

HARTS

& Minds



**UNMASKING FEMALE DESIRE
IN HYPERREALITY IN ELIZA
HAYWOOD'S *FANTOMINA***

Kyung Hwa Eun

HARTS & Minds:
The Journal of Humanities and Arts

Vol. 2, No. 2 (2015)

Article © HARTS & Minds
Image © Edouard Manet,
'Masked Ball at the Opera' (1832-33)
National Gallery of Art

UNMASKING FEMALE DESIRE IN HYPERREALITY IN ELIZA HAYWOOD'S FANTOMINA

Kyung Hwa Eun

Abstract

This article aims to examine Eliza Haywood's amatory fiction *Fantomina; or, Love in a Maze* (1725) as a work that attempts to disclose social barriers and ironies within the ideology of femininity and subvert the patriarchal order. In *Fantomina*'s pursuit of Beauplaisir, she resorts to the masquerade, through which she masks her true self and secures her reputation. *Fantomina* creates not only her own imaginary characters but also the masquerade-like world of what Baudrillard calls 'hyperreality.' In this world, the four different hyperreal characters she assumes and performs become 'simulacra' that succeed in completely deluding Beauplaisir. In this hyperreal space, *Fantomina*'s sexual desire is liberated as she frees herself from the constraints of preserving female reputation. Situating female chastity and reputation in this hyperreal space, Haywood reveals the illusory nature of female reputation, which loses its power while empowering the heroine to take the initiative in her relationship with her lover. A world in which female desire is liberated and empowered can be likened to Terry Castle's 'World Upside-Down', which embodies a realm of female desire and authority that threatens patriarchy. Thus, this seduction story delivers a voice of feminocentric subversion of patriarchy.

Key Words: Eliza Haywood, *Fantomina*, female desire, masquerade, hyperreality, simulacra, ironies of patriarchy, subversion, identity play

Introduction

No other writer in the eighteenth century enjoyed so notorious a reputation as Eliza Haywood both for her writings and her personal life. On the one hand, Haywood was as popular and admired as her contemporary Daniel Defoe. On the other, she was bitterly criticised for being an actress and a writer who 'often preferred characters that broke social taboos': that is, amatory fiction that overtly depicts female sexual desire.¹ This concern is not surprising in a society in which female sexuality was under rigorous control of patriarchal authority, and which was regarded as something obscene and illicit, therefore to be repressed, 'castrated' and 'decapitated' like 'automatons' as Cixous claims.²

In light of this perspective, Haywood's *Fantomina; or, Love in a Maze* (1725) is a story of female seduction that is not only unusual but uncomfortable. *Fantomina*'s eager pursuit of the male rake Beauplaisir inverts gender roles and challenges the patriarchal ideology of femininity. Her audacious behaviour of enticing Beauplaisir would be open to condemnation considering that eighteenth-century society set stringent regulations on female sexual desire – 'the higher one goes in the society, the greater the stress on pre-marital chastity.'³ Even middle-class women were certainly not expected to show any signs of sexual desire overtly, not even in the institution of marriage.⁴ In addition, unlike most contemporary seduction stories in which the seducer is a male character, *Fantomina* is a female seducer who strives to gain autonomy by taking an initiative in a relationship, thus not conforming to the dominant patriarchal authority. In short, *Fantomina* is a story of female subversion and empowerment.

It is particularly noteworthy that *Fantomina* discloses social barriers and ironies within the ideology of femininity in the way of a suppressed female becoming a leading subject. In her society, female sexuality has no reality, as it is replaced by images of chastity or virtue,

substituted with reputation and consumed by what is on the surface. This mode of production and consumption mechanism in patriarchy reminds us of ‘simulacra,’ which French postmodernist Jean Baudrillard postulated in his book *Simulacra and Simulation* (1994).⁵ Whether a woman is chaste de facto does not matter, rather, it is whether she is known to be chaste that matters.

This ironic property of the society, however, leaves Fantomina a loophole which enables her to satiate her forbidden desire on the condition that she pretends to cater to what patriarchy requires of a virtuous woman. In other words, she does not openly rebel against the overbearing patriarchal authority. Instead, she intentionally makes both her reputation and her true self elusive and obscure to play out her sexual and subversive desire and thus protect it. She herself becomes simulacra by repeatedly hatching cunning plots with her keen insight and switching her roles with her immaculate performing skills. To put it another way, she substitutes the real with the unreal – her chastity with reputation, her true self with four imaginary characters – as if she is in masquerade: the world saturated with simulacra, a copy without truth ‘simulating to feign to have what one doesn’t have.’⁶ Through this manoeuvre, Fantomina defies and ultimately triumphs over the dominant ideology without seeming to do so in an open, therefore condemnable manner.

Successive triumphs of Fantomina’s plots ironically betray blind spots of the strategies found within patriarchal ideology that seeks to control female sexuality. That patriarchal world hiring its own simulation mechanism is at the same time easily deceived by beguiling Fantomina’s simulacra and discloses its superficiality open to manipulation. In this regard, this article will read *Fantomina* as an account of female subversion and empowerment exploring how she discloses her desire in hyperreal masquerade and eventually how she eludes domineering patriarchal authority and attains autonomy.

Ironies of patriarchy: chastity and reputation

Fantomina goes behind the scenes and reveals the ironies in patriarchal high society that it is easily fooled by appearance. As ‘the higher one goes in the society, the greater the stress on pre-marital chastity,’ female chastity, particularly, is determined in what manner it is likely to be treated by criteria such as which social class she belongs to and who she appears to be.⁷ For example, in her role as a lady of birth, Fantomina’s chastity is secured in the name of reputation; rakish Beauplaisir never dares to entice her. Contrastingly, in her role as a prostitute, her physical chastity loses its significance and is degraded and consumed as a commodity as can be observed when ‘he [pulls] out of his Pocket a Purse of Gold [...] to procure her Content and Happiness.’⁸ Her apparent social status is so significant that even when she protests herself a virgin, the word carries no meaning or weight for him. Once seen as a prostitute, her chastity and the need to keep reputation are irrelevant factors that he can override with impunity as long as he pays for it.

In response to this maltreatment, in her true role as a young lady of birth, Fantomina speaks of reputation and loss of honour in a furious voice:

This treatment made her quite forget the Part she had assumed, and throwing it from her with an air of disdain, Is this a Reward (*said she*) for Condescensions, such as I have yielded to? – Can all the Wealth you are possessed of, make a Reparation for my Loss of Honour? – Oh! no, I am undone beyond the Power of Heaven itself to help me! – She uttered many more such Exclamations; [...] No, my dear Beauplaisir, (*added she*) your Love alone can compensate for the Shame you have involved me in; be you sincere and constant, and I hereafter shall, perhaps, be satisfy’d with my Fate, and forgive myself the Folly that betray’d me to you.⁹

Claiming that *love* rather than *wealth* can redeem her honour; *Fantomina* vehemently criticises the conventional view of the society that allows female chastity to be identified with reputation or to be worthlessly consumed as a commodity.¹⁰ Her denouncement comes from her understanding of the nature of chastity in such a society that sets a double standard of sexual behaviour: men were expected to have gained some sexual experience before marriage while women were obliged to be a virgin on their wedding night.¹¹ Delarivière Manley also boldly denounced the patriarchal double standard of virtue that was imposed on women which assumes that 'all woman's virtues as a person were inseparable from the one virtue of chastity' that indicates 'chastity once lost, the woman was forever lost.'¹² Accordingly, *Fantomina* goes even further and suggests her own definition of male and female virtue – sincerity and constancy – as she asks *Beauplaisir* to be sincere and constant. *Croskery* also notes that constancy, not chastity, becomes the primary signifier for virtue.¹³

Still, the society esteems female virtue highly; this includes sexual chastity as well as reputation for chastity. In the real world, sexual chastity is synonymous to reputation, so it can be replaced by reputation. Then, chastity lost its reality; it becomes a shadow, and thus can be lost with impunity as long as its appearance can be kept up. Then, how is female chastity produced as a sign of reputation or an image of a virtuous woman and controlled in patriarchy? For instance, as 'a young lady of distinguished birth, beauty, wit and spirit,' *Fantomina* has to conform to behave as a chaste woman and suppress her sexual desire when she desires *Beauplaisir*:¹⁴

She had often seen him in the Drawing-Room, had talk'd with him; but then her quality and reputed Virtue kept him from using her with that Freedom she now expected he would do, and had made her often think she should not be displeas'd, if he would abate some Part of his Reserve. – Now was the Time to have her Wishes answer'd:¹⁵

Although she has desired *Beauplaisir* for a long time, as a young lady of distinguished birth and *reputed* virtue, she could not approach him with freedom; neither could *Beauplaisir* dare to do so. However, when she disguises herself as a prostitute, she is now free from such restrictions, and so '[finds a] vast deal of Pleasure in conversing with him in this free and unrestrain'd manner [...] [passing] their Time all the Play with an equal Satisfaction.'¹⁶ Patriarchy, which is blinded by appearance, renders what is insubstantial substantial and thus substantial as insubstantial. For this reason, only after she manipulates her identity and places herself on the margins of society, in which the respectability demanded of women of birth no longer has any significance, is she then able to act out her inappropriate desire outside the institution of marriage, the only space in which respectable women can become sexual beings.

This reflects the illusory nature of reputation: it is often likened to breath or something fragile.¹⁷ According to *Oxford English Dictionary*, 'reputation' is the general opinion or estimate of a person's character or other qualities.¹⁸ Since it is constituted by other people, it is often influenced by them, and contains unreliable factors such as rumours and misunderstandings other than truth. Considering that it is concerned with what the majority of people think about a person, and is connected with his/her activities that they do or do not approve of, it recalls Foucault's idea of discourse: it is 'constituted by a group of signs or statements that belong to a single system of formation,' utilised by the ruling class as a means of control to determine what is true or false.¹⁹ Likewise, female reputation is an apparatus of the ruling group of patriarchal ideology and authority, as it, not the actual fact of chastity, determines whether a woman is chaste or not. It signifies a will to shackle women and their sexuality under an invisible but powerful surveillance, for women were historically and

socially regarded as ‘more lustful in their appetites and more fickle in their attachments than men.’²⁰

From this perspective, female reputation is nothing more than a symbol or a signifier which replaces the reality of female chastity. Yet, the reputation as a signifier does not contain any significance in truth, as it has nothing to do with female chastity in essence. Thus, the signifier simply feigns to be ‘the truth which actually conceals that there is none’ and then becomes simulacrum, ‘a real without origin or reality.’²¹ Alienated from the reality, female sexuality is substituted with reputation. The reputation appears in the world in the form of spurious reality. Hence, what Fantomina seems to avoid is falling into disrepute as an unchaste woman. On the brink of becoming a fallen woman, she finds herself in a situation of great dilemma and distress: as due to ‘the Apprehension of really losing her Honour, she struggled all she could, and was just going to reveal the whole Secret of her Name and Quality,’ but she chooses not to reveal her true identity.²² She shows a keen understanding of this mechanism when she sacrifices the truth for appearance. No matter how chaste or licentious she is, as long as her good reputation is left intact, she will retain her identity as a lady of *reputed* virtue.

Ironically, reputation as a mere symbol or simulacrum acquires its own significance more than chastity does in this superficial society. It is concerned mostly with what is of the surface, so is open to gullibility. It never ascertains the truth, as it does not care about what is under the surface. This begets a possibility of counterplot and manipulation. As long as one can successfully pretend to conform to what the society requires, paradoxically one has met all the social requirements that are needed. This duplicitous quality is effectively manipulated when Fantomina’s mother solicits Beauplaisir to keep Fantomina’s misbehaviours secret:

I must confess it was with a Design to oblige you to repair the supposed Injury you had done this unfortunate Girl, by marrying her, but now I know not what to say: – The Blame is wholly hers, and I have nothing to request further of you than that you will not divulge the distracted Folly she has been guilty of.²³

Fantomina’s predicament is a serious one, and in a usual sense she is on the verge of ruin. The only way she can redeem herself is through marriage. Consequently, Fantomina’s mother shows her understanding of how society works on two levels. Firstly, she knows that Fantomina is entirely in Beauplaisir’s power as it regards marriage, as she cannot marry him unless he asks her, and the mother knows that he will not marry a fallen woman. However, she also knows that Fantomina can be saved by keeping her misdemeanour secret. Fantomina’s honour as a virtuous lady can be preserved by manipulating her reputation. Fantomina’s mother’s artifice of skilfully dealing with the dangerous situation reveals the facility with which society can be duped.

Fantomina’s counterplot: from privacy to hyperreality

The ambiguous nature of reputation makes it possible for Fantomina to create a space full of manipulated identities, which is made possible by a world of secrets. Her world operates in privacy on two levels: one is private time and space; the other is private self. Firstly, private time and space allow her a degree of freedom to manifest and to unmask her desire for Beauplaisir. That she intentionally tries to be alone all the time to secure her own private time and space eventually allows her a degree of ‘physical privacy,’ and yet more significantly, that of ‘psychological privacy.’²⁴ Placing herself in the private setting of time and space, Fantomina finds herself overtly manifesting and indulging in what pleases her: sexual desire. As Spacks observes that ‘the person who claims the right to be alone, or even to keep things to herself, might meditate bad deeds or entertain bad thoughts, and no one would know.’²⁵ For

this reason, privacy evokes 'a degree of threat to the values of a society still hierarchical and still retaining ideas about the importance of the communal.'²⁶ Likewise, *Fantomina* is immersed in enjoying illicit desire in secrecy: when she is in the coach on her way back from meeting Beauplaisir, she in solitude reflects on the pleasant time with him, monitors how successful her disguise has been, and plots the next disguise. As a means of concealing herself, she arms herself with hypocrisy, 'a form of public performance, [which] deliberately attempts to obfuscate a person's true intent.'²⁷ In this sense, *Fantomina*'s will to keep her secret of 'making no person in the world a confidant in [her plot],' and of cloaking her secret even to her guardian, Aunt, can be interpreted as a form of hypocrisy that ultimately arouses fear in the patriarchal order.²⁸

In addition, she also appears as a private self while hiding her public self under a mask. According to the definition of a *self* by the psychologist Harry C. Triandis, 'the private self' is 'cognition of the self by the self' that involves 'traits, states, or behaviours of a person,' whereas 'the public self' corresponds to that of 'the self by the generalized other.'²⁹ In this respect, *Fantomina*'s public self includes her identity as a lady of birth and corresponds to her socially expected decorum: keeping up her reputation – a criterion constituted by others in the society. In order to keep her public self integral, she is supposed to suppress her sexual desire. However, as privacy liberates her from the restrictions of patriarchal authority and is about 'the ability to control the face present to the world,' her private self mirrors her inner will and hidden desire.³⁰ It enables her to be reborn as a new identity, a contrasting private self: whichever character she deems appropriate to fulfil her desire and thus successfully lead Beauplaisir to delusion. Eventually, she fabricates and wears four different characters of women – *Fantomina*, *Celia*, *Widow Bloomer* and *Incognita*.

In short, transformation of outward public self through changes of identities renders *Fantomina* unrecognisable. This entails a process of becoming the other: that of alienation of her public self from the private self. As a result, her public self remains 'elusive and inaccessible – illegible – within its fantastical encasements' of private self.³¹ Even the significance of her name, *Fantomina*, cannot go unnoticed, which demonstrates her versatility of becoming totally the other person. As a matter of fact, *Fantomina* is not her real name. Throughout the story, her real name is not made known even to the reader, and thus no one knows her real name and identity. In truth, she becomes as her name implies: insubstantial, illusory, and as elusive as a phantom.

However, *Fantomina*'s fabricated characters are not vapid and listless ones, but animated and active as if they are alive in the real world. It recalls the Baudrillardian process of 'simulation': a process of enlivening inane characters to be hyperreal ones, which have their own significance as they are.³² To simulate is not merely to pretend. For example, 'while whoever fakes an illness can simply stay in bed and make everyone believe he is ill, whoever simulates an illness produces in himself some of the symptoms.'³³ The process of such embodiment in *Fantomina* is highlighted by the narrator in the following passage:

I know there are Men who will swear it is an Impossibility and that no Disguise could hinder them from knowing a Woman they had once enjoy'd. In answer to these Scruples, I can only say, that besides the Alteration which the change of Dress made in her, she was so admirably skill'd in the Art of feigning, that she had the Power of putting on almost what Face she pleas'd, and knew so exactly how to form her Behaviour to the Character she represented that all the comedians at both Playhouses are infinitely short of her Performances: She could vary her very Glances, tune her Voice to Accents the most different imaginable from those in which she spoke when she appeared herself. – These Aids from Nature join'd to the Wiles of Art, and the Distance between the

Places where the Imagin'd *Fantomina* and *Celia* were might very well prevent his having any Thought that they were the same, or that the fair *Widow* was either of them:³⁴

Disguise often includes nothing more than a mere change of dresses, yet *Fantomina* becomes a consummate actress who is 'so admirably skilled in the Art of feigning' with imagination, to such a degree that she becomes entirely the other person.³⁵ It signifies 'a certain physical detachment from the situation and by implication a moral detachment' and permits her to freedom and license.³⁶ After all, her hyperreal characters become more real than the real, successfully delude patriarchal surveillance, and ultimately set her free from patriarchal constraints. This is why her performance can be interpreted as 'an act of ecstatic impersonation.'³⁷

While acting out her simulated characters, the world of *Fantomina* becomes that of masquerade in which feigned identities are played. Yet, that this is at first necessitated by *Beauplaisir*'s fickle and rakish nature makes this work somewhat problematic. As his name *beau* (fine) and *plaisir* (pleasure) already signifies, he is a libertine whose passion and desire is transitory and fleeting. In order to hold his attention, she too assumes four different identities transitorily and fleetingly. Usually, masquerade has its undeniably provocative visual elements as bodies were highlighted while other personal features were subsumed to ingratiate herself with scopophilic *Beauplaisir*.³⁸ In this regard, Luce Irigaray claims that the masquerade recuperates some element of female desire by participating in man's desire, but at the price of renouncing their own by remaining on the market as objects for sexual enjoyment, not as those who enjoy.³⁹ In line with Irigaray's interpretation, Mary Ann Doane also observes that 'masquerade is not [...] as a joyful or affirmative play but as an anxiety-ridden compensatory gesture, as a position which is potentially disturbing, uncomfortable, and inconsistent, as well as psychically painful for the woman [...] masquerade would seem to facilitate an understanding of the woman's status as spectacle rather than spectator.'⁴⁰ These claims highlight the passivity of the female role in the masquerade in that women in the masquerade can never be an object with the power of seeing, only being seen and consumed by circulating within the patriarchal economy.

Fantomina, however, disproves these claims. Although at first she seems to participate in *Beauplaisir*'s rakish desire, obviously she does not entirely cater to it. Instead, she makes well use of anonymity that masquerade mercifully provides her with as it exempts her from any sort of social responsibilities. As Wahrman posits, *Fantomina* takes advantage of 'the essence of the masquerade' – a play of masquerade identities: 'transformation of a different sort that makes participants unrecognisable' by undergoing 'metamorphosis' of herself to retreat into a world of liberty where she enjoys momentary liberation from the shackles of identity.⁴¹ In this viewpoint, Schofield also claims that Haywood has created a new feminine ideology by the use of disguise as a positive force; that is, through masking, women are able to discover a true self that can stand in opposition to the male-controlling ideologies of female powerlessness and romantic love.⁴² Likewise, Castle argues that historically and culturally the masquerade is a space wherein 'the reputations of middle- and upper-class women' were protected by removing 'social restraints – including sexual ones.'⁴³ Thus, when she is emancipated 'from external constraints like religious and political persecution, or the fetter of hidebound convention' – the 'great obstacles' – she is free to indulge her forbidden desire.⁴⁴

The fact that *Fantomina* in the world of masquerade would never be reproached if her original identity were left hidden encourages her to gradually become more ambitious. She now strives to take the initiative in a relationship with *Beauplaisir*. As is demonstrated, initially she simply aims to keep him constant: she is satisfied with spending some pleasant time with him. However, once she gets to know a way of keeping him, she slowly finds

pleasure in empowering herself by deluding him and ultimately making him tantalised and disempowered:

She loved Beauplaisir; it was only he whose Solicitations could give her Pleasure; and had she seen the whole Species despairing, dying for her sake, it might, perhaps, have been a Satisfaction to her Pride, but none to her more tender Inclination. – Her design was once more to engage him, to hear him sigh, to see him languish, to feel the strenuous Pressures of his eager Arms, to be compelled, to be sweetly forc'd to what she wished with equal Ardour was what she wanted and what she had form'd a Stratagem to obtain, in which she promis'd herself Success.⁴⁵

This demonstrates that *Fantomina* plans a stratagem, which aims at gaining *equal* ardour from Beauplaisir. It implies that she desires equality in this relationship and ultimately is willing to go beyond that to the subversion of power relations. Her aim lies in '[hearing] him sigh' and '[seeing] him languish,' what she ultimately wishes for is power.⁴⁶ Her success in deluding him and keeping him tantalised makes her 'extremely happy in the Reflection on the Success of her Stratagems,' and even 'laughing heartily to think of the Tricks she had played him and applauding her own Strength of Genius and Force of Resolution.'⁴⁷ What this signifies is that her masquerade is a hyperreal one and plays a pivotal role as a way of female empowerment.

The more *Fantomina* becomes active in bringing her desire to fulfilment, the more Beauplaisir becomes distant from his rakish desire. Eventually, she becomes the seducer, and he the seduced. This 'reversal of conventional male-female power relations' is often observed in masquerade as it plays a pivotal role as 'a place of significant revelations': in this world, 'the woman, more times than not, triumphs.'⁴⁸ This reversal moment is particularly 'carnavalesque' during which women celebrate 'temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order.'⁴⁹ Therefore, *Fantomina* owns power of seeing, the ability to see rather than be seen.⁵⁰ When wearing the fourth mask of *Incognita*, she not only daringly invites Beauplaisir to her hyperreality, but also emasculates him by tantalising him with the possibility of unmasking her true self. Then, he gets more preoccupied with unmasking her identity than with sexually enjoying her.

Accordingly, *Fantomina* presents a world of 'feminocracy', which embodies 'a gynesium – a realm pervaded by female desire, authority and influence.'⁵¹ In the end, *Fantomina* completely makes Beauplaisir disempowered as can be observed when he finds out that he has been fooled by *Fantomina*'s plots and '[takes] his Leave, full of Cogitations, more confused than ever he had known in his whole Life.'⁵² Hence, *Fantomina*'s world of masquerade is the 'World Upside-Down,' making a woman's place anonymous and ambiguous within patriarchy so that it remains subversive as it threatens the patriarchal order.⁵³

Conclusion

In spite of all *Fantomina*'s subversive trials, the ending of this work is still quite controversial. It seems rather conservative in that she delivers a baby, and her identity is finally debunked to Beauplaisir. Although keeping it secret has been her major preoccupation in the story, as her mother shows up, *Fantomina* seems to lose her voice in that she conforms to her mother's authority and is finally sent to a monastery in France. As if she awoke from a utopian dream of a feminocratic masquerade world, she is about to lose her power again. Evidently, the conclusion seems ambiguous and puzzling. While Croskery and Patchias agree that 'the heroine's relocation to a monastery might seem to signal the end of her sexual adventures,' they cast a doubt on this assumption since Haywood hired 'another early modern literary

mode' – 'the topos of the attractive nuns' – that puzzles readers as it begets a possibility that Fantomina may recommence her sexual adventures there.⁵⁴ Obviously, it is a rather open ending. Yet, there are some reasons that *Fantomina* should not be read as a conventional conduct book or a moral teaching text for young ladies. There is 'no guarantee of moral transformation, nor was it an effective stopgap to erotic pleasure,' so the ending implies 'not a conclusion, but a sequel.'⁵⁵ Likewise, we can hardly find any moral lessons given to Fantomina or any signs of repentance. Moreover, regarding that a French monastery permits some degree of freedom, which might hold 'the promise of further adventures,' her relocation to the monastery in France implies another possibility. It is also not told that whether her mother – Fantomina's sole influential guidance – accompanies her or not; which may allow Fantomina a degree of freedom there. In light of this viewpoint, Fantomina is not *sent* literally, but is rather *going* to the monastery.⁵⁶

Still some critics including Ros Ballaster argue that *Fantomina* is a conservative work which provides only 'a small oasis of possibility through the practice of feminine mimicry' as it shows 'the melancholy reiteration of female defeat at the hands of the fictionalizing male libertine.'⁵⁷ However, it is more significant to emphasise that '*Fantomina* resists conventional categories of sexual pursuit, sexual tragedy, or sexual victory': she is a defiant subject who refuses to become a helpless victim or a needy woman begging Beauplaisir for love even after being raped.⁵⁸ In addition, Haywood once claimed in her periodical *The Female Spectator* that it is the most infallible maxim to know 'whenever we would truly conquer, we must seem to yield.'⁵⁹ Likewise, the finale should be interpreted as Fantomina's seeming and momentary yielding to truly gain mastery. Thus, *Fantomina*, is a seduction story which delivers a voice of feminocentric subversion of patriarchy.

Notes

¹ Margaret C. Croskery and Anna C. Patchias, 'Introduction', in *Fantomina and Other Works*, (New York: Broadview Press, 2004), 9-32 (p. 16).

² Hélène Cixous, 'Castration or Decapitation?', in *Signs*, trans. by Annette Kuhn, 7.1 (1981), 41-55 (pp. 42-43).

³ Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), p. 504.

⁴ Terry Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986), p. 44.

⁵ Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation*. trans. by Sheila Faria Glaser. (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1994), p. 1.

⁶ Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation*, p. 3.

⁷ Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage*, p. 504.

⁸ Eliza Haywood, *Fantomina; or, Love in a Maze. Popular Fiction by Women, 1660-1730: An Anthology*, ed. by Paula Backscheider & John J. Richetti (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 226-48 (p. 231).

⁹ Haywood, *Fantomina*, p. 231.

¹⁰ Stone explains that women have for millennia been regarded as the sexual property of men; the value of this property is diminished if it has been or is being used by anyone other than the legal owner (*The Family, Sex and Marriage*, p. 503). See also; Fielding's *The Modern Husband* (1732) demonstrates this when Mr. Modern told his wife that "Your person is mine: I bought it lawfully in the church." (qtd. in *The Family, Sex and Marriage*, p. 501).

¹¹ Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage*, p. 501. It is also interesting to note the concept of honour in the sixteenth, seventh and eighteenth centuries: the worst thing a man could say about another man was that he was liar, whereas the worst thing a woman could say about another woman was that she was unchaste (*The Family, Sex and Marriage*, p. 503).

¹² Gwendolyn B. Needham, 'Mrs. Manley: An Eighteenth-Century Wife of Bath', in *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 14.3 (1951), 259-84 (p. 272).

¹³ Margaret C. Croskery, 'Masquing Desire: The Politics of Passion in Eliza Haywood's *Fantomina*', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on Her Life and Work*, ed. by Kirsten T. Saxton & Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington, KY: UP of Kentucky, 2000), 69-94 (pp.70, 79).

- ¹⁴ Haywood, *Fantomina*, p. 227.
- ¹⁵ Haywood, *Fantomina*, p. 228.
- ¹⁶ Haywood, *Fantomina*, p. 228.
- ¹⁷ Brittleness of female chastity or reputation is more often than not mentioned in eighteenth-century works. Alexander Pope described in his work, *The Rape of the Lock* (1714) that it is easily breakable as a 'frail china jar' (II. 106) and easily stainable as Belinda's 'new brocade' (II. 107) (Alexander Pope, *The Rape of the Lock*, in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, Vol. 1, ed. by Stephen Greenblatt & M. H. Abrams (New York: W.W. Norton, 2006) 2514-32 (p. 2520)). Reverend Villars from *Evelina* (1778) by Frances Burney, as a guardian, also gently admonishes Evelina that 'nothing is so delicate as the reputation of a woman: it is, at once, the most beautiful and most brittle of all human things' (Frances Burney, *Evelina: or, the History of a Young Lady's Entrance into the World*, ed. Edward A. Bloom (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008) p. 166.)
- ¹⁸ 'reputation, n'. Available online at: Web. *OED Online*, Korea University [accessed 12 June 2014].
- ¹⁹ Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, trans. by A. M. Sheridan Smith, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), p. 107.
- ²⁰ Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage*, pp. 501-02.
- ²¹ Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation*, p. 1.
- ²² Haywood, *Fantomina*, p. 230.
- ²³ Haywood, *Fantomina*, p. 248.
- ²⁴ Patricia Meyer Spacks, *Privacy: Concealing the Eighteenth-Century Self*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), p. 7.
- ²⁵ Spacks, *Privacy*, p. 88.
- ²⁶ Spacks, *Privacy*, p. 7.
- ²⁷ Spacks, *Privacy*, p. 12.
- ²⁸ Haywood, *Fantomina*, p. 233.
- ²⁹ Harry C. Triandis, 'The Self and Social Behavior in Differing Cultural Contexts', in *Psychological Review* 96.3 (1989), 506-520 (p. 507).
- ³⁰ Jeffrey Rosen, *The Unwanted Gaze: The Destruction of Privacy in America*, (New York: Random House, 2000), p. 46.
- ³¹ Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization*, p. 4.
- ³² Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation*, p. 1.
- ³³ Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation*, p. 3.
- ³⁴ Haywood, *Fantomina*, p. 238.
- ³⁵ Haywood, *Fantomina*, p. 238.
- ³⁶ Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization*, p. 39.
- ³⁷ Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization*, p. 4.
- ³⁸ Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization*, p. 38.
- ³⁹ Luce Irigaray, *This Sex Which Is Not One*, trans. by Catherine Porter & Carolyn Burke, (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985) pp. 133-34.
- ⁴⁰ Mary Ann Doane, 'Masquerade Reconsidered: Further Thoughts on the Female Spectator', in *Discourse*, 11.1 (1988-89), 42-54 (p. 47)
- ⁴¹ Dror Wahrman, *Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006), pp. 159, 161, 234.
- ⁴² Mary Anne Schofield, *Masking and Unmasking the Female Mind: Disguising Romances in Feminine Fiction 1713-1799*, (Newark, NJ: University of Delaware Press, 1990), p. 47.
- ⁴³ Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization*, p. 33.
- ⁴⁴ Roy Porter, 'Introduction', in *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*, ed. Roy Porter, (New York: Routledge, 1997), 1-16 (p. 1).
- ⁴⁵ Haywood, *Fantomina*, p. 234.
- ⁴⁶ Haywood, *Fantomina*, p. 234.
- ⁴⁷ Haywood, *Fantomina*, p. 240, 243.
- ⁴⁸ Schofield, *Masquerade*, p. 7.
- ⁴⁹ Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. by Hélène Iswolsky. (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984), p. 10.
- ⁵⁰ Catherine Craft-Fairchild, *Masquerade and Gender: Disguise and Female Identity in Eighteenth-Century Fictions by Women*, (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993), p. 65, 228.
- ⁵¹ Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization*, p. 254.
- ⁵² Haywood, *Fantomina*, p. 248.
- ⁵³ Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization*, p. 254-55.

⁵⁴ Croskery and Patchias, 'Introduction', p. 24.

⁵⁵ Croskery, 'Masquing Desire', p. 92.

⁵⁶ Croskery, 'Masquing Desire', p. 91. See also; Haywood delighted in rescuing her heroines from monastic confinement. Indeed, for Haywood as for Aphra Behn, monasteries are often only exotic locations for further amatory adventures. Other heroines escape from monasteries or convents in Haywood's *Idalia: or, the Unfortunate Mistress* (1723), *The Force of Nature; or, the Lucky Disappointment* (1724), and *The Agreeable Caledonian; or, Memoirs of Signiora de Morella* (1728) (Croskery, 'Masquing Desire', p. 91).

⁵⁷ Ros Ballaster, *Seductive Forms: Women's Amatory Fiction from 1684 to 1740*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 192.

⁵⁸ Croskery and Patchias, 'Introduction', p. 25.

⁵⁹ Eliza Haywood, *The Female Spectator*, Vol. 2. 3rd edn. (n.pub., 1750). Available online at: Web ECCO, Korea University [accessed 20 July 2014], p. 183.

Bibliography

Bakhtin, Mikhail, *Rabelais and His World*. trans. Hélène Iswolsky, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984).

Ballaster, Ros, *Seductive Forms: Women's Amatory Fiction from 1684 to 1740*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

Baudrillard, Jean, *Simulacra and Simulation*. trans. Sheila Faria Glaser, (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1994).

Burney, Frances, *Evelina: or, the History of a Young Lady's Entrance into the World*. ed. Edward A. Bloom, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Castle, Terry, *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986).

Cixous, Hélène, 'Castration or Decapitation?', trans. Annette Kuhn, in *Signs*, 7.1 (1981), 41-55.

Craft-Fairchild, Catherine, *Masquerade and Gender: Disguise and Female Identity in Eighteenth-Century Fictions by Women*, (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993).

Croskery, Margaret C., 'Masquing Desire: The Politics of Passion in Eliza Haywood's *Fantomina*', in *The Passionate Fictions of Eliza Haywood: Essays on Her Life and Work*. eds. Kirsten T. Saxton & Rebecca P. Bocchicchio (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), 69-94.

Croskery, Margaret C. and Anna C. Patchias, 'Introduction'. In *Fantomina and Other Works*, (New York: Broadview Press, 2004), 9-32.

Doane, Mary Ann, 'Masquerade Reconsidered: Further Thoughts on the Female Spectator', in *Discourse*, 11.1 (1988-89), 42-54.

Foucault, Michel, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972).

Haywood, Eliza, *Fantomina; or, Love in a Maze*, in *Popular Fiction by Women, 1660-1730: An Anthology*. ed. Paula Backscheider & John J. Richetti, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 226-48.

— *The Female Spectator*, Vol. 2. 3rd edn. (n.pub., 1750). Available online at: Web ECCO, Korea University [accessed 20 July 2014].

Irigaray, Luce, *This Sex Which Is Not One*, trans. Catherine Porter & Carolyn Burke, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985)

Needham, Gwendolyn B., 'Mrs. Manley: An Eighteenth-Century Wife of Bath', in *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 14.3 (1951), 259-84.

Pope, Alexander, *The Rape of the Lock*, in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Vol. 1. ed. Stephen Greenblatt & M. H. Abrams, (New York: W.W. Norton, 2006), 2514-32.

Porter, Roy, 'Introduction', in *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*. ed. Roy Porter, (New York: Routledge, 1997), 1-16.

'reputation, n', *OED Online*, Available online at: Web. *OED Online*, Korea University [accessed 12 June 2014].

Rosen, Jeffrey, *The Unwanted Gaze: The Destruction of Privacy in America*, (New York: Random House, 2000).

Schofield, Mary Anne. *Masking and Unmasking the Female Mind: Disguising Romances in Feminine Fiction 1713-1799*, (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1990).

— *Masquerade Novels of Eliza Haywood*, (New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1986).

Spacks, Patricia Meyer, *Privacy: Concealing the Eighteenth-Century Self*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

Stone, Lawrence, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1977).

Triandis, Harry C., 'The Self and Social Behavior in Differing Cultural Contexts, in *Psychological Review*, 96.3 (1989), 506-520.

Wahrman, Dror, *Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006).

Thumbnail Image: William Hogarth (English, 1697 - 1764) *After*, 1730 - 1731, Oil on canvas 39.4 x 33.7 cm (15 1/2 x 13 1/4 in.) The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles

Biography

Kyung Hwa Eun is a PhD student in English Literature at Korea University in Seoul, Korea. Her research interests include feminine desires, sexuality, and subjectivity represented in amatory fictions and courtship novels by eighteenth century women writers; she is also interested in authorisation of their works in relation to the printing market, authorship, and readership.