

Spring 5-15-2017

Becoming Pamela: The Fight for Maternal Authority in Pamela II

Danielle Pollaro
danielle.pollaro@student.shu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#), and the [Other Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pollaro, Danielle, "Becoming Pamela: The Fight for Maternal Authority in Pamela II" (2017). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 2306.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2306>

Becoming Pamela: The Fight for Maternal Authority in *Pamela II*

By

Danielle Pollaro

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts

Department of English

Seton Hall University

May 2017

© 2017 Danielle Pollaro

Seton Hall University
College of Arts and Sciences
Office of Graduate Studies
Approval
Spring Semester 2017

Thesis Advisor:

Dr. Karen Gevirtz



Second Reader:

Dr. Jonathan Farina



Abstract:

In *Pamela, Volume II*, Pamela and her husband Mr. B clash over breastfeeding their child. The conflict over breastfeeding represents a contest for control over the maternal body and with it control over woman's authority. The eighteenth-century created the concept of motherhood to maintain and perpetuate the patriarchy's social, economic and sexual hierarchies. *Pamela, Volume II* propagates eighteenth-century domestic discourse by instructing and constructing the idea of the good wife and mother. Pamela's failure to resist domesticity reveals patriarchy's role in establishing gender identity. The novel functions to reinforce, strengthen and sustain eighteenth-century domestic discourse to stabilize the aristocratic patriarchy.

Key Words: Breastfeeding, Domestic Discourse, Domesticity, Eighteenth-Century Britain, Gender Identity, Male Authority, Maternal Authority, Maternal Body, Motherhood, Patriarchy

Pamela, Volume II (1741), the sequel to Samuel Richardson's *Pamela*, follows Pamela and Mr. B's life in marriage. Pregnant with her first child, Pamela clashes with her husband over her desire to breastfeed the baby. Although Toni Bowers describes Pamela's plea to her husband as a "powerful and persuasive" argument, Mr. B still triumphs despite his "unconvincing and poorly motivated" reasoning (Bowers 260). Bowers describes their conflict as problematic on a fundamental level because "what is being contested between Pamela and Mr. B is the source of authority over a mother's body" (260). Their conflict over breastfeeding is a contest for control over the maternal body and with it control over woman's authority. The eighteenth-century created the concept of motherhood in order to maintain and perpetuate the patriarchy's social, economic and sexual hierarchies. The specific discourse used to describe women's role in the eighteenth century centered on domesticity, which propagated women's subjugation and submission to male authority. Pamela's persuasive argument to control her own body challenges eighteenth-century domestic discourse. However, when Pamela submits to the power of male authority, the novel restricts her contest and favors the patriarchy's domestic discourse.

The terms "woman," "wife," "mother," and individual," central to understanding the conflict over Pamela, are culturally contingent and contested. Judith Butler states in *Gender Trouble*, that Simone de Beauvoir "is clear that one 'becomes' a woman, but always under a cultural compulsion to become one" (Butler 23). Beauvoir's formulation implies that there is a "pregendered" person before cultural obligations shape a female – a human being with reproductive genital organs needed to grow a baby – into a woman – the culturally gendered female. Through Beauvoir's theory then, the "regulatory practices of gender formation and division constitute identity, the internal coherence of the subject" (Butler 23). In other words, the culture's concept of gender identity determines the identity of the "self." "Woman" cannot be

agent because the gender laws and restrictions to maintain social hierarchy and hegemony that culture creates removes agency from the woman.

Beauvoir argues the differing of the sexes begins with child reproduction, “the split of the two vital moments, maintaining and creating, takes place definitively in the separation of the sexes” (34). In addition, Bonnie Latimer claims, “femininity is conceived in terms of genitalia” (17). Both scholars attribute the biological body to woman, which Beauvoir explains: “defining the body starting from existence, biology becomes an abstract science; when the physiological given takes on meaning, this meaning immediately becomes dependent on a whole context” (46). A female’s biological ability to give birth and perpetuate the human species becomes her sole purpose, which suggests culture uses the ideological notions of “motherhood” or “domesticity” to Other and subjugate women.

These definitions of domestic life, motherhood, and wifehood perpetuate the ideology of the powerless woman. Latimer argues, “Women who are viewed primarily as part of the household economy cannot be individuals because they are insufficiently separable from a larger cultural paradigm, literary discourse or kin group” (Latimer 25). Therefore, woman’s subjugation results from the culturally constructed household economy. Woman becomes synonymous with domesticity, which compares women to mothers.

Cultural compulsion to breed forces women into the “servitude of maternity,” and “the relation of maternity to individual life...is undefined for women; only society can decide...in humanity individual “possibilities” depend on the economic and social situation” (Beauvoir 34, 46). The patriarchal culture imposes a dependent relationship between woman and man. The system, relying upon ideas of motherhood and domesticity – founded upon biological function – force a female to become the cultural concept of “woman” based on her relationship and use to

men. Monique Wittig describes the relationship between man and woman: “For what makes a woman is a specific social relation to a man, a relation that we have previously called servitude, a relation which implies personal and physical obligation as well as economic obligation (forced residence, domestic corveé, conjugal duties, unlimited production of children)” (108). The physical and economic obligations of domesticity create a concept of “woman” which reduces a woman to her biological and material functions benefiting man. The culture which establishes the codes of womanhood emphasize the “ostensibly sexualized features of their [women] bodies and, hence, a refusal to grant freedom and autonomy to women as it is purportedly enjoyed by men...sex, that has, through a misogynist gesture of synecdoche, come to take the place of the person” (Butler 27). Sex, or the biological function of both pleasure for men and reproducing children, establishes the gender identity of woman or the synonymous, mother, for the pregendered female.

Culture constructs gender through discourse, a system to which the novel contributes. Eighteenth-century domestic discourse constructed the idea of the “good” wife and mother. Nancy Armstrong argues in *Desire and Domestic Fiction* “that domestic discourse began its ascent circa 1740, with the publication of Richardson’s novel *Pamela*” (Francus 1). However, eighteenth-century critics of *Pamela* criticize and parody the novel. Henry Fielding, “read *Pamela* as a salacious book” and his *Shamela* parodies the original (Seager 112). In addition, “Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor show that...the *Pamela* ‘controversy’ took positions, consciously or not, on ‘social and sexual politics’” (Seager 115). Richardson creates a socially transgressive heroine in *Pamela*. Able to withstand the sexual advances of her male prerogative, reform her libertine master, and ascend from lower class servant to upper class wife, Pamela

challenges the patriarchal social structure of eighteenth-century Britain. In contrast, *Pamela II* reinforces the patriarchy through domestic discourse.

The social and political climate of England in the eighteenth-century created a discourse around motherhood in order to stabilize the patriarchy. According to Meghan Burke, “although women’s reproductive authority had been historically granted to them,” “the social and political climate of this era was ripe for such an alteration” (364). Motherhood was constructed to perpetuate England’s sexual and social hierarchy through mother’s conduct and the values passed down to children. Generally, eighteenth-century culture expected mothers to be passive, obedient, and dutiful to her husband. Motherhood included producing children at the will of her husband, attending her husband’s every sexual need, and forsaking her own opinions to her husband. The aristocratic patriarchy forced woman into the domestic economy, which removed a woman’s power, agency and authority.

The domestic discourse limited mother’s behaviors and access to other agencies. According to eighteenth-century domestic discourse, it was the duty of the mother to be submissive. In *An Address to Mothers*, the anonymous author observes that “submission....will ever be found indispensable in every possible state of society” (5). The definition of conjugal happiness was often used to keep wives obedient. The threat of husbands’ matrimonial recrimination or infidelity was a tool for husbands to maintain authority. The author of *An Address* weighs the importance of domestic “happiness” over the importance of independence and freedom from subjugation:

Think, ye who have families, how it is with yourselves, in what your domestic bliss chiefly consists, by what means things are made most easy to you. There is not one among you, who will seriously say, that any part of your comfort in a conjugal state

arises from an unlimited indulgence of all your conceits, an obstinate perseverance in your own opinion, a sullen resentment of every inconsiderate expression, a dissatisfaction with the circumstances you are in, a peevish misconstruction of the accidents that may befall you, a spurning with fury at occasional contradiction, or preferring inexceptionably your inclinations to those of your husband. (*An Address to Mothers* 13-14)

This passage does two things: first, the author establishes a discourse surrounding how to have “domestic bliss” by describing the things that would cause a break from a happy “conjugal state.” The author’s argument for conjugal bliss functions to expose the apparent faults of women that cause domestic despair, which informs the woman of what not to do. Secondly, the faults are a record of women fighting against the domestic discourse. The author reveals the noncompliance of women who refuse to participate in patriarchal domination by “preferring inexceptionably your inclinations to those of your husband” or by having an “obstinate perseverance in your own opinion.” These behaviors discipline maternal behavior by reinforcing the negative results of resistance.

In order to prevent women’s resistance to a domestic discourse that perpetuates eighteenth-century sexual and social hierarchy, the author of *An Address to Mothers* tells women it is their prerogative to teach daughters to be submissive. Rather than gives mothers true power and influence, the author of *An Address* suggests it is woman’s natural “authority” to encourage submissiveness, which perpetuates the aristocratic prerogative. It is necessary for women to be “accustomed to the earliest habits of subjection and dependence” (*An Address* 7). This type of logic perpetuates women’s subjection and dependence on men by women passing down the domestic discourse through generations. The author gives mothers authority only over the education of their daughters in which they must teach their daughters to be submissive. *An*

Address to Mothers suggests, “Family affairs are by far the most proper subjects to engross their minds, or occupy their talents. This is their natural province” (44). The author enforces the confinement to domesticity by attributing it to woman’s nature. This reasoning argues that women are domesticated because it is their “natural province” to be so, which conditions daughters to become good housewives, for “you can never make them good housewives without attaching them to the house” (*An Address* 45). There are two assumptions in the education of a daughter: first, the mother wants the daughter to become a good housewife; secondly, the mother must be a good housewife in order to teach her daughter to be one. The education of the daughter assumes and reflects the mother’s obedience to the domestic discourse.

Women educating women in domestic expectations and behaviors reinforces and perpetuates eighteenth-century patriarchy. Burke argues that in the eighteenth-century female friendship and community challenged men’s control (360). Female friendship and community allowed women to communicate outside of their husband’s surveillance, which could erupt in female resistance. Domesticity gave mothers power over their daughter’s education conditionally in order to teach their daughters submission and domesticity. This condition uses the same powerful influence of female companionship, but instead of promoting resistance, the mother promotes submission, conformity and subjugation. Women influence other women; therefore, obedient women influence other women to be obedient and propagate domestic discourse. The female community was a site for resistance, but domestic discourse made it a site for complicity.

There is a limit to domesticity and representing the maternal. Francus describes the difficulty analyzing the domestic discourse, “the disjunction between maternal experience and its cultural representation has brought the analysis of motherhood in the long eighteenth century to something of an impasse...literary and cultural analysis has not yet fully grappled with the

representations of mothers in eighteenth-century culture in light of that history” (7). In other words, the difference between actual historical representations of motherhood and the literary representation limits literary scholarly work examining the maternal experience. According to Francus, mothers and wives were not always as submissive as some literary works represent. Therefore, when a novel like *Pamela II* creates an extremely submissive representation of the maternal experience, it reveals more about how the society desires a woman to be rather than an accurate and actual representation of the maternal experience. The novel’s content and form present the ideal woman to influence readers to perpetuate the domestic discourse in response to and/or anticipation of woman’s resistance.

The domestic ideology of the eighteenth century emphasizes the control of maternal authority and agency, the reproductive enslavement of women, and male hierarchy. The discourse is important to maintain the patriarchy, “since the cause of women’s oppression is found in the resolve to perpetuate the family and keep the patrimony intact, if she escapes the family, she escapes this total dependence as well” (Beauvoir 95-96). The domestic discourse propagates women’s dependence and oppression, which supports the eighteenth-century British society’s resolve “upon domesticity as the most appropriate venue for the fulfillment of a woman’s duties to God, society, and herself” (Francus 1). Eighteenth-century discourse establishes the idea of “mother” in order to control the idea of “woman.” As sex, according to Butler, takes the place of the person, motherhood takes the place of woman because “the idealized image of the domestic woman served as a cultural shorthand for standards of female behavior, applicable to all women regardless of specific situation or subject position” (Francus 2). The idealized domestic standard of womanhood culturally compares and positions a woman even if she is not a mother; her effectiveness as woman relies on how close her image is to the

idealized domestic woman, which determines her social and economic status. Eighteenth-century domestic discourse applies to all women including non-mothers, which complicates women's ability to resist. For Mr. B, breastfeeding is unnatural for a woman of his economic and social status. Breastfeeding complicates and challenges the idea of obedient and subservient upper-class wife because breastfeeding puts the child's needs above the husband's needs, which challenges his authority and ownership of the mother's body. Mr. B's economic and social status dictates that his wife should be available for his need at all times, which would not allow Pamela to breastfeed their children.

Because the contradictory and limiting discourse of domesticity set women up "to fail," Pamela is bound to fail when she resists her husband (Francus 5). Latimer describes Samuel Richardson's novels and characters, especially his heroines like Pamela, as "consciously undertak[ing]...a form of self-management, suggesting their awareness, agency and textual control," and reads both *Pamela* and *Pamela II* as "exploiting and superseding the logic of early and mid-eighteenth-century figurings of femininity" (10). Although Pamela is portrayed "as differentiated, rational, critical participant[s] in culture," Mr. B's ultimate control and management over Pamela's body and education deprives Pamela of agency (10). Francus emphasizes women's lack of authority: "Even though women were held responsible for mothering by society, they generally lacked the authority or the power to control the material conditions of their motherhood" (Francus 199). Upper-class patriarchy does not want mothers to actively participate in mothering; Mr. B does not want Pamela to actively mother their children, which includes breastfeeding; the patriarchy wants women to produce children in order to stifle authority and agency; Mr. B wants Pamela to produce heirs and maintain his sexual needs, reducing Pamela to her biological function thereby removing her agency. Although breastfeeding

is a biological function of the female body, Pamela interprets breastfeeding as a mother's privilege by God's authority. The patriarchy, including Mr. B, interprets breastfeeding as a challenge to men's sexual prerogative and needs because it gives women control over their bodies, which counters patriarchal hegemony. The eighteenth-century established "motherhood" in order to continue the patriarchy's control. When Mr. B controls the aspects of Pamela's motherhood, he exemplifies the domestic discourse.

When Pamela questions male prerogative, she is surprised that her husband would be so persistent: "Yet he seems set upon it. What can one do?—did you ever hear of such a notion, before? Of such a prerogative in a husband? (Richardson XLI). Mr. B's declarative stance against Pamela should not come as a shock. Pamela's shock is a demonstration of her resistance. By questioning her husband's authority, she questions the domestic discourse. The novel sets up many examples of Pamela acknowledging the place of a wife in relation to her husband's authority. In the first letter, Pamela describes her relation to her husband as her "“dear master (why should I not still call him so, bound to reverence him as I am in every light he can shine in to the most obliging and sensible heart)” (Richardson I). According to the expectations of domesticity, the novel establishes the ideal relationship between a husband and wife from the beginning and does so thereafter repeatedly throughout the novel, which reinforces the domestic discourse. Pamela must acquiesce to her husband's will because she establishes Mr. B's will as her own: "O that it was in my power to recompense him for it! But I am poor, as I have often said, in every thing but will – and that is wholly his" (Richardson I). Pamela states she is poor because as a wife, the husband owns everything. Mr. B affords an allowance to Pamela of "fifty pounds quarterly, for purposes of which he requires no account, though I have one always ready to produce" (Richardson XVII). Despite her freedom with her allowance, since she always

receipts her spending, she acknowledges Mr. B's control over her decisions. Pamela repeatedly acknowledges the restraints upon her as Mr. B's wife; therefore, when she resists she appears ignorant and hypocritical, which invalidates her opinion that results in her failure to oppose domestic discourse. The novel establishes her resistance as ineffectual, which upholds the patriarchal dominance by spreading domestic discourse.

Pamela, bound to fail by the codes of domesticity, faces multiple forces against resisting eighteenth-century domestic discourse. First, her husband imposes absolute authority and control through the domestic hierarchy of eighteenth-century culture. Forced to submit to her husband's sexual needs, she loses control over her reproductive life. Pressure from other women, including Lady Davers, Sir Jacob's bigotry towards lower classes, and Pamela's parents influence Pamela to yield to the domestic framework. In addition, Mr. B's required reading of John Locke and foreign language tutoring allows him to take control over her mind as well as her body. Pamela, yielding to her husband's demands perpetuates and validates eighteenth-century domestic ideology.

The cultural representation and connotation of breastfeeding perpetuated patriarchy's control. In the eighteenth century, "maternal breastfeeding conflicted with the demands of an aristocratic property system by threatening the generation of paternal heirs" (Greenfield 83). Although not scientifically proven at the time, in practice breastfeeding provided some form of birth control and reproductive choice for women; therefore, "maternal nursing implicitly challenged the idea that an aristocratic mother's main function was to supply heirs for the paternal estate" (Greenfield 83). In addition, breastfeeding could cause a decrease in sexual activity, since breastfeeding ties the woman to the child's needs rather than to the father's needs, which suggests that "maternal nursing also had the capacity to weaken the father's authority"

(Greenfield 83). Mr. B's opposition to Pamela breastfeeding presents a fundamental aspect of control within eighteenth-century domestic discourse regarding the rights of a woman's body. Breastfeeding gave a woman options and choice; thus, when Pamela yields to Mr. B, she surrenders her authority and strengthens Mr. B's authority as father and husband. Pamela arguing for her right to breastfeed transgresses women's submission and obedience; however, when Pamela yields to Mr. B, his success in silencing Pamela's resistance represents the success of domesticity in creating an obedient and ideal wife and mother for the aristocratic man.

Eighteenth-century women such as Mary Wollstonecraft fought against patriarchal ideas of womanhood and aligned maternal breastfeeding with "the values of the French Revolution and the spirit of abolition" (Greenfield 86). According to Mary Wollstonecraft, breastfeeding implied a freedom from patriarchy, enslavement, and domination. Theoretically then, if maternal breastfeeding can free woman from the enslavement of domesticity, then Mr. B would be unable to control his wife. Wollstonecraft argued that men are responsible for women's inability to breastfeed: "lustful husbands – unwilling to share their wives' bodies with their children – are generally responsible for most of women's failure to breastfeed" (Greenfield 91). As established, domesticity ideology sets women up to fail; Wollstonecraft's argument against lustful husbands implies the imminent failure of women to claim their bodies.

Mr. B uses old aristocratic practices like the employment of wet nurses to deter his wife from breastfeeding their child. He tells Pamela he has "seen very nice ladies sink, when they become nurses" (Richardson XLV). In Mr. B's cultural ideals, women who nurse their babies are of the lower class. According to Bowers, breastfeeding was used "not only as a litmus test for maternal virtue but also as an indicator of broader personal and class virtues" (270). Breastfeeding, whether a wet nurse or maternal, is a cultural marker, which interprets class,

gender and individual ideologies. If a woman is unable to employ a wet nurse then she is unable to preserve her husband's lineage and fulfill his needs. According to the domestic ideology, if a woman, whose sole use is to breed for her husband's needs, does not conform to reproductive domestic standards then her culture does not consider her "good" woman. Mr. B threatens Pamela with cultural scrutiny and marital turmoil – "don't think to let me lose my beloved wife, and have a nurse put upon me instead of her" – which exposes Mr. B's anxiety over marrying beneath his class that parallels the aristocratic ideological fears of maternal breastfeeding challenging aristocratic hierarchies (Richardson XLV).

Mr. B says to Pamela, in regard to motherhood: "Let it have your inspection, your direction, and your sole attention, if you please, when I am abroad: but when I am at home, even a son and heir, so jealous am I of your affections, shall not be my rival in them" (Richardson XLV). Pamela's purpose as a mother is to produce "a son and heir," but when her husband is at home, her purpose must be to attend to his every need. Mr. B's will perpetuates Pamela's subjugation. According to Francus, "motherhood is more than a state of being; it is a narrative in which the mother is the principal actor;" therefore, if Pamela cannot mother her children as she sees fit, she is not the principal actor; her husband is (18). Pamela attempts to be the principal actor, but when Pamela continues to maintain her position Mr. B advises Pamela "not to weaken, or to speak in a phrase proper to the present subject, wean me from that love to you, and admiration of you, which hitherto has been rather increasing" (Richardson XLV). Mr. B silences Pamela's will forbidding her to never "speak in a phrase to the present" to breastfeeding again. Silencing Pamela's voice and opinion of breastfeeding symbolizes his control over her mind and her body. In the eighteenth century, breastfeeding reflected ideas contrary to the established male hierarchy and domination because it gave women authority over their bodies. The novel

represents typical eighteenth-century domestic discourse when Mr. B threatens Pamela with lessening his affections in exchange for control over her bodily authority.

Mr. B succeeds in silencing Pamela's resistance to domestic discourse through various channels, which renders her complicit to the eighteenth-century patriarchy. The novel participates and affirms male authority. Pamela is "no longer the feisty Pamela of the first book who can withstand male prerogative, she decorously withdraws into the tempering of her "self." (Nussbaum 84). Felicity Nussbaum argues in *Pamela*, the title character has agency because she withstands Mr. B's male authority and controls what happens to her own body. However, since she submits to Mr. B's power in *Pamela II*, she loses the control of her motherhood. The wet nurse substitutes Pamela's maternal prerogative to breastfeed that "threaten[s] Mr. B's sexual prerogative, and she keeps the two functions of the breast distinct" (Nussbaum 84). According to eighteenth-century domestic discourse, Pamela becomes a good mother and an ideal woman by delegating her duties to a wet nurse to employ herself to her husband.

The wet nurse assists one woman in participating in the domestic discourse, but because she uses her body for employment, she cannot fulfill her husband's needs. The wet nurse is a contradiction that exposes the class limits to eighteenth-century discourse. Francus examines the practical limitations of the domestic ideology: "domestic ideology refused to acknowledge the variables of class and material circumstance" (Francus 199). However, the limitation to domestic ideology reveals contradictions within the discourse "first, mothering involves effort and work, which signals that motherhood is not a natural state for women; and second, mothering-as-work reveals the class imperatives of domestic ideology, which society would prefer remain hidden" (Francus 198). The wet nurse thus fills the hole in the mothering-as-work argument. A mother's work remains hidden through the employment of a wet nurse. The wet nurse allows for an

abstract concept of motherhood, since “maternal duties were delegated to others, ‘good’ mothering became less an activity than a state of mind or a biological fact. Once a mother need not be present in order to mother, the spectralization of motherhood was justifiable and arguably inevitable” (Francus 13). Pamela is a mother, but the wet nurse exposes motherhood as a broad and conditional term, which allows domestic discourse to gloss motherhood as male authority in disguise.

Ironically, Pamela’s married position, as Nussbaum states, confiscates her bodily authority that is so prevalent in volume one. Pamela questions her husband’s authority: “For it is, that if the husband is set upon it, it is a wife’s duty to obey. But I can’t see how that is; for if it be the natural duty of a mother, it is a divine duty; and how can a husband have power to discharge a divine duty?” (Richardson XLV). Breastfeeding, according to Pamela, is a god-given attribute of motherhood. In her interpretation, breastfeeding is “natural,” innate, and inherent. Upon this ideology Pamela argues, “then the nourishment of the mother must be most natural to the child” (Richardson XLV). In her married state, Pamela’s “breasts place the women in a conjunction of the sexual and maternal that is difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile in the Englishwoman” (Nussbaum 89). The irreconcilable maternal and sexual breasts in an Englishwoman result from the cultural domestic ideology in eighteenth-century Britain. Maternal authority is a mirage for the Englishwoman.

Mr. B establishes a domestic framework including controlling Pamela’s finances, her education, and her body. It is to Mr. B’s material advantage to have Pamela learn Italian and French instead of breastfeeding, since he is her tutor and it forces Pamela to turn her attention to him instead of herself or the children. Pamela’s education is another form of control because Mr. B chooses what she learns thus shaping her mind into what he deems appropriate for his wife.

Pamela notes Mr. B “delights to teach me French and Italian... explains to me every thing I understand not” (Richardson XLI). Mr. B admits his motive in marrying Pamela: “Yet it was no small motive of his choosing me, in one respect, because he expected from me more humility, more submission, than he thought would be paid him by a lady equally born and educated” (Richardson XV). Her previous role of housemaid and lack of educational opportunities create an opportunity for Mr. B to mold Pamela to do and be whatever he wishes. Mr. B “explain[ing]” to Pamela implies her ignorance and his higher knowledge, which enforces his mind onto hers while at the same time affirming his authority. Mr. B, until the subject of breastfeeding occurs, “was pleased to say, I [Pamela] was always what he wished me to be” (Richardson XVII). Pamela –the woman– personifies eighteenth-century domestic discourse, which Mr. B uses to control his wife. Nancy Armstrong notes, “Rousseau admits that a system of voluntary consent, in order to become a reality, depends on education” (39). In order for Pamela to submit to his absolute authority, Mr. B disguises educating Pamela to submit and obey with the dream of improving her person. The guise of her education represents Mr. B applying domestic discourse in the management of women’s education in order to perpetuate obedience, ignorance and compliance, which strengthens the patriarchal framework.

Mr. B uses his authority as man to claim ownership of Pamela. He argues that he would rather see Pamela educated in foreign languages than attend to the baby; he demands, “I want to hear my Pamela read her French and Italian lessons... I insist upon it, my Pamela, that you acquiesce with my dispensation” (Richardson XLV). First, he uses the possessive “my” to claim her as his own, since men are “literally the owners of women, children, and fetuses, men rule reproduction and child rearing, and they can exploit both to their material advantage” (Greenfield 97). Therefore, when Mr. B uses “my Pamela,” he literally owns her; he possesses her. The novel

is very clear that Pamela belongs to Mr. B. The common phrase, “wife of your bosom,” which originated in Deuteronomy in the King James Bible, emphasizes the possession a husband has over his wife given by God. Therefore, when Sir Simon accuses Pamela of injury, he refers to her not by name, but by: “no other than the wife of your bosom” (Richardson XXII). In addition, the use of the phrase confirms Luce Irigaray’s phallogocentrism concept which suggests the feminine identity can only be identified by the male; therefore, Pamela can only be identified by her relationship to her husband, “silencing the feminine” (Butler 26). The phrase reiterates Mr. B’s ownership of Pamela, which removes Pamela’s agency by refusing to call her by name throughout the letter. The phrase affirms eighteenth-century domestic ideology of husband’s ownership of their wives.

Eighteenth-century domesticity emphasized the importance of a woman’s connection to the household. An *Address to Mothers* encourages women to stay at home because a good housewife was attached to the physical household (45). Mr. B uses the domestic discourse to ensure Pamela’s immobility by monitoring her through surveillance: “when he goes abroad, sends up my good Mrs. Jervis to me, because I should not be alone...then he hardly goes to any distance, but brings some pretty present he thinks will be grateful to me. When at home, he is seldom out of my company” (Richardson XLI). Armstrong writes, “the domestic woman exercised a form of power that appeared to have no political force at all because it seemed forceful only when it was desired. It was the power of domestic surveillance” (26). Although Armstrong writes about the domestic woman’s forceful authority, Mr. B uses the power of domestic surveillance to shape Pamela’s thoughts, actions, and opinions. Mrs. Jervis is like a second mother to Pamela; however, employed by Mr. B, Mrs. Jervis is under his influence. In addition, Mr. B buys gifts for Pamela to reinforce his monetary authority and remind her even when he is not present, he is

thinking of her. Finally, never leaving Pamela's company allows Mr. B to monitor her actions. Unlike other Richardsonian heroines, according to Latimer who are "more often than not...not at home," Pamela is always either at home, or with Mr. B (Latimer 26). Latimer argues the Richardsonian heroine has authority because she is not spatially designated to the household. However, Pamela can never be like the other Richardsonian heroines that Latimer describes because she is under constant surveillance and spatial control.

Others' surveillance forces Pamela to adjust and conform to mainstream opinions. When she speaks in the presence of company, the idea of wrongly speaking haunts her. In the company of Lady and Lord Davers, the Countess of C. and Mr. H, Mr. B says to Pamela "give us your opinion...be it so --- I will be determined by your opinion my dear; give it me freely" (Richardson XXIX). Pamela responds to this request with: "if I must be so bold as to speak on a subject, upon which on several accounts, it would become me to be silent, I should be against the title; but perhaps my reason is of too private a nature to weigh any thing: and if so, it would not become me to have any choice at all" (Richardson XXIX). Pamela states her opinion between denying her right to have an opinion. Mr. B's response to Pamela demonstrates his control since Pamela notes, "Mr. B had hardly patience to hear me out, but came to me and folding his arms about me, said 'just as I wished, have you answered, my beloved Pamela'" (Richardson XXIX). According to Pamela, Mr. B barely listened to what Pamela had to say, which suggests he heard the most important part of the speech: Pamela denying her choice. Since Mr. B notes she answers, "just as I wished" demonstrates Mr. B's control and Pamela's denial of her right to have an opinion. In this scene, Mr. B's demonstrative approval shows his authority without appearing forceful because Pamela complies with his opinion. If Pamela does not comply, then her disobedience will "awaken the sleeping dragon," or Mr. B's forceful authority.

Mr. B tests Pamela's complicity in front of company, since the opinions of his higher-ranking relatives are important to Pamela's position as Mr. B's wife. After prompting from Lady Davers to require Pamela's opinion, Mr. B says, "Tell us freely, Pamela, what you would advise your friend Mr. Williams to do" (Richardson XXXII). Pamela, again, questions her authority on the subject by asking, "must I, sir, speak my mind on such a point, before so many better judges" (Richardson XXXII). Pamela's hesitation allows Mr. B to persuade Pamela before she answers by saying, "'My dear,' said Mr. B., 'I'll tell you (for Mr. Williams's modesty will not let him speak it before all the company) what is his motive; and a worthy one you'll say it'" (Richardson XXXII). Mr. B impresses his opinion on Pamela by assuming what he expects her to say. Now even if Pamela disagrees Mr. Williams's motive is worthy, she will have to say it is so she does not oppose Mr. B in the presence of company.

Mr. B further molds Pamela's response when he discusses if he will abide by her will. He responds, "'Conditionally,' said Mr. B, 'provided I cannot give satisfactory reasons, why I ought not to conform to her opinion; for this, as I said, is a point of conscience with me; and I made it so, when I presented Mr. Williams to the living: and have not been deceived in that presentation'" (Richardson XXXII). Complying with eighteenth-century discourse, giving women conditional authority gave men an opportunity to test women's complicity and monitor her compliance to the domestic discourse. Mr. B provides her information in order to receive the answer he wants. His little hints to his wife on this matter force his opinion onto hers so he would have no reason "not to conform to her opinion." Pamela's response demonstrates the risk she takes in speaking her mind for she says, "I shall be the less hesitate to speak my mind, because I shall be in no danger to commit an irreparable error" (Richardson XXXII). Mr. B's condition with the wager removes any agency from Pamela speaking her opinion because if Mr.

B does not agree, he does not have to conform. Her opinion is not actionable and is reliant upon Mr. B's prerogative. This scene reveals Mr. B's influence on Pamela's mind and the significance of that influence on Pamela's individuality. When Mr. B leaves the room, Pamela is terrified that she said the wrong thing, "which made me afraid I had gone too far: and I said, 'what shall I do, if I have incurred Mr. B's anger by my over-forwardness! Did he not look displeased...I cannot stand his anger'" (Richardson XXXII). Pamela's fear suggests her "over-forwardness" earns Mr. B's anger and implies she is familiar with it because she "cannot stand his anger." Mr. B pretends to be cross by employing a grave face and leaving the room in order to rouse Pamela's fears. His deception suggests he purposefully inflicts fear in Pamela in order to maintain control.

Mr. B's control over Pamela's mind through the domestic hierarchy fosters his effectiveness in demanding Pamela's compliance regarding breastfeeding. Mr. B threatens, "Let me warn you against too much apprehensiveness, for your own sake, as well as mine; for such a mind as my Pamela's I cannot permit to be habitually over-clouded. And yet there now hangs upon your brow an over-thoughtfulness, which you must not indulge" (Richardson XLV). He presents Pamela's "over-clouded" mind and "over-thoughtfulness" as an indulgence, suggesting "a mind as my Pamela's" should not indulge in thinking too much. He claims her mind for himself when he tells her not to think too much for his own sake. In addition, he suggests he must permit Pamela's thoughts through disapproving of her "habitually over-clouded" mind. Once Mr. B controls Pamela's mind, he controls her body, which leads to her submitting to Mr. B's will because he leaves her no choice: "for I must not be put off with a half-compliance; I must have your whole will with me, if possible" (Richardson XLVI). Mr. B's effective domestic control – including dominance over education, money, her body, and her mind– sets her up to fail in asserting her authority. Without her authority, Pamela conforms to the cultural compulsion

to become the domestic woman, which includes submitting to her husband's demands by releasing her reproductive and sexual authority to the will of her husband. The various ways Mr. B coerces Pamela to submit to his will represent eighteenth-century domestic discourse in practice.

Mr. B is the primary influence in Pamela's domestication but other influences, including Lady Davers and the Andrews family, contribute to Mr. B's authority by reiterating and supporting domestic discourse. Female companionship in the eighteenth century, whether between a mother and daughter or friends, created an environment to perpetuate or resist the domestic discourse. Lady Davers complying with aristocratic ideology teaches Pamela how to be a good wife to her brother. Lady Davers is the female counterpart to Mr. B. She instructs and often instigates situations to force Pamela to submit to Mr. B and domestic codes. Her participation in Pamela's domestication demonstrates the female's complicity in her domestic enslavement. Lady Davers corresponds with Pamela in order to "let you know what is expected from you, and encourage you in the prospect already opening to you both, and to me, who have the welfare of the family I sprung from so much at heart" (Richardson IX). She affirms the importance of maintaining the family line, which aligns with Mr. B's sexual prerogative and the domestic discourse.

Lady Davers functions as an instruction manual on becoming a domestic wife. Her letters, schemes, and actions demonstrate the domestic code in practice, which strengthens the patriarchy's dominant control. Lady Davers begins her relationship with Pamela with a list of instructions on how to behave; her first instruction regards Mr. B: "In the first place, endeavor to please your sovereign lord and master" (Richardson IX). Mr. B is always Pamela's lord and master and she is more his servant as his wife than she was as his housemaid. Lady Davers

signifies Mr. B's authority by referring to him as Pamela's "lord and master." Children and heirs follow pleasing Pamela's lord and master. Although Lady Davers advises Pamela to "consider, child, the station you are raised to does not require you to be quite a domestic animal" (Richardson IX). She also demands for Pamela a "fourth employment...to perpetuate a family, for many hundred years esteemed worthy and eminent" (Richardson IX). Perpetuating the family and producing heirs, preserves eighteenth-century domestic discourse because it limits the ability for a woman to claim agency and control over her body and mind. When Lady Davers emphasizes the necessity to have babies, she justifies Mr. B's sexual needs as a cause for maintaining their family line.

In order for Mr. B's family to maintain control over his current estate, it is necessary for Pamela to produce a male heir. In the failure to produce a male heir, Sir Jacob Swynword's eldest son shall receive his estate and fortune. When Lady Davers sees Pamela's pregnant body, she "was pleased to express great favour and tenderness towards me; gave me much good advice, as to the care she would have me take of myself; and told me, that her hopes, as well as her brother's, all centred in my welfare; and that the way I was in made her love me better and better" (Richardson XXXII). Lady Davers values her love based on Pamela's pregnancy because her fortune and her brother's fortune depends upon the birth of a son. Lady Davers offers Pamela maternal advice for the sake of the heir to her family that resides in Pamela's body. By advising Pamela on motherhood, Lady Davers perpetuates the idea of woman as breeder. In addition, the physical representation of Pamela's pregnant body reiterates the definition of the "domestic woman" according to her reproductive functions. Mr. B and Lady Davers need a physical representation of their strong, continuing family line in order to validate their position. The baby belongs to the family line rather than to Pamela. Since the baby belongs to Mr. B's family, the

family decides the fate of the baby and since the family Pamela now belongs to values aristocratic practices, like employing a wet nurse, Pamela must succumb. Pamela does not ask Lady Davers for her advice when arguing for breastfeeding because Mr. B says, “the ladies are of his opinion. I’m afraid they are, and so will not ask them” (Richardson XXXVIII). Lady Davers and “the ladies” embody the domestic codes that subjugate females to their reproductive functions; since breastfeeding dilutes the chance of producing more children, breastfeeding is against the interests of Lady Davers and her family line. Lady Davers’ complicity with the domestic discourse oppresses Pamela through her influential status. When Pamela complies, the domestic ideology furthers and the subjugation of female to domestic woman endures. The relationship between Lady Davers and Pamela represents the importance of female companionship in the perpetuation of domestic discourse.

Similar to Mr. B, Lady Davers gives false assurance of power to Pamela. She suggests the aristocratic wife would be too busy for her children because she has a household to maintain: “You’ll have nothing to do but give orders. You will consider yourself as the task-mistress” (Richardson IX). However, the readers never see Pamela as the task-mistress Lady Davers predicts she will be and since Mr. B rarely leaves Pamela’s side or employs Mrs. Jervis to accompany her, Pamela is never alone. The presence of Mr. B nulls Pamela’s authority as task-mistress. Lady Davers states, “she approved of the domestic management; and to say, that she never saw such regularity and method in any family in her life, where was the like number of servants: every one, she said, knew their duty, and did it without speaking to” (Richardson XXXII). Although Lady Davers praises the management of the household, as expected, Pamela responds, “I told her ladyship, I owed all this and most of the conduct for which she was pleased to praise me, to her dear brother” (Richardson XXXII). This suggests, considering Mr. B is never

far from Pamela and he entrusts her supervision to Mrs. Jervis, it is Mr. B's authority as head of the household and Mrs. Jervis, under Mr. B's trust, that Mr. B manages the household. Pamela confirms Mr. B as responsible for the domestic bliss of the household because, "at the beginning of my happiness, gave me several cautions and instructions for my behavior; which had been the rule of my conduct ever since" (Richardson XXXII). When Lady Davers compliments Pamela on the domestic household, she actually compliments her brother on his management of Pamela.

Another way Lady Davers represents female participation in male control of the female body is by discussing and describing Pamela's body through Mr. B's authority. Lady Davers suggests Mr. B should also control the way Pamela dresses when she questions, "Why do you let her lace so tight, Mr. B?" (Richardson XXIX). Lady Davers, upon observing her new sister, does not address Pamela about her choice in lacing, but addresses Mr. B, suggesting he should be the one to monitor her dress; therefore, Lady Davers exemplifies male scrutiny and control over every aspect of a woman's life and removes Pamela as a figure of authority. Almost every comment Lady Davers makes to Pamela is a result of Mr. B's control and influence: first, Lady Davers instructs Pamela to please Mr. B and to produce heirs; second, she demonstrates her love towards Pamela through her pregnancy; third, she compliments Pamela on household management that is the result of Mr. B's influence; lastly, she attributes Pamela's dress to Mr. B's taste. The totality of these interactions result from Lady Davers interpreting Pamela through Mr. B rather than Pamela as an individual. Lady Davers speaks about Pamela, rather to Pamela, which reflects her partaking in the objectification of wives.

Lady Davers' conception of Lady Jenny interprets Pamela through domestic discourse. Lady Davers escorts Pamela into the room where Sir Jacob is and whispers her instructions on her new identity: "'Dear Pamela,' said she, 'humour all that is said to you. Here's Sir Jacob

come. You're the Countess of C.'s youngest daughter Jenny—That's your cue” (Richardson XXXIII). Pamela, unaware of the scheme and under Lady Davers' control tells Lady Davers to “Wink when I'm wrong” (Richardson XXXIII). Pamela asks Lady Davers to approve and correct her behavior. Lady Davers creates the ideal wife for Mr. B by interpreting Pamela through Lady Jenny. Pamela as Lady Jenny represents the wife Mr. B was expected to take; Sir Jacob describes Pamela/Lady Jenny as “a charming creature” and “Ay, nephew this is a lady indeed...could you not have pitched your tent here...he'd never have stooped to the cottage as he has done” (Richardson XXXIII). Pamela gives up her identity completely and assume a false one, which exhibits the control of Mr. B and his family. Sir Jacob's opinion of Pamela demonstrates the hypocrisy of upper class culture: “yet I should be glad to see Lady Jenny. But I will not sit at table with Mr. B's girl” (Richardson XXXIII). Although unaware that the two are the same person, Sir Jacob uses Lady Jenny's name when referring to her based on the superficial knowledge of her aristocratic status and sexual appealing figure. Meanwhile, Sir Jacob reduces Pamela to Mr. B's ownership through “Mr. B's girl.”

Bonnie Latimer, however, reads this scene differently. Latimer sees the concept of Lady Jenny as Pamela's agency. She uses the example of Pamela in volume I dressing as a lady in disguise, which Latimer argues, “denotes Pamela's conscious management of her own sexuality, for herself: her dressing up is for her own ‘liking’” (29). However, the Pamela in *Pamela I* and *Pamela II* are not the same. In volume I, Pamela withstands Mr. B's prerogative and maintains her agency; in volume II, Pamela conforms to Mr. B's and Lady Davers' will. Mr. B as Pamela's husband owns Pamela, her thoughts, her body, and her actions; her individuality in volume I dissipates with her role as Mr. B's wife in volume II. Latimer describes the Lady Jenny scene: “Pamela adopts the persona of ‘Lady Jenny C’ on her in-laws' whim fooling the snobbish Sir

Jacob Swynford into admitting that he likes her before revealing her true identity as the former serving-maid... Pamela appears to become two people...using her privileged position as ‘Lady Jenny’ to defend ‘Mrs. B’” (31). Latimer’s description is problematic within the context of *Pamela, Volume II*. She uses action verbs like, “adopts,” “appears” and “defend,” to signify Pamela’s agency, which makes it appear that Pamela is the mind behind the scheme. However, the novel presents something different. Lady Davers, Mr. B and the Countess of C. all speak about Lady Jenny before Pamela can present herself as Lady Jenny to Sir Jacob, which suggests the group created the persona without Pamela’s knowledge. Pamela is unaware of the scheme, because Lady Davers tells her to “humour all that is said to you” as they walk into the room with Sir Jacob. Lady Jenny is a product of Lady Davers and the company; she is not a product of Pamela’s mind or agency. In addition, Latimer describes Mr. B’s reaction to Pamela dressing up as another persona in volume one as “conveniently detached from the whole for his enjoyments” (Latimer 30). In volume I, Pamela resists Mr. B’s interpretation of her hyper-sexualized self, but in volume II, Pamela conforms to the interpretation of her body, which allows others to access her body for their own privilege. Further, Latimer writes, “Pamela dramatically resolves her apparently oppositional and one-dimensional identities as the vulgar, pagan-named lady and the enticing, upper-class Jenny into her true, manifold and unique identity” (31). Pamela does not reveal her true self; the Countess of C. reveals the ruse to Sir Jacob. Latimer again gives false agency to the character without contextualizing the scene throughout the entire second volume. Pamela, in the first volume, is agent, but she is unable to be so as Mr. B’s wife.

Pamela may be the performer behind Lady Jenny, but she performs her through the direction of the other characters. Pamela asks Lady Davers to wink at her for direction when she performs incorrectly, which implies her performance is not her own. Lady Jenny is not an

extension of Pamela's agency, because Lady Jenny is a directed performance. According to Betty Schellenberg, "Pamela's roles are assigned by the dual authorities of Providence and her husband, her role-playing is not theatrical in a deceptive and therefore transgressive sense" (79). This suggests Pamela acting as Lady Jenny is allotted by her husband's authority, not her own, which mutes the potential transgressive performance Latimer describes. Lady Jenny is a representation of the woman Mr. B tries to create in Pamela, which forces Pamela to become a woman of domestic enslavement. Lady Davers exposes Pamela as obedient and complicit in perpetuating old aristocratic ideology through her instruction and concocting the persona of Lady Jenny, which renders Pamela invisible.

It is in the interest of Mr. B's side of the family to domesticate Pamela and Mr. B makes Pamela's side of the family, the Andrews, support Pamela's domestication and Mr. B's absolute control. In the beginning of the novel, Mr. B gives the Andrews one of his estates. The Andrews describe the weight of this gesture on their livelihood: "when all our fear was, that, as we grew older and more infirm, and worn out by hard labour, we should be troublesome" (Richardson II). By providing for Pamela's parents, Mr. B eases their overall wellbeing. Mr. B provides them with one of his estates, describing Mr. B's bountiful property: "For when here, in this happy dwelling, and this well-stocked farm, in these rich meadows, and well-cropt acres, we look around us...see blessings upon blessings, and plenty upon plenty, see barns well stored, poultry increasing...and are bid to call them our own" (Richardson II). The juxtaposition of Mr. B's position as powerful, rich, landlord and provider and the Andrews' position as poor and infirm demonstrates construction of social hierarchy through agricultural and proprietary management and control. While the Andrews would have lived a life full of "hard labour," grown "infirm," and "worn out," Mr. B provides an alternative lifestyle. The Andrews are extremely grateful for

Mr. B's gift, "But thus to be provided for! Thus kindly to be owned, and called Father and Mother by such a brave gentleman! And so placed as to have nothing to do but to bless God, him" (Richardson II). Mr. Andrews' choice of words suggest they are indebted to Mr. B and through this gesture, Mr. B owns the Andrews.

The Andrews' suggest they are uncomfortable with accepting such a generous offer without paying rent on to the estate when Mr. Andrews confides in Mr. Longman, Mr. B's employee, his wish to pay Mr. B rent. Mr. Longman responds: "the 'squire will not receive any thing from you, Goodman Andrews, Why man, he has no occasion for it: he's worth a power of money, besides a noble and clear estate in land...you must not affront him...he's as generous as a prince...but he is hasty, and will have his own way" (Richardson II). Mr. Longman's portrait of Mr. B exposes the amount of wealth Mr. B has and it reveals his dominant and definitive personality. Mr. Longman advises the Andrews to "not affront him," which suggests the Andrews are now in Mr. B's control. Mr. B tells Pamela that his gift to the Andrews will "be rewarded for it too, with better health, better spirits, and a better mind; so that my dear... I shall reap more benefit by what I propose to do than I shall confer" (Richardson I). It is to Mr. B's material advantage to have the Andrews in his debt. Under the pretense "can Mr. B do too much for his lady," Mr. B uses Pamela family in order to maintain control over Pamela (Richardson II). Mr. Andrews wishes "he could act so for his [Mr. B] interest, as not to be a burden, what happy creatures should we both be" (Richardson V). Indeed, if the Andrews act in Mr. B's interest, Pamela will comply with his will and the Andrews will live a carefree life on a bountiful estate.

The Andrews' newfound wealth and comfort forces them to participate in the continuation of the domestic framework because the continuation of their new position relies on

the endurance of the domestic ideology. Pamela asks her parents' advice on her breastfeeding dilemma with Mr. B. Hoping to resolve the issue she writes to her parents "to be determined by your joint advice; for, if my father and mother, and husband, are of one opinion, I must, I think, yield up my own" (Richardson XLV). The Andrews opinion must be of Mr. B's opinion because he owns them, as he owns Pamela. The Andrews' livelihood is indebted to Mr. B; therefore, they would never dare to differ from their benefactor's position. The Andrews response, under Mr. B's authority, forces Pamela to acquiesce:

Since he so much values your person: since he gives you warning, that it may estrange his affections; since he is impatient of denial, and thinks so highly of his prerogative; since he may, if disobliged, resume some bad habits...we think, besides the obedience you have vowed to him, and is the duty of every good wife, you ought to give up the point and acquiesce. (Richardson XLVI)

The Andrews use the domestic discourse of the obedient, dutiful, good wife and advise Pamela to conform to these standards. By referring to Mr. B's old habits and temperament, the Andrews's reasoning is slightly threatening, implying Pamela should worry for her livelihood if she does not obey. Addressing Mr. B "may estrange his affections," fosters the eighteenth-century idea that men's infidelity results from women's faults, or differing from the passive, submissive, obedient wife. When Pamela enforces the "obstinate perseverance in your [her] own opinion," Mr. B threatens her with infidelity (*An Address to Mothers* 13). Her parent's reinforces Mr. B's privilege to stray from his wife's affections based on Pamela's vow of obedience. The Andrews advise their daughter "to submit to it, and with cheerfulness too" in order to not provoke Mr. B's hasty temper (Richardson XLVI). Mr. B uses his money and generosity to confirm his in-laws favor. Pamela is an example of the "cultural training in which

women, ‘seeking recognition and love, learn to forget or deny that they also wanted independence and agency’” (Burke 375). Mr. B controls Pamela through influencing other parties, like the Andrews and Lady Davers, to perpetuate the domestic discourse, which enslaves Pamela to Mr. B.

Pamela’s submitting to his views on breastfeeding, allows Mr. B to maintain control and to domesticate Pamela. She tells her parents “we have heard of a good sort of woman, that is to be my poor baby’s mother” (Richardson XLVII). Pamela refers to the new wet nurse as her “baby’s mother” because Pamela aligns breastfeeding with motherhood, but the domestic discourse, so prevalent to Mr. B’s culture, aligns producing heirs and fulfilling sexual duties for the husband as motherhood. Pamela’s compliance to fulfill Mr. B and his family’s sexual and reproductive needs rather than fulfilling her child’s needs domesticates Pamela.

The ending of the novel demonstrates the triumph over women’s resistance and agency through the execution of eighteenth-century domestic discourse. Demanding that Pamela read and comment on John Locke directly to Mr. B allows him to see Pamela interpret the domestic discourse. Pamela becomes a participant in her subordination by complying with her own domestic enslavement. This shows Mr. B the full extent of Pamela’s complicity because the “Lockean subject began as a white sheet of paper on which objects could be understood in sets of spatial relations, then pedagogical literature for women mapped out a field of knowledge that would produce a specifically female form of subjectivity” (Armstrong 21). Pamela, to Mr. B, in the beginning of the novel, is the white sheet of paper and Mr. B’s instruction, including reading Locke, produces Pamela as a specific female form: the domestic woman. These last letters validate Pamela’s transformation to Mr. B’s domestic woman. Pamela frequently denounces her intelligence and her right to have opinions, “I begin to be afraid I am out of my sphere, writing to

your dear self on these important subjects” (Richardson XC). By stating her fear, she dilutes her opinion in case they are not to Mr. B’s standard. She dramatizes the circumstances if Mr. B does not approve of her opinion: “If you are [displeased], I shall be sure I have done wrong in having applied a corrosive to eat away the proud flesh of a wound, that is not yet so thoroughly digested, as to bear a painful application and requires balsam and a gentler treatment” (Richardson XCVII). Pamela metaphorically punishes her mind or the “proud flesh” in order to please Mr. B. Her reaction to Locke’s notions about child rearing reflects her own education as well for she writes, “Self-denial is, indeed, a most excellent doctrine to be inculcated into children, and it must be done early” (Richardson XCI). From the beginning of the novel, Pamela denies herself, which gives Mr. B the power to shape and control her mind. Interpreting Locke’s instructions to teach children self-denial reflects Pamela’s own lesson of self-denial. *An Address to Mothers*, claims there is “a fundamental maxim in our constitution, that we have no real enjoyment of freedom, without previously suffering restriction” (7). Pamela’s self-denial is emblematic of the eighteenth-century discourse that values restriction over freedom. The discourse establishes the need to suffer before one can enjoy freedom. This gives women a false promise of freedom in exchange for their subjugation, obedience and submission. When Pamela encourages self-denial, she maintains patriarchal control over women’s agency.

Pamela understands her dependent and subordinate relationship to her husband and she still complies with his discourse. When she tries to defend the injustice of her sex, she sandwiches self-denial and accolades for Mr. B between her argument for women. Pamela begins with her self-denial, “But how I ramble! –Yet surely, Sir, you don’t expect method or connection from your girl” (Richardson XCII). By lacking “method” or “connection,” she positions herself as unaware and in need of guidance and instruction. Her self-denial then dilutes

the significance of her arguing the following: “So, when a poor girl, in spite of her narrow education, breaks out into notice, her genius is immediately tamed by trifling employments, lest, perhaps, she should become the envy of one sex, and the equal of the other,” which demonstrates her frustration with the domestic code (Richardson XCII). Pamela then follows her argument, which would earn her admonition from Mr. B, with praise, “But you. Sir, act more nobly with your Pamela; for you throw in her way all opportunities of improvement; and she has only to regret, that she cannot make a better use of them, and of consequence, render herself more worthy of your generous indulgence” (Richardson XCII). Mr. B consults, approves, and monitors the only “opportunities of improvements” Pamela receives for her education. Despite her true feelings regarding the education of women, Pamela still conforms to the domestic framework. The process of her logic reveals her fear of Mr. B’s matrimonial recrimination and male prerogative.

The letters addressed to Mr. B in the end of the novel reiterate Pamela’s education in abiding by the domestic framework. She says she wishes for “no parties of pleasure but with you, my dearest Mr. B., and these parties that will improve me, and make me more capable of the other, and more worthy of your conversation, and of the time you pass...in such poor company as mine” (Richardson XCVI). She demonstrates her isolation from anything that Mr. B does not approve. Her goal make herself “more worthy” of Mr. B’s company reveals her self-inflicting subordination. Mr. B establishes a hierarchy of knowledge between himself and Pamela, which she complies with: “for no other reason but because I love to be instructed, and take my lessons well, as you are pleased to say; and indeed I must be a sad dunce, if I did not, from so skillful and so beloved a master” (Richardson XCVI). Mr. B becomes the master of Pamela’s mind; he

shapes her into submission as her “love to be instructed” and “tak[ing] my lessons well” suggests.

Finally, Pamela acknowledges her limits as a ‘mother’ due to Mr. B’s control over her reproductive rights. On the topic of education her own children she writes, “But what mother can take too much pains to cultivate the minds of her children? –If...it were not for these frequent lyings-in!” (Richardson XCIX). Pamela blames her frequent pregnancies on her inability to mother her own children. Her frequent pregnancies result from her complicity to the domestic codes, which limits her agency, power and influence. Near the end of the novel, Pamela writes about the birth of her “fourth dear boy, my Jemmy (for, I think am I going on to make out the number Lady Davers allotted me)” (Richardson C). This reflects back to Lady Davers earlier demand: “your first shall be Billy...your second Davers...your third, Charley; your fourth, Jemmy; your fifth, Harry; your sixth Dudley... and your girl Pamela...I wish all seven happily over with you” (Richardson XLVIII). Pamela succeeds in obliging Lady Davers for she names her children exactly as Lady Davers demanded. Pamela’s reflections on this subject in the end of the novel exhibits her compliance and her lack of authority for she diligently does whatever her husband and her husband’s family demands.

Pamela’s last letters exhibit her practicing the instruction, demands, education and conduct Mr. B, Lady Davers, and her parents’ mandate. She acknowledges the difference between the Pamela in volume I and the Pamela in volume II. She describes the difference between a woman in her maiden state, unmarried and virginal, a woman in her married state. She advises other maidens to “think yourself above the gentlemen, and they’ll think you so too,” which parallels the agent and independent Pamela in volume I. However, she cautions, “in your married state, which is a kind of state of humiliation for a lady, you must think yourself

subordinate to your husband; for so it has pleased God to make the wife. You must have no will of your own” (Richardson CIII). If Pamela chose this opportunity to encourage the young women to resist the domestic discourse, then *Pamela II* would transgress the eighteenth-century domestic framework. However, since Pamela instructs these women on the duty of a wife to submit to her husband, she perpetuates the very thing she attempts to defeat through breastfeeding. She becomes the Lady Davers to the young women’s Pamela. By educating the other young women on the humiliation of marriage, she perpetuates the domestic discourse, which subordinates women to men and removes any agency and will deeming the married woman a nonperson, a non-individual.

Pamela, overcome by the patriarchy, subordinates herself to the restrictions and limitations of the eighteenth-century domestic code. Critics such as Nancy Armstrong and Bonnie Latimer attribute the both volumes of *Pamela* to the creation of “a private domain of culture that was independent of the political world and overseen by a woman,” *Pamela II* creates a world in which woman is overseen and dominated by male prerogative (Armstrong 105). These critics describe Richardson’s novel *Pamela* as the beginning of the “cultural fantasy...the promise that individuals could realize a new and more fundamental identity and thus free themselves of the status distinctions organizing the old society” (Armstrong 105). However, Pamela’s own words, in volume II, which demonstrate the difference between maidenhood and wifehood reveals the stronghold control of the domestic discourse that maintains the organization of society (Armstrong 105). Mr. B, Lady Davers and the Andrews employ domestic discourse to maintain Pamela’s obedience and perpetuate the patriarchal structure of their society, which renders women inactive.

Although Latimer argues Richardson's heroines differ from other domestic novels, Pamela becomes another one of the "women in these texts...couched in terms incompatible with individuality" (10). Bowers argues "by refusing to let Pamela breastfeed, Richardson's 'conduct novel' challenges conduct literature's authority to dictate maternal behavior, and...specific patterns of maternal behavior become less important than the context of female subordination in which they take place" (278). By denying Pamela the right to breastfeed, the novel exposes the women's failure in achieving bodily authority because of the influence of eighteenth-century domestic discourse. In addition, Laura Fasick writes, "Richardson demonstrates...that such a denial of the body inevitably diminishes female authority" (194). Authority results in the control over the body and the mind. The domestic woman, like Pamela, does not have control over her body or mind, which renders her powerless.

Eighteenth-century British domestic discourse defines women according to their biological and sexual functions. This construction allows the patriarchal hierarchy to continue through the production of heirs, which keeps the man in power and control over their society and culture. Limiting opportunities and education perpetuate control over the female's body. Domestic discourse, employed by men and complicit women, culturally genders the female individual into a "woman." In addition, genres, like novels and conduct literature, propagate the ideological concepts of "woman," "mother," "wife," and "individual." The eighteenth-century concept of "mother" and "wife" and "woman" all require the removal of the individual classification. The concepts of "mother," "wife," and "woman" are subordinate to their male counter parts. The gendering of female to woman prevents the female from achieving individual status, which suggests the culturally gendered "woman" is a constructed concept complicit in female subordination. Women's role in conforming to the subordination and subjugation of the

domestic woman is crucial to the ideological structure; without submission, the structure collapses.

When Wittig writes about women's oppression, she writes about woman's necessary participation in their own liberation. She writes by "gaining control of the production of children will mean... women will have to abstract themselves from the definition "woman" which is imposed upon them" (104). Wittig argues that in order to free woman from their oppression, woman must free themselves to their connection to the production of children. She suggests the "control of the production of children," centers the concept of woman, which is seen in examining Mr. B's control over Pamela's reproductive life. Woman cannot rely on the idea that their oppression is biological because connecting woman to their biological function oppressed woman in the first place. If the biological connection is removed, woman can transform from Other to Subject.

Pamela, II exhibits that gender is a cultured construct and as Beauvoir states, one becomes a woman through the influence of culture. The novel also shows how women are complicit in perpetuating their own enslavement, in which their voluntary submission to male authority authorizes subjugation. Further, women instructing other women, like Lady Davers instructing Pamela and then Pamela instructing the young women at the end of the novel on the humiliation of matrimony, supports the continuation of their subordination. In addition, the inability to have reproductive freedom and control over their body removes their authority as an individual. Women's education plays an important and necessary role in their liberation or their enslavement. *Pamela, II* perpetuates eighteenth-century domestic discourse by instructing and constructing the idea of the good wife and mother. Pamela's failure to resist domesticity reveals the role of culture in contributing to establishing gender identity. The novel functions to

reinforce the eighteenth-century domestic discourse that constructed the concept of motherhood in order to strengthen and sustain the social and political hierarchies.

Works Cited

- An Address to mothers, under the following heads: Maternal authority. Domestic attention. Diligence and activity. Oconomy. Simplicity. Objects of female prusuits. Knowledge, virtue, and religion.* Oxford, 1784. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Accessed 3 May 2017.
<<http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=setonhallu&tabID=T001&docId=CB127082274&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE>>.
- Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. Oxford UP, 1987.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Random House, 2010.
- Bowers, Toni. "'A Point of Conscience': Breastfeeding and Maternal Authority in *Pamela 2*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 7, no.3, 1995, pp. 259-278.
- Burke, Meghan L. "Making Mothers Obsolete: Eliza Fenwick's *Secresy* and the Masculine Appropriation of Maternity." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 21, no. 3, 2009, pp. 357-384.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble*. Routledge, 1999.
- Fasick, Laura. "Sentiment, Authority and the Female Body in the Novels of Samuel Richardson." *Essays in Literature*, no. 2, 1992, pp. 193-.
- Francus, Marilyn. *Monstrous Motherhood: Eighteenth-Century Culture and the Ideology of Domesticity*. Johns Hopkins UP, 2012.
- Latimer, Bonnie. *Making Gender, Culture, and the Self in the Fiction of Samuel Richardson: The Novel Individual*. Routledge, 2013.
- Nussbaum, Felicity A. *Torrid Zones: Maternity, Sexuality, and Empire in Eighteenth-Century English Narratives*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1995.
- Richardson, Samuel. *Pamela*. Yurita Press, 2015.
- Schellenberg, Betty A. "Enclosing the Immovable: Structuring Social Authority in *Pamela 2*." *Passion and Virtue: Essays on the Novels of Samuel Richardson*, edited by David Blewett, University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Seager, Nicholas, "The 1740 Roxana: Defoe, Haywood, Richardson and Domestic Fiction."
Philological Quarterly, vol. 88, no. 1/2, 2009, pp. 103-126.

Wittig, Monique. "One is Not Born a Woman." *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*, edited by
Henry Abelove, Michèle Aina Barale, and David M. Halperin, Routledge, 1993.