

DEMOCRACY IN THE EIGHTEENTH CEN- TURY NOVEL

WHEN artists like Richardson, Fielding, Sterne, and Goldsmith made common men leading characters in their novels, they were unconsciously advancing the theory of equality, and were teaching the masses, and their social superiors likewise, that all men of whatever rank in society had a right to full representation in the pages of fiction. Once in, they could not be denied the right of free thought and speech on all matters both public and private. If he was true to human nature as he claimed to be in his preface, the writer was bound literally to respect the rights of common men. Professor Stoddard calls attention to the fact that Jefferson, as author of the Declaration of Independence, was the first to assert in an utterance of great importance "the notion of individual worth, the dignity of man as man," and he adds: "Yet no less significantly, if less dogmatically, did Fielding assert the same proposition when, twenty-seven years before the Declaration of Independence was penned, he made the world take eager interest in one commonplace individual, Tom Jones. It is an assertion of the rights of men when Sterne compels us to care for Uncle Toby and for Tristram Shandy; when Richardson makes the woes of Pamela move the hearts of a generation; when Smollett finds nobility of character in a Roderick Random or a Humphrey Clinker; when Goldsmith paints a universal type in the unfortunate Vicar of Wakefield."¹

The idea of religious, social, and political equality—the notion that all men are created equal—was slowly changing English life and thought throughout the latter half of the eighteenth century. "The novel is the epic of democracy," says Professor Stod-

dard, and adds: "It is no accident that the great days of the historical novel followed the great days of strife for liberty in America and France."² But of course the struggle for liberty here and in Europe was not limited to a few years of actual fighting; men's minds had to be prepared for the times that were to try their souls. The novel, especially that of Richardson, Fielding, Sterne, and Goldsmith, did much towards this end.

Before average men can grasp the idea of democracy—equality of person and opportunity—it is necessary for them to have a fairly clear conception of personal identity—an idea of the individuality of persons. This was the first great task of the novelist. "The notion of personality," says Professor Stoddard, "is implied in the very idea of the novel."³ Professor Cross asserts that "Fielding succeeded in turning men's thoughts upon themselves." This was the first step in the process of individualization—the first step in making the average man feel the "scope and sovereignty of his ego."

One thing of very great importance—one that marked a step in advance for the masses—was the fact that people of rank—kings, lords, princes, nobles—were displaced in the novel often by people of obscure parentage, and little affluence. "Untitled humanity" now became the accepted subject for romance. Their number and character for so early a date are astonishing. Pamela, the first to appear, was a poor girl. Born in the country of obscure parents, she was happy in the service of Mr. B.'s mother, and apparently would have been content to continue in the service of Lady Booby; and simple, innocent Parson Adams declared that no man was too common or too poor for him to notice and to consider his equal. The accomplished Clarissa Harlowe was from the middle class, possibly but

¹F. H. Stoddard, *The Evolution of the English Novel*, pp. 90-91.

²*Ibid*, p. 92.

³*Ibid*, pp. 45-46.

a station in advance of Pamela. Both Tom Jones and Sophia Western had been bred in the country, and neither possessed any knowledge of the city. Amelia, Tristram Shandy, Humphrey Clinker, and a host of others seem now to have acquired a natural right in the pages of fiction. "The individual, no matter of what degree," says Professor Stoddard, "now had rights of representation in the novel no less than in government. . . . It is the declaration of independence in fiction, and ends forever the exclusive domination of the mediaeval romance."⁴

To effect this change from titled to untitled humanity, novelists made use of several means. Richardson, in defending the slow epistolary method of telling the story, does so partly on the ground that it has advantages in revealing personality. "The letters and conversations, where the story makes the slowest progress," he says, "are presumed to be *characteristic*. They give occasion, likewise, to suggest many interesting *personalities* in which a good deal of the instruction essential to a work of this nature is conveyed."⁵ One thing that made personality so conspicuous and interesting was that novelists usually pitted the wit and judgment of men and women of low birth—possessors of little culture and few desirable attainments—against those fine qualities and parts of their social and intellectual superiors. And in this combat of wits, the person of average culture and ability nearly always won his point. Authors saw to it, too, that those who assumed greater excellencies for themselves frankly confessed inferiority in this particular.

Richardson's first novel, which ran its course downward through the masses, is full of instances that elevate Pamela above her superior, Mr. B. The young girl, just fifteen years of age, writes a letter to her poor but honest parents in which she reports

a conversation between Mr. B. and Longman:

"As for the rest, said he (Mr. B.), the girl is a good sort of body, take her all together; though I must needs say, a little pert, since my mother's death, in her answers, and gives me two words for one; which I can't bear; nor is there reason I should, you know, Longman.

"Did he not, my dear father and mother, deserve all the truth to be told? Yet I overcame myself so far, as to say, 'Well, your honor may play upon a poor girl, that you know *can* answer you, but *dares* not.'"⁶

"You do well, sir, said I, to even your wit to such a poor maiden as me: but, permit me to say, that if you was not rich and great, and I poor and little, you would not insult me thus.—Let me ask you, sir, if you think this becomes your fine clothes and master's station? Why so serious, my pretty Pamela? said he: why so grave? And would kiss me; but my heart was full, and I said, Let me alone; I *will* tell you, if you was a king, and insulted me as you have done, that you have forgotten to act like a gentleman: and I won't stay to be used thus . . . and I'd have you know, sir, that I can stoop to the ordinarist work of your scullions, for all these nasty soft hands, sooner than bear such ungentlemanly imputations."⁷

"If I was your equal, sir, said I, I should say this is a very provoking way of jeering at the misfortunes you have brought upon me.

"Oh, said he, the liberties you have taken with my character in your letters, sets us upon a par, at least in that respect. Sir, I could not have taken those liberties, if you had not given me the cause: and the *cause*, sir, you know, is before the effect.

"True, Pamela, said he; you chop logic very prettily. What the deuce do we men go to school for? If our wits were equal to woman's, we might spare much time and pains in our education: for nature teaches your sex, what, in a long course of labor and study, ours can hardly attain to.—But, indeed, every lady is not a Pamela."

"Pray, Mrs. Jewkes, said I, don't 'madam' me so: I am but a silly girl, set up by the gambol of fortune, for a Maygame; . . . And let you and me talk upon a foot together; for I am a servant inferior to you, and so much the more as I am turned out of the place.

"Ay, ay, says she, I understand something of the matter; you have so great power over my master, that you may soon be mistress of us all; and so I would oblige you, if I could. And I must and will call you madam; for I am instructed to show you all respect, I'll assure you."⁸

Not only is there an air of independence in the conversations of inferiors, but there is also manifested the air of indifference—sometimes a feeling of positive disdain towards superiors:

⁴F. H. Stoddard, *The Evolution of the English Novel*, p. 91.

⁵Postscript to *Clarissa Harlowe*.

⁶*Pamela*, I, Letter xxviii.

⁷*Ibid*, I, Letter xxvii.

⁸*Ibid*, I, Letter xxxii.

"Do as I bid you," says my lady, "and don't shock my ears with your beastly language." "Marry come up," cries Slipslop, "people's ears are sometimes the nicest part about them."

"The lady, who begun to admire the new style in which her waiting-gentlewoman delivered herself, and by the conclusion of her speech suspected somewhat of the truth, called her back, and desired to know what she meant by the extraordinary freedom in which she thought proper to indulge her tongue. 'Freedom!' says Slipslop; 'I don't know what you call freedom, madam; servants have tongues as well as their mistresses.' 'Yes, and saucy ones too,' answered the lady, 'but I assure you I shall bear no such impertinence.' 'Impertinence! I don't know that I am impertinent,' says Slipslop. 'Yes, indeed you are,' cries my lady, 'and, unless you mind your manners, this house is no place for you.' 'Manners!' cries Slipslop; 'I never was thought to want manners or modesty neither; and for places, there are more places than one; and I know what I know.' 'What do you know, mistress?' answered the lady. 'I am not obliged to tell that to everybody,' says Slipslop, 'any more than I am obliged to keep it a secret.' 'I desire you will provide yourself,' answered the lady. 'With all my heart,' replied the waiting-gentlewoman, and so departed in a passion, and slammed the door after her."⁹

Again, servants sometimes make positive assertions that no real distinction exists between them and their masters and mistresses. Mr. Tow-wouse and the servant Betty, having been discovered in an act of indecency, are subjected to a severe tongue-lashing by Mrs. Tow-wouse.

Mrs. Tow-wouse to her husband and Betty:

"To abuse my bed, my own bed, with my own servant! but I'll maul the slut: I'll tear her nasty eyes out! Was ever such a pitiful dog to take up with such a mean trollop? If she had been a gentlewoman like myself, it had been some excuse; but a beggarly, saucy, dirty servant-maid. Get you out of my house, you whore." To which she added another name, which we do not care to stain our paper with. It was a monosyllable beginning with b—, and indeed was the same as if she had pronounced the words, she-dog. Which term we shall, to avoid offence, use on this occasion, though indeed both the mistress and maid uttered the above-mentioned b—, a word extremely disgusting to females of the lower sort. Betty had borne all hitherto with patience, and had uttered only lamentations; but the last appellation stung her to the quick. 'I am a woman as well as yourself,' she roared out, 'and no she-dog; and if I have been no better than I should be,' cried she sobbing, 'that's no reason you should call me out of my name; my be-betters are wo-worse than me.'"¹⁰

Although Pamela and her brother Joseph were born of poor, obscure parents, they

were finally admitted on a plane of equality, after much violent protest, into the homes of persons who thought themselves their superiors. Mr. B., apprehensive of the outcome of his marriage to Pamela, tells her frankly what she may expect, and why:

"But what can I do? Consider the pride of my position. I cannot endure the thought of marriage, even with a person of equal or superior degree to myself; and have declined several proposals of that kind. How then, with the distance between us in the world's judgment, can I think of making you my wife?—Yet I must have you; I cannot bear the thoughts of another supplanting me in your affections. . . ."

"But yet you see the plea, my girl, which I made to you before, of the pride of condition, and the world's censure, which, I own, sticks a little too close with me still: for woman shines not forth to the public as a man; and the world sees not your excellencies and perfections: If it did, I should entirely stand acquitted by the severest censures. But it will be taken in the lump; that here is Mr. B—, with such and such an estate, has married his mother's waiting-maid: not considering there is not a lady in the kingdom that can out-do her, or better support the condition to which she will be raised, if I should marry her. And, said he, putting his arm around me, and again kissing me, I pity my dear girl too, for *her* part in this censure; for here will she have to combat the pride and sleights of the neighboring gentry all around us. Sister Davers, you see, will never be reconciled to you; and you will, with a merit superior to them all, be treated as if unworthy of their notice."¹¹

Already Lady Davers had given him a large piece of her mind on this subject:

"Either you will have her for a kept mistress, or a wife," she wrote. "If the former, there are enough to be had without ruining a poor wench that my mother loved. . . . As to the *other*, I daresay you don't think of it; but if you *should*, you would be utterly inexcusable. Consider, brother, that ours is no upstart family; but is as ancient as the best in the kingdom! and, for several hundreds of years, it has never been known, that the heirs of it have disgraced themselves by unequal matches."¹²

Later when informed by Pamela that she and Mr. B. were married, Lady Davers characterized her with such epithets as "painted dirt," "baby-face," "waiting-maid," "beggar's-brat," and "beggar-born." When convinced that he had actually married his mother's waiting-maid, the proud Lady Davers committed her brother, body and soul, to mother earth: "I thought you a gentleman once, and prided myself in my

⁹Joseph Andrews, I, Ch. ix.

¹⁰Joseph Andrews, I, Ch. xvii.

¹¹Pamela, I, Letter xxxii.

¹²Pamela, Letter xxii.

brother," she cried; "but I'll say now with the burial service, 'Ashes to ashes, and dirt to dirt.'"

But Lady Davers's warnings and fits of anger did not deter her brother from marrying his mother's servant, and from making her his equal in social life. Moreover, Pamela had a brother whom Fielding named Joseph; and this same Joseph, Lady Booby importuned Adams not to "mister" to her.¹³ But when her nephew, Squire Booby, made Pamela his wife and brought her to live with them, he demanded of his aunt that Joseph be admitted into the family circle, an equal in all respects:

"They were now arriving at Lady Booby's, and the squire, desiring them to wait a moment in the court, walked in to his aunt, and called her out from his wife, acquainted her with Joseph's arrival, saying, 'Madam, as I have married a virtuous and worthy woman, I am resolved to own her relations, and show them all a proper respect; I shall think myself therefore infinitely obliged to all mine who do the same. It is true, her brother hath been your servant, but he is now become my brother; and I have one happiness, that neither his character, his behaviour, or appearance, give me any reason to be ashamed of calling him so. In short, he is now below, dressed like a gentleman, in which light I intend he shall hereafter be seen; and you will oblige me beyond expression if you will admit him to be of our party. . . .'"

Soon afterwards he says: "My love to my dear Pamela, brother, will extend to all her relations; nor shall I show them less respect than if I had married into the family of a duke."

Fielding, like Richardson, loved to give little curtain lectures and set dissertations for the perusal of his readers. In one of these he boldly asserts that there is no fundamental difference between men of so-called "high," and those of "low" degree. He discovered, as did Sterne later, that "human nature is the same in all professions." But there were those who took great delight in describing themselves as "high people" in contradistinction to "low people." Those who thought of themselves more highly than they deserved, he ridiculed as hypocrites; at the same time he informed men of low birth that they had been

allowing themselves to be deceived by distinctions that were only apparent—distinctions that were in no sense real and vital. His words are clear and forcible:

"These are pictures which must be, I believe, known: I declare they are taken from life, and not intended to exceed it. By those high people, therefore, whom I have described, I mean a set of wretches who, while they are a disgrace to their ancestors, whose honor and fortunes they inherit (or perhaps a greater to their mother, for such degeneracy is scarce credible), have the insolence to treat those with disregard who are at least equal to the founders of their own splendor. It is, I fancy, impossible to conceive a spectacle more worthy of our indignation than that of a fellow, who is not only a blot in the escutcheon of a great family, but a scandal to the human species, maintaining a supercilious behaviour to men who are an honor to their nature and a disgrace to their fortune."¹⁴

In his "Dissertation Concerning High People and Low People," he explains more freely what he means:

"Be it known then, that the human species are divided into two sorts of people, to-wit, high people and low people. As by high people I would not be understood to mean persons literally born higher in their dimensions than the rest of the species, nor metaphorically those of exalted characters or the reverse. High people signify no other than people of fashion, and low people those of no fashion. Now, this word fashion hath by long use lost its original meaning, from which at present it gives us a very different idea; for I am deceived if by persons of fashions we do not generally include a conception of birth and accomplishments superior to the herd of mankind; whereas, in reality, nothing more was originally meant by a person of fashion than a person who dressed himself in the fashion of the times; and the world really and truly signifies no more at this day. Now, the world being divided into people of fashion and of no fashion, a fierce contention arose between them; nor would those of one party, to avoid suspicion, be seen publicly to speak to those of the other, though they often held a very good correspondence in private. In this contention it is difficult to say which party succeeded: for, whilst the people of fashion seized several places to their own use, such as courts, assemblies, operas, balls, etc.; the people of no fashion, besides one royal place, called his Majesty's Bear-garden, have been in constant possession of all hops, fairs, revels, etc. Two places have been agreed to be divided between them, namely, the church and the playhouse, where they segregate themselves from each other in remarkable manner; for, as the people of fashion exalt themselves at church over the heads of the people of no fashion, so in the playhouse they abase themselves in the same degree under their feet. This distinction I have never met with any one able to account for; it is sufficient that, so far from looking on each other as brethren in the Christian language, they seem scarce to regard each other

¹³Joseph Andrews, Book IV, Ch. ii.

¹⁴Joseph Andrews, Bk. III, Ch. i.

as of the same species. This, the terms 'strange persons, people one does not know, the creatures, wretches, beasts, brutes,' and many other appellations evidently demonstrate; which Mrs. Slipslop, having often heard her mistress use, thought she had also a right to use in her turn; and perhaps she was not mistaken; for these two parties, especially those bordering nearly on each other, to-wit, the lowest of the high, and the highest of the low, often change their parties according to place and time; for those who are people of fashion in one place are often people of no fashion in another. And with regard to time, it may not be unpleasant to survey the picture of dependence like a kind of ladder; as, for instance: early in the morning arises the postilion, or some other boy, which great families, no more than great ships, are without, and falls to brushing the clothes and cleaning the shoes of John the footman, who, being dressed himself, applies his hands to the same labors for Mr. Second-hand, the Squire's gentleman; the gentleman in the like manner, a little later in the day, attends the squire; the squire is no sooner equipped than he attends the levee of my lord, which is no sooner over than my lord himself is seen at the levee of the favorite, who, after the hour of homage is at an end, appears himself to pay homage to the levee of his sovereign. Nor is there, perhaps, in this whole ladder of dependence, any one step at a greater distance from the other than the first from the second; so that to a philosopher the question might only seem, whether you would choose to be a great man at six in the morning, or at two in the afternoon. And yet there are scarce two of these who do not think the least familiarity with the persons below them a condescension, and, if they were to go one step farther, a degradation."¹⁵

The effect of such heart-to-heart talks upon the mind of the masses must have been considerable. Here in an interesting story readers met real, live men and women like themselves—a new thing to them. They listened to these people give utterance to thought, which, if they themselves had not yet dared to utter, reminded them that they might now do so if they chose. They were made aware that new possibilities and new opportunities were theirs, if they set about it in earnest to realize them.

Writing of *Pamela*, Professor Dobson says: "As the Slough incident shows, it appealed to the humbler reader as well as to the person of quality; it bridged over the then more widely trenched breach between rich and poor; for who would say that a servant-girl who played her cards as clever-

ly as Pamela Andrews might not obtain a like reward?"¹⁶

Whether or not Mr. B. took the servant-girl to wife (as her author claimed) because of the "transcendent excellencies" and "the awful heights of virtue" ascribed to her, we may assume made little difference to the masses of readers. Pamela, with whom they identified themselves, had won a husband from social ranks far above hers. This was to them the simple truth of the whole matter. No wonder the swarthy blacksmith rang the churchbell at Slough in honor of the glorious victory. What it meant to common people—those weeds that grow "in the common garden of creation," as Lady Booby's "superior mind" conceived them to be—can hardly be overestimated.

Fielding eagerly seized the opportunity to ridicule Pamela's feigned virtue—a task not difficult for him to succeed in; but he did not ridicule the fact of her marrying Mr. B. Not only does Fielding allow Squire Booby to bring Pamela home to wife, but he writes a dissertation to boot, wherein he exposes feigned differences that have long divided the human species into "two sorts of people." Undoubtedly Fielding regarded this union as proper and correct, and hence found no sufficient reason for ridiculing it. "I defy the wisest man in the world," he says, speaking through Joseph Andrews, "to turn a true good action into ridicule." And if more evidence should be desired to convince one of his sincerity in this matter, he would need only to be reminded that for his second wife Fielding himself married a young woman who was much below him socially—"his own cook-wench," Smollett called her. The union was defended, too, by ladies of high standing, such, for example, as Lady Mary Wortley Montague and Lady Louisa Stuart.¹⁷

Thus in the new kind of writing, destined

¹⁶Austin Dobson, *Samuel Richardson*, p. 33.

¹⁷W. L. Cross, *The History of Henry Fielding*, II, pp. 61-62.

¹⁵Joseph Andrews, Bk. II, Ch. xiii.

soon to become widely known, the common people discovered two great authors who were championing their cause for social equality. But they were not satisfied with the more favorable outlook for equality and justice that these authors held out to them; the Englishman's mind is really never satisfied.

Professor Burton defines the modern novel as "a study of contemporary society with an implied sympathetic interest, and, it may be added, with special reference to love as a motor force, simply because love it is which binds together human beings in their social relations."¹⁸ The democratic tone of this definition makes it no less applicable to most eighteenth-century novels.

As one reads the novels of Richardson, especially the first which Lady Mary declared was "the joy of chamber-maids of all nations," and compares the subject of this novel with that of the old romance, he is struck forcibly by the love factor in the Pamela story. It is hardly too much to say that love was the greatest single force in the process of leveling what hitherto had been social barriers. It is true that Richardson, speaking through Mr. B., greatly exaggerated Pamela's virtue; but then love is blind, so why criticise Mr. B. when he declares, even against his will, "you have too much wit and good sense not to discover (Pamela) that I, in spite of my heart and all my pride of it, cannot but love you. Yes, look up to me, my sweet-faced girl! I 'must' say I love you. . . ." ¹⁹

Mr. B. may have been disillusioned later—we leave that to him and to the gods—but we can be absolutely certain, however, that he has been captivated by the wit, the good sense, and the integrity of character, which are characteristics of his mother's servant. As for Pamela, there is evidence, and plenty of it, that she was dissembling

for a prize, and that prize a wealthy husband who was socially and politically distinguished. Persons of quality, wedded to social customs and conventions in the middle of the eighteenth century, could not permit such an infraction without protest from the élite; but of what significance was it? and what did their protest avail? When we carefully analyze the motives back of this union, how far do they fall short of "human nature?" This, after all, was what Richardson and every other writer of the new fiction claimed to present. Why should a waiting-maid be denied marriage to advantage, if love was at bottom the motivating force? But if she married for expediency only, ruling love out of the case, then of course she is the personification of deceit, and is not worthy of our consideration. Did Richardson exaggerate the motive, or warp human nature in this particular? He did neither; for this story does put love uppermost. Follow but a few of the many positive assertions, and the sentiment expressed must be convincing:

On Monday Pamela wrote in her Journal:

"This letter, when I expected some new plot, has affected me more than anything of 'that' sort could have done. For here is plainly his great value for me confessed, and his rigorous behaviour accounted for in such a manner, as tortures me much. All this wicked gypsy story is, as it seems, a forgery upon us both, and has quite ruined me: For, oh my dear parents, forgive me! but I found, to my grief, before, that my heart was too partial in his favour; but *now* with so much openness, so much affection; nay, so much *honour* too (which was all I had before doubted, and kept me on the reserve), I am quite overcome. This was a happiness, however, I had no reason to expect. But, to be sure, I must own to you, that I shall never be able to think of anybody in the world but him.—Presumption! you will say; and so it is: But love is not a voluntary thing: *Love*, did I say?—But come, I hope not:—At least it is not, I hope, gone so far as to make me *very* uneasy: For I know not *how* it came, nor *when* it came; but crept it has, like a thief, upon me; and before I knew what was the matter, it looked like love.

"Oh, my treacherous, treacherous heart! to serve me thus! and give no notice to me of the mischief thou wast about to bring upon me!—But thus foolish to give thyself up to the proud invader, without ever consulting thy poor mistress

¹⁸Richard Burton, *Masters of the English Novel*, p. 10.

¹⁹*Pamela*, I, Letter xxx.

in the least! But thy punishment will be the *first* and the *greatest*; and well deservest thou to smart, oh perfidious traitor! for giving up so weakly thy whole self, before a summons came; and to one, too, who had used me so hardly; and when, likewise thou hadst so well maintained thy post against the most violent and avowed, and, therefore, as I thought, more dangerous attacks."

Mr. B., whose "manner," says Pamela, "had something so noble and so sincere," declares over and over again that love has superseded the baser passions, and has become the motivating and regulating force of his behavior towards Pamela. He requests her to "invite" him into her presence:

"I will only say one thing, that if you will give me leave to attend you at the Hall (consider who it is that requests this from you as a 'favour'), I solemnly declare, that you will have cause to be pleased with the obliging remark of your confidence in me, and consideration for me; and if I find Mrs. Jewkes has not behaved to you with the respect due to one I so dearly love, I will put it entirely into your power to discharge her the house, if you think proper. . . . Dearest Pamela, answer favourably this earnest request of one who cannot live without you, and on whose honour to you, you may absolutely depend. . . ." ²⁰

Later, she says, "he was pleased to add another charming reflection, which showed me the noble sincerity of his kind profession. I do own to you, my Pamela, said he, that I love you with a purer flame than ever I knew in my whole life; a flame to which I was a stranger. . . . And I know more sincere joy and satisfaction in this sweet hour's conversation with you, than all the guilty tumults of my former passion ever did, or (had even my attempts succeeded) ever could have afforded me."

²⁰*Pamela*, I Letter xxxii.

Fielding was not content to introduce natural and unaffected love scenes in his great novel; but was inclined to preach against the lack of genuine affections in persons of quality and affluence. When Sophia and her lover discovered each other in Lady Bellaston's parlor, Sophia gave "a violent scream, and scarce preserved herself from fainting till Jones was able to move to her and support her in his arms."

"To paint the looks or thoughts of either of these lovers," he declares, "is beyond my power. As their sensations, from their mutual silence, may be judged to have been too big for their own utterance, it cannot be supposed that I should be able to express them: and the misfortune is that few of my readers have been enough in love to feel by their own hearts what passed at this time in theirs."—*Tom Jones*, Bk. XIII, Ch. xi.

Again he says: "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 pleasure of love as unworthy of their regard. . . ."—*Tom Jones*, Bk. XIV, Ch. i.

Such were the sentiments divulged by social unequals some years before the middle of the eighteenth century. "Richardson's novel (*Pamela*)," says Professor Cross, "ran its course down through all classes to the servant's hall. . . ." ²¹ There is no mistaking its wide and effective influence.

"Both the impatient self-assertion of the middle class, and its quiet settling down into conservative grooves of feeling, are thus foreshadowed. The story of *Pamela* is an illustration of the Christian equality of souls, quite in keeping with the wide-spread modern tendency to exalt a sentimental, theoretical democracy; it breathes, on the other hand, an involuntary subservience to the intrinsic dignity of rank and riches. . . ." ²²

Closely allied to the love factor as a motor force in furthering democratic ideas, was the question at issue regarding the choice of a husband. The convictions of despotic parents and willful daughters differed widely on this important matter—a matter of grave difference, Fielding says, that was much too common. Richardson and Fielding make much of this, and seem to have succeeded in instituting reforms.

In *Clarissa Harlowe*, the author is clear and emphatic: *Clarissa* refuses to yield to the autocratic will of her father, mother, family, and friends in the matter of choosing a husband for herself. Her so-called stubbornness, independence, and self-will bring down upon her the condemnation of her family. Her brother James writes to her:

"The liberty of *refusing* (Solme's advances), pretty Miss, is denied you, because we are all sensible that the liberty of *choosing*, to everyone's dislike must follow. . . .

"This is the light in which the whole debate ought to be taken. Blush, then, De-

²¹W. L. Cross, *The History of Henry Fielding*, I, p. 355.

²²*Cambridge History of English Literature*, X, p. 15.

licacy, that cannot bear the poet's 'amor omnibus idem!' Blush, then, Purity! Be ashamed, Virgin Modesty! And if capable of conviction, surrender your whole will to the will of the honoured pair to whom you owe your being: and beg of your friends to forgive and forget the part you have of late acted."²³

"Independence" of action Clarissa later explains in full to Miss Howe: ". . . after I became *independent*, as I may call it (by which I mean no more than to have the liberty of refusing for my husband a man whom it hurts me but to think of in that light); and such as his not visiting me but by my leave. . . ." ²⁴

Clarissa reports a conversation with her aunt to Miss Howe:

"What a hard case is mine!—. . . How often, my dearest aunt, must I repeat the same thing?—Let me but be single.—Cannot I live single?—Let me be sent, as I have proposed, to Scotland, to Florence, anywhere: let me be sent a slave to the Indies, anywhere—any of these I will consent to. But I cannot, *cannot* think of giving my vows to a man I cannot endure!—" ²⁵

Later she writes:

"Only one thing must be allowed for me; that whatever course I shall be *permitted* or be *forced* to steer, I must be considered as a person out of her own direction. Tost to and fro by the high winds of passionate control (and, as I think, unseasonable severity), I behold the desired port, the 'single state,' into which I would fain steer; but I am kept off by the foaming billows of a brother's and sister's envy, and by the raging winds of a supposed invaded authority; . . ." ²⁶

Miss Howe is convinced that Clarissa has done all that reason and justice can demand, when she offers to remain single all her life; she writes: "The tyrant word

AUTHORITY, as they use it, can be the only objection against this offer."²⁷

Just as Harlowe had determined to join his daughter's inheritance with Solme's fortune regardless of Clarissa's wishes, so Western looked forward to the near future when his own and Allworthy's estate would be joined by the union of his daughter, Sophia, and Blifel. But Tom Jones had already won Sophia's heart—which made a difference to her.

This tyrannical attitude of parents towards prospective matches for their daughters is forcibly expressed by Mr. Western, who, upon being informed by Mrs. Western that his daughter Sophia is in love, cries in a passion: "'How! in love—In love! . . . without acquainting me! I'll disinherit her; I'll turn her out of doors, stark naked, without a farthing. Is all my kindness vor'ur and vondness o'ur come to this, to fall in love without asking me?' 'But you will not,' answered Mrs. Western, 'turn this daughter whom you love better than your own soul, out of doors, before you know whether you shall approve her choice. Suppose she should have fixed on the very person whom you yourself wish, I hope you would not be angry then?' 'No, no,' cries Western, 'that would make a difference. If she marries the man I would ha' her, she may love whom she pleases; I shan't trouble my head about that.'" ²⁸

Concerning this episode in the life of Western, Felding adds his own criticism: "Instances of this behaviour in parents are so common that the reader, I doubt not, will be very little astonished at the whole conduct of Mr. Western. If he should, I own I am not able to account for it; since that he loved his daughter most tenderly, is, I think, beyond dispute. So indeed have many others who have rendered their children most completely miserable by the same conduct; which, though it is almost universal in parents, hath always appeared to me

²³Clarissa Harlowe, II, Letter x.

²⁴Ibid, Letter xiii.

²⁵Ibid, Letter iii.

²⁶Ibid, Letter xxvii.

²⁷Ibid, Letter xiv.

²⁸Tom Jones, Bk. VI, Ch. ii.

to be the most unaccountable of all the absurdities which ever entered into the brain of that strange prodigious creature man."²⁹

When Honour informed Jones that Sophia had been carried away by her father who was "swearing she should marry Mr. Blifel," Jones's reply struck the very heart of the issue. The last sentence must have put parents in mind and convinced them that, henceforth, a determined attitude toward this important matter, such as it had been, would no longer be tolerated. "Indeed, Mrs. Honour," answered Jones, 'you frightened me out of my wits. I imagined some most dreadful sudden accident had happened to Sophia, something, comparable to which, even the seeing her married to Blifel would be a trifling incident; but while there is life there are hopes, my dear Honour. Women in this land of liberty cannot be married by actual brute force.'"³⁰

CHARLES HERBERT HUFFMAN

MAGAZINES OF USE IN INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT CLASSES

TO GET in touch with publishers of magazines of use in institutional or large group living problems, letters were sent to various publishing houses and libraries. In several instances if these publishers did not publish magazines of interest in this field, they gave the names and addresses of those who did, thereby enabling the writer to gain the information she desired.

A very helpful list compiled and used by Miss Alice Zabriski of the Institutional Administration department of Teachers College, Columbia University, was sent with a check to indicate those pamphlets and magazines of greatest value to classes in Institutional Management.

In the "Guide to Magazines" section of Annie Isabel Robertson's *Guide to Literature*

of *Home and Family Life* (J. B. Lippincott Co.), a list of magazines on large group living was found. In this guide was also printed a section "Directories of Magazines." This list and these directories were fruitful sources of information.

In order that the writer might catalog these magazines, publishers were asked to submit copies. This they did willingly. In some cases two or three copies were submitted, thus making it easier to judge their worth.

The list is as follows:

JOURNAL OF HOME ECONOMICS, American Home Economics Association, Baltimore, Md. Pp. 83; 6¼x9¾. Monthly. \$2.50 per year.

This magazine is representative of the whole field of home economics in the United States. It keeps in touch with the scientific research along home economics development. Not only are there published valuable articles for teachers of home economics but for any one who is interested in clothing, in food, and in health in the home, the school, and the institution.

THE NATIONAL HOTEL REVIEW. Ghering Publishing Co., 119 West 40th street, New York. Section I, weekly; pp. 82; 9x12 in. Section II, monthly; pp. 32; 9x12. Both for \$4.00 a year.

Section I (weekly) gives news of people who own hotels or those who are interested in the success of hotels. There is a department which reports weekly in detail all legislation pending in congress and in the United States and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, directly or remotely affecting the hotel business, thereby enabling one to see at a glance the condition of legislation throughout the country. A little more than half the book is filled with advertisements.

Section II (monthly) is entirely given to the operation of successful hotels. Advertisements seldom appear in this section. Improved methods of caring for hotels and the best kind of equipment to be used are two of its main points. This magazine would be of much use to a class in Institutional Management, but its cost leads us to seek for another that is almost as good and much cheaper.

THE HOTEL WORLD. Editor, Harry J. Bohn, 440 South Dearborn street, Chicago. Pp. 48; 8½x11½. Weekly, \$4.00 a year.

Each copy of this magazine seems to take up the study either of a single hotel or of a group of hotels. Many illustrations accompany these studies. Other helpful articles are given now and then. It is really more suitable for hotel owners and for travelers than for a class in institutional management.

THE HOTEL BULLETIN. Published by the Ben P. Branham Co., 951-957 Insurance Exchange, 175 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago. Pp. 95; 8½x11½. Monthly, \$3.00 a year.

This magazine contains a few articles that

²⁹Tom Jones, Bk. VII, Ch. iy.

³⁰Tom Jones, Bk. XV, Ch. vi.