A

Abridgments

JORDAN HOWELL

During the eighteenth century, abridgments were ubiquitous in British print culture. The market was flooded with abridged, epitomized, abstracted, or adapted literature in virtually every genre, from works of divinity to historical, legal, and fictional texts. Abridgments were pivotal in the development of the legal definition of authorship and the history of copyright legislation, as well as the dissemination of affordable information. Furthermore, many of the century's most prominent writers and scholars hotly debated the educational value of abridged literature.

EARLY HISTORY OF ABRIDGMENTS

Abridgments of English texts became popular during the early eighteenth century. Abridging was more than simple summary: the process of choosing what to include, and (just as important) what to exclude, was an aesthetic judgment that suggested any text had inherent flaws that could be excised by a knowledgeable and trustworthy literary authority.

By the 1590s, printers and authors were registering their abridgments at the Stationer's Company, an action that suggested "a separate intellectual property right existed in an abridged version, and that the ownership of the full text could be separated from that of the abridgement" (St. Clair 2004, 72). Between the lapse of the Print Licensing Act in 1695 and institution of England's first copyright law in 1709, the lack of regulation prompted many publishers to flood the market with cheaply printed materials. In response, many of London's most powerful printers formed cartels known as congers and pooled their resources to manipulate the prices of books to their own benefit (Hodgson and Blagden 1956). While the actions of the congers at the turn of the century did have some success in discouraging piracies of complete texts, abridgments continued to pose a problem for printers and authors alike.

The proliferation of abridgers was widely noted and debated by the beginning of the eighteenth century. In *Essay on the Regulation of the Press* (1704), Daniel Defoe (1660?–1731) refers to abridgment as "the first sort of press piracy" (20), and John Dunton (1659–1733) complained of a "whole army of *Hackney-Authors*" who were so prevalent that "*Original* and *Abridgement* are almost reckon'd as necessary as Man and Wife" (1705, 56). Lacking any recourse under the law, authors moved quickly to associate abridgments with unethical publishing practices, but unethical was not necessarily illegal, as there was no copyright legislation at the time of either Defoe's or Dunton's remarks. Therefore, authors and publishers alike lobbied for a copyright law.

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

The Encyclopedia of British Literature 1660–1789, First Edition. Edited by Gary Day and Jack Lynch.
© 2015 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Published 2015 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

ABRIDGMENTS AND COPYRIGHT FROM ANNE TO STRAHAN

The passage of England's first copyright law, the *Statute of Anne* (1709), formally known as the *Act for the Encouragement of Learning*, did little to stem the rise in the publication of abridgments as the law applied only to reproductions of entire works, not to reproductions of parts of works, or to translations or adaptations. In effect, this lack of foresight concerning derivative texts allowed the law governing abridgments to be written in the courtroom rather than in the halls of Parliament.

Adrian Johns (1998) has suggested that the earliest copyright disputes involving abridgments were argued in the Court of the Stationers during the 1720s (246). After the Court of the Stationers demonstrated total incompetence in handling the complexities of these cases, litigation moved to the Court of Chancery, where the issue lay dormant until *Gyles v. Wilcox* (1741). Lord Chancellor Hardwicke (1690–1764) presiding over the case took the *Statute of Anne* at its word, ruling that the intent of the law was to encourage learning. Hardwicke went so far as to grant full authorial rights to abridgers, as "abridgments may with great propriety be called a new book, because…the invention, learning and judgment of the author is shewn in them" (Atkyns 1794, 2.143). The importance of *Gyles v. Wilcox* in the history of copyright legislation cannot be overstated. According to copyright historian William F. Patry (1995), the origin of modern fair use copyright theory originated with Hardwicke's ruling (6–7).

Hardwicke's ruling demonstrated remarkable staying power as it was not subject to the types of frequent counter-rulings that marked eighteenth-century litigation concerning perpetual common law copyright (Deazley 2004, 178–9). The decision was upheld in *Dodsley v. Kinnersley* (1761), wherein Robert Dodsley (1704–64) sought an injunction against Thomas Kinnersley for abridging sections of Samuel Johnson's (1709–84) *Rasselas* (1759) in the *Grand Magazine of Magazines*. Dodsley's request for an injunction was denied on the basis that Kinnersley's abridgment comprised only one-tenth of the original text (Deazley 2004, 137–8). The rights of abridgers were upheld once again in *Strahan v. Newbery* (1774), wherein Francis Newbery (1743–1818) was not only granted the right to continue selling his abridgment of John Hawkesworth's (1715?–73) *An Account of the Voyages…in the Southern Hemisphere* (1773), but the court based its decision on an aesthetic judgment that Newbery's version "conveyed in language as good or better than in the original, and in a more agreeable and useful manner" (Leeming 2005).

After 1774, abridgments flooded the market unchecked and faced no real legal challenge until the Copyright Act of 1842. Some texts, like *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), were abridged so frequently that hundreds of editions were published by the turn of the nineteenth century.

ABRIDGMENTS AND AUDIENCE

Despite the impact of jurisprudence on the publishing history of abridgments, few publishers publicly claimed a legal precedent to justify the printing of abridgments. Rather, many presented their right to publish abridgments as a public duty to make books more affordable for Britain's growing urban populations. In his preface to the abridgment of Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion* (1703), John Nutt (d. 1716) justifies the publication by suggesting that the price has made the book inaccessible to a great portion of the population. This exact argument was picked up in abridgments some decades later, such as Cox's abridgment of *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) and Stone's abridgment of *Gulliver's Travels* (1727).

Prior to the popularization of novels, abridgments consisted primarily of legal and translated texts, but as the popularity of abridgments grew publishers began abridging a more

diverse range of genres. D.R. Woolf (2000) claims that an increase in the popularity of histories encouraged more competition among publishers to tap into the growing consumer demand from readers who opted to purchase abridgments like Joseph Wild's (d. 1702?) abridgment of Camden's *Britannica* (1701) at a fraction of the cost of the original. Histories aside, Pat Rogers (1982) has suggested that the novel was particularly suitable to abridgment because of its linear narrative structure. Poetic works were also abridged, as with John Wesley's (1703–91) *Extract from Milton's Paradise Lost* (1763). In her reading of Wesley's *Extracts*, Jennifer Snead (2010) claims that Wesley's cuts to the text were exercised with the intent of emphasizing Methodist theology as a more acceptable alternative to Milton's Calvinist theology (83–4).

Although abridgments were popular, their pedagogical utility was hotly debated throughout the century. In *The Dunciad* book one, Alexander Pope (1688–1744) contends that "Index-learning" involved an amount of reading and intellect essentially inferior to that of primates (2009, 134–5). Other intellectuals, however, respected abridgments for their ability to transmit complex ideas efficiently. Samuel Johnson stated that abridgments benefited the population "by facilitating the attainment of knowledge . . . without fatiguing the attention, burdening the memory, or impairing the health of the student" (Howard 1966, 218). Johnson's sentiments arise from mid-century philosophies of sensibility that emphasized the interdependence of mind and body.

Abridgments and their audiences were not an insular or monolithic group. While abridgments by definition are shortened works, they are not necessarily short. Some historical and legal abridgments span multiple volumes, whereas some abridgments of *Robinson Crusoe* are only 24-page chapbooks. By the 1760s, abridgments were also more likely to take the form of children's literature, largely the result of the work of John Newbery (1713–67) and his descendants. Nevertheless, even with children's literature the readership of abridgments is difficult to assess, as Jan Fergus (2006) has shown that Newbery's abridgments were just as likely to be read by adults as by adolescents. Nor is it given that abridgments were always written without the consent of the original author.

By 1774, abridgments came to represent one of the most potent contradictions of the eighteenth century: Lockean ideals that correlated the expansion of education and the prosperity of the nation clashed against the cultural paranoia of expanding literacy to the rough and unpredictable lower class. This proved increasingly problematic during the tumultuous 1790s, as cheap print was increasingly seen as a danger to the status quo (Keen 1999). Abridgments were especially dangerous as they were capable of recycling potentially revolutionary social and political theories, formerly confined to impenetrable volumes, into plain language that was accessible to the working classes. Keen suggests that those who printed and distributed abridgments of Thomas Paine's (1737–1809) *Rights of Man* (1791), for example, were more likely to be the victims of prosecution and government intimidation. William Pitt's government targeted printers like Thomas Spence (1750–1814) not because they printed Paine's text, but because they reduced it, made the language more discernible to the less educated, and sold copies for a pittance, thereby making it available to a much wider segment of the population (Keen 1999, 63–73).

The practice of abridgment remained controversial, yet commercially acceptable, well into the nineteenth century. Despite various critical and authorial complaints regarding abridgments, they were instrumental in the spread of literacy and the popularization of reading during the eighteenth century.

SEE ALSO: Adaptation; Book Production; Children's Literature; Defoe, Daniel; Intellectual Property; Licensing Act; Prefatory Criticism; Serial Publication.

REFERENCES

Atkyns, John Tracy, ed. 1794. *Reports of Cases Argued and Determined in the High Court of Chancery, in the Time of Lord Chancellor Hardwicke*, 3rd ed. 3 vols. London: Printed by A. Strahan and W. Woodfall.

Deazley, Ronan. 2004. *On the Origin of the Right to Copy: Charting the Movement of Copyright Law in Eighteenth-Century Britain (1695–1775)*. Oxford and Portland: Hart Publishing.

Defoe, Daniel. 1704. *An Essay upon the Regulation of the Press*. London.

Dunton, John. 1705. *The Life and Errors of John Dunton*. London: Printed for S. Malthus. Reprinted 1974. New York and London: Garland Publishing.

Fergus, Jan. 2006. *Provincial Readers in Eighteenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hodgson, Norma, and Cyprian Blagden. 1956. *The Notebook of Thomas Bennet and Henry Clements (1686–1719): With Some Aspects of Book Trade Practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howard, Wm. J. 1966. "Dr. Johnson on Abridgment: A Re-Examination." *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 60: 215–19.

Johns, Adrian. 1998. *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Keen, Paul. 1999. *The Crisis of Literature in the 1790s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leeming, Mark. 2005. "Hawkesworth's *Voyages*: The First 'Australian' Copyright Litigation." *Australian Journal of Legal History* 9, no. 2: 159–73.

Patry, William F. 1995. *The Fair Use Privilege in Copyright Law*. Washington, DC: Bureau of National Affairs.

Pope, Alexander. 2009. *The Dunciad in Four Books*. Ed. Valerie Rumbold. London: Pearson.

Rogers, Pat. 1982. "Classics and Chapbooks." In *Books and Their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England*, edited by Isabel Rivers, 27–46. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Snead, Jennifer. 2010. "The Work of Abridgements." In *Reading in History: New Methodologies from the Anglo-American Tradition*, edited by Bonnie Gunzenhauser, 77–90. London: Pickering and Chatto.

St. Clair, William. 2004. *The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woolf, D.R. 2000. *Reading History in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adaptation

JENNIE MACDONALD

British playwrights throughout the Restoration and eighteenth century produced hundreds of plays adapted from earlier texts and contemporary works. Their diverse sources included histories, lives (biographies), legends, epic poems, operas, novels, and plays. In adapting plays, they turned both to works written by pre-Civil War playwrights such as William Shakespeare (bap. 1564–1616), Ben Jonson (1572–1637), and the team of John Fletcher (1579–1625) and Francis Beaumont (1584–1616), and to works by fellow post-Civil War authors, depending on popular demand and the encouragement of theater managers. Managers also often adapted texts themselves, for both economic and practical reasons. William Davenant (bap. 1606–68), David Garrick (1717–79), George Colman the Elder (bap. 1732–94), and John Philip Kemble (1757–1823), were all theater managers who wrote, produced, and published their own adaptations.

Late eighteenth-century drama was largely condemned throughout the twentieth century by influential critics like Allardyce Nicoll (1952), in part because of the period's large number of adaptations, which suggested a dearth of originality. During the 1980s, however, the rise of New Historicism (a critical theory that investigates texts within the social, political, and cultural circumstances of their production) prompted scholars to examine literature as not merely an artifact of history but as an active site of production, responding to and inspiring other texts within a material context. This has encouraged a re-evaluation of Restoration and eighteenth-century adaptations, offering a lens through which to reconcile the literary text with the historical moment

in which it was written and which also invites more nuanced readings of adapted works.

ADAPTATIONS OF DRAMATIC SOURCES

At the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660, there was an immediate problem for London's two licensed theater companies, the Duke's Men and the King's Company: a repertory inherited from before the Civil War. Though this repertory included plays by the stars of the day, Jonson, Shakespeare, and Fletcher and Beaumont, nearly two decades later those plays were out of date, their overwrought language archaic, and their plots and characters old-fashioned. The complex, often ambiguous nature of Shakespeare's characters, situations, and endings, for example, proved unconvincing, unsettling, and too inconclusive for a society recovering from the execution of a king and a period of enormous political upheaval, persecution, chaos, and deprivation. The old plays also required altering to accommodate new staging practices, language, stock character types, and the introduction of actresses playing female roles.

Writing for the ever-changing marketplace, adapters used a number of strategies to effectively appropriate and rework their source material. Adapters might add or eliminate scenes, characters, and plot points. Locations, time periods, and outcomes could be radically changed. In making such changes, the playwright often had in mind the types of actors likely to play the parts. Roles, especially leading roles like Oedipus, Hamlet, Lady Macbeth, and Rosalind in *Twelfth Night*, were increasingly tailored for specific actors, a trend that evolved into the star system of the eighteenth century and helped to establish the celebrity status of such actors and actresses as Garrick, Kemble, Sarah Siddons (1755–1831), and Frances Abington (1737–1815).

The reasons behind individual plays' successes varied widely, from the inclusion of multiple love plots to revision of an earlier story to support a political agenda. The most effective adapted plays survived for decades, supported by audience demand and by theater managers who recognized that the cost of staging a revival with stock scenery and costumes was far more economical than mounting a new play. Michael Dobson, for example, identifies five Restoration adaptations of Shakespearian plays that continued to enjoy popularity until well into the eighteenth century: Edward Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus; or, The Rape of Lavinia* (1678); John Dryden's *Troilus and Cressida; or, Truth Found Too Late* (1679); Thomas Otway's adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet* (first folio 1723), which was titled *The History and Fall of Caius Marius* (1679); Nahum Tate's *The History of King Lear* (1681); and Thomas Durfey's (also "D'Urfey's") version of *Cymbeline* (First Folio 1623), titled *The Injured Princess* (1682) (Dobson 1992, 62–3). A number of adapted plays prompted parodies and farces. Thomas Duffett's *The Mock-Tempest* (performed in 1674), for example, burlesqued *The Tempest; or, The Enchanted Island* (1670), Davenant and Dryden's successful adaptation of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (first folio 1723).

Some adaptations even blotted out the memory of their source texts. The author and critic Samuel Johnson (1709–84) was famously shocked to discover that Cordelia died in Shakespeare's *King Lear* (First Folio 1623) because in Tate's adaptation, *The History of King Lear* (1681), which held the stage for decades, Cordelia not only lived but married Edgar, ruling with him after her father, Lear (who survives in Tate's version), retires. Tate's optimistic revision was written long before the enshrinement of Shakespeare's original and was a response to the present moment: his refiguring of Cordelia's story gratified Restoration sensibilities with its idealized portrait of virtuous womanhood, and, on a larger level, Tate's affiliation with the Tories is evident in the play's condemnation of regicide (Maguire 1991, 35).

Johnson's reaction can be better understood in view of the fact that Shakespeare's original had not been popularly available for decades.

Recovery of original texts became a major project for dramatists and critics during the eighteenth century in response to the growth of nationalism that prompted interest in the foundations of English history and culture. Shakespeare was pre-eminent amongst these recovered authors, and Nicholas Rowe's *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear* [sic] *in Six Volumes* (1709), based on the Fourth Folio printed in 1685, is considered a primary catalyst for the institutionalization of Shakespeare as England's national bard, a status accepted without question today.

ATTRIBUTION, APPROPRIATION, AND PLAGIARISM

Identifying a text as an original or an adaptation can be as difficult a task for the modern reader as for authors and critics of centuries past. During the later 1600s through the first half of the 1700s, authors and critics lacked access to many earlier plays, which were lost or out of print. Several printing and production practices contributed to this, including: (1) the practice of leaving off authors' names from playbills, plays, title pages, and other peripheral materials that had existed well before the Interregnum and continued long after it; (2) printing a play and producing it on the stage under its original title with the adapter identified as its author, as happened to a 1760 version of Tate's *The History of King Lear*, which notes the play has been "Revived, with alterations, by N. Tate," but does not mention Shakespeare; and (3) the practice of attributing adapted plays, rather than original versions, to the author of the source text; Garrick's version of Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*, also titled *Cymbeline* (first produced in 1761 and printed in 1762), is ascribed to "Shakespear [*sic*] with Alterations."

From the Restoration well into the eighteenth century, accusations of plagiarism and responses to them appeared in newspapers, magazines, and pamphlets, as authors defended their work against rivals and a public demanding originality in return for money spent on theater tickets and printed plays. In his *Of Dramatick Poesie, An Essay* (1668), Dryden (1631–1700) famously castigated Jonson for failing to acknowledge his sources. Dryden himself carried on an acrimonious correspondence in the press with critic and cataloguer Gerard Langbaine (1656–92), who charged him with borrowing too heavily from earlier authors.

Over the course of the long eighteenth century, authors and critics came to an uneasy consensus over the idea that "proper" adaptation involved the use of pre-existing plots, characters, and themes, which were rendered in new language, as well as over the idea that an acknowledgment of the original text and its author should be given. This is a position Langbaine articulated in his *Momus Triumphans* (1688, also titled *A New Catalogue of English Plays*) and reiterated in his listing of plays and their sources, *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets* (1691), which sought to defend the public interest against plagiary and trickery in the form of old plays only marginally altered and offered as new ones. An adapter, Langbaine says, should demonstrate evidence of respect and good will toward his source, and at the same time produce a newly invigorated version of the original text.

From the early 1700s, adapters made a concerted effort to identify their sources and justify their revision of original material to forestall or combat charges of plagiarism. Their pre-emptive defenses appeared in prologues and epilogues, which accompanied both the performance and published play texts and sometimes appeared in newspapers and magazines. Printed plays often also included "advertisements" or "epistles to the reader" addressing the issue. Playwrights might further represent their authorial integrity through themes, storylines, or character perspectives within the play's dialogue.

In addition to the term "adaptation," playwrights, publishers, and theater managers employed a wide variety of labels to signal their use of source texts. Plays might be "altered" versions of originals; they could be "imita-

tions" of earlier texts or "founded upon" them. Foreign plays were "translated" into English and adapted to English culture. The term used to describe textual appropriation sometimes, but not always, suggests the degree to which the original text was changed: "alteration" may indicate the artistic updating of an older play and "adaptation" the appropriation of a different kind of text, a history or a novel, for example, to dramatic form.

The critical debates concerning plagiarism and appropriation contributed to emerging ideas of authorship and ownership. Also impacting the rhetoric and reception of adaptations were three key pieces of legislation concerned with the idea of literary property. The intent of the 1662 Licensing Act and the 1710 Act for the Encouragement of Learning was to protect copyright holders, usually booksellers, to whom authors sold the right to copy their works. The 1662 Licensing Act protected "any Booke or Pamphlet" from copying, which meant that the book as an object could not be reproduced *in toto* but excerpts or components like characters and scenes could be (see Stern 2009, 73). The 1710 Act for the Encouragement of Learning, also called the Act of Anne or the Copyright Statute, specifically gave authors the right of property in their works, thus protecting those works, again *in toto*, from theft, although complete reprints did appear, particularly in Ireland, which did not recognize or adopt the Act and which did not view reprinting of English books as theft. One result of the Act of Anne was increased interest in non-dramatic and foreign texts that were not protected by it. Playwrights eagerly translated French, German, and Italian texts to the English stage. Episodes from histories and novels, which due to their length and complexity could not be re-presented *in toto* on the stage, were increasingly mined for inspiration.

A new Licensing Act in 1737 attempted to quash anti-government sentiments from being pronounced in the theaters by limiting the production of legitimate (spoken) drama to the Theatres Royal (initially only Drury Lane and Covent Garden). All new plays had to undergo review by the Licenser of Plays in the office of the Lord Chamberlain and could be refused approval or heavily censored. The 1737 Licensing Act is viewed as the first modern effort at government-sponsored censorship, and it was effective in limiting the production of new plays for years to come. Cautious theater managers, hesitant to commit funds and time to producing new plays that might be refused by the Licenser, increasingly relied on revivals. Revivals, however, could not fully satisfy public demand for modern plays addressing modern concerns.

ADAPTING THE NOVEL

The adaptation history of Behn's *Oroonoko; or, The Royal Slave: A True History* (1688) demonstrates how adapters could shape a revised text to reflect current interests and attitudes. Thomas Southerne's *Oroonoko: A Tragedy*, one of the earliest adaptations of a novel, was performed in 1695 (printed in 1696) and demonstrates some of the issues involved in translating a novella to the stage. Exposition and plot were simplified, and expendable or redundant characters were combined or eliminated, in order to accommodate the time allotted a stage play (approximately two to three hours). Fewer characters meant fewer actors (a concern due to the limited playing space of the stages) and less expense for costumes, though costumes for principal parts were often quite elaborate and costly. Narrative was rewritten as dialogue, and staging concerns and practices had to be addressed; locations, for example, had to be reduced to two to five settings that could be produced by a theater's construction crew.

In his *Oroonoko*, Southerne omitted the first part of the novella and introduced a comic subplot involving a breeches role (in which an actress appears in male clothing). He also took care to rewrite Imoinda as a white Englishwoman, thus accommodating established theatrical practice that allowed actors but not actresses to black their faces. Evincing even less

concern with slavery than with a prince enslaved, Southerne's *Oroonoko* played for over a century and was adapted multiple times itself. The *General Evening Post* (Oct. 3–5, 1771) praised *Oroonoko, A Tragedy* (1759), the adaptation by John Hawkesworth (c. 1715–73) of Southerne's play, for its omission of the comic subplot, an omission that elevated the play as an emblem of national morality and dignity. John Ferriar's (1761–1815) adaptation, *Prince of Angola* (1788), asserted an abolitionist perspective that reflected the rising chorus of protest against slavery in the later eighteenth century.

From the early 1700s novels proliferated, spurred on by the phenomenal success of Richardson's *Pamela; or, Virtue Rewarded* (1741). Praised for its natural (i.e., realistic) depiction of the scenes of modern life, rendered sincere by the sensibility of its first-person narrator, and its dispensation of moral strictures, *Pamela* inspired a sea of novels, plays, and satires. The dramatic tension between Pamela, the virtuous maidservant, and Mr. B., master of the house and Pamela's would-be seducer, proved irresistible to readers as well as to playwrights such as Henry Giffard (1694–1772). Giffard's *Pamela, A Comedy* (1741) truncates the story line and makes a gentleman of Mr. B., whose one attempt on Pamela's virtue happens late in the play and is immediately foiled. With his play Giffard accommodated the demands of comedy, while distilling Richardson's vast novel into its basic components of pursuit, resistance, mutual attraction and respect, and marriage. Other dramatic adaptations would follow, some based on the novel and at least one derived from Giffard's play, as well as satirical comedies prompted by the anti-Pamela school inaugurated by Henry Fielding's (1707–54) *An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews* (1741).

With *The Castle of Otranto* (1764), Horace Walpole (1717–97) challenged the prevailing taste for realistic fiction. In his view, the wonder of storytelling had been drained by recent authors in their determination to portray daily life. Told in third-person narrative rather than Richardson's first-person epistolary form, Walpole's heroine, Isabella, escapes her persecutor, Manfred, Prince of Otranto, and the haunted castle he calls home, a decidedly unrealistic setting filled with ghosts, an ancient curse, the violent appearances of giant pieces of armor, murder, and all the machinery of terror that would erupt in the frenzied publishing of Gothic novels in the 1790s. The theatrical adaptation by Robert Jephson (1736–1803) of Walpole's novel, titled *The Count of Narbonne* (1781), however, eliminated the novel's fantastic elements, concentrating instead on the domestic tragedy at the heart of the story. Walpole reviewed and commented on Jephson's drafts and also supervised the play when it was in rehearsal at Covent Garden. Walpole and Jephson's partnership of novelist and playwright, extraordinary and rare for the time, presents a picture of author and adapter working together in mutual respect and admiration.

CONCLUSION

The history of stage adaptations during the Restoration and eighteenth century provides a look at production practices and illuminates cultural history during a time when authorial rights were being established. Today's scholarship is recovering adapted plays and conferring critical respect upon them as texts worthy of deeper scrutiny. At the center of this project lies a new imperative for students of the period to be vigilant in selecting and properly identifying texts, editions, authors, and adapters.

SEE ALSO: Audience, Theater; Intellectual Property; Intertextuality; Shakespeare, William; Tate, Nahum; Walpole, Horace; Women, Representation of in Drama.

REFERENCES

Dobson, Michael. 1992. *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660–1769*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Maguire, Nancy Klein. 1991. "Nahum Tate's *King Lear*: 'The King's Blest Restoration.'" In *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth*, edited by Jean I. Marsden, 29–42. New York: St. Martin's Press.
Nicoll, Allardyce. 1952. *A History of English Drama 1660–1900. Volume 3: Late Eighteenth Century Drama 1750–1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Stern, Simon. 2009. "Copyright, Originality, and the Public Domain in Eighteenth-Century England." In *Originality and Intellectual Property in the French and English Enlightenment*, edited by Reginald McGinnis, 69–101. New York: Routledge.

FURTHER READING

Brewer, David. 2005. *The Afterlife of Character, 1726–1825*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Hutcheon, Linda. 2006. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York and London: Routledge.
Iwanisziw, Susan B. 2006. *Oroonoko: Adaptations and Offshoots*. Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate.
Kewes, Paulina. 1998. *Authorship and Appropriation: Writing for the Stage in England, 1660–1710*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Keymer, Thomas, and Peter Sabor. 2005. *"Pamela" in the Marketplace: Literary Controversy and Print Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Marsden, Jean I. 1991. "Rewritten Women: Shakespearean Heroines in the Restoration." In *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth*, edited by Jean I. Marsden, 43–56. New York: St. Martin's Press.
Marsden, Jean I. 1995. *The Re-Imagined Text*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
Munns, Jessica. 2004. "Reviving *Oroonoko* 'in the Scene': From Thomas Southerne to Biyi Bandele." In *Troping "Oroonoko" from Behn to Bandele*, edited by Susan B. Iwanisziw, 174–97. Burlington: Ashgate.
Rosenthal, Laura J. 1996. *Playwrights and Plagiarists in Early Modern England: Gender, Authorship, Literary Property*. Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press.
Sanders, Julie. 2006. *Adaptation and Appropriation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Addison, Joseph

JACOB SIDER JOST

Over the course of a career that spanned three decades, Joseph Addison (1672–1719) made influential contributions to an enormous range of literary and print genres. During his early years as a student and fellow at Oxford he made a name for himself as a poet in both Latin and English. His travel narrative, *Remarks on Several Parts of Italy* (1705), provided a model for generations of British tourists and travel writers. Addison's greatest achievement, his periodical papers in the *Tatler* and *Spectator* (1709–11 and 1711–14) were celebrated throughout the century as the summit of elegant English prose style. These periodicals, managed by Addison's friend and collaborator Richard Steele with heavy input from Addison himself, were printed on a single large sheet of paper several times a week, sold for a penny or two, and provided subscribers and coffeehouse readers with a mixture of news, moral instruction, light satire, short fiction, literary criticism, advertisements, and miscellaneous observations on everyday life. Frequently reprinted in volumes after their original publication, they were avidly read for both pleasure and instruction throughout the following century. Samuel Johnson's famous assessment, published in 1781, testifies to their deep influence: "Whoever wishes to attain an English style, familiar but not coarse, and elegant but not ostentatious, must give his days and nights to the volumes of Addison" (Johnson 2010, 22.678).

Addison's emphasis on sociability and politeness in these periodicals influenced the Enlightenment philosophical programs of David Hume and Adam Smith and the prose style of Jane Austen. Meanwhile, Addison's papers on *Paradise Lost* in the *Spectator* were influential in rehabilitating Milton from his reputation in the decades after his death as a heretic and regicide, and his discussions of the pleasures of the imagination in the same periodical influenced the aesthetic theories of Lord

Kames, Edmund Burke, and Immanuel Kant. His spectacularly successful verse tragedy *Cato* (1713), whose eponymous hero chooses to die for his republican ideals rather than live under the autocratic rule of Caesar, provided a model of classicized patriotic manhood that its eighteenth-century audience found irresistible. George Washington ordered it to be performed to his troops at Valley Forge, and phrases such as "liberty or death" and "what pity it is / That we can die but once to serve our country" have become a permanent part of America's rhetorical heritage through their appropriation by Washington and his fellow revolutionaries.

In addition to his broad influence as a man of letters, Addison was an active politician and civil servant, serving in turn in both the Irish and English parliaments and rising shortly before his death to secretary of state for the southern department. Unlike contemporaries such as the Catholic Alexander Pope or the dissenter Daniel Defoe, Addison came from an Anglican clerical family that held a modest but secure place in the Restoration political establishment. He was a lifelong adherent to the Whig faction of English politics, and at every stage of his career, from the Charterhouse School to Oxford to the Grand Tour to London literary and political life, he excelled at the tasks assigned to him and cultivated prudent and fruitful patronage relationships with aristocrats and political power brokers. Indeed, literature and politics were always intertwined for Addison; he belonged to an era, almost unimaginable to us today, in which a well-written ode or verse epistle could ease a poet's entrance into Parliament or the civil service. Addison won favor in his youth for poems in praise of William III's diplomacy, and in 1705 was appointed to a government job worth £200 per year in exchange for writing an effusive panegyric, *The Campaign*, on the Duke of Marlborough. When political events such as the death of William III in 1702 or the rise to power of Robert Harley's Tory ministry in 1710 temporarily clouded Addison's prospects, he adapted, made new friends, and kept himself in the public eye with popular literary projects. Even his marriage, solemnized in middle age with a widowed countess, follows this pattern of ambition mingled with prudence.

Addison was a voice of the Establishment, both in the modern sense of the political and economic powers that be and the eighteenth-century sense of the officially recognized Anglican church. Though he did not follow his father into holy orders, the gentle social satire and understated moralizing of the *Spectator*, as well as the posthumously published apologetic treatise *Of the Christian Religion*, show Addison as an irenic yet sincere exponent of Protestant piety; hymns such as "When All Thy Mercies," which first appeared in the *Spectator* in 1712, continue to be reprinted in hymnals today. Addison saw himself as a reformer and he believed in the possibility of combined moral, social, and even aesthetic progress – especially if the public would buy and read his works.

POETRY AND THE *REMARKS ON ITALY*

As a young man Addison benefited from the best that the late seventeenth-century British educational system had to offer, passing from the grammar school of Lichfield and the Charterhouse School to studies at two Oxford colleges, Queen's and Magdalen. At this time distinction as a student meant, above all, mastery of classical Latin authors, and Addison was a brilliant Latinist. His poems of the 1690s are divided between English couplets and Latin Alcaics and hexameters, and range from lighthearted subjects (such as *Machinae Gesticulantes*, which describes a puppet show) to religious themes and praise poems addressed to contemporary Whig politicians and to the poet John Dryden. His literary reputation does not rest on these little-read pieces, but their immediate effect was to give him a name in both Oxford and London as a rising young man. In 1700 a government patron secured Addison a £200 grant that allowed him to make an extended tour of Continental Europe with a view to preparing him for subsequent diplo-

matic service. The literary fruit of these travels was the *Remarks on Several Parts of Italy*, first published in 1705 and reprinted over a dozen times in the eighteenth century. Generations of British gentlemen embarked on the Grand Tour, a one- to three-year journey through the cities, courts, and classical ruins of France and Italy, with Addison's *Remarks* in hand. The author's Latin erudition is on full display throughout, as Addison juxtaposes the geography of modern Italy with descriptions of the same places in the Roman poets. The Grand Tour was conceived of as the capstone of a genteel education, and Addison's guide to what he christens "classic ground" was the perfect textbook for travelers who, like their author, were comparing Latin verses learned in school with eighteenth-century cities and landscapes. Throughout the book Addison mingles reverence for the Romans with disdain for what he saw as the sloth and superstition of the peninsula's modern inhabitants, implying that the classically educated Protestant Englishman could appreciate Italy's history and legacy in a way that actual Italians could not – a compliment to national vanity that of course contributed to the book's success.

Upon his return to England in 1704, Addison reconnected with old patrons and became a member of the Kit-Cat Club, an influential organization of Whig aristocrats, politicians, and men of letters. Increasingly remunerative official appointments came his way over the next few years, culminating with the position of Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the Earl of Wharton, which Addison received in 1708. The office was worth as much as £2000 a year, and carried with it real power. It was during this period, in 1705, that Addison published his most famous poem, *The Campaign*. Characteristically, this celebration of the English victory over French forces at the battle of Blenheim praised a powerful political ally (the Duke of Marlborough, who was the commanding general) and patriotically affirmed English national greatness. And its appeal extended beyond Addison's coterie; *The Campaign* caught the celebratory mood of the English reading public and went into a second and third edition within the year. Its most famous lines ("Calm and serene he drives the furious blast, / And, pleas'd th' Almighty's orders to perform, / Rides in the whirlwind, and directs the storm") compared Marlborough to an avenging angel of God. As Addison's biographer Peter Smithers (1968) puts it, the simile "passed into the repertory of familiar quotation" (98) in the years that followed, and Pope paid it the compliment of a parody in the *Dunciad* two decades later.

Addison sailed for Ireland as the Earl of Wharton's secretary in April of 1709. As it turned out, however, his tenure lasted little more than a year, as the election of 1710 brought the Tory party, led by Robert Harley, the Earl of Oxford, to power, and drove Wharton from office. Back in London in the winter of 1710–11, Addison found himself in a changed political climate and without government employment. In the months that followed, he turned his energies to the periodical writings on which his most enduring reputation and importance rest.

ADDISON AS PERIODICAL WRITER: THE *TATLER*, *SPECTATOR*, *GUARDIAN*, AND *FREEHOLDER*

While Addison had been furthering his government career by means of his poetic talents, his schoolfellow and friend Richard Steele had been combining literature and Whig politics in a different way. Steele had been born the same year as Addison, 1672, and had spent his twenties and early thirties as a military officer and playwright for the London stage. In 1707, his patrons had appointed him editor to the *Gazette*, the official government newspaper. England under Queen Anne had a relatively free press by the standards of the time, and Londoners in particular were avid consumers of newspapers, pamphlets, topical sermons, broadside ballads, and other pieces of printed ephemera. The capital was filled with coffeehouses where readers could gather to peruse

and discuss papers that spanned the political spectrum. Steele's position as gazetteer gave him a detailed working knowledge of the print business, and in 1709 he inaugurated an innovative new periodical, the *Tatler*.

Steele's new paper went beyond news and politics to provide comment on the whole spectrum of contemporary life: "all matters of what kind soever that shall occur to me," as he puts it in the first number. For this purpose Steele (or rather "Isaac Bickerstaff," the pseudonym under which the *Tatler* was written) promised to take advantage of his "correspondence in all parts of the known and knowing world" to provide accounts of "gallantry, pleasure, and entertainment . . . poetry . . . learning . . . foreign and domestic news . . . and what else I have to offer on any other subject" (Bond 1987, 1.16). Although Addison had played no part in planning or launching the *Tatler*, he quickly became a major contributor, eventually writing around a quarter of the numbers. Steele had at first conceived of the paper as a miscellany, with each issue consisting of a series of unconnected or loosely related pieces. Under Addison's influence, the *Tatler* gradually became instead a sequence of essays, with the bulk of each paper dedicated to a single theme. The *Tatler* appeared on each Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, synchronized with the post office's tri-weekly delivery of mail from London to the provinces. This allowed Steele and his collaborators to build an audience not only in London but across England.

After 271 numbers, the *Tatler* ceased publication in early January 1711. Just three months later, Addison and Steele inaugurated the *Spectator*, which appeared six times a week from March 1711 to December 1712. Of the 555 papers that make up this twenty-one-month run, Addison wrote 274, while Steele and several other collaborators supplied the other half. Although Addison chose anonymity and is nowhere named as an author of the *Spectator* – the last issue, like the final paper of the *Tatler* two years before, is signed by Steele – his is the guiding creative voice. For Samuel Johnson, whose words on the topic are recorded by James Boswell in his *Life of Johnson*, Addison *was* the *Spectator*: "It is wonderful that there is such a proportion of bad papers, in the half of the work that was not written by Addison; for there was all the world to write that half, yet not a half of that half is good" (Boswell 1998, 740).

Notwithstanding Johnson's assessment, both the *Tatler* and the *Spectator* were true collaborative projects; Addison and Steele wrote papers that allude to each other, make consistent use of the same cast of supporting characters, and take up the same themes. To discuss Addison's achievement in the *Tatler* and the *Spectator* is therefore to describe the papers as a whole. The fundamental formula of these papers was to improve the moral and aesthetic standard of English life by presenting elegant and morally edifying content to the widest possible audience in the most entertaining manner possible. As Addison puts it in the programmatic tenth number of the *Spectator*: "It was said of *Socrates*, that he brought Philosophy down from Heaven, to inhabit among Men; and I shall be ambitious to have it said of me, that I have brought Philosophy out of Closets and Libraries, Schools and Colleges, to dwell in Clubs and Assemblies, at Tea-tables, and in Coffee-houses" (Bond 1965, 1.44). Addison and Steele were progressive and reformist: they thought that the stage needed to be purged of the frank sexuality of the Restoration playwrights; that poetry needed to be purified of the "false wit" of the metaphysical poets and the "sounding Phrases, hard Metaphors, and forced Expressions" that blemish the genius of Shakespeare, as Addison puts it in *Spectator*s 39 and 58; and that the moral fiber of English readers needed to be fortified against the dangers of dueling, fornication, coquetry, free-thinking, French fashion, Italian opera, excessive makeup, procrastination, idleness, oversized hoop skirts, and impudent staring at women in church (Bond 1965, 1.166, 1.245). The papers move confidently between minute questions of fashion and etiquette (as when *Tatler* 12 illustrates the meaning of the slang word "bite" (to trick,

deceive) for ignorant provincials (or Addison's *Spectator* 435 expresses disapproval of women who wear male riding coats and wigs while on horseback) to elevated reflections on the purpose and nature of human existence (as in Addison's celebrated "Vision of Mirzah," in *Spectator* 159, which allegorizes life as a journey through the "Vale of Misery" to the great "Tide of Eternity") (Bond 1987, 1.105–8, Bond 1965, 2.121–6, 4.27–30). And both the *Tatler* and the *Spectator* are explicitly targeted at women, or, as Addison frequently calls them, the "fair sex," as well as men. Mr. Spectator takes great pleasure, occasionally verging on the prurient, in describing the foibles and peccadillos of women, whom he anatomizes as "coquettes," "prudes," "picts" (i.e., women who use makeup), "peepers" (i.e., women who use their eyes to attract male attention in church), as well as commenting on the excesses of their dress.

The *Tatler* was a commercial success; the *Spectator* was a sensation. It sold in excess of 4000 papers daily for much of its run, with many more readers encountering the paper in coffeehouses or secondhand. Addison and Steele's agenda of moral and cultural uplift would have been appealing in itself; early eighteenth-century print consumers were eager to be thought both moral and refined, and bought books accordingly. Indeed, the highest price ever paid at this time for the rights to publish a book (£2500) was given by a conger of booksellers for the sermons of the Archbishop John Tillotson (Dixon 2007). But although a homiletic seriousness often crept into the Saturday paper of the *Spectator* (usually written by Addison), the periodical as a whole tended toward a light, humorous tone. Its narrator, Mr. Spectator, was a silent man who walked through all parts of London, speaking to no one and instead recording his observations for publication. His club, consisting of the Tory squire Sir Roger de Coverly, the Whig merchant Andrew Freeport, the old-fashioned restoration beau Will Honeycomb, and several other figures, offered additional perspectives on London life, and an ever-proliferating cast of correspondents (some created by Addison or Steele, many genuine letters submitted in hopes of being published in such a widely read venue) gave the paper a polyphonic quality. The *Spectator* presented its readers with a comically exaggerated version of their own world, printing such *jeux d'esprit* as an advertisement from the proprietor of an Academy of the Exercise of the Fan, offering instruction to women in the proper forms of flirtation with a fan; the rules and regulations of an Ugly Club for men; and an interview with the actor who plays the lion in the opera *Hydaspes* at the Haymarket Theatre. Individual papers sometimes took the form of short narratives (most famously *Spectator* 11, in which Steele tells the story of the faithless English slaver Inkle, who betrays the Indian maiden Yarico who saves his life), as well as satiric set pieces (such as Addison's dissection of a beau's head and a coquette's heart in *Spectator*s 275 and 281). Both the *Tatler* and *Spectator* combined topical references to current fashions and events with a deep engagement with the classics. Each issue of the *Spectator* began with an untranslated motto taken from a Latin (or occasionally Greek) author, and the papers themselves are suffused with admiring references to classical history and literature. Yet this orientation toward the classical world is in turn rooted in a sense of the essential continuity of ancient and modern. *Spectator* 67, by Eustace Budgell, describes a dialogue by Lucian (c. 120–c. 190) that depicts "a Philosopher chiding his Friend for his being a Lover of Dancing, and a Frequenter of Balls," as though second-century Athens held balls just like eighteenth-century London (Bond 1965, 1.284). The *Spectator* aspired to be both timely and timeless.

The scheme of the *Spectator* as a whole – gentle satire with a current of moral seriousness, humorous caricatures of genteel English life, and topicality mixed with classicism – owes much to both Addison and Steele. Two other features of the paper, both important to its contemporary success and subsequent reputation, are more particularly Addison's. The first of these is the silence, nearly total, of the *Spectator* on the political questions of the day.

Steele possessed a strong polemical streak, and was capable of being drawn into partisan debates and ad hominem battles with Tory writers (including his erstwhile friend Jonathan Swift, who wrote for the *Examiner*). Addison's approach was more subtle; it was he who developed Sir Roger de Coverly, the Tory country squire and most memorable member of Mr. Spectator's club, into a lovable but ridiculous figure, embodying out-of-date principles and fashions. Putting into practice the prevalent doctrine that ridicule was as sure a test of truth as reasoned argument, Addison realized that it was more effective to raise a good-natured laugh at his opponents' expense than to pay them the compliment of a polemical denunciation or get into the weeds of detailed policy debates. This stance also contributed to the enduring relevance of the *Spectator* for generations of readers after debates about the War of Spanish Succession or the toleration of dissenters had passed away.

Addison's second distinctive contribution to the *Spectator* is his emphasis on literary criticism and aesthetic theory. This takes the form of scattered observations on the classical authors, contemporary tragedians, Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, and others throughout his papers, as well as several more concentrated sets of papers on literary topics. Of these the two most notable are his 18 papers on *Paradise Lost*, which ran on each Saturday from January 5 to May 3, 1712, and his sequence of 11 consecutive papers on the "Pleasures of the Imagination," which ran from June 21 to July 3 of the same year. Addison's *Paradise Lost* papers set out to enthrone Milton's poem beside the Homeric epics and Virgil's *Aeneid* at the summit of poetry. Placing a modern English work beside and in some respects above the two most celebrated names of antiquity was a daring project, all the more so because it required Addison to reject or revise several of the dicta of then-regnant French neoclassical criticism (for instance, one French critic insisted on counting the days that pass in an epic poem, since a true epic should last for no more than a season; Addison objects that this procedure is inappropriate for a poem whose action includes episodes in heaven and hell that are outside of earthly time). The first third of Addison's papers consider the plot and language of *Paradise Lost* in general terms, referring frequently to the classical criticism of Aristotle and Longinus. The 12 papers that follow analyze each book of the poem in turn, dwelling appreciatively on particularly powerful passages and glossing the poem's allusions to its Greek and Roman predecessors. Milton's reputation in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries was mixed, for both aesthetic and political reasons, and Addison's popular essays did much to secure his status as a pre-eminent English poet. Addison's essays on the pleasures of the imagination, meanwhile, update the received doctrines of classical aesthetics with reflections derived from Cartesian and Lockean philosophy, Christian theology, recent trends in English and Continental landscape gardening, travelers' accounts of Chinese architecture, and the fairies and ghosts of popular English folklore. Addison centers imaginative pleasure in the perceiving subject, rather than in nature or artworks themselves, and argues that our delight in objects that are great, novel, or beautiful is a God-given faculty designed to foster worshipfulness, curiosity, and pleasure in creation. Though the word "aesthetics" was not to be coined until a generation after Addison's writing, his essays were a founding text of this eighteenth-century discipline, and influenced readers in both England and Germany throughout the century.

The *Spectator* drew to a close in November of 1712. In the three years that followed, Addison took part in three further such projects: the *Guardian* in 1713, a thrice-weekly continuation of the *Spectator* in 1714, and a biweekly political paper called the *Freeholder* in 1715. Each of these contains religious reflections, critical observations, and humorous caricatures of English life that recall the Addison of the *Spectator*, but none was able to sustain its consistent high quality and popular appeal. In the *Guardian*, Addison's playful satire on women's dress and behavior shades

over into prurience as he wages an elaborate campaign over several months against ladies who exposed too much of their neck and breasts to public view. The *Freeholder*, meanwhile, concerns itself exclusively with propaganda against the Jacobite rebellion of 1715, and its essays are accordingly more of historical than literary interest. Addison did, however, have one more literary triumph remaining, this time in the sphere of drama.

ADDISON AS PLAYWRIGHT

Addison's dramatic oeuvre comprises an opera (*Rosamond*, 1707), a comedy (*The Drummer*, 1716), and the celebrated tragedy *Cato* (1713). The first two of these – a panegyric on the superiority of wedded love to adultery and a satire on fashionable anti-religious scoffing respectively – were moderate successes on first performance but were not central to Addison's contemporary or posthumous reputation. *Cato*, in contrast, premiered to enormous acclaim, ran for 20 nights, and went through seven print editions in two months. The play tells the story of Cato the Younger, the Roman politician and practicing Stoic who resisted Julius Caesar and fought to preserve republican government in Rome. Addison dramatizes his hero's final hours, culminating with the suicide that preserves Cato from falling into the hands of Caesar's army. When the play appeared at the Drury Lane Theatre, both Whigs and Tories strove to outdo the other in commending Cato's integrity, patriotism, and self-command – and to appropriate his cause as an allegory of their own. Both the Duchess of Marlborough, an arch-Whig, and the Tory-leaning Queen Anne asked to receive the dedication of the printed play; in order to offend neither, Addison printed it with no dedication.

Cato became a rhetorical touchstone for eighteenth-century Britons, and its depiction of principled resistance to tyranny made it a favorite of the revolutionaries in the American colonies. Though written in a more serious and martial spirit than the *Spectator*, it shares with Addison's periodical essays a sense of the classical world as a moral resource and example for readers of Addison's own time, as well as an explicit avowal – phrased in the play in classical rather than Christian terms – of the immortality of the soul and the divine ordering of the universe.

REPUTATION AND ASSESSMENT

Following the death of Queen Anne in 1714 and the accession of the Elector of Hanover to the throne as George I, Addison's political and financial fortunes began to rise to the same heights as his literary reputation. In the last years of life, he was promoted to the powerful position of secretary of state for the southern department. In 1713 he bought an estate in the countryside for £8000; in 1715, he married Charlotte Rich, the widowed Countess of Warwick, whom he had likely been courting for some years. But prosperity and prestige came in tandem with worsening health, and Addison died on June 17, 1719, at only 47.

A four-volume collected edition of Addison's *Works* appeared in 1721, assembled by his protégé Thomas Tickell. In the decades that followed, Addison's works and character were regarded as models throughout the English-speaking world. The essays of both David Hume and Samuel Johnson are indebted to Addison, while the poet and author Edward Young held up Addison as a great writer but still greater Christian in his *Conjectures Concerning Original Composition* (1759). Alexander Pope, who had quarreled with Addison over politics and Homer in the 1710s, filed a minority report in the "Epistle to Arbuthnot" (1735) which contains a satirical portrait of a vain and self-satisfied "Atticus" who "damns with faint praise" (the origin of that stock phrase) and is surrounded by sycophants and lesser wits. More representative is Benjamin Franklin's *Autobiography* (first published posthumously in England in 1793), which describes its subject learning prose style by imitating the *Spectator*; the importance of *Cato* to Franklin's

fellow American patriots has already been noted. The *Spectator* proved to be Addison's most enduring work; translating its papers into Latin was set to students as an exercise in nineteenth-century Oxford, and the essays were frequently reprinted, as a set and in selections and anthologies, to the end of the 1800s (Pycroft 1886, 1.104).

Addison fared less well in the twentieth century. He always sought to write in a clear and accessible style that would appeal to the widest possible audience; paradoxically, this was a liability within the English departments of twentieth-century universities, which tended to prefer the complexity and irony of Pope and Swift to the humorous earnestness of the *Spectator*. Marginalized within the academy, Addison likewise lost much of his appeal to general readers, and as the world of Stuart England became more remote, so the mores recommended by his essays came to seem dated. Yet Addison has maintained a secure if modest place within the world of eighteenth-century literary scholarship, which continues to recognize his great importance to the literature and aesthetics of his own time and the centuries that followed.

SEE ALSO: Anglicanism; Clubs and Coffeehouses; Criticism, Idea of; Kit-Cat Club; Satire; Steele, Richard.

REFERENCES

Bond, Donald, ed. 1965. *The Spectator*. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bond, Donald, ed. 1987. *The Tatler*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Boswell, James. 1998. *Life of Samuel Johnson*. Ed. R.W. Chapman. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dixon, Rosemary. 2007. "The Publishing of John Tillotson's Collected Works, 1695–1757." *The Library* 8, no. 2: 154–81.

Johnson, Samuel. 2010. *The Lives of the Poets*. Ed. John H. Middendorf. 3 vols. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Pycroft, James. 1886. *Oxford Memories: A Retrospect after Fifty Years*. 2 vols. London: R. Bentley and Sons.

Smithers, Peter. 1968. *The Life of Joseph Addison*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

FURTHER READING

Addison, Joseph. 1914. *Miscellaneous Works*. Ed. A.C. Guthkelch. London: G. Bell and Sons.

Addison, Joseph. 1979. *The Freeholder*. Ed. James Leheny. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ketcham, Michael G. 1985. *Transparent Designs: Reading, Performance, and Form in the Spectator*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Lewis, C.S. 1945. "Addison." In *Essays on the Eighteenth Century, Presented to David Nichol Smith*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington. 1904. *Essay on Addison*. Ed. Charles F. McClumpha. New York: American Book Company.

Mackie, Erin. 1997. *Market à la Mode: Fashion, Commodity and Gender in the "Tatler" and the "Spectator."* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

McCrea, Brian. 1990. *Addison and Steele Are Dead*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Sherman, Stuart. 1996. *Telling Time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stephens, J.C., ed. 1982. *The Guardian*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Advertising *see* PROMOTION AND ADVERTISING

Aesthetics

TIMOTHY M. COSTELLOE

The term "aesthetics" has its linguistic roots in the Greek noun *αισθητικός* (*aisthetikos*) – "sensitive or sentient" – derived in turn from the verb *αισθάνησθαι* (*aisthanesthai*), meaning to perceive, feel, or sense. In modern parlance, it designates a sub-discipline of philosophy concerned primarily with the nature and expression of beauty and the fine arts, a use originating in the work of Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten (1714–62) and made famous by Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) in his *Kritik der*

Urteilskraft (*Critique of the Power of Judgment*) (1790). This German tradition was unknown across the Channel until introduced by Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772–1834) and, as a result, "aesthetics" did not become a term of art in British literature until the mid-nineteenth century, and then with regret that a home-grown alternative could not be found. It is absent from Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary* (1755); dismissed as peculiarly German by William Taylor (1765–1836) in 1798 (*Monthly Review* 25); and only in 1846 acknowledged reluctantly by John Ruskin (1819–1900) in *Modern Painters* II as a term "commonly employed" (Ruskin 1903–12, 42). Not until 1859, in *Lectures on Metaphysics*, was Sir William Hamilton (1788–1856) obliged to report the term's "general acceptation" throughout Europe, although he still suggested that "apolaustic" – "devoted to enjoyment" – be employed instead (Hamilton 1859, 124).

To speak of "aesthetics" in early modern Britain is anachronistic, but writers had long been concerned with similar subject matter albeit under the rubric of "taste" and "sentiment" and, from the early eighteenth century onward, pursued inquiries into a range of issues including aesthetic experience, beauty, sublimity, genius, art, tragedy, and the existence of a standard of taste. In these writings, rather than the German, the new discipline of philosophical aesthetics emerges related to, but distinct from, both the older tradition of the "art treatise" associated with Roger de Piles (1635–1709), and of "literary criticism," stretching through the fourth-century *Peri Hupsous* (*On the Sublime*) of pseudo-Longinus to Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, and represented in early modern England in the writings of John Sheffield, 1st Duke of Buckingham (1647–1721), Wentworth Dillon, 4th Earl of Roscommon (1630–85), and John Dennis (1657–1734). Dennis forms the bridge between the older tradition and the nascent discipline, especially in his treatment of the sublime (or the "grand" in the terminology of some), which designated the relation between human beings and aspects of their world that excite feelings of transcendence, shock, awe, and terror. For Dennis, however, this issue arises tangentially, as an addendum to his consideration of religion. As such, he stands at the end of a long line of thinkers from Plato onward for whom aesthetics is subordinate to other matters and, only as the eighteenth century turns and progresses, does the discipline achieve independence, with specialized practitioners and identifiable desiderata of its own.

INTERNAL SENSE THEORISTS

Approaches to aesthetics in the eighteenth century fall into three broad groups. Writers in the first isolate an internal sense to emphasize that, by analogy with the external senses of sight and hearing, aesthetic experience requires some organ of receptivity. The view is proposed and defended first by Anthony Ashley Cooper, 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury (1671–1713), in "The Moralists, A Philosophical Rhapsody," one of a series of essays composed between 1705 and 1710 and published together in three volumes as *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* in 1711. Shaftesbury develops a Neoplatonic line, proposing that aesthetic value originates with "beauty itself" that appears in material objects only through the effect of art and design imposed on them by some mind, a "forming power" of either human or divine origin. The contemplative philosopher attains to this rational truth by ascending the three "orders" of beauty, but this movement from dead forms (inanimate objects), though forms that form (human mind), to the Form that forms the forms that form (Divine Mind or Nature) is possible only because the "Idea or Sense of *Order* and *Proportion*" is "imprinted on our Minds" (Shaftesbury 2001, 27–8, 160).

In *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue in Two Treatises* (1725), Francis Hutcheson (1694–1746) translates Shaftesbury's doctrine into the empiricist idiom of John Locke (1632–1704) to produce the first systematic treatise of the aesthetic tradition. Hutcheson understands beauty as an

idea raised in human beings who possess an internal "sense of beauty" or faculty of "taste" capable of receiving it, eliciting in them a distinct kind of pleasure. Beauty is "Absolute" when it arises from "uniformity in the Object itself," or "Relative" when the pleasure arises from comparing a copy to its original. Correspondingly, objects exhibit the quality of "Uniformity and Variety" so that where uniformity is equal, beauty arises from variety, and where variety is equal it comes from uniformity (Hutcheson 2004, 29). Squares, triangles, and pentagons, for example, contain equal uniformity (equal sides of three, four, and five, respectively), so beauty increases with the number (variety) of sides in question; all triangles, by contrast, have three sides (equal variety) and beauty is proportional to the uniformity of the sides making an equilateral triangle more beautiful than an isosceles and the latter more than a scalenum. Finally, in "On Taste," the last part of *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man* (1785), Thomas Reid (1719–96) follows Hutcheson in defining taste as the power of the mind to discern beauty, but emphasizes (like Shaftesbury) its status as an intellectual faculty, which perceives the "nature or structure" of an object from which beauty arises. Beauty is a "real quality" of objects known through an act of judgment, producing a belief or opinion that there is such a quality in the object perceived, what Reid terms its "excellence" or "perfection," in the form of novelty, beauty, or grandeur (Reid 2002, 574).

IMAGINATION THEORISTS

Writers in the second group of the period emphasize that aesthetic value arises as a function of the interplay between an object with certain qualities and a faculty – the imagination – so constituted to receive and be affected by them to elicit pleasure. This approach finds expression first in the series of essays entitled the "Pleasures of the Imagination" (1712) written by Joseph Addison (1672–1719) for the *Spectator*, the publication he founded and edited with Richard Steele (1672–1729). Addison compares imagination to sight, treating it as an organ of mental vision capable of taking pleasure in what it sees. "Primary Pleasures" arise from viewing objects that are great (sublime), uncommon (novel), or beautiful, and produce feelings of astonishment, surprise, and delight, respectively. "Secondary Pleasures," by contrast, originate in the act of comparison between a copy and its original, a spontaneous mechanism of imagination that explains the beauty of art (Addison 1965, 559–60). Addison's analysis of the imagination influences various thinkers as the century progresses. It informs the aesthetics of David Hume (1711–76), including his influential essay "On the Standard of Taste" (1757), and is central to William Hogarth (1697–1764) who, in *The Analysis of Beauty* (1753), urges readers to imagine objects as having a "thin shell" composed of "very fine threads"; beauty, and its highest expression in "grace," is revealed as a function of the "waving" and "serpentine line" that then circumscribes the object's form (Hogarth 1997, 21, 50). Hogarth's fellow artist, Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723–92), draws on the same power of imagination to underpin the view of art proposed in the series of 15 lectures he delivered between 1769 and 1790 as the president of the Royal Academy of Arts, published together as *Discourses on Art* (1797). Reynolds argues that art in the "great" or "Grand Style" aims at producing a particular effect on its audience: such works "strike the imagination" of the viewer by forcing the mind to stretch and grasp at objects beyond its capacity. The result is a feeling of "repose" that comes when the imagination is expanded, uplifted, and freed from "hurry and anxiety" (Reynolds 1997, 73–6, 147).

The imagination is central, finally, to *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (1757) by Edmund Burke (1729–97), the single most influential work of the century in terms of subsequent treatments of the sublime, including that of Kant. Burke distinguishes sublimity and beauty, raising the former to equal status with

the latter and identifying each with different classes of human passions. He traces beauty to anything that causes "love" and identifies it as a feeling that soothes and calms, the effect of objects that are small, gradually varied, delicate, and fragile. The sublime, by contrast, involves "self-preservation," and arises from pain, danger, or anything "terrible." When the actual threat of such objects is removed or merely imaginary, however, the result is "delightful horror" manifest in its highest degree as astonishment and in lower forms as admiration, reverence, and respect (Burke 1958, 91, 73). Properties that produce this feeling include magnitude, vastness, infinity, obscurity, power, and difficulty. In the fourth and penultimate part of the *Enquiry* Burke explains the efficient causes of each idea through the way the human body is excited to produce the passions in question: nerves and muscles either contract in tension (pain) or relax in relief (pleasure). This is the least satisfying part of Burke's account and was criticized by contemporaries and later commentators.

ASSOCIATION THEORISTS

The third and final approach among eighteenth-century writers is associationism, a school of thought that appeals less to a single sense or faculty than to the combination of several in order to explain how aesthetic experience arises. The two most prominent thinkers in this tradition are Alexander Gerard (1728–95) and Archibald Alison (1757–1839). Gerard develops his views in the *Essay on Taste* (1759), making imagination the seat of seven "senses of taste" (novelty, sublimity, beauty, imitation, harmony, ridicule, and virtue) through which one feels what pleases and displeases, and of the principles by which ideas of objects are connected to others through resemblance, contrariety, vicinity, custom, coexistence, causation, and order (Gerard 1759, 90–1). Aesthetic experience arises through a complex process in which sensed qualities of objects affect the imagination; the ideas produced are then sorted by judgment, and pleasure is elicited through the mind's consciousness of its own exertions when it confronts objects that are novel, sublime, or beautiful. Alison, by contrast, in *Essays on the Nature and Principles of Taste* (1790), isolates a specific "Emotion of Pleasure" that arises from the real qualities that make objects beautiful or sublime; this constitutes the "Emotion of Taste," which, depending on the object in question, elicits either an "Emotion of Sublimity" or an "Emotion of Beauty." A "simple" perception alone is insufficient to produce those feelings that compose aesthetic experience, which only arises with a distinct "train of thought" or "train of imagery" elicited by the object. When "awakened," this train forms an immediate object of consciousness, which busies, seizes, or exercises the imagination. These aesthetic trains of thought differ from "ordinary" ones because connected in such a way that each individual idea and the whole succession are imbued with emotion (Alison 1790, 45–50). When the unity is broken, the emotion dissipates and aesthetic experience ends.

THE PICTURESQUE

A singular aspect of British aesthetics in the eighteenth century is the picturesque, an ideal in which nature is rearranged according to the conventions of landscape painting to depict a scene "like a picture," analyzable into formal elements of fore-, middle-, and background; distances and second-distances; side-screens, perspectives, lights, and shades. The term entered English from Italian (*pitteresco*) via French (*pittoresque*) and was in common use by mid-century, appearing in *Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope* (1756) by Joseph Warton (1722–1800), and in Johnson's *Dictionary*, although absent an entry of its own. The aesthetic found its inspiration in the Baroque artists of France and Italy, Nicolas Poussin (1594–1665), Gaspar Dughet (1613–75), Salvator Rosa (1615–73), and especially Claude

Lorrain (c. 1600–82), who provided well-established models for describing scenes witnessed by those on the Grand Tour. It found its poetic expression in James Thomson (1700–48), whose *The Seasons* (1726–30) was a landmark of the genre.

The picturesque is inseparable from the development of *le jardin anglais* with its rejection of the formal, geometrical style of gardening previously imported from France, Holland, and Italy, in favor of landscapes that reproduce and perfect naturally occurring phenomena. The movement begins with Charles Bridgeman (1690–1738), is made fashionable by William Kent (c. 1685–1748), and spread by his protégé Lancelot "Capability" Brown (1716–83), so called for telling clients that their landscapes were "capable of improvement." Admiration for the Kent-Brown school is expressed by Alexander Pope (1688–1744) in his Epistle (1731) addressed to Richard Boyle, Earl of Burlington (1695–1753), admirer of Andrea Palladio (1508–80) after whose Villa Capra "La Rotonda," near Vicenza, he modeled his country house at Chiswick. Pope's Epistle is homage to the burgeoning landscape gardening tradition, with its planted woods, glades, and created shades that follow nature's "intending Lines" before which "proud Versailles" in all her "glory falls." The theoretical justification for the Brownian aesthetic was Hogarth's line of grace and Burke's equation of beauty with the smooth and soft, manifest topographically in sweeps of lawn, clumps of trees, shrubberies, belts of gravel path, and serpentine bodies of water, arranged to give the impression of extent, exemplified in Brown's creation at Blenheim Palace, near Oxford, seat of the dukes and duchesses of Marlborough, where a waterfall was created and stream dammed to produce an artificial lake.

The aesthetics of the picturesque does not denounce this new style outright, but rejects what proponents regarded as an erroneous commitment to principles of beauty over roughness and ruggedness that define the picturesque. Nature "improved" by Brown and his school was not natural enough for writers who, in the latter decades of the eighteenth century, attempted to raise the picturesque to an aesthetic category in its own right. This attempt was the effort of four main figures, none of whom were professional philosophers, but were each engaged practically with the aesthetic they championed. The first is the country clergyman William Gilpin (1724–1804), headmaster at Cheam School in Surrey and later vicar of Boldre in the New Forest of Hampshire, author of six volumes of *Observations* containing impressions in words and aquatints from his summer travels through the British countryside. Gilpin's theoretical treatment of the picturesque is contained in *Three Essays: On Picturesque Beauty; On Picturesque Travel; and On Sketching Landscape to which is added a poem, On Landscape Painting* written in the 1770s and published in 1792. Gilpin regards the picturesque as a species of beauty predicated of objects involving "roughness" of surface and "ruggedness" of outline and more suitable for pictorial representation than those with symmetry, proportion, or smoothness (Gilpin 1794, 22). Sir Uvedale Price (1747–1829), by contrast, Whig Parliamentarian, classical scholar, and gentleman farmer of Foxley, Herefordshire, claims the picturesque as a category distinct from both beauty and the sublime, a contention he defends by following Burke, tracing it to a state of excitement he calls "curiosity" with its efficient cause in the "full tone" of the bodily fibers (Price 1810, 88–9). Third, Richard Payne Knight (1750–1824), classicist, philosopher, poet, collector, and noted all-round connoisseur with an estate, Downton, in the same county as Price, criticizes his neighbor's views in *The Landscape, a Didactic Poem in Three Books. Addressed to Uvedale Price, Esq*. (1794) on grounds defended extensively later in *An Analytic Inquiry into the Principles of Taste* (1805). Knight argues that the picturesque, as Gilpin had supposed, is a species of beauty, albeit one belonging "exclusively to the sense of vision; or to the imagination guided by that sense" (Knight 1795, 19).

The final writer in the debate over the picturesque is Humphry Repton (1752–1818), the

last great English "landscape gardener" (a term he coined) and self-styled successor to Kent and Brown. Repton's interest in the picturesque is inspired by the concerns of a "professor," a professional engaged in the practical business of improvement. Consequently, Repton's major published writings – *Sketches and Hints on Landscape Gardening* (1795) and *Observations on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening* (1803) – are reproductions of material contained in the "Red Books" (so called from the Moroccan leather in which they were bound) compiled for commissions that he undertook from 1788 onward. Repton proposes that gardening and painting are sister arts, and "improving" scenery depends on embellishing nature while concealing the means by which that is accomplished. He also emphasizes that pragmatic considerations required when producing places for human habitation are remote from painting and often demand following principles "generally adverse to picturesque beauty," viz., designs that valorize congruity, utility, order, and symmetry (Repton 1840, 112). Serious philosophical interest in the picturesque effectively ends with Repton, although its effects are felt long after, both in the physical legacy of landscaped estates and in nineteenth-century literature. It is soon lampooned by Jane Austen (1775–1817) in *Northanger Abbey* (1817), and transformed into a moral category later by Ruskin, especially in *The Stones of Venice* II (1853) and *Modern Painters* IV (1856). More immediately, it has a profound influence on William Wordsworth (1770–1850), who criticizes the inability of the picturesque aesthetic to capture the majesty of nature, and incorporates it into the category of the sublime, which is central to the poetic theory of British Romanticism.

SEE ALSO: Addison, Joseph; Burke, Edmund; Criticism and Philosophy; Criticism and the Sublime; Dennis, John; Gerard, Alexander; Hogarth, William; Reynolds, Sir Joshua; Shaftesbury, 3rd Earl of (Anthony Ashley Cooper); Sublime; Taste; Warton, Joseph.

REFERENCES

Addison, Joseph. 1965. *The Spectator*. Volume 3. Ed. Donald F. Bond. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Orig. pub. 1712.

Alison, Archibald. 1790. *Essays on the Nature and Principles of Taste*. Dublin: Byrne et al.

Burke, Edmund. 1958. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Sublime and Beautiful*. Ed. James T. Boulton. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. Orig. pub. 1757.

Gerard, Alexander. 1759. *An Essay on Taste with Three Dissertations on the Same Subject by Mr. de Voltaire, Mr. D'Alembert, F.R.S. Mr Montesquieu*. London: A. Millar.

Gilpin, William. 1794. *Three Essays: On Picturesque Beauty; On Picturesque Travel; and On Sketching Landscape to Which Is Added a Poem, On Landscape Painting*, 2nd ed. London: R. Blamire. Orig. pub. 1792.

Hamilton, Sir William. 1859. *Lectures on Metaphysics I. Works of Sir William Hamilton*. Volume 3. Ed. H.L. Mansel and John Veitch. London: William Blackwood & Sons.

Hogarth, William. 1997. *The Analysis of Beauty*. Ed. Ronald Paulson. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Orig. pub. 1753.

Hutcheson, Francis. 2004. *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue in Two Treatises*, 2nd ed. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund. Orig. pub. 1726.

Knight, Richard Payne. 1795. *The Landscape, a Didactic Poem in Three Books. Addressed to Uvedale Price, Esq.*, 2nd ed. London: G. Nicol. Orig. pub. 1794.

Price, Sir Uvedale. 1810. *Essays on the Picturesque*. Volume 1. 3 vols. London: J. Mawman. Orig. pub. 1794.

Reid, Thomas. 2002. *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press. Orig. pub. 1785.

Repton, Humphry. 1840. *Works*. Ed. J.C. Loudon. London: Longman. Orig. pub. 1795.

Reynolds, Sir Joshua. 1997. *Discourses on Art*. Ed. Robert R. Wark. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Orig. pub. 1797.

Ruskin, John. 1903–12. "*Modern Painters II*." *The Complete Works of John Ruskin (Library Edition)*. Volume 4. Ed. E.T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn. 39 vols. London: George Allen. Orig. pub. 1846.

Shaftesbury, 3rd Earl of, Anthony Ashley Cooper. 2001. *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*. Volume 1. 3 vols. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund. Orig. pub. 1711.

Africa, Representations of

ROXANN WHEELER

English interest in the continent of Africa was primarily informed by trade and, to a lesser extent, diplomacy, geography, and classical and biblical reference. If white European enslavement in the so-called Barbary states abutting the Mediterranean Sea preoccupied Britons in the period 1660–1740, black African enslavement and the western Atlantic coasts, known generically as Guinea, became more central after 1710. Enhancing profitable trade of all kinds in Africa was the most significant national goal for Britain; after 1757, a few economists, abolitionists, and politicians began making the case for expanding the non-slave trade. Colonial settlements were small and unsuccessful: derived from royal dowry, the acquisition of Tangiers in 1662 ended in 1684; Senegambia 1758–79 resulted from conflict with France; the first small settlement began and failed in 1787 Sierra Leone, and the second one followed in 1792.

The Royal Society for Improving Natural Knowledge regularized the representation of foreign land in 1665 when Robert Boyle specified the kinds of knowledge travelers should gather for a natural history of any country: its global situation registered by latitude and longitude, air quality, water features, and the earth itself as well as the nature of the soil, food and medicinal products, natural commodities, and wild and domestic animals (Boyle 1665, 186–9). Although almost all eyewitnesses comment on the beauty of Africa, they were most interested in the plenty that the land produced and whether inhabitants capitalized on its potential. Reliable information, however, was difficult to obtain. A former slave observes in *An Account of South-West Barbary* (Anon. 1713) that Morocco has "one of the best Soils in the World," but that it "lays waste like a Wilderness or Desart" because the people are idle and ignorant (36), a view at odds with the details of a highly cultivated Morocco in the major work of the previous generation, John Ogilby's *Africa* (1670). Two conflicting claims about the unknown interior beyond the coasts were common: it was uninhabitable, barren, and suitable only for the wild beasts that roamed there; it was a rich mine of gold, ivory, and other natural resources.

Representations of Barbary were shaped by religious conflict dating from the crusades and the contemporary context of three major English naval campaigns waged between 1674 and 1689 against Algiers, Tunisia, and Tripoli, the three Ottoman Empire regencies, as well as Morocco. This area, collectively, presented a contrast to English religious and political organization as well as a challenge to their military prowess (Colley 2002, 103). Over two centuries, about 20,000 Britons were kidnapped, enslaved, and, occasionally ransomed (44); in return, corsairs demanded money and weapons (68). The various towns and cities of northern Africa were more built up and cosmopolitan than their English counterparts so that the region could seem more sophisticated than England, particularly in regard to sponsoring international trade (110).

Representations of Guinea took place in the context of trade. The various western African coasts were designated according to the desirable commodities of slaves, gold, ivory, and grain (or pepper). Other important commodities were hides, beeswax, tree gum used for dyes, and bark from camwood also used for dye. Gold dominated trade until the early eighteenth century; the height of the slave trade occurred between 1763 and 1776 when about 80,000 Africans per year were forcibly transported (Eltis 2011, 272). In return, the middlemen wanted firearms, gunpowder, linen and cotton cloth, and rum (Rodney 1970, 152, 171–99). The primary factor shaping both English experience and representation of the western coasts was the limited access to the land. Many writers reported that cannibals inhabited the hinterlands, an idea that locals did not refute to protect their trade routes and mines from discovery.

Almost four times as many books about Africa appeared in the first half of the eight-

eenth century than in all of the previous century (Hallett 1965, 137). The most influential representations appeared in non-fiction. First-hand knowledge was published in travel accounts written by diplomats and former Barbary slaves held captive for between one and 26 years. These narratives provided specific information about daily life in the northern regions of Africa. Particularly important were Joseph Pitts, *A True and Faithful Account of the Religion and Manners of the Mohammetans* (1704), with four editions in the eighteenth century, and *The History and Long Captivity and Adventures of Thomas Pellow, in South Barbary* (1751). James Bruce (1730–94), a former consul in Algiers, set out to discover the sources of the Nile in 1768; he had adventures that were the talk of Europe, including living in Ethiopia for two years. The much-anticipated volumes were published in 1790. Specialist knowledge of captains, surgeons, and factors attached to the slave trade about schemes for stabilizing African commerce, including information about exchange rates, favored trade items, and natural resources, flourished, particularly in the 1730s through 1740s.

Knowledge about Africa gleaned from travel literature began appearing in the scores of geographies first published in this era. Widely hailed as the continent of the greatest diversity, Africa was also the site of several ancient civilizations. Contemporary geographies vary enough that they do not convey a uniform notion of Africa, sometimes divided into as many as 14 separate regions. Typically featuring palaces, mosques, burial grounds, Roman ruins, and other man-made curiosities of Morocco, Algiers, Tunisia, and Egypt, geographies also routinely included beautiful gardens, pleasing fountains, and the literary locations of Carthage and Thebes. The rest of the continent was represented with far less detail and characterized as providing only natural curiosities.

Literary constructions of Barbary drew heavily from the non-fiction in a stylized manner. Blockbuster Restoration stage productions such as Elkanah Settle's tragedy *The Empress of Morocco* (1673) signified the exotic land through remarkable stage props – by a large, live palm tree and a wall with iron spikes that indexed the prevalence of torture and bloody deaths. The sequel, *The Heir of Morocco* (1682), favored the seraglio and other indoor settings in Algiers. Ruler despotism, shifting loyalties, and violent men were the key elements associated with Islamic courts on the stage (Orr 2001, 57, 100). Popular early novels set in Barbary featured plots of misfortunes and adventures, including kidnap, shipwreck, or piracy. Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) includes the title character's enslavement in Salé. The first Gothic novel, Horace Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto* (1764), recounts that Theodore was captured in Sicily at age five by corsairs and enslaved for years in Algiers. Samuel Johnson's *Rasselas, the Prince of Abissinia* (1759) is set in a stylized, pleasant valley in Ethiopia. The protagonists journey to urban Cairo and the pyramids at Giza; the female character who is abducted sees hippopotamuses and crocodiles along a remote part of the Nile.

Literary treatments of the Atlantic coastal regions also loom large in the history of the early novel. Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko; or, The Royal Slave* (1688), the first novel claimed by both the English and American traditions, is initially set in Coramantien, a Gold-Coast slave-trading station; although it eschews description of the land, the novel provides an elaborate drama of court intrigues, intra-African military conflict, as well as trading activity with Europeans for arms and slaves. Defoe's *Captain Singleton* (1720) features both Africa and the island of Madagascar on the title page. Emptied of all actual infrastructure and populous cities, the land appears as a series of natural obstacles of deserts, burning sands, and enormous lakes, a place with terrifying animals, as well as the source of tremendous amounts of ivory and gold underappreciated by the inhabitants. Robert Paltock's title character in *Peter Wilkins* (1751) spends several years in the Congo region after he and Glanlepze, a fellow slave, escape their imprisonment and hard

labor; their several adventures include episodes with crocodiles and lions.

Abolitionist poetry, aimed at evoking a reader's sensibility and revulsion at the slave trade, tended to depict coastal western Africa in an even more mannered way than the fiction. Thomas Day's influential *The Dying Negro* (1773) features the speaker recalling his youthful hunting forays near the streams of the Gambia River before being kidnapped by English slavers. Hannah More's *Slavery, A Poem* (1788) conjures up the deleterious effect of English slave traders on the land: "The burning village, and the blazing town" (l. 98). William Dodd's poem *The African Prince* (1749) signifies a bucolic Africa with a palm tree; it is based on the true story of William Ansah Sessarakoo, son of a Fante trader, sent to be educated in England but sold into slavery in Barbados and eventually returned. Quobna Ottobah Cugoano's *Thoughts and Sentiments on the Evil of Slavery* (1787) and Olaudah Equiano's *The Interesting Narrative of the Life* (1789) provided (supposedly) first-hand accounts of African childhood and landscape divided by different language groups and various trading activities. The pro-slavery version emphasized Africa as a land dangerous to its inhabitants who would otherwise starve because of famine or become enslaved by their own rulers.

If previous generations of scholars emphasized the way that Africa appears as a land that seemed the most different from England, or treated it only as Britons experienced it, in the past 30 years there has been a greater tendency to seek out the tensions within English narratives of Africa. The most comprehensive analysis is Anthony Barker's *The African Link* (1978), which compares English accounts of western Africa, establishing reliability, originality, borrowing, and mistranslation. Joe Snader's *Caught between Two Worlds* (2000) and Linda Colley's *Captives* (2002) provide a similar resource for English accounts of northern Africa. Mary Louise Pratt's *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (1992) is a seminal theory of representation that situates the land as an intercultural contact zone.

SEE ALSO: Empire and Colonialism; Race.

REFERENCES

Anonymous. 1713. *An Account of South-West Barbary*. London.

Barker, Anthony. 1978. *The African Link: British Attitudes to the Negro in the Era of the Slave Trade, 1550–1807*. London: Frank Cass.

Boyle, Robert. 1665. "General Heads for a Natural History of a Countrey." *Philosophical Transactions* 1: 186–9.

Colley, Linda. 2002. *Captives*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Eltis, David. 2011. "Africa, Slavery, and the Slave Trade, Mid-Seventeenth to Mid-Eighteenth Centuries." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Atlantic World c. 1450–c. 1850*, edited by Nicolas Canny and Philip Morgan, 271–88. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hallett, Robin. 1965. *The Penetration of Africa: European Exploration in North and West Africa to 1815*. New York: Praeger.

Orr, Bridget. 2001. *Empire on the English Stage, 1660–1714*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge.

Rodney, Walter. 1970. *A History of the Upper Guinea Coast 1545 to 1800*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Snader, Joe. 2000. *Caught between Worlds: British Captivity Narratives in Fact and Fiction*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

FURTHER READING

Matar, Nabil. 2005. *Britain and Barbary, 1589–1689*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Milton, Giles. 2005. *White Gold: The Extraordinary Story of Thomas Pellow and Islam's One Million White Slaves*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Wheeler, Roxann. 1999. "Limited Visions of Africa: Geographies of Savagery and Civility in Early Eighteenth-Century Narratives." In *Writes of Passage: Reading Travel Writing*, edited by James Duncan and John Gregory, 14–48. London: Routledge.

Afterpieces

DANIEL J. ENNIS

INTRODUCTION

An afterpiece was the short dramatic performance which appeared after the "mainpiece" in a typical evening of theatrical entertainment in eighteenth-century Britain. In the broadest sense, an afterpiece could take the form of pantomimes, farces, ballad operas, burlettas, spectacles, processions, "dramatic entertainments." Whereas the mainpiece repertory in eighteenth-century British theaters tended toward a stable (critics might have said unadventurous) selection of five-act tragedies and three-act comedies, the afterpiece allowed for topical, experimental, ephemeral, and (occasionally) disreputable drama. An afterpiece could be as long as an hour or as short as ten minutes, and a very short afterpiece might be supplemented by a second afterpiece. Afterpieces were used to lighten the mood after a serious play (and in the eighteenth century, some comedies were as long and sober as tragedies), to break in a new performer, or as a vehicle for popular songs or impressive visual effects. Despite their putatively subsidiary role in the theatrical program, certain afterpieces became immensely popular and successful afterpieces were sometimes the main attraction of a theatrical evening; the practice of arriving late to the theater and paying for a half-price ticket predated the afterpiece, but the advent of the afterpiece made that half-price ticket all the more attractive.

The ad hoc nature of the afterpiece has caused critical commentary on the theater's "last word" to be scattered and provisional, both in the eighteenth century and in contemporary scholarship. Because the term refers to a time (i.e., the afterpiece is the diversion after the "main" performance of the evening has been completed), there exists no body of commentary that discusses afterpieces as a group, inasmuch it is difficult to trace a line from pantomime to farce and on through ballad opera, burlesque, and spectacle. Tragedy was rarely attempted in the afterpiece, and there was among eighteenth-century theatergoers a preference for music, comedy, and stimulating stagecraft to close the evening.

As such, the afterpiece – whatever form it took – was usually viewed as a diversion, a playlet not to be freighted with the expectations of the mainpiece. Charles Dibdin (1745–1814), discussing his opera *The Deserter* (performed and published 1773), notes that the composition was "much too grave to stand the least chance of success in an after-piece" (Dibdin 1773, 4). Sophia Lee (1750–1824), attempting to have a full-length comedy produced at Covent Garden, was advised by the theater manager to remove the serious parts of her play and "convert the humorous part into an after-piece" (Lee 1780, v). One evening in 1763, James Boswell slipped out of the crowded Theatre Royal at Covent Garden, where the bombastic three-act opera *Artaxerxes* by Thomas Arne (1710–78) (performed 1762; published 1763) was playing so he could make it over to Drury Lane in time to catch Arne's bubbly one-act afterpiece *Thomas and Sally* (performed and published 1760, written in collaboration with the Irish playwright and librettist Isaac John Bickerstaff (1733–1812?)). Boswell, describing the scene, refers to *Thomas and Sally* as the "entertainment," nicely encapsulating his (satisfied) expectations (1950, 236–7). Like Nell Gwynn, afterpieces were more enjoyed than respected.

Richard W. Bevis (1970) provides the best discussion of afterpieces in the twentieth century, suggesting that afterpieces, given their compact form, "seem curiously modern in their means and ends, their strengths and weaknesses" (Bevis 1970, vii). Bevis claims the afterpiece kept "laughing comedy" alive in the face of heroic tragedy and the sentimental comedies of the age. Leo Hughes (1981) emphasizes the variety of afterpiece forms and claims that the afterpiece was the chief site of eighteenth-century British theatrical innovation. Matthew Kinservik (2002) picks up this thread, noting that as the century wore on, playwrights viewed afterpieces as the last

refuge of satiric comedy; eventually, Kinservik asserts, the afterpiece became the "more important part of the evening's bill" (2002, 132).

In a careful reading that focuses on the early nineteenth-century London stage, Jeffrey N. Cox (1999) explores the relationship between the various elements of the theatrical evening, noting how the afterpiece's status as a supplementary entertainment allowed generic hierarchies (with tragedy on top) to be reinforced. This discipline was imperfect; as Cox points out, the "increasing slippage between main- and afterpiece" alarmed those who believed in a dramatic order where the full-length play reigned supreme and pantomimes, farces, and ballad-operas were best kept on the periphery (1999, 406). Indeed, just as pantomimes were regarded as a low form in the eighteenth century, so too have twentieth-century theater historians ignored it in their discussions of the afterpiece, preferring to focus on short comedies with their extant play-texts and quotable dialogue. This tradition of neglect led to an incomplete picture of the playbill, in that farce and burlesque became bywords for the afterpiece, even though pantomime was just as popular as one-act comedy when it came to the close of the evening. John O'Brien (2004) helps to correct the generic picture of the afterpiece by pointing out how the popularity of pantomimes helped establish the afterpiece as an essential part of the theatrical evening.

If pantomime and farce are two legs of the afterpiece stool, the third is surely what we would now call musical theater, but what in the eighteenth century was known, loosely, as opera. Michael Burden (2007) has enumerated the various forms opera took during the long eighteenth century, from full-length, all-sung Italian spectaculars to uniquely English sung-and-spoken short musicals that made ideal afterpieces. Such productions – ballad operas, "operatic farces," "lyric comedies," and many more forms – drew melodies from almost every source, from traditional tunes to classical compositions, and many proved to be long-running and profitable additions to the repertory. As Berta Joncus (2006) points out, the rise of the musical afterpiece allowed a broad range of Londoners to hear kinds of music that hitherto had been reserved for elites. For example, Henry Fielding (1707–54) used Handel's airs in ballad-opera afterpieces; individuals from the middle and lower classes entered the theaters thanks to half-price tickets, and thus Handel's works "entered the public domain of English melodies" (2006, 192). Todd Gilman (2012) expertly explains how fluid the musical afterpiece could be, as Arne not only composed full-length operas and then shortened them to serve as afterpieces, but also refurbished and/or replaced songs in long-running musical entertainments, giving those productions new life as "show-closers."

FORMS

Afterpieces were rare in the Restoration; Thomas Otway (1652–85) presented a double bill in 1676, but this was an isolated experiment. In 1703, Drury Lane included a few "Night Scenes" on the playbill, and gradually more supplemental entertainments began to appear after the mainpiece, including farces, concerts, miscellaneous "diversions," animal acts, and contortionists (Avery 1968, cxvi). It took John Rich (1692–1761), manager of the theater at Lincoln's Inn Fields, to establish the afterpiece as a regular part of the playbill. Rich was locked in commercial combat with the larger and better-financed Drury Lane. Seeking an edge, he began adding pantomimes to programs "anchored" by straight plays, in essence giving his audiences two shows for the price of one. His pantomime afterpiece *The Necromancer* (performed 1723; not published) more than doubled the nightly profits at Lincoln's Inn Fields (Hume 2011, 38). Drury Lane under Colley Cibber (1671–1757) responded, running *Harlequin Doctor Faustus* (performed and published 1724) as an afterpiece for eight consecutive nights. Rich, himself a gifted Harlequin, programmed more pantomimes, and *The Necromancer* was followed by *The Rape of Proserpine* (performed 1727; published 1731) and

Perseus and Andromeda (performed and published 1730). These afterpieces, both with libretti by Lewis Theobald (1688–1744), were elaborately staged, with new scenery and effects, and Rich's willingness to invest significant resources in these afterpieces underscores how important they were if theater managers were to compete successfully with their rivals. Drury Lane featured John Thurmond's (d. 1754) *Apollo and Daphne; or, Harlequin Mercury* (performed and published 1725) and *Harlequin's Triumph* (performed and published 1727); thus the two theaters combined to establish the pantomime as an expected manifestation of the afterpiece.

One of the most popular afterpieces of the century was *Harlequin's Invasion* (produced 1759; published 1926) by David Garrick (1717–79). In this afterpiece, pantomime is characterized as a strange creature, a theatrical form that is both fascinating and troubling: "The women are agog to see it. The children are frighted out of their wits. Our parson shakes his head, and the squire and his dogs are all in high hunt after it" (Garrick 1980, 207). Despite the persistent view that pantomime was a debased entertainment, it was too popular to be banished from the stage, and a tally of the most-performed afterpieces of mid-century is dominated by vehicles for Harlequin, with Henry Woodward's (1714–77) pantomimes such as *Queen Mab* (performed 1752; not published), *Fortunatus* (performed 1753; not published), and *Proteus* (performed 1755; not published), combining for more than 600 performances between 1747 and 1776 (Pedicord 1954, 198–9). Later in the eighteenth century, Thomas Dibdin (1771–1841) provided a stream of librettos that enriched the stock Harlequin-Columbine-Pantaloon situation, enlivening the form with arias, ballads, and popular tunes. His afterpiece *Harlequin and Mother Goose* (performed 1806; songs published 1807) was reputed to have earned Covent Garden £20,000 (Frow 1985, 64).

Despite the popularity of pantomimes, the term "afterpiece," in the eighteenth century, became near-synonymous with farce. Fielding proved an early master of the form, and his *Tom Thumb* (performed and published 1730) inaugurated his series of successful afterpieces, including *The Covent Garden Tragedy* (performed and published 1732) and *Tumble-Down Dick* (performed 1736; published 1737). Alongside Fielding's works, Garrick's farces also endured for decades. *The Lying Valet* (performed and published 1741), *Miss in Her Teens* (performed and published 1747), *The Male Coquette* (performed and published 1757), and *Bon Ton* (performed and published 1775) remained reliably profitable afterpieces even after Garrick's retirement in 1776. The narrow range of mainpieces programmed at both Drury Lane and Covent Garden led audiences to look to the afterpiece for risk, innovation, and fun. Garrick, usually desirous of a genteel reputation, deigned to entertain, as when he presented his Jonathan Swift-inspired *Lilliput* (performed and published 1757) for 17 profitable nights in one season, despite the *Theatrical Examiner* declaring the afterpiece a "trifling, indecent, immoral, stupid, pile of rubbish" (1757, 89).

Most afterpieces included music; one- and two-act operas (both "ballad" and "serious"), burlettas, and short musicals were the natural outgrowth of the Restoration practice of supplementing spoken plays with singing and dancing. Colley Cibber's "pastoral interlude" *Myrtillo* (performed and published 1715), written in collaboration with the composer Johann Christoph Pepusch (1667–1752), is an early example of the loosely plotted musical entertainments that were often programmed once the afterpiece became obligatory. *The Devil to Pay; or, The Wives Metamorphos'd* (performed and published 1731), by Charles Coffey (d. 1754) and John Mottley (1692–1750), has been called a "ballad opera," an "operatical farce," and a "ballad-farce"; whatever its genre, it held the stage as an afterpiece for so long that Jane Austen (1775–1817) was able to see it at Drury Lane in 1814. The demand for musical afterpieces was strong enough that Charles Dibdin was for a while kept under contract at Drury Lane to feed the public appetite. Dibdin

was a prodigious supplier of afterpieces, and his miscellaneous short-form musicals served as afterpieces for every major theater in London well into the nineteenth century. Dibdin's rival Stephen Storace (1762–96) emerged in the last decade of the eighteenth century as a prolific producer of musical afterpieces. Collaborating with James Cobb (1756–1818) and others, Storace could contrive melodic one-acts on short notice or revive older compositions with fresh melodies. Storace and Prince Hoare's (1755–1834) *No Song, No Supper* (performed 1790; published 1792) was dismissed upon its debut as a "trifle" (*The Historical Magazine* 1790, 100), but became one of the most popular afterpieces of the 1790s, with 28 performances in the 1790–1 season alone.

CONVERSIONS

Although many short dramatic works were intended to be performed as afterpieces, managers squeezed extra profits from full-length repertory plays by placing shortened versions of said plays in the afterpiece position. Shakespeare's plays were a favored source for such conversions. Some Shakespearean afterpieces were complete subplots lifted nearly intact, others were pastiches of famous speeches and scenes. Early on, when afterpieces were still occasional additions to the playbill, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was drawn upon by Richard Leveridge (1670–1758) for the one-act *Pyramus and Thisbe* (performed 1715; published 1716). The unknown author of *The Humours of Sir John Falstaff, Justice Shallow, and Ancient Pistol* (performed 1734; not published) provided the Haymarket with an afterpiece that invoked *The Merry Wives of Windsor* as well as the *Henry IV* plays. *The Winter's Tale* was truncated by McNamara Morgan (c. 1720–62) for Covent Garden; the resulting afterpiece, entitled *The Sheep-Shearing: or, Florizel and Perdita* (performed 1754; published 1767), entered that theater's repertory and proved so popular that Garrick responded with his own *Florizel and Perdita* (performed 1756; published 1758), a "dramatic pastoral" that was often produced in the 1760s. John Rose (b. 1754?) adapted scenes from *Timon of Athens* to create *A Quarter of an Hour before Dinner; or, Quality Binding* (performed and published 1788). These single-act portions of Shakespeare were not always applauded. Garrick in particular was accused of mangling the Bard's beauties, and Oliver Goldsmith (1730–74) derided such productions as "strange vamp'd comedies, farcical tragedies, or what shall I call them, speaking pantomimes" (Goldsmith 1759, 170).

Shakespeare's plays would seem to have been an inexhaustible source of afterpieces, but the managers turned to other authors with equal enthusiasm, and many a favorite or forgotten mainpiece found new life as an afterpiece. Operas cut down to burlettas, three-act sentimental comedies re-engineered as a one-act farces, spectacular battles and processions excised from history plays; there were many ways to create a "new" afterpiece from an old source. Cibber helped establish the practice of deploying shortened versions of longer dramatic works when he truncated his failed opera *Love in a Riddle* (performed and published 1729) to create the musical afterpiece *Damon and Phillida* (performed 1729; published 1730). Fielding's afterpiece-length adaptation of Molière's *Le Medecin malgré lui* (performed 1666; published 1667), *The Mock Doctor* (performed and published 1732) was a commercial success, and when Charles Shadwell's (d. 1726) *The Fair Quaker of Deal* (performed and published 1710) was reduced to an afterpiece, the *Monthly Review* declared that in its new form it was "a much more tolerable performance than it was before its present revival" (1773–4, 394).

The conversion of a longer work to an afterpiece was sometimes viewed as a degradation of the original. When John Milton's *Comus* (performed 1634; published 1637) was given this treatment by George Colman the Elder (1732–94), a contemporary observer complained that Milton's "most excellent Performance" had been "mutilated, and reduced to an After-piece" (Milton 1777, 5). Mutilated though

it may have been, *Comus* proved to be one of the most popular afterpieces of the age, with 215 performances in the last quarter of the eighteenth century (Hogan 1968, clxxii). Ellen Donkin (1995) points out how the practice of converting mainpieces to afterpieces had material implications for playwrights. Elizabeth Inchbald's (1753–1821) *The Child of Nature* (performed and published 1788) opened at Covent Garden as a mainpiece. After one performance, the play was downgraded to an afterpiece, a decision that likely reduced Inchbald's eventual compensation from £500–£600 to £55 (Donkin 1995, 123). On occasion, a play would journey in the opposite direction, as when Fielding expanded his successful afterpiece *Tom Thumb* (performed and published 1730) from two to three acts, retitled it *The Tragedy of Tragedies* (performed and published 1731), and saw it produced as a mainpiece. Even here we see the process of shortening a mainpiece into an afterpiece at work, as Eliza Haywood (c. 1693–1756), John Frederick Lampe (c. 1703–51), and Thomas Arne converted *The Tragedy of Tragedies* into *The Opera of Operas* (performed and published 1733), a successful full-length production, only to have Arne adapt it as an even more successful afterpiece (still called *The Opera of Operas*) the following season.

AUTHORSHIP

Prestige may have lain with the mainpiece, but the Georgian theater did not lack for writers willing and able to produce afterpieces. Susannah Centlivre (c. 1667–1723) built her reputation on a series of brilliant full-length comedies, but she holds a place in the history of the afterpiece. Centlivre's *A Bickerstaff's Burying* (performed and published 1710) a revival and renaming of *The Custom of the Country*, provided the second half of one of the earliest single-author double bills when it was paired with Centlivre's mainpiece comedy *The Busy Body* (performed and published 1709) in 1715. George Colman the Elder had his first success as a playwright with his "dramatic novel in one act" *Polly Honeycombe* (performed and published 1760). When Colman the Elder became Covent Garden's manager in 1767, he lavished energy on afterpieces, turning out new farces and short comedies throughout the 1770s and 1780s. Elizabeth Inchbald, having failed to find a producer for a full-length comedy she'd written, scored an afterpiece success with *The Mogul Tale* (performed 1784; published 1788); this farce secured Inchbald's credibility, and the rejected comedy, *I'll Tell You What* (performed 1785; published 1786) was produced the next season. Matthew Lewis (1775–1818), whose fame now rests upon his novel *The Monk*, attempted a "Tragic Scene" as an afterpiece; *The Captive* was so horrifying that the audience reaction bordered on hysteria. Lewis withdrew the piece from the stage, concerned about the "emotional well-being of his audience" (DeRochi 2007, 238).

SUBJECT MATTER

Comic afterpieces were often explicitly topical and relied on audience knowledge of current events, the social structure of "the Town," and especially theatrical gossip. John Gay's (1685–1732) *What D'Ye Call It* (performed and published 1715) was a Scriblerian production, with much of its humor derived from a mock-preface attacking some of Gay's rival writers. Fielding's *Eurydice* (performed 1737; published 1743), like many of his burlesques, was full of knowing references to other dramatic works. *Eurydice* was damned by a boisterous crowd of footmen and withdrawn from the stage, but its sequel, *Eurydice Hiss'd* (performed and published 1737) was an enormous success, in part because it gleefully danced on the grave of the author's own failure. Such metadramatic conceit was not confined to Fielding's afterpieces. Charles Macklin's *The New Play Criticiz'd, or the Plague of Envy* (performed and published 1747) appeared at Drury Lane in response to Benjamin Hoadly's (1676–1761) popular mainpiece *The Suspicious Husband*

(performed and published 1747), which had opened at the Covent Garden Theatre a few weeks earlier. Macklin's afterpiece is set an hour after a performance of *The Suspicious Husband* and its action consists of a group of critics debating the merits of Hoadly's play.

Along with plays-about-plays, the rehearsal play was a mainstay of the afterpiece repertoire. George Villiers (1628–87), 2nd Duke of Buckingham's full-length comedy *The Rehearsal* (performed and published 1672) inspired a host of imitations and homages that served as afterpieces, from Fielding's *Pasquin* (performed and published 1736) through Catherine "Kitty" Clive's (1711–85) proto-feminist update, *The Rehearsal; or, Bays in Petticoats* (performed 1750; published 1753), culminating in the most successful of Richard Brinsley Sheridan's (1751–1816) afterpieces, *The Critic* (performed 1779; published 1781). Initially presented on the same bill as *Hamlet*, *The Critic* includes an extended discussion of the best way to write a play that would please the capricious manager of Drury Lane (that is, Sheridan). Buckingham's original *Rehearsal* was fated to join its briefer descendants, as it was also shortened and presented as an afterpiece in 1786.

Political content and current events often found their way into afterpieces. Because a one-act comedy was quicker to produce than either a mainpiece comedy or tragedy, the news of the day could be swiftly translated into entertainment. Fielding used his afterpieces to attack Robert Walpole (1676–1745), "prime minister" from 1721 to 1742, so persistently that we might say that the afterpiece was in part responsible for the Licensing Act of 1737. Fielding's *An Old Man Taught Wisdom; or, The Virgin Unmask'd* (produced and published 1735), not now numbered among Fielding's great works, was among the most-produced farces of the eighteenth century. That play's jokes about "German cousins," which in the 1730s would have had strong political resonance under the German-born King George II (1683–1760), would have lost their sting by the 1790s under the thoroughly English King George III (1738–1820). Nevertheless, *The Virgin Unmask'd* (as it was known in the late eighteenth century) was staged year after year for almost six decades. As legal pressure pushed playwrights away from overtly political content, making the theater, in Elaine M. McGirr's phrase, "univocal" in support of Whig hegemony (2009, 168), afterpieces took a patriotic turn. "Rule Britannia" was first sung as part of the David Mallet (1705–65), James Thompson (1700–48), and Thomas Arne (1710–78) masque *Alfred* (performed and published 1740); Garrick adapted and restaged *Alfred* as an afterpiece, helping the "Rule Britannia" enter the national musical canon. In a similar fashion, Arne's arrangement of "God Save the King" was part of many theatrical evenings in the latter half of the eighteenth century, either sung between the mainpiece and afterpiece, or integrated into afterpieces as the final song, guaranteed to earn a standing ovation.

In times of national crisis, it was often in the afterpiece where the theater presented its patriotic credentials. Tobias Smollett (1721–71) wrote his afterpiece *The Reprisal; or, The Tars of Old England* (performed and published 1757) in response to news of British military defeats, one of many entertainments that attached patriotic speeches and songs to diverting stage effects. A singular example of this kind of production is *The Glorious First of June* (produced 1794; songs published 1794). Prepared for the stage in only three days, with Sheridan and James Cobb writing the dialogue on scraps of paper and handing it to the actors in the midst of rehearsal, this piece recreates a British naval victory. Miniature fleet maneuvers were supervised by the Duke of Clarence (1765–1837), third son of George III and a naval officer himself. Songs were contributed by many local celebrities, including the actress, dramatist, novelist, and poet Mary "Perdita" Robinson (c. 1757–1800), known as the "English Sappho." The piece had such an improvisational spirit that Richard "Dickey" Suett (1755–1805), one of Sheridan's most popular comic actors, was prevailed upon to come onstage and reprise the character of Endless from *No Song, No Supper*. *The Glorious First of June* earned over £1500 in

one night, a record at the time. With plot and character de-emphasized in favor of music and spectacle, such afterpieces presaged the kinds of entertainments that would play well in the larger theaters of the early nineteenth century.

REPUTATION AND INFLUENCE

In the late eighteenth century, anthologies of afterpieces began to appear in print. Many early afterpieces were not printed, but multivolume anthologies such as *A Collection of the Most Esteemed Farces and Entertainments Performed on the British Stage* (1786–8), *The Minor Theatre: Being a Collection of the Most Approved Farces, Operas, and Comedies* (1794), and Elizabeth Inchbald's *A Collection of Farces and Other After-Pieces, Which Are Acted at the Theatres Royal, Drury-Lane, Covent-Garden and Hay-Market* (1809) introduced audience favorites to the drawing rooms of the empire. The pleasure of reading afterpieces was even known amongst royalty; Frances Burney (1752–1840), asked to entertain Queen Charlotte (1744–1818), the wife of King George III, in 1790, was surprised that she requested not a declamation of Shakespeare, but a reading of *Polly Honeycombe* (Burney 1940, 264).

The afterpiece may have become an obligatory part of the London playbill, but it never shook its dubious reputation. William "Gentleman" Smith (1730–1819), the celebrated actor whose career spanned four decades, had inserted in his contract that he would never be asked to appear in an afterpiece, fearing potential degradation (*Theatrical Inquisitor* 1820, 311). George Colman the Younger (1762–1836), manager of the summer-only Little Theatre in the Haymarket, derived some of his income from selling full-length comedies to Drury Lane and Covent Garden. Colman also wrote farces, but used the pseudonym Arthur Griffinhoof, "through apprehension that disrepute as a farce-writer might have been prejudicial to him as an author of any kind of regular drama" (Baker 1812, 139–140). Reviewing the successful Covent Garden afterpiece *Harlequin and Asmodeus* (performed 1810; not published), the *Monthly Mirror* sniped at the immature taste of the audience: "To see the crowded house exhibited on this night, no one would wonder at the success of our dramatists, spite of their inability to write, for it was proved that the public love *pantomime* dearly. The managers have done their best to gratify this taste in boys and girls of all growths and ages, from two feet ten to five feet ten, and from six to sixty" (1810, 61).

Often dismissed, the afterpiece nonetheless persisted, a guilty pleasure that subsidized respectable drama. By the late eighteenth century, the situation was such that *A New Theatrical Dictionary* complained that a popular afterpiece might be "a considerable favorite with the public, being well-attended, while the plays of Shakespeare were acting to almost empty benches" (1792, 30). The short works that closed the theatrical evening proved nimble structures of feeling, sometimes presaging cultural shifts, and almost always responsive to the tastes of the times. For more than a century, the afterpiece was the dessert to the theatrical meal – popular, delightful, and potentially unhealthy.

SEE ALSO: Comedy; Tragedy.

REFERENCES

Avery, Emmett L. 1968. *The London Stage 1700–1729: A Critical Introduction*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Baker, David Erskine. 1812. *Biographia Dramatica; or, a Companion to the Playhouse*. London: Longman et al. Reprinted 1966. New York: AMS Press.

Bevis, Richard W. 1970. *Eighteenth Century Drama: Afterpieces*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Boswell, James. 1950. *Boswell's London Journal: 1762–63*. Ed. Frederick A. Pottle. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Burden, Michael. 2007. "Opera in the London Theatres." In *The Cambridge Companion to the English Theatre, 1730–1830*, edited by Jane Moody and Daniel O'Quinn, 205–17. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burney, Frances. 1940. *The Diary of Fanny Burney*. Ed. Lewis Gibbs. London: Everyman's Library.

Cox, Jeffrey N. 1999. "Spots of Time: The Structure of the Dramatic Evening in the Theatre of Romanticism." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 41, no. 4: 403–25.

DeRochi, Jack. 2007. "A Feminine Spectacle: The Novelistic Aesthetic of Matthew Lewis's *The Captive*." In *Prologues, Epilogues, Curtain-Raisers, and Afterpieces: The Rest of the Eighteenth-Century London Stage*, edited by Daniel J. Ennis and Judith Bailey Slagle, 238–50. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Dibdin, Charles. 1773. *The Deserter. A New Musical Drama: As It Is Performed at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane*. Dublin: Potts, Chamberlaine, Sleater and Moncrieffe. Google Books.

Donkin, Ellen. 1995. *Getting into the Act: Women Playwrights in London*. London: Routledge.

Frow, Gerald. 1985. *"Oh Yes It Is": A History of Pantomime*. London: BBC Books.

Garrick, David. 1980. *The Plays of David Garrick: Garrick's Own Plays 1740–1766*. Ed. Harry William Pedicord and Frederick Louis Bergman. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Gilman, Todd. 2012. *The Theatrical Career of Thomas Arne*. Lanham: University of Delaware Press.

Goldsmith, Oliver. 1759. *An Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning in Europe*. London: R. and J. Dodsley. Google Books.

Historical Magazine. 1790. London: D. Brewman.

Hogan, Charles Beecher, ed. 1968. *The London Stage 1660–1800, Part 5: 1776–1800*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hughes, Leo. 1981. "Afterpieces: or, That's Entertainment." In *The Stage and the Page: London's "Whole Show" in the Eighteenth-Century Theatre*, edited by George Winchester Stone, Jr., 55–70. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hume, Robert. 2011. "John Rich as Manager and Entrepreneur." In *The Stage's Glory: John Rich (1692–1761)*, edited by Berta Joncus and Jeremy Barlow, 29–60. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Joncus, Berta. 2006. "Handel at Drury Lane: Ballad Opera and the Production of Kitty Clive." *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 131: 179–226.

Kinservik, Matthew J. 2002. *Disciplining Satire: The Censorship of Satiric Comedy on the Eighteenth Century London Stage*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.

Lee, Sophia. 1780. *The Chapter of Accidents: A Comedy, in Five Acts, as It Is Performed at the Theatre-Royal in the Hay-Market*. London: Cadell. Google Books.

McGirr, Elaine M. 2009. *Heroic Mode and Political Crisis, 1660–1745*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Milton, John. 1777. *Comus. A Masque. As It Is Acted at the Theatres-Royal in Drury-Lane and Covent-Garden. Altered from Milton*. London: Starkey. Gale: Eighteenth Century Collections Online.

Monthly Mirror. 1810. "Review of *Harlequin and Asmodeus*." July. London: Harding and Wright. Google Books.

Monthly Review. 1773–4. "Review." Volume 29. London: R. Griffith.

New Theatrical Dictionary: Containing an Account of All the Dramatic Pieces, that Have Appeared from the Commencement of Theatrical Exhibitions to the Present Time...: to which Is Added an Alphabetical Catalogue of Dramatic Writers... and Also a Short Sketch of the Rise and Progress of the English Stage. 1792. London: S. Bladon.

O'Brien, John. 2004. *Harlequin Britain: Pantomime and Entertainment, 1690–1760*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Pedicord, Harry William. 1954. *The Theatrical Public in the Time of Garrick*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Theatrical Examiner. 1757. London: J. Doughty.

Theatrical Inquisitor. 1820. Volume 16. London: C. Chapple.

FURTHER READING

Anderson, Misty G. 2002. *Female Playwrights and Eighteenth-Century Comedy*. New York: Palgrave.

Backscheider, Paula R. 1989. *Dictionary of Literary Biography, Volume Eighty: Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Dramatists First Series*. Detroit: Gale Research.

Backscheider, Paula R. 1989. *Dictionary of Literary Biography, Volume Eighty-Four: Restoration and Eighteenth Century Dramatists Second Series*. Detroit: Gale Research.

Backscheider, Paula R. 1989. *Dictionary of Literary Biography, Volume Eighty-Nine: Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Dramatists Third Series*. Detroit: Gale Research.

Brown, Laura. 1981. *English Dramatic Form, 1660–1760: An Essay in Generic History*. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press.

Burling, William J. 2000. *Summer Theatre in London, 1661–1820, and the Rise of the Haymarket Theatre*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.

Freeman, Lisa A. 2002. *Character's Theater: Genre and Identity on the Eighteenth-Century English Stage*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hume, Robert D. 1980. "The Making of the Repertory." In *The London Theatre World, 1660–1800*, edited by Robert D. Hume. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Leech, Clifford, and T.W. Craik, eds. 1976. *The Revels History of Drama in English*, 1660–1750. London: Methuen.

Loftis, John. 1951. "Richard Steele and the Drury Lane Management." *Modern Language Notes* 66, no. 1: 10.

Nussbaum, Felicity. 2010. *Rival Queens: Actresses, Performance, and the Eighteenth-Century British Theater*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Pry, Kevin. 1982. "Theatrical Competition and the Rise of the Afterpiece Tradition." *Theatre Notebook* 36: 21–7.

Woodfield, Ian. 2004. *Opera and Drama in Eighteenth-Century London: The King's Theatre, Garrick and the Business of Performance*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Age

JEANINE CASLER

Literary works of the period frequently represent old age and aging characters in a negative light, with old age featuring as a time of life to be stoically endured, if not openly lamented. The following paragraphs examine old age across the genres with regard to various issues, including the characters' gender, the apparent inevitability of decline, and the individuals' own acceptance of their aging. The entry closes with a discussion of the discrepancy between the positive examples of aging borne out in the lives of many of the authors of the period and the generally unfavorable attitudes toward age expressed in their works.

Nowhere is this negativity more marked than in the drama of the Restoration, in which the comic treatment of the aged abounds. Older men and women – when not represented as impediments standing in the way of the pleasures of the young characters onstage – are satirized for pretending to youth in order to satisfy unseemly desires. For example, Lady Cockwood in Etherege's *She Would If She Could* (1668) is called a "ravenous kite" and a "long-wing'd devil" by other characters (act III, scene I; Etherege 1982, 107–210), while Lady Wishfort's frustrated passion for young Mirabell (in Congreve's *The Way of the World*, 1700) makes her a figure of fun. When such characters are not portrayed as inappropriately pursuing the young, they serve as objects of ridicule for their gullibility (Old Bellair and Lady Woodville in Etherege's 1676 *The Man of Mode*, for instance, are duped by the machinations of their youthful charges), or for attempting to insert themselves into society long after they have lost their faculties (as does nearly deaf and blind but ever-amorous Old Fumble in Thomas D'Urfey's *A Fond Husband*, 1677).

The poetry of the period reflects many of the same ideas, with male and female poets alike representing aging as a period of inevitable physical and often mental decline. In Jonathan Swift's "Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift" (1731; Swift 1973), for example, the poet envisions an old age in which his memory will decay, his wit become "out-of-fashioned," and even his friends will note that he is past his prime (l. 92). The decline of a different type of vigor is mourned in Rochester's "Song of a Young Lady to her Ancient Lover" (1691; Wilmot 1984), in which the speaker generously but perhaps futilely offers her "reviving hand" to attempt to resuscitate her superannuated lover's sexual abilities (l. 19). Striving to appear physically younger and more attractive – in essence to defy the natural order of things – is often met with mockery, as in Thomas Parnell's "Elegy, to an Old Beauty" (1722; Parnell 1989), in which the subject is advised to withdraw from society to "haunt less the plays" now that her youth and thus, it is implied, her beauty

have fled (l. 44). Though more sympathetic in tone, Mary Leapor's "Dorinda at her Glass" (1748; Leapor 2003) paints a similarly bleak portrait of an aging woman whose decline in physical beauty has led to a decline of spirit. Like Parnell, Leapor advises Dorinda to retire from lively society: to dress for comfort, not attractiveness, and to focus on "candour" and "friendship" (ll. 129–30). An aging coquette, it is suggested, must retreat and allow the new generation of beauties to shine. Pope's "Epistle II: to a Lady" (1731) also envisions a tragic later life for those who have been gay and thoughtlessly pleasure-pursuing in youth. While echoing Pope's negative commentary on the possibilities for beauties of the previous age, Mary Wortley Montagu's Lydia (from her "Town Eclogues," 1747; Montagu 1977) refuses simply to fade out of society and, as advised by others, to turn to a life of prayer, since taking her place among the "grey religious Maids" would be to "own Despair" (l. 24).

This conflict between the desire to remain a vital, autonomous member of society and the pressure to conform to a certain accepted idea of virtuous old age – which usually involves moving from a central role to a peripheral one – is also highlighted in the novels of the period. In Frances Burney's *Evelina* (1778), for example, Madame Duval "paints very high" and dresses to impress rather than to deflect attention from herself, and she is mocked for her presumption by the other characters, one of whom sums up the age's typical attitude toward older women by asking "what the devil a woman lives for after 30," for "she is only in the other folks' way" (Burney 2002, 275). Older men in novels of the period face the same prejudices, although often their withdrawal from society is represented as self-imposed, as in the case of Fielding's Old Man of the Hill (*Tom Jones*, 1749) whose long life has led to his distrust and avoidance of humankind. Smollett's Matt Bramble (*Humphry Clinker*, 1771), who takes an active and often benevolent role in society, is a slightly more positive depiction of an older character, and yet he too reveals some of the stereotypical flaws of the aged, such as irascibility and intolerance.

The later lives of many of the writers themselves, however, serve as counterexamples to the negative portrayals of the aged in their literary works. Daniel Defoe (1660–1731) published his most enduring work (including *Moll Flanders* (1722), *Roxana* (1724), and *A Journal of the Plague Year* (1722)) after age 60, and despite failing health he wrote actively until his death. After years of working as a printer and compositor, the late-flowering Samuel Richardson (1689–1761) produced *Pamela* (1740), *Clarissa* (1747–8), and *Sir Charles Grandison* (1753–4) in the last two decades of his life. Though she started publishing early, poet Anna Laetitia Barbauld (1743–1825) became increasingly active as a London literary figure as she aged, focusing more on social and political issues, and experimenting with different genres (e.g., her 1804 edition of *Richardson's Correspondence*, her 50-volume collection *The British Novelists* in 1810, and her groundbreaking satirical poem *Eighteen Hundred and Eleven* in 1812). As recent scholarship has brought to light, the active, fruitful later lives of many such writers during the period suggest that though on the page the twilight years are often represented as a time of weakening intellect, waning rationality, and greatly reduced productivity, the difference between fact and fiction was substantial.

SEE ALSO: Character; Restoration Drama.

REFERENCES

Burney, Frances. 2002. *Evelina*. Ed. Vivien Jones and Edward Bloom. London: Oxford University Press.

Etherege, George. 1982. *She Would if She Cou'd. The Plays of Sir George Etherege*. Ed. Michael Cordner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leapor, Mary. 2003. "Dorinda at Her Glass." In *The Works of Mary Leapor*, edited by Richard Greene and Ann Messenger, 3–5. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Montagu, Mary Wortley. 1977. *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu: Essays and Poems and Simplicity, a Comedy*. Ed. Robert Halsband and Isobel Grundy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Parnell, Thomas. 1989. "Elegy, to an Old Beauty." In *The Collected Poems of Thomas Parnell*, edited by Claude Rawson and F.P. Lock, 160–1. Newark: University of Delaware Press.
Swift, Jonathan. 1973. "Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift." In *The Writings of Jonathan Swift*, edited by Robert A. Greenberg and William B. Piper, 477–80. New York: W.W. Norton.
Wilmot, John. 1984. "Song of a Young Lady to Her Ancient Lover." In *The Poems of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*, edited by Keith Walker, 32–3. Oxford: Blackwell.

FURTHER READING

Looser, Devoney. 2008. *Women Writers and Old Age in Great Britain, 1750–1850*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Akenside, Mark

KEVIN JOEL BERLAND

Mark Akenside (1721–70) was born in Newcastle, the son of a butcher. Educated in a Newcastle grammar school and tutored by a dissenting minister, Akenside exhibited an early facility with poetical composition. He was only 15 when the *Gentleman's Magazine* published his Spenserian burlesque "The Virtuoso," and shortly thereafter the fable "Ambition and Content" and "The Poet: A Rhapsody." In 1738, his "A British Philippic" gave voice to opposition fervor for war with Spain, and his 1739 "Hymn to Science" praised the philosophical pursuit of truth.

In 1739 Akenside enrolled as a divinity student at Edinburgh University aided by a grant from the London Dissenter's Society. There he met Jeremiah Dyson (1722–76), a wealthy fellow dissenter who became his close friend and patron. Soon Akenside abandoned divinity for medical studies; in 1742 he was back in Newcastle writing *The Pleasures of Imagination*, published by Robert Dodsley in 1744. Johnson records Pope's comment to Dodsley: Akenside was "no every day writer" and merited a generous payment (Johnson 2010, 1441). The work was well-received, running to four editions in the year of its first publication.

In 1744, Akenside took his MD at Leiden. Upon his return to England he attempted unsuccessfully to establish medical practice in several towns, winding up in London. Dyson supplemented his income from literary production with a substantial allowance. In 1746, Dodsley appointed Akenside editor of *The Museum*, a literary magazine that, as James Tierney points out, did not chronicle the age (like the *Gentleman's Magazine*) but reflected it with essays, poetry, literary and historical memoirs; it ran to 39 numbers (Tierney 1973). At the same time, Akenside continued to write, publishing the political satire *An Epistle to Curio* (1744) and *Odes on Several Subjects* (1745). In later years, Akenside wrote new poems, revised and expanded *The Pleasures of Imagination*, and devised a short poetic form he called the "Inscription."

At last in the 1750s Akenside achieved medical success. The Royal College of Physicians licensed him to practice medicine, and in 1753 Cambridge University granted him an MD *literae regiae*. He became a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1753, and Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians in 1754, where he delivered the Goulstonian lectures on zoological anatomy (1756) and the Croonian lectures on the revival of learning (1757), and was appointed Harveian Orator in 1759. He rose to important posts in London hospitals, and was named physician-in-ordinary to Queen Charlotte in 1761.

THE PLEASURES OF IMAGINATION

Akenside's masterpiece, *The Pleasures of Imagination*, is a long, didactic blank-verse poem in three books, expanding on the operations of human imagination, the artistic process, and the connection between natural and moral beauty. The first book treats of the nature of

imagination and aesthetic pleasure. The second book explores how the imagination produces pleasure, distinguishing between artistic creations of imagination and philosophical creations of the intellect. The third book turns to the "tempers and manners of men," leading to a discussion of error and vice and the value of ridicule in restoring social harmony, to the mental process of creating imaginative works, and finally to the moral advantages of imagination.

To his contemporaries, Akenside's major influences were instantly recognizable. The title linked him to Addison's *Spectator* papers on the topic. From Addison he derived the notion of the similarity of human responses to natural beauty and to art (primary and secondary pleasures); Akenside also followed Addison's division of the experience of beauty into the sublime, the wonderful (or novel), and the beautiful. This formed the "ground-work" for Akenside's poem, as Anna Laetitia Barbauld declared, but she oversimplified the debt by saying Akenside owed Addison for "only the leading thoughts and grand division of his subject, but . . . much of the colouring also." Nor did Akenside simply ornament an Addisonian structure with "ideas of the fair and beautiful in morals and taste" gathered from Shaftesbury, Hutcheson, "and others of that stamp" (Barbauld 1794).

Those readers who expend the effort to follow Akenside's argument with care – the best guide is Robin Dix's *The Literary Career of Mark Akenside* (2006) – will recognize that describing *The Pleasures of Imagination* as a translation into verse of any one philosophical school is hopelessly inadequate. The poem is an eclectic mixture, often endeavoring to reconcile opposing philosophical positions, or at least to draw useful ideas and arguments from them without accepting the position as a whole. Akenside wrote to David Fordyce in 1742 of his intention to mix Stoic and Platonic philosophy, explaining they "would equally temper & adorn each other" (Dix 2006, 74). His notes abundantly cite both ancients and moderns without necessarily reconciling their disagreements. Akenside's theory of imagination negotiates a working relation between Lockean empiricism and the intuitionism of the moral sense school. As Locke maintained, the human mind develops its ideas from sense perception and the actions of the mind upon these perceptions. As Shaftesbury and Hutcheson maintained, the human mind is also capable of apprehending moral knowledge intuitively; this faculty, moral sense, is the highest faculty of the human mind. Imagination occupies the middle ground between sense perception and moral perception. Just as we delight in recollecting past instances of beauty at a distance from the objects that originally produced pleasure, so the imagination may appreciate beauty without immediate stimulus of perception. The pleasure we experience from literature and other arts is also produced and experienced in the imagination.

Although Akenside writes of the beauties of nature, *The Pleasures of Imagination* is not a descriptive poem, for its focus is on the *perception of* and *response to* beauty, rather than the beauties themselves. Akenside assimilated the Neoplatonic notion that the natural world is material evidence of the divine. Individual perceptions of beauty begin empirically: sense perception leads to an intellectual "sense" that produces aesthetic pleasure. But at the same time, as Kirk M. Fabel makes clear, beautiful objects have their own independent existence, representing "a materialization of the divine" (Fabel 1997, 47). The imagination is the human faculty for apprehending the divine in the natural world; Margaret Doody explains, for Akenside "the mind of God is the source of all that the imagination knows, and the mind of man is created to behold and recreate it" (Doody 1985, 28). Imaginative pleasure may result from viewing beauty in the original or in artistic representation. Employing both mimetic aesthetics (pleasure found in the resemblance between art and the natural world) and semiotic (pleasure found as artistic objects *exceed* the natural), Akenside concluded that the latter is more creative. That is,

"the natural world inadequately signifies the divine," so poetry actually improves on natural beauty. Still, the question whether beauty resides in the subject or the object remains unresolved, which "contributes to the poem's complexity of intellectual and spiritual effect" (Fabel 1997, 48).

Thus, Akenside's influences are divided. He drew on Locke's definition of secondary qualities (including the perception of beauty) belonging not to objects themselves but to ideas raised in the individual mind. Hutcheson proposed that "the beautiful is both external to the individual's sense of it" and internally realized through "rational judgment." But Akenside at the same time follows Shaftesbury's Platonic identification of beauty and moral truth:

> Thus was beauty sent from heav'n,
> The lovely ministress of truth and good are one,
> And beauty dwells in them, and they in her,
> With like participation. Wherefore then,
> O sons of earth! would ye dissolve their tye?
> (Akenside 1996, 102)

The individual's inner sense of beauty, then, is an avenue "for the understanding of God's goodness" (Fabel 1997, 50–2). Locke was less interested in the nature of beauty than in the epistemology of perception; Akenside followed Shaftesbury and Hutcheson in linking aesthetics to morality. Akenside reviews these positions and delivers not precepts but, as he states in his preface, incentives to the minds of readers "to a similar taste and habit of thinking in religion, morals, and civil life" (Akenside 1996, 88). He "exposes rather than resolves the tensions" between mimetic and Platonic theory (Fabel 1997, 64).

Over many years Akenside worked on revising and expanding his poem, a task that remained unfinished at his death, and it was published in Dyson's 1772 edition as *The Pleasures of the Imagination*. Part of this task involved refining and expanding his ideas, and part involved stylistic adjustments and refinements.

AKENSIDE AND RIDICULE

In the third book of *The Pleasures of Imagination*, Akenside explored the vice and folly to which a distorting imagination may lead, where mere opinion undercuts truth, and where Folly performs "idiot-anticks" upon his throne. First among his subjects are those "of slender thought, and easy faith," scholars, churchmen, and military or political leaders offering spurious ideas for the public to admire. Then come joyless skeptics, deluded virtuosos, censors wielding random judgments, fools hailing vice as virtue, false patriots, and shamelessly dull leaders of the ignorant:

> whether pomp
> Or praise, or beauty mix their partial claim
> Where sordid fashions, where ignoble deeds,
> Where foul deformity are wont to dwell,
> Or whether these with violation loath'd,
> Invade resplendent pomp's imperious mien,
> The charms of beauty, or the boast of praise.
> (Akenside 1996, book III, 142, ll. 252–8)

Ridicule is the natural response to the "dissonance of things," an aesthetic response of disgust that strikes the "quick observer" and elicits "grateful stings of laughter." Such laughter has a valuable social function, as Shaftesbury contended, in reaffirming the values from which the vicious and foolish have strayed.

Ever ready to do battle with Shaftesbury and his followers, Bishop William Warburton read one of Akenside's characterizations – the sanctimonious "adorn'd with holy ensigns," who receive "homage of the simple-minded throng" – as a dangerous expression of contempt for the clergy. Ridicule, Warburton insisted, was not reliable as a test of truth, but demeaned the virtuous and cast contempt on what ought to be admired. He had skirmished with Shaftesbury on ridicule in *The Divine Legation of Moses* (1737–41); he turned in 1744 to attack Akenside in his *Remarks on Several Reflections*. Warburton denied Akenside's claim for a natural sense of the ridiculous, contemptuously accusing Akenside of slavishly following

the errors of "his Master" Shaftesbury. Ridicule is trivial and self-indulgent:

> the Dealers in this Trash frequently *urge the Mind to reject* many things with *Laughter and Contempt*, without *feeling* any other *Incongruity*, than in their own Pretensions to Truth and Honesty. And this our Poet very well knows. (Warburton 1744, v, xi)

A paper war ensued, Dyson publishing a defense of Akenside in his 1744 *Epistle to the Rev. Mr. Warburton, Occasion'd by His Treatment of the Author of the "Pleasures of Imagination*. John Brown, a Warburton surrogate, counterattacked with his 1745 "Essay on Satire" and the 1751 *Essay on the "Characteristicks*." John Gilbert Cooper pilloried Warburton while reasserting the Shaftesburyean argument in his 1749 *Life of Socrates*. In 1751 Akenside charged Warburton with incompetence as Pope's editor and hypocrisy for suppressing the fact of his early friendship with Pope's adversary Matthew Concanen. The controversies sputtered on.

Johnson characterized Akenside as an enthusiast and "a lover of contradiction," shading his verdict on Akenside's attraction to Shaftesbury's "foolish assertion of the efficacy of ridicule for the discovery of truth" (Johnson 2010, 1441). Though Akenside trimmed the argument about ridicule in the revision published posthumously as *The Pleasure of the Imagination*, the disapproval of critics did not silence his ideas, which affected thinkers such as James Beattie and Lord Kames (Terry 2000, 126, 129).

AKENSIDE'S POLITICS

Akenside held that the proper subject of the poet is the public good. Early in *The Pleasures of Imagination* he names the guardian of the arts

> Majestic TRUTH; and where TRUTH deigns to come,
> Her sister LIBERTY will not be far.
> (Akenside 1996, book I, 91, ll. 23–4)

Poetic talent is not simply an individual gift, but is meant for its proper sphere: sharing truth with the purpose of building freedom. Akenside's "Ode on the Use of Poetry" places the poet just below the hero and the legislator, but he insists that the poet's rule is wider, his reward more lasting. The ancient heroes and lawgivers have vanished, but Homer lives on. Long after the turmoil of present national and international affairs has subsided, the "powerful art" of the British poet (embodied in Shakespeare) will continue to exert its power:

> Tyrants shall bow before his laws;
> And freedom's, glory's, virtue's cause,
> Their dread assertor own.
> (Akenside 1996, 260, ll. 40–2)

This argument is carried further in the "Ode to the Right Honourable Francis Earl of Huntington," in which Akenside praises Pindar for raising his countrymen's minds to virtue, and declares that the poet's duty is to present "public arguments." As Dustin Griffin has observed, "the greatest 'public argument,' of course, from Akenside's point of view, is British 'liberty' " (Griffin 2000, 29). Michael Meehan stresses Akenside's eighteenth-century reputation as "the greatest poetic spokesman, after Milton, for the cause of liberty" and traces the influence of Shaftesbury's theories of the relation between political freedom and the flourishing of wit and sublimity (Meehan 1986, 53).

There has been considerable disagreement over what "liberty" really meant to Akenside. Critics often cite Johnson's disapproval of Akenside's "unnecessary and outrageous zeal for what he called and thought liberty." Johnson was actually referring to Akenside's dissenting faith, yet for Johnson radical Protestantism such as Milton's was politically suspect. Some have charged Akenside with "republican tendencies," often citing Johnson's displeasure with Akenside's "rage of patriotism" (Johnson 2010, 1440, 1443; Houpt 1944, 96; Jump 1989, 215). However, Dustin Griffin's sensible review of Akenside's politics concludes that throughout his career he was no republican, but a

Patriot Whig. Nor was he a "turncoat" when he and his patron Dyson accepted places from Lord Bute's Tory administration upon the accession of George III. Akenside's political verse consistently framed the Whig position, "the liberty of the people, rather than the authority of the crown" (Griffin 2000, 25–7). It did not stray into extremes.

AKENSIDE'S VERSIFICATION

Akenside demonstrated an early mastery of poetic form, evidenced in his first published poems of 1737, written before he turned 16. In "The Virtuoso," he delivered "a good imitation of Spenserian grammar and vocabulary consistently and effectively" (Dix 2006, 25). In "Ambition and Content" he emulates the rhyming couplets (plus occasional triplets and lines of 12 and 14 syllables) of Dryden's fables, while "The Poet: A Rhapsody" is set in regular blank verse. The 1744 "Epistle to Curio," a satire in rhyming couplets, emulates and echoes the satires of Dryden and Pope.

Akenside's skill with blank verse in *The Pleasures of Imagination* was generally acknowledged; Johnson summed up the consensus of praise: "in the general fabrication of his lines he is perhaps superior to any other writer of blank verse; his flow is smooth and his pauses are musical." However, Johnson also voiced strictures about the shortcomings of blank verse: without the useful limits of rhyme and couplet structure, the "concatenation of the verses" goes on too long while complex syntax makes it hard for readers to maintain focus. Moreover, blank-verse poets are self-indulgently prone to heaping "image upon image, ornament upon ornament, and are not easily persuaded to close the sense at all" (Johnson 2010, 1447). Modern critics tend to agree; Patricia Meyer Spacks holds that blank verse "imposes little discipline on its users," the influence of Milton encourages excessively lofty diction, and Akenside's abstractions render his verse "ponderous" (Spacks 2009, 145, 148).

Robin Dix notes that Akenside's 1745 *Odes on Several Subjects* predated the collection by William Collins and Joseph Warton, and in so doing pioneered what became a standard of poetic production, a body of odes differing "metrically, thematically, and in mood" – some Pindaric, some Horatian – yet forming "a carefully planned harmonious unit." The first part of the 1745 collection pursued a "social theme" concerned with friendship, love, and "the moral value of a cheerful attitude and demeanor." The second part advises abandoning the pursuit of love for nobler things. "On the Use of Poetry" challenges British poets to lend their talent to the cause of Liberty. The comparison of the Dutch and British polities in "On Leaving Holland" allows Akenside to express a fervent patriotism. "On Lyric Poetry" allows Akenside to proclaim the alliance of poetry and liberty; he affirms the poet's duty to "throw incense on the vestal flame of Liberty." Thus, according to Dix, the 1745 collection embodies the transition from the lesser to the greater lyric (Dix 1996, 153–76).

In the 1772 edition Dyson added 23 more odes, some of which reincarnated earlier poems. Not all of them adapted especially well. Nonetheless, Akenside's influence on lyric poets including Collins, Warton, and Gray is significant.

SEE ALSO: Addison, Joseph; Aesthetics; Blank Verse Controversy; Didacticism; Dodsley, Robert; Dryden, John; Johnson, Samuel; Ode; Pope, Alexander; Spenserian Revival; Warburton, William.

REFERENCES

Akenside, Mark. 1996. *The Poetical Works of Mark Akenside*. Ed. Robin Dix. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.

Barbauld, Anna Laetitia. 1794. "Essay on Akenside's Poem on the Pleasures of Imagination." In *The Pleasures of Imagination* by Mark Akenside. London: T. Cadell, Junior, and W. Davies.

Dix, Robin. 2006. *The Literary Career of Mark Akenside*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.

Doody, Margaret. 1985. *The Daring Muse: Augustan Poetry Reconsidered*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fabel, Kirk M. 1997. "The Location of the Aesthetic in Akenside's *Pleasures of Imagination*." *Philological Quarterly* 76, no. 1: 47–62.
Griffin, Dustin. 2000. "Akenside's Political Muse." In *Mark Akenside: A Reassessment*, edited by Robin Dix, 19–50. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
Houpt, Charles Theodore. 1944. *Mark Akenside: A Biographical and Critical Study*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Johnson, Samuel. 2010. "Life of Akenside." In *The Lives of the Poets*, edited by John H. Middendorf, 1439–51. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Jump, Harriet. 1989. "High Sentiments of Liberty: Coleridge's Unacknowledged Debt to Akenside." *Studies in Romanticism* 28: 207–24. doi:10.2307/25600773.
Meehan, Michael. 1986. *Liberty and Poetics in Eighteenth-Century England*. London: Croom Helm.
Spacks, Patricia Meyer. 2009. *Reading Eighteenth-Century Poetry*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
Terry, Richard. 2000. "'The Mirthful Sting': Akenside and the Eighteenth-Century Controversy over Ridicule." In *Mark Akenside: A Reassessment*, edited by Robin Dix, 108–31. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
Tierney, James E. 1973. "The Museum, the 'Super-Excellent Magazine.'" *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 13, no. 3: 503–15. doi:10.2307/450003.
Warburton, William. 1744. *Remarks on Several Occasional Reflections*. London: John and Paul Knapton.

FURTHER READING

Rounce, Adam. 2005. "Akenside's Clamours for Liberty." In *"Cultures of Whiggism": New Essays on English Literature and Culture in the Long Eighteenth Century*, edited by David Womersley, 216–33. Newark: University of Delaware Press.
Rounce, Adam. 2006. "Mark Akenside, *The Pleasures of Imagination*." In *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Poetry*, edited by Christine Gerard, 237–51. Oxford: Blackwell.

Amatory Fiction

TONI BOWERS

"Amatory Fiction" is a term used by literary historians and critics to refer to the popular tales of sexual intrigue that appeared in considerable numbers between the late seventeenth and mid-eighteenth centuries in Britain. Often written in a breathless, intimate prose and authored by women, amatory fictions made female characters the center of the action and heterosexual relations the most important of all human undertakings. Themes that would come to occupy realist novels of the future – money and inheritance, travel and self-discovery, family life and manners, political struggle, the law, war, changing historical epochs, varieties of place, ethnic and racial difference – are subordinated, in amatory fiction as in the medieval and early modern romances from which it derived, to the all-important theme of sexual desire and its discontents. Other matters are present, to be sure; inheritance issues sometimes precipitate the action, for example, people move and travel constantly, babies are born, people die, wars are waged. But such matters are hurriedly recounted, not in much detail, and function mostly to set the stage for detailed, intimate, often sexually graphic accounts of beautiful people falling in and out of love, having (or, more often, *almost* having) sex, deceiving, betraying, degrading, and abandoning one another. The world of amatory fiction remains familiar to this day in soap operas, mass-market romance novels, soft-core pornography, so-called "chick lit," and melodrama – all forms of entertainment that stand in a direct line of inheritance from seventeenth- and eighteenth-century amatory fiction.

The label "amatory fiction" emerged only toward the end of the twentieth century, and whether it is the best name for the works it points to is a question still legitimately contested. Very often several generic forms and purposes overlap in works retrospectively labeled amatory fictions, and this overlap can

blur the attempt straightforwardly to define the genre. Self-styled "Secret Histories" and "Scandalous Memoirs" – where authors engaged with gusto in political satire, ad hominem takedowns, autobiographical *apologia*, social critique, and score settling – are among the related forms that at once exemplify amatory fiction and challenge that label. Whatever called and however grouped, all these forms of writing fed a readerly fascination with sexual acts and relationships, and with imaginable possibilities for women's experience. Those central concerns propel the action, assign meaning, and reveal character (to the extent that that modern concept exists here; often the actors are more properly understood as types).

What all this overlap adds up to is a fascinating feature of amatory fiction: it is a "genre" that at once participates in and exceeds the notion of genre itself. Even critics who have made efforts to elucidate the rubrics of amatory fiction and to trace its functions in late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century British culture tend to agree that a peculiar fluidity and capaciousness characterizes this tradition, an excessiveness that is salutary and intellectually suggestive in itself. "Amatory Fiction" is a genre not adequately delimited *as* a genre, and a tradition that, as we shall see, managed to be immensely influential even while it was systematically obscured, not least by later novelists (who wanted to claim respectability for fiction) and by literary historians. The phrase "Amatory Fiction" names a set of texts, a way of writing, and a way of understanding and representing the world that, by its very unfixedness and multiplicity, has been productive of richly nuanced reading practices.

Literary historians have come to recognize amatory fiction as a coherent, though not uniform, form that flourished in Britain between about 1680 and 1760. The form had clear debts to French-language precursors such as the anonymous *Les Lettres portugaises* and constituted a formative moment in the emergence of that peculiarly modern form, "the novel." For some, indeed, the emergence of amatory fiction marks the novel's inaugural moment. The recovery of amatory writers and their fictions has produced powerfully revisionary arguments among literary historians of "the" novel. Much amatory fiction predates the novels of Daniel Defoe (1660–1731), Henry Fielding (1707–54), and Samuel Richardson (1689–1761), so its recovery has made necessary a rewriting of familiar critical narratives. Formerly authoritative genealogies are continuing to be rethought, including the immensely influential genealogy offered by Ian Watt (1957), where prose fiction was assumed to have begun with Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* in 1719 and women writers did not figure at all. Much in Watt's interpretation remains useful even after many decades, and some remains controversial; but his location of the novel's origins in the work of Defoe, Fielding, and Richardson has been definitively superseded thanks in large part to scholarship on amatory fiction.

Works of amatory fiction shared not only an obsession with sex but also a set of recognizable formal, rhetorical, and thematic traits. These include: a swift, garrulous narratorial voice (whether first- or third-person), much given to maxims and moralizing; letters, exchanged or waylaid, which act as catalysts for action, create misunderstanding and delay, and literalize female vulnerability; a Continental European setting, with recourse to convents as sites of retreat or incarceration; an innocent, vulnerable young woman who begins the story entirely ignorant of sexual matters; one or more scheming, wily, experienced male seducers, whose desire is represented as an unstoppable, unaccountable force; an older woman who abets the seducer's treachery, sometimes deliberately; an insistence that the seducer's desire cools after "possession" – the moment of sexual penetration when, most often, the seduced woman falls in love with him; the remorselessness of fate, and the very different fates that await sexually transgressive women and their male partners. These are among the features that mark a late seventeenth- or early eighteenth-century work of imaginative prose as an amatory fiction.

The current scholarly consensus that it is useful to talk about amatory fiction as a genre was long in coming. In fact, the history of amatory fiction offers a dramatic case study in the power of archival research to challenge scholars' basic presuppositions and to expand a disciplinary field's objects of study. For although amatory fiction was popular in its own day, its readership was already declining by the middle of the eighteenth century in Britain, as popular tastes shifted and novelists sought to make claims for the moral and instructive value of their work. By the early nineteenth century, works in the amatory tradition were seldom read, and for many decades thereafter – in fact, right up until the 1970s – late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century amatory fictions remained absent from virtually all literary-critical scholarship and student reading lists.

The recovery of amatory fiction, and its restoration to literary history, began in the later twentieth century when British scholars, looking for the earliest roots of English-language prose fiction, noticed early seduction stories and began to bring them to light. Scholars such as John Richetti, Janet Todd, and Jane Spencer included discussions of specific amatory fictions within larger overviews of less-known or female-authored eighteenth-century writing. Those early studies sparked a wave of reprinting and anthologizing activity, driven by the desire to unearth as many texts as possible in a short period of time and get them into the hands of students and researchers. In some cases, the resulting texts were not professionally edited or rationalized; poor-quality typescripts and cumbersome reprints tended to go out of print quickly, leaving a great deal of necessary editorial work undone to this day.

Nevertheless, the reprintings of the 1970s and 1980s combined with pioneering archival investigations and critical overviews to make an overwhelming case for the significance of amatory fiction to literary history and criticism. By the 1990s it had become clear that an understanding of amatory writing would be essential to subsequent scholarly work on the history of the novel. Several important amatory fictions *were* edited to exacting standards during the 1990s, for the first time making reliable texts available for scholarly analysis and well-informed teaching. Interpretive studies began to emerge. Today, scores of essays on amatory writing have appeared in academic journals, many titles are available in print and on the internet, and book-length studies have been devoted to the genre (Ballaster 1992b; Bowers 2011).

A canon of major amatory writers has emerged, including most notably the so-called "fair triumvirate of wit": Aphra Behn (1640?–89), Delarivier Manley (1670?–1724), and Eliza Haywood (1693?–1756). Individually and as a group, these three now occupy secure berths in the canon of English literature, and their works are regularly taught in post-secondary classrooms. Of the three, Behn remains the best known – and with reason. A towering figure, Behn can be credited with having inaugurated not merely the tradition of English-language amatory fiction, but the English novel tradition broadly defined. Ironically, however, when it comes to Behn's fiction it is her least characteristic story, *Oroonoko* (1688), that students usually encounter. *Oroonoko* is attractively brief and is available in several reputable, reasonably priced editions. It offers rich pedagogical and interpretive opportunities, challenging readers to consider, among much else, early-modern understandings of human difference, colonialism, slave-trade economies, and the phenomenon of female professional authorship. But *Oroonoko* is not primarily a work of amatory fiction, and Behn's amatory fictions remain seriously neglected. The result is a skewed understanding of literary history, especially among undergraduates. (Janet Todd's scholarly edition of the *Works* (Ohio State University Press) greatly helps scholars in this respect, but its price is prohibitive for all but institutional libraries.) A selection of Behn's short amatory fictions could usefully stand alongside *Oroonoko* on undergraduate syllabi, if reasonably priced editions were available.

Also, authorship of some tales long ascribed to Behn has recently been investigated, necessitating a new discussion about her place in the amatory tradition and whether there might be further authors still to be discovered.

Eliza Haywood's work has become better and better known over the past 15 years, thanks to expert editing by a number of scholars and the bibliographical efforts of Patrick Spedding. Many reliable teaching and research editions now exist, and the list of titles finding publishers and audiences is steadily (if slowly) expanding. Haywood had a long career that spanned important literary and social shifts: in prose fiction's purposes, audiences, and means of production; realignments in national politics; and changes in popular ideas about domestic power relations, ethnicity, and, to a lesser but still significant extent, class difference. Several years ago it looked as if Haywood's corpus might be undergoing a premature narrowing and reification: some critics (the present writer among them) expressed concern that a small number of this amazingly prolific author's works seemed to be coming to stand for her whole output. That situation is improving. Haywood's writings continue to appear in useful modern editions, and scholarship addresses an ever-wider selection of her work. Much still remains to be done, however; her amatory fiction (as well as her considerable work in other genres) remains rich for scholarly and student investigation.

Among the "fair triumvirate," Manley's place remains least secure, perhaps because her long, hyper-topical, and minutely complicated narratives, though hot stuff indeed in her own day, can be difficult to edit and teach today. The situation has been helped by Rachel Carnell's political biography (2008) and by Katherine Zelinsky's useful teaching edition of *Rivella* (1999). Rosalind Ballaster's edition of *Atalantis* (1992a), once fallen out of print, is now available as a print-on-demand text. Nevertheless, more editing and teaching of Manley's work remains necessary, to give readers a reasonable understanding of her range, and we need more scholarship attentive to her work's specific resonances and influence during the early years of the eighteenth century.

Behn, Manley, and Haywood all wrote in various genres of fiction, not only the amatory kind, and they all wrote in forms other than prose fiction. During her lifetime, Behn was most famous as a playwright, and her comedies continue to be performed today for enthusiastic audiences. Behn was also a brilliant poet; her poetry has been well-represented in some fine recent teaching editions. Haywood worked extensively in what we now call journalism, editing (i.e., for the most part, writing) several magazines, including the *Female Spectator*; she was also involved in the theater, primarily as an actress. Manley, too, worked for the theater, as a playwright. She was also a published poet, an author of epistolary fictions, and an early journalist. Manley contributed to the *Examiner*, then took over as its editor in 1711. She may have been the voice of "Mrs. Crackenthorpe" in the *Female Tatler*, and she wrote a number of effective partisan political pamphlets. Manley also published what today would be called short stories, some original and some based on much earlier tales, as well as her amatory-inflected secret histories and quasi-autobiography, *Rivella*. Especially in the cases of Manley and Haywood, identification with prose fiction has sometimes worked to obscure considerable achievements in other forms of writing.

James Sterling, who in 1725 coined the label "female triumvirate of wit" to describe Behn, Manley, and Haywood, wrote as if amatory fiction was the province of these three writers alone. In fact, in his poem, the possibility of amatory writing "closed" with Haywood. Scholars were content to follow Sterling in this reductive view for many years, but lately more eighteenth-century authors have begun to gain recognition either as purveyors of amatory fiction or as writers whose works exhibit marked debts to the tradition. Among these we can include such diverse authors as Mary Davys (1674–1732), Jane Barker (1652–1732), Elizabeth Singer Rowe (1674–1737), Charlotte Lennox (c. 1729–1804), and Richardson, and

later in the century Mary Hays (1759–1843), Mary Wollstonecraft (1759–97), and writers in the late-century Gothic tradition. All these, and others, found something galvanizing in late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century amatory fiction. Their work is consonant with that of the "fair triumvirate," furthermore, not only when it exploits amatory themes and topoi, but also when it moves outside established generic parameters to indulge in versions of the extravagance, hybridity, irregularity, and sensationalism that marked late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century amatory fiction.

One recent revisionary argument that has resulted from the rediscovery of the late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century amatory tradition has been the demonstration of Samuel Richardson's special debts to the amatory writers whose work preceded and shaped his, only to be written out of literary history and remain absent from readers' experiences for centuries. Richardson has now been positioned squarely as the heir of earlier, female writers, and his supremely rich and influential work is currently being read for the way it enters into dialogue with theirs. Critics are also exploring how Richardson's novels contributed – alongside the work of other novelists and critics across the eighteenth century, including Joseph Addison (1672–1719), Henry Fielding, Frances Burney (1752–1840), Clara Reeve (1729–1807), and Anna Laetitia Barbauld (1743–1825) – to the elision of amatory fiction even as, paradoxically enough, more respectable work took the amatory tradition forward in disguise, as it were, into the changed literary landscape of the later eighteenth century.

A great deal of interpretive scholarship on amatory fiction has emerged since the late twentieth-century renewal of interest in the genre, and a few specific ways of approaching amatory fiction have gained traction among critics. These are not mutually exclusive, but can be distinguished according to their assumptions about the purposes and roles of imaginative writing. One approach understands amatory fiction as an agent in the development of women as writers of fiction (Todd 1989; Spencer 1986; Ballaster 1992b). Other critics consider the amatory fictions of Behn, Manley, and Haywood as precursors of the novel proper (Richetti 1969; Hunter 1990), as part of an early media culture (Warner 1998), or for their ideological functions in their own time (Bowers 2011). Each of these approaches constitutes a valid way to think about amatory fiction, and each can be best understood in dialogue with the others. Overall, critical attention to amatory fiction is concerned with how these texts complicate reigning models of social and intimate hierarchy and how they imagine new possibilities for power and pleasure, especially for women and other marginalized groups. Critics value amatory fiction for the varieties of sensibilities and practices that it makes visible, and for its challenges – implicit and overt – to the bourgeois values that Watt's "formal realism" embodied. The pertinence of queer theories, with their focus on instability and unresolvedness, is now becoming clear to scholars of amatory fiction and promises to yield new interpretive purchase in the near future.

SEE ALSO: Barker, Jane; Behn, Aphra; Canon; Davys, Mary; Female Authorship; Haywood, Eliza; Lennox, Charlotte; Manley, Delarivier; Richardson, Samuel; Rowe, Elizabeth Singer; Sensibility; Sex, Sexuality.

REFERENCES

Ballaster, Ros, ed. 1992a. *The New Atalantis*, by Delarivier Manley. London: Penguin.

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

Bowers, Toni. 2011. *Force or Fraud: British Seduction Stories and the Problem of Resistance, 1660–1760*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carnell, Rachel. 2008. *A Political Biography of Delarivier Manley*. London: Pickering and Chatto.

Hunter, J. Paul. 1990. *Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction*. New York and London: Norton.

Richetti, John. 1969. *Popular Fiction before Richardson: Narrative Patterns 1700–1739*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Spencer, Jane. 1986. *The Rise of the Woman Novelist: From Aphra Behn to Jane Austen*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Sterling, James. 1725. "To Mrs. Eliza Haywood, On Her Writings." In *Secret Histories, Novels and Poems*, by Eliza Haywood, 2nd ed. Volume 1. London.
Todd, Janet. 1989. *The Sign of Angellica: Women, Writing and Fiction, 1660–1800*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Warner, William B. 1998. *Licensing Entertainment: The Elevation of Novel Reading in Britain, 1684–1750*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Watt, Ian. 1957. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Zelinsky, Katherine, ed. 1999. *The Adventures of Rivella*, by Delarivier Manley. Peterborough, ON: Broadview.

FURTHER READING

Backscheider, Paula R., and John J. Richetti, eds. 1997. *Popular Fiction by Women, 1660–1730: An Anthology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Carnell, Rachel. 2006. *Partisan Politics, Narrative Realism, and the Rise of the British Novel*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Donovan, Josephine. 1998. *Women and the Rise of the Novel, 1405–1726*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
King, Kathryn R. 2012. *A Political Biography of Eliza Haywood*. London: Pickering and Chatto.
McBurney, William H. 1963. *Four before Richardson: Selected English Novels, 1720–1727*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Spender, Dale, and Janet Todd, eds. 1989. *Anthology of British Women Writers*. London: Pandora.
Summers, Montague ed. 1915. *The Works of Aphra Behn*. 6 vols. London: Heinemann. Reprinted 1967. New York: Blom.

America, Central and South, Representations of

RICHARD FROHOCK

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Spain was a dominant imperial power in Central and South America, where it established colonies, mined precious metals, and gathered riches shipped across the Pacific from Asia for transportation back to Europe. Seeking to check Spain's empire-building and siphon off some its wealth, British adventurers conducted numerous voyages into the region. These expeditions led to the production of many narratives that address topics such as the establishment of British colonies, navigational routes to the Pacific, relations with indigenous people, natural history, and the atrocities and vulnerabilities of the Spanish Empire.

As Early American studies has expanded its purview to include British colonies beyond the bounds of the future United States, scholars have increasingly drawn on textual representations of Central and South America for understanding Britain's colonial engagement in the New World. This hemispheric approach to writing in the period has led to increased scholarship on Anglophone writing about Central and South America and has contributed to efforts to make Early American and eighteenth-century studies more transoceanic, transnational, and inclusive of source material from multiple languages.

Much early British writing about Central and South America offers stark critiques of Spanish imperialism. Thomas Gage, who spent time in Mexico and Guatemala as a Dominican friar, and who recorded his experiences in *The English-American, or a New Survey of the West Indies* (1648), was among the first to sound this theme. The anti-Spanish rhetoric appealed to England's Puritan leadership, and Gage, who changed his faith, became a participant in Cromwell's Western Design, a largely unsuccessful military initiative aimed at ousting the Spanish from the Americas. William Davenant used the theme of Spanish iniquity to advantage when petitioning for permission to perform operatic masques at a time when the English theaters were still closed; his performance of *The Cruelties of the Spanish in Peru* was approved and staged in 1658. John Dryden continued the tradition of dramatizing British imperialism as the triumph of virtue

over Spanish iniquity in *The Indian Emperor* (1665).

Many British writers focused attention on the Panamanian Isthmus because of its importance as a route between the Pacific Ocean and the Caribbean Sea. Multiple buccaneering narratives describe crossings of the isthmus and attacks on Spanish ships and settlements along the Pacific coastline. The exploits of Henry Morgan are depicted in various British accounts, particularly in adaptations of Alexander Exquemelin's *Buccaneers of America* (originally published in Dutch in 1678). Lionel Wafer, a surgeon who served on a buccaneering expedition in the 1680s, was wounded while crossing the isthmus and stayed for several months with the Kuna Indians; his *New Voyage and Description* (1699) contains one of the most detailed early accounts of the region. Wafer's narrative proved of interest to the Scots, who called on him to provide information about establishing a colony there that would enable them to control trade between Europe and Asia. Various authors published accounts of the Scots' so-called Darien Scheme, some defending and some lampooning the Scots for their short-lived imperialist attempts; examples include Robert Ferguson's *A Just and Modest Vindication of the Scots Design, for the Having Established a Colony at Darien* (1699) and the anonymous *Caledonia; or, The Pedlar Turn'd Merchant* (1700).

Much British writing in the period also records travels to the Pacific coastlines of Central and South America. The English desired access to the Pacific in order to establish colonial footholds and prey on Spanish ships, especially the Manila Galleons, which transported goods from the Philippines to the Americas. In the late seventeenth century, groups of English marauders entered the Pacific, raiding villages and cruising for Spanish vessels; in the eighteenth century, state-sanctioned privateers and naval vessels followed suit. These voyages resulted in many travel narratives that, in addition to describing military actions, are rich in ethnography and natural history. Many also record internal strife and division, and multiple accounts of the same voyage often sharply contradict one another, such as George Shelvocke's *A Voyage Round the World by Way of the Great South Sea* (1726) and William Betagh's *Voyage Round the World…Relating the True Historical Facts of the Whole Affair* (1728), which provide antithetical depictions of the disastrous *Speedwell* voyage. Other prominent examples include William Dampier's *A New Voyage Round the World* (1697), Woodes Rogers' *A Cruising Voyage Round the World* (1712), George Anson's *A Voyage Round the World* (1748), and John Byron's *The Narrative of the Honourable John Byron* (1768).

Juan Fernández Island, located off the coast of Chile, served as a stopping point for many English voyagers who made the difficult journey to the Pacific. Mariner Alexander Selkirk famously was marooned on the island for four years, and his story, told first by Woodes Rogers, served Daniel Defoe as an important source for his novel *Robinson Crusoe* (1719). Although Defoe never traveled to the Americas, he was captivated by the possibilities they offered for British colonization; in his *New Voyage Round the World* (1725), Defoe depicts an English trek across South America and imagines the possibilities of English settlement there. Aphra Behn, too, was enthusiastic about English colonization in South America; her novella *Oroonoko* (1688), which describes the tragic experiences of a royal African enslaved in Surinam, laments the loss of the English colony to the Dutch. Behn's story was adapted for the stage by Thomas Southerne in 1696 and by John Hawkesworth in 1759. John Stedman's *Narrative of a Five Years' Expedition Against the Revolted Negroes of Surinam* (1796) also depicts plantation life in the then Dutch colony, and his narrative was adapted multiple times in the nineteenth century.

SEE ALSO: Behn, Aphra; Caribbean, Representations of the; Davenant, Sir William; Defoe, Daniel; Empire and Colonialism; Transatlantic Studies; Travel Narrative.

FURTHER READING

Bauer, Ralph. 2003. *The Cultural Geography of Colonial American Literatures: Empire, Travel, Modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauer, Ralph, and José Antonio Mazzotti, eds. 2009. *Creole Subjects in the Colonial Americas: Empires, Texts, Identities*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press.

Castillo, Susan P., and Ivy Schweitzer, eds. 2005. *A Companion to the Literatures of Colonial America*. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell.

Edwards, Philip. 1994. *The Story of the Voyage: Sea-Narratives in Eighteenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frohock, Richard. 2012. *Buccaneers and Privateers: The Story of the English Sea Rover, 1625–1725*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Voigt, Lisa. 2009. *Writing Captivity in the Early Modern Atlantic: Circulations of Knowledge and Authority in the Iberian and English Imperial Worlds*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Anglicanism

KEVIN SEIDEL

The beliefs and practices advocated by the Church of England, however central to the lives of eighteenth-century Britons, tend to get overlooked in literary studies, mainly because such studies assume the old story of secularization holds true. That story – in a nutshell, that the more modern we become, the less religious – makes it difficult to see any vital exchange between Anglicanism and the rest of British culture. In fact, it is often assumed that eighteenth-century British culture – its theaters and coffeehouses, cities and countrysides, shops and shipyards, work and slavery, all of its poetry, novels, newspapers, and encyclopedias – however one accounts for it, happens in the absence of the Church of England, as if the lassitude of the eighteenth-century church was necessary for the vibrancy of eighteenth-century culture. Yet, recent scholarship has challenged the old view of the Church of England languishing in the period (Walsh, Haydon, and Taylor 1993; Clark 2000), while other scholars, reflecting on the intractability of religion in the period, have questioned the long-standing assumption that Enlightenment, secularization, and the eighteenth century are basically synonymous (Young 2000; Sheehan 2003; Gregory 2009a). This rethinking of secularization and recent work on the Church of England open up new possibilities for exploring the relationship between Anglicanism and literature.

ORIGINS IN CHURCH PARTY POLITICS

The two most frequently mentioned characteristics of Anglicanism today are the *via media*, steering a middle course between Protestant and Catholic extremes, and the three-fold commitment to Scripture, reason, and tradition. The Church of England traces its history back to the *Anglicana ecclesia* mentioned in the first clause of the *Magna Carta* (1215) and the Act of Supremacy in 1534 under Henry VIII (1491–1547). However, Anglicanism as a term did not emerge until the 1830s with the Tractarians, the Oxford-based Anglican reform movement that called for renewed commitment to church liturgy, orthodox theology, and social engagement on the part of clergy. In the process, they cast the eighteenth-century church as tepid in its theology, misled in its views about the relationship between church and state, and lax in its parish work (Nockles 1994).

Other Anglicans, who thought Tractarianism dangerously close to Catholicism, offered rival accounts of the Anglican tradition. For them, the eighteenth century was useful mainly for tracing the origins of Anglican parties – High Church, Low Church, and Evangelical – sometimes polemically, to legitimate one party over the others, and sometimes irenically, to

praise peacefully the variety of theological tempers held within Anglicanism.

The delineation of parties still haunts histories of the period, which return again and again to certain key events and figures. The High Church, for example, is linked to the Nonjurors, the seven bishops and approximately 400 clergy who were excluded from the church in 1689 when they refused to take an oath of allegiance to William (1650–1702) and Mary (1662–94) after they had already sworn allegiance to the previous monarch, James II (1633–1701). In 1710, Henry Sacheverell (bap. 1674–1724), a prominent Highchurchman, was prosecuted by the Whig ministry for two sermons he preached against Nonconformity (which was basically the same as Protestant dissent). His trial sparked riots as people took to the street in his support and burned dissenting meeting houses. Politically, the High Church is commonly identified with the Tories and Conservatives.

The Low Church is frequently described in reference to the 1717 Bangorian Controversy, when Benjamin Hoadly (1676–1761), the Bishop of Bangor, preached a sermon before George I (1660–1727) that downplayed the role of the church in state affairs and described communion as a simple memorial service rather than a mysterious sacrament. It sparked a firestorm in print. The Low Church or Latitudinarians are commonly associated with the Whigs and Liberals.

Evangelicals trace their origins to George Whitefield (1714–70), John Wesley (1703–91), and the mid-century Methodist revivals, before the Methodists separated from the Anglican church in the 1790s following John Wesley's death. Their political affiliations are difficult to pin down. The High Church tends to think of Evangelicals as another branch of the Low Church, while the Low Church tends to think Evangelicals as roughly the same as Conservatives.

These labels explain some of the history of the period, but they also leave out a great deal about the lives and work of actual persons. They miss the way social connections and commitments kept Anglicans moving and cooperating across party lines, not only within the Church of England but out among dissenters. Party labels also miss how Anglicans were united by anti-Catholic sentiment, understood themselves as part of a larger Protestant cause, and participated thereby in the formation of British nationalism.

J.C.D. Clark's fruitfully polemical historical work is perhaps most responsible for refocusing attention on the relationship between church and nation in the period. Clark challenges the idea that the church became basically irrelevant to the workings of the state after the Whig ascendancy with George I in 1714. He argues that the state continued Anglican, orthodox, and monarchical, increasingly so from the 1760s, and that the confessional state remained strong until the Test and Corporation Acts (which tried to restrict political involvement to religious conformists) were repealed in 1828, Roman Catholic Emancipation passed in 1829, and the Reform Act (which significantly expanded the vote) passed in 1832. Before the advent of the abstract, secular nation-state of the mid-nineteenth century, Clark contends, there was no participation in the English nation apart from Anglicanism and no felt need to conceive of that participation otherwise. In trying to overturn Whiggish interpretations of the eighteenth century and show the pervasiveness of High-Church political theology, Clark has exacerbated party difference among historians: it has become harder to write history of the period without being labeled for or against Clark, conservative or liberal. Raising party strife to the surface may not have been the goal so much as the cost of trying to see the period aright, and no doubt something has been gained by pushing scholarly concern beyond the delineating of ecclesiastical differences to demonstrating participation in the national project, but there remains a sense of regress in the debate about Clark's work, the feeling that one is rehearsing old political debates with new scholarly force. Whether Anglicanism steps over the eighteenth century to a better past, like the Tractar-

ians claimed, whether it is praised for its moderation and ecclesiastical diversity, like the Tractarians' opponents assert, or whether it is understood in terms of its contribution to national identity, too much of the eighteenth-century church, on the ground, still gets overlooked.

FROM POLITICS TO CULTURE

John Walsh and Stephen Taylor's provocatively titled essay "The Church and Anglicanism in the Long Eighteenth Century" responds to this oversight as it introduces *The Church of England 1689–1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism* (1993), a multi-authored collection of essays that perhaps best marks the advent of the new church history. This introduction takes up the long-standing historical stereotypes of the period as one of clerical sloth or party strife and sets them against recent histories based on local parish archives. Walsh and Taylor reconnect Anglicanism to its eighteenth-century church using two historical moments. First, in 1662, attempts at comprehension – that is, including Presbyterian clergy in the Restoration Church of England – failed, and clergy who refused to abide by the minimally revised *Book of Common Prayer* were excluded from office, effectively trimming the church of its Calvinist Geneva wing. (Geneva is where John Calvin, 1509–64, ministered.) Almost three decades later, in 1689, after the Nonjurors were excluded and the Toleration Act passed, the church was trimmed of its Catholic Rome wing. (The Pope governs the Catholic church from the Vatican in Rome.) The Toleration Act gave dissenters legal rights of assembly, but unless they took communion in the Church of England once a year they could not hold civic office or attend university. No such legal rights were given to Catholics, no thought even to Judaism, Islam, other religions, or those of no religion – all beyond the legal pale. So *toleration* seems a misnomer now, but it did mark the end of hope for one strain of Anglicanism that dreamed of state-enforced uniformity in religious matters. Toleration became the legally enfranchised *via media* between uniformity and the disestablishment. After 1689, the Anglican church could stop worrying about the role of the state and get on with the work of pastoral care, mobilizing the laity for moral reform.

Sermons were one vital form of instruction. Many sermons promoted a kind of confluence between one's religious and civic interests, arguing in plain if somewhat cumbersome prose that ordinary church attendance and neighborliness were certain paths to happiness in this life and the life to come. The sermons of John Tillotson (1630–94), Archbishop of Canterbury from 1691 until his death, were famous in this regard. Sermons were delivered not just at church but at all kinds of civic occasions, often extending that occasion through print. For a long time, sermons were studied to chart changes in English prose style, but more recently scholars have looked at the way sermons created a public prior to and at least as capacious as the coffeehouse and the newspaper. Clergy often preached as ambassadors of the state, letting their sermons serve as vehicles of propaganda, but many clergy also used sermons to criticize the regime or specific policies. Tony Claydon (2000) has suggested that the capacity of the English sermon to involve its clergy and audience in public debate distinguished it from the French sermon and may be one explanation for the peculiarly religious quality of the English Enlightenment.

Another form of instruction was the church building. Unlike independent churches, whose architectural austerity emphasized the holiness of the people, Anglican churches gloried in the built space of the church itself. In colonial South Carolina, to take one specific example from recent work by Louis Nelson (2008), arched windows, barrel-vaulted ceilings, and adorning angels made the church a threshold between earth and heaven. But after about the middle of the eighteenth century, Anglican churches were built and remodeled to project not the nearness of heaven so much as the social structure of Charleston. This is especially evident in the records for pew subscriptions,

where parishioners bid for proximity to an increasingly two-dimensional altar space. The church became less a place for communicants to gather than a place to see and be seen, a visual reminder of one's moral status and obligations. In this way, church architecture did more than reflect society: it upheld the social order of the city.

The Book of Common Prayer, first published in 1549, was another means of instruction. It taught both clergy and congregation how to pray, and its Thirty-Nine Articles, short statements of doctrine, taught them what to believe. Its calendar of fast and festival days shaped their sense of time, while its schedule of scriptural readings directed their approach to the Bible. And its services for infant baptism, marriage, and death gave those social events their solemnity (Gregory 2009b). The 1662 revision is still the one used in Anglican churches today, though supplemented by alternative service books.

It is important to note, however, that parish pastoral work, sermons, church buildings, and the *Book of Common Prayer* did not make Anglicanism a church- or clergy-centered affair. The substantial participation of the laity in the work of moral reform is perhaps the distinguishing characteristic of Anglicanism in the eighteenth century (Walsh, Haydon, and Taylor 1993, 22–8). Clergy regularly collaborated with lay leaders in organizing societies for the reformation of manners, charity schools, and hospitals. The Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge (SPCK) began its work in 1698 as a domestic missions organization, printing and distributing pamphlets to the newly literate through local branches of the society. The legacy of that work continues in education, charity, and health-care institutions today, but it was not all good. The burden of moral performance was felt acutely by many, as conversion narratives among the Methodists attest. And burdens far worse could be felt by those who were the targets of Anglican moral uplift.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG) began in 1701. The first overseas Anglican missions organization, its initial efforts focused on American colonies without Anglican legal establishment, supplying those outside the Church of England – British emigrants, creoles, native Americans, slaves – with church-ordained clergy and *Book of Common Prayer*-ordered services. The SPG was critical of slavery at first and consistently affirmed the dignity of the slaves it endeavored to convert and educate, but over time, as Travis Glasson shows in *Mastering Christianity* (2012), the Society grew dependent on the support of slaveholding elites and defended the plantation as a divinely appointed institution for the Christian instruction of slaves. Slaveholding too became a means of social reform.

Other ambiguities of Anglican social mission are evident in the church's attitude toward the arts in the period. In *Pictures and Popery*, Clare Haynes (2006) shows how painting and sculpture were widely associated with Catholicism, even while the English traveled to Europe to admire the great masterpieces. Paintings were imported to England on a massive scale and then collected and criticized to appropriate them for the Protestant cause. There were a surprising number of paintings used for devotion in Anglican churches, and altars usually displayed the Ten Commandments, Sermon on the Mount, and royal insignia, all flanked by images of Moses and Aaron. At the same time, Anglicans in general shied away from the visual arts, promoting music instead and especially books.

Books properly composed and read could chart better than any other media a middle course between Catholic superstition and Protestant enthusiasm, doing for the church what the church could not do for itself. "When the pulpit fails, other expedients are necessary," as the poet Edward Young (bap. 1683–1765) put it in a 1754 letter to his friend Samuel Richardson (bap. 1689–1761), praising Richardson's latest novel, *Sir Charles Grandison*. Young believed mid-century that the pulpit was failing in a task of reform that literature might nevertheless accomplish. He used the word "expedients" not to denigrate his or Richardson's

literary art but to sweeten it with humility, to make his praise go down easier with his austere friend. The trouble with authors linking themselves to the authority of the church like this was that many churchgoers only approved of those works that obviously bolstered the authority of the clergy, Bible, and orthodox theology. It became difficult to see art doing anything more than weighing in for or against such things. Anglicanism became patron of none but itself in the arts, and reforming the culture devolved too readily into preserving the reputation of the church. If subsequent complaints about the eighteenth-century church are any indicator, that project failed.

Understanding Anglicanism in the period remains vital for thinking about culture, but it is triply difficult because (1) Anglicanism gets reduced to just another religion by the big story of secularization, (2) Anglicanism in the period gets overlooked within Anglicanism itself as a precursor to its later parties – Liberal, Evangelical, or High Church, and (3) Anglicanism challenges our secular notions that culture should be *a*religious. This third problem is roughly analogous to the difficulty of thinking about the nation before nationalism. For literary scholars, it means thinking about culture before cultural studies. Most scholars think of civil society, culture, the public – letting these terms be roughly equivalent for the point made here – as operating between the individual and the state. It is where individuals freely associate with one another beyond their private, domestic spheres and apart from the powers of the state, its law courts, legislatures, and military. Literary scholars attribute enormous significance to this realm of culture because it is where hegemony happens, on the one hand, as certain ideas and ways of living habituate themselves among the people, and where change happens, on the other, as new ideas and ways of living break in and enlighten the existing social order. But until very late in the eighteenth century, Britons across the political and religious spectrum, Anglicans especially, only thought civil society possible *because* of law and religion. The state and church were the necessary causes of polite society (Clark 2000, 3–4). This does not mean that everyone in the period thought identically about those things, but it does mean that where poems, novels, and plays talk about religion, they are also talking about culture.

Perhaps the numinous authority we attribute to culture today is the unacknowledged legacy of eighteenth-century Anglicans mobilized for social reform, hallowing the ground of which they are no longer sole proprietors. Or perhaps they never were the sole proprietors, and future work will show Anglican clergy and laity setting the reputation of their sacred institutions aside to work with those outside the church, for a good beyond their own.

SEE ALSO: Catholicism; Judaism and Jewishness; Nationalism; Protestant Dissent; Richardson, Samuel; Wesley, John and Charles; Young, Edward.

REFERENCES

Clark, J.C.D. 2000. *English Society, 1660–1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics during the Ancien Regime*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; a substantial revision of his book published in 1985 as *English Society 1688–1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Claydon, Tony. 2000. "The Sermon, the 'Public Sphere' and the Political Culture of Late Seventeenth-Century England." In *The English Sermon Revised*, edited by L.A. Ferrell and P. McCullough. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Glasson, Travis. 2012. *Mastering Christianity: Missionary Anglicanism and Slavery in the Atlantic World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gregory, Jeremy. 2009a. "Transforming 'the Age of Reason' into 'an Age of Faiths': or, Putting Religions and Beliefs (Back) into the Eighteenth Century." *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 32, no. 3: 287–305.

Gregory, Jeremy. 2009b. " 'For All Sorts and Conditions of Men'; The Social Life of the Book of Common Prayer during the Long Eighteenth Century: Or, Bringing the History of Religion and

Social History Together." *Social History* 34, no. 1: 29–54.

Haynes, Clare. 2006. *Pictures and Popery: Art and Religion in England, 1660–1760*. Burlington: Ashgate.

Nelson, Louis. 2008. *The Beauty of Holiness: Anglicanism and Architecture in Colonial South Carolina*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Nockles, Peter B. 1994. *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760–1857*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sheehan, Jonathan. 2003. "Enlightenment, Religion, and the Enigma of Secularization: A Review Essay." *The American Historical Review* 108, no. 4: 1061–80.

Walsh, John, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor. 1993. *The Church of England 1689–1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Young, B.W. 2000. "Religious History and the Eighteenth-Century Historian." *The Historical Journal* 43, no. 3: 849–68.

Animals

KATHLEEN D. KEIRN

The desire to comprehend the natural world through scientific and philosophical engagement is a marker of the eighteenth century. This engagement occurred in various discourses, including all genres of literary works, and often treated animals since they are part of the natural world. Philosophers John Locke (1632–1704), David Hume (1711–76), and Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) all contributed to an ever-increasing knowledge of animals, which for some constituted proof of man's dominion over all earthly creatures and for others provided evidence for the need to perceive animals as sentient beings. These two modes of belief in turn were rooted in the earlier philosophies of Michel de Montaigne (1533–92) and René Descartes (1596–1650). Montaigne declared in his *Apology for Raymond Sebond* (1562; Montaigne 1987) that there is no discernible difference between humans and animals in terms of what they experience physically and emotionally, while Descartes in contrast denied animals moral consideration, believing them incapable of conscious thought and therefore unable to experience pain and suffering similarly to humans. These influential and opposing philosophical perspectives inform eighteenth-century thought about animals and are seen throughout a variety of eighteenth-century literary works, including journalism, novels, poetry, and children's books.

The rise of the Royal Society of London for Improving Natural Knowledge (1660) and the scientific and exploratory travels to the New World contributed to and expanded the discourse on animals in the eighteenth century. Well-known naturalists such as John Ray (1627–1705), John Hill (1716–75), and Thomas Pennant (1726–98) employed varying classifications systems for fauna and flora, and classification of the natural world, along with discoveries in scientific knowledge, meant that cultural awareness of the animal world increasingly found its way into literature. Writers as diverse as Isaac Watts (1674–1748) and Oliver Goldsmith (1740–74) wrote about animal classification: Watts addresses his method of categorizing in *Logick* (1724; Watts 1984), suggesting an order resembling a tree with branches and limbs for various "Ranks of Being," and Goldsmith's expansive *History of the Earth, and Animated Nature* (1774; Goldsmith 1828) advanced the work of several naturalists, including Georges-Louis Leclerc, Comte de Buffon (1707–88).

Essayist Joseph Addison (1672–1719) devoted issues of the *Spectator* (1711) to the topic of animals (*Spectator* 120, 121). His writing illustrates part of the philosophical split – Addison, pondering over the instinct and attention with which animals care for their young, concludes that instinct, "which rises above Reason, and falls infinitely short of it," is the result of the divine working in the natural world.

The concept of animal subjectivity was successfully depicted throughout the period in

satirical novels such as the rational Houyhnhnms of Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (1726; Swift 1995). In this text, the role reversal of horses (Houyhnhnms) and humans (Yahoos) provides an opportunity for readers to view the lives of the Yahoos kept in circumstances not dissimilar to real horses. Francis Coventry's object-narrative *The History of Pompey the Little* (1751; Coventry 2008), exposes the foibles of politics and social class in British and European societies as seen through the eyes of the lapdog, Pompey.

Animals appear as subjects of poetry throughout the eighteenth century, often in anthropomorphized form, and nearly always aligned with Montaigne's assertion that animals are sentient creatures. An early example of animal subjectivity in poetry is Wat, the hare of Margaret Cavendish's "The Hunting of the Hare" (1653), relentlessly pursued by the men and dogs of the hunt only to die "with weeping eyes." Thomas Gray's mock-heroic "Ode on the Death of a Favorite Cat, Drowned in Tub of Gold Fishes" (1748; Gray 1966) pays homage to his friend Horace Walpole's cat Selima while commenting on the arrogance and avarice of men and women, and the intersection of science and animal sentience in Anna Laetitia Barbauld's poem "The Mouse's Petition" (1773; Barbauld 2002) engages readers with the suggested sufferings of a mouse through vivisection.

Depictions of animals in eighteenth-century literature for children evolved into two main categories. Didactically, animals were the subject of both scientific study and also used to teach lessons of social conduct and conformity. Later in the century, animals were also written in texts meant to amuse and delight. Going back to the tales of Aesop, animals have been used to teach children various lessons by using fables and bestiaries as pedagogical tools. In *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (1693), John Locke states two influential points regarding children: first, that children in their natural state are inclined toward cruelty regarding other living beings (specifically insects and animals), and second, that the trajectory from animal cruelty to human abuse was clearly demonstrable unless there was intervention or education of some kind in early childhood (Locke 1989). Thus, the inclusion of animals for didactic as well as entertainment purposes was an important progression in the growth of literature for children throughout the eighteenth century.

Natural histories of animals were safe subject matter in the early years of children's book publishing. Thomas Boreman's *A Description of Three Hundred Animals* (1730; Boreman 1970), which is widely cited as the first book of the eighteenth century designed specifically for children, depicts animals (both real and imaginary) as subjects worthy of study. John Newbery's *A Pretty Little Pocket Book* (1744) contains animal fables, and in *The History of Little Goody Two-Shoes* (1765; Newbery 1969) animals are shown to have reciprocal relationships with humans, for example when talking animals come to the aid of the heroine, Margery.

Later in the century, Sarah Trimmer (1741–1810) and Thomas Day (1748–89) combined entertainment with educating children in two enormously popular books of the eighteenth century. In Day's *The History of Sandford and Merton* (1783–9; Day 2010) two boys, wealthy and overindulged Tommy Merton and his counterpart, the simple and dutiful farm boy Harry Sandford, are brought together and taught by Mr. Barlow. Through various lessons, and often with examples of Sandford's behavior, Merton learns that it is his relationship to the natural world, including his treatment of animals, that ultimately guides his moral choices in positive ways.

Trimmer's *Fabulous Histories Designed for the Instruction of Children, Respecting Their Treatment of Animals* (1786; Trimmer 1977) details the fictional lives of two families – one a family of humans and the other a family of robins – whose intersecting lives offer a window into the human and humane treatment of animals by children. Following the rise of literature of sensibility, anthropomorphized animals accommodated both ends of the spectrum, providing both a sensitized view of

animals as well as a rational and moral perspective of them. The creation of anthropomorphized animals is firmly rooted in the literature for children of this time period.

SEE ALSO: Children's Literature; Didacticism; Object Narratives.

REFERENCES

Addison, Joseph. "*The Spectator" in Three Volumes*. www.gutenberg.org/files/12030/12030-h/SV1/Spectator1.html. Accessed May 15, 2012.

Barbauld, Anna Letitia. 2002. "The Mouse's Petition." In *Selected Poetry and Prose*, edited by William McCarthy and Elizabeth Kraft. Peterborough, ON: Broadview. Orig. pub. 1773.

Boreman, John. 1970. *A Description of Three Hundred Animals*. Reprint. Wakefield: S.R. Publishers. Orig. pub. 1730.

Cavendish, Margaret. 1653. "The Hunting of the Hare." In *Poems and Fancies*. *Early English Books Online*.

Coventry, Francis. 2008. *The History of Pompey the Little*. Ed. Nicholas Hudson. Peterborough, ON: Broadview. Orig. pub. 1751.

Day, Thomas. 2010. *The History of Sandford and Merton*. Ed. Stephen Bending and Stephen Bygrave. Peterborough, ON: Broadview. Orig. pub. 1783–9.

Goldsmith, Oliver. 1828. *A History of the Earth and Animated Nature; in Three Volumes, Illustrated with a Portrait and Numerous Plates*. London: J.F. Dove. Orig. pub. 1774.

Gray, Thomas. 1966. "Ode on the Death of a Favourite Cat, Drowned in a Tub of Gold Fishes." In *The Complete Poems of Thomas Gray; English, Latin, and Greek*, edited by H.W. Starr and J.R. Hendrickson. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Orig. pub. 1748.

Locke, John. 1989. *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*. Ed. John W. Yolton and Jean S. Yolton. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Orig. pub. 1693.

Montaigne, Michel de. 1987. *Apology for Raymond Sebond*. Trans. and ed. by M.A. Screech. New York: Viking Penguin. Orig. pub. 1562.

Newbery, John. 1969. *The History of Little Goody-Two Shoes*. Reprint. New York: Meridian Gravure. Orig. pub. 1765.

Swift, Jonathan. 1995. *Gulliver's Travels*. Ed. Christopher Fox. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's. Orig. pub. 1726.

Trimmer, Sarah. 1786. *Fabulous Histories Designed for the Instruction of Children, Respecting Their Treatment of Animals*. 1977. Reprint. New York: Garland.

Watts, Isaac. 1984. *Logick, or the Right Use of Reason*, 2nd ed. Reprint. New York: Garland. Orig. pub. 1726.

FURTHER READING

Cosslett, Tess. 2006. *Talking Animals in British Children's Fiction: 1786–1914*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Kelly, Ann Cline. 2007. "Gulliver as Pet and Pet Keeper: Talking Animals in Book 4." *English Literary History* 74, no. 2. doi:10.1353/elh.2007.0014.

Paul, Lissa. 2011. *The Children's Book Business: Lessons from the Long Eighteenth Century*. New York: Routledge.

Ridley, Glynis, ed. 2010. *Animal Studies*. Special Issue of *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 33, no. 4: 427–683.

Annotation

ADAM ROUNCE

Annotation of vernacular British literature comes from the biblical and classical tradition of commentary, emerges with the rise of the scholarly edition of English poetry in the later seventeenth century, and is then consolidated in the eighteenth. There are, of course, earlier examples – the notes in Spenser's *Sheapherdes Calendar* (1579) written by the enigmatic "E.K." (perhaps Spenser himself or his friend Gabriel Harvey), and the author's notes to Abraham Cowley's *Poems* (1656). What became more pervasive by the end of the century was the rise of the scholarly edition with customary notes, regarded as diligent scholarship or pedantic dullness and verbiage accordingly.

In the ingenious use of notes in Swift's *Tale of a Tub* (1704, and augmented in later versions) what is being parodied (or celebrated) is

the book itself as an authoritative source. In the previous decade, Patrick Hume's edition of *Paradise Lost* (1695) was significant in treating Milton's poem with the apparatus more often used for biblical commentary, even down to Hume's paraphrases echoing those of editions of Scripture. The notes supply some of the vast amounts of knowledge that the reader needs to bring to the poem if it is to be fully explicated. Hume's edition has been obscured by the later peculiarities of Richard Bentley's 1732 *Paradise Lost*, where the great classical scholar treated Milton's text in cavalier fashion, inserting conjectural emendations to correct supposed errors of transcription by a faulty amanuensis, bad editing, and other misprints. Bentley's notoriously misjudged emendations, with some famous figurative language replaced by the literal, were explained by footnotes which have a character all of their own. He was rebuffed by Thomas Newton's comprehensive 1749 variorum, with notes that quote liberally from Addison's *Spectator* papers on the poem, Hume, Bentley, and other contributors to the growing critical commentary on Milton. Newton also adds his own interpretations in the notes, in ways that would now be seen as leading the reader.

Newton uses far more of the Bible and classics than the developing English poetic tradition, which would advance in importance by the time of Thomas Warton's edition of Milton's shorter poems (1785), where much greater prominence is given to it in the notes. This illustrates how annotation changed through the century as the analogous materials and sources for it were increased in scale and scope. The range of parallels and allusions became less classical and more English, with the antiquarian interest in older vernacular verse and increased acceptance of Shakespeare and Milton as cultural touchstones.

Such a trend can be seen in the annotation of Alexander Pope: his translation of Homer (appearing from 1715) is accompanied by long footnotes, designed as an alternative to recondite scholarly versions; Pope debates academic questions, but is most concerned with illustrating the beauties of the poetry. This aesthetic approach was carried forward to his edition of Shakespeare (1725), which uses much sparser annotation in offering textual choices based (in some instances) on more personal criteria of judgment. Such taste was being questioned and superseded by the professional editing of Lewis Theobald, who earned Pope's mockery for refuting his Shakespeare edition; Theobald's own edition (1733) uses much annotation to make its points, and he, along with Bentley, would become the embodiment of academic pedantry and dullness in the different versions of the *Dunciad Variorum*, Pope's parody and mockery of scholarship, as well as an example of it, in the last, four-book version of which he became the hero. The model for Pope's parody is partly Bentley's 1717 edition of Horace, and the ambivalent result is a surge of annotation that pays homage to the scholarly edition, simultaneously mocks its excessive fussiness, and bemoans the declining cultural standards that would render such editions obsolete.

William Warburton, controversialist and Pope's friend and executor, was quite happy to add to the footnotes of the *Dunciad Variorum* in his collected edition of Pope (1751). An inveterate annotator (like many repeatedly angry writers), though not a literary specialist, Warburton's edition of Shakespeare (1747) is the last trumpet call of editing on aesthetic terms, rather than scholarship alone, and the result in many instances is of a powerful mind refusing to question or broaden its narrow premises or mistaken logic, carried through extensive annotation which perpetually argues with or insults his editorial predecessors. Johnson's Shakespeare (1765) corrected Warburton gently, and shows in its variorum-like nature (increased in the Johnson–Steevens reprints of 1773 and 1778) that the future would be collaborative, and involve the absorption of materials into annotation, rather than impressionistic remarks, subjective emendations, and ad hominem attacks (though this reduced some of the more eccentric and entertaining sorts of annotation).

By the mid-century, the annotated edition's place in Britain was secure, as can be seen by a glance at some of the most renowned examples: the subtitle of Zachary Gray's edition of *Hudibras* (1744) is "With large annotations," and no reader could accuse this of being false advertising; John Upton's important edition of *The Faerie Queene* (1758) moves its footnotes to the end of the volume, in an example of the perennial debate about whether annotation complements or interferes with the main text. Annotation was now required for even contemporary poetry. Thomas Gray declared that, with regard to his two "Pindaric Odes" of 1757: "When the Author first published this and the following Ode, he was advised, even by his Friends, to subjoin some few explanatory Notes; but had too much respect for the understanding of his Readers to take that liberty" (Gray 1768, 36). But by the time of writing (his collected poems of 1768) Gray's explanatory footnotes and glosses are included, showing how scholarship increasingly wanted annotation even of the most recent past.

SEE ALSO: Bentley, Richard (scholar); Gray, Thomas; Johnson, Samuel; Milton, John; Pope, Alexander; Warburton, William.

REFERENCES

Gray, Thomas. 1768. *Poems by Mr Gray: A New Edition*. London.

FURTHER READING

Bentley, Richard, ed. 1732. *Paradise Lost: A New Edition*. London.

Butler, Samuel. 1744. *Hudibras*. Ed. Zachary Gray. Cambridge.

Haugen, Kristine Louise. 2011. *Richard Bentley: Poetry and Enlightenment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jarvis, Simon. 1995. *Scholars and Gentlemen: Shakespearean Textual Criticism and Representations of Scholarly Labour, 1725–1765*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mack, Maynard, ed. 1967. *The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope, Volumes 7 & 8, The Iliad of Homer*. London: Methuen.

McLaverty, James. 2001. *Pope, Print, and Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Newton, Thomas, ed. 1749. *Paradise Lost. A Poem, in Twelve Books. The Author John Milton. A New Edition, with Notes of Various Authors*. London.

Rumbold, Valerie, ed. 2007. *The Poems of Alexander Pope: The Dunciad & The Dunciad Variorum*. London: Longman.

Walsh, Marcus. 1997. *Shakespeare, Milton, and Eighteenth Century Editing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weinbrot, Howard D. 2005. *Menippean Satire Reconsidered: From Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Anonymous Publishing *see* PSEUDONYMOUS AND ANONYMOUS PUBLISHING

Arbuckle, James

RICHARD HOLMES

James Arbuckle (1700?–42), poet and essayist, was of mixed Scottish and Irish background, born to a family of Presbyterian Belfast merchants. At Glasgow University (1717–23) he associated with student rebels who promoted political "Liberty" and "New Light" theology, and was personally censured for putting on plays. He became a divinity student but his first published poem, *Snuff* (Edinburgh 1717), announced his alternative commitment to his Muse: "Youth (so She spoke) I have adopted thee / Renounce thou therefore all the World for me" (ll. 611–12). The poem, dedicated to the secretary of state, the Duke of Roxburghe, and highly praised by Allan Ramsay, is a modern georgic, celebrating snuff, mercantile culture, and human inventiveness. It builds on the influence of Pope and Gay, and is notable for its passages on the delights and consolations of poetic inspiration.

In his time at Glasgow Arbuckle published two further long poems and a series of translations of Horace's odes. His *Epistle to the Earl of Hadington, on the Death of Joseph Addison, Esq.* (Edinburgh 1719) contributed to the Scottish enthusiasm for Addison, and was unusual in its emphasis on radical Whig elements in Addison's work. *Glotta* (Glasgow 1721) is his most fully achieved poem, a tribute to Glasgow and to Scottish culture framed by praise for the Act of Union of 1707 and an emerging "British" identity. It is a highly allusive poem, which takes Pope's *Windsor-Forest* as a model, and adds to it references to Allan Ramsay and to the sixteenth-century Latinist George Buchanan, an idol of republican Whiggism (Holmes 2012). The poem thus aims to join English and Scottish, and Whig and Tory cultures in a poetry of "Union."

Arbuckle is principally known for the essays he published in the *Dublin Weekly Journal* (1725–7) and later collected under the name *Hibernicus's Letters* (Dublin 1729). Arbuckle's collaborators included Francis Hutcheson (six of the 102 essays), but he wrote most of them himself under a variety of pseudonyms. They are known partly for their promotion of Hutcheson and the "politeness" of the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury. Arbuckle however expresses a friendly scepticism about Hutcheson's philosophy, and his better essays focus on politics and literary criticism. He discusses, in addition to poetry, translation, historical writing, and autobiography and offers further versions of Horace (extensive borrowing from these is found in the well-known complete Horace by the Dublin clergyman Philip Francis). The essays are also associated with the "Molesworth circle," a group of Dublin thinkers linked to the "Commonwealth" Whig, Viscount Molesworth. Arbuckle had corresponded with him from Glasgow and enjoyed the patronage of the wider Molesworth family in Dublin. But the politics of *Hibernicus's Letters* differ in important ways from modern accounts of the "commonwealth" tradition. Arbuckle later obtained government employment on the personal recommendation of Sir Robert Walpole. Molesworth (who died in 1725) and the "commonwealth" tradition are associated with "Opposition" Whigs. Arbuckle expresses a classic "Court" Whig justification of Walpole's government. His radicalism focused instead on the politics of religious toleration, including one of the first non-sectarian critiques of the Irish Penal laws (Holmes 2011).

Arbuckle's arrival in Dublin coincided with Swift's campaign as "the Drapier" against Walpole's plan for Ireland's copper coinage. Arbuckle was the victim of a series of satires emanating from Swift's circle. One telling attack (*The Dublin Scuffle* 1729) accused him of aiming to "banish aristocracy / And set up in its stead democracy." Arbuckle's views were opposed to Swift on the privilege of the Church of Ireland, on Ireland's relation to England and on the Walpole government. The differences between him and Swift also exemplify more broadly the clash between Tory and Whig literary cultures.

The critique of Swift in *Hibernicus's Letters* is oblique. In two little-known works of 1729–30 it is expressed in forceful satire. *The Tribune* is a series of essays proposing a club of representative characters, similar to Addison's "Spectator Club," to describe the political nation of Ireland. "Will Trueman" is a sympathetic interpretation of a "Commonwealthman." The writing uses Swiftian techniques of irony, parody, and the interplay of unstable personae; the best pieces attack Swift's Church Toryism by means of the bumbling persona of "Thomas Verger." Arbuckle abandoned politeness altogether in *A Panegyric upon the Reverend Dean Swift* (London 1730), which lampoons Swift as a monster of egotism and cynical self-interest. It is close enough to Swift's style to have led earlier scholars to mistake it for Swift's own work (a view corrected in Woolley 1981).

Arbuckle wrote little in the last ten years of his life, although *An Ode to the Dublin Society* (Dublin 1737) is an attractive exception. It may be significant that during this period his two offices in the Irish Revenue service probably required him to conform under the Test Act to the Anglican Church. He died in Dublin in 1742.

SEE ALSO: Addison, Joseph; Ireland, Representations of; Swift, Jonathan.

REFERENCES

There is no complete edition of Arbuckle's works. But see Holmes, Richard, ed. 2014. *James Arbuckle. Selected Works*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.

Holmes, Richard. 2011. "James Arbuckle: A Whig Critic of the Irish Penal Laws." *New Perspectives on the Penal Laws, Eighteenth Century Ireland*, Special Issue, no. 1: 93–114.

Holmes, Richard. 2012. "James Arbuckle's *Glotta* (1721) and the Poetry of Allusion." *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 35, no. 1: 85–100.

Woolley, James. 1981. "Arbuckle's 'Panegyric' and Swift's Scrub Libel." In *Contemporary Studies of Swift's Poetry*, edited by J.I. Fischer and D.C. Mell, Jr., 191–209. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

FURTHER READING

Brown, Michael. 2002. *Hutcheson in Dublin*. Dublin: Four Courts Press.

Coleborne, Bryan. 1987. "James Arbuckle and Jonathan Swift: New Light on Swift's Biography." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 11: 170–80.

Holmes, Richard. 2008. "James Arbuckle and Dean Swift: Cultural Politics in the Irish Confessional State." *Irish Studies Review* 16, no. 4: 431–44.

Scott, W.R. 1899. "James Arbuckle and His Relation to the Molesworth-Shaftesbury School." *Mind* 8, no. 30: 194–215.

Stewart, M.A. 1987. "John Smith and the Molesworth Circle." *Eighteenth-Century Ireland* 2: 89–102.

Woznak, J.F. 1988. "Loose Compositions: James Arbuckle and the Irish Literary Journal." Ph.D. thesis, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Architecture

NICOLE REYNOLDS

The notion of a formal and thematic correspondence between architecture and literature in Britain goes back to the eighteenth century: to the works of individual artists, to lectures delivered by members of the newly established Royal Academy of Arts, and to an associationist philosophy that theorized the relationship between the imagination and the material world. The boundaries between professional and intellectual disciplines were highly fluid; writers and builders alike exploited these permeable borders in ways that enriched the theory and practice of both arts (Reynolds 2010, 7).

For many, the relationship between literature and architecture hinged upon their similar capacity to stimulate the mind. In a series of *Spectator* essays, Joseph Addison (1672–1719) mulled over the relationship between works of art and imagination, claiming that architecture induces the imagination's "primary pleasures" – those derived from sight – more than any other art (Addison 1965, 3.556). In 1759 architect William Chambers (1723–96), founding member of the Royal Academy, argued that architecture, like language, when composed with skill and expressed with energy, could "actuate the mind with unbounded sway" (Chambers 1759, iii). Fellow architect and academician Thomas Sandby (1721–98) linked architecture, through the philosophy of association, to other "liberal arts," poetry among them, noting that architecture can "entertain the mind by raising agreeable emotions and exciting pleasing ideas" (qtd. in Watkin 1996, 50). Royal Academy president Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723–92) reiterated Sandby's point in his Thirteenth Discourse, delivered in 1786. Like poetry, Reynolds explains, architecture "applies itself…directly to the imagination…by means of association of ideas"; Reynolds insists that "in the hands of a man of genius," architecture "is capable of inspiring sentiment, and of filling the mind with great and sublime ideas" (Reynolds 1997, 241).

Imaginative association, then, was thought to be a key component in the experience of both architecture and literature; the formal elements of different styles and genres carried with them different metaphoric and affective values. Two styles that spoke compellingly to

British audiences during the long eighteenth century were classical and Gothic. In architecture, interest in classicism was rooted primarily in Rome, in the works of the writer, architect, and engineer Vitruvius as well as in Andrea Palladio's early modern interpretation of them; in architecture and in literature, classicism emphasized rule, form, symmetry, and the subordination of detail to overall design. Gothic, an architectural style popularly embraced as native to Britain – the style of its historic castles and churches – valued irregularity, asymmetry, variation, and ornament. At mid-century, the antiquarian study of Gothic buildings both extant and ruined sparked a literary enthusiasm for Gothic's associated charms: chivalry, piety, the otherworldly. After an initial phase of archeological recovery and literary expression, there followed a period of revival: sustained and extensive efforts across Britain to build again, anew, in the Gothic style (Clark 1995, 11).

Lee Morrissey begins his study of British literature's "architectural history" with a discussion of the Vitruvian poetics of John Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1667/1674). Morrissey describes the poem's proportionate structure – through which, according to Vitruvius, art participates in the universal order and can make the invisible visible – as well as the key architectural spaces within the poem: Pandaemonium and the Blissful Bower. Milton describes Pandaemonium in the language of classical architecture, emphasizing the formal, rule-bound quality of Satan's buildings. In contrast, Milton's description of Adam and Eve's "blissful bower" constitutes a natural, original architecture; references to how the bower was "fram'd" establish Milton's argument that through reason, or framing, humans participate in God's universal – prelapsarian – design (Morrissey 1999, 19, 30–4).

A tale of two villas in suburban London – Lord Burlington's Chiswick House (1729) and Horace Walpole's Strawberry Hill (renovated between 1747 and 1790) – reveals much about the relationship between literary and architectural topoi through the eighteenth century. Alexander Pope (1688–1744) celebrated Burlington's achievement in his 1731 "Epistle to the Right Honourable Richard Earl of Burlington," extending the qualities of Palladianism embodied in Chiswick House – symmetry, simplicity, informality – in order, as David Spurr argues, to "envision the new construction of Britain itself." Like a Palladian villa, Pope's poem advances the notion of a society "free[d] [from] constraining traditions, possess[ing] a rational harmony among constituent parts, [and] us[ing] its natural resources to advantage." Pope's genre – the verse epistle – reflects Palladian values; like the suburban villa, which offers a private retreat from urban stress as well as a more public space in which invited guests might enjoy enlightened colloquy, the epistle "combines informality with rational order," conversational tone with measured argument (Spurr 2012, 24–6). Pope's verse form, the heroic couplet – with its emphasis on balance between and within lines and on the symmetrical disposition of rhetorical antitheses – similarly echoes the aesthetics of Palladian architecture (Morrissey 1999, 78).

In his *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, Horace Walpole (1717–97) called Burlington (1694–1753) "the Apollo of the Arts" (Walpole 1782, 4.235). But while Pope and Burlington celebrated Palladian symmetry, simplicity, rule, and fidelity to nature, in his own literary and architectural projects Walpole lifted the rug on Gothic chaos, ornateness, unruliness, and artifice: what lay beneath Enlightenment reason and optimism. Building and writing along the Thames, not far from Burlington and Pope (who had himself built a Palladian villa in Twickenham), Walpole took pleasure in the scholarly, antiquarian recovery and restoration of Gothic architecture, as well as in the excitement, mental and physical, induced by Gothic's atmospheric effects.

Walpole purchased Strawberry Hill – then a modest, unexceptional house – in 1747 and began to gothicize it shortly thereafter; this project continued through the next four decades. His designs invoked Gothic's castle and ecclesiastical precedents – the pageantry

and romance of medieval Britain – and real and literary sources of inspiration. Walpole's 1784 *Description* of the house reminded viewers and readers of every architectural and textual allusion that his renovations embodied.

In 1764, shortly after he began opening Strawberry Hill for public tours, Walpole published *The Castle of Otranto*. In a now famous 1765 letter to the clergyman and antiquary William Cole (1714–82), Walpole declared that his Gothic interiors (and their imaginative associations) had inspired his Gothic novel: "I waked one morning…from a dream, of which, all I could recover was, that I had thought myself in an ancient castle (a very natural dream for a head filled like mine with Gothic story), and that on the upper-most banister of a great staircase I saw a gigantic hand in armour. In the evening I sat down, and began to write" (Walpole 1937, 1.88). Popularly cited as the first Gothic novel, *The Castle of Otranto* brings together the imagery and machinery that would become endemic to the genre. More than simply depicting Gothic manifestations, however, in writing *Otranto* Walpole replicates the very process of *making* Gothic (Lipking 1970, 154). He presents *Otranto*, like Strawberry Hill, as a medieval artifact, only to self-consciously (in the preface to the second edition) announce its imposture; like the house's "Gothic story," the novel's drama unfolds through effects of spatial and sensory distortion, as well as rhetorical and visual figures of excess and exaggeration.

Strawberry Hill's deeply personal, highly idiosyncratic interiors – as extraordinary as they were – reflect a broad trend in British domestic architecture in this period. From the estates of the wealthy to more modest middle-class homes, architectural design and décor increasingly emphasized the private, affective lives of their occupants. The cult of sensibility inaugurated a new era in which feeling came first, a revival of more subjective and lyrical literary forms – the ode, the elegy, the sonnet – that conveyed emotion through intimate, natural diction. In William Cowper's wildly popular and deeply influential poem *The Task* (1785), the lyric subject recognizes himself and his purpose through architectural configurations: the tension between home and abroad, retirement and excursion, the world within and the world without. Cowper's conversational blank verse sings the charms of private, domestic life: the speaker sets off from and returns to an architectural interior (and a much lauded sofa) where the mind is cultivated and the body restored. Through *The Task*'s spatial arrangements Cowper posits that psychological interiority, poetic form, and architectural space can be mutually constitutive.

SEE ALSO: Addison, Joseph; Aesthetics; Cowper, William; Milton, John; Pope, Alexander; Sensibility; Verse Epistle; Walpole, Horace.

REFERENCES

Addison, Joseph. 1965. *The Spectator*. 5 vols. Ed. Donald F. Bond. New York: Oxford University Press.

Chambers, William. 1759. *A Treatise on Civil Architecture*. London: Haberkorn.

Clark, Kenneth. 1995. *The Gothic Revival: An Essay in the History of Taste*, 3rd ed. London: John Murray.

Lipking, Lawrence. 1970. *The Ordering of the Arts in Eighteenth-Century England*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Morrissey, Lee. 1999. *From the Temple to the Castle: An Architectural History of British Literature, 1660–1760*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Reynolds, Joshua. 1997. *Discourses on Art*. Ed. Robert R. Wark. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Reynolds, Nicole. 2010. *Building Romanticism: Literature and Architecture in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Spurr, David. 2012. *Architecture and Modern Literature*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Walpole, Horace. 1782. *Anecdotes of Painting in England*. Volume 4. London: Dodsley.

Walpole, Horace. 1937. *The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence*. Volume 1. Ed. W.S. Lewis. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Watkin, David. 1996. *Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought and the Royal Academy Lectures.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aubin, Penelope

DEBBIE WELHAM

In 1956 William H. McBurney's landmark article "Mrs Penelope Aubin and the Early Eighteenth-Century Novel" set out many of the basic details of Penelope Aubin's literary output. It also included (supposed) information on Aubin's life from an eighteenth-century biography by the French clergyman, journalist and novelist Antoine Prévost (1697–1763). This biography (1734) described Aubin (1679?–1738) as having a French father, an ugly face, and a penchant for preaching to an audience of dissenters – information that has been repeated uncritically ever since. Prevost's commentary also began the process of amalgamating Aubin's life with the supposed characteristics of her works, an amalgamation that occurred for instance when McBurney conflated Aubin with the fictional Belinda de Beaumount to describe her as an exile, possibly a Huguenot. In the same vein, Aubin's even-handed representations of Catholics have been used to claim her as a Catholic novelist. However, more recent biographical research shows that some past conclusions should now be considered unsound.

Similarly, recent scholarship is recognizing the wide range of Aubin's work, from her early poetry, short early novels, longer "mid-career" novels, and translations to her stage presence in public oratory and, finally, her only known play. Current critical works have begun to explore Aubin's commerciality and the transatlantic appeal of her longer novels. Prévost wrote comically of the posthumous appeal of Aubin's stories, imagining a scenario where two publishers are driven to dueling over an inherited manuscript. More seriously, recent research points to the continued popularity of her novels in the later eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, from an anonymous plagiarism of *Charlotta Du Pont* titled *The Inhuman Stepmother* in 1770 to a French translation of *The Strange Adventures of the Count de Vinevil* in 1822.

On May 4, 1696, Penelope Charleton, or Temple, was married to Jersey bachelor Mr. Abraham Aubin (1673–1740) at St. James's Duke's Place. The consequences of the match were still being felt in 1703 when Penelope Aubin and her husband took Penelope's mother Anne Charleton (before 1642–after 1708) to court. They claimed that Anne had withheld a large marriage portion due on marriage or when Penelope was 21; both of those landmarks, the deposition says, had passed. Depending on how long the couple waited after Aubin's twenty-first birthday to launch their case, Aubin may have been, like several of her heroines, only 14 when she married without parental consent.

The family details revealed by the *Aubin v. Charleton* case offer some possible foundations for Aubin's noted empathy with exiles and Catholics. In the court records Aubin's mother Anne Charleton describes herself as a spinster, having never married; Anne's father (Penelope Aubin's grandfather) was the Royal physician and well-connected Royalist philosopher Walter Charleton (1620–1707). Penelope herself was, then, a "natural" child; her father was Anne's long-term "lover" Sir Richard Temple, 3rd baronet (1634–97), making politician Richard Temple, 1st Viscount Cobham (1675–1749) Aubin's half brother. Aubin seems to have known her father, who took an active role in failed financial negotiations with Abraham's parents to secure a settlement. However, her half brother, in a legal dispute with Anne Charleton, seems to have declined to acknowledge publically the existence of his half sibling. Before and immediately after her willful marriage Penelope lived with her mother in a riverside enclave in Hammersmith, surrounded by the highest ranking of genteel Catholics such as Charles II's widow Catherine of Braganza (1638–1705) and her Catholic and

female entourage. The grounds of the now almost unknown convent begun by Mary Ward (1585–1645) nearly touched the boundary of Anne Charleton's home. The convent educated the daughters of both Anglican and Catholic gentry and, in that social network of the Upper Mall, it seems likely that Aubin and her mother met socially with Catholic families. Aubin's father was also forced to prove his own Anglicanism after forming a close political alliance with the Catholic George Digby, Earl of Bristol (1612–77). When the mobs energized by anti-Catholic Titus Oates (1649–1705) came window-smashing in Catholic Hammersmith it seems unlikely that Anne Charleton's house escaped unscathed. Aubin might then have some sympathy for the treatment her gentle neighbors received.

No resolution to the Aubins' chancery case is recorded, and by 1706 Aubin was alone with three children in London whilst Abraham was away fighting in what he described as "all Queen Anne's Wars," that is, the War of the Spanish Succession between England and France. Prévost claims that Aubin wrote anonymous pamphlets on current affairs in this period before turning her hand to novels, but the first known surviving works are poems to which she openly put her name. Unlike the novels, which were all published after the ascension to the throne in 1714 of Hanoverian George I (1660–1727), Aubin's poems were penned during Queen Anne's reign. They concern themselves with marking public events, using an entangled combination of the queen's Stuart lineage and the Royalist roots of Aubin's muse. If we were to mine texts for their biographical information, then Aubin's poems are her most autobiographical texts, reflecting her own Anglican beliefs, and showing her dedication to her queen by staking her claims to a Royalist heritage and Tory political alignment. The first in the sequence of three poems, *The Stuarts: A Pindarique Ode. Humbly Dedicated to her Majesty of Great Britain* (1707) charts the pedigree of Queen Anne (1665–1714) from James I (1566–1625), who first unified the crowns of England and Scotland, to make a commentary on the 1707 Act of Union that created the kingdom of Great Britain. In *The Stuarts* Aubin celebrates the most notable characteristics of James I, that he was a "Worthy Supporter of our Church, so Beauteous grown," who "Establish'd our most Glorious Church from Superstition Free." Aubin's possessive "our" suggests that she considered herself to be English (or perhaps British, as she remarks at the start that Anne is now Queen of Great Britain), and she uses the same inclusive stance to speak of "our Church," the Anglican church.

The Stuarts was followed by *The Extasy: a Pindarick Ode to Her Majesty the Queen* (1708), which marks the mass held at St. Paul's to celebrate the victory over the French at Oudenarde and the repelling of the Stuart Pretender who had made an attempt to unseat the British monarch. Aubin's final poem *The Wellcome: A Poem to His Grace the Duke of Marlborough* (1709), takes as its subject the return of John Churchill, 1st Duke of Marlborough (1650–1722) to England to receive the thanks of the British people. Robert D. Horn identified Aubin's reflection on Churchill as decidedly lackluster (Horn 1975). Indeed in *The Extasy*, whilst remarking on "How Britain's Arms prevail," Aubin managed to leave mentioning "Brave Churchill" almost until the end of the poem. *The Wellcome* a year later carries an epigraph on the sordid nature of amassing money by asking favors, suggesting that Aubin's tone might productively be seen as a deliberate statement on the owner of Blenheim Palace (i.e., Churchill) rather than merely as poor poetic form. After these poems there are no more known published works bearing Aubin's name until the 1720s.

After the burst of poetry the next documents to hold Aubin's name are not fiction, but can be found amongst the documents recording the Board of Trade's consideration of the repatriation of pirates from Madagascar in 1709–10. The men proposing this scheme thought that Aubin would be able to obtain the signatures of the wives and dependents of the most notorious pirates to make a petition to the queen. However, Aubin declined to do so,

and she made clear her poor opinion of the organizers behind the private venture to collect and pardon the Madagascar pirates in return for a generous donation to the treasury. Aubin's doubts over the success of the project (and other objections to it; see Baer 2001) place her in opposition to Daniel Defoe (c. 1660–1731), who supported the scheme.

Following the decade-long gap in literary output Aubin became quite prolific, and between 1721 and 1729 she produced seven original novels: *The Strange Adventures of the Count de Vinevil and his Family* (1721), *The Life of Madam de Beaumount, a French Lady* (1721), *The Life and Amorous Adventures of Lucinda* (1721), *The Noble Slaves: or, The Lives and Adventures of Two Lords and Two Ladies* (1722), *The Life of Charlotta Du Pont; an English Lady* (1723), *The Life and Adventures of the Lady Lucy* (1726), and its sequel following the offspring of Lady Lucy *The Life and Adventures of Young Count Albertus* (1728). Contemporary marginalia on the British Library copy of *Charlotta Du Pont* shows that one reader found the story "quite perfect," and in recent years *Charlotta Du Pont* and *The Noble Slaves* have become the focus of the most sustained work on Aubin's novels, as they demonstrate Aubin's topicality and her ability to use and subvert generic forms such as romance and captivity narratives. *The Noble Slaves* was published just as the nation celebrated the release of 260 Barbary Slaves (i.e., British subjects held captive or enslaved in Northern Africa); the returned British captives were paraded through the streets of London to St. Paul's Cathedral. In *Lucinda* Aubin can be seen to engage in debate with contemporary women writers, as the frame story contains two inset novels that have recently been identified as retellings of tales from Delarivier Manley's *The Power of Love in Seven Novels*, which had been published a few months earlier.

Aubin also put her name to several translations of French texts. *The Doctrine of Morality* (1721) – for which Aubin is shown as the editor having inherited the manuscript as a bequest in the will of its original translator Thomas Mannington Gibbs (d. 1720) – was followed by *The Adventures of the Prince of Clermont and Madam de Ravezan* (1722), *The History of Genghizcan the Great* (1722), *Moral Virtue Delineated* (1726, which is the *Doctrine of Morality* with a new cover), *The Illustrious French Lovers* (1726), and *The Life of the Countess de Gondez* (1729). This final translation includes a prefatory comment on the characters of English princesses, indicating that perhaps the story is intended to reflect on the personal traits of George II's wife Caroline (1683–1737).

Then, between April and November 1729, and again in February 1730, Aubin stopped publishing and took to the stage at her own "Lady's Oratory," that is, once or twice a week she offered public "speeches" on various topics, concerts, and occasionally tea to paying audiences. The Lady's Oratory opened its doors on April 15, 1729, at York Buildings in Villier's Street, and the last known oration was an address to the Freemasons, at the request of their Grand Master, Thomas Howard, 8th Duke of Norfolk (1683–1732), in February 1730. Unfortunately, all that remains of Aubin's orations are the advertisements, but it is certain that the Lady's Oratory was not (as Prévost claimed) a place of religious worship. In the advertisements, Aubin declared herself "Mrs Aubin against Mr Henly" [*sic*], indicating that she was responding to the Friday orations of John "Orator" Henley (1692–1756), which were political and social commentary rounded off with a summary of the week's events in Henley's satirical "Chimes of the Times." At her own Oratory Aubin addressed topics such as how hypocrisy and dissimulation are used by statesmen and stock jobbers and how favorites, courtiers, and ministers of state achieved high office and behaved when they got there.

The Oratory was not Aubin's only foray onto the stage: her last known work was the play *The Merry Masqueraders; or, The Humorous Cuckold*, performed for two nights at the Little Haymarket Theatre in December 1730. The play was published in 1732 and again in 1733

under the revised title *The Humours of the Masqueraders*, and then once more in 1734 with the title *The Masquerade: or the Humorous Cuckold*. The masqueraders of the play are not merry, nor is the cuckold humorous. Instead this is an unresolved play in which a loathsome corrupt old magistrate is thwarted in his attempts to prove that his unhappy young bride is making a cuckold of him. The play is deliberately topical, drawing on the legal case of criminal conversation instigated by William Neville, Lord Abergavenny (1695–1744) and on the Francis Charteris (c. 1665–1732) rape case. It may also be political, invoking notable traits of the Whig "prime minister" Robert Walpole (1676–1745).

After the *Merry Masqueraders* the Aubins continued to live and pay taxes in Portugal Row for several years, but there is no evidence of any further publications until Aubin's publishers produced a posthumous collected edition of her works in 1739. Aubin's obituary appeared in the *Daily Post* on May 5, 1738; however, it says nothing of Aubin's life or literary career. Penelope Aubin was buried at St George the Martyr in Southwark.

SEE ALSO: Amatory Fiction; Augustan Drama; Transatlantic Studies; Travel Narrative; Turkey and the Middle East, Representations of; Wales, Representations of.

REFERENCES

Baer, Joel. 2001. "Penelope Aubin and the Pirates of Madagascar: Biographical Notes and Documents." In *Eighteenth-Century Women: Studies in Their Lives, Work and Culture, Volume I*, edited by Linda V. Troost, 49–62. New York: AMS Press.

Horn, Robert D. 1975. *Marlborough: A Survey. Panegyrics, Satires, and Biographical Writings, 1688–1788*. Kent: Dawson.

McBurney, William H. 1956–7. "Mrs Penelope Aubin and the Early Eighteenth-Century Novel." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 20: 245–67.

Prevost, Antoine. 1734. *Le Pour et contre*, Number 58.

FURTHER READING

Bannet, Eve Tavor. 2011. *Transatlantic Stories and the History of Reading, 1720–1810: Migrant Fictions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Prescott, Sarah. 1994. "Penelope Aubin and the Doctrine of Morality: A Reassessment of the Pious Woman Novelist." *Women's Writing* 1, no. 1: 99–112.

Welham, Debbie. 2008. "The Particular Case of Penelope Aubin." *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 31, no. 1: 63–76.

Welham, Debbie. 2013. "The Political Afterlife of Resentment in Penelope Aubin's *The Life and Amorous Adventures of Lucinda* (1721)." *Women's Writing* 20, no. 1: 49–63.

Audience, Theater

ELIZABETH BOLTON

It is customary to see eighteenth-century theater audiences as being broadly representative of the nation. Aristocrats, gentlefolk, citizens, and servants were, together, considered to constitute a unified group, capable of exercising power over actors, theater managers, and dramatic repertoire. The reality was perhaps more complicated and less unified, but this image of the audience persisted in prologues, epilogues, and scenes about drama throughout the period.

Information about eighteenth-century theater audiences comes from diverse sources, many of them partial or biased. Theater receipts loosely record the size of the audience for a given performance; playbills provide clues about the heterogeneous offerings (music, prologue, play, epilogue, dancing, afterpiece) that constituted an evening's entertainment; court records offer information about theatrical riots; and newspaper "puffs" show how plays and players were advertised. Theater criticism, less common in the early years, articulates shifting assumptions about theatrical performances while memoirs, diaries, and correspondence register the reactions of specific spectators,

such as Samuel Pepys (1633–1703). At the same time essayists such as Joseph Addison (1672–1719) and Richard Steele (1672–1729) suggest guidelines for an abstract, general spectator while novelists like Henry Fielding (1707–54) and Frances Burney (1752–1840) record ideas about appropriate (or inappropriate) theater-going behavior. Paintings and caricatures of theater audiences shift gradually over the period from a focus on individuals or small groups of spectators chatting, flirting, and buying oranges near the start of the century, for example, William Hogarth's "Laughing Audience" (1733), and Thomas Rowlandson's "Box Lobby Loungers" (1785), to group scenes stressing the numbers of people crammed into the theater at the end of the century, such as in Edward Dayes' watercolor of Drury Lane (1795). Pamphlets record theatrical controversies around casting, theater management, repertoire, and so on. Travel literature suggests national trends: visitors such as Georg Cristoph Lichtenberg (1742–99) of Germany and Thomas Campbell (1733–95) of Ireland, for instance, comment on the unusual freedom and power of the audience in relation to the players. Finally, the plays themselves, along with the prologues and epilogues which accompany them, frequently describe stereotypical members of the audience as they were commonly conceived: ladies concerned with creating a spectacle of their own appear in Edward Jerningham's *Welch Heiress* (April 17, 1795), beaux on stage are represented in David Garrick's *Lethe* (January 2, 1749), box lobby loungers are evident in Charles Stuart's *Lobby Lounger* (May 16, 1787), and aristocratic gamblers and opera fans appear in the epilogue to *The Clandestine Marriage* (February 20, 1766). None of these sources can be taken solely at face value but, together, they provide insights into the changing composition, tastes, and practices of audiences over the period.

Theater audiences constituted the period's largest daily social gatherings. While viewers came to see an evening's entertainment, they also came to participate in an image of "the Town" composed of "all persons, who pay for their places, whether noble, gentle, or simple, who fill the boxes, pit and galleries" (Cibber 1756, 5). For some audience members, the show in the house was more compelling than that on stage: prologues and epilogues often complain of spectators who ignore the play in favor of loud, distracting conversation with their neighbors. In David Garrick's preface to *The Clandestine Marriage* (1766), for example, Miss Crochet complains,

> Such crowds of city folks!—So rude and pressing!
> And their horse-laughs, so hideously distressing!
> [...]
> In the first act, lord George began to doze,
> And criticis'd the author—through his nose;
> So loud indeed, that as his lordship snor'd,
> The pit turn'd round, and all the brutes encor'd.
> (Garrick 1766)

In particular, spectators in the side boxes were often seen as competing with the players for the attention of the rest of the audience.

Playhouse architecture and the price of seating reflected the diversity of the audience. The pit, or the rows directly in front of the stage, contained men of business (Citizens or "Cits"), fearsome critics, rowdy young men of quality and some virtuous young women, along with prostitutes looking for trade. The more expensive boxes above the pit held aristocrats, primarily ladies, and the galleries, above the boxes, held more humble spectators. After approximately 1696, the second or upper gallery was known as the "footman's gallery" since, from around this date, Christopher Rich (1657–1714), competing fiercely for aristocratic audiences, offered footmen free entrance not just from the fourth act, but from the start of the play. Even after a shilling charge for the second gallery was successfully reinstated by David Garrick (1717–79) in 1759, its spectators were known as "the gods of the gallery," sitting above the rest of the house and – by calling out, rapping on the railings, and sometimes throwing food or even bottles – imposing their views on their masters in a way inconceivable in any other social context.

Eighteenth-century audiences were often rowdy, engaging the actors onstage, the theater management, and other spectators. In response to the entertainment, spectators might comment audibly upon the acting or the action; they might express their approval with applause or shouts; or they might convey disapproval through booing, hissing, using a catcall, or even throwing objects like orange peels, rotting food, and the occasional bottle. Actors and playwrights feared critics such as Sir Charles Sedley (1639–1701) for their audible commentary, especially early in the Restoration. Catcalls, instruments producing a piercing whistle, were also prevalent in the early part of the period; many prologues, plays, and pamphlets complain of audience members, particularly young men, who would come to the theater on the first night of a play simply to damn the play or cry it down before even a word could be heard. Still, London audiences saw themselves as demanding but generous: many spectators could boast an in-depth familiarity with the theatrical repertoire, the actors, and the competition, including entertainments at the minor theaters or the Italian opera. The power of the audience to determine the repertoire was broadly acknowledged, even by writers who complained of plays being rejected by a small group of biased spectators. Audience members might also protest casting decisions, or changes in ticket prices; for instance, managerial attempts to charge full prices for entry after the third act of the main play (previously charged at half price) led to theater riots in 1763.

Audiences changed over the course of the period along with the theaters, the repertoire, and management practices. Compared to the estimated 3000 seats of Shakespeare's Globe theater, the greater intimacy of early Restoration theaters probably made the proximity of different sorts of people more striking, and the relationship between audience and actors more personal. Conversely, the change from the first Theatre Royal in Drury Lane, housing roughly 700 spectators, to Sheridan's 1794 Drury Lane, holding 3600 spectators, dramatically affected audiences' experience of theater. By the middle of the eighteenth century, larger audiences, composed of less well-educated spectators, were blamed for the "the wild vicissitudes of taste" (Johnson 1747, 3) which saw spectacles such as rope dancing, ladder dancing, monkeys, and pantomime being popularized on the one hand, and sentimental drama on the other. However, mid-century management practices, pioneered by David Garrick in particular, attempted to tame those spectators and create a clearer division of audience and stage. Technological developments supported Garrick in his efforts. In the Restoration and early eighteenth century, candles were used to light the audience as much as the stage, underscoring the sense that the audience and the actors were equally on show. Garrick's lighting innovations included footlights (lights in boxes at the front of the stage) designed to make actors' faces more visible. In 1762, after years of efforts, Garrick also succeeded in removing spectators from on-stage seating, building new seats in both boxes and gallery. Larger audiences, distanced and more clearly distinguished from actors, were enticed by large-scale spectacular offerings. Despite demographic and structural changes, however, the idealized image of the audience as a figure for national and social unity persisted throughout the period.

SEE ALSO: Addison, Joseph; Augustan Drama; Burney, Frances; Cibber, Theophilus; Garrick, David; Georgian Drama; Hogarth, William; Prologues and Epilogues; Restoration Drama; Theater Buildings.

REFERENCES

Cibber, Theophilus. 1756. "Two Dissertations on the Theatres." London: R. Griffiths.

Garrick, David. 1766. "Epilogue." In *The Clandestine Marriage* by George Colman and David Garrick. London: T. Becket et al.

Johnson, Samuel. 1747. "Prologue and Epilogue, Spoken at the Opening of the Theater in Drury-Lane 1747." London: W. Webb.

FURTHER READING

Hughes, Leo. 1971. *The Drama's Patrons: A Study of the Eighteenth-Century London Audience*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Pedicord, Harry William. 1966. *The Theatrical Public in the Time of Garrick*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Smith, Dane Farnsworth, and M.L. Lawhon. 1979. *Plays about the Theatre in England, 1737–1800; or, The Self-Conscious Stage from Foote to Sheridan*. Cranbury: Associated University Presses.

Van Lennep, William Bird, et al. 1960. *The London Stage, 1660–1800: A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments & Afterpieces, Together with Casts, Box-Receipts and Contemporary Comment*, 1st ed. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Augustan Drama

MATTHEW J. KINSERVIK

"Augustan Drama" is a term that defines plays written between the so-called "Restoration" and "Georgian" periods, roughly 1690 to 1715 (although sometimes extended up to the Stage Licensing Act of 1737). The drama from this period is generally neglected by scholars, but the era was regarded in the eighteenth century as a rare time of dramatic excellence that fell between the lewdness of the Restoration stage and the crudeness of the more commercialized Georgian stage. Neither lewd nor crude, "Augustan Drama" (according to later eighteenth-century critics) was distinguished for its instructive, good-natured comedies and its pathetic and ennobling tragedies.

Literary periodization is frequently problematic, and as Howard Weinbrot (1978) has demonstrated, the application of "Augustan" to the early eighteenth century is especially dubious, given that many authors of the time explicitly rejected Augustan Rome as a model of state patronage for the literary arts. However, in the case of the drama, the use of this term seemed apt to many eighteenth-century commentators when describing the era around the turn of the century. For example, in a poem published as prefatory matter to Charles Marsh's 1738 tragedy, *Amasis, King of Egypt*, the author celebrates the turn of the century as "an *Augustan* age, / When *farce* durst not appear upon the *stage*, / E'er *pantomime* cou'd rear its mimic head, / Or *French buffoon'ries* did the land o'erspread." According to Marsh, the drama of that period was an "*Augustan* age" because it had not been adulterated by the low genres of farce and pantomime or by the pernicious influence of French culture. Marsh was not alone in this opinion. The previous year, when Opposition and government writers were debating the merits of the Stage Licensing Act of 1737, a ministerial writer in the *Daily Gazetteer* asked, "whether there be any comparison between the rude Farces of our last ten Years, and the Comedies that were written in the ten Years that preceded them?" This is a rhetorical question and the implied answer is an emphatic "No." Even Oliver Goldsmith endorses this view. In his "Essay on the Theatre," published to generate interest in the premiere of *She Stoops to Conquer* (1773), he points to the comic drama of this era as exemplary and suggests that the London stage needs to return to the models provided by writers like Sir John Vanbrugh (1664–1726) and Colley Cibber (1671–1757).

Those eighteenth-century opinions have not endured. Although the best plays from the Augustan era held the stage for generations, modern criticism has been oddly ungenerous in its treatment of them. For a long time, critical surveys and anthologies of comedy skipped from the 1670s to the 1770s with little more than a passing glance at the early eighteenth century. And the tragedies suffered a worse fate, being almost entirely ignored. More recently, scholarship and classroom anthologies have begun to correct this oversight, but the old opinions still hold powerful sway and so comic playwrights of the period continue to be overlooked because they are neither William Wycherley (c. 1640–1715) nor Richard Brinsley Sheridan (1751–1816), and tragic ones because they are neither Shakespeare nor George Lillo (1691–1739). Scholars are, of course, welcome to their aesthetic judgments,

but when those judgments distort our understanding of an era in serious ways, some correction is in order. Correction of that sort is particularly important for the Augustan era precisely because it was idealized in the eighteenth century and has been unduly chastised or ignored in modern scholarship.

THE THEATRICAL CONTEXT

If "Augustan" is meant to conjure up associations of enlightened political patronage of the arts, then applying that term to the drama at the turn of the eighteenth century is a little misleading. The years between 1690 and 1715 roughly correspond to the reigns of the late Stuart monarchs, William and Mary (r. 1689–1702), and Queen Anne (r. 1702–14), none of whom sought to exercise much influence over the theaters. But even if "Augustan" is meant to conjure up something fuzzier, like a "Golden Age" of eighteenth-century drama, the designation is still liable to objection. For the most part, the period was a deeply unsettled one in theatrical history, marked by prolonged upheaval in the management and composition of the London theatrical companies, generic change, shifting business practices, and a general uncertainty about the stability and future of theatrical entertainments in London. For the playwrights, actors, and theatrical personnel who flourished in this era, their distance from the Augustan ideal must have seemed great, yet to those with the historical distance of just over a decade, the period seemed like a golden age against which they could measure present shortcomings.

The 1690s began with a single acting company in London, but discontent over managerial practices at this "United Company" led to an actors' rebellion in 1695 in which Thomas Betterton (c. 1635–1710), the leading performer of the era, set up a rival company in Lincoln's Inn Fields. Conceived as an actors' cooperative, the Lincoln's Inn Fields troupe operated under a license from the Lord Chamberlain and competed against Drury Lane for the next decade. Operating under a royal patent, Drury Lane was led by Christopher Rich (1657–1714), whose abusive business practices were a constant source of irritation and turmoil, eventually prompting the Lord Chamberlain to "silence" him in 1709, forbidding his involvement in the theater, a state of affairs which lasted until the regime change that occurred upon the death of Queen Anne in 1714. In the midst of this period, the playwright Sir John Vanbrugh (1664–1726) was granted a royal patent and constructed a new theater in the Haymarket, where he planned to offer both spoken-word plays and operas. This became the principal venue for operatic entertainment in London until the end of the eighteenth century. However the introduction of opera presented financial challenges that neither Vanbrugh nor his successors could ever satisfactorily solve. It also introduced a foreign influence that drew audiences away from spoken-word British drama and, in the eyes of its critics, vitiated the taste of the play-going public. Some measure of stability was achieved after 1714, when John Rich (1692–1761) took over the management of Lincoln's Inn Fields, operating by virtue of his father's patents, and Drury Lane operated under a lifetime patent granted to Sir Richard Steele (1672–1729), with the day-to-day operations overseen by the triumvirate of actors, Colley Cibber (1671–1757), Barton Booth (1681–1733), and Robert Wilks (c. 1665–1732).

All of those conditions, mentioned in the barest of outlines here, added up to a distinctly unsettled atmosphere in which the only certainty was change. Two decades later, an author like Marsh might regard it as an "*Augustan* age" that preceded the commercial degradations of the next era, but that was an idealized view. The reality was that these commercial degradations – *entr'acte* entertainments, afterpiece farces, and pantomimes – were repertory innovations from this period which were introduced in order to keep audiences interested in the theater. A Shakespeare play might be announced as the mainpiece on a given evening, but advertisements from the period show that audiences

were also drawn in by performers like Mr. Clinch of Barnet (1664–1734), who did a routine of comic impersonations between the acts. Betterton imported French singers and dancers at great expense to enliven productions at Lincoln's Inn Fields. And in December 1709 the *Tatler* commented upon the great popularity of Martin Powell's satirical puppet shows, which were drawing audiences away from both operas and the plays. And all of this preceded the introduction of pantomime, that much-maligned theatrical form that appeared in the mid-1710s and became a source of audience delight and critical disdain for the rest of the century.

THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

While the theatrical world was in a state of confusion and change, the social context in which the theaters operated can only be described as perilous. This period saw the greatest threat to the legitimacy of drama since the civil wars, which came in the form of the Collier Controversy. Named after Jeremy Collier (1650–1726), a High Church Anglican clergyman with Jacobite sympathies (hardly a Puritan), the controversy began in 1698 with the publication of his book, *A Short View of the Profaneness and Immorality of the English Stage*. It was anything but a "short" view; rather, it was an extended and spirited fulmination against the stage on the grounds of morality, profanity, blasphemy, and (perhaps surprisingly for an anti-theatrical creed) aesthetics. Self-consciously modeled on the dramatic criticism of the groundbreaking critic, Thomas Rymer (c. 1643–1713), Collier's book argued that the drama of the present age exhibited both bad morals and bad taste. He asserted an explicitly moral, didactic function as the goal of all plays and then analyzed the work of contemporary playwrights and found them to be grossly deficient in promoting virtue and chastising vice.

Collier's decision to focus on contemporary playwrights was a shrewd one because it drew authors into print. Vanbrugh, William Congreve (1670–1729), and many others took up their pens in their own defense, which only served to extend the controversy and give Collier an opportunity to publish multiple replies. More than 50 individual titles were published as part of the print war over the next two decades, making this the most significant theatrical controversy of the long eighteenth century. Scholarly opinion remains divided over the impact of Collier and his allies. Some, like John Loftis (1959), believe that pressure from the Collierites led to a shift in comic dramaturgy that introduced exemplary characters and an adherence to poetic justice in the last act (the good are rewarded and the bad are punished). But others, like Robert D. Hume (1999), argue that although Collier aroused heated debate, his work failed to achieve his stated or implicit goals.

Whether or not the Collier Controversy is responsible for changes in dramatic practice, there can be no doubt that the atmosphere it created was one of polarization and outright intimidation. Moral reform groups like the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge and the Society for the Reformation of Manners were non-governmental associations that sought to address a range of social ills, including cleaning up (or abolishing) the theaters. Their influence on the theaters was strongest between their establishment in the 1690s and the 1720s, a period during which they underwrote the publication of anti-theatrical tracts, handed out blank notebooks to members and encouraged them to transcribe the profane and blasphemous dialogue they heard in the theaters, and in a few cases successfully took legal action against actors for delivering offensive lines. This was cause for serious concern because the fines ranged from £5 to £10, which were substantial sums. It was also a strong challenge to the government because the actors were fined for speaking lines that were implicitly or explicitly approved for performance by the Lord Chamberlain, who was head of the royal household and overseer of the stage. Queen Anne responded by ordering the theaters to be vigilant over the morality of plays, but

she never conceded any legitimacy to the moral reformers. Rather, in 1704 she granted a theatrical license to Vanbrugh and Congreve – two of Collier's biggest targets – so that they could start a new theater.

The polarized atmosphere must have made the decision to attend a play a more fraught (or at least more deliberate) one than before. There is unfortunately little in the way of play reviews or personal observation in the form of diaries or letters to tell us about the audience and atmosphere in the playhouses at this time. Nevertheless, one can learn a little from sources like the *Tatler* (1709–11) and *Spectator* (1711–12), which suggest that a certain level of moral zeal could cohabitate quite easily with an urbane love of the theater. Addison and Steele wrote didactic plays, championed a polite morality, and cultivated appreciation for drama among their readers. That readership was presumably as wide and diverse as the population of play-goers in London. The old view that the Restoration audience was made up of an elite coterie of Royalists has long since been discarded, and the general consensus is that although the theaters sometimes experienced difficulty attracting crowds at the turn of the century, the nature of the audience was becoming, like London itself, more socially diverse than before. If we believe the theatrical anecdotes in *Tatler* and *Spectator* and attend to the audience appeals in the prefaces, prologues, and epilogues to the plays themselves, the audience was becoming more mercantile, more nationalistic, and a bit more prudish in character.

GENERIC INNOVATIONS IN COMEDY

As the character of the audience changed, so did the nature of their stage entertainments. The biggest changes were evident in the comedies. Generic terms like "Restoration Comedy" or "Comedy of Manners" once dominated modern criticism, and they continue to exert a lamentable influence over teaching. Basically interchangeable, they refer to a handful of comic plays by a small number of playwrights who flourished prior to the 1690s. These plays were supposedly representative of the comic drama of the late seventeenth century and are characterized by sexual frankness, verbal brilliance, urbane characters, sophisticated wit, and punitive satire. But the works of Congreve, John Dryden (1631–1700), Wycherley, Sir George Etherege (1636–92), and Aphra Behn (1640–89) are neither homogenous nor representative. Some are undoubtedly great plays and several remained in the repertory for decades. But boiling down the comic plays produced in the late seventeenth century to "Comedy of Manners" is a gross misrepresentation. This is important to understand since the comedies of the Augustan age have suffered in critical esteem because the best ones are quite different from the "Comedy of Manners" in important ways. They were generically innovative, they were long popular, and they continue to be enjoyable to read and to see in performance.

The leading comic dramatists of the period were Congreve, George Farquhar, Cibber, Steele, Vanbrugh, and Susanna Centlivre (1667–1723). Vanbrugh and Congreve are often lumped in with the "Comedy of Manners" set, but their work belongs to this era and is more diverse than many have recognized. Generalizing about the work of several writers spanning a period of 25 years is a hazardous enterprise, but a critical consensus has emerged that the comedies of this era express a new social outlook, tempered by the moral reform movement and inspired by the burgeoning culture of politeness and sociability. Stuart Tave (1960) has argued that comic practice in Britain underwent a significant shift from aggressive sneering in the late seventeenth century to good-natured laughter in the eighteenth century – the difference between laughing at someone and laughing with them. The comic plays from the Augustan period are key texts in this shift. But even as critics have recognized this, they have struggled to define the comedy of this era, calling it "humane," "genteel," "sentimental," "moral/immoral," and

"sympathetic satire." Even so, there is a basic agreement that these plays are generally more indulgent of the follies of their characters than earlier works, more likely to celebrate eccentricity than wit, and more prone to mingled high-minded sentiments and emotionalism than previous comedies.

Of all the comic playwrights who flourished in this era, perhaps the most significant is George Farquhar (1678–1707), who wrote, among other things, *The Constant Couple* (1699), *The Recruiting Officer* (1706), and *The Beaux' Stratagem* (1707) – all repertory favorites for many decades. To use an eighteenth-century phrase, his characters are "no better than they should be," meaning that they are neither paragons of virtue nor contemptible fools. In *The Beaux' Stratagem*, for instance, the main characters, Aimwell and Archer, are rakish tricksters who are rewarded in the end. A strict adherence to poetic justice would either punish them or withhold a reward – and both conventional morality and the law would forbid the divorce at the end of the play between Sullen and his wife. Similarly, the characters of Captain Plume and Brazen in *The Recruiting Officer* are liable to condemnation as a whoremonger and a braggart, respectively. And yet the play clearly leads us to an indulgent acceptance (even celebration) of their shortcomings. For Farquhar, the goal was to amuse without presenting stark challenges to prevailing notions of propriety. In his "Discourse upon Comedy" (1702), he said that "Comedy is no more at present than a *well-fram'd Tale handsomly told, as an agreeable Vehicle for Counsel or Reproof*" (Farquhar 1988, 2.377). In this statement, we see the careful balancing of entertainment and instruction, but with the emphasis clearly on the former. Like most British playwrights of the early modern era, he was equally dismissive of moral purists like Collier and aesthetic purists in the classical tradition. He states quite bluntly that the rules of "*English* Comedy don't lie in the Compass of *Aristotle*, or his Followers, but in the Pit, Box, and Galleries" (2.380). Farquhar wrote for a commercial stage and so was as attentive to the demands of his diverse audience as Shakespeare had been to his.

The most famous comedy of this era is Steele's *The Conscious Lovers*, which premiered in 1722 but was drafted as early as 1707. A prominent critic and cultural arbiter, Steele aimed not just to please his audience, but also to influence the direction of comic playwriting. In his famous preface to the play, he claimed that his goal was to break with tradition and produce "a joy too exquisite for laughter." To that end, the play featured exemplary main characters and was self-consciously didactic. Steele stated that the entire work was written to showcase the scene in which the two male leads avoid a duel, rather than engage in one. Instead of gratifying the audience's expectation of action, he withholds that action and shows how reflection and self-examination can prevent misfortune. The word "conscious" in the title refers to this intellectual process. The lovers, Bevil Jr. and Indiana, are genuinely in love, but they are not impulsive. Many of the standard comic situations are not employed, and Steele seems intent on showing the need to balance passion and reason in our lives. The play was immediately popular and it entered the repertory and remained a favorite for the rest of the century.

A number of critics have credited *The Conscious Lovers* with inaugurating the genre of "sentimental comedy." But just as "Comedy of Manners" is a simplification of late seventeenth-century practice, so is "sentimental" an overly broad generic term. Many comic plays in the eighteenth century did experiment with exemplary characters and pursued high-minded goals, but an overwhelming majority of comic plays remained faithful to the traditions of eschewing any clear moral purpose and featuring characters who are negative examples. Centlivre's breezy plays are a good example of this – especially *A Bold Stroke for a Wife* (1717), which features a series of contemptible suitors who are outwitted by a young soldier whose trickery is rewarded by gaining his lover's hand at the end of the play. Plays like this may not merit extended literary analysis, but they were

highly effective performance vehicles and became perennial favorites. Looking at performance records from the eighteenth century, Shirley Strum Kenny (1976) has shown that the comic drama of the Augustan era became repertory staples throughout the century. Although they have been unduly overlooked by contemporary scholars, the works of Centlivre, Cibber, Farquhar, Vanbrugh, and Steele were the very exemplars of comedy for most of the eighteenth century. Performances of these plays constituted a significant percentage of the acting season at the major London theaters, and the plays were consistently reprinted throughout the century. And it is worth noting that when David Garrick gave his final performance on the London stage in 1776, he chose to end his illustrious career not with a Shakespeare tragedy, but with a Centlivre comedy.

AUGUSTAN TRAGEDY

If the comedies from the Augustan era have often been neglected by scholars, the tragedies have suffered from outright contempt. Allardyce Nicoll's (1955) important *History of English Drama, 1660–1900* heaps scorn on the tragedies from this period, damning them as a mélange of various subgenres of serious drama, including heroic drama, the neoclassical play (which he labels "pseudo-classical"), political drama, and Shakespearean imitation. He is especially vexed by the supposedly slavish adherence of tragedians to the neoclassical unities of time, place, and action. Surveying the field, he sees virtually no redeeming work in the tragic mode except for Lillo's "domestic" tragedies, *The London Merchant* (1731) and *Fatal Curiosity* (1736), both of which fall well outside of this period. Following Nicoll, others have argued that tragedy underwent a general demise in this period, suffering equally at the hands of neoclassical critics who insisted on the unities and moralists who demanded that all plays adhere to poetic justice. These critics worry that if every tragedy must end with a tidy distribution of rewards and punishments, then a playwright's ability to trouble an audience into thought about fate and justice is severely limited. There may be some truth to these characterizations, but they are certainly overstated. Addison's *Cato* (1713), after all, is both coldly classical and moralistic, yet it held the stage for more than a century.

Comedy dominated the repertory in the Augustan period, but tragedy was far from dead. In terms of serious drama, the repertory continued to include some heroic dramas and other love-and-honor plays of the late seventeenth century. Popular plays from before the civil wars also figured in the repertory – especially adaptations of Shakespeare. When considering new plays, the most conspicuously successful ones took the form of the "she-tragedy," a term coined by Nicholas Rowe (1674–1718), who excelled in the genre. Beginning in the 1680s, playwrights had begun to explore the dramatic possibilities of moving the focus of tragic action from male heroism to female suffering. Thomas Otway's *The Orphan* (1680) is an important early example. Although British tragedies have always had major female roles (Lady Macbeth, Cleopatra), the introduction of female performers after 1660 promised a more natural and powerful representation of female distress and eroticism. One of the most influential plays to exploit both of these opportunities is Thomas Southerne's *The Fatal Marriage* (1694), which features the travails of Isabella, a young nun who renounces her orders so that she can marry, only to then inadvertently commit bigamy. Wracked by guilt, she goes mad and commits suicide. Spurred on by the success of *The Fatal Marriage*, Betterton's company at Lincoln's Inn Fields and Rich's at Drury Lane began to produce more such tragedies that focused on pathos and featured female protagonists and played to the strengths of popular actresses like Elizabeth Barry (1658–1713) and Anne Bracegirdle (1671–1748). The greatest practitioner of the "she-tragedy" genre was Rowe. *The Fair Penitent* (1703), *The Tragedy of Jane Shore* (1714), and *The Tragedy of Lady Jane Gray* (1715) all focus

on distressed female protagonists and all have a decidedly domestic focus, leading some to regard Rowe as a transitional figure between the pathos of Otway and the domestic tragedies of Lillo. The Augustan era did not give rise to the "she-tragedy" genre, but it gave the genre its name and some of the finest plays of its kind.

The period is also distinguished for emergence of a trio of female authors who wrote a number of successful plays: Delarivier Manley (c. 1670–1724), Mary Pix (1666–1709), and Catherine Trotter (1679–1749). Pix and Trotter, in particular, made important contributions to tragedy in popular plays such as Pix's *Ibrahim, the Thirteenth Emperour of the Turks* (1696), which was revived in 1702, 1714, and 1715. Trotter wrote almost exclusively in the tragic mode and achieved her greatest success with *Fatal Friendship* (1698), a tragedy that focuses on love complications and the influence of money on human actions, instead of matters of state. This focus on romantic love is a feature of many tragic and serious plays of the period, and is something that has troubled classically minded critics. Trotter herself expressed some qualms in the front matter to her *Unhappy Penitent* (1701). The work of all three women is evidence that new opportunities for playwrights arose with the establishment of the second theater at Lincoln's Inn Fields and that, although women playwrights were vulnerable to misogynistic ridicule (as in the anonymous satire, *The Female Wits*, which is an ad feminem attack on the trio), there was an audience for their work. Their serious plays exhibit a mingling of different tragic modes, including the heroic, the "she-tragedy," and the political or "patriot" play. This is characteristic of tragedies of the period generally. For some, like Nicoll, this generic indeterminacy equals a "blundering attempt" on the part of playwrights who did not have a clear sense of what they wanted to write. But just because the serious playwrights of the Augustan period were neither Otway nor Lillo, we need not condemn them. Their work was popular with audiences, and in the case of Manley, Pix, and Trotter, there is a consensus among critics that their plays offer particularly rich representations of women and exhibit a proto-feminism that distinguishes their work from their male peers.

The serious drama of the Augustan era also registered the ever-growing popularity of musical performances. The season of 1703–4 saw what may be the first subscription concert series advertised to the public – evidence that, at a time when spoken-word plays were not drawing big crowds, there was a growing appetite for musical performance. The operas of the time were serious in subject and treatment, and if the opera presented fiscal challenges to theatrical managers, it also produced passionate responses from audience members. Among the most ambitious and successful serious plays from the period were musical ones. Peter Anthony Motteux's and Thomas Clayton's *Arsinoe* (1705) was a tremendously popular all-sung opera. It was meant for performance at the new Haymarket theater that Vanbrugh and Congreve were starting up. However, sensing the drawing power of this opera, Christopher Rich somehow contrived to steal it out from under the competition and premiered it at Drury Lane. Vanbrugh had a success of his own the following season with George Granville's *The British Enchanters* (1706). And Rich enjoyed another runaway hit that season with an English adaptation of Giovanni Bononcini's *Camilla* (1706). The rivalry over opera between the two theaters was just as fierce as the competition over pantomime would be the following decade. And the music, bombast, and pathos that characterize serious opera no doubt had an effect on audience taste for spoken-word tragedy at this time.

Considering the serious drama of the eighteenth century, Susan Staves (2007) notes that there is a paradoxical relationship between the way that critics lavished attention on tragedy, praising it as a high art form and the way that audiences clearly preferred new comedies to new tragedies. She suggests that theatrical practice never matched critical theory, resulting in serious plays that are more properly called romances than tragedies because many

of them avert catastrophe at the end and re-affirm the fundamental virtue of the main characters. In this sense, the serious drama of the Augustan period is similar to the comic: both exhibit a tendency to eschew the negative and accentuate the positive. In tragedy, horrors are often averted so that innate goodness in the form of moral or political virtue can be celebrated. In comedy, rakes are reclaimed and fools are indulged instead of being exposed to punitive ridicule. Both forms began to appeal more to pathos, making comedy more earnest and tragedy more romantic. In so doing, the drama of this period played a crucial role in the slow process of merging the distinct forms of comedy and tragedy into the modern "drama" or "problem play."

SEE ALSO: Afterpieces; Collier, Jeremy; Comedy; Georgian Drama; Heroic Drama; Restoration Drama; Theater Buildings; Theater and Commerce; Theater Criticism; Tragedy.

REFERENCES

Farquhar, George. 1988. "A Discourse upon Comedy." In *The Works of George Farquhar*, edited by Shirley Strum Kenny, Volume 2, 364–86. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hume, Robert D. 1999. "Jeremy Collier and the Future of the London Theater in 1698." *Studies in Philology* 96: 480–511.

Kenny, Shirley Strum. 1976. "Perennial Favorites: Congreve, Vanbrugh, Cibber, Farquhar, and Steele." *Modern Philology* 73: S4–S11.

Loftis, John. 1959. *Comedy and Society from Congreve to Fielding*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Nicoll, Allardyce. 1955. *A History of English Drama, 1660–1900. Volume 2: Early Eighteenth Century Drama*, 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Staves, Susan. 2007. "Tragedy." In *The Cambridge Companion to British Theatre, 1730–1830*, 87–102. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tave, Stuart M. 1960. *The Amiable Humorist: A Study in the Comic Theory and Criticism of the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Weinbrot, Howard. 1978. *Augustus Caesar in "Augustan" England: The Decline of a Classical Norm*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

FURTHER READING

Corman, Brian. 1993. *Genre and Generic Change in English Comedy 1660–1710*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Howe, Elizabeth. 1992. *The First English Actresses: Women and Drama, 1660–1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hughes, Derek. 1996. *English Drama, 1660–1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hume, Robert D. 1976. *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kinservik, Matthew J. 2002. *Disciplining Satire: The Censorship of Satiric Comedy on the Eighteenth-Century London Stage*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.

Marsden, Jean I. 2001. "Tragedy and Varieties of Serious Drama." In *A Companion to Restoration Drama*, edited by Susan J. Owen, 228–42. Oxford: Blackwell.

Milhous, Judith, and Robert D. Hume. 2012. *The London Stage, 1660–1800, Part 2, 1700–1729, A New Version*. www.personal.psu.edu/hb1/London%20Stage%202001/. Accessed June 20, 2013.

Autobiography *see* BIOGRAPHY