Capturing Pamela: An Investigation of Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* in the Context of Stockholm Syndrome

Thesis submitted to the

Institute of Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

English Language and Literature

by

Jane McGETTIGAN

Fatih University

June 2009

APPROVAL PAGE

Student	**:** Jane McGETTIGAN
Institute	**:** Institute of Social Sciences
Department	**:** English Language and Literature
Thesis Subject	**:** Capturing Pamela: An Investigation of Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* in the Context of Stockholm Syndrome
Thesis Date	**:** June 2009

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

(Prof. Visam Mansur)
Head of Department

This is to certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

(Assist Prof. Sheenagh Pietrobruno)
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

(Assist Prof. Sheenagh Pietrobruno) …….

(Assist Prof. Angela Hamilton) …….

(Assist Prof. Verena Laschinger) …….

It is approved that this thesis has been written in compliance with the formatting rules laid down by the Graduate Institute of Social Sciences.

(Assoc. Prof. Gökhan BACIK)
Director

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

1. The material included in this thesis has not been submitted wholly or in part for any academic award or qualification other than that for which it is now submitted.

2. The advanced study in the English Language and Literature graduate program of which this thesis is part has consisted of:

i) English and American literature including novel, poetry, and drama studies, a comparative approach to world literatures, and the examination of literary theory all of which have contributed to this thesis in an effective way.

ii) The thesis is composed of extracts from novels and secondary sources including books and journal articles.

Jane McGETTIGAN

June, 2009

ABSTRACT

Jane McGETTIGAN **June 2009**

Capturing Pamela: An Investigation of Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* in the Context of Stockholm Syndrome

A glance at the curriculum of many English Language and Literature programs confirms that Samuel Richardson is considered an influential contributor to the development of the English novel. The particular importance of Richardson's *Pamela* is evident not only in the continued inclusion of the book in many undergraduate and graduate English syllabuses, but also in the corollary importance of parodies such as Henry Fielding's *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews*. Richardson's significant contribution to the literary world is also indicated by the extensive body of critical work devoted to the study of *Pamela.*

However, much of this critical analysis stays within the two conventional schools of thought regarding discussion and analysis of the main character of the novel, Pamela. The novel was at the time of publication interpreted either at face value as a tale of morality and virtue or alternatively, Pamela is viewed as a calculating gold-digger actively plotting her marriage to Mr. B----, a man of fortune.

The purpose of this thesis is to propose an alternative analysis of this renowned work of fiction. Using modern psychology, the novel can be examined as an account of the hostage – captor relationship known as Stockholm syndrome. A close reading of *Pamela* indicates the presence of the major hallmarks of this condition, depicted accurately and sympathetically. Once Pamela's character is acknowledged as a victim of the syndrome, this new reading offers some

compromise between the Pamelist and anti-Pamelist arguments as it allow Pamela to be considered simultaneously both honest and contradictory in her behaviour.

The acuity of Richardson's portrayal is further confirmed when the portrayal of Stockholm syndrome in *Pamela* is compared to modern portrayals of the syndrome – in the autobiographical account of Patricia Hearst; the romance novel, *Captive Bride*; the Spanish film *Tie Me Up! Tie Me Down!*; and two popular television series, *24* and *The Simpsons*.

Key words:

Richardson, *Pamela*, Pamelist, anti-Pamelist, Stockholm syndrome, hostage, captor, Patricia Hearst.

ABSTRACT

Jane McGETTIGAN **June 2009**

Pamela'nın Esareti: Stockholm Sendromu Bağlamında Samuel Richardson'ın Pamela Adlı Eserinin Analizi

Birçok İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı bölümlerinin müfredatına bakıldığında Samuel Richardson'ın İngiliz romanının gelişiminde etkin rol oynadığı bir kez daha teyit edilmiş olur. Birçok lisans ve lisansüstü programda yer alması ve aynı zamanda Henry Fielding'in *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamella Andrews* gibi bir çok parodide atıfta bulunulması Richardson'ın *Pamela*'sının önemini aşikar kılar. Richardson'ın edebi dünyaya önemli bir katkısı da Pamela 'nın üzerine yapılan geniş kapsamlı çalışmalardır.

Bununla beraber, bu eleştireler çalışmalar iki geleneksel okulun ana karakter Pamela üzerine yaptığı tartışmalar ve analizlerden öteye geçememiştir. Roman yayımlandığı zamanda bir iffet ve fazilet öyküsü olarak ya da Pamela'nın zengin bir adam olan Mr. B--- ile evliliği baz alınarak çekiciliğini erkeklerden para sızdırmak için kullanan kadının öyküsü olarak yorumlanmıştır.

Bu tezin amacı, ünlü roman *Pamela'*nın daha farklı bir alternatif analizini ortaya koymaktır. Modern psikolojinin normları kullanılarak incelendiğinde, roman bir rehinenin hikayesi - Stocholm sendromu olarak da bilinen esaret ilişkisi - olarak algılanabilir. *Pamela* adlı eserin bu doğrultudaki yakın okuması aslında romanda birçok yerde bu konunun açıklık ve içtenlikle işlendiğini gösterir. Pamela, bu sendromun bir kurbanı olarak tanımlandığında, bu sav Pamela'yı davranışlarında

aynı anda hem dürüst hem de çelişkili bir karakter olarak tanımladığından Pamelist ve anti-Pamelist görüşler arasında bir nevi uzlaşma sunar.

Stockholm sendromu çerçevesinde analiz edilen *Pamela*'nın bu sendromun diğer modern karakterleriyle karşılaştırılması - ki bu modern örnekler Patricia Hearst'ın otobiyografik hikayesinden, romantik roman *Captive Bride*'dan, İspanyol film *Tie Me Up! Tie Me Down!*'dan ve iki popüler televizyon dizisi olan *24* ve *The Simpsons*'lardan alınmıştır – Richardson'ın tasvirindeki keskinliği daha da doğrular.

Anahtar kelimeler:

Richardson, Pamela, Pamelist, anti-Pamelist, Stockholm sendromu, esaret, esir eden, Patricia Hearst

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Assistant Professor Sheenagh Pietrobruno, for her guidance and support on this thesis.

I would also like to thank the past and present chairs of the English Language and Literature department, Assistant Professor Martin Hicks and Professor Visam Mansur, for their help and encouragement throughout my Masters program in matters both administrative and intellectual.

Another important acknowledgement is owed to the Preparatory School administration for making it possible for me to complete my Masters qualification. Their flexibility and understanding is much appreciated.

To my professors over the last two years, my gratitude for your time, effort and the many things you have taught me.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Başak Güven and Ayşe Tuba Demirel Sucu for their invaluable help with translations.

Last but not least, to the friends and family who have been my mainstays – James Lambert, Assistant Professor Louis Mazzari, Assistant Professor Martin Hicks, Michael McGettigan and Aybike Gökgiray - if it weren't for your confidence in me, there would be no thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In the eighteenth-century classic epistolary novel *Pamela, Or, Virtue Rewarded*, Samuel Richardson introduces his main character of the same name: a young, beautiful and enticingly chaste servant girl who, after manifold trials and tribulations, finds herself happily married to her master, Mr B. Over the course of the novel, the letters and journals of Pamela allow the reader to trace the evolution of the relationship between these two main characters. In short, while Pamela initially maintains that she despises Mr B.'s advances, she eventually comes to welcome his proclamations of love but only when they are offered in the context of marital commitment.

Due to the momentous and rapid reversal in Pamela's declared emotions towards her master, one common interpretation of the novel is that Pamela is not the naive and honest maiden she portrays in her written musings, but instead uses her virtue to manipulate Mr B. into a marriage which is financially and socially much to her advantage. Such interpretation, commonly labeled as anti-Pamelist, constitutes a large share of the literary criticism pertaining to the novel and is also reflected in the countless parodies written by Richardson's contemporaries. The anti-Pamelist perspective views Pamela as dishonest in her motivations and duplicitous in her accounts of her experiences.

The other conventional interpretation of the novel, held by those commonly identified as the Pamelists, mirrors the stated agenda of the author himself, that *Pamela* is a moral tale and that Pamela herself is "an honest and well-meaning person" (Doody 13). According to the Pamelists, Pamela has no secret agenda and no aspirations to rise above her station. Consequently, in the Pamelist view, the

heroine's accounts of her experiences should be read at face value and the stated worth she places upon her chastity must be considered genuine. The Pamelist understanding of the novel encourages the reader to consider that over the course of time, Mr B. experiences a moral and spiritual awakening under the influence of the steadfast model of goodness provided by Pamela. The Pamelist analysis of Richardson's novel allows the eventual union of Pamela and Mr B. in marriage to be considered beyond reproach.

However, as this paper will demonstrate, the circumstances under which the turnaround in Pamela's attitude occur offer an alternate yet compelling explanation for her marked change of heart. This thesis employs modern psychology to conclude that Pamela can be validly considered a hostage victim, that the transformation in Pamela may be described in terms of Stockholm syndrome – a condition in which hostages develop "bonds of attachment to their captors" (Speckhard et al., "Stockholm Effects" 131). A close reading of the novel when compared to both theoretical and case study descriptions of the syndrome reveals that the conditions of Pamela's captivity, as well as her actions during and subsequent to this captivity, map with exceeding accuracy to the Stockholm syndrome profile.

In light of this analysis, Richardson's achievement in his construction of Pamela's character can only be considered extraordinary. At the time the author created *Pamela*, the study of modern psychology could be barely said to be in its infancy. In fact, another two hundred years would pass before Stockholm syndrome was identified and named. The extent of Richardson's achievement is further realised as the portrayal of Pamela in the novel compares favourably with more conscious portrayals of the syndrome in modern sources such as the autobiographical account

of the renowned Stockholm syndrome victim Patricia Hearst, depictions in modern romance fiction, hostage scenario movies such as Pedro Almodóvar's *Tie Me Up, Tie Me Down*, and casual popular culture references in well-known TV shows such as *24* and *The Simpsons.* In fact, even though Richardson did not have the benefit of access to medical texts that delineate this particular psychological condition, incredibly his Pamela matches the formal features of the syndrome much more closely than many of her modern counterparts.

A more thorough exploration would be required to understand to what extent Stockholm syndrome may have been a condition present in eighteenth century society. Nevertheless, a consideration of *Pamela* in a Stockholm syndrome framework allows us to give credit to Richardson's intuitive understanding of possible human reactions in response to hostage situations. It also allows *Pamela* a much more sympathetic audience than has been granted by many of Richardson's detractors to date.

Potentially of interest to *Pamela* scholars past and present, the consideration of Pamela as a victim of Stockholm syndrome permits some sympathy with both the Pamelist and anti-Pamelist arguments. An acceptance of a Stockholm syndrome diagnosis allows Pamela to be considered simultaneously both honest and contradictory in her behaviour.

CHAPTER ONE

NEVER THE TWAIN SHALL MEET?

The 1980 Penguin Classics edition of *Pamela* describes the plot of the novel thus,

> Fifteen-year-old Pamela Andrews, alone and unprotected, is relentlessly pursued by her dead mistress's son. Although she is attracted to young Mr B., she holds out against his demands and threats of abduction and rape, determined to defend her virginity and abide by her own moral standards.

It holds little wonder that a novel promising such an enticing, adventurous and romantic plot has been lauded as "the most popular novel of the [eighteenth] century" (Sale ix). However, the popularity of the novel was accompanied by a substantial level of controversy. Judith Hawley notes that *Pamela* "caused a sensation when it was first published" (vii). Perhaps more importantly, as Margaret Doody identifies, "*Pamela* has never ceased being a controversial work" (7) or as expressed by Stuart Wilson, "If the hallmark of a good novel is seemingly endless argument about its meaning, then Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* deserves some kind of accolade" (79). That such controversy endures – despite the fact that the world of publishing now incorporates a thriving romance industry where Pamela's plight is commonplace and the captive heroine is a stock character – is indeed intriguing.

To lend credence to Doody and Wilson's claims regarding the continued debate pertaining to this eighteenth century novel, consider the fact that a major scholarly work entitled *The Pamela Controversy: Criticisms and Adaptations of*

Samuel Richardson's Pamela, 1740-1750[1] was published as recently as December 2000, some 260 years after the novel itself. A current retail price of £495[2] suggests institutional libraries as the target market for the publication, thereby indicating the level of academic interest Richardson's novel continues to attract.

Such continued interest raises questions regarding what exactly is controversial about the novel. Why does it continue to spark the fascination of the academic world? Do the original debates about the novel continue to drive the discussion or have they become *passé*? And critically, can there really be anything new to say about Richardson's most famous literary work?

The one challenge *Pamela* continues to present, the main point of contention which remains, is how to read the development of Pamela's character over the course of the novel. To date, critical interpretation has fallen into two main schools of thought. These are, as identified by Ian Watt in *The Rise of the Novel*, the Pamelists and the anti-Pamelists (168). In the view of the former group, *Pamela* is the moral tale of a virtuous girl who values her virginity. For the Pamelists, the honesty of the heroine is indubitable and she can thus be considered a reliable narrator of her experiences. In the estimation of the latter group, the anti-Pamelists, Pamela successfully contrives behind a masquerade of purity to ensure her prosperous union in marriage to her master. As such, she must be considered an unreliable narrator whose actions betray her true motivations and seriously undermine the heroine's written accounts of her experiences.

While this thesis tenders a new perspective – that Pamela can be considered a victim of Stockholm syndrome – it seems first prudent to undertake a more comprehensive survey of the major arguments tendered by both the Pamelists and the

anti-Pamelists. Such analysis is important not only for the sake of providing relevant theoretical background. As will be later exemplified, viewing the novel in the context of Stockholm syndrome provides an opportunity for some resolution between the two seemingly opposed positions held by the Pamela supporters and the Pamela skeptics.

1.1 The Pamelists

The Pamelists of the eighteenth century "praised the novel enthusiastically both for its liveliness and its morality" (Doody 7) and accepted Richardson's themes and the motivations of the main character precisely as they are explicated in the story. The Pamela of the early Pamelists is a trusted source of intelligence regarding not only herself but also the attitudes and behaviour of other central characters in the novel. For these believers, when Pamela states that she would "die a thousand deaths, rather than be dishonest any way" (Richardson 47), in the eyes of the Pamelists this can have only one possible interpretation – that Pamela would choose death over sinfulness.

Pamela's supporters, as described by Alan D. McKillop, were a reasonably innocuous group who,

> Apart from personal friends like Hill, Cibber, and Dr. Delany, the admirers of *Pamela* whose praises were carefully docketed by Richardson and filed among his papers turn out to be obscure clergymen and anonymous or pseudonymous correspondents. (425-426)

However, despite their obscurity relative to their anti-Pamelist rivals, the Pamelists did attempt to support Richardson's work publicly, their sentiment and their faith in

the novel's heroine expressed in such public works as the following poem crafted by Aaron Hill, one of Richardson's aforementioned contemporaries and also a writer,

> O PAMELA! – what native charms were thine!
> Nervously soft, and modestly divine!
> High, without straining, was thy matchless flight,
> And all unmix'd with pain, thou gav'st delight! (qtd. in Donovan 377)

Hill's depiction of Pamela reflects the portrayal found in the character's own letters and journals – beautiful and charming yet modest, a figure to be admired rather than denigrated.

Modern day critics similarly speak out on behalf of Pamela. Wilson, while not strictly speaking a Pamelist, argues in support of Pamela's honesty. He states that "There is no reason to believe that her ingenuousness, so often maligned as calculating, is anything other than genuine" ("Richardson's Pamela" 80). Unlike the heroine's eighteenth century supporters, Wilson utilises a combination of close textual analysis and Freudian pyschology to argue that Pamela's journals are an honest reflection of her conscience and that she is genuinely unaware of her subconscious sexual desire. Robert A. Donovan, a more moderate supporter of Pamela, similarly concedes that Pamela may experience some sexual awakening as a consequence of her master's expressed desire, but purports that she is nevertheless honest in her proclaimed desire to protect her virginity. He states that he "can find no convincing evidence that the attraction of Mr B.'s person ever outweigh for her those of virtue" (381).

As the abovementioned quote from Wilson reveals, this modern-day scholar of *Pamela* challenges the anti-Pamelist accusations of dishonesty based on a want of

textual support for such claims, "[t]here is no reason to believe" ("Richardson's Pamela" 80) that Pamela is lying. Indeed, textual analysis adopting a Pamelist eye furthers the arguments proferred by the heroine's supporters. As a case in point, consider the anti-Pamelist claims regarding Pamela's materialistic and monetary desires. On several occassions during her adventures Pamela has opportunities to benefit financially from her master's offers but rejects such opportunities time and again. Pamela refuses gifts of money and clothing which would have considerably changed her financial circumstances. To illustrate, as Pamela is leaving the Lincolnshire estate to return to her parents, despite her abduction and not withstanding the duress she has been subjected to, she states, "I'll have no portmanteau, I assure you, nor any thing besides what I have on, except these few things that I brought with me in my handkerchief" (Richardson 279).

The anti-Pamelists may argue that Pamela was patiently awaiting a much more substantial reward than that which she could carry on her person. However, upon her departure from Lincolnshire, Pamela had no conceivable means of foreseeing an imminent change of circumstances and her return to the estate, thus it is difficult to argue that the heroine was embroiled in any surreptitious scheming at this juncture. At times Pamela does acknowledge her own confusion in the face of the generous proposals of her master. However, directly contradicting anti-Pamelist claims to the contrary, it is not personal greed that she is tempted by, but instead an awareness of the financial relief that Mr B.'s proposals would confer upon her parents; "Why he will make my poor father and mother's life comfortable. O! said I to myself, that is a rich thought; but let me not dwell upon it, for fear I should indulge it to my ruin" (117).

Richardson's own actions lend credibility to the Pamelist argument. In later versions of the novel, reprinted several times in the 20 years between its first publication and the author's death, Richardson undertook extensive revisions of his original work to address the criticisms of anti-Pamelists. He revised the text itself to "smooth away" passages which provided support for his critics' arguments (Hawley xii) and he removed the original self-promoting 'puffery' which according to McKillop had been censured not only by Richardson's critics but also his admirers (425).

The Pamelist position is clearly conveyed in Doody's observation that "Richardson's character is an honest and well-meaning person from a fairly stable background and she wants, like most of us, to live an honest life within her own social world" (13) and within the novel, in Pamela's own reflections: "I write the very words I said" (Richardson 111). In short, the heroine's claim to honesty is central to the Pamelist understanding of the novel.

As will be elucidated in subsequent analysis, to consider Pamela a victim of Stockholm syndrome requires the reader to adopt this position – that Pamela was sincere, that her narration of her experiences was truthful and that she at no time manipulated, contrived or planned to secure a successful marriage to Mr B. Though, as we shall see, this thesis requires a more sophisticated and complex understanding than the simplistic Pamelist equation: Pamela is honest.

1.2 The Anti-Pamelists

Despite having conceded some substantiation of the Pamelist argument, an understanding of the *Pamela* controversy is incomplete without granting

consideration to the view of the anti-Pamelists. To admit Pamela's honesty does not require a complete and categorical rejection of the anti-Pamelists argument.

Robert Palfrey Utter and Gwendolyn Bridges Needham summarise the perspective of the anti-Pamelists as follows,

> Shrewdly or intuitively [Pamela] saw that she had a dowry that was as good as cash in the right market. She used it cleverly while the game was playing; love came to her aid, and she won what was the only approved prize in the woman's market of her day, marriage. (20)

In this extremely cynical interpretation, Pamela's proclaimed position that her "virtue was not to be subdued" (Richardson 123) is viewed as a sham undertaken to ensure that she secures not just the physical admiration but also the marital commitment of Mr B. As Donovan notes, to the anti-Pamelists,

> Pamela's sudden capitulation to Mr. B. is taken, at best, as the expression of a simple-minded, hopelessly commercial ethic, naively translated into sentimental platitudes. At its worst it is seen as the triumph of acquisitiveness, consciously cloaked by specious "virtue". (378)

In short, the anti-Pamelists assume that Pamela's naivety is feigned and that Pamela's ultimate success in securing her prize, a rich and influential husband, is based on contrivance.

As a by-product of their own argument – that Pamela willfully misrepresents herself throughout the novel – it is difficult to find textual support for the anti-Pamelist position on the novel itself except by virtue of rudimentary analysis of the plot: at the beginning of the novel Pamela is poor, single and of low economic status;

but by the midpoint of the story she is rich, married and increasingly accepted as a member of the upper class. It is precisely this divide between Pamela's oft proclaimed values and her eventual willingness to become the wife of Mr B. that forms the foundation of the anti-Pamelist argument. For this group, Pamela's behaviour cannot be reconciled with her words; it is only by considering her actions that her true nature and her true desires are revealed.

The anti-Pamelists had firm leadership in the eighteenth century literary elite. Interestingly, these early anti-Pamelists would not have known that Richardson was the author of Pamela as the novel was originally published anonymously (Hawley vii) so it was truly the text and the characters, not the author, that were under attack. The most vocal critics of *Pamela* in England included among them Henry Fielding and Eliza Haywood, author of the 1741 publication blatantly entitled *Anti-Pamela: or, Feigned Innocence Detected*. Even John Cleland's *Memoirs of a Women of Pleasure*, "[t]raditionally considered the first great pornographic work in English" ("John Cleland"), is treated among the anti-Pamela's of the mid-eighteenth century.

Perhaps the best known of *Pamela*'s critics is Fielding who made Richardson's work, specifically the character of Pamela, the target of ridicule in his burlesque parody *Shamela*.[3] McKillop describes *Shamela* as the "most trenchant of the anti-Pamelas of 1741" (424). In this mock epistolary novel, where even the length of the work (around 38 pages) seems in opposition to Richardson's weighty tome, Fielding portrays "Richardson's heroine as a hypocrite whose masterly deployment of the resources of the feminine role enabled her to entrap a rich booby into marriage" (Watt 168).

This highly comic lampoon of *Pamela* leaves no aspect of Richardson's novel

untouched. The title page emulates the style of *Pamela*'s first edition,

> *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews*. In which, the many notorious Falsehoods and Misrepresentations of a Book called *Pamela*, are exposed and refuted; and all the matchless Arts of that young Politician, set in a true and just Light.

Haywood adopts a similar approach in her *Anti-Pamela* which includes the following description on its title page,

> A Narrative which has really its Foundation in Truth and Nature; and at the same time that it entertains, by a vast variety of surprising Incidents, arms against a partial Credulity, by shewing the Mischiefs that frequently arise from a too sudden Admiration. Publish'd as a necessary Caution to all Young Gentlemen.

Shamela also includes its own letters of commendation and statements pertaining to the moral and educational purpose of the book, mimicking the introductory puffery in *Pamela*. Mr B.'s character is renamed Mr Booby, a word meaning stupid person or dunce since the sixteenth century ("booby," *OED Online*), reflecting how foolishly Richardson's leading male character falls into his servant's trap. As highlighted by Hawley, "Fielding signals his refusal to believe Pamela's report of herself by inserting 'I pretended' in his shamming heroine's protestations of innocence" (vii).[4] In doing this, Fielding calls into question almost every traumatic moment of Pamela's experiences at the hands of Mr B. In *Shamela*, Fielding accuses Pamela of being a master manipulator who is fully cognisant of the power that she holds in her relationship with her master when he has Shamela blatantly state her motivations, accentuating the major criticism of the anti-Pamelists, "I thought once

of making a little Fortune by my Person. I now intend to make a great one by my Vartue" (*Shamela* 29).

Fielding's literary critique of Richardson didn't cease with *Shamela*. Instead he continued to parody *Pamela*'s main characters and themes much more extensively in *Joseph Andrews*. Herein the narrator waxes lyrical regarding the "Talents" (294) and "deceit" (295) employed by the "Female or fair World" in the name of love (*Joseph Andrews* 295). The narrator declares that,

> the more they love him, the more ardently they counterfeit the Antipathy. By the continual and constant Practice of which Deceit on others, they at length impose on themselves, and really believe they hate what they love. (296)

This is at least a somewhat sympathetic interpretation of women, that is, the fairer sex are acknowledged as victims as well as perpetrators of 'deceit'. Despite the mildly benevolent attitude, Pamela viewed in the context of this philosophy can not be taken at her word. She must instead be deemed a champion of falsehood when she asserts, "Black-hearted wretch, how I hate him!" (Richardson 120) early in the novel.[5]

Where did the anti-Pamelists gain such fervour from? How could Richardson's work have inspired the prolific protests of Fielding, the lengthy refutation of Haywood's *Anti-Pamela* or the numerous allusions of Cleland? The spate of anti-Pamelist literature is indicative of a healthy readership, but for what reasons?

Certainly, Pamela's credibility is tested by the epistolary style of the majority of the text. According to Mel A. Topf,

> since the novel is first-person narrated, the world of the novel is wholly subjective. I contend that not only did Fielding *not* fail to perceive this, but that *it is precisely Pamela's subjectivism, with its inherent ambiguity concerning human motives, that Fielding attacked*. (1190)

Such subjectivity was not only a feature of Fielding's anti-Pamelist works but is also central to Haywood's depiction of Pamela double, Syrena Tricksy.

In keeping with Topf's analysis regarding the lack of objectivity inherent in a first person narrative, *Pamela*'s original audience may well have been conditioned to read Richardson's novel based on their experience of Daniel Defoe's early creation, *Moll Flanders*. Defoe's work purported in its Preface to be a moral tale of penitence, wherein "there is not a wicked action in any part of it, but is first and last rendered unhappy and unfortunate" (3). However, as highlighted by John McCormick, neither the central character's own revelations nor the intentions of the author himself were consistent with such proclamations, "Moll Flanders is a deeply sensual woman whose frequent, perfunctory penitence neither she nor we believe in; nor did her creator, Defoe" (137). It is highly conceivable that early readers familiar with Defoe's ironic deployment of his central character viewed Richardson's Pamela as similarly manipulative in her relationship with her readers.

As a consequence of Richardson's chosen narrative form, it is Pamela's professed modesty that most readily falls into question. The reader is subjected to Pamela's accounts of no end of compliments which have been bestowed upon her; "[Mr Longman] said once to Mrs Jervis, he wished he was a young man for my sake" (Richardson 74); and as described by Mrs Jervis, "You are too *pretty*, my sweet

mistress, and it may be, too *virtuous*" (81). Hawley identifies the dilemma presented by the first person narrative when she describes that throughout her letters and journals, Pamela "has to present herself as modest yet at the same time busily records all the praise that comes her way" (xiii). Certainly, Richardson's attempts to have Pamela communicate, with modesty, the compliments she has received are at times rendered clumsily. When presented with the circuitous account of the flattering observation of Lady Davers, "at table, as our butler Jonathon told Mrs Jervis, and she me, my master and her ladyship talking of me, she told him she thought me the prettiest wench she ever saw in her life" (Richardson 48), it is hardly surprising that such inconsistency between claimed modesty and the need for self promotion provided a natural target for the anti-Pamelists.

Adding further fuel to the anti-Pamelist fire, Pamela as a character is, at times, not particularly likeable. Consider her attitude when she hears of 'Squire Martin who has had three recent lyings-in in his household and states, "what sort of creatures must the women be, do you think, to give way to such wickedness? That it is that makes every one be thought of alike" (103). Here she is judgmental in the extreme, displaying no empathy or compassion for young women who may well be living in situations not strikingly different to her own. In a similarly admonishing tone, Pamela displays that she is in possession of a poisonous pen when she harshly criticises a fellow servant, Jane, for her lack of regular prayer (131). In addition, Pamela's melodramatic style may not have endeared readers to her cause – "'ask me now no questions, but let the maids carry me up to my prison; and there let me die decently, and in peace!' Indeed I thought I could not live two hours" (216) – but instead encouraged skepticism and tested credulity.

Offering a further perspective, Marlene LeGates argues that the passion of the anti-Pamelists may have been partly fueled by what she refers to as pre-Enlightenment readings, whereby Pamela's character was viewed through a seventeenth century perspective which typified women as having an "inclination to sexuality and disobedience" (22). In LeGates' view, the image of women began to change in the eighteenth century to "chaste maiden" and "obedient wife" (23) and it was this more enlightened view where "family, religion, and the state are now identified with women rather than seen as being threatened by her" (30) that Richardson was presenting. However, as *Pamela* was written at the beginning of this trend, this more enlightened view of women was not familiar and thus may have invoked cynicism and disbelief among many readers of the novel.

While it may be difficult with a lack of textual support and oftentimes flawed reasoning to accept the anti-Pamelist argument in its entirety, there is merit in questioning the discrepancy between Pamela's reflections and her actions. It does seem both remarkable and inconceivable that Pamela's abductor so swiftly transforms in her perception from "wicked designer" (Richardson 143) to "the condescending one" (288). That Pamela so readily agrees to marriage once it is offered implies at least some level of latent desire to be wedded to Mr B. all along.

The anti-Pamelist view maintains that such discordance is explained by Pamela's cleverly enacted plan; that she always had her master and marriage set firmly in her sights. However, as will be explored in the pages which follow, Stockholm syndrome similarly accounts for dissonance between the inherent nature of a person and their actions. A consideration of Stockholm syndrome also allows the anti-Pamelists to dislike the heroine but nevertheless concur with her classification as

a Stockholm syndrome victim for, as Claudia Card observes, “Being a victim does not imply that one has the character of an angel” (“Women” 512).[6]

Notably, Stockholm syndrome accounts for both the Pamelists adherance to the honesty of Pamela’s accounts and the anti-Pamelist focus on the irrational discrepancy between Pamela’s stated values and her chosen course in life. Thus, accepting the interpretation presented herein offers the opportunity for partial reconciliation between these long estabished points of opposition.

CHAPTER TWO

TOWARD AN ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS: AN INTRODUCTION TO STOCKHOLM SYNDROME

Prior to embarking upon an analysis of *Pamela* using the pyschological paradigm of Stockholm syndrome, it is first necessary to have a detailed understanding of what the syndrome entails.

Stockholm syndrome is a psychological condition which, although only recognised relatively recently, is now widely documented. A generally agreed definition for this syndrome refers to,

> the reaction of individuals or groups taken hostage whether in terrorism or other criminal act[s, who become] emotionally attached to their captors, while trying to mitigate [the] life-threatening stressful conditions of the situation. (Gordon 50)

Definitions of the condition also emphasise the seeming inexplicability of the syndrome, given its "paradoxical" and "irrational" nature (De Fabrique et al., "Understanding" 12).

2.1 Overview

It is perhaps because the Stockholm response appears so counter-intuitive that it remained so long undiscovered and unexplored. In fact, Stockholm syndrome was first named by psychologist Nils Bejerot following a robbery of a Stockholm branch of the Swedish bank, Kreditbanken, only as recently as August 1973. During this robbery, four hostages were taken and held captive for six days. After their rescue it

was discovered that some of the hostages had developed a strong psychological attachment to their captors to the extent that one captive "fell in love with and became engaged to one of the robbers and publicly berated the Swedish prime minister for his failure to understand the robber's point of view" (Card, *Atrocity* 213-214). Pertinent to the tale of Pamela, other accounts include statements that this same hostage later went on to marry the hostage taker (Sumaya-Smith 447) and even that she had consensual sex during the hostage incident (Fuselier 24). Although these latter details are mentioned much less frequently in accounts of the original Stockholm event and may possibly stem from an exaggeration or dramatisation of the known facts, there is no question that an unusual relationship developed between these hostages and the bank robbers who held them hostage. As further testimony to the existence and nature of the Stockholm bond,

> None of the captives have publicly denounced the behaviour of their captors. [In addition], Reports exist that the four captives refused to testify at the trial and even raised money for their kidnappers' legal fee. (Namnyak et al. 8)

Irrational, paradoxical and counter-intuitive – yes, but the seemingly impossible responses of the Kreditbanken hostages are now documented and accepted as real and identifiable consequences of a hostage scenario.

Since this initial determination, countless cases of and situations within which Stockholm syndrome can arise have been identified. Perhaps the most famous and often quoted account is the case of Patty Hearst who was kidnapped by the Symbionese Liberation Army in 1974 and went on to commit crimes on their behalf (Dutton 162). Providing more detail, Namnyak et al. report that "For the first 57 days

of her captivity she was locked in a closet and subjected to physical and sexual abuse, following which she remained loyal to her captors and even assisted them in terrorist activity" (7).

Another case often referred to in literature pertaining to Stockholm syndrome is that of kidnap victim Elizabeth Smart who, after being held hostage for an extended time where she "was physically and psychologically abused; tied to a tree, kept in a hole and threatened with a knife . . . had opportunities to escape which she never utilized" (Namnyak et al. 7). On the contrary, "she walked in public, attended parties, and even refused to reveal her true identity when first approached by police" (De Fabrique et al., "Understanding" 10).

Stockholm syndrome has also been used to explain the complex situation behind North Korean abductions of Japanese citizens, a front page news item in Japan for several decades. As reported by Patricia J. Steinhoff,

> One of the most puzzling parts of the story is the fact that some of the young wives who had been lured to North Korea did not use the opportunity to escape and return to Japan when they were later sent out of the country. The Yodogo members [that is, the kidnappers] offer this as proof that their wives were not coerced. However, their behavior is consistent with the well-documented "Stockholm Syndrome" and with the types of coercive control the women experienced. (140)

Among countless contemporary examples, and highlighting that the syndrome is not a gender specific phenemenon, the syndrome has also been used to describe the circumstances of other hostage cases which feature in recent memory,

including a 1994 hostage situation in a New York high school (De Fabrique et al., "Common Variables" 96) and the 2002 Chechen rebel attack on a Moscow theater (Speckhard et al., "Research Note"). Subsequent to the increased understanding of Stockholm syndrome there have also been significant developments in using the syndrome to understand the dynamics of domestic abuse (Brookoff et al.), child abuse, and even the emotional relationships that develop between nursing home residents and their caregivers (Sumaya-Smith 448).

Significantly, Stockholm syndrome has been used to retrospectively describe what may be considered anomalies in the documented history of human behaviour. In her article "Decolonizing the 1862 Death Marches", Waziyatawin Angela Wilson proposes that due to a Stockholm-like bond,

> many Dakota people in 1862 and in the subsequent generations have denied the perpetration of tremendous violence by the invaders and have attempted to focus on what they (mis)construe as positive benefits of colonization. (207)

Similar explanations have been employed to explain the bond between African-American slaves and their masters (Huddleston-Mattai and Mattai), psychological conditions developed by American Japanese who were held in internment camps during World War Two (Mura) and Jewish concentration camp prisoners who "emulated their captors to the extent of sewing scraps together to imitate SS uniforms and taking over punitive rule-enforcement functions vis-à-vis new prisoners" (Dutton 164).

2.2 Debate

There remains a noteworthy level of academic debate surrounding Stockholm syndrome. As M. Namnyak et al. report, “little work in this field ha[s] been published” (5). Perhaps as a consequence of this lack of investigation, Stockholm syndrome as a diagnosis is “not included in any international classification system of psychiatry” (5) and is “rarely mentioned in peer-reviewed academic research” (9). Despite the lack of research and a seeming reluctance on the part of the medical community to formally distinguish Stockholm syndrome from other post traumatic stress responses, there does not seem to be any significant dispute regarding the actual existence of the condition. Debate is more in the realm of fully understanding, defining and quantifying the prevalence of a condition which has potentially been “overemphasized, overanalyzed, overpsychologized, and overpublicized” (Fuselier 22) and which, given the traumatic nature of the causal factors and potential outcomes, can not be simulated for the purposes of further study in an ethical manner – the standard method in which modern science gains insight and information into new areas of research.

Most importantly, despite the many examples available for discussion and analysis, not all hostages develop the condition. Statistical accounts of the syndrome’s prevalence vary significantly. All of the victims of the original Stockholm bank robbery are reported to have formed a Stockholm bond. From a sample of 11 victims of the Moscow theatre siege, researchers found 10 to exhibit features of Stockholm syndrome (Cantor and Price 379). However, larger scale database analysis reveals it more likely that only very small percentages of hostage victims are likely to develop the condition. Nathalie De Fabrique et al. state that

"According to the FBI's Hostage Barricade Database System, which contains data pertaining to over 4,700 reported federal, state, and local hostage/barricade incidents, 73 percent of captives show no evidence of Stockholm syndrome" ("Understanding" 12). Even more conservative in his estimate, G. Dwayne Fuselier reports that from "1,200 reported federal, state, and local hostage/barricade incidents, 92 percent of the victims of such incidents reportedly showed no aspect of the Stockholm Syndrome" (23).

Research regarding who is and is not vulnerable to Stockholm syndrome is far from complete (De Fabrique et al., "Common Variables" 97) but nevertheless the level of investigation undertaken to date seems both rigorous and descriptive enough to be applied in the context of literary analysis.

2.3 Preconditions

To understand Stockholm syndrome fully, the condition must be considered both in terms of the preconditions necessary for its development and the subsequent symptoms or presentations which the victim develops.

As is the case for many psychological conditions, Stockholm syndrome can not be strictly described in black and white terms. However, observers generally appear to agree with Meg Kennedy Dugan and Roger R. Hock's identification of four basic preconditions which promote the development of Stockholm syndrome (15):

2.3.1 The victim feels threatened.

This may be a threat of death or substantial physical harm which the victim believes the captor is capable of carrying out. As described by a hostage in a

1981 heist of a US law enforcement facility, he was “convinced that any incitement [of the gunman] could cause his death” (Wesselius and DeSarno 36).

2.3.2 The victim cannot envisage their escape and sees their life in the hands of their captor.

In short, “[t]he captor becomes the person in control of the captive’s basic needs for survival” (De Fabrique et al., “Understanding” 14).

2.3.3 The victim is isolated and cannot foresee their rescue by family or friends.

As described by De Fabrique et al., “Perpetrators routinely keep information about the outside world’s response to their actions from captives to keep them totally dependant” (“Understanding” 14).

2.3.4 The behaviour of the captor is intermittently violent and kind which increases the sense of dependence in the victim.

Again, as described by the victim of the 1981 heist of a U.S. law enforcement agency, “During the siege, he [the gunman] rapidly switched from calm behavior to agitated behavior with little or no provocation” (Wesselius and DeSarno 35). This kindness may be overt but as most succinctly described by Machiavelli, “Men, when they receive good from whence they expect evil, feel the more indebted to their benefactor (qtd. in De Fabrique et al., “Understanding” 10). Thus, the intermittent withdrawal of abuse may constitute a sufficient precondition for the development of Stockholm syndrome.

2.4 Symptoms and indicators

2.4.1 The hostage – captor bond

As previously outlined, although many hostages undergo the necessary preconditions, only a subset of these victims develop Stockholm syndrome. The syndrome can be confirmed by the presence of one single but crucial indicator: the development of positive feelings by the victim toward their captor. It is easy to discriminate between the Stockholm sufferer and the non-sufferer by considering interviews conducted by Anne Speckhard et al. with hostages who survived the Chechen rebel attack on a Moscow theatre in 2002. As Speckhard et al. report, while "one hostage states that he felt no relationship with the terrorists. 'I am not sorry that they died'" ("Stockholm Effects" 132), many who had undergone the same experience reported strange and unusual emotional responses: "One hostage observes, 'When I came to (from the gas) I felt very sorry that they were all killed. The young one she never took a baby in her hands, ever.' . . . Another states, "I feel sorry for them (that they died)" (132).

In interviews with hostages from a 1981 siege, Cassie L. Wesselius and James V. DeSarno reported similar discrepencies in responses. Using the abbreviations HT for Hostage Taker and HB for a hostage anonymised as 'B', they report that

> All of the other hostages described HT as dirty, malodorous, and carelessly dressed. HB, however, described HT as clean cut, attractive and well dressed . . . [and] thought it was terrible that he was shot. (37)

2.4.2 Other possible indicators

In addition to this emotional bond, the presence of other specific emotions and behaviours has been observed in Stockholm syndrome victims (Carver par. 10):

Many victims have been noted to express negative feelings toward people trying to assist their escape. To illustrate, again from interviews with survivors of the Chechen rebel attack, one of the hostages stated that,

> At first I was happy about the storm, at first. But there is a different face of the terrorist and the face of those soldiers (who stormed the theater). I like the face of the terrorist better. I think of it a lot, especially of the old, calm and kind terrorist (Aslan). (Speckhard et al., "Stockholm Effects" 132)

The interviews conducted by Wesselius and DeSarno reveal similar sympathies when HB describes "angry feelings toward the negotiator because she thought that if the authorities had provided HT with his chaplain [as requested], all the hostages would have been out of danger" (37).

The main cause of this particular symptom is identified as a fear that the authorities themselves endanger the lives of hostages. From their research and interviews, Wesselius and DeSarno conclude that "Most hostages' fear of being killed in a police assault is equal to their fear of the hostage taker" (45).

Another common emotion of Stockholm syndrome victims is that they come to support the behaviours and attitudes of the captor. As described by Namnyak et al., this is a direct consequence of the victim being "subjected only to the captive's perspective" (9). As Steinhoff observed in her study of Japanese captives held in North Korea:

> Keeping people in isolation for an extended period and repeating a single point of view incessantly causes disorientation and eventual capitulation unless one has a very strong will and internal focus. (128)

Often sufferers are also described as unable to undertake behaviours or actions which could assist in their release. One final, intriguing factor is that captors often develop positive feelings toward their victims, revealing that the captor is also vulnerable to the unconscious Stockholm bond.

2.5 Causes of Stockholm Syndrome

The possible explanations offered for the development of Stockholm syndrome are as interesting as the condition itself. In their article “Stockholm Effects and Psychological Responses to Captivity in Hostages Held by Suicidal Terrorists”, Speckhard et al. outline the generally accepted facts regarding the development of a Stockholm bond (“Research Note” 132). That it:

- is automatic
- is unconscious
- is triggered by fear
- enhances the victim’s ability to cope with captivity
- minimises the likelihood of violence
- increases the victim’s chances of survival

Beyond this short list there are many and varied descriptions as to why the syndrome develops. Namnyak et al. describe the process as follows:

> Strong states of arousal, caused by fear, may be misinterpreted as attraction (bonding); by labeling these feelings as love, it provides the hostage with hope and therefore possible routes of escape. (7)

In this description, the mind is unable to comprehend the negative emotional state created by captivity and therefore converts it into a positive emotional state. Namnyak et al. also theorise that the personality changes associated with a Stockholm syndrome bond represent a pseudo-identity which is created by the victim in order to "create a psychological separation between their normal world and the captive state" (7). Psychiatrists have identified the development of such a pseudo-identity in the case of Patricia Hearst and believe that the criminal acts performed by the hostage on behalf of her captors can be explained by the presence of the alternative personality the victim developed under conditions of duress (Card, "Women" 510).

Another proffered explanation is that the Stockholm bond is a consequence of a process of appeasement, comprising "pacification, conciliation and submission" (Cantor and Price 380). Subscribers to this explanation or causality believe that the victim learns to understand the likes and dislikes of the captor, that hostages "attend carefully to the behaviour of the terrorist and modulate their behavior accordingly" (Speckhard et al., "Stockholm Effects" 137), and that they "become highly attuned to the pleasure and displeasure reactions of their captors" (De Fabrique et al., "Understanding" 14). De Fabrique and her colleagues summarise the consequences: that "victims seem more concerned about the perpetrator's feelings than their own" ("Understanding" 14), making unconscious and often uncharacteristic decisions in order to increase their chances of survival.

Further speculation regarding why Stockholm syndrome manifests uses identification as its core concept. According to this explanation, the hostage victim adopts or introjects the perspective of the captor in order to reduce the discomfort caused by cognitive dissonance, the gap between their own world view and that of the perpetrator (Cantor and Price 379). Card offers some interesting insight into this idea in her discussion of Patty Hearst. In Card's analysis, while the victim first made a conscious decision to emulate the position of her captors in order to maximise her chances of survival, later in her ordeal "she sided with her captors" ("Women" 511) rather than taking an opportunity to escape and reported feeling "puzzled" (511) when reflecting on her actions, not able to find a logical explanation or rationale for the choices she had made. According to Card, as the process of identification takes a firm hold on the victim,

> the victim may take up that perspective not just as though it were her own but as her own, at least in the sense of its being the only operative perspective that she now has. Her choices may come to seem normal to her, no longer even morally problematic. (510)

If decisions no longer cause moral conflict, then identification is complete.

Some observers undertake a Freudian analysis to explain the development of Stockholm syndrome. Robert D. Hinshelwood uses psychoanalytic theory to question the idea of "consistent personal identity" distinguishing between conscious and unconscious states (122). In his analysis, Hinshelwood uses the process of transference to explain how hostages may come to adopt the attitudes of the hostage taker. He explains that the circumstances of captivity force the hostage to relinquish

power, self-governance and self-determination to the captor and that the eventual bond which is witnessed to develop under such extreme conditions,

> comes from the depleted subject's attempts to recover lost and valuable parts of himself which now reside in the torturer. . . . The subject unconsciously can only conceive of recovery through attachment to that object in which these important parts of himself now exist. (135)

Thus, in the most simple of terms, Freudian analysis describes the formation of a bond between captor and captive as a need for a sense of wholeness which can only be realised through the development of a strong emotional attachment by the person who has lost control to the person who has gained control.

One of the more interesting theories regarding the development of Stockholm syndrome, albeit perhaps the least convincing, draws upon the ideas of Darwin as its basis. This idea is introduced by Chris Cantor and John Price with the following brief rationale:

> Hunter-gatherer women have been remarkably frequently kidnapped by opposing tribes, with little likelihood of rescue. From an evolutionary perspective defiance in such circumstances carries the prospect of death and the non-transmission of related genes. Submission and defection may promote genetic survival. . . . Thus the transmission of genes for appeasement may have been facilitated. (380)

H. Keith Henson also proposes genetics as the most likely explanation and elucidates,

> Those [captured women] who had the pyschological traits (ultimately gene-based mechanisms) that led them to socially reorient after a few days (i.e., bond) to their captors often survived to pass on the trait. Those who continued to resist, because they didn't have this trait, often became breakfast. . . . Once you understand the evolutionary origin of this trait and its critical nature in genetic survival and reproduction in the ancestral human environment, related mysterious human psychological states fall into place. (446)

Among the list of psychological human mysteries Henson attributes to this process of natural selection are not only Stockholm syndrome but also rituals such as fraternity bonding and more violent sexual preferences such as sadism and sadomasochism.

2.6 The Foundation for a New Analysis of *Pamela*

It is immediately clear that in his creation of Pamela's character Richardson was not influenced by such pyschological and scientific theory – Freud and Darwin's views were popularised more than a century after the publication of *Pamela*. Despite a certain popularity for the kidnapping of brides in Richardson's era, it is extremely unlikely that the phenomenon was so prevalent that the author would have witnessed, or could have had time to witness, a process of natural selection as inspiration for his novel. What is of more interest and relevance is a recognition of the opportunity that the Stockholm syndrome paradigm offers for a reassessment of Richardson's novel.

As expressed succinctly by Hawley, "The fact that Pamela eventually succumbs to the man who has pursued, kidnapped and assaulted her has been taken by many as a sign that she was shamming resistance" (xii). This is indeed the only

possible reading purported by the anti-Pamelists. However, with a knowledge of late twentieth century psychology and particularly Stockholm syndrome, a number of terms used here – 'succumbs', 'kidnapped' and 'assaulted' – alert the modern reader to the fact that under such conditions of duress, an accusation of 'shamming' may perhaps overlook a more compelling explanation for the significant shift in Pamela's feelings. Rather than creating an underhanded mercenary figure, perhaps Richardson has captured in his character a hostage displaying what modern science has since termed Stockholm syndrome.

The analyses and commentaries of several other critics similarly expose the possibility for this alternative reading of *Pamela*. William M. Sale describes Pamela as "swept away into Lincolnshire, where her ability to mold events by her own will is closely restricted" (qtd. in Donovan 380), hereby highlighting Pamela's powerlessness, undermining the anti-Pamelist perspective of the heroine as controlling and manipulative. Sale also identifies Pamela as being in possession of a "divided mind" (xii) and while he attributes this division to her struggle between virtue and her sexual desire (xii-xiii), is this necessarily the crux of the struggle? Could not this same 'divided mind' also be interpreted as Pamela's battle between her real self and her unconscious transformation as the unnatural bond she feels toward her captor takes hold of her?

Wilson identifies Pamela's desire to stay in the employment of Mr B. until she has finished embroidering his vest as Pamela being "attracted unconsciously to what she fears most" ("Richardson's Pamela" 83). However once an 'unconscious' process is acknowledged, that is, one outside the heroine's ken or control, this again allows alternative analysis to be applied to the psychological situation of Pamela. Is

she simply ‘attracted’ unconsciously or is her unconscious behaviour driven by other influences that are now known to occur in situations where a significant power differential exists? Wilson also refers to Pamela’s subconscious state when he writes that “we can observe the demon gaining possession of Pamela long before she is aware of its presence” (83), presenting an opportunity for the reader to consider what, exactly, the demon is and how it can potentially be defined. Is it necessarily the demon lust, or could it be the Stockholm bond which is ‘gaining possession’ of the heroine? Offering further support to this alternative perspective, this same critic, who approaches the text from a Freudian analytical perspective, acknowledges Pamela’s projection:

> We should note here an aspect of Pamela’s reaction to stress that becomes more frequent as her anxiety increases; she tends to project her fears externally so that the objects or places with which they are associated take on unique symbolic significance. Repeatedly, we see her try to alleviate her fears by projecting them away from herself. (83)

If we accept that Pamela is indeed projecting *a la* Freud, it is similar unconscious behaviour which psychoanalytic interpretation attributes as the cause of Stockholm syndrome.

Offering further credence to the possibilities for a new reading of *Pamela*, Hawley remarks that in “[o]bserving Pamela’s inner drama of resistance and seduction, the reader gradually develops an insight into a young woman’s psychological world unprecedented in English prose fiction” (xiii). Again, while Hawley chooses to identify the opposing forces experienced by Pamela as ‘resistance

and seduction', a modern-day understanding of human psychology allows us to reconsider the nature of these opposing forces and to examine the 'psychological world' which Pamela presents within the Stockholm syndrome framework. As Pamela herself foreshadows, there is a close relationship between love and hate – "Is it not strange that love borders so much upon hatred? But this wicked love is not like the true virtuous love, to be sure" (Richardson 86) – and perhaps in the case of Richardson's novel the bridge between the two is constructed not by the development of mutual respect and concern but by the far more interesting process of bonding between hostage and hostage taker.

Is it possible that unwittingly, Richardson penned a tale which accurately describes the preconditions and symptoms of the now accepted Stockholm syndrome phenomenon? What makes this alternative reading considerably more compelling is the opportunity which the paradigm offers in understanding the Pamela admired by the Pamelists and the Pamela distrusted by the anti-Pamelists.

CHAPTER THREE

THE PRECONDITIONS ARE RIPE

In order to be able to sympathise with Pamela as an unwitting victim of Stockholm syndrome, she must be assessed with respect to three main assumptions:

(i) that she was a hostage;

(ii) that she was subjected to the four preconditions which act as a catalyst to the syndrome; and

(iii) that she subsequently developed Stockholm syndrome symptoms or behaviours.

The first two of these are dealt with in the current chapter, while the third is examined in Chapter Four.

3.1 Pamela the Hostage

The first assumption is indisputable. Pamela unequivocally desires her freedom. From the very early stages of the drama, or more specifically, once her master's sexual intentions become apparent, she sets her heart on leaving her position as his household servant. Her expressed desire is to return to her family and her "dear, dear, happy loft once more" (Richardson 69). When she writes to her parents that "I had better get myself at once equipped in the dress that will become my condition" (76), and subsequently organises her wardrobe and her paltry collection of belongings, she is making practical preparations to return home for a welcome reunion with her parents. Just prior to departing her master's house for what she believes is the last time, she captures her sentiments in verse:

IX

Glad to my parents I return;

Nor for their low condition mourn;

Since grace and truth their souls adorn,

They're high and great to Pamela. (122)

This verse represents Pamela's last moment of innocence, for she is not carried to her family in keeping with her master's promise but instead borne entirely against her will to Mr B.'s Lincolnshire estate.

Even the harshest of critics has never accused Pamela of having engineered her own kidnapping. As Sale cogently states:

> This violation may seem to us a highhanded violation of human rights, but we must remember that, critical as Richardson's contemporaries were of many aspects of his novel, they were not really disturbed by this portion of it. (ix)

Supporting the assumption that Pamela truly was a hostage is the method by which Richardson conveys this knowledge to the reader. While the greater part of *Pamela* is in epistolary form, often attracting criticism on the basis that the reader only has access to the potentially disingenuous, first person account of Pamela herself, the kidnapping is originally introduced by the intervening voice of a third person narrator. The account of the abduction which runs for several pages describes the detailed circumstances of Pamela's capture and the meticulous planning Mr B. has undertaken "in order to prosecute his base designs upon the innocent virgin" (Richardson 123). As the narrator voices, in "every way was the poor virgin beset" (123), with no control and no opportunity of escape.

Wilson, published in January 1973 and thus unaware of Stockholm syndrome, comments that "when Mr. B. arranges to have her abducted to his Lincolnshire estate, the possibility of release evaporates, and her conflict intensifies to the point where it becomes a severe, traumatic experience" (84). The 'conflict' which Wilson alleges is between Pamela's coexisting, albeit subconscious, feelings of attraction and repulsion for Mr B. However, in a consideration of Stockholm syndrome, more critical is Wilson's identification that Pamela undergoes a 'severe, traumatic experience' as a hostage.

A close reading of *Pamela* supports the proposition that this trauma can be dissected to reveal both the preconditions and symptoms of Stockholm syndrome. The pages that follow give a detailed account of the extent to which the character of Pamela can be considered to correspond to the recognised preconditions of Stockholm syndrome.

3.2 Precondition One – Threats against Pamela

In situations typically associated with the development of Stockholm syndrome – hostage situations, kidnappings, hijackings, prisoner of war camps, incidents of domestic violence and child abuse – the victim would be expected to suffer acute fear for his or her life. Therefore, superficially at least, any relationship between *Pamela* and Stockholm syndrome could be dismissed on these grounds alone – despite the gravity of her situation, it is Pamela's morality and not her mortality that is threatened.

However, Pamela's avowed set of beliefs and moral codes allow these parameters to be reconsidered. Mr B.'s victim values her virtue as much as her life.

She believes that "VIRTUE *is the only nobility*" (Richardson 83) and never allows the reader to forget this. She herself compares the value of her virtue to that of her mortality, "do you not think, that to rob a person of her virtue, is worse than cutting her throat?" (148) and as observed by Ruth Bernard Yeazell, there is no doubt that "the sexual virtue of the heroine is under constant siege" (121). Every attempt or perceived attempt on her virtue is interpreted by Pamela as a real and powerful threat to her physical and psychological well-being. Verily so as she questions: "'May I,' said I, 'Lucretia like, justify myself by my death, if I am used barbarously?'" (Richardson 63), here threatening to take her own life as a consequence of losing her virtue, thereby expressing her conviction that the she considers the forfeit of her innocence as tantamount to fatal. Pamela is also manifestly aware that any realisation of Mr B.'s designs severely endangers her future prospects in regard to employment and marriage, not small concerns for a domestic servant from a poor family.

For Pamela, her virtue is not merely her own but also represents the values instilled in her by her family and her religion. This is clearly apparent in her written correspondence with her parents who would "rather see you all covered with rags, and even follow you to the church-yard [that is, dead], than have it said, a child of ours preferred any worldly conveniences to her virtue" (46), and who express similarly in their letters whole-hearted support for their daughter's "resolve to lose your life rather than your virtue" (52). In keeping with the moral messages of her upbringing, both the fear that Pamela attaches to the loss of her virtue and her circumspection of Mr B. are directly influenced by advice she received from her mother as a child,

> that as cows for their meekness and usefulness were to be likened to

> good women; so bulls, when fierce and untameable, were to be compared to wicked men: and thence you gave me such cautions and instructions, to avoid such libertine men. (187-188)

Despite Pamela's repeated and simplistic desire to retain her honour, she cannot be accused of naivety. She is worldly enough to realise that Mr B.'s desire is inextricably intertwined with her refusal to succumb to his sexual threats, "And must he be *more* earnest to seduce me, because I dread of all things to be seduced" (158). However, she does not have any way to control this or to realise her own wish – that she did not possess such power over her persecutor.

In the face of Pamela's continued rejection, Mr B. makes not one but multiple threats against Pamela's virtue. Pre-dating her abduction, Mr B. first "offer[s] freedoms to his poor servant" in the summer house (54) in response to which she "struggled, and trembled, and was so benumbed with terror" (55). On another occasion, Mr B. appears unexpectedly from within Pamela's closet where he has secreted himself. He physically assaults Pamela, upon which "I sighed, and screamed, and then fainted away" (96). On this occasion, Pamela believes herself saved from what she considers a fate worse than death only by the timely arrival of her fellow servant, Mrs Jervis.

Thus, by the time she is imprisoned at the Lincolnshire estate she has any number of precedents upon which to base her fears and, powerless in her predicament, can only pray "O preserve me, heaven, from his power, and from his wickedness!" (132). Upon Mr B.'s eventual arrival at the Lincolnshire estate, Pamela is again approached sexually against her will, "He came to me (for I had no power to stir) and put his arms about my neck, and would kiss me; I struggled" (225). When

Mr B.'s victim proves again uncooperative, she is offered a proposal with two equally unpalatable alternatives − to be a mistress or to be taken by force:

> And it would behove you to consider, whether it is not better for you to comply upon terms so advantageous to you, and so beneficial to your father and mother, and other friends, than to be mine without condition or equivalent. (230)

Upon declining both options, Pamela is physically threatened yet again, whereby she "got from him, and ran up stairs, and shut [her]self in the closet, extremely terrified and uneasy" (232).

The crisis point for Pamela is referred to in the Contents pages of the novel as "the worst attempt he has yet made, and of Mrs Jewkes's wicked assistance" (38). In this episode, Mr B. disguises himself as Nan, one of the Lincolnshire servants, in order to gain access to Pamela's chamber. His most violent attempt upon her virtue is described by Pamela thus:

> [H]e kissed me with frightful vehemence; and then his voice broke upon me like a clap of thunder: 'Now, Pamela,' said he, 'is the time of reckoning come, that I have threatened!' I screamed out for help; but there was nobody to help me: and both my hands were secured. . . . Sure never poor soul was in such agonies as I: 'Wicked man!' said I; 'wicked abominable woman! Good Heaven, this *one* time! this *one* time, good Heaven, deliver me, or strike me dead this moment!' And then I screamed again and again. (241)

Eventually, Pamela reports, she "quite fainted away" (242) but later recovers consciousness, surprised yet relieved to discover her virtue still intact.

Why doesn't Mr B. rape Pamela on this or any of the previous occasions when the opportunity was available? Donovan argues that "Pamela's chastity is guarded by Mr. B.'s more conscious form of snobbery; he regards rape as beneath him because it is a concession that he must resort to force to have what is his by a kind of *droit de seignuer* [lord's right]" (382-383). With Pamela as the only source of intelligence regarding the motivations of Mr B. there is no textual evidence with which this argument can be closely analysed. However, it does appear to be the case that while Mr B. is not above sexual assault, he is not inspired by the prospect of a pseudo-necrophiliac attack upon his victim once she has lost consciousness.

As a consequence of Mr B.'s regularly granting Pamela such respite, Donovan interprets the sexual interchanges between the would-be perpetrator and his victim as a "game" (383). He maintains that Pamela is confident Mr B. will not use violence because she has overhead her master's proclamation to this effect made to Mrs Jervis. He proposes that Pamela is aware "that he will always stop short of rape" (383). However, it is difficult to find logical or textual support for this argument. From the perspective of the victim there is little evidence to suggest that Mr B. is a man of his word. In addition, as Mr B.'s violence escalates with each attack, how could Pamela "know" with certitude if or when Mr B. has meted out his worst threat? On the contrary, she anticipates with each attack that he will "lay his snares surer" (Richardson 71). These circumstances are prime territory for the nurturing of Stockholm syndrome: not only is the threat of the next attack always looming, it also promises to be more violent than the last.

While Mr B.'s sexual assaults represent a substantial threat to Pamela, thus fulfilling one of the four required preconditions for the potential development of

Stockholm syndrome, these assaults by no means constitute the full extent of the menace to which she is exposed. When Donovan describes Mr B. as "nothing if not pertinacious" (387), he indicates the extremes to which Mr B. has extended himself, to ensure the successful attainment of his prize. As Pamela's time in captivity passes, it becomes clear to her that she is ensnared in a much deeper and more calculated plot than she first envisaged. The magnitude of the danger she faces is uncovered by the heroine as her world closes in upon her: Mr B. extracts a promise of silence regarding his behaviour from Mrs Jervis, Pamela's otherwise most likely helpmate (Richardson 64); he corrupts every possible ally she encounters en route to Lincolnshire; Pamela discovers John Arnold's betrayal (156-157) and is warned by the repentant man that "you are in vile hands" (156). Her worst fears are confirmed by Mr Williams who advises, "You don't know how you are surrounded: all which confirms me in your opinion, that no honour is meant you" (166). Pamela's accidental exposure to a letter addressed to Mrs Jewkes reveals that Mr B. will "let her know, that all her ensnaring speciousness shall not save her from the fate that awaits her" (236). As the story progresses, other aspects of Mr B.'s plan continue to reveal themselves: his decision to withdraw his violent attacks, instead deciding to manipulate her cooperation with feigned "kindness" and "love" (246) becomes yet another weapon against Pamela; and, even when she believes she has finally secured her safety, Pamela is warned in an anonymous letter penned by a mysterious SOMEBODY about the sham wedding Mr B. has organised:

> You may expect a parson for this purpose in a few days, or rather a man in a parson's habit; but who is indeed a sly, artful fellow, a broken attorney, whom he has hired to personate a minister. (262)

In short, every twist and turn reveals another scheme or manipulation undertaken by Mr B. to secure the object of his desire. As Pamela describes even before she herself uncovers the full extent of her predicament, "[t]his plot is laid too deep, and has been too long hatching, to be baffled" (145).

While the threat of Mr B. himself, in all its direct manifestations, looms over Pamela's virtue and contributes to her weakening psychological state, her vulnerability is further impressed upon her by the sexual menaces of both Mrs Jewkes and Monsieur Colbrand. Mrs Jewkes is complicit in the attempted rape of Pamela to the extent that she not only encourages Mr B.'s attempt: "Don't stand dilly-dallying, sir" (242); but also physically assists him. As Pamela describes, "the guilty wretch took my left arm, and laid it under his neck as the vile procuress held my right" (241). Aside from aiding and abetting her master's desires, Mrs Jewkes appears to be a sexual predator in her own right, and mirroring Mr B's nature, on several occasions making untoward physical advances upon Pamela. As Wilson notes, it is interesting that "Pamela's knowledge of the world is great enough for her to be able to hint of homosexuality in the character of Mrs. Jewkes" (80). Pamela reports that "The naughty woman came up to me with an air of confidence, and kissed me" (Richardson 144) and soon after that "she offered to kiss me. But I said, 'I don't like this sort of carriage, Mrs Jewkes; it is not like two persons of one sex to each other.'" (145). Although not violent and significantly less prevalent, Mrs Jewkes' homosexual overtures represent an additional threat which Pamela has to contend with in her powerless position as hostage.

Intensifying the atmosphere of sexual threat, about four weeks into her internment Monsieur Colbrand arrives at the Lincolnshire estate. Pamela's journal

describes only minimal contact with this man, yet to Pamela he represents a figure of great menace. Consider her physical description:

> He is a giant of a man, for stature; . . . large-boned and scraggy; and has a hand − I never saw such a one in my life. He has great staring eyes, like the bull's that frightened me so; vast jaw-bones sticking out; eye-brows hanging over his eyes; two great scars upon his forehead, and one on his left cheek; huge whiskers and a monstrous wide mouth; blubber lips, long yellow teeth, which his lips hardly cover, even when he is silent; so that he has always a hideous grin about his mouth. (206)

Wilson is somewhat disparaging about the fear that Colbrand inspires in Pamela, concluding that he is not a real threat, and "neither speaks nor acts toward her in any capacity other than that of a stern guard" (85). In his analysis, Wilson concludes that Pamela "links Colbrand with the sexual ambitions of Mr. B. and thus makes the servant the visible symbol of the absent master" (85). While the use of the word 'makes' here implies that Pamela has incorrectly, even unjustifiably, construed Colbrand as a sexual threat, the text itself lends credence to Pamela's fears. In a letter from Mr B. to Mrs Jewkes, accidentally delivered into the hands of Pamela, she reads that her master "can bear, for the sake of my revenge, and my *injured honour*, and *slighted offers*, to see any thing, even what *she most fears*, be *done to her*" (Richardson 202), assumingly condoning or encouraging any sexual attempt that Colbrand may desire to make upon Pamela. Mrs Jewkes also shares with Pamela her own belief that Mr B. "has found a way to satisfy [his] scruples: it is, by marrying me to this dreadful Colbrand, and buying me of [sic] him on the wedding-day, for a sum

of money!" (218). In the two characters of Mrs Jewkes and Mr Colbrand, therefore, the sexual threat to Pamela is physically manifest even when Mr B. himself is absent.

That for Pamela feeling her virtue in peril is no trivial matter is witnessed in her gradual psychological unravelling as her story progresses. On several occasions she locks herself in a room, falls into fits and faints, and regularly describes her emotional state as frightened and terrified. She also displays rituals born of abuse such as checking her closet before sleeping (121). Once in Lincolnshire, the inevitable consequences of her imprisonment are never far from Pamela's mind as reflected in a letter to Mr Williams, "If he [Mr B] comes, it must be for no good; and come, to be sure, he will, when he thinks he has silenced the clamours of my friends, and lulled me, as no doubt he hopes, into a fatal security" (162); and again soon after in her journal:

> *True friend!* Wicked man! O my dear parents! what a *true friend* is he, who seeks to gain the confidence of a young creature, his servant, in order to ruin her! I have no doubt of his intent. (171)

In attempting to protect herself from her master's heinous intentions, "being able to lock the door of her various sleeping places was a matter of life or a fate worse than death" (Watt 188). The earnestness of her fear is also apparent in her contemplation of suicide – "What to do, but to throw myself into the pond, and so put a period to all my terrors in this world!" (Richardson 211) – a serious thought for a girl of such Christian temperament as her ensuing internal debate reveals:

> If, despairing of deliverance, I destroy myself, do I not in effect, question the power of the Almighty to deliver me? And shall I not, in that case, be guilty of a sin, which, as it admits not of repentance,

> cannot be hoped to be forgiven? And wilt thou, to shorten thy *transitory* griefs, *heavy* as they are, plunge both body and soul into *everlasting* misery!" (213)

Although after one of his early encounters Mr B. states that he "intended no harm to her" (98), his ongoing actions do not support such proclamations of innocence. It seems nigh impossible that the intentions of Mr B. in all their direct and indirect manifestation, can be interpreted as anything other than a substantial threat which the perpetrator is entirely capable of carrying out.

Thus considering all of the abovementioned factors, the first precondition required for the development of Stockholm syndrome has been more than adequately met – during her captivity Pamela exists in an environment of extreme threat, threats against her virtue which she values as she does her life, which culminate in the deterioration of her psychological wellbeing.

3.3 Precondition Two – Pamela's Inability to Escape

This precondition for the development of Stockholm syndrome is articulated by Cantor and Price simply as "the inescapability of the situation" (379). An assessment of whether Pamela's circumstances fulfil this condition requires consideration of her opportunities (or lack thereof) to attain her freedom both before and during her Lincolnshire imprisonment.

In considering the opening events of the novel, Donovan poses a critical question – why didn't Pamela go home when she had the chance, long before the Lincolnshire kidnapping transpired? Why didn't she seize upon early opportunities that may have secured her freedom and her desired return to her family? He remarks,

"That she does not has generally confirmed the anti-pamelists in their suspicions of her ulterior motives" (386). This question is indeed pertinent to the discussion at hand as, if Pamela had sufficient opportunity to escape and did not, the argument in support of Pamela as a victim of Stockholm syndrome is weakened. The simplest explanation may go part way to answering questions about Pamela's early passivity: Pamela did not realise that escape was necessary. Instead, she assumed that safe passage would eventually be provided her in keeping with her master's assurances. It is without doubt that when she eventually enters the carriage provided by Mr B., she trusts that she is only hours away from her long awaited reunion with her parents. Pamela's distrust of Mr B. grows as the tale unfolds.

Other explanations regarding Pamela's early passivity can also be tendered. In answer to anti-Pamelist accusations of 'ulterior motives' which led Pamela to avoid early opportunities of returning to her family, Donovan offers an alternative reading that is consistent with Pamela's character throughout her crisis; that she is a planner and an organiser, that "she will not leave one position until the next is prepared" (386-387). This reading is supported by Pamela's fastidious preparations for her departure during the time that her plans are delayed. However, this explanation also fails to provide a complete picture of the complex thought processes underlying Pamela's inaction. Even in the early days of her perilous adventure it is Pamela's psychological vulnerability, fostered by the first advances of her master, which renders her initiation of an escape plan unlikely. Consider the state of confusion described in a letter to her parents following Mr B.'s first sexual attempt, made upon her in the summer house:

> Sometimes I thought I would leave the house, and go to the next

> town, and wait an opportunity to get to you; but then I was at a loss to resolve whether to take away the things he had given me or no, and *how* to take them away: Sometimes I thought to leave them behind me, and only go with the clothes I had on: But then I had two miles and a half, and a bye-way to the town; and being pretty well dressed, I might come to some harm, almost as bad as what I would run away from; and then, maybe, thought I, it will be reported, I have stolen something, and so was forced to run away: And to carry a bad name back with me to my dear parents, would be a sad thing indeed! (Richardson 56-57)

Plainly it is not just the details of packing that prevent Pamela from striking out on her own from Mr B.'s house. The world outside Mr B.'s estate is fraught with its own considerable dangers. Pamela is engaged in a consuming, torturous mental dialogue with no resolution adequate to satiate her fear. As a consequence of this paralysing internal debate she is incapable of securing her freedom when she, perhaps, had an early chance of escaping the designs of Mr B.

Although Pamela did not avail herself of the potential opportunities to return home to her parents soon after the death of her mistress, once she realises that she has been abducted, she frantically seeks a means of escape. During her overnight imprisonment at the Monkton farm en route to Lincolnshire she attempts to enlist the help of the farmer and his family: "I besought them to take pity of a helpless young maiden, who valued her honour above her life" (137), only to find them already on Mr B.'s payroll and with no intention of "intermeddl[ing] between a man of his rank and his servant" (143). However, even as this plan is thwarted, she continues to be

"not quite hopeless" (143) of finding a means of securing her own freedom.

It is only once Pamela has been successfully delivered to the Lincolnshire estate that her inability to escape becomes an irrefutable reality. Pamela is not only the prisoner of Mr B. but also of his fearsome henchwoman, Mrs Jewkes who directly informs Pamela of her loyalty to her master:

> I have a great notion of doing my duty to my master; and therefore you may depend upon it, if I can do *that*, and serve *you*, I will: but you must think, if *your* desire, and *his* will, come to clash once, I shall do as he bids me, let it be what it will. (147)

This loyalty extends to a willingness to act outside the law on his behalf, "'Look-ye,' said she, 'he is my master; and if he bids me do a thing that I *can* do, I think I *ought* to do it; and let him, who has power to command me, look to the *lawfulness* of it'" (147-148). In her role as gaoler, Mrs Jewkes presents a strong and intimidating physical presence, "She came to me, and took me in her huge arms, as if I were a feather; said she, 'I do this to shew you, what a poor resistance you can make against me, if I pleased to exert myself'" (234). Mrs Jewkes takes her responsibilities as Pamela's overseer very seriously and leaves little to chance. She "locks [Pamela] and herself in, and ties the two keys (for there is a double door to the room with different locks) about her wrist, when she goes to-bed" (148), she takes Pamela's shoes (151), all but the most basic of her clothes are locked away (157), her money is "borrowed" (169) and Pamela is "denied by this barbarous woman to go to church" (151). In short, Pamela is "closely watched" (174), Mrs Jewkes apparently foregoing her housekeeping responsibilities for the sake of vigilant surveillance. It is punishment at the hands of this same warden that Pamela

must contemplate as a consequence of any failed escape attempt. If she tries and fails, Mrs Jewkes may "again beat me, take my shoes away, and lock me up" (191), leaving her even more powerless.

As additional impediments to Pamela's establishing any possibility of escape, Mr B.'s Lincolnshire staff are also unconditionally faithful to their employer and his mission. Robert, the carriage driver who abducted and delivered Pamela to Lincolnshire, proffers her an apology for his deception but pleads loyalty to his master as his excuse for partaking in the plot (146). Pamela encounters two maids who she disparagingly describes as "equally devoted to her [Mrs Jewkes] and ignorance" (149). The other Lincolnshire staff appear similarly unquestioning of Mrs Jewkes' leadership and directives.

Furthermore, as Pamela quickly discovers, the local townsfolk have been engaged in Mr B.'s scheme or at least have no desire to attract his displeasure by assisting her. In a letter from Mr Williams, the local chaplain, she discovers the extent of Mr B.'s influence: "I have had a repulse from Mrs Jones. She is concerned at your case, she says; but don't care to make herself enemies" (172), while Sir Simon Darnford, one of the local gentry, is reported as saying "And if he takes care she wants for nothing, I don't see any great injury will be done her. He hurts no *family* by this" (172). Thus, Pamela's ability to secure the sympathy and assistance of her closest Lincolnshire neighbours is stymied by class allegiance and class distinction.

Even under such duress and against such formidable social forces, Pamela discovers a temporary accomplice to her escape attempts in Pastor Williams. Despite the watchful eye of Mrs Jewkes and the vigilant supervision of the Lincolnshire staff,

the hostage and the clergyman successfully communicate. Through the employment of elaborate deceptions and "pretence" (168), the two exchange several letters which contain the rudiments of an escape plan. Perhaps fanning the flames of the anti-Pamelists, the heroine comes to revel in her own abilities to deceive her captors. However, such "contrivance" (169) must be considered the consequence of Pamela's captivity rather than assumed as her innate tendency. Certainly such deceptive behaviour does not feature in Pamela's character prior to the time that she is taken hostage. Despite the beginnings of a well-made plan, once Mr B. is alerted to the furtive exchanges between Williams and Pamela, he finds means to have the chaplain, Pamela's only supporter, first made the victim of a brutal attack and then later arrested, thus successfully obstructing yet another escape route.

Pamela's own actions confirm her perceptions of inescapable imprisonment when she undertakes three failed attempts to escape the Lincolnshire estate. In the first, Pamela has an opportunity to escape through the back door of the garden but is unsuccessful because she is paralysed by fear when she sees two "bulls" blocking her passage and imagines them to represent "the spirit of my master in one bull, and Mrs Jewkes's in the other" (192). Once the opportunity to escape has been lost, Pamela regains clarity and realises that the dreadful threat that apparently thwarted her escape was actually posed by two grazing cows. Donovan observes that "the cow in the pasture" is an "awkward device" which allows Richardson to pursue his plot that will eventuate in the successful union of Pamela and Mr B. (386). However such analysis may well sell short the psychological profile of Pamela that Richardson is able to build. Pamela's fear is not entirely irrational but instead fuelled by a recent bull attack at the estate (Richardson 180). In addition, rather than assuming that

Pamela's delusions and an inability to recognise everyday, familiar animals expose "patent clumsiness" (Donovan 386) on the part of the author, her reaction may potentially be considered an accurate depiction of a victim under duress; a victim who by the third week of her captivity is already suffering the psychological ill-effects that will eventually present as Stockholm syndrome.

Pamela's second abortive attempt at escape from Lincolnshire is much more dramatic than her first. It includes: the secret acquisition of the garden gate key from Mr Williams; a difficult late night climb through the window bars of her bedroom; the discovery of changed locks thus rendering her key useless; and injuries sustained during an attempt to scale a crumbling garden wall. This failed bid for freedom leaves her "so weak, so low, and so dejected, and withal so stiff with my bruises, that I could not stir nor help myself to get upon my feet" (Richardson 216). In a third attempt, Pamela manages to get away from the house but before she is able to determine an escape plan, sees "a whole posse of men and women from the house, running towards me, as in a fright" (220). The consequence of this abortive escape is being "locked up ever since, without shoes" and "forced to lie between her [Mrs Jewkes] and Nan" (220) at night.

As further evidence of Pamela's inescapable captivity, part-way through her ordeal, she learns that by abusing his position as the local Justice of the Peace, Mr B. has had an arrest warrant issued against her which will be enacted if she were ever successful in attaining her liberty.

Thus, Pamela is closely restricted and monitored, reducing to virtually zero any probability and, more significantly, any perception of likely escape. Pamela's circumstances fully meet the second Stockholm syndrome precondition.

3.4 Precondition Three – Pamela's Isolation

"Monopolization" or isolation from perspectives other than that of the abuser (Brookoff et al. 1) is an important precursor to the development of Stockholm syndrome. Certainly, Pamela is physically isolated. Her Lincolnshire prison is a "handsome, large, old, and lonely mansion, that looked to me then, with all its brown nodding horrors of lofty elms and pines about it, as if built for solitude and mischief" (Richardson 146), in an unknown village and far from any environment with which she is familiar.

Nonetheless, it would be easy to discount Pamela's situation compared to the typical Stockholm syndrome victim, as she is far from alone. Instead, she is surrounded by and regularly interacts with the many members of Mr B.'s Lincolnshire staff. In keeping with the Stockholm preconditions however, these staff unfailingly represent the perspective of her captor, they are prison wardens not friends. Pamela is under constant scrutiny, most particularly that of Mrs Jewkes who, as the unquestioningly loyal servant of Mr B., controls the household employees – "There are (besides the coachman Robert) a groom, a helper, a footman; all strange creatures, that promise nothing; and all likewise devoted to this woman" (149). When Pamela perceives the possibility of the gardener as a "good, honest man" (149) and attempts to speak with him, she discovers herself unable to explore this or any other potential friendship or alliance. "[Mrs Jewkes] said, softly, 'My instructions are, not to let you be familiar with the servants'" (163). Thus, although the Lincolnshire estate is well peopled, these "companions" offer Pamela no respite from her isolation and no exposure to any perspective other than that of her abductor.

In most hostage situations this sense of isolation is reinforced by abiding

contact between the hostage taker and the victim. However, in Pamela's case the circumstances are more unusual. For the first five weeks of her captivity, Pamela has no direct, personal interaction with her oppressor. This exceptional circumstance adds an important dimension to Pamela's captive state. That Mr B. is not physically present does not detract from Pamela's terror. Rather, she lives in a state of constant fear of Mr B.'s arrival and the inevitable consequences she supposes will ensue. This fear creates an abiding and obsessive psychological contact between the hostage and the perpetrator.

Furthermore, in a very tangible sense Mr B. is never too far away as his thoughts and attitudes have such a sturdy representative in Mrs Jewkes. This "ill-principled" (161) woman enthusiastically advocates the sexual ambitions of her master in his absence:

> 'Why now,' said she, 'how strangely you talk! Are not the two sexes made for each other? And is it not natural for a man to love a pretty woman? And suppose he can obtain his desires, is that so bad as cutting her throat?' And then the wretch fell a laughing, and talked most impertinently, and shewed me, that I had nothing to expect either from her virtue or compassion. (148)

As Wilson expresses, Pamela "is isolated in an environment that is explicitly and implicitly antagonistic to her principles of chastity" (84). This antagonism increases Pamela's sense of isolation and means that the victim is never free of the sexual intentions and perspective of Mr B.

Most importantly, the entire foundation of *Pamela* is the central character's passion for writing letters – a habit which Mr B. always longs to control, knowing

that if he is successful, his victim's isolation will be complete. As described by Doody,

> When Mr B. wants to censor and suppress Pamela's papers, he is trying, like the dictator of a conquered land, to render her a region without a history, without a memory, and hence without an identity save that which he chooses to give her. (17)

Seemingly daunted by the prospect that Pamela may maintain some sense of self, some individuality in her written expression, Mr B. seeks to exacerbate her geographical isolation by ensuring he has access to all Pamela's writing, that written before as well as that penned during her imprisonment. In his censorship, his intention is to intervene between Pamela's thoughts and what she is willing to commit to paper. He does this both directly through his regular missions of search and retrieval: "I have searched every place above, and in your closet, for them [Pamela's journals], and can't find them; I *will* therefore know where they are" (Richardson 271); and indirectly via the loyal Mrs Jewkes who has instructions to see all she writes (150, 217) and to ensure that Pamela "sends no letters nor messages out of the house, nor keeps a correspondence unknown to me" (245).

That writing is a core need for Pamela is indicated by her ongoing anxiety about access to writing materials. Even prior to her abduction, she goes to great lengths, in fact begs Mr Longman, for pen and paper supplies. Once in Lincolnshire she knows that in order to fulfil her regular need for writing materials she will need to be deceptive and surreptitious. In her Lincolnshire prison she

> set about hiding a pen of my own here, and another there, for fear I should come to be denied, and a little of my ink in a broken china-

> cup, and a little in a small phial I found in the closet; and a sheet of the paper here-and-there among my linen, with a bit of the wax, and a few of the wafers, given me by good Mr Longman, in several places, lest I should be searched. (150)

Pamela's chosen strategy displays the operation of great foresight as not long into her captivity she is stripped by Mrs Jewkes of all her writing supplies bar one piece of paper and one pen (217).

The importance of writing to Pamela's identity and the sense of isolation she experiences when this privilege is withdrawn does not need to be supposed but can be tacitly assumed by her continued "fondness for scribbling" (160) in her journal, an unread cry for help, which Pamela writes "to ease my mind, though I can't send it" (131). The efforts made by Mr B. to suppress Pamela's writing are tantamount to the attempted annihilation of her spirit. His victory in this quest will represent her complete and absolute compliance. Had Pamela not been in possession of such a canny character, she was even at risk of being isolated from her own thoughts and feelings through the act of being deprived of self-expression. Instead, she employed her own methods of appeasing her master and fulfilling her own need to write by composing innocuous documents for public display and private documents which she attempts to keep hidden. By this means, at least temporarily, Pamela is able to preserve some sense of self.

Although the maintenance of her journal is Pamela's private means of fighting against her isolation, it does not offer her any real respite from her confinement. With the exception of the brief and secretive exchange of letters with Mr Williams, Pamela has no communication with the outside world which is not

controlled by her master. At the time of Pamela's kidnapping, Mr B. allows her to write a single letter to Mrs Jervis, requesting her to "let my dear father and mother, whose hearts must be well-nigh broke, know that I am well" (154). However, the content of this letter is prescribed by Mr B. and reinforces Pamela's isolation by misrepresenting her true experiences and feelings. Beyond this, Pamela has no other contact with her family or friends until she has promised to marry her master.

Based on the circumstances of Pamela's captivity, the Stockholm syndrome precondition of isolation is met, even if somewhat unconventionally. Pamela is physically isolated in a seemingly remote country estate; particularly once Mr Williams is removed, she is subjected only to the influence of Mr B. and his cronies; and importantly, although not entirely controlled, she is restricted in her ability to counter her isolation by writing of her experiences.

3.5 Precondition Four – The Violence and Kindness of Mr B.

The fourth precondition for Stockholm syndrome pertains to the dynamic of the relationship between the hostage and the hostage taker. In their research, American psychologist Anne Speckhard and her colleagues report that hostages who later developed Stockholm syndrome "commonly expressed feeling terror at the same time as being grateful to the terrorists for their acts of care" ("Research Note" 313). This is analogous to the familiar "good cop, bad cop" routine, an interrogation technique employed to elicit anxiety and sympathy simultaneously (Dripps 1).

In his dealings with Pamela, Mr B. reveals himself to be a skilled exponent of the "good cop, bad cop" formula both prior to and during her imprisonment. The essence of this pattern is attempted sexual assault and verbal violence followed by

sexual restraint and sometimes excessive compliments or kindness. As observed by Utter and Needham “His behaviour is oddly erratic, changing abruptly from tenderness to cruelty” (4).

These unsettling shifts between cruelty and kindness are the sum of Mr B.’s conduct for a vast portion of the novel. Even in the early interactions between Pamela and her master, these vacillations dominate the relationship between the two – in one breath Mr B. begs Pamela not to be afraid of him but in the very next, refers to her insultingly as “hussy” (Richardson 55), and soon after as “bold-face” (62) and “saucebox” (62). Directly following Pamela’s abduction to Lincolnshire, Mr B. sends his victim a letter which is extremely courteous and flattering: “But of this you may assure yourself, that I mean to act by you with the utmost honour; for your merit and innocence have very tenderly impressed me” (170), expressing sentiments entirely incongruous with the assault upon her freedom he has so recently engineered. In further correspondence he abuses Pamela, calling her “perverse, forward, artful yet foolish Pamela. . . . Specious hypocrite! Mean-spirited girl” (203) but perversely concludes as “Your affectionate and kind Friend” (203). As Mr B.’s reliable representative, Mrs Jewkes also delivers similar mixed messages on behalf of her master, informing Pamela that her employer has warned that while his hostage is “innocent and a dove”, she is also and “cunning as a serpent” (176). Mr B. is seemingly unable to move from his established role of countering every compliment with an insult, as though purposefully toying with Pamela’s emotions, striving to unbalance her.

Exhibiting the same deviation from conventional human interaction, when Mr B. arrives at the Lincolnshire estate, and despite his professed respect and concern

for Pamela, his first words to her are violent and full of unfounded accusations:

> ‘Well, perverse Pamela, ungrateful creature!’ said he (for my first salutation) ‘you do well, don’t you, to give me all this trouble and vexation?’ . . . Once I thought her as innocent as an angel of light; but now I have no patience with her’. (221-222)

He insults her with a “Come hither, hussy”, (225) and is sexually inappropriate with her when “he put his arm about my neck, and so rudely kissed me” (226). However, he forgoes this opportunity – he could have forced himself on Pamela – and instead retires and writes her a proposal to become his mistress, leaving Pamela grateful that her virtue has been spared for the time being, yet in the throes of apprehension of what the next day will bring. As Doody comments, “Pamela is imprisoned – escapes – is imprisoned again. There is a heartbeat rhythm of constriction – release – constriction” (17). Pamela is grateful on every occasion she survives an assault but continues to be imprisoned by the inevitability of the next attack.

The aforementioned proposal itself provides further evidence of Mr B.’s potent mix of calm and threat. Offering extremely generous financial conditions, Mr B.’s proposal to make Pamela his mistress adopts a tone of respect and gentle coercion mixed with an undercurrent of extreme threat. Pamela is offered money, jewellery, property, clothes and other benefits not only for herself but also for her impoverished family. However, the opening paragraph cautions Pamela that “what you give for answer, will absolutely decide your fate, *without expostulation or further trouble*” (227, emphasis added). In a later paragraph Mr B. warns, even more menacingly, that,

> it will behove you to consider, whether it is not better for you to

> comply upon terms so advantageous to you, and so beneficial to your father and mother, and other friends, than to be mine *without condition or equivalent*. (230, emphasis added)

In the final paragraph, Mr B. makes it clear that Pamela's loss of virtue is imminent, irrespective of her decision to accept or reject his detailed proposition, "this will be over this very day, irrevocably over; and you shall find, if obstinate, all you would be thought to fear, without the least benefit to yourself" (230).

It is in fact Pamela's refusal of this proposal that culminates in Mr B.'s attempted rape of Pamela, the most extreme occurrence amongst these fluctuations between violence and kindness. During this encounter, Mr B. ensures that Pamela is aware of her absolute powerlessness, "you now see that you are in my power! You cannot get from me, nor help yourself. . . . But if you resolve not to comply with my proposals, I will not lose this opportunity" (242) and Pamela's fear overwhelms her to such a degree that she loses consciousness. In keeping with his contradictory profile, directly following the rape attempt, Mr B. reverses his role to become Pamela's carer and protector. On this occasion, he takes Pamela's part against Mrs Jewkes for the first time and, more revealingly,

> [h]e most solemnly, and with a bitter imprecation, vowed, that he had not offered the least indecency; that he was frightened at the terrible manner I was taken with the fit: that he would desist from his attempt; and begged but to see me easy and quiet, and he would leave me directly, and go to his own bed. (242)

It is impossible to overlook the contradiction here between Mr B.'s actions and his denial of any wrongdoing, but the crucial element from the perspective of Stockholm

syndrome is the vacillation between violence and goodness, or from the victim's perspective, between terror and gratitude. As De Fabrique et al. note, as precursors to the syndrome's potential emergence "eventually, the hostage views the perpetrator as giving life by simply not taking it" ("Understanding" 12). In Pamela's case, Mr B. does not need to be overtly generous or kind, but merely to retreat, to defer his sexual threat.

3.6 The Stockholm Syndrome Preconditions are Fulfilled

While the description of these preconditions seems to provide a relatively straighforward classification or analysis framework, for those who have invested time and energy in attempting to understand the syndrome more completely, debate exists regarding the details underpinning these high level diagnostics. Most controversy exists around three specific aspects of the syndrome's preconditions. Firstly, while it is reported that a long duration under captivity has usually been considered a necessary precondition (Fuselier 24), Fuselier and De Fabrique et al., agree that it is the intensity of the experience rather than length *per se* that is critical (Fuselier 25; De Fabrique et al., "Understanding" 12). Irrespective of which side of the debate is accepted Pamela can be considered to qualify as the conditions of her captivity satisfy both the duration and intensity criteria.

The second area of discussion regarding necessary preconditions for Stockholm syndrome is in regard to the perpetration of physical violence upon the hostage. In their analysis, De Fabrique et al. insist that "a lack of physical abuse more likely will create favourable conditions for the development of Stockholm syndrome" ("Understanding" 12). If the sexual assaults of Mr B. against Pamela are

considered ‘physical’, this may take her out of contention as a potential victim of Stockholm syndrome. However, two circumstances allow the analysis to be pursued. Firstly, although Mr B. does make sexual attempts upon Pamela, the impact of these is primarily psychological – physically there is virtually no contact between the captive and her abductor. In any case, other hostage victims, most notably Patricia Hearst, who was subjected to physical abuse such as rape and torture, are nevertheless acknowledge to have developed the syndrome.

Most importantly, as pronounced by many researchers in this field of psychological research, “All the victims of ‘Stockholm syndrome’ [were] abducted or held hostage by persons previously unknown to them” (Namnyak et al. 9; De Fabrique et al., “Understanding” 13). How can Pamela be considered to fulfill this criterion for it is clear that her abductor is not a stranger to her? Firstly, we may concede that as this is literature and not science; the imagination of Richardson and not a case study; there is potential for a slightly flexible application of the medically described parameters. Secondly, in some senses the Mr B. of the novel is an unknown person, a new character in Pamela’s life once he becomes master and is no longer restrained by the expectations and censorship of his recently deceased mother. Finally, although Mr B. executes his abduction plan, initially he installs a stranger in the form of Mrs Jewkes to oversee and maintain the captivity, and thus the stranger requirement may be considered to be at least partially fulfilled by this relationship.

In Mr B.’s ever present yet unfulfilled menace, Pamela’s circumstances meet the final precondition deemed necessary for the development of Stockholm syndrome.

CHAPTER FOUR

DIAGNOSIS - STOCKHOLM SYNDROME

Having established textual evidence which supports that Pamela was subjected to the four preconditions necessary for the development of Stockholm syndrome, critical to this analysis of *Pamela* is the identification of the symptoms of the syndrome.

The single most important symptom, and the one that is most critical to the definition of the condition, is that the victim develops a bond with the captor. As outlined previously, a number of other factors, while not necessarily viewed in all cases, may also be considered reliable indicators of the syndrome. These are:

- Negative feelings by the victim toward people trying to assist their escape.
- Support by the victim of the behaviours and attitudes of the captor.
- An inability of the victim to undertake behaviours or actions which could assist in their release.
- The development of positive feelings toward the victim by the captor.

The following sections examine *Pamela* in the context of these outcomes or behaviours consistent with the suffering of Stockholm syndrome.

4.1 The Hostage-Captor Bond

The principal indicator of Stockholm syndrome is that the "positive bonds that arise during captivity are strong and appear to endure over time" (Speckhard et al., "Stockholm Effects" 131). In keeping with this description, in *Pamela* the

attitude of the heroine completely transforms over the course of her hostage experience.

There is abundant evidence that when Pamela discovers the intentions of her master, her attitude toward him is one of fear and hatred. In letters to her parents and journal entries alike she never wants for ways to describe him: as a “black heart” (Richardson 66); a “wicked wretch” (96); a “Wicked man” (171); and an “artful deluder” (171). At times she describes him in league with the devil, “Oh black, perfidious creature! . . . what an implement are thou in the hands of Lucifer” (119) and can imagine no limits to the extent of his evil, “O man! man! hard-hearted cruel man! what mischiefs art thou not capable of?” (202). She damns him to hell for “Well does he deserve that ruin, that utter ruin, which awaits so black, so odious a treachery” (201), a curse not lightly spoken given the strong Christian proclivities of the heroine. Pamela states in unequivocal terms “I hate him” (120).

In the face of her predicament, the Pamela we see before the emergence of Stockholm syndrome exhibits enormous strength of character in her impertinence and directness. Choosing not to censor herself in her addresses to her master, Pamela instead speaks her mind. As a case in point, consider the occasion that he first approaches her in the summer house,

> You . . . have lessened the distance that fortune has made between us, by demeaning yourself, to be so free to a poor servant. Yet, sir, I will be bold to say, I am honest, though poor: And if you were a prince, I would not be otherwise than honest. (55)

Despite understanding that her outspoken nature does not reduce the danger which she faces, Pamela initially stands up to her oppressor and his Lincolnshire servants.

As Mr B.'s prisoner, Pamela's journal reflects her ongoing horror at her bondage and her desire to be returned to her family. Her desperate plea to be released continues to be reiterated well into the abduction scenario: "all I desire is to be permitted to go to my father and mother" (177). In a later journal entry, Pamela writes "Mercy on me! What will become of me! Here is my master come in his fine chariot! What shall I do? Where shall I hide myself? What shall I do? Pray for me!" (221) with repetition that betrays her hysterical state.

However, in keeping with the manifestations of Stockholm syndrome, over time she can not avoid or control the strong bond of affection she develops toward Mr B., the potential object of her ruin. Just prior to his eventual arrival at the Lincolnshire estate, Pamela reflects on her master's near drowning when she writes,

> What is the matter, that, with all his ill usage of me, I cannot hate him? To be sure, in this, I am not like other people! He has certainly done enough to make me hate him; but yet when I heard this danger, which was very great, I could not in my heart forbear rejoicing for his safety; though his death would have set me free. (218)

In Pamela's reflections at this time, she revisits the idea of hate so simply expressed in the early days of her experiences, but can no longer conjure up this negative emotion. This concern for her master is undoubtedly a surprising response from a young woman who has been held captive against her will for five weeks and Pamela herself recognises this psychological anomaly when she questions her own emotional reaction. Again, around ten days later and around two months into her captivity, Pamela reflects on this idea of hate,

> I looked after him out of the window, and he was charmingly

> dressed: to be sure, he is a handsome, fine gentleman: what pity his heart is not so good as his appearance! Why can't I hate him? (235)

Here Pamela reflects on her own confusion – she knows she has good reason to hate Mr B. but finds herself incapable.

Even his attempted rape does not have a long-term impact on this developing bond of affection. The day following this attempt, after a few kind words and actions on the part of Mr B., Pamela exhibits a distinct empathy with him. She is still unable to fully trust him and his motives and is concerned that she has "fallen into the power of such a man" (257). She is unsure about the true intentions of Mr B. and retains some fear that she is falling into another well-laid trap, "What shall I do, what steps take, if all this be designing!" (257), but due to the growing Stockholm bond she is nevertheless able to assuage her reservations with arguments about the potential goodness of the male sex, reflecting of her father as an example (257). She engages with Mr B. in a warm and ready manner and describes that "His goodness overpowered all my reserves. I threw myself at his feet, and embraced his knees" (256). She is no longer impudent and argumentative but instead humble and demure.

Pamela accepts the excuses and apologies of Mr B. and is both surprisingly and alarmingly able to overlook the extremity of the violations he has perpetrated against her. This capacity for such rapid recovery is very new in the character of Pamela if we compare it to an earlier, much less brutal, incident, which Pamela replays: "the odious frightful first closet came into my head, and my narrow escape upon it" (117). In this earlier episode, the pre-hostage heroine clearly suffered longer term repercussions of a sexual attack in the form of disturbing flashbacks.

The most indubitable indication of the bond Pamela has developed toward her

abductor/would-be rapist is that when she is finally given the freedom to return to her parents, she finds she can not. As Pamela is leaving the Lincolnshire house, comparing herself to her Biblical, enslaved counterparts, she reflects,

> I think I was loth to leave the house. Can you believe it? What could be the matter with me, I wonder! I felt something *so* strange, and my heart was *so* heavy! I wonder what ailed me! But this instance of goodness was so *unexpected*! I believe that was all! Yet I have a very strange heart still. Surely, surely, I cannot be like the murmuring Israelites of old, who hungered after the onions and garlick of Egypt, where they had suffered such a heavy bondage? (280).

Pamela is shocked and surprised to find that despite the extreme circumstances under which she has been held at Lincolnshire, she is reluctant to leave, even with the attainment of her much longed for objective, freedom, so close at hand. Given such a reaction when she is finally freed from captivity, it is therefore unsurprising when Pamela decides to return and nurse her master in his illness.

That Pamela herself is taken aback by her desire to rush back to the aid of her master and prays "to God, that I might have no cause to repent my compliance" (289) gives insight into the psychological condition of Pamela when she returns to Lincolnshire at her master's behest. In a discussion of the metamorphosis of Pamela, most revealing is the opportunity to hear the character herself describe the bond she feels for her captor, "I know not *how* it came, nor *when* it began; but it has crept, crept, like a thief, upon me; and before I knew what was the matter, it looked *like* love" (283). Wilson observes that "The image of love as the subtle thief suggests her

growing awareness of the genuine affection she had rigorously submerged in the past" (89). However, the image of the creeping thief coupled with Pamela's own, although somewhat fleeting, misgivings suggests a somewhat more sinister and less romantic process, an irrational and inexplicable process Pamela describes when she reflects in despair,

> O my treacherous, treacherous heart! How couldst thou serve me thus! And give no notice to me of the mischiefs thou wert about to bring upon me! How couldst thou thus inconsiderately give thyself up to the proud invader, without ever consulting thy poor mistress in the least! But thy punishment will be the *first* and the *greatest*: and well, perfidious traitor! deservest thou to smart, for giving up so weakly, thy *whole self*, before a summons came, and to one too, who had used me so hardly; and when likewise thou hadst so well maintained thy post against the most violent and avowed, and therefore, as I thought, only dangerous attacks. (Richardson 284, underlined emphasis added)

Note the diction: her heart is treacherous, perfidious, a traitor, her actions inconsiderate and Mr B. an invader. As Pamela analyses the transformation she has experienced, she describes a sense of weakness, a complete lack of control. Pamela is clearly in a state of high confusion, concerned by her own psychological reaction to the ordeal she has experienced. We detect her trying to catch a glimpse of her own unconscious when she observes that her physical imprisonment has been replaced by psychological imprisonment − "my poor mind is all topsy-turvied, as I may say, and I have made an escape from my prison, only to be more a prisoner" (284).

Pamela is initially at a loss to explain her feelings satisfactorily, and neither is Richardson able to illuminate his heroine's behaviour in any explicit manner. Nevertheless, over time, as the relationship between the captive and the captor develops, Pamela comes to take her new psychological state for granted. She questions her attraction to her former abductor less and less; she relinquishes her moral high ground, no longer considering herself superior, but rather inferior, "How happy shall I be, if, though I cannot be worthy of all this goodness and condescension, I can prove myself not entirely unworthy of it!" (302). The strength of the bond between the two is never more apparent than when Pamela initiates sexual contact with Mr B. for the first time, "And I had the boldness to touch his hand with my lips. . . . My heart was like a too full river, which overflows its banks" (311). When Pamela agrees to marry Mr B. soon after, we witness the final consummation of this powerful Stockholm syndrome bond.

Wilson is extremely sympathetic to the inner conflict and turmoil that Pamela experiences. However, he interprets her conversion as a conflict between "Pamela's apparent and real desires" (86) using a surfeit of Freudian interpretation as his framework including: the sexual imagery of planting seeds in the Lincolnshire garden; keys in locks symbolising the inevitable sexual union of Pamela and Mr B.; the bulls in the pasture as symbols of male virility. In Wilson's estimation, over the course of her imprisonment, "against her will she [Pamela] is drawn to that which her principles reject" (86). Wilson refers to the transformation of Pamela's attitudes as a "process of gradual reconciliation" in which she must "purge herself of the fears engendered by the long period of persecution" as "her affection for Mr. B. becomes more and more irresistible" (88). However, this same analysis can also be read to

support a conclusion of the development of the Stockholm bond. Once Wilson concedes that Pamela's transformation occurs 'against her will', it may logically follow that Pamela did not experience a process of 'reconciliation' but rather the unconscious consequences of captivity, that the 'irresistible' attraction toward Mr B. is in fact a Stockholm syndrome bond.

4.2 Other Key Symptoms and Indicators

4.2.1 Negative Feelings Toward People Trying To Assist Escape

This is one facet of Stockholm syndrome that does not map very closely against the circumstances presented in *Pamela*. In more conventional Stockholm syndrome scenarios this negative feeling is usually directed toward police and other authority figures, a description that does not really apply to Pamela's circumstances. While early in her captivity Pamela does reject the proposal of Mr Williams which may have been her only escape route, this occurs before the development of Stockholm syndrome can be sufficiently supported and is therefore not relevant to the particular symptom or associated behaviour in question.

If we consider Pamela's would-be rescuers, it is apparent throughout the novel, that Pamela is consistent in her love and respect toward her parents, Mrs Jervis and the friends who could potentially assist her. However, once Pamela falls victim to the Stockholm bond this supposition is not tested as at no time throughout her captivity do any family or friends make contact or attempt to enact her removal from Lincolnshire.

4.2.2 Pamela's Support of Mr B.'s Behaviour and Attitudes

Indicative of the power and influence exerted by the Stockholm syndrome bond, "during captivity even the hostages' thoughts can come under the influence of their captors" (Speckhard et al., "Stockholm Effects" 132). In short, this symptom, perhaps not dissimilar to brainwashing, shows the victim echoing or mirroring the behaviour and attitudes of the captor. When Pamela exclaims "How times are altered!" (Richardson 312), one is patently aware of the extent to which the feisty and spirited Pamela of the novel's opening has disappeared.

Once Pamela starts to exhibit a transformation in her feelings for Mr B., and despite his long history of mistreatment, a considerable revision of her attitude toward Mr B. follows suit. She is able to successfully rationalise her abductor's behaviour. Although Pamela does not abandon her core values – her virtue, her family, and her empathy for other people – she rapidly becomes uncharacteristically compliant in her relationship with her master and seems to misremember or obliterate all knowledge of what she has experienced. Instead she is grateful for his attentions to the "humble Pamela [who] will not lose this opportunity of laying an obligation on her great master" (288) and reiterates her appreciation and undeservedness at every possible opportunity.

> 'I am afraid, sir, said I, 'that weighed down as I am with the sense of my obligations to your goodness, on one hand, and of my own unworthiness on the other, I shall behave very aukwardly (sic)on such an occasion [their wedding]: but your will in every thing I *can* obey you in, shall be mine'. (308)

Once Pamela has expressed her hopes and feelings for Mr B., she becomes

completely compliant in following his wishes for control of her, “Now, Pamela, I shall take it kindly, if you will confine yourself to your chamber pretty much for the time I am absent” (258) and Pamela stands down from her position of defiance to state that she “will not do any thing to disoblige you wilfully” (292). This includes Pamela granting Mr B. access to her journal and letters, including her assistance in retrieving those already in the possession of her parents. In short, she is no longer truly in command of her own will.

Yet another important signal that Pamela has adopted the attitudes of her former abductor is that she is able to forgive Mrs Jewkes, despite the considerable trauma she has experienced at the hands of Mr B.’s servant. She now rationalises that Mrs Jewkes’ loyalty to her master is an admirable quality and one that the two women will come to share, “I shall consider, that what you have done, was in obedience to a will, which it will become me also, for the future, to submit to” (310). This new-found and entirely inexplicable ability to forget all past wrongdoings also extends to Monsieur Colbrand, who she comes to describe as “civil” (281).

The complete success of Mr B.’s psychological coup is evident in the fact that Pamela is likewise able to rationalise her new situation with her religious beliefs. Mr B. is no longer the implement of the devil, eternally damned to hell. Pamela no longer prays to a God who “art the preserver of the innocent” (192). Instead she sees God’s hand in her fate. She considers that God has,

> abundantly rewarded me for all the sufferings I had passed through. And oh! how light, how very light, do all those sufferings *now* appear, which *then* my repining mind made so grievous to me. (312)

She reflects on her abduction and captivity as minor incidents which she was

responsible for exaggerating out of all proportion. Reflecting a complete reversal in attitude and interpretation, she adopts Mr B.'s own stated opinion – that his sins were not so grievous and his threats not so intolerable.

Some may choose to explain away this obedience and self-sacrifice as merely a reflection of eighteenth century gender relations. After all, this kind of obedience is hardly surprising in a heroine of her time (or for that matter, most heroines of romantic fiction from any era). However, the fact that the once spirited, unconventionally outspoken Pamela has chosen to stay and obey her master, when she could have removed herself to the safety of her family, means it is worth considering this acquiescence as indicative of her psychological state.

4.2.3 Pamela's Inability to Undertake Behaviours Which Could Assist Her Release

Critical to the identification of Stockholm syndrome is that a victim, when given the opportunity, will not act to facilitate their own escape. That this is the case for Pamela has already been identified and discussed in the context of her choice to return to Mr B. after she was released and safely on her way to being reunited with her family. Her strivings to abscond, characteristic of her early incarceration at Lincolnshire, diminish as the symptoms of Stockholm syndrome increase.

4.2.4 The Development of Mr B.'s Feelings Toward Pamela

Stockholm syndrome is acknowledged to have, in some cases, a multi-directional impact, that is, alongside changes in the attitude of the victim there are often changes in the feelings of the captor toward the victim. Thus, a full analysis of the developments in *Pamela*'s plot also needs to include some recognition of the

transformation of Mr B. The extent to which this can be analysed is somewhat limited by the fact that *Pamela* is written from the heroine's perspective.

While in most hostage/captor situations, the two parties are unknown to one another and therefore a change of attitude may be easily identifiable. In contrast, in *Pamela*, Pamela and Mr B. are acquainted long before her imprisonment. Despite this difference in circumstances, over the course of the novel a transformation in the attitude of Mr B. toward his victim can be discerned. Mr B. sets out with very short-term agenda regarding Pamela, essentially offering to make her "gentlewoman" if she is "obliging" (55), although the subtext implies that he wouldn't follow through on the promise much beyond taking the prize of her virginity. When she becomes his hostage, nothing much changes. His proposal to make Pamela his mistress and his rape attempt are about sexual fulfilment. Although he offers some longer term security to Pamela and her family, again there is no real assurance of respect or commitment beyond the realisation of his sexual ambitions. The watershed which illuminates the reciprocity of the Stockholm bond is seen when Mr B.'s separation from Pamela leaves him pining and ill, and on her return he states, "You need not, Mrs Jewkes . . . send for Dr Harpur from Stamford; for this lovely creature is my doctor and her absence was my disease" (291).

As was the case for Pamela, Mr B. too is disconcerted by the unconscious psychological transformation which he has undergone. Pamela reports Mr B.'s declaration that "Life is no life without you! If you had refused to return (and yet I had hardly hopes you would oblige me) I should have had a very severe fit of it, I believe; for I was taken very oddly, and knew not what to make of myself" (291). While his expression of feelings is critical to the turn in the plot beyond this point,

more important to the identification of the reciprocal Stockholm bond is Mr B.'s confusion and astonishment at being 'taken very oddly' and his inability to understand his reaction to Pamela's absence.

It is only after this incident of separation that Mr B. indicates a wholly transformed attitude toward Pamela and proposes love, not conquest, and marriage, not fornication.

CHAPTER FIVE

A MEASURE OF RICHARDSON'S ACCOMPLISHMENT

Fuselier states that Stockholm syndrome has been "overemphasized, overanalyzed, overpsychologized and overpublicized" (22), a claim that is abundantly demonstrated by the myriad of references to and depictions of the condition in popular culture. In undertaking a close analysis of a number of such modern-day representations of Stockholm syndrome it becomes apparent that Richardson, despite having created his Pamela more than two hundred years ago, is to be applauded on two important fronts: he is more accurate than most popular culture references, and equally if not more accurate than more in-depth modern portrayals of the condition.

The first section of this chapter compares *Pamela* and a number of recent popular culture Stockholm syndrome characterisations that exploit the psychological condition without the depth of appreciation or attention to detail found in Richardson. Examples taken from the television series *24* and *The Simpsons*, and from the popular romance fiction novel, *Captive Bride*, reveal that fidelity to a medically accurate depiction is not a concern of these modern Stockholm syndrome representations. Ironically, in comparison to these modern examples, which have the benefit of access to specific knowledge about the syndrome, Richardson's *Pamela* provides a more accurate model for understanding the condition. Richardson eighteenth-century novel offers a more reliable insight into the mind of the hostage and the true nature of this psychological phenomenon.

The second and third sections compare *Pamela* to other modern

representations which are more thorough and insightful. An analysis of the Spanish hostage movie, *Tie Me Up! Tie Me Down!,* a relatively detailed contemporary depiction of Stockholm syndrome, reveals a similarity of plot that closely matches Richardson's eighteenth century portrayal, and the real-life experiences recounted in the autobiography of Stockholm syndrome victim, Patricia Hearst, also map closely to the psychological transformation of Pamela. These correspondences highlight Richardson's accomplishment in describing the phenomenon of the hostage bond.

5.1 The Misrepresentation of Stockholm Syndrome

Depictions of Stockholm syndrome in popular culture tend to be superficial and glib, relying on a supposed audience familiarity with the phenomenon. Consider the following excerpt from the episode of the family television cartoon, *The Simpsons,* entitled "Blame It on Lisa". In this episode Homer Simpson is kidnapped while holidaying in Brazil and held hostage for ransom.

> **HOMER** (to his kidnappers)**:** Listen. I made a little scrapbook to remember the kidnapping. I'm still working on it but as you can see I (pause). Oh, look. This is the cigarette butt you burned me with.
>
> **KIDNAPPER** (fondly)**:** You slept like a baby that night.
>
> **HOMER AND KIDNAPPERS:** (laugh.)
>
> **MARGE:** Homer, why are you laughing?
>
> **KIDNAPPER:** He has the Stockholm syndrome. He has come to identify with his captors.

In this satiric rendition, the brief reference to Stockholm syndrome in the

form of a comic aside indicates the degree to which this psychological paradigm has permeated popular culture. The oversimplified identification of Homer's condition by means of a fleeting reference to the syndrome's most salient feature, the bond between kidnapper and hostage, assumes an audience already wise to the Stockholm condition with no need of further explication.

Overt misrepresentations of Stockholm syndrome in popular culture are also evident. As a case in point, consider the popular television series, *24*, which in Season One gives a fleeting role to Stockholm syndrome in its fast-paced plot, seemingly in ignorance of the lengthy periods of time required for the syndrome to develop. In the scene in question, Kim Bauer, a kidnap victim is being interrogated by an intelligence agent regarding the whereabouts of her kidnapper, Rick.

> **NINA MYERS:** Okay Kim but the fact is Rick ran away before we could talk to him.
>
> **KIM BAUER:** He was scared.
>
> **NINA MYERS:** Apparently. Whatever explanation he has doesn't change the fact that he's a fugitive and if you know where he is and aren't saying anything. That in itself constitutes for a serious....
>
> **KIM BAUER:** I don't know where he is.
>
> **NINA MYERS:** Are you sure?
>
> **KIM BAUER:** What I'm sure of is that he helped us escape and if it wasn't for him we would have never gotten out of there.
>
> **NINA MYERS:** Kim. When people are taken hostage it's not uncommon for them to feel a certain bond with their kidnappers.
>
> **KM BAUER:** Rick isn't a kidnapper. Anyway I don't know where he

is.

While viewing this scene, the audience is in possession of critical storyline information not available to the interrogator. The viewer is aware that Kim Bauer is lying and that she has, in fact, maintained telephone contact with her abductor. Moreover, it is clear that the recently rescued victim has developed romantic feelings toward Rick despite the fact that he was instrumental in her kidnapping. This information gap between the viewer and the character of Nina Myers encourages the audience to actively engage with the television show. The audience is compelled to synthesise 'secret' plot knowledge and use their pedestrian, potentially media fuelled, understanding of human psychology to diagnose Kim Bauer as a Stockholm syndrome victim.

In a criticism of this episode of the television series, Paul A. Cantor recognises that the writers of *24* have exploited the Stockholm syndrome idea, unnaturally incorporating it into the series plot without considering the complexity of circumstances under which the syndrome arises. In Cantor's analysis,

> Jack's daughter (Kim) has a rebellious teenage romance with the young man who kidnaps her, falling in and out of love with him with each twist of the plot – and all of this of course, within the regulation 24 hours. Talk of the Stockholm syndrome that affects victims of hostage situations, which makes them bond with their abductors, is meant to make this romance seem plausible to us. But the whole point of the Stockholm syndrome is the *weeks* or *months* the hostage spends with his or her captors – not the hours. (206)

In fact, while Cantor's analysis is correct it only touches upon one of the many

aspects in which Kim Bauer cannot be considered as a victim of Stockholm syndrome. The most significant discrepancy is that Rick, the kidnapper, does not vacillate between cruelty and kindness, an important precondition for the development of the syndrome. Instead, Rick realises the error in his decision to co-operate in the kidnapping very early in the hostage drama, after which he becomes wholly consistent in his behaviour towards Kim and is instrumental in her eventual escape.

Of course, the misrepresentation or simplification of reality is to be expected in popular culture. That the writers of *The Simpsons* and *24* chose to include this intriguing psychological condition in their scripts is not surprising. What makes the examination of these examples from popular culture interesting is the conclusion it elicits – to understand the complexity and the detail of Stockholm syndrome by means of fictional characters, it is better to look to Richardson's eighteenth century depiction than these modern day examples.

An understanding and appreciation of fictionalised portrayals of Stockholm syndrome, or at least modernised interpretation of the Stockholm phenomenon, is incomplete without turning to the arena of romance fiction. The romance industry is rife with kidnap scenarios and the following discussion focuses on the work of Johanna Lindsey as an exemplar. This prolific author's publishing history reveals a writer highly experienced in the creation of abduction tales (Lindsey, *Fantastic*). In *Fires of Winter,* "[t]he spirited Lady Brenna vowed vengeance on her handsome abductor". The plot of *So Speaks the Heart* has kidnap at its core whereby in "tenth-century France Brigitte de Louroux is abducted by the warrior Rowland of Montville and finds herself falling in love with him against her will." *Secret Fire* finds its

heroine “Kidnapped for the pleasure of her arrogant admirer, Prince Dimitri.”

A close reading of Lindsey’s 1977 best-selling novel, *Captive Bride*, allows us to compare a typical romance novel depiction to the established framework of Stockholm syndrome. Throughout the novel, it seems clear that the psychology of kidnap victims is not unknown to Lindsey. The heroine, Christina, taken from her Egyptian hotel room to a remote desert encampment, expresses many of the now-familiar sentiments of a kidnap victim. She fears not only for her life but, in the spirit of Pamela, also her chastity: “Did I come to this Godforsaken country just to die – and how will I die? Will I be raped brutally first?” (48). She has no means of escaping her captor, Philip, and his henchmen: “Christina looked around and saw the tall man climbing up the rocks, rifle in hand, to stand guard. She could not escape” (51). In addition, the shifts between violence and kindness are the mainstay of the plot. As Christina reflects, “She would never be able to comprehend this man. One minute he threatened to beat her, and the next, he was holding her with tenderness and love” (99). The heroine often meditates on her own psychological state and the inexplicability of the tenderness she feels toward her abductor. For example, when she hears of the illness of Philip’s father, “Suddenly she wanted to go to him and put her arms around him. She wanted to wipe away his sadness. What was the matter with her? She hated him” (96).

Christina’s gradual conversion to the perspective of her kidnapper is revealed when she determines after being beaten that “no matter how humiliating it had been, Philip was right, she had deserved it,” (131) and later when she reconciles her change in attitude toward her abductor by concluding that although “[s]he really had hated him those first weeks after he brought her to his camp. . . . every young woman

leaves behind all that she knows when she marries" (161-162), her own values being deposed by those of her kidnapper.

Christina and Pamela's metamorphoses as kidnap victims take almost identical paths, and the character or Christina completely fulfils Utter and Needham's thesis that "every heroine in fiction is a daughter of Pamela" (1). However in one very important aspect Lindsey strays, simultaneously undermining her attempt to portray the psychology of a hostage victim and weakening the cohesion of her central character. Although Christina displays many of the hallmarks of a classic Stockholm syndrome victim, as a writer Lindsey can not completely adhere to the conditions that would make this conclusion possible as, by definition, a romance novel needs 'romance'. Richardson's 300 page delay in providing romance is not a delay that Johanna Lindsey can make in her formula-driven novel. Thus, the author intersperses her credible Stockholm moments with somewhat graphic passages of sexual intimacy. Christina is not possessed by Pamela's sensibilities, but instead experiences a positive response to the physical advances of her abductor whose "kiss was soft and gentle, making her head spin with mixed feelings" (57). The inconsistently drawn character embarks on a lust-driven, albeit guilt-ridden, sexual relationship with her captor long before their mutual declarations of love. The novel exposes that

> Christina had fought desperately to quell the urgings sweeping through her body as Philip caressed her, but she couldn't resist his touch. She had surrendered to him completely. She had begged him to take her. (91)

Echoes of anti-Pamelist accusations can be here heard, as Christina's actions run

counter to her professed hatred of her abductor. In this important aspect of the novel, Christina's position as a Stockholm syndrome sufferer becomes untenable. Over the course of the novel, what the reader is privy to can be described more accurately as the heroine forgoing externally imposed social mores to satiate her true sexual nature. Her battle is between her willpower and her desire, rather than a struggle to retain her own identity in the face of a developing Stockholm bond.

It cannot be known to what extent Johanna Lindsey is aware of the detailed psychological profile of a hostage victim. Certainly, based on the character she creates in Christina, the writer has a reasonable awareness of the conditions that typically occur in a kidnap scenario and similarly possesses knowledge of some of the responses which a hostage situation can potentially provoke. What is also patently clear is that she is writing to a formula that has allowed her a successful career as a romance novelist, even if strong and consistent character development is not her forte.

Both *Captive Bride* and the *24* episode are examples of popular culture applications of the kidnap scenario which fall short of appreciating the complex nature of hostage psychology, a complexity more fully realised in Richardson's eitheenth-century masterpiece.

5.2 Accurate Renditions in Popular Culture

In contrast to the above examples, not all modern depictions are as inaccurate in their opportunistic borrowing from a paradigm as complex and multi-dimensional as Stockholm syndrome. In the 1990 Spanish film *Tie Me Up! Tie Me Down*[7] the Stockholm scenario is fulfilled almost in its entirety. In fact, this blackly

comic film is a close-to-perfect modern presentation of Stockholm syndrome. To illustrate this requires a detailed consideration of the plot of the film. The story centres around Marina, a former pornographic movie star and drug addict, who is held hostage in her apartment by Ricky, a young man recently released from a psychiatric institution and with whom she had had a one-night stand long in her sordid past. At the outset of the drama, Ricky explains the reason for his crime: "I had to kidnap you so you'd get to know me. When you do, I'm sure you'll love me. Like I love you." Ricky's behaviour from this point onward ensures the successful development of a Stockholm bond between the protagonist and his victim.

Each of the individual Stockholm syndrome preconditions are recreated in the film. Marina's life is threatened – "If you try something, I'll slit your throat" – with this intimidation given dramatic weight by the employment of an eerie soundtrack and close-up camera work which confirm Marina's fear and stress. It is clear that there is no chance of escape for the victim who is locked in her apartment, bound and gagged. Her one phone call to her family is controlled by Ricky and a necessary visit to the doctor is carried out at knifepoint. Key to the classification of *Tie Me Up, Tie Me Down* in the black comedy sub-genre is the intermittent kindness and violence that defines the relationship between Ricky and Marina. Ricky runs errands for his hostage, braves seedy backstreets to find illicit drugs for Marina's toothache, makes breakfast, and fixes the plumbing. Arguably, the comic high point of the movie is when Ricky visits the pharmacy and carefully selects tape and rope which will cause the least pain for his hostage while she bound and gagged.

In keeping with the expected plot development for Stockholm syndrome, when Ricky is seriously injured in a street fight Marina takes on the role of nurse and

soon after, lover. Instead of using Ricky's weakness to secure her escape, she enters into a relationship with her abductor. She becomes so loyal to the point of view of her captor that when he is forced against his will to leave her alone she requests that he bind her.

RICKY: Will you wait for me here. Or will you run away?

MARINA: I don't know. You'd better tie me up.

When Marina is eventually found by her sister, Lola, Marina's hesitation to be rescued is apparent. She takes souvenirs to remember her time spent as a hostage and informs her sister, "I love him". Her sister, Lola, is the voice of reason reminding Marina, and perhaps the audience, of the bizarre nature of the situation: "How can you love someone who ties you up? Do you think that's normal? It's probably the shock. No one's that warped." However, despite Lola's original scepticism, she later assists Marina in her reunion with Ricky, securing a diagnosis of Stockholm syndrome for the hostage victim.

Interestingly, the writer and director of *Tie Me Up, Tie Me Down*, Pedro Almodóvar, describes the film as "totally romantic – it's a love story and a fairy tale" (Almodóvar), potentially indicating the degree to which the Stockholm syndrome phenomenon has permeated modern consciousness. However, although the writer/director does not consciously acknowledge the influence of modern psychology on the development of his characters, it is clear that Almodóvar's replication of Stockholm syndrome is less remarkable than that of Richardson's. While the two depictions can be deemed equally accurate, Almodóvar's creation occurred in an environment where the Stockholm syndrome scenario has become part of popular culture, while Richardson had no access to such psychological

understanding when creating his Stockholm-afflicted Pamela.

5.3 Patricia Hearst

The following words of self-reflection, written by Patricia Campbell Hearst in 1982, could easily be mistaken for those of Richardson's Pamela:

> Changes had come over me subtly since I had been brought into this strange world. . . . In time, although I was hardly aware of it, they turned me around completely, or almost completely. (Hearst 193)

A close examination of the autobiography of Hearst, an acknowledged victim of Stockholm syndrome, is one means by which the accomplishments of Richardson and his depiction of Stockholm syndrome are affirmed. The autobiographical recollections of this real and renowned hostage call to mind the journal entry accounts of her fictional counterpart, Pamela, created by Richardson some two centuries before the psychology of abduction victims had been documented and labelled.

In considering Patricia Hearst's first hand account of her experiences, a number of important caveats must be acknowledged. First and foremost, reflecting the spirit of the anti-Pamelist criticisms of *Pamela*, it cannot necessarily be assumed that Hearst's public recollections are entirely honest or completely accurate. In addition, at the time the autobiography was penned, Stockholm syndrome had been identified for several years, suggesting the potentiality that Hearst's account was consciously or unconsciously influenced by the Stockholm syndrome formula. However, whether it is the case that *Patty Hearst: In her own words* is considered exclusively fact, altogether fiction, or somewhere within this continuum, as a

modern-day, allegedly firsthand depiction of Stockholm syndrome it is an invaluable source of comparison. The parallels which emerge between the two texts validate the consideration of Richardson's creation, Pamela, as a victim of the syndrome.

Using the framework of Stockholm syndrome as a basis for analysis, innumerable resemblances emerge when Patricia Hearst and Pamela are juxtaposed. To begin with the most fundamental requirement, just as Pamela has never been considered, by even her harshest critics, to have had a hand in her own abduction, neither has Patricia Hearst. This real-life kidnap victim was violently removed from her home at gunpoint by the Symbionese Liberation Army (SLA), a small revolutionary group, in February 1974.

Second, in terms of the preconditions for the syndrome, based on Hearst's autobiographical account of the events following her abduction, all the Stockholm syndrome preconditions are well established. Her life is threatened – "The black man told me to lie still and be quiet or I would be killed" (38) – after which she lives in constant fear. Echoing the sentiments of our fictitious heroine, Hearst reflects she had never felt "so helpless" (39), "so degraded, so much in the power of others, so vulnerable" (43). In Hearst's account of the circumstances of her captivity, she describes being kept bound and blindfolded in a closet, with no opportunity to escape, "under observation at all times" (43) to the extent that

> throughout the night there were always two heavily armed people awake and on guard duty. Even though I knew the location of the front door, there was no chance of my slipping away in the night. (105)

Here Pamela's helplessness when she contemplates her inability to elude her captors

and escape from her Lincolnshire prison is brought to mind.

In addition, Patricia Hearst's isolation was complete and absolute. At the beginning of her abduction, she describes an environment of "solitary confinement" (52) whereby "When I was taken to the bathroom or given food, no one spoke to me" (52). Again, mirroring the circumstances which Richardson created for Pamela, Hearst describes occasions on which she was forcibly compelled to communicate false information about her captivity to her family and the rest of the world.

> I had to exert all of my determination to keep from breaking down and crying as I told lie after lie about how well I was being treated and especially when I expressed the hope of getting back to my family and to Steve. (58)

The circumstances of intermittent violence and kindness which have been discussed in respect to Pamela's treatment at the hands of Mr B. are also described in the Patty Hearst autobiography. In Hearst's case, one of the SLA members, Gelina, in stark contrast to the other members of the group, is amiable and sympathetic in her dealings with the hostage. The autobiography offers the victim's own description of these contradictory approaches: "If Cin played the heavy and aroused utter fear in my heart, this girl, among all the others, played the light part, the one who seemed to want to be friendly" (47). Hearst also relates her enormous gratitude for the smallest of humane acts, describing that "I was so thankful for that bath and a hair wash one would have thought I was being led to a party. It was pitiful" (80). More often than not, however, the autobiography does not report direct kindness on the part of the SLA. It instead discloses Hearst's relief that, despite the barrage of threats, her life continues to be spared. Such expressed relief calls to mind Pamela's gratitude each

and every time her virtue is threatened and a reprieve subsequently granted by her captor and master.

However, there is no Stockholm syndrome without the development of a Stockholm bond. The presence of such a bond was demonstrated in the case of Pamela first through her voluntary return to the Lincolnshire estate after successfully attaining her freedom and later in her agreement to marry her one time abductor. In the case of Patricia Hearst, the presence of the Stockholm bond is generally considered to be exhibited by two critical factors: her co-operation in a bank robbery engineered by her captors; and, the fact that she did not take advantage of obvious opportunities of escape that presented themselves in the later stages of her ordeal.

In Hearst's firsthand recollections of these events, there are echoes of Pamela's own expressions of perturbation. Hearst is unable to reconcile her thoughts and her actions. In descriptions of the bank robbery, she questions her own psychological condition, remarking, "I sensed that I had, in fact, crossed over some sharp line of demarcation. Was I truly on the other side now, allied with the SLA?" (164). In addition, when Hearst considers one of her missed opportunities of securing freedom, she recalls,

> For the very first time since I was kidnapped, I was being left alone for hours, sometimes for most of the day. I suppose I could have walked out of the apartment and away from it all. But I didn't. It simply never occurred to me. (261)

Recalling her emotional and psychological state during her captivity, Hearst describes feeling confused and powerless in her attempts to govern her mind. After her involvement in a violent crime she recollects that a

> flash of insight into what I had done and the significance of it was at the time but a brief glimpse of reality, like a sudden streak of sunlight through a hole in dark, rolling cumulus clouds, there one instant and gone the next. (225)

In a similar vein, she later recalls, "I tried to collect my thoughts, but they ran through my head as through a sieve" (246). Throughout *Pamela*, the heroine similarly expresses moments of psychological self-awareness, and yet remains unable to rationalise her emotional responses to her captive state.

Notwithstanding the many similarities between Pamela and Patricia Hearst, there is one important aspect in which these two accounts of hostage victims diverge. As Wesselius reminds us, the accepted definition of the Stockholm bond is that there is a development of "*positive* feelings on the part of the hostage toward the hostage taker" (44, emphasis added). In the case of Patricia Hearst, although some type of bond is indisputable as evidenced in her actions, the term "positive" is not an accurate description of the victim's sentiments as expressed in her autobiography. Throughout her ordeal, Hearst fears and abhors her abductors, her compliance the product of a conscious survival strategy – "I wanted to join them so that I would survive" (106) – coupled with a much more direct and consciously administered brainwashing program undertaken by her captors. As expressed by Hearst, "I began even at times to believe. What everyone around me was saying with such sincerity began to make sense" (181). Nevertheless, one is left wondering that if our, albeit fictional, Pamela had been taken away from the Lincolnshire estate and given time to reflect on the significant and startling change in her attitudes toward Mr B., whether she would have similarly reflected, as Patricia Hearst did once her freedom had been

secured,

> But how could anyone who had the facts, and stopped to think for more than a minute, believe that someone kept bound and blindfolded in a closet for fifty-seven days would *voluntarily* join forces with his or her tormentors? (437)

As analysed by Hinshelwood "for someone to make his own decisions, he needs to be sufficiently integrated in his mind" (126), integration that can not be argued in the case of either Pamela or Patricia Hearst.

In summary, although the circumstances of their captivity differ substantially, the emotions, the confusion, and the loss of control expressed by Hearst when reflecting on her captive state, readily bring to mind Richardson's Pamela. Notably, despite the fact that Patricia Hearst is considered an authentic case of Stockholm syndrome, it is the character of Pamela that actually conforms more closely to the established description of the condition. In short, when Pamela is compared with this Stockholm syndrome case study, Richardson must be applauded for his highly acute depiction of the psychological alteration which may occur under hostage circumstances.

CHAPTER SIX

THE SECRETS OF RICHARDSON SUCCESS

A discussion of Richardson's *Pamela* cannot be deemed complete without giving consideration to how he was able to achieve what he did. By what means was Richardson, in the creation of his heroine, able to construct a hostage situation and its consequences with such accuracy and acuity? Although there is no single answer to this important question, observations made by many Richardson commentators do offer some insight.

Based on her own considerable research regarding Richardson, Doody suggests that Richardson had an inherent interest in interpersonal dynamics when she observes that "Richardson was always fascinated by the power politics of small groups, especially families, and the gestures which manifest power struggles and emotional tensions" (11). In this one sentence, Doody explicitly flags many of the issues that Richardson necessarily explores in *Pamela*, most notably 'power' and 'emotion', both of which play an extremely important role in his ability to accurately depict the evolving relationship between Pamela and Mr B.

Building on this image of Richardson as the astute observer of human interplay, both Sale and Charlotte Lefever applaud Richardson specifically in regard to his insight into the female perspective. Sale refers to the author's "congeniality with the feminine point of view" (vi) and views this frame of reference as the key to Richardson's creation of "his most successful characters" (vi). Proffering a similar argument but employing even more extreme terms, Lefever attributes Richardson with "[h]aving a *complete* knowledge of the psychology of women, especially [those

from the] lower or middle class" (857, emphasis added). Despite Richardson's being a man, Lefever extends her argument further when she states that "having a meagre knowledge of the psychology of men, he portrayed them through imagination only" (857). Although these claims may be over exaggerated, the previous analysis of *Pamela* indeed shows that Richardson was able to depict events from a female point of view with an insight into psychological response patterns that holds up under modern-day scrutiny.

An acceptance that Richardson had a sympathy and intuition for the female perspective then leads one to speculate regarding the source of such psychological intelligence. For this, there are a number of possible causative factors. Firstly, a point which seems rarely discussed by *Pamela*'s critics and supporters alike is the knowledge that *Pamela* was actually based on a true story. "Her story, as Richardson wrote Aaron Hill, arose out of events of the year 1715 and had been told to him by a 'gentleman'" (Sale vii). Thus, the accuracy in Richardson's creation of Pamela may be partly attributed to the fact that she wasn't entirely fictional. However, the determination of the degree to which Richardson was influenced by this real life case is a question for further research. One real life example notwithstanding, Hawley also alerts the *Pamela* reader to the fact that "the abuse of power by masters was an issue of public concern in the eighteenth century" (xii) and goes on to describe a famous case in 1729 where one Colonel Charteris was charged and convicted of raping a servant. The implication of Hawley's comment is that perhaps Richardson did not need to rely entirely upon imagination in the creation of his plot and character, as the social relationships of the time in which he was writing were also likely to have provided a substantial amount of inspiration.

One further interesting fact to consider is the relationship between Richardson and George Cheyne. Although predating the era of modern psychology, Cheyne is considered an influential proto psychologist. As described by Anita Guerrini in her article "*The Hungry Soul*", as "a fashionable practitioner in Bath, the most fashionable of English watering places, Cheyne attained a particular renown as a physician of nervous disorders" (280), most notably "hysteria in women" (281). This article provides a detailed account of the particular views to which Cheyne subscribed. These included beliefs that nervous illness was related to social class, with the "upper classes, being more intelligent, sensitive, nervous, and highly strung, [suffering] from these illnesses far more than did the thick-skinned (and often thick-headed) laboring masses" (281). The author goes on to describe Cheyne's conviction that "[s]ensitivity could easily cross the line to madness" (285) and that "[u]ncontrolled, the passions wrought havoc on the nervous system" (285).

Of interest is that Samuel Richardson was both a friend and a patient of this practitioner. Clearly, the specific beliefs of Cheyne are not closely represented in *Pamela*. Richardson consistently attributes far more sensitivity and intelligence to his representatives of the working class than to characters who hail from the upper echelons of society. Nevertheless, the close association between these contemporaries confirms that Richardson was interested in matters of the mind. The fact that Richardson was being treated by a doctor who specialised in nervous disorders, while simultaneously creating a character also suffering from a nervous condition seems more than coincidental.

Thus, taking into account these many factors it seems that Richardson's depiction of Pamela was more than just happenstance. Instead, a number of factors

came to bear on his creation including the era in which he was writing, his natural intuition and his personal interests. However, even this conclusion fails to give a completely accurate picture. Consider the following summative comment by made by Donovan:

> I do not want to rest my argument on the assumption of Richardson's conscious awareness that the central dilemma of the novel is not so much moral as social, because I am not certain how fully he understood the basis of his own art. (394)

Choosing to accept the latter portion of Donovan's argument implies that much of what Richardson accomplished occurred unconsciously, that the writer was not necessarily aware of the enormous influences that his personality, his friends, and his society exerted over his work.

By extension, Richardson was assumedly unaware that he was in fact writing a novel about the psychology of hostage victims. Strong support for this interpretation is found in an unusual location, that is, the original subtitle of *Pamela – Virtue Rewarded* – implying precisely the didactic tale which the novel, at least superficially, delivers. Significantly, this subtitle shows a lack of explicit understanding by the novelist himself that his novel both accurately and insightfully details the psychology of a hostage victim. The story is not an exemplum of Pamela's Virtue Rewarded. On the contrary it is the actions of Mr B. – his capturing and his psychological gaming – which are ultimately rewarded. In light of Richardson's true accomplishment, albeit perhaps unconsciously, a more honest subtitle would be Abduction Rewarded.

CONCLUSION

Little did the psychologists who identified Stockholm syndrome in the 1970's realise that they were also paving the way for the reinterpretation of a seminal, eighteenth century work of fiction. Be that as it may, in *Pamela*, Richardson has captured a character who exhibits what we now recognise to be the realistic psychological responses of a hostage victim. Unquestionably the central character is subjected to all four preconditions attributed to the development of Stockholm syndrome and after a period of prolonged captivity exhibits attitudes and behaviours consistent with the syndrome. It is only following her hostage experience that Pamela develops positive feelings toward Mr B. and when the victim accepts the captor's proposal of marriage, this represents the culmination of the Stockholm effect.

The reinterpretation of *Pamela* presented in this thesis moves beyond the more traditional analysis of Pamela's character defined by the Pamelists and the anti-Pamelists. Moreover, it offers some possible compromise between these two seemingly opposed views. Once Pamela is acknowledged as a hostage and a Stockholm syndrome victim, it is feasible to consider her as honest in her expressed emotions, but also to recognise the natural but seemingly contradictory conflict between her attitudes and behaviour which provoked the cynicism of the novel's many detractors.

One means of understanding the magnitude of Richardson's accomplishment is to compare *Pamela* to current and thus potentially more informed depictions of Stockholm syndrome. Richardson's portrayal of the hostage-captor bond is discovered to match the accuracy of modern renderings such as the autobiographical

account of Patty Hearst. In addition, Pamela emerges as a superior literary model of a hostage victim when compared to her sensationalised and over-simplified popular culture counterparts such as those portrayed in television series such as *24* and the best-selling romance novel, *Captive Bride*.

Questions remain regarding how Richardson was able to accomplish this. There is evidence to suggest many influences on Richardson's novel including the author's intuition, his interest in the human behaviour, and the existence of real kidnapping case studies in eighteenth century society. While the extent of these influences remains unknown, these issues are certainly worthy of further investigation.

Endnotes

[1] Keymer, Tom, Peter Sabor, and John Mullan, eds. *The Pamela Controversy: Criticisms and Adaptations of Samuel Richardson's Pamela, 1740-1750*. London: Pickering & Chatto Ltd, 2000.

[2] Source: amazon.co.uk

[3] Fielding never claimed this work as his own (Hawley xxxviii). However, the authorship of *Shamela* is not in dispute.

[4] Fielding's direct references to Shamela's pretence include the following: when taken by the hand "I pretended to be shy" (*Shamela* 14); when kissed "I pretended to be Angry" (14); "pretended as how I would go out the door" (16-17); "pretend to awake" (18); "pretended to fix them [my eyes, during a fit] in my Head" (18); "pretend to refuse him any Favour" (23); "pretend as how I intended to drown myself" (25); "pretended to be ashamed" (27); "pretended not to know what he meant" (27); "pretended not to hear him" (27), "pretended to tremble" (30); and "pretended to fall into a Fit" (35).

[5] When Fielding's own personal history is scrutinised it is difficult to avoid wondering whether his dramatic sensitivity to the plot and characters of Richardson were a direct response to his own, somewhat similar, exploits and experiences. His biography reveals that in 1725, Fielding himself attempted unsuccessfully to abduct a

women whom he wished to marry (Hawley xxx-xxxi). It also includes speculation that his father's 1741 remarriage was probably to his servant (xxxii). Is Fielding's ridicule of Richardson's portrayal of such events at least partially motivated by a need to exorcise his own personal demons?

[6] Card makes her observation in a much more serious context, that is, her consideration of concentration camp prisoners working with camp administration and against fellow prisoners. Nevertheless, the logic applies to Pamela – although she is not perfect this does not mean she is not a victim.

[7] Both the film and the interviews discussed herein are in Spanish. All quotes are taken from translated subtitles. The official version of the movie was used to conduct this research thus it has been assumed that the translation is reliable.

Works Cited

Almodóvar, Pedro and Antonio Banderas. Interview. *Tie Me Up! Tie Me Down!* Dir. Pedro Almodóvar. Perf. Victoria Abril, Antonio Bandereas, and Loles León. Pathe. 1990.

Amazon.co.uk. 11 April 2009 <http://www.amazon.co.uk>.

"booby, n.[1]" *OED Online*. 1989. Oxford University Press. 5 Jan. 2008 <http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50025013>

"Blame It on Lisa." *The Simpsons*. Season 13, Episode 15. <http://wtso.net/movie/63-The%20Simpsons%201315%20Blame%20it%20On%20Lisa.html>

Brookoff, Daniel, Kimberley K. O'Brien, Charles S. Cook, Terry D. Thompson, and Charles Williams. "Characteristics of Participants in Domestic Violence: Assessment at the Scene of Domestic Assault." *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)*. 277.17 (1997): 1369-1373.

Cantor, Chris, and John Price. "Traumatic entrapment, appeasement and complex post-traumatic stress disorder: evolutionary perspectives of hostage reactions, domestic abuse and the Stockholm syndrome." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 41 (2007): 377-384.

Cantor, Paul A. "8:00 PM-9:00 PM. Jack in Double Time: 24 in Light of Aesthetic Theory." *24 and Philosophy: The World According to Jack*. Ed. Jennifer Hart Weed, Richard Davis, and Ronald Weed. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008. 196-207

Card, Claudia. *The Atrocity Paradigm: A Theory of Evil*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

---. "Women, Evil, and Grey Zones." *Metaphilosophy* 31.5 (2000): 509-528.

Carver, Joseph M. PhD. "Love and Stockholm Syndrome: The Mystery of Loving an Abuser." *Dr Joe Carvers Website.* 1 May 2007 <http://drjoecarver.makeswebsites.com/clients/49355/File/love_and_stockholm_syndrome.html>.

"Cleland, John." *The Columbia Encyclopedia*. 6th ed. 2007. Questia. 12 Apr. 2009 <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=112852488>.

Defoe, Daniel. *Moll Flanders*. 1722. London: Penguin Books, 1994.

De Fabrique, Nathalie, Vincent B. Van Hasselt, Gregory M. Vecchi, and Stephen J. Romano. "Common Variables Associated with the Development of Stockholm Syndrome: Some Case Examples." *Victims & Offenders* 2.1 (2007): 91-98.

De Fabrique, Nathalie, Stephen J. Romano, Gregory M. Vecchi, and Vincent B. Van Hasselt. "Understanding Stockholm Syndrome." *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* July (2007): 10-15.

Donovan, Robert A. "The Problem of Pamela, or Virtue Unrewarded." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 3.3 (1963): 377-395.

Doody, Margaret A. Introduction. *Pamela; Or, Virtue Rewarded.* By Samuel Richardson. 1740. London: Penguin Books, 1980. 7-20.

Dripps, Donald A. "Constitutional Theory for Criminal Procedure: Dickerson, Miranda, and the Continuing Quest for Broad-but-Shallow." *William and*

Mary Law Review 43.1 (2001): 1+.

Dugan, Meg Kennedy, and Roger R. Hock. *It's My Life Now: Starting over after an Abusive Relationship or Domestic Violence*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Dutton, Donald G. *The Domestic Assault of Women: Psychological and Criminal Justice Perspectives*. Vancouver, B.C.: University of British Columbia Press, 1995.

Fielding, Henry. *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews*. 1741. Joseph Andrews *and* Shamela. Ed. Judith Hawley. London: Penguin Books, 1999.

Fuselier, G. Dwayne. "Placing the Stockholm Syndrome in Perspective." *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* July (1999): 22-25.

Gordon, Avishag. "Terrorism as an Academic Subject after 9/11: Searching the Internet Reveals a Stockholm Syndrome Trend." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 28:1 (2005): 45-59.

Guerrini, Anita. "The Hungry Soul: George Cheyne and the Construction of Femininity." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 32.3 (1999): 279-291.

Hawley, Judith. Introduction and Notes. Joseph Andrews *and* Shamela. By Henry Fielding. London: Penguin Books, 1999. vii-xxxix.

Haywood, Eliza. *Anti-Pamela: or, Feigned Innocence Detected*. London: F. Huggonson, 1741

Hearst, Patricia and Alvin Moscow. *Patty Hearst: Her own story*. 1982. London: Corgi/Avon Books, 1988.

Henson, H. Keith. "Evolutionary Psychology, Memes and the Origin of War." *Mankind Quarterly* 46.4 (2006):443-459

Hinshelwood, Robert. D. “Primitive Mental Processes: Psychoanalysis and the Ethics of Integration.” *Philosophy, Psychiatry, Psychology* 4.2 (1997): 121-143.

Huddleston-Mattai, Barbara A. and P. Rudy Mattai. “The Sambo Mentality and the Stockholm Syndrome Revisited: Another Dimension to an Examination of the Plight of the African-American.” *Journal of Black Studies* 23.3 (1993): 344-357.

Lefever, Charlotte. “Richardson’s Paradoxical Success.” *Modern Language Association* 48.3 (1933): 856-860.

LeGates, Marlene. “The Cult of Womanhood in Eighteenth-Century Thought.” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 10.1 (1976): 21-39.

Lindsey, Johanna. *Captive Bride*. New York: Avon Books, 1977.

“Lindsey, Johanna.” *Fantastic Fiction*. 2008. 12 Apr. 2009 <http://www.fantasticfiction.co.uk/l/johanna-lindsey.htm>.

McCormick, John. *Catastrophe and Imagination: An Interpretation of the Recent English and American Novel*. London: Longmans Green, 1957.

McKillop, Alan D. “The Personal Relations between Fielding and Richardson.” *Modern Philology* 28.4 (1931): 423-433.

Mura, David. “Asia and Japanese Americans in the Postwar Era: The White Gaze and the Silenced Sexual Subject.” *American Literary History* 17.3 (2005): 604-620.

Namnyak, M., N. Tufton, R, Szekely, M. Toal, S. Worboys, and E.L. Sampson. “‘Stockholm syndrome’: psychiatric diagnosis or urban myth?” *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavia* 117 (2008): 4-11.

Richardson, Samuel. *Pamela: Or, Virtue Rewarded*. 1740. London: Penguin Books, 1980.

Sale, William M. Introduction. *Pamela or Virtue Rewarded*. By Samuel Richardson. 1740. New York: W.W. Norton and Company Inc, 1958. v-xiv.

Speckhard, Anne, Nadejda Tarabrina, Valery Krasnov, and Khapta Akhmedova. "Research Note: Observations of Terrorists in Action." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 16.2 (2004): 305-327.

Speckhard, Anne, Nadejda Tarabrina, Valery Krasnov, and Natalia Mufel "Stockholm Effects and Psychological Responses to Captivity in Hostages Held by Suicide Terrorists." *Traumatology* 11.2 (2005): 121-140.

Steinhoff, Patricia J. "Kidnapped Japanese in North Korea: The New Left Connection." *Journal of Japanese Studies* 30.1 (2004): 123-142.

Sumaya-Smith, Isabel. "Caregiver/Resident Relationships: surrogate family bonds and surrogate grieving in a skilled nursing facility." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 21 (1995): 447-451.

Tie Me Up! Tie Me Down! Dir. Pedro Almodóvar. Perf. Victoria Abril, Antonio Bandereas, and Loles León. Pathe. 1990.

Topf, Mel A. "Pamela." *PMLA* 88.5 (1973): 1190-1191.

Utter, Robert Palfrey, and Gwendolyn Bridges Needham. *Pamela's Daughters*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936.

Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding.* London: Pimlico, 2000.

Wesselius, Cassie L., and James V. DeSarno. “The Anatomy of a Hostage Situation.” *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* 1.2 (1983): 33-45.

Wilson, Stuart. “Richardson’s Pamela: An Interpretation.” *PMLA* 88.1 (1973): 79-91.

Wilson, Waziyatawin Angela. “Decolonizing the 1862 Death Marches.” *American Indian Quarterly* 28.1 (2004): 185-215.

Yeazell, Ruth Bernard. “Sexuality, Shame, and Privacy in the English Novel.” *Social Research* 68.1 (2001): 119-144.

24. Season One, Episode 16. Transcript. <http://www.twiztv.com/scripts/24/season1/24-116.htm>