

Notes

Introduction: The literary coterie in the eighteenth-century media landscape

1. Lisa Gitelman, *Always Already New: Media, History, and the Data of Culture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006), p. 1.
2. James Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.*, ed. R.W. Chapman and intro. Pat Rogers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), p. 231; Elizabeth Montagu to Sarah Scott, 25 [May 1773], mo5940.
3. For an overview of these men's innovations, see Betty A. Schellenberg, "The Second Coming of Book," in *Producing the Eighteenth-Century Book: Writers and Publishers in England, 1650–1800*, ed. Laura L. Runge and Pat Rogers (Newark, NJ: University of Delaware Press, 2009), pp. 30–52.
4. Moyra Haslett, *Pope to Burney, 1714–1779: Scriblerians to Bluestockings* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 51. I address Haslett's argument, which examines phenomena related to those I study in this book, in more detail below.
5. In my use of the qualifier "literary" to designate the coteries and the field of cultural activity I focus on in this study, I am alluding to the notion of "letters" in the traditional sense of a broad field of humanistic inquiry and writing, while acknowledging the more narrowly belletristic sense of the term that becomes dominant from the eighteenth century. This doubleness is reflected in the breadth of coterie members' own interests and endeavors in the areas of history, antiquarianism, criticism, translation, natural history, theology, etc., combined with a more specific focus that tends to set apart exchanges particular to the life of the coterie – highly accomplished familiar letters, occasional poems, imitations, and criticism of literary works and genres.
6. Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1998), pp. 171–72, 182f; David McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450–1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 8, 175–78.
7. Johns, *Nature of the Book*, pp. 370–74. More precisely, Johns claims that "Book trade conflicts conditioned the making and content of histories of printing; and historical knowledge in turn conditioned the outcome of book

- trade conflicts” (p. 372); see also Nicholas Barker’s similar claim that book history was founded in the mid-eighteenth century with the celebration of the tercentenary of printing and with subsequent inside accounts of the trade such as John Nichols’ *Literary Anecdotes* (“Reflections on the History of the Book,” in *Form and Meaning in the History of the Book: Selected Essays* [London: British Library, 2003], p. 272). Alvin Kernan, *Printing Technology, Letters, and Samuel Johnson* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987); Michael J. Suarez, S.J., “Introduction,” in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 5: 1695–1830*, ed. Michael F. Suarez, S.J. and Michael L. Turner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 1–35 (at p. 2).
8. Arthur Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995); Peter Beal, *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and Their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998); Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993); Margaret J.M. Ezell, *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999) (at p. 288).
 9. Love, *Scribal Publication*, p. 288; Peter Beal, “Notions in Garrison: The Seventeenth-Century Commonplace Books,” in *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society 1985–1991*, ed. W. Speed Hill (Binghamton, NY: Renaissance English Text Society, 1993), pp. 131–47 (at p. 146). Ezell does locate the definitive shift to print with the emergence of the marketed literary series (e.g. Bell’s *British Poets*, 1777–89, and the London-based *The English Poets* with Johnson’s prefaces, 1779–81) in the late 1770s. However, she does not discuss any cases of social authorship beyond the 1730s writings of Alexander Pope.
 10. Justice, for example, in his discussion of the suppression of Frances Burney’s *The Wiltings*, applies the term “anachronistic” to the coterie culture Burney is satirizing, though it is not clear whether for him that culture is indeed so, or whether Burney is attempting to make it appear a thing of the past (“Suppression and Censorship in Late Manuscript Culture: Frances Burney’s Unperformed *The Wiltings*,” in *Women’s Writing and the Circulation of Ideas*, ed. George L. Justice and Nathan Tinker [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002], pp. 201–22); see my brief discussion of *The Wiltings* in Chapter 5 of this study.
 11. Nicholas Barker, “In Praise of Manuscripts,” in *Form and Meaning in the History of the Book: Selected Essays* (London: British Library, 2003), p. 27; McKitterick, *Search for Order*, pp. 22–52; Donald H. Reiman, *The Study of Modern Manuscripts: Public, Confidential, and Private* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), pp. 38–46.

12. Ezell, *Social Authorship*, p. 16; Kathryn R. King, “Elizabeth Singer Rowe’s Tactical Use of Print and Manuscript,” in Justice and Tinker, eds., pp. 158–81, and “Scribal and Print Publication,” in *The History of British Women’s Writing, 1690–1750*, ed. Ros Ballaster (Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 127–44; Sarah Prescott, *Women, Authorship and Literary Culture, 1690–1740* (Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 9–10 (at p. 10), 26–30; Christine Gerrard, *Aaron Hill: The Muses’ Projector 1685–1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), ch. 3 and 4; Stephen Karian, *Jonathan Swift in Print and Manuscript* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 2; Reiman, *Modern Manuscripts*, p. 24; Christina Lupton, *Knowing Books: The Consciousness of Mediation in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), pp. 95–121. Love discusses the applicability of Walter Benjamin’s notion of the “aura” of a work of art in an age of mechanical reproduction, drawing also on Walter Ong and Alvin Kernan (*Scribal Publication*, pp. 290–93). Going beyond the period of this study, Michelle Levy has shown, in *Family Authorship and Romantic Print Culture* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), how common collaborative scribal production was to the production of Romantic-era print works.
13. David Thorburn and Henry Jenkins, “Introduction: Toward an Aesthetics of Transition,” in Thorburn and Jenkins, eds., *Rethinking Media Change* (Cambridge, MA: MIT, 2004), pp. 11, 2–3; Charles R. Acland, “Introduction,” in *Residual Media*, ed. Charles R. Acland (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), p. xxiii; Thorburn and Jenkins, “Introduction,” *Rethinking Media Change*, p. 11; Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 122.
14. “Hypermediacy” is the term applied by Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin, in *Remediation: Understanding New Media* (Cambridge, MA: MIT, 1999), to a form which combines media to produce a highly self-conscious mediated product.
15. Haslett, *Scriblerians to Bluestockings*, pp. 1–30, esp. p. 25.
16. Catherine Talbot to Montagu, October 29, [1761], mo5139; Talbot to Carter, April 26, 1760, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, p. 2.322; Montagu to Lyttelton, 9 [June 1771], mo1478; Montagu to Lyttelton, November 8 [1772], mo1490. Lyttelton himself also used the term: when he hasn’t heard from his French correspondent Jean Drumgold regarding his history of Henry the 2nd, Lyttelton writes to Montagu, “I suppose it is not liked by him and his *Coterie*, and [he] does not care to say so” (September 4, 1770, mo1364).
17. Haslett, *Scriblerians to Bluestockings*, pp. 1–30 (at pp. 27, 1).

18. This definition is indebted particularly to Love's *Scribal Production* and to Paul Trolander and Zeynep Tenger's *Sociable Criticism in England 1625–1725* (Newark, NJ: University of Delaware Press, 2007), both of which focus on the seventeenth century; their analyses of the features of coterie writing are discussed further below. His valuable contributions to understanding the workings of literary sociability notwithstanding, Trolander has recently argued that the term "coterie" is "troubled and should be dispensed with," preferring to speak of literary networks. His objections appear to stem primarily from the fact that groups exchanging manuscript writings in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were often not geographically proximate, varied widely in their aims while employing the same methods, and held a primary goal of expansive, print-based influence (pp. 140–48, 217–20 [at p. 217]). While I share many of Trolander's views about the nature of coteries in an age of rapid print expansion, I consider it valuable to retain the term precisely so that historical nuances and variations between groups can come into focus as an object of study.
19. See the valuable work done to date on late eighteenth-century Edinburgh literary coteries by Pam Perkins (*Women Writers and the Edinburgh Enlightenment* [Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2010]), on the Aikin-Barbauld circle in the collection *The Dissenting Mind: The Aikin Circle, 1740s–1860s*, ed. Felicity James and Ian Inkster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), and on the Lunar Society of Birmingham by Jennifer Uglow (*The Lunar Men: The Friends Who Made the Future, 1730–1810* [London: Faber, 2002]).
20. Schellenberg, "Second Coming," pp. 33–37.
21. McKitterick, *Search for Order*, pp. 166–67, 188–89 (at p. 167).
22. Eve Tavor Bannet, *Empire of Letters: Letter Manuals and Transatlantic Correspondence, 1680–1820* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Matt Cohen, *The Networked Wilderness: Communicating in Early New England* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), p. 2; Adriana Craciun, "Oceanic Voyages, Maritime Books, and Eccentric Inscriptions," *Atlantic Studies: Global Currents* 10 (2013), 170–196; Susan E. Whyman, *The Pen and the People: English Letter Writers 1660–1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
23. Franco Moretti, *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for a Literary History* (London: Verso, 2005), p. 2.
24. Clifford Siskin and William Warner, "This Is Enlightenment: An Invitation in the Form of an Argument," in *This Is Enlightenment*, ed. Siskin and Warner (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), pp. 1–33, especially at pp. 10–12.
25. Raymond Williams, *Television: Technology and Cultural Form* (New York: Schocken, 1975), p. 23. Williams is arguing against the technological determinism that he observes in media theorist Marshall McLuhan's approach.

26. Cohen, *Networked Wilderness*, p. 2.
27. Deborah Heller and Steven Heller, “A Copernican Shift; or, Remapping the Bluestocking Heavens,” *Bluestockings Now!* ed. Deborah Heller (Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015), pp. 17–54 (at pp. 24–25).
28. Prescott, *Women, Authorship*, pp. 180, 182. While King presents Rowe’s manuscript context as feminine, Prescott has discussed the role of male connections such as Isaac Watts in Rowe’s circles (pp. 178–80).
29. See Ezell, *Writing Women’s Literary History* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993); *Social Authorship*; “The Gentleman’s Journal and the Commercialization of Restoration Coterie Literary Practices,” *Modern Philology* 89 (1992), 323–40.
30. Love, *Scribal Publication*, pp. 36–39.
31. Love, *Scribal Publication*, p. 83.
32. These terms are adopted by Ezell (*Social Authorship*), Love (*Scribal Publication*, ch. 7 only), and Reiman (*Modern Manuscripts*), respectively.
33. Love, *Scribal Publication*, pp. 199–200, 189, 282; Margaret J.M. Ezell, “The Posthumous Publication of Women’s Manuscripts and the History of Authorship,” in *Women’s Writing and the Circulation of Ideas: Manuscript Publication in England, 1550–1800*, ed. George L. Justice and Nathan Tinker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 130.
34. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*, especially ch. 1; Trolander and Tenger, *Sociable Criticism*, pp. 43–63 (at pp. 47, 43).
35. Such analyses have recently been carried out by Anni Sairio, in an examination of shifting language usage by members of Elizabeth Montagu’s circle (*Language and Letters of the Bluestocking Network: Sociolinguistic Issues in Eighteenth-Century Epistolary English* [Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 2009]) and by Heller and Heller, in their fascinating analysis of how the influence of the Bluestocking phenomenon was achieved (“A Copernican Shift,” pp. 17–54). My study is indebted to both of these projects, and I would like to see the possibilities of such approaches explored further. However, the conditions that must be met to make such studies statistically valid, and the narrowing of material that could be considered as a result, have made a quantitative approach impractical for my purposes.
36. For a very useful overview of the fundamental concepts of social network analysis, see Charles Kadushin’s *Understanding Social Networks: Theories, Concepts, and Findings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 64–74.
37. In focusing on the select group clustered around Montagu and Lyttelton in this period, I am deliberately avoiding an absorption of this coterie into the notion of “the Bluestockings,” as I explain in Chapter 2.

I. Wrest Park and North End

1. The sonnets first appeared in print for public consumption as, respectively, “Sonnet to the Author of *Clarissa*,” *Clarissa. Or, the History of a Young Lady*, 3rd ed. (London, 1750), n.p., and “Sonnet I,” in *A Collection of Poems by Several Hands*, 3 vols., 2nd ed., ed. Robert Dodsley (London, 1748), p. 2.324. In the latter the names were replaced by asterisks.
2. Jemima Campbell’s and Lady Mary Grey’s adolescent correspondence with Catherine Talbot indicates their communal or parallel reading of authors ranging from Homer, Virgil, Aristotle, Cicero, and Socrates to Sir Philip Sydney and Madame de Scudéry. Records from the early years of Grey’s marriage also refer regularly to works of history, philosophy (Locke, for example), and collections of sermons (see, for example, Talbot to Lady Mary Grey, July 17 and 21 August 1736, Add. MS 4291, ff. 254v–255 and 258–59; Campbell to Talbot, n.d., BLARS L 30/21/3/6; Talbot, *Wrest journal*, 1745, BLARS L 30/106, n.p.; Birch to Yorke, 9 June 1744, Add. MS 35396, f. 197v).
3. Joyce Godber, *The Marchioness Grey of Wrest Park, Vol. 47, The Publications of the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society* (np: Bedfordshire Historical Record Society, 1968), pp. 22–25. Principal biographical sources for Yorke and Grey are Godber and Philip C. Yorke, *The Life and Correspondence of Philip Yorke, Earl of Hardwicke, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913).
4. Lawry to Yorke, November 19, 1742, Add. MS 35605, f. 120v; Lawry to Yorke, June 10, 1743, Add. MS 35605, f. 142; Yorke to Birch, June 5, 1743, Add. MS 35396, f. 101; Lawry to Birch, October 6, 1743, Add. MS 35605, f. 163.
5. Birch’s biographer, A.E. Gunther, reports that the first earl’s patronage began in about 1735; I do not, however, see evidence of what Gunther suggests was “a degree of intimacy” between them, or of Birch acting as informal tutor to the boys (*The Life of the Rev. Thomas Birch D.D., F.R.S., 1705–1766* [Halesworth Suffolk: Halesworth Press, 1984], p. 35); similarly, Gunther consistently misreads the relationship between Birch and the younger Philip, representing the former as chafing under the latter’s patronage. I provide evidence of their friendship below, but the story of the two men’s exchange of portraits alone, recounted by Gunther, suggests otherwise (p. 31). The Edwards correspondence in the Bodleian library contains dated letters to Wray beginning 1722, when the two were young men interested in poetry, plays, dancing, and young women. Wray was likely the means of bringing Edwards into the orbit of Wrest. The best account of Edwards’ life and literary career is found in John A. Dussinger’s “General Introduction” to his recent edition of Edwards’ correspondence with Samuel Richardson (*Correspondence with Edwards*, pp. lv–lxxxix).

6. Grey to Mary Grey, May 8, 1743, BLARS L30/9a/1, f. 4; Talbot to Carter, October 24, 1751, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, p. 257.
7. Talbot, *Wrest Journal*, May 28; May 30; June 1, 1745, BLARS L 30/106, n.p.
8. Besides the *Athenian Letters*, the Grubstreet journal mentioned above, and the projects he suggested to Edwards, discussed below, he, Talbot, and Mary Grey began a collection of African Tales in 1741 that was later abandoned.
9. Edwards to Yorke, August 10, 1745; Edwards to Wray, March 14, 1745/6, Ms. Bodl. 1010, ff. 153, 196–97. “Animae quales neque candidiores/Terra tulit, neque quires me fit devincior alter” is from Horace’s fifth satire of Book I, lines 41–42, and is translated as “the most candid Gentlemen upon Earth, nor is there any one who has a greater Esteem for them than I” in *The Satires, Epistles, and Art of Poetry of Horace* (London, 1743), pp. 80–81.
10. Talbot, *Wrest Journal*, June 9, 1745, BLARS L 30/106, n.p.; Edwards to N. Paice, August 17, 1745, Ms. Bodl. 1010, f. 157.
11. Lawry to Yorke, May 3, 1740, Add. MS 35605, f. 40.
12. George Lyttelton, an important figure in this study’s account of scribal circles, seems only gradually to have grown closer to the younger generation of Yorkes, although he would write in 1763 of their father as “not only a dear and honor’d Friend, but the surest Guide of my Steps through the dark paths of that unpleasing political Labyrinth which lies before me” (Lyttelton to Montagu, November 8, 1763, m01317). Judging from the Birch and Hardwicke correspondences, Lyttelton was known to them in the early 1740s at second hand as Secretary of State; a closer connection primarily through coterie interests arose in the late 1740s and early 1750s. Grey records her eager interest in Lyttelton’s responses to *Wrest Park* in his first visit there, anxiously hoping that the place “should appear in its best Looks” (to Mary Grey, June 11, 1747, L30/9a/1, f. 142), and expresses admiration for his *Monody* on the death of his wife; Lyttelton in turn invited Philip and Jemima to Hagley in the early 1760s. Rose Mary Davis states in *The Good Lord Lyttelton: A Study in Eighteenth Century Politics and Culture* (Bethlehem, PA: Times Publishing, 1939) that Warburton introduced Lyttelton to Charles Yorke in 1745 (p. 275).
13. Edwards to N. Paice, August 17, 1745, Ms. Bodl. 1010, f. 157; Edwards to Wray, November 22, 1746, Ms. Bodl. 1010, ff. 224–25; on a later occasion, Edwards comments about Melmoth’s recently published translation of Pliny that “I cannot help admiring Lady Grey’s nice discernment, in the justness of the character she gave of it, without reading the original” (Edwards to Wray, August 8, 1747, Ms. Bodl. 1010, f. 260).
14. See entry for May 30, 1745 in Talbot’s *Wrest journal*, BLARS L 30/106, n.p., and L 30/21/3/10 and 12, dated May 22 and July 14, 1743 respectively, from Grey to Talbot.

15. Kadushin, *Understanding Social Networks*, pp. 29–30.
16. Although some sources say there were ten copies printed, Birch's letter to Yorke dated October 27, 1741 informs him that a dozen copies are at the bookbinder's (Add. MS 35396, f. 35); there may in fact have been a few more impressions in total, given the apparent distribution of one copy to each contributor.
17. Birch to Yorke, August 18, 1741, Add. MS 35396, f. 8.
18. For the group's views of Birch and his role, see Lawry to Yorke, October 6, 1741, Add. MS 35605, f. 113 (discussed below); Yorke to Birch, August 16, 1741, f. 7; Yorke to Birch, August 23, 1741, f. 10.
19. Lawry to Yorke, June 10, 1743, Add. MS 35605, f. 142; the Latin, from Horace's satires, translates loosely as "who are inspired geniuses, that sing in a grand style."
20. An exception is John Heaton, who writes in 1741 of print as abstracted from audience: "I expect shortly to see my sett of all letters compleat, a matter of no small enjoyment, for beside ye: pleasure of perusing many ingenious performances in common with but few; there is ye vanity of looking upon oneself as a small part of an author; for it is being in print that ye self complacency must generally arise from & not ye number of readers" (Heaton to Yorke, March 9, 1741, Add. MS 35605, f. 77).
21. Birch to Yorke, November 23, 1741, Add. MS 35396, f. 42v.
22. Birch to Yorke, September 2, 1742, Add. MS 35396, f. 52v; Yorke and Charles Yorke to Birch, September 5, 1742, Add. MS 35396, ff. 54–55v.
23. Derry to Talbot, January 7, 1742, transcribed by Birch in Add. MS 35396, ff. 83–87. The Bishop, a friend of Birch, insisted the latter was not his informant, although suspicion certainly fell on him in the Warburton instance. Whatever the source here, both Birch and the Bishop clearly saw the possession of manuscript materials as having an exchange value, in Birch's case a value that gave him an entrée into various social circles, as my later discussion of his circulation of Mulso's poetry will indicate.
24. Edwards to Wray, July 9, 1743, Ms. Bodl. 1010, f. 44; M. Capell to Birch, August 31, 1751, Add. MS 4302, f. 44; Talbot journal, August 24–25, 1753, Add. MS 46690, ff. 96v–97.
25. Elizabeth Montagu was given one of these copies, which she loaned to William Waller Pepys (see Chapter 5).
26. Northumberland to Hardwicke, January 5, 1782, Add. MS 35619, f. 7; Cooper to Hardwicke, June 18, 1782, Add. MS 35619, f. 190.
27. For example, Birch's commonplace book includes a sonnet to Wray dated April 20, 1742 (Add. MS 4456, f. 173) and Salter sends Yorke a Miltonic sonnet "in imitation of some late imitations" in 1743 (Salter to Yorke, June 30, 1743, Add. MS 35605, f. 151v); on April 27, 1744, Edwards

writes to John Clerke, one of the Athenians, who has loaned him a copy of Spenser, that “Much leisure and much reading of Spenser put me upon writing a few sonnets in imitation of his way; as You have a right to be troubled with my extravagances of this sort, I send You a sample which if it has the luck to please you may be followed with two or three more” (Ms. Bodl. 1010, f. 92); while the chronology cannot be established exactly, Edwards’ regular correspondence with Wray, Clerke and others associated with Wrest and his keen interest in that circle make it likely that he had seen some of the sonnets produced there. By the summer of 1745, he sends Yorke his sonnets, at the latter’s request (August 10, 1745, f. 154).

28. See Edwards to Wray, May 1, 1749, Ms. Bodl. 1011, f. 126, in anticipation of Warburton’s next attack: “Is it lawful to be satirical in a Sonnet? If it be, I struck off one yesterday, which I will shew you when we meet, merely from resentment of what You mentiond on this head. It is literally – ‘facit indignatio versum’ but perhaps for that reason fitter to be suppressed than published, even if the provocation should be given.” This sonnet, “Tongue-doughty Pedant; whose ambitious mind” was first printed with the 1750 third edition of Edwards’ *Canons of Criticism*.
29. See Edwards to Yorke, March 9, 1751, Add. MS 35606, ff. 11–12, for the sense that Yorke is attempting to keep Edwards busy and in good spirits, particularly from the year 1750, when Edwards decided he could no longer spend winters in town because of respiratory problems. I return to this function of the coterie for Edwards in Chapter 3.
30. Edwards to Lawry, May 27, 1754, Ms. Bodl. 1012, f. 172; April 11, 1751, Ms. Bodl. 1011, f. 259.
31. In 1741, Yorke writes to Birch, “You cannot imagine what prejudice our learned Friend [Warburton] has done himself, by the acrimony and coarse language, with which He treats his Adversaries: Many Persons, with whom I have conversed, seem to have stuck upon nothing but those sore places; & full of a just detestation, as they think for his Pedantry & self-sufficiency, do justice neither to [the] learning nor the merit of his Argumts” (October 6, 1741, Add. MS 35395, f. 32), but in 1751, shortly after the change of title of Edwards’ work to *Canons of Criticism* with its third edition, Lawry is not only calling for a reform of criticism, but for a set of “Canons” to guide the enterprise: “I have often thought that our Friend Edwards or one of the like Turn who has Learning & Wit with good breeding & candour might make themselves & others good diversion by ranging under proper Canons the quaintnesses & arrogancies of Those who have been or are properly speaking *Criticks by profession* from the Scaligers & Casaubon’s down to those of the present Age. For there breaks out thro’ most of them at times the Rusticitas agrestis et inconcinna – and their manner of puffing off themselves & those of

their own faction is not less fulsome than their way of setting at naught & triumphing over those who have gone before them in the same trade is too often bearish” (to Yorke, March 31, 1751, Add. MS 35606, f. 13). Edwards’ correspondence with Yorke in the fall of 1747 shows that the latter is urging him to respond to Warburton’s Shakespeare.

32. See *Correspondence with Edwards*, pp. lxxiii–lxx for a more detailed account of Edwards’ role in the matter of editing Spenser.
33. Gray to James Brown, August 8, 1759, *Correspondence of Gray*, pp. 2.632–33.
34. See Talbot’s apology to Birch, in a letter of July 12, 1753, Add. MS 4319, f. 108: “I am excessively Sorry this Letter is neither two hundred Years Old, nor a State Paper, nor in Cypher, nor very illegible, to make You some amends for the Commissions it makes bold to trouble You with.” Sir Joseph Yorke, a soldier and diplomat, often refers to his two older brothers’ documentary passions, including offering after the Battle of Culloden to send the papers found in the pockets of dead or captured Highland officers (Philip C. Yorke, *Life of Philip Yorke*, p. 1.328).
35. For an account of these early years, including Yorke’s role, see Edward Miller, *That Noble Cabinet: A History of the British Museum* (London: André Deutsch, 1973), chs. 2 and 3.
36. Lawry to Yorke, October 6, 1741, Add. MS 35605, f. 113.
37. Birch to Yorke, August 29, 1741, Add. MS 35396, f. 13; Yorke to Birch, September 20, 1741, Add. MS 35396, f. 22; Birch to Yorke, November 14, 1741, Add. MS 35396, f. 37; Birch to Yorke, November 23, 1741, Add. MS 35396, f. 42.
38. Yorke to Birch, May 24, 1748, Add. MS 35397, f. 106v; Add. MS 35400, f. 300v (the Latin phrase translates as “a day I will always remember with grief, and will always honour”).
39. Edwards to Yorke, October 13, 1747, Add. MS 35605, f. 301; Yorke to Birch, October 11, 1750, Add. MS 35397, f. 303.
40. Yorke to Birch, November 20, 1741, Add. MS 35396, ff. 40–40v; Birch to Yorke, June 30, 1753, Add. MS 35398, ff. 126–126v.
41. There are numerous references to this *jeu d’esprit* in the correspondence; Philip C. Yorke, biographer of the first earl, claims that the sheets, “when found later, for long passed as genuine documents and as the earliest examples of the English newspaper, and, when their origin was discovered, brought down upon their innocent perpetrator some severe moral reflections from a former librarian at the British Museum” (*Life of Philip Yorke*, p. 1.212).
42. The Yorke correspondence follows Johnson’s *Dictionary of the English Language* with interest and critical commentary through the initial proposal, the process of searching for quotations and supervising the

- amanuenses, its printing, the puff by Lord Chesterfield, the final push to write the historical preface, and the finished product.
43. Dustin Griffin, *Authorship in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Newark, NJ: Delaware University Press, 2014), p. 152; David Philip Miller, “‘The Hardwicke Circle’: The Whig Supremacy and Its Demise in the Eighteenth-Century Royal Society,” *Notes and Records of the Royal Society* 52 (1998), 73–91 (at 78).
 44. Walpole writes, “That family is very powerful; the eldest brother, Lord Royston, is historically curious and political; if, without its appearing too forced, you could at any time send him uncommon letters, papers, manifestoes, and things of that sort, it might do you good service” (qtd by Stephanie L. Barczewski, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. “Yorke, Philip, second earl of Hardwicke”).
 45. See a 1784 note by Hardwicke in which he records Middleton’s request, shortly before his death in 1750, to dedicate a translation of “Tullys Letters to Brutus” to him, “but my Father, when I mentioned it to him dissuaded Me from accepting it, which I acquiesced in, rather from Submission to his Authority than his Reasons” (Add. MS 35623, f. 127).
 46. Birch to Yorke, June 30, 1744, Add. MS 35396, f. 213. The teasing threat of the *Magazine of Magazines* is similarly held over Talbot in a letter from Grey cited in Chapter 3.
 47. Sarah Fielding, *The History of Ophelia*, ed. Peter Sabor (Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 2004), p. 37.
 48. Janine Barchas, *Graphic Design, Print Culture, and the Eighteenth-Century Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 96, 101.
 49. Samuel Richardson, *Clarissa*, ed. Angus Ross (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985), p. 231; Barchas, *Graphic Design*, pp. 105 and 98 (qtg. Richardson to Carter, December 18, 1747). Indeed, Richardson’s use of the poem with good intentions of honouring “the sex,” yet without permission (and without knowledge, initially, of its authorship) suggests that he was presuming on the extension of coterie practices to print; Carter’s complaint highlights the differing protocols which governed “publication” and attribution in the two media systems.
 50. See Schellenberg, “Second Coming,” pp. 37–39, which draws on the work of Barchas and of Leah Price, in ch. 1 of *The Anthology and the Rise of the Novel: From Richardson to George Eliot* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
 51. Richardson to Aaron Hill, January 5, 1747, *The Cambridge Edition of the Correspondence of Samuel Richardson I. Correspondence with Aaron Hill and the Hill Family*, ed. Christine Gerrard (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 236.
 52. Despite T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel’s challenge to this characterization of Richardson “as the happy centre of a group of admiring

(and rather silly) women” as “over-emphasized” in light of the equality of his relationships with Garrick, Fielding, Johnson, Edwards, Spence, and others (*Samuel Richardson: A Biography* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1971], pp. 537–39), the generalization has proven persistent; see, for example, Haslett’s recent discussion of the centrality of coterie groups and networks to the production of print literature of this period, in which she writes dismissively of Richardson’s “circle of lady advisers” varied only by “the many women writers, with whom he met and worked” (*Pope to Burney*, p. 12). For the masculinization of professional literary culture in the period, see Raymond Stephanson, *The Yard of Wit: Male Creativity and Sexuality, 1650–1750* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), on Pope as “a public icon exemplifying male genius, literary fame and wealth, and the cultural status of the new professional author” (p. 19); Linda Zionkowski, *Men’s Work Gender, Class, and the Professionalization of Poetry, 1660–1784* (Basingstoke and NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001) links the emerging discourse of authorial professionalization to an increasingly gendered dichotomy between the male professional and the female amateur author (see Chapter 5 below).

53. Yorke to Richardson, December 1, 1748, Victoria and Albert Museum, Forster Collection, FM XV.2, f 14; Birch to Yorke, September 29, 1750, Add. MS 35397, f. 299v.
54. Edwards to Richardson, December 2, 1748, Ms. Bodl. 1011, f. 76; Edwards to Wray, 16 January 1748/49, Ms. Bodl. 1011, f. 95; Edwards to Yorke, January 29, 1748/49, Ms. Bodl. 1011, f. 97.
55. Talbot to Richardson, [early March 1750], *Correspondence on Grandison*, p. 8.
56. Richardson also published his sonnet with the third edition of *Clarissa* in 1751.
57. *Correspondence with Edwards*, p. lxxii.
58. Rhoda Zuk, “Introduction” to the Hester Chapone section of *Bluestocking Feminism: Writings of the Bluestocking Circle, 1738–1785, Vol. 3: Catherine Talbot & Hester Chapone*, ed. Rhoda Zuk (London: Pickering & Chatto, 1999), p. 183. Works cited from this edition are noted as by “Chapone” even if composed before Mulso’s marriage.
59. Richardson to Sarah Chapone, August 30, 1758, *Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson*, ed. John Carroll (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964), p. 340; Talbot to Carter, December 17, 1750, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, pp. 1.370–71.
60. Carter to Talbot, May 13, 1753, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, p. 2.114.
61. Trolander and Tenger, *Sociable Criticism*, pp. 15, 63, 43. According to Trolander and Tenger, in such a system, work is circulated only as initiated by the author; the author seeks response in the form of “amendment criticism” that at once approves and corrects; and approbation of works, or

- “vouching,” is practiced “in order to acquire for the writer, the individual [doing the] vouching, and the group, cultural and literary prestige that could in turn be used to gain other political, economic, or literary benefits” (p. 51).
62. Richardson to Edwards, March 19, 1751, *Correspondence with Edwards*, pp. 204–8.
63. Edwards to Richardson, March 30, 1751, *Correspondence with Edwards*, pp. 208–14. The quotation is from Joseph Thurston’s 1730 poem *The Toilette*.
64. Edwards to Richardson, February 15, 1753, *Correspondence with Edwards*, pp. 275–78; Richardson to Edwards, *Correspondence with Edwards*, pp. 278–81.
65. Richardson to Edwards, February 21, 1752, *Correspondence with Edwards*, p. 244; Edwards to Richardson, February 28, 1752, *Correspondence with Edwards*, p. 246; Richardson to Edwards, July 25, 1754, *Correspondence with Edwards*, p. 337. In the end, Edwards couldn’t resist the bait, writing to Richardson on March 20, 1752, “I send you a sample by obeying in part the commands of your last letter; for I exhort instead of chiding, and address the advice to the sex in general, since a particular application, if the accident has left marks behind it, might make the lady ridiculous, whom I am really concerned for. I commend it to your candour to do with it what you please, with absolute power of life and death” (*Correspondence with Edwards*, p. 251; the poem is printed pp. 255–56).
66. Richardson to Edwards, February 20, 1753, *Correspondence with Edwards*, p. 279; Duncombe as qtd in Richardson to Edwards, July 25, 1754, *Correspondence with Edwards*, p. 338; Edwards to Richardson, December 15, 1752, *Correspondence with Edwards*, pp. 270–71 (see also Eaves and Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson*, p. 350 and n. 134). John Duncombe’s *The Feminiad; or, Female Genius: A Poem* (London, 1754) celebrated the compositions of the young ladies of this coterie (though without naming them) in the hope that “Should the public Curiosity be hereby rais’d,” “the Diffidence of the fair Authors [would] be so far remov’d as to gratify it” (“Advertisement,” n.p.).
67. Quoted in the “General Introduction” of *Correspondence with Edwards* (p. lv). Dussinger suggests that it was the “continual refrain” of criticism of Warburton and the “intimate feelings . . . about illness, suffering and religious patience” shared by the two men that made Richardson desire to keep the correspondence private.
68. For the typical phrasings and name substitutions of the Richardson–Carter letters, see June 9, 1753, June 12, 1753, June 22, 1753, July 4, 1753, and September 29, 1753, *Correspondence on Grandison*, pp. 80–85, 87–92, 142–44.
69. Discussing John Duncombe’s recently published *Feminiad*, Edwards exclaims to Richardson, “What pity it is that Mr. Duncombe was not acquainted with Miss Talbot?” (May 29, 1754, *Correspondence with Edwards*, pp. 327–29).

70. John Mulso to White, December 13, 1750, *Letters to White*, p. 45; he adds, “My Sister & Pressy [Mary Prescott] & my Brothers are much wth Him, & have spent some Days at his Country House.”
71. Richardson to Edwards, June 12, 1754, and Edwards to Richardson, July 18, 1754, *Correspondence with Edwards*, pp. 329–34 and 335–36; Duncombe to Richardson, August 16, 1754 and Richardson to Duncombe, August 24, 1754, *Correspondence of Richardson*, pp. 2.294 and 2.297; Edwards to Richardson, July 18, 1754, *Correspondence with Edwards*, p. 337 (insertion in edition); Edwards to Richardson, January 15, 1755, *Correspondence with Edwards*, p. 354; Richardson to Dewes, December 15, 1756, quoted in Eaves and Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson*, p. 347.
72. Chapone, “A Matrimonial Creed,” in *Talbot and Chapone*, p. 251.
73. Tom Keymer, *Richardson’s “Clarissa” and the Eighteenth-Century Reader* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 97.
74. Chapone, “Letters on Filial Obedience,” *The Posthumous Works of Mrs Chapone*, 2 vols. (London: 1807), pp. 2.30, 37, 142.
75. Mulso to Carter, March 25, 1750 and May 18, 1750, *Posthumous Works of Chapone*, pp. 1.26–27, 32 (it is not clear whether the reference is to Duncombe senior or junior); see also John Mulso’s report, in the letter quoted above, that the “great men” who have seen the exchange “think Mr R— hard pressed” (December 15, 1750, *Letters to White*, p. 45).
76. Keymer, *Richardson’s “Clarissa,”* p. 121.
77. Susan Staves, “Church of England Clergy and Women Writers,” *Reconsidering the Bluestockings*, ed. Nicole Pohl and Betty A. Schellenberg (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library Press, 2003), pp. 251–55 (at p. 103).
78. John Mulso to White, January 11, 1750, *Letters to White*, p. 26; November 4, 1751, *Letters to White*, p. 55.
79. Johnson to Hester Thrale, April 18, 1780, *Letters of Johnson*, p. 3.240.
80. Richardson to Mulso, August 21, 1754, *Correspondence of Richardson*, pp. 3. 209–10.
81. Carter to Talbot, April 22, 1752, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, p. 2.75. This may reflect also Carter’s somewhat ambiguous status in Richardson’s coterie, as discussed above.
82. Margaret Yorke, Philip’s younger sister, married Sir Gilbert Heathcote in 1749.
83. Birch to M. Capell, August 24, 1751, Add. MS 4302, f. 43; M. Capell to Birch, August 31, 1751, Add. MS 4302, f. 44.
84. Brotherton Lt 119, ff. 176–77; the ode is placed between “Sonnet wrote at the entrance of a Root-House in W—st Gardens. 1751. Wrote by Mr. E—ds” and “To the M—ss of G—y. By the Honble. Miss Margt. Y—ke. 1747.” I discuss this manuscript book in greater detail in the final chapter of this study.

85. Add. MS 4456, ff. 71 and 79. There are several manuscript copies of early Chapone poems preserved in the Montagu Collection (mo926, mo6892). Not only do we find there the poems eventually printed in the *Miscellanies* as “Ode to Peace. Written during the Late Rebellion. 1745,” “Ode to Health,” addressed to Elizabeth Carter in 1751, and “Ode Occasion’d by Reading Sonnets in the Style and Manner of Spenser, written by T. Edwards Esq^r 1749,” but there are two copies of the latter ode to Edwards, appearing to stem from different periods of circulation. In one, the name of “Richardson” is disguised as “Reynoldson”; this is presumably the earliest circulated version; one of the copies in Birch’s collection begins with “Ry” at this point, which is then altered to read “Richardson.” The shift of Mulso’s poems from scribal circulation to print is discussed in Chapter 3 below.
86. Delany to Dewes, November 16, 1751, *Correspondence of Delany*, p. 3.60; John Mulso to White, December 13, 1750, *Letters to White*, p. 45. On August 17, 1753, Richardson writes to Carter, “But what say you, Madam, to the Marriage-Act? Miss Mulso, who you know, has very great Reasoning-Powers, some time ago, set up for such an Advocate for Children, and argued so strenuously against the Parental Authority . . . that I the less Wonder, that (ingenious and excellent as she is) if the Debate got Wind, that it obtained the Notice of those, who brought in, and carried thro’ a Bill, which should by a National Law establish the Parental Authority, so violently attacked by a young Lady who is admired by all that know her. Things done in private have some times, and when least thought of, been proclaimed on the House-top” (*Correspondence on Grandison*, pp. 134–35). While Richardson is not making a confident cause-and-effect claim here, he certainly hints that the epistolary debate has circulated among the politically powerful.
87. Introductions to like-minded individuals, discussions of mutual reading, encouragement to compose, and exchanges of original poetry characterize the correspondence records of these friendships.
88. Carter describes him to Talbot as someone who “very kindly often gives me accounts of the clever people that fall in his way . . . he has quite an enthusiastic fondness for merit” (December 28, 1750, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, p. 1.374). Sylvia Harkstarck Myers presents the two women as meeting when HM was visiting her aunt Mrs. Donne (*The Bluestocking Circle: Women, Friendship, and the Life of the Mind in Eighteenth-Century England* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1990], p. 78).
89. Chapone, *Letters on the Improvement of the Mind*, 2 vols. (London, 1773), pp. 1.140–41.
90. Mark Granovetter, “The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited,” *Social Structure and Network Analysis*, ed. Peter V. Marsden and Nan Lin (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1982), pp. 105–30.

91. In an undated letter of July 1752, Talbot writes to Carter of Mulso, “I hope she has made you a perfect convert to a worthy man [i.e. Richardson] that you was too angry with, and who has the highest regard for you” (*Letters between Carter and Talbot*, p. 2.84).

2. Formation, fame, and patronage

1. Elizabeth Carter, *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1762), pp. 73–75.
2. The young Duchess of Portland was connected to the Yorke circle in that her mother-in-law, the Dowager Duchess, was also the mother of the Duke of Kent’s second wife, and therefore step-grandmother to Jemima Marchioness Grey. The Dowager Duchess seems to have been close to Grey and her circle at least until the death of her daughter, the Duke’s widow, in 1748. The younger Duchess of Portland and the Marchioness Grey were not intimates, however.
3. Similar questions of nomenclature have been raised recently by Emma Major, *Madam Britannia: Women, Church, and Nation, 1712–1812* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 81–83, and by Deborah Heller and Stephen Heller on pp. 17–24 of “A Copernican Shift; or, Remapping the Bluestocking Heavens.” Heller and Heller abstract the term “Bluestocking” from any distinct group of individuals, using it to designate a social and cultural function.
4. Relatively early in the first intense period of this coterie, Lyttelton writes to Montagu inquiring about the truth of an “ugly rumour” from Bristol about Carter’s death, which since Montagu has said nothing, he assumes is false; if true, he adds, “it would have given me a sensible Pain” (Lyttelton to Montagu [October 1760], mo1292). This suggests he does not yet consider himself directly connected to Carter, whereas in less than a year’s time he is addressing poetry to her.
5. Clare Barlow, in “Virtue, Patriotism and Female Scholarship in Bluestocking Portraiture,” in *Bluestockings Display’d: Portraiture, Performance and Patronage, 1730–1830*, ed. Elizabeth Eger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 60–80, has discussed the Montagu and Carter portraits in detail with respect to their common themes of a woman combining sociable ease with scholarship – qualities that, of course, embody coterie values. The Ramsay portrait of Montagu is reproduced in *Brilliant Women: 18th-Century Bluestockings*, ed. Elizabeth Eger and Lucy Peltz (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2008), p. 49. It is tempting to connect Montagu’s rose-colored dress in this portrait with Talbot’s description of her, echoing reports from Tunbridge, as “the Lady of the Rose colour’d Gown” (see below). In other words, the choice of dress for this portrait may reflect the

significance of the Tunbridge summer to the coterie; Barlow notes the echo as well (p. 69).

6. Dustin Griffin's *Literary Patronage in England, 1650–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) demonstrates the persistence of patronage in the period; for its complexity as well as ubiquity in eighteenth-century Britain, see Eve Tavor Bannet, "The Bluestocking Sisters: Women's Patronage, Millenium Hall, and 'The Visible Providence of a Country,'" *Eighteenth-Century Life* 30 (2005), 25–55, and Elaine Chalus, "'To Serve my friends': Women and Political Patronage in Eighteenth-Century England," in *Women, Privilege, and Power: British Politics, 1750 to the Present*, ed. Amanda Vickery (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001), pp. 57–88. Throughout this chapter, I will invoke the term "patron" to include "patronage brokers," intermediaries with "access to information and individuals, sound personal and political judgment, and a reputation for getting results" (Chalus, p. 76) who brought candidates for patronage to the attention of those who actually had the control over pensions, positions, book printing, and marketing. It is in this sense, of course, that both Carter and Montagu can be called patrons, though with differing degrees of power. Although my argument is indebted to Bannet's useful overview of Scott and Montagu's combined patronage, I am not here invoking her distinction between philanthropic patronage and more traditional forms, since I do not see such a separation in the practice of this coterie.
7. Talbot to Carter, December 28, 1747, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, pp. 1.243–44; Richardson to Highmore, June 4, 1750, *Correspondence of Richardson*, pp. 2.236–37; Carter to Highmore, July 9, 1750, *Carter Unpublished Letters*, p. 140. That there could be two perspectives on the legitimacy of printing a circulating manuscript poem is illustrated by Thomas Edwards' view of Carter's behavior in the episode: he writes in 1753, "You please me much with the character you give of Miss C. I was angry with her about that affair of the Ode, but from your account of her it must procede from a mistake, and therefore I forget it" (March 31, 1753, *Correspondence with Edwards*, p. 287).
8. Melanie Bigold, *Women of Letters, Manuscript Circulation, and Print Afterlives in the Eighteenth Century: Elizabeth Rowe, Catherine Cockburn, and Elizabeth Carter* (Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 170–201, 238; Carter to Mrs. Underdown, March 2, 1738; December 8, 1738; Carter to Cave, July 31, 1739, *Carter Unpublished Letters*, pp. 38, 56, 72. As I will do below, Bigold also contrasts Carter's successful retention of adherence to an older, scribally based intellectual tradition, despite her engagement in periodical and book publication, with Samuel Johnson's more complete acquiescence to the role of booksellers' hack (*Women of Letters*, pp. 185–91).

9. Carter to Highmore, June 8, 1748 and June 4, 1750, *Carter Unpublished Letters*, pp. 136–38.
10. Paul J. Korshin, “Johnson, the Essay, and *The Rambler*,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Samuel Johnson*, ed. Greg Clingham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 51. Korshin has counted “more than twenty reprintings of the entire work by 1800” (p. 52). Samuel Johnson, *The Rambler*, vols. III–V of *The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson*, ed. W.J. Bate and Albrecht B. Strauss, gen. eds. A.T. Hazen and J.H. Middendorf, 16 vols., 1958 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1969), Nos. 1–3. Johnson’s notion of the durable, transcendent literary classic may well be less about visionary thinking than the reactive strategy of the hack, struggling to bridge the chasm between his precarious socioeconomic position and his desire to establish a wide and loyal readership. In No. 14, the Rambler refuses to reveal his identity as Johnson, pursuing a “policy” of avoiding conversation with his contemporary readers, that they might not see “a man [who] writes much better than he lives” (No. 14).
11. Talbot to Carter, May 28, 1750, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, pp. 1. 349–50 (although the assigned date of this letter precedes Jemima Grey’s complaint to Talbot that the paper’s “hard Words . . . really break my Teeth to speak them” [June 21, 1750, BLARS L 30/9a/5, f. 168], Talbot does seem to be passing on Grey’s message here); Carter to Talbot, March 30, 1752, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, pp. 2.72; 1.349–50). Interestingly, when Johnson was awarded a royal pension in 1762, Grey asked Talbot if she was the one who had obtained it for her “Old Friend” (August 22, 1762, BLARS L30/9a/8, f. 53).
12. Grey to Talbot, June 28, 1750, BLARS L 30/9a/5, f. 170; Talbot to Carter, 22 April 1752 and Carter to Talbot, 9 May 1752, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, pp. 2.73–74 and 77.
13. David S. Kaufer and Kathleen M. Carley, *Communication at a Distance: The Influence of Print on Sociological Organization and Change* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1993), pp. 66, 61, 127. The authors define “reach” as “the trail of people that have been touched by a communication” (p. 125).
14. Secker to Carter, September 13, 1749, *Memoirs of Carter*, p. 114.
15. Carter to Talbot, March 31, 1753, *Memoirs of Carter*, p. 123; Talbot to Carter, January 8, 1757, *Memoirs of Carter*, p. 139; Pennington, *Memoirs of Carter*, p. 140. I discuss the implications of this translation further in Chapter 5, in relation to Carter’s establishing of a public “character.”
16. See Myers, *Bluestocking Circle*, p. 26; the Duchess of Portland’s copy of her friend’s letters is preserved as British Library Add. MS 70493; Donnellan to Montagu, July 11 [1745], mo778; Gilbert West to Montagu, November 18, 1754, mo6667.

17. Markman Ellis, “Reading Practices in Elizabeth Montagu’s Epistolary Network of the 1750s,” in *Bluestockings Display’d: Portraiture, Performance and Patronage, 1730–1830*, ed. Elizabeth Eger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 213–32 (at pp. 214–16); Montagu to Vesey, September 21, 1773, mo6432; Davis, *Good Lord Lyttelton*, p. 390.
18. Birch to Yorke, October 24, 1747, Add. MS 35397, f. 96v. It was at this time that Lyttelton seems to have attracted the attention of the Yorke–Grey coterie, as noted in Chapter 1.
19. Montagu to Duchess of Portland, [December 15, 1745], mo397; Montagu to Edward Montagu, October 14 [1746], mo2186; Montagu to Miss Anstey, [July 4, 1752], mo115; Montagu to Carter, 28 [December 1758], mo3023.
20. Montagu to Edward Montagu, October 5 [1746], mo2184; Montagu to Catherine West [+ Gilbert West], [December 1752], mo6628. The two publications are, respectively, *A Treatise on the Roman Senate* (1747) and *The Life of the Most Reverend Dr. John Tillotson, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* (1752). Ellis’s discussion of the circle’s use of book exchange as part of its economy of gift and obligation (“Reading Practices,” p. 217) is pertinent here as well.
21. Duncombe, *The Femiinad*, p. 22.
22. Montagu to Carter, June 6, 1758, *Letters of Montagu*, pp. 4.75–76.
23. Frances Burney, *Memoirs of Doctor Burney*, 3 vols. (London, 1832), pp. 2. 270–71.
24. Bath to Montagu, [c. 1762], mo4304 (Montagu supplied Bath with the requested key in mo4557).
25. A case of a letter explicitly presented as confidential is Montagu’s to Lyttelton wherein she expresses disappointment at the narrow-mindedness of Bath’s will (August 25, 1764, mo1434), despite her more public defense of his character and her consistent statements of respect for his memory. In this Montagu displays the loyalty expected of coterie members and her belief that “good fame is the virtue of the dead, by that they are still usefull to the World,” positions which become relevant in the quarrel over characters discussed in Chapter 5.
26. Montagu to Scott, [c. 1760], mo5783; Montagu to Bath, [1760], mo4502; see also mo numbers 4227–29, 4503, and 433 as belonging to this episode.
27. Lyttelton to Montagu, December 5, 1758, mo1568 (the copy of Monsey’s poem is incomplete, so the poem is in fact longer); Montagu to Vesey, [February 22, 1766], mo6388.
28. The strongly nationalist flavour of Montagu’s circle has been discussed by Nicole Pohl (pp. 87–89) in “Cosmopolitan Bluestockings,” in Heller, ed., pp. 71–89.
29. Bath to Montagu, [c. 1760], mo4229.

30. August 3, 1761, *Memoirs of Carter*, p. 153; Pennington gives a date of 1806 for the letter, but this is an obvious error.
31. Carter, “To Mrs. [Montagu],” *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1762), pp. 73–75.
32. Montagu to Carter, [November 6, 1761], mo3060.
33. Bath to Montagu, July 30, 1762, mo4264; Montagu to Bath, August 3, 1762, mo4531; Lyttelton to Montagu, August 4, 1773, mo1376.
34. These are found in the Montagu collection as mo 1505, mo1314 (Lyttelton to Montagu, [c. October 15, 1763], mo6882, mo6855, and mo6859, respectively.
35. JoEllen DeLucia, “Bluestocking Salons and the ‘Bower of Malvina,’” *Eighteenth-Century Scotland* 23 (2009), 10–13.
36. Montagu to Scott, September 16, 1760, mo5781; Lyttelton to Montagu, October 18, 1763, mo1315.
37. Chapone to Carter, July 6, 1762, *Posthumous Works of Chapone*, p. 1.146.
38. Montagu to Scott, [October] 20, 1762, mo5797 in response to mo5298. Myers states Chapone spent the summer of 1762 at Sandleford (*Bluestocking Circle*, p. 119), but this is contradicted by Montagu’s report to Scott about Chapone’s summer at Kensington. The claim is likely based on an undated letter of Chapone to Montagu referring to how she misses the latter after “the feast I have revell’d in the whole Summer” (mo705); Chapone’s letter, tentatively dated 1762 in the Montagu Collection, actually belongs to a later year, probably 1763.
39. Lyttelton to Montagu, October 25, 1762, mo1303; Montagu quotes this passage to Carter on October 29 (mo3086); her reply to Lyttelton is also dated October 29 (mo1423); Lyttelton to Montagu, June 21 [1770], mo1361; Montagu to Lyttelton, July 30, [1770], mo1474.
40. Unlike a separate copy of the sonnet to Edwards, which is in an unknown hand and may date from the 1750s, when Montagu would first have been hearing of Chapone from her new friend Carter, the poems in this booklet are copied in what seems to be Chapone’s hand. In addition, the poems are titled retrospectively, giving the dates of their first composition, and noting the poet’s age of seventeen when the first was composed.
41. Chapone to Carter, August 19, 1770, *Posthumous Works of Chapone*, pp. 1.152–53; Chapone to Montagu, [October 23, 1772], mo706 (emphasis added).
42. Montagu to Carter, July 11, 1770, mo3275.
43. Chapone, “To Mrs. Montagu,” *Improvement of the Mind*, 2 vols. (London, 1773), pp. 1. iii–vi.
44. Myers, *Bluestocking Circle*, p. 231, quoted and supported with numbers of editions and reprints by Zuk, *Talbot and Chapone*, p. 257.
45. Carter to Talbot, December 28, 1750, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, p. 1.373; E.J. Clery, *The Feminization Debate in Eighteenth-Century England*:

- Literature, Commerce and Luxury* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), pp. 153–54.
46. Talbot to Carter, December 23, 1751, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, pp. 2. 63–64; Talbot to Carter, November 13, 1752, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, p. 2.98 (Talbot is pleading with Carter to spend the winter in London); Talbot to Carter, 26 April 1760, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, p. 2.321; Grey to Mary Grey, July 17, 1754, BLARS L30/9a/2, f. 98. Myers claims that “the warmth of . . . Talbot’s attachment to her girlhood friends, especially Lady Grey, did not alter” (*Bluestocking Circle*, p. 67), but I believe this should be modified to account for Talbot’s distaste of frivolity, and for the pull of an ascetic life which made the Richardsonian ideal of femininity so appealing to her. As early as 1745, Grey is attempting to tease her out of the “Anti-Diluvian Hours” of early rising that she is intending to bring to town from the country (Grey to Talbot, January 1745, f. 27).
 47. Through her friend Henrietta Knight (Lady Luxborough), the Duchess was also currently the prospective patron of William Shenstone (see Chapter 4).
 48. Somerset to Talbot, May 5, 1754, Add. MS 19689, f. 14.
 49. Talbot to Carter, December 28, 1747, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, pp. 1.243–44.
 50. Clery, *Feminization Debate*, pp. 143, 145.
 51. Eaves and Kimpel comment that “one hopes she never knew how many ladies he had consulted” (*Samuel Richardson*, p. 360).
 52. Talbot, journal entries for January 18, 1752 and October 23, 1752, Add. MS 46690, f. 48v, 73; Edwards to Richardson, July 9, 1752 and July 6, 1753, *Correspondence with Edwards*, pp. 261 and 293; Carter to Talbot, September 21, 1753, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, pp. 2.141–42.
 53. In her journal entry for December 19, 1753, Talbot reports with satisfaction that “On Monday M [Mama] & I made three friendly Visits, in every one Sir Charles was a chief Subject, & indeed will do great good by giving the Conversations of this Town a more Rational turn” (Add. MS 46688, ff. 32–32v).
 54. Talbot to A. Berkeley, August 9, 1756, Add. MS 39311, ff. 83–84.
 55. Delany to Dewes, November 16, 1751, *Correspondence of Delany*, p. 3.266; Talbot to Carter, [May or June 1758], *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, p. 2.270 (although Pennington dates this letter December 10, 1758, Carter’s reply is written June 16, 1758, and the contents indicate that the date must be early summer); Carter to Talbot, November 3, 1758, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, p. 2.289.
 56. See, for example, Montagu to Carter, 1 [or 6] May [1760], mo3035: “Miss Talbot has done me a great favour in getting me a benefaction for a poor Clergymans daughter to whom I wish’d well with great earnestness.”

57. Talbot to Montagu, October 29, [1761], mo5139.
58. Grey to Talbot, August 2, 1750, BLARS L 30/21/3/8, f. 10; Duchess of Somerset to Talbot, May 5, 1754, Add. MS 19689, ff. 11–15.
59. Talbot, *Wrest Journal*, June 11, 1745, BLARS L 30/106, n.p.
60. Add. MS 4291, ff. 271–72; Talbot to E. Berkeley, n.d. [after 1761], Add. MS 39312, ff. 319–20; Zuk, *Talbot and Chapone*, p. 167.
61. Love, *Scribal Publication*, p. 38.
62. Carter, “Advertisement” to *Reflections on the Seven Days of the Week* by Catherine Talbot (London, 1770), n.p.; Zuk, *Talbot and Chapone*, p. 19; Montagu Pennington, Carter’s nephew and biographer, notes that the profits from the *Reflections* “eventually were not inconsiderable” (*Memoirs of Carter*, p. 281); Pennington’s 1807 *Memoirs of Carter* contained letters between the two women related to *Epictetus* and other important junctures in Carter’s life; this was followed in 1809 by an edition of their remaining correspondence. It should be noted also that Montagu may have contributed to posthumous hagiography of Talbot. As the latter was dying in late 1769, Montagu was already writing to Carter about her friend in the past tense, as one whom she “venerat’d” as “the most pure, holy, & righteous” person she had ever known, who could now be called, “without presumption,” “our Angel” (Montagu to Carter, October 31, [1769], mo3261). The Montagu collection contains at least two letters of thanks to Montagu for gifts of the *Reflections* (Countess of Shelburne to Montagu, June 27, 1770, mo4093; Hester Pitt to Montagu, July 26, 1770, mo5069).
63. This was a task apparently assigned by the tutor Edmund Wilson to the young John Pitt, 2nd Earl of Chatham, probably in about 1768; see the manuscript separate mo6780, also discussed by Harriet Guest in *Small Change: Women, Learning, Patriotism, 1750–1810* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), pp. 100–01.
64. John MacPherson to Montagu, October 15, 1772, mo1506.

3. Identity and influence from coterie to print

1. Thomas Edwards to Lewis Crusius, July 12, 1734, Ms. Bodl. 1008, ff. 14–16.
2. Catherine Talbot, journal entry for June 26, 1751, Add. MS 46690, f. 22v.
3. William Shenstone, “On Politicks,” in *The Works in Verse and Prose of William Shenstone, Esq.*, 2 vols., ed. Robert Dodsley (London, 1764), p. 2.149.
4. See Edwards’ report to Yorke, March 9, 1751, Add. MS 35606, ff. 11–12, explaining his lack of progress on these tasks (Edwards dates his letter “1750” in the old style).
5. Edwards to Lawry, May 27, 1754, Ms. Bodl. 1012, f. 172.

6. Talbot to unidentified correspondent, n.d., Add. MS 39312, ff. 304–5. Talbot's reference to having a volume of Carter's *Poems* to pass on to her correspondent suggests a date in 1762, the year of their publication.
7. I am not suggesting that Talbot did not struggle with unique personal circumstances that exacerbated her sense of frustration and uselessness. As her editor Rhoda Zuk has summarized it, "Subjected as she was to a vaguely defined paternal governance, and therefore expectations – beyond propriety, amiability, and reverence for learning – that were ambiguous, she had a propensity for obsessive self-monitoring that left her depressed and doubtful of her worth." (*Talbot and Chapone*, p. 5). It is telling that her two closest friends, Jemima Grey and Elizabeth Carter, far from frivolous themselves, can be seen regularly warning Talbot against gloom and even "prescribing" light reading and other pleasurable amusements. On one occasion, Grey notes that she and Talbot have often "quarrelled" over "this Disposition," which Grey insists "is the Effect of Spirits not of Reason" (October 19, 1745, BLARS L30/9a/4, f.71), while Carter some years later gently scolds her for being too "scrupulously cautious (may I not venture to say, in some instances so superstitiously cautious) not to misemploy the least moment" (October 21, 1751, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, p. 2.54). Siskin and Warner, "This Is Enlightenment," pp. 1–21. Ruth Perry, in her introduction to *Novel Relations: The Transformation of Kinship in English Literature and Culture 1748–1818* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004) has summarized the demographic and economic pressures on younger siblings and daughters in particular.
8. Talbot to Carter, September 27, 1751, *Letters between Carter and Talbot*, pp. 2. 51–52; Talbot journal, May 13, 1751, Add. MS 46690, f. 7v. See also Birch's comment on Talbot's "laudable . . . Zeal" in "patroniz[ing]" the Cockburn subscription (Birch to Grey, September 16, 1749, Add. MS 35397, f. 215). Melanie Bigold has detailed the role of Birch, with the assistance of patrons such as Talbot and others of the Yorke circle, in placing the manuscript works of Cockburn "at the epicentre of contemporary scholarly interest" (*Women of Letters*, pp. 94–98; 150–56 [at p. 150]).
9. After the publication of the first edition of the *Dialogues* in 1759, Lyttelton and Montagu circulated further dialogues in manuscript to appreciative readers.
10. Montagu to Carter, [October 14, 1761], m03057. The Latin, from Virgil's *Aeneid*, in Dryden's translation reads "commit not thy prophetic mind/ To flitting leaves, the sport of ev'ry wind" (John Dryden, trans., *Virgil's Aeneid*, ed. Charles W. Eliot [New York: Collier, 1909], pp. 6. 116–17).
11. Carter to Highmore, April 28, 1752, *Carter Unpublished Letters*, p. 142; Bigold, *Women of Letters*, pp. 170, 171; Ezell, "The Posthumous Publication," pp. 121–36; Karen O'Brien, *Women and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-*

- Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 56–67 (at p. 60).
12. John Mulso to White, *Letters to White*, p. 284; Chapone, *Letters*, 2 vols. (London, 1773), pp. 1.iii–iv, 1–2. Although the first edition of *Letters* was anonymous (the address to Mrs. Montagu as patron notwithstanding), the second edition, published in the same year, appeared as “By Mrs. Chapone,” and the *Miscellaneous Prose and Verse* was identified in the same way.
 13. Chapone to Carter, July 20, 1773, *Posthumous Works of Chapone*, pp. 1.162–63.
 14. Chapone to Carter, December 11, 1763, *Posthumous Works of Chapone*, p. 1.149; Chapone to Carter, June 15, 1777, *Posthumous Works of Chapone*, pp. 1.171–72. Chapone is quoting from Milton’s famous sonnet “When I consider how my light is spent,” which in turn references the biblical parable of the talents, Matt. 25:14–30.
 15. Guest, *Small Change*, p. 116.
 16. Chapone to Carter, July 20, 1773, *Posthumous Works of Chapone*, p. 1.163. John Mulso reports with glee that “She made her Bargain for this, & it is as good as the former was bad; She secures £250. So that, calculating the 3 Voll: at £100 each, She is well off. We all abuse her this Time for cheating the Public; when her Work was inestimable, She was ill-used. However, the Work has not ye Merit indeed of general Use, yet there is Merit in it.” (January 31, 1775, *Letters to White*, p. 254).
 17. These examples are taken from two letters of Shenstone to Graves, dated December 23, 1743 and 1743, respectively, in *Letters of Shenstone*, pp. 78–82.
 18. A typical early example, from Shenstone to Graves, begins “I have your poem by me, which I have read often with the greatest pleasure. I have many observations to make.” Shenstone goes on to suggest “the most *polite* and *suitable* title,” and then writes, “Your preface has a pretty thought towards the close; otherwise is on no account to be admitted. Pardon my freedom; but, I think, there is no manner of occasion for a preface; and those strokes, which I *know* to be real modesty in *you*, the world will undoubtedly impute to affectation” (December 23, 1743, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 79).
 19. For Shenstone as patron and mentor, see the work of Sandro Jung: “Mentorship’ and ‘Patronage’ in Mid-Eighteenth-Century England: William Shenstone Reconsidered,” *Bulletin de la Société d’Études Anglo-américaines des XVIIes et XVIIIes Siècles* 54 (2002), 187–98 and “Shenstone, Woodhouse, and Mid-Eighteenth-Century Poetics: Genre and the Elegiac-Pastoral Landscape,” *Philological Quarterly* 88 (2009), 127–49.
 20. Luxborough to Shenstone, June 24, 1749, *Letters written by the late Right Honourable Lady Luxborough, to William Shenstone, Esq.*, ed. John Hodgetts (London: J. Dodsley, 1775), p. 106.

21. Shenstone to Jago, March 23, 1747–48, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 129.
22. James G. Turner, “The Sexual Politics of Landscape: Images of Venus in Eighteenth-Century English Poetry and Landscape Gardening,” *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 11 (1982), 360–61, italics in original.
23. Shenstone to Graves, [July 1743], *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 70. Since the majority of Shenstone’s letters up to 1745, unlike his later ones, can be dated only on the basis of internal evidence, the sequence of shifting attitudes and priorities presented here must remain somewhat speculative.
24. John Riely, “Shenstone’s Walks: The Genesis of the Leasowes,” *Apollo* 110 (September 1979), 202–9.
25. Shenstone to Jago, [1744], *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 92; Shenstone to Luxborough, June 27, 1750, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 282.
26. See Turner; also Michel Baridon, “The Gentleman as Gardener: Pope, Shenstone, Mason,” in *The Crisis of Courtesy: Studies in the Conduct-book in Britain, 1600–1900*, ed. Jacque Carré (Netherlands: E.J. Brill, 1994), pp. 129–41.
27. This statement is Shenstone’s conclusion to a description of how he has been spending his time: “If then, Industry be a Virtue, I am possessed of it very remarkably: Not a Moment of my Time passes, but I am employed, either in overseeing Labourers; reading Robinson’s *History of Scotland*; writing in my Paper Books, (‘tis not material *what*, but writing;) perplexing the *Birmingham Artists* with Sketches for Improvements in their Manufactures, which they *will* not understand; and last, and finally, feeding my Poultry, my Ducks, my Pigeons, and my Swans” (to Dodsley, March 31, 1759, *Letters of Shenstone*, pp. 507–8).
28. Shenstone to Jago, September 17, 1747, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 109; Shenstone to Graves, [November 1744], *Letters of Shenstone*, pp. 90–91; Shenstone to Lady Luxborough, October 21, 1751, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 321; Shenstone to Jago, June 16, 1754, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 400; Shenstone to Graves, September 21, 1747, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 116. For examples of Shenstone articulating alternative hierarchies of taste, see Shenstone to Graves, c. 1757, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 473 (“A young painter of my acquaintance is advised to go to Bath; has a recommendation to the Bishop of B—, who will introduce him to the Duke of N—. And though I cannot so easily bring him acquainted with nobles or prime-ministers, I can give him directions to my friend, who, in point of taste, is their superior”), and Shenstone to Graves, May 2, 1761, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 579 (“Mr. S — is agreeable, not void of learning, has some smartness, but little taste.—Mrs. S — has *much* of the latter; and perhaps imagination, which makes a part of taste, may have had no small share in converting her to Popery”).
29. David Hill Radcliffe, “Genre and Social Order in Country House Poems of the Eighteenth Century: Four Views of Percy Lodge,” *Studies in English*

- Literature, 1500–1900* 30 (1990), 445–65 (at 447); “Rural Elegance,” in *The Works in Verse and Prose, of William Shenstone, Esq; in Two Volumes*, ed. Robert Dodsley, vol. 1, stanza XVII, lines 7–13.
30. Sandro Jung, “William Shenstone’s Poetry, The Leasowes and the Intermediality of Reading and Architectural Design,” *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 37 (2014), 53–77 (at 55); Shenstone to Lady Luxborough, June 3, 1749, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 196; Jung, “William Shenstone’s Poetry,” p. 53; Shenstone to Jago, June 16, 1754, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 400.
 31. Jung, “William Shenstone’s Poetry,” pp. 54–58.
 32. Shenstone to Graves, November 25, 1758, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 494; for examples of dedications or unsolicited works sent to him for advice or simply in homage, see Shenstone to Percy, December 1, 1758 (rec’d) and November 23, 1759, *Letters of Shenstone*, pp. 499, 533; Shenstone to Graves, September 14, 1761, *Letters of Shenstone*, pp. 588–89; Shenstone to J.C., September 17, 1761, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 593. It should be noted that Shenstone’s rhetoric of taste is very much of its time; he was an enthusiastic reader and commentator on the esthetic theories of Goldsmith, Burke, and Alexander Gerard, writing in response to the latter’s *Essay on Taste*, “the book is learned, and on a pleasing subject – I may perhaps add a very *important* one – for surely it is altogether unquestionable that taste *naturally* leads to virtue” (Shenstone to Thomas Percy, November 23, 1759, *Letters of Shenstone*, pp. 528–29).
 33. David Fairer, “Shenstone, Sensibility, and the Ethics of Looking,” *Age of Johnson* 19 (2009), 129–47 (at 133, 130, 136).
 34. Dodsley, as one of Shenstone’s literary executors, appears not to have been aware of this manuscript, which posthumously became part of Percy’s library. Ian A. Gordon’s account, in his 1952 edition, of its compilation, composition, and reception by Percy illustrates the typical scribal-culture features of the project (*Shenstone’s Miscellany 1759–1763* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1952], pp. xii–xix). Gordon does not distinguish between the nature of this “publication” and Shenstone’s participation in Dodsley’s *Collection*; however, given Shenstone’s comment of January 6, 1759 to Jago that “I have thoughts of amusing myself with the publication of a small Miscellany from neighbour Baskerville’s press, if I can save myself harmless as to expense,” I believe he conceived of this as a much more private work, to be circulated only as a selective extension of the coterie (*Letters of Shenstone*, p. 503).
 35. Trolander and Tenger, *Sociable Criticism*, p. 51; Shenstone to Jago, February 14, 1747–48 and [1744], *Letters of Shenstone*, pp. 122 and 92.
 36. Helen Sard Hughes’s article “Shenstone and the Countess of Hertford,” *PMLA* 46 (1931), 1113–27 gives an account of this lengthy process. The Duchess, incidentally, asks permission to show Shenstone’s verses to

- “the discerning Miss Talbot,” just as Talbot had introduced the Duchess to Edwards’ work. This raises the tantalizing possibility of connecting bridges between coteries, a possibility cut short by the Duchess’s death in July 1754 (Hughes 1123, qtg Hull p. 1.195).
37. Turner, “Sexual Politics of Landscape,” p. 360. This observation does not deny the popularity of representations of such gardens in paintings, descriptions, plans, and engravings, all of which promised to expand access to those who could not physically travel to the actual sites.
 38. Another consequence was that poems at times escaped Shenstone’s control before he considered them perfected; for an example, see F.D.A. Burns’s account of the early publishing history of the poet’s very popular “Pastoral Ballad,” “The First Published Version of Shenstone’s ‘Pastoral Ballad,’” *The Review of English Studies* XXIV 93(1973), 182–85.
 39. Shenstone to Jago, [1744], *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 92; Shenstone to Percy, April 24, 1761, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 578.
 40. Shenstone to Percy, May 16, 1762, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 626; Shenstone to B[innel?], October 1755, *Letters of Shenstone*, pp. 451–52.
 41. Shenstone to Luxborough, September 11, 1748 and August 30, 1749, *Letters of Shenstone*, pp. 168–69; 215.
 42. Randall L. Calhoun, “William Shenstone’s Aesthetic Theory and Poetry,” unpublished dissertation (Muncie, IN: Ball State University, 1985), p. 136.
 43. This passage is quoted by Alan D. McKillop from a Shenstone memorandum published in the *Edinburgh Magazine* for April 1800, in “Thomson’s Visit to Shenstone,” *Philological Quarterly* 23 (1944), 283–86 (at 284).
 44. Shenstone, *Works*, p. 2.142.
 45. Samuel Johnson, “Life of Shenstone,” in *Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets*, ed. Roger Lonsdale, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 2006), pp. 4.126–31 (at p. 127). These allegations, reported by Johnson, were denied by the friends of both Shenstone and Lyttelton; see Chapters 4 and 6 for further discussions of this debate.
 46. Riely, “Shenstone’s Walks,” 209.
 47. Riely, “Shenstone’s Walks,” 203.
 48. Shenstone to Hull, January 7, 1761, *Letters of Shenstone*, pp. 565–66.
 49. Johnson, “Life of Shenstone,” pp. 129–31.
 50. Shenstone to Percy, June 6, 1759 and November 10, 1760, *Letters of Shenstone*, pp. 513 and 564.
 51. A.R. Humphreys, *William Shenstone: An Eighteenth Century Portrait* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937), p. 86.
 52. See Riely, “Shenstone’s Walks,” 209 n37; Spence’s description, probably originating in a 1758 visit with Dodsley, is preserved in the Huntington Library, HM 30312, along with the plan reproduced here, apparently

- traced from a survey plan made by William Lowe. Descriptions such as this one and another by Thomas Hull preserved in the Osborn Collection at Yale University contributed to the body of manuscript travel writings that fuelled the rise of a literature of domestic tourism, as discussed in Chapter 6. For a list of social elites touring the Leasowes in the summer of 1762 and, in some cases, inviting Shenstone to their own seats, see Shenstone to Graves, November 20, 1762, *Letters of Shenstone*, pp. 638–41; the list includes the Bath and Montagu party visiting Hagley in June 1762 (see Chapter 2).
53. Shenstone first reports a request from Dodsley for verses in a letter to Graves of October 24, 1753, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 379, and writes about Dodsley's first visit in 1754.
 54. Everett M. Rogers, *Diffusion of Innovations*, 4th ed. (New York: Free, 1995), pp. 26–27. For a fuller discussion of Dodsley as innovator in book forms see Schellenberg, "Second Coming," pp. 39–42, and Harry M. Solomon, *The Rise of Robert Dodsley: Creating the New Age of Print* (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1996), who considers Dodsley to be "the most influential bookseller of his age" (p. 262). James Tierney's introduction to *Correspondence of Dodsley* provides a thorough overview of Dodsley's career that emphasizes the characteristics summarized here.
 55. Michael F. Suarez, S.J., "Trafficking in the Muse: Dodsley's *Collection of Poems* and the Question of Canon," in *Tradition in Transition: Women Writers, Marginal Texts and the Eighteenth-Century Canon*, ed. Alvaro Ribiero, SJ, and James G. Basker (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), pp. 297–313 (at p. 306); Suarez includes in his count those who subsequently succeeded to their titles.
 56. Gray to Walpole, January/February 1748, *Correspondence of Gray*, pp. 1.294–303; Edwards to Wray, July 25, 1748, Ms. Bodl. 1011, f. 37.
 57. Suarez, "Trafficking," 302–3; Edwards to Wray, July 25, 1748, Ms. Bodl. 1011, ff. 37–38; Dodsley to Shenstone, November 10, 1753, *Correspondence of Dodsley*, p. 162; Shenstone to Graves, October 24, 1753, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 379; Dodsley, "Advertisement" to *A Collection of Poems. By Several Hands In Three Volumes* (London, 1748), p. v; Suarez, "Trafficking," 312; Barbara Benedict, "The Paradox of the Anthology: Collecting and *Différence* in Eighteenth-Century Britain," *New Literary History* 34 (2003), 231–56 (at 234). Benedict elects to treat the anthology and the miscellany as one form, arguing that distinctions between the former's focus on previously published material "selected for consistency and quality" and the latter's compilation of new and more heterogeneous material were at the time not only blurred, but insignificant from the

- perspective of the reader who turned to these for “dip, sip, and skip’ reading” (231–32). From the perspective of production rather than reception, however, the miscellany’s association with a more informal gathering of scattered materials is a genealogically important one linking it to a culture of scribal circulation.
58. Robert Dodsley to Joseph Spence, October 22, 1748, *Correspondence of Dodsley*, p. 125.
 59. Shenstone to Jago, June 16, 1754, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 401; see also Shenstone to Christopher Wren, July 6, 1754, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 403 and Shenstone to Graves, July 27, 1756, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 455. That Shenstone had some prejudices to overcome is indicated by his initial wavering about whether to entrust his poems to Dodsley’s new volumes, or whether he ought to “print them in a more advantageous manner, both with regard to *Reputation & Profit*,” as his friends recommended (to Luxborough, December 12, 1753, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 387).
 60. There are multiple references in both the Shenstone and Dodsley correspondences to the circulation and revision of Dodsley’s tragedy *Cleone* and his poem *Melpomene: or the Regions of Terror and Pity*. Just after the publication of *Melpomene* in 1757, Dodsley writes to Graves, “I am sensible . . . it owes much of its correctness to Yours and Mr. Shenstone’s judicious criticisms, of which You will easily perceive the effects” (October 24, [1757], *Correspondence of Dodsley*, pp. 296–97). Both Graves and Shenstone also contributed to Dodsley’s 1761 *Select Fables of Aesop*.
 61. Gordon, *Shenstone’s Miscellany*, p. xii; Suarez comments on this over-estimation in the Introduction to his 1997 facsimile edition of the *Collection of Poems by Several Hands* (London: Routledge/Thoemmes, 1997), pp. 33–34.
 62. With the exception of two interjected poems “to which,” Shenstone acknowledged, “I am a Stranger”: they were the work of Charles Parrott (Shenstone to Graves, March 21, 1755, *Letters of Shenstone*, pp. 433 and 434 n2).
 63. Indeed, faced with the unexpected recurrence of his name further in the volume, in “Verses by Mrs. Bennet to Mr. Richardson, upon an Alcove now at Parson’s Green,” regretting not having further revised his poems, and dismayed at the fact that his name had been attached to them all counter to his instructions, Shenstone writes to Graves, “All this is against me; as a thing in itself invidious to have one’s name recur so often, and as my *own lines contradict* the merit which my friends so liberally allow me” (Shenstone to Graves, May 30, 1758, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 482).
 64. Shenstone to Jago, January 29, 1754, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 393; Dodsley to Shenstone, August 27, [1754], *Correspondence of Dodsley*, pp. 171–72; Graves to Dodsley, October 26, 1754, *Correspondence of Dodsley*, pp. 180–81; Dodsley to Shenstone, February 15, 1755, *Correspondence of Dodsley*, p. 192. It should be

- noted also that Dodsley is able to supply only nine of fifteen names when Shenstone asks to know the authors of a number of poems in the *Collection's* fourth volume, indicating how general was the practice of circulating poetry without attribution at the time (*Correspondence of Dodsley*, pp. 198–99).
65. Jago to Dodsley, October 25, 1757, *Correspondence of Dodsley*, p. 298; Dodsley to Jago, October 29, [1757], *Correspondence of Dodsley*, pp. 301–2; Shenstone to Graves, April 4, 1755, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 441.
66. In this respect, it is of interest that David Hill Radcliffe, for example, has identified a strain of “Dodsley Spenserianism” represented in the *Collection*, with Shenstone as its most influential contributor among a group of mid-century Oxonians including Lyttelton, Gilbert West, Percy, and Joseph Warton. According to Hill, the Spenserian imitations on the subject of education published by Dodsley, beginning with Shenstone’s *Schoolmistress*, propagated the influential new idea of “culture” as attained by means of education, and particularly by the study of literature, so that, “nurs’d with skill, a country lad might become a judge, a chancellor, or a bard sublime” (“The Poetry Professors: Eighteenth-Century Spenserianism and Romantic Concepts of Culture,” *1650–1850: Ideas, Aesthetics and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era* 5 [2000], 121–50; at 129). Dussinger has written of the Richardson coterie at North End as neo-Spenserian and therefore naturally attracted to Edwards’ poetry (*Correspondence with Edwards*, p. lxx).
67. Graves’s response to Shenstone’s thoughts of having Baskerville print a volume of his own elegies articulates a more print-culture-oriented view: “I told him It would give him the Air of a *local* Author – & that for my part, I should not have so high an opinion of any Production, that did not make its first appearance in the Metropolis – And I believe there are many people that have the same prejudice – It puts one in mind of one Doughty’s *country* Sermon – preach’d in a *country* Church – & published at ye request of a *Country* Congregation” (*Correspondence of Dodsley*, p. 408).
68. Shenstone to Jago, January 6, 1759, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 503. For a fuller discussion of Shenstone’s careful production of this manuscript, see Gordon’s introduction to his edition of the miscellany.
69. Relevant here is J.G.A. Pocock’s account of a shift in the defining components of a gentleman’s identity from property, leisure, and public engagement to commerce, leisure, and cultivation (“The Mobility of Property and the Rise of Eighteenth-Century Sociology,” in *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985], pp. 103–23).
70. Love, *Scribal Publication*, pp. 288–97.
71. Dodsley to Shenstone, January 21, [1758], *Correspondence of Dodsley*, p. 334; Marjorie Williams, *William Shenstone and His Friends* (London: The English

Association, 1933), p. 9; see also Gordon, *Shenstone's Miscellany*, pp. xi–xii, xvii–xviii.

72. Love, *Scribal Publication*, pp. 290–92.

73. I am not suggesting that Shenstone proceeded along a developmental trajectory from manuscript to print: in fact, as I have already indicated, while communicating with Dodsley late in his life about publishing his elegies, he was simultaneously preparing a manuscript miscellany of about ninety poems principally by authors of his coterie but also sourced from print and from Percy's collection of ballads.

4. Memorializing a coterie life in print

1. Thomas Gray to Norton Nicholls, June 24, 1769, *Correspondence of Gray*, p. 3.1067.
2. "A.F.," *The Gentleman's Magazine* 82 (March 1812), 216.
3. Montagu to Carter, October 10, 1769, m03258. Gray was proud to keep company with Shenstone's *School-Mistress* in the first edition of Dodsley's *Collection* (to Walpole, [January or February 1748], *Correspondence of Gray*, p. 1.295), but was critical of the poems in Volumes 5 and 6 (to Warton, March 8, 1758, *Correspondence of Gray*, p. 2.566). Johnson for his part stated that "Shenstone was a man whose correspondence was an honour" (*The Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides, with Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* (London, 1785), p. 331. Boswell also records Johnson's recitation "with great emotion" of the final stanza of Shenstone's poem "Written at an Inn at Henley" (*Life of Johnson*, pp. 697–98).
4. Johnson, "Life of Shenstone," *Lives*, pp. 4.126–31. Lonsdale has concluded that Johnson did not take the opportunity to obtain more direct information about Shenstone from Richard Graves, and also "made little use" of Shenstone's published letters (*Lives*, pp. 4.418, 417).
5. Shenstone's complete correspondence details the visits and friendships of Scottish noblemen and intellectuals; a French admirer erected an urn to him in his garden, and the discussion below demonstrates the popularity of Shenstone in North American magazines.
6. "The Sequestered Bard. An Elegy," by "Philander," *The Scots Magazine* 25 (February 1763), 110. "Cotswauldia" was Elizabeth Amherst Thomas (1716–1779), whose manuscript book of her original compositions, preserved in the Bodleian Library as Ms. Eng. Poet. e.109, contains a copy of this poem in her hand (ff. 60–61). One of the most notable cases of Shenstone's mentorship is that of Robert Burns, who acknowledges Shenstone's implied encouragement, through the statement that "humility has depressed many a genius to a hermit, but never raised one to fame," in the preface to his debut

collection of *Poems, Chiefly in the Scottish Dialect* (Kilmarnock, 1786), pp. iv–v. In keeping with the argument of this chapter, this mentorship was not personal but was mediated by Dodsley’s edition, which Burns references through this quotation from the essay “On Allowing Merit in Others” and through a reference to the elegies, first published in the *Works*.

7. After the publication of the 1755 volume of Dodsley’s *Collection*, Shenstone inquires of the bookseller about the possibility of publishing a “12 penny pamphlett” of a few of his poems that spring (Shenstone to Dodsley, March 23, 1755, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 435; Shenstone to Graves, April 4, 1755, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 441), but he abandons that plan and a few years later is putting together a miscellany volume, including the poems of members of his circle, selected older poems, and a few poems from contemporary magazines (see Chapter 3).
8. Robert Dodsley, “Preface,” in *The Works in Verse and Prose, of William Shenstone, Esq; Most of Which Were Never before Printed. In Two Volumes, with Decorations*, 2 Vols. (London, 1764), pp. i–viii.
9. David Fairer has discussed the image of the halcyon in Shenstone’s letters and poems, as well as on his planned coat of arms, as representing the pleasure and importance of clarity of vision (“Fishes in His Water,” pp. 140–41).
10. Pixell to R. Dodsley, April 16, 1764, *Correspondence of Dodsley*, p. 487. Pixell’s response illustrates Margaret Ezell’s observation that posthumous publications tended to claim that the author’s friends would recognize the printed text’s fidelity to the author, indicating that such publications were viewed as extensions of manuscript culture, rather than repudiations of it (“The Posthumous Publication,” pp. 128–29).
11. John Riely has reviewed evidence for the “Description” being the collaborative composition of several of Shenstone’s coterie friends, including Hylton, Percy, and Jago (“Shenstone’s Walks,” 202–9, at 209, n9). The plan is based on the drawing reproduced as Figure 3.1 in the previous chapter.
12. “Arcadio,” “Verses Written at the Gardens of William Shenstone, Esquire, near Birmingham, 1756,” *Works of Shenstone*, pp. 2.383–86; Dodsley, “Verses by Mr. Dodsley on His First Arrival at the Leasowes, 1754,” *Works of Shenstone*, pp. 2.380–82. At least five of these poems appeared earlier in magazines, one (Luxborough’s) also in volume 4 of Dodsley’s *Collection*.
13. *Correspondence of Dodsley*, pp. 486 n1; 15; Michael F. Suarez, S.J., “Publishing Contemporary English Literature, 1695–1774,” in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume V, 1695–1830*, ed. Michael F. Suarez, S.J. and Michael L. Turner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 657–58. The *Monthly* and *Critical* reviews of the edition largely concurred

with Dodsley in appreciating Shenstone's elegance, natural simplicity, appreciation for the picturesque, and justice of sentiment, but suggested that the editor should have suppressed some of the lesser works and that he had overstated somewhat the genius of the poet.

14. This account of the editions is based on findings from the *Eighteenth-Century Collections Online* database – there appears to be no bibliographical account of Shenstone's *Works*. It should be noted also that Shenstone's songs had a parallel life as lyrics, frequently being set to music in separate publications or song magazines.
15. I have found seven such poems and one prose extract; one of the poems is a piece from Shenstone's privately printed 1737 *Poems*, and the others, of dubious provenance and quality, could nevertheless possibly be scraps of juvenile and/or occasional poetry taken from Shenstone's correspondence or manuscript notebooks.
16. One short Shenstone piece on the brevity of life, entitled "A Solemn Meditation" but included in a section of the *Works* titled "Levities" and ending with the line "Surely, said I – life is a f—t!" appears to have drawn criticism; it was removed from the 1768 and subsequent Dodsley editions, then disappeared from a series of "Poetical Works" editions beginning in 1778, but was reinstated in a 1788 Dilly edition of the poetry.
17. Ann Messenger has discussed this conjunction and compared the pastoral vision of the two poets in "Like – but oh, how different!": William Shenstone and Mary Whateley Darwall," in *Gender at Work: Four Women Writers of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Ann Messenger (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1990), pp. 15–33.
18. Thomas Percy, ed., *Reliques of English Poetry*, 3 vols. (London, 1765), p. ix. As Shenstone's correspondence makes clear, he played an essential role in encouraging Percy to continue with the project and in developing its editorial principles and selection criteria.
19. Richard Jago, *Edge-Hill, or, the Rural Prospect Delineated and Moralized. A Poem in Four Books* (London, 1767), pp. 103–4; Richard Jago, *Labour and Genius: or, the Mill-Stream, and the Cascade* (London, 1768), pp. 2, 18. Jago's final publication with James Dodsley was his posthumous *Poems, Moral and Descriptive*, "prepared for the press, and improved by the author, before his death," which appeared in 1784 and featured not only these two poems but also the verses "To William Shenstone, Esq; On receiving a Gilt Pocket-Book. 1751" and others that had first appeared in Dodsley's *Collection of Poems* in 1755 and 1758.
20. David Oakleaf, "Richard Graves, *s.v.*" *ODNB*; Clarence Tracy, *A Portrait of Richard Graves* (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 1987), p. III.
21. The cabbage-garden teasing is implied in Shenstone's reply to Graves, March 28, 1753: "Cabbage-garden ornee is very high burlesque, and affects

- the improvements of your friend too nearly” (*Letters*, p. 355); Richard Graves, *The Love of Order: A Poetical Essay* (London, 1773), pp. ix, 23–24.
22. *The Monthly Review* (September 1775), 191.
 23. An engraving of Shenstone included in the *Recollections* is labeled as being from the original in possession of Mr. Thomas Hull, and is marked as printed in London, July 1778; it would therefore seem to be associated with Hull’s edition of the letters, but I have not found it in the 1778 Dodsley edition.
 24. Richard Graves, *Recollection of Some Particulars in the Life of the Late William Shenstone, Esq. In a Series of Letters from an Intimate Friend of His* (London, 1788), pp. vii–viii, vi, 1.
 25. Graves, *Recollections of Shenstone*, pp. 9, 8, 35, 52, 134. Although I do not treat them here, there were also tributes to Shenstone issuing from other booksellers, such as Thomas Nicholls’ *Shenstone; or the Force of Benevolence: A Poem*, published by Newbery in 1776.
 26. Calhoun, “William Shenstone’s Aesthetic Theory and Poetry,” p. 21.
 27. In a vestigial way, then, the magazine ethos of the later eighteenth century still reflects Ezell’s statement about the coterie features of the 1692–94 *Gentleman’s Journal*, that “the essentially communal and reciprocal principles” of the coterie can “flourish in the new commercial medium” (“*The Gentleman’s Journal*,” p. 340).
 28. These numbers were augmented slightly by four “hits” in *Nineteenth-Century Collections Online*.
 29. In this respect, my search results are in themselves biased toward a periodical culture organized around authorial attribution.
 30. See James Tierney, “Periodicals and the Trade, 1695–1780,” in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume V, 1695–1830*, ed. Michael F. Suarez, S.J. and Michael L. Turner, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 492.
 31. Shenstone to Percy, July 5, 1761, *Letters of Shenstone*, p. 583.
 32. A good example of how Shenstone was absorbed into the emotional landscape of everyday life is captured in a journal entry by Frances Burney which quotes from the “Pastoral Ballad” to convey to her sister Susan her emotional state after Susan’s marriage and departure for Ireland: “Ah my Susy – how I miss you already! – how I want you by my side – I have been repeating, internally, all Day long these heart-felt lines –

I priz’d ev’ry Hour that past by
 Beyond all that had pleas’d me before,
 But now they are gone!—& I sigh
 And I grieve that I priz’d them no more—

- Frances Burney, October 3, 1783, *The Early Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney Volume V, 1782–1783*, ed. Lars E. Troide and Stewart J. Cook (Toronto and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2012), pp. 396–97.
33. See, for example, "Sent to a Lady, with a Copy of Shenstone's Works," *The Weekly Entertainer: or, Agreeable and Instructive Repository* (August 16, 1802).
 34. Mr. Nott of Cambridge, "Lines Written in Shenstone's Leasowes," *Monthly Magazine and British Register* (January 1, 1797).
 35. Dodsley, *Works of Shenstone*, p. 1.iv; Montagu to Lyttelton, October 14, 1772, mo1480; "To a Young Lady, with the Works of Mr. Shenstone," signed "Herbert," *Moral and Entertaining Magazine* (June 1779), 383.
 36. Dodsley, *Works of Shenstone*, p. 1.iii; Shenstone to Hull, October 18, 1761, *Select Letters between the late Duchess of Somerset, Lady Luxborough, Miss Dolman, Mr. Whistler, Mr. R. Dodsley, William Shenstone Esq. and others*, 2 vols. (London, 1778), p. 2.120.
 37. "An Original Anecdote of Shenstone," *The Westminster Magazine* (May 1774), 224.
 38. E. W. Pitcher, "On the 'Original Anecdote' and Source for *Shenstone; Or the Force of Benevolence, A Poem* (1776)," *Notes and Queries* 45, 243, 4 (1998), 472–73 (at 473).
 39. Radcliffe, "Genre and Social Order in Country House Poems of the Eighteenth Century," 457–58. James G. Turner too has described, although with skepticism as to its ideological credibility, Shenstone's contribution to Augustan landscape ideology as the explicit introduction of careful accounting: "Shenstone attempts to reconcile frugality and display, and shows a concern for 'cost' as well as effect, base as well as superstructure; he tries to integrate garden finances into the familiar Augustan pattern of moderation, concealment and heightening" ("The Sexual Politics of Landscape," 358).
 40. Jung, "Shenstone, Woodhouse," pp. 138–39.
 41. Walter Scott, *Autobiography of Sir Walter Scott, Bart* (Philadelphia, PA: Carey & Lea, 1831), pp. 59–60.
 42. Riely, "Shenstone's Walks," 209.
 43. Richard Terry, "Lamb, Shenstone and the Icon of Personality," *The Charles Lamb Bulletin* 76 (1991), 124–32, at 128, 126.
 44. Joining the chorus is Horace Walpole, who in a April 27, 1773, letter to the Rev. William Cole comments that he avoids participating in the mutual exchange of compliments between "mediocre" authors, as it would make them "appear like those puny conceited witlings in Shenstone's and Hughes' 'correspondence' who give themselves airs from being in possession of the soil of Parnassus for the time being" (Horace Walpole, *The Letters of Horace Walpole Fourth Earl of Oxford, in Nine Volumes* [London: Richard Bentley

& Son, 1891], p. 5.457). Humphreys' 1937 study of Shenstone, which cites this letter (pp. 108–9), is a curious vestige of this critical tradition, blending insight into the poet-gardener's influential cultivation of “an independent life of self-determined development” with caveats about his mid-eighteenth-century mediocrity and “unconscious decorum,” and his “spiritually inadequate” way of life (pp. 36, 6).

45. One of the oddest applications of Johnson's narrative that I have found was printed in *The American Museum* of January 1792, as part of a collection of “Letters to a young lady. By the rev. John Bennet.” The first letter illustrates the dangers of “a passion for poetry” in a woman by citing the example of Shenstone as someone “whose works, though not of the first magnitude, are exceedingly agreeable; but [whose] poetical enthusiasm was a source of perpetual irritation and misfortune. Having cultivated his taste, more than his prudence, his feelings, more than his fortitude, and his imagination, more than his judgment, his life was one unvaried train of inquietudes.” Having established this Johnsonian series of alternatives, the writer goes on to build on two of the “Life's” inaccuracies – the claims that Shenstone's imprudent “enthusiasm” for improvements made him the victim of “merciless creditors” who “awoke him with an iron grasp, from his delicious entrancement,” and that he was eaten up by frustration and envy toward his neighbor George Lyttelton – to arrive at the conclusion, not supported by Johnson, that the two causes led to the poet's death.
46. *Gentleman's Magazine* 76 (March 1806), 226; “A Shenstonian,” *Gentleman's Magazine* 76 (May 1806); “Arcadio,” *Gentleman's Magazine* 76 (June 1806), 492.
47. “A.F.,” *Gentleman's Magazine* 82 (March 1812), 216.
48. “W.A.L.,” *The Analyst* 5 (June 1836), 238–40; H.T. Tuckerman, “Shenstone,” *Sartain's Union Magazine* 4.6 (June 1849), 353–57.
49. Tuckerman, “Shenstone,” 357; “A Batch of Books,” *The Leader* 5.244 (November 24, 1854), 1124; Edward Jesse, “Shenstone and the Leasowes,” *Once a Week* 6.156 (1862), 722–23 (at 723).

5. “This new species of mischief”

1. Montagu to Yorke, December 21, [1776], mo 6816.
2. Montagu to Vesey, September 21, 1773, mo6432.
3. Vesey to Montagu, July 6, [1774], mo6298; Montagu to Vesey, July 18, [1774], mo6438 (emphasis added). The immediate context is the recent publication of the late Earl of Chesterfield's letters.
4. Sören Hammerschmidt, “Pope, Curll, and the Intermediality of Eighteenth-Century Character,” *Word & Image* 28 (2012), 273–86 (at 274).

5. Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, p. 1114.
6. Montagu's papers contain a manuscript copy of Beattie's poem "The Hermit" (mo6870), first written in 1766 but not printed until it appeared in his 1776 collection of *Poems on Several Occasions*.
7. James Beattie, "Advertisement," *Essays* (Edinburgh, 1776), n.p. Montagu's correspondence also includes exchanges with Carter about their active editing and negotiations with the London bookseller Dilly for the publication of Beattie's *The Minstrel, with a Few Other Poems* in 1777 (see mo2996 and mo3438).
8. Elizabeth Eger, *Bluestockings: Women of Reason from Enlightenment to Romanticism* (Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 62–76 (at p. 70).
9. *The Gentleman's Magazine* 40 (1770), 263–64; Montagu to Carter, August 6, 1773, mo 3317; Mary Scott, *The Female Advocate; A Poem. Occasioned by Reading Mr. Duncombe's Feminead* (London, 1774), pp. 30–31. Several scholars have reviewed contemporary praise of Bluestocking women in this period; see especially Myers, *Bluestocking Circle*, pp. 271–89 and Guest, *Small Change*, pp. 95–110.
10. Ezell, *Social Authorship*, pp. 131–35 (at p. 131). For the culture of the anthology, see Barbara M. Benedict, *Making the Modern Reader: Cultural Mediation in Early Modern Anthologies* (Princeton University Press, 1996), and Leah Price, *The Anthology and the Rise of the Novel: From Richardson to George Eliot* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), especially ch. 2, "Cultures of the Commonplace." Michael F. Suarez, S.J., "Towards a Bibliometric Analysis of the Surviving Record, 1701–1800," *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol. 5, 1695–1830*, ed. Michael F. Suarez, S.J., and Michael L. Turner (Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 39–65.
11. Montagu to Carter, November 24, 1777, mo3435 (as qtd in Eger, *Women of Reason*, p. 59); Carter to Montagu, November 23, 1777, *Letters from Carter to Montagu*, pp. 3.47–48; Eger, *Women of Reason*, pp. 32–43 (at p. 43).
12. Guest, *Small Change*, p. 113.
13. Montagu to Carter, August 4, [1772], mo3301.
14. George Justice, in his discussion of Burney's *The Witlings*, observes the association of later eighteenth-century coterie writing with scandal (pp. 217–20), extrapolating from Love's emphasis on scribal publication as the vehicle of lampoons and oppositional writing (Love, *Scribal Publication*, pp. 209–10, 279–81); the contents of Mary Capell's book, discussed in Chapters 1 and 7, bear out this link; Frances Brooke, *The Excursion*, ed. Paula R. Bakscheider and Hope D. Cotton (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1997), pp. 19–20, 118 (it should be noted that Brooke's novel concludes with the heroine's return to a select country coterie that will

mount productions of her manuscript tragedies for its own pleasure. It would seem that, as a peripheral member of Shenstone's social network, Brooke was prepared to endorse his social mode of authorship as a way out of the danger that could arise when a limited coterie readership was replaced by an uninformed and debased urban audience); Richard Brinsley Sheridan, *The School for Scandal* in Vol. 1 of *The Dramatic Works of Richard Brinsley Sheridan*, 2 vols, ed. Cecil Price (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973), pp. 359, 356; emphasis in original.

15. Frances Burney, *The Witlings* in Vol. 1 of *The Complete Plays of Frances Burney*, 2 vols, ed. Peter Sabor, contributing editor Geoffrey M. Sill (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995), Act 2, pp. ll. 323–25, 187, 190–93. As one indication of that power, when Burney needed to maximize her profits from the sale of her 1796 novel *Camilla*, she turned to her Bluestocking contacts for assistance, resulting in the largest English novel subscription to that date (see Peter Sabor, Introduction to *The Subscription List to Frances Burney's "Camilla"* (Montreal: Burney Centre and Burney Society, 2003), pp. 12–13).
16. Betty A. Schellenberg, *The Professionalization of Women Writers in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 166–70; 173–74; Montagu to Carter, November 24, 1777, mo3435, as quoted in Eger, *Women of Reason*, at p. 59.
17. Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, p. 186, emphasis mine. Johnson acknowledges the role of patronage broker played by Carter in a letter of January 14, 1756 wherein he writes, "I am soliciting a benefit for Miss Williams, and beg that if you can by letters influence any in her favour, and who is there whom you cannot influence? You will be pleased to patronize her on this occasion" (Johnson to Carter, *Letters of Johnson*, p. 1.126).
18. Zionkowski, *Men's Work*, p. 23. Dustin Griffin's argument that Johnson became increasingly supportive of the patronage system in the course of his career (*Literary Patronage in England, 1650–1800*, pp. 222–30) can be reconciled with Zionkowski's reading of the *Lives* in that the role of patron was acceptable as long as it was separated out from the identity of the professional author (who might, however, act as a broker). Indeed, Zionkowski argues that "By repeatedly insisting on the distinctions between gentlemen and men of letters, Johnson in the *Lives* draws boundaries between categories that had traditionally been merged" (p. 187). In light of this artificial separation, Isobel Grundy's discussion of the parallels between Johnson and Montagu, particularly their mutual involvement in numerous subscription projects, is noteworthy ("Samuel Johnson as Patron of Women," *The Age of Johnson* 1 (1987), 59–77 [at 70]).

19. Johnson to Montagu, December 17, 1759, *Letters of Johnson* p. 1.189; June 9, 1759, *Letters of Johnson*, p. 1.186; March 5, 1778, *Letters of Johnson*, pp. 3.110–11; Johnson to Thrale, May 1, 1780, *Letters of Johnson*, p. 3.249.
20. Johnson to Thrale, October 24, 1778, *Letters of Johnson*, p. 3.131; Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, pp. 413–14, 1278.
21. Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, p. 1114.
22. James Barry, *An Account of a Series of Pictures in the Great Room of the Society of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce at the Adelphi* (London, 1783), p. 74; Grundy, “Johnson as Patron,” p. 75; Barry, *Series of Pictures*, p. 75. In making this claim I am not denying Johnson’s active support of professional women writers, whom he seems to have placed in a separate category, as in his above-quoted grouping of women who “make a trade of [their] wit.”
23. Montagu to Bath, [May? 1763], mo4586.
24. Montagu to Duchess of Portland, [March 1748], mo428 and [c. 1745], mo399; Montagu to Mary Anstey, November 23 [1751], mo114; Montagu to Catherine West (quotation an inserted address to Gilbert West), [December 1752], mo6628.
25. Carolyn R. Miller, “Genre as Social Action,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (1984), 151–67 (at pp. 158, 163, 158, 158; citing Burke, *Permanence and Change*, pp. 32–33).
26. Deidre Lynch, *The Economy of Character: Novels, Market Culture, and the Business of Inner Meaning* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), pp. 24–28; Lisa Freeman, *Character’s Theatre: Genre and Identity on the Eighteenth-Century English Stage* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), p. 27.
27. Hammerschmidt, “Intermediality of Character,” 274, 275. By “media-inflected,” I mean something almost opposite to Lynch’s view of character in the eighteenth century as “transmedia,” which asserts the inherently multi-media aspect of characteristic writing in the period (*Economy of Character*, pp. 39–40).
28. Letters exchanged between Carter, Secker, and Talbot, qtd. in *Memoirs of Carter*, pp. 113–14, 132, 114.
29. Montagu, *Letters of Montagu*, p. 4.350; Montagu to Carter, [c. October 6, 1771], mo3292.
30. Alexander Pope, “Epistle to a Lady,” in *The Poems of Alexander Pope: A One-Volume Edition of the Twickenham Text with Selected Annotations*, ed. John Butt (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1963), p. 560.
31. This is not to say that Montagu did not have her own investment in the posthumous fate of characters. In a 1786 letter, her cousin Richard Robinson,

Baron Rokeby responds to an apparent threat that materials about her private life will be published, writing, “The worst that can happen, in my view, is a publication of some of your Original Letters, for Scandalous anecdotes, such as are alluded to by Junius Junior, will gain no credit, even in this Age, which is disposed to love all characters. Pope’s Letters were published by Curll, from the Originals that had been restored to him by the Executors of his Correspondents, I always expected and I suppose you are prepared in your own mind for an event of this kind. Copies of your letters are in the hands of many Persons and a Bookseller, as such, will print any thing that will sell” (July 7, 1786, mo4887).

32. Reggie Allen, “The Sonnets of William Hayley and Gift Exchange,” *European Romantic Review* 13 (2002), 383–92, cites a cycle of exchanges between the poet Hayley and Hardwicke which included the address of a 1779 sonnet (beginning “Hardwicke! Whose bright applause a poet crown’d”) in gratitude for compliments the latter had paid to Hayley’s 1778 *Epistle on Painting* (384–85) – a sequence which recalls the roles of sonneteer and patron played by Thomas Edwards and Philip Yorke, respectively, several decades before.
33. “To the Printer of the Public Advertiser,” December 18, 1764, Add. MS 35607, ff. 150, 152; Grey to Talbot, July 13, 1766, BLARS L30/9a/8, f. 279.
34. Montagu to Bath, October 25, 1763, mo4593; Lyttelton to Montagu, November 8, 1763, mo1317. For a fuller account of the Lyttelton–Harwicke relationship, see Davis, *Good Lord Lyttelton*.
35. Davis, *Good Lord Lyttelton*, p. 396; Hardwicke to Montagu, December 20, [17]76, mo6811.
36. Hardwicke further offered his own implied condemnation of Chesterfield’s approach in his 1783 *Walpoliana*, a privately printed collection of anecdotes about Sir Robert Walpole, which he introduced with the words: “These Anecdotes of Sir Robert Walpole are not complete or digested enough for the perusal of more than a few friends; there is besides a delicacy in publishing characters of eminent persons, whilst their immediate descendants are living. Every thing I have inserted is on good authority, and from Sir Robert’s Friends rather than his Enemies” (“Introduction,” *Walpoliana* [n.p., 1783], p. 3).
37. Montagu to Hardwicke, n.d., Add. MS 35616, ff. 160–61.
38. Hardwicke to Montagu, February 20, 1781, mo6813. In this context, it is worth noting that in 1876 a surviving receipt for one of Johnson’s government pension payments, dated December 17, 1783, was quoted as reading “Of the Lord Hardwicke, one of the four Tellers of His Majesty’s Receipt of Exchequer; 75*l.* for three months’ pension, due October 10th, 1783. I say, received by me Sam. Johnson. – Witness, Tho. Gibbons” (“The Father of

- a Fashion,” *Temple Bar* 47 [1876], 89–104, [at 99]). Hardwicke’s own post as teller of the exchequer was, of course, a sinecure obtained through his father. Thus in one sense, both men were pensioners of the king, but Hardwicke’s annual salary from his post was £7000 (*ODNB*) and, unlike Johnson’s £200, included nominal duties, as this receipt indicates.
39. Reginald Blunt, *Mrs. Montagu “Queen of the Blues”: Her Letters and Friendships from 1762 to 1800*, 2 vols. (New York: Joughton, 1923), p. 2.156; Martine Watson Brownley, “Johnson’s *Lives of the English Poets* and Earlier Traditions of the Character Sketch in England,” in *Johnson and His Age*, ed. James Engell (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), pp. 31, 52; Pepys to Montagu, August 4, 1781, mo4027.
 40. Pepys to Montagu, October 5, 1781, mo4028.
 41. Frances Burney, *Early Letters and Journals*, pp. 4.366–70 (at p. 367).
 42. Robert Potter, *An Inquiry into Some Passages in Dr. Johnson’s Lives of the Poets* (London, 1783), p. 9; Blunt, “Queen of the Blues,” pp. 2.160, 164; Potter to Montagu, December 12, 1782, mo4164 and July 1, 1783, mo4165; Tracy, *Richard Graves*, p. 112.
 43. Montagu to Pepys, August 14, 1781, mo4069; Montagu to Pepys, November 3, 1781, mo4070; Montagu to Vesey, March 18 & 20, 1782, mo6572; Blunt, “Queen of the Blues,” p. 2.165.
 44. Montagu to Hardwicke, December 21, [1776], mo6816.

6. Transmediations

1. John Brown, *A Description of the Lake at Keswick (and the Adjacent Country) in Cumberland* (Newcastle, 1767). I am quoting from the earliest printed version of the letter, as transcribed by Donald D. Eddy in “John Brown: ‘The Columbus of Keswick,’” in “A Supplement to Honor Arthur Friedman,” *Modern Philology* 73, no. 4, pt. 2 (1976), S74–84 (at S80), because the original manuscript has disappeared.
2. Thomas Amory, *The Life of John Buncl, Esq.*, 2 vols. (London, 1756 and 1766), pp. 1.164–65.
3. Grey’s mode of announcing her arrival at Yarmouth, while playful, illustrates the relative uniqueness of this experience for women, even of the aristocracy, at the time: “For I too Madam have seen the Sea, I have been within Eight hours sail of Holland, & could not possibly suffer you any longer to boast of your Travels & despise your Ignorant Inland Acquaintance, upon the strength of having view’d that narrow Canal that parts Dover & Calais” (August 2, 1750, BLARS L 30/21/3/8, f. 3). Earlier correspondence reveals Grey staying home while her husband travels to the North or to the Continent.

4. John Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), p. 633.
5. See, for example, Malcolm Andrews, *The Search for the Picturesque: Landscape Aesthetics and Tourism in Britain, 1760–1800* (Aldershot, UK: Scolar, 1989), pp. 153–95; John Whale, “Romantics, Explorers, and Picturesque Travellers,” in *The Politics of the Picturesque: Literature, Landscape and Aesthetics Since 1770*, ed. Stephen Copley and Peter Garside (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 174–95; Ian Ousby, *The Englishman’s England: Taste, Travel and the Rise of Tourism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), ch. 4.
6. Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination*, pp. 630–33, 658–61; Barbara Korte, *English Travel Writing from Pilgrimages to Postcolonial Explorations*, trans. Catherine Mathias (Houndmills, UK: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin’s, 2000), pp. 70–80; Zoë Kinsley, *Women Writing the Home Tour, 1682–1812* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), part 3.
7. See James Buzard, *The Beaten Track: European Tourism, Literature, and the Ways to Culture, 1800–1918* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993); Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination*, pp. 651–61.
8. Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination*, pp. 633–34.
9. Thorburn and Jenkins, “Introduction,” *Rethinking Media Change*, p. 11; Susan Lamb, *Bringing Travel Home to England: Tourism, Gender, and Imaginative Literature in the Eighteenth Century* (Newark, NJ: University of Delaware Press, 2009), p. 12. Kinsley’s *Women Writing the Home Tour* is notable for its extensive discussions of manuscript travel writing by women.
10. Grey, August 2, 1750, BLARS L 30/21/3/9, p. 27; Yorke’s domestic travel journals are included in Godber, *The Marchioness Grey*, pp. 125–63.
11. Montagu to Portland, August 23, [1747], mo423; see also Sarah Scott to Montagu, August 19, [1747], in *The Letters of Sarah Scott*, ed. Nicole Pohl (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2014), pp. 1.86–90, obviously responding to an account of the same incident (she makes similar use of descriptions of a journey to Wilton in the fall of 1747 and to Sheep Leas in the summer of 1755); Edward Montagu to Montagu, [c. July 30, 1757], mo1887; Montagu to Edward Montagu, [c. July 30, 1757], mo2334.
12. Montagu to Lyttelton, July 14, [1757], mo1382 (transcription taken from Montagu, *Letters of Montagu*, pp. 4.265–66, where the letter is mistakenly dated 1760); Montagu to Lyttelton, October 3, 1760, mo1401 (transcription taken from *Letters of Montagu*, pp. 4.304–5).
13. Daniel Defoe, *A Tour thro’ the Whole Island of Great-Britain*, ed. G. D. H. Cole, 2 vols. (London: Peter Davies, 1927), title-page, pp. 1.1, 1.4, 1.168–69, 1.3, 2.679.
14. Daniel Defoe, *A Tour*, 3rd ed. (London, 1742), pp. 1. iii–iv, 3.228, 3.231; see also 1st ed., pp. 2.678–79.

15. Daniel Defoe, *A Tour*, 4th ed. (London, 1748), pp. i.v–vi.
16. Samuel Richardson, *Pamela*, ed. Mark Kinkead-Weekes, 2 vols. (London: Dent, 1962), pp. 2.419, 2.435–37. Lamb argues that Pamela’s tourism, far from democratizing in its import, “illustrates how fundamental [Richardson] believed [tourism] was to the British elite” (pp. 2.306).
17. William Gilpin, *Dialogue upon the Gardens of the Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Cobham, at Stowe in Buckinghamshire* (London, 1748), pp. 1, 45. Gilpin’s first aesthetic treatise on picturesque beauty was the anonymous *Essay on Prints*, published in 1768; in 1781 his authorship of the *Essay* was revealed in its third edition, and he went on in 1782 to publish his *Observations on the River Wye . . . Relative Chiefly to Picturesque Beauty*, followed by a series of such travel books, including one on Cumberland and Westmorland in 1786.
18. Gilpin, *Dialogue*, pp. 48–51.
19. Gilpin, *Dialogue*, pp. 51, 24–25.
20. Bower to Charles Lyttelton, August 26, 1755, Hagley MS, 2, fol. 263^r, as quoted in Eddy, S78.
21. See, for example, Esther Moir, *The Discovery of Britain: The English Tourists, 1540–1840* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964), p. 139, and Ousby, *Englishman’s England*, p. 143; Andrews, following Eddy, notes the earlier composition and circulation of the letter, but focuses on its print publication and content (*Search for the Picturesque*, pp. 158–59, 177–80).
22. Richard Cumberland, *Odes* (London, 1776), pp. 4–6; see James E. Crimmins, “John Brown, s.v.” *ODNB*, for a helpful account of Brown’s networks, including the Yorke introduction to Lyttelton.
23. In speaking of the “Lyttelton coterie” I wish to distinguish the Hagley-centred family group, which centrally included Lyttelton’s brother Charles, from the Montagu–Lyttelton coterie. Charles was peripherally associated with the latter and in 1757 not only visited Montagu at her country estate of Sandford, but would, according to his brother George, have proposed to her if Mr. Montagu had been dead (Lyttelton to Montagu, October 28, [1757], mo1274). Ultimately, however, Charles’s primary social allegiances seem to have been to his own antiquarian circles.
24. Lyttelton to Bower, July 14, 1755, mo1266. The 1774 printed version differs from both the manuscripts I have looked at in ways that suggest it was produced either as an amalgam of several copies or from an entirely different manuscript. Wyndham’s 1781 title page announces “To which is added, an account of a journey into Wales, by George, Lord Lyttelton”; the letter texts seem to have been taken from the *Works*. Christine Gerrard, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. “Lyttelton, George, 1st Baron Lyttelton (1709–1773).”

25. Lyttelton to Bower, July 6, 1755, mor1267; Kim Michasiw, “Nine Revisionist Theses on the Picturesque,” *Representations* 38 (1992), 76–100 (at 82–83). For Michasiw, the outcome is a mode of discourse attractive to a very specific audience – “a class sufficiently affluent to travel but unlikely to possess lands sufficient to the acting out of improving fantasies” (94). For Michasiw, this is the lower gentry, but I would include as well prosperous urbanites such as Robert Dodsley, as well as those who could afford to read but not to travel.
26. John Dalton, *A Descriptive Poem Addressed to Two Young Ladies at Their Return from Viewing the Mines Near Whitehaven* (London, 1755), pp. iv–v, 16–17n, 22n, 25n, 26. Dalton had already proven adept at gaining patronage by the time of the *Descriptive Poem*; he had in fact been tutor to the only son of the Duchess of Hertford, later Duchess of Somerset, and was scandalously associated with Shenstone’s friend Lady Luxborough, leading to her exile at Barrels.
27. Amory, *Life of John Bunclie*, p. 2.267; *The Monthly Review* 35 (July 1766), 34; *The Monthly Review* 15 (December 1756), 585–86; *The Critical Review* 2 (October 1756), 219; *The Critical Review* 21 (June 1766), 470.
28. Anna Letitia Barbauld, “The Origin and Progress of Novel-Writing,” in *Anna Letitia Barbauld: Selected Poetry and Prose*, ed. William McCarthy and Elizabeth Kraft (Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 2002), pp. 402–3; *The Critical Review* 42 (October 1776), 319; Amory, *Life of John Bunclie*, p. 2.213. Amory’s status as an outsider to elite circles is indicated by his error in referring to the Misses Lowther of Dalton’s poem as “the late excellent Lord Lonsdale’s charming daughters”; the 3rd Viscount Lonsdale had died unmarried.
29. “Advertisement” to *A Catalogue of the Antiquities, Houses, Parks, Plantations, Scenes, and Situations in England and Wales, Arranged According to the Alphabetical Order of the Several Counties*, by Thomas Gray ([London] [1773]), pp. iii–iv. The 120-page booklet is in fact simply a list, alphabetized by county, of the sorts of attractions named in the title – an even more skeletal travel record than those of Philip Yorke discussed above.
30. Arthur Young, *A Six Months’ Tour through the North of England* (London, 1770), p. xi; *The Monthly Review* 42 (April 1770), 257–63.
31. Young, *A Six Months’ Tour*, pp. iv–vii, xv, xxiv–xxv.
32. Thomas Pennant, *A Tour in Scotland*. MDCCLXIX (Chester, 1771), p. 287; Pennant, *Additions to the Quarto Edition of the Tour in Scotland, MDCCLXIX* (London, 1774), pp. iii–v.
33. Pennant, *A Tour in Scotland, and Voyage to the Hebrides; MDCCLXXII* (Chester, 1774), pp. iii–v.
34. Andrews, *Search for the Picturesque*, p. 158; Thomas West, *A Guide to the Lakes: Dedicated to the Lovers of Landscape Studies, and to All Who have Visited,*

or *Intend to Visit the Lakes in Cumberland, Westmorland, and Lancashire* (London and Kendal, 1778), pp. 1–2; [William Cockin], preface to *A Guide to the Lakes: Dedicated to the Lovers of Landscape Studies, and to All Who have Visited, or Intend to Visit the Lakes in Cumberland, Westmorland, and Lancashire*, by Thomas West, 2nd ed. (London and Kendal, 1780), pp. v, n.p., iii. West's own primary credential was his status as a well-known local antiquarian; this "local knowledge" allows him to "verif[y] by repeated observations" everything noticed by previous travellers, and therefore to correct their writings while "reliev[ing] the traveller from the burthen of dull and tedious information on the road, or at the inn, that frequently embarasses, and often misguides" (p. 3). The increasing authority of such specialized knowledge is reflected in Pennant's 1772 *Tour*, already noted, and in the 1778 eighth edition of Defoe's *Tour*, discussed below.

35. "Advertisement" to *A Supplement to the Tour through Great-Britain, containing a Catalogue . . . By the Late Mr. Gray, Author of the Elegy written in a Country Church-Yard, etc., by Thomas Gray* (London, 1787), pp. iv–v.
36. Thomas Gray, *The Poems of Mr. Gray. To Which are Prefixed Memoirs of His Life and Writings by W. Mason, M. A.* (York, 1775), pp. 271, 359, 376, 272, 351, 377.
37. Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination*, p. 653; "Preface" to *A Tour through the Island of Great Britain*, 8th ed. (London, 1778), n.p.
38. James Mulvihill, "Amory's *John Buncl*e and Wordsworth's *Excursion*," *Notes and Queries* 235 (1990), 25–26.
39. Acland, "Introduction," p. xxiii; Nicola J. Watson, *The Literary Tourist: Readers and Places in Romantic and Victorian Britain* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 13; Watson is referring broadly to acts of homage to dead authors.

7. Literary sociability in the eighteenth-century personal miscellany

1. Brotherton Lt 119, ff. 101–2. In this chapter's discussion of manuscript miscellanies, only quotations from poems and remarkable headnotes will be cited with specific reference to folio numbers; general descriptions of contents, such as poem titles, will be referenced only by manuscript number.
2. Margaret J.M., Ezell "Invisible Books," in *Producing the Eighteenth-Century Book: Writers and Publishers in England, 1650–1800*, ed. Laura L. Runge and Pat Rogers (Newark, NJ: University of Delaware Press, 2009), pp. 53–69 (at p. 55).
3. Earle Havens, *Commonplace Books: A History of Manuscripts and Printed Books from Antiquity to the Twentieth Century* (New Haven, CT: Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, 2001), p. 9; David Allan,

- Commonplace Books and Reading in Georgian England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 25–34 (at p. 34); Peter Beal, “Notions in Garrison,” p. 146; Ann Blair and Peter Stallybrass, “Mediating Information, 1450–1800,” in *This is Enlightenment*, ed. Clifford Siskin and William Warner (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), pp. 139–63 (at p. 139).
4. Harold Love, “How Personal is a Personal Miscellany? Sarah Cowper, Martin Clifford and ‘the Buckingham Commonplace Book,’” in *Order and Connexion: Studies in Bibliography and Book History*, ed. R.C. Alston (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1997), pp. 111–26 (at 112).
 5. In this my study parallels the approach of Stephen Colclough, who has examined the 1715–16 diary of Dudley Ryder for what it reveals about his communal reading practices (*Consuming Texts: Readers and Reading Communities, 1697–1890* [Houndmills and NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007], pp. 68–74); Oliver Pickering, “The BCMSV Database: A Progress Report and a Case Story,” *Library Review* 44.3 (1995), 24–31 (at 25).
 6. The model of the monthly “magazine,” established by Edward Cave with *The Gentleman’s Magazine* in 1731, was that of offering extracts of the best of the past month’s publications, although, as Tierney points out, many “magazines” of the later eighteenth-century were literary miscellanies or special-interest publications more than selections from a wide range of sources and types of information (“Periodicals and the Trade, 1695–1780,” pp. 479–97). For the increase in newspapers and magazines, see Tierney and also C.Y. Ferdinand, “Newspapers and the Sale of Books in the Provinces” in the same volume, pp. 434–47.
 7. Colclough, *Consuming Texts*, p. 34 (qtg. Love, “Personal Miscellany,” p. 126). Laura Runge, in “From Manuscript to Print and Back Again: Two Verse Miscellanies by Eighteenth-century Women,” *Literary Manuscripts: 17th and 18th Century Poetry from the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds*, www.literarymanuscriptsleeds.amdigital.co.uk, n.p. also takes an interest in how literary sociability is reflected in verse miscellanies (her preferred term). In a comparison of the Mary Capell book with a later miscellany, Runge notes the development of a reliance on previously printed materials, but emphasizes anthologies rather than periodical publications as the source of poems.
 8. Allan, “Sonnets of Hayley,” 159–80.
 9. Susan E. Whyman, *The Pen and the People: English Letter Writers 1660–1800* (Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 9–11, 6, 10, 161–217.
 10. For discussions of the social contexts and settings that tended to foster the production of manuscript poetry, see Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1995),

chs. 1 and 2; Love, *Scribal Publication*, ch. 5; and Colclough, *Consuming Texts*, pp. 68–74. These contexts may explain the tendency of personal miscellanies to favor poetry that has disappeared from even most specialists' knowledge – such as Lyttelton's 1747 monody on the death of his wife, Sarah Lewis's 1752 "Advice to a Young Lady lately married," *The Jesuit's Creed*, a clever piece which allows for alternative Church of England or Roman Catholic readings, and six anonymous lines on the Duchess of Marlborough's offer of £500 for an elogium on her late husband the Duke—*pace* Allan's claims about commonplace books as records of canon-making (p. 212). Runge has similarly noted the minority representation of canonical poets in the Capell collection, as well as the fact that such poems as do represent Pope and Gray, for example, are what are considered minor works (np).

- II. Although it might at first glance seem odd that I have not included multiple writing hands as a sign of coterie activity, a single compiling hand is much more common, even in cases where the productions of several members of a group are being recorded. Multiple hands, by contrast, occur most often in sequence, indicating the takeover of the book by another compiler, or in the form of interjections among the entries by a main hand, indicating a subsequent writer's use of a leftover half-page to enter material of their own. In other words, they tend to indicate sequential inscription rather than contemporaneity. This is not to say, however, that hands are always easily distinguishable or that intermingled hands do not, in some cases, indicate a book's simultaneous use by more than one individual. In Brotherton Lt 99, discussed below, the two hands seem to be contemporaneous and display very similar interests in their selections; the book has therefore been discussed as one act of compilation.
12. Although these poems are catalogued as anonymous, Capell attributes them to "Ld C—y."
13. Runge, n.p.
14. Capell to Birch, November 25, 1756, Add. MS 4302, f. 58.
15. See Edwards to Yorke, August 10, 1745, sending his sonnets to date, Add. MS 35605, f. 239, and Edwards to Wray, May 1, 1749, Ms. Bodl. 1011, f.126, referring to the Warburton sonnet; the former appears also in Birch's commonplace collection, in Add. MS 4457, f. 144.
16. See Grey to Talbot, n.d., BLARS L 30/21/3/4; Charlotte Capell to Grey, October 4, 1748, BLARS L30/9/21/1; Capell to Birch, August 31, 1751 and September 7, 1756, Add. MS 4302, ff. 44–46; Godber, *The Marchioness Grey*, pp. 105–6.
17. Brotherton Lt 119, ff. 103 and 106.
18. Margaret Yorke, Philip's younger sister, married Sir Gilbert Heathcote in 1749.

19. Birch to Mary Capell, August 24, 1751 and Mary Capell to Birch, August 31, 1751, Add. MS 4302, ff. 43–44. Capell's volume in the Brotherton Collection does not, in fact, contain the prose items she refers to, suggesting that the original book into which the manuscripts sent by Birch were copied was an intermediate collection of more miscellaneous materials that were then culled or sorted, perhaps by genre. Nevertheless, there is a direct connection between the book spoken of here and the surviving volume; for example, the three penultimate items (before the Lady Mary Montagu poem which ends the volume) are the Edwards sonnet to Lady Grey, dated 1751, the "Ode. By Miss M—soe," also dated 1751, and the poem of Margaret Yorke Heathcote. Follow-up correspondence with Brotherton Library staff has confirmed that the chain lines of Lt 119 are horizontal, as they would be for a true quarto volume, but that the book is in fact compiled from "a collection of unbound parts," suggesting a flexibility of contents over time (Karen Mee, private correspondence, July 29, 2014).
20. The chronological gap between manuscript circulation and print publication in Mulso's case, discussed in the first chapters of this study, is typical for items in Capell's miscellany. For further discussion of this temporal separation, see Runge, "Manuscript and Print," n.p.
21. Bodl. Ms. Eng. Poet c.9. A search of the *Eighteenth-Century Collections Online* database turns up a Thomas Phillibrown who subscribed to George Brown's *The History of the First Planting the Christian Religion* (1735) and to Henry Groves' *A System of Moral Philosophy* in 1749 (to which John Hawkins also subscribed). The Prerogative Court of Canterbury records the proving of the will of a Thomas Phillibrown, cooper, of Saint Botolph without Bishopsgate, London, on June 15, 1764, and the birth registry of dissenters begun in 1743 lists the 1751 London birth of a Thomas Phillibrown, perhaps the son of our compiler (Thomas Phillibrown, Esq., of Hackney subscribed to the Protestant Dissenters' Charity School in 1788). It should be noted also that dating in the volume, as well as its index, indicates that the recto-side (odd-numbered) pages were filled in sequence first, and then the verso pages, beginning again at the front of the volume. Thus folio 249 precedes folio 80, for example.
22. The first event marked by Phillibrown's own presence offers a good example. It is an account of the death of George I in Germany, followed by his report on the proclamation of the new king George II on June 14, 1727: "I my Self went to ye Royal Exchange that Night thinking his Majesty would have been proclaim'd but with many other were disappointed." When the proclamation is made at Leicester-House, Charing Cross, Temple-Bar, Cheapside, and the Royal Exchange on the 15th, "This Day I being to return in ye Afternoon to my Boarding School at Mrs Waters's, had not an opportunity to see the

- Proclamation” (Bodl. Ms. Eng. Hist. c.50, f.39). Colclough discusses a parallel example of a London excise man and staymaker, John Dawson, who uses the second edition of Salmon’s chronology in similar fashion (*Consuming Texts*, pp. 83–86).
23. For a perspective on this period from a position much like that of Phillibrown, see ch. 2 of John Hawkins’ *Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* and the author’s accompanying notes, which include brief accounts of Browne and Webb (Ed. Bertram H. Davis [London: Jonathan Cape, 1962]).
 24. Bodl. Ms. Eng. Poet. c.9, ff. 22; 249; 80; 69; Beyond such puffing of Stanley’s instrumental music, John Hawkins wrote the texts for many of the famous organist and composer’s songs and cantatas.
 25. Bodl. Ms. Eng. Poet. c.9, ff. 81; 13 (the article is “Of the unhappy Self-Murder of Mrs. Fanny Braddock at Bath,” *The Gentleman’s Magazine* 1 [September 1081731], 397). Insider knowledge in the Sheridan case is suggested by the fact that the magazine heads the page of poetry with an apology to “Mr. Bardus” for not being able to print more out of its “Store” of poems from Dublin (*Gentleman’s Magazine* 5 [January 1735], 48).
 26. Ms. Bodl. Eng. Poet. c.9, f. 107.
 27. Ezell, “The *Gentleman’s Journal*,” 340.
 28. Ms. Bodl. Eng. Poet. c.9, f. 12. Phillibrown also records Browne’s diplomatic conclusion that both poems are “Improvements of the Drs [i.e. of Donne’s].”
 29. Ms. Bodl. Eng. Poet. c.9, f. 230.
 30. Latour, *Reassembling the Social*.
 31. Bodl. Ms. Eng. Poet. e.28, “To Miss Arabella Bate – 1768 by Miss S Bate,” ff. 191–92. Although the latter portion of the book contains poems copied in different hands and extending beyond 1768, the first few poems in this second section continue the explicit Peart connection, being attributed to Joshua. My discussion will focus on the identifiable Peart-Bate materials in the book, comprising just over 300 folio pages.
 32. Bodl. Ms. Eng. Poet. e.28, ff. 141; 250.
 33. This pair of poems is found in Lyttelton’s hand in the Montagu Collection, as m01264.
 34. Bodl. Ms. Eng. Poet. e.48, f. 82. This same poem is applied by Scriblerus to Eliza Chapman, as discussed below.
 35. Brotherton Lt 99, ff. 82v-83; John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, 6 vols. (London, 1812), pp. 4.148–49. Another item strongly suggesting direct access to a non-print source is the Latin epitaph of George Lyttelton to his first wife Lucy, erected at Hagley soon after her death in 1747, which is entered with the note “Extract apud Hagley Iulii Die 12^{mo} 1765,” presumably the date that the compiler visited Hagley and recorded the epitaph as a souvenir (f. 65).

36. The books are Bodl. Ms. Montagu e.14, belonging to Eliza Chapman, and Brotherton Lt 100.
37. Bodl. Ms. Montagu e.14, ff. 46v–47.
38. Ms. Bodl. Mont. e.14, f. 47v.
39. Brotherton Lt 100, f. 57v; because of the mode of entry described in this paragraph, the folio numbering as continued from the start of the volume means that for the second half of the volume the span of folios for individual poems runs in descending order.
40. Brotherton Lt 100, ff. 56v; ff. 50–49v; f. 14.
41. Brotherton Lt 100, f. 53v; f. 52v; f. 51.
42. Brotherton Lt 100, f. 55; Allan, *Commonplace Books*, pp. 226–36 (at p. 236).
43. Brotherton Lt. 100, ff. 34–34v.

Conclusion

1. Michael McKeon, *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private, and the Division of Knowledge* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), p. 64.
2. Ezell, *Social Authorship*, p. 17; Benedict, “The Paradox,” p. 234; Gitelman, *Always Already New*, p. 2.