

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告 期末報告

眷戀的語言:女性、情感與小說 1778-1811(第2年)

計畫類別：個別型計畫
計畫編號：NSC 103-2410-H-004-006-MY2
執行期間：104年01月01日至104年12月31日
執行單位：國立政治大學英國語文學系

計畫主持人：吳易道

計畫參與人員：碩士級-專任助理人員：藍文玲

報告附件：移地研究心得報告

處理方式：

1. 公開資訊：本計畫涉及專利或其他智慧財產權，2年後可公開查詢
2. 「本研究」是否已有嚴重損及公共利益之發現：否
3. 「本報告」是否建議提供政府單位施政參考：否

中華民國 105 年 03 月 30 日

中文摘要：本研究計畫檢視十八世紀末及十九世紀初兩位英國女性小說家如何書寫、爭辯與探索情感的多重向度。以十八世紀「情感文化」(the culture of sensibility)作為論述架構，本研究將著眼於分析伯妮(Frances Burney)和雷德克里芙(Ann Radcliffe)如何挪用與回應傳統感性敘事方法(sensibility narratives)來發展其獨特的情感語言(the language of feeling)。

本計畫預計分兩年完成，內容分為兩大部分。第一部分「【依芙蓮娜】中的禮儀與記憶」探討伯妮的第一本暢銷著作究竟是否為一情感小說(a sentimental novel)，並進一步分析該文本對禮儀(manners)和記憶(memory)的重視如何影響情感的流露。第二部分「情感互惠：雷德克里芙對劉易士(Matthew Lewis)的回應」重新省視兩位誌異小說家的競爭與對話，我將分析人與人間的距離(distance)在後者驚世之作【僧人】與在前者小說【義大利人】中的呈現有何不同，這樣的比較將可進一步回答兩位作家所共同關心的問題：親密(intimacy)代表一種肢體上的接近還是一種情感上的交流？綜合而論，本計畫將可對十八世紀情感文化的發展、女性小說家的藝術成就以及浪漫時期英國小說的研究做出貢獻。

中文關鍵詞：情感文化、伯妮、雷德克里芙、劉易士、浪漫時期英國小說、眷戀

英文摘要：This two-year research project investigates the fraught relationship between women, feeling and fiction in late eighteenth and early nineteenth century England. It asks an important question: is there an alternative way of imagining and articulating affection in this era other than the dominant rhetoric of sensibility? This project comprises two parts. The first section, "Manners and Memory in *Evelina*" examines how Frances Burney's first novel rejects, recycles and rejuvenates the conventional assumptions about feeling codified and popularized by the eighteenth-century sentimental culture. Burney's emphasis on good manners does not indicate a resolute and thorough break from literary sentimentalism, as many critics would have us believe. I will demonstrate that *Evelina* is centrally concerned with how to sustain affection and create lasting connections. It therefore represents a new stage in the history of the sentimental novel. The second part, "Affective Reciprocity: Radcliffe's *Answers to Lewis's The Monk*," reconsiders the assumed dialogue between these two famous writers of Gothic romance. I argue that the notion of distance serves very different emotional purposes in Radcliffe's novel *The Italian* and Lewis's *The Monk*. The latter associates distance with alienation, while the former connects it with longing. These different representations of distance and feeling, I argue, reflect their contrasting definitions of interpersonal intimacy. Designed to be deeply historical, this study will demonstrate why feeling plays a central role in

understanding Romantic women novelists and in defining
“the Romantic novel.”

英文關鍵詞：the culture of sensibility, Burney, Radcliffe, Lewis, the
Romantic novel, attachment

Final report
The Language of Attachment:
Women, Feeling and Fiction 1778-1811

前言

“Nelly, I *am* Heathcliff—he’s always, always in my mind.” Few heroines have articulated her feeling as passionately and memorably as Catherine Earnshaw in Emily Brontë’s novel *Wuthering Heights* (64).¹ The novel was published in 1847, but the story that it recounts is curiously set not in the mid-19th century. The exact historical moment in which the above episode takes place deserves our attention because Brontë is so meticulous in constructing the timeline of her story and because this information can complicate our understanding of this simple sentence. The standard chronology of *Wuthering Heights* has it that Catherine declared her love for her childhood playmate Heathcliff in early summer, 1780.² On the face of it, Brontë’s choice is apt. Late 18th-century England witnessed a prevailing culture of sensibility, one that celebrated susceptibility to exquisite feeling and willingness to display emotions. Catherine’s unabashed revelation of her affection would seem appropriate and understandable in such a cultural milieu. Indeed, Catherine’s declaration crystallizes some of the central tenets of the culture of sensibility: mobility, mixture and excess (Nagle 7).³ Calculated to move Nelly, the housekeeper, and generations of future readers, it demonstrates the potential of language to arouse and to communicate strong feeling regardless of the age, class and gender of the audience. The uncanny dissolution of social boundaries and identities embedded in Catherine’s sentence (“I *am* Heathcliff”) epitomizes the power of sympathetic bond and romantic excess.

Nevertheless, Catherine’s famous line is framed by her controversial conversation with Nelly, a frame that should draw our attention to how unconventional her affective demonstrativeness actually is. Unlike a typical eighteenth-century sentimental heroine like Samuel Richardson’s Pamela or Clarissa, Catherine’s emotional effusion results not from male sexual aggression. Nor does it cause her to faint or weep. Catherine’s dilemma, either to accept a rich husband or to be loyal to her genuine love, closely resembles that of Julia in Henry Mackenzie’s sentimental novel *Julia de Roubigné* (1777). But unlike Mackenzie’s heroine, there is no oppressive father to prejudice her. Catherine’s distress is evident, but her virtue is debatable (she chooses to marry Edgar Linton without loving him).⁴ Catherine’s example suggests an interesting possibility: the expression of emotion often exceeds or disrupts the historical context in which it is supposedly placed.

¹ Hereafter the novel is referred to as *WH*.

² Examining “more than six hundred temporal allusions in the novel,” A. Stuart Daley offers a detailed chronology that corrects the 1926 version by C. P. Sanger (357-61). Daley’s effort has won wide scholarly approval.

³ Surveying the growing secondary literature on the 18th-century sentimental culture, Nagle further explains that these three terms mean, respectively, the circulation or oscillation of feeling, the disappearance of generic, formal or phenomenological differences and overwhelming affect (6).

⁴ Janet Todd summarizes the constitutive qualities of an 18th-century woman of feeling in *Sensibility: An Introduction* (110-128). After Brissenden’s important study of the novel of sentiment, the title of his book, “virtue in distress”, has become a common description of a sentimental heroine.

Unlike a typical woman of feeling, Catherine expresses her feeling not in terms of sympathy, benevolence, or submission. How should we describe Catherine's affection for Heathcliff then? To answer this question we need to examine the formal characteristics of her famous sentence and the plot that generates it in the first place. The first half of the sentence ("I am Heathcliff") merges two otherwise distinct identities and insists on absolute sameness. In the second half, however, this insistence slackens. By a subtle choice of words ("he" and "my mind"), Catherine concedes that she and Heathcliff are two different individuals. Her wishful admission that Heathcliff is always in her mind betrays a painful awareness that he is in fact physically out of her sight. Indeed, Catherine declares her passion for Heathcliff under the impression that he is far away from the room where Nelly converses with her. Metaphorical distance also plays an important role here. Catherine recognizes that Heathcliff is her social inferior, his education, wealth and manners far below the glamorous realm to which her marriage with Linton will raise her. Her refusal to be separated from him—"don't talk of our separation again: it is impracticable'" (WH 68)—only accentuates the fact that they are already separated socially. Catherine's famous declaration embodies a unique form of feeling, one that accommodates a yearning for intimacy and an awareness of inevitable distance. I shall call it "attachment."

研究目的

In this research project, I wish to argue that attachment has a much longer literary history and that it is contested, scrutinized and formulated by two English novels before Emily Brontë's masterpiece: Frances Burney's *Evelina* (1778) and Ann Radcliffe's *The Italian* (1797). To better appreciate the value and function of attachment, I plan to investigate how these two texts respond to the affective patterns dominating other contemporary novels, why the arbiter of emotion changed by the turn of the nineteenth century and why women novelists are particularly interested in revolutionizing the language of feeling.

文獻探討

"The language of feeling" is primarily an eighteenth-century literary and cultural production. In the past two decades, literary historians have identified four of its most crucial constituents: sympathy, sensibility, sentimentality and sociability. They have relied heavily on these four words or their derivatives to illustrate and elucidate how the history of the English novel and the history of emotion cross-fertilized and interpenetrated each other in the eighteenth century.⁵ To some extent, our understanding of emotion in this era is circumscribed by these four concepts, which, though useful, are not capacious enough to accommodate the variety and complexity of human feeling. Sympathy and sociability, for example, focus on the power of feeling to bridge the distance of gender, class, race and nationality. But is it not possible that some feelings owe their existence and continuation to distance, literal or metaphorical, rather than to its elimination? Sensibility prioritizes immediate and spontaneous response, while sentimental ideology cultivates irrational love

⁵ See for example, Mullan *passim*, Ellis 5-48, Van Sant 98-115, Barker-Benfield, Ellison and Jones.

that turns a blind eye to social injustice.⁶ If we pay exclusive attention to the former, we may lose sight of some forms of affection that require time to develop. If we only concentrate on the latter, we risk ignoring the potential of love to assimilate reason and the compatibility of heads and hearts. Indeed, to gain a well-rounded picture of emotion in this era beyond the cognates of sensibility and to discover alternative ways of expressing feeling, we need a new approach, a new set of vocabulary. This is where “the language of attachment” can be useful.

The *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)* defines the verb “to attach” generally as “to connect or join functionally.” When it is used to indicate a particular kind of emotion, it means “to join in sympathy or affection to a person, place, etc.”⁷ Attachment easily invokes an impression of two objects being joined together physically or figuratively. It is an emotional register that is associated with the notion of distance in general, of closeness in particular. I believe this association has immense potential to expand our perception of feeling in the second half of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth.

There are two reasons why most literary historians have generally turned a blind eye to a new narrative of feeling in this period. Both are concerned with the fortune of literary sentimentalism at that time. For those scholars advocating the longevity of sensibility, this cultural phenomenon continued well into the nineteenth century, informing a variety of Romantic and Victorian poetry and prose.⁸ The lasting triumph and dominance of the sentimental culture makes it unnecessary, even futile, to think of different modes of emotional manifestation. Recycling the old vocabulary of feeling is enough. As Ann Rowland writes: “‘Sentimental’ belongs to a group of words—including sentiment, sense, sensibility, sensitivity and sympathy—which together form a crucial lexicon of [...] Romantic literary culture ” (192).

But this narrative of sweeping continuity belies the possibility of remarkable difference. Literary sentimentalism suffered severe criticism and disgrace after the French Revolution. According to the *OED*, the meaning of “sentimental” changed from “exhibiting refined and elevated feelings” in the 1740s to “addicted to indulgence in superficial emotion” by the 1790s.⁹ This conspicuous suspicion and degradation of sentimentalism has encouraged many critics to associate private feeling with dangerous desire, administering a fatal blow to the reputation of eighteenth-century novels of sensibility. A familiar account among literary critics is that impulsive sensibility is universally criticized in this age and the unbridled (wo)men of feeling are brought to learn self-discipline, usually after public humiliation. Social consensus triumphs over individual emotions (Lynch 460). Apart from cautionary messages, it seems that little could be extracted from the wreck of a once-glorious sentimental edifice. But I will argue that there existed an alternative way of interpreting feeling in this era other than the triumph or downfall of sensibility. How to negotiate this

⁶ Summarizing Henry Mackenzie’s quintessential novel of sensibility, *The Man of Feeling* (1771), G. A. Starr observes: “[w]hat matters is [...] the goodness not of our heads but of our hearts. The focus within the novel is not on actions, which involve choice and responsibility, but on reactions—particularly reactions so abrupt as to preclude deliberation. The very idea of pausing to weigh motives and circumstances is alien to the man of feeling” (188). Claudia Johnson’s *Equivocal Beings* offers an authoritative account of sentimental ideology in the turbulent 1790s.

⁷ <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/12699?rskey=rSTnKS&result=2&isAdvanced=false#eid>> 7 October 2013.

⁸ Arguments along this line can be found in Nagel 16, Carson 1-25, Purton, and Csengei 169-94.

⁹ <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/176057?redirectedFrom=sentimental#eid>> 13 September 2013.

alternative is a controversial problem that concerned contemporary women novelists. In particular, is feeling an inherent part of human nature or is it an acquired skill? How should feeling be evaluated and sustained? What is the relationship between feeling and fiction? What role does gender play in that relationship? The research project that I propose will answer these questions adequately.

I emphasize one single gender in my research project because, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century women played a central role in reading, writing and debating the value of prose fiction. Together they helped propel issues of women's education, desires, rights and duties to the foreground of contemporary literary scene and political polemics, of which sentimental novels were an important part. At the heart of many sentimental novels lies an anxiety about female desires. This anxiety manifests itself most obviously in a familiar structural pattern that celebrates yet ultimately disciplines women's passion. Barbara Benedict aptly summarizes this pattern: "[w]hile sentimental novels depict their characters' passionate feelings as their heroic trait, they enclose these portraits within a narrative endorsing restraint, contemplation, and self-control. While they praise individuality or uniqueness, they also attempt to socialize it through a language that evokes common values and general standards" (Benedict 210). On the face of it, the two women writers covered in this project (Burney and Radcliffe) subscribe to this rule. At the end of their works there is always an ideal reconciliation between individual (almost certainly female) desire and social expectations.

But if we pay close attention to various ways by which emotions are conceived, sustained, framed and interpreted in their novels, we may discover a different story. Private passion is not necessarily threatening or anarchic but can be empowering and constructive. Although social demands frequently debar women from many active pursuits, they may motivate women to utilize their limited resources more intelligently and productively, thus blurring the boundary between restraint and liberation. Burney and Radcliffe well understand the rhetoric of feeling codified and popularized by their male predecessors and contemporaries. But they are determined to explore new forms, possibilities and dimensions of the human psyche. The representation of feeling in their novels, I shall argue, formulate a distinctive language of attachment, one that, more than four decades later, culminates in Catherine Earnshaw's powerful declaration.

研究方法

My research project comprises two sections. The first, "Manners and Memory in *Evelina*," explores Frances Burney's engagement with literary sentimentalism. Burney's first novel is widely recognized as a quintessential novel of manners whose celebration of polite conversation and enlightened self-discipline contrasts sharply with the tropes of inexpressible emotion and self-indulgence that characterize eighteenth-century sensibility narratives. *Evelina*, in other words, is "commonly not regarded as a sentimental novel" (Starr 196). But if this is the case, how can we explain the emphatic claim of one of the novel's first reviewers that it "would have disgraced neither the head nor the heart of Richardson," who is arguably

the father of sentimental novels (Rev. of *Evelina* 202)? I wish to argue that Burney shares her predecessor's interest in exploring feminine interiority. But while Richardson scrutinises the twist and turns of feeling through rakish and even thuggish behaviour, Burney achieves a similar aim via her emphasis on good manners.

In eighteenth-century London and Bath, the two fashionable cities where the story of *Evelina* unfolds, good manners stand for a thorough understanding of interpersonal distance: how intimately a man is allowed to interact with a woman and how far middle-class people should keep away from the noble class. Paradoxically, good manners are capable both of broadening and bridging interpersonal distance. Centring her plot and her style on good manners, Burney draws our attention to how attachment grows and alienation occurs. In so doing, she puts feeling in the context of psychological and social development. Feeling is understood not in terms of impetuous outburst doomed to be fragmentary and transient but of gradual progress full of potentiality.

Burney's insistence that feeling is a mental process that can be open-ended and drawn-out can be best observed in the drama of memory that underlines *Evelina*. Literary sentimentalism dictates that refined feelings generally, sympathetic bonds between individuals in particular, tend to be fragmented and transitory (Spacks 129; Benedict 5). Burney challenges this stereotype not least by demonstrating the central role memory plays in lasting connections between her characters. Forgetfulness, in other words, not only results in comic caricatures, but also reveals emotional shallowness. Through its emphasis on manners and memory, the narrative focus of *Evelina* shifts from instant emotional gratification to the gradual growth of attachment. This shift is significant because it indicates a fresh way of experiencing and writing emotion, one that grants it a long-neglected longevity.

Gothic romance has long been regarded as the logical consequence or apotheosis of literary sentimentalism (Ahern 151-202). A thorough discussion of the evolution of feeling in English fiction therefore cannot bypass this important literary fashion in late eighteenth-century England. The second part of my research project, "Affective Reciprocity: Radcliffe's Answer to Lewis's *The Monk*," attempts to analyse why Gothic novelists dramatise the intricacy of human mind differently and how these contrasting mental theatres convey different appreciations of feeling. This section is obviously my response to Syndy Conger's fine essay "Sensibility Restored: Radcliffe's Answer to Lewis's *The Monk*." I agree with Conger's argument that Radcliffe's novel *The Italian* represents her earnest effort to recuse sentiment from the associations of physicality, sensuality and transgression, a link that Lewis's scandalous work seems to popularize. But I disagree with her suggestion that both Radcliffe and Lewis are concerned with the same issue, sensibility, and that the former is simply restoring to sensibility its "intellectual and spiritual dimensions" conveniently forgotten by the latter (119). I wish to argue that these two writers in fact are pursuing two different paths, which results in diametrically opposed emotional paradigms. Radcliffe revises Lewis's plot, lines and characterization not because she wishes to return to an old sentimental tradition but because she desires to create a new ways of formulating feeling. To put it succinctly, Radcliffe rewrites Lewis's violent infatuation into tender attachment.

I plan first to examine the crisis of reciprocal relationships that underpins many critical episodes in *The Monk*. The Bleeding Nun's famous chanting, "Raymond! Raymond! Thou art mine! Raymond! Raymond! I am thine!" (161), sematically registers a wish of

intimacy and syntactically suggests another wish that this affection is reciprocal. What follows, however, is disgust and repulsion. Frustrated emotional reciprocity in the novel, either because of uncanny mistake or foolish misunderstanding, fosters further attempt to secure intimacy, which in turn leads to more violence and horror calculated to eradicate any possibility of mutual affection. This pattern is important because it speaks volumes about Lewis's conception of emotional intimacy, one that is predicated exclusively on physical proximity. For him, the exchange of feeling cannot take place when two individuals are separated. Distance nullifies affection because it frustrates its fulfilment.

One unmistakable sign of Radcliffe's disagreement with Lewis is that she, especially through picturesque prospects and absent lovers, allows distance to play a key role in arousing and mellowing her character's emotion. By scrutinising the evolution of Ellena the heroine's affection for Vivaldi (her admirer), Olivia (her mother) and Schedoni (her uncle), I will demonstrate that for Radcliffe sympathetic bonds can develop without physical closeness. In other words, Radcliffe shows that mutual affection paradoxically thrives on absence and separation. This insight, as I shall argue, is not a utopian ideal, but is a valuable skill necessitated by a tumultuous society in which affective reciprocity, especially between two sexes, was a source of profound anxiety.

In his introductory chapter to *Waverley: 'Tis Sixty Years Since* (1814), Walter Scott dismisses the conventions of sentimentality. He rejects "[A] Sentimental Tale" as the second title of his work because it instantly invokes a "heroine with a profusion of auburn hair, and a harp, the soft solace of her solitary hours, which she fortunately finds always the means of transporting from castle to cottage" (qtd. in Rowland 191). Despite this snifty description of sentimental heroines, Scott's debt to the eighteenth-century culture of sensibility is apparent.¹⁰ His hero Edward Waverley, for instance, is a man of feeling whose adventures in exotic lands frequently excite his passion and sympathy. If Scott repudiates formulaic patterns that reduce feeling to stock figures and stiff props, he nevertheless values the ability to feel intensely.

This point becomes clear in Scott's famous review of Austen's novels. In an implicit defence of Marianne's strong passion in *Sense and Sensibility*, Scott writes: "[w]ho is it, that in his youth has felt a virtuous attachment, however romantic and however unfortunate, but can trace back to its influence much that his character may possess of what is honourable, dignified and disinterested?" (qtd. in Southam 68). It seems significant that, when alluding to exquisite emotion, Scott refuses to use the familiar vocabulary of feeling like sensibility, sympathy, sensitivity or sentimentalism. Instead, he singles out "attachment" as a healthy alternative, even as an ideal worthy of pursuit. My research project will explain the degree to which Burney and Radcliffe concur with him and elaborate how their novels collectively put forward a hierarchy of emotion, with "virtuous attachment" at the top.

結果與討論

I have produced two journal articles that are direct result of my research in the culture of feeling in the late eighteenth-century. My first article, "I Suppose It Is Not Sentimental

¹⁰ For an account of Scott's literary debt, see Ferris 95 and Trumpener 139.

Enough!': *Evelina* and the Power of Feeling," appeared in *Tamkang Review* in June 2015. In this essay I read *Evelina* against the backdrop of classic eighteenth-century sentimental novels and the emotional paradigm they help to popularise. If the representation of feeling in the novels of Henry Mackenzie and Lawrence Sterne centres on impulsive reaction and immediate gratification, Burney proposes a developmental interpretation of human affection, one that stresses the ability of feeling to evolve through and last despite time. Burney's use of the verb "to attach" and its cognates in this novel support my argument that her efforts to revise conventional vocabulary of feeling produce a distinctive "language of attachment," one that foregrounds the longevity and resilience of affection.

My second article, "The Crisis of Intimacy: Lewis's Infatuation and Radcliffe's Attachment," appeared in *NTU Studies in Language and Literature*, also in June 2015. It revisits the critical consensus that Radcliffe's novel *The Italian* represents her response to Matthew Lewis's earlier work *The Monk* (1796) and that the former rejects the predominantly carnal understanding of sensibility in the latter. Sensibility alone, I argue, cannot fully explain the intertextual dialogues between these two Gothic texts, because it frequently reduces this dialogue to a matter of contrast and disapproval. I believe that the differences between infatuation and attachment can best encapsulate Radcliffe's response to Lewis. Scrutinising how Radcliffe dramatises interpersonal attachment in *The Italian* and comparing this drama to Lewis's representation of infatuation in *The Monk*, I demonstrate that the assumed contrast between them belies an important similarity. Radcliffe in fact shares with Lewis a profound scepticism about the possibility of rewarding intimacy.

I have attached the typescripts of these two articles to the end of this final report.

Bibliography

- Ahern, Stephen. *Affected Sensibilities: Romantic Excess and the Genealogy of the Novel 1680-1810*. New York: AMS Press, 2007.
- Austen, Jane. *Sense and Sensibility*. Ed. Edward Copeland. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Barker-Benfield, G. J. *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-century Britain*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Benedict, Barbara M. *Framing Feeling: Sentiment and Style in English Prose Fiction, 1745-1800*. New York: AMS Press, 1994.
- Brissenden, Robert F. *Virtue in Distress: Studies in the Novel of Sentiment from Richardson to Sade*. London: Macmillan, 1974.
- Brontë, Emily. *Wuthering Heights*. Ed. Richard J. Dunn. 4th edn. New York: Norton, 2003.
- Carson, James P. *Populism, Gender, and Sympathy in the Romantic Novel*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Conger, Sydney M. "Sensibility Restored: Radcliffe's Answer to Lewis's *The Monk*." *Gothic Fictions: Prohibition/Transgression*. Ed. Kenneth W. Graham. New York: AMS ,, 113-49.
- Csengei, Ildiko. *Sympathy, Sensibility and The Literature of Feeling in the Eighteenth Century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Daley, A. Stuart. "A Chronology of *Wuthering Heights*." *Wuthering Heights*. 357-61.
- Ellison, Julie. *Cato's Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999.

- Ellis, Markman. *The Politics of Sensibility: Race, Gender and Commerce in the Sentimental Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Ferris, Ina. *The Achievement of Literary Authority: Gender, History and the Waverley Novels*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991.
- Johnson, Claudia. *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender, and Sentimentality in the 1790s—Wollstonecraft, Radcliffe, Burney, Austen*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1995.
- Jones, C. B. *Radical Sensibility: Literature and Ideas in the 1790s*. London ; New York : Routledge, 1993.
- Lewis, Matthew. *The Monk*. Ed. Emma McEvoy. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Lynch, Deidre. “Transformations of the novel—I.” *The Cambridge History of English Romantic Literature*. Ed. James Chandler. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. 451-72.
- Mullan, John. *Sentiment and Sociability: the Language of Feeling in the Eighteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Nagle, Christopher C. *Sexuality and the Culture of Sensibility in the British Romantic Era*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Purton, Valerie. *Dickens and the Sentimental Tradition : Fielding, Richardson, Sterne, Goldsmith, Sheridan, Lamb*. New York : Anthem Press, 2012.
- Radcliffe, Ann. *The Italian*. Ed. Frederick Garber. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Rev. of *Evelina*, by Frances Burney. *Critical Review* 46 (1778): 202.
- Rowland, Ann W. “Sentimental fiction.” *The Cambridge Companion to Fiction in the Romantic Period*. Ed. Richard Maxwell and Katie Trumpener. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008. 191-206.
- Southam, Brian C. ed. *Jane Austen: The Critical Heritage Volume I, 1811-1870*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Spacks, Patricia M. *Novel Beginnings: Experiments in Eighteenth-century English Fiction*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2006.
- Starr, G. A. “Sentimental Novels of the Later Eighteenth Century.” *The Columbia History of the English Novel*. Ed. John Bender, Deirdre David, and Michael Seidel. New York: Columbia UP, 1994. 181-98.
- Todd, Janet. *Sensibility: An Introduction*. London: Methuen, 1986.
- Trumpener, Katie. *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1997.
- Van Sant, Ann Jessie. *Eighteenth-Century Sensibility and the Novel: The Senses in Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Essay 1

“I suppose it is not sentimental enough!”: *Evelina* and the Longevity of Feeling

Is Frances Burney’s *Evelina* (1778) an eighteenth-century sentimental novel? In the 1770s, when the adjective “sentimental” still retained its favorable sense of exhibiting refined

feelings and moral virtue, the answer was an enthusiastic yes.¹¹ One anonymous early reviewer of *Evelina* positioned it firmly in the tradition of literary sentimentalism and argued that the quality of this work “would have disgraced neither the head nor the heart of Richardson” (202). Implicit in this comment is the reviewer’s belief that the sentimental narratives of Samuel Richardson serve two purposes, both of which are fulfilled in *Evelina*. If Richardson consistently invests his works with moral messages that could improve “the head” of his readers, *Evelina* exudes a similar instructional spirit. With its description of the vulgarity of impertinent remarks and the attraction of good manners, the novel offers useful advice on how to navigate an increasingly commercial society. If Richardson aims at arousing readers’ tearful sympathy for the misfortune of his heroines, *Evelina* works on its readers’ heart as well. The same reviewer emphasized how affecting reading *Evelina* could be: “the father of a family, observing the knowledge of the world and the lessons of experience which it contains, will recommend it to his daughters; they will weep and . . . grow wiser” (202).

Curiously, modern critics of *Evelina* show little interest in exploring the sentimental qualities of this novel, arguably with good reason. For one thing, *Evelina* flouts some of the essential formal and thematic features that constitute sentimental fiction.¹² At the heart of a sentimental novel usually lies a conflict between a benevolent yet vulnerable hero and a hostile and unfeeling world. The pressure and pain this world inflicts on the hero is often so overwhelming that he has no other alternative but to quit it literally, either by death or self-exile. In sharp contrast, *Evelina* is about how a young lady gradually negotiates a secure niche in a fashionable society.

Moreover, a sentimental novel is fundamentally an anti-bildungsroman. The men and women of feeling that it portrays either refuse to renounce their child-like innocence and adopt adult sophistication or fail to perceive how social expectations circumscribe female subjectivity. In other words, “instead of a progress toward maturity, [a sentimental novel] deals sympathetically with the character who cannot grow up and find an active place in society” (Starr 181). *Evelina* once again does not fit this description. Its heroine slowly but surely grows from a timid young girl ignorant of social etiquette to a brave woman able to resist male aggression. As Betty Rizzo explains, “with all the sensibility in the world, *Evelina* sets out with no experience and little ability to judge.” But as the story unfolds, she acquires both autonomous judgement and “the ability to act on it” (83).¹³ Starr’s verdict on *Evelina* seems final and widely-accepted: “*Evelina* is commonly regarded not as a sentimental novel but as a kind of bildungsroman enlivened by social comedy” (196).

But if *Evelina* is purely a “bildungsroman enlivened by social comedy” of manners, how can we explain why the novel features so many scenes of weeping, fainting and nervous disorder, all of which are standard elements in sentimental fiction? How can we explain Burney’s emphasis in the preface that her heroine has “a feeling heart?” (9). Recent critics have taken a closer look at the role of feeling in *Evelina*, aligning the novel with the culture of sensibility that created such influential novels as Lawrence Sterne’s *A Sentimental Journey* (1768) and Henry Mackenzie’s *The Man of Feeling* (1771). Patricia L. Hamilton draws an analogy between politeness in *Evelina* and sensibility in general and argues that both represent a corrective social force aiming at reforming male manners. Impoliteness

¹¹ This adjective acquired negative connotations conspicuously and was attributed to superficial, disingenuous sentiments during the last two decades of the eighteenth century. See Barker-Benfield 287-395, Todd 141 and Ellis 190-221.

¹² For a summary of the defining characteristics of sentimental fiction in the eighteenth-century, see Starr 181-98.

¹³ For another two important discussions of *Evelina* in terms of female development, see Doody 45 and Fraiman 32-58.

specifically refers to an unwillingness or inability to show “deference to the feelings of others” (428). Closely analysing the reconciliation between Evelina and her father, Virginia H. Cope demonstrates how the sentimental focus on filial tenderness helps Evelina negotiate the controversial issues of legitimate inheritance (73-78). As compelling as these readings are, they discuss the sentimental aspects of *Evelina* for the sake of other thematic concerns, subordinating the importance of feeling to politeness and properties respectively. It is as if the novel is not sentimental enough to justify a sustained analysis of its representation of feeling *per se*.

This article argues that feeling in *Evelina* deserves a more thorough scrutiny precisely because it is not sentimental enough by eighteenth-century standard. By comparing moments of intense emotion in Burney’s novel and those in contemporary sentimental fiction, I would suggest that Burney disapproves of and consistently revises the emotional paradigms popularized by sentimental novelists. In particular, while Sterne and Mackenzie believe that to feel intensely means to feel spontaneously, privileging impulsive passion that fragments human interactions into moments of transport, Burney maintains that the virtue of feeling lies in its ability to cement interpersonal connections and to last through such desirable ties. This reading will refocus the issue of power in *Evelina*, but not in terms of gender inequality, as is often the case in existing scholarship. Although I agree with feminist critics’ claim that women in *Evelina* represent a disempowered group persecuted by wealthy and wolfish men, I will demonstrate how and why feeling in this novel becomes an unexpected and unlikely source of power for both sexes.¹⁴ Before presenting my arguments in greater length, I will first address the sentimental moment in eighteenth-century narratives of sensibility, which, I believe, is the target of Burney’s revisionist energy.

The Sentimental Moment and the Construction of Feeling

In the preface to *The History of Sir Charles Grandison* (1753), Richardson claims that all the following letters are “written, as it were, to the *Moment*, while the Heart is agitated by Hopes and Fears, on events undecided” (4, emphasis in original). Richardson is deeply interested in the causes and consequences of an emotional moment, when the distress of his heroine becomes so great that it affects herself, other characters and the reader. The immediacy and affective intensity of that moment, Richardson insists, can best be registered through letter-writing. Although not every sentimental writer in the eighteenth-century subscribes to the power Richardson attributes to epistolary narratives, most of them share his interests in “the moment” and punctuate their texts with momentary ecstasy, grief, rage, compassion or swoon. As Stephen Ahern has convincingly demonstrated, this fascination with an exquisitely emotional moment infiltrates a variety of novelistic forms that falls under the banner of literary sentimentalism. In early eighteenth-century amatory fiction, this fascination translates into “a dream of union with the beloved in a moment of erotic bliss.” In mid-century narratives of sensibility, it manifests itself in episodes of compassionate encounters with suffering friends. In late-century Gothic fiction, it evokes sublime terror that expands the heroine’s mind or violent horror that threatens her existence (38).

Permeating the majority of eighteenth-century novels, these moments of emotional transport conjure up two assumptions about feeling and circumscribe contemporary perception of its nature and value. First, these sentimental moments are by definition short-lived, drawing readers’ attention to the suddenness of feeling rather than to its continuity. A

¹⁴ Influential feminist criticism of the novel can be found in Staves 371 and Fraiman 45-46.

sentimental hero never takes time critically to evaluate his feeling. Scrutinizing the cause of his emotional response and weighing up its consequence would immediately disqualify him for a man of feeling. As Starr aptly puts, the focus of a sentimental novel “is not on actions, which involve choice and responsibility, but on reactions—particularly reactions so abrupt as to preclude deliberation” (188). In other words, sentimental novelists narrow the value of feeling down to transient spontaneity. The gradual evolution of feeling through time and its defiance of the eroding power of time are irrelevant to them.

This emphasis on immediate reaction to external stimuli at the expense of responsible actions problematizes the sentimental moment and reveals another assumption about feeling: that it necessarily invokes powerlessness. This assumption can be observed clearly in the general inefficacy of a sentimental hero’s sympathy for the socially disadvantaged. Although tearful encounters in sentimental novels frequently expose social injustice and resultant unhappiness, they serve not so much to address the origin of that particular misfortune as to provide fleeting aesthetic pleasure for the audience of those unhappy scenes. Thus Sterne’s Yorick and Mackenzie’s Harley may readily sympathize and weep with heartbroken women that they meet, but forget these female victims of a patriarchal society soon afterwards. Satisfying their personal emotional need, their sympathy absolves them of social responsibility and yield little constructive attempt towards social reform. For them, “the immediate emotional response matters, in terms of the sentimental project, more than any action it might generate” (Spacks 134).

Feeling unleashed by the moment of transport is powerless not only because it fails to achieve any social good but also because it is literally associated with physical vulnerability. This dimension becomes apparent in the sentimental swoon that characterizes most eighteenth-century women of feeling. In Sarah Fielding’s *The History of Ophelia* (1760), the heroine faints upon learning Lord Dorchester’s decision to fight a duel for her sake. And in Elizabeth Inchbald’s *A Simple Story* (1791), Miss Milner “sunk speechless on the floor” when she realized that the life of Dorriforth, whom she secretly loves, would be threatened by a duel with Sir Frederick Lawley (67). Their fainting represents “a disadvantage for both heroines: it prevents them stopping the life-threatening event and assisting where they would be most needed” (Csengei 140). Their loss of consciousness confirms the association of feeling and weakness, suggesting that physical vulnerability and social powerlessness are two sides of the same coin.

With spontaneous reaction and powerlessness as its two constitutive elements, a typical sentimental moment militates against the formation of a lasting connection between individuals. Because a man of feeling prioritizes immediate emotional pleasure, he is not interested in sustaining a relationship with the subject of his sympathy. When a woman of feeling faints, she literally and effectively disrupts her interaction with other characters. The dramatization of feeling in *Evelina* is not sentimental enough because it highlights how a lasting emotional bond emerges from an intensely sentimental moment and because, through this plot arrangement, it disputes the conventional association of feeling with instant gratification and vulnerability.

Lasting connections

Like many other eighteenth-century sentimental heroines, Evelina faints and weeps when her mind is burdened with overwhelming emotion. Unexpectedly discovering her maternal grandmother Madame Duval, she “sunk into Mrs. Mirvan’s arms,” “more dead than alive” (53). Returning to her native Berry Hill after a long stay in London, she “wept over” her guardian Villars’s hands (255). But it is important to notice that the person who arouses her strong feeling is neither a sexual predator nor a mere stranger but a family member. Why

does Burney choose to make her heroine faint and weep in the presence of someone with whom her fate is intertwined? I would argue that this is because Burney wants to connect long-term relationship with powerful feeling, a connection overlooked by the preoccupation of the sentimental culture with impulsive reaction.

The compatibility between sentimental moments and long-lived affective bonds can be best observed in one particular episode of the novel, in which Evelina, for the first time in her life, disobeys Villars. After her London journey, Evelina returns to Berry Hill with a heavy heart. She has written a letter to Orville to apologize for her cousins' taking advantage of his carriage. A rude reply, insinuating her intention to carry on secret correspondences with Orville, wounds her pride. Villars attempts to identify the cause of Evelina's unhappiness, but Evelina tries to evade his enquiries. Tension between them builds up, culminating in a sentimental climax where Evelina, ashamed of her ungrateful reserve, explodes: "I burst into tears: with difficulty had I so long restrained them . . . 'Say then,' cried I, kneeling at his feet, 'say then that you forgive me! . . . — my father! my protector!—my ever-honoured—ever-loved—my best and only friend!—say you forgive your Evelina, and she will study better to deserve your goodness!'"(266). In this emotional declaration Evelina gives Villars three roles: father, protector and friend. The value of each role is predicated on sustained commitment. Indeed they are titles awarded to someone with whom we wish to have or have already had a lasting connection. The order in which these three titles are arranged invites scrutiny. Villars has acted as Evelina's father and protector for seventeenth years. He cannot arrogate these titles to himself after Sir John Belmont fully acknowledges his paternal obligation and after Evelina marries. But Villars can always be Evelina's friend despite the change in her circumstances. Evelina's choice of words, "ever-honoured" and "ever-loved," also suggests that it is in the capacity of friend that Villars can develop a life-long connection with her. The spontaneous overflow of Evelina's powerful feeling channels her attention not to temporary aesthetic pleasure but to long-term relationships. As her feeling intensifies, she hits on the most flexible and capacious forms of interpersonal relations: friendship.

The importance of this sentimental moment lies not so much in Evelina's tearful excitement as in the affective bond it helps to secure after Evelina dries her tears. In particular, Evelina's reconciliation with Villars saves and strengthens three of her most cherished relationships. When Evelina chooses to withhold her confidence, Villars feels hurt and laments that "though Evelina is returned,— I have lost my child" (265). Gina Campbell argues that throughout the novel Villars consistently associates "child" with innocence. "I have lost my child" therefore implies that Evelina loses her chastity during her London journey, which is too severe a rebuke for Evelina's unwillingness to reveal her secrets. "Evelina's shock at the charge suggests how serious it is," Campbell thus concludes (566). However, Evelina's immediate response to this charge indicates that the cause of her shock lies elsewhere and that she takes Villars's "child" literally. "'No, Sir, no,' replied I, inexpressibly shocked, 'she is more yours than ever! Without you, the world would be a desert [*sic*] to her, and life a burthen'" (265). Rather than defending her innocence, Evelina tries to express her gratitude towards Villars, not least by invoking what could have happened to her had Villars not adopted her after her mother's death. Evelina is shocked because she believes Villars is accusing her of a breach of filial piety. Villars's accusation in fact carries a real threat. Evelina is legally not his child and he can choose not to leave his fortune to her. Villars does not hesitate to intimate the consequence of his displeasure: "it pains . . . me you should ever remember that you have not a natural, an hereditary right to every thing within my power" (266). But Evelina's tears soften Villars's heart. After their emotional conversation, Evelina is once again "his sole joy, his only earthly hope, and the child of his bosom" (266).

This sentimental moment contributes to securing another two long-term relationships. Evelina's resentment at Orville's apparent insult nearly extinguishes her affection for him. "I will talk,— write,— think of him no more!" she declares (262). However, her sentimental encounter with Villars obliges her to talk, write and think of Orville once more. In addition, Villars's astonishment upon hearing her stories and his attempt to excuse Orville alleviate Evelina's indignation and incline her to believe that Orville is really forgivable. Evelina concludes the account of this sentimental moment by mentioning Orville once again. Addressing her friend Maria Mirvan, she writes: "I entreat you not to acquaint even your dear mother with this affair; Lord Orville is a favourite with her, and why should I publish that he deserves not that honour" (268). Evelina's request that Mrs. Mirvan's good opinion about Orville should remain untarnished not only contradicts her previous decision not to think of him anymore. It also testifies to her continual affection for him.

It is worth noticing that Evelina relates her sentimental experience to her bosom friend Maria. Julia L. Epstein has argued that Evelina "maintains the selective privilege of the creative artist throughout her narrative" (117). She carefully edits her letters to Villars, describing her adventures from the moral perspective of which Villars would approve. On the contrary, her letters to Maria are "direct, their style colloquial and forthright, their tone unstudied" (118). Intrigued by the contrast between these two distinct groups of letters, Epstein argues: "there is a second novel here, over which *Evelina* rests like a palimpsest—the novel that Evelina's letters and conversations with a peer, another young woman, would comprise" (119). If Evelina's respective relationships with Maria and Villars are capable of producing two different novels, the difference between them nevertheless evaporates in the very letter at the centre of which lies Evelina's sentimental reconciliation with her guardian. This letter begins by linking her friendship with Maria and her filial sentiment, treating both as a good cause for letter-writing: "my dear Miss Mirvan . . . I have . . . at present, sufficient matter for a letter, in relating a conversation I had yesterday with Mr. Villars" (262). At the end of this letter, we see again that Evelina place her friend and her guardian on an equal footing: "to you, and to Mr. Villars, I vow an unremitting confidence" (268). The sentimental moment bolsters Evelina's connection with Maria in two ways. On the one hand, it provides Evelina with interesting materials worthy of communicating to her best friend. Her regular correspondence with Maria plays a key role in sustaining their friendship despite their separation. On the other hand, it allows Evelina to compare Maria with Villars and draw a fitting analogy. Both of them, she declares, deserve her "unremitting confidence" and lasting affection. Reflecting on the affecting revelation of her secrets, Evelina writes "dear to my remembrance will ever be that moment" (266). That moment is dear to her because it does not implicate her in egoistic sentimentality but considerably improves her interpersonal relationships.

"Dear to my remembrance will ever be that moment"

Evelina's association of long-term memory with an emotional occurrence points to another reason why Burney's novel appears not sentimental enough. Like contemporary sentimental novelists, Burney incorporates momentary transports into her narrative. But these dramatic moments reveal not so much her preoccupation with instant emotional gratification as her interest in what happen when feeling is allowed to span a longer period of time. This experimental spirit infiltrates two of the most emotional episodes in *Evelina*: Macartney's adventure in France and Evelina's reunion with her father.

Brought up in a single-parent family and designed for the church, Macartney is a poor Scottish man with apparently little prospect of prosperity. His visit to France, however, transforms his life. In Paris he falls in love with an English lady, Miss Belmont. Their

affection is clandestine but honest. Miss Belmont's father, Sir John Belmont, strongly opposes their relationship and accuses Macartney of seducing his daughter. Infuriated by this unjust affront, Macartney fights a duel with and severely wounds the father of his beloved. Later Macartney finds that he nearly commits the crime of patricide and incest—his lover turns out to be his half-sister. To allay Sir John Belmont's fears about his daughter being seduced or abducted, Macartney stays in London and waits for his arrival. There he is insulted by his landlords, the snobbish Branghtons, for his inability to pay his rent. There he experiences the comfort of sympathetic benevolence when Evelina, perceiving pistols in his pocket and fearing an impending suicide, rushes into his room to stop him and offers her purse. Combining frustrated love, passionate encounter, social injustice, financial distress and the balm of sympathy, Macartney's story suggests Burney's familiarity with the paraphernalia of sentimental fiction. But with a conventional sentimental hero Burney in fact attempts to introduce a fresh perspective on feeling.

Macartney's unhappiness arguably starts with the discovery by Sir John Belmont of his secret liaison with his daughter. According to Macartney himself, "the sudden and unexpected return of her father . . . proved the beginning of the misery which has ever since devoured me . . . he darted into the room with the rage of a madman. Heavens! What a scene followed!—what abusive language did the shame of a clandestine affair . . . induce me to brook" (228). The interruption of a private conversation by an angry father, who, apprehensive of his daughter's honor, accuses a young man of villainy and seduction: this plot arrangement bears a striking resemblance to the Emily Atkins episode in Henry Mackenzie's *The Man of Feeling*. Seduced and abandoned by her lover during her father's absence, Miss Atkins is forced into prostitution to earn a living. Her pitiable condition attracts Harley's attention and he visits her for a more detailed story. During their conversation, her father unexpectedly enters the room: "the door burst open, and a man entered in the garb of an officer. When he discovered his daughter and Harley, he started back a few paces; his look assumed a furious wildness! he laid his hand on his sword . . . 'Villain,' he cried, 'thou seest a father who had once a daughter's honour to preserve; blasted as it now is, behold him ready to avenge its loss!" (50). Like Belmont, Mr Atkins resorts to a stream of invective to vent his resentment. And both fathers are ready to revenge themselves on the assumed ravisher. But the similarity between Macartney's experience and Harley's adventure stops here.

Significantly, Mr Atkins only "laid his hand on his sword" but did not strike. His daughter intervenes and directs his anger towards herself: "strike here a wretch, whose misery cannot end but with that death she deserves" (50). As a result, Mr Atkins's anger does not bring about more dramatic action but culminates in sentimental speechlessness. "Her father would have spoken; his lips quivered, his cheek grew pale! . . . he burst into tears" (50). Mr Atkins's tears, mingled with those of her daughter and Harley, quickly dissolve the tension between these three characters. As the emotional intensity subsides, so does the narrator's interest in further developing this event. The narrative focus on Harley's feeling peters out: "we could attempt to describe the joy which Harley felt on this occasion, did it not occur to us, that one half of the world could not understand it though we did; and the other half will, by this time, have understood it without any description at all" (52). As a result, the exquisite sympathy Harley has just felt for Emily Atkins and her father is short-circuited. Its brevity parallels the short-lived connection between Harley and his new friends. After this emotional encounter, Harley leaves them to their own device and their memory recedes in his mind. By choosing to dwell exclusively on the immediate drama that emotion produces, Mackenzie appears uninterested in discussing feeling in developmental terms. Ann Jessie Van Sant has observed that Harley is a "reduced figure." Comparing Harley with Tobias Smollett's Matthew Bramble and Sterne's Yorick, she writes: "the physiological bodies of Matthew Bramble and Yorick determine the range and intensity of their experience. Harley— with

virtually no body—has correspondingly little experience” (112). I would argue that Harley appears to be a “reduced figure” not only because he lacks a hypersensitive body, but also because he has a fragmented emotional life characterised by a number of unconnected sentimental moments. Chameleon-like, his feeling never concentrates on one subject for a long period of time. Or rather, his mind fails to retain his feeling.

Burney portrays her man of feeling differently. It is not tears but blood that plays a central role in Macartney’s confrontation with Belmont. He fights a duel with Belmont and seriously wounds him. “At that moment I could almost have destroyed myself!” Macartney declares (228). Significantly, this overwhelming emotional moment does not mark a final climax and then fades away but haunts Macartney’s mind ever since. This retention of feeling not only makes Macartney’s emotional life coherent and unified but also becomes a powerful propeller of plot. Macartney’s mother, for example, would not have divulged his secret parentage but for her genuine concern for his sadness after his return to Scotland. As Macartney informs us, “the miserable situation of my mind was soon discovered by my mother; nor would she rest till I communicated the cause” (229). The significance of this revelation lies in two related respects. First, it confirms Burney’s preference to explore feeling in terms of long-term interpersonal connections. Second, by foregrounding the consequences and implications of Macartney’s passionate encounter, it expands a sentimental moment to a sentimental process, allowing readers to witness the complication, climax and dénouement of Macartney’s emotional entanglement with Belmont. After Macartney learns his parentage, he embarks on a long journey to find his father and seek paternal recognition. Before he meets his father in person, he suffers impoverishment, insult and bereavement. Indeed we do not know whether his petition would be successful for another 130 pages of the novel. In other words, Burney is not satisfied with describing Macartney’s feeling simply in terms of violent outburst. She associates it with an indefinite development and demonstrates how time mellows and chastises his sensibility. For Burney, the value of feeling can best be appreciated through the drama of gradual evolution rather than sudden explosion.

Burney’s interest in the intersection of feeling with time has another important dimension. She believes that feeling, when lodged in long-term memory, is one valuable part of humanity that can survive the transformative power of time. In this respect Burney markedly differs from other sentimental novelists, whose obsession with momentary effusion of emotion and whose depiction of forgetful characters imply their unwillingness to put feeling to the test of time. Once again Burney carefully engineers a sentimental moment to suggest her familiarity with and revision of the conventional rhetoric of sensibility. Upon perceiving the possibility that Macartney has committed patricide, Macartney’s mother is so overpowered by horror and grief that she faints. As Macartney recounts:

‘My son,’ cried she, ‘you have then murdered your father!’ and she sunk breathless at my feet. Comments, Madam, upon such a scene as this, would to you be superfluous, and to me agonizing: I cannot, for both our sakes, be too concise. When she recovered, she confessed all the particulars of a tale which she had hoped never to have revealed. — Alas! The loss she had sustained of my father was not by death!— bound to her by no ties but those of honour, he had voluntarily deserted her!— Her settling in Scotland was not the effect of choice, — she was banished thither by a family but too justly incensed; — pardon, Madam, that I cannot be more explicit! (229)

Literary historians of sensibility generally agree that the inexpressibility of emotion plays a central role in sentimental fiction.¹⁵ The first three lines of the passage above, in which Macartney refrains from elaborating his feeling at the sight of his unconscious mother, shows Burney recycling the sentimental convention. The second half of the passage, however, tells a very different story. Inexpressibility is replaced by volubility: Macartney's mother relates "all the particulars" of her affair with Belmont, presumably including the ups and downs of her affection for him. In the seclusion of Scotland and separated from its object, her affection for Belmont have remained dormant for more than twenty years. But through Macartney's account, the regret, resentment, disappointment and sorrow that his mother have repressed for the sake of her son's peace of mind return with a vengeance.

Feeling does not die with time, as Harley's short-lived and ineffectual sympathy for Emily Atkins would have predisposed the reader to believe. But questions remain: why does feeling last in the first place? And what message can be inferred from its longevity? To answer these questions we need to scrutinize the relationship between Belmont and Macartney's mother. We learn very little about the twists and turns of their youthful romance. The only information we have is that their love affair ends because of parental disapproval: "she was banished . . . by a family but too justly incensed." A comparison with Caroline Evelyn, the mother of Evelina, is revealing here. Belmont acts like a villain in his treatment of Caroline. He voluntarily terminates his relationship with her, by "burn[ing] the certificate of their marriage and den[ying] that they had ever been united" (17). In sharp contrast, the degree to which Belmont willingly leaves Macartney's mother is problematized by the presence of an angry family. This detail suggests that Belmont may have a stronger affection for Macartney's mother than for Caroline and that their connection could have lasted but for familial opposition. Moreover, their affection is apparently reciprocal. Macartney's mother never ascribes her misery to Belmont's perfidy. Unlike Villars who never hesitates to publicize Belmont's criminal offense, so much so that Belmont fears that Evelina is "bred to curse" him (384), Macartney's mother tells her son that he loses his father to illness. If Villars emphasizes the abrupt annihilation of Caroline's marriage, Macartney's mother stresses her unending attachment to Belmont. She tells Macartney that she begins a continual process of mourning "upon the sudden loss of [his] father" (227). This process can hardly draw to an end partly because Macartney himself represents a constant reminder of her youthful love affair. Through constant mourning and rearing the offspring of the man she loves, Macartney's mother self-consciously preserves her bitter-sweet memory of Belmont and mentally re-establishes her relationship with him. A retentive mind allows both feeling and interpersonal connections to last.

Burney's experiment with sentimental moments can be further explored in the two recognition scenes near the end of the novel. Critics have sought hard to explain why there are two meetings between Evelina and Belmont, when one seems enough. Susan Greenfield argues that, although in the first meeting Belmont is shocked by Evelina's physical resemblance to Caroline Evelyn, he does not "offer either woman legal recognition." It is not until Evelina presents her mother's letter to Belmont that he fully "acknowledg[es] his legal relationship to both child and wife" (312). Amy Pawl also claims that it takes another interview before Belmont "own[s] her as his legal child" (292). Neither critic dwells on the sentimental aspect of these two occasions, assuming that the issue of ownership outweighs the importance of feeling.

¹⁵ Spacks, for instance, has identified inexpressibility as "a formal device of considerable import" in sentimental novels (133). "A crucial aesthetic of such fiction demands sparseness in the narration of emotion. . . . Both the immediate auditor and the reader must fill in the details" (135).

But in fact these two scenes demonstrate how carefully Burney works on the representation of feeling in her novel. Unconvinced of Mrs Selwyn's assertion that she brings his daughter with her, Belmont is unexpectedly ushered in a room where Evelina stays:

What a moment for your Evelina!—an involuntary scream escaped me, and covering my face with my hands, I sunk on the floor.

He had, however, seen me first; for in a voice scarce articulate he exclaimed, 'My God! Does Caroline Evelyn still live!'

Mrs. Selwyn said something, but I could not listen to her; and, in a few minutes, he added, 'Lift up thy head,—if my sight has not blasted thee, — lift up thy head, thou image of my long-lost Caroline!'

Affected beyond measure, I half arose, and embraced his knees, while yet on my own.

'Yes, yes,' cried he, looking earnestly in my face, 'I see, I see thou art her child! She lives—she breathes—she is present to my view!— Oh God, that she indeed live!— Go, child, go,' added he, wildly starting, and pushing me from him, 'take her away, Madam, — I can-not bear to look at her!' And then, breaking hastily from me, he rushed out of the room. (372)

This passage reproduces the conventional sentimental moment in two ways. For one thing, the emotion that emerges from this moment is sudden and abrupt. Upon seeing Evelina, Belmont recognizes her resemblance to his deceased wife. And both Evelina and Belmont are immediately "affected beyond measure." The quick succession of verbs describing Belmont's actions reinforces a sense of knee-jerk impulsiveness. For another, the violent feeling it produces is short-lived and contributes little to forging or sustaining a lasting interpersonal connection. Belmont's rushing out of the room and his declaration that he cannot bear to look at Evelina combine to suggest that the strong feeling the sight of Evelina excites only serve to widen the distance between him and her. It is not until this overwhelming feeling subsides, until Belmont recovers from the shock, that he is ready to confront this puzzling affair again. As Evelina suggests, the moment of transports passes very quickly: "he soon after sent his servant to enquire how I did" (373).

On the face of it, the second meeting of Evelina and Belmont simply re-enacts the sentimental excess and impulse manifest in the first.

The moment I reached the landing-place, the drawing-room door was opened, and my father, with a voice of kindness, called out, 'My child, is it you?'

'Yes, Sir,' cried I, springing forward, and kneeling at his feet, 'it is your child, if you will own her!'

He knelt by my side, and folding me in his arms, 'Own thee!' repeated he, 'yes, my poor girl, and Heaven knows with what bitter contrition!' Then, raising both himself and me, he brought me into the drawing-room, shut the door, and took me to the window, where, looking at me with great earnestness, 'Poor unhappy Caroline!' cried he, and, to my inexpressible concern, he burst into tears. . . .

I would again have embraced his knees; but, hurrying from me, he flung himself upon a sofa, and leaning his face on his arms, seemed, for some time, absorbed in bitterness of grief. (382-83)

The passage of time is deliberately woven into this scene, which qualifies the emotional abruptness underlying a sentimental moment. Belmont may suddenly "burst into tears," but Evelina's pen directs us to see the length, not the spontaneity, of his sorrow: "for some time,

[he is] absorbed in bitterness of grief.” Moreover, interpersonal connectedness informs this scene. Whereas in their first encounter Belmont literally pushes Evelina away from him, here he “fold[s] [her] in his arms.” In return, Evelina attempts to embrace his knees. If in the previous meeting Belmont stops short of admitting his paternity, here, by pronouncing “my child,” he unreservedly includes Evelina into his family circle. Furthermore, gazing at Evelina reminds Belmont of Caroline. His gaze thus imaginatively enacts a long-awaited family reunion of father, mother and daughter. The poignancy of his memory testifies that Belmont is a man of feeling by Burney’s standard. His guilt and sympathy for Caroline’s suffering last for seventeen years.

The longevity of Belmont’s feeling can be inferred from a sentence that smacks of sentimental excess. After Belmont reads Caroline’s letter, he declares: “how willingly would I take her child to my bosom, — fold her to my heart, — call upon her to mitigate my anguish, and pour the balm of comfort on my wounds” (385). Significantly, this sentence represents not so much what Belmont wishes to do now as what he has long been yearning to do. By this point in the novel, we have already learned that Belmont wrongly acknowledged Polly Green, a nurse’s child, as his own, seventeen years ago and that “he had *always* observed that his daughter bore no resemblance of either of her parents” (374, emphasis in original). The emphasized “always” suggests that Belmont’s paternal affection for Caroline’s daughter existed long before he meets Evelina. For the past seventeen years he has been trying to treat his natural daughter with tenderness but Polly Green’s lack of resemblance to Caroline has “always” prevented him from fully enjoying a gratifying father-daughter relationship. Reconfiguring emotional excess in a way that accommodates enduring affection, Burney negotiates a middle ground between regurgitating the paraphernalia of sentimental fiction and abandoning them altogether.

Empowering Attachment

Burney does not repudiate sentimental fiction because she shares with the genre’s fascination with the ability to feel intensely and because she wishes to transform this ability from a liability to an asset. Among all letters in *Evelina*, Caroline’s is arguably the most powerful one. It is capable of undermining patriarchal authority. After reading the letter, a weakened Belmont cries: “ten thousands daggers could not have wounded me like this letter” (385). Moreover, this letter demonstrates female narrative prowess. With it, the dead mother “writes the final version of the familial script,” not least by dictating what the father should do to obtain her forgiveness (Greenfield 312). At the same time, combining maternal tenderness and references to an old romantic tie, this letter is also one of the most affectionate. It thus provides a fertile ground for investigating the link between feeling and power.

Caroline’s letter rings with her anxiety about disrupted interpersonal connections. She finds no proper way to address Belmont: “shall I call you by the loved, the respected title of husband?— No, you disclaim it!— the father of my infant?— No, you doom it to infamy!— the lover who rescued me from a forced marriage?—No, you have yourself betrayed me!” (338). Husband, father and lover: the three titles that Caroline invokes are all indicators of an affectionate and enduring relationship. The three emphatic “no,” however, sever the tie between the indicator and its referent as abruptly as Belmont burns his marriage certificate. Lamenting her husband’s cruelty alone borders on an admission of powerlessness. But showing sentimental weakness is far from what Caroline intends to do with her death-bed letter.

I would argue that Caroline’s letter testifies to the empowering potential of feeling. Caroline’s emotional trauma and postnatal weakness could have deprived her of any strength to write a letter. As she herself admits, “hopeless, and almost desperate, twenty times have I

flung away my pen” (338). But her maternal affection overrides physical frailty: “the feelings of a mother, a mother agonizing for the fate of her child, again animat[e] my courage” (338). “The feelings of a mother” does not simply invigorate Caroline but significantly contributes to establishing the father-daughter bond. Maternal apprehension prompts Caroline to write “Oh babe of my fondest affection! . . . look not like thy unfortunate mother, — lest the parent whom the hand of death may spare, shall be snatched from thee by the more cruel means of unnatural antipathy” (339). Arguably, it is this sentence that arouses and secures Belmont’s paternal love for Evelina, as this is the only sentence Belmont singles out and read aloud. “*Look not like thy unfortunate mother!*— . . . my child, my child!” (385, emphasis in original).

The objects of Caroline’s tender affection also include Belmont. The last passage of her letter reads: “shall I not offer to the man once so dear to me, a ray of consolation to those afflictions he has in reserve? Suffer me, then, to tell thee, . . . that the recollection of the love I once bore thee, shall swallow up every other!” (340). This passage demonstrates that Caroline’s residual love for Belmont is strong enough to subdue her resentment. By calling Belmont “the man once so dear to me,” Caroline is implicitly granting him the three titles that he had jettisoned: husband, father and lover. By asserting that “the recollection of the love I once bore thee” is the only thought in her head before she dies, Caroline imaginatively returns to the old days when Belmont voluntarily made a life-long commitment to her and when he perfectly deserved the honor of those three titles. Her affection for Belmont empowers her in two ways. It creates an emotional bond between husband and wife despite the destruction of the marriage certificate. It liberates her from a state of victimhood and elevates her to a position of power. By the end of the letter Caroline becomes a benefactress who can offer “a ray of consolation.” Burney’s message is clear: feeling becomes empowering when it springs from an attempt to establish an enduring interpersonal connection or an awareness of its existence.

The kind of feeling that dominates Caroline’s mind in her last moments can be variously described as pity, maternal anxiety or resilient love. But I would argue that the best descriptive term is attachment because this form of feeling emphasizes the establishment of affective connections between individuals and because building up a new relationship between father and daughter and repairing an old one between husband and wife are exactly what Caroline’s affectionate letter achieves. Burney’s exploration of attachment, however, goes beyond one isolated incident. If Caroline’s letter suggests that attachment can be empowering, elsewhere in the novel Burney demonstrates that its strength lies in its longevity.

Throughout *Evelina* Burney uses the word “attached” and its derivatives sparingly. Most of them are used to describe Evelina’s interaction with another man. All of them carry emotional connotations and judgment. The unwelcome Mr Smith “endeavoured to attach himself to [Evelina], with such officious assiduity” (195). Intent on marrying Evelina, young Branghton “would willingly have attached himself to [her]” but for her apparent displeasure (233). Describing Lord Merton’s sexual harassment in the presence of his fiancée, Evelina writes: “he attached himself to me, during the walk, with a freedom of gallantry that put me extremely out of countenance” (312). It is important to notice that, although Burney uses the verb “to attach” to suggest these three men’s attraction to Evelina, she refrains from using the noun “attachment” to define their feeling towards her. This is because their affection is too transient to deserve this name. Smith transfers his attention to Miss Branghton as quickly as young Branghton loses his interest in Evelina. After he recovers from his intoxication, Lord Merton tries to devote himself to Lady Louisa.

For Burney, attachment represents a form of enduring affection, one that is informed by an earnest wish to sustain a long-term relationship. This is why Macartney describes his feeling for Miss Belmont as “an attachment which I have a thousand times vowed, a thousand

times sincerely thought would be lasting as my life” (228). This is why, to convince Evelina of his sincerity, Orville declares “my heart is yours, and I swear to you an attachment eternal!” (368). A comparison with another contemporary sentimental text, the Duchess of Devonshire’s *Emma, or, The Unfortunate Attachment: a Sentimental Novel*, is useful here. Like Burney, the Duchess of Devonshire conceives of attachment as sustained feeling: “the two ladies soon formed an attachment as sincere as their husbands: the Inexorable Tyrant only could dissolve such band” (61). But genuine attachment in this text represents a source of profound anxiety and debility. The heroine Emma Eggerton falls in love with her childhood friend Sidney but is obliged to marry William Walpole, an aristocrat, at the behest of her father. The thought of Sidney persists in Emma’s mind, distressing and incapacitating her. Emma’s attachment is debilitating because it undermines another, arguably more sacred, long-term relationship: her marriage. Emma’s father once warns her: “the only chance you have to make me happy is by concealing all that has happened [between you and Sidney], from every living creature; let the remembrance die, even in your own breast” (96). This is the advice Macartney’s mother would have given him, upon knowing his “unfortunate attachment” to Miss Belmont. But the fact that Burney reverses Macartney’s misfortune and allows Macartney to marry his beloved, who turns out to be unconnected with Belmont, is telling. It reiterates Burney’s consistent association of enduring feeling and lasting connections. Moreover, it demonstrates her belief in the power of attachment to triumph over obstacles and adversities.

Nowhere are these points better illustrated than in Orville’s confrontational conversation with Sir Clement Willoughby and his subsequent marriage proposal to Evelina. Orville solemnly demands that Willoughby should explain why he persists in his courtship of Evelina despite her resistance. The latter replies: “I think Miss Anville the loveliest of her sex, and, were I a *marrying man*, she, of all the women I have seen, I would fix upon for a wife, but I believe that not even the philosophy of your Lordship would recommend to me a connection of that sort, with a girl of obscure birth” (347, emphasis in original). When it comes to marriage, a life-long commitment of oneself to another, Willoughby cringes. He does not even wish to name this social institution but vaguely refers to it as “a connection of that sort.” For him, marriage is an impracticable dream that can only be expressed in the subjunctive mood. Willoughby’s reluctance to bind himself emotionally and permanently to Evelina prefigures the brevity of his connection with her. Soon after this admission of his flirtatiousness, Willoughby discovers that Evelina still keeps the fraudulent letter he forges in the name of Orville, flies into a rage and quits Evelina for ever.

In stark contrast, Orville wishes to unite himself with Evelina emotionally, legally and even spiritually. He declares this in his marriage proposal: “you are the friend to whom my soul is attached as to its better half!” (351). His emotional declaration distances the word “attached” from its earlier association with unwelcome physical proximity, endows it with a romantic value and aligns it with Burney’s understanding of attachment as sustained feeling. Stressing that it is his soul that is attracted to Evelina, Orville intimates that his affection for her never ends. Orville’s attachment is empowering in two aspects. First, it prompts him to offer his hand before he fully comprehends Evelina’s family background and financial status. Considering the multiple examples of mercenary marriage in this novel, Orville’s decision reflects the strength of his love for Evelina as well as the courage that springs from that love. Second, by asking Evelina to marry him, Orville is the first man to own Evelina properly and to give her a legitimate name (Fizer 97). As a result, Evelina becomes not as helpless and vulnerable as she once was. She has a shoulder to cry upon when Belmont denies her paternal care. She can rely on an honest man to sort out the embarrassing dilemma that implicates Evelina, Belmont and Polly Green. Orville is widely perceived as a feminized hero. He does not flaunt his phaeton, his sword, or his wealth to demonstrate his masculine power. Instead,

his power lies in a genuine attachment that prioritizes intrinsic worth over material possession. Orville is a man of feeling, but his lasting affection for Evelina and the consequent empowerment distinguishes from the likes of Mackenzie's Harley.

Disagreeing with Orville's criticism of William Congreve's *Love for Love* as indelicate for female taste, Captain Mirvan retorts: "I suppose it is not sentimental enough!" (82). This remark reminds us that the dominant theatrical taste in the 1770s was sentimental drama featuring weepy scenes of reconciliation with long-lost friends and relations. However, placed in close proximity to Mr Lovel's comic failure to remember the name of the play he has just attended, Mirvan's comment goes largely unnoticed. There exists an intriguing analogy between this minor event and modern criticism of *Evelina*. Most critics understand that this novel was produced in an era when the popularity of literary sentimentalism reached its peak. But many of them divert their attention to how Burney discusses manners in a comic and satirical light. The implication is that Burney's novel of manners has little to do with sentimental fiction.

This diversion is a pity because Burney herself acknowledged the influence of popular sentimental novels on her literary enterprise. In the preface to *Evelina* she admitted that she was "charmed with the eloquence of Rousseau" and "softened by the pathetic powers of Richardson" (10). Intriguingly, Burney's admiration of her novelistic predecessors quickly segues into a modest assertion of uniqueness: "I yet presume not to attempt pursuing the same ground which they have tracked" (10). The tension between her literary debt and her claim on originality probably explains why she recycles conventional sentimental moments to produce alternative ways of appreciating and imagining feeling. These fresh alternatives, emphasising how feeling forges long-term relationships and how feeling survive time through such connections, distance *Evelina* from eighteenth-century sentimental fiction and render it "not sentimental enough." But they also indicate Burney's profound interest in exploring human psyche and in identifying where the virtue of feeling actually lies. In this respect, that *Evelina* is "not sentimental enough" in fact speaks volumes about Burney's creative engagement with eighteenth-century literary sentimentalism.

Works Cited

- Ahern, Stephen. *Affected Sensibilities: Romantic Excess and the Genealogy of the Novel 1680-1810*. New York: AMS Press, 2007.
- Barker-Benfield, G. J. *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.
- Burney, Frances. *Evelina: or the History of a Young Lady's Entrance into the World*. Ed. Edward A. Bloom. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.
- Campbell, Gina. "How to Read Like a Gentleman: Burney's Instructions to Her Critics in *Evelina*." *ELH* 57.3 (1990): 557-83.
- Cope, Virginia H. "Evelina's Peculiar Circumstances and Tender Relations." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 16.1 (2003): 59-78.
- Csengei, Ildiko. *Sympathy, Sensibility and the Literature of Feeling in the Eighteenth Century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Doody, Margaret Anne. *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.
- Duchess of Devonshire, Georgianna. *Emma, or, The Unfortunate Attachment: a Sentimental Novel*. Ed. Jonathan David Cross. Albany: State U of New York P, 2004.
- Ellis, Markman. *The Politics of Sensibility: Race, Gender and Commerce in the Sentimental Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Epstein, Julia L. "Evelina's Deception: The Letter and the Spirit." *Frances Burney's Evelina*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1988. 111-29.

- Fizer, Irene. "The Name of the Daughter: Identity and Incest in *Evelina*." *Refiguring the Father: New Feminist Readings of Patriarchy*. Ed. Patricia Yaeger and Beth Knowaleski-Wallace. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1989. 78-107.
- Fraiman, Susan. *Unbecoming Women Writers and the Novel of Development*. New York: Columbia UP, 1993.
- Greenfield, Susan C. "'Oh Dear Resemblance of Thy Murdered Mother': Female Authorship in *Evelina*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 3.4 (1991): 301-20.
- Hamilton, Patricia L. "Monkey Business: Lord Orville and the Limits of Politeness in Frances Burney's *Evelina*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 19.4 (2007): 415-40.
- Inchbald, Elizabeth. *A Simple Story*. Ed. J. M. S. Tompkins. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Mackenzie, Henry. *The Man of Feeling*. Ed. Brian Vickers. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001.
- Pawl, Amy J. "'And What Other Name May I Claim?' Names and Their Owners in Frances Burney's *Evelina*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 3.4 (1991): 283-99.
- Rev. of *Evelina*, by Frances Burney. *Critical Review* 46 (1778): 202.
- Richardson, Samuel. *The History of Sir Charles Grandison*. Ed. Jocelyn Harris. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986.
- Rizzo, Betty. "Negotiating the Gothic." *Revising Women: Eighteenth-Century "Women's Fiction" and Social Engagement*. Ed. Paula R. Backscheider. London: The Johns Hopkins UP, 2000. 58-103.
- Spacks, Patricia Meyer. *Novel Beginnings: Experiments in Eighteenth-Century English Fiction*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2006.
- Starr, George A. "Sentimental Novels of the Later Eighteenth Century." *The Columbia History of the British Novel*. Ed. John Richetti, John Bender, Deirdre David and Michael Seidel. New York: Columbia UP, 1994. 181-98.
- Staves, Susan. "*Evelina*: or, Female Difficulties." *Modern Philology* 73.4 (1976): 361-81.
- Todd, Janet. *Sensibility: An Introduction*. London: Methuen, 1986.
- Van Sant, Ann Jessie. *Eighteenth-Century Sensibility and the Novel: The Sense in Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Essay 2

The Crisis of Intimacy: Lewis's Infatuation and Radcliffe's Attachment

In a famous piece of literary criticism, Ann Radcliffe commented on the different aesthetic effects of terror and horror. She wrote: "Terror and horror are so far opposite that the first expands the soul, and awakens the faculties to a high degree of life; the other contracts, freezes, and nearly annihilates them. I apprehend, that neither Shakespeare nor Milton by their fictions, nor Mr. Burke by his reasoning, anywhere looked to positive horror as a source of the sublime, though they all agree that terror is a very high one" (qtd. in Bartolomeo 151-52). In this well-known remark Radcliffe first contrasts her preferred sentiment with its opposite, making the former appealing, the latter unpleasant. She then moves on to cite literary authorities to vindicate her own preference. Many critics have found Radcliffe's words inspiring and helpful in their attempt to compare her with other contemporary Gothic novelists generally, with Matthew Lewis in particular. As Robert Miles observes, Radcliffe's contrast between terror and horror "virtually encodes the difference between her style of Gothic and, say, Matthew Lewis's" (47). The logic underpinning her

words also helps. The transition from delineating polar opposites to celebrating one of them provides a discursive framework that facilitates such comparative approach. In fact, this framework structures most critical account of the intertextual dialogue between Lewis's *The Monk* and Radcliffe's *The Italian*.

The conventional comparative narrative regularly begins with how Lewis's novel rewrites Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolpho* into a more sensuous and sensational romance, before discussing how *The Italian* revises *The Monk* so as to vindicate Radcliffian artistic style and moral vision. Maggie Kilgour, for instance, argues that Lewis "graphically realized all the potentials for terror Radcliffe leaves implicit [in *Udolpho*]" (156). While *Udolpho* only hints at the duplicity practiced in convents, Lewis boldly demonstrates that a religious haven in fact can harbor blood-curdling crime and desire (126). When Kilgour's critical eyes focus on *The Italian*, she has this perceptive observation to offer: "While Lewis's text is a realisation of the dangers implicit in Radcliffe's work, a making public of horrors she keeps secret and private, Radcliffe reasserts her ability to choose to control and veil those horrors with her art" (185). The intertextual dialogue between *The Italian* and *The Monk* therefore represents "a pattern for revision, in which Lewis's text is reduced to a false revelation, that is now followed by Radcliffe's correct as authorised version" (174).

"Reassert[ing] her ability," "revision," "false revelation" and "correct" version: Kilgour's words suggest that Radcliffe thoroughly disapproves of *The Monk* and painstakingly repudiates Lewis's corrupt messages, not least by establishing her own more wholesome, and therefore superior, artistic model. For many scholars of Gothic fiction this view is incontrovertible and they only seek to elaborate it with more specific details. Comparing Radcliffe's Schedoni, whose greed alone accounts for his atrocious crime, to Lewis's Ambrosio, whose monastic upbringing makes him "appear to be more sinned against than sinning," Kate Ferguson Ellis maintains that "Radcliffe was writing to show her public how *The Monk* ought to have been written" (132; 125). If Lewis makes the Inquisition "crooked as well as cruel," Claudia Johnson observes, in Radcliffe's revision it "changes from a theater of horror into a theater of justice" (133). Syndy Conger's influential essay "Sensibility Restored" is widely accepted as "one of the givens of Radcliffian scholarship" (Johnson 225). Her argument that in *The Italian* Radcliffe transforms Lewis's impotent and impious sensibility into "an energetic faculty" capable of "seeing beyond natural and human surfaces" seems to confirm beyond doubt that Radcliffe's response to *The Monk* is a matter of indignant disapprobation and earnest restoration.¹⁶

If Radcliffe is so angry with Lewis's degradation of her favorite literary form and so keen to restore it to its former glory, one would expect that *The Italian* rejects everything in *The Monk* and recycles Radcliffe's familiar artistic technique as she has practiced in *The Romance of the Forest* and *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. But this is simply not the case. *The Italian* shows striking similarities to *The Monk*, most noticeably in how heavily both rely on confessional discourses to formulate their plot (Bartolomeo 152-75). And *The Italian* differs from other earlier Radcliffian gothic novels in a number of important aspects. The center of consciousness around which the story develops is not a beautiful heroine but a sullen monk (Ellis 124). Unlike Theodore in *The Romance of Forest* who is "incapacitated beyond the possibility of resistance" and Valancourt in *The Mysteries of Udolpho* who "philanders when Emily is not around," Vivaldi is loyal to Ellena and his affection makes him resourceful and resilient (Johnson 126). The historical setting of *The Italian* is also unprecedented in Radcliffe's canon. "[I]t does not deal with remote events, rather the action is set in Naples

¹⁶ Other critics who argue in a similar fashion include Susan Wolstenholme and Susan Greenfield. The former designates *The Italian* as a "corrective to Lewis's *The Monk*" (30). The latter points out the importance of mother-daughter love in *The Italian* and argues that through it Radcliffe "offers a more positive vision of maternity" than Lewis, "who tend[s] to blame the mother for incest" (72).

and Southern Italy only some forty years prior to the date of publication” (Saglia 13). The conventional reading of *The Italian* simply as a revision of *The Monk* therefore requires a second thought. Juxtaposing the respective opening scenes of these two novels confirms this necessity.

Both novels begin in a church where, thanks to the heroine’s beautiful voice, the hero finds her interesting. Lewis describes this encounter in terms of sexual fascination. “The voice came from a female, the delicacy and elegance of whose figure inspired the Youths [Lorenzo and Don Christoval] with the most lively curiosity to view the face to which it belonged” (9). This curiosity focuses Lorenzo’s sight exclusively on the woman and the ensuing detailed description of her body suggests how long his attention lasts. Radcliffe appropriates Lewis’s scene and even repeats his words: “The sweetness and fine expression of [Ellena’s] voice attracted [Vivaldi’s] attention to her figure, which had a distinguished air of delicacy and grace” (5). If Lewis only implies the intensity and duration of his hero’s emotional fixation, Radcliffe determines to articulate them. “So much indeed was he fascinated by the voice, that . . . [h]e listened to [its] exquisite expression with a rapt attention, and hardly withdrew his eyes from her person till the matin service had concluded” (5).

In this earliest example of Radcliffe recycling Lewis’s material, one can hardly detect her angry disapprobation of her literary rival and impatience to assert her superiority. Instead, Radcliffe apparently finds something interesting in *The Monk* and incorporates it in her novelistic repertoire. I will contend that that “something” refers to the affective bond between individuals, one that can be passionately exclusive and deeply controversial. Close attention to how Radcliffe, following Lewis’s step, scrutinizes and problematizes interpersonal connections will challenge the established consensus that *The Italian* represents a revision of, even an antithesis to, *The Monk*. Radcliffe’s intellectual dialogue with Lewis involves not so much a repudiation as an endorsement of Lewis’s central message and preoccupation.

Affective bonds

At one point in *The Monk* Ambrosio attempts to seduce Antonia. He begins by asking her whether she already has a lover. “Have you seen no Man, Antonia, . . . The sound of whose voice soothed you, pleased you, penetrated to your very soul? In whose presence you rejoiced, for whose absence you lamented? With whom your heart seemed to expand, and in whose bosom with confidence unbounded you reposed the cares of your own?” (261). Antonia acknowledges that she has experienced the feeling Ambrosio describes and specifies that the monk himself has aroused it in the first place. “I waited so eagerly to catch the sound of your voice, . . . I wept when you departed, and longed for the time which should restore you to my sight” (261-62). Conger has argued that words in this scene “leap across chasms” and “terminate in tragic mutual misinterpretation” as Ambrosio and Antonia think very differently. The former believes his carnal passion is returned, while the latter simply expresses sisterly sympathy (127-28).

But Conger’s contrast between sexual desire and fellow feeling only partially explains where Ambrosio and Antonia differ. Asking Antonia whether there is a man whose voice “penetrated” to her very soul and whose presence delights her, Ambrosio’s emphasis is on the elimination of distance. By contrast, waiting features prominently in Antonia’s response. She “waited so eagerly to catch the sound of [Ambrosio’s] voice,” and she “longed for the time” when they could meet again. In other words, physical and temporal distance plays a crucial role in Antonia’s professed affection for the monk. One may even say it is the precondition of her affection. Once Ambrosio forcibly draws Antonia closer to him, he kills her affection for him. After the rape Antonia only feels terror and shame in his presence. Here we have two forms of affective bond underpinning interpersonal attraction. Ambrosio’s version manifests an impatience with distance and defines intimacy in terms of physical proximity. Antonia’s

requires distance to express itself and sees intimacy as heart-felt identification with another person despite separation. I shall call the former infatuation, the latter attachment.¹⁷

Radcliffe would have agreed with my appellations because she not only shares Lewis's interest in exploring interpersonal intimacy but also gives them specific names in *The Italian*. Vivaldi's father, the Marchese, has discovered his attraction to Ellena and his frequent visit to her house. After warning his son of the impropriety of this match but without avail, the Marchese condemns Vivaldi's affection as juvenile infatuation that cannot stand separation: "I am informed that your visits have been as frequent at the residence of the unhappy young woman, . . . as formerly, and that you are as much infatuated" (39). Vivaldi, by contrast, interprets his affection for Ellena differently. He values it not because it satisfies his bodily desire but because it is besieged by chilling pride and prejudice. Social expectation and familial opposition separate him from his lover. Moreover, since Ellena has shown little inclination to marry him immediately, Vivaldi well understands that he may wait for a long while before he obtains her consent. If problems of social, physical, and temporal distance dominate Vivaldi's relationship with Ellena, it is unsurprising that he names his affection in terms of attachment: "I am as sincerely attached to her as ever" (40).

Infatuation and attachment are key elements underlying the world of emotional interconnectedness in *The Monk* and *The Italian* respectively. Although they represent two different kinds of affective ties, at the center of both lies a yearning for intimacy. Exhibiting similarity within difference, these two words provides a discursive framework that encourages us to reconsider the assumed contrast between these two novels. On the face of it, serving as an alternative to Lewisite infatuation, Radcliffean attachment seems to confirm her disagreement with her literary rival. But closer attention to how both novelists approach the problem of intimacy reveals a different story. Lewis's infatuation and Radcliffe's attachment together indicate that both novelists are skeptical about the stability of intimate interpersonal relationships.

Divisive intimacy

For both Lewis and Radcliffe, intimacy designates a specific affective bond between two individuals and therefore differs significantly from general sympathy for a fellow human being. In his influential *An Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1767), Adam Ferguson defines the latter as "unbounded" affection: "This affection is a principle of candour, which knows no partial distinctions, and is confined to no bounds; it may extend its effect beyond our personal acquaintance; it may, in the mind, and in thought, at least, make us feel a relation to the universe, and to the whole creation of God" (viii). This universal benevolence, one that sees no class and gender differences, is exactly what is missing from the cruel worlds of *The Monk* and *The Italian*. In its stead Lewis and Radcliffe places an intense yearning for exclusive relationships, a yearning that establishes boundaries to differentiate friends from strangers. The establishment of such boundaries presumably aims at bringing two lovers closer together. Nevertheless, both novelists consistently destabilize the sense of togetherness consequent on an intimate act. As a result, the notion of what it means to be intimate often divides rather than coheres.

The Monk depicts a sexually permissive society, where seduction frequently succeeds and rape is a tangible threat. In this environment, to be intimate with a person means to be literally close to him or her. Thus when Leonella finds herself attracted to Don Christoval, she daily expects his visit to her house. When Lorenzo wishes to assure Antonia of his constant affection, he needs to make sure that she hears his occasional serenade. The music

¹⁷ Lewis's own use of the word "attachment" correspond to my definition. For instance, describing the affection between Agnes and Lorenzo, he writes: "Though accident had never permitted their being much together, He entertained for her a sincere friendship and attachment" (400).

functions as a substitute for a lover who is denied the pleasure to visit by a severe mother. And when Ambrosio despairs of possessing Antonia's body, the difficulty lies not so much in her unwillingness as in the physical distance separating the monk from his prey. Lewis's novel is full of sexual frustration caused by unwanted distance and a desire to shorten or even eliminate it. Infatuation informs most interpersonal connections in the novel and seems a primary force that brings two individuals closer.

Physical proximity of two individuals in *The Monk* defines intimacy as frequently as it undermines its appeal. Marguerite's story illustrates this point well. Although her husband is a spendthrift, she is "determined not to forsake him" (122). Her infatuation for him overpowers her reason and encourages her to follow him to join a group of Banditti. On the face of it, Marguerite's choice testifies to marital intimacy. But while Marguerite decides to live with her husband, he tries to distance himself from her. We are told that he carefully conceals his murderous occupation from his wife, so much so that Marguerite knows that their life is supported by plunder but not that homicide accompanies pillage. Secrecy is necessary because Marguerite's husband desires to preserve a close relationship with his wife. "He supposed, and with justice, that I should fly with detestation from the embraces of a Murderer" (123). If secrecy preserves intimacy, it also drives a mental wedge between husband and wife, destabilizing Marguerite's vision of matrimonial satisfaction that motivates her elopement in the first place.

Marguerite's second husband, Baptiste, further demonstrates that infatuation and the consequent desire for physical contact sow the seeds of future separation. Marguerite is not allowed to leave the Banditti after the death of her first husband because Baptiste "ha[s] long entertained for [her] the most ardent regard" (123). He insists on Marguerite's living with him and consummates his love by force. Compelled to be physically intimate with Baptiste, Marguerite begins her life of horror and disgust. "Judge how I must have grieved at being united with a Man, who received the unsuspecting Guest with an air of openness and hospitality, at the very moment that He meditated his destruction" (124). Although she cannot quit Baptiste's house, she alienates herself and her two children from his infamous activities. Her coldness to Baptiste and her son Theodore's moral uprightness suggest a division amid this family. Through Marguerite's two marriages Lewis makes an important point: born out of infatuation, the quest for intimacy separates two individuals that it supposedly seeks to unite.

In addition to estrangement and disgust, horror is another by-product of an intimate act. Nowhere is this dimension more vividly illuminated than the Bleeding Nun episode. This episode comprises two parts. In the first, taking advantage of the superstitious inhabitants at the castle of Lindenberg, Agnes plans to elope with Raymond by disguising herself as the Bleeding Nun. On the fateful night, Raymond waits outside the castle and, when he sees a figure of a nun approaching him, he impatiently clasps her into his arms. This affectionate gesture is followed by an even more fervent words of endearment: "Agnes! Agnes! Thou art mine! / Agnes! Agnes! I am thine! / In my veins while blood shall roll, /Thou art mine! / I am thine! / Thine my body! Thine my soul" (155-56). Steven Blakemore has aptly described Raymond's declaration here as a "ritualistic 'wedding' vow" and the night as the lovers' "wedding night" (529). He argues that Raymond's "I am thine" exclamation "conjures up Ambrosio's 'Thine, ever thine!' as he sexually surrenders and sinks upon Matilda's bosom" (529-30). In other words, this is an occasion where Raymond metaphorically consummates his love, the "Thou are mine . . . I am thine" vow implying there is no physical distance between the couple. But Lewis takes care to show us that this act of intimacy belies a painful separation. When Raymond thinks he embraces Agnes, she in fact is still in the castle preparing for her elopement. When he thinks he is carrying Agnes away to enjoy marital bliss, he in fact dooms her to shock and dismay. "What was her surprize [*sic*] at not finding me

ready to receive her!” (164). The horrible discovery that Raymond mistakes the real Bleeding Nun for Agnes considerably undermines the attractiveness of intimacy.

The appeal of intimacy evaporates without a trace in the second half of the episode where the Bleeding Nun pays Raymond a nightly visit. Lewis describes this visit in terms of infatuation, as a desire for physical contact dominates the scene. The Bleeding Nun chants “Raymond! Raymond! Thou art mine! / Raymond! Raymond! I am thine!” (162).

Appropriating Raymond’s previous vow almost verbatim, the Bleeding Nun claims that his professed love for her is returned and that, like him, she desires literally to eliminate the distance that separates them. Indeed, after pronouncing these words, the specter “press[es] her lips to [Raymond’s]” and “touch[es] [him] with her rotting fingers” (163). For Blakemore, the Bleeding Nun’s behavior amounts to sexual violation of helpless Raymond (530). And like the rape of Marguerite by Baptiste, this enforced intimacy only repulses Raymond, who is impatient to nullify his marriage vow. Moreover, in this episode intimacy is divisive for another reason. Paralyzed and horrified by the specter’s repeated visit, Raymond is unable to enquire after Agnes. As a result, Agnes believes Raymond has abandoned her and voluntarily takes the veil. A long separation ensues.

The Italian clearly shows Radcliffe’s interest in the divisive consequences of pursuing an intimate relationship. Olivia’s unhappy second marriage with Schedoni is an apparent remodeling of Marguerite’s story, with a superficial difference that Radcliffe tweaks Lewis’s deliberately blunt language. While Lewis insists that his readers see Baptiste’s villainy directly: “He obtained those favours by violence, which I persisted to refuse him” (124), Radcliffe pushes Schedoni’s identical crime to the backstage: “she was afterwards willing to retrieve her honour by the marriage vow” (340). This difference is superficial because sexual violence itself is not the central focus of either novelist. Lewis draws our attention to what happens after the rape, and so does Radcliffe. Radcliffe in fact takes a step further. If Lewis explores divisive intimacy in a single household, Radcliffe demonstrates that Schedoni’s desire to possess Olivia jeopardizes more than one relationship. It first alienates him from his brother, whom he assassinates eventually. It later urges him to suspect an affair between Olivia and Sacchi, one of Schedoni’s friends. His murderous jealousy drives both his friend and Olivia permanently from him. Even the crack in Schedoni’s rapport with the Marchesa can be traced back to his affection for Olivia. Because he believes Ellena is the offspring of him and her, he defends Ellena’s eligibility to marry Vivaldi and, as a result, loses the Marchesa’s confidence. Like Lewis, Radcliffe surrounds intimacy with violence and moral disgust, thereby making it the original cause of interpersonal divisions.

It is important to notice that Radcliffe’s agreement with Lewis manifests itself when she seemingly revises Lewis’s materials. The relationship between Raymond and Agnes is a far cry from that between Vivaldi and Ellena because Radcliffe weaves distance into the romantic tie of her central characters. Unlike Raymond, who never feels at ease when he is separated from his lover, Vivaldi can enjoy Ellena’s absence: “[He] pleas[es] himself with the consciousness of being near her, though he could no longer behold her” (7); “he experienced . . . a joy as exquisite as her presence could have inspired” (10). If Agnes expresses her desire for Raymond through her consent to elopement and premarital sex, Ellena recognizes her affection for Vivaldi only when he is at a distance. Immured in the convent of San Stefano, Ellena muses: “as the probability of his never being able to discover her abode, returned to her consideration, . . . the anguish she suffered told [her] . . . that love was, after all, the most powerful affection of her heart” (70). Distance distinguishes Radcliffean attachment from Lewisite infatuation, making the former a less sensational form

of emotional connectedness.¹⁸ It seems that the relationship between Vivaldi and Ellena represents a wholesome alternative to that between Raymond and Agnes.

But Radcliffe's appropriation of Lewis's words suggests that similarity can lurk beneath the surface of differences. Ellena's consent to marry Vivaldi is peculiarly reminiscent of Raymond's first encounter with the Bleeding Nun. Radcliffe's lovers exchange their marriage vow in a way that closely follows Raymond's "Thou art mine! ... I am Thine" declaration. "[Y]ou are mine forever!" Vivaldi says, to which Ellena replies "I am yours" (182). Just as Lewis's words of endearment pave the way for horrible separation, Radcliffe's verbal intimacy introduces the prospect of future estrangement. Significantly, Ellena weeps when she pronounces her vow. Her tears undermine the joy of intimacy in two respects. As Vivaldi rightly interprets, they indicate that "[her] consent is given with reluctance" and that "[her] heart is no longer [his]" (182). They separate hearts despite the intended marriage ceremony. Furthermore, Ellena's tears remind Vivaldi of his parents who still despise Ellena and oppose their union. The couple would purchase matrimonial bliss at a high price: an inevitable and probably permanent alienation from the Vivaldi family. Following Lewis's example, Radcliffe demonstrates that the quest for intimacy is inextricably bound up with the potential of division.

Alternative intimacy

That Raymond's first elopement scheme fails testifies to the importance of class distinction in *The Monk*. When Raymond meets Agnes he disguises himself as a lower-class wanderer. The supernatural interruption of his intended union with aristocratic Agnes and its tragic consequence illustrate what Daniel Watkins calls "the distortion, horror, crime, and ultimately social collapse which result from violations of social hierarchy" (117). That Vivaldi and Ellena's clandestine wedding ceremony is also interrupted suggests that Radcliffe is equally suspicious of class confusion. It is not until Ellena's noble birth is confirmed that she marries Vivaldi happily. The short-circuiting of an intimate act in both novels not only reflects Lewis's and Radcliffe's social conservatism but also, I argue, reveals their shared interest in employing interruption to scrutinize close interpersonal connection. In *The Monk* and *The Italian*, interruption becomes the symptom of contentious intimacy and implies the existence of an alternative, potentially more desirable, affection. This alternative threatens to collapse the emotional boundary that protects the integrity of a particular form of affection.

Ambrosio's worship of a picture of the Madonna exemplifies the existence and potential confusion of this boundary. Joseph Andriano has argued that the Virgin Mary serves as "both a maternal figure and an object of desire" for the monk (35). But Lewis takes care to differentiate mother-son attachment from erotic infatuation in the novel. The former stresses spiritual identification. Elvira instinctively finds Ambrosio's voice familiar, although the mother and the son have not seen each other for almost thirty years (250). In contrast, Ambrosio's lewd fantasy, in which he desires "to twine round my fingers those golden ringlets, and press with my lips the treasures of that snowy bosom," emphasizes physical proximity and indicates that his fascination with the Madonna is in fact a form of amorous infatuation (41). That the image of the Madonna turns out to be the image of Matilda may suggest that filial admiration and lascivious desire are reconcilable. But Lewis insists on their irreconcilability by having Ambrosio interrupt his own fantasy: "Should I not barter for a

¹⁸ Radcliffe repeatedly designates the bond between Vivaldi and Ellena as "attachment." For instance, commenting on Ellena's indecisiveness when Vivaldi proposes to her, Radcliffe writes: "Ellena, had she obeyed the dictates of her heart, would have rewarded his attachment and his services, by a frank approbation of his proposal" (179). And when Schedoni tries to persuade the Marchesa to change her mind, Radcliffe tells us that he is gently pleading for "Vivaldi's attachment" (296).

single embrace the reward of my sufferings for thirty years? Should I not abandon. . . Fool that I am! Whither do I suffer my admiration of this picture to hurry me?" (41; ellipsis in original). The ellipsis marks not only a textual gap that cuts short a character's thought, but also, more importantly, Ambrosio's sudden awareness that his worship of the Madonna as a mother figure has gone astray and bordered on dangerous eroticism. Interruption, by highlighting an alternative and eroticized appreciation of female beauty, becomes a way of registering problematic intimacy.

Although Radcliffe does not dramatize lustful infatuation, *The Italian* continues Lewis's association of interruption, alternative affection and troubled intimacy. Radcliffe frequently identifies Paulo's affection for his master Vivaldi as "attachment." The Marchese, when realizing the role Paulo plays in liberating his son, praises his loyalty: "I never can fully reward your attachment" (407). Vivaldi decides to entrust Paulo with the management of his household because he places complete confidence in his "integrity and attachment" (407). The use of this word is consistent with Radcliffe's understanding of it as an affective form that prioritizes spiritual affinity rather than bodily contact. Thus both the Marchese and Vivaldi discuss Paulo's affection in terms of master-servant relationship. Essentially a social contract that consolidates hierarchy, this relationship would constantly remind Paulo to know his own place and not to transgress the social boundary separating him and Vivaldi.

But Paulo's attachment to Vivaldi frequently defies social expectations and becomes deeply controversial. Radcliffe, like Lewis, uses interruption to reveal where the controversy lies and where the social or emotional boundaries are violated. In particular, Paulo's effusion of emotions frequently interrupts formal social occasions and embarrasses Vivaldi. One tribunal at the Inquisition is suspended temporarily because Paulo's loud protestation overwhelms every other voice: "I will speak so loud, that every word I say shall ring in the ears of all those old black devils on the benches yonder . . . I will tell them what they have to expect for all their cruel usage of my poor master" (358). Far from being pleased, Vivaldi feels "alarmed for the consequence of such imprudent, though honest indignation" and tries to silence him (358). Paulo's outspoken attachment makes Vivaldi uncomfortable not only because it blurs the distinction between the socially powerful and the powerless, but also because it destabilizes the otherwise clear-cut emotional categories. After Vivaldi is released from the Inquisition, Paulo "smile[s] and we[e]p[s], and sob[s] and laugh[s] with such rapid transition, that Vivaldi began to be alarmed" (406). "[S]uch rapid transition" implies uncontrollable self-interruption. And this self-interruption suggests that not even Paulo himself knows whether happiness or sorrow best expresses his present mood. The alternative seems always the better choice and therefore is always potentially disruptive.

Indeed, Paulo's attachment to his master is most controversial when it appears the preferred alternative to the heterosexual romance between Vivaldi and Ellena, when it sneaks into their otherwise exclusive emotional world. As Claudia Johnson has pointed out, the narrator of *The Italian* curiously "makes not even a perfunctory attempt to inspire any credence in the heterosexual love plot" (136). The heterosexual love plot, Johnson argues, is overshadowed by the priority the novel gives to "female homoerotic attachment," especially one that exists between Ellena and Olivia (134).¹⁹ If it is remarkable that Ellena loves Vivaldi with apparent reserve, it is equally significant to notice that Vivaldi's most fervent passion is reserved not for his intended wife but for Paulo. After his adventure in the Inquisition, Vivaldi first meets his loyal servant and then his lover. In the latter occasion, he offers "few

¹⁹ The textual evidence that Johnson adduces is compelling. Just as Ellena's voice arouses Vivaldi's amorous interest in her, Olivia's voice kindles Ellena's desire to see the face behind the veil. Just as Vivaldi gazes at Ellena with rapturous delight, Olivia's eyes are often fixed on her with eroticized fondness. "The erotic intensity of this affect between women . . . so clearly surpasses what Ellena more gingerly ventures for Vivaldi himself that it is no wonder the young man feels uneasy" (135).

words of tender exclamation” (408). In the former, he expresses his satisfaction much more profusely, not least by “embrac[ing] [Paulo] with his whole heart” (407). While in the latter Vivaldi’s joy is dented by his fear that Schedoni is Ellena’s father, in the former he enjoys Paulo’s presence regardless of any other concerns: “Vivaldi was participating in all the delight, and returning all the affection of his servant, and was so wholly occupied by these pleasurable feelings as scarcely to be sensible that any persons besides themselves were in the room” (406). Ellena’s attachment to Olivia prompts Vivaldi to ask “do I then hold only the second place in your heart?” (135). Given Paulo’s genuine devotion to his master and Vivaldi’s sincere reciprocation, it is tempting to assume that Ellena “hold[s] only the second place” in Vivaldi’s heart. By finally revealing Olivia to be Ellena’s mother, Radcliffe successfully dispels the threat of female homosexual attachment to the heterosexual plot. But interestingly Radcliffe chooses not to exorcize male homoeroticism latent in her novel. Paulo remains unmarried, although the Marchese promises to give his wife a handsome dowry. Vivaldi’s affection for his servant persists, so much so that he “allow[s] [Paulo] to be always with him” (407). And Ellena’s love for Vivaldi shows no sign of considerable increase. These are unpromising clues in a novel where heterosexuality is the norm. Paulo’s attachment challenges the exclusive nature of Vivaldi’s marital intimacy. Representing an alternative, his presence hints that Vivaldi’s romantic love can be “unbounded” and that Ellena’s matrimonial happiness is far from secure.

Latent male homoeroticism in *The Italian* is further evidence that controversial intimacy links Radcliffe’s and Lewis’s novels together ideologically and that Radcliffe can appropriate Lewis’s materials without angry condemnation or self-righteous revision. Many critics have commented on the issue of sexual inversion in *The Monk* and they generally agree that the ambiguous gender identity of Rosario/Matilda invites a “queer” reading of this novel.²⁰ If sexual ambiguity underpins the homosexual import of this text, it seems to follow that after Rosario reveals to Ambrosio that (s)he is in fact a woman, heterosexual intimacy prevails.²¹ But in fact the memory of Rosario returns and counterbalances Ambrosio’s heterosexual attraction. When Antonia entreats Ambrosio to pray for her sick mother, her gentle voice brings Rosario back to his mind: “Rosario’s adventure began thus,” the monk muses (241). An interesting passage follows in which the subject of Ambrosio’s affection is cast in doubt:

The Monk retired to his Cell, whither He was pursued by Antonia’s image. He felt a thousand new emotions springing in his bosom, and He trembled to examine into the cause which gave them birth. They were totally different from those inspired by Matilda, when she first declared her sex and her affection. He felt not the provocation of lust; No voluptuous desires rioted in his bosom; Nor did a burning imagination picture to him the charms, which Modesty had veiled from his eyes. . . .

‘Happy Man!’ He exclaimed in his romantic enthusiasm; ‘Happy Man, who is destined to possess the heart of that lovely Girl!’ (242)

On the face of it, Ambrosio is thinking of Antonia. But the hint of Rosario punctuates his thoughts and infiltrates his assumed heterosexual fancy. Like Antonia, Rosario also veils his charms from Ambrosio’s eyes in a way that arouses the monk’s yearning for a closer look: “[Ambrosio] could not help sometime indulging a desire secretly to see the face of his Pupil” (43). If Ambrosio is attracted to the modesty of the veiled Antonia, it is a veiled man who initiates him into the appeal of modesty in the first place. Indeed, since Ambrosio has self-

²⁰ See Blakemore 524, Haggerty 349, Napier 129 and Fincher 87.

²¹ Blakemore therefore argues “[t]he homoerotic disguise and tease is then dropped” after Ambrosio realizes that Rosario is a woman and treats her as such (524). Clara Tuite also sees Rosario’s unexpected revelation as “the moment at which homoerotic desire is buried under a tableau of heterosexual libidinal excess” (qtd. in Fincher 89).

consciously drawn an analogy between Rosario and Antonia, it is tempting to assume that every thought of Antonia is shadowed by the memory of his beloved Rosario. His heterosexual jealousy of Antonia's future husband pales in comparison with his suppressed homoerotic urge, those "new emotions" of which "[h]e trembled to examine into the cause." The former loses its credibility as it is uncharacteristic of a sex-starved monk to care only about possessing "the heart" of a lovely girl. Ambrosio's tremble, on the other hand, makes the latter a heart-felt sensation. This sensation appears an alternative to what the monk has felt for Matilda and indeed he begins to alienate her because of this emerging emotion. We cannot attribute this emotion to sibling affection since by this point of the novel we do not know Ambrosio is Antonia's brother. A more plausible explanation is that Antonia reminds Ambrosio of his unspoken infatuation with Rosario and awakens his homoerotic desire. His enjoyment of heterosexual intimacy is undermined as a result.

The Italian shows a similar interest in dramatizing affection between two men. This shared interest manifests itself despite the apparent revisionary efforts. Unlike Ambrosio's latent infatuation with Rosario, Paulo's attachment to Vivaldi is outspoken. While Ambrosio never feels happy again when Matilda replaces Rosario and permanently frustrates his desire for him, Paulo's exultation knows no bounds after his master marries and all his profession of love for him alone must stop. But beneath these obvious differences lies Radcliffe's agreement with Lewis. Like Lewis, Radcliffe regards the affective tie between men as a powerful sentiment that encroaches on the strict emotional border established by heterosexual intimacy.

The Vivaldi family rewards Paulo's attachment to his master by inviting him to attend the otherwise exclusive wedding. Calculated both to place Vivaldi safely in a heterosexual relationship and to indicate an alternative affection, the wedding ceremony deserves close attention:

As a testimony of singular esteem, Paulo was permitted to be present at the marriage of his master, when, as perched in a high gallery of the church, he looked down upon the ceremony, and witnessed the delight in Vivaldi's countenance, the satisfaction in that of my 'old Lord Marchese,' the pensive happiness in the Countess di Bruno's, and the tender complacency of Ellena's, which her veil, partly undrawn, allowed him to observe, he could scarcely refrain from expressing the joy he felt, and shouting aloud, '*O! giorno felice ! O! giorno felice!*' (411)

A traditional marriage celebrates a man's love for a woman. But Vivaldi's wedding shows not so much how passionately he loves Ellena as how sincerely he values Paulo's friendship. Indeed, since both Paulo and Ellena are near Vivaldi, it is curiously unclear whether "the delight in Vivaldi's countenance" should be attributed to the presence of his servant or of his bride. In addition, female characters appear to enjoy this wedding much less than men. Olivia, Ellena's mother, looks "pensive." Ellena only feels complacent about her marriage. The happiest people on this occasion, significantly, are Vivaldi and Paulo. We see the former's "delight" and we hear the latter's ecstatic exclamation, while Ellena is associated with invisibility and inarticulateness. If the bride and the groom are supposed to take the central stage and share equal pleasure in a wedding, one could not help wondering which two characters are the real couple whose happiness Radcliffe's narrative celebrates? Just as Lewis implies that Rosario is the only person who can satisfy Ambrosio, Radcliffe suggests that Paulo is the real life-long companion for Vivaldi. In both texts, conventional heterosexual relationships fray as their participants look beyond their partners for emotional satisfaction. Homosexual intimacy turns out to be a potential source of genuine happiness.

Both Lewis and Radcliffe agree that interpersonal intimacy is an unstable construct vulnerable to the allure of an alternative affection. For both writers intimacy can be attacked not only by external enemies such as familial opposition or supernatural intervention. It can

also be undermined from within when it is misplaced in the first place. Arguably, Ambrosio's and Vivaldi's choice of heterosexual intimacy introduces them to a life of regret or difficulties.

Misplaced intimacy

Misplaced intimacy is not only an implied evil in *The Monk* and *The Italian*. It in fact represents a genuine Pandora's Box, from which misery proceeds. Not surprisingly, the correction of misplaced intimacy parallels a character's ascent to happiness. Agnes's relationship with her dead infant is a case in point, a relationship that has attracted polarized comments from critics. Conger argues that Agnes "is tortured by the corpse of [her] dead child" (125). Fincher highlights Agnes's maternal delight in beholding her baby, however monstrous and disgusting it may be for others (92). Both views are only partially correct because they fail to take into consideration the gradual change in Agnes's affection towards her dead child.

Agnes's maternal fondness is first characterized by physical contact: "I placed [the baby] on my bosom, its soft arm folded round my neck, and its pale cold cheek resting upon mine" (412). The intimacy between mother and child affects even Agnes's persecutor. But as the dead body turns into "a mass of putridity," tender affection translates into mad infatuation: "I vowed not to part with it while I had life . . . In vain did human feelings bid me recoil from this emblem of mortality" (412). Not until this point can we claim that Agnes is "tortured" by her dead child. Despite her unwillingness to part with the corpse, Agnes acknowledges that it has become a source of disgust: "Often have I at waking found my fingers ringed with the long worms, which bred in the corrupted flesh of my Infant. At such times I shrieked with terror and disgust, . . . trembled with all a Woman's weakness" (415). The shift from a mother's love to a woman's weakness marks the increasing discomfort of the physical intimacy that Agnes insists on sustaining. This discomfort stems from the fact that Agnes's infatuation with her child is misplaced in two senses. Not only does it deprive the child of the right to a proper burial. It also perpetuates the Domina's punishment of her, because her refusal to leave the corpse confirms and exacerbates her exclusion from the living world. Significantly, it is not until Agnes meets the Marchioness and Virginia, until their kind friendship replaces the memory of her child in her mind, that she is willing to bury the dead. Agnes's return to a happy world coincides with a redirection of her affection. But Lewis's narrative focuses primarily on what happens before such a redirection, before intimacy conforms to social norms.

Lewis's dramatization of the affective bond between parents and children must have arrested Radcliffe's attention. Radcliffe reworks Agnes's reluctance to leave a beloved object and elaborates it with more details. Agnes's declaration "I vowed not to part with it while I had life" surfaces in *The Italian* as Ellena's professed refusal to yield a cherished portrait of her "father" to Schedoni: "I cannot part with it, . . . you do not wish me to part with it" (235). On the face of it, these two emotional ties differ as much as infatuation differs from attachment. A profound fear of separation urges Agnes to treat her dead child as if it were alive. On the contrary, Ellena acknowledges that death has already separated her from her father. Far from chilling her filial fondness, separation prompts Ellena to remember her father and to think of her father with wistful yearning: "Alas! he is dead! Or I should not now want a protector" (235).

Despite this stark contrast, Agnes's infatuation and Ellena's attachment share one important common ground. Like the former, the latter is predicated on misplaced affection, one that undermines the value of intimacy. To begin with, Ellena wrongly regards the miniature of her uncle, Schedoni, as that of her father, the first Count di Bruno. And Schedoni

also mistakes Ellena for his own child. Although this mistake is not revealed until the end of the novel, interspersed in the narrative are uncomfortable hints that this assumed father-daughter relationship is a false one. For instance, Schedoni both desires and fears Ellena's expression of daughterly tenderness: "at one moment he would pause to gaze upon her, and in the next would quit her with a frenzied start" (237). Betraying a strong sense of uncertainty, this alternation suggests that Schedoni does not know whether joyful embrace of a daughter or strong disgust at an enemy is the right course of action to take. Similarly, Ellena alternates between trusting and doubting Schedoni's claim of paternity. At one moment Schedoni's apparent familiarity with Ellena's family "remove[s] every doubt of his identity" (239). The next moment sees "the gloom of doubt and apprehension again over-spread[ing] [her features]" (247). Blurring the boundary between close friends and unwelcome strangers, this disturbing uncertainty exposes the possibility that Schedoni may be unworthy of her filial attachment. Mistake and intimacy are intertwined.

The association of mistake and intimacy culminates in Ellena's own explanation of Schedoni's late visit to her room. In this instance, mistake helps both to shape and to reshape a close affective tie. Ellena wrongly believes that Schedoni comes to save her life from the villain Spalatro: "O! my father, do not deny me the pleasure of shedding these tears of gratitude, . . . can I ever forget that it was my father, who saved me from [Spalatro's] poniard!" (248). This is one of the rare moments in the novel when Ellena calls Schedoni by the name of "father" with apparent sincerity. The implied intimacy in this appellation, however, does not please Schedoni: "'It is enough, say no more;' and he raised Ellena, but turned away without embracing her" (248). Readers know, as well as Schedoni, that it is Ellena's mistaken gratitude, her confusion of a murderer with a savior, that annoys her "father." If Ellena's mistaken gratitude prompts her to be verbally intimate with Schedoni, it also prevents an intimate affective bond from taking root between them, because it constantly reminds Schedoni of his criminal intention and because Ellena finds it the only sentiment that she is capable of feeling in his presence. "[S]he perceived it was now nearly impossible to love and revere him as her father, and she endeavoured, by dwelling upon all the obligations, which she believed he had lately conferred upon her, to repay him in gratitude, what was withheld in affection" (302). Instead of being her father to whom she is connected by blood, Schedoni assumes the role of her friend to whom she owes a debt of gratitude. Bound up with mistake, father-daughter intimacy becomes either undesirable or unattainable.

Ellena and Schedoni are not the only characters in *The Italian* who find filial/parental intimacy disturbing. Misplaced affection has a powerful impact on Olivia and Vivaldi as well because it threatens to tinge intimacy with depravity. Throughout the novel Ellena never allows emotion to overwhelm her prudence. The only exception occurs when, impatient to arrange a reunion of her parents, she sends Schedoni a message requesting to see him.

Olivia's agitated response spells out the consequence of this imprudence:

'if he sees me,' said Olivia, I am irrevocably lost! O! unhappy Ellena! your precipitancy has destroyed me. The original of this portrait is not the Count di Bruno, my dear lord, nor your parent, but his brother, the cruel husband'—

Olivia left the sentence unfinished (380-81; emphasis in original)

This passage associates misplaced intimacy with terror. Wrongly believing that Schedoni is her father, Ellena terrifies Olivia by inviting her enemy to meet her. Olivia's speech is arrested probably by her terrible memory of her reluctant physical intimacy with Schedoni and the consequent marriage. Misplaced intimacy is terrifying because it collapses proper emotional boundary separating father and uncle, husband and ravisher. Without this boundary, intimacy is tainted with moral disgust.

Tainted intimacy has long been an obstacle to the consummation of Ellena's and Vivaldi's mutual attachment. The Marchese consistently associates Vivaldi's affection for

Ellena with mistakes generally, with moral lapses in particular. This can be inferred from the way he describes Ellena: “It is said that she had so artfully adapted her temper to yours, that, with the assistance of a relation who lives with her, she has reduced you to the degrading situation of her devoted suitor” (29). In this sentence the Marchese portrays Ellena as a manipulative fortune hunter whose artful contrivance has caused a young man to forget his family duty and to deviate from the right path. The Marchesa’s plotting with Schedoni against Ellena has led most readers to believe that Ellena’s obscure family background is the only reason why her marriage with Vivaldi is undesirable.²² But the Marchese’s comment indicates an alternative reading. What stands between Vivaldi and Ellena is not simply the latter’s inferior social class but also her allegedly depraved morality. And moral flaws corrupt intimacy as easily as unequal social status.

By the end of the novel, concern for moral depravity overtakes that for class as the primary barrier to Vivaldi’s union with Ellena. Schedoni’s dying confession clearly illustrates this point. Convinced that the Marchese, like his wife, objects to the marriage on socio-economic grounds, Schedoni declares in his presence that Ellena is of noble decent: “[Ellena] is my daughter, . . . She is the daughter of a noble house, . . . In me you behold the last of the Counts di Bruno” (392). In this instance, the content of the confession becomes less important than the identity of the confessor. By this point of the novel, Schedoni has been convicted of murder. This identity has already made him a social pariah and made any alliance with him repulsive. Far from exhibiting any joy, the Marchese “smile[s] contemptuously” in response to this revelation because Schedoni’s avowal of his paternity

²² The abbess of San Stefano’s taunting comment on Ellena confirm this impression: “You never can be sufficiently grateful . . . for the generosity the Marchesa displays . . . she permits you to return into [the world], and gives you a suitable partner to support you through its cares and toils, — a partner much more suitable to your circumstances than him, to whom you had the temerity to lift your eye” (83).

succeeds more in besmearing Ellena with taints of depravity than in dispelling the Marchese's prejudices (392). Even Vivaldi acknowledges that, were Schenoni Ellena's father, he must despair of marrying her (391). The removal of this obstacle, significantly, relies on the clarification of the relationship between Schedoni and Ellena. Schedoni's misplaced paternal affection for his niece must be redressed, the distinction between father and uncle established, before mutual attachment and marital intimacy can be desirable.

Conclusion: (Un)bounded affection

That a correction of misplaced affection is necessary for Vivaldi's peace of mind confirms the exclusive nature of intimacy. Unlike general benevolence, which has the potential to "transcend social boundaries and political differences" (Guest 5), intimacy requires a clear-cut border that differentiates friends from strangers. Radcliffe's contemporary William Godwin uses the term "unbounded attachment" to describe the inclusive sympathy of his wife Mary Wollstonecraft. He writes: "Affliction had tempered her heart to a softness almost more than human; and the gentleness of her spirit seems precisely to accord with all the romance of unbounded attachment" (95). By contrast, the consummation of Radcliffean romance tends to celebrate specifically an intimate tie between two virtuous characters in a secure enclave. Consider the ending of *The Mysteries of Udolpho*:

O! how joyful it is to tell of happiness, such as that of Valancourt and Emily; to relate, that, after suffering under the oppression of the vicious . . . , they were, at length, restored to each other — to the beloved landscapes of their native country, — to the securest felicity of this life . . . while the bowers of La Vallee became, once more, the retreat of goodness, wisdom and domestic blessedness! (672)

In this passage, intimacy delights characters and the narrator alike because it is informed by affection that is cohesive (Emily and Valancourt are "restored to each other"), stable (they enjoy "the securest felicity of this life") and well-judged ("the retreat of goodness, wisdom and domestic blessedness"). At this stage of her career, Radcliffe regards intimacy as "bounded" affection, emphasizing the importance of drawing a geographical or emotional boundary that protects her good characters from evil ones.

Lewis shatters this ideal picture of intimacy in *The Monk*. His drama of infatuation demonstrates that the affective bond between individuals can be divisive and misplaced. The security of intimacy is further undermined by a persistent hint that there is always a better alternative to satisfy desire. The border separating intimate insiders and unwelcome outsiders collapses as a result. One compelling proof of Radcliffe's ideological affinity with Lewis is that *The Italian*, rather than registering "a near point-by-point refutation" of Lewis's sensational story (Conger 144), in fact demonstrates a near point-by-point acceptance of his skeptical attitude toward close interpersonal relationships. Like *The Monk*, *The Italian* shows that the yearning for intimacy often results in alienation, that the emotional boundary of intimacy can be porous, through which alternative desires can enter, and that mistake plays a role in the formation of intimacy. We need to thank Lewis for teasing Radcliffe into writing *The Italian*, but not simply because he urges her to defend her own artistic and moral vision, as many critics would have us believe, but because he encourages her to think differently, to explore different possibilities and to create a new fictional world where intimacy is in crisis.

Works Cited

- Andriano, Joseph. *Our Ladies of Darkness: Female Daemonology in Male Gothic Fiction*. University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State UP, 1993.
- Bartolomeo, Joseph F. *Matched Pairs: Gender and Intertextual Dialogue in Eighteenth-Century Fiction*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2002.
- Blakemore, Steven. "Matthew Lewis's Black Mass: Sexual, Religious Inversion in *The*

- Monk.*" *Studies in the Novel* 30.4 (1998): 521-39.
- Conger, Syndy. "Sensibility Restored: Radcliffe's Answer to Lewis's *The Monk*." *Gothic Fictions: Prohibition/Transgression*. Ed. Kenneth W. Graham. New York: AMS Press, 1989. 113-49.
- Ellis, Kate Ferguson. *The Contested Castle: Gothic Novels and the Subversion of Domestic Ideology*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1989.
- Fincher, Max. *Queering Gothic in the Romantic Age: The Penetrating Eye*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Ferguson, Adam. *An Essay on the History of Civil Society*. Ed. Louis Schneider. New Brunswick, N.J. : Transaction, 1980.
- Godwin, William. *Memoirs of the Author of A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Ed. Pamela Clemit and Gina Luria Walker. Peterborough, Onta.: Broadview, 2001.
- Greenfield, Susan. *Mothering Daughters: Novels and Politics of Family Romance Frances Burney to Jane Austen*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2002.
- Guest, Harriet. *Unbounded Attachment: Sentiment and Politics in the Age of the French Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013.
- Haggerty, George. "Literature and Homosexuality in the Late Eighteenth Century: Walpole, Beckford, and Lewis." *Studies in the Novel* 18 (1986). 341-52.
- Johnson, Claudia. *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender, and Sentimentality in the 1790s*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1995.
- Kilgour, Maggie. *The Rise of the Gothic Novel*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Lewis, Matthew. *The Monk*. Ed. Howard Anderson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.
- Miles, Robert. *Ann Radcliffe: The Great Enchantress*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995.
- Napier, Elizabeth. *The Failure of Gothic: Problems of Disjunction in an Eighteenth-century Literary Form*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Radcliffe, Ann. *The Italian or the Confessional of the Black Penitents A Romance*. Ed. Frederick Garber. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.
- . *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. Ed. Bonamy Dobree. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Saglia, Diego. "Looking at the Other: Cultural Difference and the Traveller's Gaze in *The Italian*." *Studies in the Novel* 28 (1996): 12-37.
- Watkins, Daniel. "Social Hierarchy in Matthew Lewis's *The Monk*." *Studies in the Novel* 18 (1986): 115-24.
- Wolstenhole, Susan. *Gothic (Re)visions: Writing Women as Readers*. New York: State U of New York P, 1993.

科技部補助專題研究計畫執行國際合作與移地研究心得報告

日期：2016 年 3 月 27 日

計畫編號	MOST 103-2410-H-004-006-MY2		
計畫名稱	103-2410-H-004-006-MY2		
出國人員姓名	吳易道	服務機構及職稱	政治大學英國語文學系助理教授
出國時間	2015 年 8 月 12 日 至 2015 年 8 月 27 日	出國地點	英國劍橋大學
出國研究目的	<input type="checkbox"/> 實驗 <input type="checkbox"/> 田野調查 <input type="checkbox"/> 採集樣本 <input type="checkbox"/> 國際合作研究 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 使用國外研究設施		

一、執行國際合作與移地研究過程

The University Library at Cambridge is a legal deposit library, one that houses every academic book published in the U.K. It therefore offers an ideal research environment where I can read a great variety of new books on 18th-century British literature and brow through many other related titles. In addition, the library provides on-line access to over 21,000 journals. This wealth of information allows me to gain a broad understanding of the recent studies in my field. I spend most of my time in Cambridge in the library reading books about 18th-century literary sentimentalism, taking notes and thinking about how to respond to existing scholarship critically.

二、研究成果

When I was in the University Library, I found two new books that help me to think more deeply about my project on the 18th-century sentimental culture. One is Alex Wetmore's *Men of feeling in Eighteenth-century Literature: Touching Fiction* (Palgrave 2013). The other is Juliet Shield's *Sentimental Literature and Anglo-Scottish Identity, 1745-1820* (Cambridge 2015). The former book draws my attention to the tactile aspect of feeling and to the materiality of sentimental novels. The latter reminds me of the problem of nationality. Together they not only broaden my knowledge of the 18th-century literature of feeling. They also points out possible directions for future research.

In addition, when in the University Library, I read beyond the scope of my proposed research. Exposed to an inspiring array of interesting books, I am able to think about the next research project. In this regard, Ivan Kreilkamp's *Voice and the Victorian Storyteller* (Cambridge UP 2005) proves a useful read. I have always been interested in how human beings communicate their thoughts and feelings through written

language. This book usefully brings my attention to the acoustic dimension of language. My research has focused on English literature in the long eighteenth century. Reading this book helps to extend my interest to the Victorian period.

三、建議

I thank the MOST for funding my research in Cambridge. In terms of collecting information and broadening existing knowledge, this trip is very helpful indeed.

四、本次出國若屬國際合作研究，雙方合作性質係屬：(可複選)

- 分工收集研究資料
- 交換分析實驗或調查結果
- 共同執行理論建立模式並驗證
- 共同執行歸納與比較分析
- 元件或產品分工研發
- 其他 (請填寫) _____

五、其他

科技部補助計畫衍生研發成果推廣資料表

日期:2016/03/27

科技部補助計畫	計畫名稱: 眷戀的語言:女性、情感與小說 1778-1811
	計畫主持人: 吳易道
	計畫編號: 103-2410-H-004-006-MY2 學門領域: 英國文學
無研發成果推廣資料	

103年度專題研究計畫研究成果彙整表

計畫主持人：吳易道		計畫編號：103-2410-H-004-006-MY2				計畫名稱：眷戀的語言：女性、情感與小說 1778-1811	
成果項目		量化			單位	備註（質化說明： 如數個計畫共同成果、成果列為該期刊之封面故事...等）	
		實際已達成數（被接受或已發表）	預期總達成數（含實際已達成數）	本計畫實際貢獻百分比			
國內	論文著作	期刊論文	2	2	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	0	0	100%		
		專書	0	0	100%	章/本	
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力（本國籍）	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
		博士生	1	1	100%		
博士後研究員		0	0	100%			
專任助理		0	0	100%			
國外	論文著作	期刊論文	0	0	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	1	1	100%		
		專書	0	0	100%	章/本	
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力（外國籍）	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	100%		
博士後研究員		0	0	100%			
專任助理		0	0	100%			
其他成果 （無法以量化表達之 成果如辦理學術活動 、獲得獎項、重要國 際合作、研究成果國 際影響力及其他協助 產業技術發展之具體 效益事項等，請以文 字敘述填列。）		無					

	成果項目	量化	名稱或內容性質簡述
科 教 處 計 畫 加 填 項 目	測驗工具(含質性與量性)	0	
	課程/模組	0	
	電腦及網路系統或工具	0	
	教材	0	
	舉辦之活動/競賽	0	
	研討會/工作坊	0	
	電子報、網站	0	
	計畫成果推廣之參與(閱聽)人數	0	

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估

達成目標

未達成目標（請說明，以100字為限）

實驗失敗

因故實驗中斷

其他原因

說明：

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形：

論文： 已發表 未發表之文稿 撰寫中 無

專利： 已獲得 申請中 無

技轉： 已技轉 洽談中 無

其他：（以100字為限）

I have published two journal articles in Tamkang Review and NTU Studies in Language and Literature respectively.

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）（以500字為限）

The two journal articles that I have published recently offer an alternative approach to understanding the sentimental culture in eighteenth-century Britain. They also pave the way for more thorough exploration of the literature of feeling in the long eighteenth century.