Eliza Haywood’s opening of The Invisible Spy (1755) taunts the reader: “I have observed, that when a new book begins to make a noise in the world ... every one is desirous of becoming acquainted with the author; and this impatience increases the more he endeavors to conceal himself. ... but whether I am even a man or a woman, they will find it, after all their conjectures, as difficult to discover as the longitude.” Not only does this passage raise topics that Haywood’s time and our own have been obsessively interested in—authorship and gender—but two of Haywood’s professional and personal interests—current events and science—leave their traces on this sentence. The Longitude Act of 1714 had offered a huge prize, £20,000, for the person who figured out a “practical” way to calculate longitude to within half a degree of the great circle (and prize money on a sliding scale down to £10,000 for a calculation within one degree). Latitude is easily calculated by the sun or stars, but, regardless of where the prime meridian is placed, longitude can only be determined by exact time-keeping by an instrument unaffected by the motion of the water. John Harrison, an English watchmaker, successfully created a marine chronometer in 1735, but the scientific community forced trial after trial of it. The size of the prize and the controversy kept longitude in the news.¹

¹ Ptolemy plotted latitude and longitude on his atlas, but his prime meridian, the zero degree longitude line, was moved numerous times; mapmakers located it in Rome, St Petersburg, Paris, London, and
The opening quotation also suggests the difficulties of working with Eliza Haywood’s texts. She creates exceptionally complex narrators and narrative perspectives, and there always seems to be more in her writing than even the most experienced interpreter sees. Her topical allusions are myriad, her engagement with political and social issues continuous, and her fictions complex and subtle. Just before this passage from *The Invisible Spy*, she anticipates her reception: “I expect to hear an hundred different names inscribed to the Invisible,—some of which I should, perhaps, be proud of, others as much ashamed to own.—Some will doubtless take me for a philosopher,—others for a fool;—with some I shall pass for a man of pleasure,—with others for a stoic;—some will look upon me as a courtier,—others as a patriot.” And so indeed and still today do readers and critics label her and her narrators. As is clear from recent descriptions, debate continues about whether her novels are shallow, trivial, and repetitious, whether they provide important social commentary or are an important part of the literary history of the novel, and whether Haywood is an erotic writer producing (knowingly or not) arousal literature and pleasure machines or a skilful social allegorist or an important literary innovator. Whatever our opinions, however, it seems indisputable to me that she has come to stand for the nexus and the point of tension between a number of things—the transgressive, outspoken woman and the moral, admonishing woman writer, between amatory fiction and the new novel.

As seems appropriate for an essay today on Haywood, mine is more about difficulties than certainties, more about reactions than interpretations, and more about the state of Haywood criticism—and by extension criticism of the eighteenth-century novel—than about understanding a coherent group of her texts.

The “story” of the history of the English novel has broken down, and we are working amid competing histories of the form. In the introduction to a recent anthology, John Richetti and I took many of them into account. We point out: “According to this story, in place of the faceless, formulaic repetitions of booksellers’ hacks and financially distressed female authors”;
Frontispiece, *Female Spectator*, vol. 1 (1745). Engraved by Remigius Parr (fl. 1740–51). The bust of Sappho bears a resemblance to known portraits of Eliza Haywood. Reproduced by permission of McMaster University Library.
“the kind of importance [Michael] McKeon attaches to women’s fiction, however complex and dialectical, is insufficient”; “Women’s fictions by these lights”; and “these fictions ... stand in some sort of an essential or even an enabling relation to the canonical novels of mid-century.” The introduction is a part of the critical environment that is producing essays such as “Why the Story of the Origin of the (English) Novel Is an American Romance (If Not the Great American Novel)” and arguments that present the history of the novel as struggle rather than evolution. Today’s stories of the history of the novel explore how satisfactorily “minor” fiction, especially women’s novels, can be fitted into any of the extant histories; some critics, including feminists, continue to play with the idea that women’s novels represent a counter-tradition. With the critique of the privileging of the realist novel and the development of powerful feminist methods of interpretation has come greater understanding of competing sets of narrative choices and, therefore, of stories of the history of the novel.

The reasons for the breakdown of our histories of the “rise” and formation of the English novel are not hard to find. Nearly a generation of new-historicist, cultural studies, and feminist critics have brought “minor” fiction into the centre of literary study, and critics holding a wide range of opinions about early novels by women agree on at least two necessary lines of inquiry. The first question is why these novels disappeared from the canon; the second, how they may be reinserted into the history of the novel. Unfortunately, in a postmodern world, we know these decisions are political and sociological as well as “aesthetic.” With admirable common sense, Toni Bowers has suggested a starting place: “Rather than denigrate (or praise) amatory fiction wholesale, critics might better ask why we define ‘good’ literature as we do, how our assumptions about literary value still work to valorize some voices and exclude others, and how our capacities for pleasure might be augmented by respectful engagement with works we have been trained to resist or dismiss.”


3 Homer Brown, “Why the Story of the Origin of the (English) Novel Is an American Romance (If Not the Great American Novel),” *Cultural Institutions of the Novel*, ed. Deidre Lynch and William Beatty Warner (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996), pp. 11–43. Articles and book chapters that take the latter stance far outnumber those that still use in one form or another the “story” that Richardson and Fielding created the two branches of the English novel with at least some relationship to or even roots in the chaos and mediocrity of the early English novel.

Suddenly Haywood is everywhere. Yet study of her individual works is proceeding much too slowly. Jerry Beasley was a pioneer in the early 1980s when he wrote about Haywood’s Adventures of Eovaai (1736, 1741) and George Lyttleton’s The Court Secret (1741). Deep-structure comparisons such as William B. Warner’s of Fantomina and Pamela are much too rare.\(^5\)

That, in company with Daniel Defoe and Penelope Aubin, Haywood dominated the fiction of the 1720s and, with Samuel Richardson and Henry Fielding, was a major novelist of the 1740s and 1750s is now well known. Feminist critics including Margaret Anne Doody, Jane Spencer, and Ros Ballaster give her credit for initiating major forms of the novel, key character types, and even “an autonomous tradition in romantic fiction.”\(^6\) In a stimulating argument, Warner has argued that Richardson and Fielding set out rather consciously to disavow, absorb, yet erase and obliterate their female predecessors.\(^7\) Warner’s work is particularly useful because it reminds us of how powerful is the “story” of Richardson and Fielding creating out of a heap of rubbish individualized masterpieces of social observation and psychological depth. Warner and other recent critics point out that from at least the time of Samuel Johnson, two strains or branches of the English novel have been traced to them; lurking in his arguments and those of many other critics, including Richetti, is some version of this conception. It is obvious that this is a gendered story—Richardson, whether “sissy” or proto-feminist, is associated with the feminine, and Fielding with the masculine. Nothing written by Ian Watt or Alan Dugald McKillop dislodged this dichotomous story, as Watt’s chapter on Jane Austen reveals. Criticism since has not seriously undermined it. Less generalized comment on Haywood and closer study of her texts is needed.

Long ago and somewhat naïvely I argued that Roxana was Defoe’s attempt to write a “woman’s novel,” and I found some traces of Haywood in that work. The power of their shared world—socio-historical and


narrative—and what we might learn about gender and genre eluded me and is yet to be described. Their heroines live deep in the city of London, in the modern world of capitalism, free-market transactions, aristocracy of ability rather than of birth, and individual responsibility. Defoe has Moll Flanders (1722) commit crimes out of necessity, and Haywood has Glicera in *The City Jilt* (1726) do many of the same things for revenge. Such juxtapositions throw a powerful spotlight on the material conditions of eighteenth-century people and on gender; for example, we become aware of how Moll Flanders is reintegrated into marriage and a comfortable, patriarchal plot whether she repents or not, but Glicera remains an outsider and, therefore, a troubling emblem of various truths about women’s position in society.

In *Moll Flanders* and many other texts, Defoe raises powerful questions about the responsibility society bears for human misery and even for evil. Haywood’s narrator in *The Invisible Spy*, upon hearing of a large collection being taken up for Elizabeth Canning, the young woman eventually convicted of perjury and transported for accusing Mother Wells and her women of holding her captive and trying to force her into prostitution, exclaims:

> In an age when numberless, nameless miseries abound,—when all our prisons labour with the weight of wretches confined within their walls, many for small debts which their necessities obliged them to contract, and some of unjust and malicious prosecutions,—while every parish, nay almost every street, affords objects of real distress,—while the remains of the most antient and honourable families are reduced by the fatal South-Sea scheme, and other more latent public calamities, to the extreamest want, shall all these, or any of these, send unavailing petitions to those from whom they might expect redress, while a girl sprung from the lowest dregs of the people, bred up to toil, a drudge, one of the very meanest class of servants, receive donations which she as little knows how to make a proper use of as to deserve! 8

Quite apart from the shared themes and pictures of London economics, Haywood’s texts when set beside Defoe’s novels enrich and complicate our idea of the relationship between news and the novel and, on an even grander scale, our conceptions of the formation of the novel and its earliest practitioners’ belief in the “work” it can do in society.

Although we have scarcely begun to rewrite in detail the history of the decades of Richardson and Fielding, a few critics have recognized

the importance of texts such as Haywood’s *British Recluse*. Doody, for example, makes the intriguing suggestion that Richardson rewrites Haywood’s *British Recluse* into an imagined “situation of feminine defeat from the ego-satisfying view of the rake in the case.”9 With increasing assurance, others are saying with Katherine S. Green that “The question of influence ... is as appropriately posed in relation to Haywood’s on Richardson as to Richardson’s on Haywood.”10 The traces of Haywood’s existence in Fielding’s work seem to me even more important and, unfortunately, more neglected and complex. The fact that few critics of Fielding have ever bothered to consider his works in the context of earlier and contemporaneous women’s novels obscures the issues and multiplies the amount of work to be done.11 We do not even know the most important texts to compare. For example, what might we see if we analysed Haywood’s *Fortunate Foundlings* (1744) and Fielding’s *Tom Jones* (1750) together? Certainly we would learn a lot about gendering. Haywood’s foundlings are found and reared by Dorilaus, who is eventually revealed as their father. They show the kind of natural good breeding that Tom does, one that hints at their gentle birth, and their experiences are more developed examples of the gendered spheres and contrasting possibilities and narrative plots for men and women than Fielding’s for Tom and Sophia Western. *The Fortunate Foundlings* also has a stronger, more threatening incest plot that, again, reminds the reader of *Tom Jones*. As Joanna Russ and other feminists have persuasively pointed out, cross-gender dialogue is often an argument over reality. Both writers are saying, “Not that way, this way.” What, then, are the stakes—the stakes for the negotiation of reality, gender, and human possibility—in these texts and, by extension, the possibilities and aspirations alive in the culture of that time and our own?

When the history of any part of the canon breaks down, so do all the images or reputations of authors, especially of key authors and of authors such as Haywood, who challenge the existing history. Concomitant with


11 The exception to this neglect is, of course, the work of Fielding’s sister Sarah.
the breakdown of the story of the history of the English novel, we are see­
ing the disintegration of the “author function” we have called “Eliza
Haywood.” As Michel Foucault made clear, the author function gives con­
siderable stability to interpretations of literary works and to their place
in the hierarchies of texts. Behind every author function are biograph­
ical facts, myths, and interpretations as well as cultural judgments about
texts, literature, and writer. In the past decade, we have learned that Hay­
wood was not a runaway preacher’s wife, had her own bookseller’s shop for
a while, and had a sustained “domestic” relationship with William Hatch­
ett. She succeeded as a journalist and translator, wrote plays, and acted
on the most prestigious stages of Dublin and London. We have also dis­
covered her literary criticism and conduct-books. Feminist critics such as
Ballaster have offered new approaches to her work and revisionary read­
ings of individual texts. Within the feminist tradition that hypothesizes
the inadequacy of traditional reading strategies and critical methods, some
feminist critics have turned earlier denigrations of Haywood’s work back
on the perpetuators.\textsuperscript{12} For example, while some critics have found Hay­
wood’s texts repetitious and redundant, these feminist critics celebrate her
ability to expose the universal and replicated situation of women in patri­
archal society. Their argument allies Haywood’s theme and world view
with that of, for instance, Mme de Lafayette in \textit{La Princesse de Clèves}.

Destabilization of either an author function or of a canon necessarily
destabilizes the other, and, as we have seen, both have now occurred. In a
well-known and stimulating series of exchanges, Nancy K. Miller argued
that the “death of the author” movement is “one of the ‘masks ... behind
which phallocentrism hides its fictions’” and a way of authorizing the
“end of woman.” The result is a premature foreclosure of “the question of
agency,” and she joins a large number of feminists who believe in a culture
with marked gender asymmetry, “when the so-called crisis of the subject
is staged, as it generally is, within a textual model, that performance must
then be recomposed by the historical, political, and figurative body of
the woman writer.”\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} See, for example, Annette Kolodny, “Dancing through the Minefield: Some Observations on the
Claudine Herrmann, \textit{The Tongue Snatchers}, trans. Nancy Kline (Lincoln: University of Nebraska

\textsuperscript{13} Nancy K. Miller, “The Text’s Heroine: A Feminist Critic and Her Fictions” and “Changing the
Subject: Authorship, Writing, and the Reader,” \textit{Subject to Change: Reading Feminist Writing} (New
York: Columbia University Press, 1988), pp. 75, 107. This series of exchanges is often remembered
for its use of shoe metaphors.
Haywood’s body has always been writ large, and it is easy to read mythic fears and hatreds of women in some of the critical statements. Pope, of course, imagined her with “cow-like udders” drooping to her navel and “two babes of love” hanging on her. Ever since, a tone of revulsion oscillates uneasily between location on her texts and location on her imagined sexual body. Lionel Stevenson called her “the egregious Mrs. Haywood,” and Clarence Tracy wrote that although Richard Savage “had been intimate with creatures like Eliza and Clio, such associations did little or nothing in the eighteenth century to blacken a man’s character, and even in these more squeamish days cannot outweigh the favourable testimony of his other friendships”.

It is far too simple to recall that women’s writings are more often seen as autobiographical than men’s and that the woman’s body has been associated with her text. Haywood makes women’s bodies an important, multi-faceted subject. Moreover, as critics have pointed out, she identifies herself as author and, through various narrative personae, with both female readers and with the oppressed lot of womankind. She brings to mind not the women literary men create but the social being that Virginia Woolf described as “locked up, beaten and flung about the room,” “snubbed, slapped, lectured, and exhorted.” The first gives us an abused physical body, and the second recalls the Foucauldian disciplined body.

Haywood puts the body in play in myriad ways. Women characters may be seduced and swept into brief interludes of jasmine-scented bliss, or they may be brutally raped, or they may be lustful monsters of nymphomania. She can dwell on the hideous effects of poison on the body of the heroine in *The Mercenary Lover*, and she can create Atamadoul in *The Adventures of Eovaai*, who is at one with the “frightful and mishapen [sic] Spectres” that hover around the couch on which she makes love. The spectres pour “Phials of sulphurous Fire” and are accompanied by hideous creatures whose “obscene and antick Postures animated [Atamadoul and Ochihatou’s] polluted joys” (p. 162) and mirror their obscene, extreme lust. As with so

---

14 In her detailed study, Ballaster concludes that Haywood’s textual production was consistently identified with sexual promiscuity, pp. 153–70.


many of Haywood’s fictions, critics have recorded strong, personal reactions. In this story, a magician has turned Atamadoul into a monkey and often tortures her by releasing “a very ugly and over-grown Baboon” that leaps upon her, caresses her, and “is sometimes very near taking an entire Possession of” her (p. 154). Atamadoul burns continually with almost inconceivable lust for Ochihatou, and one critic remarks in some horror that “the reader cannot help wondering if [Atamadoul] would be less horrified if the beast were not so unattractive.”

We cannot, I think, resist wondering what kind of person created these fictions, out of what experiences or world view, and to what ends. Marilyn L. Williamson refers to the “bleak chronicle” of male oppression, and Ballaster admits she finds Haywood “the least attractive of the ‘fair Triumvirate of Wit [Behn, Manley, and Haywood].’” She describes an unpleasant, “profound melancholia and pessimism” in Haywood’s depiction of female possibility. These and other feminist critics find Haywood’s use of sex and sexuality unsettling and often distinctly unpleasant. Richetti finds a “compelling horror to sex” and an offensive “depersonalizing” of men, which in the light of the Atamadoul story and others are hard to deny. Sally O’Driscoll observes, “As a whole, the dizzying sequence of terrible possibilities makes it clear that all kinds of sexual behaviors are thinkable.” “That the narrative resolution backs away from them every time does not make them disappear,” she points out.

To read most of Haywood’s works in chronological order opens almost equally intractable questions and sends us back to Miller’s point and to intellectual biography and the contextual methods of cultural studies. How, for example, do we connect her texts in any meaningful way either by using recurrent themes or by connecting themes to what we can presume about her life? Williamson suggests that Haywood began to have more “faith in marriage-for-love ... as time went on” and that “she wrote to please an audience whose values had greatly changed.” Haywood’s long life with William Hatchett might be cited as contributing to this more sanguine view of men, love, and marriage. A common “plot” for Haywood’s life, one that has existed since at least David Erskine Baker’s Companion to


21 Williamson, p. 233.
the Theatre (1764) and Clara Reeve’s The Progress of Romance (1785), is that Haywood’s fictions become more moral and less shocking. We often read that for shrewd commercial reasons, she joined those riding the rising tide of rather priggish, admonitory fiction. Yet throughout her career she repeatedly wrote sentences such as these: “Already she was entered far into the mazy labyrinth of passion and ignorant of the road or the consequences which attend such wanderings of fancy. Reason grew intoxicated.” Why have we not believed in her consistency and in what Ann Messenger has recognized: “The energy of her language ... indicates a vivid sense of the serious consequences of wrong thinking and wrong doing. Her purpose, as she perceives it ... has been to provide the minds of her readers with a similar energy as they strive for survival.”

The conventional “stories” seem far too simple to me. In The City Jilt, Glicera escapes the romance plot of the seduced, abandoned woman and becomes a woman capable of using modern pastimes (cards and gaming), City tokens of exchange (mortgages, contracts, buying commissions in the military), and fraudulent representations of herself and of women’s nature to get revenge and to triumph. In the much later Invisible Spy, the heroine Alinda, who begins as an innocent and dies a virgin, is absolutely ruined by her chaplain-tutor. We watch her life fall apart and her father’s hopes thwarted; we observe her twisting, turning, struggling, begging in the snare in which the chaplain has caught her; we see her helplessly lose the love of a good man and learn that the law and good legal minds can do nothing. What has increased Haywood’s pessimism and the violence of her fictions? How do we connect them? Almost nothing useful is known of Haywood’s life and even less evidence survives of her “sensibility,” her responses to experiences and to life. It seems to me that those of us who look to authorial agency or biographical methods of any sort have been thwarted and are likely to remain so. We need to turn away from her body and engage her texts as we have those of Aphra Behn, Daniel Defoe, and Samuel Richardson—with the full arsenal of contemporary critical theory.


23 Messenger, pp. 112, 147.

According to Baker, one of her earliest biographers, Haywood “laid a solemn injunction on a person who was well acquainted with all the particulars of [her life] not to communicate to any one the least circumstance relating to her.” Just as the narrator of her *Invisible Spy* had recognized the multiple interpretations of character and conduct, Haywood, according to Baker, gave as her reason “a supposition of some improper liberties being taken with her character after death, by the intermixture of truth and falsehood.” This perception is almost comic in light of the creativity with which biographers and critics have “taken liberty” with her life, but our most accurate insights about writers of fiction may come in any case from the cumulative experience of their total *œuvre*. The “author” who has been and even today is “Haywood” has certainly not been formed by this means. Over a lifetime, a writer’s recurring opinions about society, human behavior and relationships, and what ought to be changed emerge. As we work to separate out the plots, characters, and genre fashions of each period, we find more traces of the mind and opinions that created the texts even as we comprehend the canon. How free writers are from genre conventions, their own horizons of expectation for the form in which they write, and the social forces that “construct” human beings can never be known; but something of the unique person, a creative writer with agency, is always present.

I want to suggest, then, by pointing out that in a time when the story of the history of the novel and the author function “Haywood” have broken down, we must also problematize, complicate, and revise many of the commonly accepted opinions about Haywood’s work. As examples of what I mean, I shall conclude with some observations about interpretations of her most overtly political work, a group of texts associated with George II, Robert Walpole, and Frederick, Prince of Wales. Among them is one that has received considerable attention, *The Adventures of Eovaai*. The others are *The Secret History of the Present Intrigues of the Court of Caramania* (1727), one of her scandalous memoirs, and two plays—her only tragedy, *Frederick, Duke of Brunswick-Lunenburgh* (1729), and her successful *Opera of Operas* (1733). These works have been considered heavily formulaic and transparent in their intention and political alignment. In many important ways, they illustrate how her work has most often been


26 There are other scattered pieces including essays in her *Tea Table* (1724) and *The Female Spectator* (1744; 1:350–56, on the “forced” marriage of Prince Frederick) that should be included in a full discussion of this topic.
treated and, I would argue, how much we have yet to do to understand Haywood, her career, and her texts.

Haywood has been seen as politically unengaged, and most critics would agree with Ballaster: "Haywood betrays no interest in direct political intervention or allegiance to other opposition figures or forces." Haywood is consistently but loosely associated with the opposition to Robert Walpole, the powerful prime minister who became first lord of the Treasury and chancellor of the Exchequer in 1721 and managed to stay in power until 1742. Ballaster, for instance, writes that *The Adventures of Eovaai* "was a concerted and damning attack on Robert Walpole ... however [it] appeared after the Walpole administration had fallen into decline, and at a point where the opposition had succeeded in amassing considerable popular and literary support, particularly around the figure of Prince Frederick." The book is indeed an attack on Walpole in the character of Ochihatou, but it is much more than that. For instance, parallel to the plot of the kidnapping of Princess Eovaai is the plot of the education of Eovaai as a ruler. Thus, we have an imaginative variant on the "advice to princes" genre.

Beginning with Eovaai's father's lecture, substantial sections of the book are dissertations on and dramatizations of forms of government. In a series of encounters Eovaai witnesses and discusses, often in quite theoretical terms, the relationships between a state and the people. For example, she grieves for Hypotosa's and her own subjects as she listen to Alhahuza's harangue. He begins with a contradiction of Mandeville's famous formulation: "Oh Hypotosans! for which of you has not, for a show of private Advantage, consented to give up Publick-Good?" (p. 98) His conclusion invokes the Norman Yoke theory and calls upon the people to exercise their common sense in the interest of their laws, liberties, welfare, and posterity—the traditional catalogue; Haywood even uses the phrase "throw off the Yoke" (p. 103). Near the centre of the book is Eovaai's debate with the old man in Oozoff, who persuades her of the wisdom of an extreme version of the principles of the Whig Revolution asserted by her father. As Earla Wilpute observes, in this section, which argues against the centralized control of a

27 Ballaster, p. 156.

28 Ballaster, p. 157.

powerful sovereign, the commentators on the text multiply.30 These characters, including an historian, “the Cabal,” the Translator, and “an eminent Writer,” represent opinions that Haywood’s contemporaries interested in political controversy and philosophy would have identified.

The rarely discussed conclusion is a masterly combination of the familiar beleaguered-princess romance and the political fable. Eovaai is rescued from Ochihatou by Adelhu, who has been the “Guardian” of her kingdom, behaving with “so much Justice, Prudence, and Humility, as has endeared him to all Degrees of People” (p. 204). Offering him her “Crown and Person,” she discovers that he is the exiled heir to the throne of Hypotosa. Soon the couple unite their nations as joint sovereigns and see them become “the most powerful, most opulent, and most happy Monarchies in the World” (p. 224). Their union and the theory of government they represent suggest the ideal order a good monarch brings to a fortunate nation and are somewhat reminiscent of the Revolution Settlement and the invitation to William of Orange (married to a legitimate Stuart heir, Mary) to ascend the English throne. It is important to note that Adelhu’s and Eovaai’s theory and practice of government have been carefully spelled out and illustrated in the book.

Ballaster continues her comments on the book with the reflection that “like the opposition itself, conservative ideology in this period seems to have consisted of an uneasy piecemeal alliance of otherwise contradictory positions.” She mentions neither the education theme nor the corrective that subsequent sections and the ending of the text supply. Her single footnote on this brief section cites Bertrand Goldgar’s Walpole and the Wits—significantly, Goldgar does not mention Haywood.31 The Adventures of Eovaai (and the other texts in this group), when discussed at all, are quickly slotted into an assumed category of political texts and discussed in a cursory manner in relation to Robert Walpole alone. Most critics make it obvious that the results are somewhat unsatisfactory and even puzzling—as Ballaster does when she comments that the novel appeared after Walpole’s decline. In fact, the book appeared twice, and the “decline” of Walpole in 1736 is rather different from his decline in 1741. In 1735, Walpole had lost control of the crucial committee on privileges and elections, but 1736 was a more critical year. Discontent over the Gin Act was at its height, and new disruptions to trade by Spain led to increased activity by the Opposition that culminated in the March 1737 appearance of Captain Jenkins before

31 Ballaster, p. 157. To be fair, interpreting this text is not part of Ballaster’s purpose. She uses Goldgar to discuss the historical context only.
Commons with his ear in a bottle. In February 1741 the opposition moved in parliament to ask the king to dismiss Walpole. Therefore, Haywood was not publishing anti-Walpole material “after Walpole’s decline”; in 1736, she may have been going for the jugular when it was exposed, but she was not beating a dead horse.

There are many other good reasons to place Haywood’s text within the context of anti-Walpole propaganda. For example, the *The Adventures of Eovaai* is dedicated to Sarah Churchill, Duchess of Marlborough, with an opposition-style invoking of the contrast between “some ambitious, or avaritious Favourite, void of Abilities as of Morals” and her husband, whose victories and political advice displayed “the Love of Liberty, Glory, Virtue” (p. iv). The qualities listed are markedly like those commonly cited as lacking in Walpole. The duchess’s opposition activities between 1731 and 1735—the time in which Haywood wrote *Eovaai* and adapted Henry Fielding’s *Tom Thumb* into *The Opera of Operas*—were especially energetic, and she attended the Haymarket benefit for Haywood held the night before the vote on the Licensing Act in 1737. Shortly after the reissue of *Eovaai*, Haywood dedicated the first year’s volume of *The Female Spectator* (1745) to the Duchess of Leeds, Mary Godolphin Osborne, legally the daughter of Henrietta Churchill and Francis Godolphin, second Earl of Godolphin (although always believed to be the daughter of William Congreve). Mary had recently been reconciled with Sarah. In her dedication, Haywood wrote, “It is not, therefore, madam, that you are descended from a Marlborough or a Godolphin, dear as those patriot names will ever be, while any sense of liberty remains in Britons.” Mary had married in the summer of 1740 and by the time Haywood began the periodical was very much in her grandmother’s good graces.

It is often pointed out that Haywood had good commercial sense and knew how to take advantage of the fads in the literary marketplace. Her engagement with topical events, trends in fiction, and the press is sustained and easy to document, as in her references to the Longitude Act and to Elizabeth Canning. *Eovaai* is consistent with this opinion about her career. As Goldgar and others have made clear, a chief objection to (or weapon used against) Walpole was his lack of interest in patronizing literature, and the greatest writers of the time enjoyed satirizing him. Demonized as the enemy of liberty, virtue, and the arts, he became, in Jerry Beasley’s words, “an


33 Harris, p. 338.
almost mythological figure of frightening power and gross indecency.”

A vast literature grew up around him, and there were commercial advantages to publishing new, highly original fictions with this representation of him; The Adventures of Eovaai certainly contributes a striking portrait of Walpole within a well-developed, highly readable narrative. In fact, Haywood, rather than being a follower who was always slightly behind the curve, played a greater part in creating the mythological figure than she has been given credit for. For example, as early as 1724 she had created a Walpole-magician figure with a magic well in Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia. Lucitario anticipates Ochihatou, and, as Christine Gerrard has pointed out, draws upon an English tradition of identifying “political chicanery with necromancy.” Gerrard believes Haywood’s was the first extended application of the magician analogy to Walpole and calls Memoirs of a Certain Island “brilliant.”

If we look at groups of texts rather than Eovaai individually, other, more persuasive, important, and coherent possibilities emerge. First, and almost incidentally, some of Haywood’s sustained opinions and rhetorical strategies emerge. Part of the generation of writers who saw the powerful nexus of position and wealth and understood that people who believe they are above the law transgress the ethics of sexual behaviour as freely as they do those of civic virtue, Haywood relentlessly and creatively hammered away at the dangers and abuses of power. Her Ochihatou is a magician who “cast such a Delusion before the Eyes of all who saw him, that he appeared to them such as he wished to be, a most comely and graceful Man” (p. 19). At one point, he makes Eovaai simultaneously imagine sexual pleasure and feel vanity, ambition, and lust. The absolute identification of the public and private, civic and physical is most fully expressed in the intensity with which Ochihatou wishes to possess Eovaai completely and to corrupt her utterly as sexual woman and as ruler. In a remarkable variant on the seduction story, Ochihatou, like Clitander in The Mercenary Lover, uses a variety of cultural means to seduce Eovaai physically, but equally he

34 Beasley, p. 416. The best critic of this text, Beasley mentions its attack on the court but goes little beyond treating it as an anti-Walpole work.


36 Beasley points out that Haywood’s erotic scenes are standard in the anti-Walpole fiction and, indeed, other texts such as A True and Impartial History of the Life and Adventures of Some-Body (1740) are much more obscene, pp. 426–27. Gordon D. Fulton includes a revealing comparison of Haywood’s Memoirs of ... Utopia and Richardson’s Clarissa in “Why Look at Clarissa?” Eighteenth-Century Life 20 (1996), pp. 21–32.
wants to possess her kingdom and to convert her to his ideology of power and rule. In Haywood’s earlier secret histories and in many of her fictions, she assumes that power and avarice in one sphere will be mirrored in the other—that the sexual libertarian is the unscrupulous politician, businessman, or trustee. *The Secret History of the Court of Caramania* (1727) gives us a George II character (Theodore) who is a promiscuous libertine whose wife and mistress are wiser and more admirable than he. In *The Adventures of Eovaai*, she writes:

An elevated Station is therefore chiefly to be desired, as it is a Sanction to all our Actions, indulges the Gratification of each luxurious Wish, and gives a Privilege, not only of doing, but also of glorying in those things which are criminal and shameful in the Vulgar;—Bound by no Laws, subjected by no Fears, we give a Loose to all the gay Delights of Sense. (p. 45)

Richard Savage once said of Walpole, “the whole range of his mind was from obscenity to politicks, and from politicks to obscenity.” Haywood seems to have shared that opinion, but to have extended it into a broad conception of the way a sense of entitlement and privilege worked itself out in the public and private spheres.

Second, and related to the need to expand our understanding of her work’s significance, is the necessity of contextualizing her work by seeing it in relation to events within the royal family instead of in relation to Walpole’s career alone. Both the timing and the content of her work gain additional significance. Frederick, the Electoral Prince of Brunswick-Lunenburgh, arrived in England for the first time in December 1728 and became Prince of Wales in January 1729 at age twenty-two. Haywood’s *Frederick, Duke of Brunswick-Lunenburgh* opened on 4 March 1729. Always a swift writer, Haywood prepared the play to honour him and celebrate the royal event with a play about his fifteenth-century ancestor. She mentions twice in her dedication to him that he “stands in Need of no Examples of Antiquity, having before your Eyes such shining Models, in your Own Parents of all that can illustrate Royalty and adorn a Throne.” Although he had already angered his father by trying to arrange his own marriage to a member of the Prussian royal family and had been given an almost embarrassingly private entrance into England, Haywood may have been unaware of the signs of serious trouble on the horizon or have tried to encour-

37 Tracy, p. 54.

age reconciliation.\(^{39}\) No member of the royal family attended the play, and Haywood’s preface shows she took their absence as a serious snub.

In the next few years, as Frederick became a patron of the arts (including the theatre in so far as his meagre allowance permitted), the opposition formed, and Haywood’s work displayed something of a political agenda with modest desire for “direct intervention.” Her *Opera of Operas* was produced in 1733 near the end of Walpole’s attempt to extend the excise tax and at one of the peaks of the opposition’s demand that England declare war on Spain.\(^{40}\) Using Henry Fielding’s *The Tragedy of Tragedies*, with its satiric lament for the diminished English court in comparison with the time of King Arthur, the collaborators (Haywood, Arne, and perhaps William Hatchett) produced a comic opera. The common opinion that *Opera of Operas* is a cut version of Fielding’s play is mistaken. Few lines are eliminated; many of the airs are Fielding’s lines set to music. Although innumerable minor revisions in lines of prose and verse have been made, the only substantive change is in the ending. As the familiar conclusion of *Tragedy of Tragedies* is about to unfold, Sir Crit-Operatical and Modely interrupt in the manner of Fielding’s *Author’s Farce* or *Pasquin* and a happy ending is substituted. Merlin appears and brings all the characters back, including the cow, which is induced to regurgitate Tom. Merlin says, “Be loose your Tongues, and open all your Eyes; / Be chang’d from what ye were—let Faction cease” (p. 42). Everyone is reconciled; Tom declares, “Rebellion’s dead,” and the king chortles, “My Subjects now no longer by the ears, / But all shake hands, like friends, with one another” (p. 44).

Haywood’s Merlin comes from the Trojan legend of the founding of Britain by the Roman Brut, which is central to Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia Regum Britanniae*. In this account, “England’s imperial destiny was given validity and credence by the visions of her seer and prophet, akin to the deific splendor of Virgil and his projections of a golden Roman civilization.”\(^{41}\) Fielding had added Merlin to *Tragedy of Tragedies*, using him to predict theatrical greatness mockingly: “See from a far a

---


\(^{40}\) A brief account of this time and these issues is given in W.A. Speck, *Stability and Strife: England 1714–1760* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977), pp. 203–38. The excise bill would have extended the taxes on tea and coffee to wine and tobacco.

\(^{41}\) Manuel Schonhorn, “Pope’s *Epistle to Augustus*: Notes toward a Mythology,” *Alexander Pope: Recent Essays by Several Hands*, ed. Maynard Mack and James Winn (Hamden: Archon Books, 1980), p. 552. This section is indebted to this fine essay.
Theatre arise; / There, Ages yet unborn, shall Tribute pay / To the Hero-ick Actions of this Day” (pp. 41–43). Haywood expands Merlin’s role and restores him to the Trojan myth that Marjorie Hope Nicolson described as so familiar that generations of English poets could simply allude to it without retelling the story as did, for example, John Donne in *The Second Anniversary*. Haywood’s Merlin, like Geoffrey of Monmouth’s, looks forward to a Golden Age.

The intriguing connection, however, is not to Fielding or the courtiers but, again, to Frederick and the royal family. As this play was being written and performed, Queen Caroline was building her Merlin’s Cave in Richmond Gardens. This bizarre domed building, described by one critic as looking like “a group of African native huts,” had historical and mythological figures either seated around a table or in tableaux within arches. Among the figures were Elizabeth I, two women variously identified, and Merlin, who had a globe and was musing over a book, *The Life and Predictions of the Late Celebrated Duncan Campbell*. One interpretation of the women was that they were Bradamante and Melissa visiting a Merlin figure from *Orlando Furioso*; Ariosto’s Merlin foretells the rise of the House of Este to which the lines of Brunswick and Hanover could be traced. In Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*, Merlin is not an evil magician but the British mythological seer who describes the Arthurian line as culminating in the Tudors and predicts the marriage of Britomart (who, with Glauce, has been interpreted as one of the women in the third arch). At this time, Queen Caroline was claiming credit for the arranged betrothal of Frederick to Augusta of Saxe-Gotha. The king was making reconciliatory gestures towards Frederick, including a larger allowance and permission to select his own household.

The Cave and Haywood’s play both exploit the historical and mythological emblems much in fashion at the time. For instance, a 1732 painting by

---

42 Schonhorn, p. 560.


44 Other identifications of the female figures include Minerva and Elizabeth of York, and Britannia and Mother Shipton, the most famous conjuror in English folklore, sometimes damned as a witch and sometimes described as the prophet of events in the reign of Henry VIII. This section is indebted to Wilson and to Gerrard (pp. 169–71).

Philip Mercier had depicted Frederick with eighteen companions seated at a round table. Titled *Frederick Prince of Wales with the Knights of the Round Table*, this painting, like Merlin’s Cave, drew together British iconography, and, like Fielding’s and Haywood’s plays, used Arthurian material to comment on the present. Moreover, the cult of Elizabeth had remained strong throughout the eighteenth century, and Frederick seems consciously to have exploited it, for example, by his frequent, royal-progress-like boating on the Thames. Because of Frederick’s support for British trade and the affection of City merchants, he was already being compared to Queen Elizabeth, who had instituted trade-friendly policies.

The Cave was first opened to the public in 1735, but Haywood had not only written a piece on Duncan Campbell in 1732 but exploited the iconography and irenic ambitions of the Cave in the musical comedy in 1733. The final song in the *Opera of Operas* celebrates marital and generational as well as national harmony at a moment when some have thought even the queen was doing the same. As Gerrard suggests, Caroline’s action was remarkable: “That a queen should have taken it upon herself to commission a shrine which advertised her dynastic pedigree and her descent from British antiquity suggests ... the pressure on the Hanoverians to mythologize themselves, however crudely.” From the announcement of the plan it attracted much attention. Reactions to the finished Cave were complex, and Haywood’s play seems to partake both of the nation’s hopes about its monarchy and of the ridicule poured on any “easy” resolution of the rivalries among the king, Caroline, Walpole, and Frederick. Was Haywood a serious political commentator with the kind of inside knowledge that the Opposition insiders had or an exceptionally shrewd analyst of commercial possibilities?

And that brings us back to *The Adventures of Eovaai*—and Prince Frederick. In 1735 he had done something newsworthy, something with suggestive resonance in a Haywood text; he commissioned a statue of Edward, the Black Prince, and the newspapers reported that he ordered an inscription “promising that he would make ‘that amiable Prince the pattern of his own Conduct.’” This action allied him not only with a line of promising and much-mythologized princes of Wales and with policies sure to

46 Gerrard, p. 214.

47 For the obvious similarities to Stuart use of the Thames and the mingling of high and low art in royal iconography, see my *Spectacular Politics*, chap. 1.

48 Colton, pp. 7–8.

49 Gerrard, p. 169.

50 Gerrard, p. 212.
please many English people at this time (Edward had been a great soldier who often fought in the interests of British commercial advancement) but also seemed a statement that he was proud to be the Patriot King celebrated by the Opposition. Edward had spent much of his life on the continent, seen his father’s powers and popularity decline, but had predeceased him. Parallels to Adelphi are hard to miss.

Some of the same hopes for reconciliation and prosperous unity expressed in all these texts by Haywood are also very much in evidence in *Eovaai*. By depicting the king of Hypotosa as bewitched by Ochihatou, Haywood spares him blame and creates a conclusion that is in the tradition of panegyric—an ideal, not an accurate, portrait and a wished-for resolution. The king’s joyful reconciliation with his son and the son’s almost instantaneous ascent to the throne close the satisfying fantasy. Each country has a much-loved hereditary monarch and, by marriage, a joint sovereign “chosen” by the people and the ruler. Haywood’s text can be related closely to another major event in Frederick’s life: his marriage to Augusta in April 1736, near the date of publication of *Eovaai*. Haywood, then, could have been writing an “advice to a princess” to Augusta. Caroline was the model of a political queen, consistently influential and acting as regent during George II’s extended visits to Hanover. Haywood’s vision of the demise of Walpole is even more within the realm of hopeful predictions in 1741, the year of the second edition, than in 1736. Ochihatou’s wand—emblematic both of his raging sexuality and of the prime minister’s rod of office—is broken. George II and Frederick were superficially reconciled around that time, and her picture of Walpole as self-destructive is shrewd (and borne out by history).

The details of Haywood’s work need additional contextualizing within political philosophies of the Walpole era in order that she be located within the permutations of the Opposition—or, perhaps more accurately, within their addresses to and relationships with Frederick. As early as the middle of 1726, something of an organized literary opposition to Walpole had come into being, and the friendship between William Pulteney, St John, Viscount Bolingbroke, and the Scriblerians John Arbuthnot, Jonathan Swift, and Alexander Pope resulted in what Goldgar characterizes as “independent expressions of hostility” (p. 42). Undoubtedly the relationships among the men, their encouragement of and competitiveness with each other, raised the number, quality, and creativity of their Opposition writings. By 1729, Frederick was already described as “always” with Pulteney.51 By

51 Cable, p. 119.
the mid-1730s, the opposition was quite different. Pulteney and Bolingbroke were no longer friends, but some Tories, the Whig "Boy Patriots" or "Cobham's Cubs," and a larger group of Pulteney's Whig "patriots" were the opposition—each attempting to be closest to Frederick. Haywood may have been part of the group of younger writers, a group dominated by playwrights. The circumstantial evidence is persuasive.

She was part of the group propagating the identification of Frederick with the concept "patriot king." In fact, *Eovaai* first appeared somewhat ahead of the greatest and best-known expressions of this idea. Its relationship to Bolingbroke's *The Idea of a Patriot King* is intriguing. Copies of a small private edition circulated in 1740, a few months before the second edition of *Eovaai*. In 1749, Bolingbroke dedicated it to Prince Frederick. Vincent Carretta argues that the concept of a patriot king "had influenced the rhetorical pronouncements of the opposition to Walpole since about 1738," and Giles Barber speculates that a few copies of Bolingbroke's *Patriot King* appeared in that year. Most scholars, however, date it considerably earlier. In 1738, Bolingbroke and Pope were reading and encouraging the Patriot work of Thomson, Mallet, and Hill—all members of the theatre circle to which Haywood and Savage belonged and all likely to know her book, written in the middle of her most active theatrical years. The greatest literary minds of the eighteenth century always wrote high-order political essays and books, and they took as one of their most important responsibilities to make these ideas accessible to "the people." Such work by Addison, Defoe, Hume, Smith, and Paine is familiar. Like many of the lesser lights, Haywood joined in this work, and *The Adventures of Eovaai* summarizes and evaluates generations of the best political philosophy. Her work should be treated as theirs and Fielding's has been, treated on its own terms but also related to her fiction and to the permutations of the early

---

52 Bolingbroke gave the manuscript to Alexander Pope, who published it privately. Whether, and how quickly, it reached Haywood may never be known. David Mallet, whom Eliza Haywood knew (he was part of the theatrical circle to which she and Savage belonged), had a copy, as did Pit, one of Cobham's Cubs. The printer is thought to have been John Wright (Thomas Wright printed the 1741 *Eovaai*), and the book was handed "about, not very privately" by Pope. See Giles Barber, "Bolingbroke, Pope, and the Patriot King," *Library*, 5th ser. 19 (1964), 71, 76. Barber speculates that a few copies were printed in 1738 (pp. 82, 85). In 1744, Bolingbroke attempted to have all the copies destroyed (pp. 70–71). Sections that seem to have close parallels to me are those on the causes of factions and Bolingbroke's concluding vision: "What in truth can be so lovely, what so venerable, as to contemplate a king on whom the eyes of a whole people are fixed, filled with admiration, and glowing with affection?"

novel as it moved towards its destiny as “well-worn channel of access to the public.”

A dense network of publications with which hers should be placed exists. James Thomson’s *Castle of Indolence* and *Liberty* (dedicated to Frederick in 1735) have recently been associated with both Haywood’s *Memoirs of Utopia* and Bolingbroke’s circle and his late-1730s thinking. Strong similarities among *Liberty*, Henry Brooke’s *Gustavus Vasa* (1738), David Mallet’s *Mustapha* (1739), George Lillo’s *Elmerick* (dedicated on his deathbed in 1739 to Frederick), and *Frederick, Duke of Brunswick- Lunenbergevaai* are easy to find; all depict a legitimate heir with the characteristics of the patriot prince who unites and inspires the devotion of all classes in a disheartened society. All except *Liberty* are later than Haywood’s work. Writing at a time of great experimentation in prose fiction, Haywood should be seen as a leader, perhaps even a precursor of the novels of ideas of the late century, which combined “women’s plots” with critiques and dramatizations of the writings of Rousseau, Burke, and Smith. Unfortunately, space does not allow full examination of this hypothesis here; in any case, it is but one example of the work that needs to be done on Eliza Haywood and her texts.

We need to hear Nancy K. Miller’s call for renewed openness to the “historical, political, and figurative” woman. For instance, Haywood’s little-known book, the *Invisible Spy*, is about the power of print, its diverse forms and uses, those who enjoy it and use it for good or evil, and its ability to punish and replace satire in a modern world. The elderly woman who recollects and narrates the story calls herself “patriot”—“Patriot?” We need to understand the real depth and resonance of the political novel, “scandalous memoirs,” and the *roman-à-clef*. We even need to engage the intertextuality of the novel and the drama, the complementary uses writers such as Haywood made of them, and the ways in which juxtaposing the genres reveals the emerging, defining features of the novel and its cultural purposes.


55 Gerrard, pp. 180–81; and Barber, p. 70. In contrast, Alex Pettit’s otherwise useful book, *Illusory Consensus: Bolingbroke and the Polemical Response to Walpole, 1730–1737* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1997), does not recognize Haywood as a participant at all.

The obvious question remains: why has Haywood been consistently denied what Doody calls "creative power"? Just as Haywood has not been located at the forefront of creative political propaganda in the Walpole years, she is slotted without rigorous argument as the follower of Richardson and Fielding, a person smart enough to see the commercial possibilities in the "dilated," "moral" novel, but not a creative power participating in shaping this new form and its expanding social uses. Sometimes her "imitative" novels came before those she is allegedly imitating, as her Fortunate Foundlings does before Fielding's own foundling story or Richardson's greatest exploration of class and gender politics. No wonder the history of the novel is in disarray.
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