Amelia Speirs

This is a good explication of a complicated story, with the necessary detail and enough command of writing to put it across (not an easy thing with so much going on!) But it doesn't quite get to the point of the assignment, which is to discuss how the episode in question gets at, or "mirrors" the larger story of which it is a part. To be sure, we see characters reacting emotionally, and we too react emotionally to events. But that is low-balling it.

The thing to do is to keep the "reader" in mind (the point Fielding is forever emphasizing). Put the reader at the center of your essay, and I think it would all become clearer. The point is not that Fielding "hides important lessons" but that he often leaves them implicit, letting the reader figure them out. In this case, as you point out, Allworthy is the key, but just because his character is contrasted with the story-tellers. Allworthy is cast in the role of "reader" as he hears the stories, and he arrives at a wrong conclusion, good man though he is.

How does this comment on the story of which it is a part? By showing us how even good readers can arrive at wrong conclusions—a point Fielding makes throughout the novel. So focus on this, perhaps bringing in some quotations from elsewhere if they help to make the case. The point is not, surely, that Allworthy gets emotional, but that he is deceived and passes judgment without being in possession of all the facts. This is a mistake, Fielding suggests, that we, as readers of his novel, are also likely to fall into.

The thing to emphasize, then, would not be simply the evidence per se, but how the evidence is evaluated. Note that in this case, Fielding puts us in possession of the facts (well, most of them) so that we can *see* how and why Allworthy goes wrong. He doesn't always do that—but here, early on in the novel, he gives us a fairly easy example to work with. Thus, the argument could be that the episode "mirrors" the story of which it is a part by dramatizing the skills required to evaluate stories and story-tellers. Grade: B

Beth Cameron

Except for the fact that you lose your thread halfway through, this is a good reading of the episode, with insight into the characters and the implications for "how not to read a novel." Mrs. Western is indeed an over-confident reader, and as such, a warning to us not to jump to conclusions. Perhaps the point to make is that between the two of them, the Westerns would make one fairly competent reader since between the two of them the important facts of a case are registered. But of course they can't cooperate since they are always at loggerheads, and as they alternate in the Sophia-governance process things just go from bad to worse. You could sharpen up the essay by putting more emphasis on the "reader" in your analysis, or, to put it more specifically, the "contract" or "rules" by which Fielding governs his "new province of writing." He does think of it as a contractual arrangement, with privileges and obligations on both sides. (Which, by the way, is why he makes so much of the "politics" of Squire and Mrs. Western—they are good examples of how and why politicians fail when contracts are not made or complied with.) Grade: A-

Speaking of which: about marriage contracts. The default was for property to belong to the head of the household. But in cases of women of rank like Sophia and Mrs. Fitzpatrick, the norm was to create a settlement to protect the wife by insuring that she had her "own" money. This would be of two kinds: "pin money" or a clothing allowance which would be paid annually and which she could spend as she pleased, and a "jointure" or insurance policy which the husband could not touch and which would provide for the wife after the husband's death. Women could also hold property in their own right if this was insisted upon in the marriage contract. These financial arrangements could get extremely complicated (we see how old Mr. Nightingale was trying to out-bargain his future daughter-in-law, who would not have come cheap). To be sure, an imprudent woman could get herself into trouble, and horror stories are not far to seek. But there were more legal protections available than most people think. There are also counter examples of wives who became extremely wealthy by driving a hard bargain.

Samantha Freeburn

You are on the right track here. No quarrel about Blifil's motives. I think, though, more could be said about Fielding's motives which might get us to the larger significance of this episode. True it is that we see that Blifil is a bad person and that Sophia has an affectionate attitude for Tom. But there seems to be more to it than that. We already know this information from other incidents, so I rather suspect that this information is being used for a different purpose here. Perhaps the mystery has to do with the fact that Squire Western, a certified fool, is able to see what is going on while the other characters are deceived.

How to explain this? I like your point that Western considers the act but not the motives. His very obtuseness enables him to get it right. But follow up the implication: why do the others get it wrong? Presumably because they see what they want to see, and their prejudice leaves them open to Blifil's deceitful *story*, which was indeed crafted for their benefit (explain the details of how it is crafted for these particular auditors). The point is not (simply) that Blifil is a bad person, but that he is a good story-teller—because he keeps the audience in mind.

This is the point that would enable you to compare the little story to the big story, right? Fielding, like Blifil, keeps his readers in mind, telling a story crafted to play off our expectations, vanity, and prejudices. What works for Blifil, works for Fielding, with the difference that Fielding wants us to *understand* what he does as a story-teller. Unlike Blifil, he's no hypocrite, and he deceives us to make us the wiser. He tells us this particular story to show us how easy it is to be deceived when we attribute good motives to a bad character, or when we are too inclined to hear only what we wish to hear. Or you could show how Blifil, as a clever story-telling, is able to craft a tale that works with readers holding opposing moral views. Get into the details of the story as *story*, as opposed to talking about Blifil's character, though of course that's an issue too.

To get the essay up to the next level, the thing to do would be to (more explicitly) compare the reading situation in the episode to the interplay between writer and reader that Fielding develops throughout the novel. That’s the "mirror" relationship. Grade: B+

Ryan Stebbins

I think this is good as far as it goes, though you probably spend more time on summary that is necessary for a short essay. Your point are reasonable, though perhaps there's a little more here? Fielding gives us the evidence, and then dramatizes responses, and we see how the evidence is misread. Note that this is one of those A-B situations: first the mob, then Allworthy, but they get things wrong for different reasons (I think this is the point). The mob is not quite "mindless," since they respond on the basis of prejudice and prior experience. There aren't so many cases of husbands being beaten by their wives, after all. But note the difference: Allworthy judges not based on prejudice but on the testimony of witnesses. He comes to the wrong conclusion of course, but he does seem to arrive at the proper conclusion based on what he is told. Explain the difference between how the "mob" responds and how the magistrate responds—that seems to be the chief point.

The next challenge is to draw the moral for readers of *Tom Jones*: what are we to learn about "reading" from this episode? Perhaps not just one thing; see what you can come up with. That experience and probable reasoning is sometimes wrong, that cause and effect can be perplexed, that obvious facts can be overlooked, that even reasonable decisions from the best judges sometimes need to be overturned based on additional information.

Shift your emphasis from what the characters are doing to what Fielding is doing and you can get the argument up to the next level. Notice *what* information he gives us, *when*, and *how*—obviously our prior knowledge here puts us in a different situation than the characters in the story. He doesn't always give us such knowledge: why here, why like this? Etc. Move from summery to analysis. Grade: B+

Joon Seo

You are certainly right about the characters of Tom and Blifil, though you are having some difficulties setting up an argument that addresses the assignment. It might go something like this. Blifil frees Sophia's bird, and then proceeds to tell a story about his motives for doing so. We see that the story is not true, and so does Sophia, and for that matter Squire Western rejects it too. But other characters are inclined to accept the story. The question is, why?

Your essay deals with motives, with is the right way to go about this. At issue, though, is not only Blifil's motives, but the way he crafts his story to appeal to this particular audience. Explain why Fielding would dramatize the differing responses to the story Blifil tells—he is trying to teach us something about motives, after all. Is Blifil, though a bad person, a good story-teller? How is his skill in crafting a story like and not like Fielding's way of crafting a story? Like Blifil, Fielding writes with readers in mind, selecting the information he chooses to impart, and playing off of our preconceptions and prejudices. Unlike Blifil, though, Fielding "shows his hand" in writing scenes like this because he wants us to understand the ins and outs of story-telling and story-interpretation. Something like that? Go into the particular details of Blifil's story and the responses, and you'll have plenty to write about. Grade: B

Jacqueline Bailey

Oh, well done! You get right into the details of the story and Fielding's motives for telling it the way he does. You make the important observation that we know more about Blifil's motives than do the characters in the story, and you begin to account for their differing responses. I think you could do a little more with this by showing how Blifil's story was deliberately crafted to flatter his tutors, and that their comments indicate how he succeeded. Since the tutors have opposing views, it is a bit of a trick to tell a story that will appeal to both and assuage Allworthy, but this Blifil can manages. Quote some passages to indicate just how this works.

To really get the "mirror" thing working, you could spend more time reflecting on Fielding's motives. He is not only giving us information about his characters' motives here. He is instructing us about how stories "work" by playing off of readers' expectations and prejudices. Fielding does this too, of course. By giving us the necessary information about Blifil's character ahead of time, he shapes our response to HIS story as carefully as Blifil manipulates the responses of Thawkum and Square. Since readers tend to be unconscious of how they are being manipulated, it is useful in an essay like this to explain how the business works. This you are starting to do. Grade: A-

Reece Prothero

There are things here I like a lot—the fact that you are "going long" about the book as a whole, the grand strategy as it were. I also like the way you are going after things difficult to explain, like Allworthy's failures. And you compare Fielding's remarks in his essays to the story itself. All good.

The essay is less successful insofar as it tends to ramble and doesn't use a particular story or episode to set up your points. I think, too, you could make a little more out of Allworthy's failures. He is contrasted with various "bad" readers who judge based on prejudice or ill will. He is a good reader, and yet he fails to come to the right conclusion.

I'd select a particular "Allworthy as reader" scene and go into the details of how it works. The Black George episode would do as well as any. How does the "mirror" business work, how does this episode work as an epitome of the novel itself?

There would be several ways to go with this, but I think I would argue that what Fielding is trying to show us here is that 1) the good reader is inclined to give story-tellers the benefit of the doubt (though there is some risk to this with story-tellers like Blifil) and 2) the good reader judges based on available evidence. The problem for Allworthy is that he doesn't have all the evidence, but has to make a judgment anyway. Hello! Isn't that also the case with readers of Tom Jones, who also have to make judgments without having a full command of the facts? Fielding is very careful not just about what he tells and what he suppresses, but how he tells us things: sometimes making them obvious ("Blifil is a hypocrite") but sometimes deliberately half-concealing important information. He leaves us work to do.

So the point to be made about episodes like this is that Fielding uses the stories within his story to "teach us how to read" evidence about characters. Since you are game for the hard stuff, you might argue the point that Allworthy even does the right thing by making the wrong call. I'm not sure about that, but I am sure that Fielding wants us to think about it.

Bottom line: stay with the hard questions and the broader context. But move through this in your opening paragraphs, using the bulk of your space to develop the argument with respect to a particular illustrative episode, small enough to give you space for detailed quotation, evidence, and argument. What does Allworthy know, and when and how does he know it? What does the reader know, and when and how do we know it? Grade: B+

Jay Laiche

This essay does what it sets out to do, which is to explain why this episode is a turning point in the novel, as we see Tom's affections transferred to Sophia. You describe how Fielding sets this up for the reader by supplying the necessary details. It's perhaps not the best episode to select for explication, though, since it doesn't require a particularly "sagacious" reader to follow what is going on here. Better to select a passage where more explication is required?

Neither does it work very well with the assignment, since your episode doesn't involve story-telling, except insofar as Fielding is telling a story—you do get into that a bit. But the challenge here was to show how the way a character tells a story, or interprets a story, comments on how Fielding tells his story, and how we read it. That's what the "mirror" business is about.

I think the best that could be done with this would be to concentrate your attention on the "unconscious" dimension of things. The issue here, insofar as reading is concerned, is the relative incapacity of Tom and Sophia to "read" their own minds. This would be the interest of the episode, no? What is so very obvious to us (because of the way Fielding presents the information, and because of our familiarity with romantic plots) is not at all obvious to the persons involved, creating an irony which makes the episode amusing to read. So you could underscore not just the unconsciousness of Tom and Sophia, but how this adds to our reading pleasures. Grade: B

Andrew Wimbish

This is coming along. Yes, you haven't done what I asked for, but you are doing "critical reading," showing how local details have a bearing on the larger whole. I am impressed with the insight that these characters have a bearing on a novel that is "symmetrical" and proportioned, and which is based on principles. You could develop this even more, I think, by presenting this pair as bad examples of this good thing that Fielding tries to do with his novel: uniting aesthetic to moral philosophy in ways that get at a higher philosophical truth. We, like Tom, have things to learn about this, though from better teachers than Thawkum and Square.

You could, I think, connect the names with story-telling. The point about "Tom Jones" is that the name means nothing in particular, allowing readers to fill the void as they will. Throughout the novel characters tell stories about Tom that have more to do with themselves than with him. This may be furthered by the fact that the name, like the character, is something of a blank slate for persons to write on. Not so with names like Thwakum and Square, which more or less determine how the character is to be interpreted. No ambiguity there. "Allworthy" is more problematic of course, since we see how he is fallible, which calls forth a higher level of interpretation on our part.

So, there are good things here! Grade: A-

Angela Romaine

Ah, you are getting into it! This is the way. Yes, much of the story turns on these details of who knows what, and when, and how. It is here, at a crucial moment in the narrative, that we see Blifil not merely distorting the truth, but positively lying. Which I think, puts him beyond the pale. This is more than selfishness. It is, as you say, hatred, the will to do harm to others quite apart from any benefit to one's self.

I think you could make the essay stronger were you to patiently work through just *what* Allworthy knows at this point. He does seem like rather a chump to us because Fielding has given his readers information Allworthy lacks. It makes us pause, as you have done, to look back over the story to see how things look to Squire Allworthy without benefit of what the reader has been told about Blifil and Tom. It does look pretty bad for Tom. Don't neglect the important passage where Square points out to Allworthy that all of Tom's benevolent actions can be accounted for by his supposed love for Molly Seagrim. "The idea penetrates deeply into Allworthy's mind," etc. And here we see the results.

I think the way to go with this, at least *one* way to go with this, would be to reflect on how Blifil's story-telling is like and not like Fielding's story-telling. They both select which details to mention, frame a narrative, and carefully choose the proper moment to impart information. Blifil is the anti-Fielding—using the same devices for a different purpose. It is a little scary to think that Fielding is doing to Blifil what Blifil does to Tom—blackening his character. But it is true. And reflecting on this gets us into issues of motives, the ethics of storytelling, the nature of fiction, poetic justice, and all sorts of interesting critical issues.

You are at the tipping point, it seems to me. Keep reading, and keep thinking about what you read. This is starting to get interesting! Grade: A-

Zander Merle-Smith

It is better to turn in something rather than nothing, but—wow! What happened here? The essay is not on topic, is not coherent, is filled with all manner of technical errors, and is short measure. If you need help with essay writing, let me know next time and I will try to give you a hand. Grade: C

Nicholas Allen

Very good—you sound the depths of Fielding's game-playing and get it right. It's good to bring in the story of the Wiltshire thief. I had forgotten it, but it is very much to the point when it comes to interpretation. This is not to most obvious little story to write about, but well suited to the assignment. You could perhaps add a little riff on the difference between "science" and "sagacity"—sagacity, or applied intelligence, seems to be what is required to unravel these narrative conundrums.

The essay could do with some touchups since there were places where I had to pause to make out what the argument was doing. With several balls in the air, as it were, one needs to be attentive with opening statement, transitions, pronouns, and emphasis to keep us following along. You come out in the right place.

The next place to go with this argument might be to get into the ethics of storytelling. Is this a game with rules? Can Fielding cross the line with his deviousness or is it all fair game? I'm sure that he believes that there are rules and that he is an honest player, but as you point out, we need to keep an eye on him and not necessarily take things on faith. Reptile critics indeed! Well done. Grade: A

Kendall Pace

This is coming along—I appreciate the thought that went into it, especially since the essay seems to be struggling a little bit. You have the pieces as it were—the idea that the novel is mimetic, that people are flawed, and that there is a pattern in Book II. But the pieces don't fit together very neatly, and you spend far too much time rehearsing the story as opposed to analyzing it.

Instead of "people are imperfect," you might go with "people are inclined to leap to judgment." This would get us closer to the subject of this particular group of episodes. Rather than trying to cover the whole book, do a quick summary of the episodes where we see persons rushing to judgment, perhaps pausing to quote a tasty phrase or two for illustration and evidence.

Then zoom in on the particular story or episode you want to use to illustrate your point. Having set it up with the preliminary summary, you can then go over this particular part in more detail. The obvious one to go with would be scene in which the Partridges appear before Allworthy, and Mrs. Partridge proceeds to wreck their lives out of the mistaken belief that her husband had cheated on her. She tells a story, and Allworthy believes it. In your summary you will have already established the "pattern" (people rushing to judgment) that sets this climactic moment up. We are surprised and puzzled when Allworthy, who does not rush to judgment, arrives at the wrong conclusion. Your task as critic and close-reader is to explain what is going on here.

As far as this assignment is concerned, your business is to explain what this little story has to do with the big story that Fielding (as opposed to Mrs. Partridge) tells. The point surely is (as Fielding is constantly reminding us): don't rush to judgment. In this case we see (because of how he sets things up) that poor Partridge has been abused by his wife. But we are not always given this kind of information. In other cases we, like Allworthy in this instance, are left to pass judgment without possessing all the facts, and sometimes we are left to deal with a devious storyteller—Fielding himself who has us rushing to judgment if we aren't careful.

I think these three pieces might work better for you: 1) the novel is didactic, that is, Fielding is using his stories to teach us about stories. 2) people are inclined to rush to judgment. And 3) there is a pattern in Book II that connects point 1 to point 2. Bingo. You *are* getting there! Grade: B

Benjamin Welch

I like this. You are engaging with the game-playing dimension of the story, which can indeed be a lot of fun. Your essay talks about the relation between author and reader, which is the main thing here. It would, I think, have been better to have gone with the assignment, comparing a story within the story to Fielding's larger narrative. This is *almost* what is going on in the episode you describe: while Captain Blifil doesn't tell Allworthy a story, his behavior is deliberately deceptive, which is at least story-like. Not all the books are structured like the one you discuss; Fielding has many tricks in his bag.

The way to get the "mirror" thing going would be, instead of comparing Fielding to God, to compare him to one of the story-tellers in the novel. They are of various kinds, intentionally so, to illustrate various aspects of story-telling and story-interpretation.

Since what interests you here is Fielding's deviousness, hiding things in plain sight as it were, see if you can't find something equivalent to talk about in one of the stories in the novel. Blifil, famously, tells devious stories about Tom, which, if you stop to think of it, raises interesting critical and ethical issues when we observe Fielding doing similar things: withholding information, presenting information in misleading ways, or revealing it at appropriately inappropriate times. Fielding, of course, has a moral purpose behind his deviousness, since he is trying to teach us as well as entertain us. But it can be amusing to compare him to such storytellers as Blifil, the Man of the Hill, Partridge, and Mrs. Fitzpatrick. The resemblances are intentional and the stories are there to make a point about story-telling. Grade: B+

Christa Hoeffler

You are demonstrating your "sagacity" here. I like the way in which you select the small and obscure to illustrate the larger and important. I like the detail you bring to the exposition, your clear prose, and your attention to what Fielding is doing, as opposed to just what the characters are doing. All for the good.

This episode, though, seems to me to be more of the "pattern" kind than the "mirror" kind—you describe a repetition, which to be sure is a mirror relation of sorts, but not a passage that in a very strong way comments on the narrative of which it is a part. Nor is it allegorical—it is literal, not working on two levels. You are astute in observing that it is an instance of foreshadowing. It is part of a larger pattern of episodes that illustrate the point that "it is not enough to be virtuous, one has to appear virtuous too."

It does involve a story however, since the pettifogger is relating and embroidering what he was told, and we do see the reaction of the landlady to what she hears. You could develop something of a mirror relationship out of this insofar as the landlady might stand in for the reader, the episode being thus a warning not to accept too readily what we have been told. This is not the chief point (which has to with the consequences of Tom's lack of prudence) but it is not unimportant. Fielding illustrates the gap between actions and intentions and the way such things are perceived, an important dimension of narrative generally. It's all very transparent in this instance (to the reader) but this episode does sets up others that call for more labor on our part.

There are passages in which Fielding, tongue-in-cheek, presents Tom as a hero "born to be hung," in which he, like the pettifogger, maligns his character.

For the next paper I'll ask you to analyze a pattern. You now have a leg up on that. Grade: A-

Jonathan Wolfe

This is coming right along. The exposition of the story is probably too long, and your presentation of Tom's response too short, but you grasp the idea, find the parallels, and draw the proper moral conclusion.

To get this up to the next level, you would want to discuss not just the substance of the Man of the Hill's story, but the way it is told—to treat it as a story, a narrative, and not just as a set of events illustrating the man's character. Think about your own reactions. How did you respond to the swift alternations in the man's fortunes, and the swerves in his character from virtue to vice? Were you entertained? Perplexed? Did you draw the same conclusions as Tom? I didn't—at least not on the first go. It is an awkward story, but still a moving one.

The last sentence of your essay could be the first sentence of an improved version of what you've done thus far. You could compare the Man of the Hill's story to *Tom Jones* as a whole. They both involve striking and sudden shifts from good to bad fortune, but Fielding's story is consistent—"probable"—in ways that the Man of the Hill's story is not. Work that out, shifting emphasis from the "what" to the "how" of the story, and you could have a very slick essay indeed! Grade: A-

Maegan Stebbins

This is a very well-crafted essay. You cover a lot of ground with copious and well-selected detail and without ever losing track of the argument. Your comments on the "readers" of the event are shrewd. I particularly like your observation that while Allworthy can see through Black George, he can't see through Blifil. That bears thinking about.

The episode you choose is perhaps not the best for purposes of this assignment, since you are not so much dealing with the "mirror" business as with the "pattern" business—discussing how Fielding uses repetitions to establish character and develop narrative. While a repetition is in a sense a "mirror" of its predecessor, it's not what we were going for here, which was to discuss how a story mirrors or comments on the larger work of which it is a part. The "stories" told by Blifil and Tom aren't developed in any great detail, leaving you without much leverage to discuss them as stories per se.

But there *is* a little here to work with. What's at issue is the way in which Blifil blurts out the truth, as opposed to the way in which Tom conceals it—with good effect. Could you compare that with what Fielding is doing? I think you could. Notice how, in these episodes, the narrator holds back certain facts about what transpired until the proper moment. Imagine how the story would work had it been simply a bald, chronological rehearsal of what happened—had Fielding "blurted it out" as it were. In an oblique, but I think real and artful way, the series of stories involving truth-telling and Black George does get at what Fielding is up to as a story-teller: it is not necessarily the best thing to simply "out with it." Tom is revealed as a better person, and Fielding as a better narrator, for holding back.

Do you see what I'm getting at? I'd like you to shift emphasis from the substance of the stories per se to the artful way in which they are related, from the character of Tom as a person to the character of Fielding as a writer. You yourself are a good enough writer that you can put across some complicated critical analysis once you set your mind to it. Grade: A-

Brayden Burleigh

You do a good job with what you set out to do here, with examples and a reasonable argument. This is perhaps not the best story to analyze since it seems like rather an open-and-shut case. It doesn't seem to call for much explanation. The one puzzling thing is, as usual, why Allworthy doesn't see through Blifil, for which the answer seems to be that he is willing to take people at their word unless he has reason to think otherwise.

But it is tricky to make this story work with the assignment since it is not obvious how to make the leap from this story to the novel of which it is a part. I suppose the way to make the connection would be to argue that Blifil, like Henry Fielding, trims his tail to suit his audience. There are better examples of this than the one you've chosen, which catches our villain at a very tender age. This would be a better example were you writing a "pattern" essay as opposed to a "mirror" essay, for then you could use this episode as the starting-point for a series of lies told by Blifil, who gets more sophisticated as he goes along.

If you were to stay with this, I think the thing to do would *not* tp concentrate on Blifil's character, but on the responses from Thwakum and Allworthy, trying to extrapolate from those what Fielding expects from a reader. Is the point that we should not jump to conclusions like Thwackum, but neither should we be as trusting as Allworthy? But shouldn't we trust Fielding? and if not, when not? You could develop some complications along those lines. Grade: B+

Conner Fowler

This is a good essay—you are certainly onto Fielding's game, and keeping your eye on the details. Your exposition is well-crafted, and the point about Fielding as teacher is well taken: this is absolutely what he tries to do.

To get this one up a notch, you would want to be more explicit about connecting the little story with the whole in terms of narrative—to compare what Blifil does with what Fielding does. This seems a little counter-intuitive since Blifil is a liar, but than people who write fiction belong to a not dissimilar category.

Blifil's master-stroke here is committing Allworthy to secrecy, and it not obvious how to make that go. Maybe the equivalent at the novel-level would be giving us one witness's imperfect account of events while withholding a second account that would contradict it? Can you think of an example of that in the novel?

As to deliberately misleading an audience, well, Fielding does that all the time. He has to, if we are to be surprised, and he *does* so since being surprised is what gives us pleasure. As you will see, if you haven't already, he has deliberately misled us about Jenny Jones and Bridget Allworthy, much as Blifil misleads Allworthy about Tom. He does this not because he is wicked, of course, but a case could be made that stories like the one you discuss are included not simply to shed light on Blifil's character, but to get us thinking about ethical issues involving fiction as such. When is it OK to lie? It sure seems like Tom and Sophia get whacked every time they try it. But then, novel-writing is not lying, even if it sometimes involves the same techniques. I enjoyed this! A-