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ABSTRACT

By specifically focusing upon the works of Daniel Defoe, Samuel Richardson, and James Boswell, this study describes stylistic and content shifts that occur within narrative writing during the eighteenth century. A close analysis of non-fictional and fictional personal narrative provides insight on writers and readers, the emergence of the novel, and the changing depiction of self in prose. Some assumptions underlying this study are the beliefs that individuals are influenced by what they read, different genres affect and influence one another, and the dividing line between factual and fictional narrative is more cloudy than clear. To better establish a literary context for early prose fiction, a number of published diaries and journals from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are examined throughout the study. Though no evidence for a causal relationship between Defoe’s works and journals exists, many similarities between the two forms are apparent, and the first two chapters of the study discuss these similarities in detail. Chapter Three argues that though Richardson uses the diary and letter form in his works, he departs from the reliance upon realistic personal writing that governed Defoe’s writing. Richardson reveals how the conventional characteristics of the novel were beginning to transcend the familiar characteristics of journal writing. With Boswell, one observes that the attributes of novel
writing were beginning to affect people's own personal writings. His journals, travel books, and biography of Samuel Johnson contain the kind of psychological development and character description evident in novels of his day. Boswell's writing reveals that the relationship between the diary and novel had reversed itself. Chapter Four, which focuses upon Boswell, acts as counterpoint to the Defoe chapter. Defoe's fiction seems imitative of journal writing, but Boswell's journals exhibit characteristics of the novel at work in his non-fictional prose. Ultimately, studying fictional and non-fictional narrative in tandem places the issue of genre during the eighteenth century into question. Simply measuring Defoe's works against other novels or evaluating Boswell's biography of Johnson against other biographies is too limiting for these writers who cross genre lines.
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Introduction

The eighteenth century produced a number of novelists and biographers, but a specific focus upon the works of Daniel Defoe, Samuel Richardson, and James Boswell provides today's readers with some insight into clear stylistic and content shifts that occur within narrative writing over the course of the century. One passage in particular from Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides (1785) serves to reveal how different Boswell's attitude toward the reliability of narrative was from the sentiments Defoe expressed in his fiction works. Three months into their visit to the Hebrides, Samuel Johnson and Boswell found themselves sailing by moonlight through "black and gloomy rocks," causing Johnson to remark, "If this be not roving among the Hebrides, nothing is" (5: 333). Though Johnson's statement is characteristically witty, it is Boswell's reaction that creates a unique passage:

The repetition of words which he had so often previously used, made a strong impression on my imagination; and, by a natural course of thinking, led me to consider how our present adventures would appear to me at a future period. (5: 333)

For the next paragraph, Boswell reflects upon memory and the tendency for scenes to "improve by lying in the memory." Boswell's thoughts on memory last for a mere six sentences before he continues with the description of the "tedious sail." Though brief, this paragraph on memory is significant
for two reasons. First, it reflects Boswell's tendency to disrupt the flow of narrative to incorporate his own perception of the narrative event. Second, Boswell's observation that memory can improve upon an event, signals his belief that artifice plays a necessary role in narrative construction.

Though Defoe wrote fictional narratives, the content and style of those works suggest that he would not have been so willing as Boswell to admit the unreliability of memory as Boswell is. As his prefaces indicate, Defoe made serious efforts to create narratives that appeared factual and accurate. Defoe's strong emphasis upon realism required him to favor the outward experiences of his protagonists over their inward thoughts and interpretations of those outer experiences. Though his narrators concentrate upon their own lives, often times they appear as mere reporters because of their refusal to explore fully their memory and the implications of various events in their lives. With his fictional narrators, Defoe avoids the very thing that Boswell cites as memory's advantage, so he draws the focus away from memory to the events themselves. Boswell, on the other hand, sees no reason not to incorporate his reaction to the events he describes. At first it seems ironic that a writer of fictional narrative is more concerned with the reality of an event than a writer of factual narrative. However, this difference between Defoe and Boswell represents the
significant change that transpired during the eighteenth century regarding the development of self in written narratives.

My study considers the changes in both fictional and factual narrative that took place over the course of the century. By focusing upon the manner in which writers develop and present the self, I seek to describe basic changes that took place within these narratives and to suggest the consequences of those changes upon the relationship between writer and reader. Some assumptions underlying this study are the beliefs that individuals are influenced by what they read, different genres affect and influence one another, and the dividing line between factual and fictional narrative is more cloudy than clear.

Throughout this study, I consider how both reading and writing are characterized within a narrative, and how the content and style of a narrative reflect readers’ tastes and expectations. By examining both fictional and non-fictional narratives, I seek to indicate the close relationship between the two forms and to suggest how the forms have an effect upon each other. Rather than attempt a broad literary history of narrative writing in the eighteenth century, this study focuses primarily on three major writers from three different periods of the century--Daniel Defoe, Samuel Richardson, and James Boswell. With each writer, I discuss the nature of reading, both inside and outside the narratives. For example,
to characterize the presentation of reading within the text, I consider how the four principal letter writers in *Clarissa* (1747-48) read each other’s words and how Boswell reads Johnson’s works in the *Life of Johnson* (1791). I also note how all the main characters—Crusoe, Moll, H.F., Pamela, Clarissa, Lovelace, Johnson, and Boswell himself—figuratively "read" (or interpret) events and other people. Second, I analyze the writing style of each author, comparing and contrasting their styles to suggest how their changing techniques might reflect upon real-life readers of the eighteenth century.

Before examining these authors in detail, however, Chapter One begins with a broad consideration of published journals during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Its main purpose is to establish the connection between journal writing and first-person fictional works that I will build upon throughout the study, especially in Chapters Two and Three. Along with summarizing the different kinds of journals that were published during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Chapter One describes how writers conceive and convey the self in these journals. Rather than tackling both unpublished and published journals of the eighteenth century, the first chapter concentrates specifically upon the latter by analyzing sea journals, political journals, and religious journals. Because the role of readers plays such a large part of this study, I have limited my analysis of diaries to those that would have had an audience beyond the individual diarist.
Therefore, Chapter One concentrates solely upon published diaries. Many of the diaries published during the century resemble early fiction narratives such as Behn's *Oroonoko* (1688) and Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719). There is no indication that Behn and Defoe consciously imitated any specific journals or autobiographies that were on the market, but stylistic similarities between published non-fictional narrative and fictional narrative are apparent. Though no evidence for direct influence of the non-fictional narrative on the fictional narrative exists, similar characteristics between the two genres indicate that a common sensibility toward an appropriate method of written self-expression probably existed seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Published diaries predate the earliest examples of the novel by at least a century, and their publication implies that readers were comfortable with the narrative form by the time Defoe's early prose fictions appeared, for example. Understanding Defoe's place within this timeline helps to explain his writing style, which is characterized by a concentration upon events over character and a tendency to cover several scenes within the span of only a few pages. In *The Rise of the Novel*, Ian Watt argues that the early novel was suited to new readers who desired "an easier form of literary entertainment" in comparison to classical literature (48). However, if the book-buying public had been reading published journals long before Defoe's first work appeared, it
might mean that Defoe and writers like him wrote the early novels to take advantage of an existing market. Thus, while the early eighteenth-century novel did not require a classically educated audience that a work like *Paradise Lost* (1667) might have, the novel was not merely a new, simplistic form designed to appeal to an emerging but inexperienced reading public. Eighteenth-century readers might have been novice readers of the "English novel" but they were not novice readers of narrative. Therefore, the lack of complexity regarding character development and psychology in Defoe's works might stem from his desire to capitalize upon a style of writing that was familiar to readers rather than from a desire to simplify elements for a class of readers who lacked reading experience.

While Defoe's works suggest the influence of established non-fictional narrative forms such as the diary and autobiography, he was no mere imitator of these works. The works that we now classify as his novels, however, bear a close similarity to the journals that were being published throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In her biography of Defoe, Paula Backscheider observes that "Defoe's first impulse in everything he wrote was to imagine a person and project feelings" (*Daniel Defoe* 414). While Defoe's protagonists convey their mental conditions by exhibiting their sorrows, joys, and fears on the printed page, they do not develop their inner thoughts as fully as modern readers
might expect. Defoe's narrators focus primarily upon physical action, choosing to offer little sustained consideration upon the implications of their actions. Their emphasis is on reporting rather than interpreting. Furthermore, though the protagonists all write their stories well after the events have taken place, rarely do they make use of hindsight. Instead they set down the events in their lives in a day-by-day fashion much as a diarist would. Were Defoe simply to have imitated the early self-narrative forms, his name would probably have been forgotten long ago. What interests me is the manner in which Defoe begins to diverge from the conventions of existing non-fictional narrative forms so that his works become more than simple imitations. The inclusion of Crusoe's journal within his narrative, for example, allows Defoe to experiment with two different writing styles. To consider the difference between Defoe's works and non-fictional narrative, I look specifically at the protagonists of Robinson Crusoe (1719), Moll Flanders (1722), and the Journal of the Plague Year (1722) and argue that each one presents the self differently for the reader depending upon his or her physical situation. For example, a solitary Crusoe writes a much more reflective narrative than the assiduously active Moll Flanders, who steals, plots, and mingles with others throughout her entire story. Though their levels of introspection differ, all of Defoe's protagonists concentrate upon the self more heavily than most diarists do. Defoe's
willingness to develop his characters' inner lives and personalities signals the new direction that the emerging novel was taking readers. By developing the inner world of the central character, prose fiction was de-emphasizing external reality. Still, this aspect was less important for Defoe than remaining true to the autobiographical form influencing his narratives. In the Defoe novel, realism takes priority over the construction of character in the Defoe novel. Not until Richardson's *Clarissa* (1747-48) would a major work de-emphasize the external world to such an extent that the inner world of the characters becomes the primary focus of the narrative.

Despite Richardson's use of the diary and letter form in his works, he moved away from reliance upon the realistic personal writing that governed Defoe's writing. Richardson is the transitional figure in my study, showing how the conventional characteristics of the novel were beginning to transcend the familiar characteristics of diary writing. By focusing mainly upon *Clarissa* in Chapter Three, I hope to reveal that Richardson, while still reliant upon non-fictional personal writing like letters and journals, begins to manipulate these earlier forms in a way that Defoe did not. In *Familiar Letters* (1741), one of Richardson's earliest published works, a reliance upon an established letter writing style is far more apparent than Defoe's reliance upon journals or autobiographies. Some of the letters reflect a development
of self that Richardson would continue to explore in *Pamela* (1740) and perfect in *Clarissa*. My third chapter outlines the emergence of the individual self that takes place over the course of these three Richardson works. In addition to being important for creating characters in *Pamela* and *Clarissa* who display more introspection than was evident in most non-fictional narrative, Richardson is also significant to my study because he purposefully complicates the reading experience far more than a single-person narrative would. His use of several letter writers or narrators in *Clarissa* allows him to call into question the reliability of an action or event when multiple interpretations are at work. Richardson’s innovations move the novel away from the prose forms that preceded it. This movement suggests perhaps that novel readers were becoming more mature and more comfortable with this evolving genre. They no longer sought works that so closely duplicated the non-fiction prose works that they had been accustomed to reading and writing. The middle and late eighteenth-century readers’ acceptance of the emerging style we now associate with the novel had two consequences. First, it meant that novelists no longer relied so heavily upon the journal or biography framework. Their abandonment of these earlier forms gives rise to the third-person narratives of Ann Radcliffe and Jane Austen, which are closer to our modern conceptions of the novel. Second, and more relevant to my
study, one can observe that characteristics of novel writing were beginning to affect people's own personal writings.

Readers see this latter consequence in Boswell's journals, which contain the kind of psychological development and character description evident in novels of that time. My final chapter acts as a counterpoint to the Defoe chapter. Boswell's writing reveals that the relationship between the diary and the novel had reversed itself. Defoe's fiction seems imitative of journal writing, but Boswell's journals exhibit characteristics of the novel at work in his non-fictional prose. Boswell creates an omnipresent persona that is not characterized by the emotional reserve found so often in other diaries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Religious diarists, for example, sought to de-emphasize the self; however, in his journals, Boswell heightens the self by pressing himself upon others and by repeatedly reflecting upon the importance of an action, event or conversation. In addition to the strong focus upon himself, Boswell adds drama to his journals through his incorporation of dialogue and detailed description of all that surrounds him. With a consideration of Journal of a Tour to Corsica (1768), Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides (1785), and the Life of Johnson (1791), Chapter Four also addresses what happens to one's writing when the private becomes intentionally public. Is a writer forced to fictionalize his experience? As with the Defoe and Richardson chapters, this chapter also considers the
implications of a writer's stylistic choices upon readers. The ramifications for readers, however, are more important with Boswell's writing because his decisions to integrate fictional techniques and to heighten the individual self in relation to external events affect the degree to which his works are read as true or plausible. Some readers, for example, view the Life of Johnson as a narrative of Boswell's time with Johnson rather than an accurate biography of Johnson's entire life.

This study's focus upon three writers whose works spanned the entire eighteenth century allows us to reflect upon key differences amongst their works and to draw conclusions about possible trends and changes within the personal narrative that occurred over the course of the eighteenth century. The dangers of oversimplification and generalization exist, however, whenever analysis moves from the individual writer to his or her connection with society as a whole--both in terms of whether the writer's work influences society or whether the writer's work reflects society. Using three major writers to draw larger conclusions about the overall shifts in texts over the course of approximately one hundred years requires me to exclude many writers and works in order to create a cohesive, understandable, and manageable study. In Is Literary History Possible? David Perkins asserts that because the only complete literary history could be the past itself, historians and theorists must decide upon how much incompleteness is
acceptable in a study (13). I, for example, am confining my study to prose narratives, but one can observe the century's growing concern with the individual in poetry as well. For example, Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard (1751) illustrates the kind of sustained development of self that one observes in Clarissa. After the first four stanzas, the poem no longer dwells upon the physical but instead concentrates solely upon the speaker's thoughts and imagination. The danger of exclusion or simplification can exist within the study of a single genre as well. Survey courses and literary anthologies, for example, often attempt to place the development of genres or movements into a smooth evolutionary progression, but all written works from a specific time period cannot fit neatly into this kind of pattern. Often, important works are excluded because they complicate the movement. Furthermore, as Lennard Davis argues in Factual Fictions, literary evolutionary models are flawed because they base themselves on the biological notion of adaptation whereby "radical mutations die." Davis observes that while these mutations may die in nature, they survive and thrive in the literary world, as a work like Tristram Shandy (1759-67) demonstrates (4). Lest my approach fall prey to such charges of oversimplification, it is important to understand that I do not see my study as an attempt to encapsulate the rise of the individual narrative within three writers. While I believe that the works of Defoe, Richardson, and Boswell signify some
shifts taking place regarding the manner in which individuals convey the self in writing, I do not believe that we can argue that there existed a smooth evolutionary curve by which people became increasingly introspective as the century progressed. Written works, for example, do not necessarily reflect what was happening in the population as a whole. Furthermore, often the written works themselves fail to form an evolutionary curve, as my survey of diaries in Chapter One makes clear. Some seventeenth-century diarists, for example, were much more introspective than some late eighteenth-century diarists. Primarily my chapters seek to reveal how writers characterized the written self during different periods of the eighteenth century and how contemporary readers might have responded to those written selves. It is possible to draw conclusions about what my profiles of these three writers say about any larger movements taking place during the century, but exceptions do exist within these movements. Boswell's works, for example, seem to represent in non-fictional narrative the culmination of a development of self that had been building in non-fiction and fictional works throughout the century, but readers cannot forget that Boswell was an anomaly in terms of the quantity and quality of his written works.

Simplification in genre studies is evident in other ways as well. For example, works that scholars now group together as novels were just as likely to have been called romances,
tales, or histories by their writers during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In fact, Smollett was the only major eighteenth-century novelist to call his works novels (Schulz 78). Because of the early eighteenth century’s ambiguity regarding the novel genre, critics must be careful not to judge early prose works against the later, more conventional novels from writers like Smollett, Austen or Burney. In _The Rise of the Novel_, Watt criticizes Defoe’s lack of character development, his inability to sustain a scene, and his refusal to allow readers insight into the psychology of his narrators. While Watt accurately describes the characteristics of Defoe’s novels, he errs in calling them faults. They are faults only if one judges Defoe by our contemporary conception of the novel, which attributes to the genre qualities such as fully realized scenes and introspective characters. When set in the context of novels from the end of the eighteenth century, his works seem inferior because they lack the very elements that Watt says they should have. Viewed in this light, Defoe’s works become crude forerunners of later fictional works that are much closer to our impression of what a novel should be. Patricia Meyer Spacks draws attention to the difficulty of approaching early prose fiction with fresh eyes when she writes that twentieth-century readers bring to the eighteenth century an “imagination, a sensibility, informed by [their] reading of the novels of the nineteenth century” (_Imagining a Self_ 23).
J. Paul Hunter's *Before Novels* offers a more appropriate approach by focusing upon comparisons between prose works that emerged at the same time as the writings we now consider to be the earliest examples of the English novel. Like Hunter, I seek to build a closer connection between the fictional and factual prose works that existed together during the eighteenth century. Hunter considers a wide variety of works in prose such as personal histories, travel journals, and religious tracts. My study is much more limited in that I wish to concentrate only upon individual narratives. Studying both factual and fictional personal narratives illuminates the manner in which writers develop and present the individual self in print. Furthermore, identifying and understanding the changes that take place regarding the presentation of self allow us to consider the consequences of these shifts for readers of the eighteenth century.

The self is key to any personal history--factual or fictional. The *Oxford English Dictionary* cites 1674 and the metaphysical poet Thomas Traherne's lines, "A secret self I had enclos'd within, that was not bounded with my clothes or skin" as the earliest English literary example of the philosophical notion that defines the self as "[... ] the ego (often identified with the soul or mind as opposed to the body)[... ]" (907). Thus, the introspection that plays an increasingly important role in the development of the novel and biography during the eighteenth century--a characteristic
that we have come to expect in such narratives—seems a fairly recent development in terms of its use within texts. However, Katharine Maus’ study, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance*, argues that personal inwardness was a known concept in Renaissance England as evidenced by language in a variety of texts such as Sir Philip Sidney’s *Defense of Poetry* (1595). Sidney describes Virgil’s presentation of Aeneas as characterizing both “‘his inward self’” and “‘his outward government’” (qtd. in Maus 3). Though Maus’s examples reveal an awareness of inner self prior to the seventeenth century, how the self was characterized seems ambiguous. Debora Shuger states that “[t]he modern meaning of the self as an autonomous, unique individuality possessing a continuous internal awareness is not available in the Renaissance” (232-33). She argues instead that people viewed the self as a “generic nature” that was shared by all (233). Fully exploring the origins and theories of selfhood is a study by itself, so I do not wish to go too much further in that direction here. However, though Maus and Shuger both show that the notion of the inner self existed well before the seventeenth century, a study of some important works during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries reveal that topics such as introspection, the self, and the individual were major concerns for philosophers and other writers, suggesting a greater emphasis on these areas than in previous centuries.
Several scholarly works (including the OED) locate the eighteenth-century understanding of personal identity in John Locke's *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), a work arguing that individual experience forms one's conception of the self. Watt sees Descartes' emphasis upon the thought processes as responsible for attracting English writers such as Locke, Bishop Butler, Berkeley, Hume, and Reid to the subject of personal identity (18). Stephen D. Cox's study titled "The Stranger Within Thee:" Concepts of the Self in Late-Eighteenth-Century Literature summarizes Locke's role well when he states that *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* "placed the whole question of perception, and of the mind's sensibility to what it perceives, at the heart of eighteenth-century attempts to determine the nature of self" (13). In the first chapter of Book Two of *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Locke discusses the nature and value of reflection by defining it as the process in which ideas come "as the Mind gets by reflecting on its own Operations within it self" (105). For Locke, all knowledge stems from reflection and sensation (perception of "external" objects). George Berkeley's philosophy in *Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Understanding* (1710) places even greater emphasis upon the mind's perceptive powers by arguing that no distinction exists between ideas and objects. Whatever the mind perceives is in reality that object. However, David Hume, who raises the notion of the variable nature of personal
identity, probably comes closest to describing the method by which writing conveys the self. Because Hume asserts that the self results from a variety of impressions, he concludes in *A Treatise on Human Nature* (1739-40) that memory "does not so much produce as discover personal identity" (267). Hume's argument provides the perfect rationale for journal writing. By recording their daily actions, diarists are able to see how their impressions of these actions come together to form an emerging personal identity. Felicity A. Nussbaum describes this self-discovery when she states that journals "urge readers and writers to recognize themselves in existing social relations, and to believe in a sameness that makes them like all other human beings, as well as in a difference that guarantees their individualization" (xxi). Obviously, an author can formulate this kind of discovery within a fictional narrative as well. By making use of the epistolary form, Richardson allows Clarissa, fictional readers within the text (Anna Howe, for example), and actual readers of the text to uncover her personal identity over the course of the novel. While I do not wish to argue that the ideas of Locke, Berkeley or Hume had a direct influence upon personal narrative during the eighteenth century, I do believe that Richardson's stronger emphasis upon the life of the mind in contrast to Defoe demonstrates that writers were beginning to make a greater distinction between the external and internal world than ever before. The philosophical arguments and the
corresponding emphasis upon the self in the novel suggest a shift in taste and sensibility among published writers of the eighteenth century.

With eighteenth-century philosophy placing ever-greater emphasis upon the mind's perceptions and Richardson fully exploring the mind's interpretations through the epistolary form, the notion of the inner self as characterized in philosophy and narrative becomes disassociated from the conception of self in real life. In *The Concept of Mind*, Gilbert Ryle observes that introspection often is an impossible act because it would require us to simultaneously "scrutinize" our state of mind as we are experiencing the very emotion we should be analyzing (166). Frequently, however, an omniscient narrator in a work of fiction may come close to this simultaneous effect by describing the character's actions while at the same time conveying the thoughts that are speeding through his or her head. Though we have a tendency to use introspection as an all-encompassing term for self-analysis, according to Ryle, retrospection is a more appropriate term. Retrospection is a realistic act because it enables the person to reflect upon a past event or emotion without the divided attention that introspection would require, and it is this type of analysis of self that would come naturally to a fictional first-person narrator or real-life journal writer. Furthermore, Ryle states that retrospection is as natural as any physical activity: "In the
same way that I can catch myself daydreaming, I can catch myself scratching" (166). However, the kind of conscious, developed and unified retrospection that is evidenced in the letters of Clarissa is not a natural daily activity for most people. Clarissa’s careful and detailed interpretation is of the sort that could only occur within a written text. The epistolary mode of Clarissa allows Richardson to present more realistically his characters’ thoughts because the act of writing can inspire serious introspection, though most people could not attain the high level of Clarissa. In comparison, Moll Flanders’ fleeting moments of thought seem much more like the natural activity that Ryle describes. Though a deeply introspective narrative allows readers to sympathize more with a character because the inner emotions are on display, the narrative simultaneously creates a gap between the reader’s mind and the character’s mind. Most readers relate the character’s introspection to their own experience and find little in common with the quality and quantity of the fictional character’s contemplation.

By enlarging the character’s sense of self, the writer heightens the interior emotions of the characters and manipulates the representation of the exterior circumstances being described. The reality of a situation becomes unstable because readers see how much of the external is filtered through the interpretations of the character’s mental outlook. In developing the inward over the outward, the writer chooses
to discriminate between events that move the plot forward and those that do not. His protagonists begin to focus primarily upon those events in their lives that have some significance in their minds. While such decisions unify a narrative, they further remove the work from the actual. In real life individuals cannot choose to live through only those moments of the day that carry with them some significance. Artificiality is to be expected with fictional narratives because the entire work stems creatively from the writer's mind. More problematic, however, is the intrusion of fictional methods upon the factual narrative, but this encroachment is unavoidable when the individual is emphasized over exterior events in the letter, memoir, diary, biography, or autobiography. With the heightening of the individual perspective comes the manipulation of events, increasing the fictionality of the account.

As the eighteenth century progresses, writing that places a greater emphasis upon retrospection becomes more common. Mainly this phenomenon occurs in prose fiction, but a strong concentration upon the self is evident in Boswell's journals and non-fictional publications as well. In The Invention of the Self, John Lyons characterizes Boswell in the following manner: "He feels his pulse and takes his temperature, and never fails to tell us how he feels" (93). In certain respects, one could argue that the Life of Johnson could also be referred to as the life of Boswell's mind because of the
frequent integration of his own perspective upon Johnson's life. Throughout this work and the Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides, Boswell departs from describing the outer to focus upon the inner. His first meeting with Johnson, which he records in the Life, serves as an excellent example of the manner in which Boswell draws attention to his own consciousness. When Boswell asks that Johnson not hold his Scottish background against him, Johnson states that many Scots cannot help coming from Scotland. Johnson's sarcastic remark troubles Boswell, and he reflects that "This stroke stunned me a good deal; and when we had sat down, I felt myself not a little embarrassed, and apprehensive of what might come next" (1: 392). A comparison of this scene with Boswell's record in his personal journal reveals that he added his own insight for the published version. In the London Journal he remains focused on the outward after Johnson's comment: "Mr. Johnson is a man of a most dreadful appearance. He is a very big man, is troubled with sour eyes, the palsy, and the king's evil. He is very slovenly in his dress and speaks with a most uncouth voice" (260).

In fiction, Richardson's Clarissa features workings of the mind that fill paragraphs, making the introspective nature of the characters as important as the physical world. Moving the focus from the outward to the inward is a double-edged sword, however. On the one hand, it enables a greater connection between reader and character because the readers
can look inside the character’s head. On the other hand, though the character becomes closer to readers, he or she becomes less realistic because the thoughts usually are presented to the reader in an organized, developed, and coherent manner. The character moves further away from representing a real person toward becoming ever more of an obvious author construction. This notion can even apply to Boswell’s autobiographical writings. While Boswell is a real person, the individual that comes through in the pages of his journal and published works is constructed in much the same manner as an author constructs a fictional character. Boswell carefully structures conversations, events and his own thoughts to develop a specific persona. In actuality, an individual’s thoughts are seldom organized, developed or coherent. Instead they are cursory and disjointed. Spacks’ *Imagining a Self* is quite clear regarding the issue of truth and narrative: “To tell a story of the self is [...] to create a fiction.” Even anecdotes exclude parts of the real exploit “for the sake of its telling” (311). The construction of the story’s significance to the self becomes so artificial on the printed page that it becomes foreign to a normal reader’s mode of thought, yet during the eighteenth century readers came to see such deep introspection as acceptable. This acceptance continues with us today.

Despite the artifice inherent in personal narrative, retrospection is a crucial activity for people. In *Boredom,*
Spacks' most recent cultural history, she writes that "Lives like novels, depend upon narratability. Only by telling stories of ourselves to ourselves and others do we make sense of what we have caused to happen" (83-84). Spacks' comment, however, fails to mention the frustration that can result from attempting to order one's thoughts as an author orders his character's thoughts. Much credit is due to writers like Richardson and Boswell who make the reflective self appear as a natural element of everyday life. Even though writing about an experience allows one the opportunity to become more introspective, searching the soul and mind is still a challenge that demands a good and patient writer. Chapter One of this study, for example, reveals how few journal writers during the eighteenth century bothered much with the interior self. Furthermore, reflection does not always guarantee success in terms of coming to grips with one's personal identity. Lyons argues that Boswell fails in his search for the real Boswell: "His Journal is one of the best proofs of Hume's discovery that the self cannot know itself, but Boswell never seems to doubt that a self--as distinguished from soul, mind or name--exists" (96).

At the end of his essay on the history of books, Robert Darnton asks this question: "Did the invention of movable type transform the human mental universe?" (21). Darnton then states that no satisfactory answer for this question exists. Though "transform" may be too strong a verb to describe the
effect of the printed book upon the mind, I do believe that reading has affected the way people perceive themselves or at least the way they think they should perceive of themselves. As the previous paragraphs argued, practicing the kind of introspection evident in novels from the middle of the eighteenth century to our present day is a challenge. Because the works at the beginning of the century were so different from the works at the end of the century, focusing upon the eighteenth century--as opposed to the nineteenth or twentieth century--allows us to see two distinct attitudes toward the self. Such a transformation in the published prose narratives reflects back upon the readers of these texts, allowing us to draw some conclusions about the character of the reading audience during the eighteenth century.
Chapter One:
The Diary and the Projection of Self

During the late seventeenth century and well into the eighteenth century, an ambiguity that is non-existent today surrounded the novel. Because of this ambiguity, establishing an appropriate context for the early novels is important. One needs to set these works against the prose writing that they most closely resemble, specifically diaries, memoirs, and autobiographies. This context not only establishes a better grounding for these early works, but it also helps twentieth-century readers achieve a better understanding of eighteenth-century readers and the kinds of expectations they brought to these texts.

Often, early prose fiction writers classified works that are now labeled as novels as histories. For example, Behn's Oroonoko: or the Royal Slave. A True History (1688), Defoe's The Life, Adventures, and Pyracies, of the Famous Captain Singleton (1720), and Richardson’s Clarissa, or The History of Young Lady (1747-48) reveal the blurring between fact and fiction in their titles. Observe the similarity of those titles with the following examples: John Burton's A Genuine and True Journal of the Most Miraculous Escape of the Young Chevalier, From the Battle of Culloden to his Landing in France (1749), John Philips's An Authentic Journal of the Late Expedition (1744), and Memoirs of the Life of that Learned Antiquary, Elias Ashmole, Esq.; Drawn up by Himself by way of
Diary (1717). Today, we distinguish between the fictional works of the first list and the factual works of the second list, but the extent to which eighteenth-century readers made the distinction is not so clear. Certainly, we can assume that a novelist like Defoe believed his work would be more popular if it were passed off as fact, and it seems to have worked in some cases as readers for half a century were convinced of the authenticity of Memoirs of a Cavalier (1724), for example. Even more convincing was one of the last works attributed to Defoe, Robert Drury’s Journal (1728), which, well into the nineteenth century, was taken to be one of the best factual records of Madagascar. Defoe’s preface to Drury’s Journal is interesting, however, not just for his insistence upon the journal’s factuality, but in his debunking one of his own works published just nine years earlier. In the preface, Defoe assures his readers that Drury’s Journal should not be taken as another Robinson Crusoe (1719) because “it is nothing but a plain, honest Narrative of Matter of Fact” (iii). Defoe’s admission that Crusoe is a romance contrasts dramatically to his Crusoe preface which calls the narrative a “just History of Fact” with no “Appearance of Fiction” in it. His later recanting of this claim possibly reveals the extent to which readers of the day were not always convinced of a writer’s claim of factuality. Still, whether readers were swayed or not, I think we can surmise from his repeated preface assertions regarding the truth of his
narratives that Defoe, like other early fictional prose writers, probably passed his works off as factual narratives so contemporary readers would approach the fictional works with some degree of familiarity because the books would seem similar to the non-fictional journals and autobiographies that already flooded the market.

Because published autobiographies and diaries were an established form early in the eighteenth century, it is not surprising that Defoe might want to mirror these accepted forms of narrative when he begins to write fiction late in his writing career. The public's refusal to abandon these established prose formats is still evident well into the middle of the century. Richardson, writing in the 1740s and 1750s, uses the first-person narrative, the journal and letter format to align his works closer to factual material. Laurence Sterne's *A Sentimental Journey* (1768) and *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy* (1759-67) make use of earlier prose genres by subverting the established travel narrative and autobiographical narrative forms respectively. Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones* (1749) with the narrator's constant reminders of the author's all-controlling power over his characters would seem to mark a departure from the earlier prose forms and to suggest the establishment of a fictive work as an entity that could stand alone. The narrator's numerous authorial comments throughout the novel and the opening chapters of each book, in which the narrator discusses, among
other things, critics, comic writing, tragic writing, and classical literature, remind readers that this *History of a Foundling* is not a true history. The conversational tone of these chapters, and of the entire novel, however, mirrors the kind of informality that one finds in personal writing of journals and letters.

The manner in which the early writers of fiction modeled their works after factual genres is an important attribute that needs more consideration. Today most readers distinguish between fact and fiction, approaching the two modes differently. We read factual works to learn something about history or current events, but when we read fiction, we read with different goals in mind and willingly suspend our disbelief. If we imagine reading something fictional with a factual perspective, however, then I think we might better understand the mindsets of early novel readers. For them, the enjoyment of a novel may have rested solely upon the supposed factuality of the story.² Because factuality was foremost in readers' minds, character development and plot would not have been important considerations. For the eighteenth-century reader, the value of a Defoe work could have been based solely upon its believability. If today's readers recognize his plots as fabrications, what then is the value of reading a fictional account of the Plague or the fictional account of a "famous" female criminal? If these works were mere imitations of real non-fictional autobiographies and diaries, then,
outside of historical interest, there would be no value in these works. However, other factors characterizing his more successful novels transform them beyond mere imitative works, and an analysis between his works and the factual personal writing that existed during his time reveals the extent to which Defoe created more than simple imitations.

In his important bibliography of British diaries, William Matthews writes that he includes only those works that are true diaries, in that they are personal works written by the individual on a regular basis. He does not include personal works like autobiographies. The eighteenth century, however, did not always make such a distinction between the terms diary, journal, autobiography, and memoir. Books with titles such as A Journal of the Life, Labours, Travels and Sufferings (In and for the Gospel,) of that Ancient Servant, and Faithful Minister of Jesus Christ, John Banks (1712), A Journal of the Life, Travels, and Labour of Love in the Work of the Ministry, of that Worthy Elder, and Faithful Servant of Jesus Christ, James Dickinson (1745), A Journal of the Life of Thomas Story (1747), and A Short Journal of the Labours and Travels in the Work of the Ministry, of that Faithful Servant of Christ, Deborah Bell (1762) bear a much closer relationship to autobiographies than journals because they all look back upon the writer's life, and on occasion they make use of introspection. Still, however, they owe their format to the diary, for they are often organized chronologically by year
and sometimes even by month. Occasionally the printer places a year in the margins of each page, so that a kind of regular entry format seems evident. Furthermore, for the most part, these writers seldom take advantage of their current perspective that would allow them to reflect upon the past; they write as though they do not know what will happen next. Their works are retrospections without the contemplation. On the other hand, *Memoirs of the Life of that Learned Antiquary, Elias Ashmole, Esq; Drawn up by Himself by way of Diary* (1717) begins like an autobiography but after a few pages the "memoirs," for the most part, appear to be the exact entries from his diary. Other personal narratives from the period can be a hodgepodge of autobiography, letters, and large extracts of the person's actual diary. Because of the ambiguity in terminology, it is difficult to ascertain the number of real daily-entry diaries published during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. 4

While the eighteenth century often is called the great age of diary writing, it is not the great age of diary publishing. 5 Instead, the nineteenth century sees the greatest number of eighteenth-century diaries come into print. My concern, however, is to look at diaries published during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in an attempt to provide a context for the other types of prose narratives that would have existed alongside the novel. Of course, one can look to other prose writing in addition to diaries to
contextualize early prose fiction, and some important studies like Ruth Perry's *Women, Letters, and the Novel* and Patricia Meyer Spacks's *Imagining a Self: Autobiography and Novel in Eighteenth-Century England* investigate the relevance of letters and autobiographies respectively. However, the diary increases our understanding of the self and early prose fiction in a way that is not possible with the other two forms. Studying the relationship between the diary and prose fiction enables today's readers to consider the manner in which the eighteenth-century diarist/reader would interact with a work of fiction that seems similar to his own written work. In his book, *The Invention of the Self: The Hinge of Consciousness in the Eighteenth Century*, John O. Lyons argues that a central difference between a journal and a memoir is the memoirist's ability to look back upon events and see how they "fit into the larger puzzle of life" (89). One could substitute "novel" for "memoir" in the above sentence, however, and the same theory would apply regarding the central difference between diary and novel. In contrast, Felicity Nussbaum in *The Autobiographical Subject: Gender and Ideology in Eighteenth-Century England* disagrees with Lyons' differentiation of journal and memoir because her research suggests that eighteenth-century memoirs and autobiographies, despite having the benefit of hindsight, often appear just as fragmented as journals and diaries. She also observes such fragmentation in other new genres of the century such as
meditations, descriptive poems and early novels (17). When it comes to the relationship between the diary and other forms of literature such as memoirs, autobiographies, and novels I am closer to Nussbaum's way of thinking than Lyons's. Though the author of early prose fiction could envision an overall plan for his narrative that a diarist could not, early novels still contain a high degree of digression and fragmentation, creating stylistic parallels with the diary that are as important as similarities that have been observed between the novel and the biography or autobiography. Furthermore, a comparison between novel and diary allows us to consider some artistic issues that a comparison between novel and autobiography or letter does not. What does a fictional writer do to create a work that can be enjoyed by a large audience over many years that a diarist does not do? Ultimately, a comparison between diary and fiction will reveal the degree to which the author interjects elements of creativity into a fictional work that are lacking from a diary. An entire historical study could be devoted to all the characteristics of these published diaries, but because my analysis focuses upon the diaries as a context for fiction, the following pages direct the attention mainly toward attributes that have a bearing upon the early eighteenth-century novel.
In her book discussing the importance of journal writing, Christina Baldwin describes the journal in the following manner:

The journal is a way of connecting. The journal is a connection of the self with the self. The journal sets up an inner dichotomy so that one part may write and one part may read. And since the journal connection between the two parts is interior, it fosters an increased awareness of personal psychology.

I begin with Baldwin’s lengthy quotation to dispel some twentieth-century notions about diary writing that may be applied to the material I will discuss. One of the most important characteristics to recognize about the seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century diaries is their lack of introspection. If their journals can be used as evidence, few diarists of the period would know the meaning of “a connection of the self with the self,” let alone think of journal writing as a means by which to make this connection. Most published diaries of the period contained brief entries that recorded daily observations and activities. This chapter will reveal how a limited introspective scope can still reveal much about the individual diarist, but modern readers will be disappointed if they peruse diaries in hopes of finding much reflection by the diarist. This lack of introspection is also an important characteristic because it is one of the main
features that connect the diary with the early prose fiction of the period. Readers gain an appreciation of both diary and novel will be gained if one realizes that both genres emerge from a context in which writers, while disposed to focus upon the individual, did not necessarily explore the individual in as much detail as twentieth-century readers may be accustomed to.

Many different kinds of diaries and journals were published during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but military diaries seem to be published most frequently. They feature lengthy titles such as A Compendious Journal of all the Marches, Famous Battles, Sieges, And other most noteworthy, heroical, and ever memorable Actions of the Triumphant Armies of the ever-glorious Confederate High Allies, In their late and victorious War Against the Powerful Armies of proud and lofty France, In and on the Confines of Holland, Germany, and Flanders, So far as our sucessful British Troops extended in Conjunction therein. Digested into Twelve Campaigns, begun A.D. 1701, and ended in 1712. This journal, published in 1733 and written by John Millner, an Irish sergeant, runs 364 pages and features a daily-entry format. Entries are sometimes quite long as Millner describes all the advancements that take place during the war. Other entries are devoted to the number of soldiers killed and wounded during a specific battle.

Published sea journals can be just as lengthy and monotonous. In 1744 John Philips, who was a midshipman on the
ship Centurion, published An Authentic Journal of the Late Expedition Under the Command of Commodore Anson, which, for the most part, reads like a log book with entries about the direction of the winds and the weather. It becomes slightly more interesting when he describes the disasters that take place. The most interesting part of his book, however, actually begins after his journal is finished when he writes about the other ships that left on the same expedition. A large part of this narrative is about the Wager and its crew. Philips’s report of the Wager’s adventure is much more interesting than his own first-person account of his own ship’s adventures. This aspect is somewhat surprising until one realizes that this narrative was plagiarized from a journal published the previous year by two of the Wager’s crewmates under the title A Voyage to the South Seas, In the Years 1740-1. Philips’s ease at lifting large sections of material from this book reveals the extent to which a personal narrative was not very personal at all. Furthermore, the plagiarism suggests that the individual narrative was not a sacred object, for Philips and his publisher seem to have no qualms at robbing another’s story.

A Voyage to the South Seas (1743), written by John Bulkeley and John Cummins, offers a bit more introspection than Philips’s own account of the voyage. Perhaps this is partially due to their reasons for publishing the book. As their preface reveals, the book is an attempt to clear their
names of the mutiny. Though this journal seems contemplative at times, the two authors usually withhold their personal feelings, and they make a point in the dedication of the book to say that their account has the "Facts impartially related, the whole Narrative written without the least Shadow of Prejudice or Malice" (viii). Their book also reveals the liberal manner in which the word "journal" can be used, for the book does not appear to be the real journal, but rather a narrative written from their personal journals. It reads more like a continuous narrative than something broken up by entries, and occasionally, in certain passages, the authors integrate the benefit of hindsight, which would be impossible in a real day-by-day journal.

While the Bulkeley and Cummins journal was published to clear their names, another travel journal not only describes the activities on the ship but also seeks to be a geographical, sociological, and historical study of the places the crew visits. Captain Edward Cooke's *A Voyage to the South Sea and Round the World, Perform'd in the Years 1708, 1709, 1710, and 1711*, published in 1712, is a massive two-volume affair totaling some 784 pages, complete with maps and drawings in addition to his daily entries. As with other journals of voyages, Cooke’s tries a reader’s patience with many entries describing nothing more than wind, weather, longitudes and latitudes. But when the ship enters a new country or port, Cooke halts the diary and includes several
chapters like the following: "Chapter VI: The Description of Chile, its Extent, Boundaries, Soil, Seasons, immense Wealth, Fertility, prodigious Mountains, Rivers, Fishes, Birds, Beasts, Plants, &c." While Cooke’s entries provide much-detailed observations, he never integrates himself into these entries other than to offer an occasional opinion. The diary is never introspective. Probably what is most interesting in his journal is a brief mention of Alexander Selkirk, a man "cloath’d in Goat’s Skin Jacket, Breeches, and Cap," and found stranded on an island (37), a possible source for Defoe’s Crusoe who would appear in print almost ten years later.

The same year of Cooke’s published journal, Capt. Woodes Rogers, who was part of the same expedition but on a different ship, published his own account entitled A Cruising Voyage Round the World: First to the South-Seas, thence to the East-Indies, and Homewards by the Cape of Good Hope. Begun in 1708, and finish’d in 1711 (1712). This account also follows the form of a diary, and like Cooke, Rogers will suspend his journal for several pages in favor of describing the various countries they visit. For the most part, the styles of the two accounts are very similar, with neither writer offering much in the way of his own unique voice in his narrative. Rogers, however, devotes several pages to Selkirk, probably because he took him upon his ship. At one point in his account of Selkirk, Rogers does become reflective when he muses for a few sentences on how Selkirk’s experience reveals
that "Solitude and Retirement from the World" may not be an unbearable state of being, and in fact, it may be more conducive to the health of an individual because such a situation forces a person to live without excessive meat and drink (130-131). Rogers's comments upon Selkirk are interesting not only because they exhibit a glimmer of introspection, but also because of their subject matter. Diary writing, like novel reading, is a solitary act, and here the diarist consciously notes the value of the solitary, and this valuing of the solitary would be one reason for keeping a diary in the first place. When Defoe writes Robinson Crusoe years later, Crusoe's reflections upon his solitary state will serve not only as a method by which Defoe further enlightens readers upon Crusoe's beliefs and personality but also as a means to comment upon the nature of reading and writing itself, a facet of Defoe's book that will be explored in the next chapter.

Isolation characterizes both the diary and the novel and is another feature that closely relates the two genres. In his essay "Novels and 'the Novel': The Poetics of Embarrassment," J. Paul Hunter argues that the novel emerged "as the urban consciousness began to focus the overwhelming sense of solitariness among many" (489). This same feeling could apply to many diary writers as well. In fact, when Boswell writes of diaries in The Hypochondriack No. 66 (1783), he argues that the monotony of being at sea, both in terms of
sight and activities, is conducive to keeping a regular diary (258-59). Boswell may have been writing under a pen name and imitating a persona different from his true nature, but his comments still have much validity. A sailor, soldier, missionary, or mother would all feel moments of extreme isolation, and diary writing would fill this void in a similar manner as novel reading.\textsuperscript{8} The increasing isolation that characterizes this time period coincides with a growing emphasis and awareness of the individual self.\textsuperscript{9} The chief function of a diary is to concentrate upon the individual, and the novels of Defoe, Richardson, Fielding, and Sterne also focus primarily upon the individual. The rise in individualism has long been associated with the eighteenth century, and the emergence of the novel with its reliance upon the solitary reader often is cited as evidence of this rise. The philosophy of the period also centers around the individual as Hume himself admits in \textit{A Treatise on Human Nature} (1739-40): "We now proceed to explain the nature of personal identity, which has become so great a question in philosophy, especially of late years, in England, where all the abstruser sciences are studied with a peculiar ardor and application" (264). But while the philosophical work of Hume focused upon identity, perception, memory and human understanding, evidence of an emphasis upon the self emerges a century earlier in what Lawrence Stone terms "a series of almost wholly new genres of writing" that include the diary,
autobiography and love letter (154). In 1656 John Beadle published The Journal or Diary of a Thankful Christian. This book was neither a journal nor a diary, but instead was Beadle's attempt to argue that keeping a record of one's life was part of being a good Christian. Though written by individuals, many diaries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries serve more as records of travels and transactions than as a means wherein writers can record their personal thoughts and feelings. Beadle's book, however, seems to shift the focus by encouraging his readers to concentrate more on the inward: "It is good to keep an History, a Register, a Diary, an Annales, not onely of the places in which we have lived, but of the mercies that have been bestowed on us, continued to us all our dayes" (11). Beadle desires his readers to meditate upon their lives by re-reading their journals often (102), for, of all histories, "the History of men's Lives is the most pleasant" (103). Nearly one hundred years later, journal writing still was viewed as a practice that enabled writers to explore what was happening to them.

The editors of A Journal of the Life of Thomas Story (1747) write in the preface that Story's journal writing allowed him "to make a right and useful Retrospection into his own religious conduct" (I). Though Beadle and the editors of Story's journal see the diary as an avenue to record and explore the individual self, both emphasize how the journal records the effect of outward activity upon the individual as
evidenced by the phrases "mercies bestowed on us" and "religious conduct." In fact, according to John Lyons, personal narratives from the seventeenth century at least "almost uniformly strive for patterns that are self-effacing" (71). But along with the growth in personal narrative develops a more concentrated and complex attitude toward the individual self that realizes value exists within the self when viewed as a solitary entity. In other words, writers can concentrate upon feelings and struggles within the mind or soul; they can move beyond exploring their individual selves only in relation to the outside world and its events. When John Rutty's diary is published in 1776, the editors make reference to the "inner man" and the godliness that can be experienced inside (vii). In 1783, Boswell writes that diaries are useful because "it is very necessary to have our thoughts and actions in a mode not subject to change" (emphasis added) (Hypochondriack 257). By the end of the century, the individual self had become conceptualized as something that did not necessarily require outward activity for introspection; to place it in philosophical terms, the self was self-generating (Modell 43). There were elements within a person that could be explored, and diary writing was a means by which the individual could do this.

The diary's role in the emergence of individuality is important because it establishes another connection between diary writing and fiction writing. Critics who forget diaries
and cite only the popularity of the novel as one example of growing individualism, ignore an entire movement that predates the novel—a movement that inspired people to explore and focus upon the self. However, though Rutty's "inner man" and Hume's discussion of imagination, perception, and memory prove that some individuals in the eighteenth century were cognizant of their ability to explore their own psyche, few diarists throughout the century used writing as an avenue through which to complete this exploration. Though Boswell's journals offer more introspection than many journals of the period, even he warns that too much introspection may be harmful for some people. In his essay on diaries from The Hypochondriack, he writes that it may not be advantageous for every person to keep a diary, for "[s]hould a man of great force of mind, impetuous in undertaking, and ardent in activity, examine himself frequently with nice attention, it might weaken and relax his powers, as taking it often to pieces will hurt the machinery of a watch" (259-60). For Boswell, the key to keeping a diary successfully is to have a talent for abridging (259). The refusal by many diary writers to explore the self fully on paper becomes one of the major differences between the non-fictional writing of the period and the fictional writing of the period, revealing that the early novels, while reliant upon the early non-fictional forms, were not mere imitators of those forms. The novels, beginning with Defoe, typically provide readers with a more individualized and
introspective protagonist than any diary of the eighteenth century. Diarists of the period may view their diary as a means of self-examination, but few are able to examine themselves to the extent of Clarissa, for example. When she writes, "But let me examine myself" (1: 134)\(^{10}\), she explores her heart, her conduct, her reflections, her mind, her temper, etc. to such a degree and at such length that no non-fictional narrative can compare, and this kind of thorough introspection will continue throughout this novel. Such a difference between non-fictional and fictional narrative not only reveals the early novelists' perfection of an earlier form of writing, but it also exhibits the extent to which invention played a part in their narrative construction.

To say that novelists interjected techniques of invention into their works is not to say that diaries lacked such techniques. Whether a diarist would admit it or not, all narratives—including non-fictional ones—contain elements of artificiality. The persona or role a diarist creates for himself is one of these artificial constructions, and Captain Rogers's journal demonstrates the inconsistency inherent in any persona. Just as quickly as Rogers begins his reflections that result from his finding Selkirk, he halts because he feels them inappropriate for his journal: "But I must quit these Reflections, which are more proper for a Philosopher and Divine than a Mariner, and return to my own Subject" (131). This last sentence reveals the diarist's need to construct a
role or persona of himself for his own self-narrative, establishing another link between the diary and early eighteenth-century novel. One complaint often aimed at Defoe's novels, for example, is their seeming inability to keep the protagonists consistent in character. Moll Flanders will often say she is sorry when her actions reveal just the opposite. While on the island, Crusoe speaks often of the ills of money, yet once off the island he cannot help being absorbed by his finances again. These inconsistencies, which I will detail more in the next chapter, stem not so much from Defoe's carelessness as a writer, but from the difficulty of creating a consistent persona in a realistic personal narrative. Captain Rogers is a perfect example of the problems that occur when attempting to define a specific, supposedly correct or proper, persona for oneself. If the diarist is honest in observations, then he cannot avoid demonstrating some inconsistencies of character. Events and circumstances will arise that will force the writer outside his prescribed notion of character. Therefore, it is no surprise that discovering a solitary man living self-sufficiently for more than four years on an island would cause a sailor to have thoughts similar to a philosopher or theologian. If he withheld these thoughts from his diary then not only would he be dishonest with his readers, but he would be dishonest with himself as well.
Inconsistency of character runs throughout many diaries, including spiritual ones. Some writers establish journals as a means of aiding them in their Christian lives, but instead of recording only spiritual concerns and events, the diary lapses into other issues. Writers will confess a sin in the diary, promise never to commit that sin again, and then three entries later record their falling and guilt all over again. Such inconsistency and contradiction of character, however, do not reflect that the person is dishonest with him or herself; in fact it reveals just the opposite. Arnold H. Modell, in *The Private Self*, asserts that the nature of the self is paradoxical because while one’s identity endures, one’s consciousness of the self, which depends upon “the appraisals of others” is ever-changing (3). A journal that does establish a consistent characterization of the speaker would suggest that the speaker is withholding or manipulating events to create such a consistent persona because real life does not provide for such consistency of person. In fact, in “The Diary: A Neglected Genre,” Matthews encourages anyone interested in keeping a diary to withhold from checking through previous entries to find some consistent thought, feeling or attitude: “[C]ontradictions and inconsistencies not only provide some of the most amusing things in diaries, but they are also among the most characteristically human and revealing aspects about them” (300). A consistent persona is much more likely to exist in the so-called journals that are
more similar to autobiographies. In those "journals" the writer selectively edits events from his or her life to create the appearance of consistency. When Spacks writes of autobiographies and their portrayal of self, she uses terms such as "manufacture" and "invent," revealing the artificiality of the genre (14). I think the early novel, however, bears a closer relationship to true journals that attempt to record a variety of real-life events, no matter how they might change the persona of the writer. As the century progresses, novelists will place less emphasis upon the realism, or historicity, of their narrative in favor of more consistency and unification.

One of the first aspects of fiction that most students learn in an introductory literature class is fiction's "tightness" compared to reality. A good novelist will create a narrator who writes so that everything is relevant to the plot. This is an advantage that a fictional writer has over the diarist or historian who cannot select and edit events to provide more cohesion because the larger scheme or purpose in keeping a written record is not apparent during the recording of events. In the following partial entry from *An Hue and Cry After Dr. S---T*, a satire that claims to be Swift's true diary, the anonymous author imitates just how mundane a diary can become: "Wak'd with a Headach. Said no Prayer that Morning. Drest immediately. Look'd confounded Rakish. Repeated Verses whilst I was washing my Hands. Resolv'd
(whils’t I was putting on my Gowns) to ridicule the Orders of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon” (5). The “diary” continues on in this manner for several pages, revealing that in 1714, when the book was published, a diarist’s concern for everyday detail, whether important or not, had become so ingrained in the reading public’s mind that the style could be used to parody another writer. The early novelists of the eighteenth century, however, seemed to struggle with the line between the journal style of writing down everything and the artificiality of fiction that required only the details relevant to the plot. Part of the realism in the early prose fiction of Defoe and other authors comes from the meandering, digressive style that is similar to the non-fictional personal narratives of the period. In The Autobiographical Subject, Felicity Nussbaum argues that not only did annals and journals appear fragmented, without coherence, unity or closure, but so did published autobiographies: “In short, eighteenth-century works of self-biography are less quests toward self-discovery in which the narrator reveals herself or himself than repetitive serial representations of particular moments held together by the narrative ‘I’” (18). Annals, journals and autobiographies were all published for audience consumption at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and the early novels simply took advantage of this existing market. Because these works would be fragmented, when readers of the century approached a first-person narrative, including a fictional work, they would not
expect it to be as unified and cohesive as readers would today. Tristram’s assertion that digressions are the sunshine, life, and soul of reading (58) would have applied to much of the reading material available in narrative form to the public during the eighteenth century. By the middle of the century the notion of recording a life by including only the information that a reader would find interesting was such a unique idea that Fielding, writing almost ten years before Tristram’s comment on digressions, devotes an entire chapter of *Tom Jones* (1749) to its defense. He begins the first chapter of Book II by arguing that most histories published “fill up as much Paper with the Detail of Months and Years in which nothing remarkable happened” (1: 75). However, his history of Tom Jones will be the opposite: “[. . .] if whole Years should pass without producing any thing worthy of his [the reader’s] Notice, we shall not be afraid of a Chasm in our History; but shall hasten on to Matters of Consequence, and leave such Periods of Time totally unobserved” (1: 76). Fielding’s claim, a paragraph later, that he is “the Founder of a new Province of Writing” (1: 77) reveals that his method of telling a story, which is closer to our modern expectations than Defoe’s method, was unique in comparison with many of the fictional and non-fictional narratives available to readers of his day.

Of course, regardless of when a diary was written during the century, variables such as the time span of a person’s
history and the person’s physical situation can determine how broad or narrow the focus will be for a personal narrative. In 1728, twenty-one years before Fielding’s discourse on his new method of relating history, a small 22-page journal of an anonymous Dutch sailor was published that focuses upon an extremely narrow set of circumstances. This journal, with entries running from May 5 until October 14, records the physical and mental decline of its author who was put on the uninhabited island of Ascension by the commander of his ship, and most of the details in this diary relate to the writer’s personal condition. According to the title page, the book was taken from the original journal found in his tent by some other sailors. Nothing about this journal suggests that it is anything but a factual account. Many of the entries are short and concern his trouble in finding food, but some provide important insight into his emotional and mental state:

I sincerely wished that some Accident wou’d befall me, to finish these my miserable Days. In the Evening I walked to my Tent again, but cou’d not very well find the Way. I walked very Melancholly along the Strand, praying to God Almighty to put a Period to my Days, or help me off this desolate Island. (2)

Toward the end of his life, his entries are quite brief, but they still go beyond simply recording his outward activity: “The 26th and 27th (of August), I thought of little else but
Death, and prayed earnestly for an Admittance to Heaven” (19). This small diary confounds attempts to prove that personal writing of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries moved smoothly from cursory, fragmented remarks to introspective, cohesive passages. Because this journal seems more aligned with the latter characteristics, it offers some problems to consider. First, what role does audience play in the keeping and subsequent publication of a journal? A diarist like Cooke or Rogers may have been keeping a journal with publication in mind. What was this anonymous sailor’s motivation, however, for keeping a journal? Did he write with anyone else in mind besides himself? The journal itself never indicates the diarist’s reason for beginning a record of his stay on the deserted island. Second, to what extent does one’s situation determine the amount of introspection in the diary? One wonders if this same sailor might have kept a journal of his travels, and whether it would have contained the same kind of introspection as his island journal or if it would have had a closer resemblance to Cooke’s and Rogers’s journals. The diarist’s physical situation has much to do with the content of the diary, and this Dutch sailor’s solitary situation lends itself to the kind of introspective musings that are evident in the diary. The physical situation or state of being is just as relevant in determining the extent of self-reflection in regard to fictional narrative as well. The next two chapters will discuss how the physical situation of the
characters of Defoe and Richardson determines how they convey the self in their first-person narratives. One finds, for example, that Crusoe and the narrator of Journal of the Plague Year (1722) are much more introspective than Moll Flanders because of their isolation. Richardson’s Pamela and Clarissa are also solitary characters through much of their stories, and their situations provide them with the uninterrupted time and extreme feelings of loneliness that encourage more analysis of the self.

While a reader must always keep the diarist’s situation in mind, it is not the only factor that determines the style of the diary. The personality of the diarist also determines just how revealing the diary will be. Two political diaries, both published after the deaths of the writers, display the vast differences regarding the concept of the self. The Diary of the Late George Bubb Dodington, Baron of Melcombe Regis: From March 8, 1748-9, to February 6, 1761 (1784) contains little in the way of introspection, but instead serves more as a record of meetings and appointments. While the journal provides some insight into the politics surrounding the courts of George II and George III, it provides little insight into Dodington himself. In a political gamble, Dodington aligned himself with Prince Frederick rather than with King George II. When the Prince unexpectedly died in 1751, however, Dodington never considered in his diary what the Prince’s death meant to him emotionally or politically. Instead, the next several
entries concern the various goings on within the government relating to Frederick’s death.

On the other hand, *A Journal of the Swedish Embassy* (1772), a large two-volume work detailing Bulstrode Whitelocke’s diary of his tenure as England’s Ambassador to Sweden in 1653 and 1654, provides much insight into the workings of government and Whitelocke’s personal life. Though Whitelocke’s diary was published in the latter half of the eighteenth century, when readers of it would have become accustomed to such a style, it was written more than one hundred years earlier, revealing again that certain writers violate an expected continuum of a growing self awareness in personal narrative. Whitelocke writes the entire diary in third person and goes to great efforts to incorporate very detailed exchanges between himself and other people. In terms of its style, the third-person perspective and the numerous pages of dialogue align this diary closer to Fielding than to Defoe.

Earlier, I discussed the manner in which the diarist creates a persona for him or herself. In a conversation with his wife that Whitelocke records upon leaving for Sweden, one observes not only how Whitelocke uses his own voice to create a strong persona for himself, but how his wife’s words construct Whitelocke’s character further. His wife pleads with him not to leave: “O lett my teares and desires pervayle with you not to putt yourselfe and me uppon those perills, to
serve them that love you not" (21). His response, however, does not seem directed at her; rather he uses his reply as a means of establishing a theoretical position upon God and duty to his country: "The greater the perills are, the greater will be the goodness of God in my protection, and the greater will be the merit of the service; the work of God and one's country knoweth no daungers, at least feareth none [. . .]" (21). His wife's remarks, for the most part, portray her as a weak individual, and occasionally they reflect back upon Whitelocke himself, raising his stature in this scene even further. She tells him:

Our greatest advantage will be to injoy you, whose life is our chiepest worldly comfort, and your death (which more probably is to be expected in this journey) will be an irreparable losse to me, and our twelve children, and a thirteenth comming; most of them unable to help themselves; and your friends and relations will have no small loss in you. (22)

Moments like these in his diary would prove fruitful to any cultural historian because the dialogue seems to suggest much about the roles husbands and wives define for themselves during this century. It also indicates something about the husband's allegiances during the period--here is a man who is expecting his thirteenth child, and he is leaving his family behind. In terms of my research and observations of journals, however, this passage should prove problematic for a cultural
historian because a reader must question the truth of the passage. One must wonder at the extent to which Whitelocke manipulated the dialogue in order to keep his persona consistent. This government official probably would not include anything in his journal that might make him appear weak or doubtful; throughout the exchange, he never once wavers from his devotion to God and country, and his wife never loses her respect for him. When he does leave for Sweden his description of his departure is filled with seemingly exaggerated sentiment:

His tender and loving wife trembles att the thoughts of it; his sweet and deare children hang uppon him, pray not to goe from them, joyne in tears with their disconsolate mother; and some of them motherlesse before, are frighted with an apprehension that they are shortly to become fatherless also. All of them, chiefly those of more years, sufficiently sensible of their expected misery. (98)

Whitelocke's diary represents again the close relationship between non-fictional and fictional narratives because of their reliance upon a certain level of invention and manipulation of events. Unfortunately for readers, Whitelocke's diary, once he leaves his family, becomes less of a personal journal and more of a record of politics and meetings. The diary's shift from the personal to the more
objective recording of events coincides with the diminishment of Whitelocke's strong persona. As the journal progresses, Whitelocke becomes less a part of his own journal. Thus, while his firm establishment of a role for himself at the beginning of the diary suggests a certain amount of cohesiveness, the eventual shift away from the personal supports Nussbaum's observation that so much of seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century narratives are fragmentary with no overall plan or theme to unite the events. The personal passages of his diary and his use of dialogue, however, link Whitelocke closer to Boswell than the other published diarists of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In his book *Private Chronicles*, Robert Fothergill states that diaries become increasingly literary as the nineteenth century approaches, and when one compares Boswell's journals with Samuel Pepys' journals (1660-1669), for example, Fothergill's argument holds true. However, Whitelocke's diary contradicts this notion, and my use of him in this study illustrates how one diarist can dismantle a careful theoretical construct that attempts to define a changing manner of expression and thought. His diary reveals that the self-characterization depends more upon the individual than an emerging literary style that affected the manner in which a diarist sought to convey the self.

Spiritual diaries make up the last major category of journals that I explore in connection with the prose fiction
of the period. While John Beadle's *The Journal or Diary of a Thankful Christian* provides a good foundation for the importance of keeping a diary, he never mentions publishing the spiritual diary. Beginning in the seventeenth century and continuing into the eighteenth century, however, a growing number of spiritual diaries came to be published. These publications take on a variety of forms. For example, Elizabeth Bury's journal (1720) was published after her death by her husband who organized the entries thematically rather than chronologically under chapters such as "Her Sabbath-Frames & Services," "Her Accounts of herself on Days of Fasting and Prayer," and "Answers to Prayers, and Deliverances in Danger." Famous ministers such as John Wesley and George Whitefield published portions of their diaries that related to their travels. The diary of Quaker doctor John Rutty was published in its complete form after his death. This large two-volume diary titled *A Spiritual Diary and Soliloquies* (1776) totals some 723 pages. Despite the stylistic variety amongst the texts, all contain prefaces that defend publication by arguing that the content of the journals establishes spiritual examples for readers to follow. The publication of these spiritual diaries corresponds with the increasing popularity of the private self thrust toward a reading public. We see this movement most obviously in the novels by Defoe and Richardson, but as J. Paul Hunter has revealed, this trend is also evident in the growing emergence
of the autobiography during the eighteenth century. There is something unique, however, about a spiritual life available for public consumption. So much of a person’s spiritual life such as the confessions, prayers and meditations are so personal, and are probably meant to remain that way, yet a spouse like Samuel Bury sees no problem in labeling an entire section of his wife’s journal “Her Self-Examinations.”

The spiritual narratives that were published during the eighteenth century use the term “journal” loosely. For example, many so-called Quaker journals are more like autobiographies organized by the year and month. Despite being written toward the end of the person’s life, these autobiographies rarely take advantage of such a perspective. Instead, many of them read as if they were daily journals because they serve mainly as records of travels. Most paragraphs in these Quaker journals follow a pattern: the writers relate God’s calling them to travel to meetings; they describe the meetings and the people in attendance; and then the writers either travel to another town and repeat the pattern, or they return home and thank God for the safe journey. A Quaker writer like James Dickinson organizes his journal by his trips so that many of his paragraphs begin with the prepositional phrase, “In the Year [. . .]” which continues to provide the exact year and the places visited during that year. If the paragraph does not begin by marking the year of travel, then Dickinson starts by citing the town
from which he is traveling. Like the other Quaker writers, unless strife occurs between the Friends and other people, Dickinson provides little detail for each trip. Because they concentrate so heavily upon the travels of the writer, little introspection is evident in these journals, and when the writer does break away from outward description to become somewhat contemplative, the act usually carries with it the same kind of sincerity associated with expressions as "How are you today?" and "God bless you," which are offered up more to conform to societal mores than to show concern for a person's welfare. The spiritual expressions in these diaries lack sincerity because the writers repeat the same stock emotional phrases at the end of each trip as if to fulfill an expected rhetoric and protocol of their religion rather than to express real individual thankfulness. Here, for example, are Deborah Bell's thoughts upon leaving one town, and the sentiments will be repeated similarly at the end of each trip:

The Gospel of Life and Salvation was freely preached to them, and I found much Room in the People's Minds to receive the Testimony; for which my Heart was humbly thankful to the Lord, who was graciously pleased to favour us with his Power and living Presence, and enable us to give him the Glory. (14)¹⁶

While a record of the travels provides relatively little detail about the writer's thoughts or emotions, it does serve
to stress the active life of the writer. Rarely does a town warrant more than a paragraph or so, and then it is on to the next meeting.

The effect of such a style can become exhausting, but the reader learns that the spiritual life relies on physical action as well as meditation. The emphasis upon action over contemplation that characterizes these journals is evident in the style of *Moll Flanders*. We do not know whether Defoe read any of these Quaker journals himself, but he was familiar with the Quaker movement. For example, he wrote pamphlets in which he pretended to be a Quaker, and in *Roxana* the protagonist disguises herself as a Quaker for a period of time.\(^{17}\) Defoe's mimicry of Quaker ministers suggests his familiarity with a specific kind of discourse and way of thinking that he consciously imitated in his Quaker pamphlets and possibly subconsciously imitated in his fictional works. In certain respects, *Moll Flanders* can be seen as the criminal equivalent of the Quaker journals. Throughout the novel, Moll reveals very little of her thoughts and emotions in comparison with her concern for relating all her actions and travels.

The spiritual diarist's focus upon the ordinary and the concrete was important for a couple reasons. First, for the diarist, the focus on the ordinary reveals how active God was in normal, everyday life. Second, when the diary was published, such a focus would allow readers to relate easily to the diarist's experiences. For example, the editor of the
journal of Elizabeth Harper, a Methodist woman, cites its ordinary quality as one of its chief advantages for readers:

I have published the following Extract from the artless Journal of a plain Woman, wrote merely for her own Use. I have no Doubt but God had all her Heart. But yet how many were her Infirmitues! And these are the more apparent, because she was a person of no uncommon Endowments; one that had just, plain, natural Understanding, without Advantage of Education, and who wrote down daily just what she felt, with all possible Artlessness and Simplicity [. . .]. So particular a Detail of these Things, may be a singular Use to those who find the same Temptations: And who may be encouraged thereby, to hold the Beginning of their Confidence stedfast unto the End. (iii-v)

For the most part, the writing found in most of the published journals of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries would be plain and simplistic.\(^\text{18}\) Elizabeth Harper's journal, published in 1769, features entries that are usually no more than a few lines long, and they concern matters that most readers would relate to easily such as feeling sick, experiencing wandering thoughts at church, telling a lie, craving rest, and undergoing various temptations. She maintains a plain, simple style without much depth or detail regarding more important matters as well. In the midst of the simple records relating
to her daily activities, she devotes several entries to the sickness and eventual death of her son. Her emotions are reserved, and if she does express them, she feels guilty. When her child first becomes very ill, she yells at her maid for not lighting a fire, and her entry concerns her guilt over this anger more than her sad feelings for her son. A few days later she concentrates upon her son again, but her grief seems dwarfed by her guilt:

My little Boy continued exceeding ill: I was quite resigned concerning him, only desiring it might please God, to ease his Pain, either by Life or Death. But I want more Patience: I want a more feeling Sense of the Sufferings of our Lord, which he endured for me, tho' he knew no Sin. And shall I, who deserve Hell, complain of any Thing? (18)

When her child does die several months later, she never expresses much sadness in her entries but instead turns her attention to spiritual matters by concentrating upon what God has done for her thus far and what she still needs to do in return (27). The entries that concern her son's death display Harper's reserve as a writer. Except for passages concerning the Christian conversion experience, which I will detail over the next few paragraphs, emotional reservation regarding events in the diarist's life is characteristic of most published spiritual journals from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and we see a similar tone in the
fictional writings of Defoe. Moll Flanders, for example, casually remarks upon the death and abandonment of her children. Moll's attitude could be considered as uncaring and possibly characteristic of parent's attitudes of the day. However, because my interest is focused upon the writing rather than the cultural history of the period, I want to suggest that the reserved attitude that both the real-life Elizabeth Harper and the fictional Moll Flanders exhibit is due also to the difficulty of expressing oneself emotionally in print. There are exceptions, of course; Whitelocke, for example, had no problems describing the outpouring of his family's emotions although he kept his own emotions in check. For the most part the diarists exhibit an emotional reserve, and a writer like Defoe, who might have been influenced by these personal narratives, may have subscribed to the unemotional style of journals because these were the narrative prose works published during his time. An author like Richardson who wrote when prose fiction was more established would use his creative impulses to allow Pamela and Clarissa to pour out their emotions on the page, but Defoe created "autobiographies" that were similar to the true narratives already on the market.

Though Harper's diary is only forty-seven pages in length, her emphasis upon the same action and sins in her life can become unduly repetitive. Likewise, readers may find the Quaker journals overly repetitious with their emphasis upon
travels and meetings. Reading several of these Quaker journals in a row, one finds the towns and the writers blurring in the mind because seldom do the writers take the opportunity to provide some individuality, either in terms of content or style, with their recollections. Though Quaker John Rutty's daily diary is different from many of the Quaker journals that focus upon travels and meetings, the editors of it are aware that the repetitious style of his diary will prove troublesome to some readers who may not be of the same faith:

[. . .] the same things often repeated, according to their occasions, as must necessarily happen in a work of this kind, will appear irksome to thy delicacy and fondness for novelty, and both the language and matter of it will be thought not only insipid, but disgustful. (viii)

The editor of Harper's journal credits her simplistic style to her lack of education, but spiritual diarists would also write in such an unadorned manner because their religious beliefs are such that too much attention to the individual would be considered vain. Most obviously, such a belief would explain why the diarist often focuses upon outward action rather than individual emotions and thoughts, but it could also mean that the diarist chooses a style that does not call attention to itself. Perhaps one sees evidence of Defoe's Puritanism in the depiction of his protagonists, who for the most part try
their best to move the attention away from the individual. The next chapter will reveal how such an attitude is most apparent in the character of H.F. from Journal of the Plague Year who attempts to use the journal to record what is happening around him rather than to him. However, as we shall see, the solitary situation of his circumstance forces him to look inwardly so that his document becomes his story of the Plague, not just an objective record. Richardson’s characters, on the other hand, do use their writing to individualize themselves, revealing the movement of fiction away from the non-fictional narrative, which still concentrates on action over thought or emotion well into the eighteenth century.

To study the last major point that seems relevant to a comparison between diary and novel we must return again to the issue of creativity. When the novels of Defoe and, especially, Richardson appear, they reveal the extent to which fictional writers like Moll, Pamela, or Clarissa, use invention to heighten the development of the self beyond what is apparent even in the most enlightening sections of journals. My discussion of the use of persona briefly revealed how all diarists incorporate some degree of artificiality in their work. In the spiritual narratives, the use of creative techniques appears in the most unlikely of places—the recollection of the writer’s conversion experience. John Bunyan’s Grace Abounding to the Chief of
Sinners (1666) may have established a stylistic guide for conveying a person's conversion to Christianity. Bunyan devotes several pages to his conversion, which is characterized by a heightening of his sinful life, his attempts to reject God, his eventual acceptance, and his changed attitude thereafter. While most of the Quaker journals are devoted to the travels of the writer, the most sustained episode of each is the writer's recollection of his or her conversion. The conversion experience is not merely an intellectual acceptance of the Christian doctrine, but rather, for these writers, it becomes an intense period of struggle between an old and new way of life, and it is the detailing of this struggle that provides more introspection than anything else in these journals. Yet, despite the introspection and intensity, this important event in the life of the writer seems devoid of individuality, revealing the manner in which the writer's sense of self within the doctrine of the church takes precedence over the individual person.

Banks's and Dickinson's conversion experiences both cover several pages of their journals, and they are both very similar in terms of content and style. Both discuss sorrow, days of mourning, affliction, tribulation, and struggle before their salvation. Both men endure this unpleasant period for a long time. Banks writes, "But before I came to witness that Work Effected; Oh the Days and Nights of Godly Sorrow" (6); Dickinson writes, "yet many were the Days of Mourning, and
Nights of Sorrow my Soul went under" (4). When the men do convert, their lives are characterized by transformation that contrasts dramatically with the former sinful life. There are differences between the two recollections; Banks uses war imagery (warfare, combats, enemy) that Dickinson does not, but overall the two accounts reflect that the conversion experience is one that seems more defined by Quaker doctrine than individual interpretation. Thus, the introspection and similarity of these two passages make for some interesting considerations when one analyzes the manner in which the self is conceived and presented in these Quaker journals. For Christians, the conversion experience obviously is one of the most important events in their lives. Not only do Banks and Dickinson want to stress to their readers the vital role that conversion plays in a Christian's life, but they also want to convey the idea that becoming a Christian involves more than simple mental acceptance. The persecutions that both men would undergo while traveling as Quakers serve to reinforce the idea that being a non-conforming Christian in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was difficult.

Their conversion recollections pose some questions, however. Why is it that neither narrative is nearly as introspective elsewhere in the journal? Why, despite the introspection, are their accounts so similar? Not to undercut the sincerity of their conversion experience, I would suggest that both writers (as well as other Quaker autobiographers)
employ some invention in their recollections. Their Christianity seems more valuable to them if their struggle is great. Furthermore, one must keep in mind that the details of the conversion experience were not recorded until years later, and some elaboration certainly would occur in the mind of the writer. I do not believe such creativity or elaboration invalidates the experience for both men, nor does it make the reader (then or now) dismiss the event as fiction. However, it demonstrates that some invention plays a role in the development of an individual’s self-conception. Both men realize the importance of conveying the mental struggle in the above passages, so they are forced to look into themselves and draw out the emotion. Keeping in mind that their conversion experience is meant not only for them but for readers as well, the writers have the responsibility of attempting to convey the mental struggle in as detailed a manner as possible, which requires more of them as writers than simply recalling the towns and people they see later in their journals. So that their conversion experience does not seem inadequate, they are called upon to add to it creatively. This then explains how such an important event in their lives can contain much introspection and yet at the same time lack individuality, two features which would seem to be contradictory. Such refinement does not serve to lessen their experience, but rather it increases the importance of the experience, not only in the minds of readers but in the minds of the writers as
well. A more factual, objective diary may merely describe the outward activities of a person, but such a diary will be void of introspection. What these two passages suggest when placed within the context of the rest of the journal (which does concentrate upon the outward at the expense of the inward) is that a certain degree of artificiality is unavoidable when developing the self.

William Matthews and Arthur Ponsonby have speculated upon the different reasons for keeping a diary, but one must seek other answers for why a person would want to publish a diary. Often times, family or friends publish a diary after the diarist’s death. Sometimes, a diarist will state the reason for beginning a diary, but most of the time, understanding the reason for keeping a diary involves some speculation upon the reader’s part. Such is not the case, however, for published diaries. While we may not know the exact reason for the writer’s journal keeping, the preface of a published journal usually explains the reason for its publication. The military and voyage journals published during the eighteenth century often were written to document a true record of a particular battle or expedition. The writer publishes his journal as a defense. The spiritual diaries, however, have the reader’s welfare in mind. In publishing A Journal of the Life of Thomas Story (1747), the editors argue, “that the Service of the Work might not altogether center in himself, but be extended to the Publick, affording Lessons of Instruction and
a profitable Entertainment to all such as are inclined to enquire into Things of a religious Nature" (I). In 1720, when Elizabeth Bury's husband publishes sections of her diary a short time after her death, he too believes that the diarist's life is worthy of imitation:

Her LIFE, I am well assured has been of great Service to many, and I would hope these few Memorials of it may be useful to more. And that such as have not been duly influenc'd by the Precepts of Religion, may be somewhat induced by such an Exemplar to the Practice of it. (1)

Samuel Bury's division of his wife's journal into thematic chapters indicates that he might have felt such sections necessary for readers to gain more value from his Elizabeth's life. Rearranging his wife's life not by chronology but by theme and removing "nine parts in ten" from the original version suggest an attempt to construct a narrative pattern upon a life that otherwise would not be obvious were the diary published in its complete chronological form. John Rutty's diary, published by some acquaintances, actually seeks to define a specific audience in the address to the reader by stating that the diary is for serious Christians who place "religion in the heart," not for those who have only doctrinal knowledge and want to read for "curiosity" or "amusement" (vii-viii).
How successful were these diaries in fulfilling their mission? Many were published several times in both England and America, but there is little record of how readers reacted to them. Because of their similarities in style, I think we can surmise that the early Quaker travel journals did have an influence on the other Quakers who published journals of their travels much later in the century. We do have some records of reaction to John Rutty's diary which suggest that not all people read his diary with imitation in mind. In the *Life of Johnson* Boswell includes a brief selection from Rutty's diary, excerpts from *The Critical Review*, and the following sentences detailing Johnson's reaction to the diary excerpts: "Johnson laughed heartily at this good Quietist's self-condemning minutes; particularly at his mentioning, with such a serious regret, occasional instances of 'swinishness in eating, and doggedness of temper'" (3: 171). Furthermore, the brief review of the diary in *The Critical Review* (1777) reveals that readers were still somewhat uncomfortable about the private life being made public. The reviewer warns that a person's attempts to record his own actions for a reading public are made with "difficulty and danger." In regard to Rutty, the review comments that "His two volumes are filled with a detail of circumstances of importance to himself, but of no consequence to the world" (204). Boswell in *The Hypochondriack* warns that individuals face ridicule and contempt if they publish their private diaries (258). And in
Idler 84, Johnson writes of the importance of leaving the diary unpublished if the writer is to be truthful "since falsehood cannot appease his own mind, and fame will not be heard beneath the tomb" (264). On the other hand, in Rambler 60, Johnson wrote of the value of individual histories which allow an identification with the subject that is not possible in histories that concern "the downfall of kingdoms, and revolutions of empires" (319). In The Invention of the Self, Lyons sees the 1760s as a time of shift in the perception of the individual. Throughout his study, Lyons offers a variety of examples such as travel narratives that focus upon place and personal experience rather than just place, published biographies that no longer concentrate solely upon public figures, and novels that teach readers how another person's life can be read strictly for enjoyment. All of Lyons's examples are valid, but the comments from The Critical Review, Boswell, and Johnson suggest that the emergence of the individual life as a subject for public consumption was not something that occurred without some resistance. Boswell's journals may exhibit a manner of introspection and expression that was vastly different from most journals earlier in the century, but he never intended to have them published in his lifetime.

Whether the published diaries served their direct purposes or not, their being published for the moral benefit of readers is one more aspect that establishes a parallel
between the diary and the early novel. A critic like Johnson strongly valued works of fiction that would offer something worthy of imitation, for, as he argues in *Rambler* 4, readers, especially young ones, were apt to follow what they read because they were not informed by experience (21). Johnson would desire fiction to present good examples; Defoe in his preface to *Moll Flanders* admits that the protagonist may not be a good example, but her story provides a good lesson for readers nonetheless. While Johnson and Defoe differ in regard to just how the writer conveys morality, both believe fiction has a utilitarian purpose. Just as with the published diary, however, we never really will know to what extent early readers used the novel for its moral insights. How seriously, for example, did readers take Defoe's Preface to *Moll Flanders*? While Defoe and Richardson seem content to follow a utilitarian attitude toward narrative, Fielding would question it with a work like *Shamela* (1741).

In revealing the many similarities between the diary and the novel, I have sought to establish an historical and a stylistic context for the early fiction of the eighteenth century. This context will be further developed over the next two chapters in a close analysis of specific works of Defoe and Richardson. Drawing comparisons between published journals and early prose fiction allows for consideration of a number of different issues. First, an analysis of journal writing focuses upon a style of writing that was quite similar
to early fictional narratives. Both highlight the individual. However, while the individual is at the center of the work, for the most part, the person focuses upon his or her relation to outside people or events, resulting in a lack of introspection for the diary and early novel. Furthermore, similar entities affect the composition of both the diary and the early novel such as the protagonist's personality and circumstances. Second, limiting the study to diaries and journals that were published during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, establishes a concrete notion of the marketplace for the early novels. Historical surveys of this time period make it clear that there was a movement toward the individual, and the focus upon published works reveals how the movement was reflected for readers of the century. A wide spectrum of works that concentrated upon the individual was available to readers. Because they would not have made the same distinctions between factual and fictional personal narrative that we do today, the transition to the novel, which critics like Watt view as a new invention during the eighteenth century, would have been smooth. Third, a comparison between the two genres highlights the differences between the amateur and professional writer. It is important to understand that in using diaries to establish a context for early novels, I am not arguing that the early novelists merely imitated the preceding genre. Studying the publication of journals and autobiographies that were on the market at the
same time as the early novel demonstrates that the eighteenth-century reader was familiar with the first-person narrative. Such familiarity allowed Defoe and later writers to expand upon the readers' familiarity by gradually taking the fictional work in a different direction from the diary, history, or autobiography. Thus, the novels typically provide us with a more individualized and introspective protagonist, a more cohesive plot, and more sustained episodes within that plot.
Endnotes

1 According to J. Paul Hunter in "The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Reader," Genre 10 (1977): 455-484, novels at this time "never pretended to imitate reality; when they made any reality claims at all, they claimed to be reality; and readers seldom knew whether they were reading a real "history" (the term is everywhere) or a feigned one" (468).

2 Some evidence exists that a work that appeared to be factual might have allowed readers to feel as if they were making good use of their time. In the eighteenth century, presenting fiction as fact would have been an economic necessity for authors who wrote during a time in which reading for pleasure was considered a violation of the Protestant Work Ethic, an idea that would persist well into the Victorian era (Nell 28). Despite this notion, however, toward the middle of the eighteenth century, readers seemed more willing to expand their horizons with sentimental and Gothic novels. Such books valued emotional experience over moral behavior, and the focus shifted from the "collective standards of judgment on public issues" to the "psychic life of individuals" (Tompkins 215). With the rise of Evangelicalism, what seems to have been happening in the latter half of the eighteenth century and the early half of the nineteenth was a separation of the spiritual and secular in fictional material as one group of readers rejected any material that was not related to God while
another group pursued the more secular novels that did not attempt to combine a secular and spiritual message as did novels like Robinson Crusoe, Moll Flanders, and Clarissa (Peterson 11).

Some critics today prefer to make a distinction between "journal" and "diary," but disagreement still exists. Matthews in his essay "The Diary: A Neglected Genre" defines a journal as more of a plan with a clear objective, while a diary is "more personal and less systematic" (286-287). Christina Baldwin in her book One to One: Self-Understanding through Journal Writing, however, says just the opposite. For her the diary "connotes a more formal pattern of daily entries, serving primarily to record the writer's activities, experiences, and observations," while a journal allows for a "more creative expansion of entries, and doesn't imply the obligation to write every day [. . .]" (3-4). Because no clear distinction was made during the time period of my study, and because disagreement still exists today, I will use diary and journal interchangeably.

Simply doing an ESTC search of the word "journal" will land the researcher in what appears to be a bottomless pit of citations. (In addition to autobiographies masquerading as journals, one also finds almanacs and commonplace books that were often called journals or diaries.) William Matthews' bibliography, though now forty-five years old, offers probably
the best starting place for locating diaries published during the time period in question. Using his list and supplementing it with ESTC, provides a representative sampling of the kinds of diaries published during the century.

Using William Matthews' bibliography of diaries, Felicity A. Nussbaum in *The Autobiographical Subject* concludes that among those diaries Matthews lists as written during the eighteenth century, only approximately forty-three were published during the century (24). (Because she uses Matthews, who limits his definition of diary and journal, these would not include the many pseudo diaries that were published such as Quaker journals, which I include in my study.)

To contrast the diary with biographies and autobiographies, Matthews also emphasizes the disorderly nature of the diary because of the diarist's habit of recording only what seems important on an individual day, not what is important in the scheme of the person's life ("The Diary" 289).

In *Centuries of Female Days: Englishwomen's Private Diaries*, Harriet Blodgett says few women used diaries to enhance their sense of themselves; instead most of the diaries focus upon events and other people (4). Fothergill's diary study makes the same claim: "An activity of the 'public' diary in the eighteenth century was scrutinizing, not oneself, but other people" (24). To learn of the diarist's self, readers
need to look beyond direct statements of feeling or thoughts. Spacks, for example, emphasizes external action as a means of reflecting the internal, and though her statement applies specifically to autobiographies, I think the same holds true for diaries (24).

\[8\] Isolation need not be a negative thing. In his book \textit{The Private Self}, Arnold H. Modell argues that periods of nonrelatedness are as necessary as periods of relatedness: "For individuals who must cope with dreadful environments, private space can be the place in which alternative worlds are created, worlds that guarantee psychic survival" (95).

\[9\] In his discussion of diaries, Boswell provides a good example of the eighteenth century's focus upon the individual when he writes, "'The importance of a man to himself,' simply considered, is not a subject of ridicule; for, in reality, a man is of more importance to himself than all other things or persons can be" (\textit{Hypochondriack} 257-58).

\[10\] Samuel Richardson, \textit{Clarissa, or the History of a Young Lady}, vol. 1-8, Shakespeare Head Edition (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1930). All subsequent references from this edition are cited parenthetically by volume number and page number within the text.


13 My research uncovered no analysis of this diary, and Matthews does not list this work in his bibliography. Matthews includes a reference to a 1724 manuscript that seems similar to this published journal, but it is not the same journal. Matthews' entry describes a journal by an English sailor marooned on Ascension Island who discovered a spring just as his water supply was exhausted. He believes this to be an "apparently genuine narrative" (67). This journal spans only two months whereas the one I focus upon covers six months. Furthermore, there is no mention of a spring in the published journal I consider. Nothing within the text of the Dutch sailor's journal suggests that it is a fictional account, so I am integrating it into my study as an actual diary.


15 This trend toward publicizing the private would continue to grow throughout the century. Coupled with the increasing number of published diaries, memoirs, and autobiographies is a change in the manner in which the private individual decides upon what to set forth for public reading. I will address this issue at length in the chapter on Boswell, but briefly, according to Lyons in The Invention of the Self
One sees a clear distinction between Johnson and Boswell's two versions of their tours through the Hebrides: "...Johnson records the itinerary and comments on the manners and customs of the people, whereas Boswell is attracted to the picturesque and tells us when and how he is moved (emphasis added). They saw the same things with different eyes; Johnson's were eyes that he assumed were no different from his readers', but Boswell's were his own" (12).

One's travels are not the only matters repeated often in spiritual journals. Matthews writes of the "extended self-denunciations" that are common in most Puritan diaries: "[T]he trouble with them is that they all tend to be much the same, so that there are even times when one suspects some of them of being expressions of conventional piety than of genuine feeling" ("The Diary" 292).

In her biography of Defoe, Paula Backscheider cites an 1876 source, Mary E. Ireland's "The Defoe Family in America" from Scribner's Monthly that asserts without evidence that Defoe's family was Quaker.

There are exceptions of course. Whitelocke's journal is one example that I have already discussed, and chapter four will analyze the manner in which Boswell's Journals, though not published during the eighteenth century, mark a new direction for personal writing.
Lawrence Stone's *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* describes many examples that exhibit parents' lack of concern for children including premature weaning, the transfer of infants to wet-nurses, and abandonment (55). Stone argues that the high mortality rate among infants affected parents who probably did not want to become too attached to the child: "Even when children were genuinely wanted and not regarded as economically crippling nuisances, it was very rash for parents to get too emotionally concerned about creatures whose expectation of life was so very low" (57).

In her discussion of Quaker journals, Nussbaum argues that the journals "aimed to create a unified version of the self," meaning that it was more important for the writer to reveal how he or she was like the rest of the people in this larger group, rather than to call attention to any individual characteristics. The individual was subordinated "to the religious movement and to its community spirit" (19).


23 Samuel Johnson, The Rambler, ed. W.J. Bate and Albrecht B. Strauss, vol. 3, The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson (New Haven: Yale UP, 1969). All subsequent page numbers are to this edition and are cited parenthetically within the text. Elsewhere in Rambler 60, Johnson notes, "I have often thought that there has rarely passed a life of which a judicious and faithful narrative would not be useful" (320).
The previous chapter observed the manner in which many elements of early eighteenth-century prose fiction parallel the style and content of published journals. In his book, Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century Fiction, J. Paul Hunter argues that while the novel did not "'descend' from the seventeenth-century diary, [. . .] [it] did provide a model that defined shape, scope, and epistemology" (303). For Hunter, the rise of diaries began "habituating readers" into a mindset necessary for appreciating the novel as a genre (309). Though no evidence exists for a causal relationship between the diary and early novel, Hunter's theory proves useful in establishing one part of the literary market that early novels joined. Hunter's claim regarding diaries refers to the diary form in general; however, his ideas may be even more applicable to diaries that were published, for published journals allowed readers to become accustomed in print to the private lives of individuals. Because they grew alongside each other throughout the century, a comparison between both journals and novels allows for a better understanding of any possible debt the fictional narrative owes to its factual counterpart. A comparison between the two genres also reveals the manner in which the early novelists, though probably influenced to some
extent by non-fictional narrative, did not merely copy the
genre but instead established a new kind of work altogether.
By closely analyzing Robinson Crusoe and briefly discussing
some of his other works, this chapter builds upon the outline
constructed in the last chapter to exhibit both Defoe's
reliance upon and his departure from an earlier, established
prose form.

Throughout his writing career, Defoe was well aware of
the public's expectations. In addition to being active in the
pamphlet wars, he seems to have had the uncanny ability to tap
into not just one, but several genres of writing that were
popular with the reading public. The Four Year Voyage of
Capt. George Roberts (1726) and Robert Drury's Journal (1729)
imitated real-life travel journals that were published in
abundance during the century. He also wrote military memoirs,
An Impartial Account of the Late Famous Seige of Gibraltar
(1728) and The Memoirs of an English Officer (1728); criminal
autobiographies, A Narration of all the Robberies, Escapes,
etc. of John Sheppard (1724); and biographies, The History of
the Life and Adventures of Mr. Duncan Campbell, a Gentleman,
who, tho' Deaf and Dumb, writes down any Stranger's Name at
First Sight; with their future Contingencies of Fortune
(1720). In pamphlets, he mimicked other voices as revealed in
A Friendly Epistle By Way of Reproof From one of the People
called Quakers, to Thomas Bradbury, A Dealer in many Words
(1715) and A Friendly Rebuke to one Parson Benjamen;
Particularly relating to his Quarrelling with his Own Church, and Vindicating the Dissenters, By One of the People called Quakers (1719). These titles exhibit the extent to which Defoe imitated other popular forms of literature, but because they are no more than good duplications these works offer little more than historical interest for today's scholars. Unlike his more famous prose fictions, Defoe did not seek to create anything more than strict imitations of the factual counterparts. However, concerning the works that are often labeled as his "novels," Defoe has created something more significant than a simple imitation. This chapter aims to reveal not only aspects of Defoe's major works that suggest his use of an already established, familiar literary form, but the extent to which his manipulation of that form produced something unique and original for his day.

Considering the frequency with which Defoe made use of established genres, it is not surprising to find parallels between Defoe's works and diary writing. Diaries, of course, were not the only narrative pattern upon which Defoe constructed his novels, and some important studies reveal Defoe's reliance upon other forms of literature. J. Paul Hunter's The Reluctant Pilgrim (1968), G.A. Starr's Defoe and Spiritual Autobiography (1971), and Patricia Meyer Spacks's Imagining a Self: Autobiography and Novel in Eighteenth-Century England (1976) all study Defoe's use of biographical and autobiographical forms in his fictional works. While
these three studies make reference to the large number of diaries written during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, they do not consider the extent to which the diaries might have been a factor in Defoe's fiction. My study, on the other hand, draws a parallel between the novel and the kind of written work that readers of the novel may have been composing themselves.

In his essay "Daniel Defoe and the Anxieties of Autobiography," Leo Braudy argues that studies drawing parallels between Defoe's works and other prose works from the century such as criminal and spiritual autobiographies diminish Defoe's literary status because they present him "as merely a much more skilled and successful practitioner of the old forms" (77-78). In considering Defoe's connection with diaries, however, I am not arguing that he copies or even makes use of specific diaries. Rather, I argue that the same sentiment that governs a diary has a pervasive influence upon Defoe, and this sentiment is important to consider when analyzing his first-person narratives. On the contrary, rather than dismissing the creative process, ultimately, a comparison between diary and fiction highlights the creative process that the fictional writer employs in his own work that a diarist does not.

Though this chapter considers three of Defoe's major fictional works, *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), *A Journal of the Plague Year* (1722), and *Moll Flanders* (1722), much of my
emphasis is upon Robinson Crusoe because I use that work to establish most of my major arguments regarding the parallels between diary writing and fiction writing. A quick reading of these three works suggests their similarity in the use of personal writing like diaries and autobiographies; for example, they all feature first-person narrators. Considering only the obvious similarities, however, significantly diminishes Defoe's place in literary study because it fails to recognize the uniqueness of each work. In Defoe and the Uses of Narrative, Michael M. Boardman argues that the problem with critics like Ian Watt is their attempt to force Defoe narratives into "a solid and essentially unvarying whole" (5). Boardman's study reveals the different kinds of narratives that Defoe employs in his eight major fictional works to disprove such a theory of uniformity, and my study will take the same attitude toward the similarities between diaries and Defoe's fiction. Despite his use of first person and his claim in the prefaces that these works are true, each work has its own particular style, and each narrator develops his or her story and reflects upon the self differently. These differences among Defoe's works reveal the extent to which Defoe was an author who was a creator, not just an imitator. By keeping in mind the diary form and by focusing primarily upon Robinson Crusoe with brief excursions into Journal of a Plague Year and Moll Flanders, one gains an understanding of the various means by which Defoe manipulated another genre.
For authors, making the newly developing prose fiction of the eighteenth century familiar for the early novel reader was routine. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, there was not always a clear distinction between prose fiction and other forms of prose writings such as autobiographies and histories, and the title pages of Defoe’s works all reveal this blurring between fact and fiction. The title page of *Robinson Crusoe* ends with the line “Written by Himself;” *Moll Flanders* is the “Famous Moll Flanders,” and her story is “Written from her own MEMORANDUMS;” *A Journal of the Plague Year* was “Written by a Citizen who continued all the while in London;” *Roxana* (1724) is “...a History of the Life and Vast Variety of Fortunes of Mademoiselle de Beleau, afterwards called the Countess de Wintelsheim in Germany Being the Person known by the Name of the Lady Roxana in the time of Charles II;” *Captain Singleton* (1720) is the “famous Captain Singleton;” *Colonel Jack* (1722) is called a “History,” and *Memoirs of a Cavalier* (1724) is subtitled *A Military Journal of the Wars in Germany and the Wars in England*. The extent to which eighteenth-century readers believed these title pages is unclear, but whether eighteenth-century readers trusted the claims or not, it is important to keep in mind the conscious effort of Defoe and his publishers to align his works with factual material. This alignment reveals an awareness of audience and demonstrates an attempt by the author to tap into already familiar prose works. All three title pages from the
fictional works in this chapter align themselves with the diary form. Before discussing in more detail the characteristics of the diary and how they relate to Defoe’s novels, I want to emphasize that his works are not direct imitations of the diary form.\(^3\) Except for a few passages in Robinson Crusoe, none of the novels features a daily entry format, a major characteristic of the diary. Furthermore, his novels contain foreshadowing, patterns, and retrospection that would be impossible in a diary because the diarist, writing day-by-day, would not perceive such an overall plan, unlike Defoe’s narrators who all write their stories in hindsight. Finally, the narrators reveal an awareness of readers that a diarist would not have. All these differences are significant in evaluating the literary quality of these works, and I will address these differences after discussing each of Defoe’s narratives individually.

Robinson Crusoe, the first of Defoe’s prose fictions, owes the most to diary writing. Unlike the other two Defoe novels discussed in this chapter, Robinson Crusoe contains the actual copy of the narrator’s journal. Readers learn in the preface of Moll Flanders that the narrator kept some kind of journal, but the book readers hold in their hands is an editor’s reworking of that journal. So, too, do we learn from the narrator of the Journal that he kept memoranda during the plague, which he used as the basis for his narrative (76-77), but, despite its title, nowhere in the book does he include
actual entries from these memoranda. Like the other Defoe works, the "original" material has been revamped. The diary in Robinson Crusoe makes up a very small part of the book as a whole, but its inclusion, which is a technique used only in this work, makes it a significant point to consider. Crusoe's journal begins like many journals with an introduction of the writer:

September 30, 1659. I poor Robinson Crusoe being shipwreck'd, during a dreadful Storm, in the offing, came on Shore on this dismal unfortunate Island, which I call'd the Island of Despair, all the rest of the Ship's Company being drown'd, and my self almost dead. (79)

A few paragraphs before the actual journal begins, Crusoe writes that because he wished his journal to be interesting, he waited until he was mentally and emotionally stable to begin his writing (78). For Crusoe, the right frame of mind is one of reserve and decorum. Were he to have begun his journal immediately after coming to the island, it would have reflected his "Discomposure of Mind" (78). Crusoe does not view his journal as an outlet for venting his emotions or laying bare his soul on the page. Rather, even though he may never be rescued, he writes with another audience in mind. Perceiving the journal in terms beyond himself forces him to approach it in a reserved manner.
His attitude toward his journal seems characteristic of many non-fictional journals of the period that also display similar restraint in terms of emotion and introspection. Furthermore, Crusoe's message justifying his disciplined approach toward his journal would not have seemed strange to readers of the eighteenth century who read similar notices in published factual journals. Often the preface to the published journal not only justifies its publication, but it also defends the manner in which it was written. For example in 1712, when Capt. Woodes Rogers publishes his journal of his South Seas voyage, he argues that his "Language of the Sea" is more genuine for him than an attempt to imitate the style "us'd by Authors that write ashore" (1). He assures readers that he prints his original journal to avoid straying from facts as some published voyage accounts have done. When An Authentic Relation of the Many Hardships and Sufferings of a Dutch Sailor is published in 1728, the editor cites its language as evidence of its factuality: "As the following Journal carries all the possible Marks of Truth and Sincerity in it; so we thought it fit to publish exactly as it was wrote, by the miserable Wretch, who is the Subject of it..." (iii). John Bulkeley and John Cummins publish their voyage of the South Seas in 1743 and also emphasize the truth of their account by remarking upon the "Abundance of Fiction" apparent in some published voyages, and they assure their readers that they "...have taken Care to deviate from those, by having a
strict Regard to Truth" (xix). This concern for truth is important because it forces a level of dispassion upon the narrative as these writers seek to record their own experiences as objectively as possible, and Crusoe's journal reflects this same attitude toward the act of writing.

Rather than use his journal as an outlet for his frustrations and fears, Crusoe fills the journal with short entries of his significant activities during the day as the following entry for November 1 illustrates: "I set up my Tent under a Rock, and lay there for the first Night, making it as large as I could with Stakes driven in to swing my Hammock upon" (81). Other entries are of a similar nature: Nov. 2, sets up his chests and boards to mark out his fortification; Nov. 3, kills two fowls which make good food; Nov. 4, orders the time of his work; Nov. 5, goes out with his gun and dog and kills a wild cat; Nov. 6, works on his table; Nov. 7, describes the weather. As brief as they are, these entries suggest a great deal about Crusoe as a person and a writer. For readers, then and now, Crusoe's reluctance in his journal to divulge his thoughts and emotions requires that one take his record of activities and piece them together to form a conception of this man's personality and state of mind. The many entries relating to Crusoe's daily schedules suggest that he is a methodical person. However, these entries also display a conflicted man who, on the one hand, attempts to maintain a civilized regimen of eating, sleeping and working,
while, on the other hand, finds himself reverting to a primitive way of life--killing and skinning a wild cat, for example--because of his circumstances. Overall, the entries from the journal exhibit Crusoe’s active nature. He does not wait idly for rescue but sets about to establish a home.

In his discussion of Defoe’s works, Richard Kroll notes that the eighteenth century was a period in which one’s identity was reflected more in external activities rather than “states of mind” (41). Chapter One of my study highlighted this characteristic evident in many of the century’s published diaries that, for example, focused upon activities like taking care of a sick child, going to church, praying, eating, and traveling. Kroll asserts that this focus upon the external over the internal largely is responsible for the seeming lack of self-development among Defoe’s characters: “...although characters in all the tales speak autobiographically, they do so as if able to observe themselves from without, and with the awareness that their identity derives in part from being seen or described by others within a public space” (41). Kroll’s statement has merit and is evidenced in a character like Moll Flanders who emphasizes her actions toward others and others’ actions toward her over her own thoughts and emotions. Later in this chapter, I will discuss how Moll’s active life does determine her identity, but Kroll’s remark about characters defining themselves within a public space is too broad to apply to Defoe’s characters all the time. Crusoe’s journal,
for example, provides a good counterpoint to Kroll's argument. How does Crusoe define his identity in a public space when no public space exists? It would be difficult, to say the least. With its focus upon outward activity over inward thought and emotion, Crusoe's journal is a very good imitation of the journals people were reading during the eighteenth century. A published spiritual journal, for example, may concentrate almost solely upon outward activities at the expense of the writer's psychological development, but the journal still maintains some interest for readers because the diarist interacts with other people from time to time. So while readers are not given great insight into the writer's thoughts, they are able to observe the writer's interactions with family members, servants and friends from church, for example. With the solitary Crusoe, however, Defoe encounters a challenge. While the journal appears to be a realistic depiction of journal writing of the time, Defoe realizes that without the "public space," a concentration upon Crusoe's outward activity will not sustain a reader's interest. Thus, throughout the journal section, readers see Crusoe deviating from the journal entries by offering further clarification of the events and further insight into his thoughts and emotions. Interspersed between the brief daily entries are long passages focusing upon his fears and his spirituality. When he introduced his journal to readers, Crusoe stated that he waited some time before starting to write for fear of
recording "dull things" like "...wringing my Hands, and beating my Head and Face, exclaiming at my Misery, and crying out, I was undone, undone..." (78). Yet in the midst of presenting Crusoe the diarist, Crusoe the author, who is reflecting back upon this time period after his rescue, makes emotional statements like "WRETCH! dost thou ask what thou has done! look back upon a dreadful mis-spent Life, and ask thy self what thou has not done? ask, Why is it that thou wert not long ago destroy'd?" (106). With passages such as these, Crusoe contradicts his prefatory comments to the journal because, on the one hand, he seeks to write a journal free of emotional outbursts, but, on the other hand, he inserts a number of charged statements between the journal entries. This contradiction in attitude displays Defoe's authorial realization that a strict imitation of the established, reserved prose form of the diary is effective and interesting for readers only in limited circumstances. When outward events are unexciting, an unemotional description of those events cannot be sustained for long. The contradiction also reveals that as an author Defoe is not governed by some supposed eighteenth-century attitude toward the self as Kroll's comments suggest. Rather, Crusoe's change of voice between his day-by-day journal and his later recollections demonstrates Defoe's awareness of what makes for a good narrative. When there are no longer interesting external events and people to describe, Defoe turns his attention to
what remains—the inward self of his protagonist. After several entries that seem to come verbatim from a journal, Defoe supplements later entries with additional comments from Crusoe. Ultimately, Defoe abandons the journal as a narrative device altogether when Crusoe runs out of ink (153).

Because of the similarity of Crusoe's diary with others of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, his journal reflects the general attitudes toward personal writing exhibited in many journals of the period. By including the journal within the larger narrative of the novel, Defoe reveals his differentiation between personal journal writing and personal narrative writing, the latter completed by all Defoe's protagonists. Defoe's differentiation is important because it indicates that he did not view *Robinson Crusoe* as a simple imitation of an established genre. A later author like Richardson simply would have incorporated the more introspective passages within the journal entries, creating lengthy entries, but Defoe probably would have found such a construct too artificial. Later in the century readers would accept such artificiality with emerging prose fiction narratives, and readers now recognize artifice as an attribute of literary works. However, as John Preston makes clear in *The Created Self*, Defoe "above all" does not want his works to be literary, and he relies upon realism to create an "absence of style" in his works (17). Realism, then, is key to a work like *Robinson Crusoe*, and Defoe takes great pains to make the
story believable as evidenced by Crusoe’s detailed listings of his supplies and animals, and his minute descriptions of the weather and terrain. Therefore, rather than risk the appearance of falsity by simply combining Crusoe’s “real” journal with his later introspective musings, he makes a distinction (though not always clear) between the two forms of narrative.  

The stylistic differences between the journal and the narrative not only suggest that Defoe recognized the elements of a good story, but they also imply a distinction in his mind between journal writing and personal narrative writing. Though the two forms concentrate upon the individual, they are separate genres for Defoe, and as such he uses them differently. While readers might be interested to read the “dull” ranting that Crusoe opted not to record, Crusoe makes a concerted effort to keep emotions reflecting a “Discomposure of Mind” out of his journal. His decision to exclude such material provides insight into what this fictional character thinks of journal writing, and in turn, I believe it sheds some light upon the manner in which Defoe chose to tell Crusoe’s story. Though Crusoe’s emotions are absent—for the most part—from his journal, he does not have any problem relating them to the reader outside the journal format. Why is there such a difference between his journal and the narrative he composes later? The distinction indicates something about the status of his journal. For Crusoe, the
journal is an object of decorum. It is a record of events, not emotions. Many of the diaries cited in Chapter One are characterized by a high degree of restraint. Spiritual journals, for example, display a strong heightening of emotion only in relating the conversion experience of the writer. In his study of English diaries from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries, Arthur Ponsonby stereotypes an entire nation by claiming that self-restraint on the printed page may be a peculiar English habit:

Reticence and reserve are national characteristics outwardly and probably inwardly too; and among available English diaries there are none which extend the practice of self-dissection to such an extreme as the continental diarists. Most Englishmen think it bad form to be too expansive or to give themselves away. They conceive it improper to write down their innermost feelings, and they shun like the pest anything that approaches affectation. (10)

In an attempt to find a unifying element among British diarists, Ponsonby is guilty of oversimplification and overgeneralization because the end of the century brings a new emphasis on the individual as evidenced in travel writings, novels, autobiography, biography and journals. The characteristic of restraint, however, that Ponsonby applies too broadly, certainly relates to the fictional journal of
Crusoe, and it holds true for many published journals of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

One small journal cited in Chapter One reveals the extent to which this kind of self-effacement was evidenced in the journals of the time period, and its subject matter makes it an apt comparison to Crusoe's own journal. In 1728, *An Authentic Relation of the Many Hardships and Sufferings of a Dutch Sailor* was published in England. Though the sailor was Dutch, the journal features many of the same characteristics as English diaries from the time period, and this journal appears to be the authentic record of a sailor who was abandoned on the deserted Isle of Ascension. The journal spans a period from May 5 until October 14, when the editor presumes he died. Despite the horrific conditions surrounding the sailor, his journal entries convey the same level of dispassion that is evident in Crusoe's entries. In a lengthy entry from May 6, he writes of looking for life on the island, securing his tent against the elements, and killing three birds for food. Amongst these details the sailor relates his dejection resulting from his situation, but he does so in a reserved manner, typical of many diaries from this period: "I walked very Melancholly along the Strand, praying to God Almighty to put a Period to my Days, or help me off this desolate Island" (2). While the above quotation reveals a depressed man praying for his death, it reflects a level of calm not usually associated with the circumstances. If this
man ran about the shore wringing his hands as Crusoe confesses he did, there is no evidence of it in his journal. Instead of hysteria, he writes that he "walked very Melancholly." As with Crusoe's journal, this sailor's journal places much importance on significant but monotonous details like the number of birds or turtles that he kills for food.

The diary is only twenty-two pages long, yet despite its conciseness and lack of emotion, witnessing the gradual decay of this man through his writing is quite moving. Because of the sailor's weakness from lack of food, the final entries of his journal are almost non-existent, yet their brevity serves to move the reader, as one cannot help imagining the severity of this man's condition. The editor of the journal claims he published it as it was found without adding further description of the island or the surrounding coasts. He believes that the sailor's experiences by themselves are enough to entice the reader: "The Miseries and Hardships he lingered under for more than five Months, were so unusually terrible, that the bare Reading his Account of 'em must make the hardest Heart melt with Compassion" (iii). The editor places the emphasis upon "Miseries" and "Hardships." Nowhere in the brief preface does he seem surprised by the lack of passion or self-reflection. For the editor, the outward descriptions are enough to raise emotions within readers. Both the nature of the sailor's entries and the comments of the editor suggest the importance of outward description over
inward reflection. The value of one’s existence is determined by one’s observances of life’s physical details.

In addition to foraging for food and water, this Dutch sailor passes his days on the island by praying and meditating, but beyond his prayer for deliverance or death, readers never learn much more of the content of these meditations. For the sailor, the journal is an avenue by which to leave a record of his physical activities and nothing more, suggesting that this real sailor has the same mindset toward the function of a journal as does the fictional Crusoe. The sailor’s concentration upon the outward, however, does not mean that readers are left to wonder about the state of the man’s mind. After some time on the island, the sailor begins to experience delusions of evil spirits. One night he observes an apparition, who appears in the form of a man and converses with him, causing the sailor to think and repent of the sins from his past life. I focus upon these thoughts because they bear such a strong resemblance to a passage in Crusoe’s journal in which he describes a dream that forces him to focus upon his past sins. This dream, which he relates in his June 27th entry, comprises one of the longer entries from his journal, lasting five paragraphs. Crusoe then supplements these paragraphs with another ten paragraphs written after his rescue in which he further develops the feelings that resulted from his dream. The dream entries from the two journals bear an uncanny resemblance to one another on more than one level.
First, the event itself is similar. Both men write of seeing an apparition who takes the form of a man. For the Dutch sailor, the apparition appears to converse civilly, but he frightens the sailor who writes that the ghost was "such a terrible Shock to me, that I wish'd it would kill me" (10). Likewise, the figure is threatening for Crusoe too, who offers a more detailed description of his encounter: "He was all over as bright as a Flame, so that I could but just bear to look towards him; his Countenance was most inexpressibly dreadful, impossible for Words to describe" (100). Second, and more significant, the apparition causes both men to reflect upon their past sins. The Dutch sailor writes that the figure "touched me so sensibly of the Sins of my past Life (of which I have a sincere and hearty Repentance)" (10). For Crusoe, the moment carries with it more violence:

[H]e spoke to me, or I heard a Voice so terrible, that it is impossible to express the Terror of it all; all that I can say, I understood, was this, Seeing all these Things have not brought thee to Repentance, now thou shalt die: At which Words, I thought he lifted up the Spear that was in his Hand, to kill me. (100)

With such similarity, one might suspect that the Dutch journal influenced Defoe, but Robinson Crusoe was published seven years before the Dutch sailor was marooned on the island. Perhaps the Dutch sailor was familiar with Crusoe
(many translations and pirated editions existed), but it seems more plausible that both journals reflect an attitude of the time that determined what events were worthy of "confessing" in a journal. Mainly both men use their journal to concentrate upon their daily physical activities, never detailing much psychologically, until this point in their journals. These passages of inward reflection exhibit the effect of the published accounts of conversion experiences. John Bunyan describes his at length in *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners* in 1666, and the integral moment for Protestant Christians continues to be described by Quakers and other spiritual writers throughout the eighteenth century. These kind of accounts were described in detail in the previous chapter, so I need not repeat them at length here, but to summarize briefly, the conversion experience in the journal often represents the one moment that features the greatest amount of introspection on the part of the writer, and the event often is characterized by deep struggle and violent imagery. When a person reads the journals of the Dutch sailor and Crusoe, and considers the similarity between the two "reflective" events, one sees how both journals exhibit the influence that the conversion experience had upon a personal history. For these men, the journal is an object of decorum, a place to record facts objectively, until the moment comes when something great warrants detailed introspection. Defoe's use of the conversion experience in
Crusoe's journal suggests the influence of the spiritual journals from the late seventeenth century upon Defoe. This dream of Crusoe's represents his turning point spiritually. Just a few days later, in an entry dated July 4, Crusoe writes of seriously reading the New Testament and understanding God's ability to both hear repentance and grant remission. Such a realization causes him to lift up his hands and cry aloud for forgiveness (96).

Focusing upon Crusoe's spiritual development in his journal and observing its similarity to other spiritual journals of the period is important for several reasons. Crusoe's strong emphasis upon the dream and his repentance diminishes everything else in the journal. This weakening reveals to readers the sincerity and importance of Crusoe's conversion. The sudden introspection that results from the dream seems inconsistent with the rest of the journal that concentrates mainly upon mundane activities, but because Crusoe's journal highlights the conversion experience in a similar manner as the conversion experiences featured in spiritual writings of the period, readers would not have been surprised. After Crusoe's conversion on July 4, the journal continues, though not in the same manner as before. Now, Crusoe no longer appears to reproduce the exact same entries from his journal. Defoe's movement of Crusoe away from his journal at this point is significant because it further emphasizes the importance of the journal as a creative
instrument in this fictional narrative. On a most simplistic level, the journal allows Defoe to create easily a semblance of realism and a connection with the many published sea journals during the century. But on a more complex level, the inclusion of the journal serves as a means by which Defoe the novelist can develop and reveal the seriousness of his character’s spiritual journey. In imitating the journal as realistically as possible, Defoe creates a more believable narrative and, at the same time, develops the personality of his protagonist, which some critics say Defoe fails to do. Readers are required to piece together events and look at the journal in its entirety to see Crusoe’s self emerge. Impatience, pain, fear, struggle, enlightenment, and joy characterize his spiritual journey, which lasts for months. When readers today consider his journal in light of other spiritual journals of the time period, it is clear that Crusoe reflects the same level of sincerity evident in the real spiritual journals and autobiographies. In other words, the absence of deep introspection in Crusoe’s journal is not a sign of a lack of devotion; instead, his journal is consistent with journals that emphasized events and outward behavior over the "deep" thoughts of an individual.9

As the didactic Family Instructor (1715) reveals, Defoe placed much value upon a person’s spirituality. In a time when "novels" were viewed as waste of time, Defoe would wish for his book to offer some spiritual instruction. In The Reluctant
Pilgrim, Hunter argues that *Robinson Crusoe* has its origins in material beyond travel literature and real-life stories of abandoned sailors. Hunter believes such a limited approach to the source material of *Robinson Crusoe* diminishes its artistic merits because it does not consider the moralistic aim that Defoe would have had in mind when writing the story (5). Hunter provides a close analysis of Crusoe's actions and behavior to reveal how he undergoes a Puritan conversion process of disobedience, punishment, repentance and deliverance that eighteenth-century readers would recognize. His method of analysis certainly reveals *Robinson Crusoe* to be more than an adventure story, but while Hunter focuses mainly upon Crusoe's behavior, it is also important to recognize that Crusoe's spiritual dimension is apparent through his writing style. Defoe created a bond with readers through Crusoe's spiritual actions and through Crusoe's method of storytelling.

This narrative technique is evident in *A Journal of the Plague Year* as well. Like Crusoe, H.F. sees God's hand in everything, and the writer's perception serves as an organizing tool. For example, early in the narrative, H.F. describes the charlatans who were taking advantage of people's fears by supposedly interpreting dreams and prophesying (23-33). He also describes all the "doctors" who advertise "cures" for the plague (43-44). Toward the end of the narrative, he notes that "...all the Predictors, Astrologers, Fortune-tellers, and what they call'd cunning-Men, Conjures,
and the like; calculators of Nativities, and dreamers of Dreams, and such People, were gone and vanish'd...” (217). H.F. believes that most of them died as a result of staying in London too long in hopes of gaining more wealth, and he sees their demise as evidence of “a remarkable Hand of Divine Justice” (217), revealing H.F.’s belief that God is in control and will punish those who deserve it. Defoe also organizes events in H.F.’s life so that the power of God is more evident. When the plague first begins killing large numbers, H.F. stays because he believes it is God’s will (12). Shortly thereafter, he becomes sick himself for three days, but his sickness does not develop into the plague (16). Because his illness comes so shortly after his stated claim to trust God, it is almost as if the narrator organizes the events so that the illness appears as test and his getting well his deliverance for trusting God. This kind of cause-and-effect relationship is another pattern that runs throughout the book. At the end of the narrative, he attributes the halt of the plague solely to God (298).

This pattern that H.F. establishes reveals more than just Defoe’s didacticism at work; it also exhibits H.F.’s conception of self. The pattern is the primary method through which H.F. attempts to lessen his own stature in the narrative in favor of the events. Many of the spiritual diaries published during the century reveal a strong contempt for the self. For example, the entries from An Extract from the
Journal of Elizabeth Harper (1769) depict a woman who sees God as having complete control over her life as this sentence from the March 15, 1767 entry reveals: "God was pleased this Week to afflict my Body with Sickness" (37). The publication of a diary is contradictory to the debasement of self, and a prefatory remark could serve both to heighten and to reduce the self. In the preface to his published diary, Quaker doctor John Rutty writes that his diary displays the spiritual history of "one of the fair character among men, and of some eminence for the practice of moral virtues," but a few words later he also notes that toward the end of his life God awakened in him "a sense of weakness and imperfection of faith in Christ Jesus" and "a just contempt of himself" (iii). H.F. himself takes priority within his own narrative only when he reveals to the reader the effect that the plague had upon his spiritual self. When the plague finally abates, H.F. observes people's outpouring of thanks to God, and he uses this opportunity to focus upon himself:

If I should say, that this is a visible Summons to us all to Thankfulness, especially we that were under the Terror of its Increase, perhaps it might be thought by some, after the Sense of the thing was over, an officious canting of religious things, preaching a Sermon instead of writing a History, making myself a Teacher instead of giving my Observations of things; and this restrains me very
much from going on here, as I might otherwise do: But if ten Lepers were healed, and but one return'd to give Thanks, I desire to be as that one, and to be thankful for my self. (300)

Though H.F. draws attention to himself in the above paragraph, note his reservation at doing so. He wants to be viewed as an historian rather than a teacher, and thus he "restrains" himself from focusing upon his individual self, and when he does offer up a personal comment at the end of this paragraph, it is done out of spiritual necessity. Of course, this paragraph also serves as an example of Defoe's own dualistic nature as a writer, for while H.F. asserts that he is not a teacher, the number of times he asserts God's guidance during the plague suggests otherwise. The last paragraph of the narrative reveals the manner in which Defoe wants to have it both ways. At the end, H.F. says that he could not continue his discussion further lest he "be counted censorious and perhaps unjust" of reflecting "upon the Unthankfulness and Return of all manner of Wickedness among us, which I was so much an Eye-Witness of my self" (302). Though the comment suggests that he wants to avoid what he calls this "unpleasant Work," his introduction of it still raises the issue, and thus, he is able to draw attention to the negative without actually discussing it. Whether he focuses upon it for another sentence or another hundred pages, the negative note
has been introduced and cannot be removed, yet by "refusing" to discuss it, H.F. appears above it all.

The spiritual journals provide Defoe with a means by which to develop his hero's character, but the sea journals of the period provide him with a more direct model. Voyage journals were quite popular during the eighteenth century. Readers have long credited Alexander Selkirk, whose story was recounted in at least three voyage journals, as the inspiration for *Robinson Crusoe*, and a connection between these journals and Defoe's work is apparent. For the most part, the journal aspect of these voyage narratives comprises a minor part of the entire work. Instead, the authors mainly re-write their logbook in narrative fashion (as Crusoe seems to have done), and they fill page after page with historical and sociological information about the many countries visited. The journal and narrative sections of these works both reflect the same kind of dispassionate voice that Crusoe exhibits often in his own writing. Possibly because the authors of these real-life narratives were seamen first and writers second, most of these men displayed no interest in editing their accounts in order to provide readers with only the most important details of their trips. While such narratives may have inspired Defoe, *Robinson Crusoe* is not a copy of them. When a person compares *Robinson Crusoe* to its close non-fiction companions, one clearly sees the manner by which Defoe manipulates time, events, and descriptions to entertain his
readers. Even though Defoe passed his works off as fact, I think we see evidence that as an author he realized that he needed to provide his readers with more than the illusion of fact; thus, he integrates Crusoe’s journal into the narrative to add the necessary sense of realism.

One characteristic that marks Crusoe’s journal and real diaries of the period is their attempt at objectivity and honesty. When diarists only describe their activities during the course of the day, they can be more honest with themselves than might be possible were they to attempt to record their personal thoughts and emotions toward those activities. This practice of equating objectivity with honesty is evident in Defoe’s fiction. As a narrator, Crusoe appears more honest when he focuses upon concrete details such as his description of his living quarters. Of course, Robinson Crusoe is more than a catalogue of events; it includes the thoughts and feelings of the narrator, but I think that Defoe integrates a significant amount of objective details into the text to convey the appearance of reality better. In his book on Defoe, Ian Bell argues that prose fiction of the eighteenth century “did not have to be taken as true in every tiny detail, but unless they were presented as acceptably genuine, their power to satisfy would be seriously diminished” (53). However, were Defoe simply to have imitated the published journals of the period, Robinson Crusoe would have suffered the same fate as the real journals. The text would lose its
relevancy as time passed because it would contain no universal truths that characterize works of fiction, keeping them alive for generations. Not only does Robinson Crusoe strongly emphasize the importance of spirituality, it also serves as an exploration of the solitary life and a commentary upon capitalism, for example. What is remarkable about Robinson Crusoe is the manner in which Defoe uses non-fictional prose as a base, but then departs from it to produce a timeless work through the development of character.

The inclusion of Crusoe’s journal within the narrative is an example of Defoe’s careful balance between imitation and creativity. He includes the diary in his first book to add realism, to make the fiction seem valid, but he realizes that he cannot sustain Crusoe’s banal listing of events for his entire stay on the island. Thus, he departs from the diary and allows Crusoe to narrate the events in hindsight. Defoe could have kept with the daily journal format, but then his work would have been as monotonous as Cooke’s A Voyage to the South Sea and Round the World (1712). In choosing not to sustain the diary format, Defoe breaks away from past work and what was currently on the market. The outside narrative of Robinson Crusoe reveals Defoe’s use of more typical fictional characteristics such as minimal digression, sustained development of description, and a fuller exploration of the narrator’s ideas and thoughts. He chose to integrate these elements in the narrative portion of the work, which was
written after Crusoe escapes from the island, rather than including them within the journal entry format. Studying the published journals on the market around the time of Robinson Crusoe provides a good explanation for the lack of fictional techniques in the journal entries. The majority of journals feature entries that are only a few sentences long, and as mentioned before, the entries focus upon the mundane details of life. Defoe chooses not to write a lengthy work of short entries, but also does not violate the journal form to create entries with sustained development and self-reflection either. Thus, he departs from the established journal format in order to integrate his fictional techniques. It is impossible to know why he did not make the creative leap to experiment with the journal format. Perhaps he thought it would be too much of a violation of realism. Perhaps he believed his readers would not accept such an alteration. Regardless of his reasons, it is this facet of his works, this hold on realism regarding personal writing, that makes Defoe distinct from Richardson who infuses the diary and letter format with authorial creativity, resulting in tremendously lengthy entries and letters. Richardson places the interest of the story over the realism of the journals and letters in his work.

Richardson’s protagonists find themselves isolated for large parts of the day. Both Clarissa and Pamela cloister themselves in their rooms. Such solitary states lead to more
introspection, and readers see evidence of this introspection in the journals and letters of the two women. Crusoe, too, is an isolated figure throughout much of his story, which leads to a greater development of the self than is evidenced in any other Defoe work. Outside his journal, Crusoe does more than catalogue his experiences. Compared to Moll Flanders or the narrator of the Journal, for example, Crusoe physically is the most isolated of the narrators. For much of the book, Crusoe remains alone on the island. His solitary state is important in the study of the relationship between the novel and the diary. If the autobiography and the diary--genres that praise the self--were influencing Defoe, a narrator who is physically alone can both emulate the writing style of these non-fictional forms and the physical solitary state of the diarist or memoirist. In certain respects, Robinson Crusoe becomes a celebration of solitude as the following passage reveals:

From this Moment I began to conclude in my Mind, That it was possible for me to be more happy in this forsaken Solitary Condition, than it was probable that I should ever have been in any other Particular State in the World; and with this Thought I was going to give Thanks to God for bringing me to this Place. (131)

Crusoe's acceptance of his isolated circumstance creates a bond between the readers and the novel that is easy to overlook. Like diary writing, novel reading is a solitary
activity, and Defoe takes advantage of the physical situation of reading and writing. Hunter states that one characteristic of the novel throughout its history has been its "tendency both to probe and promote loneliness and solitariness," and he argues that the novel emerged during the eighteenth century because it was able to tap into the feeling of isolation that was becoming a part of the urban consciousness ("Embarrassment" 489). More specifically, in regard to Crusoe, Watt argues that readers of the book forget that isolation can be boring; instead, "they rejoice to find that isolation can be the beginning of a new realization of the potentialities of the individual" ("Robinson Crusoe as a Myth" 297). Moll Flanders, Roxana, H.F., Tom Jones, Tristram Shandy, Clarissa, and Pamela all experience emotional and mental isolation from society, but none are removed physically from society to the extent of Crusoe. The solitary readers of Robinson Crusoe would have been able to identify with Crusoe's state in a way that was not possible with the protagonists of later Defoe narratives like Moll Flanders and Roxana whose main characters are quite active in society. Being alone allows Crusoe more time for reflection than would ever be possible were he surrounded by people to talk to. The solitary nature of his situation increases his happiness and heightens his spirituality, making his solitude integral to his change of heart. His seclusion allows him time for the kind of writing and meditation that was impossible during the more
active stage of his life before the shipwreck. In The Reluctant Pilgrim, Hunter notes just how important diary keeping was for many Puritans of the late seventeenth century because the actual act of writing down events created a permanent record of God's grace that speech (like prayers of thanksgiving) could not (83). For Crusoe the journal drives him to God. In his first entry, he complains of his "dismal Circumstances," but as the journal proceeds readers notice how easily Crusoe manages. After several entries, Crusoe himself seems to have an epiphany when he realizes that his provisions may stem from a greater source. After confessing his lack of religious foundation, he begins to believe in providence when he sees barley grow in a place he thought impossible (90). From this point on, the journal allows him to record more acts of providence, and his faith in God continues to grow.

Beadle's Journal of a Thankful Christian (1656) stresses the importance of writing and reading as a part of the meditation process. Beadle tells his readers, "Look often into this Journall, and read it over: Of all employments in the world, a studious is the most ingenuous; wherein the understanding, judgment, and memory, the most noble faculties of the soul... (102). The advantage then of writing as well as reading is that it forces one into a contemplative state. The manner in which both Beadle and Defoe place emphasis upon contemplation suggests some interesting developments regarding the emerging group of readers in the seventeenth and
eighteenth centuries. With its emphasis upon both reading and writing, Beadle's book is evidence of the growing number of readers during the seventeenth century who were completely literate, in that they could both read and write. Furthermore, *Journal of a Thankful Christian* focuses upon the solitariness of the literate life. Like Beadle, *Robinson Crusoe* praises the solitary, and through Crusoe's reading of the Bible and writing in his journal, Defoe emphasizes the importance of these activities as they relate to a person's well-being.

The first-person narration of the eighteenth-century fictional prose work was one of its more important attributes, as is evidenced by Defoe's protagonists each narrating their own story. The prefaces of the books reveal that one reason Defoe uses this narrative strategy is to make the stories seem factual, but I believe there is more to having the protagonists write their own stories than just realism. Readers cannot overlook the significance of the very act of writing in these narratives. In evaluating Defoe's protagonists then, it is crucial to understand the effect of the first-person perspective. Defoe wanted his characters to write their own stories. One could argue that for Defoe the act of writing is as important as the plot itself. Critics like J. Paul Hunter, Homer O. Brown, and Leo Braudy have written essays devoted specifically to understanding the
importance of the first-person narration in Defoe's fiction, but more analysis of the act of writing is necessary. While Crusoe is the main subject of his own narrative, such is not the case for H.F., the narrator of *A Journal of the Plague Year*. Of Defoe's major works, the *Journal* is the only one that does not begin by concentrating upon the narrator. Instead, the *Journal* opens with the onslaught of the coming plague, which sets the tone for the entire work. It is the plague that is really the main character, not the narrator. While the narrator makes reference to himself in the first sentence of the narrative, he does not really introduce himself until page nine when he begins to wonder whether he should leave London because of the plague. The one feature that truly distances readers from the narrator, however, is his failure to name himself until the last page, and then it is only with the initials "H.F." On the title page, the writer is referred to as a "Citizen," as if Defoe is attempting to make the narrator some sort of Everyman. But H.F. is not an Everyman. Defoe gives him a specific business, a family, and allows him to assert his own opinions upon events. With the *Journal* Defoe balances two kinds of writing: the personal journal and objective history. Of all Defoe's fictional works, the *Journal* seems the least like a character study despite the solitary situation of the narrator. In spite of his involvement in the events of the plague, H.F. does not offer readers the kind of individual personality that
is apparent with Crusoe or Moll. H.F. seems to be making a conscious effort to place the plague primary and his own self secondary. At one point, the narrator reminds us that along with his memoranda, he also wrote private meditations, but these he reserves for his own private use (93-94). The opening of the work records the litany of deaths that marks the beginning of the plague, yet H.F. recalls the numbers in a completely dispassionate manner, distorting his own character from the events. When he does show concern in these early pages, it is usually in the plural first person as in "This alarm'd us all again [. . .]" (5) and "[. . .] we began to hope [. . .]" (6). These opening pages establish a tone that will characterize the entire narrative, for H.F. will recall so many anecdotes and episodes to reveal the plague's destruction that he in turn diminishes his own place within the narrative. Because of the narrator's efforts never to make himself more important than his subject, we must assume that, of the two kinds of writing Defoe is juggling, he is more concerned with history than personal writing. Such a choice by Defoe poses problems for modern readers who are not as likely to accept everything in the narrative as fact as Defoe's contemporary readers might have done. With its numerous stories and statistics, the Journal provides modern readers with a sense of the general atmosphere surrounding the plague, but it remains a pseudohistory because of its fictional elements. Just as with Crusoe, though, current readers' appreciation for the Journal
will increase if they do not compare it to the traditional novel and instead look to personal writing as a measuring rod.

Much of Crusoe’s time on the island is spent reflecting upon his situation: “I spent whole Hours, I may say whole Days, in representing to my self in the most lively Colours, how I must have acted, if I had got nothing out of the Ship” (150). The above quotation once again reveals Crusoe’s thankfulness at his deliverance, but it is also important for what it says about the nature of Crusoe’s personal reflection, which is marked by much repetition. The above remark comes after Crusoe has been on the island for four years, and approximately one hundred pages from the time he first was washed up on shore, and it is not the first time he has said words to this effect. Crusoe begins reflecting about his deliverance when he first walks on the shore: “I walk’d about on the Shore, lifting up my Hands, and my whole Being, as I may say, wrapt up in the Contemplation of my Deliverance...” (52). His deliverance will continue to be a topic of his reflection throughout the book. Several times he considers the good fortune he has received such as his solitary deliverance from the shipwreck, the ship’s grounding so close to shore, and the absence of harmful people and wild animals on the island. In her essay, “Defoe’s Prodigal Sons,” Paula Backscheider notes that repetition is one of the primary techniques of the book and it serves to reveal the extent to which Crusoe reflects upon an event until he recognizes its
"context and meaning" (15). But Crusoe's repetitions go beyond his remarks about gratitude toward God regarding his salvation; he also repeats details of his day-to-day activities. Furthermore, a pattern of repetition exists regarding the structure of the entire narrative as well: a page or so of self-reflection and then many pages of detail regarding some activity that he has set about to do, then back to self-reflection.

Repetition is an essential part of the spiritual diary. Because the writer keeps the diary on a regular basis and records daily events, a certain amount of repetition can be expected in the writing process. Reflecting upon the same subjects repeatedly would not show the lack of imagination upon the diarist's part; instead, as Beadle explains in *Journal of a Thankful Christian*, it would be evidence of God's mercy in the diarist's life. As the diarist re-read his work, the repetition would serve as a source of spiritual affirmation for the diarist. The spiritual journals published during the century all contain a high level of repetition. In Crusoe's case, the repetition of his thankfulness only increases his awareness of God's mercy and grace. That Defoe expected his readers to model their own contemplation on Crusoe's would not be difficult to accept.

One of the main objectives of publishing a person's spiritual diary during the eighteenth century was for readers to model their own lives after the practices of the diarist.
In 1720, when Samuel Bury published diary selections from his wife, Elizabeth Bury, he hoped that if readers were not influenced by the "Precepts of Religion," they "may be somewhat induced by such an Exemplar to the Practice of it" (n.p.). Bury divides his wife's diary by theme rather than by chronology, and this decision heightens the repetitious nature of her diary. The section titled "Her Self-Examinations" reveals the extent to which repetition was a natural part of her diary. In this section she measures herself according to the Bible and her minister's sermons. The entries begin in the same manner by first introducing the practice of examination with phrases such as "Examining my Heart," "Comparing my Heart with God's Word," "I examined my Heart," and "Reflecting on a part of this Year's Diary." The result of her examinations is most always the same; she falls short of where she believes a Christian should be. As she looks at her character, she finds "Defects," "Folly," "Uneveness," "Wanderings" and "Unsteadiness." This section on self-examination is fairly representative of Bury's entries as a whole, and they are characteristic of the kind of style and attitude that would be representative of many spiritual diaries--published or unpublished. One notes a high level of guilt about various aspects of her life, but while she worries about sin and mentions certain kinds (peevishness, vanity, pride, folly, and passion), she never records specific events or actions from her life. In this way, her diary lacks the
kind of precision that marks Crusoe's narrative and journal. Still, the real-life Bury in her journal and the fictional Crusoe in his narrative both devote much space to general self-examination. Many Quaker and Methodist journals make use of repetition to emphasize that a spiritual life is an active life. Most entries from John Wesley's published journal of 1748, for example, serve to stress how active his life was by focusing solely upon his travels and the various places he preaches. The brevity of the entries allows him to focus upon action and little else.

As Chapter One made clear, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century readers and writers used the term journal loosely. Many books that called themselves journals were actually more like autobiographies that follow a journal or diary style in that they make use of a yearly entry format. But even these "manufactured" journals, in which one assumes that the writer had the opportunity to revise for content and style, contain many repetitive elements. *A Short Journal of the Labours and Travels in the Work of the Ministry, of that Faithful Servant of Christ, Deborah Bell* (1762) is the autobiography of a Quaker woman who began her active ministry at age 19, and continued traveling and preaching until her death at 49. Her narrative is marked by little inward probing of psyche. Rather than self-reflection, Bell fills her narrative with the same phrases, expressions, and activities, and such repetition serves to characterize her as a very hardworking and thankful
Christian woman. For example, in just the span of a few pages in which she concentrates upon Quaker meetings, she begins each paragraph in the same manner by focusing upon her movement from one town to the next. Words and phrases like "Meetings we took," "we went," "Proceeding forward," "I parted," and "pay her a Visit" emphasize the non-sedentary life of this woman. She organizes her entire narrative (and, in turn, her life) around her meetings. The manner in which the topic sentences for almost all her paragraphs emphasize her travels to meetings creates a sense of work and urgency surrounding Bell. She never discusses what she thinks of herself as a Quaker or Christian. Instead of introspection, she concentrates upon physical action. As a result, her journal appears more objective and honest, and by organizing her writing around a central theme, she allows readers to begin forming opinions about her character as they would were her autobiography more confessional.

By concentrating more upon the events surrounding the writer rather than upon the writer himself, A Journal of the Plague Year bears a closer relationship to these autobiographies than to real day-by-day journals. At no time in the book does H.F. make his narrative appear to be an actual journal. Rather, it is a record taken from a journal so that the writer had the opportunity to organize his material in a way that would be impossible for a diarist. Despite being written after the plague ended, the Journal
features a disorderly style because H.F.'s narrative does not appear to be heading in a particular direction thematically, and its length is determined only by the duration of the plague. However, through the use of repetition similar to that found in the journal autobiographies, H.F. is able to develop an organizational pattern, though it is not as evident as the kind of thematic patterns that would develop in later fiction. Because of their length, it is natural that fictional prose narratives would acquire the repetitious nature of the diary. The repetition aids readers, especially as novels become longer over the course of the eighteenth century.

Throughout the Journal, H.F. begins with an individual anecdote and uses that story to comment upon the larger effects of an issue that the story exemplifies. Other times he raises a general problem caused by the plague and then moves toward a specific example. A close look at a specific passage in the middle of the narrative demonstrates this technique. H.F. begins this passage by comparing the plague to a great fire. After this short paragraph introducing the speed with which the plague claimed its victims, he provides a general scheme for preventing such large numbers of dead, which would be to evacuate the city of its residents. The third paragraph of this section continues a general form of discussion as he explains that thousands of families did flee this plague, but many fled too late because they were already
infected, and as a result of their infection, they contaminated the healthy towns through which they passed. In the fourth paragraph, he explains that such people probably were unaware of their condition and were not willful murderers. All this discussion leads him to a specific anecdote in the fifth paragraph. He opens the paragraph by writing that he never knew of a particular case to prove the general discussion, but he does know of many cases that prove the opposite. Then he relates the story of a man who, when he realized he had distemper, removed himself from his neighbors and family, and isolated himself in an out building until he died (241-244). In these paragraphs, H.F. moves from general description to a specific example. His ability to incorporate anecdotes like the one above to fit with his broad observations establishes a pattern throughout the book, demonstrating some planning on the writer's part. This kind of purposeful design provides another link to the diary form. While a person was not able to force a pattern upon his life, the diary enables this person to look back upon his life and discern a pattern as Hunter emphasizes in The Reluctant Pilgrim:

The popularity of diary-keeping among Puritans in the seventeenth century derives ultimately from the Puritan world view. Because all the events were actively willed by God, and because a proper understanding of divine interpretation depended
upon correct interpretation of the pattern of events, every individual was obliged to observe carefully all those events which impinged on his life. But because the meaningful pattern of events was not always immediately self-evident, one needed to keep an event-by-event record so that he could later contemplate from a distance the interrelation of these events and comprehend God's total meaning in them. (82-83)

As Hunter's observation makes clear, the seventeenth-century Puritan most likely would see a meaningful pattern emerge only when he returned to his record of events and contemplated them as a whole. Because H.F. writes his narrative some time after the events he describes, he has had the luxury of analyzing the events from a distance, so he is able to force patterns onto his narrative which a diarist writing daily would not be able to do. In addition to H.F.'s ability to apply individual stories to the general features of the plague, he also sees God's organizing hand behind all the events.

Bury, Wesley, and Bell's journals all appeared after the publication of Robinson Crusoe and A Journal of the Plague Year, so obviously I am not arguing that Defoe imitated the style of any one of these specific spiritual works. Rather, referring to these three examples from many published journals, I am suggesting that during the late seventeenth century and throughout most of the eighteenth century, one can
observe a principal style that emerged in personal writing. This style was characterized mainly by the writer's refusal to explore the self fully, choosing instead to concentrate upon outward actions. Another major characteristic of personal writing during the period was the seemingly conscious tendency to write repetitively. While few writers of spiritual journals consciously explore their emotions and personalities through sustained thought development, the specific writer's personality emerges within the opening pages because the journal stresses the same actions over and over. Of course, one could argue that multiple entries on praying do not necessarily imply that the writer is a prayerful person — much of his time could be occupied with activities that he does not record. However, defining a person's character in this manner is no more unreliable than defining a person's character through pages of introspection. Both writers are likely to present a manufactured character. People can be just as dishonest about their thoughts as they are about their activities. However, writers who concentrate mainly upon outward activities are more likely to appear objective and in turn, honest. During the time that Defoe was writing his fictional works, this method of characterization seems most prevalent, and Defoe uses it effectively. Modern readers who argue that Defoe does not sufficiently develop Crusoe's character are ignoring the function that repetition plays in the work. A careful reading of Robinson Crusoe requires
readers to remember the observations and actions that Crusoe continually records. Add these up and the personality of Crusoe on the island begins to emerge.

Of all the Defoe works analyzed in this chapter, Robinson Crusoe contains the most self-reflection by the protagonist. The other narratives all feature protagonists who are involved in society and as such are more concerned with outward action than inward reflection. One sees Defoe juggling the outward with the inward in Robinson Crusoe. When Friday arrives, Crusoe, as a writer, no longer is as concerned with reflecting upon his deliverance. Crusoe is still given over to moments of spiritual reflection after Friday’s arrival, but with another person on the island, Crusoe becomes more concerned with circumstances than meditation. Shortly after saving Friday, Crusoe reflects upon God’s providence for giving all His creatures the same type of kindness and gratitude, but after a few paragraphs of contemplation, Crusoe returns to Friday and physical description with the comment, “But to return to my New Companion” (244). It is as if Crusoe has suddenly come to see his meditations as digressions from the plot of the story. When Defoe writes his last fictional work, Roxana will, at times, force herself to stop any reflection. When she begins to expound upon some moral concept, she will stop and say something like the following, “But I am not to preach, but to relate...” (43). Defoe may be making a distinction between these two narratives. The title page of Roxana classifies it
as a history, and he is consciously keeping any self-reflection at a minimum because it does not belong in a history. Robinson Crusoe, on the other hand, is not classified as a history, so its self-reflection is more appropriate. Still, however, once Friday arrives on the island, Crusoe's self-reflection diminishes. Instead readers notice Crusoe espousing his internal spiritual values to Friday orally. Crusoe's preaching to Friday seems to have taken the place of his spiritual reflection. Because of Crusoe's solitary situation upon the island, his new-found spirituality was limited to prayer and meditation, but now another person on the island means that Crusoe can put into practice the concepts that previously he was only able to think about. Just as God delivered him, so now Crusoe delivers Friday. Remembering the two kinds of spiritual journals published during the eighteenth century clarifies the transition from contemplation to action that Crusoe undergoes. While many journals like Bury's emphasized the value of meditation in a Christian's life, many journals or autobiographies of famous Quakers and Methodists focus upon the daily interaction a person has with others instead of the solitary moments in a Christian's life. In many ways Robinson Crusoe is a combination of these two kinds of journals.

From the time more people arrive on the island until the end of the book, Crusoe's religious self-reflection diminishes considerably. After he leaves the island, for example, the
rest of his narrative becomes a description of how he keeps himself occupied with his financial affairs and travels. Some would argue that he has forgotten all that God did for him on the island, but a reader must keep in mind the relationship between this book and diaries. While the latter part of Robinson Crusoe may be anticlimactic and seemingly contradictory for today's readers, in reality it is Defoe's attempt to tie the book to realistic personal narratives that would be found in diaries. In the last part of the book Defoe modifies the narrative to fit the circumstances. For Defoe, the act of writing takes priority over the plot. Our concern as readers should not be with judging whether the ending of the book is consistent with earlier passages; this would not have been a concern of Defoe's. Rather, we should study the manner in which Crusoe's writing has changed and the reasons for this change. Most obviously, Crusoe is no longer in a solitary situation, and he modifies his writing to reflect his new circumstance. For most of the twenty-eight years on the island, Crusoe had no human contact, so his mind and his writing would be devoted more to his mental and spiritual state. A transition occurs, however, when Friday arrives. Now Crusoe can write about someone else and his communication with this person. While Crusoe no longer offers much self-reflection, he does still write about spiritual matters, but they take the forms of sermons to Friday. His life after he leaves the island is a stark contrast to his previous physical
limitations. On the island, for example, he could do little half the year because of the rain. Such restrictions are no longer an issue after his return to civilization. Crusoe again becomes a man of action and his personal writing reflects this change as he relates the outward rather than the inward. Describing what is taking place in his life since leaving the island is just as important for Crusoe as the kind of deep thinking he did when he was alone on the island. According to both Hunter's research and Beadle's Journal of a Thankful Christian, events take priority in personal records because they display God's involvement in an individual's life. The events that Crusoe describes at the end of the book provide a similar kind of insight into his character as did his personal thoughts earlier in the book. The protagonist's circumstances determine the extent to which the narrator focuses upon the inward in relationship to the outward. Crusoe spent many years in isolation, causing him to explore his internal state for lack of external events. While many people surround the narrator of A Journal of the Plague Year, he too experiences moments of extreme isolation, and as a result his narrative is filled with his thoughts upon what is happening in London. However, when compared with Crusoe's stay on the island, H.F.'s situation is full of much more interaction with others, so he spends more time describing the events that are taking place in London because of the plague.
A focus on external action over internal thoughts is most evident in Defoe's *Moll Flanders*, which features a protagonist who interacts with other people more fully than either Crusoe or H.F. As a result, *Moll Flanders* contains little self-reflection in comparison to *Robinson Crusoe* or *Journal of the Plague Year*. The contrast that *Moll Flanders* provides, however, to Defoe's other two works analyzed here allows for a brief analysis of its protagonist and narrative style, leading to an appropriate conclusion for this chapter. Understanding the main differences between *Moll Flanders* and the other two works further reinforces the notion that Defoe's works are distinct from one another and, therefore, cannot be lumped into an "essentially unvarying whole" (Boardman 5).

While H.F. does not divulge information from his private journal, he, like Crusoe, does share with the reader his thoughts and fears in some detail. A common complaint against Moll as narrator, however, is with her refusal to give readers a full picture of her personality. Moll is a much different narrator than either Crusoe or H.F., and this difference is due mainly to her circumstances. When compared with *Robinson Crusoe* and *A Journal of the Plague Year*, *Moll Flanders* is a work that focuses upon a much more active narrator. As a character, Moll is constantly moving; seldom is she in circumstances that are equivalent to Crusoe's solitude on the island or H.F.'s seclusion in his house. The increased activity means more focus upon outward observation over inner
feelings. A fine example of Moll's failure to reveal her feelings is apparent when she and her lover from Bath first have intercourse after nearly two years of simply lying in bed together. Moll describes the circumstances and the actions that lead to their consummation by recording their feelings of merriment, their drinking more wine than usual, and their engagement in "some other follies" which she cannot name (121). All of these events lead to a moment when she offers herself to him for one night and no more. He accepts her offer immediately, and Moll is left with these thoughts:

   Thus the Government of our Virtue was broken, and I exchang'd the Place of a Friend for that unmusical harsh-sounding Title of Whore. In the Morning we were both at our Penitentials; I cried very heartily, he express'd himself very sorry; but that was all either of us could do at that time; and the way being thus clear'd, and the bars of Virtue and Conscience thus removed, we had less difficulty afterwards to struggle with. (121)\textsuperscript{15}

Note how Moll has no problem describing her actions at this event ("I cried very heartily") and how she now views herself ("I exchang'd the Place of a Friend for that unmusical harsh-sounding Title of Whore"), but she seems incapable or unwilling to divulge any further information about her state of mind or emotions regarding what has transpired. It would seem that this important change in her two-year relationship
with him would necessitate more than a few sentences. But while Moll's restraint is not in keeping with most modern novel characteristics, it is in keeping with diary writing of the time. In *Centuries of Female Days: Englishwomen's Private Diaries*, Harriet Blodgett says few women used the diaries to enhance their sense of themselves; instead most of the diaries focus upon events and other people (4). Another diary study, Robert Fothergill's *Private Chronicles: A Study of English Diaries*, makes the same claim: "An activity of the 'public' diary in the eighteenth century was scrutinizing, not oneself, but other people" (24).

An understanding of the diary genre answers other so-called inconsistencies and problems that modern readers may have with *Moll Flanders*. Inconsistency exists regarding what Moll perceives as important in her story. On the one hand, she gives very little detail concerning what she is thinking, but, on the other hand, she devotes much space to seemingly meaningless details for a novel like her strict budget accounts. Diaries of the period were more apt to concentrate upon such day-to-day details, and Moll's concern is in keeping with this characteristic. After Jemy leaves her, for example, two pages are spent listing the bill of fare for such things as her lodging and nurse (175-176). And when her Bath lover can see her no more, she reviews her accounts in this manner:

...before I got the last 50 l. I found my strength to amount, put all together, to about 400 l. so
that with that I had above 450 l. I had sav’d above 100 l. more, but I met with a Disaster with that, which was this; that a Goldsmith in whose Hands I had trusted it, broke, so I lost 70 l. of my Money, the Man’s Composition not making above 30 l. out of his 100 l. I had a little Plate, but not much, and was well enough stock’d with Cloaths and Linnen. (133)

One might expect this kind of detail from Crusoe or H.F., but a reader could not be blamed for doubting that a person of Moll’s lowly status would keep such strict accounts in the first place. A look at a published criminal diary of the period, however, reveals that thieves kept detailed records of their finances as well. In 1685, a book titled Memoirs, Digested into Adventures, Receits, and Expenses was published while its author, Captain Thomas Dangerfield, was imprisoned in Newgate. The journal of this highwayman covers the periods between December 1684 and March 1685. Each entry is divided into three sections: Adventures, Receits, and Expenses. Here is a sample entry from Tuesday, January 27. Note the detail and how closely it resembles the same kind of style that Moll practices:

Adventures: I called at the Crown at Bridgnorth, and from there made Scurvy Circles on the way to Kiddermaster, where being Puzled for good Quarters I was forced to Lodge at the Bull.

Receits: Of a Parson 10s 0
Of a Gentlewoman 12s 0
Dangerfield fills page after page of his diary with such detailed financial reports. Because his diary was published in the seventeenth century, it is conceivable that Defoe may have read it, but whether direct influence exists or not is unimportant in this case. Many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century diaries like Dangerfield’s exist that do nothing more than record mundane details like daily transactions. These diaries span all classes of people. For readers today, Dangerfield’s journal suggests that by focusing upon Moll’s finances, Defoe is not taking liberty with a character’s believability to construct a larger point about her financial situation. Instead it is an example of Defoe’s strong emphasis upon realism.

Viewing Defoe’s fiction in relation to published personal writing is useful for providing a context for his works, but critics do him an injustice if they simply see him imitating these other works. What features in Robinson Crusoe, Journal of the Plague Year, and Moll Flanders would be lacking in diaries? Most obviously, the narrators exhibit an awareness of readers throughout their stories that most diary writers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses: Lost my Pistolls</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of a Freeholder</td>
<td>10s  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of a Farmer</td>
<td>10s  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42s  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent at the Crown at Bridgnorth</td>
<td>2s  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent at the Bull at Kiddermaster</td>
<td>12s  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where I lay all night)</td>
<td>14s  6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would not. In *Moll Flanders*, for example, such awareness is evident in more than one way. Often times it is indirect as when she makes a point of withholding information that she deems inappropriate. Other times she directly addresses readers: "...but I leave the Readers of these things to their own just Reflections" (132). Readers are also aware that she tells her life story in hindsight, a luxury impossible for the diarist. Thus, despite the episodic nature of the book, *Moll Flanders* is a work bearing many novelistic qualities that would be completely foreign to a diary. For example, Defoe makes use of foreshadowing early in the novel when Moll as a young girl spies a woman whom she says she wants to be like: "Poor Child, says my good old Nurse, you may soon be such a Gentlewoman as that, for she is a Person of ill Fame, and has had two or three Bastards" (8). Patterns also exist in the novel. Watt observes the neat division into two parts: first, her career as a wife, and second, her career as a criminal (104). Within each of the two main parts exist smaller patterns. One can even see a metaphorical pattern of confinement, expulsion and rebirth that is repeated throughout the novel. Crusoe, because he has the benefit of hindsight, is able to manipulate time by leaping ahead and then leaping back. When he first spots the unfamiliar footprint in the sand, he says his thoughts on the footprint "...took me up many Hours, Days; nay, I may say, Weeks and Months..." (181-182), but on the next page, after describing his fears and
thoughts for a couple of paragraphs, he says he left his "castle" after three days (183). What is interesting here (and Defoe employs this technique with all his narrators) is that we see the narrator, with the benefit of hindsight, manipulate the time scheme so that it suits his purposes. Just after seeing the footprint, Crusoe first details his mindset and in doing so he moves out of the actual narrative time frame which enables him to show the extent to which the footprint plagued his thoughts. After he has effectively revealed to readers the great impact this new discovery had upon him, he moves back to the narrative time frame and picks up the story again.

All Defoe narrators attempt to show their consideration for readers. At times Moll refuses to go into detail regarding something sexual lest it offend readers. Roxana on more than one occasion apologizes to readers when she comes close to preaching rather than simply telling her history (49). H.F., like Moll, also does not want to offend his readers. For example, he refuses to say anything about the cruel behavior of the nurses who attended the sick (77). Unlike Roxana, however, H.F. finds it necessary to give his readers moral lessons and does not try to hide them as Roxana does. H.F. believes history displays some good "Patterns" for people to follow, so he makes no apologies for telling stories that may prove profitable for readers, though he makes it
clear that readers should not hold him accountable for particulars or any mistakes he makes (70-71).

This juxtaposition of novel and diary characteristics does have consequences for the reader. Throughout this chapter, I have emphasized how certain parallels between Defoe’s works and published journals might help ease readers into the fictional work by establishing recognition with the older journal form, but the combination of novel and diary may also create a feeling of disorientation. Imagine eighteenth-century readers who have some familiarity with personal journals, either through the literary market or through their own private journals, approaching *Moll Flanders*. Because the book bears a resemblance to the diary in its episodic presentation of events and concern with everyday details, Defoe creates a degree of familiarity for these readers. However, the book is not a day-by-day account but a history written after a long life. It seems unlikely, for example, that a woman, writing at almost seventy years of age, would remember the day after her marriage to her fifth husband with so much clarity that she could recall that they slept until noon (198). The Quaker journals that were written toward the end of the writer’s life, span many years and focus upon many different events, but they lack such specific details. Defoe’s departure from this particular journal characteristic, for example, is one signal that he was moving readers into a new area in which readers must accept some degree of artifice
to appreciate the realism of the story. Despite its preface, which stresses the factuality of the book, *Moll Flanders* was not another spiritual autobiography or published diary. Studying the relationship between the diary and Defoe's works does not completely resolve the "problems" of these texts, but it does provide for an appreciation of those "problems."

Furthermore, observing the diary/novel relationship allows one to reject the notion that Defoe's works are in any way crude forerunners of later novels. Rather, we see unique prose fictions that were beginning to shape early readers' understandings and expectations of the novel genre. The relationship between the novel and diary would continue to undergo changes throughout the century, and these changes would continue to influence eighteenth-century readers both in how they approached the novel and in how they viewed the self.

Faulting *Robinson Crusoe*, *Journal of the Plague Year*, or *Moll Flanders* for not possessing the traits of later novels is the equivalent of faulting a silent movie for not looking or sounding like a film from the latter half of this century. The silent movies of the early twentieth century originated from a completely different era than our movies today, so we do not fault their use of black and white film, their actors' exaggerated facial expressions, or their lack of computerized special effects. Instead we consider the filmmaker's tools and the audience's expectations, and judge those films on their own merits. Approaching the early eighteenth-century
novel with knowledge of the other prose works that surrounded it, removes Defoe from the confines of a strict novel categorization that can only limit him as a writer. Despite the inroads that Defoe made when it comes to narrative form, he still relied heavily upon realism over all else.

Using diaries and other forms of personal writing, this chapter has clarified the manner in which Defoe’s protagonists withhold insight into themselves in a similar way to actual diarists of the time period. While Defoe chooses not to move beyond this realistic depiction of self, Samuel Richardson will. Like Defoe, he is obligated to various forms of personal writing, but unlike Defoe he is not as conscious of maintaining the realism of those forms. The next chapter, studies the extent to which Richardson manipulates those forms and the effect such a manipulation has upon the narratives and the readers of those narratives.
Endnotes

1 In addition to works that seek to establish Defoe’s connection to autobiographies and biographies, studies like John J. Richetti’s Popular Fiction Before Richardson: Narrative Pattern 1700–1739 (1969) and Ian Bell’s Defoe’s Fiction (1985) concentrate upon the importance of “popular” literature in shaping the early English novel.

2 These include: Robinson Crusoe (1719), The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe (1719), Memoirs of a Cavalier (1720), Captain Singleton (1720), Moll Flanders (1722), Journal of the Plague Year (1722), Colonel Jack (1722), and Roxana (1724)

3 As the previous chapter makes clear, however, establishing the diary form of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is almost as difficult as defining the early novel.


5 In Before Novels, Hunter writes that “[t]he typical diary recorded almost everything in a diarist’s day” (307). Unlike Kroll, however, Hunter does see some introspection evident in these diaries when diarists “take stock” and look at previous entries, “noting their impressions of direction
and possible meaning;" however, he does admit, "their idea of self-examination is [. . .] vastly different from ours" (308).

6 Preston integrates Roland Barthes' theory of 'le degré zero' from *Writing Degree Zero* (1967) in his discussion of Defoe's style.

7 Understanding where the entries from the journal end and where the paragraphs written for the book begin is sometimes hard to do. Usually, only a phrase at the beginning of a new paragraph suggests that the material to follow was not written at the same time as the journal entries. Often these phrases suggest that Crusoe is looking back upon his journal and reflecting upon it, or perhaps the words refer to the story outside the journal, revealing that Crusoe is now writing with the entire narrative in mind, not just the immediate journal. For example, after five paragraphs of the June 27th entry, Crusoe makes reference to "[. . .] what is already past of my Story" (101), referring to the narrative readers now hold in their hands, not just the journal, and signaling to the readers that what is to follow was not part of the original journal.

8 Lyons in *The Invention of the Self* sees the middle of the century as a time of change in the conception of the individual self. For him, Johnson and Boswell serve as two of the best examples of this change that takes place between two generations: "An enormous difference exists between Dr.
Johnson's *Lives of the Poets* and Boswell's *Life of Samuel Johnson*. It takes little imagination to guess what Johnson’s reaction to Boswell’s version of his life would have been had he lived to see it. He would have been confused, ashamed, aghast, astonished. Not at the details—although he would surely have emendations and corrections for every page—but at the motive behind such an undertaking” (6).

9 In *Before Novels*, Hunter cites Crusoe’s activity as one of the didactic elements of the work, showing readers that “to act is better than to be idle” (281).

10 Hunter argues that the religious subject matter and didacticism so infused seventeenth- and eighteenth-century public and private discourse as to “constitute a definition of taste, desire, and habit.” Modern readers, Hunter argues, are not comfortable with such content and wish or pretend that the texts were different (*Before Novels* 225).


12 The story of Alexander Selkirk’s survival on an isolated island is recounted in William Dampier’s *A New Voyage Round the World* (1703), Edward Cooke’s *A Voyage to the South Sea and Round the World* (1712), and Woodes Rogers’ *A Cruising Voyage Round the World* (1712). Hunter’s *Reluctant Pilgrim*, however, disputes the notion of Selkirk as a source for
Crusoe. He argues that Selkirk is only one of many castaways who would have been known during the eighteenth century, and, for those who insist that Defoe capitalized on current news events, Hunter responds that too much time (seven years) exists between Selkirk's adventure and the publication of Crusoe (3-4).


Chapter Three
Factual Deviation: Richardson and the Development of the Individual Conscience

One of Samuel Johnson’s famous statements recorded in Boswell’s Life of Johnson (1791) establishes a key characteristic of Richardson’s fiction. When Thomas Erskine remarks that he finds Richardson tedious, Johnson replies, “Why, Sir, if you were to read Richardson for the story, your impatience would be so much fretted that you would hang yourself. But you must read him for the sentiment, and consider the story as only giving occasion to the sentiment” (480). Johnson’s remark in the biography contrasted Richardson to Fielding, but Johnson’s words could also be used to describe how distant Richardson’s novels are from Defoe’s plot-driven fiction. Clarissa (1748-49), published less than three decades after the last of Defoe’s fictional works, suggests a completely different attitude toward storytelling. Richardson’s Clarissa is the bridge between the plot-oriented fiction of Defoe and the character-oriented fiction of Jane Austen and Fanny Burney that evolves toward the end of the century. For Stephen D. Cox, Clarissa stands as one of the century’s “fullest investigations of the self’s attempt to define its identity and significance” (59). Watt believes that Richardson was the first major writer to emphasize both domestic life and private experience so that readers get inside the characters’ “minds as well as in their
houses" (176). Mark Kinkead-Weekes offers probably the highest praise for Clarissa's focus on the self by arguing that "[i]n no other eighteenth-century novel does one so register the painful effort of self-knowledge" (161). Furthermore, Kinkead-Weekes sees a connection between Puritan diaries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and Richardson's novels, referring specifically to the "habits of the mind" that Richardson uses imaginatively. Kinkead-Weekes goes onto to cite the similarity between the "self-scrutiny" of the diaries and Clarissa's own self-examinations, but Clarissa's self-examinations are not private as are the diarists' (161). However, he provides no specific examples of the diaries he has in mind, and I would argue that no Puritan diary contains the level of introspection apparent in Clarissa's letters.

With Clarissa, Richardson creates a complex narrative that reveals his ability to retain elements of prose fiction already in existence at the time of Clarissa's publication and his willingness to risk bringing readers into a new field of character development. This development would be present throughout the latter half of the eighteenth century and well into the nineteenth century both in fictional works and (as the Boswell chapter will reveal) non-fictional works. The manner in which Richardson makes the shift from reliance upon realism to emphasis upon character--thus heightening the artificiality of the work--reveals the growing maturity of the prose writer and the prose reader during the eighteenth
century. Clarissa displays this newly emerging variety of prose fiction development in Richardson’s presentation of his characters’ selves. Through the letters of the four main characters—Clarissa Harlowe, Robert Lovelace, Anna Howe, and John Belford—readers experience an exploration of self that is unlike even the most detailed introspection in the works of Defoe.

Richardson’s two works previous to Clarissa, however, bear a closer relationship stylistically to Defoe’s works, and they exemplify the manner in which Richardson experimented with the emerging novel form before composing a work that dismisses the strict realism of Defoe in favor of more complex narrative strategies and character development. Familiar Letters on Important Occasions was published in 1741. Although Pamela appeared the previous year, much of Familiar Letters was written before Pamela. In fact, the story of Pamela is an outgrowth of some of the pieces in Familiar Letters. When Richardson recognized a story emerging, he set aside the Familiar Letters manuscript and began work on Pamela, and published Part 1 in 1740 (Downs xxii). While some of the 173 letters that make up Familiar Letters could be connected to form a brief plot, for the most part there is little relation between the letters. Usually Richardson chooses to write the letters from the perspective of a parent or older relative who is offering advice to a son, daughter, nephew or niece. A certain level of conflict characterizes
most of the letters; usually the sender disapproves of the receiver's behavior. The subjects of the letters are wide ranging, covering everything from obedience and respect for a husband to the proper way for a young woman to ride a horse. Though *Familiar Letters* is a work of fiction, its lack of narrative makes it something other than a novel. The roots of Richardson's epistolary novels are evident in *Familiar Letters*, however, and a consideration of this volume of letters with his later fictional works reveals the extent to which he manipulated the epistolary form to heighten character at the expense of plot in *Clarissa*.

Several features of *Familiar Letters* reveal Richardson's interest in presenting the most realistic depiction of the letter form to guide the reader of the volume. In the preface, Richardson states that the letters "[... ] may not only direct the forms requisite to be observed on the most important occasions; but, what is more to the purpose, by the rules and instructions contained in them, contribute to mend the heart, and improve the understanding" (xxvii). Richardson may believe instruction of the heart and mind to be an important objective, but he is careful to follow the first aim of providing readers with models. The letters in this volume look very much like real letters in terms of their length and content; most are only a page or two in length. Because Richardson writes these letters with a moral purpose in mind, most focus primarily upon offering general advice that could
be applicable to a wide variety of readers. Though the letters might discuss specific people and events, the circumstances in the letters are so commonplace that most readers of the day could relate to the content either through personal experience or through knowledge of someone else facing a similar situation. These lines, from a letter to a younger brother, reveal Richardson's use of general character descriptions so that Miss Rocko, the subject of the letter, comes to represent a woman whose good company does not necessarily ensure that she will be a good wife: "[. . .] her features are regular, her wit sprightly, her deportment genteel; and voice,—I had almost said, ravishing...Yet, I greatly fear, with all these endowments, she will not make the wife you wish for" (17). The older brother's description of this woman's appearance and behavior could refer to a particular person, but because the brother does not provide specific instances or examples that convey Miss Rocko's wit or "genteel deportment," the description becomes more universal for readers.

Some of the letters do comprise a series. For example, there may be a grouping of letters written by various family members to the same wayward young man. However, these are not sustained beyond more than three or four letters, and rarely will the same writers appear more than once during the series. As a result, there is little opportunity or need for Richardson to develop any deep insight into the selves of the
writers. When writers do look inwardly their thoughts often are general in nature; unlike Clarissa's perceptions, they are not in reaction to any specific event. Here, for example, is how a wife relates her fears to her sailor husband:

Often and often do I reflect on the unhappiness of us poor women, who are married to seafaring men. Every wind that blows, every pyrate we hear of, and now, in time of war, every hour of our lives, the dread of enemies alarms us. God's providence is our reliance, and so it ought; for nothing else can sustain us thro' our different apprehensions every day we live. (151)

Though this woman expresses her inner thoughts in these sentences, they are the fears any wife of a sailor might have; they lack individuality. In fact, her second sentence regarding God's providence could apply to any person who is experiencing worry. This lack of individuality is in keeping with the characteristically general nature of all the letters.

These letters exist to express a broad range of ideas, advice and events, correlating to the experiences in most of his contemporary readers' lives. Richardson's intent in publishing this volume of letters is not to involve readers in the lives of the letter writers. The letters educate; they do not tell a story or entertain. As a book of instruction Richardson's **Familiar Letters** seems closely related in purpose to Defoe's **The Family Instructor** (1715), published twenty-six
years earlier. The central difference between Defoe and Richardson, however, is the width of the gap that exists between the authors' instructional writings and their fictional writings. *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) and *Moll Flanders* (1720) bear a much closer relationship stylistically to *The Family Instructor* than *Clarissa* does to *Familiar Letters on Important Occasions*. *The Family Instructor* is a collection of conversations that take place between various family members. Readers take away something of moral significance at the end of each dialogue. The dialogues never go beyond the spoken lines of each character, and as a result readers are never given much insight into the thoughts of the family members. Defoe focuses upon moral rather than psychological issues. This same goal would continue with the works that we now consider to be his novels. Richardson, however, separates the genres much more than Defoe. Richardson's purpose in *Familiar Letters* is to provide readers with models, so he avoids developing the characters of the writers, and he displays little interest in developing sustained stories. On the other hand, *Pamela* and especially *Clarissa* feature fully developed characters and complex narratives. In her study of Richardson's works, Carol Houlihan Flynn accurately describes the *Familiar Letters* as representing a "far simpler world" than what is found in *Pamela* or *Clarissa* (237).

While Flynn's claim applies to the majority of *Familiar Letters*, a series of letters toward the end of the book bears
what I believe to be a clear relationship to Richardson's later novels. Critics see a direct correlation between three letters about a master making advances toward his servant girl and Pamela (Downs xxii and Doody, Introduction 7), but the style of eleven letters to an aunt from her niece on holiday is similar to the self-reflective technique that Richardson would later perfect in Clarissa. Richardson includes these letters to serve as writing models for people traveling, but he also notes that the descriptions in the letters will interest readers who have not visited the specific sites. The first four letters describe typical London attractions such as the Tower, St. Paul's Cathedral, and Kensington Palace. The descriptions of these sites focus mainly upon what the writer sees, not upon what the writer thinks. Furthermore, these first few letters lack emotion. The writer's mundane description of the Tower is typical of her writing in these opening letters:

'Tis situated by the Thames side, surrounded with an old wall, about a mile in compass, with a broad deep ditch, which has generally more mud than water. All round the outward wall are guns planted, which on extraordinary occasions are fired; as, on more common ones, they fire only rows of others, which are fixed in the ground, on the wharf by the Thames. (193)
The writer expresses little satisfaction in seeing these famous sites and displays even less interest in writing about them. She writes to her aunt out of a sense of obligation, concluding the first three letters with the reminder that the letters signify obedience: "This, madam, may serve for a second letter, and another instance, tho' a poor one, of that obedience which will always bind me to be Your dutiful Niece" (197).

With letter five, however, the tone and content change. Between letters four and five, the niece receives a reply from her aunt. Letter number five opens with a summary of the aunt's letter: "You tell me, in your last, that my descriptions and observations are very superficial [...]." (200). The niece comes to the conclusion that "I must deliver my opinion, it seems, on what I see, as well as tell you what I have been shewn" (200). This letter and the ones that follow contain much more self-reflection than the previous four letters. She describes Bethlehem Hospital as a "more affecting scene" than she had ever experienced (201). The hospital shows her that any proud person will be convinced of his folly when faced with people "destitute of every mark of reason and wisdom" (201). This letter does not describe the building at all but concentrates solely upon the people and how they affect her. Prior to the fifth letter in the series, the young woman centers her writing on places and events, but from the fifth letter on, she focuses on her opinions,
feelings, and thoughts about the places and events. She has
gone from describing to interpreting. The first four letters
are closer to the narrative style of a *Moll Flanders*, for
example, but the final letters foreshadow the introspective
writing of *Clarissa*, writing that centers on the self.

Readers of *Familiar Letters* should not overlook
Richardson's use of a variety of writers to offer advice for
the general improvement of his audience. Beyond the title
page, preface, and the short one-sentence introductions to
each letter, no central author intrudes into *Familiar Letters*.
Little authorial point of view exists in his three major
fictional works either. With the absence of an outside
narrator or controlling author, the characters within the text
use their own writing to create and display themselves for
readers both within the text and outside the text. Such an
authorial technique that begins with *Familiar Letters*
heightens the importance of words in a person's life,
signaling perhaps the growing importance of literacy during
the eighteenth century.

The selections in *Familiar Letters* served two purposes:
to offer advice for life in general and to serve as good
models of writing. Flynn cites Richardson's reliance upon the
epistolary mode as evidence of his "unwavering faith in the
world of letters," and such a narrative method allows his
characters to invent themselves through words: "In telling
their stories, his characters try on new personalities,
analyze past actions, adapt themselves to literary models, stripping away what offends while piecing together what fits” (235). Little introspection exists within *Familiar Letters* because Richardson concentrates more upon the issues raised and advice offered by the letter writers than with the letter writers themselves. However, with *Pamela*, Richardson does seek to develop the life and character of the central letter writer, and the result is the emergence of the kind of sustained introspection that is perfected in *Clarissa*. Though the self is explored in *Pamela*, mainly through the writings of its central character, the work does not offer the consistency or the full development of the inward self that readers find in *Clarissa*. A brief consideration of *Pamela*, though, does help clarify Richardson’s accomplishments in his second work of fiction.

In her introduction to the Penguin edition of *Pamela*, Margaret Doody, like Flynn, stresses the importance of the nonexistent narrator or authorial voice. For Doody, the action in the novel is internal because everything in the novel comes through the narrator’s consciousness (16). Defoe’s fictional works are filtered through first-person narrators as well, suggesting that the action in *Moll Flanders*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and *Journal of the Plague Year* is also internal. However, those works are written from the perspectives of narrators who look back upon the action years after it occurred. *Pamela* writes as the action takes place.
Because she uses her letters to make sense of events, the novel naturally is more introspective than a work written long after the action ended.⁶

In *Imagining a Self*, Patricia Meyer Spacks argues that Pamela’s story “achieves its ‘sincerity’... by its consistent interpretation of fact through feeling” (197). Pamela, however, does not consistently use her writing to consider the significance of the events as Clarissa does. At times, Pamela as narrator sounds very much like Robinson Crusoe, Moll Flanders, or even the niece from *Familiar Letters* because she is especially concerned with reporting events rather than what she thinks about those events. Flynn notes that “[e]ven in the first letter, Pamela reports everything, refusing to subordinate her various subjects” (241). In many places, *Pamela* is just as plot-driven as a work by Defoe. For example, the seventh letter of the novel is interesting stylistically for the manner in which it looks back to Defoe rather than toward Richardson’s next novel. The opening of this letter describes the gifts she has received from Mr. B with the kind of detail Moll Flanders would have used:

[. . .] he gave me two suits of fine Flanders laced head-clothes, three pair of fine silk shoes, two hardly worse, and just fit for me (for my lady had a very little foot), and the other with wrought silver buckles in them; and several ribands and top knots of all colours; four pair of fine white
cotton stockings, and three pair of fine silk ones; and two pair of rich stays. (1: 12)

She concludes this letter to her father by reflecting upon the significance of these gifts from Mr. B. She believes the gifts probably signify nothing, and her worry is the result of her father's numerous warnings. After a few sentences of consideration on this issue she concludes with, "[...] all that happens is for our good [...]" (1: 13). In the previous paragraph she writes how she was "so confounded" by the behavior of Mr. B, she felt she could have been knocked down by a feather, and she nearly cried and went away from him blushing. Despite the great impact that these actions suggest, she dismisses her confusion as the result of her father's putting ideas into her head. At least in writing, she will not deeply ponder the importance of Mr. B's actions. Her refusal to consider fully the consequences of the events is another way in which she is similar to Moll Flanders who often devotes only a few sentences to the significance of any event.

Pamela becomes less reserved in her thoughts as the novel progresses, however. In terms of judging this change from within the world of the text, one could argue that Pamela's increasingly introspective voice results from writing about the events as they are happening. As the events build in her story and she begins to fully understand their consequences to herself, she adjusts her insight accordingly. Early on in the story, she cannot react to Mr. B's gifts fully because she is
not aware that the behavior she records in Letter VII will result in one of the first of a series of compromising positions she finds herself in because of Mr. B. Were she writing about the event years later, perhaps she would place the event in the appropriate framework for readers. For Doody, such adjustments that Pamela makes throughout the text are signs of Richardson's desire to make it seem "that the work grows into its own natural shape without artificial control" (Introduction 16). Doody's comment seems appropriate to many of the shifts in Pamela's character and mindset. For example, when Pamela, in the middle of the novel, reads two nasty letters from Mr. B--one to Mrs. Jewkes and one to her--her reactions cover a wide range of emotions over the course of several pages. At first, the harsh words of Mr. B seem to overpower her, and she actually considers whether she "was not indeed a very naughty Body, and had not done vile Things" (1: 221). A page later, however, she refutes his statement in a most assertive manner by questioning specific words and sentences in the letters. In the next paragraph, however, she returns to a passive state: "Alas! for me, what a Fate is mine, to be thus thought artful and forward, and ungrateful! when all I intended was to preserve my Innocence" (1: 223). Such a range of emotions would seem to mirror the kind of emotions any person might undergo after reading something surprising and shocking; Pamela appears inconsistent here only because she writes all the emotions down as if she were
experiencing them at the moment, rather than simply writing down what her final attitude was after some reflection. For Pamela, however, writing is her manner of reflection. Flynn argues that with Pamela, Richardson makes use of the “working mind” so that “the mind is always in the process of creating its own sense of reality” (240). However, Flynn's argument of the "working mind" and Doody's logic regarding the "natural state" carry limitations when applied to Pamela. In Clarissa, the style of the letters and Clarissa's persona will change throughout the novel, but I believe her change is more believable than Pamela's is. I will discuss Clarissa's changes in greater detail later in this chapter, but now, it is important to realize that her inconsistency results from undergoing a number of terrible events and circumstances, including the Harlowe family's complete rejection of her. Because we are presented with a number of different letter writers, we also see how other characters "read" and interpret Clarissa. Overall, the plot and narrative style of Clarissa are far more complex and developed than those of Pamela, resulting in a changing protagonist that confounds readers' expectations, yet at the same time, seems plausible. While Pamela endures many snares and entrapments as well, her experiences in the book are not comparable to Clarissa's. Furthermore, other characters in the narrative do not interpret Pamela to the same extent as characters in Richardson's second novel will interpret Clarissa. Whereas
readers can accept the changing Clarissa, the indecision, reversals, and alterations of Pamela are harder to imagine and seem to be more artificially manufactured for the purpose of plot variations. Her change of heart regarding Mr. B, the point at which she "freezes into matronage" (Flynn 230), is a good example of something readers may have a hard time swallowing.

Some of the inconsistency in Pamela's thoughts and voice is due to Richardson's inexperience with the narrative form in his first novel. He seems to have trouble making the transition between the realistic plot-centered fiction from the first half of the century and the character-driven fiction that he masters with Clarissa. Flynn, in addition to observing that Pamela reports every event she sees and experiences, also argues that Pamela fails to differentiate between important and unimportant ideas that cross her mind, simply reporting all thoughts to her readers: "'Tortured with twenty different doubts in a minute,' Pamela tortures her reader as well, offering far too many reflections for one straining paragraph" (242). This results in most of her reflections taking on equal significance (243).

There are moments when Pamela's reflections are quite serious and involved, but modern readers need to be aware that some of the more introspective passages may not have been published in the first edition of the novel. The passage in which Pamela runs through the gamut of emotions when she
considers the nasty letters of Mr. B seems to exemplify so well the "natural state" that results from readers seeing everything from Pamela's consciousness. These pages reveal the kind of complex introspection that exists throughout Clarissa. In a long paragraph that she places after her transcript of Mr. B's letter, Pamela quotes and then reacts to specific lines from the letter in the following manner:

_Brought up with him!_ How can he say so! Was he not abroad for some time? And when, of late, at home, how has he eyed me with scorn sometimes! How has the _mean_ girl been ready to tremble under his disdainful eye! How have I fought for excuses to get from my lady, when he came to visit her in her apartment, though bid to stay, perhaps! _Brought up with him!_ I say--_Brought up with him!_ He may as well say, The poor frightened pigeon brought up with the hawk! (204)⁹

Pamela continues in this manner for several more sentences, trying--by writing--to sort through her feelings regarding Mr. B's letter. The paragraph provides deep insight into Pamela's thoughts; it reveals her frustration with a number of dashes, repetitions, and exclamation points, and it clearly conveys her anger toward Mr. B. These qualities suggest that this paragraph is a precursor to similar, more developed passages in Clarissa. However, this paragraph comes from the 1801 text of Pamela that incorporated revisions Richardson made to the
novel during the 1750s, after the publication of *Clarissa*. A large portion of Pamela's rumination on Mr. B's letters is part of the second longest insertion of 1801. If people today read Pamela in other editions besides the trade Penguin paperback, this assertive reaction to his letters no longer exists. As a result, readers are left with considerably less introspection. The introspection that does exist is much more simplistic and passive. Pamela's reflection is also dwarfed by her narration of the meeting with Mrs. Jewkes that takes place afterward. In other words, plot overtakes thought because Pamela is more concerned in reporting the actions of others than she is in relating the consequences of these actions to herself. The 1801 version of this passage is much stronger emotionally than the 1740 version, making it more interesting because we are given much insight into Pamela's mindset, and, as a result, the connection between character and reader is stronger. The fact that Richardson revised this passage after he wrote *Clarissa* suggests that he was much more comfortable with the novel genre than he had been ten years earlier when he first wrote *Pamela*. With his second novel, Richardson places even more emphasis upon character over plot. With the integration of multiple writers--Clarissa, Lovelace, Anna Howe, John Belford, and a host of minor characters--Richardson is able to probe the inward psyche from multiple perspectives. The communication among the four major letter writers allows more character revelation than was possible in
Pamela because the letter writers work to draw information out of one another. Having more than one narrator also allows Richardson to present the same event from multiple perspectives, revealing the large role that the self plays in the interpretation of reality.

Though readers often refer to Richardson’s novel as Clarissa, the complete title is Clarissa or, the History of a Young Lady, a title that aligns it with other prose fiction from the first half of the eighteenth century. On the basis of the full title alone, a reader could expect something similar to a Defoe work in which the author attempts to present a detailed and realistic depiction of the events that take place throughout the protagonist’s life. Anna Howe writes the first letter in Clarissa, and her opening sentence signals a major shift away from the style and content of Defoe’s prose fictions. The novel begins: “I am extremely concerned, my dearest Friend, for the disturbances that have happened to your Family” (1: 1). Two important words in this sentence are “have happened.” The use of past tense in a novel is to be expected, but what is interesting about the past tense here is that it signals action that has already taken place before the novel begins. It is action outside the reading experience, and as the reader continues, it becomes evident that the story will continue after the disturbances; there will not be a complete recounting of these events. Rather, Richardson has chosen to begin his novel in an epic
fashion akin to Virgil or Milton. These lines thrust the reader into events that are already underway. For John Dussinger, such an opening aligns the reader with "the gossips anxious to find out whether it is true 'that the younger Sister has stolen a Lover from the elder'" (41-42).

Richardson's decision to begin the history of his protagonist at the start of her last year of life is significant. First, it reveals that the title is misleading. Clarissa may be a history of a young lady's final year of life, but it certainly is not the history of her entire life. Though Richardson keeps the eighteenth-century convention of giving the fictional work a factual-sounding title, he does little else to maintain the illusion. Defoe's Robinson Crusoe and Moll Flanders, despite being fictions, truly are histories of the protagonists in that they cover the majority of their years on earth. Moll Flanders, for example, begins with the narrator's birth and ends when she is almost 70 years old. The use of letters as a narrative device would seem to make the work appear more historical because readers are given "primary documents" without the disruption of an outside author or narrator, but in Clarissa's Ciphers, Terry Castle argues that the letters actually undermine the "History" part of the title. Reading letters that have been typeset for publication reminds readers that they are not reading the "actual" handwritten letters of the characters. Even Richardson's attempts to mirror handwritten primary documents
by manipulating typography on the page (placing lines vertically instead of horizontally as in Paper X from Letter 261) reveal just how different type is from handwritten text, heightening the work's fictionality (161-62). John Preston's study *The Created Self* makes the same point by stating that the typography of the text "is intended to keep before the reader the consciousness of being a reader. It is in fact a deliberate reminder of the unreality of writing" (46).

Richardson's refusal to take the history part of his own title seriously is the first indication that *Clarissa* will be a novel of character over plot, making the novel very different from Defoe's works that placed more emphasis upon events than the thoughts and emotions of his narrators. Furthermore, despite its colossal size, *Clarissa* is not a novel of details as are Defoe's works. Richardson chooses not to concentrate heavily upon the minutia of everyday life. When Clarissa runs off with Lovelace, for example, the reader does not receive a detailed accounting of the number of clothes and the amount of money she takes with her. In *The Rise of the Novel*, Watt quotes A.L. Barbauld who wrote that "the minuteness of Defoe was more employed about things, and that of Richardson about persons and sentiments" (175-76).

A comparison between the full title of *Clarissa* and its opening sentences reveals what I believe to be a special feature of Richardson's work. On the one hand, he is tied to the conventions of prose fiction that have already been
established in the eighteenth century, but, on the other hand, he deviates from these conventions, introducing readers to a fiction in which the selves of the characters are explored and developed to a fuller extent than in previous fictional works of the time period (including his own). On a larger scale, one can see the letter writing as Richardson's attempt to give the novel an appearance of fact because the novel then becomes a collection of primary documents, but as Castle argues, such an attempt fails because readers still see the gap between the printed version they hold in their hands and a collection of handwritten letters. The length of the letters also subverts any attempt at factual representation, for few people would write the long letters that appear throughout Clarissa. In **Familiar Letters on Important Occasions**, Richardson seemed more cognizant of imitating a realistic letter length because few of the 173 letters in the volume are more than one or two pages long. In recent years, critical studies of the novel have revealed that its epistolary nature complicates the reading process, continually reminding readers that they are reading a work of fiction. For Castle, the letters create writers and readers within the text, allowing Richardson to compose a text that draws attention to itself in a manner similar to **Tristram Shandy**, "a fiction that investigates fiction making" (40). By including multiple narrative perspectives within the novel, Richardson forces readers to consider the act of reading itself and to realize how
complicated the activity can be: “His method in *Clarissa*, far more than is usually supposed, is to make the reading not simple but problematic; and his expectation is that the reader's activity in addressing the resulting difficulties will itself be a source of instruction” (Keymer, *Richardson's Clarissa* 69). These multiple perspectives, of course, present a variety of writers and readers. Preston comments that on one level *Clarissa* is about the nature of reading because readers such as Belford and Howe play such important roles in the novel. Richardson establishes them as models for the readers of the novel. Preston observes that Howe, for example, “is really a reader; when she writes it is in order to define a reader's feelings” (58). By calling Howe a “friendly examiner,” Keymer places her in a similar role, but he seems to present her as a more active participant than Preston does because “her responses enable Richardson to incorporate in the text a sustained and explicit interrogation of its own main narrative” (45).

The comparison between Howe and readers, however, can only be taken so far. Preston makes clear that, unlike Belford or Howe, readers of the novel have the advantage of Richardson's footnotes, which help connect sections of the plot. Sometimes the footnotes are simple directions as in “See Vol. III. Letters xxxiv.xxxv” (5: 32); other times they provide authorial commentary as in “See Vol. III. Letter lli. Par. 12. and Letter liv. Par. 12. Where the Reader will
observe that the proposal came from herself; which, as it was also mentioned by Mr. Lovelace (towards the end of Letter lix. in Vol. III.) she may be presumed to have forgotten” (5: 33). These footnotes, because they often refer readers to other sections of the novel, serve as another reminder that we are reading a book and taking part in a physical act by “handling the book, turning these numbered pages of print, looking for the right page” (Preston 71). The integration of the footnotes further reveals that Richardson is more comfortable with the fictional form than was Defoe. Richardson reminds readers of the act of reading and of their ability to exert some control over the text with the author’s aid. Defoe, with the possible exceptions of his prefaces, seems to desire that readers lose themselves in the first-person narratives of the protagonists. The absence of chapters, for example, possibly suggests that even so little authorial or editorial intrusion as chapter divisions might damage the realism of the work.

Defoe’s books contain a straightforward central narrative, not multiple narratives as in Clarissa. I have discussed in Chapter Two how scholars criticize Defoe for his seeming refusal to give more narrative weight to certain moments or scenes in his novels. His works move through one action after another with little emphasis upon one over the other. He presents most action on the same level so that Moll Flanders, for example, records the birth of her children with the same kind of detachment she uses for listing her savings.
Childbirth should be one of the more important episodes in a woman's life, but Defoe de-emphasizes its importance because Moll refuses to consider the significance of the event as it relates to her narrative. One could interpret Moll's quick dismissal of her children as evidence that she is a cold-hearted criminal. At times in the story, this may be so, but from a stylistic standpoint, her de-emphasis of her children exists because Defoe accentuates plot over character, in turn creating a leveling effect upon most events. As with Defoe's single-person narratives, Clarissa's own letters are heavily egocentric, but because of the multiple correspondents, readers share her self-involved narratives with several coexisting narratives from the perspectives of Lovelace, Belford, Howe and a few other minor characters. Still, Clarissa remains the focal point throughout. Anna Howe and John Belford are living their own lives too, but for the artificial world of the novel, these lives are unimportant; their existence is determined solely in relationship to Clarissa and Lovelace. They are in the novel to react to the actions of the two main characters. For Preston, Belford and Howe fulfill "an undistinguished role" that is similar to a reader's (59). Their own lives would merely be distractions from the central story, and so their letters feature few details that do not somehow involve Clarissa or Lovelace. Defoe's works, on the other hand, seem to lack such a concentration. Though everything in his narratives revolves
around the protagonist, his incorporation of so many different events demonstrates a refusal to concentrate upon the more significant moments that affect the plot or the main character. Modern readers may complain that his works are filled with irrelevant moments that signify little, but as the last chapter argued, Defoe's works follow the style of non-fictional journals and autobiographies whose goal was simply to record daily activities, whether they seemed important or not. Richardson's works are also grounded in non-fictional models, but as Belford's and Howe's letters suggest, Richardson willingly deviates from the model to serve the purpose of his story. Realistically, the lives of these two correspondents would take on a greater significance in their own letters, but the narrative determines that these two individuals function mainly as reactors to Clarissa and Lovelace.

The opening sentence of the novel not only thrusts readers into actions that are already underway, it also establishes the central focus of the novel, "the disturbances" that the Harlowe family have undergone and will continue to undergo. Clarissa's next three letters provide Howe and the reader with background upon these disturbances and are concerned primarily with physical action. However, Clarissa's fourth letter, Letter #5 in the book, takes a different tone and establishes the kind of writing that will most typify Clarissa's letters. Clarissa's previous three letters mainly
reported activities, but this letter concentrates upon ideas and human nature by arguing that being true to oneself is important even if it means "being the less beloved for it" (1: 33). Letter 5 is her attempt to analyze the behavior of her mother, father, brother and sister. She ponders their behavior and tries to understand their motivations. For example, Clarissa believes her father's gout contributes to his ill temper, but she believes there is no excuse for her brother's behavior: "By possessing everything, he has the vice of age mingled with the ambition of youth, and enjoys nothing—but his own haughtiness and ill-temper [...]" (55). With its mix of Clarissa's opinions about her family and people in general, this letter is characteristic of many of her letters throughout the novel, but at this point, Clarissa reveals an awkwardness and discomfort with the subject matter and tone. When she criticizes her brother's "haughtiness and ill-temper" she ends the criticism with the phrase, "I was going to say," and then follows this with, "Yet again am I adding force to your dislikes of some of us." The phrase "I was going to say" establishes a point of view and then takes it back as if it was never said, yet the words still remain on the page. She tries to turn positive by imagining what it would have been like for Anna Howe and her brother to have married, but "with a disdain [...] too much of kin to his haughtiness," she once more criticizes him by arguing that her brother was not worthy of Howe's passion (1: 34). This time, however, she
stops herself in mid-sentence. The next and concluding paragraph begins, "But no more of this" (1: 34), and then shifts focus to her intent to send this letter quickly. When Clarissa opens her next letter she signals once again her discomfort with expressing her own thoughts: "I will now resume my narrative of proceedings here" (1: 35), as if her thoughts and opinions could not be a part of her own narrative. As her situation becomes worse, Clarissa will no longer refrain from incorporating interior thoughts into exterior narrative, but at this point, she still believes it is more proper to differentiate between the two, as if she could be objective in conveying the events that have taken place within her family. Richardson's readers might have expected Clarissa to remain objective as well. Certainly, Defoe's characters attempt to maintain a level of dispassion toward external events, and, as the first chapter of this study indicated, the non-fictional personal accounts that were published during the century also concentrated upon reporting daily life without the intrusion of the interior thoughts of the writer. Thus, for example, in Elizabeth Harper's published journal (1769), readers find a mother writing about the death of her child more as an objective reporter than as an involved mother.

Clarissa's discomfort with her evaluations of others is a trait that will not last long. As her situation becomes more dire and the actions of those around her more despicable,
Clarissa no longer hesitates to criticize others. In Reading Clarissa: The Struggles of Interpretation, William Warner observes that Clarissa habitually vindicates and develops herself by harshly judging others (18). Her transformation from a person who once was reserved in her criticism of others to one who freely critiques others exhibits Clarissa's inability to maintain a consistent persona throughout the text. Her voice and style of writing change depending upon her situation. According to John A. Dussinger's "Truth and Storytelling in Clarissa," the epistolary technique allows Richardson to create three Clarissas:

[. . .] the proud exemplar of her sex, vigorously self-assertive, with Anna's feminist spunk and even some of Lovelace's wit; the religious ascetic withdrawing from all worldly ambition, self-abnegating and sincere to the death; and the sentimental heroine, delicate, yielding, and erotically speechless, as seen through Lovelace's narrative. (41)

An argument from Arnold H. Modell's The Private Self may help to clarify further Clarissa's changing persona. According to Modell, one's consciousness of the self depends upon the "appraisals of others" (3). This reasoning would seem to apply to Clarissa. Her changing persona throughout the book, however, is not her attempt to use and manipulate others (as
Warner might have us believe); rather it is a reflection of how others affect her consciousness of self.

Richardson's methodology for conveying Clarissa's changes relates to both content and technique. Most obviously readers see Clarissa using a variety of narrative techniques in her letters. When relaying information to Anna Howe, Clarissa often summarizes and paraphrases other characters' dialogue as in Letter 17 when she discusses her mother's anger toward her: "She threatened to turn me over to my Father and my Uncles -- She bid me (generously bid me) consider, what a handle I gave to my Brother and Sister, if I thought they had views to serve by making my Uncles dissatisfied with me" (1: 119). Passages like this one that rely heavily upon summary are the most realistic in terms of imitating a letter, but Richardson's narrative goals are more complex than simply having Clarissa imitate realistic letter writing style. When the situation demands it, Clarissa becomes more like an author and less like a letter writer, incorporating dialogue into her letters. In such letters, Clarissa may begin by paraphrasing conversations, but the emotion heightens and she seems forced to present the words as exact. In her April 4 letter, she records a conversation with her aunt regarding a meeting with Mr. Solmes. She deftly moves from paraphrase to direct quotation as well as freely asserting her own opinions:

I never found myself so fretful in my life: And so I told my Aunt; and begged her pardon for it. But
she said, it was well disguised then; for she saw nothing but little tremors, which were usual with young Ladies when they were to see their Admirers for the first time; and as this might be called so, with respect to me; since it was the first time I had consented to see Mr. Solmes in that light.--But that the next--

How, Madam, interrupted I--Is it then imagined, that I give this meeting upon that foot?--To be sure it is, child--

To be sure it is, Madam! Then do I yet desire to decline it.--I will not, I cannot, see him, if he expects me to see him upon those terms. (2: 196-97)

As the dialogue becomes more heated, Clarissa interjects her opinions amongst the quoted material: "Oh the hideous wretch!--Pardon me, Madam--I to be supposed to meet such a man as that, with such a view!" (2: 197). Scenes like this--and there are many throughout the book--suggest that Richardson is more comfortable with the narrative form than Defoe because he is willing to subvert the realistic letter form when the story demands it. While the dialogue in this scene rings true, the fact that it is contained in a letter does not. Rather than writing a letter to a friend here, Clarissa appears to readers as if she were writing a novel.
In Richardson's *Clarissa* and the Eighteenth-Century Reader, Tom Keymer remarks that one unique aspect of *Clarissa* in contrast to a novel such as *Tom Jones* is the absence of an author to assess the experience of the characters (xiv). Richardson, however, simply has made his characters the authors of their own stories. Keymer argues that though the absence of a central intermediary author would seem to make the action more direct for readers, it in fact, detaches them because the number of characters telling their own stories in letter form allows readers to see how two characters can have two different interpretations of the same event: "[...] the letter form provided Richardson with the ideal medium in which to explore such distortions and interferences to the full" (xv). This feature of the novel reveals the extent to which Richardson was able to use something quite familiar to his readers (the letter form) but in such a way as to complicate their expectations of the established and familiar. Defoe, by allowing more inward reflection than was common in non-fictional travel journals and biographies, was also able to expand upon his readers' expectations, but, making use of only one narrative perspective in his works, he does not complicate the reading experience as does Richardson.

With the absence of a central author, "[...] the reader is left to perform those basic organizational tasks which, in first- and third-person modes, are performed paradigmatically (and with varying degrees of intrusiveness) by a narrator [...]"
the reader shapes the novel in letters into a coherent structure" (Castle 167-68). Without an overarching narrator, readers of Clarissa are allowed more freedom in asserting opinions and interpretations of the characters in the novel. Richardson transfers much more authorial control to readers than does Defoe, in turn complicating matters for them. Just how is a reader to view Clarissa's extreme dependence on letter writing as a means of communication? By using letter writing as a narrative device, Richardson allows readers to see the same events from multiple perspectives, thus revealing the manipulation that takes place among the main correspondents. Scott Paul Gordon's 1997 essay, "Disinterested Selves: Clarissa and the Tactics of Sentiment," exhibits the extent to which Richardson's narrative method causes confusion and misreading, not only within the novel itself but among reader-critics today. Three major works on Clarissa, Warner's Reading Clarissa (1979), Castle's Clarissa's Ciphers (1982), and Keymer's Richardson's Clarissa and the Eighteenth-Century Reader (1992), view the practice of letter writing in the novel skeptically, arguing that it serves the self-interest of the letter writer. When discussing letter writing as a discourse, these critics use words like "intimidation," "force," and "aggression" (Gordon 478-479). Because the letters are written with the writer's self-interest foremost, readers are required to read all the letters (including Clarissa's) critically, judging and
questioning the writers' motives and interpretations. For Gordon, however, this view of the eighteenth-century reader is an historical inaccuracy. Rather than seeing the Richardson reader as a judging reader, he prefers to see him as a feeling reader: "[. . .] Richardson counted on his readers' sensibilities, not their intellects, to prove his heroine's honesty" (484). Clarissa's uncles who weep over her letters are Richardson's model readers, not her brother and sister. The action of the uncles "dramatizes Richardson's hope that only readers energized by personal animus could misread Clarissa's pathetic texts" (486).

This added complexity within Clarissa not only suggests the growing maturity of the mid-eighteenth-century reading audience, but it also demonstrates the ease with which Richardson discounts a realistic form. The manner in which Richardson incorporates the letter form in his novel both enhances and undercuts fictional realism. With the absence of a third-person omniscient author, Richardson removes the intermediary between characters and readers. By not allowing the characters' words to be filtered through another voice, Richardson enables his readers to maintain immediate "contact" with the characters. The fact that the letters are written shortly after the physical action being described takes place— or at times during the physical action—further enhances readers' sense that they are very close to these characters, as compared to the first-person narratives of Defoe which are
written years after the physical action in the novel takes place.

Despite this immediacy, the manner in which Anna Howe, John Belford, Lovelace and Clarissa write undercuts the realism of the novel, constantly reminding readers of the fictionality of the story. In a sense, by providing readers with multiple "authors," Richardson achieves the same effect as Fielding's personable narrator who serves to remind his reading companions that he, not the characters, is in control of the events and action in *Tom Jones*. Whenever Fielding's narrator draws attention to himself or the finer points of story telling, he reminds readers that the work is a fiction, not a real-life history. Their immersion and personal involvement within the story is interrupted much in the same way it is when an actor in a film addresses the camera rather than the other characters in the film. Richardson achieves this same kind of interruption but without the third-person narrator. Richardson, of course, does not intentionally create such an effect in the same manner as Fielding and Sterne do. Like Defoe, his desire is to immerse readers into the fictional world with minimal interruptions, hence the almost complete absence of authorial intrusion. However, despite the absence of a controlling author, Richardson's multiple authors still draw attention to the act of reading. The readers within the text interpret each other just as the real readers outside the text interpret the fictional
characters within. Thus, the various letter writers in Clarissa reveal the creating, interpreting, manipulating, and controlling aspects of the reading/writing experience. Whether Richardson intended to call attention to the fictionality of the text is unimportant; multiple letter writers result in the same effect--the act of reading is presented as an inexact and questionable experience. This feature is evident in non-fictional narrative as well. Where Fielding and Sterne accomplished the same effect in a more overt manner, Boswell takes this notion one step further. His published works demonstrate (in a subtle way like Richardson) that a person can "read" reality a specific way, and then form the experience on the page so that it can be read again as a neatly formed narrative. The next chapter will further detail Boswell's technique of ordering events and emphasizing certain actions over others so that readers are presented with a unified story that would otherwise be lacking in a simple recording of major events.

In referring to Keymer's points, I have already hinted at one way Richardson interrupts the story and undercuts the realism. By using more than one character to view the same events and actions differently, Richardson reveals the unreliability of text. Because of individual interpretation, a writer's record of an event can never be objective or completely true. Writing is a removal from the event itself and as such will always be somewhat of a fiction. By using
multiple narrators, Richardson clearly holds the inadequacies of the written word before his readers' eyes. The use of multiple narrators undercuts the novel's realism because it makes clear that a written text can never be as real as the event itself. Richardson also undermines the novel's realism by turning his letter writers into authors. Incorporating dialogue, developing scenes fully, and describing events as if they are taking place in the present are all more characteristic of fiction writers than letter writers. Thus, though Richardson may be making use of a realistic form, he distorts the form so that the letters are not as realistic. In comparison, Defoe included only small portions of direct dialogue in his realistic narratives. While Defoe's characters may speak, often the narrator records the speech as if he or she is summarizing or paraphrasing what is said. Because these writers compose their narratives years after the events have taken place, too much dialogue would call into question the "factuality" of the stories, rendering them less realistic. However, Richardson's use of dialogue within the realistic letter form signals a belief that readers would be likely to suspend their disbelief or to accept the fictional aspects of the novel form. To return to the earlier example in which Clarissa relates to Anna a conversation with her aunt, some might argue that such a combative conversation would force her to record it exactly to best display the emotion of the scene rather than distancing herself and her reader, Anna
Howe, with a paraphrase. However, dialogue recorded hours or even minutes later cannot be a completely accurate duplication of the original conversation. Furthermore, because Clarissa writes the letter after the event, she is already removed from the scene, and the direct quotations only serve as an illusion of immediacy. While the dialogue heightens the emotion of the moment, it weakens the realism of the epistolary narrative method that Richardson has chosen. The extent to which readers had come to accept fictional techniques toward the end of the century is evident by Boswell's recorded conversations in the *Journal of a Tour of the Hebrides* (1785) and the *Life of Johnson* (1791). Boswell seems not to worry whether readers will doubt the accuracy of the dialogue in his factual works. The immediacy that dialogue imparts to readers counters any skepticism that might be raised regarding the accuracy of the scene.

The subjects of Clarissa's letters also are important for a consideration of how Richardson advances the novel genre. The bulk of Clarissa's letters are concerned with moving the plot forward in that they discuss what is happening to her in terms of Solmes, Lovelace, or her family. Were her letters concerned only with these external events, the work as a whole would differ little from the plot-driven work of Defoe. However, Clarissa—as writer—does not focus merely on the external. In conveying events, her letters enlighten readers on subjects such as human nature, the self, and the importance
of the written text. Warner opens his book by observing that what characters in Clarissa say and write has little meaning other than to gain control over another character (5). In a similar manner, Clarissa's discussions of human nature do not drive the plot forward; instead they provide insight into Clarissa's character and her attitudes toward others as Johnson's famous statement on reading Richardson for sentiment makes clear. Clarissa first analyzes human nature in Letter 5:

> Upon my word, I am sometimes tempted to think that we may make the world allow for and respect us as we please, if we can but be sturdy in our wills, and set out accordingly. It is but being the less beloved for it, that's all: And if we have power to oblige those we have to do with, it will not appear to us that we are. Our flatterers will tell us anything sooner than our faults, or what they know we do not like to hear. (1: 32-33)

The lines above comprise one short paragraph within a long letter. Despite their brevity, these lines reveal much about Clarissa's inner self. As Warner would point out, these lines are characteristic of Clarissa's ability to build herself up ("we may make the world allow and respect us as we please, if we can be but sturdy in our wills") at the cost of others ("Our flatterers will tell us anything sooner than our faults"). Robinson Crusoe, Moll Flanders, and H.F. all
offered such discussions upon the human condition to varying degrees as well. However, their discussions are nowhere near as sustained as Clarissa's, nor are they as complex and multi-layered.

Clarissa's discourses on human nature are important for what they say about the direction of the novel genre in the latter half of the eighteenth century. As Watt made clear in *The Rise of the Novel*, one of the unique features of the novel as a genre is its concentration upon the individual (13). What is unique about Richardson is the extent to which this novel celebrates the inner life of the characters—the life of the mind. Novels that follow *Clarissa* would be more apt to develop this aspect than they would the heavy reliance upon realism that is evident in Defoe's works. For Doody, Richardson does not merely focus upon the inner life of his characters; he has them create their own world of imagination: "The heroes of Defoe, Fielding and Smollett have strong egos, but their extrovert egotism does not try to create a world, but to find a place in it" (*A Natural Passion* 106). While one might expect a person of Clarissa's status and situation to expound upon humanity at times, the number of times she does so and the extent to which she develops her thoughts are about as unusual as her lengthy letters. Clarissa's thoughts are artificial because they are so carefully crafted. This is not to say that a real woman of the eighteenth century would be incapable of careful and insightful thoughts, but rather that
real people, men or women, would be unlikely to construct their individual thoughts so that they pertain to a larger whole, in the case of Clarissa, the larger themes of the novel. As John Carroll, editor of a volume of Richardson's personal correspondence, observes, the author's own letters fail to convey the complexity of human experience that his fictional letter writers do: "The novelist [. . .] had a more complex temperament than he ever revealed as a correspondent. Nor do his letters fully convey the subtle craftsmanship and the knowledge of human nature that went into his three novels" (35). To return to the quotation on human nature from Letter 5, readers should note that those sentences not only typify Clarissa's personality, they also foreshadow what will happen to her as the novel progresses. She will be less beloved by others because she is sturdy in her will. Readers see this theme at the start of the novel when her family rejects her because of Clarissa's refusal to marry Solmes, and they see it later in the novel when Lovelace mistreats her for refusing to submit to him. In real life, however, one's thoughts on human nature are not so carefully crafted to come together as a part of a unified whole.

Because of Clarissa's first-person narration, readers receive significant insight into her state of mind as she relates her story. We can trace the changes of her personality throughout the book in the way in which she comments upon events and other characters. While this feature
holds true for most first-person narrative fiction, Richardson takes Clarissa's development of self one step further by studying her own character changes. Clarissa consciously analyzes her self throughout the novel as in this letter dated July 13:

All I will at present add are my thanks to your Mother for her Indulgence to us. Due Compliments to Mr. Hickman; and my Request, that you will believe me to be, to my last hour, and beyond it, if possible, my beloved friend, and my dearer self (for what is now my Self?). (6: 214)

Clarissa's and Lovelace's letters reflect a development of self that is not evident in other letters in the novel. Heightening Clarissa's sense of self in relation to other characters is another technique that enhances the fictionality over the realism of the story. In Letter 27, Anna Howe tells Clarissa that she does not write to please herself but to please Clarissa (1: 186). Certainly, the opposite applies to Clarissa--she does write to please herself. Chapter Two of this study analyzed how Robinson Crusoe's journal praises the very act of writing, and a similar satisfaction with writing exists in Clarissa's letters. For her the act of writing is so important that at one point she requests pen and paper but promises not to send what she writes. In her chapter on Pamela from Imagining a Self, Patricia Meyer Spacks argues that for Pamela, writing, which allows for interpretation and
manipulation of real events, gives her control in her relationship with Mr. B: "The writer has the power of interpretation, of selection, and consequently of creating meaning and order; by comparison Squire B's claim of control sounds like pure bluster" (198). Richardson develops this aspect of writing even further in Clarissa's letters. Writing is a way for her to work through her problems. She is able to unburden herself on the page. Sending her letters gives her a sympathetic audience in Anna Howe, but when she promises to write and not to send her letters, readers can see that for Clarissa the act of writing itself is empowering. Recording events and her thoughts provides a permanent account of Clarissa's own interpretations. Much of the time throughout the novel, writing is the only way in which she can empower herself. When her family refuses to hear her case against Solmes, the blank page acts as her supportive audience. Sending the letters without the knowledge of her parents, or later in the novel, without the knowledge of Lovelace, empowers her even more.

For readers, however, Clarissa provides a much more complex and ambiguous view of control and empowerment than Pamela because Clarissa's adversaries are also writers, and readers must decipher whose accounts are most honest. In Pamela, Mr. B's offenses were presented to readers through Pamela's eyes. In Clarissa, Lovelace's atrocities are presented through the eyes of the heroine, but readers also
receive Lovelace’s interpretation of events. This forces readers to often view two sides of the same story, and, depending upon the perspective of readers, some might even fault Clarissa’s interpretations because of her motives. Because of his actions, it is hard to imagine readers siding with Lovelace, but Warner in *Reading Clarissa* finds Clarissa’s development of self manipulative and destructive toward others. Thus, with a somewhat sympathetic view toward Lovelace, Warner opens himself to this blistering attack from Castle:

[Warner’s] study modulates too often into a barrage of ill-considered attacks on Clarissa and boyish expressions of admiration for Lovelace—all of which rest upon an implicit sexual politics he never stops to examine. Characteristically Warner blames the woman, Clarissa, for the very action ("construction") he praises in the man, Lovelace. Because she tries to articulate her own "Story"—to control the way she is understood by others, and thus arrive at "the moment of achieved meaning" (p. 111)—Clarissa becomes for Warner a "suffocating" or "claustrophobic" presence in the text, one who "induces anger and irritation—and a profound itch for an entirely new wave of sentiment" (p. 113). Lovelace on the other hand (whose rights to articulation and "Story"-telling go unquestioned)
is "a brilliant elaborator of fictions" (p. ix).

This disagreement between two modern scholars of the novel highlights the complexity behind first-person accounts. In Clarissa, Richardson reveals seriously what Sterne reveals comically in Tristram Shandy: External reality is secondary to the mind's reality. Readers must consider motive and circumstance in addition to the writing on the page. This problem remains with factual writing as well, especially if the writing reads like fiction. Boswell adds to the complexity of the issue even more because he publishes first-person accounts of his travels and interactions with Johnson. Furthermore, in combining fictional techniques with factual narrative, Boswell could cause readers to question his reliability as a writer as they might question a fictional narrator.

When Defoe wrote Robinson Crusoe, Moll Flanders, and Journal of the Plague Year, he set about presenting the events in the book solely through the eyes of his protagonists. Fielding's Tom Jones is more complex than a Defoe narrative because the Fielding novel presents a fairly objective telling of events that are often elaborated upon or undercut by the narrator/companion who interrupts the action whenever he feels it appropriate. The narrator can take what at first appears a momentous event, such as Tom's impending death at the end of the novel, and reduce its significance with a glib comment.
Such a practice shows the instability of the written word and the greater importance of perspective. By incorporating a number of different letter writers and hence different perspectives within *Clarissa*, Richardson accomplishes the same thing as Fielding (albeit in a more serious manner) without the interruptions of an outside narrator. Examples abound throughout *Clarissa* that reveal the influence of the interior individual perspective upon an exterior event, but Clarissa's rape offers possibly the clearest example of Richardson's technique.

The rape of Clarissa, one of the more consequential events in the book, fully exhibits the interpretation, manipulation, reduction, and enlargement that are all possible with the mind's reflection. With letter after letter containing the fears of Clarissa or the threats of Lovelace, one could argue that the entire narrative has been leading up to this point, yet when the moment of Clarissa's rape arrives, the event is not in the novel. Terry Eagleton remarks that the rape is the "hole at the centre of the novel towards which this huge mass of writing is sucked only to sheer off again" (61). Of course, the rape itself would only appear in the novel were Richardson to depart from his epistolary structure and relate the action as an authorial narrator, but readers do not receive a full report of the rape for another fifty letters or so. Instead, readers must fill in the gap between the letter in which Lovelace describes—in "lively present-
tense manner" (5: 312)--Mrs. Sinclair's assault upon Clarissa, and the next letter which simply states: "And now, Belford, I can go no farther. The affair is over. Clarissa lives. And I am Your humble servant, R. Lovelace" (5: 314).

Rather than concentrating upon the details of the event, subsequent letters focus upon the consequences of Lovelace's action. Belford responds in the role of reader with "O thou savage-hearted monster! What work hast thou made in one guilty hour, for a whole age of repentance!" (5: 314). In the opening of his response to Belford, Lovelace attempts to end the argument by valuing fact over interpretation in stating that "peoples (sic) extravagant notions of things alter not facts" (5: 318). The "fact" for Lovelace is that his violation of Clarissa is finished, and she has now suffered that fate of thousands of other women before her. Of course, few readers will accept Lovelace's defense as adequate. While his statement contains the inherent truth that actions and events cannot be reversed, the novel, up to this point, has reflected that people try to convince themselves of the opposite. In numerous letters, the characters have attempted to force their "extravagant notions" to alter facts. Preston argues that the letters of the novel present "a medium for people who seem unable to deal with the present [. . .]. They are a medium for those who have lost the syntax of experience" (49). Doody believes that Clarissa and Lovelace "live in the imagination," providing "something more real for each than the
'reality' which the world sees" (A Natural Passion 104). And according to Cox, Lovelace's fantasy of conquest and Clarissa's fantasy of self-destruction are both used to "dramatize the self" (74-75). Lovelace, with his beliefs that his tricks and arguments could persuade Clarissa to sleep with him, thus reversing her rejections, is possibly the character most guilty of believing that perception can alter reality. Even within this same letter, Lovelace will undercut his argument by suggesting that his violation of Clarissa might not have been a violation at all if she had not been so virtuous a person: "But have I not known twenty and twenty of the Sex, who have seemed to carry their notions of virtue high; yet, when brought to the test, have abated of their severity?" (5: 319). He then delves further into "extravagant notions" by convincing himself that marriage to Clarissa would set things right (5: 320). Clarissa's response serves as a direct contrast to her previous letters. Prior to this point, Clarissa's letters, while often full of anger, pain, confusion, and self-doubt, were constructed carefully, reporting the action and her thoughts as clearly and as accurately as she believed she could. The writing that immediately follows the rape, however, reflects an inability to order her thoughts and convey her self. Richardson reveals such a disarray by presenting her words in the form of fragments labeled as PAPER I, PAPER II, and so on. He also attaches parenthetical
comments such as "Torn in two pieces" (5: 327) and "Scratch'd thro', and thrown under the Table" (5: 328), suggesting the physical disorder of these fragments. Clarissa's words themselves, however, say the most about her state of mind. When she writes to Howe, she can only state that "dreadful, dreadful things" (5: 327) have happened, but rather than recount the event as she would have in the letters prior to her rape, she places the focus upon Howe's well being while at the same time debasing herself: "You may well be tired of me!-And if you are, I can forgive you; for I am tired of myself [. . .]") (5: 327). In the next fragment to her father, Clarissa will write that she does not know her name (5: 328). In PAPER V, she writes to her sister, "You knew me better than I knew myself" (5: 330). Even weeks after the rape, Clarissa still seeks to diminish the self. In her letter to Anna that Mrs. Howe intercepts, Clarissa writes of her "lost Self," her "vile" and "hated Self" (6: 115-16). In relating her escape from Lovelace, Clarissa opens this letter by making a distinction between physical and philosophical self; and readers see that she perceives her loss to be the latter: "Once more have I escaped--But, alas! I, my best self, have not escaped!" (6: 115). Throughout the novel, Anna has served as an ear for Clarissa's reflections, yet in this letter, Clarissa makes a plea that "Self, then, be banished from Self one moment (for I doubt it will for no longer) to inquire after a dearer object, my beloved Anna Howe!" (6: 116). In
raping her, Lovelace has in effect dislodged Clarissa's sense of herself. His statement emphasizing fact over belief from his letter to Belford may be his attempt to diminish the significance of his act, but these fragments from Clarissa, which serve as such a contrast to her earlier letters, reflect the severity of Clarissa's loss. For Kinkead-Weekes, these fragments reflect such a "deep psychological truth" that "not for a hundred and fifty years could the English novel begin to approach again a 'new way of writing' which could probe its characters as deeply as this" (241). Lovelace's worst crime is not taking her virginity and ruining her reputation but failing to "conceive or respect" Clarissa's "private inner core of personality" (241). By not concentrating immediately upon a report of the rape itself, Richardson strongly emphasizes the extent to which consequences and people's perceptions matter over the events themselves. Furthermore, withholding the account of the rape for approximately fifty letters forces readers away from the outer toward the inner lives of the characters.

Though Clarissa's report of the rape focuses primarily upon external events, its placement in the novel and her detailing of the rape still reflects much upon her inward state of mind. Lovelace first refers to the rape in the brief letter written on the morning of June 13, and readers finally receive the most complete report of the rape and the circumstances surrounding it beginning with the letters.
Clarissa writes on July 6. Doody remarks that the epistolary method "allows a great many tricks to be played with time within an ostensibly straight progressive narrative" (131), and by delaying the full account of Clarissa's rape, Richardson manipulates time so as to concentrate more upon the consequences of the act than the act itself. The length of the time that passed between the rape and Clarissa's recounting of it, however, further suggests the impact that the event had upon her psyche. It takes her nearly a month to relive the experience through written words and several times during her report she must stop writing because the events are too painful. Though her story is detailed and covers several pages, she still is unable to describe the actual rape itself, returning to the style of writing (dashes, disorganization) that characterized her attempts to correspond in the days just following the rape: "And then such scenes followed--Oh my dear, such dreadful scenes!--Fits upon Fits (faintly indeed and imperfectly remembered) procuring me no compassion--But death was withheld from me" (6: 190). As Stephen Melville observes, Clarissa cannot even bring herself to say, "'and then he raped me'" (146). Clarissa's failure to be explicit in this one section of her story reveals the severe impression that the rape had upon her psychologically, and it places the focus once again upon the consequences rather than the act itself.
The effects of both Clarissa's rape and her family's rejection account for the remainder of the novel and reveal themselves primarily through Clarissa's deteriorating health, which is brought about by her inability to reconcile the terrible actions with her own characterization of self. For the most part, Clarissa is silenced during the final part of the novel. Keymer notes that though she continues to write, most of her letters serve "simple practical purposes and few are substantially descriptive" (224). Richardson's shift from the physical to the mental marks the most significant change from the narratives of Defoe. For a critic like Preston, it is a dramatic shift. He argues that while literature is removed from events, the letter writing in Clarissa attempts to "displace" events so that "[t]he only action it (letter writing) can tolerate is the act of writing" (53). Preston's comments throughout his study seek to reveal the frustration that Richardson creates for readers through the epistolary mode, but if the eighteenth-century popularity of Clarissa is any guide, readers were willing to accept such frustration to delve more deeply into character and personality than in places and events. 14

Richardson is an integral part of my study between non-fictional and fictional narratives because his works highlight the novel genre's deviation from the non-fictional prose works of the century. A consideration of Familiar Letters, Pamela, and Clarissa reveals just how this change took place over the
course of three of his works. Richardson's central technique for creating a more complex novel form with *Clarissa* was to fully develop and explore the selves of his central characters. Such a development of self creates a greater distance between a reader's own observations of everyday life and the presentation of everyday life within the novel. With the publication of *Clarissa*, the gap between non-fictional and fictional narrative had widened considerably from the time of Defoe's works. Toward the end of the century, however, Boswell's writing suggests a closing of this gap again. This time, though, the non-fictional does not appear to influence the fictional; instead readers see Boswell integrating fictional techniques into his factual narratives. My next chapter highlights the manner in which this shift is apparent in two of his published works. *In Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides* (1785), for example, Johnson's and Boswell's perceptions of place become just as important as the place itself. *In the Life of Johnson* (1791), Boswell elevates Johnson's thoughts and opinions to the same level as his accomplishments. Because Boswell's writings are not works of fiction, however, his techniques hold different implications for readers than do Richardson's.
Endnotes

1 Samuel Richardson, *Familiar Letters on Important Occasions* (London: George Routledge, 1928). All subsequent page references are to this edition.

2 After several pages of analysis, Kinkead-Weekes, in *Samuel Richardson: Dramatic Novelist*, remarks that Defoe and Richardson are "poles apart" in their creation of narrative. His conclusion stems mainly from the difference in which the two authors view the importance of character in relation to plot. In Richardson he sees "sharply individualized characters," an absence of episodic structure, reality defined by the "growth of consciousness," and a desire to understand "everything that goes to form personal identity" (481).

3 This aspect separates this book from Richardson's earlier advice manual titled *Vade Mecum* (1739) for young men. As with *Familiar Letters*, this short book addresses such topics as good manners, gaming, and theater going, but instead of including multiple narrators or letter writers, it is written from the fatherly perspective of the author himself.

4 Spacks observes that "The official first heroine of the English novel has an incorrigible urge to write herself down" (193).

5 For the most part, Doody's observations are accurate, but for clarification purposes the author does intrude at times upon Pamela's narrative. For example, the authorial
voice informs readers that Mr. B really was intercepting Pamela’s letters before sending them on to her father.

6 In *Samuel Richardson and the Dramatic Novel*, Ira Konigsberg states that one of Richardson’s epistolary techniques is to dramatize the correspondent over the action. Sometimes the passages become so self-revealing that the correspondent forgets the letter’s recipient and “seems to pour forth a dramatic soliloquy” (107).


8 There is no guarantee, however, that a writer will make use of the benefit of hindsight when recording a personal history. As Chapter Two of this study observed, Defoe’s narrators rarely use hindsight to comment upon the significance of events.


10 The 1801 edition contains more than 8,400 changes (Hannaford 6). The Shakespeare Head *Pamela*, the edition most used by scholars, follows the 1742 octavo of *Pamela* (6). Three trade paperbacks of *Pamela* are currently in print—Penguin, Everyman, and Norton. No indication is present for which edition the latter two paperbacks follow (6), but one bibliography describes the Everyman edition as a corrupt text
(Smith 185), and the Norton does not feature the 1801 changes. Of the three, the inexpensive Penguin edition, based on the 1801 text, is likely to be the one most readers buy today.


12 In his discussion of the differences between Defoe and Richardson, Ralph W. Rader's comments on Pamela's imitation of letters can be applied to Clarissa as well. Rader remarks that Pamela is not an imitation of real letters in the sense that Moll Flanders is an imitation of a real autobiography. With Moll Flanders, Defoe makes it appear as if Moll is the real author of the story but not of the events of the story so that the work seems literally true (89). However, for Rader, "[t]he 'real documents' of Pamela cannot [. . .] be like natural letters at all in the sense that they must at every point tell us Richardson's 'once upon a time' story clearly and powerfully while they only seem to tell Pamela's story to her parents." Rader goes on to argue that the dramatic vividness of Pamela's letters is "not the result of their likeness to real letters (and real events) but of their unlikeness to them, though, of course, the minimal signs of likeness given are a necessary condition of the illusion" (88). In Samuel Richardson: Dramatic Novelist, Mark Kinkead-Weekes writes that
"[. . .] Richardson’s ‘letters’ are in many ways unlike letters that people actually write [. . .] to the extent that they are to the moment dramatic narratives, attempts to catch living voices in a dramatic present" (396).

13 **Familiar Letters**, which imitates the kinds of letters most people would most likely write, contains very little dialogue. The letters that do contain dialogue exist in the series of letters from the niece on holiday to her aunt. Earlier in this chapter, I argued that this series of letters reflects a glimmer of the kind of introspection Richardson would develop further in Pamela and especially Clarissa. One could also suggest that Richardson is testing the limits of the letter form in another way with his limited use of dialogue in this series.

14 If the number of editions is a guide to popularity, Clarissa probably did not sell as well as Pamela. The first part of Pamela went to its sixth edition within two and a half years, but Clarissa reached only five editions from the time of its first publication to Richardson’s death, thirteen years later; however, the number of editions is not always a good indicator of a book’s popularity because the number of copies in each edition is not known (Eaves and Kimpel 306). Keymer, who has studied the printing history closely, concludes that the first four volumes of Clarissa sold much better than the latter volumes, so much so that Richardson did not sell “as
many copies of Vols. V-VII, *in both the first and second editions*, as he had of Vols. I-IV *in the first edition alone* ("Clarissa’s Death, Clarissa’s Sale, and the Text of the Second Edition" 392). In seeking a reason for the decline in sales after the first installment, Keymer does not concentrate upon the difficulty that the text might have posed for readers but rather on their distaste for the impending death of Clarissa, which readers discussed before the final installment even appeared in print (394-95). Kinkead-Weekes writes that many readers threatened not to buy the final installment unless Richardson changed the ending, surmising that "as a businessman he (Richardson) must have known very clearly how much better a happy ending would have sold" (219). Richardson’s correspondence suggests that the sales of Clarissa might have been disappointing, but as Richardson’s biographers argue, considering the length and complexity of the work, "Richardson had no reason to complain about the reception of his book" (306).
Chapter Four

Factual Ambiguity: Boswell and the Development of the Individual Life

By focusing upon Familiar Letters (1741), Pamela (1740), and Clarissa (1747-48), the previous chapter revealed the emergence of the individual self in Richardson’s writings. Clarissa presented readers with characters who maintain a level of introspection not evident in previous prose fiction. Within her letters, Clarissa concentrates heavily upon her interpretations of the events surrounding her so that her thoughts come to be as important for readers as the action itself. In comparison, Defoe’s narrators focus mainly upon the action, refusing to allow an excessive display of their own thoughts to intrude upon the stories they relate. In Chapter Two, I observed that Defoe’s decision to concentrate upon plot over character was consistent with non-fictional prose narratives of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Furthermore, I argued that prioritizing action over thought made it appear as if writers were being more factual because they were not allowing their own interpretations to cloud the narrative. Richardson’s decision to create more introspective characters reveals a shift from Defoe’s heavy reliance upon the appearance of factuality or reliability. A work like Clarissa delights in the ambiguity that results from having multiple narrators relate their own versions of the same events.
One could argue that the popularity of Richardson during the middle of the eighteenth century suggests that readers no longer expected the novel to imitate so closely the factual autobiographies, biographies, and journals as prose fiction did during Defoe's day. In hindsight, such a shift seems inevitable. As novels became more widespread during the century, they came to be accepted as individual entities that were worthy to stand by themselves. No longer did writers of fiction feel the need to pass off their works as factual narratives, as Defoe did at the beginning of the century. With the parallel between factual and fictional narrative fading, the believability of a fictional narrative no longer was a major concern for readers. Once a reader accepts a plot as a work of fiction, it follows that the degree to which the work imitates reality becomes less important. No longer must prose fiction masquerade as a history or autobiography. Jane Austen's novels, for example, with their third-person omniscient narration, do not appear to be anything other than fictions whose narrative and characters are completely at the mercy of their creator.

The three major published works of James Boswell reveal that toward the end of the century readers might also accept manipulation of reality in non-fiction as well. To what extent is the manipulation of events, characters, dialogue, and action acceptable in a non-fictional narrative, however? Such a question is appropriate for Boswell because his
writings bear a closer relationship to Richardson's than to Defoe's or most of the non-fictional narratives published during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. As I argued in Chapter Two, Defoe's works concentrated heavily upon external circumstances rather than his protagonists' thoughts because, I believe, a focus on the external makes a text appear more reliable or authentic. Once a text (Clarissa, for example) begins to highlight the thoughts of the writer, the reliability of events is called into question because readers are continually reminded that they are seeing interpretations rather than objective reports of events. Boswell's works are characterized by this style. Whether his focus is upon Pasqual Paoli in An Account of Corsica (1768)¹ or Samuel Johnson in the Life of Johnson (1791), Boswell never lets a reader forget that his mind filters all the information on his subjects. In his published works, Boswell repeatedly draws readers' minds back to the writer through phrases like "I observed," "I saw" or "I believed" and lengthy extrapolations on the significance of a person, meeting, or event. Just as readers of Clarissa always take note of the letter writer, so too do readers note the presence of Boswell in his writings.

Observing a connection between Richardson and Boswell is nothing new. In his biography of Boswell, Frederick Pottle remarks that with his emphasis upon drama, Boswell is indebted to Richardson: "It was Richardson--in the mode of fiction, to be sure--who first demonstrated the values of the scrupulous
short-term dramatic stance which furnishes the prime characteristic of Boswell's journalizing" (92). Furthermore, Lovelace's comments on the nature of his own dramatic writing style aptly pertain to Boswell's own method of writing (92). David L. Passler also views Richardson's narratives as precursors to Boswell's style of writing. For Passler, Boswell does not so much imitate the "verbal details" of Richardson's "writing to the moment," but like Richardson he attempts "to catch in words the rhythm and associativeness of thought and conversation" (79). However, neither Pottle nor Passler fully discusses the implications for readers of the fictional/non-fictional narrative pairing that is inherent in paralleling Richardson and Boswell.

As I noted in Chapter Three, the concentration upon writers in Clarissa forces readers to question the reliability of each writer because they see the large role the writer's perspective plays in his or her relating of any event. To a lesser extent, Boswell's integration of himself into his non-fictional writing also draws attention to the role of perspective. In Clarissa such a focus undermines the reliability of the recorded event or action. Though Boswell's writings are works of fact, not fiction, the frequent integration of himself within the work creates the same effect. One might argue that readers accept Boswell's presence just as they do Moll's, Crusoe's, or H.F.'s, but
there is a difference between Boswell and these fictional narrators.

The central contrast, especially between Boswell and Moll or Crusoe, is that Defoe's protagonists are writing their own narratives. In Boswell's published works, however, the narrative concerns another person; Boswell the narrator is not the protagonist. Because of this characteristic, Boswell comes closest to H.F. in *Journal of the Plague Year* (1722), but as I emphasized in Chapter Two, H.F., as a narrator, is characterized by restraint, subordinating the individual self to the plague. While Boswell does exhibit some restraint in *The Journal of a Tour to Corsica* (1768), he puts himself very much on display in his two Johnson narratives, the *Journal of a Tour of the Hebrides* (1785) and the *Life of Johnson*. In addition to a heavy concentration upon self, Boswell employs other fictional techniques such as the use of dialogue and suspense within the narrative.

With these elements in mind, we can return to the earlier question: How important is the manipulation of reality to readers? The popularity of Boswell's published works during his lifetime would suggest that absolute truth was not a high concern for readers. In her discussion of the *Life of Johnson*, Felicity A. Nussbaum states that the debate over whether Boswell's work is fiction or biography has been "completely exhausted and ought to be abandoned" (118), and it is not my goal to continue that particular vein of argument.2
Rather, this chapter assumes at the outset that Boswell’s factual narratives integrate a wide variety of fictional techniques and devices. These techniques range from his extensive use of dialogue to his thorough development of his self as narrator and character. By focusing upon three of his published works, I will consider the implications behind Boswell’s mixture of fiction and fact.

Studying the content of Boswell’s private journals and published works provides insight into how a specific writer records his own sense of self and characterizes other people’s individual selves. Before considering Boswell’s published works, I want to discuss the manner in which his private journals incorporate fictional techniques. Boswell’s use of such techniques sets his journals apart from the kinds of journals and diaries discussed in Chapter One, stylistically aligning them with the works of Defoe and especially Richardson. Because Boswell wrote journals for more than thirty years, readers can observe all the changes Boswell made and note the variation that occurs in his writing style and introspection. Despite some disparity of style and introspection, Boswell’s journals consistently reflect a sense of drama and self that is far closer to the prose fiction of the eighteenth century than to the published journals of the eighteenth century.

One central caveat underlies my approach to Boswell’s works. While Boswell’s fictional techniques and assertion of
self say a great deal about the popularity of fiction and the emergence of individuality toward the end of the century, it is important to realize that Boswell is an exceptional diary writer. Few other writers have conveyed such devotion toward recording personal events. In his biography of Boswell, Frank Brady argues that "sensation" was an important component of Boswell's temperament: "More than most people he lived each day, and he lacked some of the ordinary adult's ability to distance or deaden feeling" (54). Brady reasons that this aspect of Boswell is responsible for his failure to control or hide his sensual desires and emotions. If Boswell did experience a stronger level of sensation than others, it would also suggest that he had a greater compulsion than most writers to write down his feelings as explicitly as he could. Certainly, few writers have sought to record events with the kind of detail evident in Boswell's journals. Though Boswell may be atypical, the success of The Journal of a Tour of Corsica, the Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides, and the Life of Johnson among readers displays their growing interest in the public display of the private self. In his journals and published works, Boswell emphasizes this emerging concentration on the individual by referring to individuals such as John Wilkes who encourage him and his journal writing. In the Life, for example, Boswell records Johnson's advice to "[. . .] write down every thing that you remember, for you cannot judge at first what is good or bad [. . .]" (2: 217).
The sheer scope of Boswell’s journals distinguishes him from writers such as Deborah Bell, Elizabeth Bury, Edward Cooke, Elizabeth Harper, and John Rutty who were discussed in Chapter One. Those journals, which typically covered only a few years of an individual’s life, are far shorter than the thousands of pages that make up all of Boswell’s journals. The multitudinous pages of Boswell’s journals align them more closely with the diaries of John Evelyn or Samuel Pepys. During the years that Evelyn and Pepys maintained diaries (Evelyn for most of his life, Pepys for ten years), they seem to have devoted the same kind of energy to their efforts that Boswell does to his. Furthermore, their diary entries, especially in the case of Pepys, record the events of life with the same kind of specificity that readers find in Boswell’s journal entries. Despite the devotion to detail, neither Evelyn nor Pepys can match Boswell in depicting daily events of life. Boswell is far more introspective than Evelyn, Pepys, or any of the diarists cited in Chapter One. The consistent introspection Boswell’s private journals is the most noticeable parallel to the prose fiction of the middle and late eighteenth century.

By “consistent introspection” I do not mean to argue that every entry in Boswell’s journals contains some reflection on the self. In fact, many of Boswell’s entries are just as cursory as those of spiritual diarists Bury, Harper, and Rutty. In fact, Boswell’s final diary entry, which ends three
decades of journal writing, serves only to record the major events of his day: "Walked into the City, and being kindly asked by Dilly, dined with him and his sister. Nobody could be found to play whist with us. In the evening I was lucky enough to find Mr. George Dance at home, and it ended pleasantly with him" (The Great Biographer 299). Despite this brief entry, the later journals of Boswell contain passages that are more developed and pensive than those from his earlier journals. The smaller emphasis upon introspection that was characteristic of early Boswell probably resulted from his lack of maturity and his intent to write for a specific audience (John Johnston and William McQuhae) (Pottle, Earlier Years 86-87). Still, the London Journal contains many passages in which Boswell the writer considers the significance of an event or remark. For example, Boswell begins this early journal by citing his desire that writing will allow for self-examination:

A man cannot know himself better than by attending to the feelings of his heart and to his external actions, from which he may with tolerable certainty judge 'what manner of person he is.' I have therefore determined to keep a daily journal in which I shall set down my various sentiments and my various conduct, which will not only be very useful but very agreeable. (39)
Boswell’s remarks reflect a more humanistic version of John Beadle’s argument from *The Journal or Diary of a Thankful Christian* (1656) that journal writing allows the diarist to see God’s mercies by re-reading and reflecting upon the events recorded therein. Indeed, Boswell argues that reflecting upon a scene proves more pleasurable than the individual’s original participation in the scene (40).

Boswell’s decision to use journal writing as a means to learn more about himself, however, also parallels the manner in which the fictional Clarissa perceives of her letter writing. Statements throughout Clarissa’s letters display her self-reflection at work as she writes. For example, in one of her earlier letters to Anna Howe, she writes, “But let me examine myself” (1: 134), and then she continues to contemplate her nature by asking questions about vanity, her heart, and the temperament of women. Rather than simply summarize what she learned about herself from her reflections, Clarissa details the very nature of the reflection. When Clarissa seeks to justify her letter writing, she does not simply view her letters as a means for reporting events to Anna; rather the letters serve to convey Clarissa’s state of mind: “If two or three Letters reach you together, they will but express, from one period to another, the anxieties and difficulties which the mind of your unhappy but ever affectionate friend labours under” (1: 151). Furthermore, both Boswell and Clarissa consciously view writing as a means by
which to explore the self, and both writers find rewards in the actual act of writing. Clarissa, for example, tells Anna Howe that she has "no delight...equal to that which I take in conversing with you--By Letter, when I cannot in Person" (1: 29). After Johnson advises Boswell to maintain his journal for life, Boswell addresses the journal as if it were a person; "O my journal! art thou not highly dignified? Shalt thou not flourish tenfold?" (London Journal 305). A few sentences later, Boswell remarks, "I have at present such an affection for this my journal that it shocks me to think of burning it" (305).

Boswell and Clarissa's attitude toward writing is similar to the spiritual diarist's justification for keeping a diary. Though Elizabeth Bury did not begin keeping a diary until she was twenty-six, she writes of seeking God "to try and discover me to myself" when she was only nine years old (53), and the central goal of John Rutty's published diary as stated in the introduction is to reveal to readers the importance of self-examination (xxv). The actual journals of Bury and Rutty, however, fail to heighten a sense of self to the extent of Boswell or Clarissa, nor do the writers take the same pleasure in writing about the self. Rather, the opposite seems the case. In the preface to his published diary, Rutty remarks that the "clearer sight of himself" resulted in a "just contempt of himself" (iii), and Bury equates her journal as the "Account of the Tryals of my self" (54). Boswell and
Clarissa will both undergo periods of depression and self-doubt, but neither writer views the act of writing as a means by which to devalue the self or lower self-esteem as Rutty and Bury do.

At least the journals of Rutty and Bury both acknowledge journal writing's capacity for exploring the self. Other diarists, however, focus upon the journal more as a legacy of one's life than an exploration of one's life. With his fictional narratives, Defoe expresses this latter attitude. The prefaces of his works, which emphasize the instructional value that his protagonists' lives hold for readers, suggest that a record of the individual life holds little value in and of itself. The utilitarian purpose behind Defoe's narratives partially accounts for the reason that a development of self is not a central goal for his protagonists. Like Defoe's protagonists, however, Boswell's personal circumstances and physical surroundings often determine his level of introspection. In Chapter Two, I argued that Robinson Crusoe and H.F. are more introspective than Moll Flanders because they lead more solitary lives in their narratives, and one can observe this same feature throughout Boswell's journals. During the more isolated moments of Boswell's life he becomes more contemplative. Readers also find a more thoughtful Boswell when the events are dire and serious, as in the case of John Reid's conviction for sheep stealing and subsequent hanging. While Boswell's reflective style is evident
throughout each journal volume, he seems to offer more sustained introspection in the later journals. In their introduction to *Boswell in Extremes*, the volume covering Boswell’s middle period, Charles M. Weis and Pottle observe this shift by stating that “Boswell’s middle and later years are not marked by continuously important external events” (ix). However, the growing emphasis upon the “inner stage” does not mean that his journals become monotonous: “The clashing states of mind and feeling which now make up his consciousness are as dramatic, as interesting, as anything in his previous existence” (ix).

Boswell’s later years are characterized by many moments of physical and mental isolation. Preparing his biography of Johnson, attempting to attain a seat in Parliament, worrying about his wife’s health, and ultimately grieving her death are the central subjects of Boswell’s life and his journals during these years. No longer do readers find an energetic young man taking full advantage of London’s opportunities. Rather than holding court with Johnson, Hume, Rousseau or Paoli, we find Boswell figuratively held captive at James Lowther’s remote estate during December of 1787. Without the distractions of a bustling city or an animated conversation, Boswell finds the cold, isolated, and boring atmosphere of Lowther’s home a fine inducement for introspection:

The immediate pressure of uneasiness was terrible, and the dreary waste of the cold house, with nobody
but Saul, a sycophantish fool, to talk to made me almost desperate. I fancy my mind was in a state very similar to that of those wretched mortals who kill themselves. (The English Experiment 167)

Such emotion allows him to write a six-page diary entry for December 28 that records with minute detail the mundane activities of the day: failing to get a good night’s sleep, skipping breakfast, resolving to stay in bed all day, leaving the house, returning to the house, drinking coffee at a nearby inn, and finally speaking to Lowther about being the Recorder at Carlisle. But this entry is most interesting for clearly conveying Boswell’s state of mind during this time. His poor night’s sleep allows him to consider the futility of his current project:

I viewed with wonder and regret my folly in putting myself at such an age as my forty-sixth year into a new state of life by becoming an English barrister. I saw that it was not a life of spirited exertion, as I had supposed, but of much labour for which I had ever been unfit, and of much petulant contest, which in some states of my changeful mind I could not bear. (167)

Thinking of his children and sick wife only makes him more miserable (168). His decision to leave Lowther’s estate sparks some momentary happiness (“a gleam of felicity”) at the thought of seeing his wife again, but the negative
consequences that might result from his leaving push the "warm glow" aside: "But I feared that she would despise my impatience and flight, and that I should be made ridiculous on account of thus forfeiting my expectations from the Great Lowther" (169). Like Clarissa, Boswell uses his writing to work through his emotions. Readers know that Boswell often completed his entries days after the events took place. If this entry is one of those that Boswell did complete later, it reveals his desire to still reflect the indecisiveness that permeated his mind that day. The end of the day reflects a change of heart for Boswell: "The relief as to the Recordership, the novelty of Dr. Lowther, the little comforts of the stomach, and the prospect of moving next day to Whitehaven Castle, which I was assured was warm, made me go to bed in tranquillity" (172). Though Boswell might have composed this entry days later, there is no indication at the beginning of the entry that this day would end on a positive note. Instead, Boswell writes the entry in such a way as to duplicate his state of mind as realistically as possible, which allows readers to experience the wide array of Boswell’s emotions on that day.

Boswell’s ability to convey clearly the variety of emotions and thoughts of a given time period provides for a drama similar to that of Richardson’s epistolary novels. Because Boswell’s writing parallels Richardson’s style of “writing to the moment,” readers of Boswell’s private journals
are always kept in suspense, but Boswell also makes his journals dramatic by taking full advantage of his creative capacity as a writer. Defoe's narratives and many diaries published during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are characterized by a lack of literary style. The prose exists mainly as a means of recording information. For example, Defoe's narrators may record a number of minute details regarding everyday aspects of life, but they do not present these details with a great deal of description. The narrators may summarize conversations but seldom do they incorporate much dialogue. With Defoe's works, diminishing their literary style creates a more objective voice, producing a more believable report in much the same way that a newspaper story does. Defoe's narratives are not at all hampered by this lack of style because the extraordinary circumstances of the protagonists hold readers' interests even though the events are not presented in a very remarkable manner. Unfortunately, most real-life journals of the time period are not comprised of episodes that are nearly as exciting as the "Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Famous Moll Flanders." When a writer refuses to enliven the narrative with description, dialogue or other creative techniques, a chronicle of daily mundane activities soon becomes boring for outside readers.

Like the life of a fictional Defoe protagonist, Boswell's life is filled with more excitement than most people could ever hope to experience. Even if Boswell's journals were not
characterized by a lively narrative voice, fully developed scenes, concrete description, and drama-like exchanges of dialogue, readers would still find Boswell's sexual escapades, conflicts with his father, and meetings with famous people holding their attention. Boswell, however, is not content to provide merely a record of these interesting events; rather he hopes to create a vivid record of his life. For Pottle, Boswell "seizes all his material imaginatively, he creates it" (Introduction 14). This is not to say that Boswell manufactures his life story, but rather that he uses his imagination to present a picture that is "lifelike and dramatic" while still keeping "within the bounds of historical circumstance" (14). Though Boswell's use of imagination certainly brings his journals to life for readers, his decision to incorporate creative techniques does have other (possibly negative) consequences as well, which will be explored later in this chapter.

Though the later journals of Boswell may display more introspection, Pottle argues that the London Journal, covering the years 1762-63, may feature the best writing of his journals: "In his later journals he sometimes has more interesting matter, and as he grew older he became himself a more interesting man, but it is doubtful whether he ever displayed greater literary skill than he does here" (11). Although the opening pages are mainly concerned with brief entries recording his daily activities, the sights, and the
people he meets, the entries soon become more than simple summaries. They come to act as a means through which he can fully develop and sustain the dramatic moment as he experienced it himself. Thus, for example, the entry for 17 December 1762 does not merely list his meetings with Mrs. Lewis (Louisa) and Thomas Sheridan, but instead presents these meetings with detail and rhythm one would expect in a fictional narrative.

Boswell opens this entry by describing his state of mind—"I felt the fine delirium of love" (89)—that necessitates another meeting with Louisa. The subsequent scene between Louisa and Boswell fully reveals the playful nature of their conversation that only can be accomplished through dialogue as Boswell himself acknowledges—"(I think such conversations are best written in the dialogue way)." The scene also conveys Boswell’s emotions—"I was a little bashful"—and his attitude toward Louisa—"(She looked soft and beautiful)" (89). After his meeting with Louisa, Boswell devotes the next several pages to his dinner with Thomas Sheridan. As with the Louisa scene, Boswell relates his time with Sheridan with a similar mixture of dialogue, description, and incorporation of his own thoughts, conveying vividly both the action of the scene and Boswell’s state of mind. Boswell’s balancing act between outward description and his inner thoughts is the same narrative technique that Richardson’s Clarissa integrates in her letters to Anna Howe. On one level, Clarissa’s natural
inclination for storytelling provides readers with fully developed dramatic narratives of her personal circumstances, but at the same time, Clarissa's desire to incorporate her reactions to these circumstances allows reader insight into her emotional and mental states.

As can be expected when writers make the private public, the insight into Boswell's emotional state that characterizes his personal journals is not so prevalent in his published works. Even though Boswell is not the primary subject of his three published works, to varying degrees they still exhibit his propensity for adding drama and self into his writings. Before concentrating upon Boswell's two major published works written toward the end of his life, it is useful to consider briefly a smaller, earlier work that foreshadows the stylistic qualities of the later works. Seventeen years before the Tour to the Hebrides, Boswell in 1768 published The Journal of a Tour to Corsica as part of An Account of Corsica. In this short work focusing primarily upon Boswell's meetings with Pasqual Paoli, leader of Corsica's independence movement, readers see hints of self-integration that would emerge more fully with Boswell's latter publications. Though Boswell's persistent use of "I" reminds readers that the information on Corsica and Paoli is filtered through Boswell's eyes, this work does not contain the self-development evident in the Tour to the Hebrides or the Life of Johnson. Rather than present his travels as a journal, he presents it as a continuous
narrative similar to Defoe's *Journal of the Plague Year*. Boswell believes a diary format would "tire" his readers, so he refrains from relating the events of each day in favor of recording only those most worthy of observation for the publication of the *Tour to Corsica* (154). Such an organizational strategy allows Boswell to focus more upon Paoli and the Corsican revolution than upon his own presence in the country. Still, Boswell relates his emotions throughout the book. In addition to sentences that simply define his place within the report as in "I dined and supped constantly with the General" (164), readers are also privy to information such as "I no longer anxiously thought of myself" (163), "Every day I felt myself happier" (163), and "I felt an elation of mind to see Paoli delighted with the sayings of Mr. Johnson..." (182). Though these statements are not nearly as developed or introspective as those emotions he conveys in the pages of *Tour to the Hebrides*, the *Life*, or his own private journals, they do express Boswell's desire to become a part of the narrative, a feature of the work that caught Johnson's attention. When the Corsica journal was first published, it was paired with Boswell's history titled *An Account of Corsica*, and Johnson writes to Boswell that he strongly prefers the journal version because it stems from Boswell's own experiences: "You express images which operated strongly upon yourself, and you have impressed them with great force upon your readers" (Boswell, *Life* 2: 70). Boswell would not
publish another personal account for seventeen years, but he must have remembered Johnson's advice because he places even more emphasis upon "notions generated within" (2: 70) in the Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides.

The Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides covers Boswell and Johnson's three-month excursion in 1773. Many critics view the journal as a preview to the Life of Johnson. Rather than view the Tour as a lesser Life of Johnson, I see it as a text that reveals Boswell's ability to incorporate his own thoughts more fully than travel writers prior to Boswell did. Almost everything in the Tour is a reaction to a place or the actions of another person, most often Johnson. But where Boswell differs from so many previous diarists is in his desire to provide more than the mere description of the place or action. Instead, he often reflects for several sentences upon the significance of what he has seen or what Johnson has said. In Chapter One, I quoted one of Boswell's comments from The Hypochondriack in which he defends diaries on the grounds that writing allows individuals to place their "thoughts and actions in a mode not subject to change" (257), and the Tour serves as a fine example to reveal how Boswell uses the written text to link inner thoughts and external actions.

Though the Tour exhibits many literary characteristics such as the use of dialogue, manipulation of time, and awareness of audience, it still reads as a journal with its daily-entry organization and informal style. Despite
featuring many characteristics of other journals published during the century, the Tour is far more introspective than most. Boswell has the ability to take an insignificant event and heighten it to make a point. For example, in the 31 August entry Boswell writes of Johnson and himself passing a group of soldiers. Boswell and Johnson give them two shillings for drinks. The soldiers, he writes, go on to "make merry." Boswell then develops this event, which most diarists would mention only in passing, for several sentences. Not only is Boswell's lengthy treatment of this event important, but his organization proves interesting as well. Boswell juxtaposes references to the soldiers' actions with Johnson's own ideas and Boswell's thoughts on those ideas. After Johnson gives them more money, Boswell reacts in the following manner:

He (Johnson) is really generous, loves influence, and has the way of gaining it. He said, 'I am quite feudal, sir.' Here I agree with him. I said, I regretted I was not the head of a clan; however, though not possessed of such an hereditary advantage, I would always endeavor to make my tenants follow me. I could not be a patriarchal chief, but I would be a feudal chief. (5: 136)

Note how Boswell moves from describing outward action, to inner thoughts, to Johnson's comment, and back to his own ideas on class structure. Boswell returns to the soldiers
again, some of whom are fighting and tracking blood on the floor. He then digresses into a detailed physical description of the house where they are staying—how it was built of thick turfs, was thatched with thinner turfs, was three rooms in length, and had a little room that projected (5: 136). The next paragraph describes dinner, at which point Boswell is able to make reference to the soldiers again, which leads to Johnson’s comments on the duty and job of a soldier. This part of the entry that I have described, with its tangents and detours, serves as an example of Boswell’s informality that I alluded to earlier. But within the disarray of this passage is Boswell’s remarkable ability to take what seems an insignificant event (giving money to soldiers) and turn it into something that reveals both the character of the writer (Boswell) and his subject (Johnson).

Throughout Boswell’s works readers note his ability to draw information out of a person. Boswell himself admits in the Tour that he believes he was “fortunate enough frequently to draw [Johnson] forth to talk, when he would have otherwise been silent” (5: 278). This scene with the soldiers, however, exhibits his skill at extracting detailed information from something most people would view as nothing more than a mundane moment. What I find interesting in this scene and the others like it in this journal is the complexity that exists despite the lack of cohesion within the scene. Boswell is almost like a film editor, cutting here, drawing in for a
close-up there. This kind of writing does not exist in the prose narratives from earlier in the century. Defoe, for example, were he to develop a scene around such a small event would not sustain the episode as long as Boswell does. He would mention the event and possibly his narrator's thoughts on the event briefly, and then move on to something else. In contrast, however, Richardson's narrators regularly incorporate their own insight along with their descriptions of events and people. Pamela and, to a much greater extent, Clarissa both are excellent reporters of events, but they also focus a great deal of attention upon the implications those events hold for them. Boswell may not prolong a specific moment or scene for several pages as Clarissa chooses to do in some of her letters, but he does "read" people and events in much the same manner as Clarissa does. Unlike most of the journals that I focused upon in Chapter One, the full exploration of topics in Boswell's *Tour* removes much of the reader's guesswork regarding the writer's thoughts and motivations.

Boswell is careful when divulging his emotions to readers, however, and at times, he delays telling us his true feelings, and this hesitation builds a fiction-like suspense into the *Tour*. At the end of the entry for 1 September, Boswell writes of making Johnson angry when Boswell leaves him alone for a short time:
I thought there could be no harm in leaving him for a little while. He called me back with a tremendous shout, and was really in passion with me for leaving him. I told him my intentions, but he was not satisfied, and said, 'Do you know, I should as soon have thought of picking a pocket, as doing so.'--Boswell. 'I am diverted with you, sir.'--Johnson. 'Sir, I could never be diverted with incivility. Doing such a thing, makes one lose confidence in him who has done it, as one cannot tell what he may do next.'--His extraordinary warmth confounded me so much, that I justified myself but lamely to him; yet my intentions were not improper. (5: 145)

Boswell continues with a discussion of other matters, but he ends this entry by including Johnson's threat that if Boswell had continued on without him, Johnson would have parted with him at Edinburgh and never spoken to him again. This scene represents the kind of restraint that is so common in both non-fictional and fictional eighteenth-century narratives. Often, readers have to surmise the true emotions of the writer or protagonist because he or she refuses to put the emotions on the page. How serious was the confrontation between Boswell and Johnson? The nearest hint we have is the following: "His extraordinary warmth confounded me so much, that I justified myself but lamely to him; yet my intentions
were not improper" (5: 145). "[W]armth," "confounded," "lamely"—what do these descriptors mean for readers? We are left to wonder—that is, until the next entry. Then, we learn that Boswell had a hard time sleeping because he was so upset. Boswell honestly feared that he could have lost the friendship of Johnson completely. When Boswell confronts Johnson about the event, Johnson makes clear that he would never have left him as he threatened, but he adds that Boswell received what he deserved by believing such a claim from night until morning (5: 147). Matters are resolved. Now readers are better able to realize the seriousness with which Boswell took the claim, and the spirit in which Johnson made the claim, but like Boswell, we had to wait until the next day or entry.

Boswell may keep readers in the dark or in suspense for a few paragraphs, but he does give us a better understanding of his emotions. As Chapter One made clear, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, many writers of fiction and non-fiction—whether they were writing for an audience or not—failed to fully disclose their emotions. It is important to note, however, that Boswell, though more open than most writers, still withholds information and keeps readers wondering. The best example occurs at the end of the Tour when he writes of the argument that developed between his father and Johnson. He writes "They became exceedingly warm, and violent, and I was very much distressed by being present at such an altercation between two men, both of whom I
reverenced; yet I durst not interfere" (5: 382). Here are words similar to those used in his entry from 1 September--"warm," "violent," "distressed." Unlike the 1 September entry, however, Boswell keeps the information to himself. The next sentence reads: "It would certainly be very unbecoming in me to exhibit my honoured father, and my respected friend, as intellectual gladiators, for the entertainment of the publick; and therefore I suppress what would, I dare say, make an interesting scene in this dramatich sketch" (5: 382). And so this argument goes down in history as what Allan Wendt in his introduction to the Tour says may well be the greatest unwritten scene in English literature (xiv). Unfortunately, the manuscript of the Tour does not elaborate further on this scene either. Despite his restraint, Boswell still devotes more space to this personal scene than Johnson, who does not even record it in his Journey to the Western Islands (1775).

Johnson’s version of the trip differs significantly from Boswell’s version by focusing more heavily upon the land, buildings and general populace of the islands. On the whole, Johnson’s account of Scotland is similar to the descriptive sections of Edward Cooke’s and Woodes Rogers’ sea journals that were discussed in Chapter One. Rather than concentrating upon himself, Johnson observes the country’s physical aspects of the country that most travelers would note, so he rarely refers to Boswell and incorporates no dialogue. He omits most personal activities such as sleeping arrangements,
conversations and meals that comprise such a large portion of Boswell’s account. Often, references to the traveler are in third person, as when he explains that the “roads of Scotland afford little diversion to the traveller” (9). These characteristics of Johnson’s account do not mean that it is void of an individual voice. Johnson includes his opinions throughout, but they tend to lack the specificity of Boswell’s opinions. When they visit the village of Glenmollison, for example, Johnson is impressed by the landlord, who is more educated than Johnson seems to have expected. When he describes the landlord, Johnson is careful to convey his insight in such a manner so that readers do not become distracted by the writer’s presence:

We had gained so much the favour of our host, that, when we left his house in the morning, he walked by us a great way, and entertained us with conversation both on his own condition, and that of the country. His life seemed to be merely pastoral, except that he differed from some of the ancient Nomades in having a settled dwelling. (37)

While these lines do reflect the personality of a writer (who but a city dweller would find the life of a village landlord to be “pastoral”?), they draw only enough attention to the writer’s experience to convey the host’s friendliness and simple life. Johnson, for example, relates the general subject of their conversation (the growing dissatisfaction
with rising rents that was forcing many Scots to emigrate), but he does not record his opinions of the discussion.

Of course, Boswell's account of this host is much different. Boswell focuses upon the same aspects of the host as Johnson, such as his knowledge of grammar and his dissatisfaction with the rising land rents; unlike Johnson, Boswell gives the host's name (M'Queen) and records Johnson's reply when the host says that he would emigrate to America in a year (135-36). The central difference between the two accounts, however, is Boswell's refusal to keep himself in the background as Johnson does. In the next journal entry, Boswell refers to the host again but in a more negative manner by expressing his own fears of the man: "I awaked very early. I began to imagine that the landlord, being about to emigrate, might murder us to get our money, and lay it upon the soldiers in the barn" (139). According to Boswell, Johnson had these same fears, but they are never raised in Johnson's account. Boswell then presents an unflattering description of Johnson "sound asleep [. . .] with a coloured handkerchief tied round his head" (140). Like Johnson, Boswell records M'Queen's walk with them, but rather than mentioning the dissatisfaction with the high rents, Boswell reports that the host narrated the events of his time in the Highland army. At this point, Boswell again focuses the reader's attention upon himself by stating his emotional reaction to the host's account of the battle of Culloden:
[. . .] I could not refrain from tears. There is a certain association of ideas in my mind upon that subject, by which I am strongly affected. The very Highland names, or the sound of a bagpipe, will stir my blood, and fill me with a mixture of melancholy and respect for courage [. . .]. (140)

Introspective passages like this one in the Tour remind readers that the book is very much Boswell's personal account of Scotland. Johnson's account of Scotland is personal as well (this exclusion of M'Queen's battle story probably was based on its lack of relevance for him), but Johnson does not seek to remind readers of the personal viewpoint as Boswell does. Johnson's focus away from himself makes his report appear more objective. Because Boswell develops his internal thoughts along with his external observations, his account takes on a more individualistic quality than Johnson's does, making it, I believe, more interesting. However, at the same time, his narrative appears less reliable than Johnson's because Boswell continually reminds readers of his personal involvement in events. Thus, readers note the high degree of interpretation in Boswell's version.

Contrasting Johnson's Journey to the Western Islands with Boswell's Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides reveals the large role that the individual self plays in the latter work. Although the Tour is introspective, it does not feature the same kind of developed or sustained introspection that one
finds in Richardson's *Clarissa*, for example. Richardson's work portrays individuals who use writing to explore in great detail different facets of their internal and external conflicts. In his published works, Boswell rarely expounds upon a single idea or conflict for more than a few sentences or paragraphs. What typifies Boswell's exploration of self is its omnipresence. In the *Tour* and less so in the *Life*, Boswell continually relates other people's words or actions to his own situation. Boswell rarely seems unable to find some personal relevance in almost everyone or everything. At the beginning of this study, I suggested that Elizabeth Harper's restraint about her son and Moll Flanders' restraint about her children may be due in part to their discomfort with the written text. Boswell, on the other hand, like Pamela, Clarissa, and Lovelace, is quite comfortable with the written word. Patricia Meyer Spacks refers to Boswell's comment in the *Life* in which he states, "'And as a lady adjusts her dress before a mirror, a man adjusts his character by looking at his journal'" (3: 228), as an example of the value that Boswell places upon the journal: "By studying his journal he discovers and partly controls who he is" (*Imagining a Self* 228). According to Pottle, an experience for Boswell "[. . .] was not complete, not lived through, not wholly realized, until he had explored it verbally and had written it down" (87). Erin F. Labbie takes Pottle's observation further by observing that the language of the journal allows Boswell both to complete
his life and to conceive of his life. Without this language, "the self ceases to exist" (56). This same sentiment is echoed by Brian Evenson, who argues that "[f]or Boswell, life has no privilege over writing," because events are completed and take on a life of their own only when Boswell writes about them (71). Boswell "completes" the events in his life a number of ways. In my discussion of his personal journals, I cited the manner in which Boswell uses writing to reflect upon the significance of an event. Furthermore, writing allows him to develop a persona or to present himself in such a manner that he takes on a more positive role than he has in the actual world, as when he writes in the London Journal that he fancies himself like Macheath (264). In the Tour Boswell goes to great lengths both to cite his admiration for Johnson, a feeling that would have been obvious to his acquaintances, and to portray himself as a near equal, an image that was neither apparent nor acceptable to his acquaintances. Boswell's writing reveals this heightening of self in a number of different ways, from the unflattering descriptions of Johnson's habits or behavior, making Johnson appear more common, to the emphasis upon Johnson's flattering remarks to Boswell, as in the case of Johnson's comments on Boswell's writing: "'You improve: it grows better and better'" (5: 226). Boswell's work exhibits the real power of text, however, in the manner in which he uses writing to get in the last word against Johnson. For example, after Johnson crushes a comment
about night caps that Boswell thought was witty, Boswell writes one more sentence in which he justifies for readers his comment to Johnson, claiming that his own “hit was fair enough” (5: 269). While Boswell uses his journal as a defense against Johnson, he also reveals to readers the pleasure of writing down memories when he says: “I have often experienced, that scenes through which a man has passed, improve by lying in the memory: they grow mellow” (5: 333). What better way to remember the past than through the written word?

Readers can expect some focus on himself in Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides because the book is after all primarily taken from his personal journal, and furthermore, he was at Johnson’s side almost every moment of the three-month trip. Thus, the Tour is still more travel book than biography. On the other hand, the Life of Johnson is a biography whose primary subject is Samuel Johnson. The title page is not the Life of Johnson and Boswell, yet through much of the biography readers might wonder if such a title might be more accurate.

Patricia Meyer Spacks, for example, observes that though Boswell’s introduction justifies his focus on both the public and private nature of Johnson’s life, he never explains why this focus requires “insistent self-presentation” (Gossip 102). The extent to which Boswell thrusts himself forth in the story of another man’s life reveals just how comfortable Boswell had become with the development of self.
Because of its scope, Boswell’s *Life of Johnson* offers readers a much greater variety of introspection than *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*. In comparison to the parts of the biography that cover the years after Boswell and Johnson’s first meeting, the opening pages cover Johnson’s life in a more cursory manner with less insight from the author. Though Boswell does not integrate himself into the narrative to the extent that he will do later, it is significant that he chooses to integrate himself at all.

He never lets the reader forget that “Boswell the writer” is responsible for what is included in the biography. Marlies K. Danziger observes that readers are aware of Boswell’s presence not only as a participant in the narrative but “as a later self engaged in the process of writing and rethinking his material” (162). From the beginning of the narrative, Boswell uses the pronoun “I” extensively. Perhaps to modern readers, Boswell’s use of “I” does not seem strange, but a stylistic comparison to Johnson’s *Life of Savage* (1744) reveals the lengths to which an earlier biographer will go to keep himself out of the narrative. Nearly fifty years separate the publications of *Life of Savage* and *Life of Johnson*, and a comparison between the two not only reflects upon Boswell’s perception of the biographer’s role, but also reveals the significant stylistic changes that would take place within the evolving genre of biography. According to Brady, Boswell’s *Life* was innovative in two distinct ways.
First, Boswell combined the ethical and anecdotal traditions of biography so that the Life serves to hold up Johnson as an example to readers and to involve readers in his life through the incorporation of Boswell's stories about Johnson. Second, Boswell developed the role of psychological analysis (The Later Years 425). Boswell's willingness to expand this last aspect in his biography signals the growing acceptance of the individual perspective toward the end of the century. Just as prose fiction integrated more introspective narrators as the eighteenth century progressed, biographical writing substantially developed the role of the biographer's thoughts and interpretations of the subject as the century advanced. Though Johnson never draws as much attention to himself as Boswell does, his later biographies, which make up the majority of his Lives of the Poets (1781), do reflect a writer more willing to draw attention to his role as biographer. For example, in introducing a discussion of Gray's works he purposely focuses upon himself as writer: "Gray's poetry is now to be considered, and I hope not to be looked on as an enemy to his name if I confess that I contemplate it with less pleasure than his life" (433). After recording the major events of William Collins's life, Johnson states that Collins was a person "with whom I delighted to converse, and whom I yet remember with tenderness" (339).

Even though these later biographies reflect a more forthright Johnson, they still do not elevate the biographer's
role to the level of Boswell, both in terms of his repeated intrusion into Johnson’s life story and his confidence in the work itself: “I flatter myself that few biographers have entered upon such a work as this, with more advantages; independent of literary abilities, in which I am not vain enough compare myself with some great names who have gone before me in this kind of writing” (1: 26). A few pages later, after defending the organization of the Life, Boswell writes: “Had his other friends been as diligent and ardent as I was, he might have been almost entirely preserved. As it is, I will venture to say that he will be seen in this work more completely than any man who has yet ever lived” (1: 30). So definitive a statement reflects the value that the individual life has in Boswell’s mind. Despite Johnson’s preference for the “narratives of the lives of particular persons” over “[h]istories of the downfall of kingdoms” (319) that he espouses in Rambler 60, he might have been surprised at Boswell’s belief that a life can be presented so completely in prose. In observing the changes that the notion of self undergoes in the eighteenth century, John O. Lyons focuses upon the Lives of the Poets and the Life of Johnson as representing two different attitudes toward the individual life:

It takes little imagination to guess what Johnson’s reaction to Boswell’s version of his life would have been had he lived to see it. He would have
been confused, ashamed, aghast, astonished. Not at the details—although he would surely have emendations and corrections for every page—but at the motive behind such an undertaking. (6)

A more specific comparison between *Life of Savage* (1744) and *Life of Johnson* reveals just how extensively Boswell integrates himself. Like Boswell’s biography, Johnson’s biography makes many evaluative statements upon the life and works of his subject. However, where Boswell seems comfortable in making it clear that he is the one forming the opinions, Johnson expresses his opinions in a more anonymous fashion. Johnson’s focus away from himself as writer and onto his subject necessitates a heavy reliance passive sentence constructions: “It may be alledged, that the same Man may change his Principles...” (45), “This must at least be acknowledged...that this Poem can promote no other Purposes than those of Virtue, and that it is written with a very strong Sense of the Efficacy of Religion” (54), and “It is observable, that the Close of this Poem discovers a Change which Experience had made in Mr. Savage’s Opinions” (94). Over the course of *Life of Savage*, Johnson employs the first-person “I” in referring to himself only about twenty times. In comparison, Boswell uses “I” twenty times just between the years 1709 and 1727 in his biography of Johnson, and this count does not include Boswell’s footnotes. Boswell’s application of the first-person singular draws attention to
the controlling power of the writer in statements such as "Nor can I omit a little instance of that jealous independence of spirit" (1: 39), "I always thought that he did himself injustice in his account of what he had read" (1: 70), or "I do not find that he formed any close intimacies with his fellow-collegians" (1: 74).

Boswell's integration of himself into the first part of the biography reveals a unique confidence in the self. Several times for the years prior to 1763, Boswell adds personal anecdotes about the older Johnson to supplement the biographical information for the younger Johnson he never knew personally. This technique is evident, for example, when Boswell details young Johnson's vision problems. Boswell begins the paragraph by simply describing the condition:

Young Johnson had the misfortune to be much afflicted with the scrophula, or king's evil, which disfigured a countenance naturally well formed, and hurt his visual nerves so much, that he did not see at all with one of his eyes, though its appearance was little different from that of the other. (1: 41)

This sentence and the rest of the paragraph, however, reveal the manner in which Boswell uses his own experiences with Johnson to reflect upon a moment in Johnson's life about which he has no personal knowledge. This passage on Johnson's eyesight appears under the heading of 1712--when Johnson was
three years old—but Boswell uses his familiarity with the older Johnson to argue that though blind in one eye, Johnson’s eyes differed little in appearance from one another. Later in the paragraph Boswell asserts that Johnson’s poor eyesight was probably only nearsightedness, and Boswell relates a brief story from their trip to Scotland to support his belief: “When he and I were travelling in the Highlands of Scotland, and I pointed out to him a mountain which I observed resembled a cone, he corrected my inaccuracy, by shewing me, that it was indeed pointed at the top, but that one side of it was larger than the other (1: 41). In this passage and others similar to it from the years prior to 1763, Boswell reveals his determination not to allow the absence of personal contact to deter him from offering his own personal insight. Boswell’s manipulation of time—using his knowledge of Johnson’s later life to reflect upon his early life—reveals that the writer’s perspective characterizes even these early scenes, reminding readers that even these early anecdotes are not objective.

How did Johnson’s sight affect him at age three? Readers of the Life will never know, but instead will assume—because of Boswell’s direction—that it affected him about as much as it did when he was an older man. Though Boswell organizes the Life chronologically, he allows the later years to shape the perception of the early years of his subject.

In contrast, Defoe’s fictional narrators rarely use the benefit of hindsight to reflect back upon something in their
lives. Readers may know from the title page, for example, that Moll Flanders was married five times during her life, but as a narrator relating the history of her life, she never allows her knowledge of subsequent husbands to intrude upon the manner in which she writes of her first husband. Moll never says something like, "Had I known that one day I would meet Jemy, a man I would love more than any other, I might have been less apt to quickly marry my first husband." Instead, she remains loyal to the chronological organization of her story, rarely letting knowledge of later events clarify earlier events in her narrative. While Boswell's decision to include an anecdote about the 59-year-old Johnson to reflect upon the three-year-old Johnson may diminish young Johnson's physical plight, it does convey something about Johnson's determination to overcome this disability. The difference between Boswell's and Defoe's methods as writers is the degree to which they control the reading experience. Though a Defoe narrator may not manipulate time to suggest something significant about a character or an event, readers will still grasp the significance at some point in the narrative. In the earlier example of Moll Flanders, readers, early in the narrative, may not realize fully how shallow Moll's love is for her first husband, but as she relates each subsequent marriage, readers may look back to this first marriage with increasing disapproval. In the *Life*, as readers learn of Johnson's trip to Scotland or France, most would reach the
conclusion--consciously or subconsciously--that Johnson
overcame or certainly tolerated the vision problem that
afflicted him in his childhood, but Boswell chooses to make
the point early in the book even at the risk of trivializing
the childhood malady.

Boswell also integrates himself into Johnson’s narrative
prior to their first meeting by stating his opinions upon
Johnson’s works. This technique is evident throughout the
Life, but after 1763, Boswell not only comments upon Johnson’s
written works but upon his oral arguments as well. In
addition to allowing him another means through which to insert
himself into the Johnson narrative prior to 1763, Boswell’s
comments on the Life of Savage, The Rambler and The Idler also
convey his own personality and his perception of Johnson’s
role in his own life.

In his study of the Life, Greg Clingham sees Boswell’s
comments upon Rasselas, The Rambler, and The Lives of the
Poets as Boswell’s failure to adequately convey the complexity
of Johnson’s content and style (James Boswell 85-97). For
example, Clingham faults Boswell’s reading of the Rambler
because Boswell underplays the flexibility of the essays and
stereotypes Johnson as a grave moralist (91). In their
introduction to the Rambler essays, Bate and Strauss observe
that fewer than half can be considered strictly moral essays
(xxvi), so it would seem that Clingham’s opinion of Boswell is
well-founded. Rather than see Boswell as simplifying
Johnson, however, one might look at Boswell’s statements upon Rambler morality as providing insight into what he believes to be an important function of reading, and it is obvious that he finds instruction to be one of the fundamental advantages of reading. Several other times during his analysis of the Rambler, Boswell alludes to its instructional quality with such statements as the following: “The Rambler furnishes such an assemblage of discourses on practical religion and moral duty [. . .]” (1: 214); “[. . .] in no writings whatever can be found more bark and steel for the mind[. . .]” (1: 215); “[t]hough instruction be the predominate purpose of The Rambler [. . .]” (1: 215); and “Johnson writes like a teacher” (1: 224). A reader of Boswell’s private journals knows that morality was a large concern of Boswell, and his emphasis upon the moral aspects of The Rambler in the Life reflects this aspect of his intellect. Furthermore, his comments reflect Boswell’s perception of Johnson himself. Throughout the last two-thirds of the biography, readers find Boswell habitually seeking advice from Johnson. Some critics see Boswell’s prodding as a means of manipulating Johnson so that he can gather material for the biography that he was planning as early as 1772. However, Boswell’s actions also demonstrate that Boswell found in Johnson a teacher and father figure. For readers, these comments upon The Rambler foreshadow these roles that Johnson would come to play in Boswell’s life after 1763.
Throughout the Life, Boswell will serve as a critic of Johnson’s works, but once he encounters Johnson personally in 1763, he no longer restricts himself solely to Johnson’s publications. He now reacts to Johnson’s statements throughout the Life. Just as the passages that focus upon “Boswell the reader” reflect what he values as part of the reading experience, the “Boswell as listener” passages reflect Boswell’s values in general. The first quarter of Boswell’s biography integrates the biographer more than many other biographies would, but from the time Boswell records his first meeting with Johnson, the Life becomes almost as much Boswell’s story as Johnson’s story. Boswell signals this shift with the following statement: “This is to me a memorable year; for in it I had the happiness to obtain the acquaintance of that extraordinary man whose memoirs I am now writing; an acquaintance which I shall ever esteem as one of the most fortunate circumstances in my life” (1: 383), and much has been written about Boswell as listener or subject in the Life. Regardless of whether readers see Boswell’s expansion of self in a negative or positive light, the consequence of this expansion is the same. By heightening himself to the extent that he does in the last three-quarters of the Life, Boswell uses the biography as a means for him to address his own struggles with life. Explicating life’s conflicts was the same goal of Boswell’s private journals; with the Life, however, the explication becomes public. Danziger observes
that despite Boswell's concentration upon himself, he still reveals a self-restraint in the Life that is not evident in the Tour. For example, she cites Boswell's reluctance to include his feelings for Margaret Boswell in the Life, despite the fact that she was slowly dying while he was writing the biography (163). This restraint is not evident in the Tour, however, as he feels the need "to pay fulsome tribute to his wife Margaret for giving up their bedchamber during Johnson's visit--and, indeed, for marrying him in the first place" (162).

Boswell may restrain himself in the Life by omitting many specific personal stories, but his conversations with Johnson reveal Boswell's skill in directing the topics toward his personal interests. The difference between the Life and his private journals is in Boswell's approach to topics that concern him directly. In his private journals, Boswell explicitly addresses his attitudes toward his father, his family, his religion and his sexual promiscuity. The Life addresses these same topics though in a more general and discursive manner. A short anecdote from 28 July 1763 serves as a good example of Boswell's method of incorporating a seemingly insignificant event that was of great importance for Boswell:

As we walked across the Strand to-night, arm in arm, a woman of the town accosted us, in the usual enticing manner. 'No, no, my girl, (said Johnson)
it won’t do.’ He, however, did not treat her with harshness, and we talked of the wretched life of such women; and agreed, that much more misery than happiness, upon the whole, is produced by illicit commerce between the sexes. (1: 457)

Later, in a passage from 5 April 1772, Boswell records a discussion with Johnson as to whether fornication qualifies as a heinous sin, and Johnson responds with an explication of the word “whoremonger,” suggesting that a sin is only a heinous sin “if persisted in” (2: 172). This must have been the response Boswell was seeking, for he writes a footnote stating, “It must not be presumed that Dr. Johnson meant to give any countenance to licentiousness, though in the character of an Advocate he made a just and subtle distinction between occasional and habitual transgression” (2: 172). The inclusion of this discussion and the earlier encounter with a prostitute reflect Boswell’s concern with his own sexual misconduct. Pottle and Brady’s two-volume biography of Boswell and Boswell’s journals themselves return repeatedly to Boswell’s sexual indiscretions. The London Journal conveys forthrightly Boswell’s divided self regarding his relations with women. Within one paragraph, for example, Boswell makes the claim that he is “determined to have nothing to do with whores,” but seven sentences later he writes that he “picked up a girl in the Strand” (49). This story comes early in the Journal, and readers know that it marks only the first of many
references to prostitutes, Louisa and "Signor Gonorrhoea." Boswell's *Life* contains no such explicit examples or stories, but his decision to raise sexual subjects within the narrative suggests that not only did Boswell see the real-life Johnson as a sounding board for his concerns, but he also found that writing about Johnson allowed him to continue to raise issues that plagued his mind long after Johnson's death.

Johnson's advice and compliments to Boswell on a variety of matters become recurring themes in the biography, and Boswell's inclusion of them is one more method through which he draws attention to himself. Johnson, for example, advises him to maintain his personal journal and write of his travels. As I noted earlier in this chapter, he compliments Boswell on the personal account of Corsica, and he expresses sadness when Boswell must return to Scotland. Boswell defends these moments in the narrative by arguing that they are included not because of his vanity but because "they afford unquestionable evidence of [Johnson's] tenderness and complacency" (1: 451). Because the majority of the *Life* is filled with Johnson's advice for Boswell, his observations on life, and his peculiar habits, these aspects of Johnson's life become as important or more important than sections of the biography devoted to Johnson's works. The effect for readers then is that "Johnson the conversationalist obscures Johnson the writer" (Brady, *The Later Years* 449). While this alteration may trouble some critics, shifting the priority from the works to the man is
Boswell's central point in writing the biography, for he argues in the introduction "that minute particulars are frequently characteristick, and always amusing, when they relate to a distinguished man" (1: 33).

This focus, however, probably best represents the century's growing concern with the individual. Defoe's narratives also incorporated "minute particulars," but his narrators concentrated more upon objects than conversation. Boswell is so concerned with the individual personality that he sometimes includes remarks or arguments only to disregard the topics in favor of further describing the demeanor of Johnson. For example, on 3 August 1763, Boswell records a time when he jokingly remarked upon Hume's comment that Johnson "'would stand before a battery of cannon, to restore the Convocation to its full powers'" (1: 464). Boswell erroneously believed Johnson would never utter such a statement, and Boswell's mistake upsets Johnson tremendously. Boswell writes:

He was walking up and down the room while I told him the anecdote; but when he uttered this explosion of high-church zeal, he had come close to my chair, and his eyes flashed with indignation. I bowed to the storm, and diverted the force of it, by leading him to expatiate on the influence which religion derived from maintaining the church with great external respectability. (1: 464)
In this instance, however, Boswell does not record what Johnson said. Instead, he focuses upon the individual over the individual's message - Johnson's actions are more important than what Johnson says. Simultaneously, this scene draws attention to Boswell's character. Throughout my analysis of Boswell's works, I have given examples of his method of using writing to defend himself in print against some of Johnson's remarks. This moment in the Life serves as one more example of such a defense. In focusing upon Johnson's behavior in this scene, Boswell asserts his own individuality. He describes Johnson's remarks on the high church as an "explosion of high church zeal." Johnson's "eyes flashed with indignation." Boswell comes off as the pacifist surrendering to the "storm," and he wisely diverts "the force of it" by guiding Johnson to "expatiate" upon the church and its respectability. In refusing to present what Johnson says about the church, Boswell leaves the reader with the image of an angry Johnson and a meek Boswell. The presentation of this scene is quite different in Boswell's private journal, suggesting that when writing the Life, Boswell was deeply concerned with how he appeared to readers. Though the London Journal does not transcribe Johnson's specific remarks on the Anglican Church either, there is no figurative language or suggestion of Johnson's hostility toward Boswell. Instead, he describes the whole matter in one sentence: "He talked much of restoring the Convocation of the Church of England to its full
powers, and said that religion was much assisted and impressed on the mind by external pomp" (333).

Perhaps because he does not want his presence to detract from the solemn mood the biography evokes for Johnson’s final days, Boswell attempts to remove himself from the Life: “I now relieve the readers of this Work from any farther personal notice of its authour” (4: 380). But as Spacks rightly observes, Boswell “continues to ‘obtrude’” in the final pages of the Life (Gossip 102). He returns once again to his mode as reader and offers examples and opinions on imitators of Johnson’s style (4: 385-392). He focuses upon his job as a writer by drawing the reader’s attention to the difficult task of presenting Johnson’s final days (4: 398). However, after Johnson’s death, Boswell finds that he is unable to develop a significant reaction to his departure: “I trust, I shall not be accused of affectation, when I declare, that I find myself unable to express all that I felt upon the loss of such a ‘Guide, Philosopher, and Friend.’ I shall, therefore, not say one word of my own, but adopt those of an eminent friend...” (4: 420). Boswell’s inability or refusal to record his own thoughts upon this great loss reflects, I believe, the difficulty that comes with attempting to make one’s feelings appear “true” in writing. Boswell’s mute voice reflects the limitations of text. Throughout the Life, Boswell has presented a confident self to the reader; the dialogue, opinions, and stories not only provided readers with a greater
understanding of Johnson but a greater appreciation for the friendship between Boswell and Johnson. If Boswell's final statement upon Johnson's death seems inadequate to readers, however, it has the potential to undercut the persona and relationship that Boswell has sought to establish for more than one thousand pages. Rather than risk diminishing the self at this point, Boswell chooses to remove it altogether.

As I have emphasized throughout this chapter, the matter of truth is a concern when approaching any factual work. Since its publication, readers have debated the extent of truth in the Life. For a reader like William C. Dowling, factual and imaginative works are not mutually exclusive. In the Boswellian Hero, Dowling asserts that just as readers no longer expect to find the "real" or historical Macbeth in Shakespeare's play, we should not concern ourselves with the "real" Boswell or the "real" Johnson in Tour to the Hebrides or Life of Johnson (90). Though interesting, Dowling's comparison is flawed. Readers approach a work of non-fiction trusting that it will be true, and the writer's use of literary or fictional techniques must inherently affect the truth of a work. Brady, for example, observes that "[f]act and fiction evoke fundamentally different mental sets, and faced with a written work a reader is profoundly uneasy until he knows which set is appropriate" (The Later Years 423). Because of Boswell's strong emphasis upon self and interpretation in his writings, however, readers can never be
completely at ease with the factuality of the narrative because they are continually reminded that the reality of the narrative stems from the writer's point of view. The clearest example in the *Life* that displays both the power of point of view and the inaccuracy that results from this point of view is Boswell's friendship with Johnson. In Boswell's *Johnson: A Preface to the Life*, Richard B. Schwartz observes that from our knowledge of other sources, "Boswell was far less important to Johnson than the *Life* might suggest" (101). Yet because of Boswell's skills as a writer we are still surprised to recall that he was not mentioned in Johnson's will (101). The friendship with Johnson that Boswell develops over the pages of the *Life* makes it a much more interesting biography than it would be were the friendship not portrayed as strongly. But in exchange for interest, readers lose a certain degree of truth.
Endnotes

1 The full title of Boswell’s work is An Account of Corsica, The Journal of a Tour to That Island, and Memoirs of Pascal Paoli, reflecting the three sections of the book. Throughout this chapter, I am concerned with the section of Boswell’s personal account, The Journal of a Tour to That Island, which, during this century, has been published separately and as part of Boswell on the Grand Tour, edited by Frank Brady and Frederick A. Pottle. To avoid confusion between Boswell’s historical account of the island and his own personal account, I will refer to the journal portion of An Account of Corsica as The Journal of a Tour to Corsica.

2 On the debate of fiction and fact, Greg Glingham, in his essay “Truth and Artifice in Boswell’s Life of Johnson,” observes that scholars’ attitudes toward the Life can be divided into two groups. The first group, which includes William Siebenschuh, Ralph Rader, William Dowling, and Fredric Bogel, accepts Boswell’s use of fictional techniques and views the Life “as self-contained, self-consistent, and self-reflexive.” The second group, which includes Frederick Pottle, Frank Brady, Geoffrey Scott and Marshall Waingrow, while acknowledging Boswell’s “dramatizing powers,” believes Boswell’s Life to be “factually accurate and authentic” (212).

3 Boswell’s variation regarding self or his inability to locate and present a single self is of great interest to
scholars. Though my concern is not to study the theoretical implications of Boswell's divided self, I want to summarize some of the major arguments in this area. The twentieth-century devotion to this aspect of Boswell's writing reflects upon the large and complex role that the self came to play in personal writing by the end of the eighteenth century. Three essays from the anthology *James Boswell: Psychological Interpretations* emphasize the disparity in self that can emerge within only one or two journal volumes. In "Boswell's Grand Tour of Selves," Brian Evenson reveals the schizophrenic nature of Boswell that becomes evident over the course of entries within a single journal volume: "Even in his realization that he must be himself, Boswell postulates neither a stable nor a constant self" (76). Like Evenson, Elaine Perez Zickler in "Boswell's London Journal: Binding a Life" also believes that Boswell exhibits a divided or split self within only one journal volume. The London Journal reflects Boswell's desire for a stable self in statements like "'I resolved'" or "'I determined'" but "[...] his competing desire to be many selves, to merge into many places, is so easily and frequently fulfilled in London that Boswell's expressed longings for stability seem to fly in the face of an overwhelming and convincing reality that is difficult for him to accept and interpret, even as he experiences it" (34-35). Erin F. Labbie in "Identification and Identity in James
Boswell's: A Psycholinguistic Reflection" cites Pottle's difficulty in dividing some of the middle journal volumes by theme or topic as evidence of Boswell's attempt to find a "centralized self in the midst of multiple, ephemeral selves" (52). In her essay "'This Philosophical Melancholy': Style and Self in Boswell and Hume" from the collection New Light on Boswell, Susan Manning discusses the manner in which Boswell's melancholy relates to his failure to find a cohesive self: "Melancholy was for Boswell [. . .] an ever-present reality of living. It is part of the self he is, but not the self he wants to be [. . .]" (128). As a result, Boswell's journals feature a "constant tussle" between the "social being he would like to project" and his "honesty towards the private experiences" that do not fit with how he would like to shape the self (128).


5 These three spiritual diarists were discussed at length in Chapter One. With few exceptions all three diaries are typified by short entries of only a few lines.

6 In The Later Years, Frank Brady remarks that the journal section of An Account of Corsica "[. . .] evinces Boswell's supreme ability to both depict character through
select detail and to utilize his own personality as part of his presentation" (5).


9 This selection of text also reveals the extent to which Boswell occasionally made small but significant revisions to the private journal manuscript. For example, the published journal passage features four significant additions. First, Boswell mentions that Vass and Joseph remained with Johnson along with Hay. Second, Johnson's statement about losing confidence in Boswell becomes a direct quote in the published version; it was a paraphrase in the original. Third, in the published version, Boswell adds the line that re-emphasizes his reason for leaving Johnson. Fourth, the published version adds the phrase, "His extraordinary warmth confounded me so much" prior to his statement about justifying himself lamely to Johnson. These changes add up to only a few words, but
they reveal the extent to which Boswell was willing to alter his original version so that he appeared in a better light.

10 Samuel Johnson, A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland, ed. Mary Lascelles (New Haven: Yale UP, 1971). All subsequent references are to this edition and are cited parenthetically within the text.

11 Bate’s biography does a much better job of conveying to readers the severity of Johnson’s vision problems as a young child. Bate writes of Johnson’s need for an escort to take him to school. Furthermore, Johnson’s foster brother, John Marklew, despite being afflicted to a lesser degree with the same problem was so affected by it that he was unable to earn a living (7-8).

12 Boswell certainly does have didacticism in mind when he presents his opinions of the Rambler, and as a result, he mentions specific essays that he believes are especially important for readers: Numbers 55, [59], 7, 110, 54, 32, 19, 34, 82, 88, [98], 182, 194-95, 197-98, and 179. With three of these, Numbers 7, 110, and 54, Boswell recommends constant study and meditation (1: 214). If readers view only Boswell’s selections, for example, they do not know that some Rambler essays such as Numbers 4, 36, 37, 60, and 121 serve as examples of Johnson’s literary criticism; instead, Boswell makes only the briefest mention that the Rambler includes critical investigations (1: 214).
Brady's "Boswell's Self-Presentation and His Critics" addresses the manner in which "critics have consistently patronized Boswell the man" (545). Even those critics who are sympathetic to Boswell believe that his persona in the *Life* comes at "the cost to his reputation" (545).
Conclusion

Our reading of prose narratives has been so influenced by novels from the mid-eighteenth century onward that we might forget how close Defoe’s narrative technique may be to our everyday experience of reading newspaper and magazine articles. His concentration upon plot over character presents us with works that are quite different from character-driven works such as Clarissa (1747-48), Pride and Prejudice (1813), Jane Eyre (1847), Wuthering Heights (1847), Jude the Obscure (1895), or Heart of Darkness (1902). However, Defoe’s emphasis upon the external mirrors non-literary texts like news stories. During his own day, his writing was similar to writing in non-fictional histories, diaries, travel journals, biographies and autobiographies. Because Defoe’s protagonists do not discuss the implications of the events, readers must piece together the external narrative details to decide why something is significant. Many events in a Defoe work seem to be conveyed with the same emphasis so that readers must conclude for themselves whether Moll’s abandoned children are as important to her as the amount of money she steals, for example. Watt observes that most novelists incorporate two kinds of scenes in their works, “fully realised” passages that make up the bulk of the novel and “barer and less detailed summary” passages that “set the stage” for the important scenes. Watt notes, however, that the organization of Moll Flanders opposes this notion of storytelling by offering more
than two hundred fully developed scenes that are normally under two pages in length (Rise of the Novel 100). Thus, Defoe's protagonists report on an unusually large number of scenes that, on the surface, all seem to carry the same narrative weight. Today, non-fictional narratives like biographies and autobiographies contain a far greater degree of introspection than was evident in those same genres in Defoe's day, but his heavy reliance on observable events and behavior--what might be classified as "just the facts"--is an attribute still prevalent in journalism today. Measuring Defoe's works against this journalistic tradition is far more useful than measuring his works against the narrative tradition that emerges in the mid-eighteenth century because it provides a better understanding of the expectations that Defoe's readers brought to his fiction.

Richardson's novels, which mark the beginning of a literary tradition that continues throughout the eighteenth century and into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, require readers to "work" a text much differently than they would a Defoe text. Defoe forces readers to understand, interpret, and evaluate his characters' motives through the way they adapt to circumstances in the story. Events and action matter with Richardson as well, but he complicates reading further by fully conveying the thoughts of his protagonists on their surroundings. At first, such a technique would seem to create a more approachable text
because the character's thoughts openly convey the purpose or significance behind actions and events. However, by heightening the importance of the writer's thoughts, Richardson places additional emphasis upon the interpretation of the event rather than simply upon the event itself. Readers then must decide the extent to which they accept the writers' opinions. Because she is a sympathetic character, Clarissa's opinions will probably hold more value for readers than Lovelace's opinions. In drawing this distinction between Defoe and Richardson, I do not suggest that readers are free from judging the reliability of a Defoe narrator. The sincerity of Moll's repentance at the end of her narrative is much debated, for example. However, readers face far fewer opportunities to make such judgments because Defoe's protagonists are concerned with portraying the events of their active lives rather than considering the consequences of those events, as Richardson's protagonists do throughout their stories. In addition, Defoe's journalistic style would be a failure with Richardson's plots. Even when a Defoe narrator is isolated from human interaction, as Crusoe is, the plot still emphasizes physical activity--building, gardening, hunting, and exploring. On the other hand, Pamela and Clarissa, in several instances are confined to their rooms, where little physical activity other than writing, reading, sleeping and eating are possible. Richardson's narrators must explore the life of the mind because their outer lives are
If the protagonist of a personal narrative is real, as in a biography, the liberty with which an author can focus on the subject's inner life is constricted. First, if the writer's subject is someone other than the writer, then knowledge of the subject's thoughts and emotions is limited. Second, a writer chooses to write and readers choose to read about the biographical subject based primarily upon the accomplishments and actions during the person's lifetime. Boswell's works reveal, however, that the inner life of the nonfictional protagonist should not be ignored completely. Instead, with the publication of the *Life of Johnson*, Boswell demonstrates the manner in which biography at the end of the century had come to use narrative qualities found in the works of both Defoe and Richardson. Frank Brady observes the unique manner in which the *Life* combines the ethical and anecdotal traditions of biography along with aspects of psychological analysis (424-425). Boswell's fusion of the ethical and anecdotal strains creates a more complete biography because readers are able to ascertain both the achievements of the subject that make his life worthy of reading (the ethical strain) and the everyday behavior of the subject that conveys the personality of the individual (the anecdotal strain). In light of the narrative form, however, Boswell's combination of these two is not original because we see both in the works of
Defoe. As the Defoe prefaces reveal, Defoe believed that the life stories of his protagonists could offer moral lessons to readers, but he presented these lessons by concentrating upon the normal actions of his protagonists. This latter aspect causes Watt to remark that *Robinson Crusoe* was "the first fictional narrative in which an ordinary person's daily activities are the centre of continuous literary attention" (74). What was more inventive for Boswell was his addition of the psychological component. By relating to readers his thoughts on both Johnson's literary accomplishments and his ideas, actions, and conversations, Boswell brings to the biography the introspective nature of Richardson's narratives. In doing so, he effectively unites the plot-driven and character-oriented sides of fictional narrative to create a new style of biography that remains with us today, as Greg Clingham argues when he states that Boswell's "biographical artifice is part of a cultural change at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries of which the twentieth century is the inheritor" (James Boswell 113).

By concentrating on journal writing and the works of Defoe, Richardson and Boswell, my study has highlighted the relationship between factual and fictional narratives and the manner in which writers convey the self within these narratives. This study's consideration of factual and fictional narrative in tandem gives today's readers a better grounding for approaching eighteenth-century prose than
focusing solely upon either factual or fictional works. During the eighteenth century, narrative form was anything but stable. In my introduction, I discussed Lennard Davis’s caveat against forcing literary works into an evolving curve. I do believe, however, that there appears to be a gradual heightening of self, at least in terms of published narratives, over the course of the century. The lack of stability is evident in the combination of both factual and fictional techniques in narrative writing. A clear distinction between the two modes never fully emerges during the eighteenth century. Davis concludes by stating that “novels are framed works (even if they seem apparently unframed) whose attitude toward fact and fiction is constitutively ambivalent” (212). While I reach similar conclusions, my study has a much different purpose than Davis’s. In focusing upon the ambiguity between fact and fiction, Davis argues that a news/novel discourse existed in the eighteenth century wherein the fictionality of the novel masks an ideology that paradoxically defends against and supports censorship, power, and authority. My comparative study between factual and fictional narratives does not have the political focus of Davis’s work. Because of the blurring of genres in the eighteenth century, any narrative study that seeks to reveal the evolution of the novel by focusing its attention strictly within the genre itself oversimplifies the narrative form of the eighteenth century. Furthermore, such a
perspective diminishes prose fiction for failing to conform to a theoretical notion of the novel genre that does not emerge until the nineteenth century. Because of my focus upon journals and biographies, this study exhibits the manner in which factual narrative was being transformed within the eighteenth century as well. At the beginning of the century, Defoe's fiction is similar in style to contemporary diaries and autobiographies, but with its dialogue and heightened introspection, Boswell's biography of Johnson seems more like a novel than Defoe's prose fictions.

While a genre may stabilize long enough to allow scholars to draw up a list of characteristics to define the particular genre, rarely does the genre remain unchanged for long. Jane Austen's major works, for example, would seem to mark a period in which the novel form had finally come to stand on its own without borrowing from other genres--the letter, diary, autobiography, or biography. Her novels feature third-person omniscient narrators and no pretense of fact. However, with its use of letters and reliance upon first person-narrators to lend more authenticity to the plot, Mary Shelley's Frankenstein (1818), which was published a little more than a decade after Austen's death, seems closer stylistically to the eighteenth century than to Austen's works. On the nonfictional side, Boswell's Life of Johnson would appear to represent the extent to which a biography can integrate fictional techniques and still be classed as a work of fact,
yet Thomas Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* (1831) reveals that the line between truth and artifice can be far more nebulous. Rather than receive a straightforward personal account of his own life and philosophy, readers find Diogenes Teufelsdrockh's life and philosophical musings. Its combination of philosophy, autobiography, biography, and fiction places *Sartor Resartus* in a group of literary works that defies simple classification in much the same way as early eighteenth-century prose fiction such as *Journal of the Plague Year*.

The twentieth century still sees continued experimentation between the factual and fictional form. The emergence of works in the second half of this century that are designated as "creative nonfictions" is ample evidence that narrative writing still refuses to draw clear distinctions between fiction and fact. The characteristics of creative nonfiction can be traced back to the eighteenth century, though, and the creation of a new genre suggests that our desire to categorize is not confined to historical works. By choosing a term that is an oxymoron to describe these works, however, at least scholars of this contemporary genre acknowledge how inadequate a simple label can be. We should approach the eighteenth century and the emergence of the novel and biography with the same kind of attitude by describing, understanding, and accepting the historical incongruities that exist within the prose narrative form. Only then can we begin
to appreciate the degree of complexity behind works by Defoe, Richardson, and Boswell that too often are admired simply for their role as stepping stones to later writing that is more consistent with our academic definitions of narrative.
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