady of Quality', Genre 8 (1975),
146-64; David K. Jeffrey, 'Smollett's Irony in Peregrine Pickle', Journal of Narra-
tive Technique 6 (1976), 137-46.

For the 'Paper War' between the two writers, see CGJ, 17-19, 24-6, 31-
3, 38-40; A Faithful Narrative ... Habbakkuk Hilding (London, 1752); Smollett,
Letters, ed. Knapp, 11; Howard Swazey Buck, A Study in Smollett (New Haven
and London, 1925).

54Habbakkuk Hilding, 19-20.

55Boucè, Les Romans de Smollett, 250. And see n. 31.
Compare Buck, 118; Griffith, 46 and passim; Boucè, Les Romans de
Smollett, 202-03; and Tuvia Bloch, 'Smollett's Quest for Form', MP 65 (1967-68),
103-113; G.S. Rousseau, review essay in ECS 4 (1970-71), 340; Paulson in Bicen-
tenial Essays, eds Rousseau and Boucè, 58, 65, 69-70; R.G. Collins, 'The Hidden
Bastard: A Question of Illegitimacy in Smollett's Peregrine Pickle', PMLA 94
(1979), 100-102.

56See 388-91, 736; 165-6, 168-70, 295-307, 350; 371-2, 427-8; 308-09, 622, 750-
1, 756. See also the moral ambiguity of 290-1, 576-7.
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58 Ibid., 185.

59 See Buck, 8-11 and 123-207 (esp. 138-42, 146-7, 149-51, 160-66, 169, 179-90); PP, 785; and Smollett's prefatory 'Advertisement' in the second edition of Peregrine Pickle (London, 1758), [iii-v].

60 Of interest in Ferdinand Count Fathom: see Damian Grant's edn (London, 1971), 200 ('What's bred in the bone will never come out of the flesh'); 6-9, 234; 40-1 (self-interest); 53-90-2, 129, 145, 164, 212, 264, 265f., 271 (ruling passion, humours); 71, 168, 235, 333, 335 (fate, providence &c.; also the flimsy plot connexions in general); 83-9, 317 (Gothic interludes); 34, 60, 164 (drugging and rape); 90 (adventures in the hundreds of Drury); 164, 199, 200, 211 and n., 211-30, 242, 291-2, 299-300, 354-5, 358-61, 363, 366 (the nature of vice and of repentance); 110-26, 184-8, 345-52 (digressions, including the history of the dispossessed King Theodore of Corsica); 205, 264-5 (school of adversity); 244, 286 (luxury, corruption).

It might be appropriate to raise the vexed question of Smollett and the picaresque at this point. I have been avoiding it, partly because the rake is not a picaresque in the strict sense, and it is probably of limited value that he is in some vague way like one. For the controversy as it concerns Smollett, see: G.S. Rousseau, 'Smollett and the Picaresque', SBT 12 (1970-71), 1886-1904 and review essay in ECS 4 (1970-71), 336-42; P.-G. Boucé, 'Smollett's Pseudo-picaresque: A Response to Rousseau's "Smollett and the Picaresque"', SBT 14 (1972-73), 73-79; Maximillian E. Novak, 'Freedom, Libertinism, and the Picaresque', SECC 3 (1973), 35-48.

In Sir Launcelot Greaves, ed. David Evans (London, 1973), see 2 (Tom Clarke's rakish qualities associated with 'goodness of heart', and excused), 40-1, 98, 204.

61 HC, 319. Hereafter, references to this edition will be cited in the text, following my usual practice.

62 For the view that Clinker represents a synthesis of earlier diffuse characteristics, see Bloch, 'Smollett's Quest for Form'; Boucé, Les Romans de Smollett, 240; Robert Folkenflik, 'Self and Society: Comic Union in Humphry Clinker', PQ 53 (1974), 195-204.

63 See nn 1, 2, 4, 8, supra.

64 See William Park, 'Fathers and Sons -- Humphry Clinker', Literature and Psychology 16 (1966), 166-74; Folkenflik, 'Self and Society', 196-7, 201-2; Boucé, 294-6.

65 For Bramble's constipation, see 5, 12, 33, 47, 118, 141, 155, 339; also 6, 45,
155 for references to constipation in other members of Bramble's circle.


Bramble's allusion to unclogging the wheels of life appears to have been inspired in part by *Tristram Shandy*, IV. 32; see Boucé, *Les Romans de Smollett*, 295 and Folkenflik, 'Self and Society', 203n.


67 See nn 1 and 2, above.

68 See 165; 164-5; 171; 297-305; 147-52; 98-99, 110-14; 281-2.

69 See Dunn and Folkenflik, 'Self and Society' for views that are sound, but perhaps too sanguine.


71 See 33, 77, 297, 320, 339, 343; also 270.

72 See 5-6, 9, 14-15, 21-2, 28, 38, 61-2, 77, 90.

73 For this vulgar error, see, among other places, Sekora, 246; Driscoll, 89. For another rediscovered bastard in Smollett, see *Sir Launcelot Greaves*, 209.

74 See 216, 229, 234, 241-4, 248, 252, 269, 270.

75 See Folkenflik, 'Self and Society', 197.

76 See n. 35 and my discussion in the text, supra.
Chapter Six

1 The Finish'd Rake; Or, Gallantry in Perfection (London, [1733]).

2 See esp. Chapter One, nn 8-25 and Chapter Two, nn 3, 8, 9, 45, 59.

3 See Chapter Two, n. 26.

4 [Sarah Scott], A Description of Millenium Hall (London, 1762), 3-4, 15-16, 58-9, 63-5, 111, 141-2, 144-5, 156, 207-11, 221-5, 254-5, 261-2.


Mary Wollstonecraft, The Wrongs of Woman: Or, Maria. A Fragment In Two Volumes, in 'Mary' and 'The Wrongs of Woman', eds James Kinsley and Gary Kelly (London, 1976), 84-5, 97, 100, 106-13 9 (esp. 109, on novels of seduction), 130, 135, 137-9, 144, 146-50, 154-6, 196.


Maria Edgeworth: see Castle Rackrent, ed. George Watson (London, 1964), 18-32; and Belinda, 2d edn, 3 vols (London, 1802), I. 18-20, 98, 170, 324, 327, 337-8 and II. 32, 68, 386 and III. 4-5, 10-17, 98-100, 224-5, 217-96 (also Lady Delacour and Harriot Freke as female rakes).

[Jane West], A Gossip's Story, 2 vols, 3d edn (London, 1798), I. 168-9, 170, 180-
A Tale of the Times, 3 vols (London, 1799), I. 17-18, 298 and II. 87, 159, 233, 238-9, 254, 278 and III. 9, 372 (standard rakery); II. 97-8, 152-3, 239, 272-7 and III. 128-9, 367, 372-6 (Fitzosborne's combination of radicalism and seduction -- the rake as intellectual); I. 27-30, 35, 68, 124, 144, 184, 187-9, 280 and II. 9-10, 16-21, 30-40, 124, 253 and III. 115-16, 380 (reiteration of feudal duty).


See also I. 56, 60, 72, 76-82, 94, 99, 135-74, 231 and II. 250-1.


See George Colman, snr, Polly Honeycombe (London, 1760), ix-xiii (the pre-1740 novels cited include Defoe's Colonel Jack and Roxana; up-dated versions of Manley's New Atalantis for 1758, 1759 and 1760, Haywood's Memoirs of a Certain Island; Davys's AccomplishedRake; Thomas Brown's Lindamira); and Novelist's Magazine 1-22 (1780-87).
15 See Ernest Tuveson, 'The Importance of Shaftesbury', *ELH* 20 (1953), 268, 277.
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The Daily Post 495 (2 May 1721).

Dalton, J. An Epistle to a Young Nobleman from his Preceptor. London: Lawton Gilliver, Robert Dodsley, 1736.
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[--------]. *Some Consideration upon Street-Walkers. With A Proposal for lessening the present Number of them. In two Letters to a Member of Parliament. To which is added, A Letter from One of those unhappy Persons, when in Newgate, and who was afterwards executed, for picking a Gentleman's Pocket, to Mrs. ---- in Great P"ney Street*. London: A. Moore, [1726].
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London: J. Bell, 1771.

The Fruit-Shop, a Tale; or, a Companion to St. James's Street. 2 vols. 2d edn. London: 
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The Harlot's Progress.  Being the Life of the noted Moll Hackabout, In Six Hudibrastic Cantos With a Curious Print to Each Canto; ingrav'd from Mr. Hogarth's Originals. 6th edn. London: R. Montagu, 1740.
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Love Upon Tick: Or, Implicit Gallantry Exemplified, In some Merry Memoirs of the Rise and Progress of an Extraordinary and Occasional Amour. In which The Whole Mechanism of that Pasion (sic) is Expos'd, and made Obvious to the Meanest Capacity. By the Author of--------. 3d edn, with additions. London: A. Bettesworth and others, 1725.

The Female Spectator. 5th edn. 3 vols. London: T. Gardner, 1755
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[———]. Chrysal ... '4th' edn. London: T. Beckett, 1764.


[———. Liberal Education: Or, a Practical Treatise on the Methods of Acquiring


Law, William. Remarks upon a Late Book, Entitled, The Fable of the Bees, or Private Vices, Publick Benefits. In a Letter to the Author: To which is added, A Postscript, containing an Observation or two upon Mr. Bayle. 2d edn. London: W. & J. Innys, 1725.


A Letter from a Citizen of London to his Fellow Citizens, And through them, to the People of England in General, Occasion'd by the late Earthquakes: Wherein some Vices of the Great are particularly exposed, which were not taken Notice of in the late excellent Letter of the Lord Bishop of London. London: J. Hinton, 1750.


The Levellers: see under Mundus Foppensis.


[Madan, Martin].  Thelyphthora; Or, A Treatise on Female Ruin, in its Causes, Effects, Consequences, Prevention, and Remedy; Considered on the Basis of the Divine Law: Under the following Heads, viz. Marriage, Whoredom, and Fornication, Adultery, Polygamy, and Divorce; With many other Incidental Matters; Particularly Including An Examination of the Principles and Tendency of Stat. 26 Geo. II. c. 33. Commonly Called The Marriage Act.  3 vols.  2d edn of vols 1 and 2, 1st edn of vol. 3.  London: J. Dodsley, 1781.


The Man of Pleasure; Or, Memoirs of Will Wilding, Esq.  Written by Himself.  London: Ann Lemoine, 1800 (engraved frontispiece bears the date 1799).


An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour and The Usefulness of War. By the Author of the Fable of the Bees. London: John Brotherton, 1732.


A Letter to Dion, Occasion'd by his Book call'd Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher. By the Author of the Fable of the Bees. London: J. Roberts, 1732.


Memoirs of Europe, Towards the Close of the Eighth Century. Written by Egignardus, Secretary and Favourite to Charlemagne. And done into English by the Translator of the New Atlantis. 2 vols. London: John Morphew, 1711.
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--------. *An Antidote Against Atheisme Or An Appeal to the Naturall Faculties of the Minde of Man, whether there be not a God.* London: Roger Daniel, 1653.

*The Morning Herald, and Daily Advertiser,* 16 December 1781

*The Morning Post, and Daily Advertiser,* 11 April 1777.


---. *An Address to Persons of Quality and Estate. By Robert Nelson, Esq: To which is added, A Representation of the several Ways and Methods of doing Good with some Reflections upon the Necessity and Excellence of Christian Beneficence*. Dublin: Peter Wilson, 1752.


*The New Universal Magazine*, October 1755, 125-58.


'News from Covent-Garden: or, the Town-Gallants Vindication. Being the Debates and Result of a famous Club of Wits, and Men of Humours and Intrigues, assembled for the Damning of the late Character.' London: J.T., 1675.


'The Noble Prodigal. Or, The young Heir newly come to his Estate. Who very kindly doth invite you all To feast upon his fathers Funeral. A new Medley of six Ayres.' In *Black-Letter Broadside Ballads* (Bodleian Don b 13i c. 1686).
Nocturnal Revels: Or the History of King's-Place, And other Modern Nunneries. Containing their Mysteries, Devotions, and Sacrifices. Comprising also, The Ancient and Present State of Promiscuous Gallantry. With Portraits of the most celebrated Demireps and Courtesans of this Period. As well as Sketches of their Professional and Occasional Admires, By a Monk of the Order of St. Francis. 2d edn. 2 vols. London: M. Goadby, 1779.
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Oldmixon, John. The History of England, During the Reigns of King William and Queen Mary, Queen Anne, King George I. Being the Sequel of the Reigns of the Stuarts. London: Thomas Cox and others, 1735.

[Osborne, Francis]. Advice to a Son; Or, Directions For your better Conduct, Through the various and most important Encounters of this Life. Under these Generall Heads I. Studies &c. II. Love and Marriage. III. Travell. IV. Government. V. Religion. Conclusion. 2d edn. Oxford: Thomas Robinson, 1656.


[------]. New Instructions for the Guardian: Shewing That the last Remedy to Prevent the Ruin, Advance the Interest, and Recover the Honour of this Nation is, I. A More Serious and Strict Education of the Nobility and Gentry. II. To breed up all their younger Sons to some Employment. III More of them to Holy Orders. With a Method of Institution from Three Years to Twenty One. London: Walter Kettiby, 1694.

The Perfidious P... Being Letters From a Nobleman To Two Ladies. Under the Borrow'd Names of Corydon, Clarinda & Lucina. With the Ladies Answers. N.p.: np, 1702.


Philemon to Hydaspes; Relating A Second Conversation with Hortensius upon the Subject of False Religion. In which is asserted The General Lawfulness of Pleasure; and The Extra vagant Severities of some Religious Systems are shewn to be a direct Contradiction to the Natural Appointment and Constitution of Things. London: M. Steen, 1737.


'Plot upon Plot: A Ballad. To the Tune of Heigh Boys up go we. [London]: n.p, [1712].

*The Political Register, and Impartial Register of New Books* 3 (1768), 42-3.


*The Port Folio* n.s. 6 (July-December 1811), 412-31.

*The Post-Boy* 4957 (29 April-2 May 1721).

[Povey, Charles]. *The Virgin in Eden: Or, the State of Innocency: Delivered by Way of Image and Description. Presenting A Nobleman, a Student, and
Heiress, on their Progress from Sodom to Canaan. With the Parable of the Shepherd; Zachariah, and Mary, who dwelt in thatched Tenements, secluded from Noise and Snares. Their holy Living and Dying. To which are added, Pamela's Letters prov'd to be immodest Romances painted in Images of Virtue: Masquerades in Disguise, that received Birth now Vice reigns in Triumph, and swells in Streams even to a Deluge. In this Treatise are the Divine Sayings of Queen Mary and Carolina [sic] in public Assemblies and select Companies. Taken from their own Manuscripts. The Decree of God appoints these Records to be kept in every House, in every Kingdom and State, from one Generation to another, till the great Fall of Nature. 5th edn. London: J. Brown, 1767.


The Presentment of the Grand-Jury for the County of Middlesex, To His Majesty's Court of King's Bench, At Westminster, Against the Infidels and Sodomites, And Impious Books. London: A. Dodd and others, 1728.


The Progress of a Rake: Shewing The Various intrigues and Dangers he met with: under the following Heads: I. His Intrigue with a certain City-Lady, and the Trick she contrived to gratify her Desires. II. His Adventures with the Whores in Drury-Lane, and the Comical Trick that was serv'd the Informers. III. The History of a certain Counsellor noted for a good Stomach. IV. His Intrigue with a Butcher's Wife; his Quarrel with a young Officer, and the Duel thereupon. V. The Treatment he met with at a Conventicle. VI. His Intrigue with a Dutchess; the Trick he play'd the Merchants at Garraway's. And several other Entertaining Passages and Occurrences. To which is prefixed, by way of Introduction, A Poem called The Rakes Night. London: N. Cox, 1732. (Identical to The Ramble, q.v., except that the latter does not include 'The Rakes Night'.)

The Public Register: Or, Freeman's Journal, 9-12 March 1771 (VIII. 324)


The Rake of Taste; or, Elegant Debauchee: A True Story. London: P. Wicks, 1760.

'The Rakes [sic] Complant [sic] in Limbo.' London: J. Pitts, [1820?]

The Rake's Progress (play): vide 'Gibber, Theophilus'.


The Rake's Progress; Or, the Humours of St. James's Being the Life of the celebrated Squire Rakewell, In Six Hudibrastic Cantos. With a curious Print to each Canto, engrav'd from the Originals of Mr. Hogarth. A New Edition. With a curious Love Epistle from Squire Rakewell, to the Young Woman, who was the Object of his first Passion. London: G. Robson, n.d.

The Rake's Progress; or, the Templar's Exit. In Ten Cantos, in Hudibrastic Verse. The whole Interspers'd with innocent Mirth, good Morals, and too much of the Author's Experience. By the Author of The Harlot's Progress. London: J. Dourse, 1753.

'The Rake's Resolve. A New Song Sung by Mr Lowe, at Vaux-Hall.' London: n.p., [1780?].

'The Rakish Husband.' London: Jennings, [1820?].
The Ramble Or, a View of Several amorous and diverting intrigues lately pass'd be-
tween some Ladies of Drury, and two certain Rakes living near St. James's.
Likewise of the many Vices now reigning in the righteous Cities of London
and Westminster. Inscribed to the Members of the R-f-r-n-g-n of M-n-s.
London: J. Bodle, [1730]. (Identical to The Progress of a Rake, q.v., except
that the latter attaches a poem, 'The Rakes Night'.)

The Rambler's Magazine; Or, the Annals of Gallantry, Glee, Pleasure, and the Bon
Ton; Calculated for the Polite World; And to Furnish The Man of Pleasure
with a most delicious Banquet of Amorous, Bacchanalian, Whimsical,
Humorous, Theatrical and Polite Entertainment 1-8 (1783-90).

The Rambler's Magazine; Or, Fashionable Emporium of Polite Literature, The
Fine Arts -- Politics -- Theatrical Excellencies -- Wit -- Humour -- Genius --
Taste -- Gallantry -- And All The Gay Variety of Supreme Bon Ton 1 (1822).

[Ramsay, Allan]. An Address of Thanks from the Society of Rakes, To the pious
Author of An Essay upon improving and adding to the Strength of Great
Britain and Ireland by Fornication. To which is added, An Epistle to the said

The Ranger's Magazine; Or, the Man of Fashion's Companion; Being The Whim
of the Month, And general Assemblage of Love, Gallantry, Wit, Pleasure,
Harmony, Mirth, Glee, and Fancy. Containing Monthly Lists of the Covent-
Garden Cyprians; or, the Man of Pleasures [sic] Vade-Mecum -- The Annals
of Gallantry -- Essence of Trials for Adultery -- Crim. Con. -- Seduction --
Double Entendres -- Choice Anecdotes -- Warm Narratives -- Curious
Fragments -- Animating Histories of Tête-à-Têtes [sic] -- and Wanton
Frolicks. To which is added the Fashionable Chit Chat, And Scandal of the
Month, From the Pharaoh Table to the Fan Warehouse 1 (1795).

Ranger's Progress: Consisting of a Variety of Poetical Essays: Moral, Sensous, Comic,
and Satyrical. By Honest Ranger, Of Bedford-Row. London: the author,
1760.

Reeve, Clara. The Old English Baron. Ed. James Trainer. London: OUP,
1967.

———. The Progress of Romance and The History of Charoba, Queen of
Egypt. Intro. Esther M. McGill. Facsimile reprint of 1785 edn printed for the
'The Repentance and Happy Death, of the Celebrated Earl of Rochester. To which is added, Some suitable Verses on the Occurrence by Dr. Isaac Watts.'
Nottingham: Sutton and Son, 1814.


[Scott, Sarah]. *A Description of Millemium Hall, And the Country Adjacent: Together with the Characters of the Inhabitants, And such Historical Anecdotes and Reflections As May excite in the Reader proper Sentiments of Humanity and lead the Mind to the Love of Virtue*. By a Gentleman on his Travels. London: J. Newbery, 1762.


*The Singular Life and Adventures of Fanny Hill, A Fair Cyprian, Many Years Resident in Russell Street, Covent Garden*. Originally Written by John Cleland, Esq. 3d edn. London: W. Glendinning, [c. 1800-10].


Some Doubts Occasioned by the Second Volume of an Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times. Humbly proposed to the Author or to the Public. London: W. Sandby, 1758.


Florio: A Moral History. In The Museum: Or, the Literary and Historical Register 1 (1746), 7-10.


Stanhope, Philip Dormer, 4th Earl of Chesterfield. *Letters Written by the Late Right Honourable Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield, to His Son, Philip Stanhope, Esq; Late Envoy Extraordinary at the Court of Dresden: Together with Several Other Pieces on Various Subjects. Published by Mrs. Eugenia Stanhope, from the Originals now in her Possession.* 2 vols. London: J. Dodsley, 1774.


--------. *The Guardian.* 3 (14 March 1712/13), 17 (31 March 1713), 131 (11 August 1713), 151 (3 September 1713).

--------. *The Lover: Written in imitation of the Tiller.* 3 (2 March 1714/15)


[Stevens, G.A.] *The Celebrated Lecture on Heads: Which has been exhibited upwards of One Hundred Successive Nights, To Croud Audiences, And Met with the most Universal Applause.* London: Richard Bond, 1765.

[Hall-Stevenson, John]. *Makarony Fables; Fables for Grown Gentlemen; Lyrick Epistles; and Several Other Poems; By the Author of Crazy Tales.* Dublin: Thomas Ewing, 1772.


*The Supplement.* 702 (7-9 April 1712), 703 (9-12 April 1712).


Swing, Swithin (pseudonym) *Letters to the Estimator of the Manners and Principles of the Times* by One who has served the State. London: J. Coote, 1758.


*The Theatre of Love. A Collection of Novels, None of which were ever printed before*. London: W. Reeve, 1759.


*Town and Country Magazine; Or, Universal Repository of Knowledge, Instruction and Entertainment* 1 (1769), 122-3; 5 (1773), 245-6; 6 (1774), 9, 44; 9 (1777), 311-12.


*The True Meaning of the Fable of the Bees: In a Letter To the Author of a Book entitled An Enquiry whether a general Practice of Virtue tends to the Wealth or Poverty, Benefit or Disadvantage of a People? Shewing That he has manifestly mistaken the True Meaning of the Fable of the Bees, in his Reflections on that Book*. London: William and John Innys, 1726.

'The two Noble Converts; or the Earl of Marlborough and the Earl of Rochester Their Dying requests and remonstrance, To the Atheists and Debauchees of this Age.' London: Randal Taylor, 1680.


The *Universal Spectator, and Weekly Journal*. By Henry Stonecastle, of Lincoln's-Inn, Esq: 91 (4 July 1730), 104 (3 October 1730), 207 (23 September 1732), 366 (11 October 1735), 367 (18 October 1735), 368 (25 October 1735), 707 (24 April 1742), 708 (1 May 1742), 709 (8 May 1742).


Wallace, Robert. 'Of Venery, or of the commerce of the two sexes': *vide* 'Smith, Norah', in *Secondary Sources*.
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